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In order to get a useful idea to make military officers selection test, this study is done about what personal factors are more commonly related to successful leadership. First of all, this problem is discussed under following four headings; (1) Trait approach (2) Typological approach (3) Functional, Situational approach (4) Social Psychological approach.

After that, I get a useful idea from Maddi’s personality theories. Then, I summarize the main points of his theory and try to relate his theory to leadership.
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I worked ever in Japanese Air Self Defense Force (JASDF) as a personnel officer. It seems to me that after World War II, the problem in personnel such as airmen classification test, pilot selection test and airmen proficiency test in JASDF, has reached a certain level which was to be satisfied in the view of personnel administration.

But, the personnel officers have many problems to solve or develop in the future. I presume that how to assess and train the high rank officers like Captain, Major, and Lieutenant Colonel will be the most important in these problems.

Frederiksen tried to determine what aspects of their work the officers were expected to perform more effectively as a consequence of the training in the Command and Staff School.

Preston used the Critical Incident Technique in the order to get a practical simple, direct evaluation form to provide early identification of officers both for elimination and for an accelerated advancement. As a result, he suggested some elements required to the successful officers.

The categories including these elements are very similar to Frederiksen’s results. So, I try to match the two results in the Table 1.

According to these results, I think that leadership is a very important factor as well as technical skill to be required as officer. Gibb also discussed the importance of Military leadership in officer selection.

Then, in the process of thinking about personal factors associated with leaderships, I would like to get some useful ideas about personalities and leadership in making officer selection test in the future.

The history of the “leadership” concept highlights the shifting focus in theoretical orientation. Early leadership research focused on the leader himself, to the virtual exclusion of other variables. It was assumed that leadership effectiveness could be explained by isolating psychological and physical characteristics or traits, which were presumed to differentiate the leader from other members of his group.

But, there is considerable agreement among those who have given the matter extended thought and examination that leadership is definitely not unitary human commodity.

With the fall from grace of the trait approach, the emphasis swung away from the leader as an entity complete unto himself. Instead, the situationalist approach came to
the fore. The situationalist does not necessarily abandon the search for significant leader characteristics, but they attempt to look for them in situations containing common elements.

More recently the follower has been systematically considered as a major variable in the leadership research. This approach focuses on personal needs, assuming that the most effective leader is the one who most nearly satisfies the need of his followers.

Thus, we can say that leadership is both a function of the social situation and a function of personality, but it is a function of these two in interaction. “Leadership” is a concept applied to the personality-environment relation to describe the situation when one or at most a very few, personalities are so placed in the environment that his or their “will, feeling and insight direct and control others in pursuit of a cause.”

What personal factors are more commonly related to successful leadership behavior? I would like to discuss these topics under following four headings; 1. Trait Approach 2. Typological Approach 3. Functional, Situational Approach 4. Social Psychological Approach.

1. Trait Approach

The total list of traits is actually long if we include every trait that have any probability at all of contributing to success. If we look Stogdill’s article, we can get some perspective of traits associated with leadership. He reviewed 124 leadership studies focused on personal characteristics of following earlier similar reviews by Smith and Krueger and Jenkkins.

I would like to point out some traits that will be especially related to the latter section in this paper.

1. **Height** is usually found to be positively related to leadership.
2. According to many researchers (Bellingratn, Brown, Cox, Stray, and Wetzel), leader are characterized by a high rate of **Energy output**.
3. Many study showed high correlation between leadership and **Fluency of Speech**.
4. In addition to **Soundness and Finality of Judgment**, Cowley also found three factors that appeared to represent **Speed of Decision**.
5. The general trend of many studies suggests that leaders rate higher than followers in **Self Confidence and Self Esteem**.
6. According to Chevale–Ianouskaia, leaders are characterized by predominance of **Excitation over inhibition**.
7. Fairly high positive correlations (around .50) between **Sociability** and leadership are reported by many studies.
8. Cox also reported that great leaders rate outstandingly high in sense of **Cooperate spirit**.

Stogdill after examining these leadership studies, comes to the following conclusion; “the qualities, characteristics and skills required in a leader are determined to a large extent by the demands of the situation in which he is to function as a leader.”

2. Typological Approach

The early stage of the study of an area of behavior has been marked often by a wealth of typologist.

A list of leadership “types” provided by Fisher suggests that Leadership has had many meanings:

---

**Table 1. Relationship between Preston’s result and Frederiksen’s result related to elements required to successful officers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preston’s result</th>
<th>Frederiksen’s result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Proficiency in Handling Administrative Details</td>
<td>I. Efficient Use of Routines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Proficiency in Supervising Personnel</td>
<td>II. Evaluate data effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Proficiency in Planning and Directing Action</td>
<td>III. Foresight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Acceptance of Organizational Responsibility</td>
<td>IV. Effective Guidance of the Decision-Making function of the Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Acceptance of Personal Responsibility</td>
<td>V. Flexibility, Adaptability, and Willingness to introduce change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. Proficiency in Duty Military Occupational Specialty</td>
<td>VI. Knowledge of Military</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Conway\(^{52}\): Compellers vs. Exponents vs. Representative
Smith\(^{50}\): Cognitive vs. Authoritative
Bogardus\(^{53}\): Direct vs. Indirect
Social vs. Mental
Autocratic vs. Paternalistics vs. Democrat
Burns\(^{54}\): Intellectual vs. Business
Small Group vs. Mass leader vs. Administrator

These typologies indicate an ideal leadership. A person sometimes has many types of these. So, by these concepts, we can not differentiate the person who has really leadership ability in the case of selecting personal, that is, it has no practical sense. Another problem is that these have different meanings depending upon culture because concepts of types are broad. These types also depend on the social situation as well as trait approach.

3. Functional, Situational approach

Functionalist assumes that the effects of leadership is the function of demands of organization (or situation) for the leader.

According to Tannenbaum\(^{19}\), one larger company has formally defined supervision (leadership) in terms of the following six requirements (functions).

1. Planning: Make flexible plans regarding the work of subordinates.
2. Organization: Make good use of allotted time. Organize the job to be done in such a manner that the people doing that job clearly understand their responsibilities.
3. Controlling: See, through effective follow-up, that others do the job you have planned and organized.
4. Communication: Express yourself clearly concisely in written or oral communication.
5. Delegation: Be receptive to duties delegated to you and be assured that duties delegated out are performed. Use good judgment in delegation.
6. Acceptance of Responsibility: Accept the responsibility of your job performance and of the people reporting to you. Use good judgment in areas where responsibilities have not been defined and then take the responsibilities for making decisions in these areas.

I can recall that these requirements reconcile to the categories of Table 1. to a great extent.

Functionalist does not say to differentiate leadership because each situation is unique, consequently each situations require unique leadership.

Brown\(^{20}\) said that leader’s function is to keep the emotional climate constant through many changing situations, to keep the situations which seem to demand the dictator or the agitator from arising. A good leader is the man or woman who is most fitted to take charge in a given situation.

4. Social Psychological Approach

Reviewing previous three approaches, we can conclude that different types of group require different type of leadership.

But this knowledge is not very helpful unless we can also specify the exact conditions under which each of these leadership type will work best.

Social psychological approach is fairly recently developed. I think Fiedler’s article\(^{21}\) is a good example of this approach. Then, I would like to mention his main point of view as an example of social psychological approach.

In order to measure leadership effectiveness, he used a simple test which is called his least preferred co-worker (LPC). Leader with high LPC scores tend to be permissive, non-directive, consideration in their reactions to group members while leaders with low scores tend to be directive, managing, task controlling in their leadership behavior.

Then, he administered the test to a wide variety of groups. These studies have yielded high correlation between the LPC score of the leader and measure of actual group performance. However, in some studies the permissive, considerate leaders had the best performing groups while the managing, controlling, directive leaders had groups which yielded the best results in other case.

A review of these studies indicated the need for system of classification which identify the type of leader required for a particular group and task. Then, he suggested a classification based on three major factors.

1. Leader–Member relation—These involve the degree to which the leader is personally accepted and liked, that is, the member’s esteem for, and loyalty to, their leader. If the leader has no the loyalty and confidence of his group he needs little else to influence the group.

2. Task structure—When the task is highly structured, the organization through its group leader can control how well the task will be done. The unstructured task obviously presents a much more difficult situation for the leader than does a task which can be neatly
programmed and controlled.

(3) Power of position—Finally, he considers the power inherent in the position of the leader apart from his personal attraction or ability to command respect and loyalty.

Having measured or judged each of the group–task situations on the three dimensions, he located the group–task situation in three dimensional space represented by a cube (Fig 1).

Each dimension of the cube represents a vital factor affecting group performance. Groups falling into cell 1, have good leader–member relations, high task structure, and leader has a powerful position. In contrast, group cell 8, has low task structure, the leaders are weak and have relatively poor relation with the group.

Then, he can ask whether difficult situations require different types of attitudes on the part of the leader. This was done by plotting the correlation between the leader’s LPC score and performance of group for each type of group task situation. The result shows that managing, controlling, directive leaders tend to be most effective in the situations which are either very favorable for them or which are relatively unfavorable. Non–directive, permissive considerate leader tend to perform best in situations of intermediate difficulty.

Fiedler showed for these results to fit everyday experience and also tested the various hypothesis by administrating the model in multi–lingual military group of the Belgian Navy.

We have examined personal factors related with leadership at preceding section from various viewpoints.

In order to guide the research in the future, or to select the most appropriate method and systematize or generalize the finding results, we must have some idea about personality theory to understand leadership more fully.

I think Maddi’s personality theory is most suitable to understanding leadership behavior. Therefore, I try to relate his personality theory to leadership in this section.

In organizing personality theory, he proposed to distinguish between the core and periphery of personality. The core of personality is common to all people and discloses the inherent attributes of man. These common features do not change much in the course of living, and exert an extensive, pervasive influence on behavior.

On the other hand, the periphery of personality is much more concrete and close to behavior that can be readily observed. These attributes are generally learned, rather than inherent, and have a relatively circumscribed influence on behavior.

He also thought that the link between the core and periphery of personality is usually assumed to be development.

1. The core of personality

Fiske and Maddi said that core personality is that the person will attempt to maintain the level of activation to which he is accustomed. According to them, activation is a neuropsychological concept, referring on the psychological side to the common core of meaning in such terms as
Having offered a rough definition of activation, Fiske and Maddi concern themselves with the determinants of the state of excitation. They implicate three dimensions of stimulation and three sources of stimulation.

The three dimension of stimulation are intensity, meaningfulness and variation. **Intensity**, to be defined in terms of physical energy, is an obvious attribute of stimulation. **Meaningfulness** is defined as the significance or importance of a stimulus for the experiencing organism. In considering **variation**, they make a number of points, with in brief they are change, novelty, unexpectedness.

The three sources stipulated by Fiske and Maddi are exteroceptive, interoceptive and cortical. **Exteroceptive** stimulation involves chemical, electrical, or mechanical excitation of the sense organs sensitive to events in the external world. In contrast, **Interoceptive** stimulation refers to such excitation of the sense organs sensitive to events within the body itself. By **cortical** stimulation, they suggest that the cortex itself be considered one of the actual sources of stimulation by reviewing the recent discovery that the cortex not only receives, but also sends nerve fibers to the reticular formation, which is the implicated subcortical center.

Having considered actual level of activation, which is given at any moment in time by the total impact of stimulation, they turn to the customary level of activation. Fiske and Maddi assume that the levels of activation experienced by a person over the course of many days tend to be fairly similar. Over time, the person should come to experience a particular level of activation as normal or usual for a particular part of the day. These normal, usual, customary levels of activation can be roughly measured by averaging the actual activation curve for a person over a period of some days. Such measurement was accomplished by Kleirtman, who found a regularity which he called the “cycle of existence”.

Their core tendency refers to the attempt on the part of the person to maintain actual activation at the level which is customary for a given time of the day. If actual activation deviates from customary level, impact-modifying behavior is instituted. Two kinds of deviation are possible. When actual activation level is above that which is customary, impact-increasing behavior occurs. When actual activation level is below that which is customary, impact-decreasing behavior occurs.

I think that the theory of Fiske and Maddi is a good example of what is called a homeostatic position.

2. The Periphery of Personality

Elaborating upon the core theorizing he and Fiske have offered, Maddi has developed a view of the periphery of personality, including an emphasis upon both concrete peripheral characteristics and their organization into types of personality. The first consideration is the characteristic curve of activation. Activation customarily rises sharply after waking, then more gradually to some point in the middle of the day, then begins to decline gradually, and finally decline more rapidly as sleep is approached. But Maddi and Propst hold out the possibility that there may be differences among people concerning the sharpness of rise and fall, and the point during the day when the shift from rising to falling takes place.

The second basic consideration of similarity and difference between people involves the average height of a person’s characteristic curve of activation. It is the distinction between high-activation and low-activation people. High-activation people will spend the major part of their time and effort pursuing stimulus impact in order to keep their actual levels from falling too low, whereas low-activation people will spend the major part of their time and effort avoiding impact so as to keep their actual activation level from getting too high.

The third consideration involves the anticipatory and correctional techniques used for maintaining actual activation at the characteristic level. We can recall that impact is considered a joint function of the intensity, meaningfulness, and variety of stimulation from interoceptive, cortical, and exteroceptive sources. The high-and-low activation personality types are both subdivided into three parts reflecting this distinction concerning preference for particular stimulus attributes. High-activation people who favor intensity, meaningfulness or variety are considered to have an approach motive for intensity, meaningfulness or variety, respectively. Low-activation people for whom intensity, meaningfulness or variety, is most salient are considered to have an avoidance motive for intensity, meaningfulness or variety, respectively.

At this point, it should be clear that Maddi is offering a
typology of peripheral personality including three high- and three low-activation types, with the three sub-division of each major types bearing content resemblances. So, for example, the high-activation-need for meaningfulness person would spend most of his time and effort in instrumental behavior aimed at the goal of increasing the meaningfulness of his experience, with this concrete directionality serving the overall function of keeping his actual activation level from falling too low. Just the opposite would be true for the low-activation fear of meaningfulness person.

In order to gain further understanding of the activation theory position on peripheral personality, it is necessary to introduce additional distinction. One has to do with the favored source of stimulation. Here Maddy, Propst and Feldinger collapse the three distinctions offered by Fiske and Maddi into tow, the internal and the external. As the distinction between cortical and interceptive sources postulated by Fiske and Maddi will undoubtedly be quite hard to make in practice, in simplification suggested by Maddi et al. seems reasonable. In any event, it is considered important to know whether the person is oriented toward internal or external sources of stimulation. This distinction recognizes that one way of regulating impact is to look to sources of stimulation essentially outside the body (anything from thunderclaps or wind to music or pictures) whereas another way is to turn within the organism (focusing on anything from thoughts or daydreams to pain or dizziness). The former orientation is called external trait and the latter the internal trait, with the term trait being used in the manner of McClelland to emphasize habitual rather than motivational behavior.

Moreover, Maddi offers yet another distinction that must taken into account in understanding the activation position on peripheral personality. It is the distinction between the active and the passive trait. The person with the active trait has the habit of initiative, such that he influences his external and even internal stimulus environment, whereas the person with the passive trait is habitually indolent, permitting himself to be influenced by internal and external stimuli over which he has no subjective sense of control.

Then Madd’s personality types make total of 24 in all. Again I would like to express his personality traits by cube (see, Figure 2). For example, personality falling into cell 1, presents the high-activation person with active and external trait. Each cells also have three different types respectively according to motive for intensity, meaningfulness, and variety.

So for, Maddi’s presentation of the typology has been very abstract. It lacks vividness for us. Although he tried to describe the types a little more fully, I have no room to write details of those. If you have interest in those, please...
3. Relation between Personality Theory and Leadership

I think there is the most suitable personality for leader in these 24 personality types depending upon his situation. For example, Maddi described about the personality of the high-activation person with active and external traits. It will be a “go-getter”, seeking out challenges to meet in the physical and social environment. He will be energetic and voracious in his appetites. Interested in a wide range of concrete, tangible events and things, he will be a hard man to keep up with. Although he will not be especially hampered by pressures toward conformity, he will tend to be a man of facts, not fancies. He will not spend much time in rumination or daydreaming. He will be straightforward and not complex and subtle so much as extensively committed and enthusiastic. He will want to encounter people and things rather continuously. If he also has a high need for meaningfulness, he will be a pursuer of cases and problems, a statesman, businessman, or journalist, rather than a scholar. But if he has a high need for intensity, he may pursue, action and tumult per se, being an athlete or soldier or bon vivant. And if he has a high need for variety, he will show curiosity about causes and mechanism governing men and things, being adventurer, explorer, or world traveler.

These characteristic descriptions coincide with personality which I point out as a certain trait required as a successful leader in the previous section (III Personal Factor associated with Leadership).

I think that, depending upon the needs of the situation and the member of the group, certain personalities will be more pertinent and more in demand than others, some persons have the qualities that match more nearly the pattern of desired attribute than other’s have. It is also true that over a considerable range of situation and groups there are, after all, certain attributes required in common. In this sense it is meaningful to speak of leadership qualities that have a greater probability of being needed and of ensuring successes in JASDF.

Although the activation view of the periphery of personality has an unfinished quality because it is very recent development within the study of personality, Maddi discussed about empirical analysis by using objective method. Now I have no concrete idea what kind of test use in order assess successful leader in JASDF. But if I can combine Maddi’s idea with earlier theoretical efforts of other researchers that I have mentioned in this paper, I think that it is possible for me to make some selection test for JASDF.
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リーダーシップと性格
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この論文は軍隊における幹部選抜検査を作成するために有効な考え方を得るために行なわれた。このため、成功したリーダーシップにはどのような性格要因が共通して関連しているかについて研究した。そこで、先ずこの問題を次の4項目のもとに検討している。①特性論的アプローチ ②タイプ別アプローチ ③機能、状況的アプローチ ④社会、心理学的アプローチ

これらの研究の後、Maddi の性格理論から有用な知見を得たので、彼の理論の主要な部分を要約し、リーダーシップとの関連付けを試みた。