

# Content, Hierarchy, Intensity of Motives and their Possibility to be Implemented in Servicemen with Various Levels of Effectiveness of Service Activity

Oleksandr KOLESNICHENKO<sup>1</sup>,  
Yanina MATSEHORA<sup>2</sup>,  
Ihor PRYKHODKO<sup>3</sup>,  
Stanislav LARIONOV<sup>4</sup>,  
Anastasiia BOLSHAKOVA<sup>5</sup>,  
Olena BILYK<sup>6</sup>,  
Svitlana IZBASH<sup>7</sup>,  
Viktoriiia KUZINA<sup>8</sup>,  
Vitalii PANOK<sup>9</sup>,  
Vira KRAMCHENKOVA<sup>10</sup>

<sup>1</sup> National Academy of National Guard of Ukraine, [alex\\_kolesnichenko@ukr.net](mailto:alex_kolesnichenko@ukr.net)

<sup>2</sup> National Academy of National Guard of Ukraine, [yanina\\_gora@ukr.net](mailto:yanina_gora@ukr.net)

<sup>3</sup> National Academy of National Guard of Ukraine, [prikhodko1966@ukr.net](mailto:prikhodko1966@ukr.net)

<sup>4</sup> National Academy of National Guard of Ukraine, [larionov1985@gmail.com](mailto:larionov1985@gmail.com)

<sup>5</sup> Kharkiv State Academy of Culture, Ukraine, [bolshakova777@ukr.net](mailto:bolshakova777@ukr.net)

<sup>6</sup> Kharkiv State Academy of Culture, Ukraine, [bilikle@gmail.com](mailto:bilikle@gmail.com)

<sup>7</sup> National Academy of National Guard of Ukraine, [izbashes@gmail.com](mailto:izbashes@gmail.com)

<sup>8</sup> Ukrainian Military Medical Academy, Ukraine, [0960118847@ukr.net](mailto:0960118847@ukr.net)

<sup>9</sup> Ukrainian Science Methodological Center of Applied Psychology and Social Work of NAES, Ukraine, [panokvitaly@ukr.net](mailto:panokvitaly@ukr.net)

<sup>10</sup> Kharkiv National Pedagogical University, Ukraine, [kramchenkova@ukr.net](mailto:kramchenkova@ukr.net)

**Abstract:** *In accordance with the results of conducted research there were figured out the content, hierarchy, intensity of motives and their possibility to be implemented in servicemen with various levels of effectiveness of service activity. 8435 male servicemen participated in the research, they equally presented all the operational and territorial military unifications and units of the National Guard of Ukraine. Each unit proportionately presented officers as well as military personnel under contract who included the participants of hostilities and those who did not have such experience. Examination of various aspects of servicemen motivation was conducted with the help of the following the methods which were standardized being based on the Ukrainian selection “Close Questionnaire of Examining the Motivation of Professional Choice Made by Applicants of the Ministry of Internal Affairs”, “Questionnaire of Estimation of the Effectiveness of Military Tasks’ Execution by Servicemen of the National Guard of Ukraine”, questionnaire on “Sense-Bearing and Life Orientations”, the methods of “Studying the Motivational Profile of Personality”, and “Locus of Control”. There was conducted the cluster analysis which gave the possibility to figure out six motivational types connected with the effectiveness of servicemen operational activity. Motivational types were located between the poles which were introduced by two dimensions: self-efficacy (autonomous and controlled motivation) and motivation of helping others (motivations of public service - selfishness). Those motivational types of servicemen were the following: motivated by public service, stagnant, prosocial, romantic, deficient, and dependent. Distinguished types included the content, hierarchy, intensity of motives and their possibility to be implemented.*

**Keywords:**  *motive, motivational sphere, effectiveness of service, servicemen, public service.*

**How to cite:** Kolesnichenko, O., Matsehora, Y., Prykhodko, I., Larionov, S., Bolshakova, A., Bilyk, O., Izbash, S., Kuzina, V., Panok, V., & Kramchenkova, V. (2021). Content, Hierarchy, Intensity of Motives and their Possibility to be Implemented in Servicemen with Various Levels of Effectiveness of Service Activity. *BR.AIN. Broad Research in Artificial Intelligence and Neuroscience*, 12(4), 374-410. <https://doi.org/10.18662/brain/12.4/256>

## **Novelty and Relevance**

### ***What is already known about the topic?***

Autonomous motivation and motivation of public service increase the efficiency of professional activity.

Servicemen have different motives for professional activity and their differentiation is necessary to manage the effectiveness of their activities, the choice of stimulation, encouragement.

### ***What this paper adds?***

This is the first study of the motivation of Ukrainian military personnel, in which the typology of motivation is correlated with expert assessments of the effectiveness of military personnel.

These results of the study will reduce the number of errors in the in the process of predicting the effectiveness of their operational activity with the help of the structure of motivation diagnostics of applicants for military service based on their classification in accordance with one of the distinguished types.

Motivation as a factor of professional as well as personal development was significant but was not completely discussed aspect of a complicated issue of profессиographical examination of servicemen operational activity; though, the necessity of examining the proposed topic was mostly caused by a need of practice (Prykhodko et al., 2019). Experience of using military units and formations of the Armed Forces of Ukraine (AFU) and of the National Guard of Ukraine (NGU) during combat operations in Ukraine since 2014 strongly convinced that with a considerable degree successful conduction of combat and operational tasks depended on the level of personnel's motivation. Its independent level during operations devaluated any advantages of military formations in logistics and professional development; moreover, it provoked combat stress (Prykhodko, 2018). Before the combat conflict on the East of Ukraine daily service of servicemen faced difficult times including low level of logistics and salary, absence of prospects to receive their private accommodation, and plenty of other social and domestic problems which brought the situation to the line where servicemen made inappropriate choice (Prykhodko et al., 2019). Insufficient level of motivation occurred in negative facts of refusal of some parts of the Ukrainian military formations' personnel to continue the service on the territory of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea, of Donetsk and

Luhansk regions at the beginning of 2014 as well as in adequate efficiency of units' operation which were manned by mobilized servicemen, in significant quantity of suicides, crimes, and violations of military discipline among servicemen at the Anti-Terrorist Operation zone (further Joint Forces Operations) (Prykhodko et al., 2019).

Besides the fact that there were many scientific researches of peculiarities of personal motivation concerning professional activity under extreme conditions, namely: combat operations constantly made adjustments to components of its diagnostics and formation. Especially that issue was related to the sphere of professional activity of the Ukrainian servicemen. Military service included participation in combat operations, execution of operational tasks connected with vital risks, combat trainings, and daily activities (Kolesnichenko, 2018). Motivation concerning the military activity included a range of various social and psychological conditions, and determined the complex of positive as well as negative aspects of military service (Kapluchenko & Prykhodko, 2019). Motivation included the reveal and actualization of inner resources of servicemen and creation of positive motivation in combination with external conditions (Prykhodko et al., 2019). Its specifics depended on personal peculiarities as well as on professional activity.

The vast majority of modern foreign researches on individual motivation concerning professional activity, namely, under extreme conditions, were focused on the paradigm of the theory of self-determination. This paradigm was proposed by Deci and Ryan (1985) after that it was accepted as a reliable empiric theory. According to its core postulates human motivation was divided into external and internal, internal included three congenital universal psychological needs: competency (need of people to show their abilities), autonomy (right of choice to choose the profession), and interrelationship (need of feeling their own involvement into social groups and/or spheres of activity). This theory led to the conclusion that different regulating processes which, being the core of achieving goals, were correlated with the effective functioning and welfare. Different contents of goals were correlated with the quality of behaviour, mental health, and with the level of needs' satisfaction in different ways.

To prove the key notions of the theory of self-determination Gillet et al. (2017) analyzed interrelationship between motivating profiles of servicemen and civil workers. The results of their research showed that profiles were differently connected with accepted organizational support as well as with involvement into the activity of both selections including communication and support from the side of management and with positive

and negative effects in the second selection. Moreover, servicemen with the highest indicators of autonomous motivation presented the highest levels of organizational support acceptance and involvement into activity. Nevertheless, the highest level of autonomous motivation was connected with the highest level of communication, support of commander, and positive influence.

Using the theory of self-determination as a theoretical basis, Chambel et al. (2015) created a model that included the servicemen's perception of organizational support on exchange between commanders and members of military staff, professional motivation and welfare. The results showed that motivation concerning autonomous activity was significantly connected with both contextual factors. Besides that, motivation concerning autonomous work was positively connected with its involvement into activity and was negatively connected with professional burnout while controlled motivation demonstrated the opposite reaction.

Foreign researchers (Griffith, 2008; Helmus et al., 2018) to prove main aspects of the theory of self-determination distinguished institutional and pragmatic motivation as well as their combination. Internal motivation was included into the process of launching the activity because that was interesting and could self-satisfy despite the activities turned to the achievement of external goal. Though, Griffith (2008) using the analysis of motivation of the US National Guard servicemen included into the list of institutional type such internal motives as: patriotism, desire to test themselves, desire to be useful for country and society. Pragmatic motivation to serve was demonstrated through general attitude to army as if it was an employer who made delightful proposition.

In another research Helmus et al. (2018) from RAND center distinguished key motives of entering the US Army and revealed the specificity of army life reality. The results showed that the choice of future servicemen selection in the USA was influenced by two groups of motives which were interrelated with each other: institutional and pragmatic. The key motives to choose the profession of the US Army serviceman were "adventures and travelling", "advantages", "stability of the work and salary", "avoidance of negative surrounding", and "professional education".

Moreover, Helmus et al. (2018) figured out that on the contrary those servicemen who were motivated by pragmatic incentives tended to long-term military service in contrast with those who chose the service as a "call of their heart" being based on institutional motives. Thus, the most of candidates chose the military service in the US Army due to pragmatic

(material) reasons, but for the majority of recruits the military service became the work and only after that – call of their hearts.

The research of Bury (2017) which was based on the determination of motives of recruiting and retention in logistics' divisions of the British Army reserve demonstrated that servicemen who served because of institutional motives were focused on longer service. Servicemen with pragmatic motivation were less satisfied with the conditions of their service and entered the military sphere to follow the contract only.

Woodruff (2017) had the same conclusion which pointed out that internal motives created stronger connections with army and military values than external motives such as: salary, experience for future professional activity, finances for future education, etc.

The Norwegian experts Johansen et al. (2014) proved that institutional and pragmatic motives could cohabit and a serviceman who was interested in salary, help and economic welfare was not obligatory a bad soldier. The authors pointed out that during the international mission beyond the borders of their own country it was hard to maintain the ideal images of military service; however, mainly the loyalty to traditional military ideals were the best motives of serving and factors of effective military organization.

Grigorov and Spiridonov (2018) confirmed the theses that there was institutional and pragmatic motivation. They conducted the research to distinguish core motives of choosing the military profession in the Republic of Bulgaria and suggested that the dominant motivational structures in the process of choosing the profession was the coexistence of leading factors which were connected with pragmatic motivation in comparison with internal factors which related to one definite work, independence, achievement, and recognition.

According to Taiyang (2010) the system of motivation to serve in the Chinese Army was determined with the factors of tradition and culture: national flag as a symbol of honour, courage, role of model caused the involvement into nobility and caring about other people; non-material motivated stimulation.

Analyzing the motivation of the Brazilian servicemen, Rodrigues-Goulart (2006) highlighted that it always had crucial importance for servicemen who executed tasks under combat conditions which posed risks for their life and health. According to the researcher for many situations motivation was a core to succeed in battle. Rodrigues-Goulart (2006) distinguished the following motives of military profession: sense of obligation, belonging to military sphere, responsibility, sacrificing, need of

fate, desire of adventures, leadership, working abilities, tendency to recognition and awards, ideas of legitimacy of war, hope and victory, hatred of enemies, and need of self-preservation.

In accordance with Catignani (2004) “strong spirit” of military division was equal to high combat motivation. It was impossible to overestimate the importance of combat motivation to succeed in execution of military operations such as patrolling as well as full-scale war. Combat motivation was key factor that gave possibility to ordinary army to succeed in conflicts; talking about Israel it was called “secret weapon” of the army. Catignani (2004) pointed out that there was “a tough connection between cohesion, motivational level of servicemen and combat effectiveness”.

Analysis of modern scientific works indicated unbelievable urgency of the problem of servicemen motivation to act under extreme conditions in different countries all around the world. Systematization of analyzing the peculiarities of professional motivation of servicemen gave the possibility to conclude that motivation was one of the most significant factors for military division to achieve the posed goals in many situations which occurred in the process of executing combat operations under extreme conditions.

The aim of the research was to determine the content, hierarchy, intensity of motives and their possibility to implement them in servicemen with various levels of effectiveness of service activity.

## **Method**

### ***Participants and Procedure***

The research was conducted from 2019 to 2021. There participated 8435 servicemen of the NGU who equally presented all the operational and territorial divisions and military units of the NGU. Each unit equally presented their officers – 29.84% (from Lieutenant to Colonel) and servicemen under contract – 70.16% (from Crewman to Warrant Officer), participants of hostilities and those who did not have such experience. The age of the respondents was from 20 to 55. All procedures carried out in the study conformed to the ethical standards of the 1964 Helsinki Declaration and its later amendments. All participants gave consent for their data to be used in this research.

### ***Instruments and Measures***

To determine various aspects of servicemen motivation there were used the methods which were standardized being based on the Ukrainian selection.

1. *“Close Questionnaire of Examining the Motivation of Professional Choice Made by Applicants of the Ministry of Internal Affairs”* by Moskalenko (2002). This questionnaire was developed by the Ukrainian researcher for professional psychological selection for future policemen education, it gave possibility to evaluate: “Motives Related to Objective Socially Posed Tasks and to Content of Profession”, “Motives Related to Personal and Professional Development”, “Independent Profession Selection”, “Dependent Profession Selection”, “Motives Related to External Prestigious Professions and Financial Welfare”, “Motives Related to Romanticization of Profession”, “Motives Related to Eagerness of Compensation of Temper Flaws”, “Antisocial Motives (attitude to profession was as if it was a way to satisfy own antisocial needs)”. The instruction of this method proposed to answer the question concerning the reason of choosing this profession where the respondents using a scale made of 5 points could estimate 40 statements which described the profession of law enforcements.

2. *“Methods of Studying the Motivational Profile of Personality”* by Ritchie and Martin (1999). The use of this method gave the possibility to determine the urgent motivation of professional activity. It had the following scales: “Need of High Salary and Financial Benefits”, “Need of High Working Conditions and Comfortable Surrounding”, “Need of Accurate Structurization of Work and Feedback”, “Need of Social Relations”, “Need of Forming and Supporting Long-Term Stable Relations”, “Need of Obtaining the Recognition by Other People”, “Need of Posing Brave and Tough Goals and of Achieving Them”, “Need of Interesting and Socially Beneficial Work”, “Need of Self-Improvement and Development as Personality”, “Need of Being Creative, Thoughtful, and Open for further Ideas Employee”, “Need of Diversity, Breaks and Stimulations, Eagerness to Avoid Everyday Routine”, “Need of Manipulation and Power, Eagerness to Control the Other People”. This questionnaire included 33 questions with 4 variants of answers where the respondents had to replace 11 points in accordance with the importance of the answers.

3. *Method of “Will-Regulated Personality”* by Gutkin and Mikhalchenko (2000) gave the possibility to determine general indicator which characterized willed organization and willed peculiarities of personality: organization of will and sense, organization of activity, determination, perseverance, self-control, and self-reliance. This method included 56 questions with 4 variants of answers.

4. *Method of “Locus of Control”* in modification proposed by Ksenofontova (1999) which gave the possibility to analyze internal orientation of serviceman personality, his/her ability to recognize and take

responsibility for his/her decisions and actions. This method included 40 statements which respondent could agree or disagree with. This questionnaire determined 17 options of internality: general internality, internality in thoughts about life in general, internality in description of personal experience, internality in the sphere of achievements, internality in the sphere of fails, tendency to self-incrimination, internality in the sphere of professional activity, professional and social aspect of internality, professional and processual aspects of internality, internality in interpersonal communication, competence in the sphere of interpersonal relations, responsibility in the sphere of interpersonal relations, internality in the sphere of family relations, internality in the sphere of health, negation of activity, readiness for activities which was connected with difficulties overcoming, readiness for self-planning, acting and responsibility for their activities.

5. *Test of "Sense-Bearing and Life Orientations"* in adaptation made by Muzdybaev (1998). This test was the adapted version of test "Goal of Life" by Crumbaugh & Maholick (1969). Within the further work with the method there was developed a scale of searching for sense-bearing and life goals (Crumbaugh & Henrion, 1988). It was planned as an additional scale for the test devoted to life understanding. According to the ideas of the authors the scale had to measure the strength of motivational tendency to search for sense of life; thus, it was opposite to the scale "Goal of Life" – the more goals of life there were the less need for their search.

Adaptation of this text into the Russian language was completed by Muzdybaev (1998). The factor structure of the Russian version of the text was determined during special research. This research demonstrated that despite the small quantity (20 points) during the factor analysis there were distinguished six factors on the basis of which there were marked out some subscales in the final variant of sense-bearing and life orientations.

6. *"Questionnaire of Estimation of the Effectiveness of Military Tasks' Execution by Servicemen of the National Guard of Ukraine"* by Matsegora et al. (2013) gave the possibility to estimate the level of development of important professional qualities and peculiarities of executing the servicemen's combat operations. Experts were the commanders of servicemen who participated in the research. The questionnaire included 37 criteria of estimation. In the process of estimation experts used the scale with 5 points: 5 points was the maximal possible level of development of estimated professional important quality or maximal level of effectiveness of the estimated aspect of service. 0 points was used to determine the absence, undevelopment of estimated important professional quality or full inefficiency of subordinate individual

in estimated aspect of combat operations. Informative paragraphs of this questionnaire revealed all the processual aspects of work, peculiarities of professional communication and motives, professional skills, and possibilities of productive work.

Mentioned methods were standardized for the Ukrainian selections, they were often used to determine the peculiarities of professional motivation of servicemen and law enforcements of Ukraine.

### ***Data Analysis***

A cluster analysis was used to compare the data of psychodiagnostic scales in studied groups. To represent the data, we used the main descriptive statistics (arithmetic mean -M- and standard deviation -SD). To reliably detect significant differences between comparative groups, the t-Student criterion was used. Mathematical data were processed through SPSS 17.0.

### **Results**

Conducted cluster analysis gave possibility to distinguish 6 groups which differed due to their ways of estimation of combat operations effectiveness as well as typical sphere of motivation and will. The indicators for psychodiagnostic methods that determine the characteristics of the identified types of motivation in servicemen are showed in Tables 1 and 2.

**Table 1.** Indicators for psychodiagnostic methods that determine the characteristics of the identified types of motivation in servicemen (in standard points)-I

	MWE	MHE	HE	WE	MLE2	MLE1
<i>“Questionnaire of Estimation of the Effectiveness of Military Tasks’ Execution by Servicemen of the National Guard of Ukraine”</i>						
General indicator of the effectiveness of service and combat activities	19.43±3. 22	20.43±2. 16	21.05±2. 59	18.52±1. 93	20.23±1. 88	20.40±1. 71
<i>“Close Questionnaire of Examining the Motivation of Professional Choice Made by Applicants of the Ministry of Internal Affairs”</i>						
“Motives Related to Objective Socially Posed Tasks and to Content of Profession”	20.71±3. 40	17.13±4. 13	21.47±2. 98	23.69±1. 75	19.61±2. 92	23.22±2. 34
“Motives Related to Personal and Professional Development”	18.50±4. 30	13.53±4. 38	17.60±4. 52	22.38±3. 99	20.04±2. 29	20.04±3. 70
“Independent Profession Selection”	17.15±4. 66	12.34±4. 91	18.73±3. 96	23.00±1. 53	18.74±2. 82	20.74±2. 95
“Dependent Profession Selection”	13.20±4. 97	9.87±4.5 3	10.41±4. 34	21.31±4. 94	18.17±3. 07	11.98±4. 89
“Motives Related to External Prestigious Professions and Financial Welfare”	18.20±3. 58	13.51±3. 76	17.00±3. 28	23.62±1. 89	19.26±3. 66	18.93±3. 27
“Motives Related to Romanticization of Profession”	15.71±4. 51	11.00±3. 99	13.68±4. 41	22.69±2. 72	18.96±3. 35	14.83±5. 01
“Motives Related to Eagerness of Compensation of Temper Flaws”	19.12±3. 61	13.66±4. 67	17.44±4. 22	23.08±2. 06	19.91±3. 07	20.57±3. 66
“Antisocial Motives (attitude to profession was as if it was a way to satisfy own antisocial needs)”	14.43±4. 99	9.89±3.9 9	10.30±3. 62	21.46±3. 48	18.70±3. 10	13.30±5. 67
<i>“Methods of Studying the Motivational Profile of Personality”</i>						
“Need of High Salary and Financial Benefits”	32.49±6. 74	36.11±9. 65	32.67±8. 12	30.69±4. 13	39.17±7. 62	34.56±7. 53
“Need of High Working Conditions and Comfortable Surrounding”	30.72±5. 74	31.70±5. 65	28.96±7. 12	31.08±2. 13	30.26±4. 62	28.50±5. 53

Content, Hierarchy, Intensity of Motives and their Possibility to be ...  
Oleksandr KOLESNICHENKO, et al.

	40	99	36	56	27	80
“Need of Accurate Structurization of Work and Feedback”	33.58±7. 92	31.30±6. 81	33.17±5. 53	32.00±4. 00	33.52±4. 33	32.70±6. 53
“Need of Social Relations”	28.07±5. 24	27.85±5. 13	29.42±4. 68	28.23±3. 96	27.61±4. 98	30.83±4. 98
“Need of Forming and Supporting Long-Term Stable Relations”	28.41±5. 45	28.02±4. 55	28.64±6. 66	31.23±2. 74	28.83±3. 65	29.89±4. 47
“Need of Obtaining the Recognition by Other People”	31.29±5. 93	30.87±5. 03	30.95±5. 76	29.38±4. 13	34.09±6. 16	32.39±6. 96
“Need of Posing Brave and Tough Goals and of Achieving Them”	30.47±4. 82	29.53±4. 98	31.14±4. 18	30.31±3. 22	30.83±4. 49	28.98±4. 11
“Need of Manipulation and Power, Eagerness to Control the Other People”	26.66±7. 54	26.85±5. 42	26.35±5. 28	28.85±2. 51	26.61±5. 24	26.70±4. 45
“Need of Diversity, Breaks and Stimulations, Eagerness to Avoid Everyday Routine”	29.59±4. 66	29.42±6. 01	28.81±4. 67	31.08±3. 01	27.52±3. 82	27.56±5. 22
“Need of Being Creative, Thoughtful, and Open for further Ideas Employee”	29.34±3. 93	29.02±5. 09	29.23±4. 12	30.62±6. 21	31.30±4. 35	28.59±5. 00
“Need of Self-Improvement and Development as Personality”	31.27±5. 03	30.60±4. 09	30.87±4. 59	30.62±1. 85	28.43±3. 81	31.22±4. 11
“Need of Interesting and Socially Beneficial Work”	31.12±5. 57	31.74±6. 02	32.79±6. 31	28.92±4. 35	24.83±4. 98	31.07±5. 16
<i>Test of “Sense-Bearing and Life Orientations”</i>						
General indicator of “Sense-Bearing and Life Orientations”	90.41±1 1.21	95.23±1 4.75	116.60±1 2.03	105.38±2 0.48	78.91±1 2.02	120.09± 9.84
“Goal”	27.76±5. 08	29.62±5. 23	36.35±4. 39	29.08±8. 90	24.13±5. 89	38.17±2. 95
“Process”	25.85±4.	28.72±4.	32.90±4.	33.92±7.	23.91±5.	32.69±4.

	55	75	86	25	52	64
“Result”	22.92±4. 20	24.26±4. 19	30.17±3. 27	26.54±5. 90	19.17±4. 99	31.72±2. 68
“Locus of Control-I”	18.84±3. 60	19.83±3. 51	24.29±2. 76	20.85±4. 88	18.04±4. 67	25.98±1. 68
“Locus of Life Control”	27.42±4. 69	28.30±5. 57	35.73±4. 23	28.85±6. 73	24.57±5. 81	37.81±3. 24

Notes: MWE – middle level of effectiveness with tendency to weak indicator of effectiveness; MHE – middle level of effectiveness with tendency to high indicator of effectiveness; HE – highly effective; WE – weakly effective; MLE2 – middle level of effectiveness; MLE1 – middle level of effectiveness.

**Table 2.** Indicators for psychodiagnostic methods that determine the characteristics of the identified types of motivation in servicemen (in standard points)-II

	MWE	MHE	HE	WE	MLE2	MLE1
<i>Method of “Locus of Control”</i>						
General internality	25.71±3.7 4	20.64±2.9 4	29.60±3.55	24.15±3.2 9	20.43±3. 70	20.44±3.5 0
Internality in thoughts about life in general	12.07±2.3 3	9.81±2.39	14.05±2.24	10.31±1.4 9	9.87±2.5 1	9.37±1.83
Internality in description of personal experience	13.64±2.3 8	10.83±2.6 8	15.56±2.12	13.85±2.9 7	10.57±2. 84	11.07±2.6 8
Internality in the sphere of achievements	5.76±1.68	4.55±1.29	6.82±1.21	6.46±1.45	4.17±1.4 4	4.76±1.53
Internality in the sphere of fails	4.59±1.24	3.40±1.46	4.68±1.47	5.15±1.41	4.04±1.1 9	3.04±1.44
Internality to self-incrimination	- 1.16±1.91	- 1.15±1.97	-2.15±1.72	- 1.31±1.55	- 0.13±1.7	- 1.72±2.18

Content, Hierarchy, Intensity of Motives and their Possibility to be ...  
Oleksandr KOLESNICHENKO, et al.

					4	
Internality in the sphere of professional activity	10.63±1.7 5	7.66±1.80	11.83±1.85	9.85±1.52	8.13±1.9 6	7.78±2.00
Professional and social aspect of internality	5.43±1.13	3.81±1.23	6.04±1.25	4.69±0.75	4.13±1.3 6	4.06±1.41
Professional and processual aspects of internality	5.20±1.23	3.85±1.34	5.79±1.33	5.15±1.28	4.00±1.6 5	3.72±1.46
Internality in interpersonal communication	9.34±1.88	7.75±2.08	11.15±1.90	8.00±1.83	8.09±2.0 9	7.74±1.67
Competence in the sphere of interpersonal relations	5.02±1.67	3.98±1.50	6.40±1.38	3.77±1.74	3.70±1.4 6	4.24±1.48
Responsibility in the sphere of interpersonal relations	4.31±1.46	3.77±1.22	4.76±1.16	4.23±0.83	4.39±1.4 7	3.50±1.46
Internality in the sphere of family relations	4.15±1.17	3.74±1.18	4.90±1.22	3.69±0.85	3.87±1.1 0	3.69±1.30
Internality in the sphere of health	5.60±1.28	4.28±1.26	6.29±1.17	5.54±0.66	4.30±1.4 0	4.37±1.57
Negation of activity	5.14±2.12	7.55±1.67	3.30±1.86	7.46±0.78	8.13±1.7 4	7.83±2.39
Readiness for activities which was connected with difficulties overcoming	5.19±1.63	3.96±1.37	6.63±1.25	2.54±1.45	3.22±1.6 2	4.13±1.89
Readiness for self-planning, acting and responsibility for their activities	5.67±1.58	4.49±1.09	6.07±1.45	6.00±1.78	4.65±1.8 7	4.04±1.67
<i>Method of "Will-Regulated Personality"</i>						
Value-semantic organization of personality	14.02±3.2 5	13.19±3.7 3	17.60±2.85	13.54±3.6 7	11.04±2. 40	19.39±2.6 9
Organization of activity	14.56±2.3	13.32±2.4	15.53±2.17	13.69±1.8	11.39±2.	16.00±2.6

	7	1		9	10	4
	15.16±3.2	14.72±2.7	18.56±2.99	13.85±3.8	11.22±2.	20.11±2.5
Determination	1	5		9	26	6
	15.85±2.9	14.72±3.7	19.25±2.81	14.15±4.0	10.87±2.	20.46±2.4
Perseverance	7	7		4	26	5
	15.30±2.8	14.42±3.3	18.44±2.64	13.23±4.6	10.91±2.	19.31±2.3
Self-control	4	2		8	43	9
	12.88±3.1	13.85±3.0	14.66±2.38	9.15±4.20	8.35±2.9	14.54±3.5
“Self-Reliance”	5	0			0	4
	10.72±2.3	8.79±3.32	11.70±3.04	11.08±3.1	10.13±2.	13.43±2.9
Lies index	8			2	62	8
General indicator characterizing the volitional organization of the personality	87.78±12.	84.21±12.	104.04±10.	77.62±18.	63.78±5.	109.81±7.
	20	48	10	06	33	75

Notes: MWE – middle level of effectiveness with tendency to weak indicator of effectiveness; MHE – middle level of effectiveness with tendency to high indicator of effectiveness; HE – highly effective; WE – weakly effective; MLE2 – middle level of effectiveness; MLE1 – middle level of effectiveness.

Table 3, 4, 5 and 6 show the significance of differences between the proposed types according to the scales of methods for describing the features of the motivation of military personnel.

Table 3. The significance of the differences between the proposed types according to the scales of methods for describing the features of the motivation of military personnel (in standard points)-I

	<i>t</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>t</i>
	MWE- MHE	MHE- HE	MWE- WE	MWE- MLE2	MWE- MLE1	MHE- HE	MHE- WE	MHE- MLE2
<i>“Questionnaire of Estimation of the Effectiveness of Military Tasks’ Execution by Servicemen of the National Guard of Ukraine”</i>								
General indicator of the effectiveness of service	2.19*	3.89**	1.42	1.52	2.32*	1.65 <sup>0</sup>	3.12**	0.41

Content, Hierarchy, Intensity of Motives and their Possibility to be ...  
Oleksandr KOLESNICHENKO, et al.

and combat activities								
<i>“Close Questionnaire of Examining the Motivation of Professional Choice Made by Applicants of the Ministry of Internal Affairs”</i>								
“Motives Related to Objective Socially Posed Tasks and to Content of Profession”	5.30**	1.67 <sup>0</sup>	4.91**	1.55	5.17**	6.91**	8.78**	2.98**
“Motives Related to Personal and Professional Development”	6.54**	1.47	3.24**	2.32*	2.25*	5.60**	7.03**	8.48**
“Independent Profession Selection”	5.72**	2.56*	8.90**	2.05*	5.58**	8.37**	13.38**	7.16**
“Dependent Profession Selection”	4.06**	4.21**	5.51**	5.96**	1.42	0.74	7.60**	9.31**
“Motives Related to External Prestigious Professions and Financial Welfare”	7.27**	2.47*	8.31**	1.24	1.24	5.87**	13.72**	6.24**
“Motives Related to Romanticization of Profession”	6.43**	3.24**	7.78**	3.81**	1.05	3.96**	12.54**	8.96**
“Motives Related to Eagerness of Compensation of Temper Flaws”	7.27**	3.08**	5.73**	1.06	2.31*	5.08**	10.96**	6.89**
“Antisocial Motives (attitude to profession was as if it was a way to satisfy own antisocial needs)”	5.91**	6.57**	6.36**	5.07**	1.21	0.65	10.43**	10.40**
<i>“Methods of Studying the Motivational Profile of Personality”</i>								
“Need of High Salary and Financial Benefits”	2.40*	0.18	1.32	3.83**	1.65	2.28*	3.09**	1.48
“Need of High Working Conditions and Comfortable Surrounding”	0.97	2.00*	0.39	0.43	2.26*	2.59*	0.57	1.19
“Need of Accurate Structurization of Work and Feedback”	1.80 <sup>0</sup>	0.42	1.13	0.05	0.71	1.76 <sup>0</sup>	0.48	1.71 <sup>0</sup>
“Need of Social Relations”	0.24	1.92 <sup>0</sup>	0.13	0.39	3.13**	1.91 <sup>0</sup>	0.29	0.19
“Need of Forming and Supporting Long-Term Stable Relations”	0.45	0.27	2.94**	0.44	1.75 <sup>0</sup>	0.71	3.26**	0.82
“Need of Obtaining the Recognition by Other People”	0.45	0.41	1.45	1.95 <sup>0</sup>	0.96	0.10	1.11	2.21*

“Need of Posing Brave and Tough Goals and of Achieving Them”	1.09	1.05	0.15	0.34	1.94 <sup>0</sup>	2.06	0.69	1.12
“Need of Manipulation and Power, Eagerness to Control the Other People”	0.17	0.33	2.04*	0.04	0.04	0.56	1.96 <sup>0</sup>	0.18
“Need of Diversity, Breaks and Stimulations, Eagerness to Avoid Everyday Routine”	0.18	1.20	1.52	2.20**	2.34*	0.66	1.42	1.65
“Need of Being Creative, Thoughtful, and Open for further Ideas Employee”	0.39	0.18	0.72	1.96 <sup>0</sup>	0.93	0.27	0.86	2.00 <sup>0</sup>
“Need of Self-Improvement and Development as Personality”	0.85	0.58	0.87	2.94**	0.06	0.38	0.02	2.23*
“Need of Interesting and Socially Beneficial Work”	0.61	2.03*	1.63	5.25**	0.05	1.05	1.92 <sup>0</sup>	5.21**

Notes: MWE – middle level of effectiveness with tendency to weak indicator of effectiveness; MHE – middle level of effectiveness with tendency to high indicator of effectiveness; HE – highly effective; WE – weakly effective; MLE2 – middle level of effectiveness; MLE1 – middle level of effectiveness; <sup>0</sup> $p \leq .1$ ; \* $p \leq .05$ ; \*\* $p \leq .01$ .

**Table 4.** The significance of the differences between the proposed types according to the scales of methods for describing the features of the motivation of military personnel (in standard points)-II

	<i>t</i> MHE- MLE1	<i>t</i> HE- WE	<i>t</i> HE- MLE2	<i>t</i> HE- MLE1	<i>t</i> WE- MLE2	<i>t</i> WE- MLE1	<i>t</i> MLE2- MLE1
<i>“Questionnaire of Estimation of the Effectiveness of Military Tasks’ Execution by Servicemen of the National Guard of Ukraine”</i>							
General indicator of the effectiveness of service and combat activities	0.09	4.34**	1.81 <sup>0</sup>	1.99*	2.57*	3.21**	0.37
<i>“Close Questionnaire of Examining the Motivation of Professional Choice Made by Applicants of the Ministry of Internal Affairs”</i>							
“Motives Related to Objective Socially Posed	9.35**	4.01**	2.80**	4.22**	5.24**	0.81	5.26**

Content, Hierarchy, Intensity of Motives and their Possibility to be ...  
Oleksandr KOLESNICHENKO, et al.

Tasks and to Content of Profession”							
“Motives Related to Personal and Professional Development”	8.29**	4.06**	3.91**	3.77**	1.94 <sup>0</sup>	1.93 <sup>0</sup>	0.01
“Independent Profession Selection”	10.70**	7.72**	0.02	3.75**	5.88**	3.87**	2.81**
“Dependent Profession Selection”	2.32*	7.65**	10.36**	2.04*	2.07*	6.12**	6.71**
“Motives Related to External Prestigious Professions and Financial Welfare”	7.94**	10.98**	2.77**	3.61**	4.70**	6.81**	0.38
“Motives Related to Romanticization of Profession”	4.38**	10.58**	6.57**	1.47	3.63**	7.73**	4.22**
“Motives Related to Eagerness of Compensation of Temper Flaws”	8.51**	8.22**	3.32**	5.01**	3.69**	3.30**	0.81
“Antisocial Motives (attitude to profession was as if it was a way to satisfy own antisocial needs)”	3.60**	10.96**	11.62**	3.58**	2.38*	6.61**	5.37**
<i>“Methods of Studying the Motivational Profile of Personality”</i>							
“Need of High Salary and Financial Benefits”	0.93	1.46	3.72**	1.50	4.33**	2.51*	2.44*
“Need of High Working Conditions and Comfortable Surrounding”	2.81**	2.18*	1.17	0.45	0.72	2.43*	1.48
“Need of Accurate Structurization of Work and Feedback”	1.09	0.96	0.34	0.46	1.06	0.49	0.65
“Need of Social Relations”	3.05**	1.01	1.62	1.77 <sup>0</sup>	0.41	2.02*	2.60*
“Need of Forming and Supporting Long-Term Stable Relations”	2.14*	2.68**	0.20	1.47	2.23*	1.38	1.09
“Need of Obtaining the Recognition by Other People”	1.30	1.25	2.27*	1.33	2.73**	2.02*	1.06
“Need of Posing Brave and Tough Goals and of Achieving Them”	0.62	0.86	0.31	3.20**	0.40	1.26	1.69 <sup>0</sup>
“Need of Manipulation and Power, Eagerness to	0.15	2.96**	0.21	0.45	1.73 <sup>0</sup>	2.32*	0.08

Control the Other People”							
“Need of Diversity, Breaks and Stimulations, Eagerness to Avoid Everyday Routine”	1.71 <sup>0</sup>	2.43*	1.43	1.52	3.08**	3.21**	0.03
“Need of Being Creative, Thoughtful, and Open for further Ideas Employee”	0.44	0.78	2.11*	0.83	0.35	1.09	2.39*
“Need of Self-Improvement and Development as Personality”	0.78	0.39	2.72**	0.51	2.30*	0.80	2.87**
“Need of Interesting and Socially Beneficial Work”	0.61	2.90**	6.73**	1.90 <sup>0</sup>	2.57*	1.54	4.98**

Notes: MWE – middle level of effectiveness with tendency to weak indicator of effectiveness; MHE – middle level of effectiveness with tendency to high indicator of effectiveness; HE – highly effective; WE – weakly effective; MLE2 – middle level of effectiveness; MLE1 – middle level of effectiveness; <sup>0</sup> $p \leq .1$ ; \* $p \leq .05$ ; \*\* $p \leq .01$ .

**Table 5.** The significance of the differences between the proposed types according to the scales of methods for describing the features of the motivation of military personnel (in standard points)-III

	<i>t</i> MWE- MHE	<i>t</i> MHE- HE	<i>t</i> MWE- WE	<i>t</i> MWE- MLE2	<i>t</i> MWE- MLE1	<i>t</i> MHE- HE	<i>t</i> MHE- WE	<i>t</i> MHE- MLE2
<i>Test of “Sense-Bearing and Life Orientations”</i>								
General indicator of “Sense-Bearing and Life Orientations”	2.04*	16.16**	2.58**	4.13**	16.46**	9.31**	1.68 <sup>0</sup>	5.06**
“Goal”	2.07*	12.75**	0.52	2.70**	15.34**	8.21**	0.21	3.86**
“Process”	3.51**	10.74**	3.90**	1.55	8.55**	5.33**	2.46*	3.63**
“Result”	1.84 <sup>0</sup>	13.44**	2.13*	3.30**	15.14**	9.14**	1.31	4.28**
“Locus of Control-I”	1.60	11.85**	1.43	0.76	15.88**	8.22**	0.71	1.65
“Locus of Life Control”	0.96	13.12**	0.74	2.17*	15.49**	8.69**	0.27	2.61*

Content, Hierarchy, Intensity of Motives and their Possibility to be ...  
Oleksandr KOLESNICHENKO, et al.

<i>Method of "Locus of Control"</i>								
General internality	8.89**	7.58**	1.56	6.06**	8.44**	17.44**	3.52**	0.24
Internality in thoughts about life in general	5.47**	6.14**	3.64**	3.79**	7.64**	11.01**	0.94	0.09
Internality in description of personal experience	6.26**	6.00**	0.24	4.76**	5.75**	11.40**	3.34**	0.38
Internality in the sphere of achievements	4.76**	5.05**	1.60	4.52**	3.61**	10.92**	4.35**	1.07
Internality in the sphere of fails	4.97**	0.45	1.36	1.95 <sup>0</sup>	6.56**	5.34**	4.01**	2.03 <sup>0</sup>
Internality to self-incrimination	0.03	3.81**	0.30	2.47*	1.55	3.20**	0.31	2.26*
Internality in the sphere of professional activity	9.55**	4.79**	1.69 <sup>0</sup>	5.55**	8.62**	14.02**	4.48**	0.98
Professional and social aspect of internality	7.78**	3.68**	3.06**	4.21**	6.05**	11.03**	3.29**	0.97
Professional and processual aspects of internality	5.95**	3.32**	0.12	3.24**	6.17**	8.87**	3.26**	0.39
Internality in interpersonal communication	4.51**	6.85**	2.45*	2.60*	5.23**	10.20**	0.42	0.64
Competence in the sphere of interpersonal relations	3.81**	6.27**	2.43*	3.75**	2.90**	10.04**	0.40	0.78
Responsibility in the sphere of interpersonal relations	2.35*	2.35*	0.30	0.22	3.21**	4.99**	1.60	1.77 <sup>0</sup>
Internality in the sphere of family relations	2.02*	4.49**	1.71 <sup>0</sup>	1.08	2.14*	5.97**	0.15	0.48
Internality in the sphere of health	5.97**	3.95**	0.29	4.04**	4.86**	9.90**	4.98**	0.06
Negation of activity	7.44**	6.51**	7.40**	6.98**	6.78**	14.97**	0.27	1.36
Readiness for activities which was connected with difficulties overcoming	4.75**	6.92**	6.03**	5.17**	3.39**	12.15**	3.21**	1.92 <sup>0</sup>
Readiness for self-planning, acting and responsibility for their activities	5.22**	1.85 <sup>0</sup>	0.62	2.40*	5.76**	7.98**	2.93**	0.39
<i>Method of "Will-Regulated Personality"</i>								
Value-semantic organization of personality	1.35	8.23**	0.45	4.87**	10.58**	7.70**	0.31	3.00**

Organization of activity	2.96**	3.03**	1.49	6.23**	3.27**	5.76**	0.60	3.51**
Determination	0.87	7.77**	1.16	6.76**	10.08**	8.31**	0.76	5.80**
Perseverance	1.86 <sup>0</sup>	8.33**	1.45	8.73**	9.98**	7.86**	0.46	5.49**
Self-control	1.62	8.09**	1.55	7.41**	8.99**	7.83**	0.86	5.14**
“Self-Reliance”	1.81 <sup>0</sup>	4.43**	3.07**	6.54**	2.81**	1.75 <sup>0</sup>	3.80**	7.52**
Lies index	3.68**	2.62**	0.39	0.98	5.63**	5.48**	2.33*	1.88 <sup>0</sup>
General indicator characterizing the volitional organization of the personality	1.65	10.17**	1.96 <sup>0</sup>	13.94**	13.07**	10.23**	1.25	10.00**

*Notes:* MWE – middle level of effectiveness with tendency to weak indicator of effectiveness; MHE – middle level of effectiveness with tendency to high indicator of effectiveness; HE – highly effective; WE – weakly effective; MLE2 – middle level of effectiveness; MLE1 – middle level of effectiveness; <sup>0</sup>*p* ≤ .1; \**p* ≤ .05; \*\**p* ≤ .01.

**Table 6.** The significance of the differences between the proposed types according to the scales of methods for describing the features of the motivation of military personnel (in standard points)-IV

	<i>t</i> MHE- MLE1	<i>t</i> HE- WE	<i>t</i> HE- MLE2	<i>t</i> HE- MLE1	<i>t</i> WE- MLE2	<i>t</i> WE- MLE1	<i>t</i> MLE2- MLE1
<i>Test of “Sense-Bearing and Life Orientations”</i>							
General indicator of “Sense-Bearing and Life Orientations”	10.24**	1.94 <sup>0</sup>	13.81**	2.03*	4.26**	2.52*	14.49**
“Goal”	10.38**	2.91**	9.48**	3.22**	1.79 <sup>0</sup>	3.63**	10.87**
“Process”	4.37**	0.50	7.31**	0.28	4.32**	0.59	6.68**
“Result”	10.95**	2.19*	10.18**	3.32**	3.80**	3.09**	11.39**
“Locus of Control-I”	11.53**	2.50*	6.22**	5.02**	1.68 <sup>0</sup>	3.74**	7.94**
“Locus of Life Control”	10.78**	3.61**	8.78**	3.59**	1.92 <sup>0</sup>	4.68**	10.27**
<i>Method of “Locus of Control”</i>							

Content, Hierarchy, Intensity of Motives and their Possibility to be ...  
Oleksandr KOLESNICHENKO, et al.

General internality	0.32	5.64**	10.98**	15.98**	3.11**	3.61**	0.01
Internality in thoughts about life in general	1.07	8.12**	7.45**	14.62**	0.66	1.94 <sup>0</sup>	0.86
Internality in description of personal experience	0.47	2.02*	8.02**	10.88**	3.23**	3.08**	0.73
Internality in the sphere of achievements	0.77	0.87	8.32**	8.79**	4.56**	3.76**	1.61
Internality in the sphere of fails	1.28	1.16	2.26*	6.94**	2.41*	4.85**	3.19**
Internality to self-incrimination	1.43	1.83 <sup>0</sup>	5.11**	1.27	2.09*	0.79	3.40**
Internality in the sphere of professional activity	0.32	4.38**	8.39**	12.73**	2.92**	4.13**	0.72
Professional and social aspect of internality	0.96	5.70**	6.27**	8.95**	1.60	2.25*	0.22
Professional and processual aspects of internality	0.47	1.70 <sup>0</sup>	4.91**	8.93**	2.33*	3.52**	0.70
Internality in interpersonal communication	0.04	5.90**	6.56**	12.00**	0.13	0.47	0.70
Competence in the sphere of interpersonal relations	0.90	5.27**	8.22**	9.12**	0.13	0.90	1.49
Responsibility in the sphere of interpersonal relations	1.05	2.08*	1.13	5.59**	0.42	2.40*	2.44**
Internality in the sphere of family relations	0.21	4.64**	4.07**	5.85**	0.54	0.02	0.64
Internality in the sphere of health	0.32	3.56**	6.42**	8.06**	3.59**	4.15**	0.18
Negation of activity	0.72	15.28**	12.10**	12.39**	1.59	0.95	0.61
Readiness for activities which was connected with difficulties overcoming	0.52	9.80**	9.57**	8.89**	1.29	3.33**	2.14**
Readiness for self-planning, acting and responsibility for their activities	1.67 <sup>0</sup>	0.14	3.45**	7.76**	2.14*	3.61**	1.36
<i>Method of "Will-Regulated Personality"</i>							
Value-semantic organization of personality	9.85**	3.87**	11.65**	4.01**	2.20*	5.41**	13.44**
Organization of activity	5.49**	3.29**	8.63**	1.15	3.37**	3.64**	8.13**

Determination	10.50**	4.24**	13.57**	3.52**	2.23*	5.52**	15.20**
Perseverance	9.33**	4.44**	15.66**	2.90**	2.70*	5.40**	16.61**
Self-control	8.75**	3.95**	13.45**	2.19*	1.66	4.55**	13.96**
“Self-Reliance”	1.09	4.65**	9.84**	0.24	0.61	4.27**	8.00**
Lies index	7.59**	0.69	2.58*	3.53**	0.92	2.46*	4.85**
General indicator characterizing the volitional organization of the personality	12.73**	5.19**	28.08**	4.15**	2.70*	6.29**	30.06**

*Notes:* MWE – middle level of effectiveness with tendency to weak indicator of effectiveness; MHE – middle level of effectiveness with tendency to high indicator of effectiveness; HE – highly effective; WE – weakly effective; MLE2 – middle level of effectiveness; MLE1 – middle level of effectiveness; <sup>0</sup> $p \leq .1$ ; \* $p \leq .05$ ; \*\* $p \leq .01$ .

The group of highly effective (HE) servicemen included 35% of the general selection of the research. This group consisted of 1/3 from every category which participated in the research: officers, military personnel under contract, and participants of hostilities (PH).

The group of weakly effective (WE) servicemen included 4% of the general selection of the research. This group consisted of 85% of military personnel under contract and 15% of officers. 85% of this group were the participants of hostilities.

There were two groups with middle level of effectiveness of operational activity. Group number 1 with middle level of effectiveness (MLE1) was more numerical – 15% of the general selection of the research. This group consisted of 2/3 of military personnel under contract and 1/3 of officers. The status of the participants of hostilities belonged to 3/4 of respondents.

Group number 2 with middle level of effectiveness (MLE2) was less numerical – 7% of the general selection of the research. The indicator of combat operations' effectiveness was distinguished as  $20.23 \pm 1.88$ . This group consisted of 87% of military personnel under contract and 13% of officers. The status of the participants of hostilities belonged to 48% of respondents.

There was distinguished one more group which took intermediate place between the groups with high effectiveness and with middle level of effectiveness. It was marked as a group with middle level of effectiveness with tendency to high indicator of effectiveness (MHE). The group included 15% of the general selection of the research. This group consisted of 70% of military personnel under contract and 30% of officers. The status of the participants of hostilities belonged to 50% of respondents.

Moreover, there was detected the group which indicator of combat operations' effectiveness took intermediate place between the group with middle level of effectiveness and the group with weak level of effectiveness. It was marked as a group with middle level of effectiveness with tendency to weak indicator of effectiveness (MWE). The group include done-in-four participant of the research. This group consisted of 73% of military personnel under contract and 27% of officers. The status of the participants of hostilities belonged to 45% of respondents.

According to *“Close Questionnaire of Examining the Motivation of Professional Choice Made by Applicants of the Ministry of Internal Affairs”* there were highlighted the motives of choosing military profession by group HE, but their indicators were significantly weaker than those of groups WE and MLE1. The peculiarity of motives of choosing military profession in this

group was determined by hierarchy indicators. Thus, the most expressed were “Motives Related to Objective Socially Posed Tasks and to Content of Profession”. The next stage of hierarchy was occupied by “Independent Profession Selection”, “Motives Related to Personal and Professional Development”, “Motives Related to Eagerness of Compensation of Temper Flaws”, “Motives Related to External Prestigious Professions and Financial Welfare”. The lowest stage of hierarchy was occupied by “Dependent Profession Selection” and “Antisocial Motives”.

According to *“Methods of Studying the Motivational Profile of Personality”* there were determined the highest points of the scale “Need of Accurate Structurization of Work and Feedback” that demonstrated their responsible attitude to accurate realization of the goal as well as eagerness to satisfy the expectations. The second stage of the hierarchy was occupied by “Need of Interesting and Socially Beneficial Work” and “Need of High Salary and Financial Benefits”. The proximity of indicators concerning those indicators showed that for servicemen of the NGU socially beneficial work considered to be the source of income. The next stage was occupied by “Need of Posing Brave and Tough Goals and of Achieving them”, “Need of Obtaining the Recognition by Other People”, “Need of Self-Improvement and Development as Personality” which characterized those servicemen as brave, ambitious, and desiring to develop people.

In accordance with *“Sense-Bearing and Life Orientations”* servicemen of group HE had one of the highest indicators of “Life Understanding”. They had significant prospects of life and one of the highest indicators concerning the scale “Locus of Control-I” and “Locus of Life Control”.

During the use of the method *“Locus of Control”* servicemen of group HE had the highest indicators of internality among all the compared groups: “General Internality”, “Internality in the Sphere of Achievements”, “Internality in the Sphere of Professional Activity”, “Internality in Interpersonal Communication”. Furthermore, they had high indicators of the scale “Internality in the Sphere of Health”, “Readiness for Activities which was Connected with Difficulties Overcoming”, “Readiness for Self-Planning”. This group had the lowest indicator of a return scale “Negation of Activity”. Servicemen of this group did not eager to shift the blame of fails on others “Internality in the Sphere of Fails”.

Due to the *method of “Will-Regulated Personality”* members of group HE also had one of the highest indicators they conceded only before group MLE1. The highest indicators of group HE were “Perseverance”, “Determination” and “Self-Control”. The lowest indicators were “Self-Reliance” and “Organization of Activity”. The latest indicators were the

highest among the compared groups and had sufficient level of development.

The less effective group was distinguished on the basis of other significantly high indicators of the method which described the motivation. Thus, due to the data of "*Close Questionnaire of Examining the Motivation of Professional Choice Made by Applicants of the Ministry of Internal Affairs*" the participants of group WE differed from all other groups on statistically significant level. The exceptions were the indicators of group MLE1 in the scale "Motives Related to Objective Socially Posed Tasks and to Content of Profession", "Motives Related to External Prestigious Professions and Financial Welfare" and the lowest and minimal indicators were presented by the scales "Dependent Profession Selection", "Antisocial Motives". This data demonstrated the passion of those servicemen and their high emotionality.

To the core of "*Methods of Studying the Motivational Profile of Personality*" there was incorporated the mechanism of overcoming social eagerness to get answers. It gave more information concerning the hierarchy of motives of this group; however, the distance from the most significant motive to the least significant stayed the shortest among all the compared groups. The most expressed motives of this group as well as in group HE of servicemen were "Need of Accurate Structurization of Work and Feedback", but the next stage was occupied by motives which described comfortable conditions of work including normal circle of communication: "Need of Forming and Supporting Long-Term Stable Relations", "Need of High Working Conditions and Comfortable Surrounding", "Need of Diversity, Breaks and Stimulations, Eagerness to Avoid Everyday Routine". The least important in that group were the motives which described the interest in society: "Need of Obtaining the Recognition by Other People", "Need of Interesting and Socially Beneficial Work", "Need of Manipulation and Power, Eagerness to Control the Other People", "Need of Social Relations".

According to the data proposed by "*Sense-Bearing and Life Orientations*" the participants of group WE had middle indicators of life overthinking and control localization (that level was higher than in groups MWE, MHE, and MLE2 and lower than in groups MLE1 and HE). Peculiarities of this group were in concentration on "Life Process", in accordance with this scale there were distinguished the highest indicators among all the compared groups.

Moreover, there was a need to highlight the indicators of group WE concerning the method of "*Locus of Control*" and their combination with indicators on the method "*Will-Regulated Personality*". Thus, on the "General Scale" those servicemen with low efficiency had one of the highest

indicators giving priority only to group HE. That showed absolute connection between their “I” and motives including desires and needs.

Participants of this group had one of the lowest indicators of the scale “Will-Regulated Personality”, they gave priority only to group MLE2. Among all the compared groups the least effective servicemen had the lowest indicators of the scale “Self-Reliance” that way they developed the dichotomy with highly effective servicemen whose indicators of this scale were the highest among all the groups.

Participants of group WE as well as of MLE1 had the highest points of the scale “*Close Questionnaire of Examining the Motivation of Professional Choice Made by Applicants of the Ministry of Internal Affairs*”. However, the hierarchy of motives of choosing the profession in group MLE1 differed from group WE. The most expressed and significant in comparison with other groups were the “Motives Related to Objective Socially Posed Tasks and to Content of Profession”. The next hierarchy stage was developed by three types of motives which were marked with the eagerness of self-regulation: “Independent Profession Selection”, “Motives Related to Eagerness of Compensation of Temper Flaws” and “Motives Related to Personal and Professional Development”.

“Motivational Profile of Personality” of this group was built around the vector: “Need of High Salary and Financial Benefits”, “Need of Manipulation and Power, Eagerness to Control the Other People”. That characterized those servicemen as performers, so called “employee”.

The second hierarchy stage was formed by: “Need of Accurate Structurization of Work and Feedback”, “Need of Obtaining the Recognition by Other People”. Such a high position of desire to be recognized highlighted this group among all the other groups.

The third stage was developed with the help of the following motives: “Need of Self-Improvement and Development as Personality”, “Need of Interesting and Socially Beneficial Work”. Their combination demonstrated the importance of professional honour for those servicemen.

Specific stage was occupied by the motives of social cooperation “Need of Social Relations”, “Need of Forming and Supporting Long-Term Stable Relations”. Indicators of the scale “Need of Social Relations” of this group were the highest among all the compared groups (differences reached the level of statistic importance and tendency to these motives with other groups except group HE).

The next stage included four types of motives due to which servicemen of group MLE1 had the lowest indicators among all the compared groups: “Need of Posing Brave and Tough Goals and of

Achieving Them”, “Need of Being Creative, Thoughtful, and Open for Further Ideas Employee”, “Need of High Working Conditions and Comfortable Surrounding”, and “Need of Diversity, Breaks and Stimulations, Eagerness to Avoid Everyday Routine”.

The peculiarities of group MLE1 included incredibly high indicators of the general scale “Sense-Bearing and Life Orientations” which statistically differed from other groups. Sense of life in this group was focused on the future – those servicemen had the highest indicators of the scale “Goal”. However, group MLE1 had the highest indicators among all the compared groups of the scale “Result” that highlighted the importance of recognizing their achievements by the participants.

Group MLE1 had an interesting combination of scales “Locus of Control” and “Will Regulation”. Thus, group MLE1 had the highest indicators among all the compared groups of both scales of locus of control method of “*Sense-Bearing and Life Orientations*”: “Locus of Control – I”, “Locus of Control – Life”. Although, according to the method “Locus of Control” in group MLE1 there were one of the lowest indicators of the general scale and according to the scales which differentiated that indicator: “Internality in Thoughts about Life in General”, “Professional and Processual Aspects of Internality”, “Responsibility in the Sphere of Interpersonal Relations”, “Readiness for Self-Planning”, and “Internality in the Sphere of Fails”.

According to all the scales “Will-Regulated Personality” the servicemen of group MLE 1 had the highest points. The exception was made by the scale “Self-Reliance” which was the highest in group HE. Among the components of will regulation of servicemen from group MLE1 the most expressed were: “Perseverance” and “Determination”. The least expressed indicators were: “Self-Reliance” and “Organization of Activity”.

Group MLE1 also had the highest points of the indicator “Insincerity” that did not demonstrate the insincerity, but their being orientated on socially approved “correct” answer on the commander’s claims.

Participants of group MLE2 were the only individuals whose motives connected with socially posed goals and with the content of profession were not leading during the military profession selection. Other peculiarities included slight differentiated motives of profession selection. Thus, the most highlighted were: “Motives Related to Personal and Professional Development”, “Motives Related to Eagerness of Compensation of Temper Flaws”. The least expressed were motives “Dependent Profession Selection”. Penultimate stage was obtained by

“Motives Related to Romanticization of Profession”, “Independent Profession Selection”, and “Antisocial Motives”. Nevertheless, romantic and antisocial motives were significantly higher than in other compared groups, but they gave priority only to the indicators of group WE.

Received indicators of the method *“Motivational Profile of Personality”* were protected from the effects’ activity which negatively influenced the differentiation of motives. According to the data of this method group MLE2 had the following significant indicators: “Need of High Salary and Financial Benefits”. The least expressed and lagged indicators were “Need of Interesting and Socially Beneficial Work”.

The second stage in hierarchy of motives was occupied by “Need of Obtaining the Recognition by Other People”, “Need of Accurate Structurization of Work and Feedback”. The data represented by the scale “Need of Obtaining the Recognition by Other People” showed that on statistical level servicemen of group MLE2 differed from other groups except group MLE1 with which they had almost identical indicators.

The next stage in hierarchy of motives “Need of Being Creative, Thoughtful, and Open for further Ideas Employee”, “Need of Posing Brave and Tough Goals and of Achieving them”, and “Need of High Working Conditions and Comfortable Surrounding”. Group MLE2 had one of the highest indicators of “Need of Being Creative, Thoughtful, and Open for Further Ideas Employee” due to which on statistic level they differed from all other groups except group WE.

On the next stage there was a combination of “Need of Forming and Supporting Long-Term Stable Relations” and “Need of Self-Improvement and Development as Personality” which demonstrated definite benefits of relations. Servicemen of group MLE2 wanted to choose the surrounding which could help their development.

Servicemen of group MLE2 had the lowest indicators among all the compared groups on the scales of the method “Sense-Bearing and Life Orientations”. Despite that, the indicators of this group on the scale “Goal” were and “Process”, those results were almost identical that demonstrated their orientation on the nearest future.

Indicators of the motivation of choosing the military profession in group MHE were weakly expressed in the scale of the method *“Close Questionnaire of Examining the Motivation of Professional Choice Made by Applicants of the Ministry of Internal Affairs”*. The motives which were diagnosed with the help of this method developed the vector from “Dependent Profession Selection”, “Antisocial Motives” to “Motives Related to Objective Socially Posed Tasks and to Content of Profession”. The second stage in hierarchy

of motives of profession selection showed the struggle for professional development in the past: “Motives Related to Eagerness of Compensation of Temper Flaws”, “Motives Related to Personal and Professional Development” and “Motives Related to External Prestigious Professions and Financial Welfare”.

Due to the *“Methods of Studying the Motivational Profile of Personality”* the group MHE had the most expressed indicators which made them significantly different from others in “Need of High Salary and Financial Benefits” and the least expressed were indicators of “Need of Manipulation and Power, Eagerness to Control the Other People”.

Less important for group MHE were the motives which described the eagerness to get new and non-standard issues in their work: “Need of Posing Brave and Tough Goals and of Achieving Them”, “Need of Diversity, Breaks and Stimulations, Eagerness to Avoid Everyday Routine”, and “Need of Being Creative, Thoughtful, and Open for further Ideas Employee”.

Due to the scales of the method *“Sense-Bearing and Life Orientations”* servicemen of group MHE had statistically lower indicators than groups HE and MLE1, but higher than group MLE2. Besides that, they as well as the mentioned groups had almost identical indicators of the scales “Goal” and “Process”. There was not any increase of the scale “Result”.

Due to the indicators of the method *“Locus of Control”* servicemen of group MHE had identically low quantity of general points as well as groups MLE1 and MLE2. The peculiarities of group MHE included the lowest indicators among all the compared groups “Internality in the Sphere of Professional Activity” which were formed because of weak indicators “Professional and Social Aspect of Internality”.

In accordance with the data of the method *“Will-Regulated Personality”* servicemen of group MHE had indicators which were maximally close to group WE. However, their indicators of scales were weakly differentiated that did not demonstrate any urgency of will regulation, they substituted it with postarbitrary activity to make professional activities automatic.

Servicemen of group MHE had the lowest indicator of “Insincerity” that showed not only the desire to give completely honest answers, but also demonstrated slightly weaker social tolerance and communicative correctness.

In the structure of motivation of choosing the military profession group MWE had the most expressed motives such as: “Motives Related to Objective Socially Posed Tasks and to Content of Profession”. Close to them there were “Motives Related to Eagerness of Compensation of

Temper Flaws”. On the other side of hierarchy there were Dependent Profession Selection”, “Antisocial Motives”, “Motives Related to Romanticization of Profession”. In group MWE intermediate position between values and motives which depreciated was occupied by the motives “Independent Profession Selection”.

The participants of group MWE came close to the indicators of group HE: “Motives Related to Objective Socially Posed Tasks and to Content of Profession”, “Motives Related to Personal and Professional Development”. According to the scales “Dependent Profession Selection”, “Motives Related to External Prestigious Professions and Financial Welfare”, “Motives Related to Romanticization of Profession” and “Antisocial Motives” participants of group MWE moved closer to group MLE1.

Due to the data presented by the *“Methods of Studying the Motivational Profile of Personality”* group MWE had the most expressed indicators of “Need of Accurate Structurization of Work and Feedback”, “Need of High Salary and Financial Benefits”. The next dense group of motives revealed in group MWE the urgency of needs of improving social status with their own powers “Need of Obtaining the Recognition by Other People”, “Need of Self-Improvement and Development as Personality” and “Need of Interesting and Socially Beneficial Work”.

The eagerness to change life for better and to make it more comfortable distinguished the place in hierarchy of motives of group MWE due to results received from the scales: “Need of High Working Conditions and Comfortable Surrounding”, “Need of Posing Brave and Tough Goals and of Achieving Them”.

Less important for group MWE were indicators of “Need of Forming and Supporting Long-Term Stable Relations”, “Need of Social Relations” and “Need of Manipulation and Power, Eagerness to Control the Other People” that demonstrated the eagerness to avoid social relations.

According to the scales of the method *“Sense-Bearing and Life Orientations”* servicemen of group MWE had one of the lowest indicators (lower than in the 5<sup>th</sup> group). Their indicators of the methods *“Locus of Control”* and *“Will-Regulated Personality”* moved indicators closer to group WE (it had the lowest quantity of statistically important differences). Unlike group WE they had significantly better indicators of the scale “Negation of Activity”, they had more readiness to act to overcome the differences, as well they had higher level of confidence in possibility to run their own lives, they did not tend to shift their responsibility on others due to results of cooperation, and they had significantly higher indicators of “Self-Reliance”.

That indicated their high level of self-reliance and low level of dependency in professional and interpersonal relations in comparison with participants from group WE.

## **Discussion**

The research demonstrated that servicemen with the lowest effectiveness of combat operations had the highest indicators through all the motives unlike those with high effectiveness. However, this case was not the realization of the law of Yerkes and Dodson (1908). It was likely that the received data demonstrated the phenomenon of forming the tangentiality of awakening and of free motivation which were described by the Eastern European psychology by Leontiev (1975) and Vygotsky (1983), by phenomenon of self-efficiency proposed by the American psychology Bandura (1994) who considered that the success of activity was determined not only by the attractiveness of result, but also by the trust in their personal powers.

Thus, to estimate the motivation appropriately there was a need to include servicemen of distinguished groups into motivational types which consisted of content, hierarchy, intensity of motives and their possibility to be implemented.

In that way highly effective servicemen choosing profession considered its content, expressed eagerness to realize themselves in their profession, comply with it, develop in profession, and acquire the professional skills. They rejected dependency and unlawful benefit as motives of profession selection. For relevant motivation of HEit was typical to have eagerness to execute posed tasks and to meet expectations. It was important for them to do socially beneficial work which was understood by them as the only source of income. Important peculiarity of their motivation was the preservation of high professional ambitions – they struggled for professional development, tough tasks, and high estimation of their achievements. Motives which described the conditions and regime of work, social cooperation were non-essential. Servicemen with high effectiveness were characterized as those who had high level of life understanding, significant life prospects, and considered themselves to be strong personality with sufficient will of selection. They were assured that people could control their lives, could make decisions by themselves, and could implement them. Existing content of motivation was supported by high level of internality and developed qualities of will. Thus, servicemen of group HE took ultimate responsibility for their actions having analyzed them, they did not avoid any work, could plan, and put efforts by themselves to achieve the results they

struggled for and which they were not ashamed of. Their responsibility spread on the results of professional activity and interpersonal communication as well as on the health. Their obtained level of internality was, first of all, their own experience of successes and fails. Strong-willed quality of servicemen from the group with high efficiency was well-developed and, first of all, met the requirements of their professional activity including tough and unsafe character of their profession as well as cruel normative settlement.

Servicemen with weak effectiveness, as it was already mentioned, had significantly high indicators of all the scales which described the motives of activity and its selection and slight differentiation of those motives. This data gave possibility to talk about insufficiently formed randomness of activity which was presented by inability to cope with desires, low level of self-reliance and reluctance to overcome difficulties. Servicemen from group WE depended on their desires as well as on their surrounding. They wanted to have simple, comfortable work which was usually occupied by them thanks to the patronage of people from their close surrounding.

Presented features of servicemen from groups HE and WE on the indicators of combat activity correlated with the situations concerning the connection between Public Service Motivation (PSM) with work effectiveness and its mediated self-efficiency (Breugh et al., 2018).

According to it servicemen from group HE was depicted as the type which was guided by motivation of public service, and servicemen from group WE as dependent motivational type.

Servicemen from group MLE1 had highly expressed motivation of a performer which was based on conscious trust in their commanders and marked qualities of will. Those servicemen were orientated namely on military profession acquiring (high points for the motives of professional selection) and on making efforts to master it. They were responsible and determined concerning the execution of their tasks. They agreed to execute tough tasks, routine actions, and were undemanding concerning the working conditions. It was quite important for those servicemen to have high salary, recognition of their achievements, conformity of social expectations, and support of friendly relations.

Having compared motives of groups HE and MLE1 it was possible to conclude that they had plenty of common aspects concerning their motives of public service and prosocial motivation (Schott et al., 2019). According to that data servicemen from group MLE1 were included into prosocial motivational type. Besides that, the description of this type was supported by the data received by Gillet et al. (2017). They determined that

servicemen with the highest indicators of autonomous motivation felt high organizational support, commander's support, positive experience, and high level of communication because they were engaged into professional activity due to their pleasure, personal choice, and personal will, demonstrated the highest level of well-being.

Servicemen of group MLE2 were the only participants among all the distinguished types who chose their profession being led by their own mercenary interests, possibility to work with things they liked and were interested in, those activities were full of romantic, but not of objective content of the profession. They used social relations to be "on good standing" with their commanders or to gain satisfaction from communication. Those servicemen did not want to realize their strong-willed qualities. Such servicemen required constant control from the side of commanders because they could be addicted to the "romantic" features of their profession neglecting its core sense. The description of this group of servicemen was close to the definition of motivational type proposed by Lyk-Jensen and Glad (2018) – "Personal Benefit". Thus, servicemen from group MLE2 were included into romantic (struggle for adventures) motivational type. Servicemen of this type searched for adventures, challenges; however, they were unstable concerning the hardships of service, the actions of combat factors of stress and, usually, these servicemen resigned after the first contract expired.

Servicemen of group MHE choosing the military profession considered its content and were ready to make everything possible to acquire it; however, this motivation lost its urgency. Acquiring the profession they concentrated on financial benefits, personal ambitions, and comfortable conditions of work; they were weakly motivated to put efforts to acquire new profession. It was useful for them to be orientated on the nearest future. Most of professional actions were executed automatically without any strong-willed efforts. They did not get along with their surrounding and showed low level of tolerance. This type was determined as a stagnated one. Nevertheless, even if this type had quite high indicators of effectiveness the general prospects for this type were pessimistic. In accordance with Voet et al. (2017), who distinguished positive relations between the eagerness of changes and prosociality, group MHE was likely to decrease its altruistic behaviour.

Servicemen of group MWE chose the military profession because of its content as well as of his/her own desire to change the life and social status for better. In urgent situation it was important for them to have understandable and well-paid activity which would give them the possibility

to improve their social status and conditions of life internally. These servicemen did not feel themselves ready for intellectual and creative work. They did not cooperate with their surrounding and that fact detained the process of professional socialization. Despite the desire to help other people, work, endeavour, and change, they did not achieve high effectiveness in professional activity as a serviceman due to their concentration on defeating the difficulties of life. This type having analogy with Maslow (1943) was marked as a deficient type of motivation. The determination of deficient type of motivation of servicemen who joined the army to change their lives for better, to get new prospects, all those factors were not something new in military psychology. That was the way the American researchers pointed out that military service was often joined by Afro-Americans and people from Latin America, not so often it was joined by people who positively studied at school, planned to enter the college and by parents who graduated from the Higher Educational Establishments (Bachman et al., 2000).

Conducted research gave the possibility to determine 6 motivational types related to the effectiveness of servicemen's operational activity. These motivational types were located between the poles which were introduced by two dimensions: self-efficacy (autonomous and controlled motivation) and motivation of helping others (motivations of public service – selfishness). Those motivational types of servicemen were motivated by public service, stagnant, prosocial, romantic, deficient and dependent. Distinguished types included the content, hierarchy, intensity of motives and their possibility to implement them.

Development of the motivation diagnostics of the applicants to the military service on the basis of their determination to one of the distinguished motivational types would help to decrease the quantity of mistakes during the prediction of effectiveness of operational activity.

---

## References

---

- Bachman, J. G., Segal, D. R., Freedman-Doan, P., & O'Malley, P. (2000). Who Chooses Military Service? Correlates of Propensity and Enlistment in the U.S. Armed Forces. *Military Psychology*, 12(1), 1-30.  
[http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/S15327876MP1201\\_1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/S15327876MP1201_1)
- Bandura, A. (1994). Self-efficacy. In R. J. Corsini (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of psychology* (2nd ed., Vol. 3, pp. 368-369). Wiley.  
<http://doi.org/10.1002/9780470479216.corpsy0836>
- Breaugh, J., Ritz, A., & Alfes, K. (2018). Work motivation and public service motivation: disentangling varieties of motivation and job satisfaction, *Public*

- Management Review*, 20(10), 1423-1443.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2017.1400580>
- Bury, P. (2017). Recruitment and Retention in the British Army Reserve Logistics Units. *Armed Forces & Society*, 43(4), 608-631.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0095327X16657320>
- Catignani, S. (2004). Motivating soldiers: the example of the Israeli defence forces. *The United States Army War College Quaterly: Parameters*, 34(3), 108–121.  
<https://press.armywarcollege.edu/parameters/vol34/iss3/4/>
- Chambel, M. J., Castanheira, F., Oliveira-Cruz, F., & Lopes, S. (2015). Work Context Support and Portuguese Soldiers' Well-Being: The Mediating Role of Autonomous Motivation. *Military Psychology*, 27(5), 297-310.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/mil0000087>
- Crumbaugh, J. C., & Henrion, R. (1988). The PIL test: Administration, interpretation, uses, theory and critique. *The International Forum for Logotherapy*, 11(2), 76–88. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1991-17191-001>
- Crumbaugh, J. C., & Maholick, L. T. (1969). *Manual of Instructions for The Purpose-in-Life Test*. Psychometric Affiliates.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Determination in Human Behavior*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4899-2271-7>
- Gillet, N., Becker, C., Lafrenière, M. A., Huart, I., & Fouquereau, E. (2017). Organizational Support, Job Resources, Soldiers' Motivational Profiles, Work Engagement, and Affect. *Military Psychology*, 29(5), 418-433.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/mil0000179>
- Griffith, J. (2008). Institutional Motives for Serving in the US Army National Guard: Implications for Recruitment, Retention, and Readiness. *Armed Forces & Society*, 34(2), 230-258.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0095327X06293864>
- Grigorov, G., & Spiridonov, S. (2018). Research on the Motivation for Choosing the Military Career. *International Conference of Knowledge-Based Organization*, 1, 302–307. <https://doi.org/10.1515/kbo-2018-0048>
- Gutkin, M. S., & Mihalchenko G. F. (2000). *Metodika issledovaniya volevoy organizatsii lichnosti* [Research methodology for the volitional organization of personality]. Prosvischenie. <https://sites.google.com/site/test300m/ivol>
- Helmus, T. C., Zimmerman, R. S., Posard, M. N., Wheeler, J. L., Ogletree, C., Stroud, Q., & Harrell, M. C. (2018). *Life as a Private: A Study of the Motivations and Experiences of Junior Enlisted Personnel in the U.S. Army*. RAND Corporation. <http://doi.org/10.7249/RR2252>
- Johansen, R. B., Laberg, J. C., & Martinussen, M. (2014). Military Identity as Predictor of Perceived Military Competence and Skills. *Armed Forces & Society*, 40(3), 521-543. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0095327X13478405>

- Kapluchenko, O. P., & Prykhodko, I. (2019). Vy`znachennya providny`x moty`viv v`yjs`kovosluzhbovciv Nacional`noyi gvardiyi Ukrainy` do sluzhbovo-bojovoyi diyal`nosti v ekstremal`ny`x umovax [Determination of the leading motives of the military personnel of the National Guard of Ukraine in service and combat activities in extreme conditions]. *Honor and law*, 3(70), 114-122. <http://dx.doi.org/10.33405/2078-7480/2019/3/70/190049>
- Kolesnichenko, O. S. (2018). *Zasady` bojovoyi psy`xologichnoyi travmaty`zaciyi v`ijs`kovosluzhbovciv* [Fundamentals of combat psychological traumatization of servicemen]. Nacional`na akademiya Nacional`noyi gvardiyi Ukrainy. [http://books.ndcnangu.co.ua/knigi/Monograf\\_bojov\\_psihol\\_travm\\_2018.pdf](http://books.ndcnangu.co.ua/knigi/Monograf_bojov_psihol_travm_2018.pdf)
- Ksenofontova, E. G. (1999). *Issledovanie lokalizatsii kontrolya lichnosti - novaya versiya metodiki Uroven sub'ektivnogo kontrolya* [Study of the locus of control: New version of level of subjective control]. *Psibologicheskij zhurnal*, 20, 103-114. <https://istina.msu.ru/publications/article/322491636/>
- Leontiev, A. N. (1975). *Deyatelnost. Soznanie. Lichnost* [Activity. Consciousness. Personality]. Politizdat. <https://www.marxists.org/russkij/leontiev/1975/dyeatyelnost/deyatelnost-soznyanie-lichnost.pdf>
- Lyk-Jensen, S. V., & Glad, A. (2018). Why do they serve? Changes and differences in motives of Danish soldiers deployed to peace-keeping and peace-enforcing missions. *Defence and Peace Economics*, 29(3), 312-334. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10242694.2016.1200220>
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50(4), 370-396. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/h0054346>
- Matsegora, Y., Vorobyova, V., & Prikhodko, I. (2013). *Psykhologichni zasady efektyvnosti sluzhbovo-bojovoi diialnosti viiskovosluzhbovciv viiskovoi sluzhby za kontraktom vnutrishnikh viisk MVS Ukrainy* [Psychological principles of efficiency of service and combat activity of servicemen of military service under the contract of internal troops of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Ukraine]. Akad. VV MVS Ukrainy. [http://books.ndcnangu.co.ua/knigi/Monohraf\\_Efektyvnist.pdf](http://books.ndcnangu.co.ua/knigi/Monohraf_Efektyvnist.pdf)
- Moskalenko, A. P. (2002). Aktualni problemy profesiinoho psykhologichnoho vidboru do vuziv systemy MVS [Current problems of professional psychological selection for universities of the Ministry of Internal Affairs]. *Visnyk Universytetu vnutrishnikh sprav*, 18, 452-457. <http://dspace.univd.edu.ua/xmlui/handle/123456789/8887?show=full>
- Muzdybaev, K. (1998). *Strategiya sovladaniya s zhiznennymi trudnostyami* [A strategy for coping with life's difficulties]. *Zburn. sotsiologii i sots. antropologii*, 1, 100-111. [http://ecsocman.hse.ru/data/647/774/1231/007\\_Muzdabaev.pdf](http://ecsocman.hse.ru/data/647/774/1231/007_Muzdabaev.pdf)

- Prykhodko, I, Matsehora, J, Lipatov, I, Tovma, I, & Kostikova, I. (2019). Servicemen's Motivation in the National Guard of Ukraine: Transformation After the "Revolution of Dignity". *The Journal of Slavic Military Studies*, 32(3), 347-366.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13518046.2019.1645930>
- Prykhodko, I. (2018). Features of the Motivation of Specialists for the Professional Activity in Special Conditions. *International Journal of Education and Science*, 1(3-4), 35. <http://dx.doi.org/10.26697/ijes.2018.3-4.24>
- Ritchie, S., & Martin, P. (1999). *Motivation management*. Gower Publishing Limited Gower House. <https://lib.ugent.be/catalog/rug01:000461801>
- Rodrigues-Goulart, F. (2006). Combat motivation. *Military Review*, 86, 93–96.  
[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/332551117\\_Combat\\_Motivation](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/332551117_Combat_Motivation)
- Schott, C., Neumann, O., Baertschi, M., & Ritz, A. (2019). Public Service Motivation, Prosocial Motivation and Altruism: Towards Disentanglement and Conceptual Clarity, *International Journal of Public Administration*, 42, 1200-1211. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2019.1588302>
- Taiyang, Q. (2010, November 23). *Military Motivation. The Chinese Way*. Harvard Business Review. <http://blogs.hbr.org/frontline-leadership/2010/11/military-motivation-the-chines.html>
- Voet, J., Steijn, B., & Kuipers, B. S. (2017). What's in it for others? The relationship between prosocial motivation and commitment to change among youth care professionals. *Public Management Review*, 19(4), 443-462.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2016.1183699>
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1983). *Istoriya razvitiya vysshib psibicheskib funktsiy* [The history of the development of higher mental functions]. Pedagogika.
- Woodruff, T. D. (2017). Who Should The Military Recruit? The Effects of Institutional, Occupational, and Self-Enhancement Enlistment Motives on Soldier Identification and Behavior. *Armed Forces & Society*. 43(4), 579-607.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0095327X17695360>
- Yerkes, R. M., & Dodson, J. D. (1908). The Relation of Strength of Stimulus to Rapidity of Habit Formation. *Journal of Comparative Neurology & Psychology*, 18, 459-482. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cne.920180503>