

1-1-2009

# Culture's Influence on the Perceived Characteristics of Employees: Comparing the Views of U.S. and Chilean Workers

Chong W. Kim

*Marshall University*, kim@marshall.edu

Leopoldo Arias-Bolzmann

Harlan M. Smith II

*Marshall University*, smithh@marshall.edu

Follow this and additional works at: [http://mds.marshall.edu/mgmt\\_faculty](http://mds.marshall.edu/mgmt_faculty)



Part of the [Business Administration, Management, and Operations Commons](#), and the [Management Sciences and Quantitative Methods Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Chong, Kim W., Leopoldo Arias-Bolzmann, and Harlan H. Smith, II. "Culture's Influence on the Perceived Characteristics of Employees: Comparing the Views of U.S. and Chilean Workers." *Dias Technology Review: The International Journal for Business and IT* 5, no. 1 (2009): 63-74.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Management, Marketing and MIS at Marshall Digital Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Management Faculty Research by an authorized administrator of Marshall Digital Scholar. For more information, please contact [zhangj@marshall.edu](mailto:zhangj@marshall.edu).

CULTURE'S INFLUENCE ON THE PERCEIVED CHARACTERISTICS OF EMPLOYEES:  
COMPARING THE VIEWS OF U.S. AND CHILEAN WORKERS

Chong W. Kim  
Leopoldo Arias-Bolzmann  
Harlan M. Smith II

Correspondence:

Chong W. Kim  
Professor of Management and Interim Dean  
Lewis College of Business  
Marshall University  
One John Marshall Drive  
Huntington, WV 25755  
Voice: (304) 696-2682; Fax: (304) 696-6013  
Email: kim@marshall.edu

Leopoldo Arias-Bolzmann  
Professor of Marketing  
School of Business  
Universidad Adolfo Ibañez  
1625 Balmaceda, Recreo,  
Viña del Mar, CHILE  
Phone (56-32) 2503818  
Fax (56-32) 2660225  
Email: larias@uai.cl

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

## **Abstract**

As noted in previous work (Kim & Sikula, 2005; Kim & Sikula, 2006; Kim, Sikula & Smith, 2006; Kim, Cho & Sikula, 2007), there are three types of people in the workplace: “Necessities,” “Commoners,” and “Parasites.” A person of Necessity is irreplaceable and crucial to the functioning of an organization. A Commoner is a person of normal ability and talent who has no significant impact on organizational success. Parasites are detrimental freeloaders who damage the functioning of an organization.

Kim & Sikula (2005) asked 25 students in an MBA Organizational Behavior class and 13 working managers (all of whom live and work in the United States) for their views on the leading traits and behaviors of Necessities, Commoners, and Parasites. In this paper we replicate the 2005 study in a different cultural setting, by surveying a sample of Executive MBA students in Viña del Mar, Chile. We then compare the results.

The leading traits and behaviors that characterize Necessities and Parasites in both data sets are very similar. The Chilean and U.S. subjects, however, differ significantly on what defines a Commoner. One potential explanation for this difference, we conclude, can be traced to differences in the respondents’ cultural backgrounds.

## **Introduction**

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

Within each of these roles, there is always more than one person involved, from a very small number of members in an institution like the nuclear family, 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: a “Necessity,” a “Commoner,” or a “Parasite.”

The most desirable type of person is the Necessity. Without colleagues (or partners) who are Necessities, the group as a whole cannot conduct successful activities. The person of Necessity focuses his/her efforts on achieving the group’s goals, and thus consistently makes valuable contributions to collective success. From the group’s perspective, such a person is an enormous asset. Conversely, the loss felt within the group by the departure of such an individual is considerable.

The characteristics that make for Necessity in group relations are, to some extent, role-specific. In other words, the traits and behaviors that characterize a person of Necessity in one particular role may be different from the traits and behaviors that characterize a person of Necessity in a different role. For example, to be a Necessity as a spouse one must display patience, a loving and caring attitude, and the ability to compromise. To be a Necessity as an academic administrator, however, one should demonstrate self-confidence, intelligence, responsibility, dedication to work, and an ability to supervise.

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 “glue” that holds an organization together and enables it to function as a cohesive whole.

Commoners have no significant impact on the success of the group. They do not contribute much to the accomplishment of group goals, but neither do they harm group performance in any significant way. A Commoner 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 group functioning. The Commoner 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 type of person 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. S/he 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 would leave as soon as possible, as the organization would be better off not having such a person around.

In this paper we focus on the characteristics exhibited by the person of Necessity, the Commoner, and the Parasite in the workplace. 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 organizational hierarchy. The structure of the organization itself also determines, in part, what traits and behaviors characterize each category of worker. More broadly, cultural attitudes towards age, gender, religion, or ethnic background, along with societal views on the nature of work and success, may also matter.

People's perceptions of the traits and behaviors that characterize each of these three categories of workers may, therefore, vary across cultures. Human beings are by nature socio-cultural creatures. Their behavior is influenced by the norms and values of the society to which they belong, and they act to suit the nature of their traditional cultures. For example, education and training received in childhood can create differences in personalities and cultural values, which, in turn, can make people perceive education and training differently (Newcomb, 1950). Hofstede (1980) focuses on the differences culture can make in a workplace setting. For example, Americans have a high degree of individualism and a short-term orientation, whereas Japanese score high on collectivism and on having a long-term perspective. Perceptions of the characteristics of Necessities, Commoners, and Parasites may therefore differ across U.S. and Japanese workplaces.

Nevertheless, we believe that it may well be possible to identify a general set of traits and behaviors that characterizes each of these three categories of workers across a wide range

of workplace settings. This knowledge would be very 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, Commoners, 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.

Kim & Sikula (2005) attempted to isolate the general traits and behaviors of Necessities, Commoners, and Parasites in the U.S. on the basis of survey data collected from an MBA Organizational Behavior class and a sample of working managers. The purpose of our present study is to compare and contrast the results obtained by Kim & Sikula (2005) with those obtained from an identical survey administered in an Executive MBA class in Viña del Mar, Chile. Our working hypothesis is that the responses obtained from these two samples will enable us to identify some key characteristics of Necessities, Commoners, and Parasites. We recognize, though, that cultural differences across the two samples may influence the ways in which the U.S. and Chilean respondents perceive Necessities, Commoners, and/or Parasites. Such perceptual differences, if significant, could create confusion in the human resource practices of joint venture U.S./Chilean companies.

### **Collection and Organization of the Data**

The data for Kim & Sikula (2005) were collected in the U.S. from 38 individuals in July of 2003. Twenty-five respondents were MBA students with significant work experience; 13 were managerial employees of one student's company. After explaining the definitions of Necessity, Commoner, and Parasite, Kim and Sikula asked each student to voluntarily turn in a list of 10 traits and behaviors describing each type of worker. Students received bonus points as an incentive to participate. Neatly-typed entries of 30 traits and

behaviors (10 for each category) earned seven points towards the student's course grade (out of a maximum of 100 available for 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 tabulated for frequency within each category (Necessity, Commoner, and Parasite). If a response was too generally stated, or too similar to the overall descriptor of each category, it was discarded. For example, responses such as "hard to replace" and "vital person" define a Necessity and hence are not traits or behaviors that characterize the person who is a Necessity. These were discarded.

A total of 1002 usable responses were included for frequency tabulation: 343 for Necessity, 314 for Commoner, and 345 for Parasite. These responses were then grouped together according to the words' synonyms and meanings through a two-step process. First, a simple table for each category was created by listing all the responses, from most frequent to least frequent. Second, a more specific frequency table was constructed 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, all the individual responses were organized under subheadings such as Responsible, Punctual, Dedicated, Organized, or Mature. These subheadings were then placed 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, all the responses were



organized under subheadings such as Selfish, Arrogant, Antagonistic, Disrespectful, or Immature. These subheadings were then placed 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 final, complete frequency table for all three types of workers can be found in Appendix I.

For the present paper we collected additional survey data, during the summer of 2007, from 35 Executive MBA students in Viña del Mar, Chile. This sample is quite similar to the one studied in Kim & Sikula (2005) in terms of the number of students, their work experiences, and ages. However, this sample differs from the one used by Kim & Sikula (2005) in two ways: the MBA students are Chileans, and the responses were collected in Spanish, not English. The process of collecting, organizing, and analyzing the data was identical to that followed by Kim & Sikula (2005), with the additional step of translating the responses from Spanish to English. To guarantee the accuracy of our translation, we asked a Chilean colleague who is fluent in both Spanish and English to do the original translation. Before we proceeded further, Professor Arias-Bolzmann (also bilingual in Spanish and English) reviewed this translation carefully.

A total of 912 usable responses were included for frequency tabulation: 347 for Necessity, 265 for Commoner, and 300 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. This table can be found in Appendix II.

### **Analysis of the Data**

In Table 1 below we highlight the top five traits and behaviors for each type of worker,

based on the frequency tables in Appendices I and II.

Table 1. Comparison of the U.S. and Chilean Responses

	The U.S. Sample	The Chilean Sample
Sample Size & Subjects	38 total: 25 MBA students who also work; plus 13 managers	35 total: Part-time Executive MBA students, with most having full-time managerial experience
Necessity	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Reliable (64 entries)</li> <li>2. Hard-working (56)</li> <li>3. Friendly (38)</li> <li>4. Motivated (36)</li> <li>5. Knowledgeable (29)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Reliable (61 entries)</li> <li>2. Hard-working (56)</li> <li>3. Motivated (54)</li> <li>4. Good Communicator (47)</li> <li>5. Friendly (40)</li> </ol>
Commoner	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Friendly (48)</li> <li>2. Unmotivated (37)</li> <li>3. Conforming (35)</li> <li>4. Reliable (31)</li> <li>5. Hard-working (29)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Unmotivated (51)</li> <li>2. Ordinary (37)</li> <li>3. Reliable (34)</li> <li>4. Troublemaker (31)</li> <li>5. Unreliable (25)</li> </ol>
Parasite	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Troublemaker (114)</li> <li>2. Lazy (56)</li> <li>3. Unreliable (55)</li> <li>4. Incompetent (38)</li> <li>5. Immoral (35)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Troublemaker (102)</li> <li>2. Unreliable (54)</li> <li>3. Unmotivated (44)</li> <li>4. Incompetent (29)</li> <li>5. Immoral (22)</li> </ol>

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. Four of the five leading traits (Reliable, Hard-working, Friendly, and Motivated) are identical. The other leading traits identified – Good Communicator and Knowledgeable – are positive and consistent in their description of a person of Necessity. All six 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.

Note that Reliable is the top-ranked characteristic of a Necessity in both data sets, while Hard-working is ranked second in both samples. The response frequencies for Reliable were

very similar (64 and 61, respectively) and the frequency of Hard-working in both data sets was identical at 56. In these two cultural settings, Reliable and Hard-working are clearly considered to be the most important traits and behaviors characterizing a person of Necessity. In the U.S. setting, know-how (knowledgeable) was also important for being a Necessity, whereas good communication was very important to the Chilean students.

The frequency tables for the Parasite category also reveal nearly identical results across the two data sets. The characteristics Troublemaker, Unreliable, Incompetent and Immoral appear among the top five in each set. The characteristics Lazy and Unmotivated, ranked second and third in the U.S. and Chilean samples, respectively, are also traits and behaviors that we believe accurately characterize a Parasite in the workplace. Indeed, one could argue that the terms Lazy and Unmotivated are essentially interchangeable.

The key traits and behaviors of a Commoner, as identified in the two data sets, reflect fewer similarities. The U.S. respondents identified a Commoner (in frequency order) as Friendly, Unmotivated, Conforming, Reliable, and Hard-working. The subjects in the Chile data set, on the other hand, considered a Commoner to be Unmotivated, Ordinary, Reliable, Troublemaker, and Unreliable—in that order. Four of these traits and behaviors are negative. Indeed, three of them (Troublemaker, Unmotivated, Unreliable) appear in both data sets among the top five characteristics of a Parasite. In sum, it appears that the U.S. MBA students and managers have a significantly more positive impression of a Commoner than do the Chilean 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. The characteristics of really good workers (people

of Necessity) and really bad workers (Parasites) appear to be the same in both U.S. and Chilean eyes. All eight 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. These results imply that companies in both countries should seek to hire employees who are Reliable, Hard-working, Friendly, and Motivated. They should avoid those who appear to be Troublemakers, Unreliable, Incompetent, or Immoral.

Although Reliable was ranked the number one trait of a Necessity in both data sets, upon closer examination we find subtle differences in the ways the U.S. and Chilean respondents articulate what they mean by “Reliable.” To the U.S. students Reliable means dependable, accountable, and responsible, while the Chilean students define this term with words such as loyal, trustworthy, and organized. These word choices, combined with the fact that in the Chile data set Good Communicator is a key characteristic of a Necessity, suggest to us that the Chilean respondents may be more interpersonal-relations oriented than their U.S. counterparts. We would like to follow up on this hypothesis in future research.

More generally, we note that many U. S. companies are doing joint ventures with foreign companies, and have established subsidiaries in countries across the world. If the managers of such companies do not realize that the implicit meaning of an “Excellent employee” can vary across cultural contexts, one result will be ineffective human resources management.

The identified traits and behaviors for the Commoner reveal a striking difference of opinion between the U.S. and the Chile respondents. One possible explanation for the different responses across the two data sets may be cultural differences. The respondents in the U.S. data set viewed Commoners in a relatively positive light—as acceptable workers

who have some things in common with people of Necessity. U.S. culture, therefore, may be more willing to consider reality in terms of a continuum, from the very good to the very bad with many “shades of gray” in between. This would mean, for example, that U.S. workers may be more accepting of the ordinary, or perhaps more willing to accept that in any work setting there will be people who merely fulfill their minimum job obligations and collect their paychecks without contributing in any special way to an organization’s success. As long as these workers do not harm an organization, they are viewed in a positive light.

The responses of the U.S. cohort could also reflect a view that while Commoners may not be special, many actually do their jobs and contribute, albeit in small ways and without being leaders, to the success of an organization. Perhaps the U.S. respondents simply perceive Commoners as “ordinary” or “regular” employees, and view Necessities as outstanding leaders and contributors, the stellar members of an organization.

The Chilean students, on the other hand, took a relatively negative view of Commoners. Three out of the five identified characteristics of Commoners were negative (Unmotivated, Troublemaker, Unreliable), and one was neutral (Ordinary). Reality, we hypothesize, may be perceived in Chile as distinctly dichotomized: there is the good and there is the bad, without much in between. In Chile, simply being average may not be a desirable outcome, given that society places considerable status and esteem on those who excel. One has to be the best or risk being labeled a failure. If this is true, then the responses of the Chilean MBA students would naturally reflect this “black-and-white” sense of reality in which everything is either very good or very bad. Hence their negative perception of a Commoner.

In sum, if the U.S. respondents do in fact hold a more relativist view of how the world works, and the Chilean respondents hold a more absolutist, dichotomized view of reality, this

could explain the different perceptions of the Commoner across the two data sets.

Our analysis supports and corroborates the findings of Kim & Sikula (2005, 2006), Kim, Sikula & Smith (2006), and Kim, Cho & Sikula (2007), 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, retention, and promotion. However, as shown here and in Kim, Sikula & Smith (2006), further work needs to be done to find out if it is possible to identify a general set of traits and behaviors that characterize Commoners across a wide variety of workplace settings.

We plan, therefore, to study more carefully how the two data sets examined in this paper compare and contrast with the India MBA student data set analyzed in Kim, Sikula & Smith (2006). We will also survey additional employees, managers, and students in different workplace and cultural settings on what traits and behaviors they believe characterize Necessities, Commoners, and Parasites. As we gather this data we hope to determine more precisely a general set of traits and behaviors that describes each of these three types of employees, and to identify the reasons why doing this may at times prove difficult. This information, we believe, is crucial for effective human resources management.

## References

- Hofstede, G. (1980), *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work Related Values*, Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Chong W. Kim & Andrew Sikula, Sr., "The Characteristics of "Necessity" in a Work Place: A Replication Study," *The International Journal for Business & IT*, Vol.1, No.2, pp. 20 – 32. Jan., 2005.
- Chong W. Kim & Andrew Sikula, Sr., "Three Types of People in the Workplace: 3D Theory," *Ethics & Critical Thinking Journal*, Vol. 2006, Issue 1, pp. 95 – 109, March 15, 2006.
- Chong W. Kim, Andrew Sikula, Sr., & Harlan M. Smith II, "Perception of the Characteristics of Good, Bad and Ordinary Workers on the Job: The Influence of Work Experience and Culture," *DIAS Technology Review: The International Journal for Business and IT*, Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 26 – 37, March 2006.
- Chong W. Kim, Yung-Ho Cho, & Andrew Sikula, Sr., "Cultural Implications of "Excellent Employees: Comparing American and Korean Workers," *Business Journal for Entrepreneurs*, Vol. 2007, Issue 1, pp. 67 – 84, January 15, 2007.
- Newcomb, T. M. (1950), *Social Psychology*, New York: Dryden Press, p. 429.

## APPENDIX I: THE U.S. DATA SET

### NECESSITY

<b>1. <u>Reliable</u></b>		<b>5. <u>Knowledgeable</u></b>	
(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	<u>1</u>
Organized (Structured)	5	Total for Knowledgeable	29
Emotionally stable	4		
Responsive	2	<b>6. <u>Confident</u></b>	
Mature	<u>2</u>	(Self-assured, Secure, Decisive)	13
Total for Reliable	64	Aggressive, Assertive	7
		Risk-taker (Courageous)	5
<b>2. <u>Hard-working</u></b>		Competitive	<u>3</u>
(Ambitious, Motivated, Passionate, Tenacious, Persistent, Determined)	15	Total for Confident	28
Hard worker (Constructive, Diligent, Productive, Industrious)	10		
Goal-oriented (Focused)	10	<b>7. <u>Visionary</u></b>	
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	<u>1</u>	Perceptive (Alert)	<u>3</u>
Total for Hard-working	56	Total for Visionary	28
<b>3. <u>Friendly</u></b>		<b>8. <u>Honest</u></b>	
(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	<u>1</u>
Good sense of humor	2	Total for Honest	19
Forgiving, Patient	2		
Serves others (Charitable)	<u>2</u>	<b>9. <u>Flexible</u></b>	
Total for Friendly	38	(Adaptable, Willing to change)	13
		Open-minded	3
<b>4. <u>Motivated</u></b>		Receptive	<u>1</u>
(Energetic, Positive, Optimistic, Upbeat, Eager, Dynamic, Lively)	21	Total for Flexible	17
Curious (Inquisitive, Asks Questions)	5		
Energetic (Enthusiastic, Spontaneous)	4	<b>10. <u>Good Communicator</u></b>	
Self-motivator, Self-starter	4	(Good Networker, Good listening skills)	10
Perfectionist	1	Articulate	2
Continual learner	<u>1</u>	Conflict manager (Mediator)	<u>2</u>
Total For Motivated	36	Total for Good Communicator	14



## COMMONER

<b>1. <u>Friendly</u></b>		<b>7. <u>Knowledgeable</u></b>	
(Agreeable, Sociable, Gets along with others, Easygoing, Amiable, Likeable, Amicable, Good attitude, Congenial, Pleasant, Kindhearted, Friendly)	27	(Intelligent, Prudent, Good ability)	11
Team Player (Works well with others, Compliant, Cooperative)	9	Logical (Rational, Sensible)	4
Humble (Modest)	4	Competent	2
Understanding (Empathy)	3	Technology oriented	<u>1</u>
Civil (Good citizenship)	2	Total for Knowledgeable	18
Appreciative (Gratefulness)	2		
Patient	<u>1</u>	<b>8. <u>Motivated</u></b>	
Total for Friendly	48	(Enthusiastic, Self-starter, Self-sufficient, Can leave unsupervised)	10
		Eager (Upbeat)	<u>5</u>
<b>2. <u>Unmotivated</u></b>		Total For Motivated	15
(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)	13	<b>9. <u>Ordinary</u></b>	
Slow-paced (Doesn't like pressure, Relaxed)	<u>4</u>	(Average, Undistinguished, Mundane)	11
Total for Unmotivated	37	Limited potential (e.g., cannot multi-task)	2
		Blue-collar	<u>1</u>
<b>3. <u>Conforming</u></b>		Total for Ordinary	14
(Follows instruction, Follower instead of leader, Passive, Meek, Conformist)	22		
Needs guidance (Needs direct supervision, Needs exact parameters)	5	<b>10. <u>Unreliable</u></b>	
Apprehensive (Anxious, Insecure)	3	(Imprecise, Inconsistent quality/lapses in work)	5
Ambivalent (Lacks assertiveness)	3	Careless (Impulsive, Impetuous, Indiscriminate)	4
Controlled	<u>2</u>	Overlooks specifics (Little concern for detail)	2
Total for Conforming	35	High absenteeism (High turnover)	<u>2</u>
		Total for Unreliable	13
<b>4. <u>Reliable</u></b>			
(Dependable, On time, Punctual, Prompt)	16	<b>11. <u>Inflexible</u></b>	
Responsible (Consistent, Stable)	8	(Not adaptable to change, Inflexible, Dogmatic, Conservative)	10
Emotionally stable (Even-tempered)	4	Not willing to take a chance	<u>2</u>
Organized	1	Total for Inflexible	12
Takes pride in workmanship	1		
Fair to Good attendance	<u>1</u>		
Total for Reliable	31		

<b>5. <u>Hard-working</u></b>		<b>12. <u>Introverted</u></b>	
(Dedicated, Good effort, Productive)	13	(Quiet, Calm, Peaceful)	10
Helpful (Useful, Practical, Pragmatic, Always doing something)	7	Minds own business	<u>1</u>
Conscientious (Accurate, Attentive)	6	Total for Introverted	11
Self-disciplined	2		
Achiever	<u>1</u>	<b>13. <u>Troublemaker</u></b>	
Total for Hard-working	29	Complains	2
		Selfish (Lack of empathy, Blunt)	2
<b>6. <u>Honest</u></b>		Disrespectful (Harsh)	2
(Trustworthy, Sincere, Authentic)	11	Distrustful (Skeptical)	2
Loyal	6	Thinks about self before company	1
Fair (Equitable)	2	Separatist	<u>1</u>
Integrity	<u>1</u>	Total for Troublemaker	10
Total for Honest	20		

## PARASITE

<b>1. <u>Troublemaker</u></b>		Not creative (Unoriginal)	4
Complains (Negative, Pessimistic, Cynical, Judgmental, Critical, Bad attitude)	28	Uneducated (Unskilled)	4
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	Slow learner	2
Arrogant (Proud, Conceited, Stubborn, Insolent, Dominant, Bossy, Defensive, Blames others, Passes the buck)	15	Unorganized	1
Antagonistic (Belligerent, Destructive, Abrasive, Virulent, Chaotic, Creates conflict, Confrontational)	13	Low quality product	<u>1</u>
Disrespectful (Rude, Insensitive, Rebellious, Obnoxious, Offensive, Verbally aggressive, Does not respect authority)	12	Total for Incompetent	38
Hostile (Spiteful, Angry, Irritable, Disagreeable, Unsociable)	10		
Immature (Impatient, Petty)	7	<b>5. <u>Immoral</u></b>	
Gossips	5	(Dishonest, Untrustworthy, Mendacious, Liar)	12
Violent (Hazardous, Unsafe)	3	Cheater (Unethical, Doesn't follow rules)	6
Distrustful (Skeptic)	<u>1</u>	Manipulates (Back stabber, Deceptive, Deceitful, Scheming, Fraudulent)	8
Total for Troublemaker	114	Dishonorable (Lacks integrity)	5
		Thief (Freeloader, Cagy)	3
<b>2. <u>Lazy</u></b>		Foul-mouthed	<u>1</u>
(Idle, Apathetic, Not eager, Uninterested, Indifferent, Defeatist)	27	Total for Immoral	35
Underachiever (Puts forth minimum effort, Only works for paycheck, Half-hearted, No goals/direction)	19		

Procrastinates (Always provides an excuse to avoid work)	8	<b>6. <u>Conforming</u></b>	
Lack of focus (Easily distracted)	<u>2</u>	(Dependent, Passive, Acquiescent)	8
Total for Lazy	56	Insecure (Neurotic, Anxious, Nervous, Tense, Low self-esteem)	8
		Indecisive (Hesitant, Has to be told what to do)	<u>5</u>
<b>3. <u>Unreliable</u></b>		Total for Conforming	21
(Unpredictable, Inconsistent, Undependable, Imprecise, Negligent)	18		
Careless (Reckless, Irresponsible, Unaccountable)	15	<b>7. <u>Inflexible</u></b>	
Tardy (Late to work)	9	(Not adaptable, Rigid, Unwilling to change)	8
High absenteeism	8	Narrow-minded (Close-minded)	<u>3</u>
Unstable (Moody, Emotionally unstable)	4	Total for Inflexible	11
Forgetful	<u>1</u>		
Total for Unreliable	55	<b>8. <u>Introverted</u></b>	4
<b>4. <u>Incompetent</u></b>		<b>9. <u>Hard-working</u></b>	
(Ineffective, Non-contributor, Does not accomplish tasks)	10	Persistent (Repeatedly)	3
No communication skills (Low interpersonal skills, Difficulty in handling conflict/stress)	9	Ambitious	<u>1</u>
Senseless (Irrational, Disoriented, Pathetic, Dimwitted, Ignorant)	7	Total for Hard-working	4

## APPENDIX II: THE CHILE DATA SET

### NECESSITY

<b>1. <u>Reliable</u></b>		<b>5. <u>Friendly</u></b>	
Loyal (Faithful, Committed, Devoted)	21	Caring (Sympathetic, Humane, Concerned, Kind)	16
Reliable (Responsible, Trustable, Prepared, Punctual)	18	Helpful (Collaborating, Helper, Teamwork, Good workmate)	11
Organized (Systematic, Methodical, Structured, Neat)	13	Personable (Respectful, Sociable, Friendly, Agreeable, Easy to build personal relationship)	9
Independent (Autonomous)	4	Happy (Content)	2
Calm (Balanced, Even)	4	Modest	1
Reflexive	<u>1</u>	Thankful	<u>1</u>
Total for Reliable	61	Total for Friendly	40
<b>2. <u>Hard-working</u></b>		<b>6. <u>Visionary</u></b>	
Hard worker (Diligent, Tenacious, Ambitious, Upward, Contributes, Participative, Undertaking, Gives/Does their best effort, Good quality service, Value/Satisfaction Provider, Value added Person)	28	Creative (Innovative, Clever, Idea provider, Solution provider)	31
Focused (Efficient, Effective, Achievement Oriented, Solutions oriented, Accomplishes objectives)	10	Visionary (Big Picture, Pioneer)	<u>8</u>
Persistent (Perseverance, Resolve, Resilient)	8	Total for Visionary	39
Fulfills work no matter what)		<b>7. <u>Knowledgeable</u></b>	
Meticulous (Obsessive, Rigorous)	5	Skillful (Capable, Qualified, Competent, Talented,	8

Useful (Practical)	4	Agile, Coordinated)	
Busy	<u>1</u>	Knowledgeable (Brilliant, Smart, Well-educated,	6
Total for Hard-working	56	Right judgment, Application of knowledge)	
<b><u>3. Motivated</u></b>		Analytical (Strategic, Thinker)	4
Motivated (Initiative, Self-motivated, Proactive)	28	With experience	<u>1</u>
Positive (Optimist)	7	Total for Knowledgeable	19
Energetic (Enthusiastic, Vivacious, Dynamic, Active)	7	<b><u>8. Confident</u></b>	
Perfectionist (Self-Criticizing, Improvement-Seeking)	7	Audacious	4
Self-Demanding, Self-Development, Idealist)		Assertive	3
Studious (Curious, Interested)	<u>5</u>	Self-confident (Secure)	<u>3</u>
Total for Motivated	54	Total for Confident	10
<b><u>4. Good Communicator</u></b>		<b><u>9. Honest</u></b>	
Leader (Executive, Manager, Foreman,	23	Honest (Sincere)	4
Coordinator, Delegates)		Objective (Fair, Conscientious)	<u>3</u>
Inspiring (Inspires, Motivational, Model for others,	14	Total for Honest	7
Influential, Demanding)		<b><u>10. Flexible</u></b>	
Communicative (Clear, Shares Knowledge/Expertise)	4	Adaptable	2
Attentive (Perceptive, Observer)	3	Open-minded (Receptive)	<u>2</u>
Integrative (Conciliatory)	<u>3</u>	Total for Flexible	4
Total for Good Communicator	47	<b><u>Others listed</u></b>	
		Vital (Indispensable, Essential, Key, Worthy)	5
		Arguing (Questioning)	2
		Same	<u>1</u>
			8

## COMMONER

<b><u>1. Unmotivated</u></b>		<b><u>7. Introverted</u></b>	
Unmotivated (Little motivation, Disinterested, Apathetic,	31	Quiet worker (Very low profile)	11
Bored, Indifferent, Without incentive, Must be pushed,		Introverted (Non-communicative person)	<u>2</u>
Little/Without initiative, No interest in achievements,		Total for Introverted	13
Non-ambitious, Non-motivated, Non-enthusiastic,		<b><u>8. Hard-working</u></b>	
Without striving)		Hard Worker (Ambitious, Participative, Makes best	6
Lazy (Indolent, Least effort, Half-effort worker,	10	effort)	
Non-active, Non-participative)		Persistent	1
Without Goals (Without Objectives, Does Not Plan,	6	Pursuer	<u>1</u>
Projectionless)		Total for Hard-working	8
Non-Contributing Person (Little contributor)	<u>4</u>	<b><u>9. Friendly</u></b>	
Total for Unmotivated	51	Personable (Respectful, Agreeable, Warm, Nice)	5
<b><u>2. Ordinary</u></b>		Helpful (Collaborating)	<u>2</u>
Average (Mediocre, Plain, Normal, Common)	17	Total for Friendly	7
Works Just Enough (Marking time, Passing by,	10	<b><u>10. Incompetent</u></b>	
Never stays longer, Adjusted to timetable)		Slow (Simple, Limited work)	4
Mechanical (Non-creative)	4	Incompetent (Not talented)	2
Dispensable (Insignificant, Invisible, Non-value added)	4		
Relaxed	<u>2</u>		

Total for Ordinary	37	Tedious	1
<b>3. <u>Reliable</u></b>		Total for Incompetent	7
Responsible (Reliable, Trustable, Disciplined, Punctual Serious, Executes, Fulfills demands)	17	<b>11. <u>Good Communicator</u></b>	
Organized (Methodic, Procedural, Structured, Available (Willing)	7	Attentive (Discreet)	3
Comprehensive	2	Conciliatory	1
Balanced (Sensible, Moderate)	4	Total for Good Communicator	4
Faithful (Continuity)	2	<b>12. <u>Knowledgeable</u></b>	
Total for Reliable	34	Smart (Ingenious)	2
		Competent	1
<b>4. <u>Troublemaker</u></b>		Total for Knowledgeable	3
Selfish (Self-Absorbed, Opportunist, Uninvolved in others' issues, Comfort loving)	12	<b>13. <u>Honest</u></b>	
Negative (Demoralized, Morose, Displeased, Unhappy, Frustrated, Pessimist, Criticizing mumbler, System critic)	10	Sincere	3
Unwilling, Unwillingly	3	<b>14. <u>Inflexible</u></b>	
Tricky	3	Rigid	1
Talkative	1	Narrow Vision	1
Copying	1	Total for Inflexible	2
Non-friendly	1	<b>15. <u>Motivated</u></b>	
Total for Troublemaker	31	Active	1
		Positive	1
<b>5. <u>Unreliable</u></b>		Total for Motivated	2
Insecure (Reactive, Tense)	10	<b>16. <u>Confident</u></b>	
Unorganized (Tangled, Untidy, Complicated)	4	Self-confident (Audacious)	2
Non-committed (Little commitment, Sometimes loyal)	4	<b>17. <u>Visionary</u></b>	
Forgetful (Absent-minded)	4	Clever	1
Distant	2	<b>Others Listed</b>	
No Expectation of Them	1	Essential (Necessary, Indispensable)	3
Total for Unreliable	25	Austere	1
<b>6. <u>Conforming</u></b>		Order Executive	1
Passive (Obedient, Conformist, Follower, Complying, Dependent, Easily manipulated, Low self-esteem)	20	Specialist of Generalizing	1
Must be led (Limited to instruction)	2	Total	6
Total for Conforming	22		

## PARASITE

<b>1. <u>Troublemaker</u></b>		<b>5. <u>Immoral</u></b>	
Negative (Pessimistic, Cynical, Unhappy, Frustrated, Bitter, Demoralized, Demoralizing person, Displeased, Resentful, Unfulfilled, Fault finder)	36	Manipulating (Controlling, Opportunist, Advantage taker)	12
Troublemaker (Problematic, Conflictive, Nuisance, Distracter, Poisonous, Chaotic)	18	Liar (Dishonest, Shammer, Dilutes work to make it seem difficult)	11
Unprofessional (Gossipy, Considers boss useless, Bad at relationships, Bad workmate, Little collaboration, Not easy to work on team, Rejects delegation,	15	Insidious (Abusive, Ill-intentioned)	8
		Double Standard	1
		Copying Person	1

Rude, Unfriendly, Non-respectful, Bad worker, Generates complaints from clients)	
<b>Selfish</b> (Individualist, Not interested in team)	13
<b>Harmful</b> (Dangerous, Aggressive, Belligerent, Traumatic)	8
<b>Jealous</b> (Envious)	5
<b>Arrogant</b> (Shameless, Insolent)	3
<b>Mad</b> (Ill-tempered, Bad-tempered)	3
<b>Prejudiced</b>	1
<b>Total for Troublemaker</b>	<u>102</u>

## **2. Unreliable**

<b>Irresponsible</b> (Unprepared, Negligent, Unfocused, Absent-minded, Careless, Non-meticulous, Requires constant supervision)	17
<b>Disloyal</b> (Traitor, Non-committed, Unable to trust)	16
<b>Disorganized</b> (Untidy, Messy, Not clean, Unstructured)	10
<b>Absent</b> (Not punctual)	6
<b>Insecure</b> (Reactive, Unstable)	4
<b>Distant</b>	1
<b>Total for Unreliable</b>	<u>54</u>

## **3. Unmotivated**

<b>Lazy</b> (Gives least effort, Indolent)	33
<b>Unmotivated</b> (Apathetic, Non-contributor, Displeased by extra responsibilities, Non-contributor)	7
<b>Short Sighted</b> (Without direction, No vision, No aspiration)	4
<b>Total for Unmotivated</b>	<u>44</u>

## **4. Incompetent**

<b>Inefficient</b> (Delay in work, Tedious, Makes things more difficult, Hinders work, Hinders people)	11
<b>Incompetent</b> (Incapable, Useless, Unable to operate, Deficient quality service)	9
<b>Failure</b> (Loser, Low expectations)	5
<b>Unable to Communicate</b>	2
<b>Retrograde</b> (Unable to Adapt)	2
<b>Total for Incompetent</b>	<u>29</u>

<b>Scamp</b>	<u>1</u>
<b>Total for Immoral</b>	22

## **6. Ordinary**

<b>Dispensable</b> (Exemptible, Unnecessary, Anodyne)	6
<b>Mediocre</b> (Common)	4
<b>Conservative</b> (Non-risk taker)	2
<b>Leaves as Soon as They Can</b>	1
<b>Total for Ordinary</b>	<u>13</u>

## **7. Inflexible**

<b>Uncompromising</b> (Close-minded, Narrow-minded)	3
---	---

## **8. Introverted**

<b>Unsociable</b> (Low Profile)	2
---------------------------------	---

## **Others Listed**

<b>Never Gets to Term</b>	3
<b>Intriguing</b>	1
<b>Ironic</b>	1
<b>Focused on Form, Not on Content</b>	1
	<u>6</u>