

Standardization and Optimization of Psychodiagnostic Questionnaires

Dilbar Mukhamedova, Abdimumin Rasulov, Indira Rakhimova and Muhammadrasul Ibrogimov

National University of Uzbekistan after M.Ulugbek, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

**barnoshka4675@gmail.com*

Keywords: Unification, Methodology, Personality, Questionnaire, Efficiency, Economy, Thrifty, Provides Uniformity, Allows Fast Execution

Abstract: Psychological diagnosis of a condition/entity is influenced by various groups of standardized and non-standardized techniques. The leading position among them is currently held by individual surveys. Alongside these surveys, there is a category of personal questionnaires that serve as psychodiagnostic approaches where they come in the form of discussions or questions. When employing these approaches, certain criteria are applied to the processes involving psychology students. The purpose of this paper is to examine the standardization of survey programs used in psychological studies. During this research, the optimization of the method for the interpretation of their findings was accomplished by upgrading a variety of specific questionnaires on an answer sheet. The study was conducted in compliance with respondent comprehension standards, with the ability to expand them fairly for the purpose of improving the questionnaire answer sheet processing method and the resulting data, the time spent on processing the responses, the reasonable prices of the test materials and the nature of the operation. Following the standardization of the research findings processing system, the validity of the methodology was defined in compliance with the statistical parameters.

1 INTRODUCTION

Survey questions are assessment instruments that require continuous changes. In both initial and recent interviewing approaches, the emergence of new options has been observed from the very beginning. Various classifications of individual research questionnaires have been formulated and are widely used as research instruments. As these questionnaires are developed over multiple periods, specialists have enhanced their use for research purposes through various means: utilization of the "big five" in research (Balgiu B. A. (2018)), (Costa, P. T. & McCrae, R. R. (1985)), (Donnellan, M. B., Oswald, F. L., Baird, B. M. & Lucas, R. E. (2006).); inclusion of cultural and ethnic groups (Benet-Martinez, V., & John, O. P. (1998)); questionnaire analysis (Ben-Porath, Y.S. (2012)), (Hoelzle, J. B., & Meyer, G. J. (2008)); and adaptation of questionnaires (Rasulov A.I. (2018)), (Stilwell NA, Wallick MM, (2000)), (Shmelev A. G. (2002)). The utilization of psychometric criteria for questionnaires is continuously subjected to

empirical scrutiny (Baturin, N.A. –(2009)), refinement of stages and criteria for upgrades (Yegorova, M.S. (2016).), availability of psychometric characteristics (Yeliseyev O.P), the question of technology for questionnaire development and adaptation (Mitin O.V. (2011)), and the necessity for ongoing study. However, in certain cases, psychologists recognize the need to improve the questionnaire processing system and the interpretation of the results. The development of the survey processing system and survey outcomes must align with psychometric requirements. Our study focuses on teaching psychology students how to work with worksheets and establish a framework for collecting responses to personal questionnaires.

The Purpose of the Study

The focus of the research is to study the mechanism of consolidating the questionnaire response sheet and the overall processing system. This also aims at strengthen the response sheet for students' questionnaires in the field of psychology.

* Corresponding author

Table 1: Features of questionnaires split in order to unify the answer processing method.

№	Name of the questionnaire	Confirmation of feedbacks, quantity of questions	Version of answers	Scale of ranking
1.	Mini-mult (SMOL) form of MMPI	71	dichotomic	11
2.	Myers-Briggs personality type indicator (MBTI) questionnaire	94	dichotomic, trichotomic	4
3.	“Psychodiagnostic test” of V.M.Melnikov and L.T. Yampolski	174	dichotomic	14
4.	“Temperament structure” questionnaire of Y.Strelau	134	dichotomic	3
5.	“Q-qualifying” questionnaire	60	trichotomic	6
6.	H.J.Eysenck’s questionnaire EPI	57	dichotomic	3
7.	V.M. Rusalov’s “Questionnaire on the official-dynamic characteristics of individuality (of QOCI)”	150	rated	13
8.	Questionnaire of V.V.Stalin and S.R.Panteleyev “Evaluation of self personality”	110	dichotomic	9
9.	Questionnaire of Freyburg (FPI)	114	dichotomic	12

2 METHODOLOGY

Specialized questionnaires are the most popular assessment tool for psychodiagnostics. Identity surveys (pq, opq, opq32) are designed to determine emotions, behaviors, motives and other personal characteristics of an individual. Identity survey questions have been compiled in various versions over more than a century (Batashev 2020), (Costa 1985), and have been modified in diverse cultural environments (John 2011), (Rasulov 2018), (Batashev 2020), (Sobchik 2007). Moreover, they are currently being implemented (Balgiu 2018), (Benet-Martinez 1998), (Shmelev 2002). Questionnaire preparation technology is utilized ensure the fulfillment of psychometric criteria.

3 METHODS

The situational framework is used for analysing performance outcomes as a tester, survey answer, and response processing (20), Styuden's T-criteria are utilized to verify the degree of predictive reliability of empirical measures obtained from the analysis using K. Pearson and Mann-Whitney criteria" for improved clarity and better sentence structure.

Questionnaire on the official-dynamic characteristics of individuality (of QOCI)", questionnaire of V.V.Stalin and S.R.Panteleyev "Evaluation of self personality", the questionnaire of Freyburg (FPI)" was revised to "To standardize the process, the study also selected the following questionnaires (20): the mini-mult (SMOL) form of MMPI; the Myers-Briggs personality type indicator (MBTI) questionnaire; the “Psychodiagnostic test” by V.M. Melnikov and L.T. Yampolsky; the “Temperament questionnaire” and Y. Strelau Temperament diagnostic questionnaire; the “Q-breeding” questionnaire; H.J. Eysenck’s EPI questionnaire; V.M. Rusalov’s “Questionnaire on the official-dynamic characteristics of individuality (QOCI)”; the questionnaire by V.V. Stalin and S.R. Panteleyev for “Evaluation of self-personality”.

The survey project allows the analysis of the issue and details of strategies and methodology used in its research. The research was conducted with the participation of students in psychology and pedagogy. 135 students engaged in the application process for the unification of questionnaires; 50 for the control group-in the verification of the validity at the post-unification stage of the questionnaire answer sheet; 50 students were involved in the experimental group.

4 DATA ANALYSIS

The basic characteristics of the questionnaires chosen for unification during the study are shown in Table 1 below. The table provides comprehensive statistics on questionnaire confirmations, response choices and ranking scales.

a) The mini-mult (SMOL) form of the MMPI consists of 71 responses and has 11 assessment tools. Variations of responses have a dichotomic (“right” and “wrong”) character, there is a variant designed in the Uzbek language;

b) The Myers-Briggs Personality type indicator (PTI) questionnaire is based on 94 confirmations and a network evaluation scale, with responses on both dichotomic and trichotomic character;

Table 2: The degree to which the unification approaches of classification meet the requirements.

№	Questionnaires	Criteria			
		Questionnaires of dihotomies, trichotomies, “like-dislike” or rating responses	Let only one ranking scale be used in the survey questionnaires and verification	The sensitivity of examiners to survey questions remains the same indicator.	The indicator of average value
	Mini-mult (SMOL) form of MMPI	135	-	135	90
	Myers-Briggs “Personality type indicator” (MBTI) questionnaire	135	135	135	135
	“Psychodiagnostic test” of V.M.Melnikov L.T. Yampol	135	-	126	87
	“Temperament structure” questionnaire Y.Strelya	135	135	135	135
	“Q-qualifying” questionnaire	135	135	135	135
	H.J. Eysenck’s Questionnaire EPI	135	135	135	135
	V.M. Rusalov’s “Questionnaire on the official-dynamic characteristics of individuality (of QOCI)”	135	135	135	135
	Questionnaire of V.V. Stalin and S.R. Panteleyev “Evaluation of self personality”	135	135	135	135
	Questionnaire of Freyburg (FPI)	135	118	123	125

c) V.M. Melnikov and L.T.Yampolsky’s “Psychodiagnostic test” consists of 174 questions and has 14 evaluation scales and “dihotomic” responses;

d) Y. Strela’s “Temperament structure” questionnaire consists of 134 questions, with three evaluation scales and “trichotomic” responses;

e) “Q-qualifying” questionnaire consists of 60 items and has six evaluation scales and answers “trichotomic” character;

f) H.J. Eysenck questionnaire EPI consists of 57 questions, characterizes “dichotomic” responses in two main and one controlling scales;

g) The questionnaire of V.M. Rusalov’s “Questionnaire on the official-dynamic characteristics of individuality (of QOCI)” consists of 150 reviews, consists of 12 reviews and one control scale, the rating system is evaluated;

The questionnaire of V.V. Stalin and S.R. Pantelev “Evaluation of self personality” consists of

110 reviews and responses on a rating scale and is “dichotomous” in nature;

The Freiburg questionnaire (FPI) consists of 114 items, with 12 rating scales and responses that are “dichotomous” in nature.

At the second step, the full version of the survey questions and a brief outline of the structure and assessment process were presented. This allowed the survey participants to organize their project work. At the introductory level, 135 students were selected as respondents for the experiment (based on the training course “General psychodiagnostics”) to study the approach for processing the study findings according to defined standards. After providing details of the methods, they were asked to determine strategies that could be used against the evaluation criteria to replicate the results processing platform. The following techniques assembled the methodological approaches at the step of sorting (Table 2).

In order to conduct the production system, the techniques that achieved a score above the following 25 factors were divided based on the performance results of the examiners for the three parameters. The outcome included the mini-mult (Smol) version of the so-called MMPI (23.33) and “Psychodiagnostic Test” of V.M. Melnikov and L.T. Yampolsky (20.33) to meet the requirements. We did not ask respondents why they also rated the Freiburg questionnaire (FPI) highly in their comments. This was because,

according to the second evaluation criterion of this questionnaire, one question served to evaluate two scales, which led to their disregard. However, some respondents noticed this.

At the next level of the experiment, the five participants were divided into small teams, and each group performed an independent analysis on the response sheet and the main sorting methods. It was suggested that they adhere to the following requirements in order to propose a unified version:

- 1) Allow the option of participating uniformly to all questionnaires;
- 2) The time required on the results analysis is considerably less;
- 3) Low consumable costs;
- 4) Operational character;
- 5) Be accessible to users.

It was also clarified that they could be contacted to clarify the task. After a two-week innovative strategy, respondents were presented with a wide range of interpretations and various materials prepared alongside the survey. However, the ability to find an optimal version of the technique was severely constrained, and progressions in placing the questionnaire key on the response sheet in the intergroup were considered the most desirable selection. Thus, six of these empirical indicators were summarized in Table 3.

Table 3: The indicators of the groups of materials prepared for the unified system of the questionnaire response processing sheet and results (significance of differences were determined by the student's criterion).

Criteria	Groups													
	1		2		3		4		5		6		7	
	M	σ	M	σ	M	σ	M	σ	M	σ	M	σ	M	σ
Provides uniformity	2.53	0.68	3.43	0.72	2.26	0.78	2.53	0.86	2.53	0.68	4.70	0.70	2.53	0.86
t	-3.137***				1.06				3.628**				3.848**	
Time consumption is low	2.93	0.98	3.10	0.60	2.03	0.55	2.23	0.56	2.93	0.98	4.53	0.62	2.23	0.56
t	-0.926				1.92				-3.049**				3.057**	
Thrifty	2.90	0.66	3.13	0.345	2.90	0.305	2.31	0.05	2.90	0.66	4.60	0.49	2.96	0.31
t	-1.882				1.541				-3.618				3.548**	
Allows fast execution	2.86	0.43	2.83	0.69	2.64	0.11	1.83	0.64	2.53	0.86	4.63	0.49	1.93	0.52
t	0.226				1.012				-3.157**				3.078**	
For users, it is clear and comfortable.	1.63	0.49	2.80	0.48	1.88	0.49	1.63	0.49	2.23	0.56	4.26	0.52	2.60	0.56
t	-3.042**				0.195				-3.098**				3.302**	

According to the results presented in Table 3, the group that presented the alternative was significantly assessed by the other groups, which ensured the unification of the answer sheet of the methods in the study. This has been confirmed by empirical indicators of statistical significance (provides validity relative to the fifth and seventh category indicators – 4.70, $p \leq 0.01$; has low time consumption – 4.53, $p \leq 0.01$), saves – 4.60, $p \leq 0.01$ by the criterion; enables

quick execution – 15.157, $p \leq 0.001$; is understandable and comfortable for users – 4.26, $p \leq 0.01$).

In turn, work has been done to review the mutual influence of the expert assessment parameters of the other six groups included in this category. For this purpose, a correlation research was conducted using the material prepared by these six groups based on the responses of other members in the group (see Table 4).

Table 4: Indicator of the correlation between the evaluation criteria for the unification of the questionnaire response processing system and the results.

№	Criteria	Provides uniformity	Low time consumption	Thrifty	Allows fast execution	Convenient and comfortable for users
1	Monotonous	1	0.477**	0.469**	-0.328*	0.333*
2	Low time consumption		1	0.450*	-0.020	0.487**
3	Thrifty			1	0.079	0.357*
4	Allows fast execution				1	-0.348*
5	Convenient and comfortable for users					1

Annotation: * $p \leq 0.05$; ** $p \leq 0.01$

According to the correlation study, strong positive and, conversely, negative correlations were found between the methodological variables in relation to the criterion for determining the examiners' unification process.

Looking at the responses of the methods as a simple process to the processing system leads to an erroneous conclusion. Therefore, using the example of the option with the most effective indicator, the correlation coefficients of expert assessments provide a specific definition. The proposed option for a response processing system ensures uniformity for all methodologies under the condition of unification. This criterion resulted in a "reduction in time consumption" ($r=0.477$, $p \leq 0.01$), and an increase in 'savings' ($r=0.69$, $p \leq 0.01$).

Although unification is provided by the criterion of "low time consumption", the criterion of "saving" is the naturally leads to an increase ($r=0.450$, $p \leq 0.01$), and "understandable and convenient for users" also leads ($r=0.487$, $p \leq 0.01$). Ensuring the criterion of "saving" in unification, as long as it provides "clarity and convenience for users" ($r=0.357$, $p \leq 0.05$).

Ironically, the provision of the unification process may have triggered confusion and discomfort to the customers according to the criterion of "allows fast execution" ($r=-0.348$, $p \leq 0.01$). Perhaps this concept also applies to difficulties in focusing, making snap judgments, reluctance to perform monotonous

actions, failure to have dynamic activity, and a multitude of other psychological factors.

At this phase, visual aids helped progress to the next step of the analysis. A research experiment was conducted using materials formed for the unification of the psychodiagnostic methods' answer processing system.

The next step of the experiment focused on the single questionnaire method for analyzing answers. The experiment was conducted with a group of students who participated in the unification, as well as 3-4 students from the course. One of these groups was developed as the control group ($n=45$), and the other served as the experimental group ($n=50$).

Additionally, test materials were designed for the types of research methods based on regular and unified response processing framework in an earlier stage of the experiment. The study group members were assigned to work on the questionnaire of answers obtained on the regular approach types and on the questionnaire for unification of answers.

Responses from the application of techniques were processed with the support of the participants from both groups. Both the control group and the experimental group members completed the assigned task and noted the time spent on reviewing the responses on the answer sheet. Their empirical parameters were comparatively studied in the experiment. Responses from the use of strategies

were processed with the assistance of participants from both groups. In the experiment, the participants of the control group were given the full details of the questionnaire and were offered to process the results by applying it in practice. In the experimental group, along with the details of the questionnaire, a

methodological instruction was given to improve its response sheet. The statistical processing results of the indicators between the results of the groups participating in both experiment and the test are presented in Table 5.

Table 5: Descriptive and formative group indicators for the unification of the questionnaire answer sheet processing method and findings, N=100.

Scales	Medium rang		Mann-Whitney's criterion	Significance-degree of validity (p)
	Control group, N=50	Experimental group, N=50		
EPI (H. Y. Eysenck)	64.19	22.81	35.00	0.000*
Temperament structure (Y. Strelyau)	64.58	22.42	18.01	0.001*
FPI (Frayburg questionnaire)	62.81	24.19	94.25	0.000*
QOCI (V.M. Rusalov)	60.79	26.21	18.,00	0.000*
Self-attitude questionnaire (V.V. Stolin)	65.12	22.00	36.12	0.000*

Annotation: * – expression of statistically significant differences.

From the collected quantitative indicators, it can be seen that it is necessary to save time in the processing questionnaire responses and not to ignore the concept of improving the response sheet for the acquisition of unbiased details, or to rely on the use of a single method of processing results. However, based on our experience, analytical measures suggest that the situation has been sufficiently achieved. H.Y. Eysenck's (EPI) questionnaire (U=35.00, $p<0.05$), Y. Strelyau's "Temperament structure" (U=18.01, $p<0.05$), Frayburg's questionnaire (FPI) (U=94.25, $p<0.05$), V.M. Rusalov's questionnaire ((U=181.01, $p<0.05$), and Self-attitude (V.V. Stolin) questionnaire (U=36.12, $p<0.05$) showed variations in the unification of the method of processing outcomes in terms of control and experimental experience.

The study conducted on the unification of the production mechanism in identity psychodiagnostic technique responses followed the analysis aimed at being part of the studies in this direction. This was done to identify the empirical facts that determined the objective and unbiased nature of our study and validate it. Taking this into account, as a continuation of our studies on the integration of processing structures, the analysis involved testing consistency between the individual questionnaire answers and post-unification indicators with their original choices.

At the next level of the study, respondents were recruited to assess the consistency status of individual questionnaires between the original and unified alternatives. Additionally, students in the educational

path of "psychology" were engaged as main research participants. The examiners administered both variants of the questionnaires, and the correlation between them was determined. The results are presented in the below table (see Table 6). In the application of the technique, the metrics obtained after the unification findings do not influence the standards of reliability. Although the unification of questionnaires has a positive influence on the productivity of the experts' work, they do not change the individual findings collected. Indicators were developed comparing the outcomes of the application of the first and second versions of the Eyzenk EPI questionnaire. To do this, according Styuden's T-criteria, the reliability of the variations between the mean arithmetical values of the scales and the relationship between the scales was calculated. The methodological metrics from the table indicated that the outcomes of the first and second versions of the questionnaire were correlated. The scales of questionnaire for "extraversion-introversion" ($r=0.548$, $p\leq 0.01$), "neuroticism" ($r=0.701$, $p\leq 0.01$) and sincerity reliability indicators showed correlation. Differences were also not observed in the mean arithmetic values of the scales according to the first and second forms of the questionnaire: (12.96 and 12.76; $t=0.358$), "neuroticism" (12.05 and 11.96; $t=0.068$) and scale of sincerity (3.60 and 3.62; $t=0.071$). It can be concluded that the unified form of the Eysenck questionnaire provided convenience to specialists for processing answers, and it did not have a negative impact on its internal stability indicators.

Table 6: Correlation relationship between the EPI questionnaire scales of G. Y, Eysenck (n=50).

№	Scales	Figure 1		Figure 2		t	r
		M	σ	M	σ		
1	Extraversion-introversion	12,96	4,46	12,76	3,59	0,358	0,548**
2	Neuroticism	12,05	5,67	11,96	4,82	0,068	0,701**
3	Sincerity	3,60	1,62	3,62	1,52	-0,071	0,348*

Annotation: * $p \leq 0,05$; ** $p \leq 0,01$.

In determining reliability indicators between the unification methods, the test was carried out based on Y.Strelya's temperament study questionnaire. When checking the level of reliability between both variants

of this methodology, the differences between the mean values and the correlation relationship between the indicators were determined. The indicators of the experiment are reflected in Table 7.

Table 7: Correlation relationship between scales of Y. Strelyau's questionnaire on learning temperament (n=50).

№	Scales	1-figure		2-figure		t	r
		M	σ	M	σ		
1	Excitation force (F_d)	56.79	13.97	55.51	13.09	0.693	0.371*
2	Braking power (F_b)	52.69	11.60	53.28	9.69	0.221	0.428*
3	Mobility (F_m)	53.56	10.14	2.07	11.09	1.064	0.643**

Annotation: * $p \leq 0.05$; ** $p \leq 0.01$.

Indicators on the average slope of the first and second forms between the scales "excitation force", "braking force", and "mobility" of the methodology were 56.79 and 55.51; $t=0.693$; 52.69 and 53.28; $t=0.221$; 53.56 and 52.07; $t=1.064$. On average, there was no difference in the arithmetic mean between the indicators of both forms. This suggests that the methodology has been tested in two different forms in the same contingent respondents, comparing whether there is a discrepancy between their indicators. Although the discrepancy has not been observed, it is recognized as a positive indicator. In turn, the determination of the correlation relationship between the methodological scales is the second method, which serves to check the degree of reliability of the methodology through the indicators. The relationship between questionnaire scales on correlation analysis indicators was found to have the following coefficients: "excitation force"- $r=0.371$, $p \leq 0.05$, "braking power" - $r=0.428$, $p \leq 0.01$, and "mobility"- $r=0.648$, $p \leq 0.01$. This reflects a positive correlation between the variation of the methodology used in practice and the results obtained from the modified forms of response processing system. The unification form of this questionnaire is evidenced by

the fact that it has no effect on the content of the methodology.

In order to ensure the objectivity and fairness of the research conducted on the unification of the response processing system of personality psychodiagnostics methods, an attempt was made to investigate the validity of one of the contents of the other questionnaire forms. For this purpose V.V. Stalin and S.R. Panteleev's questionnaire on "individual self-attitude" was carried out. The findings on the unification form feature of the questionnaire were reflected in the materials analyzed above. The question arises: will there be a change in the responses given by the respondent to the questionnaire after the response processing system has been unified, or will it keep its original state, like the form in which it is applied in practice? To answer this question, it was tried to determine the reliability indicators between the forms of the methodology of "self-examination of the individual", such as the questionnaires of Eysenck and Strelyau, and this was achieved.

The correlation relationship between the scale of V.V. Stalin and S.R. Panteleev's questionnaire on "Individual self-attitude" is presented in Table 8.

Table 8: Correlation relationship between the scale of V.V. Stalin and S.R. Panteleev's the questionnaire "Individual self-attitude" (n=50).

№	Scales	1-figure		2-figure		t	r
		M	Σ	M	σ		
	Sincerity	5.46	1.51	5.52	1.35	-0.760	0.472**
	Self-confidence	5.21	1.68	5.40	1.88	-1.534	0.261*
	Self-administration	5.72	1.79	5.42	1.79	-1.358	0.563**
	Reflection of self-attitude	6.25	1.93	6.41	1.93	-1.889	0.278*
	Self-esteem	5.96	1.80	6.00	1.78	-1.375	0.203
	Self-acceptance	6.41	2.15	6.70	1.69	-1.097	0.672**
	Limited nature	6.48	1.90	6.68	1.76	0.045	0.462**
	Internal contradiction	6.22	1.13	6.53	1.35	0.971	0.781**
	Self-blame	6.57	1.61	6.97	1.53	1.217	0.281*

Annotation: * $p \leq 0.05$; ** $p \leq 0.01$.

After the unification of V.V.Stalin and S.R. Panteleev's questionnaire "Individual self-attitude", the placement of scales was replaced. However, we relied on the original state of the scale to determine the content reliability of the questionnaire. The mean value of the questionnaire scale and the relationship between the two correlations indicated a similar pattern as the methods previously analyzed. There were no differences between the average values of the scales of the questionnaire forms: sincerity-5.46 and 5.52; $t=-0.760$; "self-confidence"-5.21 and 5.40; $t=-1.534$; "self-administration"-5.72 and 5.42; $t=-1.358$; "reflection of self-attitude"-6.25 and 6.41; $t=-1.889$; "self-esteem"-5.96 and 6.00; $t=-1.375$; "self-acceptance"- 6.41 and 6.70; $t=-1.097$; "limited nature"-6.48 and 6.68; $t=0.045$; "internal contradiction"-6.22 and 6.53; $t=0.971$; "self-blame"-6.57 and 6.97; $t=1.217$. This end result demonstrates the reliability of the methodology.

The second approach is to determine the correlation between the scales. The correlation measures obtained at this point are seen in Table 4.2.8. Just one non-significant coefficient was calculated among the scales (scale "self – worth" – $r=0.203$). Only one significant correlation has been found between all the remaining scales of the questionnaire: sincerity- $r=0.472$, $p \leq 0.01$; "self-confidence"- $r=0.261$, $p \leq 0.05$; "self-administration"- $r=0.563$, $p \leq 0.01$; "Reflection of self-attitude"- $r=0.462$, $p \leq 0.01$; "self-acceptance"- $r=0.672$, $p \leq 0.01$; "limited nature"- $r=0.462$, $p \leq 0.01$; "internal

contradiction"- $r=0.781$, $p \leq 0.01$; "self-blame"- $r=0.281$, $p \leq 0.05$. The positive correlation coefficients of the scales indicate that the questionnaire has validity and reliability .

5 CONCLUSION

The unification of the system for processing questionnaire answer sheets and responses is an integral part of the professional training of psychology specialists. The unification of the processing of questionnaire response sheets and responses has ensured increased efficiency for psychologists in the following ways:

- The uniform appearance and use of the questionnaire answer sheet have contributed to a consistent response style.
- Time savings have been achieved through the reprocessing of data collected from the questionnaire.
- Unification has not resulted in a decline in the conformity of questionnaires with psychometric parameters.
- It has ensured that the examiners' sensitivity to the questions in the survey has not changed.

The authors express their gratitude to the National University of Uzbekistan and the Tashkent State Pedagogical University for their assistance in conducting this research and look forward to continue

their collaboration in further questionnaire development studies.

REFERENCES

- Balgiu B. A. (2018). The psychometric properties of the Big Five inventory-10 (BFI-10) including correlations with subjective and psychological well-being. *Global Journal of Psychology Research: New Trends and Issues*, 8 (Benet-Martinez 1998), 061–069.
- Benet-Martinez, V., & John, O. P. (1998). Los cinco grandes across cultures and ethnic groups: Multitrait multi-method analyses of the Big Five in Spanish and English. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75, 729–750.
- Ben-Porath, Y.S. (2012). Interpreting the MMPI-2–RF. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Boyd R, Brown T. (2005) Pilot study of Myers Briggs Type Indicator personality profiling in emergency department senior medical staff. *Emerg Med Australas.*; 17:200–203.
- Costa, P. T. & McCrae, R. R. (1985). The NEO personality inventory manual. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Donnellan, M. B., Oswald, F. L., Baird, B. M. & Lucas, R. E. (2006). The mini-IPIP scales: tiny-yet-effective measures of the Big Five factors of personality. *Psychological Assessment*, 18(Benet-Martinez 1998), 92–203.
- Hahn, E., Gottschling, J. & Spinath, F. M. (2012). Short measurements of personality: validity and reliability of the GSOEP Big Five Inventory (BFI-S). *Journal of Research in Personality*, 46(Ben-Porath 2012), P.355–359.
- Hoelzle, J. B., & Meyer, G. J. (2008). The factor structure of the MMPI-2 Restructured Clinical (RC) scales. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 90, –P.443–455.
- John R. Graham. MMPI-2: Assessing Personality and Psychopathology. Oxford University Press; 5 edition (July 15, 2011). 688 p.
- Rasulov A.I. (2018). Adaptation of the thirteen factor version of Cattell's personality questionnaire// *European Journal of Research and Reflection in Educational Sciences*. Vol. 6. No. 6. Pp.10–15.
- Stilwell NA, Wallick MM, (2000); Thal SE, Burleson JA. Myers-Briggs type and medical specialty choice: a new look at an old question. *Teach Learn Med*. 12: –P.14–20.
- Batashev A.V., (2000). Multi-factor personal questionnaire R.Cattell: A practical guide. - Talin, - 88 p.
- Baturin N.A. (2010). Methods of quality control of psychodiagnostic techniques based on the standard of requirements for psychodiagnostic techniques // *Journal Bulletin of the South Ural State University, series "Psychology"*.— № 27. – P. 7–9.
- Baturin, N.A. –(2009). Test development technology: Part II / N.A. Baturin, N.N's // *Journal Bulletin of the South Ural State University, series «Psychology»*.— № 42 (175). – P. 11–25.
- Yegorova, M.S. (2016). Psychometric characteristics of the Short Portrait Questionnaire of the Big Five (B5-10)// *Psychological research*. — T. 9. – № 45. – P. 9.
- Yeliseyev O.P. Constructive typology and psychodiagnostics of personality / edited by V.N.Panferov. - Pskov, (1994). - 280 p.
- Mitin O.V. (2011) Development and adaptation of psychological questionnaires. – M.: Meaning,. - 235 p.
- Morov M.D. (2011). Diagnostics of personal qualities in the system of measurement procedures: author's abstract. thesis. Candidate of psychological sciences: 19.00.01 / Morov Mikhail Dmitrievich. – M.,– 27 p.
- Rasulov A.I. (2019). Psychodiagnostics: methods and methodology of study of the individual // *Monograph.-Tashkent:"Info Capital Group"*, -199 p.
- Rusalov, V.M. (2009). Battery Test Questionnaire «Temperament-Character»// *Bulletin of the Samara Humanitarian Academy. Series: Psychology*. — № 1. – P. 165–178.
- Sobchik L. N. (2007). Standardized multifactorial method of personality research (MMPI) A practical guide. - M.: Speech, - 224 p.
- Shmelev A. G. (2002) Psychodiagnostics of personality traits. Sankt-Peterburg.: Speech, , 480 p.