American Journal of Alternative Education
ISSN **2997-3953** (Online)
Vol. 3, No. 3, July 2026,
Available online at: https://scientificbulletin.com/index.php/AJAE

Article

Dynamics of Concepts about Professionally Important Qualities of Pedagogical University Students

S. Kh. Djalilova
Candidate of Psychological Sciences, Associate Professor of the Department of "Applied Psychology" at the Nizami National Pedagogical University of Uzbekistan

Article information:
Manuscript received: 15 April 2025; **Accepted:** 10 May 2026; **Published:** 11 Jun 2026

Abstract: This article presents the results of a study on personal professionalization, specifically the representation of the "Retrospective Self" regarding the professionally significant qualities of pedagogical university students, depending on the course of study.

Keywords: Professionally Significant Qualities, Retrospective Ego, Empathy, Communicativeness, and the Image of the "Ideal Teacher".

1. Introduction

In personality psychology, it is generally considered that personality development in ontogenesis proceeds from the social world of society toward the individual world of the individual. This idea, put forward by L.S. Vygotsky, S.L. Rubinstein, and A.N. Leontyev, is accepted as a postulate in modern psychology. Meanwhile, various cultures and sociotypic environments, while influencing the formation of the psyche, have their own patterns that require analysis. However, in most studies, the concept of the social world of society becomes abstract [1].

In defining the theoretical and methodological basis of this research, we emphasize that there is no psychology of pedagogy outside of socio-cultural problems and there can be none. This position will remain unchanged in the future [2].

In solving the specific tasks of this study, we used observation, questionnaires, analysis, and generalization to study the dynamics of students' perceptions of professionally significant qualities depending on the course of study (Table 1).

2. Materials and Methods

The version of the questionnaire we developed allows for obtaining students' opinions about themselves in the past, present, and future, as well as their opinions on how they are represented and evaluated by others (teachers and fellow students). At the same time, 19 questions had a limited set of answers: "certainly so" - 5 points; "perhaps it is so" - 4; "difficult to say" - 3; "perhaps it is not so" - 2; "it is definitely not so" - 1 point.

It should be emphasized that the properties offered to students for evaluation are generally the image of an "ideal teacher" or can be conventionally called a "teacher's standard." Of course, this "set" of properties could be continued, but we limited ourselves mainly to the properties that characterize the teacher as a person. Their significance in the teacher's personality and activities does not require proof. We assume that their direction

and overall psychological-pedagogical content are well-known. They are well-known. Therefore, we will focus further on their research results (2).

3. Results

The students' opinion of themselves in the past (retrospective self) is shown in Table 1.

1.The ability to understand the inner world of students. This property characterizes empathy in students. As seen from the table, 1st-year students consider themselves not very prepared in the past for this property (3,6). Although their indicators are significantly ($p<0.01$) higher than those of 2nd-year students (3.1), who tend to have an indefinite assessment of this property ("difficult to say") [3].

Interestingly, the opinions of 2nd and 3rd-year students regarding the manifestation of the considered professionally significant trait are almost identical. Their indicators do not differ significantly. Apparently, both are characterized by the so-called "social desirability" of responses, which is one of the mechanisms of self-surrender for the purpose of self-defense of one's own "I."

However, as early as the 4th year, students assess this property more positively (3.9), which is significantly higher ($p<0.05$) than among 3rd-year students. In our view, this can be explained and linked to the comparison of real knowledge in the past with the real world of students [4].

Table 1. Students' opinions in points regarding their professionally significant personality traits in the past (retrospective "Self")**.**

No	Personality traits and qualities	Average for all examined individuals n=406	Indicators of differences depending on the training courses			
			1d n=60	2k n=171	3k n=90	4k n=75
1.	Ability to understand the inner world of students	3.5	3.6*	3.1	3.3**	3.9**
2.	The ability to establish contact with another person	4.1	4.5***	4.1	4.1*	3.7***
3.	Ability to actively influence a student	3.3	3.1	3.2**	3.6	3.4**
4.	Communicativeness	3.8	3.8	3.9	3.8	3.6*
5.	Respect for the beliefs and convictions of others	3.9	4.2	3.9	3.9*	4.2**
6.	The ability to convince people	4.2	4.3*	4.1	4.2	4.4
7.	Self-confidence	4.3	4.7*	4.5**	4.0*	4.5**

8.	Patience and self-control	3.9	4.1	4.1	4.1	3.8
9.	Demandingness	3.8	4.1***	3.7***	4.2***	3.4**
10.	Persistence	3.9	3.6	4.1	4.1	4.3**
11.	Initiative	3.5	3.1*	3.6*	3.9*	3.4*
12.	Vigor	3.9	4.1	4.1***	3.3*	3.8*
13.	Patience	3.7	4.1	4.1***	3.3*	3.8*
14.	The quality of an organizer and leader	3.3	3.2	3.2	3.3	3.4
15.	The ability to manage one's own and others' behavior	3.7	3.7	3.9	3.7	3.8
16.	Flexibility of behavior	3.8	4.0	4.1***	3.4**	4.1**
17.	Orderliness	3.7	3.9	3.7**	3.4***	4.2**
18.	Independence and creative thinking	3.5	4.0	4.1	3.9	4.1*
19.	Special knowledge	4.0	4.4	4.1	4.1	3.9

***- p‹0.01; **- p‹0.05; ***- p‹0.001**

2. The ability to establish contact with another person (communicative qualities). In this important quality for a teacher, first-year students are the most positive (4.5). Their answers mean that they definitely possessed this property in the past. Already in the 2nd year, students take a different position, i.e., they (apparently comparing themselves to who they were in the 1st year) evaluate themselves (4.1) significantly lower than 1st-year students (p‹0.001). However, students' self-assessment for this property in the past did not change in the 3rd year (4.1) [5].

The retrospective assessment of communicative qualities by 4th-year students also decreases. One can even note their worst assessment by 4th-year students (p‹0.05). We assume that this is a consequence of a more critical and objective approach to oneself, linked specifically to the accumulation of experience and knowledge. He who knows little knows everything. Knowledge generates ignorance (Goethe) [6].

3.Ability to actively influence the student. The manifestation of this property by 1st and 2nd-year students is assessed uncertainly in the past (3,1 and 3,2), which most likely indicates their inability to see a serious problem in the teacher's work in full, whereas with the acquisition of certain knowledge, skills, and abilities, as well as due to continuous pedagogical practice, this property is more seriously realized in the past by the 3rd year (3,6). This indicator is significantly higher (p‹0.05) than that of 2nd-year students. This tendency (to evaluate as ignorance of the past) persists in subsequent years of study [7].

4.Sociability. The retrospective assessment of this personality trait at all stages of university education is quite average. No specific dynamics in self-assessment based on this trait have been observed in the past. "Perhaps he possessed this quality" is the general opinion among students in all courses. We suggest that this is a phenomenon of more critical self-assessment of the past "I" in the manifestation of this personality trait, rather than an indicator of insufficient manifestation in the present.

5. Respect for people's beliefs and convictions. This personality trait is considered a manifestation of the teacher's general culture. However, under the conditions of the socio-cultural environment and the uniqueness of the Uzbek ethnic group, it also serves as an important regulator of the teacher's sociotypic manifestation [8].

4. Discussion

Students evaluate themselves quite moderately in the past based on this personality trait. If we take into account that it was with the acquisition of independence and the establishment of sovereignty in the Republic of Uzbekistan that the attitude toward religion and people's diverse beliefs began to shift in a positive direction, it is not difficult to understand a certain "warming" in the assessment of one's past in this regard among 1st and 4th-year students (4, 2) [9].

6.The ability to convince people. In the manifestation of this trait in the past, students find quite high scores (4.2). The most positive self-assessment was shown by 1st-year students (4.3), which is significantly ($p<0.01$) higher than the scores of 2nd-year students (4.1). Subsequently, no significant differences were observed between the indicators of students in different courses (Table 1), which we evaluate as a positive fact, as all students evaluate themselves well in this regard. Their general opinion: "probably possessed this quality in the past."

7.Self-confidence. This very important quality of a teacher is also highly valued in the past (4,3). Interestingly, 1st-year students (4,7) consider themselves the most confident in the past. However, in the worst case, such confidence begins to decrease from exchange rate to exchange rate (4.5; 4.0). Only by the 4th year does self-esteem in the past increase again (4.5) [10].

8.Courage and self-control. The average score of all students (3.9) is quite high. This means that they "probably possessed this quality" in the past. No significant differences are found between the indicators of students in different courses. Let us only note the more critical assessment of 4th-year students [11].

9.Demandingness.In the past, students evaluated themselves based on this quality as its owners (3,8). However, students differ significantly from each other ($p<0.001$) in the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd years. All these years of study provide students with positive self-esteem. But in the 4th year, this self-esteem in the past becomes the lowest (3.4). This quality, being one of the most important in a teacher's personality, is, in our view, realized by them already in the process of direct pedagogical activity and is one of the integrative indicators of teacher professionalism [12].

10.Persistence. The average score in assessing this quality in the past for students (3.9) indicates that this quality is also the most formed ("probably possessed this quality"). The table shows a certain growth dynamic in self-esteem from the 1st to the 4th year (3.6; 4.1 and 4.3).

11. Initiative (3.5). This property was probably the most undervalued in the past. Interestingly, this property tends to be highly valued from the 1st to the 4th year, and then is again evaluated more critically by 4th-year students. The low assessment of this quality in the past, in our opinion, can be explained by the insufficient development of initiative among students in school and students in higher education institutions. This is due to the fact that first-year students see themselves as schoolchildren in the past, while older students tend to compare themselves with their previous course of study at the university [13].

12.Energeticity. Average score for students is 3.9 points. Apparently, students are not inclined to belittle themselves in their energy.

13. Patience. This quality is inherent to the Uzbek ethnos in general (1), and it acquires even greater significance for a teacher. Interestingly, students evaluating themselves by this quality in the past believe they possess it (3,7). As predicted, 1st and

2nd-year students have the highest self-esteem in the past (4.1). But by the 3rd year, there is a sharp decrease in the assessment of this property in the past (3.3), which is significantly lower than that of 2nd-year students ($p<0.001$) and 4th-year students ($p<0.01$).

14. Organizational and leadership qualities. Students' self-esteem for this trait is uncertain (3,3). Their response is "difficult to say." In general, in the past, all students considered themselves unprepared in this regard. No significant differences are found in the indicators of students across different courses. We can observe the same situation when students retrospectively evaluate the following personality trait: ***15.''The ability to control one's own behavior and the behavior of others''*** (3,7).

Somewhat more positively, students in the past evaluated the following properties, which we named as - ***16. ''Behavioral flexibility''*** (3.8), meaning that students consider themselves flexible in their behavior. 2nd and 4th-year students highly value themselves in this regard [14].

17. Organization (3,7). 18. Independence and creative thinking (3.5). These personality traits are also highly valued by students in the past. An increase in indicators is observed from exchange rate to exchange rate. The highest assessment of these properties was given to 4th-year students (Table 10).

19.Special knowledge. As strange as it may seem, according to our data, lower-year students evaluate themselves much higher in this regard than high-year students. However, there are no significant differences in self-assessments of this property between students of different courses. We suggest that the underestimation of self-esteem among high school students is linked to their more conscious identification with the image of the teacher. Therefore, all problems related to knowledge, skills, and abilities begin to be realized on a more practical level [15].

5. Conclusion

Thus, the dynamics of students' perceptions of professionally significant properties vary depending on the course of study. It is primarily related to the processes of forming students' professional self-awareness and socialization.

As the course progresses, students begin to more critically evaluate themselves in the "Retrospective Self" and expand their understanding of the "Ideal Teacher" image.

REFERENCES

[1] S. Kh. Dzhalilova, "The Problem of Professionally Important Qualities in Pedagogical Activity and Their Formation in the Process of Training in Pedagogical Universities," *Science and World: International Scientific Journal*, vol. 2, no. 5 (21), 2015.

[2] S. Kh. Dzhalilova, "Features of the Teacher's Personality in Professional Activity," *Science and World: International Scientific Journal*, vol. 2, no. 5 (45), 2017.

[3] O. P. Eliseev, *Praktikum po Psikhologii Lichnosti* [Practicum on Personality Psychology]. Saint Petersburg, Russia, 2002.

[4] A. K. Markova, *Psikhologiya Truda Uchitelya* [Psychology of Teacher Labor]. Moscow, Russia: Prosveshcheniye, 1993.

[5] L. E. Kim, V. Jörg, and R. M. Klassen, "A Meta-Analysis of the Effects of Teacher Personality on Teacher Effectiveness and Burnout," *Educational Psychology Review*, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 163–195, Mar. 2019.

[6] E. M. Samfira, T. S. Dughi, and J. de la Fuente, "Editorial: Successful Teacher: Personality and Other Correlates," *Frontiers in Psychology*, vol. 14, Art. no. 1293759, Nov. 2023.

[7] F. Ibad, "Personality and Ability Traits of Teachers: Student Perceptions," *Journal of Education and Educational Development*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 162–178, Dec. 2018.

[8] S. Thompson, J. G. Greer, and B. B. Greer, "Highly Qualified for Successful Teaching: Characteristics Every Teacher Should Possess," *Essays in Education*, vol. 10, no. 1, Art. no. 5, 2004.

[9] E. Yayuk and Y. A. Haqqi, "Maximizing Teacher Competence and Performance: The Influential Factors Across Individuals, Organizations, Leadership, and Environment – A Comprehensive Systematic Review and Model," *Al-Ishlah: Jurnal Pendidikan*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 257–272, Mar. 2024.

[10] S. O. Bekoe, I. Mahama, B. M. Amoako, T. Antwi, and P. M. Amos, "Teachers' Characteristics and Technological Efficacy in Applying the Standard-Based Curriculum in Ghana: A Mixed-Method Study," *Educational Point*, vol. 2, no. 2, Art. no. e138, 2025.

[11] G. Castro Castillo, J. Cárdenas-Cobo, M. T. Soldevilla, and C. Vidal-Silva, "Analyzing the Teaching Profile and Competency-Based Training in Online Education: A Case Study of Ecuadorian Professors," *Frontiers in Education*, vol. 9, Art. no. 1397086, May 2024.

[12] R. Zhang, X. Liu, Y. Yang, J. Tripp, and B. Shao, "Preservice Science Teachers' Instructional Design Competence: Characteristics and Correlations," *EURASIA Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 1025–1039, 2017.

[13] I. Burić, A. Butković, and L. E. Kim, "Teacher Personality Domains and Facets: Their Unique Associations with Student-Ratings of Teaching Quality and Teacher Enthusiasm," *Learning and Instruction*, vol. 88, Art. no. 101827, Dec. 2023.

[14] R. Zhi and Y. Wang, "English as a Foreign Language Teachers' Professional Success, Loving Pedagogy, and Creativity: A Structural Equation Modeling Approach," *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, vol. 49, Art. no. 101370, Sep. 2023.

[15] A. R. Brubacher, "The Teaching Personality Quotient," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 39–45, Mar. 1921.