

Organization of psychological work

Deryabina O.M

A Psychologist's Place in the State and Social Expertise

The present article meets the requirements of the society, namely the necessity to give students and psychologists – colleagues the information and knowledge about one of the most “less advertised “ (i.e. not published) unit of psychology which is organizational psychology on the macro level (Ashmarin and Judin, 1997 call it “fundamental level”).

The author feels the responsibility for writing such an article not only because she has been delivering special courses on this theme to the students of the psychology department of MGOPU for five years, but primarily she was involved in the very first experimental works of the kind since late 80s when neither the author nor her colleagues knew that they are engaged in organizational psychology associating themselves as social psychologist (a well-known Molier's character didn't know that he speaks prose).

The article enables psychologists (especially mature psychologists and consulting psychologists) to see the significance of the previous experience and establish their own niche in the field of “fundamental humanitarian expertise” (Ashmarin, Judin, 1997).

Keywords: *socio-humanitarian, humanitarian, scientific, social-psychological expertise; social and state expertise, complex expertise.*

The notion of “humanitarian expertise” penetrated the psychologists' life in the late 1980s.

I.Expertise: socio-humanitarian, humanitarian, scientific, social.

The analysis of literature shows that about at the same time investigations in the field of the expertise began in different spheres of science connected with psychology (cf.the literature: Reimers,1990; Dridze,Tukov et.al./Sociohumanitarian expetize, Round Table,1992/; Genisaretsky, Judin, et.al.,1996-1997; Lukov,1996).

It was Nikolay Fyodorovich Reimers who first began analysing the definition, aims and principles of the expertise and called it scientific. One of the first basic requirements is the following: “ the object must be subjected to the goals of development of the local economy and population (including

keeping people healthy and making the life span longer) , and only then – to the state interests”²³ (27,p.1). Such principle (together with other principles written in the same work - for example, the principle of “social value”, p.11, or the principles “ the person’s risk of being sick,.13; “ social risk”, p.14, etc) allows to reckon that Reimers mentions about the same humanitarian (or sociohumanitarian) expertize calling it “scientific” like all other authors do. By “scientific” this researcher implies independent from interested structures and institutions.

Let’s consider different authors’ opinions. According to A.U.Kharashu humanitarian expertize is the activity of the total evaluation of “consequences for a person (the population of the region or a social group) which happened in the past (early or recent), present or the nearest future (31, p.101).

According to Ashmarin and Judin (1997), humanitarian expertize is “ the systematically organized activity directed to the prediction of new dangers for human potential” (see 2). It is conducted for the complex analysis of bills, draft projects and decisions of the executive branch, for estimation of technical gadgets, for the evaluation of condition (the dynamics of human potential changes), of existing and project technologies, including social ones (for instance, the contents of the humanitarian education at school). The authors underline that it would be unreasonable to treat the expertize of any new technology (in a broader sense) as one action; it is necessary to trace new phenomena and effects made by it, and to assess revealing opportunities, as well as risk factors caused by the expertise. The result of the humanitarian expertise mustn’t be limited by the final conclusion; one more result is also important – it is the establishing channels through which the interaction can be carried out with the formation of communicators²⁴ realising and using its constructive opportunities. In the author’s opinion, humanitarian expertize, on the whole, might have been the effective tool of the strategic and tactical correction of social (and cultural) state policy by assessing state solutions, federal and regional programmes²⁵, projects, initiatives.

Norwegian philosopher Skirbek, in our authors’ opinion, is the father of the term “ humanitarian expertise” and the main founder of this notion. He considers it as “the transition from technological expertise to multi- and interdisciplinary expertise and further – to a wide public discussion (2,30,38). In other words, “ humanitarian expertise according to Skirbek is not only the

²³ Underlined by us.- O.D.

²⁴ I.e. the formation of civil positions of people involved in the process

²⁵ It was in the case with the State expertizing of Chernobyl programe (1990).

process of making up specific decisions but continuous and full-scale dialogue during which the process of disclosing, discussing and agreeing hints and values (often hidden, unconscious) of different social groups take place alongside with the reasoning and critical notes of supposed solutions”. It should be emphasized that A.U.Kharash also treats the humanitarian expertise as a dialogue beginning with the expert investigation and finishing with not the expert conclusion (see 31, p.121-122). He introduces the term of regional preparation for the humanitarian expertise (31, p.120), which implies the feedback of population, institutions, administration and mass media.

Nearly at that time the dialogue of Russian and French scientists happened on the problem of sociohumanitarian expertise. It was a round-table discussion within the frameworks of Russian-French conference “Psychoanalysis and Sciences About Human Beings” held on March,30 – April,3 1992. (29, p.73-81). The participants of this round-table discussion expressed different opinions on both the history of sociohumanitarian expertise and definitions of the expertise, its goals and procedures.

Eve Schwarts, Ph.D. (Paris) proposed to treat the expertise sociohumanitarian if experts, a person or the social group as respondents are in human relationships. In other words experts are searching for the human meaning in the activity to be projected onto these respondents (29,p.73).

Developing this idea V.M.Rosin underlines that “on the one hand sociohumanitarian expertise should be considered as the description of the situation, on the other hand – as the beginning of the innovation process” (29, p.75). As we can judge, this very opinion is intertwined with G.Skirbek’s and A.U.Kharash’s points of view.

A.A.Tukov adds that the expertise becomes sociohumanitarian when respondents are seen not “objectively”, but “ public personalities having their own opinion, attitudes to these projects” and when these opinions are compiled and taken into consideration (29, p.76).

Anatoly Tukov stresses that the compilation of these opinions (and their further decoding, as T.Dridze particularizes, p.80) is rather hard work on “transferring” a person from common point of view to the position of a public personality²⁶ having civil opinion (29, p.77).

V.S.Styopin underlines the historic character of sociohumanitarian expertise: only after the formation of social – oriented system of liberal economics in developed countries the problem of the sociohumanitarian

²⁶ We may say – to the active civil position.

expertise might arise because it “ensures the harmonization of human relations, elimination of social conflicts” (29, p.76).

Tamara Dridze expressed an interesting opinion that there is a completely different approach to the expertise in France and Russia: in France it has the arbitration character (i.e. it is held in conflict situations), whereas in Russia it holds the character of supporting decisions and the status by branch departments and, correspondingly, it is held sometimes in the process of realization of this or that project (for instance, building)- 29,.77. V.A.Lukov pointed out(25), later T.M.Dridze(26,p.205) was for the development of principles and methodology of conducting the complex ecosociohumanitarian expertise. It was facilitated by theoretical thinking of her participating in practical expertise (for example, in Zaporozhskaya, 1989).

T.M.Dridze’s idea is still true, and therefore the following idea deserves special attention that “governmental solutions of the expertise have a department- branch character. The consequences of such “solutions have a social-regional character...City-dwellers and villagers reap the fruits, their life principles don’t coincide with official ones, regarding the fact that their life quality is subjected by irretrievable damage” (29,p.78).

Unfortunately, the dialogue about sociohumanitarian expertise was about an abstract thing, there were no examples of particular expertise; all these facts result in misunderstanding of the discussed subject and if the participants are competent in the question not only in theory, but in practice as well.

Valery Andreevich Lukov demonstrates another approach. He develops the notion of **social expertise**, which became the subject-matter of the textbook published by the Youth Institute in 1996.

“Social expertise is the research being conducted by specialists (experts) and comprises the diagnostics of social object condition, maintaining the true information about it and surrounding environment, prediction of its further changes and impact on other social objects, and also recommendations for taking management solutions and social project in terms when the research task is hard to formulate” (25,p.19). Under social objects V.A.Lukov means people, social communities, social institutions and processes, organizations, social values, ideas, concepts, standard acts, directly or indirectly implying normative changes, etc. “The list of social objects must be incomplete because the social reality is manifold and it doesn’t lead to a great number of characteristics. At the same time practical tasks of the social expertise don’t

make us exclude some of many social objects from the sphere of expert investigation, but pay attention to various objects” (25,p.19).

“The purpose of the social expertise is to bring the correspondence of government bodies acts and other social institutions with civil social interests, social politics tasks, and suggestions of attaining this conformity” (25,p.22).

As objects of the social expertise Lukov emphasizes federal and regional bills, department standard acts, normative judicial self-governing bodies acts, federal, regional, local social programmes and projects, state concepts in social politics field, social investigation concepts, etc. (p.23).

V.A.Lukov stresses that he came to realize the notion of “social expertise” working on the Family Law – “in the course of developing the concepts and mechanisms of family expertise to order of Social Protection Ministry of Russia in 1993-199” (p.4). That’s why the notion of “social expertise” is narrower to some extent than the notion of “humanitarian expertise”: the former includes the experimentation only project documents of the standard- legislative character, whereas the latter adds the analysis of situations of object projects: building, rebuilding, replanning, dismantling of pecuniary plants, bridges, nuclear power stations; it often happens in the situations of real or potential risk.

In any case, all researchers agree that humanitarian expertise is an estimating (theoretical and practical) activity IN THE NAME OF MEN, from the point of view of a man’s interests (the particular individual or separate social groups), where the man is the cornerstone, interpreted from Albert Schweitzer’s position (“veneration for life”) and some other humanists.

II. State and social expertise. It should be mentioned that till mid -90s it was no sense to split the expertise into state and social, for the status of social expertise wasn’t defined yet.

After the Law of Russian Federation “About Environment Protection” had come into practice (1994), new judicial frames appeared for the state ecological expertise (unit V, pp.35-38) and for social ecological expertise (p.39), though in our real life social ecological expertise appeared much earlier (see accounts about ecological expertise in Social Economic Union SEU, where the author worked, and international organization Greenpeace²⁷).

The necessity to differentiate the state and social expertise arose with the adoption of the law “About Ecological Expertise” (1995), where the principal significance of not only state, but also social expertise was marked.

²⁷ In the late 1993 Greenpeace published the report of its expert group 96 attempts of importing wastes in Russia in 1987-1993 (New Time, №38, 1994, p.33).

Examples (and the list) of expertise can be seen also in the article by A.U.Kharash (31, pp.90-99): he enumerates 16 scientific- practical works, some of them are mentioned here. It goes without saying, these two lists don't exhaust all expertise held for the last 15 years. Unfortunately, the access is limited to the titles of expertise and spheres of their implementation, not only to their texts.

To make a sophisticated summary the author tries to stick to rather simple scheme of describing the expertise, which duplicates the form of the very expert conclusion²⁸:

The title of the expertise and its problem; The client; Expert group; The deadline of conducting the expertise; Used methods; The Process of the expertise; Results; Conclusions and recommendations. And if it is possible, the consequences of the expertise where a psychologist's place is reflected. Such units as Used Literature and Appendix, being the main components of the expert conclusion, will not be mentioned here.

More complicated schemes of expert conclusions reflecting the reality deeper can be seen in the work of Elena Simakhina (2003), who analyzed some of the given expertise from the point of view of their form. The investigation was done under the supervision of the author of the article (see the literature).

III. State and social expertise: brief descriptions of cases.

It should be noted the main difference between state and social expertise: the difference is in the client. The first one is ordered by the state (in different forms), the second expertise is ordered by the society up to initiative groups of people. Correspondingly, they are subsidized by either the state or social budget (grants, donation, sponsor money, etc).

A.U.Kharash wrote the detailed information about this expertise, which can be found in his works (31, pp.88, 91) and in materials of VINITI (3, pp.104-108).

IV. State, social, complex and other expertise: a psychologist's place.

As for a psychologist's role, it combines both the role of the practical researcher and a citizen's role.

It is necessary to underline that this role depends a lot on the active position of the psychologist (to be more correct, on a psychological group: a psychologist rarely performs in such large –scale expertise alone). Probably, the activity of a psychologist's position may be well illustrated on the sample of Chernobyl programs expertise: A.U.Kharash, being the deputy director of

²⁸ Cf.Lukov (25,p.123-124, the chapter "Expert conclusion": the form of the review; Kharash (31,p.118-119).

the social- psychological group, was convinced for all expert group, comprising 88 people, 36 of them were academicians and Doctors of Sciences, that, primarily, the general text of the expert conclusion consisting of 80 pages (3, pp.14 – 95) includes the chapter “Notes and Suggestions on the Social – ecological Security” of 44 pages (3, pp.23 – 67), based on the conclusion of the social- psychological group. The impact of the social- psychological group is perceived in the rest part of the text (about 40 pages). Secondly, the same publication includes additional conclusion of this very social- psychological group – more 30 pages (3, pp.96 – 126). Thirdly, the conclusion of the expert group helped to correct people and territory rehabilitation programs who suffered in Chernobyl disaster: in the 1990s a great number of rehabilitation programs were carried out having medical and social character and intended both for adults and children. One of these programs was above- mentioned activity of VTK by Bobnyova M.I. “Votum- Psy” who published the results of practical investigations. And it is not the expert commission fault that in 2000s all Chernobyl privileges were taken away, and compensations were abolished.

To sum up, it should be noted that, first of all, new activity has emerged in our country for the last 15 years – expertising different projects (creative, building and dismantling projects of military, nuclear power and chemical plants) on the **project stage**. Secondly, clients of the experiment might be both state and social structures (including initiative groups of citizens engaged in the planned changes). Thirdly, despite the client (the state or society), competent specialists are invited to be experts possessing not only knowledge and experience but also certain social weight.

Thus, a psychologist’s place in both expertise may be the following: it is not only theoretical and practical role but also the skill to find and pick out groups of people involved, in order to demonstrate what is necessary to do to defend the vital interests of all revealed groups. It can be defined as the role of ideologist turning the expertise to a man – and it corresponds to the citizen’s role.

Bibliography

1. Avdeeva N.N., Ashmarin I.I., Stepanova G.B. Human Potential of Russia. - A Man. №1, 1997.
2. Ashmarin I.I., Judin B.G. The Basics of Human Expertise. // A Man., №3, 1997//.
3. International Environment Day: Reference Materials. 1990.Expert evaluation of programs and suggestions on disaster consequences liquidation in Chernobyl Nuclear Power Station. M., 1991 – 128p.

4. Genisaretsky O.I., Nosov N.A., Judin B.G. The Concept of Human Potential: general considerations. // A Man. №4, 1996 //.
5. Darmodehin S.V., Muratov U.I. Social and Family Expertise of state solutions: Scientifically grounded problems. // Family in Russia. - №2,1994 //.
6. Deryabina O.M. The Tasks of social- psychological expert investigation of problems of children injured by disaster on ChNPS and deprived of parents' care (examination in Tula region). - Chernobyl Trace. Psychological Consequences of Chernobyl Disaster. M.:MGP "Votum-Psy", 1992, p.201 – 207.
7. Deryabina O.M. The concept of radiation, medical and social protection of people of Russian Federation from a psychologist's point of view. //Reports Theses of the 2nd International Radioecological Conference. – Krasnoyarsk- Tomsk, 1994. – P.49 – 51.
8. Deryabina O.M. General approaches and notions of the concept of children legal protection suffered in the result of Chelnobyl NPS disaster. – Social and legal protection of children and adolescents suffered in the result of Chernobyl disaster (psychological – legal research). M.: MGP "Votum-Psy", 1992, p. 139- 147.
9. Deryabina O.M. Practical Ecological Psychology: expertise, diagnostics, correction, rehabilitation, and training. // The conference on Ecological Psychology. M., 1996. – p. 47-48 //.
10. Deryabina O.M The reasons of post- traumatic stress in residents of regions located near industrial and military radioactive objects. The conference materials RPO "Psychology Today". M., 1996. – P.212 – 213.
11. Deryabina O.M. The problems of military-nuclear power complex and conversion with a psychologist's eyes. // After the cold war: disarmament, conversion and security (Krasnoyarsk, September 12-16, 1994). – Krasnoyarsk: Ekologichesky Vestnik, 1995. – P.103-109.
12. Deryabina O.M. Problems of special care of children-orphans and children without parents' guardianship. // Chernobyl trace.Social and legal protection of children and adolescents suffered in the result of Chernobyl disaster (psychological – legal research). M.: MGP "Votum-Psy", 1992, p. 180 –202.
13. Deryabina O.M. Psychological aspects of building AST –500. Materials of reports in Tomsk, September 15, 2000. - Tomsk,2000. – P.202 –210.
14. Deryabina O.M. Psychological aspects of building and exploitation of nuclear objects (risks estimation) // Reports reviews at the international conference "Radioactivity in nuclear explosions and accidents" (Moscow, April 24 – 26, 2000). – St.Petersburgh : Gidrometeoizdat, 2000. – p.391.
15. Deryabina O.M. Psychological aspects of building and exploitation of nuclear objects. // 2nd Russian conference on ecological psychology. Issues (Moscow, April 12 – 14, 2000). – M.: IPC "Globes", 2000. – p.63 – 64.

16. Deryabina O.M. Psychological aspects of ecological information, education and upbringing. // The conference on ecological psychology. M., 1996. – P.48 – 50.
17. Deryabina O.M. Psychological problems of closed cities, connected with the military production of Plutonic. // The 4th international conference. The utilization of Plutonic: problems and solutions. Issues. (Krasnoyarsk, June 5 – 10,2000). – p.79 – 83.
18. Deryabina O.M. Psychological condition of Chernobyl children – orphans methodological and method principles of expert evaluation. // Up – to date problems of modern childhood: M., 1992. – p. 64 –67.
19. Deryabina O.M. Social – psychological expert investigation of perception the situation of ecological risk by pupils of boarding house, their teachers and administration (on the example of Tula region). Ed. Chernobyl Trace. Injured Children. Part I. M.: MGP “Votum – Psy”, 1992,p. 23 –110.
20. Deryabina O.M. Society participation in the processes of taking vital regional decisions as a psychological problem. // The conference on ecological psychology. M., 2003. – P. 253 – 256.
21. Deryabina O.M. The training of project and development of organization. Special course for students of 3 – 5 years of social and pedagogical psychology department of the psychology faculty MGOPU, delivered in 2000 – 2003.
22. Deryabina O.M. Organizational psychology. Special course for students of 5th year of management psychology department of the psychology faculty of MGOPU, has been delivering since 2003.
23. Deryabina O.M. Organizational psychology. The course program for management psychology students of the psychology faculty of MGOPU after M.A.Sholokhov. - M.: Alpha, 2004.
24. Zhukov U.M. Practical psychologist positions. // Introduction to practical social psychology //. Ed. by Zhukov U.M, L.A.Petrovskaya, O.V. Solovyova. – 3d corrected edition. – M.: Smysl, 1998, - p.21 – 34.
25. Lukov V.A. Social Expertise. – M.: Institute of Youth, 1996 – 144p.
26. Predictable social project: Theoretical – methodological problems //Institute of Sociology of RAS: the editor is T.M Dridze. – 2nd ed., corrected and additional. - M: Nauka, 1994.
27. Reimers N.F. The Methods of scientific (ecological – social – economic) expertise of projects and economic beginnings (general principles). M.: Ecological Union of USSR, 1990. –24p.
28. Simakhina E.V. Possible forms of expert psychologist’s conclusion about organizing development (based on the materials of expertise on the macrolevel). Diploma paper. – M., Psychology faculty of MGOPU, 2003. – 74p

29. Sociohumanitarian expertise: principles and methods. The results of "Round Table". // Sociological researches. №11, 1992, p.73 – 81.
30. Skirbek G. Does Expertise Have Ethical Norms? // A Man. №16 1991. – pp.87 –93//.
31. Kharash A.U. Humanitarian expertise in extreme situations: ideology, methods, and procedure. // Introduction to practical social psychology // . Ed. By U.M.Zhukov, L.A.Petrovsky O.V.Solovyova. – 2nd corrected ed. – M.: Smysl, 1996, - p. 87 –129.
32. Kharash A.U. An expert research: situation and progress (methods, techniques, procedure, result) // Introduction to practical social psychology//. Ed. By U.M.Zhukov, L.A.Petrovsky O.V.Solovyova. – 3d corrected ed. - M.: Smysl, 1998, -p.114 – 129.
33. Covello V. T. (Ed.) The Analysis of Actual versus Perceived Risk. Plenum – N.Y. – London, 1983.
34. Covello V. T. Social and behavioral research on risk: uses in risk management decision-making. Pp 1-14 in: Environmental Impact Assessment, Technology Assessment and Risk Analysis. NATO ASL Series G. Volume 4, Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1985.
35. Douglas M. Risk acceptability according to the social sciences. Russel Sage NY.,1985.
36. Douglas M., Wildavsky A. Risk and culture: an essay on the selection of technological and environmental dangers. Berkley University of California Press, 1988.
37. Government. New Jersey, Department of Environmental Protection, 1988.
38. Skirbek G. Rationality and Modernity. Oslo, Scandinavian University Press, 1993.