3-1-2006

Perceptions of the Characteristics of Good, Bad and Ordinary Workers on the Job: The Influence of Work Experience and Culture

Chong W. Kim
Marshall University, kim@marshall.edu

Andrew Sikula Sr.
Marshall University, sikula@marshall.edu

Harlan M. Smith II
Marshall University, smithh@marshall.edu

PERCEPTIONS OF THE CHARACTERISTICS OF GOOD, BAD, AND ORDINARY
WORKERS ON THE JOB:
THE INFLUENCE OF WORK EXPERIENCE AND CULTURE*

Chong W. Kim
Andrew Sikula, Sr.
Harlan M. Smith II

Correspondence:

Chong W. Kim
Professor and Division Head
Div. of Management & Marketing
Marshall University
One John Marshall Drive
Huntington, WV 25755
Voice: (304) 696-2682
Fax: (304) 696-6013
Email: kim@marshall.edu

Andrew Sikula, Sr.
Richard G. Miller Distinguished Professor of
Human Resource Management
Graduate School of Management
Marshall University
South Charleston, WV 25303
Voice: (304) 746-1956
Fax: (304) 746-2063
Email: sikula@marshall.edu

Harlan M. Smith II
Professor of Economics
Lewis College of Business
Marshall University
One John Marshall Drive
Huntington, WV 25755-2320
Voice: (304) 696-3233
Email: smithh@marshall.edu

Abstract

As noted in Kim & Sikula (2003; 2004), there are three types of people in the workplace: people of Necessity, Common people, and Parasites. A person of Necessity is irreplaceable, crucial to the functioning of an organization. The Common person is a worker of average ability and talent who makes no significant difference to the success of an organization. Parasites are detrimental freeloaders, harmful to the functioning of an organization.

In the 2004 paper we analyzed the survey responses of 25 students in an MBA Organizational Behavior class, and of 13 working managers, all in the United States. In this paper we replicate our 2004 study in a different cultural setting an MBA Organizational Behavior class in Bangalore, India--and then compare the results. The leading traits and behaviors that characterize the Necessity and Parasite categories, in both data sets, are very similar. Significant differences exist, however, between the data sets when it comes to identifying the leading traits and behaviors that define a Common worker. We conclude by exploring potential explanations for the similarities and differences, based on the respondents' work experience and cultural background.

Introduction

Human beings, by nature, are relational creatures. At any given time all people, regardless of their individual differences (e.g., age, gender, ethnic background), assume multiple roles in society, such as spouse, parent, employee, friend, club member, citizen of a city, town, or country, and member of a religious organization.

Within each of these roles there is always more than one person involved, from a very small number of members in an institution such as a marriage, to the very large number of members comprising the citizenship of a nation. No matter what type of role a person plays for a group at any given time, however, that person falls into one of three categories: the person of Necessity, the Common person, and the Parasite.

The most desirable category is that of Necessity. Without colleagues (or partners) who are Necessities, the group as a whole cannot conduct normal activities. The person of Necessity focuses his/her efforts on achieving the group's goals, and thus consistently makes valuable contributions to the success of the group. From the group's perspective, such a person is an enormous asset. The loss felt within the group by the departure of such an individual, consequently, is considerable. Comments made in the workplace, about a person of Necessity, include, "It would be hard to fill his shoes, or she is an excellent person, it's a shame to lose her."

The person of Necessity, however, may also be someone who works diligently without receiving much visibility or recognition within an organization (e.g., the faithful janitor who immaculately cleans the offices; the sports team member who sacrifices his/her individual statistics to do what is needed to help the team win). Either way, the person of Necessity occupies an important position. S/he provides the social Aglue which holds an organization

together and enables it to function as a cohesive whole.

Common workers, partners, or colleagues do not make a significant difference whether present or not. They are average performers who do not contribute much to the accomplishment of group goals. But neither do they harm group performance in any significant way. A Common person is not a self-starter, and tends to focus on just getting by. S/he does not provide significant input into group activities, and shows little willingness to participate in improving the functioning of the group. The Common person does only what s/he is told or what is absolutely required, but nothing extra. And such a person never volunteers. Employees in this category are the deadwood of an organization, going through the motions and often just waiting for retirement. They are easily replaceable and not missed much when they leave.

The third and least productive worker is the Parasite. This individual not only fails to contribute to group performance, but also harms the organization by acting as a leech and a drain on others. The Parasite is a loafer who desires a free ride, complains about everything, blames mistakes on others, and exudes pessimism in the workplace. The Parasite is not loyal to the organization, and cannot be trusted to contribute productively to the group's goals. Such a worker is like the bad apple, corrupting much of what s/he touches. Many group members wish the Parasite to go away as soon as possible, as the organization would be much better off not having such a person around.

The traits and behaviors that characterize a person of Necessity in a particular role may be different from the traits and behaviors that characterize a person of Necessity in a different role. In other words, the characteristics that make for Necessity in group relations are, to some extent, role-specific. For example, to be considered a Necessity as a spouse one must display patience, have a loving and caring attitude, and know how to compromise. To be considered a

Necessity as an academic administrator, however, one should demonstrate self-confidence, intelligence, responsibility, dedication to work, and supervisory ability.

For the purposes of this paper we focus on the characteristics that are exhibited by the person of Necessity, the Common person, and the Parasite in the workplace, as employees. But workplace settings can vary in many ways. The characteristics that place workers into these three categories, therefore, may depend on the workers' occupations, assigned tasks, and positions in the organization's hierarchy. The structure of the organization itself also determines, in part, what traits and behaviors characterize each category of worker. More broadly, the state of technology and cultural attitudes towards age, gender, and ethnic background also matter.

Nevertheless, we argue that identifying a general set of traits and behaviors that characterizes each of these three categories of workers across a wide range of workplace settings is useful for managers of organizations. Managers in any organization are interested in finding and attracting people of Necessity. Knowing the general traits and behaviors that characterize people of Necessity, Common workers, and Parasites should help managers recruit the right people. This knowledge can also help managers decide how to make good use of their current employees.

In our attempt to identify the general traits and behaviors of people of Necessity, Common workers, and Parasites we have collected three sets of survey data. Our first two sets of data were collected here in the U.S., from surveys done in undergraduate and MBA Organizational Behavior classes, and from a survey done of working managers. Our analysis of these data sets can be found in Kim & Sikula (2003) and Kim & Sikula (2004). In the next section we compare and contrast the results obtained in Kim & Sikula (2004) based on surveys

of U.S. MBA students and working managers with the results obtained from an identical survey we administered in an MBA Organizational Behavior class in Bangalore, India.

Collection and Organization of the Data

The data for Kim & Sikula (2004) were collected in the U.S., from 38 individuals, in July of 2003. Twenty-five were MBA students with significant work experience; 13 were managerial employees of one student's company. After we explained the meaning of Necessity, Common, and Parasite, we asked each student to voluntarily turn in a list of 10 traits and behaviors describing each type of person. Bonus points were offered as an incentive to participate. Neatly-typed entries of 30 traits and behaviors (10 for each category), having validity at first glance, earned seven points towards the student's course grade (out of a maximum 100 available during the semester). If the content and effort were sloppy, or if a student listed fewer than 10 traits and behaviors for each type of person, the student earned fewer points. All students who completed the exercise, however, did earn at least some bonus points.

The responses of the 38 individuals were evaluated for tabulation of the frequency with which they appeared among all the traits and behaviors listed by the entire sample for the categories of Necessity, Common, and Parasite. If any response was too generally stated, or too similar to the general concept of each category, it was discarded. For example, responses such as hard to replace and vital person explain what Necessity means and hence are not traits or behaviors that characterize the person of Necessity, so they were discarded.

A total of 1002 usable responses from the 38 individuals in the sample were included for frequency tabulation: 343 for Necessity, 314 for Common, and 345 for Parasite. These responses were then grouped together according to the words' synonyms and meanings, through a two-step process. First, we made a simple table for each category by listing all the responses,

from most frequent to least frequent. Our Research Assistant then constructed a more specific

frequency table by organizing all the responses in each category into a set of headings and

subheadings. Two examples illustrate the process. In developing the frequency table for the

Necessity category, he organized all the individual responses under subheadings such as

Responsible, Punctual, Dedicated, Organized, or Mature. He then placed these subheadings

under the broader heading of Reliable. The final frequency table for the Necessity category

contains 10 headings such as Reliable and Hard-working, with a varying number of subheadings

under each. In developing the frequency table for the Parasite category, he organized all the

individual responses under subheadings such as Selfish, Arrogant, Antagonistic, Disrespectful,

or Immature. He then placed these subheadings under the broader heading of Troublemaker.

The final frequency table for the Parasite category contains nine headings such as Troublemaker

and Incompetent, with a varying number of subheadings under each. The complete, final

frequency table for all three types of workers can be found in Appendix I.

We recently collected additional survey data, during June 2004, from 24 MBA students

in an Organizational Behavior class in Bangalore, India. This sample differs from the sample

studied in Kim & Sikula (2004) in two ways: the MBA students included are Indian, and do not

have much formal work experience. The process of collecting and analyzing this data was

identical to that followed in Kim & Sikula (2004). A total of 700 usable responses from the 24

individuals were included for frequency tabulation: 245 for Necessity, 237 for Common, and 218

for Parasite. After applying the two-step grouping process described above, the result was the

complete, final frequency table for all three types of workers, according to the survey responses

of the India students. This table can be found in Appendix II.

Analysis of the Data

In Table 1 below we identify the top five traits and behaviors for each type of worker, based on the frequency tables in Appendices I and II.

Table 1. Comparison Between the US and India Data Sets

	The US-MBA Sample	The India-MBA Sample
Sample Size & Subjects	38 total: 25 MBA students who also work; 13 working managers	24 total: Full-time MBA students without much work experience
Necessity	1. Reliable (64 frequencies) 2. Hard-working (56) 3. Friendly (38) 4. Motivated (36) 5. Knowledgeable (29)	1 & 2. Confident; Hard-working (40 frequencies each) 3. Reliable (36) 4. Friendly (34) 5. Good Communicator (29)
Common	1. Friendly (48) 2. Unmotivated (37) 3. Conforming (35) 4. Reliable (31) 5. Hard-working (29)	1. Conforming (42) 2. Unmotivated (36) 3 & 4. Ordinary; Incompetent (32 each) 5. Friendly; Unreliable; Troublemaker; Inflexible (14 each)
Parasite	1. Troublemaker (114) 2. Lazy (56) 3. Unreliable (55) 4. Incompetent (38) 5. Immoral (35)	1. Troublemaker (82) 2. Unmotivated (39) 3. Conforming (26) 4. Immoral (22) 5. Unreliable (20)

As shown in Table 1, the key traits and behaviors that characterize a person of Necessity in the workplace are very similar across the data sets. Three of the five leading traits (Hard-working, Reliable, and Friendly) are identical. The other leading traits identifiedBMotivated, Knowledgeable, Confident, and Good Communicator are all positive and can be thought of as consistent in their description of a person of Necessity. In other words, all seven leading traits and behaviors identified across the two data sets do, in our view, characterize someone who would be considered a Necessity in the workplace.

The frequency tables for the Parasite category also yield similar results across the two

data sets. The characteristics Troublemaker, Immoral, and Unreliable appear among the top five in both data sets. The characteristics Lazy, Incompetent, and Unmotivated, while not in the top five in both data sets, are traits and behaviors that we believe characterize a Parasite in the workplace. The only key characteristic that, on the surface, does not appear consistent with our theoretical concept of a Parasite is Conforming. This raises a question: What do the Indian students mean by the word Conforming? The answer is found in Appendix II. The India sample frequency table lists the following words and phrases under the heading of Conforming: dependent, passive listener, does not take initiative, no leadership qualities, indecisive, weak-minded, coward, low or no self-esteem, no self-identity. These descriptions are negative and, while they might also be used by some to describe the Common worker, they can reasonably be understood as characterizing, in some people's minds, the Parasite.

The key traits and behaviors of a Common worker, as identified in the two data sets, also show some similarities. For example, Unmotivated, Conforming, and Friendly appear in both data sets. But the subjects in the U.S. data set also identified a Common worker as Reliable and Hard-working, both of which also appear on the top five list of traits and behaviors characterizing a Necessity in the two data sets. The subjects in the India data set, on the other hand, used words such as Incompetent, Unreliable, Troublemaker, and Inflexible to describe a Common worker. These traits and behaviors are negative, and all of them but Inflexible appear in both data sets among the top five traits and behaviors characterizing a Parasite. In sum, it appears that the U.S. MBA students and managers have a significantly more positive impression of a Common worker than do the India MBA students.

Conclusion: Possible Explanations and Directions for Future Research

The key traits and behaviors identified for the person of Necessity and the Parasite are

almost identical across the two data sets. All seven of the traits and behaviors listed for each of

these categories in Table 1, moreover, are consistent with the theoretical concepts of Necessity

and Parasite. But the identified traits and behaviors for the Common worker, while to some

extent similar across the two data sets, reveal a striking difference of opinion (or perception)

between the U.S. respondents and the India respondents.

One possible explanation for this overall pattern lies in the difference between the U.S.

and India samples in terms of work experience. Work experience may not in fact be needed to

identify the characteristics of really good workers (people of Necessity) and really bad workers

(Parasites). When describing Common workers, however, a respondent's level of work

experience may indeed matter. The respondents in the U.S. data set, all of whom have

significant work experience, viewed Common workers in a relatively positive light--as

acceptable workers who have something in common with people of Necessity. The responses of

the U.S. cohort could be reflecting their knowledge of the reality of most organizational

environments. More specifically, these responses could be based on the workplace pragmatism

that has been acquired, on the job, by the U.S. respondents. Common workers may not be

special, but many actually do their jobs and contribute, albeit in small ways and without being

leaders, to the success of the organization. In other words, maybe the U.S. respondents simply

see Common workers to be Aordinary workers, and people of Necessity to be outstanding leaders

and contributors who are considered stellar members of an organization?

The India MBA students, on the other hand, took a relatively negative view of Common

workers. This could be due, in part, to their lack of practical work experience. The responses of

the India MBA students could be reflecting an idealistic black-and-white view of the workplace,

where everything is either very good or very bad. One could hypothesize that the experienced

U.S. respondents, who may have once held such an idealistic view of the workplace before they entered the world of work and career, now have a more pragmatic, nuanced sense of how organizations function in the real world.

Another possible explanation for the overall pattern of responses across the two data sets lies in the influence of Indian culture. Indian culture, we have learned, tends to perceive reality as distinctly dichotomized: there is the good and there is the bad, without much in between. It may be the case in India, as in many Asian cultures, that being simply average is not a desirable outcome, as society places considerable status and esteem on those who excel. One has to be the best or risk being labeled a failure. This view of the world could be one reason why the India students perceive a Common worker in so negative a light.

U.S. culture, on the other hand, may be more willing to consider reality in terms of a continuum, from the very good to the very bad, with many shades of grey in between. This would mean, for example, that in the U.S. people may be more accepting of the ordinary. The U.S. respondents may be more willing to accept that in any work setting there will be people who merely fulfill their job obligations, collect their paychecks, and go home without contributing in any special way to the organization's success. As long as these workers do not harm the organization, they are viewed in a positive light. In sum, if the U.S. respondents do in fact hold a more relativist view of how the world works, and the India respondents hold a more absolutist, dichotomized view of reality, this could explain the different perceptions of the Common worker across the two data sets.

The above two possible explanations for the results we obtained, however, must be viewed in the light of the difficulties we faced in organizing and analyzing the India responses. We found it much more difficult to classify the India responses than the U.S. responses. The

individual responses from the India students were much more dissimilar, and more difficult to interpret. There were also many more unusable responses in the India data set than in the U.S. data set. These problems may reflect the students' lack of fluency in the English language. Although all of the India students were proficient in English, it was not their native tongue. We recognize that this may well have led us to misunderstand some of the India responses, at least to some extent.

Despite this particular difficulty, the analysis we have conducted here supports and corroborates the findings of Kim & Sikula (2003) and Kim & Sikula (2004), in terms of the key traits and behaviors that characterize people who fit the Necessity and Parasite categories. Our findings, therefore, should help separate these two types of people for organizational personnel decisions, including selection, promotion, and layoff processes. Further work needs to be done, however, in identifying a general set of traits and behaviors that characterize Common workers across a wide variety of workplace settings.

We plan, therefore, to survey additional employees, managers, and students, in yet different workplace and cultural settings, on what traits and behaviors they think characterize people of Necessity, Common workers, and Parasites. As we gather more data, we hope to delineate more precisely a general set of traits and behaviors that describes each of these three categories of people in the workplace. We will then design measurement instruments for these traits and behaviors, and make them available for human resource management practice.

References

Chong W. Kim & Andrew Sikula, Sr. (2003), ΑThree Types of People in the Workplace: 3D Theory, Proceedings of Pan-Pacific Conference XX, Shanghai, China, May 28-30. This paper has been accepted for publication in a future issue of Ethics & Critical Thinking Journal.

Chong W. Kim & Andrew Sikula, Sr. (2004), ΑThe Characteristics of ΑNecessity in a Workplace: A Replication Study, Proceedings of Pan-Pacific Conference XXI, Anchorage,

APPENDIX I: THE U.S. DATA SET

NECESSITY

1. <u>Reliable</u>		**5. <u>Knowledgeable</u>**	
(Dependable, Accountable, Loyal, Takes pride in what they do)	23	(Intelligent, Smart, Sharp, Clever, Highly skilled, Expert, Capable)	20
Responsible (Independent, Self-monitoring)	15	Problem solver	4
Punctual (Prompt, Fast-acting)	7	Resourceful	4
Dedicated, Committed	6	Fast learner	1
Organized (Structured)	5	Total for Knowledgeable	29
Emotionally stable	4		
Responsive	2	**6. <u>Confident</u>**	
Mature	2	(Self-assured, Secure, Decisive)	13
Total for Reliable	64	Aggressive, Assertive	7
		Risk-taker (Courageous)	5
2. <u>Hard-working</u>		Competitive	3
(Ambitious, Motivated, Passionate, Tenacious, Persistent, Determined)	15	Total for Confident	28
Hard-working (Constructive, Diligent, Productive, Industrious)	10		
Goal-oriented (Focused)	10	**7. <u>Visionary</u>**	
Conscientious (Careful, Detail-oriented)	9	(Long term thinker, Creative, Generates ideas, Innovative)	17
Exceeds expectations (Goes beyond the call of duty, Arrives early for work)	6	Proactive (Anticipates, Challenges)	4
Achieves/Accomplishes	5	Originality	4
Multi-tasks	1	Perceptive (Alert)	3
Total for Hard-working	56	Total for Visionary	28
3. <u>Friendly</u>		**8. <u>Honest</u>**	
(Cooperative, Collaborative, Team Player, Inclusive, Courteous, Respectful, Reverent, Likable)	18	(Credible, Trustworthy, Loyal)	12
Empathetic (Compassionate, Understands others' needs)	5	Fair, Objective	3
Humble (Approachable, Safe, Relaxed)	5	Integrity (Professional)	3
Extrovert, Charismatic	4	Ethical	1
Good sense of humor	2	Total for Honest	19
Forgiving, Patient	2		

Serves others (Charitable)	2
Total for Friendly	38

4. <u>Motivated</u>

(Energetic, Positive, Optimistic, Upbeat, Eager, Dynamic, Lively)	21
Curious (Inquisitive, Asks Questions)	5
Energetic (Enthusiastic, Spontaneous)	4
Self-motivator, Self-starter	4
Perfectionist	1
Continual learner	1
Total For Motivated	36

9. <u>Flexible</u>

(Adaptable, Willing to change)	13
Open-minded	3
Receptive	1
Total for Flexible	17

10. <u>Good Communicator</u>

(Good net-worker, Good listening skills)	10
Articulate	2
Conflict manager (Mediator)	2
Total for Good Communicator	14

COMMON

1. <u>Friendly</u>

(Agreeable, Sociable, Gets along with others, Easygoing, Amiable, Likeable, Amicable, Good attitude, Congenial, Pleasant, Kindhearted, Friendly)	27
Team Player (Works well with others, Compliant, Cooperative)	9
Humble (Modest)	4
Understanding (Empathy)	3
Civil (Good citizenship)	2
Appreciative (Gratefulness)	2
Patient	1
Total for Friendly	48

2. <u>Unmotivated</u>

(Satisfied, Comfortable, Content, Complacent, Safe, Does the minimum amount of work required)	20
Apathetic (Uninterested, Dispassionate, No desire to move ahead, Static, Lackadaisical, Lazy, Indifferent, Neutral, Impassive)	13
Slow-paced (Doesn't like pressure, Relaxed)	4
Total for Unmotivated	37

3. <u>Conforming</u>

(Follows instruction, Follower instead of leader, Passive, Meek, Conformist)	22
Needs guidance (Needs direct supervision, Needs exact parameters)	5

7. <u>Knowledgeable</u>

(Intelligent, Prudent, Good ability)	11
Logical (Rational, Sensible)	4
Competent	2
Technology oriented	1
Total for Knowledgeable	18

8. <u>Motivated</u>

(Enthusiastic, Self-starter, Self-sufficient, Can leave unsupervised)	10
Eager (Upbeat)	5
Total For Motivated	15

9. <u>Ordinary</u>

(Average, Undistinguished, Mundane)	11
Limited potential (i.e., cannot multi-task)	2
Blue-collar	1
Total for Ordinary	14

10. <u>Unreliable</u>

Apprehensive (Anxious, Insecure)	3	(Imprecise, Inconsistent quality/lapses in work)	5
Ambivalent (Lacks assertiveness)	3	Careless (Impulsive, Impetuous, Indiscriminate)	4
Controlled	2	Overlooks specifics (Little concern for detail)	2
Total for Conforming	35	High absenteeism (High turnover)	2
		Total for Unreliable	13

4. Reliable

(Dependable, On time, Punctual, Prompt)	16	**11. Inflexible**	
Responsible (Consistent, Stable)	8	(Not adaptable to change, Inflexible, Dogmatic, Conservative)	10
Emotionally stable (Even-tempered)	4	Not willing to take a chance	2
Organized	1	Total for Inflexible	12
Takes pride in workmanship	1		
Fair to Good attendance	1	**12. Introverted**	
Total for Reliable	31	(Quiet, Calm, Peaceful)	10
		Minds own business	1
		Total for Introverted	11

5. Hard-working

(Dedicated, Good effort, Productive)	13		
Helpful (Useful, Practical, Pragmatic, Always doing something)	7	**13. Troublemaker**	
Conscientious (Accurate, Attentive)	6	Complains	2
Self-disciplined	2	Selfish (Lack of empathy/Blunt)	2
Achiever	1	Disrespectful (Harsh)	2
Total for Hard-working	29	Distrustful (Skeptical)	2
		Thinks about self before company	1
6. Honest		Separatist	1
(Trustworthy, Sincere, Authentic)	11	Total for Troublemaker	10
Loyal	6		
Fair (Equitable)	2		
Integrity	1		
Total for Honest	20		

PARASITE

1. Troublemaker		Slow learner	2
Complains (Negative, Pessimistic, Cynical, Judgmental, Critical, Bad attitude)	28	Unorganized	1

Selfish (Self-centered, Self-absorbed, Disloyal, Uncooperative, Not a team player, Does not work well with others, Does not care about others, Individualistic, Exclusive, Unlikable) — 20

Arrogant (Proud, Conceited, Stubborn, Insolent, Dominant, Bossy, Defensive, Blames others, Passes the Buck — 15

Antagonistic (Belligerent, Destructive, Abrasive, Virulent, Chaotic, Creates conflict, Confrontational) — 13

Disrespectful (Rude, Insensitive, Rebellious, Obnoxious, Offensive, Verbally aggressive, Does not respect authority) — 12

Hostile (Spiteful, Angry, Irritable, Disagreeable, Unsociable) — 10

Immature (Impatient, Petty) — 7

Gossips — 5

Violent (Hazardous, Unsafe) — 3

Distrustful (Skeptic) — 1

Total for Troublemaker

114

2. **Lazy**

(Lazy, Idle, Apathetic, Uneager, Uninterested, Indifferent, Defeatist) — 27

Underachiever (Puts forth minimum effort, Only works for paycheck, Half-hearted, No goals/direction) — 19

Procrastinates (Always provides an excuse to avoid work) — 8

Lack of focus (Easily distracted) — 2

Total for Lazy — 56

3. **Unreliable**

(Unpredictable, Inconsistent, Undependable, Imprecise, Negligent) — 18

Careless (Reckless, Irresponsible, Unaccountable) — 15

Tardy (Late to work) — 9

High absenteeism — 8

Unstable (Moody, Emotionally unstable) — 4

Forgetful — 1

Total for Unreliable — 55

4. **Incompetent**

(Ineffective, Non-contributor, Does not accomplish tasks) — 10

Low quality product — 1

Total for Incompetent — 38

5. **Immoral**

(Dishonest, Untrustworthy, Mendacious, Liar) — 12

Cheater (Unethical, Doesn't follow rules) — 6

Manipulates (Back stabber, Deceptive, Deceitful, Scheming, Fraudulent) — 8

Dishonorable (Lacks integrity) — 5

Thief (Freeloader, Cadgy) — 3

Foul-mouthed — 1

Total for Immoral — 35

6. **Conforming**

(Dependent, Passive, Acquiescent) — 8

Insecure (Neurotic, Anxious, Nervous, Tense, Low self-esteem) — 8

Indecisive (Hesitant, Has to be told what to do) — 5

Total for Conforming — 21

7. **Inflexible**

(Not adaptable, Rigid, Unwilling to change) — 8

Narrow-minded (Close-minded) — 3

Total for Inflexible — 11

8. **Introverted** — 4

9. **Hard-working**

Persistent (Repeatedly) — 3

Ambitious — 1

Total for Hard-working — 4

No communication skills (Low interpersonal skills, Difficulty in handling conflict/stress)	9
Senseless (Irrational, Disoriented, Pathetic, Dimwitted, Ignorant	7
Not creative (Unoriginal)	4
Uneducated (Unskilled)	4

APPENDIX II: THE INDIA DATA SET

NECESSITY

1. Confident

(Confident, Self-confident, Self-assurance, High self-esteem, Dignity)	11
Takes initiative (Decisive)	15
Risk taker (Courageous)	7
Competitive (Enjoys challenges)	2
Mental toughness (Deals with critics, Has presence of mind)	3
Distinct identity (Makes presence felt)	2
Total for Confident	40

2. Hard-working

(Hard working, Ambitious, Determined, Motivated, Driven, Energetic)	23
Goal-oriented (Career oriented, Clarity of mission, Articulation of goals, , Sense of purpose)	9
Achiever (Self-actualizing)	4
Participates (Contributor)	2
Efficient	1
Type A personality	1
Total for Hard-working	40

3. Reliable

(Dependable, Reliable, Loyal, Disciplined, Self-monitoring)	13
Responsible	9
Organized (Planner)	4
Committed (Dedicated)	3
Valuable (Respected, Irreplaceable)	3
Punctual (Good timing)	2
Independent (Self-sufficient)	2
Total for Reliable	36

5. Good communicator

(Communicator, Negotiator, Good Reviewer, Manages Conflict, Listener)	12
Leader (Supervisor of employees)	8
Motivator (Challenging, Inspiring)	5
Coordinator (Net-worker)	2
Presenter	1
Surround themselves with talent	1
Total for Good Communicator	29

6. Knowledgeable

(Knowledgeable, Intelligent, Capable, Competent)	15
Good use of power (Utilizes resources, prioritizes well)	3
Understands cultural diversity	2
Acquainted with developments	1
Aware of organizational culture	1
Problem solver	1
Total for Knowledgeable	23

7. Visionary

(Visionary, Creative, Imaginative, Conceptual)	18
Enterprising (Looks to expand)	3
Big-picture oriented	1
Total for Visionary	22

8. Honest

(Honest, Trustworthy, Straightforward)	8
Fair (Moral, Ethical)	7
High integrity	1

Total for Honest	16

4. <u>Friendly</u>
(Friendly, Courteous, Respectful, Jovial/Bubbly, Extrovert, Outgoing) — 7

9. <u>Flexible</u>

Team player (Easy to work with, Develops Relationships, Interpersonal, Compatible, Cooperative, Helpful) — 13

(Adaptive, Adjusting) — 3

Positive	5
Approachable (Reasonable, Realistic)	3
Giving (Self-sacrificing, Concerned)	3
Encouraging	2
Humorous	1
Total for Friendly	34

Broad-minded	1
Comfortable with ambiguity	1
Total for Flexible	5

COMMON

1. <u>Conforming</u>
(Follower, Dependent, Does not initiate, No leadership qualities, Influenced by others, Passive listener, Coerced/Compelled by threats) — 29

8. <u>Inflexible</u>

Low self esteem (Low self-confidence)	6
Needs supervision (External locus of control)	3
Idolizes an individual (Imitative)	2
Hesitates	2
Total for Conforming	42

Resists change (Stickler for the rules)	9
Bureaucratic mentality	2
High authoritarianism (High focus on control)	2
Not open to others' views	1
Total for Inflexible	14

2. <u>Unmotivated</u>
(Unenthusiastic, Disinterested, Needs motivation, Low motivation, Not easily motivated, Low/little/no ambition) — 18

9. <u>Reliable</u>

Obedient	5

Lazy (Lethargic, Procrastinates)	5

Responsible (Mature)	3
Emotional stability	1

Not bothered about performance (Holds job at minimum status, Ignores his importance in society, Takes things for granted) — 5

Type B personality	2
Non-participative	2
Neutral (No attitude)	2
Does not volunteer for responsibility	1
Medium concern	1
Total for Unmotivated	36

Not disloyal	1
Repetitive	1
Total for Reliable	11

10. <u>Hard-working</u>
Task oriented (Concentrates on one thing, Good short-term focus) — 4

Aspires to achieve a lot	1
Concerned with their job	1

3. <u>Ordinary</u>
(Average goals/aims, Normal performer, Average speed executor) — 3

Low risk-taker (Avoids challenges)	8

No need for financial reward	1
Total for Hard-working	7

Not creative (Unimaginative, Predictable)   7

Easily replaced (Substitutable, Will not be missed, No impact on anybody, Contributes little, Least important)   7

Bound to perform routine jobs (Not involved in decision making, Not a savior)   3

Simple (Harmless, Not dashing)   3

Working class people   1

Total for Ordinary   32

4. Incompetent

(Incompetent, Low self-efficacy)   3

Restricted skill set (Needs formal training)   7

Inefficient (Not organized, Wastes time, Not a great planner)   7

Unproductive   5

Bad communicator (Not a good listener, Average communication skills)   4

Poor decision making (Can't manage complex situations)   3

Less knowledge (Fewer analytical skills)   2

Not sophisticated   1

Total for Incompetent   32

5. Friendly

(Sociable, Respectable, Emotional)   5

Team player (Cooperative)   5

Humble (Easy going)   2

Empathetic   1

Serving nature   1

Total for Friendly   14

6. Unreliable

(Not responsible, Not dependable)   9

Absenteeism   2

Less focused (Lack of clarity)   2

Inconsistent   1

Total for Unreliable   14

7. Troublemaker

Selfish (Self-oriented, Opportunistic, High entitlement)   5

No contribution (Not helpful)   2

Negative attitude   3

Not attractive   2

Not trustworthy   1

Unhappy in minor events   1

Total for Troublemaker   14

11. Confident

Aspires to be a leader   2

Moderate risk takers   1

Self confident   1

Satisfied with what they believe   1

Initiative   1

Total for Confident   6

12. Honest

(Sincere and honest, Honest in their job, Trustworthiness)   4

Integrity   1

Total for Honest   5

13. Knowledgeable

(Educated, Intelligent)   2

Professional competency   1

Strong technical skills   1

Total for Knowledgeable   4

14. Introverted

Does not want to be noticed   3

Total for Introverted   3

15. Good Communicator

Communicates easily   1

Ability to teach   1

Total for Good Communicator   2

16. Flexible   1

1. <u>Troublemaker</u>

Selfish (Bad team member, Uncooperative, Enjoys feeling of entitlement, Opportunist, Jealous, Takes advantage of others, Always looks for weaknesses, Always points figure outside)   21

Complains (Pessimist, Criticizer, Fault-maker, Whistle-blower, Negative approach, Dissatisfied, Annoying, Disagreeable, Feels he's being ignored)   17

Arrogant (Egotistic, Domination, Hard-hitting Autocratic, Stubborn)   13

Disrespectful (Rude, Hates discipline, Not influenced by authority, Unprofessional, Disregardful of obligations)   12

Insensitive (Least friendly, Not social to others)   8

Avoided (Least desired kind of person, People want to get rid of them, Unwanted people)   4

No trust in others (Does not delegate authority to followers)   3

Discrimination (Misjudgment, Unfair opinion)   2

Negative Contribution   1

Rage   1

Total for Troublemaker   82

2. <u>Unmotivated</u>

Unmotivated (Not interested in job, Minimum effort, No ambition, Resistant to motivation, Creative but needs motivation, No sense of time, Time-killer, No direction in life, Unaware of own potential, Fails to see opportunity, Intellectual but does not put to use)   17

Lazy (Laid back, Dislikes working, Discouraged by challenges, Does not want to handle tough job, Wants readily-made answers, Prefers chance-oriented awards)   15

Low morale (Does not participate in team activities, Hardly participative in activities, De-motivates his employees)   6

Minimal sense of achievement   1

Total for Unmotivated   39

3. <u>Conforming</u>

5. <u>Unreliable</u>

(Irresponsible, Not responsible, Not dependable, Undisciplined, Less faithful)   12

Unstable (Highly impulsive, Gambler)   5

Impatient   1

Absenteeism   2

Total for Unreliable   20

6. <u>Incompetent</u>

Bad communicator (Not good listener, No interpersonal skills)   5

Incapable (No professional skill set, Lacks industriousness, Low self-efficacy)   4

Ignorance (Lack of self-awareness, Poor understanding of organizational culture)   4

Unrealistic (Sets impossibly high targets)   2

Total for Incompetent   10

7. <u>Inflexible</u>

Resists change (Not flexible, Not easily swayed)   4

Job oriented (only wants work done, Believes in task accomplishment only)   4

Closed-minded (Narrow-minded)   2

Total for Inflexible   10

9. <u>Good Communicator</u>

Good at communicating (Good at informal communication)   3

(Dependent, Passive listener, Does not take initiative, No leadership qualities)	19	Negotiator	2
Indecisive (Follows decisions taken by others, Weak-minded, Coward)	4		
Low self-esteem (No self-esteem)	2	Total for Good Communicator	5
No self identity	1		
Total for Conforming	26	**10. <u>Ordinary</u>**	____

4. <u>Immoral</u>

		Not a risk- taker	1
		Not considered for improving/expansion	1
Unethical (No morality, Back-stabber, Swindler of resources, Win At All Costs philosophy, Nonconforming to norms)	9	Value-less people	1
Manipulative (Cunning, Mischievous, Glibness)	5	Holds jobs of low status	1
Disobedient (Low obedience, Does not obey orders)	4	Total for Ordinary	4
Dishonest (Not very truthful)	3		
Punitive (Tend to inflict punishment)	1		
Total for Immoral	22		