Preface

Arrogance is defined as that species of pride which consists in exorbitant claims of rank, dignity, estimation or power or which exalts the worth or importance of the person to an undue degree. Arrogance is engaging in behaviors intended to exaggerate a person's sense of superiority by disparaging others (Johnson et al., 2010).

Through actions associated with this inflated sense of entitlement and superiority, arrogant employees often impede effective organizational functioning (Johnson et al., 2010). Arrogant managers are therefore more likely to pursue failing courses of action that could otherwise have been prevented. Arrogant behavior can be an especially challenging problem to deal with due to the fact that arrogant individuals consider their own behavior acceptable and thus do not monitor their own actions when interacting with others.

A 2007 landmark study by the University of Akron investigated arrogance and its implications to an organization's morale and bottom line. According to the researchers, accounts of arrogant employees abound, but evidence is predominantly anecdotal and that there is little systematic research on arrogance within organizations, and sparse empirical data that verify the alleged negative relationship between arrogance and performance. The researchers developed the Workplace Arrogance Scale (WARS) to help obtain empirical data.

Among other things, Silverman et al. (2007) found empirical evidence to support the claim that the more arrogant a person is, the more self-centered and the less agreeable he is likely to be. Likewise, in another portion of the study which involved a 360-degree performance feedback survey, arrogance was shown to be negatively related to performance and cognitive ability. Competitive advantage might be gained by providing disincentives for arrogant behavior while providing for positive reinforcements for positive behaviors like humility.

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.

Hence, despite the importance of understanding arrogant behavior at work and the exploration of the relationship between workplace arrogance and organizational performance, 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).

The purpose of this book is to generate a collection of papers contributing to cope with the shortage of the academic research related to the concept of "workplace arrogance" in the field of strategic management. It focuses on the relationship between workplace arrogance and organizational effectiveness. Hence, some correspondences were developed between the former and some managerial concepts, namely: job performance, job satisfaction and organizational performance. This book bridges research in, and the practice, of workplace arrogance.

This book presents a collection of six chapters that address key themes, topics and approaches for managers, academics, and students: workplace arrogance, self-esteem, self-confidence, hubris, vanity, narcissism, job performance, job satisfaction, organizational performance, strategic scope, competence, among others.

Chapter 1, "Workplace Arrogance and Organizational Performance," aims to cope with the research scarcity on workplace arrogance and in order to explore and explain the relationship between workplace arrogance and organizational performance, the authors have made a focus on a various concepts: arrogance and its correlates, its relationship with firms' competitive advantage, strategic dynamism, strategic choices and company performance; arrogance selling, arrogance in advertising or brand arrogance and their implications on purchase intentions. Moreover, they have undertaken an empirical study to explore this relationship. The findings of this research were unexpected and first time discovered, such as the study of the dimensionality of the workplace arrogance.

Chapter 2, "Workplace Arrogance and Its Impact on the Organizational Performance in the Hospitality Industry," aims to test empirically the fundamental hypothesis highlighting the relationship between "workplace arrogance" and "organizational performance". The results of this study undertaken in the Tunisian hotel industry validate two hypotheses out of thirty

and reach crucial findings: (1) workplace arrogance is a multidimensional variable (6 dimensions) and its dimensions are unidimensional; (2) workplace arrogance has a significant and negative impact on organizational performance measured by two dimensions: the customer satisfaction and the quality of service; and (3) workplace arrogance has a significant and positive impact on organizational performance measured by two dimensions: quality of service and financial performance. These findings could be considered as a theoretical contribution never been discovered before.

Chapter 3, "Workplace Arrogance and Job Satisfaction," aims to cope with the inadequacy of studies related to the job satisfaction and its relationship with workplace arrogance. This chapter consists of three main parts: the first deals with this notion of "job satisfaction". The second part focuses on the factors explaining job satisfaction with a focus on an empirical study entitled "Job satisfaction of operational employees in the tourism and hospitality sector in Tunisia". In fact, this study aims to enrich the literature by overcoming the deficit of international and Tunisian research on factors explaining the job satisfaction of the operational employees belonging to the tourism and hospitality industry. The results of this research provide the eight factors explaining the job satisfaction of employees belonging to this sector which are divided into factors of hygiene (pay and remuneration, social benefits, supervision, colleagues, equity) and motor factors (promotion, training, working environment). In addition, the results of this research demonstrate that (1) these factors explaining job satisfaction affect different groups of employees in different ways that the cluster analysis allowed them to extract. And that (2) these groups are distributed in a quasi-equal way in terms of demographic characteristics (age, gender, position held, etc.) contrary to the results of the majority of the research carried out in this field. Thus, these factors do not play an explanatory role for the differential of hotel staff satisfaction. Finally, the third part will focus on the relationship between job satisfaction and workplace arrogance based on the concept of self-esteem.

Chapter 4, "Workplace Arrogance and Job Performance," aims to cope with the scarcity of studies related to the job performance and its relationship with workplace arrogance. It consists of five main parts: the first deals with this notion of "job performance as a dynamic concept". The second part depicts the models of job performance by presenting the two main and the most known job performance models: (1) the Campbell et al.'s (1993) model and (2) the Borman and Motowidlo (1993) model. The third part deals with the predictors (antecedents or determinants) of job performance with a focus on an empirical study entitled "Job performance of nurses in hospitality

sector in Qatar". In fact, this study aims to deepen our knowledge on the nurses` job performance in a particular environment: the gulf region and precisely in Aspetar, a multicultural hospital. It aims to explore the nursing job performance at Aspetar by studying its dimensionality by using the Schwirian Six Dimension Scale of Nursing Performance (Schwirian 1978). Finally, the fourth part will focus on the relationship between job performance and workplace arrogance.

Chapter 5, "How Do Competences Valorize Strategic Scope Dimensions?" deals with the concept of the competence as a main dimension of the organizational effectiveness and with its mysterious relation with the concept of the arrogance. In fact, competences are considered as a main driver of any company that drives it towards competitiveness but its definition remains very large to the extent that we mixed it with the concept of the arrogance. In order to explore the relationship between competence and arrogance, the authors attempted to answer the following question: how do competences valorize strategic scope dimensions? In fact, they tried to view empirically how the competences can impact the strategic scope dimensions of any business which are: Research and Development, Market and Resources.

Chapter 6, "Case Study: A Young Entrepreneur Agronomist Between Arrogance and Competence," is a pedagogical case addressed to students who would be entrepreneurs and studying in business administration and wishing to create their own projects It explores the relationship between competence and arrogance based on real facts that a young ergonomist entrepreneur was confronted with. In fact, the main question that the authors asked in this case: do we think that all these competences that entrepreneur should acquire cannot be done comparatively to his old age? In the reality, entrepreneur need only "over trust" and strong personality, an arrogance that permits to him to live more experience and then acquire expertise. This chapter is in the continuity of the previous. It offers to the reader a different perspective in order to investigate this ambiguous relationship between arrogance and competence in the field of entrepreneurship.

Khaled Tamzini
University of Sousse, Tunisia

Tahar Lazhar Ayed
Umm Al-Qura University, Saudi Arabia

REFERENCES

Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Expanding the Criterion Domain to Include Elements of Contextual Performance. In N. Schmitt & W. Borman (Eds.), *Personnel Selection in Organizations* (pp. 71–98). New York: Jossey-Bass.

Campbell, J. P., McCloy, R. A., Oppler, S. H., & Sager, C. E. (1993). A theory of performance. In C. W. Schmitt & W. C. A. Borman (Eds.), *Personnel Selection in Organizations* (pp. 35–70). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Day, D., & Silverman, S. (1989). Personality and job performance: Evidence of incremental validity. *Personnel Psychology*, *42*(1), 25–36. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.1989.tb01549.x

Johnson, R. E., Silverman, S. B., Shyamsunder, A., Yao. Swee, H., Rodopman, O. B., Cho, E., & Bauer, J. (2010). Acting Superior But Actually Inferior?: Correlates and Consequences of Workplace Arrogance. *Human Performance*, *23*(5), 403–427. doi:10.1080/08959285.2010.515279

Jones, J. (2016). *How Do Confidence and Arrogance Work in the Workplace? Organizational and Employee Development*. Society for Human Resource Management. Retrieved from https://www.shrm.org/resourcesandtools/hr-topics/organizational-and-employee-development/pages/how-do-confidence-and-arrogance-work-in-the-workplace.aspx

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

Meyer, G., Brünig, B., & Nyhuis, P. (2015). Employee competences in manufacturing companies – an expert survey. *Journal of Management Development*, *34*(8), 1004–1018. doi:10.1108/JMD-06-2014-0056

Padua, R. N., Lerin, M. M., Tumapon, T. T., & Pañares, Z. A. (2010). Patterns and Dynamics of an Arrogance-Competence Theory in Organizations. *Liceo Journal of Higher Education Research Cutting Edge Research*, *6*(2), 2094–1064.

Schwirian, P. (1978). Evaluating the performance of nurses: A multidimensional approach. *Nursing Research*, *27*(6), 347–351. doi:10.1097/00006199-197811000-00004 PMID:251246