
HIM 1990-2015

2013

Personality and interpersonal aspects of the work environment

RoseAnn Swiden Wick
University of Central Florida

 Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Find similar works at: <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/honorstheses1990-2015>

University of Central Florida Libraries <http://library.ucf.edu>

This Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by STARS. It has been accepted for inclusion in HIM 1990-2015 by an authorized administrator of STARS. For more information, please contact STARS@ucf.edu.

Recommended Citation

Swiden Wick, RoseAnn, "Personality and interpersonal aspects of the work environment" (2013). *HIM 1990-2015*. 1469.

<https://stars.library.ucf.edu/honorstheses1990-2015/1469>

PERSONALITY AND INTERPERSONAL ASPECTS OF THE WORK
ENVIRONMENT

by

ROSEANN E. SWIDEN-WICK

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Honors in the Major Program in Psychology
in the College of Sciences
and in the Burnett Honors College
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Spring Term 2013

Thesis Chairs: Karen Mottarella, Psy.D., Shannon Whitten, Ph.D.

ABSTRACT

Workplace arrogance has emerged as a research focus area for many industrial-organizational psychologists. Employees who demonstrate arrogance tend to demonstrate poor job performance, executive failure and poor overall organizational success. The present study investigates arrogance measured by the Workplace Arrogance Scale (WARS: Johnson et al., 2010) in relation to the Honesty Humility facet of the HEXACO Personality Index –Revised (HEXACO PI-R: LEE & Ashton, 2004). A total of 273 participants completed the WARS and HEXACO PI-R Honesty-Humility Facet of the HEXACO. Results show significant, strong negative correlations between the Honesty-Humility subfacets and the overall Honesty Humility facet score with the WARS scores. These findings indicate that workers high in arrogance lack important honesty-humility characteristics. Once we fully understand the complex mixture of personality traits that make up workplace arrogance, we can begin to screen for it in the hiring process and develop ways to better address it in the workplace.

DEDICATION

For my children Zachary, Emily, and Noah; let this be a reminder to never give up on your dreams. Let the twists and turns of life inspire you to always find innovative ways accomplish all of your goals. I love each one of you just for being yourself, never let anyone change who you are and always follow your heart.

For my husband, Donnie, whose love and support are never ending; words cannot express my love and gratitude for everything you put into each day to make my goals achievable. You are my rock.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Most importantly, I would like to thank my thesis chairs:

Dr. Karen Mottarella, Thank you for always making the words in my head make sense once they are put on paper. When I think of you, I am not at a loss for words, dedicated, kind, caring, patient, and hardworking are only the first words of many that come to mind. Your, kindness, mentorship, and ideas will always remain with me.

Dr. Shannon Whitten, your guidance and teachings have been a priceless asset to my education. You were given the gift of teaching; you inspired me to excel beyond what I ever thought I could. You are a true inspiration; I am so humbled to have had you as part of my education.

I also wish to thank my committee member, Nancy Brasel, for all of her advice and assistance throughout this process.

To Dr. Whittarella, you are the perfect educator and mentor. You understood me when I needed to make my decisions with a game rock, paper, scissors, lizard, Spock, and yet your wisdom always guided me to the right decisions and through the toughest times. Your sincerity, kindness, and guidance have made my education one of the best experiences ever. You touched my heart and my brain, and I cannot thank you enough for always being there. I strive to follow in your footsteps and touch just one half of the people you have.

To all of my family and friends; each and every one of you have touched my life in more ways than you could ever imagine, thank you for supporting me and adding love and laughter when it is needed the most.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
Workplace Arrogance	1
Workplace Arrogance Scale (WARS).....	4
HEXACO	4
Honesty Humility	6
Purpose of Study	8
METHODS	10
Participants	10
Procedures	10
Measures.....	11
RESULTS	13
DISCUSSION	16
Limitations	17
Future Studies.....	17
APPENDIX A: WORKPLACE ARROGANCE SCALE	19
APPENDIX B: HEXACO PI-R.....	21
APPENDIX C: DEMORGAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE FORM	25
APPENDIX D: PARTICIPANT INFORMATION FORM	31
APPENDIX E: IRB APPROVAL FORM	34
REFERENCES	38

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 13

Table 2 14

Table 3 15

Table 4 36

INTRODUCTION

Workplace arrogance is an emerging field of research within Industrial Organizational Psychology. Workplace arrogance involves a set of behaviors used to display a person's superiority in relation to others, and is associated with poor job performance, low cognitive ability, tense social interactions, low employee morale, executive failure, and poor organizational success (Johnson et al., 2010; Silverman, Johnson, McConnell & Carr, 2012). The Workplace Arrogance Scale (WARS; Johnson et al., 2010) was developed to measure workplace arrogance. The validity of the scale was examined in relation to the Five Factor Model of personality (McCrae & Costa, 1987) using parts of the International Personality Item Pool (IPIP; Goldberg, 1999) and the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI; Raskin and Hall, 1979). Recently, the lexically- based HEXACO model suggested a sixth personality dimension, Honesty – Humility. The present study explores the WARS in relation to the HEXACO Honesty-Humility dimension and its subscales.

Workplace Arrogance

While Johnson et al. (2010) define arrogance as “a set of behaviors that communicates a person's exaggerated sense of superiority, which is often accomplished by disparaging others” (p. 405); they indicate that the “common conceptualization of arrogance defines it as a stable belief of superiority and exaggerated self importance that are manifested with excessive and presumptuous claims.” (p. 405). The more arrogant the individual, the more self-centered and less agreeable they tend to be. Individuals with acute forms of arrogance portray themselves as

supreme or indestructible, but are unable to back up these assertions with their actual performance (Johnson et al., 2010; Silverman et al., 2012).

Arrogance can be distinguished from confidence, hubris and narcissism; although there is overlap among these. Confidence is reality-driven, accurate, and founded in an individual's true ability. It is differentiated from arrogance in that arrogant individuals overestimate their ability and behave in a manner that belittles those around them. Narcissism differs from arrogance as well. While arrogance involves interpersonal dynamics, narcissism involves self-focused love and self-aggrandizement that can occur without others. Narcissistic individuals are more focused on their own actions and abilities. They hold higher opinions of themselves and their behaviors than others do (Johnson, et al. 2010).

A third and related concept to arrogance is hubris. Hubris is conceptualized as the result or consequence of the arrogance or narcissism. For example, the NFL's "excessive celebration" penalty has been referred to as the "hubris penalty" by social psychologists who found biased penalizing of such displays for Black football players compared to White players, even when controlling for the racial make-up of the teams. In experimental studies, they found similar results and concluded that arrogance is more tolerated by others when displayed by high status group members, but is punished for low status group members (Hall & Livingston, 2012).

Athletes are just one example of the potential for arrogance to harm the individual and the team. In relation to the workplace, arrogant employees often obstruct the productive functioning of organizations by personifying themselves as supreme and invincible, which often begets tense, strained interactions (Johnson et al., 2010). Others are unsure of the proper actions necessary to counteract the behavior of the arrogant individual, who displays an exaggerated

sense of who they really are. Arrogant individuals often do not see anything wrong with their actions (Leary, Bednarski, Hammon, & Duncan, 1997).

While research in the area of worker arrogance is in its infancy, a negative relationship between performance and arrogance has been established. Specifically, Leslie and Van Velsor (1996) note that arrogant behavior accelerates executive failure. They found that such behavior at the management level often causes belittlement of other employees leading to high employee turnover and overall organizational dysfunction. Arrogant employees often promote a negative social workplace atmosphere, fail to motivate others, and do not contribute to the organization as a whole. Thus, arrogant employees who are left to run rampant can be destructive to an organization. Arrogant behavior in management-level employees also correlates with lower intelligence scores and lower self-esteem in comparison to managers who do not display arrogant behaviors (Silverman, n.d.). Similarly, in 360-degree performance evaluation of mid-level managers, managers with higher arrogance received low performance ratings even after controlling for cognitive ability. These findings suggest that arrogance is a predictor of task performance independent of cognitive ability (Johnson et al., 2010).

A relationship was also found between workplace arrogance and organizational citizenship behavior, prevention focus, and strain. As cited by Johnson et al. (2010), organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) is “behavior that advances the psychological and social environments where formal job duties are accomplished.” Prevention focused individuals are more detail and avoidance-oriented and have momentum to meet expectations, fulfill obligations and minimize committing errors. It is postulated that arrogance and prevention focus are positively related due to the individual’s need to moderate behaviors in order to cover up

deficiencies. Strain is also positively related to arrogance. Strain stems from the excessive demands of both the task itself and the constant need for prevention focus (Johnson et al., 2010). The results of all of these findings connecting arrogance to poor performance and poor behavior present an interesting paradox noted by Silverman, Johnson, McConnell, and Carr (2012). In general, workers who display arrogance actually perform more poorly than those who do not.

Workplace Arrogance Scale (WARS)

The Workplace Arrogance Scale (WARS; Johnson et al., 2010) was developed to provide more adequate and steadfast assessment of workplace arrogance. It was specifically designed to measure “self-aggrandizing behaviors at work” (Johnson, 2010, p. 421). The convergent and discriminant validity of the scale was examined in relation to dominance, anger, superiority, entitlement, vanity, humility and agreeableness using parts of the International Personality Item Pool (IPIP; Goldberg, 1999) and the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI; Raskin & Hall, 1979). As expected, high scores on the WARS positively related to the constructs of Dominance, Anger, Superiority, Entitlement and Vanity. High WARS scores negatively related to Humility, measured using 8 items from the IPIP, and Agreeableness. The WARS demonstrates no relationship to Exploitiveness and Vanity of the NPI, and also does not relate with IPIP’s Conscientiousness.

HEXACO

The HEXACO Personality Inventory (HEXACO PI; Lee & Ashton, 2004), measures Honesty-Humility (H), Emotionality (E), Extraversion (X), Agreeableness (A), Conscientiousness (C), and Openness (O). It was developed using lexically-based personality

research from several distinct languages for the purpose of assessing the six dimensions of personality variation (Lee & Ashton, 2004; Ashton, Lee & Goldberg 2007). The lexical method of personality structure is founded on the theory that the most important personality characteristics have been encrypted as words, usually in adjectives, in human languages (Goldberg, 1981). Up until the development of the HEXACO, the lexical investigations that were conducted generally involved factor analyses of self or peer ratings using the most common descriptive adjectives of any given language. These analyses attempted to disclose the replicable and large factors that influence personality lexicons of various distinct languages. These studies were first conducted in English and produced the five dimensions known as the “Big Five Personality Factors,” which are Openness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism (Ashton et al., 2007).

During the development of the HEXACO, lexical differences began to emerge differentiating it from the Big Five Factor Models (BFFM). While the HEXACO and Big Five/Five Factor Model’s components of Extraversion, Conscientiousness and Openness share a close resemblance with one another, the HEXACO authors identify differences in the Emotionality and Agreeableness domains. One of these differences is that the HEXACO’s Emotionality facet is similar to the BFFM Neuroticism, but does not include the anger aspect, which is generally included in the BFFM. In place of anger, the HEXACO Emotionality domain includes sentimentality, which generally is associated with the FFM Agreeableness domain. The HEXACO Agreeableness domain includes the features of the FFM Agreeableness factor but also includes the low anger facet of the FFM Neuroticism domain and excludes sentimentality which is in the HEXACO’s Emotionality domain (Ashton & Lee 2007).

The most notable difference of the HEXACO was the discovery of a sixth factor, Honesty-Humility, which emerged from the lexical studies of several diverse languages. An individual high in the Honesty-Humility personality dimension is described as sincere, fair, modest, and unassuming versus sly, deceitful, greedy, and pretentious. People who score higher on the Honesty – Humility domain have a tendency to view themselves as everyday people, to be genuine in interpersonal relations, to avoid corruption and fraud, and are not generally motivated by social status or monetary gain (Ashton & Lee 2007; Lee & Ashton, 2004).

As a whole, because of these differences, the HEXACO model demonstrates a predictive advantage over the BFFM, and accounts for more variance than the BFFM with many variables, such as unethical business decisions, workplace delinquency, materialism, risk taking and psychopathy.

Honesty Humility

The emergence of the Honesty Humility scale (H) differentiates the HEXACO from the Big Five/Five Factor Models previously used in personality testing. Often seen as a virtue, Honesty Humility is a highly desired trait associated with integrity, trust and loyalty. As defined by the HEXACO model, Honesty Humility involves Sincerity, Greed-Avoidance, Fairness, and Modesty, which form the 4 subfacets of the Honesty Humility scale within the HEXACO-PI-R measure. Lee and Ashton (2005) define Sincerity as the propensity toward being genuine in interpersonal relationships. Greed Avoidance involves the inclination to be disinterested in signs of high social status or luxury goods, while Fairness consists of the propensity to avoid

committing acts of fraud or corruption. Lastly, Modesty encompasses the propensity to be unassuming and modest.

Emerging research indicates that the Honesty Humility factor predicts other aspects of personality. High levels of Honesty Humility correlate with desirable traits such as treating people fairly, pro-social behavior, and a disconcern for self-promotion. Those who score high on the H factor value demonstrate fidelity in their relationships. High Honesty Humility correlates with relationship exclusivity (Burdage, Lee, Ashton, & Perry, 2007).

Low levels of the H factor are also associated with aspects of personality. For example, in relation to creativity, Silvia, Kaufman, and Reiter-Palmon, & Wigert (2011) found that creativity has a negative relationship with the H factor indicating that people who are more creative tend to be less honest and humble. However, overall, low Honesty Humility has harmful effects on society and on humanity as a whole and is associated with unethical behaviors such as adolescent bullying, criminal activity, sexual quid pro quos, social adroitness, seductiveness, as well as power-seeking and materialistic tendencies (Ashton & Lee, 2008). Status-driven risk taking, a motivation to gain at the expense of others, negatively correlates with low levels of honesty humility (Ashton, Lee, Pozzebon, Visser, & Worth, 2010). Low levels of Honesty Humility strongly correlate with what has been referred to as the dark triad of personality traits Psychopathy ($r = -.72$), Machiavellianism ($r = -.57$), and Narcissism ($r = -.53$) (Lee & Ashton, 2005).

In the workplace, the H factor predicts counterproductive workplace behaviors, job performance ratings, workplace deviance (intentional acts which harm other employees or the

organization) and workplace delinquency (e.g. absenteeism, employee theft, workplace drug and alcohol usage) (Lee, Ashton & de Vries, 2005). Additional studies have shown the H factor is a more reliable predictor for job performance than the other 5 personality traits (Johnson, Rowatt, & Petrini, 2011). A propensity to enter into opportunities for profits using bribery and kickbacks, environmental damage and risks to worker or consumer health and safety, and sexual harassment have also been associated with low levels of Honesty Humility factor (Ashton & Lee, 2008).

Purpose of Study

The developers of the WARS (Johnson et al., 2010) called for more research exploring the scale in relation to humility. The present study investigates arrogance in relation to the Honesty-Humility portion of the HEXACO PI-R.

Specifically this study hypothesizes:

H1: There will be a negative relationship between scores on the HEXACO's Honesty-Humility personality dimension, and all of its subscales, and scores on the WARS.

H1a: There will be a negative relationship between the Sincerity subfacet of the Honesty-Humility personality dimension on the HEXACO and the scores on the WARS.

H1b: There will be a negative relationship between the Fairness subfacet of the Honesty-Humility personality dimension on the HEXACO and the scores on the WARS.

H1c: There will be a negative relationship between the Greed Avoidance subfacet of the Honesty-Humility personality dimension on the HEXACO and the scores on the WARS.

H1d: There will be a negative relationship between the Modesty subfacet of the Honesty-Humility personality dimension on the HEXACO and scores on the WARS.

METHODS

Participants

This study included 273 participants recruited through the University's SONA research participation system. All participants were between the ages of 18 and 62 years old with mean age of 20.53($SD=5.10$). These participants included 173 (63.37%) females and 100 (36.63%) males. They report race/ethnicity as follows: 170 (62.27%) White/Caucasian, 24 (8.79%) Black/African American or Negro, 24 (8.79%) Other Hispanic, Latino or Spanish origin, 16 (5.86%) Puerto Rican, 12 (4.4%) Cuban, 6 (2.2%) Asian Indian, 4 (1.47%) Arabic/Middle Eastern, 4 (1.47%) Other/ Not Specified, 3 (1.10%) American Indian or Alaska Native, 3 (1.10%) Filipino, 2 (.73%) Chinese, 2 (.73%) Vietnamese, 2 (.73%) other Asian, and 1 (.37%) Korean. All participants are undergraduate students at a large metropolitan university in the southeast. The respondents' year in school is as follows: 137 (50.18%) Freshman, 40 (14.65%) Sophomores, 50 (18.32%) Juniors, 44 (16.12%) Seniors and 2 (.73%) Other. Their majors are as follows: 76 (27.84%) Psychology, 70 (25.70%) Other/Not Specified, 31 (11.36%) Business, 31 (11.36%) Biology, 29 (10.62%) Engineering, 11 (4.03%) Communications, 10 (3.66%) Education, 6 (2.20%) Nursing, 3 (1.10%) Computer Science, 3 (1.10%) Interdisciplinary Studies, 2 (2.73%) Legal Studies/Criminology, and 1 (.37%) Political Science. Participants could receive extra credit for their participation in certain psychology courses.

Procedures

All participants were informed that they were taking part in a study to examine personality in the workplace. All data was collected anonymously online through the psychology

department's data collection and management website. Participants logged into the site, selected the link for the study, and electronically acknowledged informed consent. Participants then completed the WARS, the HEXACO PI-R, and a participant information form collecting basic demographic information. The study was completed entirely online and was estimated to take a maximum of 60-90 minutes to complete.

Measures

Workplace Arrogance Scale (WARS; Johnson et al., 2010). This 26-item self-report scale measures workplace arrogance using a five-point Likert scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). The WARS contains questions such as “*I criticize others.*” and “*I give others credit for their own ideas.*” The scale's reliability is solid with a reported classical reliability coefficient (RHO) of .93. The composite reliability (CR) is reported at .96 with variance extracted (VE) reported at .50. (Johnson, et al., 2010). This scale is located in Appendix A.

HEXACO Personality Inventory-Revised (HEXACO PI-R; Lee & Ashton, 2004). This 100 item inventory measures the six dimensions of personality variation: Honesty-Humility, Emotionality, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Openness to Experience. The inventory uses a five-point Likert scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). The scale's reliability coefficients range from .50 to .85 (Lee & Ashton, 2008). The HEXACO PI-R demonstrates acceptable convergent reliability with the IPIP ranging from highest with Extraversion ($r = .86$) to lowest with Openness to Experience ($r = .68$), (Lee & Ashton, 2004). Honesty-Humility is one of the facets that differentiate the HEXACO from Big Five/Five Factor Models previously used in personality testing. As discussed earlier, the Honesty Humility facet

of the HEXACO contains 4 subscales: Sincerity, Greed-Avoidance, Fairness, and Modesty. This scale is located in Appendix B.

Demographic questionnaire. – This questionnaire collected general demographic and background information about the participants including information, age, ethnicity, gender, year in school, and general employment information. This questionnaire is located in Appendix C.

RESULTS

Pearson bivariate correlation coefficients were computed to establish the statistical relationships among the scores on the WARS and the Honesty-Humility sub facets of the HEXACO. The presence of significant correlations between the WARS scores and Humility sub facets and overall Humility facet score was found at alpha level .001. The r-values for each comparison can be found in Table 1.

Table 1

Pearson's r correlation data for Honesty Humility and its sub scales with WARS.

Scale	<i>WARS Score</i>	<i>Sincerity (H1)</i>	<i>Fairness (H2)</i>	<i>Greed- Avoidance (H3)</i>	<i>Modesty (H4)</i>	<i>Honesty - Humility (H)</i>
<i>WARS Score</i>	1					
<i>Sincerity (H1)</i>	-.273**	1				
<i>Fairness (H2)</i>	-.415**	.368**	1			
<i>Greed-Avoidance (H3)</i>	-.256**	.352**	.339**	1		
<i>Modesty (H4)</i>	-.506**	.331**	.329**	.362**	1	
<i>Honesty-Humility (H)</i>	-.505**	.690**	.739**	.735**	.687**	1

****All correlations are significant at $p < .001$ N=273**

The mean scores and standard deviations for the sub facets and overall facet scores can be found in Table 2.

Table 2**Participant Means and Standard Deviations for WARS and Honesty Humility Subfacets.**

Scale	<i>Mean</i>	<i>(SD)</i>
<i>WARS Score</i>	53.31	(11.526)
<i>Sincerity (H1)</i>	3.12	(.71)
<i>Fairness (H2)</i>	3.64	(.91)
<i>Greed-Avoidance (H3)</i>	2.77	(.87)
<i>Modesty (H4)</i>	3.59	(.74)
<i>Honesty-Humility (H)</i>	3.28	(.58)

In relation to the overall hypothesis of this study that participants' WARS scores would be negatively correlated with the HEXACO's Honesty-Humility personality dimension, a significant negative correlation was found between the Honesty Humility facet and the WARS score, $r(272) = -.505, p < .001$ supporting *H1*. A significant negative relationship was found between the Sincerity subfacet of the Honesty-Humility factor on the HEXACO scores on the WARS, $r(272) = -.273, p < .001$, supporting *H1a*. *H1b* was also supported. There was a negative relationship between the Fairness subfacet of the Honesty-Humility dimension on the HEXACO and respondents' scores on the WARS, $r(272) = -.415, p < .001$. There was also a negative relationship between the Greed Avoidance subfacet of the Honesty-Humility personality dimension on the HEXACO and the respondents' scores on the WARS, $r(272) = -.256, p < .001$ such that *H1c* was supported. Lastly, there was a negative relationship between the Modesty subfacet of the Honesty-Humility personality dimension on the HEXACO and scores on the WARS, $r(272) = -.506, p < .001$, which supports *H1d*.

Further exploratory analyses were performed on the data to better understand the factors

related to worker arrogance. A multivariate analysis of variance revealed a significant difference between females and males on several scores. The alpha level adopted for these exploratory analyses was .05. In general, females scored significantly lower on the WARS $F(1, 271) = 4.02$, $p < .05$. On the Honesty-Humility Fairness subfacet of the HEXACO, females scored higher $F(1, 271) = 13.94$, $p < .001$, and also did so on the Modesty subfacet $F(1, 271) = 9.00$, $p < .01$. The means and standard deviations of males and females on the WARS, and the Honesty Humility facet and its subfacts can be found in Table 3. No significant differences were found on WARS or HEXACO scores in relation to participants' race, major, year in college, or number of years working.

Table 3
Participant Means and Standard Deviations for WARS and Honesty Humility Subfacets by gender.

Scale	Gender	Mean	(SD)
<i>WARS Score</i>	Female	52.25	(10.82)
	Male	55.14	(12.49)
<i>Sincerity (H1)</i>	Female	3.14	(0.73)
	Male	3.07	(0.67)
<i>Fairness (H2)</i>	Female	3.79	(0.83)
	Male	3.39	(0.98)
<i>Greed Avoidance (H3)</i>	Female	2.82	(0.88)
	Male	2.68	(0.86)
<i>Modesty (H4)</i>	Female	3.69	(0.72)
	Male	3.41	(0.74)
<i>Honesty-Humility (H)</i>	Female	3.36	(0.56)
	Male	3.13	(0.58)

DISCUSSION

These results show significant, strong negative correlations between the Honesty-Humility subfacet scores and overall Honesty Humility facet scores of the HEXACO with the WARS scores. These results indicate that workers high in arrogance lack important honesty-humility characteristics. These findings suggest that worker arrogance is very problematic because workers who are arrogant are likely to be greedier, less fair, less sincere, and less modest than non-arrogant workers. These findings are consistent with the works of Johnson et al. (2010) and Silverman, Johnson, McConnell and Carr (2012) who found that arrogance is associated with poor job performance, low cognitive ability, tense social interactions, low employee morale, executive failure, and poor organizational success. Lee, Ashton and de Vries (2005) also found that individuals who scored low on the Honesty Humility scales scored low on the Employee Integrity Index, a measure of attitudes about and admissions to theft, indicating that employees with high workplace arrogance scores may be more prone to workplace delinquency.

Significant gender differences were observed which show females score lower on the WARS and higher on the Honesty Humility subfacets of fairness and modesty. These results indicate that in general females may tend to be less arrogant and more likely to avoid acts of fraud or corruption than their male co-workers. This is consistent with the work of Lee & Ashton (2005) who found that men scored higher on the dark triad of personality traits. The psychopathy component of the triad predisposes an individual to antisocial and criminal behaviors, and the narcissistic component leads to an exaggerated sense of one's abilities and accomplishments.

The results of this study confirm that worker arrogance should be screened for or at least a factor attended to in employee selection. Screening for arrogance could help to identify and address this negative behavior before harm is done to other employees or to the overall success of the organization. This study also suggests that additional research in the area of detection and management of worker arrogance is warranted.

Limitations

One limitation of this study is the use of a convenience sample of university students, which limits the size and variation of the participants. Future research should collect respondents who have been fully engaged in the workplace for a longer amount of time and are farther along in their careers. The use of the WARS as our measure of worker arrogance involves participant self-reported arrogance. Self-report of arrogance may not be the most accurate measure of arrogance. Utilizing a social desirability scale would help to assess and control for the influence of social desirability on participants' self-reported WARS scores. An even stronger approach may be use of 360 feedback from the respondents' co-workers and their superiors in order to obtain a better picture of true arrogance levels. However, the results of this study indicate that participants' WARS levels do correlate with HEXACO facets in the expected directions and suggest that the WARS provides meaningful information.

Future Studies

Future research could examine other personality factors, physical and cognitive abilities in relation to arrogance in the workplace. Further studies could also investigate workers' actual performance in the workplace and perceived arrogance in order to compare the respondents'

ability to perform required job duties, their knowledge of what the position requires, and WARS scores. Further studies could also focus on the ways to reduce arrogance in employees who have been identified as arrogant.

APPENDIX A: WORKPLACE ARROGANCE SCALE

Workplace Arrogance Scale

- 1) I believe that I know better than everyone else in any given situation.
- 2) I make decisions that impact others without listening to their input.
- 3) I use non-verbal behaviors like glaring or staring to make people uncomfortable.
- 4) I criticize others.
- 5) I belittle my co-workers publicly.
- 6) I assert my authority in situations when I do not have the required information.
- 7) I discredit other's ideas during meetings and often make those individuals look bad.
- 8) I shoot down other people's ideas in public.
- 9) I exhibit different behaviors with co-workers than with supervisors.
- 10) I make unrealistic time demands on others.
- 11) I do not find it necessary to explain my decisions to others.
- 12) * I am willing to listen to others' opinions, ideas, or perspectives.
- 13) * I welcome constructive feedback.
- 14) * I take responsibility for my own mistakes.
- 15) * I never criticize other coworkers in a threatening manner.
- 16) * I realize that it does not always have to be my way or the highway.
- 17) * I avoid getting angry when my ideas are criticized.
- 18) I take myself too seriously.
- 19) * I give others credit for their ideas.
- 20) * I am considerate of others' workloads.
- 21) * I am willing to take credit for success as well as blame for failure.
- 22) * I do not mind doing menial tasks.
- 23) * I can get others to pay attention without getting emotionally "heated up".
- 24) * I promise to address co-workers' complaints with every intention of working to resolve them.
- 25) * I do not see myself as being too important for some tasks.
- 26) * I put organizational objectives before my own personal agenda.

All items are scored using a five-point Likert scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*).

Items marked with * are reverse scored.

APPENDIX B: HEXACO PI-R

HEXACO PI-R

- 1) * I would be quite bored by a visit to an art gallery.
- 2) I clean my office or home quite frequently.
- 3) I rarely hold a grudge, even against people who have badly wronged me.
- 4) I feel reasonably satisfied with myself overall.
- 5) I would feel afraid if I had to travel in bad weather conditions.
- 6) * **If I want something from a person I dislike, I will act very nicely toward that person in order to get it.(S)**
- 7) I'm interested in learning about the history and politics of other countries.
- 8) When working, I often set ambitious goals for myself.
- 9) * People sometimes tell me that I am too critical of others.
- 10) * I rarely express my opinions in group meetings.
- 11) I sometimes can't help worrying about little things.
- 12) * **If I knew that I could never get caught, I would be willing to steal a million dollars.(F)**
- 13) * I would like a job that requires following a routine rather than being creative.
- 14) I often check my work over repeatedly to find any mistakes.
- 15) * People sometimes tell me that I'm too stubborn.
- 16) * I avoid making "small talk" with people.
- 17) When I suffer from a painful experience, I need someone to make me feel comfortable.
- 18) **Having a lot of money is not especially important to me.(GA)**
- 19) * I think that paying attention to radical ideas is a waste of time.
- 20) * I make decisions based on the feeling of the moment rather than on careful thought.
- 21) * People think of me as someone who has a quick temper.
- 22) I am energetic nearly all the time.
- 23) I feel like crying when I see other people crying.
- 24) **I am an ordinary person who is no better than others.(M)**
- 25) * I wouldn't spend my time reading a book of poetry.
- 26) I plan ahead and organize things, to avoid scrambling at the last minute.
- 27) My attitude toward people who have treated me badly is "forgive and forget".
- 28) I think that most people like some aspects of my personality.
- 29) * I don't mind doing jobs that involve dangerous work.
- 30) **I wouldn't use flattery to get a raise or promotion at work, even if I thought it would succeed.(S)**
- 31) I enjoy looking at maps of different places.
- 32) I often push myself very hard when trying to achieve a goal.
- 33) I generally accept people's faults without complaining about them.
- 34) In social situations, I'm usually the one who makes the first move.
- 35) * I worry a lot less than most people do.
- 36) * **I would be tempted to buy stolen property if I were financially tight.(F)**
- 37) I would enjoy creating a work of art, such as a novel, a song, or a painting.

- 38) * When working on something, I don't pay much attention to small details.
- 39) I am usually quite flexible in my opinions when people disagree with me.
- 40) I enjoy having lots of people around to talk with.
- 41) * I can handle difficult situations without needing emotional support from anyone else.
- 42) * **I would like to live in a very expensive, high-class neighborhood.(GA)**
- 43) I like people who have unconventional views.
- 44) * I make a lot of mistakes because I don't think before I act.
- 45) I rarely feel anger, even when people treat me quite badly.
- 46) On most days, I feel cheerful and optimistic.
- 47) When someone I know well is unhappy, I can almost feel that person's pain myself.
- 48) **I wouldn't want people to treat me as though I were superior to them.(M)**
- 49) If I had the opportunity, I would like to attend a classical music concert.
- 50) * People often joke with me about the messiness of my room or desk.
- 51) * If someone has cheated me once, I will always feel suspicious of that person.
- 52) * I feel that I am an unpopular person.
- 53) When it comes to physical danger, I am very fearful.
- 54) * **If I want something from someone, I will laugh at that person's worst jokes.(S)**
- 55) * I would be very bored by a book about the history of science and technology.
- 56) * Often when I set a goal, I end up quitting without having reached it.
- 57) I tend to be lenient in judging other people.
- 58) When I'm in a group of people, I'm often the one who speaks on behalf of the group.
- 59) * I rarely, if ever, have trouble sleeping due to stress or anxiety.
- 60) **I would never accept a bribe, even if it were very large.(F)**
- 61) People have often told me that I have a good imagination.
- 62) I always try to be accurate in my work, even at the expense of time.
- 63) * When people tell me that I'm wrong, my first reaction is to argue with them.
- 64) I prefer jobs that involve active social interaction to those that involve working alone.
- 65) Whenever I feel worried about something, I want to share my concern with another person.
- 66) * **I would like to be seen driving around in a very expensive car.(GA)**
- 67) I think of myself as a somewhat eccentric person.
- 68) I don't allow my impulses to govern my behavior.
- 69) Most people tend to get angry more quickly than I do.
- 70) * People often tell me that I should try to cheer up.
- 71) I feel strong emotions when someone close to me is going away for a long time.
- 72) * **I think that I am entitled to more respect than the average person is.(M)**
- 73) Sometimes I like to just watch the wind as it blows through the trees.
- 74) * When working, I sometimes have difficulties due to being disorganized.
- 75) * I find it hard to fully forgive someone who had done something mean to me.
- 76) * I sometimes feel that I am a worthless person.
- 77) * Even in an emergency I wouldn't feel like panicking.

- 78) **I wouldn't pretend to like someone just to get that person to do favors for me.(S)**
- 79) * I've never really enjoyed looking through an encyclopedia.
- 80) * I do only the minimum amount of work needed to get by.
- 81) Even when people make a lot of mistakes, I rarely say anything negative.
- 82) * I tend to feel quite self-conscious when speaking in front of a group of people.
- 83) I get very anxious when waiting to hear about an important decision.
- 84) * **I'd be tempted to use counterfeit money, if I were sure I could get away with it.(F)**
- 85) * I don't think of myself as the artistic or creative type.
- 86) People often call me a perfectionist.
- 87) * I find it hard to compromise with people when I really think I'm right.
- 88) The first thing that I always do in a new place is to make friends.
- 89) * I rarely discuss my problems with other people.
- 90) * **I would get a lot of pleasure from owning expensive luxury goods.(GA)**
- 91) * I find it boring to discuss philosophy.
- 92) * I prefer to do whatever comes to mind, rather than stick to a plan.
- 93) * I find it hard to keep my temper when people insult me.
- 94) * Most people are more upbeat and dynamic than I generally am.
- 95) * I remain unemotional even in situations where most people get very sentimental.
- 96) * **I want people to know that I am an important person of high status.(M)**
- 97) I have sympathy for people who are less fortunate than I am.
- 98) I try to give generously to those in need.
- 99) * It wouldn't bother me to harm someone I didn't like.
- 100) * People see me as a hard-hearted person.

All items are scored using a five-point Likert scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*).

Items marked with * are reverse scored.

Honesty–Humility facet items in bold.

Subfacet items indicated:

(S) Sincerity; (F) Fairness; (GA) Greed-Avoidance; (M) Modesty

APPENDIX C: DEMORGAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE FORM

Demographic Questionnaire Form

On average, how many hours do you work for pay each week? _____

What industry is you current job in?

- Agriculture
- Automotive
- Banking/Financial services
- Education
- Food/Beverage
- Healthcare
- Manufacturing
- Sales
- Technology
- Other

Taking into account all jobs you have had, please indicate how long you have been working.

- 1-3 Months
- 4-6 Months
- 7-12 Months
- 13-18 Months
- 19-24 Months
- 2-3 Years
- 4-5 Years

6 or more years

I have never worked for pay

Decline to Answer

Do you supervise or manage any employees? Yes No

If so how many? _____

How long have you been a supervisor/manager?

1-3 Months

4-6 Months

7-12 Months

13-18 Months

19-24 Months

2-3 Years

4-5 Years

6 or more years

I am not a supervisor or manager

What is your age in years? _____

What is your gender? _____ Male _____ Female

What is your race/ethnicity?

- White / Caucasian
- Black / African American or Negro
- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Native Hawaiian
- Arabic / Middle Eastern
- Mexican, Mexican, American, Chicano
- Puerto Rican
- Cuban
- Asian Indian
- Chinese
- Japanese
- Korean
- Filipino
- Vietnamese
- Guamanian or Chamorro
- Samoan
- Other Asian
- Other Hispanic, Latino or Spanish origin
- Other Pacific Islander
- Other

What is your major? (Psychology, Business, Biology, Education, etc.)

Business

Biology

Communications

Computer Science

Education

Engineering

Interdisciplinary Studies

Legal Studies/Criminology

Nursing

Political Science

Psychology

Sociology

Women's Studies

Other

What year in college are you?

Freshman

Sophomore

Junior

Senior

Other

What is your marital status?

- Single never married
- Living with a significant other
- Married
- Separated/Divorced
- Widowed

What are your current living arrangements?

- On campus
- Off campus, with friends, roommate or by yourself
- Off campus, with parents
- Off campus, with significant other, husband and/or your children

Do you have children? Yes No

APPENDIX D: PARTICIPANT INFORMATION FORM



Honesty – Humility and Workplace Arrogance

Explanation of Research

Principal Investigator(s): Karen Mottarella, Psy.D.

Co-Investigator(s): RoseAnn Swiden-Wick, Shannon Whitten, Ph.D.

Investigational Site(s): Psychology Department
University of Central Florida, Palm Bay Campus

Introduction: Many topics of research are studied at the University of Central Florida (UCF). To complete this research we need the help of people who agree to take part in studies. You are being asked to take part in a research study which will include approximately 100 people at UCF. You have been asked because you are an undergraduate student at UCF. You must be 18 years of age or older to complete this study.

The persons doing this research are Dr. Karen Mottarella, a UCF Psychology Department faculty member and RoseAnn Swiden-Wick, an undergraduate student in the Psychology department completing Honors in the Major. The research is being conducted as a part of the requirements for the Honors in the Major Program in Psychology. Dr. Shannon Whitten is also involved in this research study.

What you should know about a research study:

- A research study is something you volunteer for.
- Whether or not you take part is up to you.
- You should take part in this study only because you want to.
- You can choose not to take part in the research study.
- You can agree to take part now and later change your mind.
- Whatever you decide it will not be held against you.
- Feel free to ask all the questions you want before you decide.

Purpose of the research: The purpose of this study is to examine the correlation between personality traits of working college students.

What you will be asked to do in the study: Participants will be asked to rate their workplace behavior on the Workplace Arrogance Scale (WARS) ranking their workplace behavior on a scale of 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). They will then be asked to complete the HEXACO PI-R to measure the six dimensions of personality variation: Honesty-Humility, Emotionality, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Openness to Experience using the same scale of 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). Finally, each participant will be asked to complete a demographic questionnaire to collect work information and general information such as age, gender and marital status.

Location: The study can be completed entirely online and from any location with internet access.

Time required: This study is expected to take between 60 and 90 minutes to complete.

Risks: Participants should incur less than minimal risks.

Compensation or payment: Students who participate will receive extra credit points which they can apply to select psychology courses.

Anonymous research: This study is anonymous. Anonymous means that no one, not even the research team, will know that who provided the information.

Study contact for questions about the study or to report a problem: For any questions, concerns, and/or complaints, or if you feel that the research has caused harm, contact RoseAnn Swiden-Wick undergraduate student, Psychology Department, College of Science, roseann.s@knights.ucf.edu or Dr. Mottarella, faculty supervisor, Department of Psychology, College of Science, Karen.Mottarella@ucf.edu.

IRB contact about your rights in the study or to report a complaint: Research at the University of Central Florida involving human participants is overseen by the Institutional Review Board (UCF IRB). This research has been reviewed and approved by the IRB. For information about the rights of people who take part in research, contact: Institutional Review Board, University of Central Florida, Office of Research & Commercialization, 12201 Research Parkway, Suite 501, Orlando, FL 32826 or by telephone at (407) 823-2901.

Withdrawing from the study: You may leave the study at any time. If you decide to leave you will not receive any credit for participation and will not be included in the analysis of data.

APPENDIX E: IRB APPROVAL FORM



University of Central Florida Institutional Review Board
Office of Research & Commercialization
12201 Research Parkway, Suite 501
Orlando, Florida 32826-3246
Telephone: 407-823-2901 or 407-882-2276
www.research.ucf.edu/compliance/irb.html

Approval of Exempt Human Research

From: **UCF Institutional Review Board #1
FWA00000351, IRB00001138**

To: **Karen E. Mottarella and Co-PIs: Roseann E. Swiden-Wick, Shannon N. Whitten**

Date: **December 18, 2012**

Dear Researcher:

On 12/18/2012, the IRB approved the following activity as human participant research that is exempt from regulation:

Type of Review: Exempt Determination
Project Title: Personality and Interpersonal Aspects of the Work Environment
Investigator: Karen E Mottarella
IRB Number: SBE-12-08918
Funding Agency:
Grant Title:
Research ID: N/A

This determination applies only to the activities described in the IRB submission and does not apply should any changes be made. If changes are made and there are questions about whether these changes affect the exempt status of the human research, please contact the IRB. When you have completed your research, please submit a Study Closure request in iRIS so that IRB records will be accurate.

In the conduct of this research, you are responsible to follow the requirements of the Investigator Manual.

On behalf of Sophia Dziegielewski, Ph.D., L.C.S.W., UCF IRB Chair, this letter is signed by:

Signature applied by Joanne Muratori on 12/18/2012 01:46:45 PM EST

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'Joanne Muratori'.

IRB Coordinator

Table 4

HEXACO PI-R Domain and Facet – Level Descriptions

Honesty – Humility (H)

Sincerity (H1) – Assesses a tendency to be genuine in interpersonal relations.

Fairness (H2) – Assesses a tendency to avoid fraud and corruption.

Greed-Avoidance (H3) – Assesses a tendency to be uninterested in possessing lavish wealth, luxury goods and signs of high social status.

Modesty (H4) – Assesses a tendency to be modest and unassuming.

Emotionality (E)

Fearfulness (E1) – Assesses a tendency to experience fear.

Anxiety (E2) – Assesses a tendency to worry in a variety of contexts.

Dependence (E3) – Assesses a one's need for emotional support from others.

Sentimentality (E4) - Assesses a tendency to feel strong emotional bonds with others.

Extraversion (X)

Social Self – Esteem (X1) – Assesses a tendency to have positive self-regard.

Social Boldness (X2) – Assesses a tendency to be comfortable or confident within a variety of social situations.

Sociability (X3) – Assesses a tendency to enjoy conversation, social interaction, and parties.

Liveliness (X4) - Assesses one's typical enthusiasm and energy.

Agreeableness (A)

Forgiveness (A1) – Assesses one’s willingness to feel trust and liking toward those who may have caused one harm.

Gentleness (A2) – Assesses a tendency to be mild and lenient in dealings with other people.

Flexibility (A3) – Assesses one’s willingness to compromise and cooperate with others.

Patience (A4) – Assesses a tendency to remain calm rather than to become angry.

Conscientiousness (C)

Organization (C1) – Assesses a tendency to seek order, particularly in one’s physical surroundings.

Diligence (C2) – Assesses a tendency to work hard.

Perfectionism (C3) – Assesses a tendency to be thorough and concerned with details.

Prudence (C4) – Assesses a tendency to be deliberate and carefully inhibit impulses.

Openness to Experience (O)

Aesthetic Appreciation (O1) – Assesses one’s enjoyment of beauty in art and nature.

Inquisitiveness (O2) – Assesses a tendency to seek information about and experience with the natural and human world.

Creativity (O3) – Assesses one’s preference for innovation and experiment.

Unconventionality (O4) - Assesses a tendency to accept the unusual.

Altruism (internal facet scale) – Assesses a tendency to be sympathetic and soft-hearted toward others.

All definitions in the table are from Lee & Ashton, (2004).

REFERENCES

- Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2007), Empirical, theoretical, and practical advantages of the HEXACO model of personality structure, *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 11, 150 – 166.
- Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2008), The HEXACO Model of Personality Structure and the Importance of the H Factor. *Social and Psychology Compass*, 2/5,1952-1962.
- Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2008), The Prediction of honesty-humility-related criteria by the HEXACO and Five-Factor models of personality. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 42, 1216-1228.
- Ashton, M.C., Lee, K., & Goldberg, L.R., (2007). The IPIP-HECAXO scales: An alternative public-domain measure of the personality constructs in the HEXACO model. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 42, 1515-1526.
- Ashton, M. C., Lee, K., Pozzebon, J. A., Visser, B. A., & Worth, N. C. (2010). Status-driven risk taking and the major dimensions of personality. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 44, 734-737.
- Bouradege, J.S., Lee, K., Ashton M.C., & Perry, A. (2006). Big Five and HEXACO model personality correlates of sexuality. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 43, 1506-1516.
- Eagly, A. H., Johanneson-Schmidt, M. C., & van Engen, M. L. (2003). Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles: A meta-analysis comparing women and men. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129, 569-591.
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D., (1981). Structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18, 39-50.
- Hall, E.V., Livingston, R.V., (2012). The hubris penalty: Biased responses to “celebration” displays of black football players. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 48, 899-904.
- Hareli, S., & Weiner, B. (2000). Accounts for success as detriments for perceived arrogance and modesty. *Motivation and Emotion*, 24, 215-216.
- 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* (Vol7, pp. 7-28). Tilburg, the Netherlands: Tilburg University Press.

- Goldberg, L. R. (1981). Language and individual differences: The search for universals in personality lexicons. In L. Wheeler (Ed.) *Review of personality and social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 141-165). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Johnson, R.E., Silverman, S.B., Shymsunder, A., Swee, H., Rodopman, O. B., Bauer, J., & Chao, E. (2010). Acting superior but actually inferior?: Correlates and consequences of workplace arrogance. *Human Performance*, *23*, 403–427.
- Johnson, J.K., Rowatt, W.C., Petrini, L. (2011). A new trait on the market: Honesty-Humility as a unique predictor of job performance ratings. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *50*, 857-862
- 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., Bednarski, R., Hammon, D., & Duncan, T. (1997). Blowhards, snobs, and narcissists: Interpersonal reactions to excessive egoism. In R. M. Kowalski (Ed.), *Behaving Badly: Aversive Behaviors in Interpersonal Relationships* (pp. 111–131). New York, NY: Plenum.
- Lee, K, & Ashton, M.C. (2004), Psychometric properties of the HEXACO personality inventory. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, *3:2*, 329-358.
- Lee, K, & Ashton, M.C. (2005). Psychopathy, Machiavellianism, and Narcissism in the Five-Factor Model and the HEXACO model of personality structure. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *38*, 1571-1582.
- Lee, K, Ashton, M.C. & de Vries, R.E. (2005) Predicting Workplace delinquency with the HEXACO and five-factor models of personality structure. *Human Performance* *18/2* 197-197.
- Leslie, J. B., & Van Velsor, E. (1996).). *A look at derailment today: North America and Europe*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.
- McCrae, R.R., & Costa, P.T. (1987) Validation of the five-factor model of personality across Instruments and observers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *52*, 81-90.
- Raskin, R.N., & Hall, C. S., (1979). A narcissistic personality inventory. *Psychological Reports*, *45*, 590.
- McKay, D.A., & Tokar, D.M., (2012), The HEXACO and five-factor models of personality in relation to RIASEC vocational interests. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *81* 138-149.

- Silverman, S. (n.d.). The University of Akron: Summit College News. *The University of Akron: UA Home*. Retrieved November 2, 2012, from <http://www.uakron.edu/summitcollege/news-and-events/news-detail.dot?newsId=04c167e1-09af-44ea-a365-87927c3de0c0&pageTitle=Recent%20Headlines&crumbTitle=Identifying%20the%20arrogant%20boss>
- Silverman, S. B., Johnson, R. E., McConnell, N., & Carr, A. (2012). Formula for Leadership Failure. *The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist*, 50(1), 21-37.
- 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, NY.
- Silvia, P.J., Kaufman, J.C., Reiter-Palmon, R. & Wigert, B. (2011). Cantankerous creativity: Honesty-Humility, Agreeableness, and the HEXACO structure of creative achievement. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 51, 687-689.