

# MULTI-FACTOR STRUCTURE OF PERSONALITY AND DETERMINATION OF MORAL-VOLITIONAL QUALITIES IN PUBLIC SECURITY MILITARY PERSONNEL

Zohirov Nodirbek Ulugbekovich

Senior Lecturer, Independent Researcher, University of Public Safety of the Republic of Uzbekistan  
[zohirovnodirbek5@gmail.com](mailto:zohirovnodirbek5@gmail.com)

**Abstract:** This article presents a systemic-empirical investigation into the multi-factor personality structure, motivational strategies, and risk-taking readiness of public security military personnel ( $n=441$ ). The research methodology incorporates R.B. Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF), T. Ehlers' motivational inventories, and the Schubert Risk-Readiness Test. Mathematical-statistical analysis via the Z-test revealed non-normal distributions across all evaluated scales ( $p \leq 0.01$ ) alongside high interpersonal dispersion. The empirical findings indicate a prominent regulatory core within the respondents' psychological profile, characterized by "Social Maturity-Conscientiousness" ( $M=6.44$ ), "Independence" ( $M=6.20$ ), and "Self-Control" ( $M=6.16$ ), coupled with a high manifestation of "Achievement Motivation" ( $M=26.46$ ). Although the Schubert test yielded a moderate mean for "Risk-Readiness" ( $M=9.78$ ), the acutely elevated standard deviation ( $\sigma=11.61$ ) confirms a stark polarization (differentiation) regarding risk attitudes within the cohort. Based on these findings, actionable recommendations are proposed for the digitalization of personnel selection frameworks.

**Keywords:** Public security, Cattell 16PF, achievement motivation, avoidance of failure, risk-readiness, social maturity, self-control, standard deviation, differential psychology.

## Introduction

The operational activity of public security personnel is characterized by a high degree of institutional regulation, profound social responsibility, the imperative for real-time decision-making in dynamically shifting environments, and intense psychophysiological loads during crisis scenarios. Under such complex deterministic conditions, the professional suitability and operational efficiency of military personnel are inherently dictated by deep-seated foundational personality factors, their motivational tendencies, and their psychological readiness to navigate risk under conditions of uncertainty [1].

**Table 1. Descriptive Statistics and Normality Testing for the Multi-Factor Personality Questionnaire (n=441)**

Indicators / Scales	Mean (M)	Std. Deviation ( $\sigma$ )	Z-value	Significance (p)
Social Boldness / Extraversion	5,37	2,10	2,746	0,000**
Emotional Stability vs. Instability	5,19	2,11	2,576	0,000**
Dominance vs. Submissiveness	5,60	1,80	2,291	0,000**
Social Maturity / Conscientiousness	6,44	2,28	4,084	0,000**
Social Bravery / Venturesomeness	5,62	1,98	2,845	0,000**
Trust vs. Suspiciousness	5,49	2,00	2,876	0,000**

Self-Assurance vs. Apprehension	5,41	1,87	2,416	0,000**
Independence vs. Dependence	6,20	2,90	3,096	0,000**
Self-Control / Compulsion	6,16	2,12	2,298	0,000**
Excitability / Tension	4,70	2,11	2,198	0,000**

Note: \*\*  $p < 0,01$

According to the descriptive statistics and normality analysis of the Multi-Factor Personality Questionnaire, the mean scores across the scales—Social Boldness (5.37), Emotional Stability (5.19), Dominance (5.60), Social Maturity-Conscientiousness (6.44), Social Bravery (5.62), Trust-Suspiciousness (5.49), Self-Assurance (5.41), Independence (6.20), Self-Control (6.16), and Excitability (4.70)—demonstrate a clear predominance of socio-volitional and regulatory components within the respondents' personality architecture [2].

Within the hierarchy of metrics, the highest value is observed in the Social Maturity-Conscientiousness scale ( $M=6.44$ ). This indicates a conscious internalisation of social norms and values, reflexive behavioral regulation, and a heightened level of perceived social responsibility. In the context of military-professional activity, this trait serves as a primary psychological anchor ensuring normativity and disciplinary stability [3].

The subsequent prominent markers are situated within the Independence-Dependence ( $M=6.20$ ) and Self-Control ( $M=6.16$ ) scales. These metrics reveal well-developed internal regulatory mechanisms, specifically the capacity for autonomous behavioral guidance, impulse regulation, and adaptive responsiveness to fluctuating environments. This dyad constitutes the central nucleus of the volitional trait system, ensuring overall psychological stability [4].

The relatively high parameters for Social Bravery ( $M=5.62$ ) and Dominance ( $M=5.60$ ) reflect an active social posture, an inclination toward initiating action, leadership potential within a collective, and a propensity for social influence. These attributes are highly instrumental in bolstering collective operational efficiency and executing managerial or command functions [5].

## Methodology

The moderate values obtained for Trust-Suspiciousness ( $M=5.49$ ), Self-Assurance ( $M=5.41$ ), and Social Boldness ( $M=5.37$ ) signify a balanced system of social interaction and interpersonal relations. While respondents remain open to social engagement, they manifest neither excessive credulity nor closed, defensive stances, indicating adequate social adaptation and well-formed communicative competence. The Emotional Stability score ( $M=5.19$ ) indicates a relatively well-tempered emotional regulation framework, illustrating the subjects' capacity to maintain composure, modulate emotional reactions, and exhibit sufficient psychological resilience under stressful conditions.

Conversely, the lowest mean score was identified on the Excitability scale ( $M=4.70$ ). This underscores a low level of impulsivity and affective reactivity among respondents, implying that mechanisms of emotional inhibition and conscious cognitive control are dominant. This particular quality is critical in military-professional environments, as it underpins the preservation of behavioral stability in extreme situations. Thus, the personality profile is led by social maturity, independence, and self-control, mirroring a psychological portrait dominated by conscious regulation, social accountability, and volitional stability, while low excitability acts as an auxiliary buffer reinforcing emotional resilience.

The verification of normality for the Multi-Factor Personality Questionnaire indicates that the distributions across all scales—Social Boldness ( $Z=2.746$ ), Emotional Stability ( $Z=2.576$ ), Dominance ( $Z=2.291$ ), Social Maturity-Conscientiousness ( $Z=4.084$ ), Social Bravery ( $Z=2.845$ ), Trust-Suspiciousness ( $Z=2.876$ ), Self-Assurance ( $Z=2.416$ ), Independence

(\$Z=3.096\$), Self-Control (\$Z=2.298\$), and Excitability (\$Z=2.198\$)—are asymmetric and significantly skewed (\$p < 0.01\$).

The particularly pronounced \$Z\$-value for Social Maturity-Conscientiousness (\$Z=4.084\$) points to substantial individual differentiation among the respondents regarding this trait, implying that social awareness, duty, and normative behavior are non-uniformly distributed across the sample. Similarly, notable deviations in Independence (\$Z=3.096\$) and Trust-Suspiciousness (\$Z=2.876\$) demonstrate that individual capacities for autonomous decision-making, interpersonal trust, and stance defense vary considerably. The asymmetry in Social Boldness (\$Z=2.746\$) and Social Bravery (\$Z=2.845\$) confirms a lack of uniformity in interpersonal interaction styles and social proactivity. Even the lower-range values for Excitability (\$Z=2.198\$) and Self-Control (\$Z=2.298\$) retain statistical significance, indicating substantial individual variations in emotional regulation and impulsivity.

## Results

These insights are heavily contextualized by the selective and differential impacts of military-professional engagement. Throughout the service trajectory, personality traits do not coalesce around a singular, unyielding template; rather, they undergo multi-faceted transformations shaped by individual experiential backgrounds, length of service, rank, immediate social environments, and baseline psychological idiosyncrasies [6]. Consequently, the distribution of personality traits assumes a non-normal, multi-dimensional, and skewed character.

**Table 2. Descriptive Statistics and Normality Testing for the Achievement Motivation Inventory (n=441)**

Indicator / Scale	Mean (M)	Std. Deviation ( $\sigma$ )	Z-value	Significance (p)
Achievement Motivation	26,46	4,95	2,369	0,000**

Note: \*\*  $p \leq 0,01$

Based on the empirical evaluation of T. Ehlers' Achievement Motivation inventory, the observed mean score (\$M=26.46\$) indicates a highly developed motivational component within the respondent pool. This metric underscores a pronounced goal-orientation, a drive for positive outcomes, and robust internal psychological resources directed toward maximizing operational performance [7]. This level of motivation manifests behaviorally as proactivity in task execution, sustained engagement under adverse conditions, and a stable orientation toward successful outcomes. Within the specific purview of military-professional service, this indicator correlates closely with a deep internalization of duty, an intrinsic need for qualitative task performance, and psychological readiness to secure high-tier results [8].

Concurrently, the normality test for this inventory (\$Z=2.369; p < 0.01\$) establishes a statistically significant deviation from a normal distribution. This confirms that achievement-oriented motivation is not uniform across the cohort but is instead distributed differentially—appearing exceptionally high in certain individuals while remaining moderate in others. In other words, the drive for success has been uniquely molded by individual experiential pathways, length of service, personal value hierarchies, and professional socialization factors, indicating an unequal distribution of motivational resources across the sample [9].

**Table 3. Descriptive Statistics and Normality Testing for the Avoidance of Failure Motivation Inventory (n=441)**

Indicator / Scale	Mean (M)	Std. Deviation ( $\sigma$ )	Z-value	Significance (p)
Avoidance of Failure Motivation	14,63	3,37	3,261	0,000**

Note: \*\*  $p \leq 0,01$

The data obtained from the Avoidance of Failure Motivation inventory shows a mean score of  $M=14.63$  and a standard deviation of  $\sigma=3.37$ . These metrics indicate that motivation geared toward error avoidance manifests at a moderate, balanced level within the sample. The relatively tight standard deviation signifies a lack of extreme dispersion in the subjects' responses, meaning the intra-group motivational indicators are closely clustered. This points to a stable and systematically uniform character of failure-avoidance tendencies within the evaluated cohort [10].

## Discussions

The statistical test for normality ( $Z=3.261$ ;  $p \leq 0.01$ ) reveals that these values deviate significantly from the Gaussian curve. Avoidance of failure is interpreted as a motivational construct reflecting a cautious psychological stance toward potential failure, criticism, social rejection, or negative evaluation [11]. The observed distribution indicates that a specific sub-segment of respondents prioritizes the minimization of failure likelihood over the proactive optimization of outcomes. This orientation can cultivate heightened vigilance, internal psychological tension, over-caution during decision-making matrices, and an explicit inclination toward risk mitigation [12].

**Table 4. Descriptive Statistics and Normality Testing for the Risk-Readiness Inventory (n=441)**

Indicator / Scale	Mean (M)	Std. Deviation ( $\sigma$ )	Z-value	Significance (p)
Risk-Readiness Level	9,78	11,61	3,143	0,000**

Note: \*\*  $p \leq 0,01$

The analysis of the Schubert Risk-Readiness inventory demonstrates a mean score of  $M=9.78$  paired with an exceptionally wide standard deviation of  $\sigma=11.61$ . While the overall mean suggests a moderate baseline level of risk-readiness across the sample, the high variance indicates profound individual discrepancies within the cohort. Specifically, one segment of the personnel displays an acute propensity for risk-taking behavior, whereas another segment is heavily dominated by cautious, threat-avoidant strategies [13].

Risk-readiness encapsulates an individual's psychological capacity for decision-making under conditions of ambiguity, adaptation to novel crises, acceptance of unforeseen consequences, and the conscious calculation of exposure to danger. Viewed through this lens, the high dispersion index highlights that motivational and emotional attitudes toward risk are highly polarized among the personnel. While certain subjects lean into assertiveness, initiative, and proactive operational strategies, others prioritize security, stability, and cautious behavioral protocols as their dominant psychological stance [14].

The normality test ( $Z=3.143$ ;  $p \leq 0.01$ ) corroborates that the empirical distribution deviates fundamentally from a normal distribution model. The high statistical significance of this deviation confirms an uneven distribution of scores, substantiating the existence of highly polarized subgroups within the sample. This distribution pattern suggests that while some individuals develop hyper-readiness for risk, others entrench defensive, risk-averse strategies [15].

## CONCLUSIONS

A systemic empirical evaluation of the multi-factor personality architecture, motivational orientations, and risk-readiness profiles of public security military and sergeant personnel ( $n=441$ ) allows for the crystallization of the following fundamental scientific conclusions:

1. **Socio-Regulatory Nuclear Dominance:** Within the hierarchy of R.B. Cattell's 16PF framework, the primary positions are occupied by "Social Maturity-Conscientiousness" ( $M=6.44$ ), "Independence-Dependence" ( $M=6.20$ ), and "Self-Control" ( $M=6.16$ ). This configuration objectifies a potent socio-regulatory nucleus within the psychological profile of public security personnel. It is empirically demonstrated that these operatives consciously internalize military

discipline and social norms, maintain rigorous command over internal impulses, and possess a well-developed reflexive management system. This is reinforced by the low manifestation of "Excitability" ( $M=4.70$ ), which confirms that conscious inhibitory processes decisively override affective reactions within their emotional infrastructure.

2. Motivational Equilibrium: Comparative analysis of T. Ehlers' metrics shows a high level of "Achievement Motivation" ( $M=26.46$ ), indicating robust goal-directedness and a proactive drive for professional efficacy. Conversely, "Avoidance of Failure Motivation" ( $M=14.63$ ,  $\sigma=3.37$ ) operates within a stable, moderate range with low dispersion. This reflects a state of institutional equilibrium: personnel are driven to excel, yet their ambition is modulated by a systemic, institutional caution designed to avert tactical errors, mitigate official reprimands, and avoid negative assessments.
3. Polarization of Risk-Readiness: The moderate mean for "Risk-Readiness" ( $M=9.78$ ) via the Schubert method, juxtaposed against an acutely high standard deviation ( $\sigma=11.61$ ), constitutes a pivotal scientific finding. This high variance reveals a stark polarization within the cohort, splitting it into two distinct tactical archetypes: a "proactive-extremal" group displaying hyper-readiness for risk, and a "defensive-cautious" group characterized by absolute risk-averseness. This pattern explains why different operatives select fundamentally divergent operational-tactical strategies when confronted with identical situations of high uncertainty.
4. Rejection of Linear Uniformity: Across all utilized scales, the null hypothesis regarding normal distribution was comprehensively rejected ( $p \leq 0.01$ ), validating non-parametric regularities. The prominent  $Z$ -scores observed in Social Maturity-Conscientiousness ( $Z=4.084$ ), Avoidance of Failure Motivation ( $Z=3.261$ ), Risk-Readiness ( $Z=3.143$ ), and Independence-Dependence ( $Z=3.096$ ) demonstrate that military personnel do not fit into a singular, unyielding psychological template. Instead, their personality architectures, motivational dynamics, and risk tolerances undergo highly differential, multi-variant transformations driven by idiosyncratic life histories, service longevity, specific institutional roles, and professional socialization vectors.

These empirical and statistical findings should serve as a foundational methodological framework for the University of Public Safety and affiliated sectoral academies to design and implement Digitalized Personnel Selection Frameworks and Cyber-Psychological and Situational-Tactical Simulators.

Particularly for administrative appointments and critical operational postings, factoring in individual differential-psychological profiles—especially regarding high-dispersion metrics such as risk-readiness and decision-making motivation—will optimize operational efficiency, ensure appropriate personnel placement, and systematically preempt critical procedural failures during emergency contingencies.

## REFERENCES

- [1] A. N. Kapustina, R. Kettelling ko'p omilli shaxs metodikasi. Sankt-Peterburg, Rossiya: Rech, 2001.
- [2] T. Ehlers, "Muvaffaqiyatga erishish motivatsiyasi va muvaffaqiyatsizlikdan qochish motivatsiyasini baholash so'rovnomalari," in *Menejment psixologiyasi va kasbiy faoliyat bo'yicha praktikum*, G. S. Nikiforov, tahr. Sankt-Peterburg, Rossiya: Rech, 2003, pp. 132–136.
- [3] Yu. Schubert, "Tavakkalchilikka tayyorlik darajasini diagnostika qilish metodikasi," in *Rahbarlik va boshqaruv psixologiyasi: amaliy diagnostika metodlari*, V. A. Rozanova, tuz. Moskva, Rossiya: Biznes maktabi "Intel-Sintez", 1999, pp. 84–89.
- [4] E. P. Ilyin, Motivatsiya va motivlar. Sankt-Peterburg, Rossiya: Piter, 2011.
- [5] E. P. Ilyin, Tavakkalchilik psixologiyasi. Sankt-Peterburg, Rossiya: Piter, 2012.
- [6] A. G. Maklakov, Xodimlarni kasbiy psixologik tanlash. Nazariya va amaliyot. Sankt-Peterburg, Rossiya: Piter, 2008.

- [7] G. J. Boyle, "O'n olti omilli shaxs so'rovnomasi (16PF) sharhi," *Journal of Personality Assessment*, vol. 68, no. 3, pp. 712–724, 2017.
- [8] J. W. Atkinson, "Tavakkalchilikka asoslangan xulq-atvorning motivatsion determinantlari," *Psychological Review*, vol. 64, no. 6, pp. 359–372, 1957.
- [9] D. C. McClelland, *Muvaffaqiyatga intiluvchi jamiyat*. Princeton, NJ, AQSH: D. Van Nostrand Company, 1961.
- [10] C. S. Dweck, "O'zlik nazariyalari: ularning motivatsiya, shaxs va rivojlanishdagi o'rni," *Psychology Press*, pp. 45–60, 2013.
- [11] M. Zuckerman, *Sensatsiyalarni izlash va tavakkal xulq-atvori*. Washington, DC, AQSH: American Psychological Association, 2007.
- [12] H. Heckhausen and J. Heckhausen, *Motivatsiya va harakat*, 3-nashr. Kembrij, Buyuk Britaniya: Cambridge University Press, 2018.
- [13] R. E. Franken, *Inson motivatsiyasi*, 5-nashr. Belmont, CA, AQSH: Wadsworth, 2022.
- [14] J. R. Harrison and R. E. Thayer, "Kasbiy tanlov sharoitlarida ko'p omilli psixometrik vositalarning strukturaviy yaxlitligini baholash," *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, vol. 55, no. 2, pp. 184–199, 2023.
- [15] A. L. Duckworth and P. D. Quinn, "Qisqa Grit shkalasini (Grit-S) ishlab chiqish va validatsiya qilish," *Journal of Personality Assessment*, vol. 91, no. 2, pp. 166–174, 2019.