Human Performance, 23:403–427, 2010

ISSN: 0895-9285 print/1532-7043 online
DOI: 10.1080/08959285.2010.515279

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Acting Superior But Actually Inferior?: Correlates and Consequences of Workplace Arrogance

Russell E. Johnson
Michigan State University

Stanley B. Silverman
The University of Akron

Aarti Shyamsunder
Infosys Leadership Institute

Hsien-Yao Swee
The Eaton Corporation

O. Burcu Rodopman
Bogaziçi University

Eunae Cho and Jeremy Bauer
University of South Florida

Accounts of arrogant employees abound, yet there is little systematic research on arrogance within organizations. In response to this oversight, this article presents the findings from four studies. In Studies 1 and 2, the authors developed the Workplace Arrogance Scale and found support for its convergent and discriminant validity. In Study 3, the Workplace Arrogance Scale was included as part of a 360-degree performance feedback survey. Results revealed that there was satisfactory agreement between self- and other-ratings of arrogance. The authors also found that arrogance was negatively related to self- and other-rated task performance. Findings from Study 4 suggested that arrogance is negatively related to cognitive ability and self-esteem. The authors conclude by discussing the theoretical and practical implications of these findings.

Each of us has likely crossed paths with someone who acted arrogant. Perhaps she or he scoffed at something you said or belittled something you did. Some of these encounters may have occurred

Correspondence should be sent to Russell E. Johnson, Department of Management, Eli Broad College of Business, Michigan State University, N438 North Business Complex, East Lansing, MI 48824–1121. E-mail: johnsonr@bus.msu.edu

at work, such as supervisors publicly humiliating subordinates or passing blame on to coworkers. A cursory search on the Internet using the keywords *arrogant* and *employee* produces a myriad number of links to chat rooms and personal blogs that contain accounts of workplace arrogance. A common theme is that dealing with arrogant employees makes organizational functioning difficult because such people are difficult to communicate with, often producing tense interactions. Interactions are tense because people are unsure of how to respond to arrogant individuals, who misrepresent themselves as being better than they really are and may not see anything wrong with the way they act (Leary, Bednarski, Hammon, & Duncan, 1997). This misrepresentation creates problems for the arrogant person as well. For example, arrogant CEOs whose behavior is left unchecked may find themselves out of a job, because executives are often hired on experience but fired on personality (Fernandez-Araoz, 1999). In fact, acting arrogant is one factor that precipitates executive failure (Leslie & Van Velsor, 1996).

Despite the importance of understanding arrogant behavior at work, little systematic research has examined its occurrence and consequences in organizational settings. This is especially surprising given that personality is an important predictor of work outcomes (Day & Silverman, 1989). To date, existing evidence concerning arrogance is predominantly anecdotal. For example, arrogance is implicated as an attribute of corrupt organizations, such as Enron (Levine, 2005), where "leaders of the greedy corporation substitute the goal of self-aggrandizement for the goals of honest dealing and doing the real work of developing and producing good products for their customers and making profit for their shareholders" (Levine, 2005, p. 726). Arrogant behavior has also been labeled as a leader-based trigger of destruction within organizations (Ma & Karri, 2005).

Unfortunately, empirical data verifying the alleged negative relationships between arrogant behavior and performance are sparse. Although anecdotes abound, rigorous tests of relationships between arrogance and its correlates (e.g., narcissism) and consequences (e.g., task performance) are needed. We therefore examined these relationships across four studies. One reason for the lack of empirical evidence involving arrogance may be the absence of a measure of arrogant behavior as it is manifested at work. Lacking such a measure, it is difficult to assess the prevalence and predictive utility of arrogance. Although measures of related constructs exist (e.g., narcissism), they are neither synonymous with arrogance nor specific to work contexts. For example, Rowatt and colleagues (2006) developed an implicit measure of humility–arrogance, but it is intended for use in college rather than work contexts. Thus, we had the secondary goal of developing and validating a work-based measure of arrogant behavior.

In Study 1, we developed a measure of workplace arrogance and examined preliminary evidence for its construct-related validity. Using critical incident methodology, we generated a pool of items and administered them to participants. The data were used to create the Workplace Arrogance Scale (WARS). In Study 2, we collected data from two samples and tested whether the factor structure of the WARS was invariant across the samples. We also examined the degree of social desirable responding associated with WARS scores. In Study 3, the WARS was included in a 360-degree performance feedback survey, with ratings collected from target employees and their supervisors, direct reports, and peers. These data were used to determine the agreement between self- and other-ratings of arrogance, and relationships of arrogance with job performance. In Study 4 we examined relationships of arrogance with cognitive ability and self-esteem. Before describing each study, we first review the construct of arrogance.

ARROGANCE

Common conceptualizations of arrogance define it as a stable belief of superiority and exaggerated self-importance that are manifested with excessive and presumptuous claims (Hareli & Weiner, 2000; Kowalski, Walker, Wilkinson, Queen, & Sharpe, 2003; Leary et al., 1997; Silverman, Shyamsunder, & Johnson, 2007). We view arrogance as a set of behaviors that communicates a person's exaggerated sense of superiority, which is often accomplished by disparaging others. In its extreme form, arrogant behavior cultivates perceptions of the self as invincible and omnipotent (Ma & Karri, 2005). Hareli and Weiner (2000) found that people are seen as arrogant when they attribute success to internal, stable, uncontrollable, and desirable causes, such as high intelligence. Of interest, they found that perceptions of arrogance were unrelated to the extent of people's actual success.

Although arrogance is not commonly studied by organizational scholars, it is easy to form mental caricatures of employees who exaggerate their own qualities and worth while belittling their colleagues. Such employees are likely those who take credit for the success of others and assert authority in situations that extend beyond their expertise. However, it is not clear what the consequences of such behaviors are in work settings. Research conducted outside work contexts suggests that arrogance has negative socioemotional outcomes (e.g., decreased liking; Schlenker & Leary, 1982), yet it is unclear whether these detrimental effects extend to job performance. Although we suspect that arrogance may be negatively related to job performance (e.g., because arrogance is associated with being closed to other people's ideas and overreacting to criticism), this proposition has not been empirically tested.

ARROGANCE AND NARCISSISM

Despite the paucity of research on arrogance, a related construct—narcissism—and its relationships with work behavior have received some attention (e.g., Rosenthal & Pittinsky, 2006). For example, narcissism is associated with the performance of counterproductive behaviors at work, particularly in situations where job constraints are plentiful (Penney & Spector, 2002). When the egos of narcissistic individuals are threatened, they often respond with violent behaviors (Bushman & Baumeister, 1998). Narcissistic employees also hold more favorable views of their own leadership ability and their task, contextual, and counterproductive behaviors as compared to the opinions of their supervisors and peers. For example, Judge, LePine, and Rich (2006) found that self-rated narcissism was negatively related to supervisor-rated job performance.

Although research concerning narcissism may be informative for anticipating possible effects of arrogance, the two constructs differ in at least two ways. First, arrogance has narrower implications than narcissism. Although it may share conceptual ties with some dimensions of narcissism (e.g., superiority), arrogance is conceptually unrelated to other dimensions (e.g., self-sufficiency; Emmons, 1987). Example items on Raskin and Hall's (1979) Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI) include "I like to look at myself in the mirror" and "I like to start new fads and fashions," which describe behaviors that do not fit our definition of arrogance. The narrower bandwidth of arrogance may also make it a better predictor of facet-level attitudes and behaviors compared to a large bandwidth/low fidelity trait like narcissism (see Hogan & Roberts, 1996). Thus, a

work-based arrogance measure that assesses specific behaviors is likely to be a better predictor of organizational phenomena than a general measure of narcissism like the NPI due to predictor–criterion correspondence (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1977).

A second way in which arrogance and narcissism differ is that arrogance is more social in nature because it is manifested during interpersonal interactions—it encompasses actions and language that exaggerate one's own importance while also disparaging others (Leary et al., 1997; Schlenker & Leary, 1982). In contrast, narcissistic thoughts (e.g., fantasies of self-grandeur) and behaviors (e.g., excessive physical self-admiration) can occur in the absence of others. In fact, the term *narcissism* (meaning "self-love") is based on the Greek myth about Narcissus, who died alone while admiring his own reflection in a pool of water—a decidedly nonsocial event! Thus, whereas arrogance is manifested by overt behaviors, narcissism involves both overt and covert behaviors and cognitions. To verify our assumption that arrogance differs in meaningful ways from narcissism, we collected data on both constructs as part of Studies 1 and 2 to assess their convergent and discriminant validity.

ARROGANCE, HUBRIS, AND CONFIDENCE

Another related construct is hubris, a term that originates from ancient Greek culture. Hubris was displayed by mortals who believed they could tempt the fates and control their own destinies. Hubris results from being excessively proud of one's own successes, abilities, or attributes, despite any justification for such pride (Hayward & Hambrick, 1997). Hayward (2007) defined hubris as the damaging *consequences* that arise from the decisions that reflect false overconfidence, which he contrasted with authentic overconfidence that carries no negative consequences. In this sense, hubris may reflect the results that occur from exhibiting arrogant behaviors. Although Stein (2003) presented anecdotal and qualitative evidence showing that hubris causes organizational decision-makers to take unwarranted risks that often fail to pay off, testing hubris therefore implies a retrospective analysis, as the punishment or consequences are often looked at in hindsight.

Someone who is confident knows who they are and their ideas about themselves are built on information that is authentic or reality driven. 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. Although arrogance may relate to low job performance—an effect we examine in this study—hubris is defined by the consequences of arrogance, such as company failure or public harm (Hayward & Hambrick, 1997). With regards to confidence, part of the issue comes down to whether the extreme confidence is factual. For example, Mohammed Ali's extreme confidence in his prime was factual—he was winning every single fight. Arrogance would have been if he belittled others and claimed to be "the greatest" but was in fact not winning many fights. Although Ali may have scored high on a few items on the WARS, most of the items are specific work-related items in organizations that are not necessarily analogous to sports. For example, the "superior" person who exhibits arrogant behaviors is still not performing well on important interpersonal dimensions of job performance for managers, which does not extend to the example of Ali. Although Ali's arrogant behavior may have provided him with a psychological edge over his competition, he did not direct such behavior at those who trained him (Dundee & Sugar, 2008).

Taken together, arrogance differs from narcissism, hubris, and confidence in vital ways, and thus there may be value added by measuring arrogant behavior and identifying its correlates and consequences. Furthermore, a work-based measure of arrogance may prove particularly useful because it has greater fidelity in organizational contexts than more general measures of narcissistic personality and because no established measure of organizational hubris exists. In Study 1 we developed such a measure and took initial steps toward assessing its validity.

STUDY 1

Item Development

Our first goal was to develop and validate a measure of workplace arrogance. To generate potential items we conducted multiple focus group sessions with full-time employees. During the sessions, employees thought about someone at work who behaved arrogantly and described the behaviors of that person. The critical incidents that employees generated were recorded verbatim. Example responses included "Belittles someone else's competence in front of others," "Attacks people not issues," and "Wants to be in charge even though he lacks the know-how for it." Paralleling our definition of arrogance, these quotes paint a picture of arrogant employees as those who exaggerate their self-importance, often by disparaging others. Next we wrote 50 preliminary items based on these critical incidents. Items were written to reflect specific behaviors (e.g., "Makes unrealistic time demands on others") based on recommended guidelines (see Spector, 1992). To ensure the set of items was content valid, we verified that multiple items tapped each theme that emerged during the focus groups (e.g., provides ineffective feedback, disregards other people's ideas). We also compared our preliminary list of items with items from established measures of related constructs (e.g., narcissism, humility) to assess the similarity of item content. This assessment revealed that our item content was not redundant with these measures. Finally, items were refined via an iterative process whereby subject matter experts individually reviewed and edited the items until their meaning was clear and wording was satisfactory. Special care was taken to ensure that items would be minimally susceptible to social desirability effects, which we assessed empirically in Study 2.

Construct Validity

In addition to administering the 50 preliminary items, we also included measures of humility, dominance, Agreeableness, anger, superiority, entitlement, vanity, and authority (the latter four are NPI subscales) in order to assess convergent validity. We included an "at-work" frame for each scale in order to improve its validity (see Hunthausen, Truxillo, Bauer, & Hammer, 2003). Based on existing research (e.g., Hareli & Weiner, 2000; Kowalski et al., 2003), we expected that arrogance would be positively related to dominance, anger, superiority, entitlement, and authority, and negatively related to humility and Agreeableness. Although some of this research assessed observer perceptions of arrogance (e.g., Hareli & Weiner, 2000), it still informs our hypothesizing because arrogance is operationalized as a set of specific work behaviors that are visible to both actors and observers.

We also assessed discriminant validity by measuring constructs assumed to be weakly related to arrogance. These constructs were self-sufficiency and exploitiveness, which are dimensions of narcissism. We also included a measure of Conscientiousness because it is among one of the strongest personality-based predictors of job performance (Barrick & Mount, 1991). There was no reason to suspect that arrogance would correlate strongly with Conscientiousness.

H1: Workplace arrogance will be positively related to (a) dominance, (b) anger, (c) superiority, (d) entitlement, (e) vanity, and (f) authority, and negatively related to (f) humility and (g) Agreeableness.

H2: Workplace arrogance will be weakly ($r < |.30|$) or not at all related to (a) self-sufficiency, (b) exploitiveness, and (c) Conscientiousness.

Method

Participants and Procedure. Participants completed a questionnaire that contained self-report measures of all variables. Most participants (83.9%) completed the questionnaire online via a paid survey-hosting website (the remaining participants completed a paper version). Useable data were collected from 239 students enrolled in a psychology course at a large Midwestern university in the United States. The majority of participants were female (63.3%), were either Caucasian (78.1%) or African American (14.6%), and had an average age of 24.3 years ($SD = 6.3$). Only students with formal work experience were permitted to participate. Participants worked an average of 27.4 hr per week ($SD = 9.6$) and had an average job tenure of 13.1 months ($SD = 4.4$).

Measures. Participants rated themselves on all measures using a 5-point Likert response scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*).

Arrogance. Participants completed 50 items that were intended to tap workplace arrogance. Information regarding the factor structure and reliability of these items are presented in the Results section, and the final 26-item version ($\alpha = .93$) is listed in the Appendix. Note that participants self-reported their own behavior, so items were framed in the first person (e.g., "I believe that I know better than everyone else in any given situation").

Narcissism. Narcissism was measured using Raskin and Hall's (1979) NPI, which consists of 40 items across seven subscales: Authority (8 items, $\alpha = .70$; "I see myself as a good leader"), Vanity (6 items, $\alpha = .78$; "I will never be satisfied until I get all that I deserve"), Superiority (5 items, $\alpha = .73$; "I am apt to show off if I get a chance"), Entitlement (3 items, $\alpha = .70$; "I insist on getting all the respect that I am due"), Self-sufficiency (7 items, $\alpha = .70$; "I live my life in any way I want to"), Exploitiveness (5 items, $\alpha = .64$; "I find it easy to manipulate people"), and Exhibitionism (6 items, $\alpha = .71$; "I really like to be the center of attention").

Dominance. Dominance is assumed to be a key trait of arrogant persons, and thus it should relate positively to our set of arrogance items. Dominance was measured using an 11-item scale ($\alpha = .82$) adapted from Goldberg's (1999) International Personality Item Pool (IPIP). An example item is "I try to outdo others."

Anger. Arrogance is expected to be associated with anger because arrogant individuals have excessively favorable perceptions of themselves, which produces discrepancies between their self-views and how others see them. When people's self-views are not verified by others, it leads

to frustration and anger (Swann, 1983). Anger was measured using a 10-item scale ($\alpha = .88$) taken from Goldberg's (1999) IPIP. An example item is "I become angry easily."

Humility. People who are humble do not act superior to others, which runs counter to arrogant behavior. Humility was measured using an eight-item scale ($\alpha = .70$) taken from Goldberg's (1999) IPIP. An example item is "I let other people take credit for their work."

Agreeableness. Arrogance is expected to be negatively related to Agreeableness, which refers to people who are altruistic and value social harmony (McCrae & Costa, 1997). We measured Agreeableness using the 10-item subscale ($\alpha = .88$) in Goldberg's (1999) IPIP. An example item is "I feel little concern for others <reverse scored>."

Conscientiousness. Conscientiousness refers to people who engage in purposeful planning and tightly regulate their behavior (McCrae & Costa, 1997). We measured Conscientiousness using the 10-item subscale ($\alpha = .81$) in Goldberg's (1999) IPIP. An example item is "I am always prepared."

Results

Factor Structure of the WARS. We submitted the 50 arrogance items to an exploratory factor analysis with maximum likelihood estimation and an oblique rotation (Promax) using Mplus 4.0 software (Muthén & Muthén, 2006). Results showed that a two-factor solution fit the data best based on an examination of eigenvalues and the Scree plot (see Fabrigar, Wegener, MacCallum, & Strahan, 1999). The eigenvalues for the first five factors were $\lambda_1 = 17.73$, $\lambda_2 = 5.05$, $\lambda_3 = 1.66$, $\lambda_4 = 1.42$, and $\lambda_5 = 1.29$. Together, the first two factors accounted for 45% of the pooled variance. As an additional way to evaluate the fit of the factor solution, we calculated its normed chi-square (i.e., chi-square divided by its degrees of freedom). The solution had adequate fit because its normed chi-square equaled 1.59 (1,787.35 divided by 1,126), which is less than the 4.0 cutoff recommended by Carmines and McIver (1981). Upon further scrutiny, all 16 items that loaded on the second factor were reverse scored items, such as "I never criticize other employees in a threatening manner" and "I give others credit for their ideas." However, because 14 of these 16 items had high cross-loadings on the first factor, we retained these 14 reverse-scored items and discarded only the 2 items that did not load on the first factor, which characterizes arrogant behavior. The second factor was not considered further because it appeared to reflect an artifact of item wording rather than having conceptual meaning.

The next step involved reducing the number of items by approximately half. Doing so served two purposes: Shorter scales are more practical in applied settings, and discarding poor items improves the psychometric qualities of scales. We reduced the number of items by eliminating those with factor loadings less than .60, which resulted in a 26-item scale. The fit of a one-factor confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) solution was acceptable and met or exceeded conventional benchmarks (Hu & Bentler, 1999; Kline, 2005): normed $\chi^2 = 2.12$, root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) = .06, standardized root mean square residual (SRMR) = .04, comparative fit index (CFI) = .96, and Tucker–Lewis index (TLI) = .95. The 26-item WARS ($\alpha = .93$) is include in Table A1 in the appendix. The composite reliability (CR) and variance extracted (VE) for the WARS were .96 and .50, respectively, which satisfy the cutoffs recommended by Fornell and Larcker (1981).

Construct Validity. Descriptive statistics and intercorrelations among the variables are reported in Table 1. In line with H1, arrogance was positively related to dominance ($r = .66$, $p < .01$), anger ($r = .71$, $p < .01$), superiority ($r = .53$, $p < .01$), entitlement ($r = .50$, $p < .01$), and vanity ($r = .38$, $p < .01$), and negatively related to humility ($r = –.55$, $p < .01$) and Agreeableness ($r = –.72$, $p < .01$). Only authority had an unexpected nonsignificant relationship ($r = .01$, *ns*). In support of H2, arrogance was weakly related to Conscientiousness ($r = –.23$, $p < .05$) and unrelated to exploitiveness ($r = .13$, *ns*). It was however related to self-sufficiency ($r = –.37$, $p < .01$).

Discussion

Workplace arrogance encompasses behaviors that exaggerate actors' self-importance and that disparage their colleagues. This definition is consistent with existing research and the list of arrogant behaviors that employees generated in the focus groups. We used this information to develop a measure of arrogance that is appropriate for use in work contexts, which culminated in the WARS (see Table A1 in the appendix). We also collected preliminary evidence for the validity of this measure. As predicted, scores on the WARS were positively related to constructs like dominance and entitlement and negatively related to constructs like humility and Agreeableness. Notably, the WARS was not redundant with the NPI, a common measure of narcissism. Although arrogance was positively related to some NPI subscales (e.g., Entitlement), it was negatively related (e.g., Self-Sufficiency) and unrelated (e.g., Exploitiveness) to other subscales.

Although these findings are interesting, they are also limited. First, it is unclear to what extent responses on the WARS are infected by social desirability. Social desirable responding may be a problem given that many items describe behaviors that violate workplace norms. Second, although we shed light on some of the correlates of arrogant behaviors, it is not clear what the consequences are of such behaviors, such as relationships between arrogance and job performance. To address these limitations, we conducted three additional studies.

TABLE 1
Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations Among the Variables Included in Study 1

Variable	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*	*10*	*11*	*12*
1. Arrogance	(.93)											
2. Dominance	**.66**	(.82)										
3. Anger	**.71**	**.61**	(.88)									
4. Humility	**–.55**	**–.38**	**–.46**	(.70)								
5. Agreeableness	**–.72**	**–.62**	**–.73**	**.53**	(.88)							
6. Conscientiousness	**–.23**	–.11	**–.23**	.07	**.39**	(.81)						
7. NPI - Superiority	**.53**	**.73**	**.41**	**–.35**	**–.51**	**–.16**	(.73)					
8. NPI - Entitlement	**.50**	**.72**	**.42**	**–.40**	**–.44**	.01	**.64**	(.70)				
9. NPI - Vanity	**.38**	**.59**	**.33**	**–.18**	**–.38**	–.12	**.70**	**.54**	(.78)			
10. NPI - Authority	.01	**.45**	.07	–.13	.03	**.48**	**.36**	**.53**	**.36**	(.70)		
11. NPI - Self-sufficiency	**–.37**	.07	**–.27**	**.21**	**.44**	**.52**	.13	.15	.12	**.62**	(.70)	
12. NPI - Exploitiveness	.13	**.52**	**.16**	–.01	**–.18**	.04	**.54**	**.46**	**.50**	**.55**	**.36**	(.64)
Mean	3.60	3.70	3.63	2.20	2.41	3.02	3.74	3.86	3.58	3.92	2.97	3.24
SD	.68	.66	.73	.59	.77	.66	.75	.86	.80	.69	.66	.67

Note. $N = 239$. Coefficient alphas are listed in parentheses. NPI = Narcissistic Personality Inventory. Statistically significant correlations are displayed in bold.

STUDY 2

The purpose of Study 2 was threefold. First, we sought to replicate the findings from Study 1, this time using samples of more experienced employees. One sample consisted of full-time university students who worked part-time, whereas the second sample consisted of full-time workers who attended university part-time (e.g., employees taking weekend MBA classes). Having two samples allowed us to conduct a multiple-group CFA to test the invariance of the factor structure of the WARS. We also added potential correlates of arrogance—chronic prevention regulatory focus and strain—to the list of variables examined in Study 1. Prevention focus refers to an avoidance-oriented goal-striving strategy, which is driven by the need to minimize mistakes and fulfill perceived obligations and expectations (Higgins, 1997). We predicted that arrogance is positively related to chronic prevention focus because arrogant people, who exaggerate their self-importance, must closely regulate their at-work behaviors to prevent any revelations of deficiencies. Although all employees are expected to complete their work assignments, the cognitive resources of arrogant employees are taxed not only by the demands of these assignments but also by the demands of regulating their self-image and their worries about failure. This excessive self-monitoring may therefore increase their likelihood of experiencing psychological strain.

A second aim of Study 2 was to assess a potential consequence of workplace arrogance, namely organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). OCB refers to behavior that promotes the social and psychological environments in which formal job duties and responsibilities are carried out (Organ, 1988). We suspected that arrogant individuals would engage in less frequent acts of OCB because they likely see themselves as too important to "waste" their time helping colleagues and listening to others' problems. Arrogant individuals also place their own welfare and agenda ahead of the organization and its members, which serves to decrease their performance of OCB.

The third and final aim was to include a measure of social desirability (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960) to assess the extent to which scores on the WARS are related to such bias. Doing so enabled us to evaluate whether the level of social desirability associated with the WARS is greater than it is for measures of the other constructs.

H3: Workplace arrogance will be positively related to (a) chronic prevention focus and (b) work-related strain, and negatively related to (c) OCB.

RQ1: To what extent are scores on the WARS correlated with scores on a measure of social desirability?

Method

Participants and Procedure. Participants enrolled in psychology and business classes at a university in the southeast United States were recruited. Participants received extra credit in exchange for completing the survey. Sample 1 data were collected from 421 participants who attended university full-time and worked part-time. The student participants were mostly female (74%); were primarily Caucasian (66%), African American (16%), or Hispanic/Latino (11%); and had a mean age of 22.7 years (SD = 2.8). The majority of students were employed in retail/service (61%) or professional (18%) positions, had an average tenure of 17.2 months (SD = 14.5), worked an average of 21.6 hr per week (SD = 6.0) in their current job.

Sample 2 data were collected from 335 full-time employees who attended evening or weekend classes. The majority of participants were female (53%); were Caucasian (60%), African American (14%), Hispanic/Latino (14%), or Asian/Pacific Islanders (11%); and had a mean age of 29.5 years (*SD* = 5.9). Employees worked in industries ranging from retail/service (50%; e.g., store manager) and professional (24%; e.g., accountant) to manufacturing (13%; e.g., assembly line attendant) and government (11%; e.g., court stenographer). Employees had an average tenure of 24.1 months (*SD* = 24.4) and worked an average of 42.7 hr per week (*SD* = 9.4).

Measures. Participants were administered the same self-report measures of arrogance, narcissism, dominance, anger, humility, and Agreeableness used in Study 1. Participants rated the extent to which each item was characteristic of them or their behavior using a 5-point Likert response scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*).

Prevention Focus. Prevention focus was measured using Johnson and Chang's (2008) six-item work-based subscale (α = .82). Example items are "I am focused on failure experiences that occur while working," "I am fearful about failing to prevent negative outcomes at work," and "I feel anxious when I cannot meet my responsibilities at work."

Strain. Work-related strain was measured using House and Rizzo's (1972) seven-item Work Tension scale (α = .80). An example items is "I have felt nervous as a result of my job."

OCB. OCB was measured using Williams and Anderson's (1991) scales. Seven items each measure OCB directed at specific others (OCBI, α = .73; e.g., "I help others who have heavy workloads") and OCB directed at the organization (OCBO, α = .70; e.g., "I adhere to informal rules devised to maintain order").

Social Desirability. Social desirability was measured using nine items (α = .68) from Crowne and Marlowe's (1960) scale. Example items include "I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake" and "I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings."

Results

Descriptive statistics and intercorrelations among the variables are reported in Table 2. Correlations from the student (Sample 1) and employee (Sample 2) data are shown above and below the diagonal, respectively.

Factor Structure of the WARS. A one-factor CFA of the 26 Arrogance scale items was conducted using the data from each sample. In the full-time student sample, the fit of the one-factor solution was acceptable: $\chi^2(208) = 413.76$, normed $\chi^2 = 1.99$, RMSEA = .05, SRMR = .03, CFI = .94, and TLI = .91. The coefficient alpha in this sample was α = .87, and the CR and VE were .88 and .41, respectively. In the full-time employee sample, the fit of the one-factor solution was also acceptable: $\chi^2(208) = 408.17$, normed $\chi^2 = 1.96$, RMSEA = .05, SRMR = .03, CFI = .93, and TLI = .90. The coefficient alpha in this sample was α = .89, and the CR and VE were .90 and .47, respectively.

We conducted a multiple-group CFA that compared the factor structure of the workplace arrogance construct across the two samples. For Model 1, the factor loadings and factor variance for the arrogance construct were freely estimated in the two samples. The fit of this freely estimated model was acceptable: $\chi^2(441) = 847.93$, normed $\chi^2 = 1.92$, RMSEA = .04, SRMR = .04, CFI =

TABLE 2
Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations Among the Variables Included in Study 2

Variable	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*	*10*	*11*	*12*	*13*	*14*	*15*	*16*
1. Arrogance	.89\.87	**.56**	**.44**	**–.28**	**–.57**	**.22**	**.17**	**.17**	.03	.03	**.21**	**.27**	**.36**	**–.35**	**–.50**	**–.31**
2. Dominance	**.46**	.82\.74	**.29**	.09	**–.43**	**.12**	**.21**	**.16**	**.26**	.06	**.28**	**.32**	**.38**	–.09	**–.29**	**–.40**
3. Anger	**.44**	**.23**	.85\.88	.07	**–.25**	.08	**.10**	**.12**	–.05	–.06	**.16**	**.28**	**.22**	**–.16**	**–.28**	**–.56**
4. Humility	**–.30**	**–.17**	.08	.77\.77	**.22**	**–.10**	**–.17**	**–.14**	**–.25**	**–.16**	–.04	**.22**	**.26**	.00	**.31**	–.08
5. Agreeableness	**–.51**	**–.38**	**–.31**	**.19**	.85\.81	–.01	**–.11**	–.08	–.02	.01	–.09	**–.16**	**–.27**	**.51**	**.46**	**.39**
6. NPI - Superiority	**.14**	**.17**	.02	–.02	.10	.68\.63	**.36**	**.42**	**.34**	**.42**	**.31**	.04	.02	–.02	–.03	**–.24**
7. NPI - Entitlement	.08	**.31**	.00	**–.14**	–.04	**.31**	.67\.62	**.37**	**.39**	**.34**	**.28**	.04	.03	–.04	–.02	**–.33**
8. NPI - Vanity	**.17**	**.24**	.02	–.03	–.02	**.44**	**.38**	.66\.61	**.21**	**.32**	**.34**	**.11**	.03	–.03	–.07	**–.35**
9. NPI - Authority	–.06	**.23**	–.02	**–.23**	.07	**.33**	**.42**	**.25**	.79\.82	**.43**	**.35**	**–.13**	–.04	.01	.09	**–.22**
10. NPI -Self-sufficiency	.02	**.16**	–.10	**–.19**	.04	**.40**	**.37**	**.32**	**.42**	.64\.55	**.33**	**–.15**	–.05	–.04	**.13**	**–.22**
11. NPI -Exploitiveness	**.13**	**.28**	.00	–.05	.01	**.30**	**.32**	**.29**	**.40**	**.30**	.72\.65	**.17**	**.19**	.05	–.09	**–.43**
12. Prevention focus	**.23**	**.21**	**.19**	**.34**	–.06	–.02	–.05	.04	**–.16**	**–.18**	–.05	.82\.83	**.64**	.05	**–.22**	**–.21**
13. Strain	**.24**	**.23**	**.17**	**.33**	–.11	.08	–.02	.01	–.07	**–.11**	–.02	**.63**	.86\.75	.01	**–.28**	**–.20**
14. OCBI	**–.31**	–.10	**–.17**	.03	**.43**	.04	–.03	–.10	.00	–.06	.00	.03	.04	.87\.81	**.40**	**.27**
15. OCBO	**–.50**	**–.23**	**–.28**	**.27**	**.38**	.01	.05	–.10	.09	.10	–.03	**–.22**	**–.19**	**.36**	.80\.76	**.39**
16. Social desirability	**–.24**	**–.40**	**–.45**	.06	**.34**	**–.28**	**–.28**	**–.36**	**–.22**	**–.21**	**–.36**	**–.19**	**–.14**	**.21**	**.37**	.68\.68
Employee Mean	2.01	2.86	2.59	2.13	4.09	3.62	3.57	3.48	3.76	3.70	3.48	2.82	2.56	4.03	4.06	3.19
Employee *SD*	.50	.65	.71	.71	.63	.25	.33	.26	.26	.21	.33	.86	.95	.71	.58	.60
Student Mean	2.09	2.85	2.73	2.12	4.12	3.60	3.58	3.48	3.73	3.69	3.47	2.82	2.49	3.99	3.97	3.18
Student *SD*	.51	.65	.76	.70	.58	.26	.34	.26	.28	.22	.31	.91	1.03	.59	.60	.60

Note. Data from the student ($N = 421$) and employee ($N = 335$) samples are displayed above and below the diagonal, respectively. Coefficient alphas are listed along the diagonal (employee\student). Statistically significant correlations are displayed in bold. NPI = Narcissistic Personality Inventory.

.94, and TLI = .91. For Model 2, the factor loadings of identical items in the two samples were constrained to be equal. Specifying this equality constraint did not worsen model fit: $\Delta\chi^2(25) = 21.74$, *ns*. Finally, for Model 3, the factor loadings and factor variance were constrained to be equal across the two samples. Again, model fit did not appreciably worsen: $\Delta\chi^2(1) = 0.78$, *ns*. Because the fit of Model 3 was acceptable, $\chi^2(441) = 870.45$, normed $\chi^2 = 1.86$, RMSEA = .05, SRMR = .04, CFI = .93, and TLI = .91, the factor structure of the arrogance measure was invariant and scores on the WARS generalized across part- and full-time workers.

Construct Validity. In support of H1 and H2, workplace arrogance was positively related to dominance ($r = .56$ and .46 in the student and employee samples, respectively, $p < .01$) and anger ($r = .44$ for both, $p < .05$), and negatively related to humility ($r = –.28$ and –.30, $p < .01$) and Agreeableness ($r = –.57$ and –.51, $p < .01$). In general, arrogance was positively yet weakly related to the narcissism subscales: Superiority ($r = .22$ and .14, $p < .05$), Entitlement ($r = .17$, $p < .05$, and .08, *ns*), Vanity ($r = .17$ for both, $p < .05$), Authority ($r = .03$ and –.06, *ns*), Self-Sufficiency ($r = .03$ and .02, *ns*), and Exploitiveness ($r = .21$ and .13, $p < .05$). In support of H3, arrogance was positively related to prevention focus ($r = .27$ and .23, $p < .01$) and strain ($r = .36$ and .24, $p < .01$), and negatively related to OCBI ($r = –.35$ and –.31, $p < .01$) and OCBO ($r = –.50$ for both, $p < .01$). Using hierarchical regression, we examined whether arrogance accounted for significant variance in OCBI and OCBO incremental to narcissism by first regressing OCB on the seven narcissism subscales in Step 1 followed by arrogance in Step 2. When we did, arrogance was a significant predictor of OCBI ($\beta = –.35$, $p < .01$) as it accounted for an additional 11% of the variance in the criterion, $F_\Delta(1, 747) = 93.08$, $p < .01$. Arrogance ($\beta = –.44$, $p < .01$) also accounted for an additional 17% of the variance in OCBO, $F_\Delta(1, 747) = 110.99$, $p < .01$.

Finally, we examined relationships between WARS scores and social desirability. Results revealed that correlations between arrogance and social desirability were small ($r = –.31$ and –.24 in the student and employee samples, respectively, $p < .01$ for both). Arrogance did not correlate any higher with social desirability than did the other personality constructs, such as dominance ($r = –.40$ in both samples) and anger ($r = –.56$ and –.45 in the student and employee samples). Across both samples, arrogance–social desirability relationships were smaller than half (54%, or 15 of 28) of the other correlations involving social desirability. Thus, social desirable responding does not appear to be a critical problem for the WARS. In addition, we reran all of the H1 to H3 analyses with social desirability as a control variable, which did not alter the pattern of results (these analyses are available from the first author upon request).

Discussion

Four general conclusions can be drawn from our Study 2 findings. First, we verified the nomological network of workplace arrogance that was established in Study 1. Consistent with expectations, arrogant people scored higher on social dominance and trait anger and lower on humility and Agreeableness than those who rated themselves less arrogant. Also, arrogance was related to some dimensions of narcissism (e.g., superiority, entitlement) but unrelated to other dimensions (e.g., authority, self-sufficiency), which suggests that the two constructs differ. Second, we replicated Study 1 findings with a sample of full-time employees who worked over 40 hr per week and had an average tenure of 2 years in their current job. The factor structure of the WARS was invariant across part-time and full-time employees. Third, responses on the WARS were not strongly re-

lated to social desirability. In fact, relationships of social desirability with arrogance were comparable to relationships of social desirability with other variables (e.g., dominance), including seemingly innocuous ones (e.g., prevention focus). Last, our results suggest that arrogance has implications for job performance, which owes to its negative relationship with self-reported OCB.

Although Study 2 extended what is known about workplace arrogance, some unanswered questions remain. First, it is not clear to what extent self- and other-ratings of arrogance converge, because thus far all data have been collected from a single source, which may cause concerns owing to common source bias (Harrison & McLaughlin, 1996). Second, although arrogance was negatively related to interpersonal work behavior, its relationship with the performance of formal work tasks is unclear. We therefore sought to determine whether people are arrogant because their knowledge and skills are indeed superior to those around them.

STUDY 3

We included the WARS as part of a 360-degree performance feedback survey. Data on task performance and arrogance were collected from target employees as well as their supervisors, peers, and direct reports. We also collected cognitive ability scores from a subset of the target employees. This study enabled us to address two unresolved issues. First, we assessed the extent of agreement between self- and other-ratings of arrogance. Because social desirable responding did not appear to be problematic for the WARS and because the WARS consists of specific work behaviors that are visible to both actors and observers, we expected that self- and other-ratings would be positively correlated. Second, we assessed whether arrogant employees are high performers who happen to boast about this fact or whether this boasting unwarranted. Because no compelling theoretical or empirical evidence exists, we treated relationships of arrogance with task performance and cognitive ability as exploratory issues.

H4: Self- and other-ratings on the WARS will be positively correlated.

RQ2: Is workplace arrogance related to (a) task performance and (b) cognitive ability? If so, what is the nature of these relationships?

Method

Participants and Procedure. Data consisted of 360-degree performance ratings of 82 target employees. About half of the target employees were male (52%), and the mean age of the sample was 44.9 years ($SD = 8.8$). The majority of target employees worked for companies in property management/real estate (43%) or manufacturing (33%) industries. Self-ratings of arrogance and performance were collected from target employees, and other-ratings of these variables were collected from their supervisors, peers, and direct reports. In total, other-report data were obtained from 93 supervisors (60% male; average age of 49 years), 245 peers (53% male; average age of 45 years), and 192 direct reports (42% male; average age of 43 years). On average, raters had known the target employees for 87.9 months ($SD = 13.6$).

We received permission from various company CEOs and human resources directors to administer a 360-degree performance feedback survey to upper and lower level managers in their respective organizations. Feedback was for developmental purposes only. In exchange for this consult-

ing service, we were permitted to embed the 26-item WARS among the performance survey items to use for research purposes. One of the companies further consented to allow us to collect cognitive ability data from target employees (n = 32).

Each company provided the authors with a list of names and contact information of employees who could potentially participate in the 360-degree performance survey. We contacted employees via e-mail and described the purpose of the survey. If interested, employees sent a reply e-mail to the authors that listed the names and contact information of their direct supervisors, peers, and direct reports. In total, 96 potential targets were contacted, 82 of whom agreed to participate (a response rate of 85%). After a database was compiled of the names and e-mails of target employees and the persons nominated to provide performance ratings, a link to an online survey was emailed to all parties. Target employees were instructed to rate themselves when responding to the survey items, whereas all other raters were instructed to rate the person who nominated them. Responses on the survey were anonymous and could only be linked back to target employees via a three-digit identification number.

Measures. Raters responded to all survey items using a 5-point Likert response scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*).

Arrogance. Workplace arrogance was measured using the 26-item WARS (α = .92). Items on the self- and other-report surveys referenced the self and target employee, respectively.

Facet-Level Task Performance. Facet-level task performance was measured using items developed by Diefendorff and Silverman (2000). This 44-item, 360-degree tool consists of three performance dimensions: *customer focus* (20 items, α = .88; e.g., "Looks at problems from external customers' point of view"), *relationship oriented* (13 items, α = .92; e.g., "Accommodates others' personal needs as they relate to work issues"), and *developmental oriented* (11 items, α = .89; e.g., "Provides intentional learning opportunities").

Overall Task Performance. A measure of overall work performance (α = .91) was created by averaging responses across three items. The items were "How would you describe <your *or* the employee's> overall task performance?" "Compared to others performing similar jobs, how would you rate the results that <you *or* the employee> achieves?" and "To what extent <do you *or* does the employee> behave in accordance to the values espoused by the organization?"

Cognitive Ability. The Wesman Personnel Classification Test (Wesman, 1965) was used to measure target employees' cognitive ability. Employees are given 18 min to complete the verbal ability subtest (40 items) and 10 min to complete the numerical ability subtest (20 items). The test is scored separately for verbal ability and numerical ability, and a total score is computed by summing the two subtests.

Results

Table 5 contains the descriptive statistics and intercorrelations for the variables measured in Study 3 (data are aggregated across rater source).

Self- and Other-Rated Arrogance. To evaluate H4, we calculated correlations between self- and other-rated arrogance. Although correlations among arrogance ratings were positive in every instance, the magnitudes varied. The strongest correlations were observed between peer and

supervisor ratings ($r = .45$, $p < .01$), peer and direct report ratings ($r = .41$, $p < .01$), and direct report and self-ratings ($r = .35$, $p < .01$). The weakest associations were between direct report and supervisor ratings ($r = .23$, $p < .05$), self- and peer ratings ($r = .19$, $p < .10$), and supervisor and self-ratings ($r = .13$, *ns*). In general, there was greater agreement among non-self-ratings of workplace arrogance. We also examined mean levels of arrogance scores across the different sources. Self-ratings of arrogance were the lowest ($M = 1.92$, $SD = .31$), followed by peer ratings ($M = 1.97$, $SD = .60$), supervisor ratings ($M = 2.02$, $SD = .47$), and direct report ratings ($M = 2.04$, $SD = .69$). None of these mean differences were statistically significant. As a set, the data provide adequate support for H4.

Relationships of Arrogance With Task Performance and Cognitive Ability. A quick glance at Table 3 reveals that arrogance is significantly related to task performance and cognitive ability, and all relationships are in the negative direction. Table 4 summarizes correlations of WARS scores with performance and cognitive ability, broken down by rater source. With respect to arrogance and task performance, there are 64 separate correlations (WARS scores from four sources × performance scores from four sources × four performance dimensions). Of those 64 correlations, 41 (64%) were statistically significant and all but 1 were negative in direction. For example, self-ratings of arrogance were negatively related to relationship oriented performance as rated by supervisors ($r = –.25$, $p < .05$), direct reports ($r = –.36$, $p < .01$), and peers ($r = –.19$, $p < .10$). The lone positive correlation was observed between supervisor-rated arrogance and target-rated development oriented performance ($r = .28$, $p < .05$). Although the strongest correlations tended to occur between arrogance and performance ratings collected from the same source, 27 (or 56%) of the 48 correlations involving ratings collected from different sources were at least

TABLE 3
Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations Among the Variables Included in Study 3

Variable	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*	*10*	*11*
1. Arrogance	(.92)										
Demographics											
2. Age	.01	—									
3. Sex	–.06	**–.21**	—								
4. Position	.25	–.30	.23	—							
Task Performance											
5. Customer Focus	**–.45**	**.12**	–.05	–.15	(.88)						
6. Relationship	**–.82**	.00	.06	.11	**.67**	(.92)					
7. Development	**–.36**	–.01	.06	.31	**.71**	**.57**	(.89)				
8. Overall Performance	**–.66**	.00	.07	**–.35**	**.57**	**.72**	**.45**	(.91)			
Cognitive Ability											
9. Verbal - Wesman	**–.49**	.06	–.16	**–.44**	.13	.27	–.24	.35	—		
10. Math - Wesman	**–.38**	.15	–.27	–.30	.10	.24	–.12	.17	**.60**	—	
11. Total - Wesman	**–.50**	.10	–.22	**–.43**	.13	.29	–.21	.31	**.94**	**.83**	—
Mean	2.00	44.95	1.48	2.49	3.60	3.96	3.39	3.87	15.94	5.73	21.67
SD	.59	9.67	.50	.74	.65	.68	.93	.92	6.37	3.88	9.24

Note. *N* ranges from 32 (*r*s involving the cognitive ability variables) to 239 (all other *r*s). Coefficient alphas are listed in parentheses. Sex is coded 1 = male and 2 = female; Position is coded 1 = top executive, 2 = upper management, and 3 = lower management. Correlations highlighted in bold are statistically significant at $p < .05$.

TABLE 4
Relationship of Workplace Arrogance With Task Performance and Cognitive Ability

	Arrogance Ratings			
	Target (Self)	*Supervisor*	*Direct Report*	*Peer*
Target ratings				
Customer focus	–.14	–.02	.18	**.21†**
Relationship oriented	**–.52****	–.09	**–.24***	–.09
Development oriented	–.06	**.28***	.15	.14
Overall performance	**–.38****	–.10	–.10	.07
Supervisor ratings				
Customer focus	**–.27***	**–.58****	**–.30***	**–.22†**
Relationship oriented	**–.25***	**–.88****	**–.28***	**–.47****
Development oriented	–.12	**–.25***	–.12	–.06
Overall performance	**–.31***	**–.52****	**–.20†**	**–.25***
Direct report ratings				
Customer focus	**–.21†**	–.07	**–.37****	–.06
Relationship oriented	**–.36****	**–.19†**	**–.78****	**–.36****
Development oriented	**–.18†**	–.02	**–.31****	–.07
Overall performance	**–.36****	**–.22†**	**–.68****	**–.29***
Peer ratings				
Customer focus	–.07	**–.26***	–.14	**–.39****
Relationship oriented	**–.19†**	**–.41****	**–.39****	**–.83****
Development oriented	.17	**–.18†**	–.03	**–.19†**
Overall performance	.01	**–.37****	**–.34****	**–.66****
Cognitive ability				
Verbal	**–.46****	–.05	**–.21†**	.14
Numerical	**–.36***	.04	**–.28***	–.14
Total	**–.47****	–.02	**–.28***	.03

Note. *N* ranges from 32 to 81. Values highlighted in bold are at least marginally statistically significant.
†$p < .10$ *$p < .05$ **$p < .01$.

marginally significant. The strongest of these were (a) peer-rated arrogance and supervisor-rated relationship oriented performance ($r = –.47$, $p < .01$), (b) supervisor-rated arrogance and peer-rated relationship oriented performance ($r = –.41$, $p < .01$), and (c) peer-rated arrogance and direct report-rated relationship oriented performance ($r = –.39$, $p < .01$). Overall, employees who were rated high on arrogance tended to receive low performance ratings, regardless of rater source.

With respect to arrogance and cognitive ability, Tables 3 and 4 suggest that relationships between the two variables tended to be significant and negative. However, as shown in Table 4, the pattern of relationships is less clear than it was with task performance. Self- and direct report-ratings of arrogance were all significantly and negatively related to the cognitive ability scores, and supervisor and peer ratings were weakly related.

Because cognitive ability is one of the most robust predictors of task performance (Schmidt & Hunter, 1998), we used it as a benchmark to evaluate our arrogance measure. To do so, we regressed other-rated task performance (i.e., a composite of supervisor, peer, and direct report ratings) on cognitive ability in Step 1, followed by self- and other-rated arrogance in separate Step 2s. As shown in Table 5, arrogance accounted for incremental variance in seven of eight models. Al-

TABLE 5
Predicting Task Performance With Arrogance Incremental to Cognitive Ability

	Other-Rated Task Performance			
Predictors	*Customer focus*	*Relationship*	*Developmental*	*Overall*
Step 1				
Cognitive ability	.45	.42	.04	.39
R^2	.20*	.18*	.00	.15*
Alternate				
Step 2s				
(a) Self-rated arrogance	–.15	–.22	–.08	–.24
ΔR^2	.09*	.11*	.01	.10*
(b) Other-rated arrogance	–.30	–.80	–.32	–.68
ΔR^2	.14*	.59**	.10*	.43**

Note. N = 32. Values reported in the table correspond to standardized regression coefficients (b). Self- and other-rated arrogance were entered in separate regression models.

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

though the sample size for these analyses is small ($n = 32$), the findings suggest that arrogance predicts task performance independent of cognitive ability.

Discussion

Results of Study 3 speak to two issues. First, they suggest that there is satisfactory between-source agreement concerning arrogance ratings, especially among nonself sources (rs ranged from .23 to .45). Correlations between self- and other-ratings tended to be slightly lower (rs ranged from .13 to .35) yet were all positive. One reason why these correlations are small to moderate may be due to impression management. That is, arrogant employees may modify their behavioral manifestations of superiority around supervisors and possibly peers, more so than when in the presence of direct reports. In support of this idea, interrater agreement was lower for supervisors and direct reports ($r = .23$) than it was for supervisors and peers ($r = .45$). Second, our results suggest that arrogance is consistently, negatively related to multiple dimensions of task performance, in the case of both self- and other-rated performance. These negative arrogance–performance relationships held up even when the effects of cognitive ability were controlled for. In light of these findings, it appears that arrogant individuals, who tout their superiority to others, may not be able to substantiate these claims, both in terms of job performance and cognitive ability. However, one caveat is that our results concerning cognitive ability were based on a small sample, which prompted us to conduct an additional study.

STUDY 4

The aim of this study was to replicate the negative relationship between arrogance and cognitive ability, this time using a larger sample and one comprising participants employed in a broader range of occupations. Because of the somewhat counterintuitive finding that arrogant employees

tend to have lower task performance and cognitive ability, which runs counter to the way they behave in the presence of others, we sought to further examine this contradiction. We did so by measuring participants' general appraisal of self-worth (i.e., self-esteem) as a way to better understand how arrogant individuals actually feel about themselves. Although we treated the relationship between arrogance and self-esteem as a research question, we suspected that it may be negative given the negative relationship between arrogance and task performance.

Method

Participants and Procedure. One hundred seventy-two employed participants completed this study. Participants were contacted several ways, including through business and human resources contacts, university alums, and full-time workers enrolled in evening and weekend MBA courses at a large university in the southeast United States. Participants who were enrolled in university courses received extra credit for completing the study. People who agreed to participate were scheduled to meet the researchers at a laboratory on a university campus. Participants first completed the timed cognitive ability measure, followed by paper-and-pencil measures of arrogance and self-esteem.

Participant demographics were as follows: 58% were female; their average age was 27.1 years ($SD = 9.3$); they were mostly Caucasian (52%), African American (23%), or Hispanic (17%); they had an average tenure of 26.3 months ($SD = 28.1$); they worked an average of 37.2 hours per week ($SD = 17.5$); and were employed predominantly in retail/service (49%), professional (22%), government (13%), and manufacturing (10%) industries.

Measures. Participants completed the same arrogance and cognitive ability measures used in Study 3. Self-esteem was measured using Rosenberg's (1965) 10-item scale ($\alpha = .89$), which participants responded to using a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). An example item is "I feel that I have a number of good qualities."

Results and Discussion

Descriptive statistics and intercorrelations among the variables are listed in Table 6. Arrogance was negatively related to verbal ability ($r = -.48$, $p < .01$), numerical ability ($r = -.54$, $p < .01$), and total cognitive ability scores ($r = -.57$, $p < .01$). We were encouraged by this finding because it is consistent with the results of Study 3 and it generalized to a larger, more diverse sample of employees. There was also a negative relationship between arrogance and self-esteem ($r = -.39$, $p < .01$). This latter finding suggests that arrogant employees may engage in socially dominating and demeaning behaviors as a way of compensating for perceived personal shortcomings. Low self-esteem may also derive from poor interpersonal relations that are engendered by arrogant behaviors. Leary and Baumeister (2000) argued that self-esteem is, in part, a barometer of a person's current relational value to others. Arrogant individuals may therefore develop low self-esteem because they receive unfavorable appraisals from colleagues (Schlenker & Leary, 1982; Silverman et al., 2007). Unfortunately, this creates a vicious cycle because people often battle low self-esteem by belittling others as a way to discredit and dissociate themselves from future self-esteem threats (Baumeister, Dale, & Sommer, 1998). Thus, arrogant behaviors may lead to low self-esteem, causing people to act more arrogant in response. More complex relationships are also possi-

TABLE 6
Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations Among the Variables Included in Study 4

Variables	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*
1. Arrogance	(.84)				
2. Self-esteem	**–.39**	(.89)			
3. Verbal ability	**–.48**	.13			
4. Numerical ability	**–.54**	**.19**	**.54**		
5. Total cognitive ability	**–.57**	**.18**	**.83**	**.72**	
Mean	2.22	4.33	18.31	6.99	25.30
SD	.35	.58	6.35	3.89	9.08

Note. $N = 172$. Coefficient alphas are listed in parentheses. Correlations highlighted in bold are statistically significant at $p < .05$.

ble. For example, whether low self-esteem translates into arrogant behavior may depend on other individual differences, such as the superiority dimension of narcissism or more socially oriented variables like dominance and empathy. Future research that examines these possible relationships would be intriguing. Next we discuss implications of our findings from the set of four studies.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Although the topic of employee arrogance is an appealing one, very little empirical evidence accompanies existing anecdotal accounts. Although arrogant behaviors are generally seen as socially undesirable (Wosinska, Dabul, Whetstone-Dion, & Cialdini, 1996), the correlates of arrogance in organizational settings are not clear. This lack of attention is surprising given that personality variables have been a popular topic among organizational scholars since the late 1980s (e.g., Day & Silverman, 1989). We therefore examined the nomological network of arrogance and its relationships with important work criteria.

Workplace Arrogance and Its Correlates

Arrogance refers to behaviors that exaggerate one's own importance. Such self-aggrandizement clashes with reality and typically occurs at the expense of others. Examples of arrogant behavior include disrespecting colleagues and their ideas, claiming to be more knowledgeable than others, and discounting feedback. Although behavioral manifestations of arrogance are recognizable, less is known about what effects it has on other attitudes and behaviors at work. One reason for the lack of empirical evidence is that no established measure of workplace arrogance exists. Although constructs such as narcissism and hubris have been measured, they are not synonymous with arrogance. As such, a measure of arrogance, like the 26-item WARS, may be most appropriate for measuring self-aggrandizing behaviors at work.

Paralleling expectations, results from Studies 1 and 2 revealed that WARS scores were positively related to dominance, anger, superiority, prevention-oriented motivation, and psychological strain, and negatively related to Agreeableness and humility. We also found that arrogance did not overlap with other widespread personality-based variables (e.g., Conscientiousness). This finding

is important because it suggests that whatever effects arrogance has on work outcomes, they are independent from those of Conscientiousness. Thus, arrogant employees do not have poorer task performance owing to low Conscientiousness. Although conceptual similarities exist between arrogance and narcissism, the WARS and NPI measure different phenomena. For example, arrogance was positively related to some facets of narcissism, such as entitlement, but negatively related and unrelated to others, such as self-sufficiency and authority, respectively.

In addition to assessing expected correlates of arrogance, we also compared WARS ratings across different sources. Results revealed that self- and other-ratings were all positively correlated. Of interest, there was greater agreement between self- and direct report-rated arrogance than compared to supervisor- and peer-ratings. It may be that arrogant employees act differently toward those who are at the same or higher levels in the organization compared to those who are below them. Arrogant behaviors directed at subordinates presumably carry fewer negative consequences than ones displayed to supervisors and peers. The fact that there was correspondence between self-and other-rated arrogance and that WARS scores were weakly related to social desirability is encouraging with respect to the usefulness of collecting self-ratings of arrogant behaviors.

Workplace Arrogance and Its Outcomes

The evidence for the reliability and validity of the WARS was favorable, and its factor structure generalized across multiple samples, yet the construct of workplace arrogance does little good unless it predicts important organizational criteria. Our results provide direct support that it does. Previous research (e.g., Kowalski et al., 2003; Leary et al., 1997; Silverman et al., 2007) has shown that behaving in arrogance ways carries negative socioemotional consequences for actors, such as being liked and respected less, and judged more deserving of failure. In addition to these socioemotional outcomes, we found that arrogance is also related to job performance. Specifically, in Study 2, we found that arrogance was negatively related to self-reported OCB. In Study 3 we collected self- and other-ratings of arrogance and task performance via a 360-degree performance evaluation. The 360-degree feedback survey was for developmental purposes, which likely increased honest and accurate responding (Dalessio, 1998). Results revealed that self- and other-ratings of arrogance were negatively related to task performance criteria, especially ones pertaining to interpersonal aspects of work.

The negative relationships between arrogance and performance ratings were consistent regardless of the source. For example, 13 (or 81%) of the possible 16 correlations between arrogance ratings from each of the four sources and each supervisor-rated performance criterion were statistically significant and all negative in direction. When performance ratings were aggregated across all nonself sources, 14 of 16 (or 88%) possible arrogance–performance relationships were at least marginally significant and all in the negative direction (the average r was –.38).

Of interest, a lone positive relationship was observed between arrogance and performance (specifically, between supervisor-rated arrogance and self-rated development oriented performance; $r = .28$, $p < .05$). This finding may suggest that some behaviors which managers believe aid subordinates' development (e.g., criticizing, assigning arduous workloads) are actually viewed by others (e.g., the manager's supervisor) as being arrogant. Along these same lines, self-rated development oriented performance was also positively associated with direct report and peer ratings of arrogance, albeit these correlations failed to reach significance.

Are Arrogant Employees Actually Superior Performers?

An exploratory question of this research was to ascertain whether arrogant employees act superior because they do, in fact, have exceptional knowledge, skills, and abilities. Three pieces of evidence suggest that arrogant employees are not necessarily superior as advertised. First, as previously discussed, high levels of arrogance were associated with poor task performance and low OCB. Second, high levels of arrogance were associated with low cognitive ability. This negative relationship was observed across two independent samples of full-time employees. Last, high levels of arrogance were also associated with low self-esteem. It therefore appears that some employees who hold unflattering views of themselves may exhibit arrogant behaviors to compensate for perceived inadequacies. Arrogant behaviors also engender negative responses from other people, which may serve to lower self-esteem. Because we cannot draw causal inferences about the links between arrogance and self-esteem owing to our cross-sectional data, future research is needed that teases apart the nature of these relationships. Another direction for future research would be to ascertain whether arrogant behaviors result from discrepancies between people's representations of their own capabilities versus their actual capabilities, or discrepancies between their own capabilities and the capabilities of the people around them. If the latter is correct, then displays of arrogant behaviors may vary according to the social context. Regardless, it appears that arrogant behaviors may be performed as a façade in order to mask incompetence or unfavorable self-evaluations.

Practical Implications

Understanding the influence and implications of workplace arrogance has several practical advantages. In certain jobs, workplace arrogance could prove particularly costly if it ends up costing the organization customer loyalty or satisfaction, team morale, leader–member relationships, or commitment to a project or task. Silverman, Pogson, and Cober (2005) identified a set of individual and organizational precursors that, when present, increase the likelihood that an individual will change in response to feedback. Silverman and Muller (2009) provide a performance management model that embeds these precursors (e.g., feedback environment, accountability, willingness for feedback) into the performance management process. For example, an organization that has clear job-related systems that reinforce valued behaviors and holds individuals accountable for these valued behaviors enhance the probability of change. Including an empirically validated measure of arrogance in the performance management system through a 360-degree feedback survey might serve as an invaluable method of diagnosing such problems as well as providing developmental interventions.

Some arrogant leaders may be overly optimistic concerning the possibility of success, often underestimating adversaries and competition. With an arrogant mentality, it is easy to belittle the competition and mock their presence, complacently allowing small rivals to grow until they are too powerful to defeat or contain (Ma & Karri, 2005). Curtailing arrogant behavior may therefore provide a competitive advantage to organizations as well as encouraging positive behaviors such as humility (Vera & Rodriguez-Lopez, 2004). Examples of successful entrepreneurs and leaders such as Norberto Odebrecht and Konosuke Matsushita, who consciously made organization-wide efforts to eradicate arrogance and complacency, have shown that in-

stilling humility could be critical to the success of their business. For their own as well the organization's benefit, then, there are advantages to curtailing arrogant behaviors in individuals.

A behavioral measure of workplace arrogance could therefore be useful in developmental interventions designed to lessen the harmful effects of arrogance and promote the benefits of performance feedback and action planning. This is especially true in light of the disconnect we found between self-perceptions and others' perceptions of arrogant behaviors. Inasmuch as one could be arrogant and unaware, this could present a developmental opportunity for coaches and managers. A nontransparent self-report measure of arrogance might also provide useful insights into whether a commonly cited hypothesis is really true—that employees do not leave organizations, they leave managers. In fact, many potential detrimental effects of arrogant leaders likely impact those who are around them, particularly subordinates. In this study, we limited our attention to outcomes associated with arrogant persons themselves, yet it would be fruitful to examine how arrogant behaviors affect the stress levels, compliance, job performance, and so on, of colleagues. It is likely that arrogance disrupts socioemotional and performance-based processes for numerous organizational constituents. If such assumptions are true, then organizations need to find ways to soften the blow of arrogant leaders while working on a developmental front with them.

Conclusion

Although we were encouraged by our performance-related findings, one potential limitation is that our measures of task performance and OCB consisted of subjective ratings. Although we believe that observed negative arrogance–performance relationships will generalize to more objective indices, such as sales volume or units produced, such assumptions must be tested. Despite this drawback, our findings are intriguing because of the consistent relationship between arrogance and performance, even when ratings were provided by different sources. Also, subjective ratings can be very important, as personnel decisions are often made on the basis of them. Despite this potential drawback, arrogance appears to be a useful predictor of performance, similar to other personality variables like narcissism (Judge et al., 2006) and Conscientiousness (Barrick & Mount, 1991). Specifically, we found that arrogance scores were negatively related to task performance ratings provided by supervisors, peers, and direct reports, as well as cognitive ability scores. A needed direction for future research is demonstrating that arrogance predicts performance outcomes incremental to related variables. Although we found that arrogance predicted task performance and OCB after controlling for cognitive ability and narcissism, respectively, other variables like humility and dominance ought to be examined as well. In particular, future research ought to empirically investigate the role of arrogance vis-à-vis hubris in order to identify points of similarity and divergence across the two constructs. Unfortunately, length constraints prohibited us from measuring additional variables on the 360-degree performance feedback survey in Study 3, which meant we were unable to assess the incremental prediction of arrogance. Our results, however, do suggest that behavioral manifestations of arrogance at work ought to be identified and dealt with to mitigate their negative consequences. We look to future research to identify the effects that employees' arrogance has on those around them and the extent of within-person stability of arrogance across various work settings.

REFERENCES

Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (1977). Attitudes–behavior relations: A theoretical analysis and review of empirical research. *Psychological Bulletin, 84,* 888–918.

Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The Big-Five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 44,* 1–26.

Baumeister, R. F., Dale, K., & Sommer, K. L. (1998). Freudian defense mechanisms and empirical findings in modern social psychology: Reaction formation, projection, displacement, undoing, isolation, sublimation, and denial. *Journal of Personality, 66,* 1081–1124.

Bushman, B. J., & Baumeister, R. F. (1998). Threatened egotism, narcissism, self-esteem, and direct and displaced aggression: Does self-love or self-hate lead to violence? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75,* 219–229.

Carmines, E. G., & McIver, J. P. (1981). Analyzing models with unobserved variables: Analysis of covariance structures. In G. W. Bohmstedt & E. F. Borgatta (Eds.), *Social measurement: Current issues* (pp. 65–115). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology, 24,* 349–354.

Dalessio, A. T. (1998). Using multi-source feedback for employee development and personnel decisions. In J. W. Smither (Ed.), *Performance appraisal: State of the art in practice* (pp. 278–330). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Day, D. V., & Silverman, S. B. (1989). Personality and job performance: Evidence of incremental validity. *Personnel Psychology, 42,* 25–36.

Diefendorff, J. M., & Silverman, S. B. (2000, April). *Differences and similarities of 360 degree feedback across multiple countries*. Paper presented at the 15th Annual Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology Conference, New Orleans, Louisiana.

Dundee, A., & Sugar, B. R. (2008). *My view from the corner: A life in boxing*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Emmons, R. A. (1987). Narcissism: Theory and measurement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52,* 11–17.

Fabrigar, L. R., Wegener, D. T., MacCallum, R. C., & Strahan, E. J. (1999). Evaluating the use of exploratory factor analysis in psychological research. *Psychological Methods*, *4,* 272–299.

Fernandez-Araoz, C. (1999, July–August). Hiring without firing. *Harvard Business Review*, pp. 109–120.

Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. (1981). Structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research, 18,* 39–50.

Goldberg, L. R. (1999). A broad-bandwidth, public domain, personality inventory measuring the lower-level facets of several five-factor models. In I. Mervielde, I. Deary, F. De Fruyt, & F. Ostendorf (Eds.), *Personality psychology in Europe* (Vol. 7, pp. 7–28). Tilburg, the Netherlands: Tilburg University Press.

Hareli, S., & Weiner, B. (2000). Accounts for success as determinants of perceived arrogance and modesty. *Motivation and Emotion, 24,* 215–236.

Harrison, D. A., & McLaughlin, M. E. (1996). Structural properties and psychometric qualities of organizational self-reports: Field tests of connections predicted by cognitive theory. *Journal of Management, 22,* 313–338.

Hayward, M. L. A. (2007). *Ego check: Why executive hubris is wrecking companies and careers and how to avoid the trap*. New York: Kaplan.

Hayward, M. L. A., & Hambrick, D. C. (1997). Explaining the premiums paid for large acquisitions: Evidence of CEO hubris. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 42,* 103–127.

Higgins, E. T. (1997). Beyond pleasure and pain. *American Psychologist, 52,* 1280–1300.

Hogan, J., & Roberts, B. (1996). Issues and non-issues in the fidelity/bandwidth tradeoff. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 17,* 627–637.

House, R., & Rizzo, J. (1972). Role conflict and role ambiguity as critical variables in a model of behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 7,* 467–505.

Hu, L., & Bentler, P.M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indices in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling, 6,* 1–55.

Hunthausen, J. M., Truxillo, D. M., Bauer, T. N., & Hammer, L. B. (2003). A field study of frame-of-reference effects on personality test validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88,* 545–551.

Johnson, R. E., & Chang, C.-H. (2008, April). *Development and validation of a work-based regulatory focus scale*. Paper presented at the 23rd Annual Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology Conference, San Francisco, California.

Judge, T. A., LePine, J. A., & Rich, B. L. (2006). Loving yourself abundantly: Relationship of the narcissistic personality to self- and other perceptions of workplace deviance, leadership, and task and contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91,* 762–776.

Kline, R. B. (2005). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling* (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford.

Kowalski, R. M., Walker, S., Wilkinson, R., Queen, A., & Sharpe, B. (2003). Lying, cheating, complaining, and other aversive interpersonal behaviors: A narrative examination of the darker side of relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 20,* 471–490.

Leary, M. R., & Baumeister, R. F. (2000). The nature and function of self-esteem: Sociometer theory. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 32, pp. 1–62). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Leary, M. R., 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: Plenum.

Leslie, J. B., & Van Velsor, E. (1996). *A look at derailment today: North America and Europe*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

Levine, D. P. (2005). The corrupt organization. *Human Relations, 58,* 723–740.

Ma, H., & Karri, R. (2005). Leaders beware: Some sure ways to lose your competitive advantage. *Organizational Dynamics, 34,* 63–76.

McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (1997). Personality trait structure as a human universal. *American Psychologist, 52,* 509–516.

Muthén, L., & Muthén, B. (2006). *Mplus user's guide*. Los Angeles: Muthén & Muthén.

Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington.

Penney, L. M., & Spector, P. E. (2002). Narcissism and counterproductive work behavior: Do bigger egos mean bigger problems? *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 10,* 126–134.

Raskin, R. N., & Hall, C. S. (1979). A narcissistic personality inventory. *Psychological Reports, 45,* 590.

Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Rosenthal, S. A., & Pittinsky, T. L. (2006). Narcissistic leadership. *Leadership Quarterly, 17,* 617–633.

Rowatt, W., Powers, C., Targhetta, V., Comer, J., Kennedy, S., & Labouff, J. (2006). Development and initial validation of an implicit measure of humility relative to arrogance. *Journal of Positive Psychology, 1,* 198–211.

Schlenker, B. R., & Leary, M. R. (1982). Audiences' reactions to self-enhancing, self-denigrating, and accurate self-presentations. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 18,* 89–104.

Schmidt, F., & Hunter, J. (1998). The validity and utility of selection methods in personnel psychology: Practical and theoretical implications of 85 years of research findings. *Psychological Bulletin, 124*, 262–274.

Silverman S. B., & Muller, W. M. (2009). Assessing performance management programs and policies. In J. W. Smither & M. London (Eds.), *Performance management: Putting research into practice* (pp. 527–554). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Silverman, S. B., Pogson, C. E., & Cober, A. B. (2005). When employees at work don't get it: A model for enhancing individual employee change in response to performance feedback. *Academy of Management Executive, 19*, 135–147.

Silverman, S. B., Shyamsunder, A., & Johnson, R. E. (2007, April). *Arrogance: A formula for failure*. Paper presented at the 22nd Annual Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology Conference, New York, New York.

Spector, P. E. (1992). *Summated rating scale construction: An introduction*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Stein, M. (2003). Unbounded irrationality: Risk and organizational narcissism at long term capital management. *Human Relations, 56,* 523–540.

Swann, W. B., Jr. (1983). Self-verification: Bringing social reality into harmony with the self. In J. Suls & A. G. Greenwald (Eds.), *Social psychological perspectives on the self* (Vol. 2, pp. 33–66). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Vera, D., & Rodriguez-Lopez, A. (2004). Strategic virtues: Humility as a source of competitive advantage. *Organizational Dynamics, 33,* 393–408.

Wesman, A. G. (1965). *Personnel classification test*. San Antonio, TX: PsychCorp.

Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management, 17,* 601–617.

Wosinska, W., Dabul, A. J., Whetstone-Dion, R., & Cialdini, R. B. (1996). Self-presentational responses to success in the organization: The costs and benefits of modesty. *Basic & Applied Social Psychology, 18,* 229–242.

APPENDIX

TABLE A1
Workplace Arrogance Scale

Item	λ
1. Believes that s/he knows better than everyone else in any given situation	.78
2. Makes decisions that impact others without listening to their input	.78
3. Uses non-verbal behaviors like glaring or staring to make people uncomfortable	.76
4. Criticizes others	.75
5. Belittles his/her employees publicly	.75
6. Asserts authority in situations when s/he does not have the required information	.72
7. Discredits others' ideas during meetings and often makes those individuals look bad	.72
8. Shoots down other people's ideas in public	.71
9. Exhibits different behaviors with subordinates than with supervisors	.70
10. Makes unrealistic time demands on others	.70
11. Does not find it necessary to explain his/her decisions to others	.70
12. *Willing to listen to others' opinions, ideas, or perspectives	.69
13. *Welcomes constructive feedback	.69
14. *Takes responsibility for his/her own mistakes	.68
15. *Never criticizes other employees in a threatening manner	.67
16. *Realizes that it does not always have to be 'his/her way or the highway'	.67
17. *Avoids getting angry when his/her ideas are criticized	.66
18. Takes him/herself too seriously	.66
19. *Gives others credit for their ideas	.66
20. *Is considerate of others' workloads	.66
21. *Is willing to take credit for success as well as blame for failure	.66
22. *Does not mind doing menial tasks	.64
23. *Can get others to pay attention without getting emotionally 'heated up'	.64
24. *Promises to address subordinates' complaints with every intention of working to resolve them	.63
25. *Does not see him/herself as being too important for some tasks	.62
26. *Puts organizational objectives before his/her personal agenda	.61

Note. $\alpha = .93$.