Asesorías y Tutorías para la Investigación Científica en la Educación Puig-Salabarría S.C.
José María Pino Suárez 400-2 esq a Lerdo de Tejada. Toluca, Estado de México. 7223893475
RFC: ATI120618V12

Revista Dilemas Contemporáneos: Educación, Política y Valores.
http://www.dilemascontemporaneoseducacionpoliticayvalores.com/
Año: VII Número: Edición Especial Artículo no.:92 Período: Noviembre, 2019.

TÍTULO: Actividad innovadora de la personalidad.

AUTORES:

1. Assoc. Prof. Zhanylsyn Sabirova.

2. Assoc. Prof. Nurzhaugan Zhumasheva.

3. Master. Gulmira Mussina.

4. Master. Zhanar Bekzhanova.

5. Master. stud. Stud. Alfiya Adiyeva.

6. Master. stud. Zulfazar Bulkanova.

7. Master. stud. Gaukhar Smayeva.

8. Master. stud. Zhazira Kuttybaeva.

RESUMEN: Los autores de este artículo llevaron a cabo un análisis teórico de dos enfoques para el estudio de la actividad innovadora del individuo (conductual y organizacional). Se consideran dos formas de actividad innovadora de una persona: comportamiento y actividad. Se destacan las principales escuelas de investigación extranjeras y nacionales sobre el problema de la actividad innovadora del individuo. Los siguientes son los mecanismos psicológicos básicos de la actividad innovadora de una persona, como el locus de control, identificación, equilibrio dinámico.

PALABRAS CLAVES: comportamiento, equilibrio dinámico, actividad, actividad innovadora de una persona, identificación.

TITLE: Innovative activity of personality.

AUTHORS:

1. Assoc. Prof. Zhanylsyn Sabirova.

2. Assoc. Prof. Nurzhaugan Zhumasheva.

3. Master. Gulmira Mussina.

4. Master. Zhanar Bekzhanova.

5. Master. stud. Stud. Alfiya Adiyeva.

6. Master. stud. Zulfazar Bulkanova.

7. Master. stud. Gaukhar Smayeva.

8. Master. stud. Zhazira Kuttybaeva.

ABSTRACT: The authors of this article carried out a theoretical analysis of two approaches to the study of the innovative activity of the individual (behavioral and organizational). Two forms of innovative activity of a person are considered: behavior and activity. The main foreign and domestic research schools on the problem of innovative activity of the individual are highlighted. The following are the basic psychological mechanisms of innovative activity of a person such as locus of control, identification, dynamic balance.

KEY WORDS: behavior, dynamic balance, activity, innovative activity of a person, identification.

INTRODUCTION.

The modern idea of nature, sources, forms and types, content and mechanisms, formation and manifestations of human activity is based on an analysis of the results of theoretical and experimental studies of problems of behavior and activity.

The main difference between activity and behavior is the presence of a specific goal that the subject faces. It is the presence of a motive that distinguishes such activity and makes it unique. Activity is a system of targeted actions that are subordinate to each other, have a motive, subject, and means.

Besides, the creature's behavior can only be external, while activity can also be internal (thinking, scientific work). Manifestations of activity types also differ.

Behavior is always aimed at satisfying biological needs, and activity is also at fulfilling socio-cultural needs. In science, there is an opinion that it was they who predetermined the development of man and had a significant impact on him.

Activity is the dominant type of activity in people, while the behavior is more characteristic of other living beings that are not endowed with consciousness. There are certain similarities between these categories. So, both behavior and activity are aimed at changing the initial matter, the implementation of certain tasks, the solution of which is very important for the subject of activity.

Thus, the difference between activity and behavior is as follows:

- Awareness. Human activity is always conscious, while the behavior is spontaneous and acts as a reaction to stimuli.

- Levels. Human activity is internal and external, behavior - only external.

- Motivation. Activity is focused, while the behavior may be devoid of any purpose.

- Manifestation. The behavior of a living creature is expressed in a single act, a response to an irritant. An activity is an organized system led by a specific goal.

- Stimulus. The basic need for behavior is the presence of internal needs, that is, instincts. Activities can also be determined by cultural, social needs.

Activity is an integral property and condition of any living organism, including humans. Without activity, a person cannot exist either as a biological being or as a member of society. So, the representatives of the activity approach consider the phenomenon of activity through the prism of

the problem of activity. So, A.N. Leontyev (2004) considers the activity as an internal prerequisite for the self-movement of activity. S.L. Rubinstein (2000) by activity means the general characteristic of the subject, playing the role of a mediator between the acts of the individual and the requirements of society. In the works of S.L. Rubinstein's problem of activity is considered in close connection with the internal determination of behavior. According to the position of the author, a person consciously transforms the world. In the conscious activity of a person, his activity is manifested. Thus, put forward by S.L. Rubinstein's principle, according to which external influences are refracted through the internal position of a person, opposed notions of the fatal predetermination of activity on the part of external influences, as well as the interpretation of activity as a special force independent of the interaction of the subject with the external environment.

A.V. Petrovsky, M.G. Yaroshevsky (1996) defining activity as "the active state of the subject", note that it is determined internally, from the side of his relationship to the world, and is realized outside, in the processes of behavior.

According to A.K. Abulkhanova-Slavskaya (1991, p. 41), "the fundamental difference between activity and activity is that activity comes from the need for an object, and activity from the need for activity". Activity determines activity (its motives, goals, orientation, desire (or unwillingness) to carry out the activity, that is, it is a driving force, a source of awakening in a person of his "dormant potentials." Thus, activity seems to precede activity in time, "activity is caused by the need for activity, represents the battle is the highest-level concerning activity" (Abulkhanova-Slavskaya, 1991, p. 43).

Despite some peculiarities in understanding the role and place of activity in the life of an individual within the framework of various currents of the activity approach, the following provisions are generally recognized: 1) on the decisive role of internal psychological factors of an individual's

activity, in comparison with the external conditions for the manifestation of activity; 2) on the activity of the personality as a determinant of its self-movement, self-development.

DEVELOPMENT.

An important issue is the motive forces of an individual's activity, i.e. about the mechanism that starts the process of self-propulsion. In domestic psychological science, many researchers adhere to the point of view that the driving force of the process of self-development of the personality, the initiation of its activity is intrapersonal contradictions (K.A. Abulkhanova-Slavskaya, A.I. Antsiferova, A.G. Asmolov, G. S. Kostyuk, A.N. Leontyev, V.D. Shadrikov, etc.). These theoretical positions are based on the dialectical approach, according to which "a contradiction is the root of all movement and vitality, only because something has a contradiction in itself, it moves, has an impulse to activity" (Gegel, 1997). So, A.G. Asmolov (1990) notes that "manifestations of an individual's activity do not arise as a result of any initial push caused by certain needs.

The search for the "engine" that gives rise to the activity of the individual must be sought in those contradictions that arise in the process of activity, which is the driving force behind the development of the personality". A.I. Krupnov (1984) considering the driving forces of activity, defines them as contradictions that arise in the process of interaction of internal and external factors, in the course of the implementation of activity. V.D. Shadrikov (1996), the main contradiction initiating the activity of the individual, considers the contradiction between the individual's abilities and the requirements of activity. Thus, the driving force of an individual's activity is the intrapersonal contradictions that arise in the process of carrying out activities.

Table 1. Main approaches to the study of innovative activity of the individual.

	Behavioral	**Organizational**
Subject of study	Characteristics of personality traits and individual behavior (activities).	Organizational characteristics
Subject of innovation	Personality	Firm
Main directions	- creative behavior - innovative labor behavior - entrepreneurial behavior	- corporate entrepreneurship - innovation control systems - organizational innovation

Appeal to the problems of innovative activity becomes impossible without a preliminary analysis, systematization, and classification of methodological premises, teaching methods and empirical results accumulated by representatives of various schools and areas.

A wide range of concepts is used to study the innovative activity of a person in world literature. Most of them, one way or another, are based on the term “behavior”. Accordingly, the concepts arise such as innovative behavior, entrepreneurial behavior, innovative organizational behavior, creative work behavior, etc.

Two approaches to the study of the innovative activity of the personality can be distinguished such as a behavioral approach and organizational approach.

For representatives of the behavioral approach, the innovator is the personality itself. For them, issues of individual creativity of a person (T. Amabail), personal activity in the development and implementation of innovative ideas (M. Basadur), or the receptivity of the closest organizational environment of the innovator to the proposed improvements (O. Jansen) become central.

This approach is represented primarily by American experts in the field of so-called “creative behavior” (Harvard School led by Theresa Amabile), researchers of “innovative labor behavior” (O. Jansen and others), as well as experts in the field of “entrepreneurial behavior” (D. Kuratko and others).

Representatives of the second, organizational approach, believe that innovation is, ultimately, the product of the company that is responsible for it. Within the framework of the organizational approach, we distinguish several areas such as corporate entrepreneurship, organizational innovation, innovation control systems. Research by proponents of this approach combines an interest in structural methods for the development and implementation of innovations (Basadur & Hausdorf, 1996).

Despite the need to study innovation from both points of view, in this paper we will focus on the first approach. There are three reasons for this:

1) Today in domestic social psychology there are serious methodological and methodological developments in the field of innovation (S.R. Yagolkovsky, A.D. Karnyshev, V.E. Klochko, and others). First of all, it is necessary to note the contribution of the Department of Social and Economic Psychology of Baykalsky State University of Economics and Law, which systematized and developed a system of basic methodological principles and methodological techniques for studying the psychology of innovation, innovative interaction within business organizations (Karnyshev, 2009; Klochko & Galazhinsky, 2009; Yagolkovsky, 2010).

2) It seems to us that it is at the level of stable practices of the behavior of subjects of innovative activity that we can achieve the most serious results in the analysis of the reasons for the underdeveloped innovative potential of the individual. To this assumption, we are led by studies conducted by the Department of Social and Economic Psychology. The study showed that innovative personality behavior manifests itself at the level of everyday socio-psychological interaction.

3) Social psychology is focused on research not so much on organizational forms of promoting innovation as on the study of the role of the individual, individual efforts in generating useful innovations. Of course, organizational forms of innovation development are more abstract.

Meanwhile, the people responsible for the development of innovations in the company are specific people who, through their activity, zeal, and difficulty, produce new things (Terekhova, 2012, 2013).

The study of this problem area is impossible without solving some questions: What is an innovative activity (behavior, activity, etc.) of an individual? What are its main indicators? How to measure it?

Let us analyze the achievements and achievements of the representatives of the behavioral approach in the study of innovation.

1) Harvard School for the Study of Creative Behavior (T. Amabile) developed and justified a three-factor model of creative behavior. Factors that determine the creative potential of an individual at an individual level are described through three core components:

a) Skill level.

b) Creative abilities (general ability to generate new).

c) The motivational structure of the personality.

The main attention of the authors focuses on the study of the third factor: the motivational structure of the personality. T. Amabail and colleagues show that depending on how much a particular type of motivation (external or internal) dominates in the work of the individual, fundamentally different basic conditions are formed for the manifestation of creative behavior. In the case of the prevalence of external motivation (associated, for example, with financial reward or with career growth), the creative abilities of an employee have a significantly lower chance of realization than in a situation where they are exclusively motivated by the interest in the process of the activity. Of particular note are the studies of this group of scientists on the role of the organization's internal competitive environment as a factor in innovation activity.

It is shown that in a situation where a person receives either high encouragement (when implementing a particular project, solving a specific problem, etc.) or a significant punishment (in the opposite case) - his creativity is sharply inhibited. In this case, traditional, perhaps less effective, but guaranteed from failure methods, methods of work, etc. come to the fore (Kramer & Amabile, 2011).

The Harvard School of studying innovative (creative) behavior is distinguished by two features:

- Strong socio-psychological emphasis.
- A specific understanding of innovative behavior.

Indeed, the authors make extensive use of psychological tests and techniques. The advantage of this approach is the ability to measure such a complex parameter as the employee's creative abilities.

Another feature arising from the first is a specific understanding of innovative behavior. The concepts of "innovative" and "creative" are not strictly separated. Any new decision or idea of an employee, one way or another related to the implementation of his professional duties, is considered "innovative". At the same time, the employee's activity in promoting the innovative proposals of other employees, or the employee's activity in introducing, applying someone else's idea into life, is not considered as innovative behavior (Abykanova, Bilyalova, Makhatova, Idrissov, & Nugumanova, 2016).

2) Research on innovative work behavior. Another area of research, whose representatives made a significant contribution to the study of innovative activity of the individual, is concentrated in the Netherlands and the main subject of their research is the so-called Innovative Work Behavior (E. Wilson-Evered, G. Van der Vegt, J. Rank, N. Nelson, and others). Of particular importance for the development of this problem area are the works of O. Janssen (2005).

This group of scientists sees the activity of the employee as a source of innovation. However, unlike the American school, O. Janssen, M. Revers, and others determine innovative behavior not only through the creativity of the actions performed by the employee but also through the useful participation of the employee in creating innovation. Thus, the definition of innovative behavior includes four different aspects:

- Employee discovery of a new opportunity.
- Generation of a new idea.
- Promotion of a new idea.
- Implementation of innovative solutions in the life of the organization. Implementation is understood as the transformation of innovative practices of behavior, structural education, technological solutions, etc. into a standard element of the production process.

A new look at the definition of innovative behavior is one of the main advantages of researchers of innovative labor behavior. Of the other important achievements in this area, it should be noted:

1) Developments in the field of studying the relationship of the socio-psychological organization of relations in the company and the innovative behavior of its employees. In particular, special attention is paid to the relationship of the innovator with his environment and bosses.

2) Researchers' attention to such organizational parameters as employee autonomy, the degree of differentiation of his functional responsibilities, etc.

3) Studies of entrepreneurial behavior in an organization as a form of innovative activity (Abykanova et al., 2019a, 2019b).

The concept of "entrepreneurial behavior" only recently began to be used in scientific literature devoted primarily to "corporate entrepreneurship". Entrepreneurial behavior, as a holistic phenomenon, is understood by representatives of this direction as an innovative activity aimed at achieving goals related to the development of innovations such as increasing profitability, strategic

renewal of a company, accumulating knowledge for future changes, developing in the international arena, effectively allocating and structuring available resources. Research in this direction has only just begun, but D. Kuratko, R.D. Ireland and others, based on their research and generalization of the achievements of other researchers, have developed a theoretical model of entrepreneurial behavior of managers:

1) Prerequisites for entrepreneurial behavior.

- Independence, autonomy.

- A system of encouraging and stimulating innovative activity.

- The availability of a temporary resource.

- The organizational framework of innovation activity.

2) The manifestation of entrepreneurial behavior.

- Search, identification of innovative opportunities for the development of the organization, and control over the implementation of these opportunities.

- Identification of resource requirements for the implementation of innovative opportunities, accumulation, and use of these resources.

3) The likely consequences of entrepreneurial behavior of middle-level managers:

At the individual level: career advancement, career demotion, redistribution to another position in the organization, development of political (communication) skills, creation of a new network of social relations, material reward, conflict with more conservative members of the organization.

At the organizational level: the development of an innovative organizational culture, the formation of competitive advantages, the allocation of new market niches, economic losses, an increase in the innovative capacity of an enterprise, etc. (Abykanova, Idrissov, Saltanova, Shazhdekeyeva, & Syrbayeva, 2017).

According to the authors, a cycle is formed depending on what outweighs: the positive or negative consequences of innovative behavior, prerequisites more or less conducive to innovative activity are formed, which in turn determine the degree of profitability for the employee and the organization as a whole of innovative behavior. This topic requires further development.

Thus, several theoretical developments have been identified, which, of course, will be useful for future research. This includes, inter alia, the preparation and conduct of an empirical study of the innovative activity of the individual.

In this regard, the model of "entrepreneurial behavior" developed by D. Kuratko and others, as well as the three-factor model of creative behavior (T. Amabail and others) are of particular importance. The first sets the conceptual framework for the analysis of innovative activity considering both organizational conditions and individual personality qualities, and the second focuses on individual blocks-factors, presumably playing a decisive role in the formation of innovative behavior: qualification, motivation, creative abilities.

In the study of the problem of innovative activity as a special phenomenon, an important place is occupied by the disclosure of the mechanisms of its implementation. In the modern psychological literature, there is no single approach to determining the essence of the psychological mechanism. However, most often the psychological mechanism is defined as a "subjective description", or reflection at the subjective level of those objective processes that ensure human interaction with the environment. Moreover, the psychological mechanism is not a simple statement of these processes but rather reveals their substantial and functional characteristics. The psychological mechanism performs a regulatory function in controlling various energy levels of human interaction with the environment (Tashkeyeva, Abykanova, Sariyeva, Sadirbekova, & Marhabaeva, 2016).

Let us dwell on the analysis of the psychological mechanisms that regulate human activity in the implementation of innovations.

Psychological mechanisms have a different functional load, a different scope of their action, but they all underlie the diverse species, forms of human activity. And therefore, the identification of the nature, principles, conditions of their action are extremely important in the knowledge of the innovative activity (Abykanova, Tashkeyeva, Idrissov, Bilyalova, & Sadirbekova, 2016).

One of the important psychological mechanisms of innovative activity of the personality is the locus of control.

The emergence of the concept of "locus of control" in the psychological literature is associated with the work of J. Rotter (1954), who proposed distinguishing between people according to how they localize control over messages that are significant for themselves. The locus of control is also called the localization of control of the volitional effort. There are two extreme types of such a localization, or locus of control such as internal and external.

The internal type - a person believes that the events taking place with him primarily depend on his personal qualities and are a logical result of his innovative activity.

The external type - a person is convinced that his successes or failures are the results of external forces such as luck, chance, environmental pressure, other people, etc.

The locus of control is considered by Rotter and his followers as a special, fundamental type of generalized expectations, as "the degree to which a person understands the causal relationships between his behavior and the achievement of the desired".

Experimental data indicate that internals have more innovative activity, they, in contrast to externals, are more consistent in their behavior. They are more productive in decision-making situations and situations associated with risk, they are more willing to defer short-term, easily

accessible pleasure to achieve a remote, but more valuable good (Tashkeyeva, Abykanova, & Idrissov, 2014).

Another important psychological mechanism is identification. Identification (from Late Latin *identifico* - to identify), recognition of identity, identification of objects, identification.

Thanks to the identification mechanism, the senses, relationships, motives inherent in those people whom the person takes as a model are appropriated, an example to follow. Moreover, a person can identify himself not only with another person but also with ideals, models, social values (L.V. Popova, V.S. Mukhina, V.F. Petrenko, etc.).

Professor A.D. Karnyshev (2009) showed that innovation, on the one hand, is something new, created reality, the essence and content of which does not correspond to traditions, on the other hand, this is the influence of the minority on the majority.

Innovation, the created reality is half the battle, the main thing is to introduce innovation, turn innovation into a form of innovation, i.e. implement the innovation process and get a positive result. In this case, the identification mechanism is manifested, on the one hand, as identifying oneself with others, immersion in the world of personal meanings of the other; on the other hand, it is the creation and implementation of innovation (Abykanova, Nugumanova, Yelezhanova, Kabylkhamit, & Sabirova, 2016). At the behavioral level, it is possible to consider the mechanism of identity as a process for solving significant innovative problems.

The basic mechanism for the development of activity is the mechanism of dynamic equilibrium, which is associated with causal characteristics of dynamic processes and the stability of mental activity.

V.G. Leontyev (2002), developing mechanisms of motivation, drew attention to the presence of a certain initial generalized mechanism, which is an important link in all other motivational mechanisms. This is the mechanism of dynamic equilibrium [8]. Conducted special observations

showed that the imbalance in any system always arises after reaching equilibrium in another system connected with it. Moreover, equilibrium is the true cause of activity in various systems. The imbalance forms the desire for its restoration and generates the corresponding consequences, which is, ultimately, the source of motivation, the energy element of the activity. This is the mechanism of dynamic equilibrium. So, for example, people, having reached high in labor, begin to introduce elements of creativity or game into this process. According to these positions, people are trying to transform the process of activity so that it becomes more productive, which helps to increase the level of innovative activity.

The English psychologists M. Apter and C. Smith, by research, have established a connection between the level of activity of the subject and his hedonistic tone. According to their findings, two alternative systems control human activity. One such system helps to avoid activity - when it is active, the subject experiences the most pleasant state when the activity is minimal, and the least pleasant - at the maximum value. The second such system is, on the contrary, aimed at searching for activity. When it “acts”, the most pleasant state occurs with maximum activity (joyful or “combat” excitement; the least pleasant state with minimal activity (relaxation) (Shadrikov, 1996).

CONCLUSIONS.

M. Apter and C. Smith (1977) formulated their ideas in the theory of reverse activity, according to which, in the course of professional activity, the body can switch from one regulation system to another, with a corresponding change in hedonistic tone.

The subject deliberately will create difficulties and dangers in the activity, causing a state of “combat” excitement associated with them, as if moving along the “search” curve of activity right-up. After successfully solving the “dangerous” problem, he has a pleasant state of relaxation, which means a reverse activity - a transition from the activity search curve to the avoidance curve. Then

the subject will again have a desire to test himself on a “dangerous” task, activation will reverse to the search curve and the described process will be repeated. There is a system of innovative activity. This theory indicates the mutual transitions of balance and imbalance in related systems and that these transitions are among the main psychological conditions for the action of psychological mechanisms of activity.

Innovative activity differs from the traditional in its uncertainty and risk. The innovative activity of the personality is a systemic psychological phenomenon that includes various levels of functioning that are in complex dynamic interaction. Therefore, in the framework of this article, we analyzed the basic psychological approaches, forms, and mechanisms of innovative activity of the individual.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES.

1. Abulkhanova-Slavskaya, K. A. (1991). Strategiya zhizni [Life strategy]. Moscow.

2. Abykanova, B., Bilyalova, Z., Makhatova, V., Idrissov, S., & Nugumanova, S. (2016). Psychological and pedagogic conditions of activating creative activity in students for successful learning. International Journal of Environmental and Science Education, 11(10), 3333-3343.

3. Abykanova, B., Idrissov, S., Saltanova, G., Shazhdekeyeva, N., & Syrbayeva, S. Z. (2017). The problem of practice-oriented instruction in higher education. Revista Espacios, 38(56).

4. Abykanova, B., Nugumanova, S., Yelezhanova, S., Kabylkhamit, Z., & Sabirova, Z. (2016). The use of interactive learning technology in institutions of higher learning. International Journal of Environmental and Science Education, 11(18), 12528-12539.

5. Abykanova, B., Tashkeyeva, G., Idrissov, S., Bilyalova, Z., & Sadirbekova, D. (2016). Professional competence of a teacher in higher educational institution. International Journal of Environmental and Science Education, 11(8), 2197-2206.

6. Abykanova, T. B., Sariyeva, A. K., Bekalay, N. K., Syrbayeva, S. J., & Rustemova, A. I., & Maatkerimov, N. O. (2019a). Technology and prospects of using solar energy. News of National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Series of Geology and Technical Sciences, 3, 173-179.

7. Abykanova, B., Yelezhanova, S., Mailybayeva, A., Sadirbekova, D., Turmukhanova, G., & Kabiden, K. (2019b). Information technology in modern education. Revista Dilemas Contemporáneos: Educación, Política y Valores, 6(Special Edition).

8. Apter, M. J., & Smith, K. C. P. (1977). Humour and the theory of psychological reversals (pp. 95-100). In A. J. Chapman & H. C. Foot (Eds.). Oxford: Pergamon Press.

9. Asmolov, A. G. (1990). Psikhologiya lichnosti [Psychology of Personality]. Moscow: MGU.

10. Basadur, M., & Hausdorf, P. (1996). Measuring divergent thinking attitudes related to creative problem solving and innovation management. Creativity Research Journal, 9(1), 21-32.

11. Gegel, G. V. F. (1997). Nauka logiki [Science of logic]. Saint Petersburg.

12. Janssen, O. (2005). The Joint impact of perceived influence and supervisor supportiveness on employee innovative behaviour. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 78, 573-579.

13. Karnyshev, A. D. (2009). Ekonomicheskaya psikhologiya i soderzhatelnyy analiz innovatsiy [Economic psychology and a meaningful analysis of innovation]. In A. D. Karnyshev (Ed.), Ekonomicheskaya psikhologiya [Economic Psychology]. Irkutsk: BGUEP.

14. Klochko, V. Ye., & Galazhinskiy, E. V. (2009). Psikhologiya innovatsionnogo povedeniya [Psychology of innovative behavior]. Tomsk: Tomskiy gosudarstvennyy universitet.

15. Kramer, S., & Amabile, T. (2011). The Progress Principle. Harvard Business Review Press.

16. Krupnov, A. I. (1984). Psikhologicheskiye problemy issledovaniya aktivnosti cheloveka [Psychological problems of human activity research]. Voprosy psikhologii, 3, 25-33.

17. Leontyev, A. N. (2004). Deyatelnost. Soznaniye. Lichnost [Activity. Consciousness. Personality]. Moscow.

18. Leontyev, V. G. (2002). Motivatsiya i psikhologicheskiye mekhanizmy yeye formirovaniya [Motivation and psychological mechanisms of its formation]. Novosibirsk: Novosibirskiy poligrafkombinat.

19. Petrovskiy A. V., & Yaroshevskiy, M. G. (1996). Istoriya i teoriya psikhologii [History and theory of psychology]. Rostov-na-Donu: Feniks.

20. Rubinstein, S. L. (2000). Osnovy obshchey psikhologii [Fundamentals of General Psychology]. Saint Petersburg: Piter.

21. Shadrikov, V. D. (1996). Psikhologiya deyatelnosti i sposobnosti cheloveka [Psychology of human activity and ability]. Moscow: Logos.

22. Tashkeyeva, G., Abykanova, B., & Idrissov, S. (2014). Intensification of students' creative activity in educational environment of higher educational institutions. Life Science Journal, 11(11s), 133-137.

23. Tashkeyeva, G., Abykanova, B., Sariyeva, A., Sadirbekova, D., & Marhabaeva, A. (2016). Proceedings from 16th International Multidisciplinary Scientific GeoConference SGEM: Application of methods of interactive training in the educational environment of higher educational institutions. Sofia: Surveying Geology & Mining Ecology Management (SGEM).

24. Terekhova, T. A. (2012). Professionalnaya psikhodiagnostika [Professional psychodiagnostics]. Irkutsk: BGUEP.

25. Terekhova, T. A. (2013). Empiricheskoye issledovaniye proyavleniya innovatsionnogo potentsiala lichnosti v zavisimosti ot ispolneniya sotsialnoy roli [An empirical study of the manifestation of the innovative potential of a person depending on the performance of a social role]. Electronic journal, 2.

26. Yagolkovskiy, S. R. (2010). Psikhologiya innovatsiy. Podkhody, modeli, protsessy [Psychology of innovation. Approaches, models, processes]. Moscow: IPRAN.

DATA OF THE AUTHORS.

1. Zhanylsyn Sabirova. Associate Professor. Candidate of Psychological Sciences, Kh. Dosmukhamedov Atyrau State University, Kazakhstan. E-mail: zhanylsyn.sabirova@mail.ru

2. Nurzhaugan Zhumasheva. Associate Professor. Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Kh. Dosmukhamedov Atyrau State University, Kazakhstan. E-mail: nur_az@mail.ru

3. Gulmira Mussina. Senior Lecturer. Master of Arts, Senior Lecturer, Kh. Dosmukhamedov Atyrau State University, Kazakhstan. E-mail: Gulmi-76@mail.ru

4. Zhanar Bekzhanova. Senior Lecturer. Master of Arts, Kh. Dosmukhamedov Atyrau State University, Kazakhstan. E-mail: zhanar_b_s@mail.ru

5. Alfiya Adiyeva. Master's-degree Student, Kh. Dosmukhamedov Atyrau State University, Kazakhstan.

6. Zulfazar Bulkanova. Master's-degree Student, Kh. Dosmukhamedov Atyrau State University, Kazakhstan.

7. Gaukhar Smayeva. Master's-degree student, Kh. Dosmukhamedov Atyrau State University, Kazakhstan.

8. Zhazira Kuttybaeva. Master's-degree student, Kh. Dosmukhamedov Atyrau State University, Kazakhstan.

RECIBIDO: 8 de octubre del 2019**.** **APROBADO:** 18 de octubre del 2019.