Tuijin Jishu/Journal of Propulsion Technology
ISSN: 1001-4055
Vol. 46 No. 3 (2025)

Unification of the Questionnaire Answer Sheet and the Results Reprocessing System

[1]A.B. Kadirova,[2]Yu.Kh. Karayeva, [3]S. Almardanova, [4]G.O.'Jumaeva, [5]D. Normo'minova, [6]S. Haydarova

[1]Doctor of Psychology (DSc) ,

[2]Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Psychology

[3]Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Psychology

[4]Senior Lecturer

[5]Senior Lecturer

[6]Lecturer

Abstract: Psychological diagnosis of an entity is influenced by various groups of standardized and non-standardized techniques. The leading position among them is currently held by individual surveys. Upon its official edge, there is a category of personal questionnaires-psychodiagnostic approaches where they come in the form of discussions or questions. When dealing in this type of approaches, there are criteria for the processes of students in the field of psychology. The paper is dedicated to the study of the unification of the program for the reproduction of surveys used in psychological studies. In the course of this research, the optimization of the method for the interpretation of their findings was accomplished by upgrading a variety of specific questionnaires on answer sheet. It was conducted out in compliance with the standards of comprehension the respondents, with the ability to extend them fairly in order to enhance the processing method of the questionnaire answer sheet and the results, the time spent on processing the responses, the reasonable prices of the test materials and the nature of the operation. After the unification of the system for processing the findings of the research, the degree of validity of the methodology was defined in compliance with the statistical parameters.

Keywords: unification, methodology, personality, questionnaire, efficiency, economy, thrifty, provides uniformity, allowsfast execution

I. Introduction

Survey questions are assessment instruments that are continuously mandated for change. In the first and latest ways of interviewing, witnesses to the formation of new options have been separated from the very outset. Various classifications of individual research questionnaires are formulated and are known to be the most commonly used research instrument. Since this formulation of questionnaire survey takes place throughout multiple periods, the reasons for their use in study are improved by specialists: use of the “Big five” in researchs [1], [5], [6]; use of cultural and ethnic groups [2]; analysis of the questionnaire [3], [8]; adaptation of the questionnaire [10], [11], [21]. The use of psychometric criteria of questionnaires is continuously subject to empirical control [14], the refinement of the stages and criteria for their upgradement [15], the availability of psychometric characteristics of questionnaires [16], the question of technology for the development and adaptation of questionnaires [17], the need for continuous study. Nevertheless, in some cases, psychologists feel the need to improve the system of reprocessing the questionnaire on the answer sheet and the results. Developing the survey processing system and the outcomes of the survey must not change the psychometric requirements. Our study has been performed in the process of teaching students in the field of the psychology students to work on the worksheet and the framework for the collection of personal questionnaire responses.

II. The purpose of the study

The focus of the research is to study the mechanism of consolidation of the questionnaire response sheet and the summary processing system overall. This was also aimed at strengthening the response sheet of students' questionnaires in the sphere of psychology.

III. Methodology

Specialized questionnaires are the most popular assessment tool for psychodiagnostics. Identity surveys (PQ, OPQ, OPQ32) are intended to determine emotions, behaviors, motives and other personal characteristics of a person. Identity survey questions have been assembled in a variety of versions over more than a century [12], [5], modified in diverse cultural environments [9], [10], [12], [21], and it is being implemented [1], [2], [8], [20], [22]. Questionnaire preparation technology [14], [16], [17] testing is being done to ensure that psychometric criteria [12], [15], [17], [18] are fulfilled.

IV. Methods

The situational framework is used for the analysis of performance outcome as a tester, survey answer and response processing [20], Student's T-criteria to verify the degree of predictive reliability of empiric measures obtained as a finding of the analysis, the method of correlation analysis by the criteria of K. Pearson and Mann-Whitney.

To unify the process, the following questionnaires were also selected in the study [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", Y.Strelau Temperament diagnostic questionnaire, "Q-breeding" questionnaire, H.J.Eysenck's EPI questionnaire, V.M.Rusalov's "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).

V. Participant

The survey project allows the analysis of the issue and details of strategies and methodology used in its research. The research was attended and examined by 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.

VI. Data analysis

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

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

a) the mini-mult (SMOL) form of the MMPI consists of 71 approvals 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) Myers-Briggs Personality type indicator (PTI) questionnaire is a 94 confirmation-based, network evaluation scale, with responses of dihotomic and trichotomic character;

c) V.M.Melnikov and L.T.Yampolsky's "Psychodiagnostic test" consists of 174 questions and has 14 evaluation scales and answers "dihotomic" character;

d) Y. Strela's "Temperament structure" questionnaire consists of 134 questions, with three evaluation scales and answers having a "trichotomic" character;

e) "Q-qualifying" questionnaire consists of 60 reviews and has six evaluation scales and answers "trichotomic" character;

f) H.J. Eysenck questionnaire EPI consists of 57 questions, characterizes "dihotomic" 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. Panteleev "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 reviews, 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 arrange their project work. At the introductory level, 135 students were selected as respondents in the experiment (based on the training course "General psychodiagnostics") on the research approach for processing the findings of the study by examiners according to the defined standards. Then, after the details of the methods were given, they were asked to arrange out the strategies that could be used against the evaluation criteria to replicate the results processing platform. The following aspects at the step of sorting the methodological approaches (Table 2) assembled the techniques.

In needed to conduct on the production system, the outcome of the techniques that achieved a score above the following 25 factors were split based upon its performance results of the examiners for the three parameters. The outcome is a mini-mult (Smol) type of the so-called MMPI (23,33) and "Psychodiagnostic Test" of V.M.Melnikov and L.T.Yampolsky (20,33) to comply with the requirements. We did not ask respondents why they also rated the Freiburg questionnaire (FPI) highly for comments. Because, according to the second point of the evaluation criteria of this questionnaire, one question served to evaluate two scales, which led to their ignoring. But some respondents noticed this.

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

№	c 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
1.	Mini-mult (SMOL) form of MMPI	135	-	135	90
2.	Myers-Briggs “Personality type indicator” (MBTI) questionnaire	135	135	135	135
3.	“Psychodiagnostic test” of V.M.Melnikov L.T. Yampol	135	-	126	87
4.	“Temperament structure” questionnaire Y.Strelya	135	135	135	135
5.	“Q-qualifying” questionnaire	135	135	135	135
6.	H.J.Eysenck’s Questionnaire EPI	135	135	135	135
7.	V.M. Rusalov’s “Questionnaire on the official-dynamic characteristics of individuality (of QOCI)”	135	135	135	135
8.	Questionnaire of V.V.Stalin and S.R. Panteleyev “Evaluation of self personality”	135	135	135	135
9.	Questionnaire of Freyburg (FPI)	135	118	123	125

Five participants should be split into small teams at the next level of the experiment, and each group should perform an independent analysis on the response sheet and the main methods of sorting. It was suggested to depend on the following requirements in order to propose a version of their unification:

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 in order to clarify the task. After a two-week innovative strategy, respondents were presented with a wide range of interpretations, a variety of materials prepared on the side of the survey, but the ability to find an optimal version of the technique was very constrained, and progressions in putting the questionnaire key on the response sheet in the intergroup were evaluated as the most desired selection, i.e. six of these empirical indicators were summarized in Table 3.

A primary agreement with the table was demonstrated by the answers proposed by the classes. This group was also able to define the errors made in the previous process by the participants and to try to show that the response sheet for the related Freiburg questionnaire (stenciled) matched the requirements needed. They developed a version of the "Temperament structure" questionnaire Y. Strelya, questionnaire "Q-qualifying", H.J.Eysenck's questionnaire EPI, "Questionnaire on the official-dynamic characteristics of individuality (of QOCI)", the leaves of Questionnaire V.V.Stalin and S.R.Panteleyev also suitable for the development of the questionnaire "Evaluation of self personality".

Table-3 The indicators of the groups of materials prepared for the unification of the system of processing of the questionnaire response sheet and results (significance of differences were determined by the criterion Styudent)

№	Criteria	Groups													
		1		2		3		4		5		6		7	
		M	σ	M	σ	M	σ	M	σ	M	σ	M	σ	M	σ
1	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**	
2	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**	
3	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**	
4	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**	
5	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**	

**p≤0,01

According to the results presented in table 3, the other groups were significantly assessed by the team which presented the alternative that served to assure the unification of the answer sheet of the methods in the study. This has been verified by empirical indicators of statistical importance (provides validity relative to fifth and seventh

category indicators - 4,70, p≤0,01; time consumption is low - 4,53, p≤0.01), saving - 4,60, p≤0.01 by the criterion; makes quick execution - 15,157, p≤0,001; understandable and comfortable for users - 4,26, p≤0.01).

In turn, a work has been done to review the mutual influence of the expert assessment parameters of the other six groups supplied to this category. A correlation research was performed out for this intention on the material prepared by 6 groups on the basis of the replies of other members of the group (Table 4).

According to the correlation study, there were strong positive and, in turn, negative correlation affiliations between the methodological variables on 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, on the example of an option with the most effective indicator, the correlation coefficients of expert assessments give a certain definition to this. The proposed option for a response processing system provided uniformity for all methodologies under the condition of unification. This criteria led to a "reduction in time consumption"(r=0,477, p≤0,01), an increase in "savings"(r=0,69, p≤0,01).

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≤0,05; ** p≤0,01

Although unification is provided by the criterion of “low time consumption”, the criterion of “saving” is the natural increase (r=0.450, p≤0.01); “understandable and convenient for users” leads (r=0,487, p≤0,01). While ensuring the criterion of “saving” in unification as long as it provides “clarity and convenience for users” (r=0.357, p≤0.05).

The irony seems to be that the provision of the unification process may have triggered confusion and discomfort to the customer according to the criteria “allows fast execution” (r=-0,348, p≤0.01). Perhaps this concept also applies to focus concentrating, trouble making snap judgments, a reluctance to perform action monotonously, failure to have dynamics on activity, and a multitude of other psychological factors.

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

On the single questionnaire method for analyzing answers, the next step of the experiment was conducted. The experiment was built on the basis of a group of students who took part in the unification, as well as 3-4 students from the course. As a control group (n=45), one of these groups was developed, and the other as an experimental group (n=50).

In addition, test materials focused on the types of research methods based on the normal and unification response processing framework were devised at an earlier stage of the experiment. The members of the study group were scheduled to work on the questionnaire of answers obtained on the regular approach types and on the questionnaire of unification of answers.

Responses from the application of techniques were processed with the support of the participants from both classes. With the control group, the experimental group members performed the mission assigned to them. Any of them noted in the response sheet the time spent on reviewing the replies. Comparatively, their empirical parameters were studied in the experiment. With the assistance of participants in both groups, responses from the use of strategies were processed. With the control group, the experimental group members performed the mission assigned to them. The time spent reading the responses on the answer sheet was reported by both of them. In the experiment, relative empirical parameters were tested.

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. And in the formative group, along with the details of the questionnaire, a methodological instruction was given to improve its response sheet. Then, according to the statistical processing result of the indicators between the results of the group participating in both experiment-test were obtained result indicators 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	181,00	0,000*
Self-attitude questionnaire (V.V.Stolin)	65,12	22,00	36,12	0,000*

Annotation: * – expression of statistically significant differences.

It can be seen from the quantitative indicators collected that it is necessary, of necessity, to save time in the processing of their responses during the use of questionnaires 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 results processing. However, in our experience, analytical measures suggest that the situation is sufficiently achieved. H.Y. Eysenck (EPI) questionnaire (U=35,00, p<0,05), Y. Strelyau's "Temperament structure" (U=18,01, p<0,05), Frayburg questionaire (FPI) (U=94,25, p<0,05), V.M.Rusalov's questionaire ((U=181,01, p<0,05), Self-attitude (V.V.Stolin) questionaire (U=36,12, p<0,05). It is important that there are variations in the unification of the method of processing outcomes in terms of control and experimental experience.

The study done on the unification of the production mechanism in identity psychodiagnostic technique responses followed the analysis with a view to being part of the studies in this direction. This was to locate the empirical facts that determined the objective and unbiased existence of our study carried out and validated it. Taking this into account, as a continuation of our studies on the integration of processing structures, the analysis consisted of testing the state of conformity between the individual questionnaire answers and post-unification indicators with their original choices.

Respondents were recruited at the next level of the study to assess the consistency status of individual questionnaires between the alternatives of the original and unification. At this point, as a main research participant, students in the educational path "psychology" were also engaged. In the analysis, the examiners administered both variants of questionnaires and the correlation between them was determined. In the tables below, the results are presented (table 5).

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 work of experts, they do not, however, change the individual findings collected.

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≤0,05; ** p≤0,01.

Indicators were developed between the outcomes of the application of the first and second versions of the Ayzenk 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 between "extraversion-introversion" (r=0,548, p≤0,01), "neuroticism" (r=0,701, p≤0,01) and sincerity reliability indicators found their confirmation. 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 ва 12,76; t=0,358), "neuroticism" (12,05 ва 11,96; t=0,068) and scale of sincerity (3,60 ва 3,62; t=-0,071). We can say that the unification form of G. Y, Eysenck questionnaire provided convenience to specialists for processing answers, but it did not have a negative impact on its internal stability indicators.

In determining reliability indicators between unification methods, the test was carried out on the basis of Y.Strelya's temperament study questionnaireWhen checking the level of reliability between both variants of this methodology, the differences between the mean values were determined reliability and the correlation relationship between the indicators. The indicators of the experiment are reflected in Table 7.

Table 7 Correlation relationship between scales of Y. Strelyau's questionnaire 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	52,07	11,09	1,064	0,643**

Annotation: *p≤0,05; ** p≤0,01.

Indicators on the average slope of the first and second forms between the scales "excitation force", "braking force", "mobility" of the methodology: 56, 79 ва 55, 51; t=0,693; 52,69 ва 53,28; t=0,221; 53,56 ва 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 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. 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≤0, 05, "braking power" - r=0,428, p≤0,01, "mobility"- r=0,648, p≤0,01. This reflected 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 part of the content of the methodology.

In order to ensure the objectivity and fairness of the research carried out on the unification of the response processing system of personality psychodiagnostics methods, it was attempted 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 was carried out on "individual self-attitude". The findings on the unification form feature of the questionnaire were reflected in the materials analyzed above. And we are wondering if there will 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.

On the forms of the questionnaire, the correlation between the mean arithmetic values of the scales and the scales were determined.

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**		
1.	Sincerity	5,46	1,51	5,52	1,35	-0,760	0,472**
2.	Self-confidence	5,21	1,68	5,40	1,88	-1,534	0,261*
3.	Self-administration	5,72	1,79	5,42	1,79	-1,358	0,563**
4.	Reflection of self-attitude	6,25	1,93	6,41	1,93	-1,889	

							0,278*
5.	Self-esteem	5,96	1,80	6,0	1,78	-1,375	0,203
6.	Self-acceptance	6,41	2,15	6,70	1,69	-1,097	0,672**
7.	Limited nature	6,48	1,90	6,68	1,76	0,045	0,462**
8.	Internal contradiction	6,22	1,13	6,53	1,35	0,971	0,781**
9.	Self-blame	6,57	1,61	6,97	1,53	1, 217	0,281*

Annotation: *p≤0,05; ** p≤0,01.

After the unification of V.V.Stalin and S.R. Panteleev's questionnaire "Individual self-attitude", the place of scales was replaced. But we relied on the original state of the scale in determining whether the questionnaire had content reliability. The mean value of the scale of the questionnaire and the relationship between the two correlations reflected the same attitude 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 6,0; 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. Moreover, this is the end result that 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). A significant correlation has been found between all the remaining scales of the questionnaire: sincerity- r=0,472, p≤0,01; "self-confidence"- r=0,261, p≤0,05; "self-administration"- r=0,563, p≤0,01; "Reflection of self-attitude"- r=0,462, p≤0,01; "self-acceptance"- r=0,672, p≤0,01; "limited nature"- r=0,462, p≤0,01; "internal contradiction"- r=0,781, p≤0,01; "self-blame"- r=0,281, p≤0,05. The fact that the correlation coefficients of the scales shows positive indexes that the questionnaire has a validity and reliability.

Conclusion

The future of an integral part of professional training of specialists in psychology is unification of the system of processing of questionnaires' answer sheets and responses. Unification of the processing of questionnaires response sheet and responses ensured psychologists labor efficiency:

the same appearance and use of the questionnaire answer sheet contributed to a style of response;

time savings were achieved as the data collected from the questionnaire were reprocessed;

unification did not result in a decline in the conformity of questionnaires with psychometric parameters;

it ensured that the sensitivity of the examiners to the questions in the survey did not change.

The authors express their gratitude to the National University of Uzbekistan and the Tashkent State Pedagogical University for their assistance in carrying out this research and are eager to continue their collaboration in carrying out further research on the development of questionnaires.

References:

[1] 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 (2), 061–069.

[2] 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.

[3] Ben-Porath, Y. S. (2012). Interpreting the MMPI–2–RF. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

[4] Boyd R, Brown T. Pilot study of Myers Briggs Type Indicator personality profiling in emergency department senior medical staff. Emerg Med Australas. 2005;17:200-203.

[5] Costa, P. T. & McCrae, R. R. (1985). The NEO personality inventory manual. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

[6] 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(2), 92–203.

[7] 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(3), P.355–359.

[8] 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.

[9] John R. Graham. MMPI-2: Assessing Personality and Psychopathology. Oxford University Press; 5 edition (July 15, 2011). 688 p.

[10] Rasulov A.I. Adaptation of the thirteen factor version of Cattell's personality questionnaire// European Journal of Research and Reflection in Educational Sciences. 2018. Vol. 6. No. 6. Pp.10-15.

[11] Stilwell NA, Wallick MM, Thal SE, Burleson JA. Myers-Briggs type and medical specialty choice: a new look at an old question. Teach Learn Med. 2000;12: –P.14–20.

[12] Batashev A.V., Multi-factor personal questionnaire R.Cattell: A practical guide. - Talin, 2000. - 88 p.

[13] Baturin N.A. 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".– 2010. – № 27. – P. 7-9.

[14] Baturin, N.A. Test development technology: Part II / N.A. Baturin, N.N's // Journal Bulletin of the South Ural State University, series «Psychology». – 2009. – № 42 (175). – P. 11-25.

[15] Yegorova, M.S. Psychometric characteristics of the Short Portrait Questionnaire of the Big Five (B5-10)// Psychological research. – 2016. – T. 9. – № 45. – P. 9.

[16] Yeliseyev O.P. Constructive typology and psychodiagnostics of personality / edited by V.N.Panferov. - Pskov, 1994. - 280 p.

[17] Mitin O.V. Development and adaptation of psychological questionnaires. – M.: Meaning, 2011. - 235 p.

[18] Morov M.D. 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., 2011. – 27 p.

[19] Rasulov A.I. Psychodiagnostics: methods and methodology of study of the individual // Monograph.- Tashkent:"Info Capital Group", 2019. -199 p.

[20] Rusalov, V.M. Battery Test Questionnaire «Temperament-Character»// Bulletin of the Samara Humanitarian Academy. Series: Psychology. – 2009. – № 1. – P. 165-178.

[21] Sobchik L. N. Standardized multifactorial method of personality research (MMPI) A practical guide. - M.: Speech, 2007. - 224 p.

[22] Shmelev A. G. Psychodiagnostics of personality traits. Sankt-Peterburg.: Speech, 2002, 480 p.