VI International Forum on Teacher Education

Adaptive Assessment of Personality of a Foreign Student

Endzhe A. Latypova[*] (a)

(a) Kazan Federal University, 420008, Kazan (Russia), 18 Kremlyovskaya street, ahm2003@mail.ru

Abstract

The relevance of the study of this problem is based on the need to select suitable assessment materials in the work of the teacher and their insufficiency. First, we selectively analyze existing instruments and identify current gaps in the measurement literature. Here we discuss the role of adaptive assessment as a tool for assessing student's personality on way path to successful learning, as well as teacher's tool for planning, implementing and evaluating preventive strategies to strengthen students' mental health. Next, we examine adaptability and compare the results with the mental health scale. 300 foreign students from 1 to 5 years of study were tested. The results of the adaptive assessment of the personality of each individual student are compared with a three-level pyramid of intervention based on the public health model (Frieden, 2010), which was adapted by educators to determine the need for support of school population (US Department of Education, 2010). The location on the pyramid is determined by the strengths and problems of the student.

A quantitative research method was used. Strong points on the path to learners' adaptability are self-acceptance, acceptance of others, emotional comfort and internal control. Weak points are: self-rejection, rejection of others, emotional discomfort, need of guidance and escapism (avoiding problems).

Socio-psychological maladaptation leads to a pronounced activation of regulatory mechanisms, which naturally leads to high energy consumption of the body and a decrease in the effectiveness of activities. Assessing adaptability, we study functioning trends of a goal-oriented personality system, determined by the correspondence (mismatch) of its goals and results achieved in the process of activity. We can talk about the effectiveness of the learning process if personal goals coincide with educational goals.

Understanding personality mechanisms will help teachers to build up an appropriate strategy for interacting with students. The inclusion of a motivational and targeted approach to the development of subjects will reduce maladaptiveness and lead to the correspondence of student's personal goal with educational activities. The location on the pyramid is determined by strong sides and problems of the student. There is a need to measure the level of mental health of students. This will allow educators and psychologists to identify risk groups.

Keywords: foreign students, teacher's tool, assessment of personality, psychology and pedagogy of adaptation processes.

―――――――

[*] Corresponding author. E-mail: ahm2003@mail.ru

Introduction

The relevance of the study of this problem is based on the need to select suitable assessment materials in the work of the teacher and their insufficiency. An important tool in the work of the teacher and psychologist is the assessment. Current research trends are mainly associated with assessment of educational environment. There are few works on assessing the personality of the student.

By adaptability we mean the tendencies of functioning of the purposeful personality system, determined by the correspondence (mismatch) between its goals and the results achieved in the process of activity. The specifics of human interaction with the outside world are influenced, first of all, by the culture and history of the development of civilization, which, first of all, was noted by Vygotsky (1972) in his cultural-historical concept of the development of higher mental functions, which explains the development of the psyche by individual's assimilation of cultural experience. In line with this, a large number of scientific studies of social adaptation are carried out on the problems of cultural adaptation (acculturation). Quite distinctly a personal regulation is defined in adaptation processes in a changing sociocultural environment. In this case, it is realized in integration and coordination of mental properties, depending on specific features of social transformations. The works of Vygotsky (1984) show that the process of human adaptation has a close relationship with the cultural and historical conditions of person's life; mental functions develop on the basis of social relations, gradually becoming personal. Being developed on the provisions of the theory of Vygotsky (1984), the concept of activity gave a new stage in the development of this problem. Vygotsky (1984) put forward the assumption that the environment determines the development of the child and has a significant impact on this development. Therefore, the focus of our research is aimed at the personality of the student.

Most authors believe that a particularly active development of personality features occur at the stages of adolescence and youth (Vygotsky, 1972; Ionin, 2000; Rubinstein, 1973), when personality traits are developed, the person acquires a stable character (Raygorodsky, 2003), and the need for communication plays a leading role in its development (Leontiev, 1987). At this age, the most significant motives are associated with the self, then with motives of communication and only then with business motives. In the period of adulthood, a person develops socially, involving into various spheres of social relations and activities. The process of personal development in this case largely depends on the level of social activity and the degree of productivity of the personality itself. With regard to the personality, Petrovsky and Shpalinsky (1978) believe, the most important factor in its development is the development of culture as the most the important aspect of the social experience is accumulated by mankind. The problems of personality development were discussed with by a number of authors, for instance, Rean (2017).

The development of personality does not occur on the dominant of internal forces, but as a result of either taking certain position or developing new properties and qualities (Vygotsky, 1960).

Development can also be the result of the "simple adoption" of social sub-information (without the clear expression of the specific criteria of struggle and contradictions), especially at the early stages of development (and in the case of "coherence" and "coexistence"). Subsequently, it can serve as the basis with which new information or new generalized social experience come into conflict. However, its constancy and absence of this mechanism at the next stages of development is not necessary at all. Unconditional acceptance of subinformation continues throughout life, which may well be progressive to the individual.

Once again focusing on the significance of the personality aspect of social adaptation, one cannot but note the priority of personality regulation in this process. It is a personality, turning into a center of integration, regulates the unification of psychological, psychophysiological and physiological properties necessary for successful interaction with the surrounding reality and ensures the emergence of such relationships between them that it needs in changed living conditions.

As noted above, a social adaptation, which requires the regulation of social behavior, supposes the interaction of individual with social environment, during which optimal performance is achieved, ensuring the development of individual and preserving its viability.

In earlier studies, this questionnaire was tested by Akhmadullina (2006) with emigrants living in English-speaking environment, and the dynamics of the motivational-value sphere of the emigrants' personality was studied.

Purpose and objectives of the study

The purpose of this study is: 1. to review the existing literature on assessing the personality of a student in an attempt to study how different authors evaluate personality, what factors are taken into account; 2. to investigate the role of adaptive assessment as a tool for assessing student's personality on the path to successful learning; 3. to consider adaptive assessment in a comprehensive way as teacher's tool for planning, implementing and evaluating preventive strategies to enhance the mental health of students.

Literature review

Factors affecting the success of the learning process

Currently, there are few proven tools for measuring socio-emotional learning in a school context. Using SELS (Social-Emotional Learning Scale) before and after the intervention would allow researchers to measure changes in students' social and emotional state and provide support for the effectiveness of the program. Coryn et al. (2009) revealed a positive relationship between social emotional learning and academic performance, which led to an increase in the number of programs to improve students' social and emotional abilities. We concluded that in order to identify the success of the program, it is important to be able to accurately assess the socio-emotional state of students before and after such programs.

Cohn et al. (2009) made an analysis of the differences between men and women in the learning process and found that women evaluate themselves in relation to socio-emotional forces and assets higher than men. These results show that, on average, women feel that they have more social and emotional strength (for example, social competency with peers, emotional regulation skills, empathy) than men. These results are interesting, given that they seem to be at odds with what is known about the self-assessment of gender differences in the internalizing symptoms of the problem, when girls tend to report higher levels of symptoms of the problem than men, as well as higher indicators of depressive disorders. The greatest differences were found for school students of seventh to eleventh grades.

Malti et al. (2018) developed the HSA tool - holistic assessment of students based on the theory of socio-emotional development. The authors note the importance of timely prevention of socio-emotional development for the development of the strengths of children, studying the needs of student, as well as how they change over time.

According to the clover model (Noam et al., 2013), personality parameters are significant for assessing the social and emotional development of students: (1) sustainability (internal and external), (2) relationships, and (3) studies and (4) involvement in school. The clover model includes four key components of the healthy development of adolescents. The model helps these students gain self-management skills by teaching them how to reflect their actions. Malti et al. (2018) conclude that empathy, understanding of emotions according to age, regulation of emotions, etc. are important factors in assessing personality.

Scientists Oberle et al. (2014) and Ursache et al. (2012) associate social and emotional competencies with active participation, self-confidence, belonging and reflection with academic success, positive relationship with peers and adults and mental health.

Goodman (2001) uses the questionnaire (SDQ - Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire) to identify the psychopathology of children aged 3 to 16 years. The questionnaire has a five-factor structure (emotional, behavioral, hyperreactivity, inattention, peer relationships, sociolization). The reliability of this questionnaire makes it useful for studying the issue of adaptation and psychopathology of children and adolescents.

Whittingham (2006) in his work confirmed the influence of personality on productivity. Of particular interest were gender interactions with personal indicators, some of which had a significant impact on performance, while gender itself did not have a significant impact.

Presbitero (2016) determined that many factors influence the adaptation of foreign students, one of them is CQ - cultural intelligence cultural shock, which reduces the negative impact on the psychological and sociocultural adaptation of students.

Research results (Shafaei et al., 2016) using SmartPLS (research model version 3.0) also confirm the significant and positive impact of psychological and sociocultural adaptations on psychological well-being and perceived academic satisfaction.

Adaptation to new culture can be very stressful, especially at complicated stages of development, such as adolescence. How adolescents adapt to culture and their well-being can be significantly affected by their personal qualities, as well as the degree to which they fit the values of the new culture (Achenbach & Rescorla, 2001). Hierarchical regression analysis showed that acculturation played a minimal role in predicting mental health problems, while personality traits were strong predictors.

The emotional sphere, motivation and socio-psychological adaptation, in addition to the methodological aspect, are the main factors of satisfaction with university education (Sharok, 2015). People who are satisfied with university education and their future profession are characterized by psychological well-being, while dissatisfied people are characterized by indifference, renunciation, and denial.

Cole et al. (2004) suggest that the simultaneous consideration of the combined effects of student learning motivation and their psychological stamina can increase understanding of the learning experience and its impact on important learning outcomes. In particular, the authors suggested that the relationship between

learning motivation and learning outcomes would be tempered by the psychological endurance of individuals. The results of the study are of particular importance to anyone who has ever taught or participated in teaching. Sometimes, for example, students may feel overwhelmed by many responsibilities connected with being a college student. As a result, some suffer a loss of motivation for performance and, even worse, some experience a severe state of depressed mood. Therefore, in this study, we consider these problems and offer concrete recommendations that can be implemented by universities and teachers to circumvent these disastrous consequences.

The methodology of Pakulina and Ket'ko (2010) can be useful for studying the relationship between success achievement motivation, learning motivation and adaptation of students at a university, students' value attitudes in the process of studying at a university, psychodiagnostics in motivational training and, in general, for building a forecast of social personal development.

The level of adaptability of first-year students in university to a new learning process and a new social environment, which is a pedagogical university, determines the effectiveness of the system of adaptation measures. Despite the apparent similarity, the criteria for assessing the effectiveness of adaptation and adaptability must be distinguished, the adaptation criteria relate to the process itself, and the adaptation criteria to the result. The author's criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of the functioning of the system of adaptation measures are as follows: satisfaction with university education; the effectiveness of training at the university; activity in the educational and public life of the university; satisfaction with oneself as a person (Tolstykh, 2011).

Kostylev et al. (2017) assess personality-oriented motivation for learning success according to a survey of sociocultural and psychological attitudes in students, including the identification of behavioral risk factors for the development of noncommunicable diseases (tobacco use, lack of physical activity, unhealthy diet, use of psychoactive substances and alcohol).

Factors in assessing the educational environment

Analysis of the literature shows that a number of authors focus on assessing the educational environment, rather than on assessing the personality. Authors such as Whittingham (2006), Lunenburg (2011) note that the quality of the environment affects a wide range of factors, including the social environment, the school district and the community environment, as well as the school and class environment. A positive school environment creates optimal conditions for teaching and learning. Assessing the school environment can provide opportunities for identifying and resolving problems that may interfere with student learning and

healthy development. The Comprehensive Assessment of School Environments (CASE) is a psychometrically sound tool that can be used to measure student, teacher, and parental satisfaction in addition to school climate.

A positive school environment creates optimal conditions for teaching and learning. This climate is influenced by a wide range of factors, including the social environment, the school district and the community environment, as well as the school and classroom environment. Assessing the school environment can provide opportunities for identifying and resolving problems that may interfere with student learning and healthy development. Comprehensive School Environment Assessment (CASE) is a psychometrically sound tool that can be used to measure student, teacher, and parental satisfaction in addition to school climate (Lunenburg, 2011).

The aim of the study conducted by Zullig et al. (2010) was to study the existing literature on socio-emotional conditions in educational institutions to create a valid and reliable tool for assessing personality combining and improving existing ones. Important factors in the formation of climatic conditions in schools are social relations: the general social environment, the positive relations of the student and teacher, and the alleged exclusion / privilege. These classifications can allow schools to better identify the positive and negative aspects of the social environment that can affect adolescent learning. This fact is underlined by the positive correlation between the positive student-teacher relationships and other areas of the school climate and the negative correlation between perceived exception / privilege and school connectivity. Cohen (2006) and an additional literature review reveal at least five important school climate areas: order, safety, and discipline (Blum et al., 2002; Furlong et al., 2005); academic results (Griffith & Frieden, 2000; Loukas et al., 2006; Worrell, 2000); social relations (Furlong et al., 2005); school facilities (Rutter & Maughan, 2002; Wilson, 2004); and the relationship between schools (Blum et al., 2002).

Psychological Health Factors

The analysis of theoretical literature shows the need to consider the indicator (index) of mental health in integration with other indicators. Aizman et al. (2017) as the basis of the methodological approach to assessing the health of students laid the following fundamental principles such as: health is a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being; the level of health can be quantified if we take as a basis the value of the reserve capabilities of the body, ensuring the preservation of homeostasis of its internal environment when adapting to constantly changing conditions of the external world (or loads); the organism and its environment are a single whole, which determines the mutual influence on each other; when assessing the health of children and adolescents, it is necessary to take into account not only the

presence or absence of existing diseases, but primarily the dynamics of the processes; when characterizing health, an integrative approach is important, taking into account the dynamics of physical development, the functional, psycho-emotional state of the body and the individual typological status of a person.

Volochkov (2014) revealed that the factor of educational activity is a significant resource of psychological health in students.

Dubrovina (1975) shares the term mental and psychological health. The term "mental health" refers primarily to individual mental processes and mechanisms. The term "psychological health" refers to the personality as a whole, and is closely related to the highest manifestations of the human spirit and allows us to highlight the psychological aspect of the mental health problem in contrast to the medical, sociological, philosophical and other aspects. Shuvalov (2009) defines psychological health as a state that characterizes the process and result of the normal development of subjective reality within an individual life; the maxim of psychological health is the integral of completeness and wholeness (viability and humanity of the individual). By Khukhlaeva (2013), psychological health expresses a dynamic balance between an individual and the environment, and its criterion is a measure of harmony between a person and society. Khlomov and Kaliteevskaya (2000) single out among the criteria of psychological health, the ability to go beyond the limits of one's biological, social and even psychological determination, acting as the subject of one's life in a changing world. The position of these authors is quite close to our understanding of the activity of the sphere of life as an expression of a measure of subjectivity. A different level of student learning activity leads to a different (quantitative and qualitative) level of their psychological health. Of the various manifestations of student activity (communicative, cognitive, reflective, contemplative-reflective, and educational), the most active are educational activity, especially its regulatory component (Volochkov, 2014).

In our study, we rely on the pyramid of the public health model (Frieden, 2010). Adapted by educators to determine support needs for school population. Using a three-level model of prevention, practitioners combine psychological health and educational focus to contribute to student success in school, society, and emotional life. The pyramid describes best the impact of various types of public health measures and provides the basis for better health. At the heart of this pyramid, which indicates interventions with the greatest potential impact, are efforts to address the socio-economic determinants of health. In ascending order interventions are listed that change the context to make the right decisions of individuals healthy, clinical interventions that require limited contact but provide long-term protection, ongoing direct clinical care, and health education and counseling.

Interventions aimed at lower levels of the pyramid tend to be more effective as they span the wider sections of society and require less individual effort.

The implementation of activities at each level can provide the greatest possible sustainable benefits for public health.

Monitoring on social adaptability scales can help practitioners understand the socio-emotional state, inform about interpersonal differences before an intervention, and track changes during the implementation of the program and evaluate the results of preventive strategies, policies and practices to promote adaptability and reduce psychological health risks.

Methodology

300 foreign students from 1 to 5 years of study were tested. A quantitative research method was used. The survey was conducted using the methodology of social adaptation of Osnitsky (2004). The questionnaire includes 101 questions and 7 scales.

The study involved 300 students from various institutes and faculties of Kazan Federal University from 1 to 5 full-time courses, aged 17 to 26 years. During the study, 50 students with high adaptability and 50 students with low adaptability were selected. The female sample was 66 people, the male sample was 34. Participation in the experiment was voluntary and free of charge.

Full information about the participants in the experiment is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Information about the subjects

Test subjects	N	Average age	Min	Max
Whole sample	100	19.9	17	26
Women	66	19.8	17	26
Men	34	20.1	18	25

The study was done by foreign students of Kazan Federal University from 10 countries, such as Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, China, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Indonesia, Guinea, Moldova. Full information about the participants in the experiment is presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Countries

The country	Women N=66	Men N=34
Kazakhstan	24	5
Turkmenistan	11	6
Tajikistan	1	3
Uzbekistan	22	16
Kyrgyzstan	2	1
China	2	3
Bosnia and Herzegovina	1	-
Indonesia	1	-
Guinea	1	-
Moldova	1	-

The studies included by students of Kazan Federal University in the following fields of study: jurisprudence, philology, physics, international relations, fundamental medicine and biology, state and municipal administration, journalism, pedagogy, and historical sciences. Full details of the participants in the experiment are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Subject training profile

Training profile	Women N=66	Men N=34
Law	2	3
Philology	35	8
Physics	4	11
International relationships	4	6
Basic medicine and biology	14	5
State and municipal government	1	1
Journalism	1	-
Pedagogy	1	-
Historical sciences	4	-

Table 4. Name and purpose of scales

Scale	Purpose
Adaptability	reveals the level of human adaptation to existence in society in accordance with the requirements of this society and with students' own needs, motives and interests. Adaptability is a trend in the functioning of a single-minded system, determined by the correspondence (or mismatch) between its goals and the results achieved in the process of activity.
Maladaptation	determines the immaturity of a personality, neurotic deviations, disharmonies in the field of decision-making, which are the result of constant unsuccessful attempts of an individual to realize a goal or the presence of two or more equivalent goals.
Deceitfulness	determines the level of sincerity of the subject in the examination situation. The results on this scale are subject to analysis in the first place.
Self-acceptance	acts as a result of the individual's self-esteem, determines the degree of personal satisfaction with their characteristics.
Self-rejection	reveals the degree of dissatisfaction of the individual with his/her personality traits.
Accepting others	talks about the degree (level) of the individual's needs in communication, interaction, joint activities.
Rejection of others	opposite in content to the previous scale.
Emotional comfort	reveals the degree of certainty in its emotional attitude to the current reality, surrounding objects and phenomena.

Internal control, external control	determine the individual's predisposition to a certain form of the locus of control (internality and externality). If responsibility for events occurring in a person's life is assumed to a greater extent, the results of the activity are explained by their behavior, character, and abilities. This assumption indicates the presence of an individual internal control. If the tendency prevails to ascribe the causes of what is happening to external factors (environment, fate or chance), then this indicates that the individual has external (external) control.
Dominance	reveals the level of aspirations for leadership, leadership in solving problems, often personally significant tasks are solved at the expense of others.
Submission	determines the level of desire to be subordinate, to fulfill the tasks set by someone.
Escapism (avoiding problems)	determines the level of avoiding problem situations, avoiding them. The most representative personality characteristics that most differentiate the sample are the integral indicators "adaptation", "self-acceptance" and "acceptance of others".

The results were processed by comparing the average values of the studied indicators using Student's T-test to assess the reliability of the degree of detected differences, correlation analysis, as well as ANOVA univariate analysis to compare independent samples with a high level of adaptability and low adaptability.

Results

Table 5. Correlation of indicators of adaptability and performance

Scales	Unsatis-factory	Excellent	Deceit	Self acceptance	Self rejection	Acceptance of others	Rejection of others	Emotional comfort	Emotional discomfort	Internal control	External control	Dominance	Submission	Escapism
Adaptability				.933**		.772**	.761**			.776**		.549*		

Number of items	.583**	.569**					
Maladaptation		.573**	.890**	.718**	.929**	.898**	.759**	.719**

Note. (R) indicates reverse keyed items.

* p< .05

** p< .01.

The study revealed a connection between adaptability, self-acceptance (t = .933) and acceptance of others (t = .772), emotional comfort (t = .761) and internal control (t = .776).

A relationship was found between the number of items, excellent marks (t = .569) and unsatisfactory ratings (t = .583).

There is a logical connection between maladaptation, self-rejection (t = .890), non-acceptance of others (t = .718), emotional discomfort (t = .929), submission (t = .759) and escapism (t = .719).

Table 6. Descriptive statistics on the study of adaptability

	Low adaptive (n=50)		Highly adaptive (n=50)			
Scales	M	SD	M	SD	t(100)	p
adaptability	113.72	19.94	163.44	8.11	-16.33	<.001
items	41.52	24.27	42.12	24.9	-0.12	.903
unsatisfactory	4.34	5.47	3.08	3.95	1.31	.073
excellent	5.58	7.43	7.98	8.30	-1.52	.131
maladaptation	89.22	34.10	58.18	28.60	4.93	<.001
deceit	14.16	5.53	14.42	5.82	-0.22	.819

self-acceptance	35.74	9.56	54.22	4.70	-12.25	<.001
rejection of oneself	17.54	8.47	8.84	6.44	5.77	<.001
acceptance of others	20.98	5.11	28.24	3.23	-8.47	<.001
rejection of others	20.02	7.21	17.60	6.72	1.73	.086
emotional comfort	19.66	5.06	28.68	4.32	-9.58	<.001
emotional discomfort	19.16	9.74	11.20	7.97	4.47	<.001
internal control	49.26	10.50	63.80	5.30	-8.73	<.001
external control	24.10	10.71	14.50	8.97	4.85	<.001
dominance	7.88	3.64	12.20	3.45	-6.08	<.001
submission	18.52	5.75	16.46	5.58	1.81	0.073
escapism	13.80	5.18	11.28	5.58	2.33	<.05

Differences between low adaptive and highly adaptive groups were revealed:

in terms of adaptability. For highly adaptive students, the indicator is higher (M = 163.44) than for low-adaptive students (M = 113.72). The significance of the difference is confirmed by the Livin test (<.05) and (p <.001);

in terms of maladaptation. For low-adaptive students, the indicator is higher (M = 89.22) than for highly adaptive students (M = 58.18). The significance of the difference is confirmed (p <.001);

in terms of self-acceptance. Highly adaptive students have a higher indicator (M = 54.22) than low-adaptive students (M = 35.74). The significance of the difference is confirmed by the Livin test (<.05) and (p <.001);

in terms of rejection of myself. For low-adaptive students, the indicator is higher (M = 17.54) than for highly adaptive students (M = 8.84). The significance of the difference is confirmed by the Livin test (<.05) and (p <.001);

in terms of acceptance of others. For highly adaptive students, the indicator is higher (M = 28.24) than for low-adaptive students (M = 20.98). The significance of the difference is confirmed by the Livin test (<.05) and (p <.001);

in terms of emotional comfort. For highly adaptive students, the indicator is higher (M = 28.68) than for low-adaptive students (M = 19.66). The significance of the difference is confirmed (p <.001);

in terms of emotional discomfort. For low-adaptive students, the indicator is higher (M = 19.16) than for highly adaptive students (M = 11.20). The significance of the difference is confirmed (p <.001);

in terms of internal control. Highly adaptive students have a higher rate (M = 63.80) than low-adaptive students (M = 49.26). The significance of the difference is confirmed by the Livin test (<.05) and (p <.001);

in terms of external control. For low-adaptive students, the indicator is higher (M = 24.10) than for highly adaptive students (M = 14.50). The significance of the difference is confirmed (p <.001);

in terms of dominance. Highly adaptive students have a higher rate (M = 12.20) than low-adaptive students (M = 7.88). The significance of the difference is confirmed (p <.001);

in terms of escapism. For low-adaptive students, the indicator is higher (M = 13.80) than for highly adaptive students (M = 11.28). The significance of the difference is confirmed (p <.05).

Thus, adaptability is associated with the acceptance of oneself, others, emotional comfort, internal control, dominance. Disadaptivity is directly interconnected with the rejection of oneself, others, emotional discomfort, external control, statements, escapism. Highly adapted students are characterized by a high level of adaptability, self-acceptance, acceptance of others, level of emotional comfort, internal control, dominance, manifestation of leadership qualities. The above-mentioned personality characteristics help foreign students to set personal goals, compare them with the results achieved during the activity, fulfill environmental requirements, correlate them with needs, motives and interests. It brings a degree of satisfaction. The need for communication with others is realized thanks to the formed up emotional attitude. This is an important feature of a person in a cultural environment and indicates high adaptive capabilities.

Low-adapted students are characterized by a level of maladaptation, self-rejection, emotional discomfort, and external control. This group of students is characterized by an inability to make decisions, correlation of personal and educational goals. Unreadiness to take responsibility for what is happening, to bring to a result. Unreadiness for joint activities can complicate the work in groups. The lack of emotional guidelines for what is happening complicates relations with peers and teachers. Failure to take responsibility speaks of the mental immaturity of the individual.

According to the questionnaire by Osnitsky (2004) the normal indicator in terms of adaptability is the level of 68-136. The results of an adaptive assessment of the personality of each individual student are compared

with a three-level pyramid of intervention based on a public health model (Frieden, 2010), which was adapted by educators to determine the need for support for the school population. Students below 68 points belong to the 3rd level of the Pyramid. From 68-136 - to the 2nd level of the Pyramid. Over 136 points - to the 1st level of the Pyramid.

Strong sides on the path to adaptability are self-acceptance (t = .933) and acceptance of others (t = .772), emotional comfort (t = .761) and internal control. (t = .776).

Weak sides include self-rejection (t = .890), rejection of others (t = .718), emotional discomfort (t = .929), submission (t = .759) and escapism (t = .719).

Discussions

The objectives of this preliminary study were to study the existing literature on student assessment. It is necessary to create a valid and reliable tool for assessing the personality of the student, combining and improving existing tools.

Summing up the theoretical analysis of the literature, it can be seen that different authors indicate different significant aspects of the personality within the educational process. Such personality traits, personal processes as: adaptive characteristics, motivational components, socio-emotional components of the personality, psychological endurance, socio-emotional development, social stability, social competence, regulation of emotions, empathy, self-esteem make it possible to evaluate the student's mental health and identify its strengths and weaknesses.

In contrast to personal approaches to studying personality assessment, studying the assessment of the educational environment as a whole, the climate provides a holistic view and shows the relationship between the factors. But since the climate is a more dynamically changing measurement, measuring the school climate with accuracy is more difficult. Assessment of the student's personality helps educators to work individually, identify strengths and weaknesses of the personality, provide timely psychological assistance, tutoring.

From a practical point of view, an understanding of the adaptive developmental processes helps practitioners to identify the strengths and needs of the learner, as well as how they change over time. Thus, the assessment of dynamic parameters can improve the use of intervention strategies that are appropriate to the developmental needs of students (Malti et al., 2016). Socio-psychological maladaptation leads to a pronounced activation of regulatory mechanisms, which manifest itself in an increase in the effects of the

sympathetic nervous system and naturally leads to high energy consumption of the body and a decrease in the efficiency of activity (Malti et al., 2016).

Assessing adaptability, we study the functioning trends of a goal-oriented personality system, determined by the correspondence (or mismatch) between its goals and the results achieved in the process of activity. We can talk about the effectiveness of the learning process if personal goals coincide with educational goals.

There is a need to measure the level of mental health of the student. This will allow educators and psychologists to identify risk groups. At level 1 of the base of the pyramid help is focused on increase of attention of individuals, not the entire group, but theoretically they can have a big impact if it is used universally and effectively. At level 2 - students with average values of adaptability (norm). They do not require constant assistance; rare preventive interventions are possible. At level 3 - students with a low level of adaptability, it is necessary to carry out activities to maintain the existing level. 1st level students can work in small groups. Teachers do their best to give children education that matches their skill level and how they learn best. However, not always there is time to devote individual attention to children.

The school (universities) tracks and monitors children's performance with homework, tests, and other measures to see how things are going with the children. If a child is struggling, the child can go to level 2.

Children who are not progressing at level 1 will receive level 2 assistance. This usually means that small groups are taught two to three times a week using methods that have proven to be effective. It may also mean special training. Educators call this help intervention.

It is important to know that children who are on the second level still participate in regular lessons along with the rest of the class. They still get Level 1 support.

Every one or two weeks, the teacher checks the students' skill level to see if they have made progress. If they are doing well, students can return to level 1. If not, the school can leave the child at level 2, or even move the student to level 3.

When children are struggling, and level 1 and 2 support does not seem to help, they are placed on level 3. This is the most intense level of help.

Level 3 can mean working in small groups or individual lessons. Most of the children who receive this support still spend most of their day in the general education class. However, they can spend most of the day in the resource room.

Because students at level 3 are the most at risk, schools are closely monitoring them. Teachers carefully monitor their progress, in order to improve student performance, to leave level 3.

Conclusion

The number of subjects does not affect the student's academic performance. Strong point towards students adaptability include self-acceptance, acceptance of others, emotional comfort, and internal control. These personality traits increase adaptability.

Weak points are: self-rejection, rejection of others, emotional discomfort, escapism. These personality traits reduce adaptability.

Orientation of teachers to the strong and weak points of the personality of foreign students will help to build the necessary strategy for working in classes according to the pyramid. The pyramid consisting of 1, 2, 3 levels will help teachers build a suitable strategy for interacting with students. Psychological and pedagogical assistance at different levels of the pyramid is determined by the strong points and problems of the student.

An individual approach and work in small subgroups are recommended for low-adapted students.

The inclusion of a motivational and targeted approach to the development of subjects will reduce maladaptiveness and lead to a correspondence between the student's personal goal and the goals of educational activity.

An adaptive assessment of the student will help the teacher, psychologist to build an educational process focused on three levels of students: strong, weak, average, to assess the psychological health of the student, and the degree of intervention.

Using a differentiated approach, students can receive special education. The difference is that in order to receive a special education, a child must be evaluated and qualified, which may take some time.

References

Achenbach, T. M., Rescorla, L. A. (2001). *Manual for the ASEBA school-age forms and profiles.* Burlington: University of Vermont, Research Center for Children, Youth, and Families.

Aizman, R. I., Lebedev, A. V., Aizman, N. I., & Rubanovich, V. B. (2017). Methodology and practice of health monitoring of the studying youth. *Health and Education in the XXI Century*, *19*(5), 73-78.

Akhmadullina, E. A. (2006). *Peculiarities and dynamics of the value-motivational sphere of personality in the process of sociocultural adaptation of emigrants.* [PhD Thesis, Kazan State University].

Blum, R. W., McNeely, C., & Rinehart, P. M. (2002). *Improving the odds: The untapped power of schools to improve the health of teens*. Center for Adolescent Health and Development.

Cohen, J. (2006). Social, emotional, ethical, and academic education: Creating a climate for learning, participation in democracy, and well-being. *Harvard educational review*, *76*(2), 201-237.

Cohn, B., Merrell, K. W., Felver-Grant, J., Tom, K., & Endrulat, N. R. (2009). Strength-based assessment of social and emotional functioning: SEARS-C and SEARS-A. In *meeting of the National Association of School Psychologists Boston, MA*.

Cole, M. S., Harris, S. G., & Feild, H. S. (2004). Stages of Learning Motivation: Development and Validation of a Measure 1. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *34*(7), 1421-1456.

Coryn, C. L., Spybrook, J. K., Evergreen, S. D., & Blinkiewicz, M. (2009). Development and evaluation of the social-emotional learning scale. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, *27*(4), 283-295.

Dubrovina, I. V. (1975). *On the individual characteristics of schoolchildren*. Moscow: Znanie.

Frieden, T. R. (2010). A framework for public health action: the health impact pyramid. *American journal of public health*, *100*(4), 590-595.

Furlong, M. J., Greif, J. L., Bates, M. P., Whipple, A. D., Jimenez, T. C., & Morrison, R. (2005). Development of the California school climate and safety survey-short form. *Psychology in the Schools*, *42*(2), 137-149.

Goodman, R. (2001). Psychometric properties of the strengths and difficulties questionnaire. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, *40*(11), 1337-1345.

Griffith, B. A., & Frieden, G. (2000). Facilitating reflective thinking in counselor education. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *40*(2), 82-93.

Ionin, L. G. (2000). *Sociology of culture: the way to the new Millennium*. Moscow: Logos Publ.

Khlomov, D., & Kaliteevskaya, E. (2000). *Philosophy of the gestalt approach*. Moscow: MGI.

Khukhlaeva, O. (2013). Classification of psychological disorders health of preschoolers and younger students. *Psychological Science and Education psyedu.ru, 5*, 81-90.

Kostylev, A. N., Alekseenko, S. N., Pil'shykova, V. V., Bondina, V. M., Gubareva, D. A. (2017). Evaluation of personal orientating motivation of students for successful studying at the institutions of higher education. *Modern Problems of Science and Education, 5*, 32-32.

Leontiev, D. A. (1987). Self-regulation, resources and personality potential. *Siberian Psychological Journal, 62*, 18-37.

Lunenburg, F. C. (2011). Comprehensive Assessment of School Environments (CASE): An underused framework for measuring school climate. *National forum of educational administration and supervision journal*, 29(4), 1-8.

Loukas, A., Suzuki, R., & Horton, K. D. (2006). Examining school connectedness as a mediator of school climate effects. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, *16*(3), 491-502.

Malti, T., Zuffianò, A., & Noam, G. G. (2018). Knowing every child: Validation of the Holistic Student Assessment (HSA) as a measure of social-emotional development. *Prevention science*, *19*(3), 306-317.

Malti, T., Chaparro, M. P., Zuffianò, A., & Colasante, T. (2016). School-based interventions to promote empathy-related responding in children and adolescents: A developmental analysis. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology*, *45*(6), 718-731.

Noam, G. G., Malti, T., & Karcher, M. J. (2013). Mentoring relationships in developmental perspective. *The handbook of youth mentoring*, 99-115.

Oberle, E., Schonert-Reichl, K. A., Hertzman, C., & Zumbo, B. D. (2014). Social–emotional competencies make the grade: Predicting academic success in early adolescence. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, *35*(3), 138-147.

Osnitsky, A. K. (2004). Defining characteristics of social adaptation. *Psychology and school, 1*, 43-56.

Pakulina, S. A., & Ket'ko, S. M. (2010). Diagnostics method of learning motivation in pedagogical university students. *Psychological Science and Education, 2*(1), 1-11.

Petrovsky, A. V., & Shpalinsky, V. V. (1978). *Social psychology of the team*. Moscow: Prosveshchenie.

Presbitero, A. (2016). Culture shock and reverse culture shock: The moderating role of cultural intelligence in international students' adaptation. *International journal of intercultural relations*, *53*, 28-38.

Raygorodsky, D. Ya. (2003). *The psychology of self-awareness*. Samara: Bakhrakh-M.

Rean, A. A. (2017). *Psychology of personality*. St. Petersburg: Piter.

Rubinstein, S. L. (1973). *Philosophical concept of man. S. L. Rubinstein in the context of humanistic and positive psychology*. Retrieved from http://en.medicine-guidebook.com/professiyu-psiholog-vvedenie_rubinshteyn.html

Rutter, M., & Maughan, B. (2002). School effectiveness findings 1979–2002. *Journal of school psychology*, *40*(6), 451-475.

Shafaei, A., Abd Razak, N., & Nejati, M. (2016). Integrating two cultures successfully: Factors influencing acculturation attitude of international postgraduate students in Malaysia. *Journal of Research in International Education*, *15*(2), 137-154.

Sharok, V. V. (2015). Features of socio-psychological adaptation of students of different course years. *Applied Legal Psychology, 3*, 135-145.

Shuvalov, A. (2009). Man's psychological well-being. *St. Tikhon's University Review. Series IV: Pedagogy. Psychology, 4*(15), 87-101.

Tolstykh, Yu. I. (2011). Criteria for assessing the success of adaptation of first-year students at university. *University proceedings. Volga region. Humanities, 4*(20), 137-142.

Ursache, A., Blair, C., & Raver, C. C. (2012). The promotion of self-regulation as a means of enhancing school readiness and early achievement in children at risk for school failure. *Child Development Perspectives*, *6*(2), 122-128.

Volochkov, A. A. (2014). Psychological health and activeness of the student. *Psychological and Pedagogical Sciences, 1*, 57-68.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1972). Spinoza's theory of emotions in light of contemporary psychoneurology. *Sov. studies in philosophy, 10*, 362-382.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1984). *Collected works: Child psychology* (Vol. 4). Moscow: Pedagogika.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1960). *Development of higher mental functions: From unpublished works*. Moscow: Publishing house of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of the RSFSR.

Whittingham, K. L. (2006). Impact of personality on academic performance of MBA students: Qualitative versus quantitative courses. *Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education*, *4*(2), 175-190.

Wilson, M. E. (2004). Teaching, learning, and millennial students. *New directions for student services*, *2004*(106), 59-71.

Worrell, F. C. (2000). The reliability and validity of the instructional climate inventory-student form. *Psychology in the Schools*, *37*(3), 291-298.

Zullig, K. J., Koopman, T. M., Patton, J. M., & Ubbes, V. A. (2010). School climate: Historical review, instrument development, and school assessment. *Journal of psychoeducational assessment*, *28*(2), 139-152.