EXPERT APPROACH IN ASSESSING PSYCHOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE FUTURE PROFESSIONAL

Abstract. The results of the analysis of self-assessing the professionally important personality traits of experts, the ratio of personal decision-making factors, indicators of reflexivity, intolerance to uncertainty and an indicator of personality type are presented. The advantage of the expert approach, areas of its use, features of application in assessing the ability of a professional to make decisions, as well as potential and future professionals, are shown. Approaches to conducting an expert assessment of a professional’s resources were assessed: modelling of situations of activity, the use of a specially organized assessment procedure, the creation of reference “images of the subject”, special requirements for the training and selection of assessment experts, including the use of independent Assessment Centres. The current state of the problems of the expert approach in assessing the components of the professional personality structure (professionally important qualities, traits of personality and personality traits), professionalization of the personality as a whole is considered. The author proved the necessity of its use in the practice of professional consulting, made a theoretical substantiation, and obtained empirical confirmation of differences in expert assessment and self-assessment of professionally important personality traits of a professional.

The relevance of the study is conditioned by the need for practice in early prediction of professionally important personality traits, in improving the efficiency of using resources and the potential of specialists, in theoretical and methodological generalization of expert approach research, in developing technological procedures and techniques for conducting expert assessment. A representative sample of examinees aged 25-47 years was formed with a total number of 75 people, two subgroups were distinguished – the first one compared expert assessment and self-assessment (31 people), the second one used an expert assessment of the integral
properties of the personality to determine the areas of self-realization of the future professional (44 people). The diagnostic results were obtained using a set of techniques: “Personal decision-making factors” by T. Kornilova; “Personality Type Indicator”, K. Briggs and I. Myers, modified by T. Shalaieva; scale “Intolerance-tolerance to uncertainty” by St. Badner; “Indicator of the social type of personality” by D. Keirsey (research version).

A description of the relationship between expert assessments and self-assessments of the properties of decision-making by a person is presented. The distinctive features of expert assessment in the forecast and self-assessment of personality traits and personality traits of a professional are shown. The direction of development of the expert approach for solving the problems of professional consulting is highlighted – the assessment and prediction of the parameters of choice and decision-making in persons with different composition of individuality indicators.
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**EKSPERTNYI PÕDHÍD V ÒCNIÞ ÏÞÞÝÝOLÓGÝÝNÝH ÏÓSCÍLIVOSTÝÊ MÀYBUÝNTÝÖGØ PROFÉSÝONÁLÁ**

**Анотація.** Наведено результати аналізу самооцінки професійно важливих властивостей особистості експертів, співвідношення особистісних факторів прийняття рішень, показників рефлексивності, інтOLERантності до невизначеності та індикатора типу особистості. Показано перевагу експертного підходу, галузі його використання, особливості застосування при оцінці здатності професіонала приймати рішення, а також потенційних майбутніх професіоналів. Оцінено підходи до проведення експертної оцінки ресурсів професіонала: моделювання ситуацій діяльності, використання спеціально організованої процедури оцінки, створення еталонних «образів суб’єкта», спеціальні вимоги щодо підготовки та відбору експертів оцінювання, включаючи використання незалежних Центрів оцінювання.
Розглянуто поточний стан проблематики експертного підходу в оцінці компонентів структури особистості професіонала (професійно важливих якостей, властивостей особистості та особистісних властивостей), професіоналізації особистості в цілому. Доведено необхідність його використання у практиці професійного консультування, виконано теоретичне обґрунтування та отримано емпіричне підтвердження відмінностей в експертній оцінці та самооцінці професійно важливих властивостей особистості професіонала.


Подаю опис взаємозв’язків експертних оцінок та самооцінок властивостей прийняття рішень особистістю. Показано відмінні риси експертної оцінки в прогнозі та самооцінки властивостей особистості та особистісних властивостей професіонала. Виділено напрямок розвитку експертного підходу для вирішення завдань професійного консультування – оцінка та прогнозування параметрів вибору та прийняття рішень у осіб з різним складом показників індивідуальності.

Ключові слова: експертна оцінка, самооцінка, прийняття рішення, професійно важливі якості, властивості особистості, індикатор типу особистості.

Urgency of the problem. The assessment of the level of professionalism in organizations is carried out by line managers not only when preparing documents for the promotion of an employee to a position, but also after the end of the probationary period of a candidate for a position. In some companies, in order to obtain the necessary information about the potential of employees as a reserve of the organization, employees of the personnel management service are involved. This kind of information is rightly considered one of the sources of the organization’s effectiveness, which, together with others, ensures the achievement of the
company’s goals. To date, the most effective means of obtaining information about an employee are a business and comprehensive assessment, which, along with traditional diagnostic methods, includes an expert assessment. The developed mathematical apparatus for carrying out and processing expert assessments only partially overcomes the gap between possible and real spheres of its use. Expanding the field of application of expert assessment to solve the range of psychological issues of recruitment and selection of personnel, formation of project groups, finding an informal leader in the group aside from the problem of professionalization of employees makes this research relevant not only from a scientific, but also from a practical point of view [7].

At the same time, forecasting the professional success of an individual requires detailed study not only at the stage of completion of education, when significant funds are invested in the education of an individual, but before choosing the first profession and place of education. In this case, forecasting professional success in the recommended field of activity will not only help to solve the problem of developing professionally important personal qualities, but also form an approach to solving the state problem of providing personnel for enterprises and organizations of the national economic complex of the country. In addition, the development of the personality of the “future professional”, taking into account the active inclusion of the family, if this inclusion is done in advance, turns into the development of the “professional of the future”. Considering the interests, motivation of a young person, their abilities, the financial costs of preliminary training acquire the role of justified investments, the implementation of a rational and thoughtful professional plan of the individual. Undoubtedly, a professional consultant plays an important role in this process [5].

State of the problem. The problem of the expert approach has been thoroughly investigated in modern science [3]. Until now, the results of the research have been reflected in the literature on methods of expert assessments, in reviews of their development and practical use (Azgaldov, 1982; Shmerling, 1977, et al.). This was facilitated by the fact of detailed statistical and mathematical substantiation of this approach, which is also widely presented in the works of researchers (Lublinska, 1960). The expert approach has justified itself well when it is used in economic, managerial, technical, as well as production types of expertise (Reichman, 1973; Frenkel, 1977).

Herewith, the psychological features of the expert approach, the effectiveness of its use in assessing the specialist’s potential to increase the level of professionalism of employees are extremely insufficiently studied. They are more often covered in the publications of foreign researchers, and in the total volume of works on the problems of expert methods, they are not so significant. This is due, on the one hand, to a large extent to the fact that the expert approach was more developed for the assessment of goods, equipment and their characteristics, which distracted researchers both from psychological issues in general and from the
The problem of using expert assessments or expert systems in the formation of the professionalism of specialists [6]. A significant contribution to the development of works on this issue was made by F. Hayes-Roth, D. Waterman, and D. Lenat (1983); D. Memmi, A. Nguyen Huan (1988); K. Van Dam (1991); J. Norkini, J. Qi, L. Crosso (1991); D. Schwartz, J. Goodman (1992); A. Sarovain (1993); M. Koppen (1993); Ter Laak (1994); S. Chao, G. Salvendi (1995); V. Moustakis, M. Leto, G. Salvendi (1996); and others.

Such understanding of the relevance of the work made it possible to determine the goal of the real research – to identify and study the set of professionally important psychological properties of the individual with the help of an expert assessment to clarify the acceptable directions of professionalization of the subject of activity, which form the professional specificity of his personality. At the same time, we proceeded from the assumption that the application of the method of expert assessment of professionally important personality qualities will allow us to form not only a source of information about their totality, but also to determine the most significant regulators of professional activity. The object of research is the personality of the future professional. The subject is professionally important personality qualities of a professional, which are characteristic of a certain activity.

The hypothesis of the study was based on the assumption that for the subject of future professional activity, for the implementation of functions that can be assigned to an employee or a candidate for a position, two groups of psychological properties are characteristic at two levels of significance. Firstly, this is an invariant core – a certain set of professionally important qualities that are necessary for a professional, regardless of the profile of his training, received specialty or specialization. Their development is largely based on the originality of the temperamental properties of the individual, their formation at the time of choosing a profession. And, secondly, the specific properties and qualities of the individual, the development of which is based on the originality of the content of professional activity. It is the specificity of professional activity that determines the peculiarities of performing labour tasks in specific practical situations and requires a certain level of formed knowledge, skills and abilities from the individual to perform certain actions, operations, activities in general. The greatest success for a professional occurs when there is a basis – the core of professionalization and abilities that are ready in real conditions for development under the influence of professional activity [4].

Research methods and techniques. A set of methods was used to conduct the empirical research [1; 2; 4; 5]: “Personal decision-making factors” by T. Kornilova; the “Opposition” technique, modified by MBTI, version by T. Shalaieva; The Intolerance of Ambiguity Scale (IAS) by S. Budner; the “Indicator of social personality type” research version by D. Keirsey.

The choice of the “Indicator of social personality type” by D. Keirsey was conditioned by two circumstances. It is considered legitimate to assert that the
prediction of temperamental manifestations is the basis for determining the social type based on the totality of the integral properties of the personality and provides the possibility of forecasting the spheres of self-realization of the personality, as well as the prediction of behavior in decision-making, behavior, and professional activity. In addition, earlier studies have shown that the identification of the personality type using the D. Keirsey indicator opens up the possibility of using recommendations for the selection of professions based on them for people who consistently differ in typological manifestations.

The research was conducted in two stages. At the first stage of the study, 31 master’s students of the psychological training of the State institution “K.D. Ushinsky National Pedagogical University” took part. The purpose of the first stage was to confirm the ability to use the expert version to assess professionally important qualities of a specialist. Computer data processing was performed using the IBM SPSS Statistics 23 statistical package.

At the second stage, two groups took part in the study. The first group (professional consultants, 2 people) had the skills to interpret the results, the technique of conducting research and the technology of professional forecasting. Their tasks were: organization of the study, selection of a methodological platform, determination of the composition and nomenclature of diagnostic tools, adaptation of the expert version of the indicator of the social type of personality to the conditions of distant study, creation of an electronic version of a set of examination materials, selection of experts and instruction on the procedure for conducting the assessment procedure, monitoring the conduct expert assessment, statistical processing of survey data, correct interpretation of data and coordination of forecasting results with members of the expert group.

Representatives of the second group (experts, 42 people) possessed the skills of assessment. Their tasks were: familiarization with the assessment standards, self-assessment of one’s ability to act as an expert, the ability to imagine possible forms of response of the examinee to difficult situations, to argue one’s position and justify the point of view at the stage of agreeing on professional characteristics, with voluntary consent to participate in the survey.

Research results. At the first stage, a correlation analysis was performed to establish relationships between indicators of the expert version of the “Indicator of Social Personality Type” (D. Keirsey) and decision-making properties. The results of the correlation analysis are presented in the table 1.
Table 1

Matrix of correlations of indicators of the Indicator of personality type (according to D. Keirsey's method) and decision-making (n = 31).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MSD</th>
<th>D. Keirsey’s indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>StR</td>
<td>DgR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rat</td>
<td>262*</td>
<td>234*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rrt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ddm</td>
<td>505**</td>
<td>-320**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dtm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rgd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1) here and further in the text the symbols “0” and “,” are omitted; 2) * - correlation at ρ ≤ 0.05 significance levels; ** - correlation at the level of ρ ≤ 0.01 significance; 3) shortening of values of the personality type indicator (according to D. Keirsey’s method): J, Je - judgment, advantage to plan and organize information in advance, decisive personality type; P, Pe - perception, the advantage to act without detailed prior training, more guided by the circumstances, the perceiving personality type; 4) shortenings of indicators of the decision-making questionnaire (OFR-25, T. Kornilova): Rat - rationality, Rrt - readiness for risk-taking; 5) shortenings of H. Eizenko’s decision-making questionnaire indicators: Ddm - decisiveness in decision-making, Dtm - determination, Rgd - rigidity, Ips - impulsiveness in decision-making; 6) shortening of the indicator “Impulsivity” of V. Losenkov’s questionnaire – Imp; 7) shortenings of indicators of decisiveness scales, SDC: ImT – impertinence, DgT – dogmatism, SpT – spontaneity.

The analysis of the obtained relationships demonstrates several multidirectional trends in the relationships of the studied parameters. On the one hand, a block of positive, significant connections is an indicator of decision-making logic, rationality, and purposefulness. The indicators of the same block are characterized by the presence of significant negative relationships of rationality (OFR-25 methodology) and decisiveness (OPR methodology) with indicators of the risk-trait methodology. The second block of positive connections forms rigidity, impulsivity, a perceptive type of personality with all indicators of risk-traits. Risk-trait indicators form a stable formation in this block, in which its indicators, which form it, are closely and positively connected. A special place is the indicator of the decisive personality type, which is significantly negatively associated with emotional, cognitive and general risk-trait indicators. Individual indicators of risk propensity are significantly negatively associated with rationality (OFR-25 methodology) and
decisiveness (OPR methodology). A special place is occupied by the indicator of the
decisive personality type, which is significantly negatively associated with
emotional, cognitive and general risk-trait indicators. Individual indicators of risk
propensity are significantly negatively associated with rationality (the OFR
methodology) and decisiveness (the OPR methodology).

The obtained results demonstrate trends that are characteristic of the type of
expert assessment. The very fact of significant connections between indicators of the
Indicator of personality type and decision-making confirm the unity of the emotional
and rational in the individual. A risky personality with a pronounced emotional
component is characterized by saturation, the strength of emotional experiences
related to the risk itself. A pronounced cognitive component helps a risky individual
to easily recognize exactly those situations in which the risk component is presented.
The behavioral component reflects the external manifestation of propensity to risk –
in emotions, in expression, in statements, in actions, risky behavior.

The results of the second stage of the study (according to correlation analysis)
made it possible to establish the following patterns:
− interrelationships of reflexivity indicators (RfR, RfA, RfM, RfV) are set at
1% significance level. The absence of regular interrelations of interaction reflection
(RflV) and reflection of the future (RflM) is confirmed by their meaningful analysis;
− statistically significant relationships (at 5% and 1% significance levels)
were established between indicators of reflexivity and indicators of the Personality
Type Indicator (MBTI modification, Opposition version): positive – with intuitive,
social and perceiving types (N, F, P); negative relationships – with the sensory,
thinking and decision type (S, T, J);
− negative correlations (at 5% and 1% levels of statistical significance) of
reflexivity indicators with indicators of intolerance-tolerance to uncertainty (IvP,
IvP) were highlighted;
− a statistically significant relationship was found at the 5% significance level
of the interaction reflection indicator (Rfl) with the risk readiness indicator (Rrt);
− statistically significant relationships were identified at the 1% level of the
problem unsolvability indicator (IrP): negative with intuitive (N) and perceiving
type (P); positive with sensory (S) and decision type (J);
− statistically significant relationships were identified at the 5% level of self-
assessment and expert assessment indicators of the Personality Type Indicator:
positive for the same-name indicators of sensory (So, Se) and intuitive type (No,
Ne), sensory and decision type (Se, Jo), intuitive and perceiving type (Ne, Po); as
well as negative interconnections of the sensory and intuitive type with each other
(Se, No; Ne, So), sensory and perceiving type with each other (Se, Po), intuitive and
decisive type with each other (Ne, Jo).
− statistically significant relationships were found at the 5% significance level
of the indicator of risk readiness (Rrt): positive with extraversion () and reflection
of interaction (RflI) with the indicator of risk readiness (Rrt);
− statistically significant correlations (at the 5% level) of risk readiness index (Rrt) were found: positive with extraversion (E) and negative with introversion (I).
− statistically significant relationships were identified at the 1% level of indicators of the personality type indicator.

The identification of reliable relationships of the studied indicators using the method of correlation matrices, as well as the results of the analysis of these relationships, confirm our assumption that the experts have a complex of professionalism. It manifests itself in the psychological readiness of the group for an expert assessment of the future professional. The complex is formed on the basis of the reflexivity of the personality and combines, in addition to reflexivity, risk readiness (Rrt), tolerance for novelty and insolvability of the problem (NvP, NrP), indicators of the personality type indicator (S - N, T - F, J - P).

**Results of qualitative analysis.** To identify the peculiarities of the expert assessment of professionally important qualities, at the first stage of the study, a group of examinees was formed. The group included people who used an expert assessment of the properties of decision-making, manifestations of personality type and personality traits. The sample of the examinees is quite homogeneous, because it was formed from undergraduates who chose the profession of psychologist, so the values of the standard deviation are very low and tend to zero. At the same time, the scatter of the values of the indicators led to the selection of two subgroups, with high and low values for the total indicator of the ability for expert assessment (Ek+, Ek-).

A comparison of the values of the risk propensity indicators in the group shows that they differ by the type of assessment, demonstrating those areas of values that significantly distinguish the individuals of the selected subgroup. These are the emotional and cognitive components of risk-taking. The expressiveness of the differences between both indicators confirms the previously obtained dependences (Sannikov, 2015). The profiles of selected groups according to the OFR-25 methodology give the opposite picture: some members of the group (Ek-) have a much lower indicator of rationality in decision-making and a significantly higher indicator of readiness for risk. In part, this can be explained only by the fact that the author considers the indicator of readiness for risk (Rrt) not only in a risky environment, but also in an environment of uncertainty. Moreover, this applies not only to informational uncertainty, but also uncertainty that was formed by a lack of time.

Profiles of indicators of decision-making by a person according to the OPR methodology coincide in the form of the curve. The indicators of one subgroup (Ek-) are lower than the indicators of the second subgroup, with the exception of the rigidity indicator – in the first subgroup (Ek+) it is higher than in the second subgroup almost twice – and it is at the level of the average values of the other indicators. This largely explains the reason for caution when making decisions – checking and re-evaluating the found decision option, comparing options and agreeing on them before the final choice (convincing yourself that the adopted
decision option is correct).

According to the indicators of the Indicator of the social type of personality (given by the methods of D. Keirsey), the following can be stated: a) for the first subgroup (Ek+ – their scores are higher in those indicators where there is an opportunity to monitor, observe the manifestation of a property, perceive the manifestation of a certain characteristic (the indicator, characteristic of a specific type of personality, in the terminology of D. Keirsey). This is a sensory type, a feeling type, a perceiving type. For the second subgroup (Ek-), more reliable are the assessments that can be presented in one’s imagination. This is an intuitive type, a thinking type, a deciding type. However, it is impossible to be so categorical – the Student’s t-test of both subgroups on these indicators did not reveal significant differences.

The results of the second stage of the study fully confirmed the previously expressed assumptions about the close relationships within the complex of certain professionally important properties in the expert’s personality. The setting for the examination of the properties and qualities of the future professional gives the opportunity to each of the group of experts (44 people) to gather and focus on the object of assessment – future professionals. The expressiveness of the properties of the complex among the experts selected for the group significantly exceeds the average level of a number of indicators of each of the methods of the complex. To a large extent, this is explained by the responsibility that the experts have assigned to themselves, as well as the specifics of the examination – the professional future of the optant.

The results obtained in the study allow us to make the following generalizations:

a) new data on the ratio of expert assessments and self-assessments of professionally important qualities were received;

b) correlational and qualitative analyzes of empirical research results revealed the specific role of personality traits such as personality type, determination, decision-making indicators, etc.;

c) expert assessments are more adequate in terms of conditions, if the manifestation of quality can be observed;

d) self-assessment is more correct if there is time to think about the level that the indicator can reach.
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