

# Arrogance: A formula for failure

---

Stanley B. Silverman  
*The University of Akron*

Aarti Shyamsunder  
*Kronos, Inc.*

Russell E. Johnson  
*University of South Florida*

Presented at 22<sup>nd</sup> Annual Society for Industrial and Organizational  
Psychology (Division 14 of American Psychological Association)  
Conference  
April 29, 2007  
New York, NY

# Work-Based Arrogance

---

- Language and behaviors that:
    - exaggerate self-importance
    - make colleagues feel inferior
    - blame others, discount feedback
  - vs. narcissism
    - Less clinical, narrower, more social
  - vs. self-confidence
-

# Work-Based Arrogance

---

- Shyamsunder & Silverman (2006)
    - Workplace Arrogance Scale (WARS)
      - “Belittles his/her subordinates publicly”
      - “Makes decisions that impact others without listening to their input”
      - “Welcomes constructive feedback (RS)”
      - “Takes responsibility for own mistakes (RS)”
  - Correlates unfavorably with socioemotional outcomes
    - e.g., liking, respect, deserving of failure
-

# Work-Based Arrogance

---

- What about work performance?
    - Illusion of invincibility
    - Discount feedback
    - Blame others for failure
    - 'Prickly' interpersonally
  - Examine relationships with performance ratings and cognitive ability
-

# Method

---

- 360° performance ratings of 82 managers
    - 52% male
    - 44.9 yrs old ( $sd = 8.8$ )
    - 43% property management, 33% manufacturing
  - Non-self sources
    - 93 supervisors (1.1)
    - 192 direct reports (2.3)
    - 245 peers (2.9)
  - \*360° *for developmental purposes*
-

# Measures

---

- 26-item WARS
  - Work performance
    - Dimensions: 44 items (Diefendorff & Silverman, 2000)
      - Relationship oriented, development oriented, & customer focus
    - Overall: 3 items
  - Wesman cognitive ability test ( $N = 31$ )
    - Numerical & verbal
-

# Inter-Rater Agreement

---

<b>Arrogance Ratings</b>	<i>Self</i>	<i>Super</i>	<i>Subord</i>
<i>Super</i>	.13		
<i>Subord</i>	<b>.35</b>	<b>.23</b>	
<i>Peer</i>	.19	<b>.45</b>	<b>.41</b>

# Arrogance & Performance

---

	<b>Arrogance Ratings</b>			
<b>Other-Rated Performance</b>	<i>Self</i>	<i>Super</i>	<i>Subord</i>	<i>Peer</i>
<i>Relationship oriented</i>	<b>-.37</b>	<b>-.57</b>	<b>-.67</b>	<b>-.68</b>
<i>Development oriented</i>	-.08	-.22 <sup>†</sup>	-.23 <sup>†</sup>	-.13
<i>Customer focus</i>	<b>-.25</b>	<b>-.34</b>	<b>-.35</b>	<b>-.23</b>
<i>Overall</i>	<b>-.30</b>	<b>-.50</b>	<b>-.58</b>	<b>-.57</b>

---

# Arrogance & Cognitive Ability

---

	<b>Arrogance Ratings</b>			
<b>Cognitive Ability</b>	<i>Self</i>	<i>Super</i>	<i>Subord</i>	<i>Peer</i>
<i>Numerical</i>	<b>-.46</b>	-.05	<b>-.21</b>	-.14
<i>Verbal</i>	<b>-.36</b>	.04	<b>-.28</b>	-.14
<i>Overall</i>	<b>-.47</b>	-.02	<b>-.28</b>	.03

Note:  $N = 31$

---

# Incremental Prediction

	<b>Other-Rated Performance</b>			
<b>Predictors</b>	<i>Relationship oriented</i>	<i>Development oriented</i>	<i>Customer focus</i>	<i>Overall</i>
Step 1 Cognitive Ability	<b>.42</b> <b>(.18)</b>	.04 (.00)	<b>.45</b> <b>(.20)</b>	<b>.39</b> <b>(.15)</b>
Step 2a Arrogance (Self)	<b>-.22</b> <b>(.11)</b>	-.08 (.01)	<b>-.15</b> <b>(.09)</b>	<b>-.24</b> <b>(.10)</b>
Step 2b Arrogance (Other)	<b>-.80</b> <b>(.59)</b>	<b>-.32</b> <b>(.10)</b>	<b>-.30</b> <b>(.14)</b>	<b>-.68</b> <b>(.43)</b>

# Conclusions

---

- Arrogance “–” related to socioemotional and performance outcomes
    - What about those of others?
  - Also “–” related to cognitive ability
    - Small *N* though
  - Modest inter-source agreement
    - Self-ratings appear useful
  - WARS useful diagnostic and developmental tool
    - Executives hired for experience, fired for personality
    - Subordinates leave managers, not companies
    - Selection purposes... effects of faking?
-

Thank you!

---