

Chapter 14

Organizational Arrogance and a Theory-Based Instrument

C. Victor Herbin III
Regent University, USA

ABSTRACT

Prior studies provided insight on arrogance at the individual level and how arrogant individuals express superiority through (1) overconfidence in capabilities, (2) dismissiveness, (3) and disparagement, and how these behaviors may negatively impact those employees in and around their work teams, yet did not indicate how these behaviors impact organizational culture. Organizational arrogance represents an emerging concept that describes arrogance at the organizational level. Organizational arrogance provides the body of knowledge with a comprehensive and inclusive definition that led to the development and validation of the Organizational Arrogance Scale with a Cronbach Alpha of .922 that accurately measures the presence of organizational arrogance.

INTRODUCTION

Organizational arrogance explains arrogance at the organizational level and how a leader's arrogant behavior shapes organizational culture and organizational members' acceptable behaviors. The theoretical and conceptual foundation consists of narcissistic leadership theory, Machiavellian leadership theory, psychopathy leadership theory, autocratic leadership theory, organizational identity, and arrogance. This chapter shows the origin of the organizational arrogance concept and demonstrates how it impacts organizational behavior and culture. Organizational arrogance introduces a comprehensive and inclusive definition that helps the reader recognize this phenomenon's intricacies. It also explains how organizational arrogance contains three behavioral components: Overconfidence in Organizational Capabilities, Dismissiveness Towards Internal and External Organizational Matters, and Disparagement Towards Intra-organizational and Interorganizational Members. Finally, this chapter presents the validation process for the 5-Item Organizational Arrogance Scale that measures organizational arrogance in the workplace.

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-7998-7665-6.ch014

Learning Objectives

After studying this chapter, one should be able to:

- Understand the historical evolution of studies on arrogance
- Recognize how leader behavior can influence arrogant behaviors in the workplace
- Theoretical and conceptual influences that build organizational arrogance
- Define organizational arrogance
- Understand the three organizational arrogance behavioral components
- Understand the development of the Organizational Arrogance Scale
- Recognize the five indicators that measure organizational arrogance
- Identify future research opportunities on organizational arrogance

BACKGROUND

Arrogance represents a collection of thoughts, attitudes, and behaviors that demonstrate an individual's superiority level. The term "sense of superiority" reflects a consistent theme identified throughout the literature and pertinent to the definition of arrogance. Whether one perceives "the sense of superiority" as realistic or not, it serves as the foundational premise for understanding arrogance. Tiberius and Walker (1998) claimed that arrogant people possess an actual or perceived belief in their considerable talents and abilities, creating opportunities for them to infer their above-average superiority to most other people. Arrogance also describes an essential human trait whereby individuals feel inclined to publicly convey their individual qualities and value over others (Lewis, 2000). Brown (2012) strengthens the definition as a "chronic belief of superiority and exaggerated self-importance that is demonstrated through excessive and presumptuous claims" (p. 555). Arrogance also describes a specific type of pride that leads one to believe that they hold power over other individuals (Poggi & D'Errico, 2011). Additionally, Tiberius and Walker (1998) submit a critical assertion that previous studies mistakenly focused arrogance on the person instead of recognizing arrogance as an interpersonal matter that illustrates how individuals engage with one another.

Before developing the organizational arrogance construct, arrogance was only evident at the individual level and described how an individual's self-perception of superiority manifests itself within the organizational environment. Arrogance harvests self-perceptions that an individual possesses invincibility and omnipotence (Ma & Karri, 2005). Maintaining this excessive belief in oneself establishes an attitude and behavior that distinguishes an arrogant individual from other individuals and contributes to a sense of overconfidence and overestimation of their capabilities. Similarly, arrogant people dismiss internal or external contributing factors and instead attribute their success to their high intellect and other noncontrollable, internal, stable, or desirable causes (Hareli & Weiner, 2000). Arrogance also depicts an extreme belief in an individual's superiority and exaggerated self-importance that reveals itself through excessive and presumptuous claims (Brown H., 2012). Most notably and more emotionally detrimental, arrogance describes an assortment of attitudes, behaviors, and thoughts that portrays one's exaggerated sense of superiority achieved through disparaging others (Johnson et al., 2010).

Johnson et al. (2010) further declared that organizational scholars rarely study arrogance due to the limited empirical evidence involving arrogance and the inability to measure how arrogant behaviors

manifest in the workplace. Despite their findings, the researchers explored this phenomenon and developed the workplace arrogance construct, which the researchers defined as “behaviors that exaggerate actors’ self-importance and that disparage their colleagues” (p.410). The workplace arrogance construct and subsequent Workplace Arrogance Scale provided relevant and purposeful insight that successfully targeted the existing knowledge gap. However, the body of knowledge still lacked a more exhaustive, inclusive, supportable definition and a means to measure arrogance on an organizational-wide scale. To this point, prior studies provided insight on arrogance at the individual level and how arrogant individuals express superiority through (a) overconfidence in capabilities, (b) dismissiveness, (c) and disparagement, and how these behaviors may negatively impact those employees in and around their work teams, yet did not indicate how these behaviors impact organizational culture.

Herbin (2018) filled the void in the body of knowledge and built upon Johnson et al.’s findings and posited that arrogant leaders could influence and shape a culture of arrogance and developed the organizational arrogance construct. Organizational arrogance defines an organizational environment where leaders shape a culture in which members behave with a sense of superiority, leading to overconfidence in organizational capabilities, dismissiveness toward internal and external organizational matters, and disparagement toward intra-organizational inter-organizational members (Herbin, 2018). Specifically, this definition focuses on arrogance at the organizational level, addresses organizational behavior, and how an organization treats its employees as a culture.

Organizational arrogance requires an understanding that organizational behavior exists at three distinct levels that include: (a) individual level that examines employees’ motivation, personality, perception, and attitudes; (b) group level that investigates leadership, power, communication, politics, and work teams; and (c) organizational level that explores organizational culture, structure, conflict and change, cultural diversity, and inter-organizational cooperation (Robbins & Judge, 2012). Arrogance at the individual level primarily impacts members at the individual or group level but not at the organizational level. Hence the need for the Organizational Arrogance Scale that Herbin (2018) also developed to measure arrogant behaviors at the organizational level. Most specifically, arrogant behaviors, thoughts, and attitudes that represent overconfidence, dismissiveness, and disparagement. Again, organizational arrogance describes an organizational environment where leaders shape a culture in which these behavioral components manifest themselves. Issues arise when arrogant individuals assume leadership positions because their span of influence expands in width and depth, impacting organizational members.

Organizational arrogance denotes a culture. Leader-inspired and leader developed arrogant beliefs, customs, ideas, and behaviors that organizational members execute and encapsulate the organizational environment. Instances of rogue managers and leaders engaging in immoral and unethical conduct in the workplace indicate that this behavior contributes to incivility (Solas, 2016). Enron, Kodak, and IBM represent a sample of organizations that experienced organizational failure directly attributed to individual arrogance. A thorough review of these cases demonstrates a recurring theme whereby leaders within these organizations behaved with a sense of superiority that contributed to a level of overconfidence in business practices, disregard for organizational members’ input and contributions, or some level of employee maltreatment or disparagement. Whether governmental, private, public, or non-profit, each industry remains susceptible to arrogant organizational members fostering a hostile work environment and low morale.

Organizations develop when leaders successfully convey values that employees accept as appropriate thinking and behavior (Sergiu, 2015). Arrogant behaviors can become acceptable behaviors that influence organizational members to replicate and mirror. Possibilities exist where a leader may inherit

Organizational Arrogance and a Theory-Based Instrument

a culture of arrogance and, based on their level of influence, may reinforce, shape, or transform the existing arrogance culture. Yukl (2010) posited 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) discovered that a leader’s ability to help shape the culture becomes challenged when uncertainty prompts organizational members to assign meaning to their current environment and how their interpretations contribute to develop a highly interwoven patchwork of culture. Bolman and Deal further presented the question, “do leaders shape culture, or are they shaped by it?” (p. 231). In which, 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, an organization can function as an arrogant organization without an arrogant leader when existing norms, values, and customs display and support arrogant behaviors. These arrogant behaviors lead to the existence of two underlying themes: arrogant leaders possess the capability to influence, foster, and shape an organizationally arrogant culture (leader arrogance), and that an arrogant culture can prevail independent from the leader (organizational arrogance).

Organizational arrogance illustrates how an organization as a culture behaves and treats organizational members. Most importantly, a culture where arrogance surpasses the individual level and settles at the organizational level. At this point, arrogant behaviors develop into cultural norms that shape an arrogant organizational culture. One cannot underestimate the influential nature arrogant leaders possess when developing an organizational culture and incorporating acceptable workplace behaviors, attitudes, and thoughts. Leadership and culture seamlessly work together. Directly or indirectly, a leaders’ influence affects the direction of an organization because leaders “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). When organizational members at the individual or group level perceive certain arrogant leader behaviors as acceptable, these behaviors expand to the organizational level. They can create a culture of arrogance, creating the phenomenon of organizational arrogance.

Unlike prior attempts to formulate a consistent definition for arrogance, organizational arrogance encompasses a series of critical leadership theories and concepts that explore arrogant leader behavior and explains how leaders who demonstrate this aura of superiority impact the organizational environment. Narcissistic leadership theory, Machiavellian leadership theory, psychopathy leadership theory, autocratic leadership theory, and organizational identity provide the breadth necessary for explaining arrogant behaviors in the organizational environment and the width required to encapsulate the pervasive nature of culturally arrogant behaviors.

Narcissistic Leadership

Narcissist leaders endeavor for external affirmation. Narcissistic Leadership Theory represents a behavioral characteristic that indicates a leader’s self-absorption and proclivity for exploiting opportunities that elevate their self-image and importance. Within the workforce, this leadership style promotes an environment that encourages an inflated ego and high-risk behavior. Zhu and Chen (2015) introduced the idea that narcissistic leaders display a self-absorbed behavioral characteristic and an innate desire for continual praise and belief that the organizational environment revolves around them. Zhu and Chen examined 292 CEOs from Fortune 500 companies that possessed narcissistic behaviors. They found they were more likely to hire directors that displayed an equal level of narcissism, which led to significant levels of risky spending. A narcissistic leader also possesses self-motivated actions and behaviors that

support their egomaniacal needs and belief that supersedes an organization and its members' needs and interests (Rosenthal & Pittinsky, 2006).

Narcissistic leader behavior increases jealous behaviors that create a counterproductive organizational environment and negatively impact organizational citizenship (Braun, Aydin, Frey, & Peus, 2016). More alarming involves the narcissistic leaders increased level of insecurity that "any recognition of someone else's accomplishments or abilities are a threat to their self-importance and risks the loss of the exclusive admiration they crave from their followers" (McIntosh & Rima, 2007). When these leaders are no longer the center of attention, they not only perceive the slight as a threat, but their level of insecurity dramatically increases that can lead to a destructive nature, a ruthlessness that hinders their productivity and contributions to the overall team (Maccoby, 2000); (Lubit, 2002). Essentially, this leader functions with a superior attitude that suggests self-reliance, extreme confidence, and independence that significantly distances themselves from organizational members they deem inferior. Moreover, the narcissistic leader's inflated self-importance and perceived sense of superiority contribute towards faulty, damaging, and unsustainable decision-making that places an organization and its employees' reputation at risk (Rijsenbilt & Commandeur, 2013). When these behaviors occur at the highest level of an organization, it impacts collaborative efforts, and the levels of insecurity and fractured personal relationships trickle down to lower levels of management (Braun, Aydin, Frey, & Peus, 2016); (Nevicka, De Hoogh, Van Vianen, Beersma, & McIlwain, 2011).

When leaders display these behaviors at the individual or group level, it may occur unbeknownst to upper management because it directly impacts members at an isolated level. However, when leaders exhibit these narcissistic leadership characteristics at the organizational level and assume higher levels of influence, they can foster an environment of prideful, self-destructive, and mistrustful behaviors that negatively impact the organization. Ultimately, these thoughts, attitudes, and behaviors directly threaten to build cohesive relationships, effective communication, empowerment, transparency, and a mutually respectable work environment organizational-wide.

Machiavellian Leadership

Machiavellian leadership theory represents another leadership style that leverages arrogant behavioral characteristics established on the premise of self-preservation. Specifically, a Machiavellian leader describes a self-interested leader singularly focused on their achievements. Motivated to maintain relevancy and importance, the Machiavellian leader exploits opportunities to accomplish tasks, objectives, or goals that reinforce their greatness and success even at the expense of others. Brown and Trevino (2006) contend, "Machiavellian leaders are motivated to manipulate others to accomplish their own goals. They have little trust in people and, in turn, tend not to be trusted by others" (p. 604). In turn, this mistrustful environment promotes apathetic leader behavior for both the interpersonal relationships with their subordinates and their feelings (Drory & Gluskinos, 1980); (Sakalaki, Richardson, & Thepaut, 2007). While the Machiavellian leader pursues greatness and mission accomplishment, they invariably 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).

Notably, this leader disregards morals and maximizes guile or manipulation in conjunction with dishonesty to pursue and maintain power (Smith & Lilienfeld, 2013). Because retaining power serves the ultimate goal, these manipulative tactics can foster an organizational environment whereby counterproductive and harmful work behaviors such as apathy or callousness towards interpersonal relationships

Organizational Arrogance and a Theory-Based Instrument

devalue subordinates' feelings, deceit, propensity to cheat, and abuse subordinates become prevalent (H. Brown, 2012; Drory & Gluskinos, 1980; Lee & Ashton, 2005). Invariably, this leadership style conveys that when it operates at the individual, group, or organizational level, "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 of utmost importance that organizations should avoid recruiting and nourishing Machiavellian leadership" (Gkorezis, Petridou, & Krouklidou, 2015). Leaders that display untrustworthiness, cynicism, and apathetic behaviors negatively impact the organizational environment. The Machiavellian leader's sense of superiority and self-preservation behaviors within a culture hinder organizational progress, degrade organizational commitment, threaten organizational health, decrease organizational cohesion and employee morale. Highlighting the Machiavellian leader behavior characteristics conveys how this leader can establish arrogant organizational culture conditions.

Psychopathy Leadership

Psychopathy leader also exhibits a sense of superiority and self-centeredness. Cleckley (1941) discovered that psychopathy leaders manifest 16 behavioral characteristics: a lack of anxiety, superficial charm, inadequate impulse control, empathy, egocentricity, absence of psychotic or neurotic symptoms, irresponsibility, inability to possess love, or maintain close relationships, and unmotivated antisocial deviance. When these behavioral characteristics appear in the work environment, it poses substantial risks that lead to others' emotional or physical harm. Invariably this sense of superiority contributes towards unnoticeable mistreatment that destroys a work environment. Similarly, Smith and Lilienfeld (2013) posit how psychopathic leaders' behavioral characteristics are well-established correlators and predictors of violence and aggression in other settings. Because this leader possesses a dual behavioral nature, recognizing and correcting unhealthy behaviors within the work environment presents significant challenges.

On the one hand, this leader operates under the cloak of normalcy and charm, while the other hand functions with manipulative or deceptive that destroy the organization's internal essence. Babiak, Neuman, and Hare (2010) observed that executives that possessed exceptional communication skills in conjunction with innovative and strategic mindsets also displayed ineffective management skills, unsatisfactory teamwork, and received low appraisals from their immediate bosses. A leader that demonstrates a psychopathy leadership style can shape an organizational culture with a sense of superiority that deems misleading kindness, incivility, irrational decision making, and harmful behaviors as acceptable.

Autocratic Leadership

Autocratic leaders demonstrate a sense of superiority and self-belief in their intellect to discount, ignore, and dismiss others' input and guidance. An autocratic leader operates autonomously to accomplish self-glorifying goals through maximum, authoritarian control over subordinates and displays the ability to "force favorable or unfavorable decisions upon others" (De Cremer, 2007, p. 1388). In turn, organizational members feel devalued because they lack the opportunity to participate in organizational decision-making, maintain limited to no direct influence on decisions, or execute decisions without considering their employees' opinions (Bhatti, Mura Maitlo, Shaikh, Hashmi, & Shaikh, 2012). Essentially, this leader's behavior conveys little concern regarding subordinates' ideas, inputs, or feelings related to decision-making. Most notably, this leader possesses a self-belief that others lack the intellectual capa-

bility to participate in organizational matters that shape an environment whereby subordinates display fear, insecurities, blame-shifting, demonstrate nervous behaviors of doubt, and immediacy to remain distant from the leader (Daft, 2005); (Siewiorek & Lehtinen, 2011). Without limits or balance, an autocratic leader tends to rely upon their intuition for decision making with a mission-focused approach that cannot display concern for organizational members' wellbeing. (Bhatti, Mura Maitlo, Shaikh, Hashmi, & Shaikh, 2012). Leaders who subscribe to this leadership style foster a workplace that reinforces the leader's perception of inferior subordinates and contributes to employee neglect, decreased morale, and job satisfaction.

To grasp the complexity of organizational arrogance, it remains imperative one recognizes how these leadership styles mentioned above contribute to the existence and development of organizational arrogance. In particular, a leader who demonstrates a leadership style from one of the "Dark Triad" characteristics impacts an organizational environment. However, these leadership styles alone are not solely responsible for forming organizational arrogance. Instead, one must also accept how a leader with a sense of superiority and their subsequent arrogant behaviors shape an organizational environment where these behaviors no longer exist at the individual or group level but expand to the organizational level and become accepted as an organizational identity.

Organizational Identity

When one considers that leaders' behavior shapes culture and affects members' behavior, it becomes noteworthy to understand how organizational members and organizations perceive themselves and develop their identity. Organizational identity represents the final pillar in constructing organizational arrogance. It explains how, like individual identities, organizations also hold unique qualities and identities that capture their internal essence and define them. Albert & Whetten (1985) asserts that organizational identity reflects a set of central (relevant and critical organizational descriptors), distinctive (exclusive and noticeable from other organizations), and enduring (continual and permanent towards organizational change) statements that organizational members believe accurately epitomize their organization. When organizational members develop a sense of belonging, it creates an organizational identity. Organizational identity introspectively poses the question of "Who are we? What are we? Where are we going?" Organizational identity describes the shared and collective work experiences that provide meaning for organizational members and professional groups operating at various hierarchical levels (Glynn, 2000); (Harrison, 2000); (Kjaergaard & Ravasi, 2011). Leaders that demonstrate arrogant behaviors can establish an organizational environment that reflects an organizational identity displaying these arrogant behaviors and experiences. When arrogant leaders develop an organization where organizational members adopt the central, distinctive, and enduring cultural characteristics of arrogance, their connection to the organization evolves to mirror these characteristics.

Arrogance represents the overarching theme that connects narcissistic, Machiavellian, psychopathy, and autocratic leadership styles. Recognizing how arrogance as a behavioral characteristic interacts with organizational identity helps understand the formation of the organizational arrogance construct. Organizational arrogance leverages the idea that leader behavior shapes the culture. A leader with any arrogance level, especially to the extreme degree of the "dark triad" characteristics, can influence the norms, beliefs, shared values, customs, and life within the organization that reflects an organizationally arrogant culture.

ORGANIZATIONAL ARROGANCE

While organizational arrogance recognizes a leaders' role in shaping an environment with a sense of superiority, it also presents behavioral components that describe how this phenomenon manifests itself in the workforce at the organizational level. Prior research indicated a lack of clear evidence that arrogance existed at the organizational level and, therefore, limited the discourse towards individual and leader arrogance operating at the individual or group level. However, Herbin (2018) leveraged the current literature that classified individuals exhibiting a sense of superiority as arrogance and developed the comprehensive definition that demonstrates how arrogance manifests itself at the organizational level, that describes how organizational members treat one another and become culturally acceptable norms, in three distinctive behavioral patterns: overconfidence in organizational capabilities, dismissiveness towards internal and external organizational matters, or disparagement towards intra-organizational and inter-organizational members.

Overconfidence in Organizational Capabilities

Overconfidence in organizational capabilities represents an organizational arrogant behavioral component that describes when organizational members exhibit self-absorbed behaviors and an overinflated ego in their abilities, thoughts, attitudes, and behaviors when performing organizational tasks or making organizational decisions. These behaviors promote a work environment that displays overconfidence and contributes to eventual organizational impediments at the organizational level. At the individual and group level, Pater (2013) found that arrogance epitomizes a dangerous flaw because it misguides individuals that they possess all-knowing powers, the inability to fail, or a superior intellect level than others that contributes to overestimating oneself, underestimating others, and a firm conviction that they can possess all the correct answers. When organizational members model this leader behavior at the organizational level, it promotes a culture whereby organizational members no longer display humility or receptive to openly evaluate and assess environmental threats and factors that potentially hinder organizational growth or even organizational survival. For example, Mui (2012) and Anthony (2016) demonstrate how Kodak represented an industry giant in photography for over a century. When Kodak invented the digital camera, many Kodak executives overconfidently believed that the digital camera would never surpass film camera popularity and failed to effectively expand their digital camera market's technological capabilities to remain relevant. As a result, Kodak's leadership mistakenly relied upon their past successes in the film camera industry and underestimated the emerging technologies that led to the once-industry giant declaring bankruptcy in 2012 and never returned to their once-prominent status.

Other research scholars indicated that highly overconfident individuals develop overconfidence and rely upon their tuition after experiencing success and exhibit a false sense of security that leads towards a form of apathy, reckless expansion into diverse markets, dismiss feedback tools, external data, commitment towards activities outside their expertise and discount purposeful strategizing that negatively impact the organization's success (Ma & Karri, 2005; (Harms, Spain, & Hannah, 2011). The Kodak example demonstrated how this false sense of security dissuaded organizational members from accepting their vulnerability towards an emerging market and displayed complacency and an attachment to outdated marketing strategies. Overconfidence in organizational capabilities promotes an organizational-wide attitude of unrealistic desires, organizational expectations, and hope. Organizational members also tend to exhaust opportunities that reinforce their superiority or others' inferiority in ways that may encompass a

series of unethical behaviors such as deceit, the misrepresentation of data or self, and workplace sabotage that stagnates the work environment. When this organizational arrogant behavioral component manifests itself in the workforce, organizational members recklessly commit to activities and engagements that supersede their individual and organizational capabilities and threatens organizational survivability.

Overconfidence in Organizational Capabilities

- **Overconfidence in Organizational Capabilities:** Organizational members exhibit self-absorbed behaviors and an overinflated ego in their thoughts, attitudes, and capabilities that influence organizational decision-making.
- Individuals can recognize this behavior's presence when organizational members behave with a personal belief that their intellect supersedes personal and organizational limitations.

Examples may include:

- Organizational members exaggerate self-importance.
- Organizational members engage in reckless decision-making.
- Organizational members believe they are more intelligent than anyone else.
- Organizational members underestimate others.
- Organizational members behave like they possess all the correct answers.
- Organizational members do not value lessons from past mistakes.
- Organizational members overestimate who they are.
- Organizational members overestimate what they can do.
- Organizational members overestimate what they can do.
- Organizational members make those around them feel inferior.

Dismissiveness Towards Internal and External Organizational Matters

Dismissiveness towards internal and external organizational matters is another organizational arrogant behavioral component that describes when organizational members overtly or covertly dismiss, quell, discourage, or disregard other organizational members' thoughts, input, creativity, innovation, and active participation towards organizational matters. Internal and external organizational matters refer to activities, events, opportunities, or threats that impact organizational growth, morale, and cohesion. Examples of internal organizational matters may include employee training, self-development opportunities, logistical, financial, human resources, or equal opportunity and diversity concerns. Examples of external organizational matters may consist of corporate social responsibility, marketing and branding, mergers and acquisitions, emerging markets and technological advancements, and even pandemics.

Dismissiveness that occurs at the organizational level impedes organizational progress, trust, respect, and effective organizational communication. Unfortunately, this behavioral component is so commonplace and prevalent in the work environment that one may overlook it as an arrogant organizational trait. Arrogant leaders that devalue or dismiss their subordinates' input towards internal and external organizational matters only reinforce their sense of superiority and prevent receiving critical insight, advice, and counsel from organizational members. Milyavsky, Krunglanski, Chemikova, & Schori-Eyal (2017) posited that arrogant leaders passively or actively dismiss organizational members' feelings, thoughts, counsel, or words self-justify their actions due to their self-perceived intellectual superiority.

Organizational Arrogance and a Theory-Based Instrument

This organizational arrogant behavioral component also demonstrates how organizational members that inflict harm on one another who desire more active workplace participation further hinder organizational progress. Organizational members with arrogant behaviors exhibit disdain, a lack of reciprocity, deference, hurtful and disrespectful behaviors, and conviction that organizational members do not possess the substance, competence, or value in their interactions and eventually discourages members from using their talents and capacities for future purposes (Tiberius & Walker, 1998). Examples of this behavior include disrespecting a colleague and their ideas, claiming to be more knowledgeable than others, discounting advice, dismissing organizational members', and even ignoring or punishing organizational members who provide negative feedback. (Johnson, 2010'; Pater, 2013; Milyavsky, Krunglanski, Chemikova, & Schori-Eyal, 2017). Leaders who encounter the stressors of internal or external organizational matters and exhibit a dismissive attitude toward other members' views and opinions inhibit their ability for self-awareness and shape a new cultural norm. A cultural norm whereby organizational members mirror this behavior discourages others from participating in the organization's decision-making process or feeling valued.

Dismissiveness towards internal and external organizational matters also demonstrates how individuals exhibit dismissive behavior when they remain fixated on past successes and refuse to accept the current technological environments to stay competitive (Ma & Karri, 2005). Tenured organizational members can possess an extreme attachment to outdated policies, processes, and procedures that once contributed towards organizational success. These same members now reject organizational members' input who recognize emerging markets and challenge the status quo by recommending new and evolving growth opportunities. Leaders that adopt this self-imposed limitation and commitment towards a nostalgic past resist change efforts that create complacency and ensures missed opportunities that risk organizational survival. In turn, these individuals dismiss pertinent and critical organizational needs required for succeeding in the current operating environment (Kane & Cunningham, 2013). This organizational arrogant behavioral component degrades organizational members' ability to maintain effective communication, stifles organizational members' creativity, engagement, and commitment to accomplishing organizational objectives, and impedes organizational growth. This stagnation leads to organizational failure based on complacency, inflexibility, and short-sightedness because arrogant individuals ignore organizational members' important input, wise counsel, environmental changes (such as changes in markets), and competitive threats (Rosenthal & Pittinsky, 2006).

As an example, Fusaro and Miller (2002), McLean and Elkind (2003), and Fox (2003) illustrate how the energy conglomerate Enron provides a good description of dismissiveness towards internal or external organizational matters. After experiencing a period of sustained success and publicly recognized as one of America's 100 best companies, Enron executives, attorneys, and accountants engaged in unethical business practices. These leaders created notional subsidiaries to sell and inflate assets, create false earnings, avoid taxes, and hide losses in an attempt to increase Enron's stock. As stocks continued to rise, arrogant organizational members dismissed existing policies and ethical conduct guidelines, encouraged improper accounting practices, failed to enforce conflict-of-interest rules, and even punished employees who attempted to report wrongdoing. The organizational members' arrogant and self-serving behaviors eventually led to Enron's bankruptcy in 2001. While some attribute the Enron organizational collapse to unethical behavior and leadership practices, a further examination into the case indicates how Enron leaders shaped an arrogant organizational culture where dismissiveness towards internal and external organizational matters became normal and acceptable practices. Enron dismissed and discouraged checks and balances that would provide organizational members the confidence in the

ethical misconduct reporting process to ensure internal and external organizational matters remained a priority and protected. Instead, Spector & Lane (2007) indicated that Enron operated within a closed environment of dismissiveness, arrogance, complexity, no transparency, self-censorship towards existing problems, and organizational-wide deception.

Dismissiveness Towards Internal and External Organizational Matters

- **Dismissiveness Towards Internal and External Organizational Matters:** Organizational members overtly or covertly dismiss, quell, discourage, or disregard other organizational members' thoughts, input, creativity, innovation, and active participation in organizational matters.
 - Internal organizational matters may include employee training, self-development opportunities, logistical, financial, human resources, equal opportunity, and diversity concerns.
 - External organizational matters may include corporate social responsibility, marketing and branding, mergers and acquisitions, emerging markets and technological advancements, and even pandemics.
- Individuals can identify this behavior's existence when organizational members display the propensity to ignore or disregard information regarding organizational matters. Examples may include:
 - Organizational members prevent a close relationship with others.
 - Organizational members disregard the value of others.
 - Organizational members make others feel devalued.
 - Organizational members claim to be more knowledgeable than others.
 - Organizational members discourage the use of others' talents and capacities.
 - Organizational members ignore any instances where negative feedback occurs.
 - Organizational members display a lack of attention towards how others think.
 - Organizational members ignore or do not acknowledge others.

Disparagement Towards Intra-Organizational and Interorganizational Members

Disparagement towards intra-organizational and interorganizational members characterizes the third organizational arrogant behavioral component described when organizational members exhibit maltreatment, underappreciation, and disrespect towards internal or external organizational members. This particular component indicates the most aggressive, harmful, and damaging organizational arrogance characteristic compared to the other two organizational arrogance behavioral components. This behavioral component describes instances where arrogant members unjustly and publicly belittle their rivals, mock their presence, criticize and humiliate their staff members during meetings, display negative behavior toward staff, play staff members against each other, attack people and not issues, demonstrates a lack of self-awareness that contributes to insensitive behavior and failure to recognize how their behavior affects others (Hamlin & Hatton, 2013); (Ma & Karri 2005; Johnson, 2010, Pater, 2013). The psychological, emotional, and mental impact of this component significantly demoralizes the workforce, destroys employee self-confidence, creates a toxic environment, and can lead to high employee turnover.

In one example recounted by Wigglesworth (2018) and Wagner (2019), James B. Comey, Former FBI Director, oversaw an investigation into the possible linkage between Russia and Former President Donald Trump's 2016 election campaign. During the investigation, Trump fired Comey and publicly belittled

Organizational Arrogance and a Theory-Based Instrument

Comey with characterizations such as “a “nut job,” “a showboat,” “a grandstander,” and a “weak and untruthful slime ball.” Trump also publicly discredited Comey with statements that his leadership “was a disaster,” with a nickname “Sanctimonious James Comey” and that Comey was “either very sick or very dumb.” When Comey defended the FBI against Trump’s criticism, Trump’s Former Press Secretary, Kellyanne Conway, publicly attacked Comey also calling him, “a grandstander and a showboat” and referred to him as a liar. While Trump’s disparaging comments towards Comey demonstrates arrogant leader characteristic at the individual level, Conway’s disparagement and public criticism of Comey indicates that these mirrored behaviors now exist at the organizational level as an acceptable cultural practice supporting organizational arrogance.

An organization affected with disparagement towards intra-organizational and interorganizational members creates conditions where arrogant and distracted organizational members become aware of these problems and respond with anger and blame-filled reactions that discount their role in modeling the behavior. Within this component, organizational members exaggerate their self-importance and sense of mental superiority through disparaging others. These behaviors decrease productivity because individuals reluctantly share their ideas for fear of being attacked or seen as incompetent or discredited (Johnson et al., 2010; Tiberius & Walker, 1998). When organizational members in upper management, middle management, and lower management continually exhibit these disparaging behaviors throughout the organization, it reinforces these destructive arrogant characteristics as the cultural norm and acceptable behavior. Opportunities for cultivating a healthy work environment, organizational cohesion, information sharing, and employee commitment decreases and become replaced with maltreatment, condescension, neglect, and disrespect.

Disparagement Towards Intra-Organizational and Interorganizational Members

- **Disparagement Towards Intra-Organizational and Interorganizational Members:** Organizational members exhibit maltreatment, underappreciation, and disrespect towards internal or external organizational members.
- Individuals can identify this behavior’s presence when organizational members’ exhibit aggressive and hostile actions designed to belittle, degrade or discredit organizational members. Examples may include:
 - Organizational members mistreat others when they express their views.
 - Organizational members play staff members against each other.
 - Organizational members criticize staff in public areas.
 - Organizational members pass blame towards each other.
 - Organizational members attack each other and not the issues.
 - Organizational members discredit others.
 - Organizational members individuals appear incompetent during meetings.
 - Organizational members make jokes at the expense of others.

MEASURING ORGANIZATIONAL ARROGANCE

Organizational arrogance presents a new workplace complexity that illustrates how arrogance impacts organizational behavior and culture. Organizational members who exhibit arrogant behaviors reinforce

cultural norms and present work environments with significant challenges that impede employee participation and organizational progress. Understanding organizational arrogance helps scholars, consultants, HR practitioners, and leaders describe these arrogant behaviors, recognize how they manifest within the workplace, and their enduring impact on organizational members and the organization. While acknowledging the existence of these arrogant organizational behaviors remain critical, possessing the ability to measure the presence of organizational arrogance remains just as important. Using existing literature on arrogant behaviors, Herbin (2018) developed and validated an Organizational Arrogance Scale designed to measure the three organizational arrogant behavioral components that appear in the organizational environment.

Construct and Instrument Development

Organizational arrogance builds upon theoretical domains that describe arrogance that include: individual arrogance, workplace arrogance, corporate arrogance, or consumer arrogance (Tiberius, 1998; Johnson et al., 2010; Brown, 2012; Gregg, 2014; Ruvio, 2016). The studies indicated that arrogance manifests itself in three distinct ways: a demonstrated sense of superiority that leads to overconfidence, dismissiveness, and disparaging behavior. Although limited to the individual level, these studies also signified construct validity for these three factors. Organizational arrogance uses these same constructs as elements for application at the organizational level. It includes a sense of superiority that leads to (a) overconfidence in organizational capabilities, defined as the organizational members' personal belief that their intellect supersedes any personal and organizational limitations; (b) dismissiveness towards internal and external organizational matters, described as the organizational members' propensity to ignore or disregard information regarding organizational matters; and (c) disparagement towards intra-organizational and interorganizational members, defined as the organizational members' actions that belittle, discredit, or degrade organizational members. These existing constructs prompted the need for a broad scale that measures arrogance at the organizational level.

Theoretically Based Item Pool

The literature displayed 75 illustrative examples that describe how arrogance manifested itself in the workplace and represent potential items to measure organizational members' attitudes, behavior, and thoughts to develop the organizational arrogance scale. The list of items extracted from the literature revealed 16 items related to a sense of superiority that leads to overconfidence in capabilities, and 34 items that address a sense of superiority that leads to dismissiveness towards internal and external organizational matters, and 27 items that relate to a sense of superiority that leads to disparagement towards intra-organizational and interorganizational members.

Expert Panelists

DeVellis (2017) indicates that selecting qualified panelists represents a critical step in developing a credible and reputable scale. To support their analysis of the 75-item measure, the panelists adhered to the following four guidelines: (1) confirm content validity, which required rating each item's relevancy between 0 to 6 and identify its effectiveness for measuring its assigned factor; (2) item evaluation, that required evaluating each survey item against the organizational arrogance definition and provide indi-

Organizational Arrogance and a Theory-Based Instrument

vidual comments and recommended changes as necessary; (3) alternate means, whereby each panelist submits alternate perspectives to identify organizational arrogance; (4) conclusion, enabled panelists the opportunity to provide general comments, suggestions, or recommendations as required. This process reduced the items to 50 items.

Organizational Arrogance Scale Format

The organizational arrogance scale measures the frequency and intensity of behaviors that demonstrate a culture of superiority that leads to the overconfidence of organizational capabilities, dismissiveness towards internal and external organizational matters, and disparagement towards intra-organizational and interorganizational members. Each item captures organizational members' opinions, beliefs, and attitudes about arrogance within the organizational environment. The organizational arrogance scale uses a seven-point scale format because it provides the upper limits of a scale's reliability, decreases interpretive confusion and respondent fatigue (Allen & Seaman, 2007). The organizational arrogance instrument contains seven responses from left to right ranging from 1 to 7: 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).

Population and Sample Size

According to DeVellis (2012), to achieve instrument validity and generalizability based on the 5:1 ratio of subjects to item, the 50-item pilot test was targeted to a population of at least three hundred participants. The test was administered to three-hundred twenty-two participants and collected demographic data to ensure participant validity that included the participants: (a) age, (b) gender, (c) ethnicity, (d) education, (e) job level, (f) and employer type. The participants represented a diverse group from various industries to validate the Organizational Arrogant Scale.

Analysis

Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) posited that correlation coefficients must achieve a score of .30 or greater because items that scored less indicate a weak relationship between variables. Based on this guidance and using SPSS Version 25, the pilot test underwent an exploratory principal component analysis (PCA) that indicated the existence of a five-factor solution that possessed eigenvalues over 1.0. Total Variance Explained table identified eigenvalues percentages reached a high of 50% for Component 1 to as low as 2% for Component 5. More specifically, Component 1 loaded 43 items that ranged in coefficient scores of .455 to .845.

Another principal component analysis was conducted that adjusted the fixed numbers of factors to extract to 3, with a Direct Oblimin rotation, and suppressed the coefficients with an absolute value below .600. The 50-item pilot test was further reduced to 43 items with all factors loading to Component 1 with new values that ranged from .604 to .846. An additional six items with an absolute value less than .650 were eliminated, reducing the items to 37. A reliability test on the 37 items produced a Cronbach Alpha of .955. According to DeVellis, a reliability test helps determine scale length because it provides insight on the strength of factor loads, redundant items, and items identified for retention or elimination

that ensures optimal scale length. DeVellis asserts that shorter scales place less burden on participants and are more acceptable, while longer scales provide more reliability. For this reason, DeVellis recommends that scale developers must identify the balance between brevity and reliability.

To further optimize the scale length, coefficients with an absolute value below .818 were suppressed and revealed five top-loading items suggesting a unidimensional scale. The five items selected for the scale fit the brevity criteria and provide a broad umbrella encompassing the previously deleted items to create a more inclusive and restricted scale. A final reliability test performed on the 5-items resulted in a Cronbach Alpha of .922, signifying a highly reliable instrument that measures organizational arrogance.

Table 1. 5-item organizational arrogance component matrix

	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 2. 5-item organizational arrogance reliability statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.922	5

Indicators for Overconfidence in Organizational Capabilities

The Organizational Arrogance Scale at Table 3 contains one item entitled “*Organizational members exhibit behaviors that make those around them feel inferior,*” reflecting the behavioral component of Overconfidence in Organizational Capabilities. These arrogant thoughts, attitudes, and behaviors enable organizational members to overlook market trends, possess a false sense of security, display reckless decision-making, and underestimate others’ strengths. When organizational members perceive a threat towards their superiority, it creates instances where organizational members engage in self-preserving behaviors, including deceit, misrepresentation of data or self, workplace sabotage, or theft aimed to protect their self-proclaimed reputation superiority and reinforce others inferiority.

Indicators for Dismissiveness Towards Internal and External Organizational Matters

The Organizational Arrogance Scale contains two items entitled “*Organizational members disregard the value of others’ reactions, feelings, and thoughts*” and “*Organizational members’ treatment towards coworkers discourages them from using their talents and capacities*” that reflect the behavioral compo-

Organizational Arrogance and a Theory-Based Instrument

ment Dismissiveness Towards Internal and External Organizational Matters. These items demonstrate how organizational members behave in a manner that only their views, ideas, and perspectives matter and, as a result, limits information sharing with other organizational members. Incorporating these two items into the final 5-item scale denotes how organizational members can overtly or covertly display these pervasive behaviors in the work environment and their impact on others. Patterns of dismissiveness threaten opportunities to build synergy, collaboration, trust, sense of belonging, mutual respect, training, succession planning, job satisfaction, and morale.

Indicators for Disparagement Towards Intra-Organizational and Interorganizational Members

The Organizational Arrogance Scale contains two items entitled “*Organizational Members Demean Others*” and “*Ignore Other Staff Members*,” which reflect the behavioral component Disparagement Towards Intra-organizational and Interorganizational Members. These items measure organizational members’ thoughts, attitudes, and behaviors that belittle, degrade, or discredit organizational members. In particular, organizational members exhibit more aggressive, hostile, intimidating, and threatening behaviors when interacting with internal or external organizational members. Disparaging behaviors range in intensity and manifests in various ways that inflict extreme psychological harm on others and the organization. When organizational members display these behaviors, it discourages participation levels, employee cohesion, job security, effective two-way communication, job satisfaction, and retention. It ostracizes certain members and discounts their value to the organization. These items reflect the breadth and depth necessary to capture this behavior accurately.

Organizational arrogance and the validated organizational arrogance scale represent significant steps in understanding this complex organizational phenomenon. The Organizational Arrogance Scale encapsulates this organizational behavioral characteristic’s comprehensive, expansive, and exhaustive nature. The scale provides an effective means for evaluating the presence, frequency, and intensity of arrogant behaviors, attitudes, and thoughts that manifest within the organizational environment and threatens organizational effectiveness. The pilot test indicated that the participants across many industries, job experience, gender, and ethnic backgrounds encounter organizational arrogance in their respective work environments that pose risks to their long-term survival. The 5-item Organizational Arrogance Scale provides insight and awareness to organizational leaders that may not understand or witness the degree to which arrogant behaviors exist within their organizational culture.

Table 3. 5-item organizational arrogance scale

Behavioral Component	Item
Overconfidence in Organizational Capabilities	Organizational members exhibit behaviors that make those around them feel inferior.
Dismissiveness Towards Internal and External Organizational Matters	Organizational members disregard the value of others’ reactions, feelings, and thoughts. Organizational members’ treatment towards coworkers discourages them from using their talents and capacities.
Disparagement Towards Intra-organizational and Interorganizational Members	Organizational Members Demean Others Ignore Other Staff Members

SOLUTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Studies indicate countless examples that attempt to explain how organizational leaders engaged in unethical practices that contributed to poor employee morale, workplace stress, high turnover rates, abysmal organizational culture, and the eventual organizational collapse. However, organizational arrogance provides another perspective on the role leaders play in shaping organizational behavior and organizational culture, creating environmental conditions that threaten organizational survival. While this phenomenon poses significant risks to organizations, recognizing its existence provides the necessary awareness that should prompt organizational leaders to invest in training and develop mitigating strategies designed to counter the effects of organizational arrogance.

Organizational culture remains a leader's responsibility that requires keen attention, astute observations, and immediate action to eliminate any signs of organizational arrogance. Combatting organizational arrogance requires engaged leadership. Organizational leaders can dictate their strategic focus once they identify how severe and widespread organizational arrogance is within their organizational environment. Implement purposeful leadership efforts designed to eliminate any instances of institutional paranoia associated with transparent communication and knowledge sharing, increase job satisfaction, and incorporate a zero-tolerance policy. These strategies must remain focused on addressing individuals who display arrogant behaviors and maximize organizational efficiencies to reach optimal performance. Organizational arrogance and the Organizational Arrogance Scale provide opportunities to effectively diagnose organizations and implement strategies designed to improve organizational behavior, culture, and organizational productivity.

FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

Limited studies examining arrogance at the organizational level indicate the endless research opportunities for furthering this phenomenon traditionally associated with arrogant leaders or arrogant individuals versus arrogant organizations. Organizational arrogance represents a construct that lends itself to applicability across many private and public sector organizations, academic disciplines, leadership training, and coaching. Conceptually, this construct provides the body of knowledge with a new insight that may better explain previous leadership or organizational failure findings. Exploring previous and current studies under the organizational arrogance auspice widens the research aperture, illuminating new areas for further research. A site may identify the relationship between workplace stress, job satisfaction, retention rates, and organizational arrogance. Researchers can also examine how organizational arrogance differs from each management level and what management level is more likely to exhibit this behavior. One can also investigate what careers or work environments are more susceptible to organizational arrogance. Phenomenological studies, narrative inquiry, ethnographic observations, or case studies represent a few recommended research methods that can capture organizational members' accounts that convey organizational arrogance's emotional, psychological, and mental impact. Exploring the behaviors, attitudes, thoughts, cultural norms, and customs within an organization will provide deeper insight into the phenomenon and further the body of knowledge. Overall, this chapter demonstrates how this emerging concept deems worthy of critique, examination, replication, and, most importantly, universal acceptance.

CONCLUSION

This chapter introduced a process whereby arrogant behaviors that no longer exist at the individual and group level manifest themselves at the organizational level evolving into an emerging concept called organizational arrogance. Organizational arrogance explains how organizational members interact with one another and how these arrogant behavioral characteristics impact a culture. Organizational arrogance defines an organizational environment whereby leaders shape a culture in which members behave with a sense of superiority, leading to overconfidence in organizational capabilities, dismissiveness towards internal and external organizational matters, and disparagement towards intra-organizational and inter-organizational members. Organizational arrogance leveraged theoretical domains that described arrogance, narcissistic leadership theory, Machiavellian leadership theory, psychopathy leadership theory, autocratic leadership theory, and organizational identity to build a comprehensive and inclusive definition that describes arrogance at the organizational level.

Each domain provided insight in understanding the multiple ways arrogant behaviors manifested themselves in the workplace and served as a foundational premise for the three organizational arrogant behavioral characteristics. The first organizational arrogance behavioral component, Overconfidence in Organizational Capabilities, describes when organizational members exhibit self-absorbed behaviors and an overinflated ego in their thoughts, attitudes, and capabilities that influence organizational decision making. The second organizational arrogant behavioral component, Dismissiveness Towards Internal and External Organizational Members, denotes when organizational members overtly or covertly dismiss, quell, discourage, or disregard other organizational members' thoughts, input, creativity, innovation, and active participation towards organizational matters. Finally, the third and most psychologically damaging organizational arrogant behavioral component, Disparagement Towards Intra-Organizational and Interorganizational Members, represents instances where organizational members exhibit maltreatment, underappreciation, and disrespect towards internal or external organizational members.

This chapter also demonstrated the process of validating the 5-Item unidimensional Organizational Arrogance Scale. Existing literature that described arrogant behaviors contributed to the prospective pool of items that developed the Organizational Arrogance Scale. After extracting 50-items, Herbin (2018) administered the pilot test to a three-hundred twenty-two heterogeneous sample size representing various work experiences, management levels, age, race, and gender. Each respondent completed the scale based upon their workplace observations that indicated organizational arrogance. The 50-items were subjected to exploratory principal component analyses and suppressed coefficients with an absolute value below .818, revealing five top-loading items for inclusion on the unidimensional scale. The final 5-item Organizational Arrogance Scale produced an Alpha score of .922, indicating a reliable instrument that accurately measures the three organizational arrogance behavioral components, Overconfidence in Organizational Capabilities, Dismissiveness Towards Internal and External Organizational Matters, and Disparagement Towards Intra-organizational and Interorganizational members. Overall, this chapter indicates how organizational arrogance threatens employee engagement opportunities, cohesion and morale, and long-term organizational success worthy of the unlimited research opportunities that exist.

REFERENCES

- Albert, S., & Whetten, D. (1985). Organizational Identity. In L. Cummings & M. Staw (Eds.), *Organizational Behavior* (Vol. 7, pp. 263–295). JAI Press.
- Allen, E., & Seaman, C. (2007). Likert Scales and Data Analyses. *Quality Progress*, 40(7), 64–65.
- Anthony, S. (2016, July 15). Kodak's Downfall Wasn't About Technology. *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/2016/07/kodaks-downfall-wasnt-about-technology>
- Babiak, P., Neumann, C., & Hare, R. (2010). Corporate Psychopathy: Talking the Walk. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 28(2), 174–193. PMID:20422644
- 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
- Bolman, L. (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.
- Brown, H. (2012, July/August). So What If I Don't Have An iPhone? The Unintended Consequences of Using Arrogance in Advertising. *Journal of Applied Business Research*, 28(4), 555–563. doi:10.19030/jabr.v28i4.7040
- 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
- Cleckley, H. (1941). *The Mask of Sanity* (1st ed.). C.V. Mosby.
- Daft, R. (2005). *The Leadership Experience*. Thomson Corporation.
- Dahling, J., Whitaker, B., & Levy, P. (2009). The Development and Validation of a New Machiavellianism Scale. *Journal of Management*, 35(2), 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
- DeVellis, R. (2012). *Scale Development: Theory and Applications* (3rd ed.). Sage.
- Drory, A., & Gluskos, U. (1980). Machiavellianism and Leadership. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 65(1), 81–86. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.65.1.81
- Fox, L. (2003). *Enron: The rise and fall*. Wiley.
- Fusaro, P., & Miller, R. (2002). *What went wrong at Enron: Everyone's guide to the largest bankruptcy in U.S.history*. Wiley.

Organizational Arrogance and a Theory-Based Instrument

- 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 PMID:27247681
- Glynn, M. (2000). When Cymbals become Symbols: Conflict over Organizational Identity within a Symphony Orchestra. *Organization Science, 11*(3), 285–298. doi:10.1287/orsc.11.3.285.12496
- 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
- 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*(3), 495–509. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.04.007
- Harrison, J. (2000). Multiple Imaginings of Institutional Identity. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 36*(4), 425–455. doi:10.1177/0021886300364003
- Herbin, C. V., III. (2018). *Measuring Organizational Arrogance: Development and Validation of a Theory-Based Instrument* (Doctoral Dissertation). Regent University.
- 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*(5), 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
- 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*(3), 514–543. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6486.2010.00954.x
- Lee, K., & Ashton, M. (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
- Lewis, M. (2000). Self-conscious Emotions: Embarrassment, Pride, Shame, and Guilt. In M. Lewis, & J. M. Haviland-Jones, *Handbook of emotions* (pp. 623–636). Guilford.
- Lubit, R. (2002). The Long-term Organizational Impact of Destructively Narcissistic Managers. *Academy of Management Review, 16*, 127–138.
- Ma, H., & Karri, R. (2005). Leaders Beware: Some Sure Ways to Lose Your Competitive Advantage. *Organizational Dynamics, 34*(1), 63–76. doi:10.1016/j.orgdyn.2004.11.002
- Maccoby, M. (2000). Narcissistic Leaders-The Incredible Pros, The Inevitable Cons. *Harvard Business Review, 78*, 69–77.
- McIntosh, G., & Rima, S. (2007). *Overcoming the Darkside of Leadership: How to Become an Effective Leader by Confronting Potential Failures*. Baker Books.

- McLean, B., & Elkind, P. (2003). *Smartest guys in the room: The amazing rise and scandalous fall of Enron*. Portfolio/Penguin Group.
- 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 PMID:28683114
- Mui, C. (2012, January 18). How Kodak Failed. *Forbes*. Retrieved from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/chunkamui/2012/01/18/how-kodak-failed/?sh=2941395a6f27>
- 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. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *22*(5), 910–925. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.07.011
- Pater, R. (2013, November). Overcoming Leadership ADD: The Flaws of Arrogance, Distraction and Disconnection. *Professional Safety*, 30–34. www.asse.org
- 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). Springer-Verlag.
- Rijsenbilt, A., & Commandeur, H. (2013). Narcissus Enters the Courtroom: CEO Narcissism and Fraud. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *117*(2), 413–429. doi:10.1007/10551-012-1528-7
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2012). *Organizational Behavior* (15th ed.). Prentice Hall.
- 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. (-B. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Sergiu, G. (2015, March). Developing the Organizational Culture. *Review of International Comparative Management*, *16*(1), 137–143.
- Siewiorek, A., & Lehtinen, E. (2011). Exploring Leadership Profiles from Collaborative Computer Gaming. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, *6*(3), 357–374.
- 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 and Leadership*, *35*(3), 18–24. doi:10.1108/10878570710745794
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using Multivariate Statistics* (5th ed.). Allyn & Bacon.
- Tiberius, V., & Walker, J. (1998). Arrogance. *American Philosophical Quarterly*, *35*(4), 379–390.

Organizational Arrogance and a Theory-Based Instrument

Wagner, J. (2019, May 29). 'A grandstander and a showboat': Kellyanne Conway attacks Comey for op-ed. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/a-grandstander-and-a-show-boat-kellyanne-conway-attacks-comey-for-op-ed/2019/05/29/863b0594-8214-11e9-933d-7501070ee669_story.html

Wigglesworth, A. (2018, April 15). From 'nut job' to 'slimeball': A timeline of Trump's insults aimed at Comey. *Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.latimes.com/politics/la-na-pol-trump-comey-insults-20180415-htmlstory.html>

Yukl, G. (2010). *Leadership in Organizations*. Prentice Hall.

Zhu, D., & Chen, G. (2015). Narcissism, Director, Selection, and Risk-taking Spending. *Strategic Management Journal*, 36(13), 2075–2098. doi:10.1002/mj.2322

ADDITIONAL READING

Albert, S., & Whetten, D. (1985). Organizational Identity. In L. Cummings & M. Staw (Eds.), *Organizational Behavior* (Vol. 7, pp. 263–295). JAI Press.

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(5), 403–427. doi:10.1080/08959285.2010.515279

Lee, K., & Ashton, M. (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

Ma, H., & Karri, R. (2005). Leaders Beware: Some Sure Ways to Lose Your Competitive Advantage. *Organizational Dynamics*, 34(1), 63–76. doi:10.1016/j.orgdyn.2004.11.002

McIntosh, G., & Rima, S. (2007). *Overcoming the Darkside of Leadership: How to Become an Effective Leader by Confronting Potential Failures*. Baker Books.

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 PMID:28683114

Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2012). *Organizational Behavior* (15th ed.). Prentice Hall.

Sergiu, G. (2015, March). Developing the Organizational Culture. *Review of International Comparative Management*, 16(1), 137–143.

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

Tiberius, V., & Walker, J. (1998). Arrogance. *American Philosophical Quarterly*, 35(4), 379–390.

KEY TERMS AND DEFINITIONS

Autocratic Leadership: Signifies a behavioral characteristic that indicates a leader with a sense of superiority and self-belief that they possess little concern regarding subordinates' ideas, inputs, or feelings related to decision-making.

Dismissiveness Towards Internal and External Organizational Matters: Organizational members tend to ignore or disregard information regarding internal and external organizational matters.

Disparagement Towards Intra-Organizational and Interorganizational Members: Organizational members' actions are designed to belittle, degrade, or discredit organizational members.

Internal and External Organizational Matters: Activities, events, opportunities, or threats that impact organizational growth, morale, and cohesion.

Machiavellian Leadership: Represents a behavioral characteristic that indicates a self-interested leader who behaves with a sense of superiority and engages in manipulative acts to accomplish tasks, objectives, or goals that reinforce their greatness and success even at others' expense.

Narcissistic Leadership: Denotes a behavioral characteristic that indicates a leader with self-absorbed behaviors and a perceived sense of superiority who exploits opportunities that elevate their self-image and importance.

Organizational Arrogance: An organizational environment whereby leaders shape a culture in which members behave with a sense of superiority, leading to overconfidence in organizational capabilities, dismissiveness towards internal and external organizational matters, and disparagement towards intra-organizational and interorganizational members.

Organizational Identity: An organizational theory construct explains how organizations are similar to individuals. They also hold unique qualities and identities that capture their internal essence and define them.

Overconfidence in Organizational Capabilities: Describes an organizational members' personal belief that their intellect supersedes any personal and organizational limitations.

Psychopathy Leadership: Characterizes a behavioral characteristic that indicates a self-centered leader with a sense of superiority who displays a dual behavior nature that can manipulatively inflict emotional or physical harm on others with unnoticeable mistreatment.