

# THE LEADERSHIP ARCHITECT® 2009 GLOBAL NORMS

## *Report III:*

### *Career Stallers and Stoppers Norms and Analysis*

#### Technical Report



October 2009

Guangrong Dai  
Kenneth P. De Meuse

# Table of Contents

---

Section	Page
<hr/>	
Executive Summary.....	3
Sample Description.....	5
Part I: Career Stallers and Stoppers Norms	
▪ Global Ratings and Rankings.....	9
▪ Regional Ratings.....	10
▪ Regional Rank Orders.....	11
▪ Ratings and Rankings by Gender.....	12
▪ Ratings and Rankings by Position Level.....	13
Part II: Career Stallers and Stoppers Harmfulness Norms	
▪ Global Ratings and Rankings.....	15
▪ Regional Ratings.....	16
▪ Regional Rank Orders.....	17
▪ Ratings and Rankings by Gender.....	18
▪ Ratings and Rankings by Position Level.....	19
Part III: Comparison with Previous Norms	
Career Stallers and Stoppers Norm Over Time.....	21
▪ Ranking Stability by Gender.....	22
▪ Ranking Stability by Position Level.....	22
Harmfulness Norms Over Time.....	23
▪ Ranking Stability by Gender.....	24
▪ Ranking Stability by Position Level.....	25

---

## Executive Summary

This report presents the results of the 2009 Career Stallers and Stoppers Global Norms Study. The data for this study were obtained from the VOICES<sup>®</sup> online surveys administered between April 2008 and May 2009. The total sample size was 1,674. Learners worked in a variety of organizations located across the globe, including North America, Europe, New Zealand/Australia, Asia, South America, and Africa.

Raters who take VOICES<sup>®</sup> evaluate individuals (so-called “learners”) on two different scales. One scale measures the degree to which the learner possess a career staller or stopper; a behavior that can derail his or her career. It is a 5-point scale, ranging from 1 (*not a problem*), 2 (*probably not*), 3 (*not sure*), 4 (*probably yes*), to 5 (*definitely*). The higher the rating, the more likely it is a problem. The second scale measures how harmful it would be to the learner’s career if she or he possessed this staller. The harmfulness scale ranges from 1 (*not a problem*), 2 (*a slight problem*), 3 (*somewhat of a problem*), 4 (*could be a problem*), to 5 (*definitely a problem*). The higher the rating the more of a problem it would cause. In total, there are 19 Career Stallers and Stoppers rated in this study.

Part I of the report presents the norms related to Career Stallers and Stoppers in general. Overall, the findings indicated that the three stallers and stoppers most pervasive in the workplace are (a) “Overmanaging,” (b) “Defensiveness,” and (c) “Overdependence on a Single Skill.” Very few differences were observed among the six global regions. Inter-regional rank-order correlations ranged from a low of  $r = 0.76$  to a high of  $r = 0.92$ , indicating that all the learners were evaluated *relatively* the same with regard to their Career Stallers and Stoppers. On the other hand, learners in Asia had the highest *absolute* mean ratings on 17 of the 19 Career Stallers and Stoppers, suggesting that their potential for derailing was perceived higher than in other regions. Males and females were rated very similarly. The largest difference was on “Lack of Composure,” with females ( $M = 1.73$ ) being rated slightly higher than males ( $M = 1.60$ ). The findings with regard to position level revealed that managers, directors, and executives had more problems with insensitivity (“Insensitive to Others”) and being “Overly Ambitious” than individual contributors and supervisors. In contrast, managers, directors, and executives tended to have fewer problems with “Political Missteps” and being “Non-Strategic.”

Part II presents the norms related to the Harmfulness of each of the 19 Career Stallers and Stoppers to derailing one’s career. The results indicate that (a) “Performance Problems,” (b) “Lack of Ethics and Values,” and (c) “Betrayal of Trust” are the most harmful; whereas, being “Overly Ambitious” and “Overdependence on an Advocate” was perceived the least harmful. Although

the relative rating among the six regions of the world was very high (correlation coefficients primarily were in the 0.90s), South America consistently reported the highest mean ratings. It suggests that breaching these 19 Career Stallers and Stoppers would be perceived as most egregious for learners in South America. No significant differences were observed between males or females. In general, the results reveal that Career Stallers and Stoppers become increasingly harmful to success as one moves up the corporate ladder. However, the data suggest that “Failure to Build a Team” becomes particularly important as one transitions from an individual contributor to a supervisor. Further, “Failure to Staff Effectively” and being perceived as “Non-Strategic” becomes relatively more important as one moves from a supervisory role to a managerial one.

In Part III of the report, we compare the 2009 Career Stallers and Stoppers Global Norms with the ones reported in 2003. In general, there was much stability over time. The #1 Career Staller and Stopper remains “Overmanaging.” However, the overall pattern of results suggests that they have become slightly more pervasive in the workforce. Mean scores were higher in 2009 than in 2003 on 15 of the 19 areas. The #1 most harmful Career Staller and Stopper remains “Performance Problems.” There was much stability in gender and position level norms over time.

## Sample Description

### Career Stallers and Stoppers Data

The total sample size for this normative study is 1,674. Nearly 93% ( $N = 1,548$ ) of the learners are from 16 client companies. The remaining respondents ( $N = 126$ ) are from two consulting companies. The demographic breakdown is as follows:

<b><i>By Region</i></b>	<b><i>Sample Size</i></b>	<b><i>Percentage</i></b>
North America (NA)	735	43.9%
Europe (EU)	221	13.2%
New Zealand/Australia (NZ/AU)	116	6.9%
Asia	289	17.3%
South America (SA)	52	3.1%
Africa (AF)	63	3.8%
<i>Not Specified</i>	197	11.8%

<b><i>By Gender</i></b>	<b><i>Sample Size</i></b>	<b><i>Percentage</i></b>
Female	526	31.4%
Male	958	57.2%
<i>Not Specified</i>	190	11.4%

<b><i>By Age</i></b>	<b><i>Sample Size</i></b>	<b><i>Percentage</i></b>
Less than 30	62	3.7%
31 to 35	275	16.4%
36 to 40	420	25.1%
41 to 50	565	33.8%
Over 51	157	9.4%
<i>Not Specified</i>	195	11.6%

<b><i>By Position Level</i></b>	<b><i>Sample Size</i></b>	<b><i>Percentage</i></b>
Entry-level Individual Contributors	9	0.5%
Senior Individual Contributors	100	6.0%
Supervisor	386	23.1%
Manager	575	34.3%
Director	278	16.6%
Senior Executives	122	7.3%
<i>Not Specified</i>	204	12.2%

<b><i>By Years of Managerial Experience</i></b>	<b>Sample Size</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Less than 1 year	55	3.3%
1-2 years	68	4.1%
2-3 years	81	4.8%
3-5 years	179	10.7%
5-10 years	405	24.2%
10 years above	679	40.5%
<i>Not Specified</i>	207	12.4%

<b><i>By Industry Sector</i></b>	<b>Sample Size</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Communication	35	2.1%
Healthcare/Life Sciences	29	1.7%
Financial Services	169	10.1%
Industrial	1,047	62.5%
Consumer	196	11.7%
Technology	68	4.1%
<i>Not Specified</i>	130	7.8%

<b><i>By Job Function</i></b>	<b>Sample Size</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Accounting	75	4.5%
Administration & Support	13	0.8%
Advertising/Public relations	13	0.8%
Credit/Finance	84	5.0%
Education & Social Service	4	0.2%
Engineering	37	2.2%
Human Resources/Training	116	6.9%
Information Technology	105	6.3%
Law	12	0.7%
Manufacturing	64	3.8%
Marketing	165	9.9%
Materials	4	0.2%
Management/Purchasing	49	2.9%
Medicine	4	0.2%
Operations	106	6.3%
Product Development	25	1.5%
Quality Control	13	0.8%
Research/Analysis	24	1.4%
Research and Development	37	2.2%
Sales	258	15.4%
Security	6	0.4%
Systems Analysis	6	0.4%
Management & Administration	159	9.5%
<i>Not Specified</i>	295	17.7%

## **Career Stallers and Stoppers Harmfulness Data**

Total sample size for this normative study is 1,570. Nearly 92% ( $N = 1,462$ ) of the learners are from 15 client companies. The remaining respondents ( $N = 108$ ) are from two consulting companies. The demographic breakdown is as follows:

<b><i>By Region</i></b>	<b><i>Sample Size</i></b>	<b><i>Percentage</i></b>
North America (NA)	720	45.9%
Europe (EU)	208	13.2%
New Zealand/Australia (NZ/AU)	115	7.3%
Asia	277	17.7%
South America (SA)	39	2.5%
Africa (AF)	42	2.7%
<i>Not Specified</i>	168	10.7%

<b><i>By Gender</i></b>	<b><i>Sample Size</i></b>	<b><i>Percentage</i></b>
Female	512	32.6%
Male	897	57.1%
<i>Not Specified</i>	161	10.3%

<b><i>By Age</i></b>	<b><i>Sample Size</i></b>	<b><i>Percentage</i></b>
Less than 30	62	4.0%
31 to 35	267	17.0%
36 to 40	398	25.4%
41 to 50	522	33.2%
Over 51	155	9.8%
<i>Not Specified</i>	166	10.6%

<b><i>By Position Level</i></b>	<b><i>Sample Size</i></b>	<b><i>Percentage</i></b>
Entry-level Individual Contributors	10	0.6%
Senior Individual Contributors	110	7.0%
Supervisor	365	23.2%
Manager	553	35.3%
Director	251	16.0%
Senior Executives	107	6.8%
<i>Not Specified</i>	174	11.1%

<b><i>By Years of Managerial Experience</i></b>	<b><i>Sample Size</i></b>	<b><i>Percentage</i></b>
Less than 1 year	58	3.7%
1-2 years	69	4.4%
2-3 years	82	5.2%
3-5 years	172	11.0%
5-10 years	383	24.4%
10 years above	627	39.9%
<i>Not Specified</i>	179	11.4%

<b><i>By Industry Sector</i></b>	<b><i>Sample Size</i></b>	<b><i>Percentage</i></b>
Communication	30	1.9%
Healthcare/Life Sciences	29	1.8%
Financial Services	169	10.8%
Industrial	991	63.2%
Consumer	196	12.5%
Technology	68	4.3%
<i>Others</i>	87	5.5%

<b><i>By Job Function</i></b>	<b><i>Sample Size</i></b>	<b><i>Percentage</i></b>
Accounting	70	4.5%
Administration & Support	11	0.7%
Advertising/Public relations	13	0.8%
Credit/Finance	80	5.1%
Education & Social Service	4	0.3%
Engineering	37	2.4%
Human Resources/Training	111	7.1%
Information Technology	101	6.4%
Law	12	0.8%
Manufacturing	57	3.6%
Marketing	156	9.9%
Materials	4	0.3%
Management/Purchasing	48	3.1%
Medicine	5	0.3%
Operations	97	6.2%
Product Development	26	1.7%
Quality Control	12	0.8%
Research/Analysis	25	1.6%
Research and Development	33	2.1%
Sales	246	15.6%
Security	6	0.4%
Systems Analysis	5	0.3%
Management & Administration	148	9.4%
<i>Not Specified</i>	263	16.6%

## Part I:

### Career Stallers and Stoppers Norms

In Part I of this report, we present the specific mean ratings and rankings for each of the 19 Career Stallers and Stoppers. Throughout the report, the mean ratings are based on the “All Others” rating category. This set of ratings is calculated by computing the average mean rating of all rater sources, excluding self. Typical other raters include the immediate boss, peers, and direct reports. In some cases, companies also ask customers and other individuals to provide a rating.

The Career Stallers and Stoppers rating scale ranged from 1 (*not a problem*), 2 (*probably not*), 3 (*not sure*), 4 (*probably yes*), to 5 (*definitely*). Thus, low mean ratings indicate that a specific career staller or stopper likely is not a problem. The higher the mean rating the more likely it is a problem.

#### Global Ratings and Rankings

The table below presents the global mean ratings and the rankings of the 19 Career Stallers and Stoppers based on the entire data set of 1,674 individuals collected from companies around the world. As can be seen, “Overmanaging,” “Defensiveness,” and “Overdependence on a Single Skill” have the highest mean values. “Lack of Ethics and Values” has the lowest.

Item	Career Stallers and Stoppers	Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank
117	Overmanaging	1.76	0.50	1
108	Defensiveness	1.76	0.53	2
116	Overdependence on a Single Skill	1.75	0.43	3
114	Non-Strategic	1.70	0.46	4
113	Key Skill Deficiencies	1.69	0.49	5
111	Failure to Staff Effectively	1.68	0.44	6
107	Lack of Composure	1.65	0.51	7
110	Failure to Build a Team	1.64	0.48	8
103	Overly Ambitious	1.64	0.50	9
112	Insensitive to Others	1.63	0.56	10
104	Arrogant	1.63	0.55	11
101	Unable to Adapt to Differences	1.59	0.42	12
119	Political Missteps	1.59	0.43	13
102	Poor Administrator	1.59	0.50	14
115	Overdependence on an Advocate	1.53	0.45	15

Item	Career Stallers and Stoppers	Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank
106	Blocked Personal Learner	1.49	0.37	16
118	Performance Problems	1.43	0.43	17
105	Betrayal of Trust	1.43	0.41	18
109	Lack of Ethics and Values	1.22	0.29	19

## Regional Ratings

The table below presents the mean Career Stallers and Stoppers ratings for the six international regions. Means displayed in **red** denote the highest mean value among the six global regions – suggesting the greatest likelihood it would be a problem. Means displayed in **green** denote the lowest mean value among the six regions – suggesting the least likelihood it would be a problem. The last row indicates the average rating across all 19 Career Stallers and Stoppers.

Item	Career Stallers and Stoppers	NA	EU	NZ/AU	Asia	SA	AF
101	Unable to Adapt to Differences	1.53	1.59	1.57	<b>1.72</b>	<b>1.47</b>	1.57
102	Poor Administrator	1.54	1.63	<b>1.53</b>	<b>1.66</b>	1.56	1.59
103	Overly Ambitious	<b>1.55</b>	<b>1.75</b>	1.57	<b>1.79</b>	1.61	1.75
104	Arrogant	<b>1.56</b>	1.71	1.59	1.69	<b>1.72</b>	1.67
105	Betrayal of Trust	1.38	1.47	<b>1.33</b>	<b>1.52</b>	1.40	1.45
106	Blocked Personal Learner	1.43	1.51	1.51	<b>1.60</b>	<b>1.34</b>	1.41
107	Lack of Composure	<b>1.55</b>	1.75	1.59	<b>1.79</b>	1.68	1.80
108	Defensiveness	<b>1.68</b>	1.83	1.69	<b>1.90</b>	1.88	1.84
109	Lack of Ethics and Values	1.16	1.22	1.21	<b>1.34</b>	<b>1.13</b>	1.22
110	Failure to Build a Team	1.59	1.71	<b>1.57</b>	<b>1.75</b>	1.60	1.70
111	Failure to Staff Effectively	1.63	1.66	<b>1.54</b>	<b>1.89</b>	1.63	1.74
112	Insensitive to Others	<b>1.56</b>	1.74	1.57	<b>1.77</b>	1.64	1.67
113	Key Skill Deficiencies	<b>1.61</b>	1.68	1.64	<b>1.87</b>	1.65	1.74
114	Non-Strategic	1.61	1.67	1.67	<b>1.92</b>	<b>1.56</b>	1.76
115	Overdependence on an Advocate	1.47	1.49	1.46	<b>1.73</b>	<b>1.37</b>	1.56
116	Overdependence on a Single Skill	<b>1.67</b>	1.75	1.76	<b>1.96</b>	1.71	1.81
117	Overmanaging	1.71	1.78	1.72	1.88	<b>1.68</b>	<b>1.89</b>
118	Performance Problems	1.38	1.43	<b>1.37</b>	<b>1.57</b>	1.43	1.39
119	Political Missteps	1.53	1.57	1.57	<b>1.73</b>	<b>1.42</b>	1.60
	<i>Overall Mean Rating</i>	<b>1.53</b>	1.63	1.55	<b>1.74</b>	1.55	1.64

Overall, Asia consistently has the highest mean ratings – 17 out of the 19 Career Stallers and Stoppers are highest (most problematic) in Asia. In contrast, 7 out of the 19 lowest (least problematic) ratings are in North America. This finding is consistent with the results for competency ratings as well. That is, we repeatedly

observe that North America has relatively higher skill ratings on competencies than other regions across the globe. Although it may be tempting to interpret that managers in North America have superior leadership skills, perhaps, raters in North America are more lenient graders. Thus, caution needs to be used when drawing conclusions from these scores.

## Regional Rank Orders

The table below presents the rank orders of the 19 Career Stallers and Stoppers for each of the six international regions.

Item	Career Stallers and Stoppers	NA	EU	NZ/AU	Asia	SA	AF
117	Overmanaging	1	2	2	5	4	1
108	Defensiveness	2	1	3	3	1	2
116	Overdependence on a Single Skill	3	5	1	1	3	3
111	Failure to Staff Effectively	4	11	13	4	8	7
113	Key Skill Deficiencies	5	9	5	6	6	8
114	Non-Strategic	6	10	4	2	12	5
110	Failure to Build a Team	7	7	10	10	10	9
104	Arrogant	8	8	6	14	2	11
112	Insensitive to Others	9	6	8	9	7	10
103	Overly Ambitious	10	4	12	7	9	6
107	Lack of Composure	11	3	7	8	5	4
102	Poor Administrator	12	12	14	15	11	13
101	Unable to Adapt to Differences	13	13	9	13	13	14
119	Political Missteps	14	14	11	11	15	12
115	Overdependence on an Advocate	15	16	16	12	17	15
106	Blocked Personal Learner	16	15	15	16	18	17
118	Performance Problems	17	18	17	17	14	18
105	Betrayal of Trust	18	17	18	18	16	16
109	Lack of Ethics and Values	19	19	19	19	19	19

Some Career Stallers and Stoppers are consistently among the top ranked, such as “Overmanaging,” “Defensiveness,” and “Overdependence on a Single Skill.” Other Career Stallers and Stoppers are consistently among the bottom ranked, such as “Lack of Ethics and Values,” “Betrayal of Trust,” “Performance Problems,” and “Blocked Personal Learner.” Career Stallers and Stoppers such as “Arrogant,” “Non-Strategic,” and “Failure to Staff Effectively” vary greatly across regions.

However, overall, the Career Stallers and Stoppers ratings are highly correlated across the six global regions investigated in this study. The following table displays the inter-regional correlation coefficients. The coefficients above the

diagonal (**in bold**) depict correlations for the *mean ratings*. The coefficients below the diagonal depict correlations of the *rank orders*.

Region	NA	EU	NZ/AU	Asia	SA	AF
NA	—	<b>0.93</b>	<b>0.95</b>	<b>0.95</b>	<b>0.88</b>	<b>0.95</b>
EU	0.82	—	<b>0.90</b>	<b>0.86</b>	<b>0.95</b>	<b>0.95</b>
NZ/AU	0.86	0.82	—	<b>0.92</b>	<b>0.82</b>	<b>0.91</b>
Asia	0.89	0.76	0.81	—	<b>0.81</b>	<b>0.93</b>
SA	0.85	0.88	0.83	0.68	—	<b>0.90</b>
AF	0.90	0.92	0.86	0.92	0.82	—

Note. All the correlation coefficients are statistically significant,  $p < .001$ .

## Ratings and Rankings by Gender

The table below presents the mean Career Stallers and Stoppers ratings and rankings for males and females, respectively. The last row presents the average ratings across the 19 Career Stallers and Stoppers. As can be seen, the mean difference between males and females is very trivial. In general, there is much similarity between males and females. The mean ratings across the 19 Career Stallers and Stoppers are highly correlated ( $r = 0.89$ ). The rankings also are highly correlated ( $r = 0.84$ ). The largest difference among the 19 Career Stallers and Stoppers is on “Lack of Composure,” with females ( $M = 1.73$ ) having a relatively higher rating than males ( $M = 1.60$ ).

Item	Career Stallers and Stoppers	Male			Female		
		Mean	Std.	Rank	Mean	Std.	Rank
116	Overdependence on a Single Skill	1.78	0.45	1	1.70	0.39	4
117	Overmanaging	1.73	0.51	2	1.82	0.49	1
108	Defensiveness	1.73	0.50	3	1.82	0.55	2
113	Key Skill Deficiencies	1.72	0.50	4	1.62	0.46	8
111	Failure to Staff Effectively	1.69	0.45	5	1.67	0.42	6
114	Non-Strategic	1.69	0.46	6	1.69	0.44	5
103	Overly Ambitious	1.66	0.51	7	1.59	0.47	10
110	Failure to Build a Team	1.66	0.50	8	1.61	0.46	9
104	Arrogant	1.65	0.57	9	1.57	0.49	12
112	Insensitive to Others	1.63	0.56	10	1.65	0.55	7
102	Poor Administrator	1.63	0.52	11	1.48	0.42	15
119	Political Missteps	1.60	0.45	12	1.54	0.39	13
107	Lack of Composure	1.60	0.49	13	1.73	0.54	3
101	Unable to Adapt to Differences	1.58	0.43	14	1.58	0.39	11
115	Overdependence on an Advocate	1.52	0.45	15	1.53	0.43	14
106	Blocked Personal Learner	1.50	0.39	16	1.45	0.33	16
118	Performance Problems	1.46	0.45	17	1.37	0.38	18

Item	Career Stallers and Stoppers	Male			Female		
		Mean	Std.	Rank	Mean	Std.	Rank
105	Betrayal of Trust	1.44	0.41	18	1.38	0.38	17
109	Lack of Ethics and Values	1.23	0.30	19	1.19	0.24	19
	<i>Overall Mean Rating</i>	<i>1.61</i>			<i>1.58</i>		

## Ratings and Rankings by Position Level

Because the sample size for entry-level individual contributors is extremely small ( $N = 9$ ), we only calculated the mean ratings for the other five position levels – senior individual contributor, supervisor, manager, director, and executive. The table below presents the mean ratings of the 19 Career Stallers and Stoppers for each of these five positions.

Means displayed in **red** denote the highest mean value among the six global regions – suggesting the greatest likelihood it would be a problem. Means displayed in **green** denote the lowest mean value among the six regions – suggesting the least likelihood it would be a problem. The last row indicates the average rating across all 19 Career Stallers and Stoppers. As can be observed, no distinct pattern of low and high mean scores seems to favor one position over another.

Item	Career Stallers and Stoppers	Senior IC	Supv	Mgr	Dir	Exec
101	Unable to Adapt to Differences	<b>1.64</b>	1.62	<b>1.55</b>	1.56	1.58
102	Poor Administrator	1.57	1.58	<b>1.60</b>	<b>1.52</b>	<b>1.60</b>
103	Overly Ambitious	<b>1.55</b>	1.62	1.65	1.66	<b>1.66</b>
104	Arrogant	<b>1.57</b>	1.61	<b>1.62</b>	1.68	1.61
105	Betrayal of Trust	<b>1.38</b>	1.40	<b>1.43</b>	<b>1.43</b>	1.42
106	Blocked Personal Learner	1.52	1.51	1.47	<b>1.45</b>	<b>1.48</b>
107	Lack of Composure	<b>1.59</b>	<b>1.70</b>	1.62	1.64	1.60
108	Defensiveness	<b>1.76</b>	1.77	1.74	<b>1.81</b>	1.70
109	Lack of Ethics and Values	<b>1.16</b>	<b>1.24</b>	1.21	1.21	1.18
110	Failure to Build a Team	<b>1.70</b>	1.67	<b>1.62</b>	1.63	1.63
111	Failure to Staff Effectively	<b>1.63</b>	1.66	1.70	1.67	<b>1.74</b>
112	Insensitive to Others	<b>1.57</b>	<b>1.57</b>	1.63	<b>1.74</b>	1.63
113	Key Skill Deficiencies	1.65	<b>1.73</b>	1.68	<b>1.61</b>	1.71
114	Non-Strategic	<b>1.78</b>	<b>1.78</b>	1.68	<b>1.57</b>	1.62
115	Overdependence on an Advocate	1.57	<b>1.58</b>	1.53	1.47	<b>1.44</b>
116	Overdependence on a Single Skill	1.81	<b>1.83</b>	1.72	1.72	<b>1.70</b>
117	Overmanaging	<b>1.71</b>	<b>1.79</b>	1.77	1.76	1.73
118	Performance Problems	1.40	<b>1.48</b>	1.42	<b>1.37</b>	1.44
119	Political Missteps	<b>1.63</b>	<b>1.63</b>	1.55	1.55	<b>1.53</b>
	<i>Overall Mean Rating</i>	<i>1.59</i>	<i>1.62</i>	<i>1.59</i>	<i>1.58</i>	<i>1.58</i>

The table below presents the rank orders for the five position levels.

Item	Career Stallers and Stoppers	Senior IC	Supv	Mgr	Dir	Exec
116	Overdependence on a Single Skill	1	1	3	4	4
114	Non-Strategic	2	3	5	11	9
108	Defensiveness	3	4	2	1	5
117	Overmanaging	4	2	1	2	2
110	Failure to Build a Team	5	7	10	9	7
113	Key Skill Deficiencies	6	5	6	10	3
101	Unable to Adapt to Differences	7	10	14	12	13
111	Failure to Staff Effectively	8	8	4	6	1
119	Political Missteps	9	9	13	13	14
107	Lack of Composure	10	6	11	8	11
102	Poor Administrator	11	13	12	14	12
104	Arrogant	12	12	9	5	10
112	Insensitive to Others	13	15	8	3	8
115	Overdependence on an Advocate	14	14	15	15	16
103	Overly Ambitious	15	11	7	7	6
106	Blocked Personal Learner	16	16	16	16	15
118	Performance Problems	17	17	18	18	17
105	Betrayal of Trust	18	18	17	17	18
109	Lack of Ethics and Values	19	19	19	19	19

In this instance, there are some noteworthy observations. Some Career Stallers and Stoppers are consistently among the top ranked for all five positions. They are “Overdependence on a Single Skill,” “Overmanaging,” and “Defensiveness.” At the same time, there are some Career Stallers and Stoppers that are consistently among the bottom ranked for all five positions (e.g., “Lack of Ethics and Values,” “Betrayal of Trust,” “Performance Problems,” and “Blocked Personal Learner.”

In addition, the rank order findings reveal that some Career Stallers and Stoppers (e.g., “Non-Strategic” and “Political Missteps”) decrease along the organizational hierarchy. This finding suggests that higher level managers generally have less of an issue on strategy and organizational politics than lower level ones. In contrast, other Career Stallers and Stoppers (e.g., “Overly Ambitious” “Insensitive to Others,” and “Failure to Staff Effectively”) increase as one ascend the organizational hierarchy.

## Part II:

### Career Stallers and Stoppers Harmfulness Norms

In Part II of this report, we present the specific mean harmfulness ratings and rankings for each of the 19 Career Stallers and Stoppers. Such ratings denote the extent to which a given career staller and stopper acts as a derailer. Again, the mean harmfulness ratings are based on the “All Others” rating category.

The Career Stallers and Stoppers Harmfulness rating reflects how harmful a specific staller and stopper would be to the position. The scale ranged from 1 (*not a problem*), 2 (*a slight problem*), 3 (*somewhat of a problem*), 4 (*could be a problem*), to 5 (*definitely a problem*). The higher the mean score, the more of a problem it would cause.

#### Global Harmfulness Ratings and Rankings

The table below depicts the global harmfulness ratings and rankings of the 19 Career Stallers and Stoppers based on the entire data set of 1,570 individuals.

Item	Career Stallers and Stoppers	Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank
118	Performance Problems	4.38	0.40	1
109	Lack of Ethics and Values	4.30	0.44	2
105	Betrayal of Trust	4.30	0.40	3
110	Failure to Build a Team	4.18	0.44	4
114	Non-Strategic	4.06	0.48	5
113	Key Skill Deficiencies	4.06	0.39	6
102	Poor Administrator	4.02	0.43	7
107	Lack of Composure	4.00	0.39	8
111	Failure to Staff Effectively	3.98	0.54	9
119	Political Missteps	3.97	0.41	10
101	Unable to Adapt to Differences	3.92	0.38	11
112	Insensitive to Others	3.91	0.41	12
104	Arrogant	3.87	0.39	13
106	Blocked Personal Learner	3.85	0.39	14
108	Defensiveness	3.84	0.38	15
117	Overmanaging	3.82	0.42	16
116	Overdependence on a Single Skill	3.61	0.38	17
103	Overly Ambitious	3.44	0.44	18
115	Overdependence on an Advocate	3.43	0.44	19

We correlated the global Harmfulness ratings with the global Career Stallers and Stoppers ratings. The two ratings are negatively correlated ( $r = -0.47$ ,  $p < .05$ ). This finding suggests that individuals generally do not have potential derailment issues on areas that are very harmful to their career success.

## Regional Harmfulness Ratings

The table below presents the mean Harmfulness Career Stallers and Stoppers ratings for each of the six international regions. Means displayed in **red** denote the highest mean value among the six global regions – suggesting that this staller and stopper would be more harmful to one’s career than others. Means displayed in **green** denote the lowest mean value among the six regions – suggesting that this staller and stopper would be less harmful to one’s career than others. The last row indicates the average harmfulness rating across all 19 Career Stallers and Stoppers.

As can be seen, South America has the highest harmfulness rating for all 19 Career Stallers and Stoppers. In contrast, New Zealand/Australia has the lowest 12 out of 19 times.

Item	Career Stallers and Stoppers	NA	EU	NZ/AU	Asia	SA	AF
101	Unable to Adapt to Differences	3.98	3.89	<b>3.77</b>	3.85	<b>4.23</b>	3.99
102	Poor Administrator	4.13	<b>3.78</b>	3.91	3.91	<b>4.30</b>	4.14
103	Overly Ambitious	3.53	<b>3.22</b>	3.26	3.39	<b>3.88</b>	3.56
104	Arrogant	3.95	<b>3.73</b>	3.84	3.76	<b>4.10</b>	3.95
105	Betrayal of Trust	4.36	4.23	<b>4.20</b>	<b>4.20</b>	<b>4.48</b>	4.45
106	Blocked Personal Learner	3.87	3.81	<b>3.71</b>	3.84	<b>4.20</b>	3.92
107	Lack of Composure	4.07	3.94	3.90	<b>3.86</b>	<b>4.30</b>	4.11
108	Defensiveness	3.91	3.68	<b>3.69</b>	3.80	<b>4.16</b>	3.94
109	Lack of Ethics and Values	4.35	<b>4.15</b>	<b>4.15</b>	4.25	<b>4.68</b>	4.43
110	Failure to Build a Team	4.19	4.12	<b>4.03</b>	4.19	<b>4.50</b>	4.33
111	Failure to Staff Effectively	4.02	3.97	<b>3.76</b>	3.95	<b>4.31</b>	4.19
112	Insensitive to Others	3.99	<b>3.77</b>	3.83	3.78	<b>4.29</b>	4.01
113	Key Skill Deficiencies	4.10	4.06	<b>3.94</b>	3.97	<b>4.34</b>	4.19
114	Non-Strategic	4.10	4.08	<b>3.84</b>	4.00	<b>4.49</b>	4.20
115	Overdependence on an Advocate	3.42	3.34	<b>3.29</b>	3.51	<b>3.87</b>	3.58
116	Overdependence on a Single Skill	3.64	<b>3.50</b>	3.51	3.59	<b>3.95</b>	3.73
117	Overmanaging	3.89	3.71	<b>3.66</b>	3.76	<b>4.15</b>	3.95
118	Performance Problems	4.43	4.36	<b>4.25</b>	4.26	<b>4.58</b>	4.50
119	Political Missteps	4.05	3.88	3.91	<b>3.81</b>	<b>4.23</b>	4.05
	<i>Overall Mean Rating</i>	4.00	3.85	<b>3.81</b>	3.88	<b>4.26</b>	4.07

## Regional Harmfulness Rank Orders

The following table presents the rank order of the 19 Career Stallers and Stoppers based on Harmfulness ratings for each of the six international regions.

Item	Career Stallers and Stoppers	NA	EU	NZ/AU	Asia	SA	AF
118	Performance Problems	1	1	1	1	2	1
105	Betrayal of Trust	2	2	2	3	5	2
109	Lack of Ethics and Values	3	3	3	2	1	3
110	Failure to Build a Team	4	4	4	4	3	4
102	Poor Administrator	5	12	7	8	8	8
113	Key Skill Deficiencies	6	6	5	6	6	6
114	Non-Strategic	7	5	9	5	4	5
107	Lack of Composure	8	8	8	9	9	9
119	Political Missteps	9	10	6	12	12	10
111	Failure to Staff Effectively	10	7	13	7	7	7
112	Insensitive to Others	11	13	11	14	10	11
101	Unable to Adapt to Differences	12	9	12	10	11	12
104	Arrogant	13	14	10	15	16	14
108	Defensiveness	14	16	15	13	14	15
117	Overmanaging	15	15	16	16	15	13
106	Blocked Personal Learner	16	11	14	11	13	16
116	Overdependence on a Single Skill	17	17	17	17	17	17
103	Overly Ambitious	18	19	19	19	18	19
115	Overdependence on an Advocate	19	18	18	18	19	18

There is more similarity across the regions on the harmfulness rankings than career stallers and stoppers rankings. The harmfulness of some Career Stallers and Stoppers is consistently among the top ranked, such as “Performance Problems,” “Betrayal of Trust,” “Lack of Ethics and Values,” and “Failure to Build a Team.” Other Career Stallers and Stoppers are consistently among the bottom ranked (e.g., “Overdependence on an Advocate,” “Overly Ambitious,” and “Overdependence on a Single Skill”).

The table on the next page illustrates the inter-region correlation coefficients for Harmfulness ratings. The numbers above the diagonal represent correlations of the **mean staller ratings (in bold)**. The numbers below the diagonal depict the correlations of the *rank orders*.

Region	NA	EU	NZ/AU	Asia	SA	AF
NA	—	<b>0.91</b>	<b>0.96</b>	<b>0.93</b>	<b>0.94</b>	<b>0.97</b>
EU	0.91	—	<b>0.87</b>	<b>0.97</b>	<b>0.95</b>	<b>0.95</b>
NZ/AU	0.96	0.88	—	<b>0.86</b>	<b>0.86</b>	<b>0.91</b>
Asia	0.93	0.97	0.87	—	<b>0.97</b>	<b>0.95</b>
SA	0.94	0.94	0.86	0.97	—	<b>0.96</b>
AF	0.97	0.95	0.91	0.95	0.96	—

Note. All the correlation coefficients are statistically significant,  $p < .001$ .

## Harmfulness Ratings and Rankings by Gender

The table below presents the mean Career Stallers and Stoppers Harmfulness ratings and rankings for males and females, respectively. Overall, the harmfulness ratings are extremely similar between males and females. The correlation between males and females is greater than  $r = 0.99$  ( $p < .001$ ).

Item	Career Stallers and Stoppers	Male			Female		
		Mean	Std.	Rank	Mean	Std.	Rank
118	Performance Problems	4.36	0.41	1	4.41	0.39	1
105	Betrayal of Trust	4.29	0.40	2	4.32	0.38	2
109	Lack of Ethics and Values	4.28	0.45	3	4.32	0.42	3
110	Failure to Build a Team	4.17	0.43	4	4.19	0.45	4
114	Non-Strategic	4.05	0.49	5	4.10	0.47	5
113	Key Skill Deficiencies	4.04	0.39	6	4.10	0.37	6
107	Lack of Composure	3.99	0.40	7	4.03	0.38	8
102	Poor Administrator	3.98	0.43	8	4.09	0.41	7
111	Failure to Staff Effectively	3.98	0.52	9	4.00	0.54	9
119	Political Missteps	3.95	0.42	10	4.00	0.38	10
101	Unable to Adapt to Differences	3.90	0.38	11	3.97	0.37	11
112	Insensitive to Others	3.89	0.40	12	3.95	0.41	12
104	Arrogant	3.85	0.41	13	3.92	0.35	13
106	Blocked Personal Learner	3.83	0.38	14	3.89	0.40	15
108	Defensiveness	3.81	0.37	15	3.90	0.37	14
117	Overmanaging	3.80	0.41	16	3.86	0.42	16
116	Overdependence on a Single Skill	3.58	0.38	17	3.65	0.38	17
103	Overly Ambitious	3.41	0.43	18	3.50	0.43	18
115	Overdependence on an Advocate	3.41	0.44	19	3.47	0.45	19
	<i>Overall Mean Rating</i>	3.92			3.98		

## Harmfulness Ratings and Rankings by Position Level

We calculated the mean Career Stallers and Stoppers Harmfulness ratings for the following five position levels: (a) senior individual contributor, (b) supervisor, (c) manager, (d) director, and (e) executive. The table below displays the results. As previously done, means depicted in **red** denote the highest mean value among the six global regions – suggesting that this staller and stopper would be more harmful to an individual in this position than the others. Means displayed in **green** denote the lowest mean value among the six regions – suggesting that this staller and stopper would be less harmful to one in this position than in another position. The last row indicates the average harmfulness rating across all 19 Career Stallers and Stoppers for each of the five position levels.

As can be seen, the overall mean rating (see bottom row) generally increases along the organizational hierarchy. It appears that the Career Stallers and Stoppers become more harmful to the success as one moves up the career ladder. The senior individual contributor position has the lowest mean harmfulness score on 17 of the 19 derailleurs. All of the highest harmfulness mean scores are for the director and executive positions. Surprisingly, the harmfulness of the Career Stallers and Stoppers appears more salient for the director-level position than for executives. Fully, 17 of the 19 were perceived most damaging for directors. One interpretation is that raters perceive executives can get away with such transgressions due to their high organizational power and influence.

Item	Career Stallers and Stoppers	Senior IC	Supv	Mgr	Dir	Exec
101	Unable to Adapt to Differences	3.79	3.86	3.95	4.03	4.01
102	Poor Administrator	3.99	4.02	4.01	4.08	3.97
103	Overly Ambitious	3.23	3.41	3.46	3.56	3.48
104	Arrogant	3.79	3.85	3.87	3.96	3.90
105	Betrayal of Trust	4.25	4.22	4.32	4.41	4.35
106	Blocked Personal Learner	3.71	3.81	3.87	3.92	3.92
107	Lack of Composure	3.86	3.93	4.03	4.12	4.03
108	Defensiveness	3.70	3.78	3.88	3.94	3.85
109	Lack of Ethics and Values	4.16	4.19	4.31	4.47	4.38
110	Failure to Build a Team	3.78	4.06	4.25	4.32	4.36
111	Failure to Staff Effectively	3.44	3.83	4.08	4.16	4.23
112	Insensitive to Others	3.76	3.87	3.93	4.01	3.91
113	Key Skill Deficiencies	3.99	4.02	4.07	4.17	4.07
114	Non-Strategic	3.81	3.86	4.12	4.31	4.26
115	Overdependence on an Advocate	3.28	3.36	3.45	3.55	3.49
116	Overdependence on a Single Skill	3.45	3.56	3.63	3.71	3.65
117	Overmanaging	3.48	3.75	3.88	3.95	3.91
118	Performance Problems	4.26	4.28	4.40	4.51	4.45
119	Political Missteps	3.87	3.87	4.00	4.09	4.01
	<i>Overall Mean Rating</i>	3.77	3.87	3.97	4.07	4.01

The table below presents the harmfulness ranking orders by position level.

Item	Career Stallers and Stoppers	Senior IC	Supv	Mgr	Dir	Exec
118	Performance Problems	1	1	1	1	1
105	Betrayal of Trust	2	2	2	3	4
109	Lack of Ethics and Values	3	3	3	2	2
113	Key Skill Deficiencies	4	6	7	6	7
102	Poor Administrator	5	5	9	10	11
119	Political Missteps	6	8	10	9	10
107	Lack of Composure	7	7	8	8	8
114	Non-Strategic	8	10	5	5	5
104	Arrogant	9	12	15	13	15
101	Unable to Adapt to Differences	10	11	11	11	9
110	Failure to Build a Team	11	4	4	4	3
112	Insensitive to Others	12	9	12	12	14
106	Blocked Personal Learner	13	14	16	16	12
108	Defensiveness	14	15	14	15	16
117	Overmanaging	15	16	13	14	13
116	Overdependence on a Single Skill	16	17	17	17	17
111	Failure to Staff Effectively	17	13	6	7	6
115	Overdependence on an Advocate	18	19	19	19	18
103	Overly Ambitious	19	18	18	18	19

Some Career Stallers and Stoppers are consistently among the top ranked for all the five positions. They include “Performance Problems,” “Betrayal of Trust,” and “Lack of Ethics and Values.” At the same time, there are some Career Stallers and Stoppers that are consistently among the bottom ranked for all five positions (e.g., “Overly Ambitious,” “Overdependence on an Advocate,” and “Overdependence on a Single Skill”).

From individual contributor to supervisor, the largest change is “Failure to Build a Team.” As expected, it becomes more harmful for a supervisor than an individual contributor. From supervisor to manager, the significant changes are on “Failure to Staff Effectively” and Non-Strategic.” They become more harmful for managers than supervisors. Relatively, there is less significant change among the upper three positions – manager, director, and executive.

## Part III:

### Comparison with Previous Norms

In this section, we compared the 2009 norms for Career Stallers and Stoppers with the norms reported in the 2003 technical report. This interval represents a six-year window. Business conditions, global competition, technology, governmental regulations, and talent management practices changed substantially during this time period. It is interesting to see what effect, if any, they had on rater perceptions of career stallers and stoppers.

#### Career Stallers and Stoppers Norms Over Time

The table below directly contrasts the mean ratings and rank orders of the 19 Career Stallers and Stoppers in 2009 with those values in 2003. In addition, the difference in mean ratings (*d* Mean) is reported in the last column.

Item	Career Stallers and Stoppers	2009		2003		<i>d</i> Mean
		Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	
117	Overmanaging	1.76	1	1.74	1	0.02
108	Defensiveness	1.76	2	1.62	4	0.14
116	Overdependence on a Single Skill	1.75	3	1.71	3	0.04
114	Non-Strategic	1.70	4	1.59	9	0.11
113	Key Skill Deficiencies	1.69	5	1.72	2	-0.03
111	Failure to Staff Effectively	1.68	6	1.60	6	0.08
107	Lack of Composure	1.65	7	1.60	5	0.05
110	Failure to Build a Team	1.64	8	1.57	12	0.07
103	Overly Ambitious	1.64	9	1.53	13	0.11
112	Insensitive to Others	1.63	10	1.58	11	0.05
104	Arrogant	1.63	11	1.60	7	0.03
101	Unable to Adapt to Differences	1.59	12	1.59	8	0.00
119	Political Missteps	1.59	13	1.52	14	0.07
102	Poor Administrator	1.59	14	1.58	10	0.01
115	Overdependence on an Advocate	1.53	15	1.42	17	0.11
106	Blocked Personal Learner	1.49	16	1.45	16	0.04
118	Performance Problems	1.43	17	1.47	15	-0.04
105	Betrayal of Trust	1.43	18	1.42	18	0.01
109	Lack of Ethics and Values	1.22	19	1.22	19	0.00
	<i>Overall Mean Rating</i>	1.60		1.55		0.05

As can be observed, the mean ratings and rankings were very stable across time. The rank-order correlation coefficient is  $r = 0.88$  ( $p < .001$ ). Nevertheless,

the overall pattern of results suggests that the presence of Career Stallers and Stoppers increased – albeit only slightly – over time. Mean scores were higher in 2009 than in 2003 on 15 of the 19 areas. The largest difference in mean ratings ( $d = 0.14$ ) is for the career staller and stopper “Defensiveness.” It suggests that learners were slightly more defensive in 2009.

## Ranking Stability by Gender

The table below presents the gender rank orders of Career Stallers and Stoppers based on ratings obtained in 2009 and 2003. Overall, the findings indicate that the rank order for both males and females was very stable across time. The correlation coefficients are  $r_s = 0.91$  and  $0.90$  for males and females, respectively ( $p_s < .001$ ).

Item	Career Stallers and Stoppers	2009		2003	
		Male	Female	Male	Female
116	Overdependence on a Single Skill	1	4	3	5
117	Overmanaging	2	1	1	1
108	Defensiveness	3	2	4	7
113	Key Skill Deficiencies	4	8	2	4
111	Failure to Staff Effectively	5	6	6	10
114	Non-Strategic	6	5	9	3
103	Overly Ambitious	7	10	13	12
110	Failure to Build a Team	8	9	7	11
104	Arrogant	9	12	5	8
112	Insensitive to Others	10	7	11	9
102	Poor Administrator	11	15	8	15
119	Political Missteps	12	13	14	13
107	Lack of Composure	13	3	10	2
101	Unable to Adapt to Differences	14	11	12	6
115	Overdependence on an Advocate	15	14	17	14
106	Blocked Personal Learner	16	16	16	16
118	Performance Problems	17	18	15	17
105	Betrayal of Trust	18	17	18	18
109	Lack of Ethics and Values	19	19	19	19

## Ranking Stability by Position Level

In order to compare our current norms with the 2003 norms, we collapsed the positions into three levels. The three position levels are individual contributor,

manager, and executive. The table below presents the rank orders for these three positions.

Item	Career Stallers and Stoppers	2009			2003		
		IC	Mgr	Exec	IC	Mgr	Exec
116	Overdependence on a Single Skill	1	2	3	4	3	3
108	Defensiveness	2	3	1	2	5	5
114	Non-Strategic	3	4	11	6	4	13
110	Failure to Build a Team	4	8	10	10	8	11
117	Overmanaging	5	1	2	1	1	1
101	Unable to Adapt to Differences	6	14	12	3	7	9
113	Key Skill Deficiencies	7	5	8	7	2	2
119	Political Missteps	8	13	13	11	13	14
107	Lack of Composure	9	7	9	5	6	8
111	Failure to Staff Effectively	10	6	5	15	9	7
112	Insensitive to Others	11	11	4	9	11	6
104	Arrogant	12	10	7	8	10	4
102	Poor Administrator	13	12	14	13	12	10
115	Overdependence on an Advocate	14	15	16	14	15	18
103	Overly Ambitious	15	9	6	12	14	12
106	Blocked Personal Learner	16	16	15	17	16	15
118	Performance Problems	17	17	18	16	17	16
105	Betrayal of Trust	18	18	17	18	18	17
109	Lack of Ethics and Values	19	19	19	19	19	19

Overall, the findings indicate that the rank order for each of the positions is stable across time. The correlation coefficients for the individual contributor, manager, and executive positions are  $r_s = 0.86, 0.91,$  and  $0.87$  respectively ( $p_s < .001$ ).

## Career Stallers and Stoppers Harmfulness Norms Over Time

The table below compares the 2009 norms with the 2003 norms.

Item	Career Stallers and Stoppers	2009		2003		d Mean
		Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	
118	Performance Problems	4.38	1	3.69	1	0.69
109	Lack of Ethics and Values	4.30	2	3.48	5	0.82
105	Betrayal of Trust	4.30	3	3.58	2	0.72
110	Failure to Build a Team	4.18	4	3.48	6	0.70
114	Non-Strategic	4.06	5	3.41	10	0.65
113	Key Skill Deficiencies	4.06	6	3.45	7	0.61
102	Poor Administrator	4.02	7	3.53	3	0.49

Item	Career Stallers and Stoppers	2009		2003		d Mean
		Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	
107	Lack of Composure	4.00	8	3.48	4	0.52
111	Failure to Staff Effectively	3.98	9	3.42	9	0.56
119	Political Missteps	3.97	10	3.43	8	0.54
101	Unable to Adapt to Differences	3.92	11	3.39	11	0.53
112	Insensitive to Others	3.91	12	3.37	12	0.54
104	Arrogant	3.87	13	3.35	13	0.52
106	Blocked Personal Learner	3.85	14	3.29	16	0.56
108	Defensiveness	3.84	15	3.34	15	0.50
117	Overmanaging	3.82	16	3.34	14	0.48
116	Overdependence on a Single Skill	3.61	17	3.10	17	0.51
103	Overly Ambitious	3.44	18	3.04	18	0.40
115	Overdependence on an Advocate	3.43	19	2.85	19	0.58
	<i>Overall Mean Rating</i>	<i>3.94</i>		<i>3.37</i>		<i>0.57</i>

As with the Career Stallers and Stoppers, the Harmfulness norms were relatively stable over time. The rank-order correlation is  $r > 0.99$  ( $p < .001$ ). However, the mean rating on average increased 0.58 from 2003 to 2009. Consequently, the data indicate that people perceived these 19 Career Stallers and Stoppers much more harmful to one's career now than a few years ago.

## Harmfulness Ranking Stability by Gender

The table below contrasts the gender norms for 2009 and 2003. Again, the rank order is very stable across time for both males and females. The rank-order correlation coefficients are  $r_s = 0.91$  and  $0.85$  for males and females, respectively ( $p_s < .001$ ).

Item	Career Stallers and Stoppers	2009		2003	
		Male	Female	Male	Female
118	Performance Problems	1	1	1	1
105	Betrayal of Trust	2	2	2	3
109	Lack of Ethics and Values	3	3	4	6
110	Failure to Build a Team	4	4	8	7
114	Non-Strategic	5	5	9	12
113	Key Skill Deficiencies	6	6	7	4
107	Lack of Composure	7	8	5	5
102	Poor Administrator	8	7	3	2
111	Failure to Staff Effectively	9	9	10	16
119	Political Missteps	10	10	6	9
101	Unable to Adapt to Differences	11	11	11	8

Item	Career Stallers and Stoppers	2009		2003	
		Male	Female	Male	Female
112	Insensitive to Others	12	12	12	10
104	Arrogant	13	13	14	11
106	Blocked Personal Learner	14	15	16	14
108	Defensiveness	15	14	15	13
117	Overmanaging	16	16	13	15
116	Overdependence on a Single Skill	17	17	17	17
103	Overly Ambitious	18	18	18	18
115	Overdependence on an Advocate	19	19	19	19

### Harmfulness Ranking Stability by Position Level

Again, we collapsed the positions into three levels to compare the 2009 Career Stallers and Stoppers Harmfulness norms with the 2003 norms. Again, the three position levels are individual contributor, manager, and executive. The following table presents the rank orders for each position in 2009 and 2003.

Item	Career Stallers and Stoppers	2009			2003		
		IC	Mgr	Exec	IC	Mgr	Exec
118	Performance Problems	1	1	1	1	1	1
105	Betrayal of Trust	2	2	3	3	3	2
109	Lack of Ethics and Values	3	3	2	6	7	4
113	Key Skill Deficiencies	4	5	7	4	4	10
102	Poor Administrator	5	7	10	2	2	6
107	Lack of Composure	6	8	8	5	5	7
119	Political Missteps	7	10	9	7	8	9
104	Arrogant	8	13	13	12	11	14
101	Unable to Adapt to Differences	9	11	11	8	9	13
110	Failure to Build a Team	10	4	4	10	6	5
114	Non-Strategic	11	6	5	11	14	8
112	Insensitive to Others	12	12	12	13	12	12
106	Blocked Personal Learner	13	14	15	15	16	16
108	Defensiveness	14	15	16	9	15	15
117	Overmanaging	15	16	14	14	13	11
116	Overdependence on a Single Skill	16	17	17	17	17	17
111	Failure to Staff Effectively	17	9	6	16	10	3
115	Overdependence on an Advocate	18	19	19	19	19	19
103	Overly Ambitious	19	18	18	18	18	18

As you can see, “Performance Problems” remained the #1 career derailer regardless of position level. Overall, the rank order for each of the three positions

is very stable across time. The rank-order correlation coefficients for the three positions are  $r_s = 0.94, 0.87, \text{ and } 0.94$ , respectively ( $p_s < .001$ ).