

Measuring Organizational Arrogance: Development and Validation of a
Theory-Based Instrument

Submitted to Regent University

School of Business & Leadership

In partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy in Organizational Leadership

C. Victor Herbin III

April 2018

ProQuest Number: 10825534

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10825534

Published by ProQuest LLC (2018). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

School of Business & Leadership

Regent University

This is to certify that the dissertation prepared by:

C. Victor Herbin III

titled

**MEASURING ORGANIZATIONAL ARROGANCE: DEVELOPMENT AND
VALIDATION OF A THEORY-BASED INSTRUMENT**

Has been approved by his/her committee as satisfactory completion of the dissertation
requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Approved By:

James A. (Andy) Wood, JR., Ph.D., Chair

School of Business & Leadership

Bruce E. Winston, Ph.D., Committee Member

School of Business & Leadership

G.R. Bud West, Ph.D., Committee Member

School of Business & Leadership

April 2018

Abstract

This research described the formation of an emerging concept, organizational arrogance, and the development of an instrument designed to measure this organizational behavior phenomenon. This dissertation was completed in response to the established need for empirical evidence examining arrogant behaviors and their negative impact on organizational members and organizations in general. This study defined organizational arrogance as an organizational environment where leaders shaped a culture in which organizational members behaved with a sense of superiority, leading to overconfidence in organizational capabilities, dismissiveness toward internal and external needs, and disparagement of intraorganizational and interorganizational members. Using existing theories, this research developed and validated a 5-item measurement scale for organizational arrogance with a Cronbach alpha of .922, indicating a reliable instrument. Ongoing research reported findings on a variety of factors that played into organizational failure, including level of job satisfaction, employee engagement, morale, workplace stress, organizational culture, and ineffective leadership and followership styles. Findings from this study provided the body of knowledge opportunities for new exploration to gain further understanding of how organizational arrogance and its associated traits contributed to or birth from the dark side of leadership. The practical significance of this study was that it reinforced the idea that organizational culture remained a leader responsibility that required keen attention, astute observations, and immediate action to eliminate any signs of organizational arrogance.

Dedication

This work is dedicated to my Almighty Father in Heaven, who despite my human frailty, trusted me with such a large responsibility in the area of leadership. Who, in 2009, woke me from slumber during my third combat deployment to Iraq and told me to pursue this degree despite my protests. Who provided me the encouragement, perseverance, work ethic, time, and supernatural energy to make what I believed the impossible become possible. Not to be remised, his unconditional love, grace, and mercy provided me with the confidence to complete his work.

Acknowledgements

Special thanks to Dr. James (Andy) Wood, who served as my dissertation chair and possessed unwavering belief in, encouraged, and supported me throughout my doctoral journey.

Special thanks to my wife, Dr. Serelda Herbin, who witnessed the highs and lows of my journey and encouraged me to find balance throughout the process and endure hardship as a good soldier. My son, C. Victor Herbin IV, and my daughter, Aladrian (Lady) Herbin, who, for 5 years, had to share my time with projects and papers but found ways to make me smile and laugh daily. You three are my world, and I am truly blessed beyond all measure.

Special recognition to my parents, Lieutenant Colonel C. Victor Herbin, Jr, United States Army Retired, and Hervadine Herbin, who instilled in me a “never give up” work ethic, the power of family, and incomparable support and encouragement over the course of my life.

To the Herbin Hoover Brewer (HHB) who continues to demonstrate love and protection of your big brother to ensure that I not only reach my goals in life, but also give the care, compassion, and support to keep things in perspective.

To my brothers of Omega Psi Phi Fraternity Incorporated who reinforced our cardinal principles of Manhood, Scholarship, Perseverance, and Uplift as I endeavored to reach my aspirations through truth.

Finally, a special thanks to the military and civilian members of the 12th Battalion/Baltimore Military Entrance Processing Station in Fort Meade, Maryland; Fort Lee, Virginia; Fort Jackson, South Carolina; Beckley, West Virginia; Charlotte, North Carolina; and Raleigh, North Carolina, who provided encouragement, positive communication, trust, and unique leadership experiences that reignited a leadership spark in me that will shine forever. Thank you for believing in me and reaffirming the importance of making personnel business personal.

Table of Contents

Abstract	iii
Dedication	iv
Acknowledgements	v
List of Tables.....	ix
Chapter 1 – Introduction	1
Theoretical and Conceptual Framework.....	4
Narcissistic Leadership Theory	5
Machiavellian Leadership Theory	6
Psychopathy Leadership Theory.....	6
Autocratic leadership Theory	7
Organizational Identity	8
Organizational Arrogance.....	9
Leads to Overconfidence in Organizational Capabilities	10
Leads to Dismissiveness Toward Internal and External Organizational Matters	11
Leads to Disparagement Toward Intraorganizational and Interorganizational Members.....	12
Scope of This Study	13
Method	14
Define the Construct	14
Generate an Item Pool	15
Determine the Format for the Measurement.....	15
Expert Reviewed Item Pool	15
Administer Items to a Development Sample	16
Evaluation of the Items	16
Optimize Scale Length	17
Significance of the Study	17
Chapter 2 – Literature Review	19
Recognize the Problem: Leaders Shape the Culture and Identity.....	20
Narcissistic Leadership	20

Machiavellian Leadership.....	20
Psychopathy Leader.....	21
Autocratic Leader	22
Organizational Identity	23
Defining the Problem: Building the Organizational Arrogance Definition.....	23
Overconfidence in Organizational Capabilities.....	27
Dismissiveness Toward Internal and External Organizational Matters	30
Disparagement Toward Intra-Organizational and Interorganizational Members	36
Measuring the Problem: Summary of the Literature and Prospective Items	39
Chapter 3 – Method.....	46
Construct and Instrument Development	46
Theoretically Based Item Pool.....	47
Organizational Arrogance Scale Format	47
Expert Panelists	48
Population and Sample Size.....	49
Data Collection	49
Analysis.....	50
Chapter 4 – Results	51
Expert Item Review	51
Results of Pilot Test.....	58
Demographic Data.....	58
Results of the Organizational Arrogance Scale Pilot Test.....	61
Results Summary	69
Chapter 5 – Discussion	71
Theoretical Significance	73
Indicators for Overconfidence in Organizational Capabilities	73
Indicators for Dismissiveness Toward Internal and External Organizational Matters	74
Indicators for Disparagement Toward Intraorganizational and Interorganizational Members.....	75

Practical Significance.....	76
Limitations	78
Areas of Future Research.....	79
Conclusion	80
References	81
Appendix A	90
Original Organizational Arrogance Pool of Items	90
Appendix B	96
Expert Panel Questionnaire.....	96
Appendix C	107
Participant Enlistment Message	107
Appendix D	108
Informed Consent Language: Survey Research.....	108
Appendix E	109
Pilot Test	109
Appendix F.....	124
Regent University: Human Subjects Review Board Application	124

List of Tables

Table 1: Overconfidence and Disparagement Items	27
Table 2: Overconfidence in Organizational Capabilities Items	29
Table 3: Dismissiveness Toward Organizational Matters Items.....	34
Table 4: Disparagement Toward Intraorganizational and Interorganizational Items.....	38
Table 5: Prospective Organizational Arrogance Scale Items.....	40
Table 6: 50-Item Organizational Arrogance Scale Pilot Test	55
Table 7: Ethnicity.....	59
Table 8: Job Level.....	59
Table 9: Organizational Size.....	60
Table 10: Education Level	60
Table 11: Total Variance Explained	62
Table 12: 37-Item Organizational Arrogance Component Matrix.....	64
Table 13: 27-Item Organizational Arrogance Reliability Statistics.....	66
Table 14: 27-Item Organizational Arrogance Scale.....	67
Table 15: 5-Item Organizational Arrogance Component Matrix.....	69
Table 16: 5-Item Organizational Arrogance Reliability Statistics.....	69

Chapter 1 – Introduction

Pride is an independent, me-oriented spirit. It makes people arrogant, rude and hard to get along with. When our heart is prideful, we don't give God the credit and we mistreat people, looking down on them and thinking we deserve what we have. (Meyer, 2011, para. 2)

Kodak, Enron, GM, IBM, US Steel, United Way, and the Nixon administration represent a sample of organizations that experienced organizational failure directly attributed to individual arrogance. A review of these cases indicated leaders within these organizations behaved with a sense of superiority that led to unethical business practices, poor decision making, greed, and a disregard for organizational members' input and contributions. Whether private, public, non-profit, or a governmental organization, each industry remains vulnerable to arrogant organizational members who, if not properly corralled, will establish conditions for a negative work environment and poor morale.

Employees highly favor modest coworkers, as opposed to arrogant ones (Wosinska, Dabul, Whetstone-Dion, & Cialdini, 1996). Subsequently, arrogance represents a critical factor that precedes executive failure and can lead toward organizational failure (Leslie & Van Velsor, 1996; Burke, 2006). Executive or organizational failures manifest in a variety of ways, ranging from leader dismissal, organizational collapse, or—the most significant—a corporate scandal that involves greed, power, sex, or money. As a result, organization leaders experience shame and embarrassment, and organizational members risk job security, stability, and their quality of life. Further insight into the source of the scandals typically reveals arrogant behavior contributed to the destruction within the organization (Ma & Karri, 2005). Arrogance is defined as a “set of behaviors that communicates a person's exaggerated sense of superiority, which is often accomplished by disparaging others” (Johnson et al., 2010, p. 405). Johnson et al. (2010) furthered the existing definition of arrogance and introduced the concept of workplace arrogance, defined as “behaviors that exaggerate actors' self-importance and that disparage their colleagues” (p. 410).

While the workplace arrogance construct and measuring instrument provided relevant and substantial insight that successfully narrowed the existing knowledge gap, the body of knowledge required a more comprehensive and sustainable definition to measure the construct on an organization-wide scale. The focus of this research addressed this gap and built Johnson et al.'s (2010) workplace arrogance construct and the Workplace Arrogance Scale (WAS). Moreover, it introduced the concept of organizational arrogance (OA), defined as an organizational environment where leaders shaped a culture in which members behaved with a sense of superiority that led to overconfidence in organizational capabilities (cf. Croft & Donker, 2006; Ma & Karri, 2005; Pater, 2013), dismissiveness toward internal and external organizational matters (cf. Milyavsky, Krunglanski, Chemikova, & Schori-Eyal, 2017; Tiberius & Walker, 1998), and disparagement toward intra-organizational and interorganizational members (cf. Hamlin & Hatton, 2013; Johnson et al., 2010). Unlike individual or group level arrogance, this definition focuses on arrogance at the organizational level, most specifically how the organization behaves and treats its employees as a culture.

Leaders remain instrumental in developing an organizational culture and the acceptable behavior toward employees. Schein (2010) contended that “culture and leadership are two sides of the same coin” (p. 22) that required effective engagement to ensure successful alignment. Successful leaders demonstrate their levels of influence “through a managerial and organizational culture. At the same time, they help to shape a culture, to transform. In turn, the organizational culture and the management will shape the attitudes and behaviours of managers and employees within the company” (Sergiu, 2015, p. 139). Building on this premise, individually arrogant leaders, at the highest levels, can help shape an arrogant organization.

Even though this definition of organizational arrogance demonstrates how individual leaders' arrogant behaviors occur at the organizational level and shape organizational members' social status within the internal or external organizational environment, it does not suggest that an organization requires an arrogant leader to adopt an arrogant culture. Even though leader arrogance and organizational

arrogance relate, one does not automatically create the other. However, literature indicated that these certainly could and did exist side-by-side in organizations. The following question remained: When does leader arrogance lead to organizational arrogance?

An organization develops when leaders successfully convey values that employees accept as appropriate thinking and behavior (Sergiu, 2015). When individuals or groups within an organization convey certain leader behaviors, employee behaviors, absent leadership, disengaged leadership, or poor leadership as acceptable, a culture of arrogance can develop and expand to the organizational level. A leader may inherit a culture of arrogance, and—based on his or her level of influence—may either help shape and transform or reinforce the existing culture of arrogance. For example, Yukl (2013) declared that “it takes considerable insight and skill for a leader to understand the current culture in an organization and implement changes successfully” (p. 309).

Bolman and Deal (1997) found that what challenged a leader’s ability to help shape the culture involved the manner in which ambiguity and uncertainty prompted employees to assign meaning to their environments and how their interpretations contributed to form a highly interwoven patchwork of culture. Bolman and Deal (1997) further posed the following question: “Do leaders shape culture, or are they shaped by it?” (p. 231). Schein (2010) answered that “if leaders... do not become conscious of the culture in which they are embedded, cultures will manage them” (p. 22). Essentially, the literature indicated that an organization could operate as an arrogant organization without an arrogant leader when existing values, norms, and customs displayed and supported arrogant behaviors. Two overarching themes existed: arrogant leaders’ capabilities to influence and shape an organizationally arrogant culture (leader arrogance), and an arrogant culture could exist independent from the leader (organizational arrogance).

To date, the body of knowledge expertly provided scales to measure individual arrogance. However, no scale existed that measures arrogance on an organizational level. With history as a guide, not all organization leaders who have experienced catastrophic failure occurred because of leader arrogance. A low-

performing culture with workplace incivility and a lack of accountability might foster environmental conditions to override a leader's influence, thereby contributing to an arrogant organization and organizational failure. Therefore, a scale that aided organizational leaders, human resource professionals, leadership practitioners, consultants, and scholars to identify the existence of organizational arrogance would provide beneficial insight for implementing education and mitigation strategies to enhance organization effectiveness and cohesion.

Additionally, this research developed and validated a measurement scale for organizational arrogance. This research leveraged the scientific scale development principles and psychometric testing with an instrument that represented a summated rating scale with a Likert differential response format (DeVellis, 2012). The following questions guided this research:

1. What are the most accurate indicators of an organizational environment where organizational members behave with a sense of superiority that leads to overconfidence in organizational capabilities?
2. What are the most accurate indicators of an organizational environment where organizational members behave with a sense of superiority that leads to dismissiveness toward members within the organization?
3. What are the most accurate indicators of an organizational environment where organizational members behave with a sense of superiority that leads to disparagement toward intra-organizational and interorganizational members?
4. What are the most accurate indicators of the presence or absence of organizational arrogance?

Theoretical and Conceptual Framework

A foundational premise of the organizational arrogance construct originated from specific aspects of leader behavior that shaped the culture. The theoretical and conceptual framework for this dissertation leveraged (a) narcissistic leadership theory, (b) Machiavellian leadership theory, (c) psychopathy leadership theory, (d) autocratic leadership theory, (e) organizational identity, and (f) arrogance. First,

narcissistic leadership theory showed the manifestation of behaviors that indicated self-absorption and maximizing opportunities to elevate self-image and importance. Second, Machiavellian leadership theory established the premise of behaviors that indicated overconfidence and apathy. Third, psychopathy leadership theory addressed leadership behaviors that indicated dismissiveness and low empathy for others. Fourth, autocratic leadership theory highlighted behaviors that supported threatening behaviors and lack of desire for the opinions and ideas of others. Fifth, organizational identity established the premise of how organizational members perceived themselves and how these perceptions influenced their interactions and decision-making abilities. Sixth, the concept of individual arrogant behaviors in the workplace highlighted how these behaviors evolved to the organizational level.

Narcissistic Leadership Theory

Exploring the influential actions and behaviors of narcissistic leadership theory provided theoretical support and value to the overall organizational arrogance construct. Narcissistic leadership refers to when leaders' actions and behavior are self-motivated on the basis of their egomaniacal needs and beliefs, which supersede the needs and interest of an organization and its members (Rosenthal & Pittinsky, 2006). A leader who operates with self in mind and reinforces this behavior as acceptable will shape a culture that reflects this belief accordingly. Leaders, who view their organizational environment as an individual absent from others and not as a collective body, foster a superior attitude of independence and self-reliance. Similarly, narcissists "feel they must rely on themselves rather than on others for the gratification of life's needs. They live with the assumption that they cannot reliably depend on anyone's love or loyalty" (Kets De Vries & Miller, 1985, p. 588). This lack of trust within the work environment enhances leaders' sense of superiority that threatens their ability to build cohesive relationships to leverage mutual respect, communication, empowerment, and transparency. This behavior can result in catastrophic consequences, in which a narcissistic leader becomes self-destructive, as envy and ruthlessness leads to devaluing others (Lubit, 2002). Furthering this theory at the organizational level, the narcissist leader's overconfidence, and self-importance leads to unsustainable

decisions and activities that place an organization's reputation at risk (Rijsenbilt & Commandeur, 2013). With these narcissistic leadership behavioral actions at play in the modern workplace, understanding how influential and widespread these traits were and the impact at the organizational level remained the purpose of this study.

Machiavellian Leadership Theory

Machiavellian leadership style refers to self-interested leaders with a sole focus on their achievements. These leaders exhibit apathy for both the interpersonal relationships with their subordinates and their feelings (Drory & Gluskinos, 1980; Sakalaki, Richardson, & Thepaut, 2007). Within the Machiavellian leaders' pursuit for greatness and mission accomplishment, these leaders possess a "willingness to utilize manipulative tactics and act amorally and endorse a cynical, untrustworthy view of human nature" (Dahling, Whitaker, & Levy, 2009, p. 220).

Untrustworthiness, cynicism, and apathetic leader behaviors create a negative ripple effect within the organizational environment. M. Brown and Trevino (2006) posited, "Machiavellian leaders are motivated to manipulate others in order to accomplish their own goals. They have little trust in people and, in turn, tend not to be trusted by others" (p. 604). Establishing the theoretical premise for how these behaviors manifested in the organizational culture reflected the need and purpose of this study.

Psychopathy Leadership Theory

Psychopathy leadership style traits have evolved significantly over the years, beginning with Cleckley's (1941) 16 characteristics of superficial charm, lack of anxiety, absence of psychotic/neurotic symptoms, egocentricity, lack of remorse or empathy, incapacity for love or close relationships, poor impulse control, irresponsibility, and unmotivated antisocial deviance. These behaviors indicated the proclivity to inflict emotional or physical harm on others. Introducing these behaviors in the work environment posed significant risks.

Evolving the construct more, Hare (1991) identified a four factors solution in the Psychopathy Revised Checklist (PCL-R) as (a) interpersonal (glibness/superficial charm, grandiose sense of self-worth, pathological lying, and conning/manipulative), (b) affective (lack of remorse or guilt, shallow affect,

callous/lack of empathy, and failure to accept responsibility for actions), (c) lifestyle (need for stimulation/proneness to boredom, parasitic lifestyle, lack of realistic long-term goals, impulsivity, and irresponsibility), and (d) antisocial (poor behavioral controls, early behavior problems, juvenile delinquency, revocation of conditional release, and criminal versatility). Further extending the research on this complicated behavioral trait, Patrick, Fowles, and Krueger (2009) developed a triarchic model to examine psychopathy with three prongs: (a) Disinhibition indicated the inability to demonstrate impulse control, foresight, planning, inability to delay gratification, and behavioral restraint deficits; (b) boldness to explain the capability of an individual to remain calm in threatening situations, exercising calmness, and the ability to quickly recover from stressful situations; and (c) meanness that occurred through apathy, lack of attachment, rebelliousness, exploitation of others, gaining empowerment through cruelty, and disdain for other members. These three pivotal studies indicated this trait presented significant insight and foundation in pursuit of developing the organizational arrogance construct and measuring instrument.

Autocratic leadership Theory

Consistent with the theme of self, an autocratic leadership style reflects a leader's pursuit of self-glorifying goals through the absolute, authoritarian control over a group and demonstrates the ability to "force favorable or unfavorable decisions upon others" (De Cremer, 2007, p. 1388). In essence, these leaders exhibit the behavior of superiority and believe they possess the final say in organizational matters. Through this behavior, organizational members feel devalued because of their inability to participate in organizational decision making. Consequently, organizational members have no direct influence on decisions.

An autocratic leadership style also describes cases in which "leaders implement their decisions on the employees and do not consider the opinion of their employees" (Bhatti, Mura Maitlo, Shaikh, Hashmi, & Shaikh, 2012, p. 196). Similarly, this leader's behavior demonstrates limited concern for the ideas and input that his or her subordinates provide regarding decision making (Yukl, 2013).

These behaviors indicate that the leader's needs and desires remain the priority, and subordinates experience neglect or are viewed as inferior.

Organizational Identity

As leaders' behaviors shaped culture and affected members' behaviors, these behaviors were of interest to understand how organizational members perceived themselves. Researchers have defined organizational identity as a set of central (characteristics that are important and essential to the organization), distinctive (distinguishable from other organizations), and enduring (sustainable and resistant to organizational change) statements that organizational members have recognized as thematic of their organization (Albert & Whetten, 1985). Essentially, organizational identity represents a collectively shared identity statement that organization members leverage to answer the introspective question of "Who are we? What are we? Where are we going?"

Organizational identity influences organizational members with a sense of direction, purpose, and is instrumental in developing the organizational strategic direction. Again, this sense of identity reflects the culture created through a leader's behavior. Those acceptable behavioral traits that resonate throughout the organization. Most notably, Albert and Whetten (1985) also demonstrated the expansiveness of organizational identity that paralleled human personality and identity concepts, considering that dual and multiple personalities applied to organizations, as well. When organizational members have recognized how the central, distinctive, and enduring cultural characteristics personally resonate with them, attachment to the social group or organization occurs.

Extending the organizational identity study, Brickson (2005) introduced the concept that identity orientation occurred in three forms: individualistic, relational, and collectivist. The researcher concluded that main characteristics of organizational identity resided in organizational relationships with stakeholders who emphasized clearly-specified organizational variables that served as predictors of identity orientation, as opposed to general organizational or individual level variables. Identity formation and how members related with the identity represented critical components of building organizational culture. Organizational

culture values represented critical determinants to the psychological process of identity formation (Ashforth & Mael, 1989). These cultural values and traits that aided in identity development shaped the focus of this dissertation.

Organizational Arrogance

An encompassing theme that bridged narcissistic, Machiavellian, psychopathy, and autocratic leadership behaviors was arrogance. These traits, combined with understanding the organizational identity construct, established the conditions for the organizational arrogance construct. As the foundational premise of the construct indicated, leader behavior shaped the culture. Theoretically, a leader with any level of arrogance, especially to the extreme degree of the “dark triad” traits, would shape the organizational culture. The norms, beliefs, shared values, customs, and the way of life within the organization would reflect that arrogance.

In general, arrogance related to a collection of behaviors that exhibited an individual’s exaggerated sense of superiority accompanied with disparaging other members (Johnson et al., 2010). Critical to the definition of arrogance is the term “sense of superiority” because whether the perceived sense of superiority was realistic or not, it served as a basis for this organizational construct and directly shaped the three behavioral components within the measure. A consistent theme identified throughout the literature indicated that arrogant individuals possessed a sense of superiority. Hareli and Weiner (2000) contended, “Arrogance and arrogant communications emphasize that one’s qualities and worth are better or superior than those of others” (p. 216). This assertion indicated that organizational members operating at this level of superiority would exploit opportunities to convey their greatness and others’ inferiority, thus creating an environment in which organizational members either replicated the behavior as a new norm or harbored resentment, increased stress, low-morale, or decreased job satisfaction.

Similarly, Tiberius and Walker (1998) posited that arrogance “does include a high opinion of one’s talents and abilities, and it typically also includes, as an inference from this, a high opinion of one’s excellence as a human being” (p. 382). Arrogance also refers to a basic human trait, where one possesses the inclination to

publicly convey one's qualities and worth over other individuals (M. Lewis, 2000). H. Brown (2012) reinforced the definition as a "chronic belief of superiority and exaggerated self-importance that is demonstrated through excessive and presumptuous claims" (p. 555). Arrogance also refers to an individual's pride, insolence, and overall disrespectful behavior (Poggi & D'Errico, 2011). Complimentarily, researchers have viewed arrogance as a particular type of pride that leads an individual to believe that they possess power over others (Poggi & D'Errico, 2011). These theoretical concepts and definitions contribute to the organizational arrogance construct defined as an organizational environment where leaders shape a culture in which members behave with a sense of superiority that leads to overconfidence in organizational capabilities, dismissiveness toward internal and external organizational matters, and disparagement toward intraorganizational and interorganizational members.

Leads to Overconfidence in Organizational Capabilities

Leaders with this aura of arrogance who demonstrated a sense of superiority would promote an environment of overconfidence that can lead to organizational failure. The following studies highlighted how arrogance manifested through overconfidence within the organizational environment. According to Ma and Karri (2005), "The arrogance of strong incumbents often blindfolds their top management teams and create illusions that they are invincible. What worked before will always work" (p. 68). This illusion of invincibility represents the idea of overconfidence and inability to fail. Similarly, arrogant organizational members may perceive themselves as subject matter experts, market experts, or opinion leaders; these individuals will attribute their knowledge with a broader self-perception as superior in all regards (Flynn, Goldsmith, & Eastman, 1996; Hayward & Hambrick, 1997; Ruvio & Shoham, 2016).

Arrogance demonstrates instances where individuals misrepresent themselves with a better status than they truly possess and do not interpret their behavior as inappropriate (Leary, Bednarski, Hammon, & Duncan, 1997). Additionally, arrogance supersedes confidence because individuals overestimate who they are and their capabilities, thereby exhibiting behavior that makes others

feel inferior (Johnson et al., 2010). Similarly, arrogance leads individuals to believe they make rational decisions and perceive themselves as immune from arrogance or conceit that results from excessive self-confidence (Croft & Donker, 2006). Pater (2013) asserted that arrogance was a dangerous leadership flaw because it erroneously suggested that an individual was infallible, omniscient, or smarter than anyone else, eventually leading to underestimating some, overestimating self, and believing that an individual could possess all the right answers. More dangerously, extremely arrogant organizational leaders possess the boldness and high self-belief that they will not succumb to the same mistakes of their predecessors; therefore, they do not value lessons from the past when making current decisions (Parnell, Von Bergen, & Soper, 2005).

Leads to Dismissiveness Toward Internal and External Organizational Matters

With a dangerously inflated ego and arrogance that leads to sense of superiority, arrogant leaders exhibit a lack of reciprocity, disdain, deference, and conviction that organizational members do not provide substance or value in their interactions (Tiberius & Walker, 1998). Similarly, arrogance emerges based on previous organizational success but impedes rapid changes to remain competitive and relevant with the current technological environment (Ma & Karri, 2005). Likewise, Pater (2013) posited that arrogance “closes the door to further inquiry and progress, and it can lead to ignoring, or, worse, punishing, any hint of negative feedback that suggests the company or leader is not world class” (p. 30).

Arrogant leaders remain cunning in their abilities to manifest their arrogant behaviors because they can passively and actively dismiss organizational members’ feelings, thoughts, counsel, and words and feel self-justified because of their perceived superiority in competence (Milyavsky et al., 2017). Organization leaders who dismiss messages that convey potential problems are more susceptible to the organizational failure (Seeger & Ulmer, 2003). Ignoring the potential pitfalls of failure or the insight of others could create tragic results, as studies indicated that executives’ arrogant and dismissive behavior manifested in their avoiding reality, rejecting traditional values, prohibiting questions or alternate discussions, and creating peer group pressure (B. Spector & Lane, 2007). Similarly, long serving

organizational leaders can become overly attached to outdated processes and procedures that contribute to previous success but will impede organizational progress in the current operating environment because they are reluctant to accept change (Kane & Cunningham, 2013). Consequently, arrogant individuals remain so rooted in their personal beliefs and ideas that they do not consider alternatives (Mason, 2004). This issue leads toward a level of dismissiveness that discounts opportunity for growth through effective dialogue. Harms, Spain, and Hannah (2011) asserted that “highly overconfident individuals are less likely to accept negative feedback and may be dismissive of it” (p. 27). Arrogance leads to dismissiveness and eventual organizational failure because it creates complacency, inflexibility, and short sightedness. These issues prevent organizational leaders from accepting valid council on environmental conditions, emerging trends, and competitive threats (Rosenthal & Pittinsky, 2006).

Leads to Disparagement Toward Intraorganizational and Interorganizational Members

While each aspect of the organizational arrogance construct required immediate attention due to its alarming potential to negatively impact organizational members, the third aspect, disparagement toward intraorganizational and interorganizational members, represented the most damaging. Hamlin and Hatton (2013) described how arrogant leaders exhibited disparagement toward organizational members through manipulation; undermining, threatening behavior; belittlement in public areas; and derogatory comments. These behaviors lead organizational members to more passive aggressive behaviors to avoid fear and shame because they do not accept responsibility for their roles in major or minor organizational mishaps. Instead, they tend to blame others for their inability to think positively and accomplish assigned tasks (Pater, 2013). As the organizational work environment accepts these behaviors as acceptable, arrogant members mock the presence of others and unjustly belittle others (Ma & Karri, 2005). These behaviors continue to escalate when arrogant behaviors manifest in the workplace, as employees who misrepresent their own qualities and value, while belittling fellow coworkers and taking credit for the accomplishments of others (Johnson et

al., 2010). Arrogant employees exhibit behavior that expresses their sense of mental superiority, tramples others' rational abilities, discounts the validity of others' opinions and ideas, and openly demeans and belittles others (Tiberius & Walker, 1998). The evolving nature of arrogance within disparagement grows to a point where individuals ignore, demean, and interrupt organizational members to demonstrate their exaggerated sense of superiority (Milyavsky et al., 2017).

Scope of This Study

The scope of this study provided a conceptualization and development of the organizational arrogance construct and validated a measurement scale for the construct. For the purpose of this study, the term *organization* referred to a private, public, non-profit, or government entity that operated under policies that governed members in their pursuit of accomplishing assigned tasks and missions. Similarly, the term *organizational member* was a generic term that indicated anyone assigned to the organization. The term could be used interchangeably with *leader*, *member*, *employee*, *follower*, *subordinate*, or any word that described individuals within the workplace. Based on this understanding, organizational arrogance might resemble other forms of arrogance, such as individual (including leader) arrogance, workplace arrogance, corporate arrogance, consumer arrogance, or intellectual arrogance (M. Brown & Trevino, 2006; Gregg & Mahadevan, 2014; Johnson et al., 2010; Ruvio & Shoham, 2016). However, the study of organizational arrogance specifically explored arrogance at the organizational level. In particular, one used this construct to examine ways in which leaders' arrogant behaviors might shape an organizationally arrogant culture in which organizational members manifested these behaviors through communications and relationships on an organizational-wide scale. Leveraging the P. Spector (1992) and DeVellis (2012) summated rating scale development principles, this study developed an applicable instrument to aid future research in organizational behavior, organizational culture, and leadership effectiveness.

Method

The organizational arrogance scale provided researchers the opportunity to measure respondents' perceptions, behavior, attitude, and thoughts regarding the presence of arrogance at the organizational level. The organizational arrogance scale was founded on the following guidelines: (a) define the construct, (b) generate an item pool, (c) determine the format for measurement, (d) expert review of the initial item pool, (e) consider inclusion of validation items, (f) administer items to a development sample, (g) item evaluation, (h) and optimize scale length (DeVellis, 2012; P. Spector, 1992).

Define the Construct

The organizational arrogance construct leverages a broad array of theoretical domains that include individual arrogance, workplace arrogance, corporate arrogance, and consumer arrogance (H. Brown, 2012; Gregg & Mahadevan, 2014; Johnson et al., 2010; Ruvio & Shoham, 2016; Tiberius & Walker, 1998). While significant in describing the arrogance phenomenon, the extant literature limited the manifestation of the arrogant construct to the individual level. At this point, the manifestation of arrogance invoked three distinct and valid descriptions that included a sense of superiority that led to overconfidence, dismissiveness, and disparaging behavior. These constructs included (a) sense of superiority that led to overconfidence in capabilities, described as the organizational members' personal belief that their intellect superseded any personal and organizational limitations; (b) sense of superiority that led to dismissiveness toward internal and external organizational matters, defined as the organizational members' propensity to ignore or disregard information regarding organizational matters; and (c) sense of superiority that led to disparagement of intra-organizational and interorganizational members, such as the organizational members' actions were designed to belittle, degrade, or discredit organizational members. The existing constructs demonstrated the need for a comprehensive scale to measure arrogance at the organizational level.

Generate an Item Pool

Existing literature indicated 75 theoretically based items for consideration in the organizational arrogance scale. The item breakout for the scale included 16 consolidated items that pertained to a sense of superiority that leads to overconfidence in capabilities, 34 items that addressed a sense of superiority that led to dismissiveness toward internal and external organizational needs, and 27 items that related to a sense of superiority that led to disparagement toward intra-organizational and interorganizational members. The items focused on organizational members' behaviors, attitudes, and communication patterns within the organizational environment.

Determine the Format for the Measurement

The organizational arrogance scale consisted of items designed to measure the frequency and intensity of behaviors to demonstrate a culture of superiority that led to overconfidence, dismissiveness toward internal and external matters, and disparagement toward intra-organizational and interorganizational members. Each item captured organizational members' attitudes, opinions, and beliefs about the existence of arrogance within the organizational environment. The organizational arrogance instrument represented a sliding scale that contained an odd number of response items ranging from 1 (*never*) to 7 (*always*) to ensure respondents avoided neutrality or indecisiveness and committed to a decision.

Expert Reviewed Item Pool

The scale relied on six proven experts within the fields of organizational leadership, ethics, organizational behavior, social psychology, arrogance, statistics, and scale development. Their main objective was to provide critical analysis, review, and insight to rate the prospective items identified to support the overall factor definition prior to administering to the sample population. Each expert received a 75-item measure with detailed instructions, explaining the relevant terms and adhered to the following steps: (a) confirm content validity, which required rating each item's relevancy between 0 to 6 and identifying its effectiveness for measuring its assigned factor; (b) item evaluation, where each panelist provided individual comments and recommended changes; (c) alternate means, where the

panelists provided alternate methods or perspectives to identify organizational arrogance; and (d) conclusion, which provided panelists the opportunity to submit general comments, suggestions, or recommendations.

Administer Items to a Development Sample

A 50-item pilot test was delivered via an online-only survey that targeted a minimum sample size of 300 working adults over the age of 18 to achieve instrument validity and generalizability based on the 5:1 ratio of subjects to item (DeVellis, 2012). In addition to the identified scale items, one used the instrument to collect demographic data to ensure participant validity that included (a) the participant's age, (b) the participant's gender, (c) the participant's race, (d) the participant's ethnicity, (e) the participant's role in the organization (e.g., middle management, upper management, and employee), (f) length of time at their particular job, (g) length of time in the workforce, and (h) job industry (military, government, private sector, and non-profit). Obtaining this sample size required a myriad of traditional communication and social media platforms that included Facebook, LinkedIn, Twitter, traditional email, text messaging, and referrals to the survey to reach a diverse sample population nationwide.

Evaluation of the Items

SPSS Version 25.0 evaluated the 50 items, which the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure verified, sampling adequacy at $KMO = .934$, indicating a strong value (Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2008). Bartlett's test of sphericity indicated that the correlation matrices were suitable for factor analysis with a significance of .000. Subsequent analysis on each item determined the applicability to a unidimensional organizational scale. A principal component analysis (PCA) of factors served as the primary evaluation method that determined correlation and the employment of an oblique rotation. SPSS Version 25 performed the appropriate data analysis required to retrieve the correlation alpha coefficient scores that contributed to the development of the scale. The coefficient alpha indicated a score of .922, deeming it a reliable instrument.

Optimize Scale Length

Prior to submitting the 50 items to the first reliability test, an additional 13 items were deleted with coefficient scores less than .650. After eliminating items deemed too weak or redundant, a 5-item unidimensional Organizational Arrogance Scale was developed with an Alpha score of .922. The Organizational Arrogance Scale accurately measured a culture of superiority that led to overconfidence in organizational capabilities, dismissiveness toward internal and external needs, and disparagement toward intra-organizational and interorganizational members.

Significance of the Study

This research successfully described the formation of an emerging concept, organizational arrogance, and the development of an instrument designed to measure the phenomenon in response to the established need for empirical evidence examining arrogant behaviors and the negative influence on organizational members and organizations in general. Ongoing research reported findings on a variety of reasons for organizational failure that included factors related to job satisfaction, employee engagement, morale, workplace stress, organizational culture, and leadership and followership styles. This study introduced and defined organizational arrogance as an organizational environment where leaders shaped a culture in which organizational members behaved with a sense of superiority that led to overconfidence in organizational capabilities, dismissiveness toward internal and external needs, and disparagement of intraorganizational and interorganizational members.

The theoretical and practical application value from this work included (a) a theoretically based and comprehensive definition of organizational arrogance, which occurred at the organizational level; (b) strategic, operational, and tactical implications for administering the instrument; (c) greater awareness of this phenomenon and its impact on organizational members and organizations; and (d) proposed areas of future research that would expand and further explain the theory. The limited number of studies examining arrogance indicated the unlimited possibilities that existed for furthering this phenomenon that was traditionally

associated with individuals or leaders and not organizations. Organizational arrogance represented a new construct that lent itself to applicability across a myriad of academic disciplines, private, and public sector.

Chapter 2 – Literature Review

A good leader can engage in a debate frankly and thoroughly, knowing that at the end he and the other side must be closer, and thus emerge stronger. You don't have that idea when you are arrogant, superficial, and uninformed.

—Nelson Mandela

Organizational arrogance represents a culture. A set of arrogant beliefs, customs, ideas, and behaviors that are leader inspired, leader developed, and executed by business members saturates the organizational environment. Developing the organizational arrogance construct and an effective instrument to measure the phenomenon remained the primary focus of this dissertation. However, one could not discount the leadership theories and the critical role leaders played in shaping this environment. The prevalence of immoral and unethical conduct in the workplace indicated that organizational wrongdoing was typically the result of rogue managers and leaders who contributed to incivility in the workplace (Solas, 2016). This issue represented a significant problem worthy of exploration and an exhaustive review.

Organizational arrogance represents a new construct that illustrates how an organization as a culture behaves and treats its employees. This chapter explores the existing literature that pertains to organizational arrogance in four sections: (a) recognizing the problem: theoretical support to understand how this is an issue; (b) defining the problem: the literature support for developing the organizational arrogance definition and elements that aid in the scale development for solving the problem, leaders shape a culture with a sense of superiority of overconfidence in organizational capabilities, dismissiveness toward internal and external organizational needs, and disparagement toward intra-organizational and interorganizational members; (c) and measuring the problem: prospective test items that contribute to developing the instrument's initial item pool.

Recognize the Problem: Leaders Shape the Culture and Identity

Narcissistic Leadership

Narcissistic leaders strive for external affirmation. They are self-absorbed, seek continual praise, and believe that the organizational environment revolves around them (Zhu & Chen, 2015). This leadership style within the workforce promotes an environment that encourages inflated ego and high-risk behavior. Zhu and Chen examined 292 *Fortune 500* companies with chief executive officers who exhibited narcissism were prone to hire directors with the same level of narcissism, leading to significant levels of risky spending. This behavior supported the claim that narcissistic leaders exhibited the belief of superiority, infallibility, overestimation, and excessive concern for their own well-being and success.

Narcissistic leader behavior negatively influences organizational citizenship with counter productivity and increases envy and jealousy (Braun, Aydin, Frey, & Peus, 2016). Even more troublesome is the narcissistic leaders' level of insecurity that "any recognition of someone else's accomplishments or abilities is a threat to their own self-importance and risks the loss of the exclusive admiration they crave from their followers" (McIntosh & Rima, 2007, p. 115). Because narcissistic leaders demonstrate levels of insecurity when they are not the center of attention, a destructive nature that hinders their productivity and contributions to the overall team can erupt (Maccoby, 2000).

The existence of these behaviors at the highest level of an organization is even more troublesome. These influence collaborative efforts, and the levels of insecurity and fractured personal relationships influence to lower levels of management (Braun et al., 2016; Nevicka, De Hoogh, Van Vianen, Beersma, & McIlwain, 2011). This extreme self-belief stifled organizational development because the leader exhibited lack of concern for others, which represented the main focus of this study. Therefore, the ability to express concern toward the professional development of organizational members was nonexistent.

Machiavellian Leadership

Similarly, findings indicated that Machiavellian leader behavior was associated with disregard for morals and use of guile or manipulation, as

accompanied with dishonesty to pursue and maintain power (Smith & Lilienfeld, 2013). The self-serving nature of these leaders prompted them to maximize opportunities to remain in power and contributed to counterproductive work behaviors that included apathy for others, proclivity to lie and cheat, and abuse of subordinates (H. Brown, 2012; Drory & Gluskinos, 1980; Lee & Ashton, 2005). Similarly, these behaviors led them to “disregard standards of morality and see value in behaviors that benefit the self at the expense of others” (Dahling et al., 2009, p. 228).

The assimilation of Machiavellian leaders in the workforce creates significant challenges and threats to the overall work environment. In fact, some have argued, “Machiavellian leaders have a detrimental impact on employees’ organizational cynicism and emotional exhaustion. Given that both outcomes negatively affect core attitudinal and behavioral outcomes...it is utmost importance that organizations should avoid recruiting and nourishing Machiavellian leadership” (Gkorezis, Petridou, & Krouklidou, 2015, p. 625). Within a culture, these behaviors could impede organizational progress and degrade organizational commitment, thereby threatening the health of the organizational environment that this study aimed to illuminate.

Psychopathy Leader

An ongoing debate has existed between scholars and media regarding the type and level of attention that should be granted to psychopathy in the workplace (Babiak & Hare, 2006; Board & Fritzon, 2005; Boddy, 2011; Clow & Scott, 2007; Coynes & Thomas, 2008; Smith & Lilienfeld, 2013). However, this portion of the literature review introduces the prevalent behavioral traits psychopathic leaders demonstrate. Smith and Lilienfeld (2013) indicated that the psychopathy demonstrated behaviors characterized by “superficial charm, dishonesty, egocentricity manipulativeness, risk-taking, and lack of empathy and guilt masked by apparent normalcy...is a well-known correlate and predictor of violence and aggression in other settings” (p. 205).

Similarly, as these leaders operated under the cloak of normalcy and progress in their careers using their charm, Babiak, Neuman, and Hare (2010)

examined 203 corporate personnel to identify the relationship between psychopathy and leadership. Babiak et al. discovered that those with high psychopathy scores held high executive positions within their respective organizations, including vice president, director, and supervisor. They were identified as poor team players lacking management skills and received poor appraisals from immediate bosses. However, these individuals displayed exceptional communication skills, and possessed strategic, creative, and innovative mindsets. The duality of this behavioral trait indicated that, if unmonitored, leaders could shape the culture by displaying apathy for organizational members in pursuit of organizational goals, while appearing normal. Again, this finding reinforced the premise that leader behaviors influenced an organizational culture and added relevance to the purpose of this study.

Autocratic Leader

Autocratic leaders operate autonomously with absolute power and make decisions with little to no input from organizational members (Yukl, 2013). Extreme measures of this leadership trait indicate that the leader exhibits a self-belief that others lack the intellectual ability or knowledge to participate in organizational matters, prompting a fearful staff of subordinates who demonstrate passive or apprehensive behaviors of doubt, insecurities, blame-shifting, and immediacy to remain away from the leader (Daft, 2005; Siewiorek & Lehtinen, 2011). Without limits or balance, this leader tends to rely on his or her own intuition for decision making and remains mission-focused at the detriment of showing concern for the wellbeing of organizational members (Bhatti et al., 2012). Because of this leader's inability to share decision-making responsibilities with subordinates, employee retention rates remain low and attracting new members becomes difficult (Vugt, Jepson, & Cremer, 2004). Leaders who disregard the input of organizational members and their value to the organization's goal will shape an organizational culture with a frustrated work force, low morale, and decreased job satisfaction.

Organizational Identity

Similar to individual identities, organization leaders also possess unique identities that define them and their internal essence. Organizational identity indicates the sense of belonging for organizational members, essentially providing organizational members the ability to answer the fundamental question, “Who are we as an organization?” (Gioia, 1998, p. 17). More specifically, the definition describes organizational identity as a set of central (characteristics that are important and essential to the organization), distinctive (distinguishable from other organizations), and enduring (sustainable and resistant to organizational change) statements that organizational members recognize as thematic of their organization (Albert & Whetten, 1985).

Others have contended that organizational identity finds solace on a rich past of legacy, history, culture, status, characteristics, and reputation (Martin, Johnson, & French, 2011). Organizational identity also refers to the shared and collective work experiences that give meaning to organizational members operating at various hierarchical levels and professional groups (Glynn, 2000; Harrison, 2000; Kjaergaard & Ravasi, 2011). Organizational identity remains influential for organizational members to establish a strategic, organizational, and operational roadmap and direction for accomplishing organizational objectives (Barney & Stewart, 2000; Dutton & Duckerich, 1991). Moreover, organizational identity resonates with organizational members’ abilities to envision and align themselves with the organization seamlessly as one entity. This sense of identity reflects the culture created through a leader’s behavior deemed acceptable, which resonates throughout the organization. Once organizational members recognize ways in which the central, distinctive, and enduring cultural characteristics personally resonate with them, their attachment to the organization develops.

Defining the Problem: Building the Organizational Arrogance Definition

Examining the influential leadership theories that possess a strong foundation of pride and arrogance, coupled with insight on organizational identity, establishes the foundation to further the discussion about the development of the

organizational arrogance construct. Organizational arrogance defines an organizational environment where leaders shape a culture with organizational members who behave with a sense of superiority, leading to overconfidence in organizational capabilities, dismissiveness toward internal and external organizational matters, and disparagement toward intra-organizational and interorganizational members. This behavior phenomenon takes place at the organizational level.

According to Robbins and Judge (2012), one could use organizational behavior to examine ways in which individuals behave or respond in an organizational environment at three distinct levels: (a) individual level that explores individuals' attitudes, personality, perception, motivation and emotions; (b) group level that examines work teams, communication, leadership, power and politics, and conflict; and (c) organizational level that investigates organizational culture, structure, cultural diversity, interorganizational cooperation, and conflict and change. At the third level, organizational arrogance manifests. Most specifically, one could study organizational arrogance to examine how the organization, as a culture, treated organizational members.

As demonstrated earlier with the leadership theories, leaders remain critical to the development of an organizational culture. A leader's behavior (active or passive) influences the behavior of organizational members and eventually the organizational identity and culture. Sergiu (2015) found, "Managerial culture and the organizational culture act as paradigms, as intellectual and emotional patterns. These models lead to the creation of the identity of individuals or groups that generate a sense of belonging, membership of a particular society" (p. 140). A leader's ability to demonstrate behaviors and actions that foster an environment where organizational members possess a desire for belonging must remain a priority to establish a healthy culture. Complementing this finding, Jain and Jain (2013) asserted, "Leaders must set the example by living the elements of culture: values, behaviors, measures, and actions. Values are meaningless without the other element, such that organizations with clearly codified and enforced cultures enjoy great employee and customer loyalty" (p. 43). Managers and leaders maximize the

use of their abilities to inspire their employees with a sense of belonging to an organization's cultural model and to remunerate those that, through behavior, sustain the implementation of change (Ionescu, 2014). These studies showed that, at the organizational level, a leader possessed the ability to shape, establish, and set the expectations and norms for an organization. The organizational arrogance definition built on this premise that an arrogant leader or one with arrogant traits could shape an arrogant organization, which indicated the significant difference between individual arrogance and organizational arrogance.

Present literature focused on ways in which arrogance primarily existed at the individual level and how an individual's self-perception of superiority manifested within the organizational environment. Arrogance leads to self-perceptions of invincibility and omnipotence (Ma & Karri, 2005). This excessive belief in one's self establishes an attitude and behavior that separates an arrogant individual from others and leads to a sense of overconfidence and overestimation of their capabilities. Similarly, arrogant people attribute their personal successes to their high intelligence and other uncontrollable, internal, stable, or desirable causes; they dismiss internal or external contributing factors (Hareli & Weiner, 2000). Arrogance also represents an extreme belief in one's superiority and exaggerated self-importance that is manifested through excessive and presumptuous claims (H. Brown, 2012). Most notably and more emotionally damaging, arrogance represents a set of behaviors that conveys an individual's exaggerated sense of superiority accomplished through disparaging others (Johnson et al., 2010). Equally alarming are the more deceptive techniques, where Johnson et al. (2010) found that arrogant employees modified their proclivity to exhibit superiority behaviors when in the presence of supervisors and possibly peers more often than when in the presence of their subordinates.

At the individual level, arrogant people possess a real or perceived realistic belief in their considerable talents and abilities. They then infer that they are superior to most other people, insofar as they manifest the excellences appropriate to human beings to an above-average degree. They "take themselves to be more perfect" (Tiberius & Walker, 1998, p. 380). Additionally, Tiberius and Walker

(1998) asserted that previous studies erroneously focused arrogance on the arrogant person, as opposed to recognizing arrogance as an interpersonal matter and the way individuals engaged with one another.

While Johnson et al. (2010) declared that organizational scholars rarely studied arrogance, he noted that one reason for the limited empirical evidence involving arrogance was the absence of means to measure the manifestation of arrogant behavior in the workplace. Review of the literature did indicate a lacuna existed regarding arrogance at the organizational level; however, an organizational arrogance construct was nonexistent. The literature did not affirm an arrogant leader's ability to influence a culture of organizational arrogance; however, the literature did provide insight on arrogance at the individual level and how arrogant individuals expressed superiority through (a) overconfidence in capabilities, (b) dismissiveness, (c) and disparagement, as well as ways in which these behaviors might negatively influence those employees in and around their work teams. Based on these findings from the literature, the organizational arrogance construct leveraged these three components of individual arrogance to build the organizational arrogance scale.

Table 1: Overconfidence and Disparagement Items

Item	Description	O	D	B
1	Organizational members demonstrate a sense of invincibility in their decision making.	*		
2	Organizational members openly communicate that they are incapable of failing.	*		
3	Organizational members demonstrate exaggerated self-importance through unrealistic and excessive claims.	*		
4	Organizational members portray a belief that their talents and abilities are superior to other organizational members.	*		
5	Organizational members attribute their success to their own intelligence and not to the efforts or contributions of other members.	*		
6	Organizational members demonstrate disparaging (belittling) behaviors toward others.			*

Note: O = Overconfidence Item. D = Dismissiveness Item. B = Disparagement Item.

Overconfidence in Organizational Capabilities

Leaders who display actions supported by their self-absorption and overinflated esteem will promote an environment of overconfidence that contributes to organizational impediments. The following studies showed ways in which arrogance manifested in overconfidence within the organizational environment. Arrogance originates from an organization's elite past and fosters a culture that prevents rapid changes in tune with the technological environment (Ma & Karri, 2005). Most notably, "overconfidence takes the form of apathy that arises out of a false sense of security experienced after success. Firms, therefore, see little need for purposeful strategizing and thus find themselves in a storm" (Ma & Karri, 2005, p. 69). Additionally, researchers have discovered that organizational leaders' overconfidence led to reckless expansion into a variety of markets. Overconfidence, coupled with arrogance, served as a contributing factor, where organization leaders engaged in activities outside their realm, resulting in a negative influence on the organization's bottom line (Ma & Karri, 2005).

Similarly, arrogance is the “most dangerous flaw. Thinking you are infallible, omniscient or just smarter than everyone else inevitably leads to underestimating others or to overestimating that you have all the right answers” (Pater, 2013, p. 30). Furthering this point, Croft and Donker (2006) furthered this assertion and claimed that arrogant managers could not learn from their failures and that “they believe themselves to be immune from the arrogance or conceit that arises from excessive self-confidence” (p. 32). Most importantly, arrogance not only promotes an attitude of unrealistic desires, hopes, and organizational expectations, but arrogant leaders behave with a sense of superiority. Based on these attitudes, this sense of superiority will mislead organizations to a level of overconfidence in their capabilities and erroneous decision-making.

With these committed and self-absorbed individuals in the workplace, others imposing barriers or restraining them presents significant challenges because “those who are arrogant are likely to take this confidence to a different level, as they overestimate who they are and what they can do, along with acting in ways that make those around them feel inferior” (Johnson et al., 2010, p. 407). Additionally, this overconfidence creates an environment where senior leaders disregard past organizational success or failure that may provide valuable insight for decision-making. Frequently, highly arrogant senior executive leaders have believed they will not repeat the same mistakes others made in the past; therefore, they see no value in reviewing the past (Parnell et al., 2005). Most significantly, managers limit themselves when they remain committed to specific courses of actions that have historically proved successful because it intensifies egocentric tendencies among leaders who attribute their success to their existence and respective leadership style (Antonacopoulou & Sheaffer, 2014). This belief becomes more troubling because “overconfidence and complacency prompt leaders to act intuitively and impulsively. They become arrogant and conformist concurrently, in seeking to secure ongoing successes, that impairs their ability to make decision and amplifies their crisis proneness” (Antonacopoulou & Sheaffer, 2014, p. 12).

Table 2: Overconfidence in Organizational Capabilities Items

Item	Description	O	D	B
7	The organization's elite past and legacy of success fosters a culture that discourages rapid changes.	*		
8	Organizational members exhibit overconfidence that leads to reckless decision making.	*		
9	Organizational members exhibit overconfidence that leads to overextension of the organization's resources.	*		
10	Organizational members exhibit a belief that they are smarter than everyone else.	*		
11	Organizational members underestimate others.	*		
12	Organizational members behave like they possess all the right answers.	*		
13	Organizational members demonstrate behaviors that indicate they do not value reviewing lessons learned from past mistakes.	*		
14	Organizational members exhibit behaviors that overestimate who they are	*		
15	Organizational members exhibit behaviors that overestimate what they can do.	*		
16	Organizational members exhibit behaviors that make those around them feel inferior.	*		
17	Organizational members demonstrate the belief that they will not repeat the same mistakes others made in the past.	*		
18	Organizational members limit themselves when they remain committed to specific courses of actions that historically proved successful.	*		
19	Organizational members tend to act intuitively and impulsively.	*		

Note: O = Overconfidence Item. D = Dismissiveness Item. B = Disparagement Item

Dismissiveness Toward Internal and External Organizational Matters

Leaders stifle organizational members' creative and innovative thoughts when they disregard, dismiss, or discourage organizational members' active participation regarding organizational matters. This dismissiveness appears to establish significant hindrances in the workplace, and the "heart of arrogance displays the dismissive attitude toward the views and perspectives of others" (Tiberius & Walker, 1998, p. 382). A dismissive attitude manifests in arrogant leaders when they treat organizational members with disdain and contempt that further prevents and discourages using their talents and capacities for future purposes (Tiberius & Walker, 1998). This maltreatment of organizational members fosters an environment of dismissiveness toward internal and external organizational matters. Furthermore, arrogant leaders exhibit disdain, deference, a lack of reciprocity, and conviction that organizational members do not possess substance, competence, or value in their interactions (Tiberius & Walker, 1998).

When arrogant leaders devalue the input of their subordinates, it reinforces the sense of superiority that prevents them from receiving substantial insight and counsel from others. Arrogance serves as a barrier to establishing and maintaining close, reciprocally enriching relations with others and is a significant hindrance to an arrogant person's ability to acquire information; therefore, arrogance is an obstacle to having a good life (Tiberius & Walker, 1998). Additionally, arrogant people possess a disposition to mistreat others and frequently welcome others with disdain when they exhibit self-expression of their views (Tiberius & Walker, 1998). Most notably, arrogant leaders disregard organizational members' reactions, feelings, and thoughts as possessing any significance for the leader (Tiberius & Walker, 1998). This dismissive attitude toward the views and opinions of others prevents the leader from acquiring self-understanding because it discourages organizational members from participating in the decision-making process or feeling valued in the organization. Tiberius and Walker (1998) concluded that arrogant individuals' behavior "toward other people in ways that are both hurtful and disrespectful is an impediment to forming and maintaining valuable friendships" (p. 388). The tendency of these leaders to inflict harm on

organizational members who desire more active participation in the workplace is a significant issue that requires attention and opportunity for resolution.

Arrogance also emerges from an organization's previous success and contributes to leaders' inability to accept rapid changes that remain competitive and relevant within the current technological environment (Ma & Karri, 2005). This self-imposed limitation for organizational development and growth relates to individuals' resistance to change because other members remain committed to a nostalgic past. Researchers have highlighted ways in which arrogance leads to complacency that creates an organizational blind spot, dismissing threats in the competitive environment (Ma & Karri, 2005). Consequently, arrogance, coupled with blind spots, degrades the organizational members' ability to maintain effective communication and negatively influences the culture.

Examples of arrogant behavior include disrespecting colleagues and their ideas, claiming to be more knowledgeable than others, and discounting feedback (Johnson et al., 2010). People show arrogant behaviors by dismissing organizational members' opportunities for further inquiry and progress, thereby leading to ignoring or punishing any instances in which negative feedback indicates the company or leader is not world class (Pater, 2013). Most notably, arrogant executives have called it disloyalty when organizational members voiced anything less than perfect feedback about the company's safety, performance, or culture (Pater, 2013). This finding indicates that leaders have stifled organizational members' creativity, engagement, and commitment to accomplish organizational objectives. Unfortunately, Pater (2013) discovered that arrogant leaders ignored the statistics that indicated the prevalence of injuries and underperformance.

Additionally, arrogance manifests in the form of dismissing advice (Milyavsky et al., 2017). Of note, individuals display dismissive behavior due to arrogance because the act of dismissing others becomes justified by an individual's perceived superiority in competence (Milyavsky et al., 2017). Most notably, individuals may display dismissive behavior to others in either a passive way or an active way. Passive ways include (a) not looking at them, (b) lack of attention directed to their coworker's feelings or thoughts and what he or she says, or (c) not

answering or acknowledging his or her presence (Milyavsky et al., 2017). This passive or active dismissive behavior promotes an environment in which organizational members remain disengaged and feel undervalued. This negatively impacts their morale. Individuals exhibit an active dismissal in the form of demeaning others or interrupting them, and people will perceive dismissal of advice as arrogant if an individual attributes the advisee's desire to establish his or her superiority over the advisor (Milyavsky et al., 2017). Milyavsky et al. (2017) identified an advisee's relative competence and the manner in which one dismissed the advice as two factors that contributed to whether an individual perceived the dismissal of advice as arrogant.

Complementarily, literature indicated that organizational leaders could shape a culture to support dismissive behavior. The energy conglomerate, Enron, fostered a closed culture of complexity, arrogance, avoiding reality, concealment and the dismissive behavior of executives (B. Spector & Lane, 2007). This culture of a dismissive behavior indicated a continual problem that degraded organizational member's morale, commitment, and participation. Additionally, Enron represented an organization that failed to remain transparent to problems, and its prevailing culture of no bad news also contributed to the development of self-censorship and self-persuasion of internal and external organizational needs (Seeger & Ulmer, 2003). Enron employees displayed a reluctance to accept the reality of the mounting losses and obvious deceptions (Seeger & Ulmer, 2003). Even with the evidence of the inevitable failure increasing, organizational members remained committed to the Enron mantra, and even purchased more company stock. Seeger and Ulmer (2003) identified that Enron's perception as a model of business success and innovation dominated the environment, and individuals ignored any information inconsistent with the message.

Equally important, arrogance contributes to stagnating organizational progress. Long-serving organizational leaders can exhibit an extreme attachment to outdated processes and procedures that contribute to previous success but will impede organizational progress due to their inability to accept change. They dismiss the organizational needs that remain necessary for success in the current

operating environment (Kane & Cunningham, 2013). Similarly, Harms et al. (2011) found that highly overconfident individuals not only displayed less willingness to accept negative feedback, but also demonstrated their ability to dismiss it entirely. Individuals who were dismissive toward feedback tools or external data and who relied on their own intuition resisted the idea of others changing their opinion (Harms et al., 2011). Because of this stagnation, arrogance can lead to failures based on complacency, inflexibility, and short sightedness because individuals ignore important input from organizational members, wise counsel, environmental changes (e.g., changes in markets), and threats from competitors (Rosenthal & Pittinsky, 2006).

Table 3: Dismissiveness Toward Organizational Matters Items

Item	Description	O	D	B
20	Organizational members display a dismissive attitude toward the views and perspectives of others.	*		
21	Organizational members treat others with disdain and contempt that discourages them from using their talents and capacities.	*		
22	Organizational members' attitude serves as a barrier to establishing and maintaining close, reciprocally enriching relations with others.	*		
23	Organizational members' attitude prevents others from sharing important information.	*		
24	Organizational members indicate a disposition to mistreat others when they express their views.	*		
25	Organizational members disregard the value of others' reactions, feelings, and thoughts.	*		
26	Organizational members' attitude toward others' views and opinions discourages others from participating in the decision-making process.	*		
27	Organizational members attitude toward others' views and opinions makes others feel devalued in the organization.	*		
28	Organizational members behave toward other people in ways that are disrespectful.	*		
29	Organizational members display complacency that creates an organizational blind spot for threats in the competitive environment.	*		
30	Organizational members demonstrate behavior that degrades the ability to maintain effective communication.	*		
31	Organizational members disrespect others and their ideas.	*		
32	Organizational members claim to be more knowledgeable than others	*		
33	Organizational members discount feedback.	*		

Item	Description	O	D	B
34	Organizational members dismiss organizational members' opportunity for further inquiry and progress.	*		
35	Organizational members ignore any instances where negative feedback occurs.	*		
36	Organizational members punish others when negative feedback occurs.	*		
37	Organizational members communicate that it is a sign of disloyalty when individuals express their displeasure with the organization's performance and culture.	*		
38	Organizational members avoid looking at subordinates.	*		
39	Organizational members exhibit lack of attention to how others feel.	*		
40	Organizational members exhibit lack of attention to how others think.	*		
41	Organizational members tend to act intuitively and impulsively.	*		
42	Organizational members exhibit lack of attention to what others say.	*		
43	Organizational members do not answer or acknowledge others presence.	*		
44	Organizational members demean others.	*		
45	Organizational members interrupt others.	*		
46	The organization fails to remain transparent regarding existing problems.	*		
47	The organization's prevailing culture does not encourage bad news.	*		
48	Organizational members are not receptive to change and impede organizational progress.	*		
49	Organizational members display inability to accept negative feedback.	*		
50	Organizational members rely upon their own intuition and are	*		

Item	Description	O	D	B
	not receptive to feedback tools.			
51	Organizational members rely upon their own intuition and are not receptive to the idea of others changing their opinion.	*		
52	Organizational members ignore important input from other organizational members.	*		

Note: O = Overconfidence Item. D = Dismissiveness Item. B = Disparagement Item.

Disparagement Toward Intra-Organizational and Interorganizational Members

Literature revealed that arrogance could manifest in a manner that contributed to maltreatment of, underappreciation of, and disrespect for organizational members. This finding indicated the most aggressive and harmful aspects of organizational arrogance. Ma and Karri (2005) found that arrogant members unjustly belittled their rivals and mocked their presence. Similarly, arrogance could contribute to managers' beliefs that they possessed better managerial skills than they really did, and their lack of self-awareness could contribute to insensitive behavior and failure to recognize how their behaviors affected others (Hamlin & Hatton, 2013). Another noteworthy finding revealed that arrogant individuals criticized and humiliated members of their staff publicly during meetings, displayed negative behavior toward staff, negated the need for transparency and honesty with the staff, played staff members against each other, overruled decisions made by staff, and belittled staff in public areas (Hamlin & Hatton, 2013).

Similarly, arrogant people tend to blame others for non-positive thinking or failing to meet expectations (Pater, 2013). More specifically, the process of not-me thinking combined with finger pointing at all members except the senior leaders dominate (Pater, 2013). Further, Pater (2013) found that, even though select executives did not take responsibility for their own actions, the same senior executives exhibited aggressive behavior against organizational members' lack of personal responsibility. In turn, when these leaders became aware of these problems, arrogant and distracted leaders exhibited reactionary responses filled with anger and blame, discounting their role of modeling the behavior.

Arrogant employees represented those who exaggerated their own self-importance, often by disparaging others (Johnson et al., 2010). Johnson et al. (2010) further described arrogant behaviors where supervisors publicly humiliated subordinates or passed blame to coworkers. More importantly, arrogant leaders have publicly belittled others' competence and attacked people, not issues (Johnson et al., 2010). This disparaging behavior may also take the form of individuals using meetings to discredit others' ideas, often making those individuals appear incompetent; dismissing other people's ideas in public; and criticizing other employees in a threatening manner (Johnson et al., 2010).

Finally, arrogant employees demonstrate behavior that expresses their sense of mental superiority, tramples individuals' rational abilities, discounts the validity of individuals' opinions, and openly demeans and belittles others (Tiberius & Walker, 1998). The literature indicated that mistreatment existed, as arrogant individuals tended to act as though others' opinions did not matter to protect themselves from criticism (Tiberius & Walker, 1998). Additionally, Tiberius and Walker (1998) suggested that individuals did not like being condescended to or treated as though they had nothing to offer, and this behavior contradicted efforts to build a healthy and valuable relationship. Most specifically, arrogant individuals behave "toward other people in ways that are both hurtful and disrespectful is an impediment to forming and maintaining valuable friendships" (Tiberius & Walker, 1998, p. 388). Arrogant individuals could damage the workplace, which reinforced the need for this dissertation; its purpose was not only to explain this phenomenon, but also to develop an instrument that effectively measured the phenomenon.

Table 4: Disparagement Toward Intraorganizational and Interorganizational Items

Item	Description	O	D	B
53	Organizational members unjustly belittle their rivals and mock their presence.		*	
54	Organizational members display that they possess better managerial skills than they really do.		*	
55	Organizational members criticize their staff in front of other staff members.		*	
56	Organizational members criticize or display negative behavior toward staff during meetings.		*	
57	Organizational members are not transparent and honest with the staff.		*	
58	Organizational members play staff members against each other.		*	
59	Organizational members overrule staff decisions.		*	
60	Organizational members belittle staff in public areas.			*
61	Organizational members tend to blame others for non-positive thinking or not doing what one expects.		*	
62	Organizational members tend to blame others for not doing what one expects.		*	
63	Organizational members work in an environment where the process of not-me thinking dominates.		*	
64	Organizational members work in an environment where the process of finger pointing occurs toward all members except the senior leaders.		*	
65	Leaders do not take responsibility for their own actions.		*	
66	Organizational members pass blame to coworkers.		*	
67	Organizational members attack people, not issues.		*	
68	Organizational members use meetings to discredit others' ideas.		*	
69	Organizational members use meetings to often make individuals appear incompetent or bad.		*	

Item	Description	O	D	B
70	Organizational members use a threatening manner to criticize other employees.		*	
71	Organizational members express their sense of mental superiority.		*	
72	Organizational members discount the validity of an individuals' opinions and ideas.		*	
73	Organizational members openly demean and belittle others.		*	
74	Organizational members treat others as though their opinions do not matter.		*	
75	Organizational members behave toward other people in ways that are both hurtful and disrespectful.		*	

Note: O = Overconfidence Item. D = Dismissiveness Item. B = Disparagement Item.

Measuring the Problem: Summary of the Literature and Prospective Items

After an exhaustive review of the literature regarding the organizational arrogance construct, a valid and reliable instrument that effectively measured organizational members' attitude, behavior, or communication did not exist. Despite this gap in the research, the literature did reveal an abundance of prospective items that served as a foundation for developing the organizational arrogance instrument. The organizational arrogance instrument consisted of items that reflected the previous definition of the construct. The instrument included a measure of organizational members' personal belief that their intellect superseded any personal and organizational limitations to measure sense of superiority that led to overconfidence in capabilities; a measure of the organizational members' propensity to ignore or disregard information, regarding organizational matter to measure sense of superiority that led to dismissiveness toward internal and external organizational matters; and a measure of the organizational members' actions designed to devalue, discount, and belittle organizational members to measure sense of superiority that led to disparagement toward intra-organizational and

interorganizational members. Table 5 shows the summary pool of test items for the organizational arrogance scale:

Table 5: Prospective Organizational Arrogance Scale Items

Item	Description	O	D	B
1	Organizational members demonstrate a sense of invincibility in their decision making.	*		
2	Organizational members openly communicate that they are incapable of failing.	*		
3	Organizational members demonstrate exaggerated self-importance through unrealistic and excessive claims.	*		
4	Organizational members portray a belief that their talents and abilities are superior to other organizational members.	*		
5	Organizational members attribute their success to their own intelligence and not to the efforts or contributions of other members.	*		
6	Organizational members demonstrate disparaging (belittling) behaviors toward others.			*
7	The organization's elite past and legacy of success fosters a culture that discourages rapid change.	*		
8	Organizational members exhibit overconfidence that leads to reckless decision making.	*		
9	Organizational members exhibit overconfidence that leads to overextension of the organization's resources.	*		
10	Organizational members exhibit a belief that they are smarter than everyone else.	*		
11	Organizational members underestimate others.	*		
12	Organizational members behave like they possess all the right answers.	*		
13	Organizational members demonstrate behaviors that indicate that they do not value reviewing lessons learned from past mistakes.	*		

Item	Description	O	D	B
14	Organizational members exhibit behaviors that overestimate who they are.	*		
15	Organizational members exhibit behaviors that overestimate what they can do.	*		
16	Organizational members exhibit behaviors that make those around them feel inferior.	*		
17	Organizational members demonstrate the belief that they will not repeat the same mistakes others made in the past.	*		
18	Organizational members limit themselves when they remain committed to specific courses of actions that historically proved successful.	*		
19	Organizational members tend to act intuitively and impulsively.	*		
20	Organizational members display a dismissive attitude toward the views and perspectives of others.	*		
21	Organizational members treat others with disdain and contempt that discourages them from using their talents and capacities.	*		
22	Organizational members' attitude serves as a barrier to establishing and maintaining close, reciprocally enriching relations with others.	*		
23	Organizational members' attitude prevents others from sharing important information.	*		
23	Organizational members treat others with disdain when they express their views.	*		
24	Organizational members indicate a disposition to mistreat others when they express their views.	*		
25	Organizational members disregard the value of others' reactions, feelings, and thoughts.	*		

Item	Description	O	D	B
26	Organizational members' attitude toward others' views and opinions discourages others from participating in the decision-making process.	*		
27	Organizational members attitude toward others' views and opinions makes others feel devalued in the organization.	*		
28	Organizational members behave toward other people in ways that are disrespectful.	*		
29	Organizational members display complacency that creates an organizational blind spot toward threats in the competitive environment.	*		
30	Organizational members demonstrate behavior that degrades the ability to maintain effective communication.	*		
31	Organizational members disrespect others and their ideas.	*		
32	Organizational members claim to be more knowledgeable than others	*		
33	Organizational members discount feedback.	*		
34	Organizational members dismiss organizational members' opportunity for further inquiry and progress.	*		
35	Organizational members ignore any instances where negative feedback occurs.	*		
36	Organizational members punish others when negative feedback occurs.	*		
37	Organizational members communicate that it is a sign of disloyalty when individuals express their displeasure with the organization's performance and culture.	*		
38	Organizational members avoid looking at subordinates.	*		
39	Organizational members exhibit lack of attention toward how others feel.	*		
40	Organizational members exhibit lack of attention toward how others think.	*		

Item	Description	O	D	B
41	Organizational members tend to act intuitively and impulsively.			
42	Organizational members exhibit lack of attention toward what others say.			
43	Organizational members do not answer or acknowledge others' presence.	*		
44	Organizational members demean others.			*
45	Organizational members interrupt others.			*
46	The organization fails to remain transparent regarding existing problems.			*
47	The organization's prevailing culture does not encourage bad news.			*
48	Organizational members are not receptive to change and impede organizational progress.			*
49	Organizational members display inability to accept negative feedback.			*
50	Organizational members rely upon their own intuition and are not receptive to feedback tools.			*
51	Organizational members rely upon their own intuition and are not receptive to the idea of others changing their opinion.			*
52	Organizational members ignore important input from other organizational members.			*
53	Organizational members unjustly belittle their rivals and mock their presence.			*
54	Organizational members display that they possess better managerial skills than they really do.			*
55	Organizational members criticize their staff in front of other staff members.			*
56	Organizational members criticize or display negative behavior toward staff during meetings.			*

Item	Description	O	D	B
57	Organizational members are not transparent and honest with staff.			*
58	Organizational members play staff members against each other.			*
59	Organizational members overrule staff decisions.			*
60	Organizational members belittle staff in public areas.			*
61	Organizational members tend to blame others for non-positive thinking or not doing what one expects.			*
62	Organizational members tend to blame others for not doing what one expects.			*
63	Organizational members work in an environment where the process of not-me thinking dominates.			*
64	Organizational members work in an environment where the process of finger pointing occurs toward all members except the senior leaders.			*
65	Leaders do not take responsibility for their own actions.			*
66	Organizational members pass blame toward coworkers.			*
67	Organizational members attack people not issues.			*
68	Organizational members use meetings to discredit others' ideas.			*
69	Organizational members use meetings to often make individuals appear incompetent or bad.			*
70	Organizational members use a threatening manner to criticize other employees.			*
71	Organizational members express their sense of mental superiority.			*
72	Organizational members discount the validity of an individuals' opinions and ideas.			*
73	Organizational members openly demean and belittle others.			*
74	Organizational members treat others as though their opinions			*

Item	Description	O	D	B
	do not matter.			
75	Organizational members behave toward other people in ways that are both hurtful and disrespectful.			*

Note: O = Overconfidence Item. D = Dismissiveness Item. B = Disparagement Item.

Chapter 3 – Method

People who act the most arrogant often are the most insecure, and they just can't even begin to accept the possibility that they might not be as good as they think they are.

—Matt McGorry

This chapter describes the research design, pilot test, and analysis leveraging P. Spector's (1992) and DeVellis' (2012) eight steps: (a) define the construct, (b) generate an item pool, (c) determine the format for measurement, (d) expert review of the initial item pool, (e) consider inclusion of validation items, (f) administer items to a development sample, (g) item evaluation, and (h) optimize scale length. This chapter concludes with a discussion regarding the study limitations and describing the scale's final version that was used for the pilot test.

Construct and Instrument Development

The organizational arrogance construct leverages a broad array of theoretical domains that include individual arrogance, workplace arrogance, corporate arrogance, or consumer arrogance (H. Brown, 2012; Gregg & Mahadevan, 2014; Johnson et al., 2010; Ruvio & Shoham, 2016; Tiberius & Walker, 1998). While significant in describing the arrogance phenomenon, these researchers have limited the arrogance construct to describe behavior, attitude, and communication solely at the individual level. Their research led to three distinct and valid descriptions of arrogance, including a sense of superiority that leads to overconfidence, dismissiveness, and disparaging behavior. While the literature indicated that construct validity existed for the three factors at the individual level, organizational arrogance leveraged these same constructs as elements for application at the organizational level. These included (a) sense of superiority that led to overconfidence in capabilities, described as the organizational members' personal belief that their intellect supersedes any personal and organizational limitations; (b) sense of superiority that led to dismissiveness toward internal and external organizational matters, defined as the organizational members' propensity to ignore or disregard information regarding organizational matters; and (c) sense

of superiority that led to disparagement toward intra-organizational and interorganizational members, that is, the organizational members' actions designed to belittle, degrade, or discredit organizational members. The existing constructs demonstrated the need for a comprehensive scale that measured arrogance at the organizational level.

Theoretically Based Item Pool

Chapter 2 introduced 75 theoretically based items for consideration in the organizational arrogance scale. The item breakout for the scale included 16 consolidated items that pertained to a sense of superiority that led to overconfidence in capabilities, 34 items to address a sense of superiority that led to dismissiveness toward internal and external organizational needs, and 27 items that related to a sense of superiority that led to disparagement toward intra-organizational and interorganizational members. Appendix A illustrates the complete list of pool items directly extracted from the literature review that ensures applicability within the organizational environment. The items focused on organizational members' behaviors, attitudes, and communication patterns within the organizational environment.

Organizational Arrogance Scale Format

The organizational arrogance scale consisted of items designed to measure the frequency and intensity of behaviors that demonstrated a culture of superiority that led to the overconfidence of organizational capabilities, dismissiveness toward internal and external needs, and disparagement toward intra-organizational and interorganizational members. Each item captured organizational members' attitudes, opinions, and beliefs about the existence of arrogance within the organizational environment. A reliable and consistent Likert Scale must include five response categories at a minimum, and "the ends of the scale often are increased to create a seven-point scale by adding 'very' to the respective top and bottom of the five-point scales. The seven-point scale has been shown to reach the upper limits of the scale's reliability" (Allen & Seaman, 2007, p. 64). DeVellis (2012) contended that the key distinction involved even or odd number response items. The organizational arrogance instrument contained an odd number of

response items, ranging from 1 (*never*) to 7 (*always*) that ensure whether respondents avoided neutrality or indecisiveness and committed to a decision.

While the larger Likert scale, response items increased reliability, validity, and variance; these also challenged respondents to decipher their attitudes, opinions, or beliefs effectively. When respondents were prompted to decipher the slight differences between indications of “never” or “always” that might exist, they could struggle. For example, how did one interpret their varying degrees of their *always* to *nearly always* versus their *sometime always*? In an effort to mitigate this threat to validity, the researcher implemented a sliding scale to measure arrogant behavioral intensity and provide for a more reliable and valid instrument. The following describes the ratings for the scale from left to right: 1 -*never* (does not occur), 2 - *rarely* (occurs less than 10% of the time), 3 - *occasionally* (occurs about 30% of the time), 4 -*sometimes* (occurs 50% of the time), 5 - *frequently* (occurs about 70% of the time), 6 -*usually* (occurs about 90% of the time), and 7 - *always* (occurs all the time). This response range supported the aforementioned scholarly recommendations that Likert scales reliability occurred at seven possible answers because it decreased interpretive confusion and respondent fatigue.

Expert Panelists

Identifying and selecting qualified panelists represented a critical aspect of ensuring a reputable, respectable, applicable, and—most importantly—credible scale exists. The researcher selected each panelist based on their significant contributions to the body of knowledge in a myriad of areas. Most specifically, organizational leadership, ethics, organizational behavior, social psychology, arrogance, statistics, and scale development were sought. Their main objective was to provide their critical analysis, review, and insight to rate the prospective items identified to support the overall factor definition prior to administering to the sample population.

The experts received the 75-item measure with detailed instructions explaining the relevant terms and their requirement to adhere to the following four steps: (a) confirm content validity, which required the experts rating each item’s relevancy between 0 to 6 and identify its effectiveness for measuring its assigned

factor, and (b) item evaluation, where each panelist evaluated each survey item as it related to the organizational arrogance definition. This process required each panelist to provide (a) individual comments and recommend changes; (b) alternate means, where the panelists provided alternate methods or perspectives to identify organizational arrogance; and (c) a conclusion, which provided panelists the opportunity to submit general comments, suggestions, or recommendations as required.

Population and Sample Size

A 50-item pilot test was delivered via an online-only survey that targeted a minimum sample size of 300 working adults over the age of 18 to achieve instrument validity and generalizability based on the 5:1 ratio of subjects to item (DeVellis, 2012). In addition to the identified scale items, one used the instrument to collect demographic data to ensure participant validity that included (a) the participant's age, (b) the participant's gender, (c) the participant's race, (d) the participant's ethnicity, (e) the participant's role in the organization (e.g., middle management, upper management, and employee), (f) length of time at their particular job, (g) length of time in the workforce, and (h) job industry (military, government, private sector, and non-profit). Obtaining this sample size required a myriad of traditional communication and social media platforms that included Facebook, LinkedIn, Twitter, traditional email, text messaging, and traditional word of mouth that included a link to the survey to reach a diverse sample population nationwide.

Data Collection

Data collection leveraged a myriad of traditional communication and social media platforms that included Facebook, LinkedIn, Twitter, traditional email, text messaging, and traditional word of mouth with a link to the anonymous survey, along with incentive details to win a \$50 gift certificate. Throughout the 2-week survey window, a metrics tracker provided real-time email notifications on the number of completed surveys. To avoid multiple entries, the pilot test required respondents to register into the site. After the survey window closed and prior to

inputting data into SPSS Version 25.0, the researcher exported the data to Microsoft Excel and prescreened the data for any anomalies to include missing elements or ineligible respondents. The researcher concluded there were no inconsistencies with the data collected. Following the confirmation that all data elements were completed and the minimum number of cases was accomplished, the Microsoft Excel spreadsheet was exported to SPSS Version 25 software.

Analysis

A principal component analysis (PCA) of factors served as the primary evaluation method and was used to determine the appropriate factor rotation method based upon correlations requirements. DeCoster (1998) contended that the factor analysis indicated the number of factors that influenced the variables and what variables were connected. One used SPSS Version 25 to perform the appropriate data analysis required to retrieve the correlation alpha coefficient scores to aid in the scale development. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2007), the correlation coefficients must achieve a score of .30 or greater because anything less would indicate a weak relationship between variables. Based on this guidance, items identified as weak were eliminated, and strong items were retained for inclusion in the scale and submitted for a reliability test. The reliability testing phase required a trial and error period in which the researcher identified good and great items and scales accordingly to reach optimal length to achieve internal consistency of at least .700 and higher (Hair et al., 2008).

DeVellis (2012) asserted that shorter scales were acceptable because these placed less burden on participants, while longer scales were also good because of reliability. For this reason, DeVellis recommended that scale developers must balance between brevity and reliability. The reliability test served as the primary basis for determining scale length because it provided insight on the strength of factor loads, redundant items, and items identified for retention or elimination that ensured the optimal scale length.

Chapter 4 – Results

We want to believe that we're invulnerable, and that people who get tricked deserve it. Well, they don't. And someday the arrogant types who mock the gullible are likely to get their turn to wear the dunce cap. (Kim, 2002, p. 20)

This chapter describes the data collection process, the respondent sample demography, and the results discovered from various stages of the Organizational Arrogance Scale development process. More specifically, the chapter summarizes the expert panel review and the pilot test that includes the item and demographic analysis. The pilot test included a factor (principal components) analysis and reliability test that contributed to the final items selected for inclusion in the Organizational Arrogance Scale.

Expert Item Review

The six-person expert panel reviewed the 75 prospective pool items and evaluated the consistency as it pertained to the definition of the organizational arrogance construct. The experts completed the 4-step evaluation process, as mentioned in Chapter 3, which was designed to ensure representativeness, comprehensiveness, and clarity. The panel experts enhanced the effectiveness of the organizational arrogance construct, the quality of the scale used to measure organizational arrogance, and the overall scale development. The panelists selected included those listed in the following paragraphs.

Byron Cherry, Sr., is the CEO of Succeed to Lead, LLC, which he founded in 2008. Cherry served 26 years in the U.S. Army and retired at the rank of Colonel. He earned his B.S. in Accounting from Norfolk State University, Master of Business Administration from Troy State, a Master of Science in National Resource Strategy from Industrial College of the Armed Forces, and a Ph.D. in Organizational Leadership from Regent University. As the CEO of Succeed to Lead, he provided qualitative and quantitative opinion research and a broad range of consulting services to include Organizational Leadership; Human Resource Management, Financial Management; and Information Technology and Portfolio management to the Department of Defense, other federal agencies, state, and local

governments. Cherry served as Rector for Norfolk State University Board of Visitors, responsible for promoting interest, involvement, and activity among the member of the board.

Gregory Cruell earned his Masters of Philosophy (Ethics) from Georgia State University and his Ph.D. in Leadership from Gordon Conwell Theological Seminary. Cruell is the founder and primary facilitator of the Ethnos Leadership Process and author of three published books that accompany the framework: *The Leader's Character*, *The Leader's Capabilities*, and *The Leader's Competencies*. Cruell is a featured writer on leadership development in Promoting Purpose Magazine with over 1.2 million subscribers. He currently serves as a member of the President's Advisory Board of Diversity and Inclusion, the Institutional Review Board, and Texas A&M University Central Texas Campus. Cruell also serves as a member of the Board of Directors of "The Four Tree's Project" (Innovation-Education-Equality-Trust), which represents a national program of reformation of police policies and procedures on the human element of law enforcement in America. He previously served as the second African American Chaplain in the 215th history of the U.S. Military Academy, Professor of Leadership and Hermeneutics at Valley Forge University, and Ethics Instructor at the United States Army and Armor Center.

Michael Mahan serves as an adjunct professor at Regent University in the School of Arts and Sciences and in the School of Business and Leadership. He instructs in undergrad, graduate, and doctoral programs, dealing with leadership, exegetical analysis, and research methods. Additionally, he works independently as a subject matter expert and curriculum developer in the subjects of leadership and business. Mahan provides focus on leader development through consulting, research, training, and teaching. He earned his B.S. in Bible *magna cum laude* from Lubbock Christian University, an M.A. in Biblical Interpretation *summa cum laude* from Lubbock Christian University, and a Ph.D. in Organizational Leadership from Regent University. His scholarly interests include organizational design, organizational climate, organizational culture, emerging leadership theories, ecclesial leadership, second order ecclesiology, and the effects of theological

perspectives on leadership. He presents regularly at leadership conferences and has published numerous quantitative and qualitative journal articles that focused on narcissistic leadership, servant leadership, meaningful workplace, employee performance, and organizational climates.

Maxim Milyavsky currently works as a lecturer at Ono Academic College (The Faculty of Business Administration). Milyavsky earned his B.A. in Psychology and Cognitive Science *magna cum laude* from Hebrew University of Jerusalem, his M.A. in Psychology in Cognitive Psychology *magna cum laude*, and his Ph.D. in Social Psychology from Hebrew University. He completed his postdoctoral project on the motivational and epistemic underpinnings of intellectual humility and arrogance with Prof. Arie Kruglanski at the University of Maryland. Milyavsky's research and writings on attitudes, behaviors, epistemic, and affective responses are published in *Psychological Inquiry*, *Psychological Review*, *Consciousness and Cognition*, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory and Cognition*, and *Behavior and Brain Sciences*. His most recent article published is entitled the *Evidence for Arrogance: On the Relative Importance of Expertise, Outcome, and Manner*. Milyavsky is well known internationally and presented at numerous conferences on the topics of arrogance, advice-taking, motivation, unconscious processes, and emotion regulation.

Samantha Hartzell currently serves as the Assistant Professor of Education at the University of Incarnate Word in San Antonio, Texas. She received a B.S. in Physics at Utah State University, her MBA at the University of Nevada Las Vegas, and her Ph.D. in Educational Psychology at the University of Nevada Las Vegas. Her published works and presentations focus on a variety of topics, including cognitive and motivational characteristics, epistemological beliefs, goal orientation, emotional intelligence, statistical tools, and survey development.

Cecelia Snowden is an adjunct professor in the school of Social Work (teaching the entire curriculum of Statistics) at Morgan State University. She holds a B.S. in Statistics, Computer Science, and Applied Mathematics from The American University, an M.A. in Statistics from The American University, and a

Ph.D. from John Hopkins University in Health Services Research and Evaluation. She has more than 30 years of statistical experience in the federal government—Department of Health and Human Services. She previously served as an adjunct professor at Bowie State University and Sojourner Douglass College, a Research Scientist at Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation, and a Statistician for the Maryland State Health Department. She published more than 20 journal articles and presented at several conferences using quantitative and statistical methodology that enhanced the missions of local, county, state, and federal agencies.

The panelists evaluated each survey item as it related to the organizational arrogance definition and presented a series of concerns: (a) respondent confusion based on word choice, sentence length, jargon, biased wording and ambiguity; (b) realigning items with different dimensions; (c) behavior attributed to another reason as opposed to arrogance; (d) redundancy of items; (e) antecedents; (f) specific manifestations; (g) cause and effect, two characteristics in the same statement; (h) eliminate certain items that are immeasurable or (undefined); (i) cross-loading concerns between dismissiveness and the disparagement factors; and (j) and the addition of two items.

After I reviewed their analysis and findings, I made necessary changes aligned with the panelists' recommended concerns and issues. Specifically, this involved (a) editing words and replacing these with more universally understandable terms that could reach a diverse population, (b) separating compound words that addressed two behavioral traits or represented a cause and effect dynamic, (c) reviewing existing factor definitions to realign items based on right fit or eliminated these completely, and (d) addressing redundancies and identifying the strongest item that represented a more comprehensive or overarching umbrella for multiple items. Overall, the panelists provided positive and encouraging comments regarding the scale's potential to the body of knowledge. Between the panelists' recommendations and the evaluation ratings, I eliminated 25 total items, reducing the scale's size from 75 items to 50 (see Table 6).

Table 6: 50-Item Organizational Arrogance Scale Pilot Test

Item	Description	O	D	B
1	Organizational members demonstrate a sense of invincibility in their decision making.	*		
2	Organizational members openly communicate that they are incapable of failing.	*		
3	Organizational members exaggerate their self-importance through unrealistic and excessive claims.	*		
4	Organizational members demonstrate that their talents and abilities are superior to others.	*		
5	Organizational members credit their success to the efforts or contributions of other members and not their own intelligence.	*		
6	Organizational members respect each other.			*
7	Organizational members make reckless decisions.	*		
8	Organizational members overextend individuals or organizational resources.	*		
9	Organizational members exhibit a belief that they are smarter than everyone else.	*		
10	Organizational members underestimate others.	*		
11	Organizational members behave like they possess all the right answers.	*		
12	Organizational members demonstrate they do not value lessons learned from past mistakes.	*		
13	Organizational members exhibit behaviors that overestimate who they are.	*		
14	Organizational members display behaviors that overestimate what they can do.	*		
15	Organizational members exhibit behaviors that make those around them feel inferior.	*		

Item	Description	O	D	B
16	Organizational members demonstrate the belief that they will not repeat the same mistakes others made in the past.	*		
17	Organizational members tend to act intuitively and impulsively.	*		
18	Organizational members display a superior attitude toward the views and perspectives of others.		*	
19	Organizational members' attitude prevents close relationships with others.		*	
20	Organizational members' attitude allows others to share important information.		*	
21	Organizational members mistreat others when they express their views.			*
22	Organizational members disregard the value of others' reactions, feelings, and thoughts.		*	
23	Organizational members' attitude toward others' views and opinions encourages others to participate in the decision-making process.		*	
24	Organizational members' attitude toward others' views and opinions makes others feel devalued in the organization.		*	
25	Organizational members respect others and their ideas.			*
26	Organizational members claim to be more knowledgeable than others.		*	
27	Organizational members' treatment toward coworkers discourages them from using their talents and capacities.		*	
28	Organizational members reject others' ability to ask for progress updates.		*	
29	Organizational members ignore any instances where negative feedback occurs.		*	

Item	Description	O	D	B
30	Organizational member pay attention toward how others feel.		*	
31	Organizational members display a lack of attention toward how others think.		*	
32	Organizational members listen toward what others say.		*	
33	Organizational members ignore or do not acknowledge others' presence.		*	
34	Organizational members demean others.			*
35	Organizational members interrupt others.			*
36	The organization remains transparent regarding existing problems.		*	
37	Organizational members value important input from other organizational members.		*	
38	Organizational members belittle their rivals and mock their presence.			*
39	Organizational members display negative behavior toward staff during meetings.			*
40	Organizational members are not transparent and honest with the staff.		*	
41	Organizational members play staff members against each other.			*
42	Organizational members overrule staff decisions.			*
43	Organizational members criticize staff in public areas.			*
44	Organizational members pass blame toward coworkers.			*
45	Organizational members attack each other and not the issues.			*
46	Organizational members discredit others' ideas during meetings.			*
47	Organizational members make individuals appear incompetent or bad during meetings.			*

Item	Description	O	D	B
48	Organizational members treat others as though their opinions matter.			*
49	Organizational members often make jokes at expense of others.			*
50	Organizational members tend to ignore other staff members' advice.			*

Note: O = Overconfidence Item. D = Dismissiveness Item. B = Disparagement Item.

Results of Pilot Test

The participants for the pilot test were solicited from social media sites (Facebook, LinkedIn, and Twitter), emails to human resource professionals, colleagues of the researcher, and referrals. A letter of instruction was emailed to individuals and posted on the social media sites to solicit participants. The participant enlistment letter is included in the Appendix E. To ensure anonymity, access, and avoid data error, the Organizational Scale was published online at <https://goo.gl/forms/NCLAXznqubpJMRiF3>.

The Organizational Arrogance Pilot Test contained 50 items requiring a minimum of 250 participants but a goal of 300 to ensure greater reliability. As an incentive, I offered three \$50.00 gift certificates to winners of a random drawing that participants might receive if they provided their email address. The Organizational Arrogance Scale was available online for 2 weeks.

Demographic Data

Leveraging a myriad of social media platforms that included Facebook, LinkedIn, Twitter, GroupMe, email, text messaging, face-to-face engagements, and referrals, 322 individuals participated in the data collection. The study consisted of 155 men (48%) and 167 women (52%). Participants' ages ranged from 18 to 65 years old and older with a mean age range group of 35 to 44 years old. The sample was moderately distributed among the ethnic groups with an African-American participation rate of 49%, Asian/Pacific Islander of 4%, Caucasian rate of 34%, Hispanic rate of 27%, and other of 13% (see Table 7).

Table 7: Ethnicity

Race	<i>n</i>	Percent
African American	159	49.4
Asian/Pacific Islander	13	4.0
Caucasian	110	34.2
Hispanic	27	8.4
Other	13	4.0
Total	322	100.0

The population represented a variety of employer types, where military represented the largest contingent at 29%; government (federal, state, and local) employees represented 21%; for profit represented 16%; education represented 14%; and those from non-profit, healthcare, and other represented 18% of the respondents. The participants represented a diverse job level population that ranged from interns to owners, as depicted in Table 8.

Table 8: Job Level

Job Level	<i>n</i>	Percent
Intern	2	.6
Entry Level	13	4.0
Analyst/Associate	58	18.0
Manager	157	48.8
Senior Manager	11	3.4
Director	47	14.6
Vice President	4	1.2
C level executive (CIO, CTO, COO, CMO)	13	4.0
President or CEO	9	2.8
Owner	8	2.5
Total	322	100.0

The pilot test collected data from a diverse group of participants that ranged from new hires to those with over 26 years of employment. The majority of the participants represented the 1 to 5 years employment range at 30%, while those with less than 12 months in their organization represented a 6% participation rate. The participants represented organizations that ranged in size from 21 to 50 (9%) employees to greater than 5,000 (34%). Table 9 depicts the organizational size demographic.

Table 9: Organizational Size

Organizational size	<i>n</i>	Percent
21-50	30	9.3
51-100	52	16.1
101-500	61	18.9
501-999	23	7.1
1000-4,999	48	14.9
5,000+	108	33.5
Total	322	100.0

Additionally, the pilot test captured the educational level of the participants, ranging from highly educated professionals with doctorate or professional degrees to individuals with only high school (equivalency) degrees. Table 10 reflects these data.

Table 10: Education Level

Level of education	<i>n</i>	Percent
High School Graduate (includes equivalency)	6	1.9
Some college, no degree	40	12.4
Associate Degree	26	8.1
Bachelor's Degree	69	21.4
Master's Degree	129	40.1
Doctorate/Professional Degree	52	16.1
Total	322	100

Results of the Organizational Arrogance Scale Pilot Test

The Organizational Arrogance Scale Pilot Test consisted of 50 items that directly related to the dimensions of organizational arrogance. Overconfidence in Organizational Capabilities dimension contained 14 items depicted with a letter “O”; Dismissiveness Toward Internal and External Matters contained 21 items depicted with a letter “D”; and the Disparagement of Interorganizational and Intraorganizational Members contained 15 items depicted with a “B.”

To reduce the data and investigate the existence of any underlying themes or factors among these effects further, an exploratory principal components analysis was conducted. The total variance explained and the scree plot recommended a 5-factor solution. However, the total variance explained chart indicated the eigenvalues percentage of variance ranged from a high of 50% for Component 1 to a low of 2% for Component 5, as depicted in Table 11.

Table 11: Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			ESS Loadings		
	Total	% of Var.	Cum %	Total	% Var.	Cum. %
1	25.350	50.699	50.699	25.350	50.699	50.699
2	2.473	4.947	55.646	2.473	4.947	55.646
3	2.233	4.467	60.113	2.233	4.467	60.113
4	1.247	2.494	62.607	1.247	2.494	62.607
5	1.182	2.365	64.972	1.182	2.365	64.972
6	.989	1.979	66.950			
7	.971	1.942	68.892			
8	.869	1.738	70.630			
9	.831	1.662	72.293			
10	.756	1.512	73.804			
11	.740	1.480	75.284			
12	.679	1.357	76.641			
13	.647	1.294	77.935			
14	.601	1.202	79.138			
15	.582	1.165	80.302			
16	.557	1.114	81.417			
17	.525	1.051	82.468			
18	.499	.997	83.465			
19	.492	.985	84.450			
20	.460	.921	85.370			
21	.454	.908	86.278			
22	.428	.856	87.135			
23	.421	.842	87.977			
24	.385	.769	88.746			
25	.370	.740	89.486			
26	.356	.711	90.197			
27	.344	.687	90.885			

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
28	.329	.658	91.543			
28	.329	.658	91.543			
29	.318	.635	92.178			
30	.300	.600	92.777			
31	.289	.579	93.356			
32	.269	.537	93.893			
33	.266	.531	94.425			
34	.255	.510	94.935			
35	.231	.461	95.396			
36	.222	.444	95.840			
37	.206	.412	96.253			
38	.195	.389	96.642			
39	.190	.381	97.022			
40	.174	.348	97.370			
41	.167	.334	97.704			
42	.164	.327	98.031			
43	.157	.313	98.344			
44	.145	.291	98.635			
45	.139	.277	98.912			
46	.127	.254	99.166			
47	.120	.239	99.405			
48	.111	.222	99.627			
49	.099	.198	99.824			
50	.088	.176	100.000			

When evaluating the 5-factor solution, the component matrix indicated the existence of 43 items loading on Component 1 (ranging in coefficient scores of .455 to .845); Components 2 through 5 consisted of double-loaded items, ranging in score from .310 to .500, unequally dispersed between the four remaining components. Considering this, I conducted the analysis again and adjusted the fixed numbers of factors to extract to 3, with a Direct Oblimin rotation, to suppress coefficients' absolute value below .600. This process reduced the original test of 50 items to 43 items, with all factors loading to Component 1 with values ranging from .604 to .846. Due to the number of high value factor loads, I eliminated six additional items with an absolute value less than .650 to reduce the items to 37 further prior to the reliability test, as depicted in Table 12.

Table 12: 37-Item Organizational Arrogance Component Matrix

	Component 1
Q3 (O3) Exaggerate Self-Importance	.731
Q6 (B1) Respect Each Other	-.718
Q7 (O5) Reckless Decision Making	.735
Q9 (O7) Smarter Than Anyone Else	.764
Q10 (O8) Underestimate Others	.725
Q11 (O9) Behave Like They Possess All Right Answers	.732
Q12 (O10) Do Not Value Lessons from Past Mistakes	.680
Q13 (O11) Overestimate Who They Are	.797
Q14 (O12) Overestimate What They Can Do	.787
Q15 (O13) Make Those Feel Inferior	.829
Q18 (D3) Display Superior Attitude Toward Views of Others	.762
Q19 (D4) Prevents Close Relationships with Others	.748
Q22 (D6) Disregard the Value of Other	.843
Q24 (D8) Makes Others Feel Devalued	.815
Q25 (D9) Respect Others and Their Ideas	-.760
Q26 (D10) Claim to Be More Knowledgeable Than Others	.796
Q27 (D11) Discourages Use of Talents and Capacities	.818

	Component
	1
Q28 (D12) Reject Others	.728
Q29 (D13) Ignore Any Instances Where Negative Feedback Occurs	.793
Q30 (D14) Pay Attention Toward How Others Feel	-.740
Q31 (D15) Display Lack of Attention Toward How Others Think	.809
Q32 (D16) Listen Toward What Others Say	-.713
Q33 (D17) Ignore or Do Not Acknowledge Others	.760
Q34 (B3) Demean Others	.855
Q35 (D21) Interrupt Others	.756
Q38 (B4) Belittle Their Rivals and Mock Their Presence	.689
Q39 (B5) Display Negative Behavior Toward Staff During Meetings	.718
Q40 (D20) Not Transparent and Honest with Staff	.716
Q41 (B6) Play Staff Members Against Each Other	.742
Q43 (B8) Criticize Staff in Public Areas	.696
Q44 (B9) Pass Blame Toward Coworkers	.782
Q45 (B10) Attack Each Other And Not the Issues	.762
Q47 (B12) Individuals Appear Incompetent During Meetings	.793
Q49 (B14) Make Jokes at Expense of Others	.684
Q50 (B15) Ignore Other Staff Members	.828

The reliability test on the 37-item Organizational Arrogance Scale resulted in a Cronbach's alpha of .955, which could be increased to .962 if Item Number 30 ("Pay Attention to How Others Feel") was removed. However, the composition of the 37 items included nine items that represented the overconfidence element, 15 items that represented the dismissiveness element, and 13 items that represented the disparagement element. To create a more equally configured scale, where the three elements of overconfidence, dismissiveness, and disparagement would be fairly represented, I eliminated an additional 10 items (six Dismissiveness and four Disparagement items) that would create nine items for each element and equate to a 27-item scale for reliability test consideration. I eliminated Item Number 6 (*Respect*

Each Other), Item Number 18 (*Display Superior Attitude Toward Views of Others*), Item Number 25 (*Respect Others and Their Ideas*), Item Number 28 (*Reject Others*), Item Number 30 (*Pay Attention Toward How Others Feel*), Item Number 32 (*Listen Toward What Others Say*), Item Number 38 (*Belittle Their Rivals and Mock Their Presence*), Item Number 39 (*Display Negative Behavior Toward Staff During Meetings*), Item Number 40 (*Transparent and Honest With Staff*), and Item Number 50 (*Ignore Other Staff Members*). Items were eliminated because these were either low loading or redundant with other, more encompassing items already in place. Afterward, I conducted another reliability analysis on the 27-items that resulted in a Cronbach alpha of .974, indicating a highly reliable instrument, as illustrated in Table 13 and Table 14.

Table 13: 27-Item Organizational Arrogance Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.974	27

Table 14: 27-Item Organizational Arrogance Scale

	Scale Mean If Item Deleted	Scale Variance If Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha If Item Deleted
Q3 (O3) Exaggerate Self-Importance	93.95	912.689	.712	.974
Q7 (O5) Reckless Decision Making	94.60	923.681	.718	.974
Q9 (O7) Smarter Than Anyone Else	93.78	909.379	.747	.974
Q10 (O8) Underestimate Others	93.69	926.172	.710	.974
Q11 (O9) Behave Like They Possess All Right Answers	93.56	918.945	.710	.974
Q12 (O10) Do Not Value Lessons from Past Mistakes	94.20	921.657	.656	.974
Q13 (O11) Overestimate Who They Are	94.00	914.682	.785	.973
Q14 (O12) Overestimate What They Can Do	93.99	920.766	.781	.973
Q15 (O13) Make Those Feel Inferior	94.06	910.756	.811	.973
Q19 (D4) Prevents Close Relationships with Others	93.89	915.230	.723	.974
Q21 (B2) Mistreat Others When They Express Their Views	94.65	909.960	.813	.973
Q22 (D6) Disregard the Value of Other	94.20	904.133	.832	.973
Q24 (D8) Makes Others Feel Devalued	94.16	906.001	.793	.973
Q26 (D10) Claim to Be More	93.78	914.222	.786	.973

	Scale Mean If Item Deleted	Scale Variance If Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha If Item Deleted
Knowledgeable Than Others				
Q27 (D11) Discourages Use of Talents and Capacities	94.20	906.311	.805	.973
Q29 (D13) Ignore Any Instances Where Negative Feedback Occurs	94.18	909.301	.775	.973
Q31 (D15) Display Lack of Attention Toward How Others Think	94.15	911.309	.785	.973
Q35 (D21) Interrupt Others	93.96	919.761	.739	.974
Q33 (D17) Ignore or Do Not Acknowledge Others	94.75	917.005	.738	.974
Q34 (B3) Demean Others	94.77	905.168	.832	.973
Q41 (B6) Play Staff Members Against Each Other	94.83	910.144	.727	.974
Q43 (B8) Criticize Staff in Public Areas	95.03	919.584	.675	.974
Q44 (B9) Pass Blame Toward Coworkers	94.22	906.091	.773	.973
Q45 (B10) Attack Each Other And Not the Issues	94.53	912.069	.749	.974
Q46 (B11) Discredit Others	94.74	912.524	.820	.973
Q47 (B12) Individuals Appear Incompetent During Meetings	94.96	912.372	.774	.973
Q49 (B14) Make Jokes at Expense of Others	94.84	919.656	.660	.974

While the 27-item proposed scale presented a highly reliable instrument, I further examined the number of high-weighted items and recognized more opportunities for additional scale reduction to avoid respondent fatigue and still maintain internal consistency. Based on the original finding that these items loaded heavily on Component 1 suggesting a unidimensional scale, I reviewed the original 37 items and eliminated all items that weighted less than .818 and selected the top five loading items. Additionally, these five items in Table 15 serve as more broad and encompassing items that overlap the others, creating a more inclusive and restricted scale items. Items were as follows: Item 15 *Make Those Feel Inferior*, Item 22 *Disregard the Value of Other*, Item 27 *Discourages use of Talents and Capacities*, Item 34 *Demean Others*, and Item 50 *Ignore other Staff Members*, as depicted in Table 15. A reliability test on these five items revealed an Alpha of .922, indicating a reliable instrument that also met the criteria of brevity, as illustrated in Table 16.

Table 15: 5-Item Organizational Arrogance Component Matrix

Items	Component
	1
Q15 (O13) Make those Feel Inferior	.879
Q22 (D6) Disregard the Value of Other	.884
Q27 (D11) Discourages Use of Talents and Capacities	.883
Q34 (B3) Demean Others	.884
Q50 (B15) Ignore Other Staff Members	.838

Table 16: 5-Item Organizational Arrogance Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.922	5

Results Summary

The expert panel approved a 50-item Organizational Arrogance Pilot Test that was distributed electronically to a convenient development sample, leveraging

a myriad of social media platforms that included Facebook, LinkedIn, GroupMe, Twitter, traditional email, professional discussion forums, face-to-face referrals, and word of mouth. To ensure a valid test, the 50-item pilot test received 322 participants, thus exceeding the goal of 300 participants. A principal component analysis revealed five initial components with Eigen values over 1.0. However, Component 1 accounted for over 50% of the total variance and 43 loaded items, while Components 2 through 5 accounted for 14% of the variance consisting of unequally dispersed items with coefficient scores below .500. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure verified sampling adequacy at $KMO = .934$, indicating a strong value (Hair et al., 2008). Bartlett's test of sphericity indicated that the correlation matrices were suitable for factor analysis with a significance of .000. The data indicated a high level of correlation significance with Component 1 and was validated after a direct oblimin rotation.

Prior to conducting the first reliability test, an additional 13 items were deleted due to coefficient scores less than .650. A second reliability test was initiated on a 27-item unidimensional Organizational Arrogance Scale that resulted with an alpha score of .974. Because the items indicated a unidimensional scale and consisted of a series of high weighted items, an additional 22 items with coefficient scores less than .815 were eliminated and another reliability test executed. This led to the development of a 5-item Organizational Arrogance Scale with an Alpha score of .922, indicating high reliability that accurately measured a culture of superiority that led to overconfidence in organizational capabilities, dismissiveness toward internal and external needs, and disparagement toward intraorganizational and interorganizational members.

Chapter 5 – Discussion

There is one vice of which no man in the world is free; which everyone in the world loathes when he sees it in someone else; and of which hardly any people, except Christians, ever imagine that they are guilty of themselves... The essential vice, the utmost evil, is Pride. Unchastity, anger, greed, drunkenness, and all that, are mere fleabites in comparison: it was through Pride that the devil became the devil: Pride leads to every other vice: it is the complete anti-God state of mind. (C. S. Lewis, 1968, p. 20)

History indicated arrogant behaviors led toward destructive endings, fractured relationships, ostracized individuals, over inflated egos, and failed organizations. In 1 Corinthians 4:6-21, the Apostle Paul expertly addresses the arrogant phenomenon and how arrogance threatens effective leadership and followership behaviors. Most importantly in this passage, the Apostle Paul identifies organizational arrogance in its early existence and how it manifested in the First Century Church.

As was the case with the Apostle Paul, organizational arrogance still represents a significant threat to the modern day work environment. Throughout the years, organization leaders have experienced declined employee retention and morale, low productivity, impeded progress, and eventual catastrophic failure. After the organizational failure, individuals have sought answers to identify how, why, and what the missed signs were, only to misattribute the reasons for a leadership failure and lack of accountability. However, they have often missed the key component that an organizational culture built on a foundation of arrogance might serve as the direct link to organizational failure. Therefore, the purpose of this dissertation was not only to place a name conceptually and define this organizational behavior phenomenon called organizational arrogance, but to also develop a valid instrument that accurately measured the phenomenon.

Organizational arrogance was defined as an organizational environment, where leaders shaped a culture with organizational members who behaved with a sense of superiority that led to (a) overconfidence in organizational capabilities, (b) dismissiveness toward internal and external organizational needs, and (c)

disparagement toward intra-organizational and interorganizational members. This dissertation leveraged research that identified arrogance in its multiple facets, developed a comprehensive set of items based on the existing literature, and subjected the items to expert panels for a thorough review to ensure content validity, which contributed to the development of a unidimensional 5-item Organizational Arrogance Scale. The organization represented the unit of analysis. Most specifically, this scale measured a culture of a sense of superiority that led to overconfidence in organizational capabilities, dismissiveness toward internal and external organizational needs, and disparagement toward intra-organizational and interorganizational members. This scale should aid organizational leaders, consultants, human resource practitioners, and leadership scholars in identifying organizational arrogance and the opportunity to develop effective strategies to minimize this threat to building a healthy organizational environment.

The principal component analysis, performed on the theoretically based 50-item Organizational Arrogance pilot test, revealed strong correlation of the 43 items that loaded to Component 1 with scores that ranged between .455 and .845. These scores indicated that the sample from a variety of industries encountered a significant issue with organizational arrogant behaviors in their respective work environments. Each item in the pilot test loaded with a favorable rating; therefore, the eliminated items were primarily based on optimizing scale length, not because the items failed to reach the .30 threshold, as Kline (2014) suggested, or that any items were deemed inconsistent with the overall concept.

This concluding chapter focuses on the theoretical and practical significance of organizational arrogance, while answering the research questions designed to identify the most accurate indicators of an organizational environment. These include organizational members who behave with a sense of superiority that leads to overconfidence in organizational capabilities, dismissiveness toward members within the organization, and disparagement toward intra-organizational and interorganizational members. Following this discussion, the dissertation identifies limitations, areas of future research, and conclusion.

Theoretical Significance

The emerging concept of organizational arrogance showed support of the previous literature that focused on arrogance. A major issue facing the modern work environment remained: the existence of unaccountable leaders who stifled employees' thoughts, talents, gifts, and their abilities to contribute directly to the overall success of an organization. Leaders who exhibited and shaped a culture of arrogant behaviors found themselves at the center of unethical practices with low employee morale and minimal productivity, or even at a high-performing organization in its final stages of survival before experiencing a rapid descent toward catastrophic failure.

The severity of arrogant behaviors that manifested within the workplace because of developing this culture were demonstrated in the results of this study. The overall sample size captured for this study indicated a diverse make up, along ethnic and gender lines, education level, employer type, organizational size, and job level, thereby suggesting generalizability, and the expansive reach organizational arrogance provided the body of knowledge for further theoretical exploration. The following sections extend the discussion on the theoretical significance of the five Organizational Arrogance Scale items and how each item relates to the research questions.

Indicators for Overconfidence in Organizational Capabilities

The organizational arrogance scale contained one item that reflected “a sense of superiority that leads to overconfidence in organizational capabilities.” This item measured the presence of organizational members' personal belief that their intellect superseded any personal and organizational limitations.

Item 15 *organizational members exhibited behaviors that make those around them feel inferior* represented the *overconfidence of organizational capabilities* element. This item indicated that 28% (90) respondents answered *sometimes*, 23% (74) answered *frequently*, and 19% (61) answered *rarely*. The item revealed a mean of 3.85 (occasionally) and median of 4.0 (sometimes). Arrogance represents interpersonal relationships between one another (Tiberius & Walker, 1998). This item highlighted this interaction among organizational members and

presented a significant warning sign that—if left unchecked—could lead toward unethical behaviors that would include deceit, misrepresentation of data or self, workplace sabotage, or theft to protect the self-proclaimed reputation of superiority and reinforce others inferiority. I concluded this item aligned itself with theoretical principles and served as a quality indicator outlying behavior that led to overconfidence in organizational capabilities.

Indicators for Dismissiveness Toward Internal and External Organizational Matters

The organizational arrogance scale contained two items that reflected “a sense of superiority that leads to dismissiveness toward internal and external organizational needs.” These items measured the organizational members’ propensity to ignore or disregard information regarding organizational matters. The two items included in the scale were as follows:

Item 22 *organizational members disregarded the value of others’ reactions, feelings, and thoughts* contained a response rate that 23% (75) answered *sometimes*, 18% (59) answered *occasionally*, and 16% (53) answered *frequently*, with a mean of 3.26 and median of 3.0. These responses indicated that respondents perceived organizational members with a low level of emotional intelligence degraded their abilities to empathize with others’ thoughts, feelings, or behaviors within the organization. This item showed a significant organizational cultural concern, where members possessed the mental ability to disconnect from others and reduce the value of their emotions. Mackey, Perrewe, and McAllister (2017) described this finding as a form of interpersonal workplace deviance that included “overt acts in the presence of at least one other person that inflict harm upon at least one individual” (p. 463). Because of the harm and negative impact this finding could create, organizational members must maintain visibility and awareness of this sign of dismissiveness, as it could directly lead to significant levels of workplace stress. Organization leaders subscribing to a pattern of disregarding their employees’ reactions, feelings, and thoughts could threaten management techniques to build synergy, trust, and mutual respect. Devalued organizational members could lose morale and the sense of belonging. Organizational members perceived

organizational fit influenced their psychological reactions that influenced their attitude and behaviors (Wheeler, Buckley, Halbesleben, Brouer, & Ferris, 2005).

Item 27 *organizational members' treatment toward coworkers discourages them from using their talents and capacities* revealed that 30% (97) answered *sometimes*, 24% (80) answered *rarely*, and 16% (52) answered *frequently*, with a mean score of 3.71 (occasionally) and median 4.0 (sometimes). These answers indicated that the respondents encountered organizational members who demonstrated an attitude of superiority regularly. This superiority complex manifested in organizational members insisting that their own views, ideas, and perspectives would remain the best thought out, planned, articulated, and developed, thereby preventing other organizational members from engaging in dialogue or knowledge sharing because their perspectives failed to measure to an intellectual level perceived as worthy of acceptance. This item indicated the value of the overall organizational arrogance concept and how this attitude would negatively influence job satisfaction, workplace engagement, and collaborative efforts, particularly in working groups or projects requiring staff analysis. I concluded these two items aligned with theoretical principles and served as quality indicators, outlying behavior that led to dismissiveness toward internal and external organizational matters.

Indicators for Disparagement Toward Intraorganizational and Interorganizational Members

The organizational arrogance scale contained two items that reflected “a sense of superiority that leads to disparagement toward intra-organizational and interorganizational members.” These items measured the organizational members’ actions designed to belittle, degrade, or discredit organizational members. These items indicated more aggressiveness and hostility toward organizational members. The two items included in the scale were as follows:

Item 34 *organizational members demeaned others* revealed 26% (85) answered *rarely*, 24% (77) answered *sometimes*, 15% (51) answered *never*, and 12% (40) answered *frequently*, with a mean average of 3.14 (occasionally) and median of 3.00 (occasionally). This item indicated the frequency of arrogant

behaviors contributed to workplace incivility in a particular organization. Ideally, organizational leaders would want the majority, if not all, responses for this item to range between *never* and *rarely*, as opposed to the *occasionally* through *always* selections of the Likert responses. However, a mean of 3.0 still indicated the occasional presence of the demeaning behaviors and suggested the requirement for organizational members to maintain visibility and direct engagement with the negative behavior that influenced the development of a healthy work environment. This item's performance illuminated the interpersonal relationships of organizational members and potential areas of concern requiring immediate action.

Item 50 *ignore other staff members* revealed that 30% (97) answered, *sometimes*, 21% (68) *occasionally*, and 21% (67) *rarely*. Despite the genesis and motivation, ignoring an individual represented a form of disparagement. This behavior discouraged organizational members from participating, seeking guidance, or interacting with others because it ostracized certain members and discounted their value to the organization or others. Studies indicated that 66% of American employees experienced ostracism within their work environment (Fox & Stallworth, 2005). Further supporting this claim and the value of this item, ostracized employees were prone to deteriorated job performance, affective commitment, and work engagement and higher propensity to quit (Yang & Treadway, 2018). Not only did organizational members who deliberately engaged in this behavior negatively influence those around them and the organization overall, but 66% of American employees accepted this as normal and expected workplace behavior. Therefore, capturing this item on this scale showed a prevailing issue facing the work environments. I concluded these two items aligned themselves with theoretical principles and served as quality indicators of underlying behavior that led to the disparagement of intraorganizational and interorganizational members.

Practical Significance

Three-hundred-twenty-two respondents, representing a diverse group of organizations from a multitude of industries, recognized a troubling phenomenon

throughout their working careers. Each respondent could describe the phenomenon, picture the phenomenon, emotionally connect to the phenomenon, feel the phenomenon, and even rate the manifestation and frequency of the phenomenon. However, they did not possess the ability to refer to the phenomenon by name because it did not theoretically exist.

Throughout this dissertation journey, the emerging concept of organizational arrogance was formally introduced, defined, effectively measured, and identified as a significant threat to developing a healthy, productive organizational environment. Practical significance addressed the strategic, operational, and tactical employment to measure organizational arrogance. Naming organizational arrogance and developing the instrument represented the first of many steps ahead. As the pilot test and subsequent data analysis indicated, organizational members experienced significant issues with unhealthy, unproductive, and uncivil work environments that threatened the organization's long-term survival. This dissertation introduced a concept to prompt organizational leaders to invest in training and developing mitigating strategies designed to enhance employee engagement, increase job satisfaction, eliminate the institutional paranoia associated with transparent communication and knowledge sharing, and maximize efficiencies for organizations to reach optimal performance.

Leadership and followership behaviors work collectively to shape and reinforce the existing culture. An organizational culture has three parts: (a) organizational leaders developing organizational vision and values, (b) organizational leaders recruiting like-minded employees, (c) upper management remaining responsible for the socialization and assimilation process, and (d) organizational culture shaped (Robbins & Coulter, 2009). The extant literature and the data collected during the course of this study indicated that somewhere along the Robbins and Coulter (2009) continuum, arrogant behaviors in the workplace influenced unsuspecting organizations with the aim of infecting and demoralizing the workforce. The reality of organizational arrogance and a valid instrument to measure it provided the necessary catapult to effectively diagnose organizations

and triage these accordingly. Identifying the severity of and how widespread organizational arrogance would dictate the strategic focus of professionals.

Finally, this concept leveraged the extant literature to bridge the existing lacuna regarding arrogance at the organizational level and an effective means to measure it. Findings from this study provided the body of knowledge opportunities for new exploration to gain further understanding of how organizational arrogance and its associated traits contributed to or derived from the dark side of leadership. The practical significance of this study was that it reinforced the idea that organizational culture remained a leader responsibility that required keen attention, astute observations, and immediate action to eliminate any signs of organizational arrogance.

Limitations

The pilot test depended heavily on social media platforms, word of mouth, and email to meet the requisite number of a heterogeneous population to qualify for a reliable scale and generalizability. However, the population acquired consisted primarily of a contingent of highly educated managers with advanced degrees, mainly *white collar* jobs. While this population provided invaluable insight, leveraging the social media platform as the primary means to solicit participants assumed that everyone possessed a social media account. However, this method might have led to missing the *blue collar*, less educated, less economically stable, and lower level management population.

The extant literature provided a robust pool of items that contributed to naming the construct, defining the construct, and developing a validated 5-item instrument to measure the construct. However, I did not take the subsequent step to administer the validated scale to a homogenous sample for real-world application. Therefore, convergence and discriminability studies remain imperative in an effort to develop this emerging concept further. Subsequent researchers must formally employ the Organizational Arrogance Scale in a host of diverse organizations based upon their size, location, and population composition. The diversity of the

population obtained in the pilot test favorably show this scale has the potential to succeed against the tests of convergence and discriminability.

Areas of Future Research

The limited studies examining arrogance indicates the unlimited possibilities that exist for furthering this phenomenon that are traditionally associated with individuals or leaders and not organizations. Organizational arrogance represents a new construct to apply across a myriad of academic disciplines, as well as the private and public sector. Additionally, reintroducing previous studies with the lens of organizational arrogance widens the research aperture and may reveal new areas requiring further research. For instance, one may question whether this concept applies to overseas organizations. One can question whether differences exist between a collectivist versus individualistic cultures regarding organizational arrogance. Examining the relationship between organizational identity and organizational arrogance, one can study whether organization leaders consider themselves arrogant. If not, one can question the difference between a proud organization and an arrogant organization. Engaging in qualitative studies that inquire into the impact of organizational members on the receiving side of organizational arrogant behaviors and examining the retention or turnover for arrogant organizations can also advance the research on this topic. Moreover, one can question whether any particular industries are more susceptible to organizational arrogance. Future researchers can also question if narcissism, Machiavellian, or psychopathy personality/leadership styles are more prone to shape a culture of organizational arrogance.

Additionally, future research may benefit from examining the relationship between work-place stress and organizational arrogance. One can examine ways in which organizational arrogance influences group dynamics, processes, and eventual performance. Adding to this dynamic, future researchers can examine ways in which the perceptions of organizational arrogance differ from each management level and what management level is more susceptible to this behavior or the recipient. Overall, this dissertation introduced to the body of knowledge an

emerging concept worthy of critique, examination, replication, and—most importantly—universal acceptance.

Conclusion

This research successfully described the formation of an emerging concept, organizational arrogance, and the development of an instrument designed to measure the phenomenon in response to the established need for empirical evidence examining arrogant behaviors and its negative influence on organizational members and organizations in general. Ongoing research reported findings on a variety of reasons for organizational failure that were related to job satisfaction, employee engagement, morale, workplace stress, organizational culture, and leadership and followership styles. I introduced and defined organizational arrogance as an organizational environment, where leaders shaped a culture in which organizational members behaved with a sense of superiority that led to overconfidence in organizational capabilities, dismissiveness toward internal and external needs, and disparagement of intra-organizational interorganizational and members. The theoretical and practical application value of this work included (a) a theoretically based and comprehensive definition for recognizing organizational arrogance, which occurred at the organizational level; (b) strategic, operational, and tactical implications for administering the instrument; (c) greater awareness of this phenomenon and its influence on organizational members and organizations; and (d) proposed areas of future research that further expanded and explained the theory.

References

- Albert, S., & Whetten, D. (1985). Organizational identity. In L. Cummings & M. Staw (Eds.), *Organizational behavior* (Vol. 7, pp. 263-295). Greenwich, England: JAI Press.
- Allen, E., & Seaman, C. (2007). Likert scales and data analyses. *A Quality Progress*, 40(7), 64-65. Retrieved from <http://asq.org/qualityprogress/>
- Antonacopoulou, E., & Sheaffer, Z. (2014). Learning in crisis: Rethinking the relationship between organizational learning and crisis management. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 23(1), 5-21.
doi:10.1177/1056492612472730
- Ashforth, B., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *The Academy of Management Review*, 14(1), 20-39.
doi:10.5465/amr.1989.4278999
- Babiak, P., & Hare, R. (2006). *Snakes in suits: When psychopaths go to work*. New York, NY: Harper Collins.
- Babiak, P., Neumann, C., & Hare, R. (2010). Corporate psychopathy: Talking the walk. *Behavioral sciences & the Law*, 28(2), 174-193. doi:10.1002/bsl.925
- Barney, J., & Stewart, A. (2000). Organizational identity as moral philosophy" competitive implications for diversified corporations. In M. Schultz, M. Hatch, & M. Larsen (Eds.), *The expressive organization* (pp. 36-47). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Bhatti, N., Mura Maitlo, G., Shaikh, N., Hashmi, M., & Shaikh, F. (2012). The impact of autocratic and democratic leaderships style on job satisfaction. *International Business Research*, 5(2), 192-201. doi:10.5539/ibr.v5n2p192
- Board, B., & Fritzon, K. (2005). Disordered personalities at work. *Psychology, Crime and Law*, 11, 17-32. doi:10.1080/10683160310001634304
- Boddy, C. (2011). Corporate psychopaths, bullying and unfair supervision in the workplace. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 100, 367-379.
doi:10.1007/s10551-010-0689-5
- Bolman, L., & Deal, T. E. (1997). *Reframing organizations*. (2nd ed.) San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Braun, S., Aydin, N., Frey, D., & Peus, C. (2016). Leader narcissism predicts malicious envy and supervisor-targeted counterproductive behavior: Evidence from field and experimental research. *Journal of Business Ethics, 135*, 1-17. doi:10.1007/s10551-016-3224-5
- Brickson, S. (2005). Organizational identity orientation: Forging a link between organizational identity and organizations' relations with stakeholders. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 50*, 576-609. doi:10.2189/asqu.50.4.576
- Brown, H. (2012, Jul/Aug). So what if i don't have an iPhone? The unintended consequences of using arrogance in advertising. *The Journal of Applied Business Research, 28*(4), 555-563. Retrieved from <https://clutejournals.com/index.php/JABR/index>
- Brown, M., & Trevino, L. (2006). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. *The Leadership Quarterly, 17*(6), 595-616. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.10.004
- Burke, R. (2006). Leadership and spirituality. *Foresight, 8*(6), 14-25. doi:10.1108/14636680610712504
- Cleckley, H. (1941). *The mask of sanity*. Oxford, England: C.V. Mosby.
- Clow, K., & Scott, H. (2007). Psychopathic traits in nursing and criminal justice majors: A pilot study. *Psychological Reports, 100*, 495-498. doi:10.2466/pr0.100.2.495-498
- Coynes, S., & Thomas, T. (2008). Psychopathy, aggression, and cheating behavior: A test of the Cheater-Hawk hypothesis. *Personality and Individual Differences, 44*, 1105-1115. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2007.11.002
- Croft, E., & Donker, H. (2006, Jul/Aug). Does the winner take it all? The dark side of takeovers. *Corporate Finance Review, 11*(1), 31-35. Retrieved from <https://tax.thomsonreuters.com/products/brands/checkpoint/ria-wgl/journals/cmjauthor/>
- Daft, R. (2005). *The leadership experience*. Stamford, CT: Thomson Corporation.
- Dahling, J., Whitaker, B., & Levy, P. (2009). The development and validation of a new Machiavellianism scale. *Journal of Management, 35*, 219-257. doi:10.1177/0149206308318618

- De Cremer, D. (2007). Emotional effects of distributive justice as a function of autocratic leader behavior. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 37*(6), 1385-1404. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2007.00217.x
- DeCoster, J. (1998). *Overview of factor analysis*. Retrieved January 27, 2018 from <http://www.stat-help.com/notes.html>
- DeVellis, R. (2012). *Scale development: Theory and applications* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Drory, A., & Gluskinos, U. (1980). Machiavellianism and leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 65*(1), 81-86. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.65.1.81
- Dutton, J., & Duckerich, J. (1991). Keeping an eye on the mirror: Image and identity in organizational adaptation. *Academy of Management Journal, 34*(1), 517-554. doi:10.5465/256405
- Flynn, L. R., Goldsmith, R. E., & Eastman, J. K. (1996). Opinion leaders and opinion seekers: Two new measurement scales. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 24*(2), 137-147. doi:10.1177/0092070396242004
- Fox, S., & Stallworth, L. (2005). Racial/ethnic bullying: Exploring links between bullying and racism in the US workplace. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 66*(3), 438-456. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2004.01.002
- Gioia, D. (1998). From individual to organizational identity. In D. Whetten & P. Godfrey (Eds.), *Identity in organizations, building theory through conversations* (pp. 17-31). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gkorezis, P., Petridou, E., & Krouklidou, T. (2015). Machiavellian leadership, organizational cynicism and emotional exhaustion. *Europe's Journal of Psychology, 11*(4), 619-631. doi:10.5964/ejop.v11i4.988
- Glynn, M. (2000). When cymbals become symbols: Conflict over organizational identity within a symphony orchestra. *Organization Science, 11*, 285-298. doi:10.1287/orsc.11.3.285.12496
- Gregg, A., & Mahadevan, N. (2014). Intellectual arrogance and intellectual humility: An evolutionary-epistemological account. *Journal of Psychology & Theology, 42*(1), 7-18. doi:10.1177/009164711404200102

- Hair, J., Black, W., Babin, B., & Anderson, R. (2008). *Multivariate data analysis*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hamlin, R., & Hatton, A. (2013). Toward a British taxonomy of perceived managerial and leadership effectiveness. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 24(3), 365-406. doi:10.1002/hrdq.21163
- Hare, R. (1991). *The Hare Psychopathy Checklist-Revised PCL-R*. Toronto, Canada: Multi.
- Hareli, S., & Weiner, B. (2000). Accounts for success as determinants of perceived arrogance and modesty. *Motivation and Emotion*, 24(3), 215-236. doi:10.1023/A:1005666212320
- Harms, P., Spain, S., & Hannah, S. (2011). Leader development and the dark side of personality. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22, 495-509. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.04.007
- Harrison, J. (2000). Multiple imaginings of institutional identity. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 36, 425-455. doi:10.1177/0021886300364003
- Hayward, M., & Hambrick, D. (1997). Explaining premiums paid for large acquisitions: Evidence of CEO hubris. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42(1), 103-127. doi:10.2307/2393810
- Ionescu, V. (2014). Leadership, culture and organizational change. *Manager Journal*, 20, 65-73. Retrieved from <http://www.manager.unibuc.ro/>
- Jain, A. K., & Jain, S. P. (2013). Understanding organizational culture and leadership-enhance efficiency and productivity. *Pranjan*, 16(2), 43-53. Retrieved from <http://www.indianjournals.com/ijor.aspx?target=ijor:pr&type=home>
- Johnson, R., Silverman, S., Shyamsunder, A., Swee, H., Rodopman, O., & Bauer, E. (2010). Acting superior but actually inferior?: Correlates and consequences of workplace arrogance. *Human Performance*, 23, 403-427. doi:10.1080/08959285.2010.515279
- Kane, C., & Cunningham, J. (2013). Leadership changes and approaches during company turnaround. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 42(4), 52-85. doi:10.2753/IMO0020-8825420403

- Kets De Vries, M., & Miller, D. (1985). Narcissism and leadership-an object relations perspective. *Human Relations, 38*, 583-601.
doi:10.1177/001872678503800606
- Kirn, W. (2002). *Up in the air*. New York, NY: Anchor Books.
- Kjaergaard, M., & Ravasi, D. (2011). Mediating identity: A study of media influence on organizational identity construction in a celebrity firm. *Journal of Management Studies, 48*, 514-543.
doi:10.1111/j.1467-6486.2010.00954.x
- Kline, P. (2014). *An easy guide to factor analysis*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Leary, M., Bednarski, R., Hammon, D., & Duncan, T. (1997). Blowhards, snobs, and narcissists: Interpersonal reactions to excessive egoism. In R. M. Kowalski (Ed.), *Behaving badly; Aversive behaviors in interpersonal relationships* (pp. 111-131). New York, NY: Plenum.
- Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2005). Psychopathy, Machiavellianism, and narcissism in the five-factor model and the HEXACO model of personality structure. *Personality and Individual Differences, 38*(7), 1571-1582.
doi:10.1016/j.paid.2004.09.016
- Leslie, J. B., & Van Velsor, E. (1996). *A look at derailment today: North America and Europe*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.
- Lewis, C. S. (1968). *A mind awake: An anthology of C.S. Lewis*. New York, NY: Harvest.
- Lewis, M. (2000). Self-conscious emotions: Embarrassment, pride, shame, and guilt. In M. Lewis, & J. M. Haviland-Jones, *Handbook of emotions* (pp. 623-636). New York, NY: Guilford.
- Lubit, R. (2002). The long-term organizational impact of destructively narcissistic managers. *Academy of Management Review, 16*, 127-138.
doi:10.5465/ame.2002.6640218
- Ma, H., & Karri, R. (2005). Leaders beware: Some sure ways to lose your competitive advantage. *Organizational Dynamics, 34*(1), 63-76. Retrieved from <https://www.journals.elsevier.com/organizational-dynamics>

- Maccoby, M. (2000). Narcissistic leaders-the incredible pros, the inevitable cons. *Harvard Business Review*, 78, 69-77. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/>
- Mackey, J., Perrewe, P., & McAllister, C. (2017). Do i fit in? Perceptions of organizational fit as a resource in the workplace stress process. *Sage*, 42(4), 455-486. doi:10.1177/1059601115625155
- Martin, K., Johnson, J., & French, J. (2011). Institutional pressures of marketing ethics initiatives: The focal role of organizational identity. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 39, 574-591. doi:10.1007/s11747-010-0246-x
- Mason, D. (2004). How to live with a charismatic leader. *Nonprofit World*, 22(5), 26-29. Retrieved from <https://www.snpo.org/publications/nonprofitworld.php>
- McIntosh, G., & Rima, S. (2007). *Overcoming the darkside of leadership: How to become an effective leader by confronting potential failures*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books.
- Meyer, J. (2011, March 29). Do you need to get over yourself? *Christian Post*. Retrieved from <https://www.christianpost.com/news/do-you-need-to-get-over-yourself-49626/>
- Milyavsky, M., Krunglanski, A., Chemikova, M., & Schori-Eyal, N. (2017). Evidence of arrogance: On the relative importance of expertise, outcome, and manner. *PloS ONE*, 12(7), 1-31. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0180420
- Nevicka, B., De Hoogh, A., Van Vianen, A., Beersma, B., & McIlwain, D. (2011). All I need is a stage to shine: Narcissists' leader emergence and performance. *Leadership Quarterly*, 22, 910-925. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.07.011
- Parnell, J., Von Bergen, C., & Soper, B. (2005). Profiting From past triumphs and failures: Harnessing history for future success. *SAM Advanced Management Journal*, 70(2), 36-47. Retrieved from <http://samnational.org/publications-2/sam-advanced-management-journal/>

- Pater, R. (2013, November). Overcoming leadership ADD: The flaws of arrogance, distraction and disconnection. *Professional Safety*, 58, 30-34. Retrieved from <http://www.asse.org>
- Patrick, C., Fowles, D., & Krueger, R. (2009). Triarchic conceptualization of psychopathy: Development origins of disinhibitions, boldness, and meanness. *Development of Psychopathology*, 21, 913-938. doi:10.1017/S0954579409000492
- Poggi, I., & D'Errico, F. (2011). Types of pride and their expression. In A. Esposito, A. Vinciarelli, K. Vicsi, C. Pelachaud, & A. Nijholt (Eds.), *Analysis of verbal and nonverbal communication and enactment* (pp. 434-448). Berlin, Germany: Springer-Verlag.
- Rijsenbilt, A., & Commandeur, H. (2013). Narcissus enters the courtroom: CEO narcissism and fraud. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 117, 413-429. doi:10.1007/s10551-012-1528-7
- Robbins, S. P., & Coulter, M. (2009). *Management* (10th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2012). *Organizational behavior* (15th ed.). Boston, MA: Prentice Hall.
- Rosenthal, S., & Pittinsky, T. (2006). Narcissistic leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 617-633. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.10.005
- Ruvio, A. A., & Shoham, A. (2016). Consumer arrogance: Scale development and validation. *Journal of Business Research*, 69, 3989-3997. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.06.004
- Sakalaki, M., Richardson, C., & Thepaut, Y. (2007). Machiavellianism and economic opportunism. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 37(6), 1181-1190. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2007.00208.x
- Schein, E. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Seeger, M., & Ulmer, R. (2003). Explaining Enron: Communication and responsible leadership. *Management Communication*, 17(1), 58-64. doi:10.1177/0893318903253436

- Sergiu, G. (2015, March). Developing the organizational culture. *Review of International Comparative Management*, 16(1), 137-143. Retrieved from <http://www.rmci.ase.ro/>
- Siewiorek, A., & Lehtinen, E. (2011). Exploring leadership profiles from collaborative computer gaming. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, 6(3), 357-374. Retrieved from <https://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/ijls/new/home.htm>
- Smith, S., & Lilienfeld, S. (2013, March-April). Psychopathy in the workplace: The knowns and unknowns. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 18(2), 204-218. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2012.11.007
- Solas, J. (2016). The banality of bad leadership and followership. *Society and Business Review*, 11(1), 12-23. doi:10.1108/SBR-09-2015-0049
- Spector, B., & Lane, H. (2007). Exploring the distinctions between a high performance culture and a cult. *Strategy & Leadership*, 35(3), 18-24. doi:10.1108/10878570710745794
- Spector, P. (1992). *Summated rating scale construction: An introduction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Tiberius, V., & Walker, J. (1998). Arrogance. *American Philosophical Quarterly*, 35(4), 379-390. Retrieved from <http://www.press.uillinois.edu/journals/apq.html>
- Vugt, M., Jepson, S., & Cremer, D. (2004). Autocratic leadership in social dilemmas: A threat to group stability. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 40(1), 1-13. doi:10.1016/S0022-1031(03)00061-1
- Wheeler, A., Buckley, M., Halbesleben, J., Brouer, R., & Ferris, G. (2005). "The Elusive Criterion of Fit" revised: Toward an integrative theory of multidimensional fit. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 24, 265-304. doi:10.1016/S0742-7301(05)24007-0

- Wosinska, W., Dabul, A., Whetstone-Dion, R., & Cialdini, R. (1996). Self-presentational responses to success in the organization: The costs and benefits of modesty. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 18*(2), 229-242. doi:10.1207/s15324834basp1802_8
- Yang, J., & Treadway, D. (2018). A social influence interpretation of workplace ostracism and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics, 148*, 879-891. doi:10.1007/s10551-015-2912-x
- Yukl, G. (2013). *Leadership in organizations* (8th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Zhu, D., & Chen, G. (2015). Narcissism, director, selection, and risk-taking spending. *Strategic Management Journal, 36*, 2075-2098. doi:10.1002/smj.2322

Appendix A

Original Organizational Arrogance Pool of Items

Item	Description	O	D	B
1	Organizational members demonstrate a sense of invincibility in their decision making.	*		
2	Organizational members openly communicate that they are incapable of failing.	*		
3	Organizational members demonstrate exaggerated self-importance through unrealistic and excessive claims.	*		
4	Organizational members portray a belief that their talents and abilities are superior to other organizational members.	*		
5	Organizational members attribute their success to their own intelligence and not to the efforts or contributions of other members.	*		
6	Organizational members demonstrate disparaging(belittling) behaviors toward others.			*
7	The organization's elite past and legacy of success fosters a culture that discourages rapid changes.	*		
8	Organizational members exhibit overconfidence that leads to reckless decision making.	*		
9	Organizational members exhibit overconfidence that leads to overextension of the organization's resources.	*		
10	Organizational members exhibit a belief that they are smarter than everyone else.	*		
11	Organizational members underestimate others.	*		
12	Organizational members behave like they possess all the right answers.	*		
13	Organizational members demonstrate behaviors that indicate they do not value reviewing lessons learned from past mistakes.	*		

Item	Description	O	D	B
14	Organizational members exhibit behaviors that overestimate who they are	*		
15	Organizational members exhibit behaviors that overestimate what they can do.	*		
16	Organizational members exhibit behaviors that make those around them feel inferior.	*		
17	Organizational members demonstrate the belief that they will not repeat the same mistakes others made in the past.	*		
18	Organizational members limit themselves when they remain committed to specific courses of actions that historically proved successful.	*		
19	Organizational members tend to act intuitively and impulsively.	*		
20	Organizational members display a dismissive attitude toward the views and perspectives of others.	*		
21	Organizational members treat others with disdain and contempt that discourages them from using their talents and capacities.	*		
22	Organizational members' attitude serves as a barrier to establishing and maintaining close, reciprocally enriching relations with others.	*		
23	Organizational members' attitude prevents others from sharing important information.	*		
23	Organizational members treat others with disdain when they express their views.	*		
24	Organizational members indicate a disposition to mistreat others when they express their views.	*		
25	Organizational members disregard the value of others' reactions, feelings, and thoughts.	*		
26	Organizational members' attitude toward others' views and opinions discourages others from participating in the decision-making process.	*		

Item	Description	O	D	B
27	Organizational members attitude toward others' views and opinions makes others feel devalued in the organization.	*		
28	Organizational members behave toward other people in ways that are disrespectful.	*		
29	Organizational members display complacency that creates an organizational blind spot toward threats in the competitive environment.	*		
30	Organizational members demonstrate behavior that degrades the ability to maintain effective communication.	*		
31	Organizational members disrespect others and their ideas.	*		
32	Organizational members claim to be more knowledgeable than others	*		
33	Organizational members discount feedback.	*		
34	Organizational members dismiss organizational members' opportunity for further inquiry and progress.	*		
35	Organizational members ignore any instances where negative feedback occurs.	*		
36	Organizational members punish others when negative feedback occurs.	*		
37	Organizational members communicate that it is a sign of disloyalty when individuals express their displeasure with the organization's performance and culture.	*		
38	Organizational members avoid looking at subordinates.	*		
39	Organizational members exhibit lack of attention toward how others feel.	*		
40	Organizational members exhibit lack of attention toward how others think.	*		
41	Organizational members tend to act intuitively and impulsively.	*		

Item	Description	O	D	B
42	Organizational members exhibit lack of attention toward what others say.	*		
43	Organizational members do not answer or acknowledge others presence.	*		
44	Organizational members demean others.	*		
45	Organizational members interrupt others.	*		
46	The organization fails to remain transparent regarding existing problems.	*		
47	The organization's prevailing culture does not encourage bad news.	*		
48	Organizational members are not receptive to change and impede organizational progress.	*		
49	Organizational members display inability to accept negative feedback.	*		
50	Organizational members rely upon their own intuition and are not receptive to feedback tools.	*		
51	Organizational members rely upon their own intuition and are not receptive to the idea of others changing their opinion.	*		
52	Organizational members ignore important input from other organizational members.	*		
53	Organizational members unjustly belittle their rivals and mock their presence.			*
54	Organizational members display that they possess better managerial skills than they really do.			*
55	Organizational members criticize their staff in front of other staff members.			*
56	Organizational members criticize or display negative behavior toward staff during meetings.			*
57	Organizational members are not transparent and honest with the staff.			*

Item	Description	O	D	B
58	Organizational members play staff members against each other.			*
59	Organizational members overrule staff decisions.			*
60	Organizational members belittle staff in public areas.			*
61	Organizational members tend to blame others for non-positive thinking or not doing what one expects.			*
62	Organizational members tend to blame others for not doing what one expects.			*
63	Organizational members work in an environment where the process of not-me thinking dominates.			*
64	Organizational members work in an environment where the process of finger pointing occurs toward all members except the senior leaders.			*
65	Leaders do not take responsibility for their own actions.			*
66	Organizational members pass blame toward coworkers.			*
67	Organizational members attack people not issues.			*
68	Organizational members use meetings to discredit others' ideas.			*
69	Organizational members use meetings to often make individuals appear incompetent or bad.			*
70	Organizational members use a threatening manner to criticize other employees.			*
71	Organizational members express their sense of mental superiority.			*
72	Organizational members discount the validity of an individuals' opinions and ideas.			*
73	Organizational members openly demean and belittle others.			*
74	Organizational members treat others as though their opinions do not matter.			*
75	Organizational members behave toward other people in ways that are both hurtful and disrespectful.			*

Note: O = Overconfidence Item. D = Dismissiveness Item. B = Disparagement Item

Appendix B

Expert Panel Questionnaire

ORGANIZATIONAL ARROGANCE SCALE

EXPERT PANEL REVIEW FORM

C. Victor Herbin, III

Regent University

January 6, 2018

Introduction

This review consists of three sections. The Representativeness section requires you to evaluate the degree to which the selected item reflects the definition of the factor. The Comprehensiveness section requires you to consider whether any additional items should be added to a particular factor or moved to from one factor to another. The Clarity section requires you to identify any items that suggest any ambiguity or interpretations or are not well written. This form also includes a section for general comments about the instrument.

Definitions

For purposes of this instrument, *organizational arrogance* is defined as an organizational environment where leaders shape a culture that behaves with a sense of superiority that leads to:

- (a) overconfidence in organizational capabilities;
- (b) dismissiveness toward internal and external organizational needs; and
- (c) disparagement toward intra-organizational and interorganizational members.

Organizational member is a generic term to indicate anyone assigned to the organization. The term could be used interchangeable with “leader,” “member,” “employee,” “follower,” “subordinate,” or any word that describes individuals within the workplace.

Orientation

The Organizational Arrogance Scale provides leaders, supervisors, peers, employees, human resource professionals, and consultants to evaluate an

organizational culture and behaviors associated with organizational members within the culture in question through evaluating the frequency of their observable behaviors. Scale options will range between “1” (representing “never”) to “7” (representing always”).

I. Representativeness

Please indicate the degree to which you consider each individual item represents the associated factor, by placing an X in one of the seven corresponding boxes. The higher the number, indicates the stronger your agreement is that the item is representative of the factor.

Overconfidence in Organizational Capabilities Factor

One aspect of the Organizational Arrogance Scale seeks to measure how organizational leaders shape a culture with a sense of superiority that leads toward overconfidence in organizational capabilities. The Overconfidence in Organizational Capabilities Factor seeks to evaluate the leaders or members personal belief that their intellect supersedes any personal and organizational limitations by asking the rater(s) to identify the degree of frequency of the following behaviors.

No.	Item	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
1	Organizational members demonstrate a sense of invincibility in their decision making.							
2	Organizational members openly communicate that they are incapable of failing.							
3	Organizational members demonstrate exaggerated self-importance through unrealistic and excessive claims.							
4	Organizational members portray a belief that their talents and abilities are superior to other							

	organizational members.								
7	The organizations' elite past and legacy of success fosters a culture that discourages rapid changes.								
8	Organizational members exhibit overconfidence that leads to reckless decision making.								
9	Organizational members exhibit overconfidence that leads to overextension of the organization's resources.								
10	Organizational members exhibit a belief that they are smarter than everyone else.								
11	Organizational members underestimate others.								
12	Organizational members behave like they possess all the right answers.								
13	Organizational members demonstrate behaviors that indicate they do not value reviewing lessons learned from past mistakes.								
14	Organizational members exhibit behaviors that overestimate who they are								
15	Organizational members exhibit behaviors that overestimate what they can do.								
16	Organizational members exhibit behaviors that make those around them feel inferior.								
17	Organizational members demonstrate the belief that they will not repeat the same mistakes others made in the past.								
18	Organizational members limit themselves when they remain committed to specific courses of actions that historically proved successful.								

Dismissiveness Toward Internal and External Organizational Matters Factor

The second aspect of the Organizational Arrogance Scale seeks to measure how organizational leaders shape a culture with a sense of superiority that leads toward dismissiveness toward internal and external organizational needs. The Dismissiveness Toward Internal and External Organizational Needs Factor seeks to evaluate the leaders or members propensity to ignore or disregard information regarding organizational matters by asking the rater(s) to identify the degree of frequency of the following behaviors.

No.	Item	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
5	Organizational members attribute their success to their own intelligence and not to the efforts or contributions of other members.							
19	Organizational members tend to act intuitively and impulsively.							
20	Organizational members display a dismissive attitude toward the views and perspectives of others.							
21	Organizational members treat others with disdain and contempt that discourages them from using their talents and capacities.							
22	Organizational members' attitude serves as a barrier to establishing and maintaining close, reciprocally enriching relations with others.							
23	Organizational members' attitude prevents others from sharing important information.							
24	Organizational members treat others with disdain							

	when they express their views.								
25	Organizational members indicate a disposition to mistreat others when they express their views.								
26	Organizational members disregard the value of others' reactions, feelings, and thoughts.								
27	Organizational members attitude toward others' views and opinions discourages others from participating in the decision-making process.								
28	Organizational members attitude toward others' views and opinions makes others feel devalued in the organization.								
29	Organizational members behave toward other people in ways that are disrespectful.								
30	Organizational members display complacency that creates an organizational blind spot toward threats in the competitive environment.								
31	Organizational members demonstrate behavior that degrades the ability to maintain effective communication.								
32	Organizational members disrespect others and their ideas.								
33	Organizational members claim to be more knowledgeable than others								
34	Organizational members discount feedback.								
35	Organizational members dismiss organizational members' opportunity for further inquiry and progress.								
36	Organizational members ignore any instances where negative feedback occurs.								
37	Organizational members punish others when								

	negative feedback occurs.								
38	Organizational members communicate that it is a sign of disloyalty when individuals express their displeasure with the organization's performance and culture.								
39	Organizational members avoid looking at subordinates.								
40	Organizational members exhibit lack of attention toward how others feel.								
41	Organizational members exhibit lack of attention toward how others think.								
42	Organizational members exhibit lack of attention toward what others say.								
43	Organizational members do not answer or acknowledge others presence.								
44	Organizational members demean others.								
45	Organizational members interrupt others.								
46	The organization fails to remain transparent regarding existing problems.								
47	The organization's prevailing culture does not encourage bad news.								
48	Organizational members are not receptive to change and impede organizational progress.								

Disparagement Toward Intra-Organizational and Interorganizational Members Factor

The final aspect of the Organizational Arrogance Scale seeks to measure how organizational leaders shape a culture with a sense of superiority that leads toward disparagement toward intra-organizational and interorganizational members. The Disparagement Toward Intra-Organizational and Interorganizational Members Factor seeks to evaluate the organizational members' actions designed to

maltreat, underappreciate, and disrespect toward organizational members by asking the rater(s) to identify the degree of frequency of the following behaviors.

No.	Item	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
6	Organizational members demonstrate disparaging(belittling) behaviors toward others.							
49	Organizational members display inability to accept negative feedback.							
50	Organizational members rely upon their own intuition and are not receptive to feedback tools.							
51	Organizational members rely upon their own intuition and are not receptive to the idea of others changing their opinion.							
52	Organizational members ignore important input from other organizational members.							
53	Organizational members unjustly belittle their rivals and mock their presence.							
54	Organizational members' display that they possess better managerial skills than they really do.							
55	Organizational members criticize their staff in front of other staff members.							
56	Organizational members criticize or display negative behavior toward staff during meetings.							
57	Organizational members are not transparent and honest with the staff.							
58	Organizational members play staff members against each other.							
59	Organizational members overrule staff decisions.							
60	Organizational members belittle staff in public areas.							
61	Organizational members tend to blame others for							

	non-positive thinking or not doing what one expects.								
62	Organizational members tend to blame others for not doing what one expects.								
63	Organizational members work in an environment where the process of not-me thinking dominates.								
64	Organizational members work in an environment where the process of finger pointing occurs toward all members except the senior leaders.								
65	Leaders do not take responsibility for their own actions.								
66	Organizational members pass blame toward coworkers.								
67	Organizational members attacks people not issues.								
68	Organizational members use meetings to discredit others' ideas.								
69	Organizational members use meetings to often makes individuals appear incompetent or bad.								
70	Organizational members use a threatening manner to criticize other employees.								
71	Organizational members express their sense of mental superiority.								
72	Organizational members discount the validity of an individuals' opinions and ideas.								
73	Organizational members openly demean and belittle others								
74	Organizational members treat others as though their opinions do not matter.								
75	Organizational members behave toward other people in ways that are both hurtful and								

Appendix C

Participant Enlistment Message

March 11, 2018

Dear Colleagues,

I am currently a doctoral student at Regent University completing my dissertation. My research focuses on a phenomenon entitled organizational arrogance. Organizational arrogance is identified through the presence of behaviors witnessed within a work environment. I am developing an instrument that can assist organizational leaders, consultants, human resource professionals, and leadership scholars recognize specific behaviors that indicate the presence or absence of organizational arrogance.

In order to validate this instrument, it is necessary to test the questionnaire itself. This requires your support. You can access the questionnaire, the Organizational Arrogance Instrument, online where you are able to complete the questionnaire anonymously. Your efforts to make this research project a success is critical. For this reason, I will need the following assistance:

1. Would you be able to take about 10 minutes to complete the questionnaire? To participate, all you will have to do is access the URL address below and follow the instructions. The questionnaire is tailored for you to reflect upon behaviors that characterizes your work environment or organizational culture. Most specifically, think about some of the common and acceptable behaviors organizational members exhibit within your organization. The website is: <https://goo.gl/forms/NCLAXznqubJMRiF3>. (Either click on the hyperlink, or copy and paste the URL in the browser's address bar)

2. Please take the time to refer this URL to your family, friends, colleagues, or anyone you feel can contribute to this overall study. I want to emphasize that this questionnaire is completely anonymous and results are confidential. You can have reassurance that you will not receive any unsolicited calls or requests for information as a result of participating in this project. As an incentive to participate, I am having a random drawing for three Amazon \$50.00 gift certificates.

Again, I appreciate your support as I seek to identify ways to measure organizational arrogance and enhance awareness to this phenomenon and develop mitigating strategies to foster a healthy work environment.

Sincerely,

C. Victor Herbin III
Woodbridge, VA

Appendix D

Informed Consent Language: Survey Research

C. Victor Herbin III, a Ph.D student researcher at Regent University is conducting a study on **Organizational Arrogance**. C. Victor Herbin III has explained to me the purpose of this research and the intended outcome. I understand that I will be asked to complete an online survey that poses no safety risk. My participation in this study should take a total of about 10 minutes. I understand that my responses will be anonymous and will be preserved and that my name will not be associated with any results of this study. I know that I may refuse to answer any question asked and that I may discontinue participation at any time.

I also understand that any payment for participation will not be affected by my responses or by my exercising any of my rights. Potential risks resulting from my participation in this project have been described to me. I am aware that I seek further information about this study by contacting C. Victor Herbin III at connher@mail.regent.edu.

I am aware that I must be at least 18 years of age to participate. My completion of the survey signifies my voluntary participation in this project.

Appendix E

Pilot Test

Instructions: This assessment measures the degree of organizational arrogant behaviors that organizational members exhibit within the work environment. Please rate the organizational member in question by the following description of behavior. Circle one of the digits to the right of the description. Ratings are measured on a 1-7 scale in terms of frequency of behavior. 1=Never, 7=Always. Response choices are distributed evenly between the two.

After completing the scale items, please complete the brief demographic survey. All answers are confidential, unless you elect to participate in the random drawing for one of three \$50.00 Amazon.com gift certificates. If that is your desire, then please include your email address at the end of the form.

(Note: The term "organizational member" refers to anyone assigned to the role of leader, member, co-worker, employee, follower, subordinate, or any word that describes individuals within the workplace.)

Organizational Arrogance Instrument

Instructions: This assessment measures the degree of organizational arrogant behaviors that organizational members exhibit within the work environment. Please rate the organizational member in question by the following description of behavior. Annotate one of the digits to the right of the description. Ratings are measured on a 1-7 scale in terms of frequency of behavior. 1=Never, 7 =Always. Response choices are distributed evenly between the two.

After completing the scale items, please complete the brief demographic survey. All answers are confidential, unless you elect to participate in the random drawing for one of three \$50.00 Amazon.com gift certificates. If that is your desire, then please include your email address at the end of the form.

(Note: The term "organizational member" refers to anyone assigned to the role of leader, member, co-worker, employee, follower, subordinate, or any word that describes individuals within the workplace.)

Think about the common and typically acceptable behaviors in your organization. How often do you find that:

1. Organizational members demonstrate a sense of invincibility in their decision making.

Mark only one oval.

- 0 Never
- 0 Rarely
- 0 Occasionally
- 0 Sometimes
- 0 Frequently

- 0 Usually
- 0 Always

2. Organizational members openly communicate that they are incapable of failing.

Mark only one oval.

- 0 Never
- 0 Rarely
- 0 Occasionally
- 0 Sometimes
- 0 Frequently
- 0 Usually
- 0 Always

3. Organizational members exaggerate their self-importance through unrealistic and excessive claims.

Mark only one oval.

- 0 Never
- 0 Rarely
- 0 Occasionally
- 0 Sometimes
- 0 Frequently
- 0 Usually
- 0 Always

4. Organizational members demonstrate that their talents and abilities are superior to others.

Mark only one oval.

- 0 Never
- 0 Rarely
- 0 Occasionally
- 0 Sometimes
- 0 Frequently
- 0 Usually
- 0 Always

5. Organizational members credit their success to the efforts or contributions of other members and not their own intelligence.

Mark only one oval.

- 0 Never
- 0 Rarely
- 0 Occasionally
- 0 Sometimes
- 0 Frequently
- 0 Usually
- 0 Always

6. Organizational members respect each other.

Mark only one oval.

- 0 Never
- 0 Rarely
- 0 Occasionally
- 0 Sometimes
- 0 Frequently
- 0 Usually
- 0 Always

7. Organizational members make reckless decisions.

Mark only one oval.

- 0 Never
- 0 Rarely
- 0 Occasionally
- 0 Sometimes
- 0 Frequently
- 0 Usually
- 0 Always

8. Organizational members make reckless decisions.

Mark only one oval.

- 0 Never
- 0 Rarely
- 0 Occasionally
- 0 Sometimes
- 0 Frequently
- 0 Usually
- 0 Always

9. Organizational members exhibit a belief that they are smarter than everyone else.

Mark only one oval.

- 0 Never
- 0 Rarely
- 0 Occasionally
- 0 Sometimes
- 0 Frequently
- 0 Usually
- 0 Always

10. Organizational members underestimate others.

Mark only one oval.

- 0 Never
- 0 Rarely
- 0 Occasionally
- 0 Sometimes
- 0 Frequently
- 0 Usually
- 0 Always

11. Organizational members behave like they possess all the right answers.

Mark only one oval.

- 0 Never
- 0 Rarely
- 0 Occasionally
- 0 Sometimes
- 0 Frequently
- 0 Usually
- 0 Always

12. Organizational members demonstrate they do not value lessons learned from past mistakes.

Mark only one oval.

- 0 Never
- 0 Rarely
- 0 Occasionally
- 0 Sometimes
- 0 Frequently
- 0 Usually
- 0 Always

13. Organizational members exhibit behaviors that overestimate who they are.

Mark only one oval.

- 0 Never
- 0 Rarely
- 0 Occasionally
- 0 Sometimes
- 0 Frequently
- 0 Usually
- 0 Always

14. Organizational members display behaviors that overestimate what they can do
Mark only one oval.

- 0 Never
- 0 Rarely
- 0 Occasionally
- 0 Sometimes
- 0 Frequently
- 0 Usually
- 0 Always

15. Organizational members exhibit behaviors that make those around them feel inferior.
Mark only one oval.

- 0 Never
- 0 Rarely
- 0 Occasionally
- 0 Sometimes
- 0 Frequently
- 0 Usually
- 0 Always

16. Organizational members demonstrate the belief that they will not repeat the same mistakes others made in the past.
Mark only one oval.

- 0 Never
- 0 Rarely
- 0 Occasionally
- 0 Sometimes
- 0 Frequently
- 0 Usually
- 0 Always

17. Organizational members tend to act intuitively and impulsively.
Mark only one oval.

- 0 Never
- 0 Rarely
- 0 Occasionally
- 0 Sometimes
- 0 Frequently
- 0 Usually
- 0 Always

18. Organizational members display a superior attitude toward the views and perspectives of others.

Mark only one oval.

- 0 Never
- 0 Rarely
- 0 Occasionally
- 0 Sometimes
- 0 Frequently
- 0 Usually
- 0 Always

19. Organizational members' attitude prevents close relationships with others.

Mark only one oval.

- 0 Never
- 0 Rarely
- 0 Occasionally
- 0 Sometimes
- 0 Frequently
- 0 Usually
- 0 Always

20. Organizational members' attitude allows others to share important information.

Mark only one oval.

- 0 Never
- 0 Rarely
- 0 Occasionally
- 0 Sometimes
- 0 Frequently
- 0 Usually
- 0 Always

21. Organizational members mistreat others when they express their views.

Mark only one oval.

- 0 Never
- 0 Rarely
- 0 Occasionally
- 0 Sometimes
- 0 Frequently
- 0 Usually
- 0 Always

22. Organizational members disregard the value of others' reactions, feelings, and thoughts.

Mark only one oval.

- 0 Never
- 0 Rarely
- 0 Occasionally
- 0 Sometimes
- 0 Frequently
- 0 Usually
- 0 Always

23. Organizational members' attitude toward others' views and opinions encourages others to participate in the decision-making process.

Mark only one oval.

- 0 Never
- 0 Rarely
- 0 Occasionally
- 0 Sometimes
- 0 Frequently
- 0 Usually
- 0 Always

24. Organizational members' attitude toward others' views and opinions makes others feel devalued in the organization.

Mark only one oval.

- 0 Never
- 0 Rarely
- 0 Occasionally
- 0 Sometimes
- 0 Frequently
- 0 Usually
- 0 Always

25. Organizational members respect others and their ideas.

Mark only one oval.

- 0 Never
- 0 Rarely
- 0 Occasionally
- 0 Sometimes
- 0 Frequently
- 0 Usually
- 0 Always

26. Organizational members claim to be more knowledgeable than others.

Mark only one oval.

- 0 Never
- 0 Rarely
- 0 Occasionally
- 0 Sometimes
- 0 Frequently
- 0 Usually
- 0 Always

27. Organizational members treatment toward coworkers discourages them from using their talents and capacities.

Mark only one oval.

- 0 Never
- 0 Rarely
- 0 Occasionally
- 0 Sometimes
- 0 Frequently
- 0 Usually
- 0 Always

28. Organizational members reject others' ability to ask for progress updates.

Mark only one oval.

- 0 Never
- 0 Rarely
- 0 Occasionally
- 0 Sometimes
- 0 Frequently
- 0 Usually
- 0 Always

29. Organizational members ignore any instances where negative feedback occurs.

Mark only one oval.

- 0 Never
- 0 Rarely
- 0 Occasionally
- 0 Sometimes
- 0 Frequently
- 0 Usually
- 0 Always

30. Organizational member pay attention toward how others feel.
Mark only one oval.

- 0 Never
- 0 Rarely
- 0 Occasionally
- 0 Sometimes
- 0 Frequently
- 0 Usually
- 0 Always

31. Organizational members display a lack of attention toward how others think.
Mark only one oval.

- 0 Never
- 0 Rarely
- 0 Occasionally
- 0 Sometimes
- 0 Frequently
- 0 Usually
- 0 Always

32. Organizational members listen toward what others say.
Mark only one oval.

- 0 Never
- 0 Rarely
- 0 Occasionally
- 0 Sometimes
- 0 Frequently
- 0 Usually
- 0 Always

33. Organizational members ignore or do not acknowledge others' presence.
Mark only one oval.

- 0 Never
- 0 Rarely
- 0 Occasionally
- 0 Sometimes
- 0 Frequently
- 0 Usually
- 0 Always

34. Organizational members demean others.

Mark only one oval.

- 0 Never
- 0 Rarely
- 0 Occasionally
- 0 Sometimes
- 0 Frequently
- 0 Usually
- 0 Always

35. Organizational members interrupt others.

Mark only one oval.

- 0 Never
- 0 Rarely
- 0 Occasionally
- 0 Sometimes
- 0 Frequently
- 0 Usually
- 0 Always

36. The organization remains transparent regarding existing problems.

Mark only one oval.

- 0 Never
- 0 Rarely
- 0 Occasionally
- 0 Sometimes
- 0 Frequently
- 0 Usually
- 0 Always

37. Organizational members value important input from other organizational members.

Mark only one oval.

- 0 Never
- 0 Rarely
- 0 Occasionally
- 0 Sometimes
- 0 Frequently
- 0 Usually
- 0 Always

38. Organizational members belittle their rivals and mock their presence.

Mark only one oval.

- 0 Never
- 0 Rarely
- 0 Occasionally
- 0 Sometimes
- 0 Frequently
- 0 Usually
- 0 Always

39. Organizational members display negative behavior toward staff during meetings.

Mark only one oval.

- 0 Never
- 0 Rarely
- 0 Occasionally
- 0 Sometimes
- 0 Frequently
- 0 Usually
- 0 Always

40. Organizational members are not transparent and honest with the staff.

Mark only one oval.

- 0 Never
- 0 Rarely
- 0 Occasionally
- 0 Sometimes
- 0 Frequently
- 0 Usually
- 0 Always

41. Organizational members play staff members against each other.

Mark only one oval.

- 0 Never
- 0 Rarely
- 0 Occasionally
- 0 Sometimes
- 0 Frequently
- 0 Usually
- 0 Always

42. Organizational members overrule staff decisions.

Mark only one oval.

- 0 Never
- 0 Rarely
- 0 Occasionally
- 0 Sometimes
- 0 Frequently
- 0 Usually
- 0 Always

43. Organizational members criticize staff in public areas.

Mark only one oval.

- 0 Never
- 0 Rarely
- 0 Occasionally
- 0 Sometimes
- 0 Frequently
- 0 Usually
- 0 Always

44. Organizational members pass blame toward coworkers.

Mark only one oval.

- 0 Never
- 0 Rarely
- 0 Occasionally
- 0 Sometimes
- 0 Frequently
- 0 Usually
- 0 Always

45. Organizational members attack each other and not the issues.

Mark only one oval.

- 0 Never
- 0 Rarely
- 0 Occasionally
- 0 Sometimes
- 0 Frequently
- 0 Usually
- 0 Always

46. Organizational members discredit others' ideas during meetings.

Mark only one oval.

- 0 Never
- 0 Rarely
- 0 Occasionally
- 0 Sometimes
- 0 Frequently
- 0 Usually
- 0 Always

47. Organizational members make individuals appear incompetent or bad during meetings.

Mark only one oval.

- 0 Never
- 0 Rarely
- 0 Occasionally
- 0 Sometimes
- 0 Frequently
- 0 Usually
- 0 Always

48. Organizational members treat others as though their opinions matter.

Mark only one oval.

- 0 Never
- 0 Rarely
- 0 Occasionally
- 0 Sometimes
- 0 Frequently
- 0 Usually
- 0 Always

49. Organizational members often make jokes at expense of others.

Mark only one oval.

- 0 Never
- 0 Rarely
- 0 Occasionally
- 0 Sometimes
- 0 Frequently
- 0 Usually
- 0 Always

50. Organizational members tend to ignore other staff members' advice.
Mark only one oval.

- Never
- Rarely
- Occasionally
- Sometimes
- Frequently
- Usually
- Always

Demographic Questions

51. Age: What is your age?
Mark only one oval.

- 18-24
- 25-34
- 35-44
- 45-54
- 55-64
- 65 years or older

52. Gender: What is your gender?
Mark only one oval.

- Male
- Female

53. Ethnicity origin or Race: Please specify your ethnicity.
Mark only one oval.

- African American
- Asian/Pacific Islander
- Caucasian
- Hispanic
- Native American
- Other

54. Education: What is the highest degree or level of school you have completed? If currently enrolled, highest degree received.
Mark only one oval.

- Less than high school
- High School Graduate (includes equivalency)
- Some college, no degree

- Associate Degree
- Bachelor's Degree Master's Degree
- Doctorate/Professional Degree

55. Type of Employer: What best describes the your type of organization?

Mark only one oval.

- Government (Federal, State, Local)
- Military
- For Profit
- Non-Profit (religious, arts, social assistance etc)
- Health Care
- Education
- Other:

56. Job Level/Job Title: Which of the following most closely matches your job title?

Mark only one oval.

- Intern
- Entry Level
- Analyst/Associate
- Manager
- Senior Manager
- Director
- Vice President
- C level executive (CIO, CTO, COO, CMO)
- President or CEO
- Owner
- Other:

57. How many years employed with this organization?

Mark only one oval.

- Less than 12 months
- 1-5years
- 6-10 years
- 11-15 years
- 16-20 years
- 21-25 years
- 26+ years

Optional:

58. Please provide your email address to be considered for a random drawing for one of three gift certificates from Amazon.com:

Appendix F

Regent University: Human Subjects Review Board Application

Please submit *one electronic* copy of this form and any supporting documents to your dissertation chair or to the SBL IRB representative, Dr. Emilyn Cabanda at ecabanda@regent.edu .

1. PROJECT REVIEW

New Project (The HSRB will assign an ID#)

_____ Revised Project (Enter ID#)

_____ Renewal (Enter ID#)

2. PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: C. Victor Herbin III

Address: 15305 Colonel Tansill Court, Woodbridge, VA 22193

Phone: 254-833-2553

E-Mail connher@mail.regent.edu; cvectorherbin3@gmail.com

Date: 19 January 2018

List of all project personnel (including faculty, staff, outside individuals or agencies)

If you are a **student**, please provide the following additional information:

This research is for Dissertation Thesis Independent Study
 Other

_____ Faculty Advisor's Name: Dr. James Wood

3. TRAINING: The National Institutes of Health Office of Extramural Research offers free self-paced online training at phrp.nihtraining.com.

I have completed human subjects research training. Training Date: 27 Feb 2017

4. PROJECT TITLE: Measuring Organizational Arrogance: Development and Validation of a Theory-Based Instrument

5. IS THIS RESEARCH BEING SUBMITTED AS PART OF A FUNDED RESEARCH PROPOSAL? Yes No

If yes, please identify the funding source:

6. ANTICIPATED LENGTH OF HUMAN SUBJECTS CONTACT:

Beginning Date: 15 March 2018 Ending Date: 1 April 2018

7. DESCRIPTION OF PARTICIPANTS:

Number 330 Age Range: 18 and older

Briefly describe subject population: The participants in this study will be a minimum of 330 American adults. It is important to find a diverse population of participants based upon age, race, gender, job title, education, organizational type and years of employment. Participants will be solicited through the internet using various social media sites to include Facebook, LinkedIn, Twitter, and traditional email.

8. INDICATE THE REVIEW CATEGORY FOR WHICH YOU ARE APPLYING.

- I am applying for an **exempt review**, based on *one or more* of the following categories (check all that apply):
Note: Exempt review cannot be claimed for any research involving prisoners and most research involving children.

- Research conducted in established or commonly accepted educational settings and involving normal educational practices such as (i) research on regular and special education instructional strategies, or (ii) research on the effectiveness of or the comparison among instructional techniques, curricula, or classroom management methods
- Research involving the use of survey procedures, educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), interview procedures or observation of public behavior, if information from these sources is recorded in such a manner that participants cannot be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; and (ii) any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research could not reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation

Note: This category cannot be used for research involving children

- Research involving the use of survey procedures, educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), interview procedures, or observation of public behavior, if (i) the human subjects are elected or appointed public officials or candidates for public office; or (ii) federal statute(s) require(s) without exception that the confidentiality of the personally identifiable information will be maintained throughout the research and thereafter

- Research involving the collection or study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens, if these sources are publicly available or if the information is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that subjects cannot be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects
- Research and demonstration projects which are conducted by or subject to the approval of federal department or agency heads, and which are designed to study, evaluate, or otherwise examine (i) Public benefit or service programs; (ii) procedures for obtaining benefits or services under those programs; (iii) possible changes in or alternatives to those programs or procedures; or (iv) possible changes in methods or levels of payment for benefits or services under those programs

I am applying for an **expedited review**, based on meeting *all* of the following conditions (check all that apply):

Note: Expedited review cannot be claimed for research involving prisoners.

Research poses no more than minimal risk to subjects (defined as "the probability and magnitude of harm or discomfort anticipated in the research are not greater in and of themselves than those ordinarily encountered in daily life or during the performance of routine physical or psychological examinations or tests.")

Research limited to one or more of the following data collection procedures:

- Collection of data through noninvasive procedures routinely employed in clinical practice
- Research involving materials (data, documents, records, or specimens) that have been collected, or will be collected solely for non-research purposes
- Collection of data from voice, video, digital, or image recordings made for research purposes

Research on individual or group characteristics or behavior (including, but not limited to, research on perception, cognition, motivation, identity, language, communication, cultural beliefs or practices, and social behavior) or research employing survey, interview, oral history, focus group, program evaluation, human factors evaluation, or quality assurance methodologies

Note: Some research in this category may be classified as exempt; this listing refers only to research that is not exempt.

- Continuing review of research previously approved by the convened HSRB as follows: (a) where (i) the research is permanently closed to the enrollment of new subjects; (ii) all subjects have completed all research-related interventions; and (iii) the research remains active only for long-term follow-up of subjects; or (b) where no subjects have been enrolled and no additional risks have been identified; or (c) where the remaining research activities are limited to data analysis.

- I am applying for **full board review**.

9. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Briefly describe (or attach) the methodology and objectives of your research (including hypotheses and/or research questions), the data collection procedures, and any features of the research design that involve procedures or special conditions for participants, including the frequency, duration, and location of their participation. The description should be no longer than 3 pages single space. Attach addendums for materials and detailed descriptions of the research if more space is needed. *Please note that complete chapters of thesis/dissertation proposals will not be accepted.*

The participants will be solicited through the internet and various social media sites to include email, Facebook, LinkedIn and Twitter. Employees will be provided either a link or an email with a link to the survey over the span of two weeks. This study defines the Organizational Arrogance construct and an instrument to validate the degree of Organizational Arrogance within the workplace. Local and internet participants will receive the link to complete the instrument online to assess the behaviors present in their organizations. Demographic data will be collected for both samples to avoid sampling error. After obtaining IRB approval and consent from participants, the investigator will distribute the instrument to each participant. The survey should last for 10-minutes. As each instrument is recorded, data collected will be inputted into SPSS for analysis as a factor analysis.

HSRB Project Description Checklist

a) Is your data completely anonymous, where there are no possible identifications of the participants.	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Will you be using existing data or records? If yes, describe in project description (#9 above)	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
c) Will you be using surveys, questionnaires, interviews or focus groups with subjects? If yes, describe in #9 and include copies of all in application.	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Will you be using videotape, audiotape, film? If yes, describe in #9	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
e) Do you plan to use any of the following populations? Regent students, Regent employees, Non-English speaking, cognitively impaired, patients/clients, prisoners, pregnant women? If yes, describe which ones in #9	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
f) Do you plan to use minors (under 18)? If yes, describe in #9 and give age ranges	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>

g) Are sites outside of Regent engaged in the research? If yes, describe in #9 and give consent letter or their IRB information	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
h) Are you collecting sensitive information such as sexual behavior, HIV status, recreational drug use, illegal behaviors, child/elder/physical abuse, immigrations status, etc? If yes, describe in #9.	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
i) Are you using machines, software, internet devices? If so describe in #9	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Are you collecting any biological specimens? If yes, describe in #9	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
k) Will any of the following identifying information be collected: names, telephone numbers, social security number, fax numbers, email addresses, medical records numbers, certificate/license numbers, Web universal resource locators (URLs), Internet protocol (IP) address numbers, fingerprint, voice recording, face photographic image, or any other unique identifying number, code or characteristic other than “dummy” identifiers? If yes, describe in #9	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
l) Will there be data sharing with any entity outside your research team? If so, describe who in #9	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
m) Does any member of the research team or their family members have a personal financial interest in the project (for commercialization of product, process or technology, or stand to gain personal financial income from the project)? If yes, describe in #9.	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
n) As applicable, do you plan to provide a debriefing to your participants? If written, include in application as addendum	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
o) Will there be any inducement to participate, either monetary or nonmonetary? If there is inducement please describe how the amount is not coercive in #9.	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
p) Will there be any costs that subjects will bear (travel expenses, parking fees, professional fees, etc. If no costs other than their time to participate, please indicate)? If yes describe in #9	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
q) Will subjects be studied on Regent University campus? If yes, please describe where the study will be done in #9	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
r) Will subjects be obtained by internet only? If yes, please describe what internet forums or venues will be used to obtain participants in #9	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
s) Are you using the Regent University <u>consent form template</u>? Whether using the template or requesting an alternate form, you must include a copy in your submission.	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

10. PARTICIPANT RECRUITMENT

Describe the sources of potential participants, how they will be selected and recruited, and how and where you will contact them. Describe all relevant characteristics of the participants with regard to age, ethnic background, sex, institutional status (e.g., patients or prisoners), and their general state of mental and physical health.

Researcher will leverage social media to recruit online participants. For those local employees, the researcher will use organizational leaders to request volunteers. The researcher will employ a convenience sample of employees and include the informed consent form, followed by the opportunity to complete the Organizational Arrogance Instrument. The participants will represent a minimum age of 18 years old, male or female, and working class adults with sound mind and body.

11. INFORMED CONSENT

Describe how you will inform participants of the nature of the study. Attach a copy of your cover letter, script, informed consent form and other information provided to potential participants.

See Guidelines for Informed Consent and the Template Informed Consent

Document for additional information.

An informed consent form will be used (attached). The collected data will not require the name of participants.

**** EXEMPT APPLICATIONS SKIP TO QUESTION 17: ATTACHMENTS ****

12. WRITTEN CONSENT

I am requesting permission to **waive written consent**, based on one or more of the following categories (check all that apply):

The only record linking the subject and the research would be the consent document, and the principal risk would be potential harm resulting from a breach of confidentiality.

The research presents no more than minimal risk of harm to subjects and involves no procedures for which written consent is normally required outside of the research context.

- I will be using a **written consent form**. Attach a copy of the written consent form with this application.

13. CONFIDENTIALITY OF DATA

What procedures will be used to safeguard identifiable records of individuals and protect the confidentiality of participants?

The confidentiality of information collected from all participants will be guaranteed. Participants will be assured that data collected will be identified in terms of pseudonyms.

**** EXPEDITED APPLICATIONS SKIP TO QUESTION 17: ATTACHMENTS ****

14. RISKS AND BENEFITS

Describe in detail the immediate or long-range risks, if any, to participants that may arise from the procedures used in this study. Indicate any precautions that will be taken to minimize these risks. Also describe the anticipated benefits to participants and to society from the knowledge that may be reasonably expected to result from this study.

15. DEBRIEFING STATEMENT

The two major goals of debriefing are dehoaxing and desensitizing. Participants should be debriefed about any deception that was used in the study. Participants also should be debriefed about their behavioral response(s) to the study. Please describe your debriefing plans and include any statements that you will be providing to the participants.

16. DISSEMINATION & STORAGE OF RESULTS

- a) How and where do you plan on disseminating the results of your study?

- b) For electronic data stored on a computer, how will it be stored and secured (password, encryption, other comparable safeguard)?
 - c) For hardcopy data, how will it be stored (locked office or suite, locked cabinet, data coded by team with master list secured separately, other)?
 - d) What are your plans for disposing of data once the study is ended (give method and time)?
-
-
-
-

17. ATTACHMENTS:

Attach copies of all relevant project materials and documents, including (check all that apply):

- A copy of your training certificate (required for principal investigator)
- Surveys, questionnaires, and/or interview instruments
- Informed consent forms or statements
- Letters of approval from cooperative agencies, schools, or education boards
- Debriefing statements or explanation sheet

18. AFFIRMATION OF COMPLIANCE:

By submitting this application, I attest that I am aware of the applicable principles, policies, regulations, and laws governing the protection of human subjects in research and that I will be guided by them in the conduct of this research. I agree to follow the university policy as outlined in the Faculty & Academic Policy Handbook (available online at http://www.regent.edu/academics/academic_affairs/handbook.cfm) to ensure that the rights and welfare of human participants in my project are properly protected. I understand that the study will not commence until I have received approval of these procedures from the Human Subjects Review Board. I further understand that if data collection continues for more than one year from the approval date, a renewal application must be submitted.

I understand that failure to comply with Federal Regulations (45 CFR 46, available online at <http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/humansubjects/guidance/45cfr46.htm>) can result in confiscation and possible destruction of data, suspension of all current and future research involving human subjects, or other institutional sanctions, until compliance is assured.

Signature of Investigator

Date

Signature of Co-Investigator (if applicable)
James A. Wood, Ph.D.
Digitally signed by James A. Wood,
Ph.D.
Date: 2018.03.06 08:36:09 -05'00'

Signature of Faculty Advisor (if applicable)

Date
3/6/2018

Date

To Be Completed By HSRB

Assigned ID # _____

- Approve _____
- Recommend Revisions _____
- Reject _____

Emilyn Cabanda, Ph.D.
Digitally signed by Emilyn Cabanda,
Ph.D.
Date: 2018.03.06 08:36:40 -05'00'

HSRB Member

3/6/2018


Date

HSRB Member (if applicable)

Date

HSRB Member (if applicable)

Date



Certificate of Completion

The National Institutes of Health (NIH) Office of Extramural Research certifies that **C. Herbin III** successfully completed the NIH Web-based training course "Protecting Human Research Participants".

Date of completion: 02/27/2017.

Certification Number: 2339345.