PSYCHOLOGICAL REGULATORS OF CHOICE AND MAKING AGGRESSIVE DECISIONS

Abstract. The paper presents the results of research into the psychological characteristics of choosing and making aggressive decisions. The views of scientists on the problem of personality aggressiveness, the structure, mechanisms and role of aggressiveness in professional activity, in the professionalization of personality are considered. The role of aggressiveness as a component of decisiveness in the situation of choice and decision making by an individual in the system «person – profession – society» is shown. It is substantiated that aggressiveness is included in the structure of the ergicity block and is a stable characteristic of an individual’s decisiveness, along with spontaneity, flexibility and adventurism, ensures that the individual is focused on quickly obtaining a solution option, taking into account and overcoming possible obstacles to finding an effective solution (including risk and uncertainty of the situation). It has been proven that a pronounced level of aggressiveness (threat) of decisiveness can support the manifestation of aggressiveness in an active state, provides the function of activating the aggressive actions of a professional and monitoring their implementation. In the empirical part of the study, a psychodiagnostic complex of methods was used, including «Multi-Dimensional Decisiveness Scales», «Personality Type Indicator», «Diagnostics of Indicators and Forms of Aggression», «Volitional Personality Properties», etc. Statistical data processing was carried out using the software IBM Statistics SPSS.
23.0. Quantitative (correlation) and qualitative data analysis (the «ace» method and the «profile» method) were used.

A description of the psychological characteristics of decisiveness in individuals with high and low levels of threat in situations of choice and decision making is given. Statistically significant relationships were identified between the aggressiveness of the individual, reflexivity of the past, dogmatism, anxiety and decisiveness of the individual. The substantive relationships between aggressiveness and decisiveness (threat component), decision making properties and volitional properties of a professional’s personality are substantiated. A comparison of the characteristics of personality aggressiveness in the groups of subjects showed that the expressed aggressiveness of the personality in decision making is aimed at destroying the object, the subject, and the relationships between the subjects of interaction. It has been proven that individuals with a high level of aggressiveness and decisiveness are distinguished by a propensity to risk-taking, tolerance, impetuosity, perseverance, and a high level of motivation to achieve goals.
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**ПСИХОЛОГІЧНІ РЕГУЛЯТОРИ ВИБОРУ І ПРИЙНЯТТЯ АГРЕСИВНИХ РІШЕНЬ**

**Анотація.** У статті наведено результати досліджень психологічних особливостей вибору та прийняття агресивних рішень. Розглянуто погляди вчених на проблему агресивності особистості, структуру, механізми та роль агресивності у професійній діяльності, у професіоналізації особистості. Показано роль агресивності як компонента рішимості у ситуації вибору та прийняття рішень особистістю в системі «людина – професія – суспільство». Обґрунтовано, що агресивність входить до структури блоку ерічності і є стійкою характеристикою рішимості особистості, поряд зі спонтанністю, гнучкістю та авантюрністю забезпечує спрямованість особистості на швидке отримання
Formulation of the problem. Since the second half of the 20th century, scientists have noted an intensive increase in the level of aggressiveness in modern society. Modern society is characterized by an intensive growth of aggression, cruelty, violence, and at the same time a rapid growth of social activity, which often also takes the form of aggression, albeit with other meanings. Occurring in critical situations, personality aggression can perform not only a protective function, but sometimes even provide a decision-making function in conditions of an unfolding conflict. Meanwhile, people in such environments are known to differ markedly in how quickly they can assess circumstances and make decisions under the influence of conditions that are perceived as aggressive. The independence of the individual, their activity and responsibility in achieving their own goals under the influence of conditions of aggression is manifested in the tendency to make tough decisions (even with a lack of information, or in conditions of uncertainty, threat and risk).
The study of manifestations of personality aggressiveness in various conditions of life becomes important not only in terms of finding ways to practically solve the problem, but also in theoretical terms as a solution to one of the multifaceted problems of psychological science. The search for methodological approaches and theoretical concepts that reveal the nature of human aggressiveness and provide identification and adequate understanding of the reasons for its manifestation, becomes the subject of study in adolescence (aggression of adolescents, cruelty to animals), family relationships (relationships between spouses, child-parent relationships), relationships between colleagues when performing professional activities (the attitude of a manager towards subordinates, conflicts between employees at work), and so on.

At the same time, the problem of the source that guides a person to choose and make aggressive decisions – a threat of decisiveness that prompts a person to display activity in this form – remains practically undeveloped. The nature of the manifestation of forms of aggression in a situation of individual or joint decision making, the role of the aggressive component of decisiveness (the ergicity block) in the professionalization of the individual at its different levels and stages is unclear.

**Analysis of the latest research and publications.** Theoretical generalizations of research into personality aggressiveness have shown that this phenomenon is considered in line with approaches that have not only already been established in psychology so far, but each of which fundamentally represents an original interpretation of aggressiveness or aggression. So, by now the following approaches have developed and separated: instinctive (S. Freud, K. Lorenz); biological approach (W. Hess, R. Jacobs, S. Mednick, D. Olds); cognitive approach (L. Berkowitz, L. Eron, D. Zillmann, L. Hiusmann); consideration of aggressiveness as frustration (J. Dollard, L. Oak, N. Miller); social-psychological approach (A. Bandura, A. Bass, R. Beron and D. Richardson, B. Craigie). Manifestations of aggression and aggressive behavior have interested many domestic and foreign scientists, such as L. Berkovits, H. Breslav, V. Huldan, S. Zhabokritskyi, O. Sannikova, L. Semeniuk, E. Fromm et al. [5].

A generalization of the results of the study of aggressiveness confirmed the presence of general patterns of its manifestation both in adults examined and in adolescents. Based on research carried out by Mandy Grumm et al. on a student sample (2009), it was proven that the form of manifestation of aggressiveness is largely determined by the typological characteristics of the individual. Using the clustering method (based on the scales of the NEO-FFI questionnaire) allowed the authors to identify three personality types. They were described as a stable type (low neuroticism, high extraversion), an undesirable type (high neuroticism, low extroversion, agreeableness, and conscientiousness), and a reserved overcontrolled type (low extraversion and openness to experimenting, high agreeableness, and...
conscientiousness). The prototypes were associated with the level of aggression assessed by the A. Bass and M. Perry Diagnostic Aggression Questionnaire (BPAQ-24). The results indicate that the three clusters differ primarily in levels of hostility, verbal aggression, and anger. In terms of overall aggressiveness, the undesirable type showed the highest BPAQ scores, while the reserved prototype showed the lowest [12]. Trends in the relationship between indicators of aggressiveness were recorded in adults examined earlier, already during the analysis of data that was obtained by the authors of the methodology in 1992. Data from the BPAQ have shown that there is a relationship between aggressiveness and other personality traits. Thus, in individuals with a low level of neuroticism and high extraversion, average indicators of aggressiveness were identified, and slightly below the group average (stable type); in individuals with low indicators of extraversion and openness, with a high level of goodwill and conscientiousness, a low level of aggressiveness was found (restrained, over-controlled type). Most often in the works of scientists, the traits of an aggressive personality are seen as a mirror reflection of the «stability» profile, that is, a high level of neuroticism is observed in combination with low scores on other personality traits [11].

The identified models of the relationship between aggressiveness and various structures of personality traits are also observed in adolescents. Thus, adolescents with a pronounced form of hostile attitude, who experience conflicts and have a low sense of self-control, react more often aggressively in social situations than submissive children, who are characterized by pronounced control in social situations and a more positive attitude towards others. Similarly, adolescents with negative attitudes and low self-control respond more aggressively than submissive ones, with greater control in social situations and more positive attitudes toward others (Grumm & Collani, 2009; Mofrad & Mehrabi, 2015). These results also indicate that diligence, agreeableness, and self-efficacy for self-control place adolescents on a continuum where assertive («steady») and aggressive («out of control») are at opposite ends of the continuum, and submissive («dependent») occupy the central position. Adolescents classified as «resilient» have the highest scores for prosocial behavior and the lowest scores for aggressiveness. Representatives of the «uncontrollable» group had higher rates of aggressiveness (and the lowest scores on prosocial behavior) compared to those who belonged to the «stable» group. At the same time, the «dependent» group showed higher scores for both prosocial behavior and aggressiveness [12; 13].

Thus, in a study by V. Tovt, the results of an analysis of the psychological characteristics of manifestations of aggressive behavior an adolescent individual are presented [7]. An attempt to consider the main approaches to the study of aggressiveness allowed the author to establish the following. There is no single approach to the study of this concept, and the approaches that are presented in
foreign and domestic psychology complement each other, revealing different aspects of this problem. Analysis of the provisions considered made it possible to define aggression as antisocial behavior that violates any social or cultural norms. Diagnosis of aggressive and hostile personality reactions (using the Bassa-Darka method), which was carried out in 2021 on a sample of students (1st and 2nd year university students), made it possible to obtain a description of a group of individuals with a dominance of various indicators of aggressiveness. Representatives of the sample show suspicion and resentment most of all, and negativism and pronounced physical aggression to a lesser extent. The author suggests that these results may indicate that the majority of those surveyed are not inclined to use physical force against other persons (both in the form of passive resistance and in the form of active struggle), against the customs and laws established in the social environment. A limited portion of those examined have high scores on the aggressiveness scale, which indicates a stable tendency to aggressively eliminate and destroy obstacles, to overcome everything that opposes or may oppose the individual. The peculiarities of this part of the sample include the fact that aggressiveness can manifest itself in the active aggravation of conflict situations, in angry verbal gestures and reactions, in demonstrating a threat or in the desire to use physical force [9].

High values were obtained on the hostility scale, which indicates a pronounced tendency of the surveyed to feel negative emotions regarding others, manifested in feelings of disappointment, irritability, manifestations of undisguised hostility, outbursts of anger, and negative assessments of the personal qualities of those to whom hostility is manifested. The examined often display suspicion and resentment, and a tendency to direct and indirect verbal aggression. However, almost half of the group in conflict behavior are inclined to cooperate, but at the same time to maximum satisfaction of their own interests in the conflict and only partially the interests of the opponent. Some have a significant level of physical aggression, which can manifest itself in withdrawal from the social environment and inhibition of manifestations. It has been shown that their irritability manifests itself in the transfer of actions from an «unattainable» object to an «attainable» one. Suspicion, which is noted among those examined, is often accompanied, in interaction with other personality traits, by a manifestation of cynicism [ibid, p. 32].

The leading external and internal determinants of the formation of aggressiveness, which are observed in young people, have been identified [1]. These include, first of all, the observation of the aggressive behavior of other people in a variety of living conditions (cinema, martial arts, computer games). It also seems reasonable to identify a complex of situational environmental factors, including discomfort, large crowds of people, a socially hostile environment, pain, climatic conditions, an acute reaction to stress, which can cause a persistent manifestation of aggression in verbal or physical form. At the same time, the influence of factors will
enhance the manifestation of aggressiveness in the case when certain personal characteristics contribute to this. These, first of all, include high environmental hostility, low levels of logical and emotional intelligence, negative affectivity, high emotional reactivity (quick reaction to negative events), high or low self-esteem, as well as such negative personality traits as envy, vindictiveness, the tendency to attribute aggressive intentions to others (ibid, p. 64).

Specially organized studies have found in adolescents the presence of relationships between aggressiveness and character accentuations [4]. Analysis of the data that was obtained using the methodology for assessing the level of aggressiveness showed that the majority of the examined corresponded to the optimal level of its manifestation. The peculiarities of this sample also include a pronounced tendency towards indirect verbal aggression. As a result of the study, correlation analysis also made it possible to identify the presence of stable statistically significant relationships between character accentuations and aggressive behavior of the individual. Thus, persons with hyperthymic, dysthymic, psychosthenic, schizoid and conformal types of character accentuations are not characterized by manifestations of aggressiveness and hostility; they are not characterized by outbursts of anger, physical or verbal aggression. On the contrary, persons who have strictly defined types of character accentuations (emotive, stuck, exalted, demonstrative, unbalanced, asthenico-neurotic, epileptoid, hysterical and unstable types) are not only prone to displays of hostility and aggressiveness, but also to outbursts of anger, manifestations of physical and verbal aggression. These results indicate that individuals with a pronounced emotive type of accentuation have more pronounced levels of aggressiveness and hostility, and this type of accentuation is characterized by both a tendency to anger and manifestations of physical and verbal aggression. The distinctive features of this type include special impressionability and sensitivity (ibid, p. 97).

Analysis of situations that contribute to the choice of the type and form of aggression, making of threatening decisions, and the manifestation of aggressiveness, made it possible to identify several equivalent reasons for their occurrence. The main ones include the following: a low level of self-regulation and formation of volitional properties; insufficient professional motivation; unfulfilled ambitions of a professional; increased conflict; lack of skills to establish contacts in a professional group; low ability to maintain business relationships; fatigue, overwork and overload at work; inability to exert a psychological influence on people when searching for solutions in activities; unwillingness to show tolerance for someone else’s position when discussing professional problems; the desire to change or destroy the conditions for the successful functioning of others; and so on. [1; 4; 5; 10; 11; 12; 13]. For the purposes of this analysis, the results of a study that revealed the relationship between hostility, aggressiveness and indicators of
subjective localization of control are also of interest: individuals with an external locus of control have higher levels of both aggressiveness and hostility, and there is no control over their aggressive feelings, thoughts, attitudes and reactions [7]. An analysis of the works of foreign researchers also showed that the most important factor in the manifestation of physical aggression in activity is the insufficient level of both psychological and professional preparedness, as well as the presence of specific professional stress loads. As a result, the line between the acceptable use of aggression to solve professional problems (for example, enhancing the effect of influence) and excessive manifestation of physical aggression by a specialist is very conditional [12].

It is important to note that in modern conditions, solving complex problems of professional activity that require contact with the manager and other members of the professional group, in most cases, is carried out with a high level of responsibility and psycho-emotional stress. In individuals prone to open manifestations of aggressiveness, the situation of threat and the need to «fight» triggers an aggressive complex, which is formed by three components and can manifest itself in both the type of attack and/or defense. The complex includes aggression as a psycho-emotional state, aggressiveness as an integral personality property and aggressive behavior as a behavioral reaction to danger or threat (non-existent danger that is created by the imagination) [8]. In addition, it is necessary to take into account that the components of the complex in any combination can cause destructive behavior of a professional – such activity that is aimed at destroying (either the subject, or the object of influence, or relationships in a situation of interaction between professionals).

It should also be noted that researchers do not have the same views on the definition of the concept of «aggressiveness». So, by aggressiveness they mean:

– inclination, selective focus of the individual on activity, activity of a certain type (E. Zmanovska, D. Richardson, R. Beron);

– specificity of the individual’s response to internal, mental changes or changes in the state of the external environment (K. Bütnner, H. Vilfing, V. Huldan);

– characteristics of the psycho-emotional state of the individual, which reflects all the uniqueness of individuality (the course of mental processes in connection with the characteristics of mental states) (A. Bass, I. Boiko);

– leading typological personality trait, characterological feature, generalized characteristic of personality behavior (E. Fromm, L. Sobchik, V. Mendelevych, A. Nalchadzhian);

– a complex systemic personality property, a stable feature and a relatively constant integral characteristic that determines the consistency and constancy of certain behavior patterns (V. Znakov, E. Ilin, A. Rean, A. Ratinov) (Drozdov, Skok, 2000; Mikhailoiva, 2017; Mikhailyshyn, Ilina, 2021).
Summarizing a short theoretical analysis of the literature on the problem, we will accept two working concepts – aggression and personality aggressiveness. Aggression in this work is understood as a specific form of human action, which is characterized by the use of force against another person or group of people, causing physical or psychological harm and is generated by the need for self-affirmation, the desire for achievement, as well as protection from actions that are imposed on the individual [2]. Aggressiveness is considered as a personality trait, which is expressed in the inclination and readiness to implement aggressive actions in the process of achieving one’s own goals [7, p. 152]. In a situation of choice and decision making, aggressiveness takes the form of a threat – the intention to commit aggression or implement various aggressive actions. It is the «threat» component in the structure of decisiveness that performs not only the function of launching aggressive actions (in a form and volume acceptable for resolving the situation), activating aggressive forms and types of aggression, aggressive actions, but also the function of monitoring their implementation.

The aim of this paper is to analyze the psychological characteristics of making aggressive decisions, as well as the relationships between the aggressive component of decisiveness and other personality properties (personal aggressiveness, volitional properties, decision making properties).

In this regard, the main objectives of the study are:

– theoretical analysis of works on this issue and determination of an approach to studying the specifics of aggressive choice, making aggressive decisions, in the structure of decisiveness as an integral personality trait;

– justification for the choice of aggressiveness as a structural component of the block of decisiveness «energy», which directs the aggressiveness of the individual to the destruction (suppression) of the subject, object or relationships of the decision maker’s personality;

– development of an empirical research program and design of a set of diagnostic tools that are adequate to the aim of the study;

– conducting empirical research, statistical processing of the results obtained;

– analysis of the nature of the relationship between aggressiveness as a property of decisiveness and other personality properties, determination of the characteristics of making aggressive decisions by an individual.

Main body. To verify the stated assumption, an empirical investigation was carried out. It involved full-time and part-time master degree students at the State Institution «South-Ukrainian National Pedagogical University named after K. D. Ushynsko», with a total of 41 people. The age of the examined was from 24 to 52. Those surveyed had some professional experience (teachers, economists, civil servants, etc.). These conditions confirmed the high level and completeness of self-actualization of the individual for these conditions of professionalization.
A set of methods was designed to diagnose indicators of selected personality traits, which included [6; 7]: questionnaire «Diagnosis of the level of development of reflexivity» (RFO) by V. Ponomareva; «Questionnaire for decision-making» (OPR-53) by H. Eysenck; «Achievement motivation test-questionnaire» by A. Mehrabian; modification of the MBTI «Opposition» by T. Shalaieva; V. Chumakov’s «Volitional qualities of personality» method; O. Sannikov’s «Multidimensional Scales of Decisiveness» (MSD) method; «Methodology for diagnosing indicators and forms of aggression» by A. Bass, A. Durkee. Processing of the obtained data was carried out with the help of quantitative and qualitative analyzes and the computer software IBM Statistics SPSS 23.0.

The choice of the Bassa-Darki questionnaire was made purposefully, as it makes it possible to obtain a detailed picture of the severity of the characteristics of aggressiveness in those examined. The authors identified two types of hostility (resentment and suspicion) and five types of aggression (physical, indirect, irritation, negativism and verbal aggression). The authors used a Likert scale (from 1 to 5) as a tool for assessing the choice of subjects. The content of the physical and verbal aggression scales reflects causing harm to others and represents an instrumental or motor component of aggressive behavior. The anger scale includes physiological arousal and preparation for aggression, essentially being the emotional or affective component of aggressive behavior. The hostility scale, as a cognitive component of individual behavior, includes the manifestation of feelings of resentment and suspicion [10].

**Results of correlation analysis.** The correlation relationships of the studied indicators (decisiveness, aggressiveness of the individual, decision making properties) are presented in Figure 1.

Analysis of the correlation relationships between decisiveness scales, including the threat scale (choosing and making aggressive decisions) and indicators of personality aggressiveness, allowed us to establish the following patterns. Firstly, positive statistically significant relationships between the choice of threat (TrC) and the aggressiveness index, AI (0.881 at the 1% level of significance) and its structural components were identified: physical aggression, As (0.608 at the 1% level), irritability, Ir (0.588 at the 1% level), 1% level of significance) and verbal aggression (0.657 at 1% level of significance). Secondly, positive statistically significant relationships were identified between the threat of resolve indicator (TrC) and the hostility index, HI (0.415 at 1% significance level) and its components: resentment, Rs (0.331 at 5% level) and suspicion, Sp (0.383 at 5 % level). Thirdly, positive statistically significant connections were identified between individual indicators of aggressiveness and scales of personal decisiveness: the indicator of indirect aggression, Ih, with spontaneity, SpR (0.352 at the 5% level of significance); indicator of suspicion, Sp, with dogmatism, DgR (0.367 at the 5% level); indicator
of verbal aggression, \( Vh \), with foresight, \( DvR \) (0.350 at the 5% level of statistical significance).
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\begin{align*}
\text{SpR} & \quad \downarrow \quad \text{Ih} \\
\text{Frs} & \quad \downarrow \quad \text{Vh} \\
\text{AvR} & \quad \downarrow \quad \text{As} \\
\text{AI} & \quad \downarrow \quad \text{ImP} \quad \downarrow \quad \text{Rrt} \quad \downarrow \quad \text{TrC} \\
\text{Qt} & \quad \downarrow \quad \text{HI} \quad \downarrow \quad \text{Ind} \\
\text{HI} & \quad \downarrow \quad \text{Ind} \\
\text{AsP} & \quad \downarrow \quad \text{Ng} \\
\text{Dgm} & \quad \downarrow \quad \text{Sp}
\end{align*}
\]

**Fig. 1.** Relationships between indicators of aggressiveness and personality decisiveness scales.

Note: 1) – positive relationship at the level of 5% (\( \rho \leq 0.05 \)); – positive relationship at the level of 1% (\( \rho \leq 0.01 \)); – negative relationship at the level of 5% (\( \rho \leq 0.05 \)); – negative relationship at the level of 1% (\( \rho \leq 0.01 \)); 2) abbreviations are used here and in the following meanings: a) conventional designations of decisiveness indicators (according to the MSD method, «Multidimensional scales of

Finally, negative statistically significant correlations were found between indicators of aggressiveness and decisiveness scales: I) indicator of physical aggression, As, with indicator of adventurism, AvP (-0.346 at the 5% level of statistical significance); II) the irritation indicator, Ir, with swiftness, StP (-0.452 at the 1% level), with riskiness, RkP (-0.471 at the 1% level) and adventurousness of choice, AvP (-0.332 at the 5% level of significance); III) the indicator of negativity, Ng, with assertiveness, AsP (-0.346 at the 5% level) and with independence, NzP (-0.325 at the 5% level of significance); IV) the indicator of resentment, Rs, with impetuosity, StR (-0.335 at the 5% level of significance), with riskiness, RkR (-0.329 at the 5% level) and with independence, self-sufficiency, WIP (-0.423 at the 1% level of statistical significance); V) indicator of guilt, Qt, with swiftness, StP (-0.335 at the 5% level), with riskiness, RkP (-0.329 at the 5% level of significance); VI) indicator of Aggression Index, AI, with swiftness, StP (-0.334 at the 5% level) and adventurousness of choice, AvP (-0.343 at the 5% level of significance); VII) indicator of Hostility Index, HI, with independence, NzP (-0.491 at the 1% level of statistical significance).

In addition, positive and negative relationships between the threat of decisiveness and the characteristics of an individual’s decision-making were obtained [6]. Positive statistically significant relationships were found between threat (TrC) and reflexivity of the past, RfP (0.340 at 5% significance level), with rigidity in decision making, Rgd (0.434 at 1% level) and personal anxiety in a choice situation, OT (0.343 at 5% level of statistical significance). Negative statistically significant relationships between threat (TrC) and motivation to achieve success in decision making, MDs (-0.342 at the 5% level of significance), with the perceptive type indicator of the MBTI indicator, P (-0.325 at the 5% level of statistical significance), and with property of the will – decisiveness, Dsv (-0.439 at the 1% level).

The results of the correlation analysis confirmed the possibility of comparing the psychological characteristics that are studied and allowed us to carry out a qualitative analysis of the data obtained.

To study the forms of aggression in individuals with high and low levels of aggressive decisiveness, the «profiles» method was used [8]. During the analysis of
empirical data obtained by assessing aggressiveness, the «threat» component of decisiveness, three groups of individuals were identified that showed maximum, minimum and average values. The group of people who had a high level of threat indicator in a decision making situation (TrC+) included 8 examined people, the second group included 11 examined people who had a low level of aggressiveness in decision making (TrC-), and the third group included 22 persons with an average level of aggressive decisiveness. The first and second groups (TrC+ and TrC-, respectively) were selected for comparative analysis. Profiles of types and forms of aggression (according to the Bassa-Darka method) among representatives of groups with different levels of threat are presented in Fig. 2.

On the X-axis are indicators of types and forms of aggression, on the Y-axis are their values, which represent the average assessment of each indicator among representatives of the selected groups, which is expressed in deviations from the average line of a number of the surveyed sample. Values that lie in the plane above the midline of the series characterize a tendency towards a strong manifestation of this type and form of aggression; values of indicators below the midline of the series indicate a tendency towards weak manifestation of the studied property of aggressiveness.

![Graph showing aggressiveness profiles](image)

**Fig. 2** Aggressiveness profiles (according to the Bass-Darka method) in individuals who differ in the level of threat of decisiveness (TrC+, TrC-).
Visually, significant differences were identified in the same indicators of different groups of aggressive choice. The most pronounced indicators in the aggressive choice group (TrC+) are the level of physical aggression (As), irritation (Ir), verbal aggression (Vh) and the general indicator - Aggression Index (AI). In the first comparison group (TrC+), all indicators that form the aggressiveness index are higher than in the second group (TrC−). In the second group, indicators of indirect aggression (Ih), negativism (Ng), suspicion (Sp), feelings of guilt (Qt) and the Hostility Index (HI) are consistently expressed. In terms of negativism (Ng), resentment (Rs) and suspicion (Sp), the group with a high level of threat (TrC+) differs slightly from the other group (TrC−). The indicators of irritation (Ir) and Aggression Index (AI) differ the most: the spread of values is greatest in both groups (TrC+, TrC−).

The results of a comparative analysis show that a high level of threat of decisiveness in a situation of choice and decision making activates such properties of personality aggressiveness as irritation, physical and verbal aggression, which manifest themselves in negative feelings even with slight arousal (ardor, rudeness), including through verbal reactions (both through the form and content of verbal responses), up to and including the use of physical force against another person.

In the group with a low level of threat of decisiveness, tendencies towards the manifestation of such types of aggression as suspicion, negativism, guilt and indirect aggression were identified. Representatives of this group are characterized by distrust and caution towards others, resistance in a passive form to the established order on the part of management, as well as aggression that is directed at another person indirectly (evil jokes and gossip), or at no one at all (for example, outbursts of rage).

Conclusions:
1. Based on a comparative analysis of materials on the research problem, the concept of «threat» as an aggressive indicator of a person’s decisiveness, which is considered as a tendency to choose and make aggressive decisions, is clarified. Threat is one of the characteristics of a person’s decisiveness, it is a component of the ergicity block, which manifests itself in professional self-realization. Threat is one of the most informative predictors of choosing and making aggressive decisions in the implementation of management functions in hybrid sociotechnical systems (information and social).

2. Assessing the status of a threat as a property of decisiveness, it is necessary to highlight its main functions (the function of launching aggressive actions in a form and volume acceptable for resolving the situation, and the function of monitoring their implementation), as well as options for directing the aggressive component of resolve (at the object, subject and relationships between subjects).
3. It has been confirmed that in a modern professional, threat as a characteristic of decisiveness is consistently associated with a complex of such professionally important personality traits as reflexivity of the past, rigidity, personal anxiety and aggressiveness.

3. Aggressiveness is considered as a personality trait, which manifests itself in the inclination and readiness for aggressive actions in the process of achieving one’s own goals. Aggression is understood as a specific form of human action, which is characterized by the use of force against another person or group of people, causing physical or psychological harm and is generated by the need for self-affirmation, the desire for achievement, as well as protection from actions imposed on the individual. As a result of the study, it was established that persons with a high level of threat are characterized by the manifestation of such types of aggression as irritation, physical and verbal aggression. Representatives of the group with a low level of threat are characterized by suspicion, negativism, guilt and indirect aggression.

**Prospects for further research.** The study showed the presence of many statistically significant connections between the threat of decisiveness and a set of professionally important personality traits. Further study of the problem can be aimed at finding factors influencing the threat of decisiveness through theoretical analysis and special modelling of the conditions for conducting empirical research.
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