

Characteristics of Unfamiliar People Personality in the Assessments of Observers with Different Teaching Experience

Olga A. Korolkova

Moscow State University of Psychology & Education, Moscow, Russia
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4814-7266>, e-mail: olga.kurakova@gmail.com

Evgeny G. Khoze

Moscow State University of Psychology & Education, Moscow, Russia
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9355-1693>, e-mail: house.yu@gmail.com

Elena A. Lupenko

Moscow State University of Psychology & Education; Moscow Institute of Psychoanalysis, Moscow, Russia
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4026-7581>, e-mail: elena-lupenko@yandex.ru

The study analyzes the professional ability of teachers to accurately perceive and evaluate the student's personalities. Teachers with varying levels of professional experience (1—4 years and 5 years and above) as well as individuals without teaching experience were recruited for this study. Video recordings of the behavior of six posers (three women and three men) during an interview were used as stimuli. From the video recordings, fragments lasting 1 minute were extracted, containing the poser's speech and their responses to the interviewer's questions. The audio track in the video clips was removed. Participants, both with and without pedagogical experience, evaluated the posers using a specially designed semantic differential that included 25 scales. These scales describe various aspects of personality as self-regulation, organizational and communication skills, empathy, and more. Prior to this evaluation, participants had been assessed using the same semantic differential scales. Subsequently, they were asked to rate, on a ten-point scale, the success of their current or potential professional activity as a teacher in high school, college, and university. The forecast of potential teaching activities was also conducted in relation to the posers being assessed. The results of the study in all groups showed that the mean scores on the scales did not differ significantly. The method of semantic universals made it possible to identify the characteristics of each of the posers. The sets of semantic universals varied, but participants with different professional backgrounds highlighted different sets of characteristics. However, a number of characteristics were consistently emphasized in all groups. A similar factor structure was obtained, containing four common factors: factor 1 "responsiveness", factor 2 "discipline", factor 3 "activity" and factor 4 "stress resistance", i.e. we can say that the perception of an unfamiliar poser by all individuals is based on the same latent variables. However, factor 4 "stress resistance" has the greatest weight in the group of teachers with extensive teaching experience (5 years and more).

Keywords: nonverbal communication; teacher's professional experience; first impression; semantic differential.

For citation: Korolkova O.A., Khoze E.G., Lupenko E.A. Characteristics of Unfamiliar People Personality in the Assessments of Observers with Different Teaching Experience. *Psikhologicheskaya nauka i obrazovanie = Psychological Science and Education*, 2024. Vol. 29, no. 6, pp. 205—220. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17759/pse.2024290614> (In Russ.).

Характеристики личности незнакомого человека в оценках наблюдателей с разным педагогическим опытом

Королькова О.А.

ФГБОУ ВО «Московский государственный психолого-педагогический университет»
(ФГБОУ ВО МГППУ), г. Москва, Российская Федерация
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4814-7266>, e-mail: olga.kurakova@gmail.com

Хозе Е.Г.

ФГБОУ ВО «Московский государственный психолого-педагогический университет»
(ФГБОУ ВО МГППУ), г. Москва, Российская Федерация
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9355-1693>, e-mail: house.yu@gmail.com

Лупенко Е.А.

ФГБОУ ВО «Московский государственный психолого-педагогический университет»
(ФГБОУ ВО МГППУ); НОЧУ ВО «Московский институт психоанализа»
(НОЧУ ВО МИП), г. Москва, Российская Федерация
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4026-7581>, e-mail: elena-lupenko@yandex.ru

Представленное в статье исследование посвящено проблеме умений педагога воспринимать и оценивать личность учащегося. Его участниками были педагоги с разным профессиональным опытом (1—4 года; 5 лет и выше) и контрольная группа испытуемых без педагогического опыта. В качестве стимульного материала использовались видеозаписи поведения шести натурщиков (трех женщин и трех мужчин), проходящих собеседование. Из полученных видеозаписей выделялись фрагменты длительностью 1 мин., содержащие речь натурщика и его ответы на вопросы интервьюера. Звуковая дорожка в видеофрагментах была удалена. Участники (без педагогического опыта и с педагогическим опытом) оценивали натурщиков по специально разработанному семантическому дифференциалу, содержащему 25 шкал. Шкалы описывают различные аспекты личности, связанные с саморегуляцией, организационными и коммуникативными способностями, эмпатией и др. Предварительно была произведена самооценка участников по тем же шкалам семантического дифференциала. Далее участникам предлагалось по десятибалльной шкале оценить успешность своей текущей (или дать прогноз возможной) профессиональной деятельности как педагога в образовательных учреждениях разного уровня — в средней школе, в колледже и в вузе. Прогноз возможной педагогической деятельности выполнялся и по отношению к оцениваемым натурщикам. Результаты исследования во всех группах испытуемых, независимо от опыта педагогической деятельности, говорят о том, что средние профили оценок по шкалам значимо не различаются. Метод семантических универсалий позволил выделить

характеристики каждого из натурщиков, одинаково оцениваемых значимым большинством однородной группы испытуемых. Наборы семантических универсалий варьируют в зависимости от конкретного натурщика, но при этом участники с разным профессиональным опытом выделяют разные наборы характеристик натурщиков. Вместе с тем ряд характеристик стабильно выделяется в оценках натурщиков всеми группами испытуемых. Получена сходная факторная структура, содержащая по четыре общих фактора: фактор 1 «отзывчивость», фактор 2 «дисциплинированность», фактор 3 «активность» и фактор 4 «стрессоустойчивость», т.е. можно говорить о том, что восприятие незнакомого натурщика всеми испытуемыми происходит с опорой на одни и те же латентные переменные. Однако фактор 4 «стрессоустойчивость» имеет наибольший вес в группе педагогов с большим педагогическим опытом (5 лет и более).

Ключевые слова: невербальная коммуникация; профессиональный опыт педагога; первое впечатление; семантический дифференциал.

Для цитаты: Королькова О.А., Хозе Е.Г., Лупенко Е.А. Характеристики личности незнакомого человека в оценках наблюдателей с разным педагогическим опытом // Психологическая наука и образование. 2024. Том 29. № 6. С. 205—220. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17759/pse.2024290614>

Introduction

The studies of interpersonal communication in the course of professional activity hold a special place in psychological science, as it indicates the communicative competence of specialists in a wide variety of professions. Thus, in pedagogical occupation, a teacher needs to monitor constantly the situation in the classroom and make a variety of decisions that mainly depend on the behavior of students [17]. Some researchers even note that the main specificity of a teacher's work lies in the need to continuously observe students' behavior and track their reactions [19; 32]. Based on this, of particular interest to researchers is the ability of a teacher to perceive and adequately interpret not only the students' behavior, but also their individual and personal characteristics.

A number of authors have studied how accurately teachers assess the characteristics of students, with the main focus on judgments about their individual cognitive or motivational and affective characteristics [28]. The studies have shown that teachers assess students' academic knowledge more accurately than

their general cognitive abilities, self-esteem, or interest. In addition, teachers tend to perceive students holistically and to mix up different student characteristics when asked to evaluate, for example, only student performance or motivation [35].

In other studies, student profiles obtained from teacher assessments were compared with student self-assessments [27; 35]. These studies have shown that teachers consistently tend to rate their students' performance in a predominantly homogeneous manner, as "generally strong", "generally weak", and most often "generally average". However, the profiles obtained from student assessments are much more varied, including contradictory patterns such as underestimation, overestimation, or lack of interest [27].

The studies of the accuracy of teachers' assessment of individual characteristics of students have shown that teachers assess self-esteem, motivation for learning, and positive and negative emotions of students with low to moderate accuracy [18; 25; 34]. No evidence was found for a general ability to

accurately assess students' personality traits: most correlations between different components of accuracy within a trait, and the same components between traits, were insignificant [34]. Four factors have been revealed based on the description of personal characteristics of students by their school teachers: behavior in the classroom; dominance; physical health; sense of beauty [26].

The first impression that a teacher forms of students, as well as their expectations and prejudices, can affect further interaction during the educational process and the academic performance of students.

As the length of teaching experience increases, a number of personal characteristics of teachers can change significantly [6]. In particular, in the first years of service, school teachers have a reduced tendency to experience the emotion of joy, but an increased tendency to experience sadness, fear, and anger. As the length of service increases, this tendency changes to the opposite [13]. Also, as the length of service of school teachers increases, their empathy increases, but emotional burnout becomes more pronounced, and latent aggression increases [10].

The present study was conducted in the paradigm of "thin slices" of human behavior and activity [15; 16; 29]. This approach is well-established in psychology, sociology, medicine and communication studies [14; 30; 33]. It is based on the phenomenon that an adequate representation of an unfamiliar person's personality can be formed on the basis of a short-term exposure to their non-verbal behavior. Such thin "slices" of behavior provide evolutionarily significant and ecologically valid information about the possibility of interaction and communication with a given interlocutor, or the need to avoid them [36; 37]. Significant theories of interpersonal perception, such as the lens model, the ecological approach, and others, consider the "thin slices" approach as

an effective and adequate way to study a person in specific life situations. It has been shown that key personality traits are unconsciously manifested in nonverbal behavior [20—24; 31]. According to studies, thin sections allow for a reliable and valid assessment of the behavior of an unfamiliar person [30].

Unlike previous studies, our aim was to study the peculiarities of perception and assessment of personal traits of strangers made by teachers with different professional experience. The importance to study the first impression of teachers is in the first impression of students that the teacher forms, as well as their expectations and prejudices, that can affect further interaction during the educational process and the academic performance of students. A set of personality traits that, according to experts, are significant during the educational process, were used as individual psychological characteristics. We were interested in whether the perception and assessment of personality would change depending on the length of professional service of a teacher. If the professional experience indeed changes the first impression, we expect to obtain differences between the groups of novices and experienced teachers. If the first impression is not related to the professional experience of a teacher, similar assessment profiles are expected for all groups of participants.

Methods

Participants. One-hundred and five people (115 women and 20 men aged 19 to 71 years, median age 35 years) took part in the study. They were students and teachers of Moscow universities, and had normal or corrected-to-normal vision. Based on their teaching experience, the participants were divided into three groups:

- participants with no teaching experience (84 people: 71 women and 13 men; age 19—53, median 32 years);

- participants with less than 5 years of teaching experience (23 people: 20 women and 3 men; age 24—50, median 38 years);
- participants with 5 years or more of teaching experience (28 people: 24 women and 4 men; age 29—71, median 40 years).

Stimuli and apparatus. We recorded videos of six people (three women and three men) who were interviewed by a researcher. They were students of second higher education (Psychology), and had different occupations. We aimed at recording their natural non-verbal behavior during an autobiographical interview. They answered questions asked by the interviewer, who sat in a chair in front of them at a distance of 150 cm. We used Panasonic HC-V720MEE video cameras (Full HD, shooting frequency 50 Hz) to record the communication process from different points of view. The camera filming the interviewee's face was located at a distance of 200—250 cm at their eyes level. The face and shoulders of the interviewee were filmed at three-quarter. We extracted 1-minute fragments from the resulting video recordings, that included the interviewee's answers to the interviewer's questions. The sound track in the video fragments was deleted. As the main objective of the current study was to examine the ability of teachers with different teaching experience to determine the individual psychological characteristics of unfamiliar people based on their non-verbal behavior, the interview was used as a model communication situation in which the non-verbal component of communication is expressed clearly. Therefore, the particular content of the interview is not a significant factor in the study.

Procedure. The study was conducted online using jspsych 6.3.0. The stimuli were presented via a web browser in full-screen mode, and the participants' responses were recorded. The technical requirements included a minimum screen resolution of 800 600 pixels

and usage of a computer or laptop. The procedure included two parts. First, participants provided information about their gender, age, occupation, and teaching experience. Then they were asked, using scale from -3 to +3, to complete a self-assessment on bipolar scales that were prepared on the basis of scientific literature about the leading professionally important qualities of a teacher [5]. The scales describe various aspects of personality associated with self-regulation, organizational and communicative abilities, empathy, etc. [7]. The scales for the semantic differential were selected based on the ideas about the leading professionally important qualities of a teacher. Initially, the widest possible list of such qualities was formed, then synonyms were excluded from it. Then the list was reviewed by experts (experienced teachers), and the least relevant qualities were excluded. Despite the fact that formal validation was not carried out, we conducted a pilot study to refine the initial list. The final list included the following 25 bipolar seven-point scales: "attentive — inattentive"; "disciplined — undisciplined"; "friendly — unfriendly"; "initiative — uninitiative"; "critical — uncritical"; "loving children — not loving children"; "observant — unobservant"; "sociable — unsociable"; "objective — inobjective"; "optimistic — pessimistic"; "responsible — irresponsible"; "responsive — unresponsive"; "far-sighted — short-sighted"; "independent — dependent"; "able to see the potential of others — unable to see the potential of others"; "capable of self-regulation — incapable of self-regulation"; "empathetic — lacking empathy"; "able to lead — unable to lead"; "fair — unfair"; "striving for self-development — not striving for self-development"; "stress-resistant — not stress-resistant"; "tactful — tactless"; "demanding — undemanding"; "sensitive — insensitive"; "energetic — passive". Then the participants were asked to rate on a ten-point

scale the success of their current (or give a forecast of possible) professional activity as a teacher in educational institutions of different levels: at school, college and university.

Next, the participants were sequentially shown video clips of people undergoing interview, in randomized order. The video clips lasted 1 min and were shown without sound. The participants' task was to assess each interviewee using the same scales that were used at the first stage of the study, and to predict the success of the person's possible professional activity as a teacher. Each video was shown only once. The linear dimensions of the stimuli were 500×500 pixels. Before the video clips began, a fixation cross was shown in the center of the screen (duration 1 s), and after the end of the video clip, a blank light-gray screen was shown (duration 200 ms).

Data analysis. We used Statistica 10 and R 3.6.3 to analyze the data. In each of the three groups of participants, the structure of the assessments was revealed using Factor analysis (Principal components method) with Varimax normalized rotation. A comparison of assessments between different groups of participants was conducted using the Mann—Whitney U test with the Benjamini—Hochberg correction for multiple comparisons. Additionally, we used the method of semantic universals to analyze the responses [2; 12]. A semantic universal for a given stimulus is a list of evaluations that are rated similarly by a significant majority of a homogeneous group of subjects [12, p. 259]. It is a data-driven structure of presenting experimental data, which has an advantage over formal mathematical models, based on the properties of a set of real numbers and the conditions for the applicability of quantitative methods [12, p. 22].

Results

Self-assessment of personal qualities, performed by teachers with different profes-

sional experience, were compared using U Mann—Whitney test. The results showed significantly higher results in the most experienced teachers, compared to participants with no experience, on the following scales: “observant — unobservant” ($U = 1522$; $p = .012$); “objective — inobjective” ($U = 1504$; $p = .017$); “fair — unfair” ($U = 1454.5$; $p = .039$), however, after applying the correction for multiple comparisons, the differences became non-significant. Also, compared to participants with no experience, teachers with the most experience rated higher the success of their professional activity as a university teacher ($U = 738.5$; $p = .003$). No significant differences were found between the groups of participants with little and much experience, as well as between teachers with little experience and the control group.

The semantic universals were identified based on the results of self-assessment. Two of them coincide in all groups of participants: “striving for self-development” and “not stress-resistant”. Additionally, in the group of participants without teaching experience, we revealed the universals “responsible” and “empathetic”.

The comparison of personality assessments of the interviewees between different groups of participants using the Mann—Whitney U criterion did not reveal any significant differences (all $p > .05$).

The method of semantic universals allowed us to identify the characteristics of each of the interviewees, similarly assessed by a significant majority of the homogeneous group of subjects. The results are presented in Table 1. As in our previous work [8], the sets of the semantic universals vary depending on the poser. Participants with different professional experience identify different sets of characteristics of the unfamiliar people. At the same time, a number of characteristics are consistently identified by all groups of subjects.

Factor analysis revealed four factors common for all groups of participants. The results are presented in Tables 2—4.

Factor 1 (contribution to the total variance: 22.6% — control group; 20.3% — teachers with 1 to 4 years of experience; 20.0% — teachers with 5+ years of experience) is interpreted as

“responsiveness”. It includes high loadings on the variables: “friendly — unfriendly”, “loving children — not loving children”, “responsive — unresponsive”, “empathetic — lacking empathy”, “sensitive — insensitive”.

Factor 2 (contribution to the total variance: 17.8% — control group; 16.0% —

Table 1

Semantic universals identified during the assessment of the interviewees by participants with different professional experience

Inter-viewee	Control group	Experience 1—4 years	Experience 5+ years
S01	Sociable Energetic Uncritical Undemanding	Sociable Optimistic Uncritical	Sociable Optimistic Energetic Uncritical Unable to lead Undemanding
S02	Friendly Objective Responsible Independent Fair Stress-resistant Tactful Passive	Disciplined Stress-resistant Pessimistic Unable to lead Passive	Capable of self-regulation Stress-resistant Unable to lead
S06	Responsible Independent Fair Tactful Passive	Attentive Disciplined Critical Observant Responsible Independent Passive	Friendly Critical Objective Responsible Capable of self-regulation Fair Tactful Pessimistic Passive
S08	Friendly Empathetic Tactful Unable to lead Undemanding	Friendly Tactful Uninitiative Unable to lead Undemanding	Friendly Unable to lead
S11	Responsible Far-sighted Independent Unsociable Passive	Observant Responsible Tactful Unable to lead	Attentive Responsible Capable of self-regulation Striving for self-development Pessimistic Unable to lead
S12	Responsible Insensitive	Disciplined Insensitive	Disciplined Responsible Far-sighted Pessimistic

Note. For each interviewee, the universals that coincide in the three groups of observers are shown in bold.

teachers with 1 to 4 years of experience; 20.6% — teachers with 5 years of experience and above) is interpreted as “discipline” and includes high loadings on the variables: “attentive — inattentive”, “disciplined — undisciplined”, “observant — unobservant”, “responsible — irresponsible”.

Factor 3 (contribution to the total variance: 14.5% — control group; 23.4% — teachers with 1 to 4 years of experience; 15.6% — teachers with 5+ years of experience) is interpreted as “activity” and includes high loadings

on the variables: “initiative — uninitiative”, “sociable — unsociable”, “able to lead — unable to lead”, “energetic — passive”.

Factor 4 (contribution to the total variance: 1% — control group; 1% — teachers with experience from 1 to 4 years; 12.8% — teachers with 5+ years of experience) is interpreted as “stress resistance”. It includes high loadings on the variables: “capable of self-regulation — incapable of self-regulation” and “stress-resistant — not stress-resistant”.

Table 2

Factor loadings (control group)

Scales	Factor 1 “responsiveness”	Factor 2 “discipline”	Factor 3 “activity”	Factor 4 “stress resistance”
Attentive — Inattentive	.189127	.800778	.127447	-.035043
Disciplined — Undisciplined	.189795	.763324	.118751	.079760
Friendly — Unfriendly	.775085	.103556	.265396	-.035213
Initiative — Uninitiative	.192875	.330917	.758442	.151555
Critical — Uncritical	-.305026	.581412	.166947	.298543
Loving children — Not loving children	.746768	.106162	.318212	.028706
Observant — Unobservant	.241363	.743902	.172912	.133233
Sociable — Unsociable	.401998	.067045	.777842	.022192
Objective — Inobjective	.509103	.368349	-.116839	.346865
Optimistic — Pessimistic	.541728	.049059	.649760	.094215
Responsible — Irresponsible	.331119	.668633	.064527	.237607
Responsive — Unresponsive	.780421	.101679	.323812	.069600
Far-sighted — Short-sighted	.047595	.667822	.046510	.256036
Independent — Dependent	.046896	.509971	.241157	.486098
Able to see the potential of others — Unable to see the potential of others	.463689	.395504	.249183	.302784
Capable of self-regulation — Incapable of self-regulation	.314748	.301940	.104693	.601070
Empathetic — Lacking empathy	.793781	.111711	.311594	.036688
Able to lead — Unable to lead	.115507	.320639	.667242	.464015
Fair — Unfair	.645805	.132416	-.033432	.504923
Striving for self-development — Not striving for self-development	.382025	.417704	.328682	.268636
Stress-resistant — Not stress-resistant	.003022	.196362	.198488	.744447
Tactful — Tactless	.724632	.101819	-.078396	.185486

Scales	Factor 1 "responsiveness"	Factor 2 "discipline"	Factor 3 "activity"	Factor 4 "stress resistance"
Demanding — Undemanding	-.283578	.523383	.385268	.275964
Sensitive — Insensitive	.783184	.079176	.293706	-.017936
Energetic — Passive	.225160	.178543	.843361	.162687
Contribution to total variance	22.6%	17.8%	14.5%	1.0%

Note. Loadings >.6 are highlighted in bold.

Table 3

Factor loadings (group of teachers with experience from 1 to 4 years)

Scales	Factor 1 "responsiveness"	Factor 2 "discipline"	Factor 3 "activity"	Factor 4 "stress resistance"
Attentive — Inattentive	.153970	.744808	.416895	.019330
Disciplined — Undisciplined	.215076	.817902	-.016460	.116818
Friendly — Unfriendly	.734277	.376838	.151815	-.191996
Initiative — Uninitiative	.226424	.365308	.738019	.082911
Critical — Uncritical	-.552224	.281560	.199711	.337001
Loving children — Not loving children	.635600	.235330	.404453	-.084583
Observant — Unobservant	.072781	.656888	.376918	.104751
Sociable — Unsociable	.418271	.047721	.732936	-.042405
Objective — Inobjective	.453063	.576166	.114291	.370816
Optimistic — Pessimistic	.511444	.112287	.712360	.133267
Responsible — Irresponsible	.261894	.746237	.266842	.191513
Responsive — Unresponsive	.835957	.170221	.251073	-.052340
Far-sighted — Short-sighted	-.006753	.599303	.560450	.221681
Independent — Dependent	-.090293	.365759	.622664	.286981
Able to see the potential of others — Unable to see the potential of others	.364235	.197101	.569291	.227065
Capable of self-regulation — Incapable of self-regulation	.120595	.189574	.441726	.665174
Empathetic — Lacking empathy	.724957	.107460	.314902	.000465
Able to lead — Unable to lead	.039009	.316246	.743263	.314661
Fair — Unfair	.567035	.212129	.211958	.383371
Striving for self-development — Not striving for self-development	.290226	.233124	.722945	.163904
Stress-resistant — Not stress-resistant	-.069709	.156521	.160905	.848333
Tactful — Tactless	.739757	.051961	-.017181	.254288
Demanding — Undemanding	-.372628	.414107	.482560	.396782
Sensitive — Insensitive	.672320	.141881	.355307	.000638

Scales	Factor 1 “responsiveness”	Factor 2 “discipline”	Factor 3 “activity”	Factor 4 “stress resistance”
Energetic — Passive	.256024	.110019	.861131	.166065
Contribution to total variance	20.3%	16.0%	23.4%	1.0%

Table 4

Factor loadings (group of teachers with 5+ years of experience)

Scales	Factor 1 “responsiveness”	Factor 2 “discipline”	Factor 3 “activity”	Factor 4 “stress resistance”
Attentive — Inattentive	.228923	.687531	.144332	.145281
Disciplined — Undisciplined	.208167	.809103	-.004106	.135618
Friendly — Unfriendly	.752899	.056986	.226978	.061285
Initiative — Uninitiative	.214697	.349507	.724145	.240076
Critical — Uncritical	-.165299	.675062	.365994	.054627
Loving children — Not loving children	.766301	.067815	.230816	.105651
Observant — Unobservant	.266289	.655465	.329604	.194472
Sociable — Unsociable	.490751	.065169	.749772	.104051
Objective — Inobjective	.287317	.463307	.079460	.541366
Optimistic — Pessimistic	.503702	.077122	.699580	.161659
Responsible — Irresponsible	.223220	.684853	.061433	.461298
Responsive — Unresponsive	.820304	.018108	.268887	.183207
Far-sighted — Short-sighted	.126238	.699954	.154864	.428606
Independent — Dependent	.039406	.499152	.281667	.610443
Able to see the potential of others — Unable to see the potential of others	.487225	.341664	.464316	.304995
Capable of self-regulation — Incapable of self-regulation	.045789	.379426	.273549	.605972
Empathetic — Lacking empathy	.794871	.191337	.150730	-.046349
Able to lead — Unable to lead	.089923	.377697	.638200	.447061
Fair — Unfair	.500685	.243452	.094673	.633649
Striving for self-development — Not striving for self-development	.243685	.622941	.308808	.226135
Stress-resistant — Not stress-resistant	-.048202	.126189	.303223	.805641
Tactful — Tactless	.602163	.502724	-.180308	.079714
Demanding — Undemanding	-.047604	.570110	.435102	.286522
Sensitive — Insensitive	.816434	.223828	.108250	.041499
Energetic — Passive	.257108	.228093	.792186	.238113
Contribution to total variance	20.0%	20.6%	15.6%	12.7%

Since the contribution of a factor to the total variance of results is an indicator of its power, we can say that for the control group (participants without teaching experience), the most important is factor 1 “responsiveness”, i.e. the characteristics included in this factor are the most important and essential for pedagogical activity, according to the participants. For the second group (teachers with 1—4 years of experience), the most important characteristics are those included in factor 3 “activity”. For the group of experienced teachers (teaching experience of 5 years or more), the most important are the characteristics included in factor 2 “discipline” and factor 1 “responsiveness”. Thus, as the duration of teaching experience increases, the ratio of the contribution of each of the identified factors changes.

Notably, factor 4, which has a low contribution to the total variance (1%) in the group of participants without experience and in the group with 1—4 years of teaching experience, becomes more powerful in the case of experienced subjects (5 years of teaching experience or more), i.e. such characteristics as stress resistance and the ability to self-regulate are more important qualities to this group of subjects, and more experienced teachers pay attention to them. We assume that these same individual psychological characteristics, which are part of the representation of another person, are important for the professional activities of teachers. This factor was also identified in our previous work [8] when using the “Personality Differential” method on a group of teachers with 5+ years of experience. Thus, since the same factor is identified with different versions of the semantic differential, it can be assumed that the results obtained in the current study reflect a stable semantic structure of the perception of an unfamiliar person by experienced teachers.

Discussion

The results of the current study indicate that in all groups of participants, regardless of their teaching experience, the average profiles of assessments do not differ significantly.

A similar factor structure is distinguished in all groups, containing four common factors: factor 1 “responsiveness”, factor 2 “discipline”, factor 3 “activity” and factor 4 “stress resistance”, i.e. we suggest that the perception of an unfamiliar model by all subjects is based on the same latent variables. However, when analyzing the contribution of each factor to the overall dispersion of the results, we revealed differences as the length of teaching experience increases. In particular, factor 4 “stress resistance” has the greatest weight in the group of teachers with extensive teaching experience (5 years or more), i.e. it can be assumed that the variables included in this factor become more important for this group than for the control group and the group with low professional experience (1 to 4 years), which is consistent with previously obtained data [8].

The key role of stress resistance in the effectiveness of the professional activity of teachers is confirmed by a number of other studies. Stress resistance, or emotional stability, is considered a professionally important quality that influences the productivity of pedagogical activity and contributes to the personal realization of the teacher [1; 3; 11]. The structure of stress resistance of teachers includes such components as balance, activity, desire for self-development, ability to set goals and achieve results, communication skills, etc. [4]. Teachers who are highly successful in their professional activity have a more effective adaptation to stress, while less successful ones experience “pseudo-adaptation” [3]. It has also been shown that young teachers with up to three years of experience,

who have a higher level of stress resistance, implement more productive styles of pedagogical activity, which indicates a higher level of their professional realization [9].

Semantic universals, which reflect for a given stimulus a set of scale ratings, equally assessed by a significant majority of a homogeneous group of subjects, indicate that in all groups of subjects, different posers are assessed differently, but the distinguished individual characteristics of a particular model are present in all three groups of subjects. We suggest that such characteristics remain stable in the perception of a given person.

Conclusion

1. Observers are able to assess the personality of a stranger based on their video recording during an interview.

2. The set of semantic universals obtained in the assessments of varies with the teaching experience. At the same time, a number of semantic categories, such as “sociable”, “friendly”, “stress-resistant”, remain unchanged for individual posers, as in our previous study.

3. A similar structure of assessment of posers in all study groups was obtained. Four

common factors were identified: factor 1 “responsiveness”, factor 2 “discipline”, factor 3 “activity”, factor 4 “stress resistance”.

4. In the group of experienced teachers (experience of 5 years or more), factor 4 “stress resistance” is more powerful (contribution to total variance 12.7%), compared to the groups without teaching experience and with experience from 1 to 4 years (contribution to total variance 1%). Perhaps, the characteristics included in this factor become more significant for the more experienced teachers than for the control group and the group with little professional experience (1 to 4 years), which is consistent with the previously obtained data.

To conclude, the hypothesis about the influence of teaching experience on the perception of personality traits of an unfamiliar person is partially confirmed. We further plan to analyze the relationship between the assessments of the models’ professional success prediction and the assessments of their individual psychological characteristics, to reveal which personality traits are the most professionally important qualities, according to teachers.

References

1. Aminov N.A. Psikhofiziologicheskie i psikhologicheskie predposylki pedagogicheskikh sposobnostei [Psychophysiological and psychological prerequisites for teaching abilities]. *Voprosy psikhologii [Issues of Psychology]*, 1988, no. 5, pp. 71—78. (In Russ.).
2. Artem'eva E.Yu. Psikhologiya sub'ektivnoi semantiki [Psychology of subjective semantics]. Moscow: Izd-vo MGU, 1980. 136 p. (In Russ.).
3. Baranov A.A. Psikhologiya stressoustoichivosti pedagoga: teoreticheskie i prikladnye aspekty. Avtoref. dis. ... dokt. psikhol. nauk [Psychology of teacher stress resistance: theoretical and applied aspects. Abstract of thesis of Doctor. Psychol. Sci.]. Saint Petersburg: SPbGU, 2002. 41 p. (In Russ.).
4. Vizitova S.Yu. Psikhologicheskie osobennosti stressoustoichivosti pedagoga i puti ee povysheniya: Avtoref. dis. ... kand. psikhol. nauk [Psychological

- characteristics of a teacher's resistance to stress and ways to improve it: Abstract of thesis of Cand. Psychol. Sci.]. *Elets*, 2012. 22 p. (In Russ.).
5. Zimnyaya I.A. Pedagogicheskaya psikhologiya. Uchebnik dlya vuzov. Izd. vtoroe, dop., ispr. i pererab. [Pedagogical psychology. Textbook for universities. 2nd ed., added, corrected and revised]. Moscow: Izdatel'skaya korporatsiya «Logos», 2000. 384 p. (In Russ.).
6. Il'in E.P. Izmenenie svoistv lichnosti pedagogov v svyazi so stazhem ikh deyatelnosti [Changes in the personality traits of teachers in connection with their length of service]. *Izvestiya RGPU im. A.I. Gertsena [Bulletin of the Russian State Pedagogical University named after. A.I. Herzen]*, 2009, no. 100, pp. 157—165. (In Russ.).
7. Korolkova O.A., Khoze E.G. Otsenka professional'no vaznykh kachestv budushchego pedagoga po ego neverbal'nym proyavleniyam

- [Assessing the professionally important qualities of a future teacher based on his nonverbal manifestations]. In D.V. Ushakov, A.L. Zhuravlev, N.E. Kharlamenkova, A.V. Makhnach, G.A. Vilenskaya, N.N. Kazymova (eds.). *Chelovek, sub'ekt, lichnost': perspektivy psikhologicheskikh issledovaniy: Materialy Vserossiiskoi nauchnoi konferentsii, posvyashchennoi 90-letiyu so dnya rozhdeniya A.V. Brushlinskogo i 300-letiyu osnovaniya Rossiiskoi akademii nauk, 12—14 oktyabrya 2023 g., Moskva [Man, subject, personality: prospects for psychological research: Proceedings of the All-Russian scientific conference dedicated to the 90th anniversary of the birth of A.V. Brushlinsky and the 300th anniversary of the founding of the Russian Academy of Sciences, October 12—14, 2023, Moscow]*. Moscow: Publishing house "Institute of Psychology RAS", 2023, pp. 740—745. (In Russ.).
8. Lupenko E.A., Korolkova O.A., Khoze E.G. Perception of Individual Psychological Characteristics of a Person Based on Nonverbal Behavior. *Eksperimental'nai pshologiya = Experimental Psychology (Russia)*, 2023. Vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 21—35. DOI:10.17759/expssy.2023160402 (In Russ., abstr. in Engl.).
9. Miklyaeva A.V., Bezgodova S.A. Stressoustoichivost' kak faktor professional'noi samorealizatsii molodykh pedagogov [Stress resistance as a factor of professional self-realization of young teachers]. *Izvestiya Irkutskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya «Psikhologiya» [Bulletin of Irkutsk State University. Series "Psychology"]*, 2016. Vol. 18, pp. 66—73. (In Russ.).
10. Panova E.M. Agressivnost' v protsesse professionalizatsii pedagogov v zavisimosti ot vozrasta i stazha: Avtoref. dis. ... kand. ped. nauk [Aggression in the process of professionalization of teachers depending on age and experience: Abstract of thesis of Cand. Ped. Sci.]. Saint Petersburg: RGPU im. A.I. Gertsena, 2009. 142 p. (In Russ.).
11. Rean A.A., Baranov A.A. Faktory stressoustoichivosti uchitelei [Factors of teachers' stress tolerance]. *Voprosy psikhologii [Issues of Psychology]*, 1997, no. 1, pp. 45—54. (In Russ.).
12. Serkin V.P. Metody psikhologii sub'ektivnoi semantiki i psikhosemantiki [Methods of psychology of subjective semantics and psychosemantics]. Moscow: Izd-vo «Pchela», 2008. 382 p. (In Russ.).
13. Syritso T.G. Emotsional'nost' kak professional'no-vazhnoe kachestvo uchitelya: Avtoref. dis. ... kand. ped. nauk [Emotionality as a professionally important quality of a teacher: Abstract of thesis of Cand. Ped. Sci.]. SPb., 1997. 160 p. (In Russ.).
14. Ambady N., Bernieri F.J., Richeson J.A. Toward a histology of social behavior: Judgmental accuracy from thin slices of the behavioral stream. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 2000. Vol. 32, pp. 201—271. DOI:10.1016/S0065-2601(00)80006-4
15. Ambady N., Rosenthal R. Half a minute: Predicting teacher evaluations from thin slices of nonverbal behavior and physical attractiveness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1993. Vol. 64, no. 3, pp. 431—441. DOI:10.1037/0022-3514.64.3.431
16. Ambady N., Rosenthal R. Thin slices of expressive behavior as predictors of interpersonal consequences: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1992. Vol. 111, no. 2, pp. 256—274. DOI:10.1037/0033-2909.111.2.25614
17. Borko H., Roberts S.A., Shavelson R. Teachers' Decision Making: from Alan J. Bishop to Today. In P. Clarkson, N. Presmeg (ed.). *Critical Issues in Mathematics Education*. Boston, MA: Springer US, 2008, pp. 37—67. DOI:10.1007/978-0-387-09673-5_4
18. Carr M., Kurtz B.E. Teachers' perceptions of their students' metacognition, attributions, and self-concept. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1991. Vol. 61, no. 2, pp. 197—206. DOI:10.1111/j.2044-8279.1991.tb00975.x
19. Clarridge P.B., Berliner D.C. Perceptions of Student Behavior as a Function of Expertise. *The Journal of Classroom Interaction*, 1991. Vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 1—8.
20. Fleeson W., Law M.K. Trait enactments as density distributions: The role of actors, situations, and observers in explaining stability and variability. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 2015. Vol. 109, no. 6, pp. 1090—1104. DOI:10.1037/a0039517
21. Funder D.C. Toward a social psychology of person judgments: Implications for person perception accuracy and self-knowledge. In J.P. Forgas, K.D. Williams, W. von Hippel (ed.). *Social judgments: Implicit and explicit processes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003, pp. 115—133.
22. Funder D.C. Towards a resolution of the personality triad: Persons, situations, and behaviors. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 2006. Vol. 40, no. 1, pp. 21—34. DOI:10.1016/j.jrp.2005.08.003
23. Funder D.C., Colvin C.R. Explorations in behavioral consistency: Properties of persons, situations, and behaviors. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1991. Vol. 60, no. 5, pp. 773—794. DOI:10.1037/0022-3514.60.5.773
24. Geukes K., Nestler S., Hutteman R., Küfner A.C.P., Back M.D. Trait personality and state variability: Predicting individual differences in within- and cross-context fluctuations in affect, self-evaluations, and behavior in everyday life. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 2017. Vol. 69, pp. 124—138. DOI:10.1016/j.jrp.2016.06.003
25. Givvin K.B., Stipek D.J., Salmon J.M., MacGyvers V.L. In the eyes of the beholder: students' and teachers' judgments of students' motivation. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 2001. Vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 321—331. DOI:10.1016/S0742-051X(00)00060-3

26. Greaney V. Teachers' perceptions of pupil personality. *The Irish Journal of Education*, 1974. Vol. 2, pp. 89—101.
27. Huber S.A., Seidel T. Comparing teacher and student perspectives on the interplay of cognitive and motivational-affective student characteristics. *PLOS ONE*, 2018. Vol. 13, no. 8, pp. e0200609. DOI:10.1371/journal.pone.0200609
28. Kaiser J., Retelsdorf J., Skamp A., Möller J. Achievement and engagement: How student characteristics influence teacher judgments. *Learning and Instruction*, 2013. Vol. 28, pp. 73—84. DOI:10.1016/j.learninstruc.2013.06.001
29. Murphy N.A., Hall J.A. Capturing Behavior in Small Doses: A Review of Comparative Research in Evaluating Thin Slices for Behavioral Measurement. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 2021. Vol. 12, pp. 1—13. DOI:10.3389/fpsyg.2021.667326
30. Murphy N.A., Hall J.A., Schmid Mast M., Ruben M.A., Frauendorfer D., Blanch-Hartigan D., Roter D.L., Nguyen L. Reliability and Validity of Nonverbal Thin Slices in Social Interactions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 2015. Vol. 41, no. 2, pp. 199—213. DOI:10.1177/0146167214559902
31. Shoda Y. A unified framework for the study of behavioral consistency: bridging person × situation interaction and the consistency paradox. *European Journal of Personality*, 1999. Vol. 13, no. 5, pp. 361—387. DOI:10.1002/(SICI)1099-0984(199909/10)13:5
32. Shulman L.S. Those Who Understand: Knowledge Growth in Teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 1986. Vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 4—14.
33. Slepian M.L., Bogart K.R., Ambady N. Thin-Slice Judgments in the Clinical Context. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, 2014. Vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 131—153. DOI:10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-090413-123522
34. Spinath B. Accuracy of teacher judgments on student characteristics and the construct of diagnostic competence. *Zeitschrift für Pädagogische Psychologie*, 2005. Vol. 19, no. 1—2, pp. 85—95. DOI:10.1024/1010-0652.19.1.85
35. Südkamp A., Praetorius A.-K., Spinath B. Teachers' judgment accuracy concerning consistent and inconsistent student profiles. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 2018. Vol. 76, pp. 204—213. DOI:10.1016/j.tate.2017.09.016
36. Zebrowitz L.A. Ecological and Social Approaches to Face Perception. In A.J. Calder, G. Rhodes, J.V. Haxby, M.H. Johnson (ed.). *Oxford Handbook of Face Perception*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012, pp. 31—50. DOI:10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199559053.013.0003
37. Zebrowitz L.A., Collins M.A. Accurate social perception at zero acquaintance: the affordances of a Gibsonian approach. *Personality and social psychology review: an official journal of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, Inc*, 1997. Vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 204—23. DOI:10.1207/s15327957pspr0103_2

Литература

1. Аминов Н.А. Психофизиологические и психологические предпосылки педагогических способностей // Вопросы психологии. 1988. № 5. С. 71—78.
2. Артемьева Е.Ю. Психология субъективной семантики. М.: Изд-во МГУ, 1980. 136 с.
3. Баранов А.А. Психология стрессоустойчивости педагога: теоретические и прикладные аспекты: Автореф. дис. ... докт. психол. наук. СПб.: СПбГУ, 2002. 41 с.
4. Визитова С.Ю. Психологические особенности стрессоустойчивости педагога и пути ее повышения: Автореф. дис. ... канд. психол. наук. Елец, 2012. 22 с.
5. Зимняя И.А. Педагогическая психология. Учебник для вузов. Изд. второе, доп., испр. и перераб. М.: Издательская корпорация «Логос», 2000. 384 с.
6. Ильин Е.П. Изменение свойств личности педагогов в связи со стажем их деятельности // Известия РГПУ им. А.И. Герцена. 2009. № 100. С. 157—165.
7. Королькова О.А., Хозе Е.Г. Оценка профессионально важных качеств будущего педагога по его невербальным проявлениям //

- Человек, субъект, личность: перспективы психологических исследований: Материалы Всероссийской научной конференции, посвященной 90-летию со дня рождения А.В. Брушлинского и 300-летию основания Российской академии наук, 12—14 октября 2023 г., Москва / Отв. ред. Д.В. Ушаков, А.Л. Журавлев, Н.Е. Харламенкова, А.В. Махнач, Г.А. Виленская, Н.Н. Казымова. М.: Изд-во «Институт психологии РАН», 2023. С. 740—745.
8. Лупенко Е.А., Королькова О.А., Хозе Е.Г. Восприятие индивидуально-личностных качеств человека по его невербальному поведению // Экспериментальная психология. 2023. Том 16. № 4. С. 21—35. DOI:10.17759/exppsy.2023160402
9. Микляева А.В., Безгодова С.А. Стрессоустойчивость как фактор профессиональной самореализации молодых педагогов // Известия Иркутского государственного университета. Серия «Психология». 2016. Том 18. С. 66—73.
10. Панова Е.М. Агрессивность в процессе профессионализации педагогов в зависимости от возраста и стажа: Автореф. дис. ... канд. пед. наук. СПб.: РГПУ им. А.И. Герцена, 2009. 142 с.

11. Реан А.А., Баранов А.А. Факторы стрессоустойчивости учителей // Вопросы психологии. 1997. № 1. С. 45—54.
12. Серкин В.П. Методы психологии субъективной семантики и психосемантики. М.: Изд-во «Пчела», 2008. 382 с.
13. Сырицо Т.Г. Эмоциональность как профессионально-важное качество учителя: Автореф. дис. ... канд. пед. наук. СПб., 1997. 160 с.
14. Ambady N., Bernieri F.J., Richeson J.A. Toward a histology of social behavior: Judgmental accuracy from thin slices of the behavioral stream // *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*. 2000. Vol. 32. P. 201—271. DOI:10.1016/S0065-2601(00)80006-4
15. Ambady N., Rosenthal R. Half a minute: Predicting teacher evaluations from thin slices of nonverbal behavior and physical attractiveness // *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1993. Vol. 64. № 3. P. 431—441. DOI:10.1037/0022-3514.64.3.431
16. Ambady N., Rosenthal R. Thin slices of expressive behavior as predictors of interpersonal consequences: A meta-analysis // *Psychological Bulletin*. 1992. Vol. 111. № 2. P. 256—274. DOI:10.1037/0033-2909.111.2.256
17. Borko H., Roberts S.A., Shavelson R. Teachers' Decision Making: from Alan J. Bishop to Today // *Critical Issues in Mathematics Education / Ed. P. Clarkson, N. Presmeg*. Boston, MA: Springer US, 2008. P. 37—67. DOI:10.1007/978-0-387-09673-5_4
18. Carr M., Kurtz B.E. Teachers' perceptions of their students' metacognition, attributions, and self-concept // *British Journal of Educational Psychology*. 1991. Vol. 61. № 2. P. 197—206. DOI:10.1111/j.2044-8279.1991.tb00975.x
19. Claridge P.B., Berliner D.C. Perceptions of Student Behavior as a Function of Expertise // *The Journal of Classroom Interaction*. 1991. Vol. 26. № 1. P. 1—8.
20. Fleeson W., Law M.K. Trait enactments as density distributions: The role of actors, situations, and observers in explaining stability and variability // *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 2015. Vol. 109. № 6. P. 1090—1104. DOI:10.1037/a0039517
21. Funder D.C. Toward a social psychology of person judgments: Implications for person perception accuracy and self-knowledge // *Social judgments: Implicit and explicit processes / Eds. J.P. Forgas, K.D. Williams, W. von Hippel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. P. 115—133.
22. Funder D.C. Towards a resolution of the personality triad: Persons, situations, and behaviors // *Journal of Research in Personality*. 2006. Vol. 40. № 1. P. 21—34. DOI:10.1016/j.jrp.2005.08.003
23. Funder D.C., Colvin C.R. Explorations in behavioral consistency: Profiles of persons, situations, and behaviors // *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1991. Vol. 60. № 5. P. 773—794. DOI:10.1037/0022-3514.60.5.773
24. Geukes K., Nestler S., Hutteman R., Küfner A.C.P., Back M.D. Trait personality and state variability: Predicting individual differences in within- and cross-context fluctuations in affect, self-evaluations, and behavior in everyday life // *Journal of Research in Personality*. 2017. Vol. 69. P. 124—138. DOI:10.1016/j.jrp.2016.06.003
25. Givvin K.B., Stipek D.J., Salmon J.M., MacGyvers V.L. In the eyes of the beholder: students' and teachers' judgments of students' motivation // *Teaching and Teacher Education*. 2001. Vol. 17. № 3. P. 321—331. DOI:10.1016/S0742-051X(00)00060-3
26. Greaney V. Teachers' perceptions of pupil personality // *The Irish Journal of Education*. 1974. Vol. 2. P. 89—101.
27. Huber S.A., Seidel T. Comparing teacher and student perspectives on the interplay of cognitive and motivational-affective student characteristics // *PLOS ONE*. 2018. Vol. 13. № 8. P. e0200609. DOI:10.1371/journal.pone.0200609
28. Kaiser J., Retelsdorf J., Südkamp A., Möller J. Achievement and engagement: How student characteristics influence teacher judgments // *Learning and Instruction*. 2013. Vol. 28. P. 73—84. DOI:10.1016/j.learninstruc.2013.06.001
29. Murphy N.A., Hall J.A. Capturing Behavior in Small Doses: A Review of Comparative Research in Evaluating Thin Slices for Behavioral Measurement // *Frontiers in Psychology*. 2021. Vol. 12. P. 1—13. DOI:10.3389/fpsyg.2021.667326
30. Murphy N.A., Hall J.A., Schmid Mast M., Ruben M.A., Frauendorfer D., Blanch-Hartigan D., Roter D.L., Nguyen L. Reliability and Validity of Nonverbal Thin Slices in Social Interactions // *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*. 2015. Vol. 41. № 2. P. 199—213. DOI:10.1177/0146167214559902
31. Shoda Y. A unified framework for the study of behavioral consistency: bridging person × situation interaction and the consistency paradox // *European Journal of Personality*. 1999. Vol. 13. № 5. P. 361—387. DOI:10.1002/(SICI)1099-0984(199909/10)13:5
32. Shulman L.S. Those Who Understand: Knowledge Growth in Teaching // *Educational Researcher*. 1986. Vol. 15. № 2. P. 4—14.
33. Slepian M.L., Bogart K.R., Ambady N. Thin-Slice Judgments in the Clinical Context // *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*. 2014. Vol. 10. № 1. P. 131—153. DOI:10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-090413-123522
34. Spinath B. Accuracy of teacher judgments on student characteristics and the construct of diagnostic competence // *Zeitschrift für Pädagogische Psychologie*. 2005. Vol. 19. № 1—2. P. 85—95. DOI:10.1024/1010-0652.19.1.85
35. Südkamp A., Praetorius A.-K., Spinath B. Teachers' judgment accuracy concerning consistent and inconsistent student profiles // *Teaching and*

Teacher Education. 2018. Vol. 76. P. 204—213. DOI:10.1016/j.tate.2017.09.016

36. Zebrowitz L.A. Ecological and Social Approaches to Face Perception // Oxford Handbook of Face Perception /Eds. A.J. Calder, G. Rhodes, J.V. Haxby, M.H. Johnson. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012. P. 31—50. DOI:10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199559053.013.0003

37. Zebrowitz L.A., Collins M.A. Accurate social perception at zero acquaintance: the affordances of a Gibsonian approach // Personality and social psychology review: an official journal of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, Inc. 1997. Vol. 1. № 3. P. 204—23. DOI:10.1207/s15327957pspr0103_2

Information about the authors

Olga A. Korolkova, PhD in Psychology, Leading Research Associate, Center of Experimental Psychology, Moscow State University of Psychology & Education, Moscow, Russia, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4814-7266>, e-mail: olga.kurakova@gmail.com

Evgeny G. Khoze, PhD in Psychology, Senior Researcher, Institute of Experimental Psychology, Moscow State University of Psychology & Education, Moscow, Russia, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9355-1693>, e-mail: house.yu@gmail.com

Elena A. Lupenko, PhD in Psychology, Senior Research Associate, Center of Experimental Psychology, Moscow State University of Psychology & Education; Moscow Institute of Psychoanalysis, Moscow, Russia, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4026-7581>, e-mail: elena-lupenko@yandex.ru

Информация об авторах

Королькова Ольга Александровна, кандидат психологических наук, ведущий научный сотрудник Центра экспериментальной психологии, ФГБОУ ВО «Московский государственный психолого-педагогический университет» (ФГБОУ ВО МГППУ), г. Москва, Российская Федерация, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4814-7266>, e-mail: olga.kurakova@gmail.com

Хозе Евгений Геннадиевич, кандидат психологических наук, старший научный сотрудник Центра экспериментальной психологии Института экспериментальной психологии, ФГБОУ ВО «Московский государственный психолого-педагогический университет» (ФГБОУ ВО МГППУ), г. Москва, Российская Федерация, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9355-1693>, e-mail: house.yu@gmail.com

Лупенко Елена Анатольевна, кандидат психологических наук, старший научный сотрудник Центра экспериментальной психологии, ФГБОУ ВО «Московский государственный психолого-педагогический университет» (ФГБОУ ВО МГППУ); НОЧУ ВО «Московский институт психоанализа» (НОЧУ ВО МИП), г. Москва, Российская Федерация, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4026-7581>, e-mail: elena-lupenko@yandex.ru

Получена 26.04.2024

Принята в печать 30.12.2024

Received 26.04.2024

Accepted 30.12.2024