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SUMMARY

A multimethod study was conducted to provide greater conceptual clarity around the construct of organizational pride (i.e., an employee’s pride in the organization for which he or she works). Study 1 investigated the nature, emergence, and role of organizational pride in the workplace. Thirty semi-structured interviews were conducted among employees across four industries (advertising/marketing; financial services; food & beverage; healthcare). Analysis of these interviews revealed the distinct affective nature of organizational pride, how employees come to experience it, and its influence on employees’ attitudes and behaviors.

Study 2 was designed to develop a psychometrically valid measure of organizational pride. This study, which included data from four samples of working adults, provided empirical support for a new nine item, three-dimensional measure of organizational pride. The measure demonstrated strong reliability at the global construct and dimension level and confirmatory factor analysis validated the construct’s higher-order and three-factor structure. This study also provided evidence of construct distinctiveness from affective commitment and organizational identification. In terms of incremental validity, the new measure of organizational pride explained variance in key employee attitudes and behaviors when controlling for Blader and Tyler’s (2009) measure of pride. While the study design did not allow for casual interpretations, the results suggest that organizational pride influences employees’ engagement at work, their extra-role performance, as well as their intentions to remain with their organization. Overall, this research was designed to advance our understanding of organizational pride and lay the foundation for future research.
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

“…for me, it’s a very emotional thing. I think if you are proud you feel very strong emotions. You could be proud and it could make you really happy but it could bring you to tears...I think it means you really care about something. It’s probably a very powerful motivating force for people at work...” [Qualitative interview, 2015]

Observation of the world around us reveals great variation in the extent to which employees are proud of the companies or organizations for which they work. Most often, fostering pride is deemed a positive employment practice. The Great Place to Work Institute, widely known for developing the annual lists of “Best Companies to Work For,” even notes pride as one of the three components needed to create a great workplace (Great Place to Work Institute, 2015). Yet, it is not just the intensity with which employees feel proud of their organization that warrants our attention. The nature or content of employees’ pride in their organizations as well as the conditions under which these feelings arise is also worthy of consideration. Such distinctions in organizationally-directed pride may enhance the well-being of, or, conversely, generate distress for organizations’ internal (i.e., employees) and external stakeholders (e.g., customers). At its best, pride may influence positive organizational outcomes such as increased employee loyalty, helping behavior, or customer service (e.g., Blader & Tyler, 2009; Gouthier & Rhein, 2011; Michie, 2009); at its worst, it may lead to employees’ mistreatment of stakeholders or engagement in illegal activities (see Mishina, Dykes, Block, & Pollock, 2010; Smith-Crowe & Warren, 2014). To address such issues, I investigated the phenomenon of organizational pride (i.e., an employee’s pride in his or her company or organization) in the workplace. Specifically, this research was designed to explore the nature, emergence, and function of organizational pride as well as develop a new psychometrically valid measure of the construct.
Pride is one of the most powerful psychological forces that humans can experience (Fischer & Tangney, 1995). Along with shame, guilt, and embarrassment, it is situated within a “special class of emotions” (Tangney & Tracy, 2011: 447) that is intimately tied to issues of self and identity and fundamental to individuals’ psychological functioning (Tracy & Robins, 2004; Tracy & Robins, 2007a). While extant research is largely focused on individuals’ feelings of pride that result from their own actions, as social creatures who maintain social identities, we can also experience pride as a result of others’ actions (e.g., family members, those of the same gender or race, etc.) (Lickel, Schmader, & Spanovic, 2007). When thinking about pride within the context of the workplace, employees can feel pride in their own accomplishments and also those of their company or organization. Yet, with few exceptions (Blader & Tyler, 2009; Brickson & Akinlade, 2015a; Cable & Turban, 2003; Gouthier & Rhein, 2011), employees’ pride in their organizations has rarely been examined as a distinct phenomenon within the realm of management studies. Rather, it has been captured as part of more widely studied constructs such as affective commitment (e.g., Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979- “I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization”) or organizational identification (e.g., Rotondi, 1975-“I take pride in being a part of this organization”). By not fully recognizing organizational pride as a distinct construct, we may be failing to understand the breadth and depth of employees’ affect in the workplace and, importantly, the influence of these reactions on their thoughts and behaviors.

While scant attention has been paid to employees’ pride, the time is ripe to rigorously investigate this emotional experience. Broadly, there is a growing sense of urgency to examine the prominent role of emotions in the workplace as “our theories of management still largely adopt a cold, rational perspective that fails to integrate the full nature of human thinking, feeling, and behaving” (Ashkanasy, Humphrey, & Huy, 2014: 1; see also Barsade, Brief, Spataro, &
Greenberg, 2003; Elfenbein, 2007). Accordingly, there are considerable theoretical and empirical strides—including a more precise focus on discrete emotions (Weiss & Beal, 2005; Weiss, Suckow, & Cropanzano, 1999)—that need to be taken to more fully understand the potentially profound influence of emotions on employees’ actions, behaviors, and decision-making processes. With regard to advancing our understanding of pride specifically, there is a great opportunity to build on an emerging and compelling stream of social psychological research on self-referent pride (i.e., pride in one’s self) (e.g., Carver, Sinclair, & Johnson, 2010; Wubben, DeCremer, & vanDijk, 2012). This work reveals the complex and multidimensional nature of pride (e.g., Tracy & Robins, 2007b; 2007c), its strong motivational properties (Williams & DeSteno, 2008), and the role of identity in eliciting self-conscious emotions (e.g., Tracy & Robins, 2004). Despite the richness of this body of research, examinations of organizational pride have yet to apply these affective and identity-based lenses.

This dissertation entailed a multimethod examination of organizational pride. Such a design enabled the examination of organizational pride “from multiple perspectives” and also enhanced my understanding of the construct “by allowing for new or deeper dimensions to emerge” (Jick, 1979: 603). Multimethod research also helps to generate both convergence and divergence, which challenged me think about the construct in new and insightful ways (Brewer & Hunter, 2006). In Study 1, I investigated the nature, emergence, and role of organizational pride in the workplace. Taking an inductive approach, I sought out employees’ narratives or rich descriptions of times when they were proud of their organizations. These interviews generated insight into the distinct affective nature of organizational pride, the different ways in which employees come to experience it, and its influence on employees’ attitudes and behaviors. This
qualitative study also, importantly, laid the foundation for a scale development study (Study 2) that resulted in a psychometrically sound measure of organizational pride.

Overall, this research was conducted to provide greater conceptual clarity around the construct of organizational pride. In doing so, I aspire to offer a more holistic understanding of what it means to be proud of one’s company or organization and encourage scholars and practitioners alike to more seriously consider issues of pride when exploring and addressing key organizational challenges. With a richer understanding of organizational pride emerging from the qualitative study coupled with the measure developed in the quantitative study, I hope to cultivate greater interest in the inclusion of organizational pride in future research.
CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Advancing our knowledge of employees’ pride in the organizations for which they work requires an understanding of the nature of emotions, generally, and self-conscious emotions, specifically. This chapter begins with a brief review of current conceptualizations of emotions, including how they are distinct from attitudes and their impact on employees’ thoughts and behaviors. I then detail pride as a self-conscious or identity-relevant emotion (Lewis, 2000; Tangney & Tracy, 2011) and discuss the intersection between emotions and identity theory. Lastly, I address emerging research related to targets of pride other than one’s self.

2.1 Defining Emotions

Acknowledging the influential role of emotions in organizational life, scholars’ attention to the subject has enjoyed great momentum over the past 20 years. And, there is much to explore as the “experience of work is saturated with emotion” (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1995: 97). Empirical evidence supports the notion that employees can experience a wide range of positive and negative emotions—such as happiness, pride, fear, and anger—while engaging in and with their organization (Ashkansay, 2003; Basch & Fisher, 1998; Fitness, 2000; Kish-Gephart, Detert, Trevino, & Edmondson, 2009). These emotional experiences can greatly shape employees’ behaviors at work including in-role and extra-role performance, creativity, and the ways in which they engage with others (Barsade & Gibson, 2007).

Traditionally, emotions are defined as discrete and intense feelings that are experienced for a limited amount of time (Frijda, 1996). In this sense, emotions have beginnings and endings (Weiss & Beal, 2005). The fleeting or transient nature of emotions is due to the fact that, in comparison to affect and moods, emotions are reactions to particular stimuli (Brief & Weiss, 2002). Emotional experiences result from an individual’s exposure to and registration of specific
events or occurrences (Elfenbein, 2007). When studying emotions in the workplace, scholars most often draw upon affective events theory (AET) (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). At the core of this theory is that discrete events are central to the emergence of emotional reactions (Weiss & Beal, 2005). In the context of the workplace, such events might include a performance review, layoffs, or a new client acquisition. Of note, this theory does not identify or predict which particular emotions employees will experience as a result of particular events. Rather, AET addresses employees’ emotional reactions in the workplace (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996) and has been used to explain the connection between employees’ “post-emotional responses” including attitudes, thoughts, behaviors, and physical expressions (Elfenbein, 2007: 318; e.g., Rupp & Spencer, 2006; Todorova, Bear, & Weingart, 2014; Yang & Diefendorff, 2009). Overall, AET emphasizes the dynamic nature of emotions and their influential role in the workplace.

This growing body of literature also demonstrates the strong motivational properties of emotions. Put simply, “Emotions are meant to move us.” (Elfenbein, 2007: 346; see also Williams & DeSteno, 2008). On the one hand, emotions can encourage employees to think and act in fresh and possibly more meaningful ways. Frederickson’s broaden and build theory (2001) explains that positive emotions can broaden employees’ thinking and lead to more creative approaches to doing work. Similarly, positive emotional experiences can lead to the processing of information in new and different ways (Forgas, 2003). They can also generate positive interactions with others such as leaders, colleagues, or even customers (see Barsade & Gibson, 2007 for review; e.g., Pugh, 2001). On the other hand, the intensity with which arguably more negative emotions are experienced can lead employees to go “out of control” (Loewenstein, 1996). Yet, we should not assume that feeling good (i.e., positive emotions) leads only to good behaviors and feeling bad (i.e., negative emotions) dictates only bad actions;
instead, a nuanced lens is needed to identify the full range of outcomes associated with distinct emotional experiences (Elfenbein, 2007).

2.2 Pride as a Self-Conscious Emotion

As a self-conscious emotion, pride (along with guilt, shame, and embarrassment) is distinct from basic emotions (e.g., joy, sadness, anger) in a number of ways (Tracy & Robins, 2004). Pride is cognitively complex, requiring self-evaluation and the ability to tap into actual and ideal personal, relational, and collective self-representations (Brewer & Gardner, 1996; Tracy & Robins, 2004). Because of the required awareness of self-representations, feelings of pride (along with other self-conscious emotions) are unique to humans and develop later in childhood (vs. basic emotions) (Lewis, 2000). Tracy and Robins (2004; 2007a) explain that individuals experience pride when they evaluate a positive event as relevant to their identity and identity-based goals.

In terms of their function, self-conscious emotions serve both intrapsychic and interpersonal functions (Tracy & Robins, 2004). Internally, pride has the power to strengthen one’s sense of self-worth. Tracy, Shariff, and Cheng state, “there is no other emotion that not only makes individuals feel good, but makes them feel good about themselves” (2010: 168). Interpersonally, pride, enables the attainment of complex social goals (Tracy & Robins, 2004) — particularly thoughts, feelings, and behaviors directed toward the enhancement of social status (Cheng, Tracy, & Henrich, 2010; Martens, Tracy, & Shariff, 2012; see Tyler & Blader, 2003). Expressions of pride signal to others that an individual deserves higher status in a social hierarchy (Oveis, Horberg, & Kelner, 2010; Williams & DeSteno, 2008). This newly achieved status within society enhances one’s self-esteem (Tangney & Tracy, 2011) and reinforces the
2.3 Emotions and Identity Theory

There is also much to be learned by considering emotions, broadly, and pride, specifically, in the context of identity theory. Scholars from a sociological tradition suggest that emotions are highly intersected, and perhaps even reciprocal, with one’s sense of self or identity (Stets & Trettevik, 2014; Stryker, 2004). From the social interactionist perspective, identity refers to the “meanings that persons attach to the multiple roles they typically play in highly differentiated contemporary societies” (Stryker & Burke, 2000: 284). These roles are accompanied by a set of perceived role expectations (Stryker & Burke, 2000) and emotions are the result of meeting (or not) these expectations (Stets & Trettevik, 2014; Stryker, 2004). When role expectations are met and one’s identity is verified, he or she will experience positive emotions; in the absence of these events, negative feelings will ensue (Stets & Trettevik, 2014). And, the degree to which these expectations are met can shape the intensity of one’s emotional reaction (Stryker, 2004). Stets and Trettevik (2014) explain that emotional responses are the product of how we think others see us and whether we believe others see us as living up to our identity claims (Burke & Stets, 2009). They also acknowledge that this idea dates back to Cooley’s work (1902) on the “looking glass self,” which suggests that pride can be a reaction to others’ evaluations. As an example, in the context of the workplace, an employee may feel proud when receiving a performance review from a supervisor depending upon how the content of the feedback aligns with the employee’s understanding of his or herself and associated role expectations.

Additionally, when positive emotions are elicited as a result of identity verification, individuals are likely to proceed in the same path that got them there in hopes that the same
result will occur (Stets & Trettevik, 2014). Stets and Trettevik (2014), however, warn that positive emotional experiences via identity verification can also lead to “selective interpretation” where individuals narrow the scope of their attention to only stimuli that reinforce their sense of self, and, consequently, continue to elicit positive emotions (Forgas, 1995). Similarly, when one feels good (i.e., has a positive emotional experience) as a result of achieving perceived role expectations, this identity is likely to become more salient and lead one to engage with others who share and reinforce this same identity (Stets & Trettevik, 2014; Stryker, 2004).

2.4 Beyond Self-Referent Pride

Going beyond self-referent pride, a more recent stream of research calls attention to “group-conscious emotions” whereby pride can be elicited in response to the actions of those around us (i.e., other group members) (Lickel et al., 2007; Lickel, Steele, & Schmader, 2011). This body of work is grounded in two central ideas—(1) individuals can possess shared identities with members of the groups or larger collectives with which they affiliate; (2) individuals can maintain a strong sense of interpersonal interdependence and shared goals with close others (Lickel et al., 2007). Individuals do not (or rarely) experience life in isolation or in the absence of social contact; rather, in addition to personal identities, we also maintain social or collective identities that shape our goals and actions (Brewer & Gardner, 1996; Tajfel, 1978). Based upon this understanding of the social nature of individuals’ interactions, one may deem others’ actions as salient to their own sense of self, triggering an evaluation of identity-goal relevance and congruence (Tracy & Robins, 2007a; see Williams & DeSteno, 2008). Put simply, one can feel pride for “who I am” as well as for “who we are.” Additionally, the extent to which individuals identify with a group or collective shapes the way in which others’ actions are interpreted (i.e., as
relevant to their identity or not) and the intensity with which pride is experienced (Lickel et al., 2007; Blader & Tyler, 2009).

The spirit of Tyler and Blader’s work on pride (e.g., Blader & Tyler, 2009; Tyler & Blader, 2002; Tyler & Blader, 2003) also taps into this idea. Most notably, in their group engagement model, pride is viewed as an evaluative component of social identity along with respect (Blader & Tyler, 2009). It is considered a reflection of one’s categorical self and assessment of group membership (Tyler & Blader, 2003). Specifically, they argue that pride in one’s group membership (e.g., work team) has implications for cooperation and engagement in group-oriented behavior (e.g., citizenship). In this same vein, Boezeman and Ellemers (2007) revealed a positive relationship between pride in group membership and organizational commitment and cooperation among a sample of non-profit volunteers. Additionally, scholars have examined anticipated pride of group membership on organizational attractiveness. For example, Jones, Willness, and Madey (2014) revealed that potential employees’ anticipated pride helped to explain the positive relationship between organizational corporate social performance and their attractiveness to job seekers.

Lastly, Brickson and Akinlade (2015a) bring attention to organizationally-directed pride. Their work reveals that pride is a type of value that organizations create for their internal stakeholders (e.g., employees) and also examine role of organizational identity its emergence. Based on a multiple case study analysis, they find that psychological esteem defined as “the subjective appraisal of being deemed socially worthy and appropriate” is a vital currency along with material and physical currencies that members can derive from membership (2015a: 3). Organizational pride is one of four states of psychological esteem and conceptualized as “esteem granted by stakeholders to the organization as a social actor” (2015a: 3). More recently, their
ongoing research (2015b) reveals that organizational pride was generated when internal and external organizational routines affirmed the organization’s identity by showing members and outsiders that it was who it claimed to be—that it was living up to role expectations.

2.5 Content of Pride

With regard to the content of pride, Tracy and Robbins (2007c) argue that there are two distinct facets—authentic and hubristic. While both facets act as strong motivating forces, Tracy and colleagues explain that they emerge from unique attributions of success and are associated with varying degrees of self-worth and self-esteem (Tracy, Cheng, Robins, & Trzesniewski, 2009). Authentic pride is elicited when one internally attributes an event to effort or other unstable, specific, and controllable causes and reflects individuals’ confidence, humility, and sense of accomplishment (e.g., “I am proud to win this award because it required a lot of hard work and dedication”) (Cheng et al., 2010; Tracy & Robins, 2007c). In comparison, hubristic pride is elicited when one internally attributes an event to ability or other stable, global, or uncontrollable causes and reveals individuals’ arrogance, feelings of superiority over competitors, and a sense of egotism (e.g., “I am proud to win this award because it shows others that I am the best”) (Cheng et al., 2010; Tracy & Robins, 2007c). This two-faceted conceptualization of pride, however, has arisen with some speculation. Holbrook, Piazza, and Fessler (2014) question the theoretical and empirical distinction between authentic and hubristic pride, suggesting that future research needs to reconsider existing measurements of pride as well as explore other potential dividing aspects.

Additionally, Brickson and Akinlade (2015a; 2015b) argue that the content of members’ pride is a function of an organization’s context, specifically that of the organization’s identity orientation. Their emerging research reveals that when the organization’s identity emphasized
being different/better than others (individualistic identity orientation), members experienced pride in its status; when it emphasized dyadic connections (relational identity orientation), they experienced pride in its relational qualities (e.g., being caring); and when it emphasized the organization’s members in a broader group such as the community (collectivistic identity orientation), members experienced organizational pride in the organization’s ideological purpose (e.g., helping out) (Brickson & Akinlade, 2015b).

Taken together, this body of research reveals the potentially profound influence of pride in the workplace. It also supports the notion that employees can experience pride as a result of not only their own actions but also the actions of the groups and organizations to which they belong. Yet, the opportunity remains to bring greater definitional clarity to organizational pride as the construct has been treated as an emotion (e.g., Lickel et al., 2007), cognitive evaluation (Blader & Tyler, 2009), and sense of esteem (Brickson & Akinlade, 2015a; 2015b). Furthermore, research is warranted to identify the different ways in which it emerges and its influence on employees’ attitudes, motivations, and behaviors.
CHAPTER 3. STUDY 1: QUALITATIVE EXAMINATION OF ORGANIZATIONAL PRIDE

I conducted an inductive grounded-theory study to explore the nature, emergence, and function of organizational pride in the workplace. The following chapter details the research questions, methods, results, and discussion of Study 1.

3.1 Research Questions

In considering the limited body of knowledge on organizational pride, this first study was designed to explore employees’ pride in the companies or organizations for which they work and the meanings they attach to these emotional experiences. In the spirit of inductive qualitative research, this study was guided by three overarching research questions (Gioia, Corley, & Hamilton, 2013): (1) What is the nature of organizational pride? (2) How does organizational pride emerge? (3) What outcomes are associated with organizational pride?

With regard to the first question, I sought to offer greater conceptual clarity around the nature—namely the structure and content—of organizational pride. This involves advancing our understanding of the affective structure of the construct as existing studies addressing pride within management studies have predominantly treated it as a cognitive assessment of group status (e.g., Blader & Tyler, 2009), deemphasizing its affective properties. This study was also designed to build on emerging research that provides reason to explore what lies beneath the word “proud” (e.g., Brickson & Akinlade, 2015a; Tracy & Robins, 2007c; Tracy et al., 2009) and explored the content and multidimensional properties of organizational pride. Second, this investigation delved into how individuals come to experience pride in the organizations for which they work. Third, this study identified the various outcomes associated with employees’ pride in their organizations. This included outlining the spectrum of outcomes associated with
the emotion (Tangney & Tracy, 2011). I also examined the impact of organizational pride on employees’ attitudes and actions toward multiple groups and stakeholders including their company overall, co-workers, customers/clients, and competitors. Of note, given the qualitative nature of this study, the intent was not to report the magnitude or frequency of these antecedents or outcomes. Rather, this research was designed to help uncover pieces of the conceptual puzzle that is organizational pride.

3.1.1 Defining Organizational Pride

For purposes of this first research study, I defined organizational pride as a pleasurable self-conscious emotion reflecting an employee’s understanding of his or her organization as socially valued (see Mascolo & Fischer, 1995; Tracy & Robins, 2007a). This conceptualization of organizational pride is rooted in existing literature and comprised of three definitional components. First, as an emotion, organizational pride is generated in reaction to a specific organizational event and begins as a “discrete and intense” momentary experience (Elfenbein, 2007: 317). At the same time, while conducting this research, I remained open to the idea that individuals may eventually come to experience organizational pride as an affective state or disposition. Second, while feelings of pride in the workplace may be targeted at different actors (e.g., self, supervisor, colleagues), I focused on employees’ pride in the company or organization for which they work. Third, research on self-referent pride (i.e., pride in one’s self) has traditionally emphasized the acknowledgement of positive or “socially valued” (Mascolo & Fischer, 1995: 66; Dutton, Dukerich, & Harquail, 1994) outcomes as central to the experience of pride (see Tracy & Robins, 2007a). From this perspective, organizational pride is an emotional response to a positive event (as perceived by the individual) that results in a pleasurable feeling for the individual (see Tracy & Robins, 2007a; 2007d). This definition of organizational pride
was developed to be narrow enough to offer guidance during this investigation but also purposefully broad to enable an open mind to emerging insights throughout the data collection and analysis (Locke, 2002). Allowing for openness during this study was of the utmost importance, as the primary goal was to bring greater understanding to the very definition of the construct—not simply test or reaffirm existing conceptualizations of pride.

### 3.2 Methods

A qualitative field design was executed to inductively examine the stated research questions. Qualitative research is particularly valuable when exploring new research questions, challenging existing perspectives, and/or aspiring for a deeper sense of intimacy with the phenomenon under investigation (Bansal & Corley, 2011). When qualitative research is rigorously designed and executed, it can generate the discovery of “new variables and relationships, to reveal and understand complex processes, and to illustrate the influence of the social context” (Shah & Corley, 2006: 1824). Specifically, I followed the grounded theory method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). While not appropriate for all qualitative investigations, this approach is beneficial when exploring meaning making and the subjective nature of actors’ experiences (Suddaby, 2006). Thus, given my interest to thoroughly examine organizational pride, as understood by those who have experienced it (rather than strictly adhering to an existing perspective or definition), an inductive qualitative study was most appropriate.

#### 3.2.1 Sample

**Purposeful sampling.** As a self-conscious emotion, pride is part of the human experience and should not be limited to particular jobs or industries (Tracy & Robins, 2007a). Accordingly, a broad, purposeful sampling strategy was used to maximize the likelihood of capturing a wide range of experiences of organizational pride (Marshall & Rossman, 1999). A
total of 30 interviews were conducted among adults employed full-time across the following four industries: (1) Advertising/Marketing (n=8); (2) Financial Services (n=8); (3) Healthcare (n=7); (4) Food & Beverage (n=7). These industries offered variety in occupational skills, tasks, wages, and social status as well as context in terms of the nature of social interactions with stakeholders inside (e.g., employees, executives) and outside (e.g., customers, partners, competitors) the organization.

Aligned with the principles of grounded theory, I also adhered to theoretical sampling. In this sense, sampling does not refer to the research respondents per se but instead incidents and events of interest with the goal being to “bring about the greatest theoretical return” (Strauss & Corbin, 1998: 202). To do so, I collected data where the phenomenon was taking place, analyzed the data concurrently, and went where the data directed (Locke, 2002). As part of this process, the interview protocol was frequently reevaluated to ensure that it was capturing insights most relevant to the phenomenon of interest. Additionally, data collection continued until the point of theoretical saturation—that is when no new information, dimensions or connections surfaced during the analysis and coding process and my codes were sufficiently developed (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). More specifically, upon completion of my 30 interviews, no unique insights continued to emerge that required the creation of new codes or challenged my understanding of the content or structure of organizational pride. By simultaneously pursuing a purposeful sample with a rich range of incidents, I hoped to “generate novel, theoretically grounded insights” (Margolis & Molinsky, 2008: 850) by enhancing my ability to compare, classify, and differentiate between incidents of pride (Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

**Recruitment.** I identified potential participants from a list of target organizations (developed by the primary investigator) that included a range of company types (e.g., size, profit-
structure) and job titles that represented various functions and status levels. From this list I invited them either via email or in person (using IRB approved recruitment materials) to participate. This recruiting effort was supplemented with a convenience sampling technique, which involved leveraging personal contacts to refer potential study respondents (see Ladge, Clair, & Greenberg, 2012 for example). See Table 1 for detail on participants’ demographic characteristics.

3.2.2 Data Collection

Data were collected via semi-structured interviews. This approach allowed for a deeper connection with the phenomenon of interest through sincere listening to respondents’ thoughts and stories, rather than forcing them to inappropriately fit their answers into a pre-determined list of statements (O’Connell Davidson & Layder, 1994). As the primary investigator, I personally conducted all of the interviews. Interviews were approximately 45-60 minutes in length and conducted in-person or via telephone. Upon participants’ consent, the interviews were digitally recorded and transcribed.

An interview protocol, consisting of both structured (i.e., consistent across interviews) and unstructured (i.e., customized for each interview) questions, guided the interviews. Structured questions played an important role in that they allowed for comparison across participant experiences (Kreiner, Hollensbe, & Sheep, 2006). For example, every participant was asked to recall and describe a time when they were proud of their company or organization. Complementing the structured questions, the unstructured component enabled the opportunity to
probe more deeply into specific issues and gain richer perspectives on each participant’s experiences (Kreiner et al., 2006; Vough, Cardador, Bednar, Dane, & Pratt, 2013). Of note, the interview protocol was not a script; instead, it guided the discussion. See Appendix A for detail on the interview protocol.

The interview protocol began with questions related to the participant’s history with his or her organization and daily job responsibilities. This line of questioning provided me an initial background of the participant’s work experience, helped the participant become comfortable answering questions, and built rapport with the participant. The interview then moved into a set of questions intended to tap into the nature of the organization, including the participant’s perceptions of his or her organization’s values, goals, identity (i.e., what is most distinct, central, and enduring to the organization) as well as the extent to which he or she identified with the organization. This line of questioning was included to examine extensions of the relationship between identity and pride targeted at one’s self (e.g., Stets & Trettevik, 2014; Stryker, 2004; Tracy & Robins, 2004) to organizationally-directed pride. The discussion then proceeded to focus more exclusively on the topic of pride. Of note, at no time during the interview did I define what it means to be proud; rather, I sought such definitions and meanings from the participants. Specially, they were asked to recall and describe in great detail pride-eliciting events (i.e., times when they were proud of their organization) to capture rich and “thick” descriptions or narratives of organizational pride (Geertz, 1973). This also included a series of questions designed to assess the impact of organizational pride on participants’ attitudes and actions toward their company, daily job, co-workers, customers/clients, and self. After discussing pride-eliciting events, participants were asked to discuss the ways, if any, in which their organization tries to foster a sense of pride among employees. The interview closed with an
opportunity for the participant to contemplate the potentially positive and negative consequences of such activities.

The effectiveness and clarity of the interview protocol were assessed and revised based on a series of pilot interviews (n=5). The data from the first two interviews were not included in the final sample or analysis. Rather, I used these interviews to try out my protocol questions; this allowed me to make revisions to the interview protocol to follow up on interesting leads and add, edit, or delete questions accordingly. Additionally, in the tradition of grounded theory research, data analysis occurred simultaneously with the data collection (see more detail in the Data Analysis section 3.3 below) (Locke, 2002; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). In doing so, I reevaluated the interview protocol throughout the data collection phase to ensure it appropriately addressed new theoretical issues of interest.

3.2.3 Ethical Treatment of Respondents

Interviews were conducted in accordance with IRB standards and were voluntary (UIC IRB Protocol #2014-1159). Participants were not provided a financial incentive to participate in the interview.

3.3 Data Analysis

I used the grounded theory method as the primary approach to analyze the interview data. When using grounded theory to analyze qualitative data, Charmaz explains that “…coding is the pivotal link between collecting data and developing an emergent theory to explain these data. Through coding, you define what is happening in the data and begin to grapple with what it means.” (2014: 113). Noted above, the data collection and data analysis processes occurred in tandem (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Beginning with the first interview, the data were initially coded using a close coding process that involved an intimate examination of the text (Charmaz,
By analyzing the data line by line, I developed a list of highly detailed codes that comprehensively captured participants’ attitudes, feelings, and actions. At this point in the analysis, the codes were not restricted to the phenomenon of organizational pride; rather, this list of more than 200 codes was exhaustive of all thoughts and topics discussed by participants. For example, these finer-grained codes captured thoughts and feelings involving one’s self (e.g., *being promoted, admitting when the job could be done better, working around the clock*), colleagues (e.g., *creating camaraderie, working with the best colleagues, colleagues feeling left out*), external stakeholders, (e.g., *empathizing with the client, welcoming customers, satisfying investors*) and the organization (e.g., *defending the organization, fulfilling the mission, trying to connect more with the organization*), and were often industry specific (e.g., *saving someone’s life, providing good food, or earning repeat business*). This process continued for the first eight interviews. At this point, I discussed the initial list of codes with a member of the dissertation committee and then developed a second set of more “focused” codes (Charmaz, 2014). This focused set of codes enabled me to narrow the analysis to answer my guiding research questions (Charmaz, 2014). To represent the structure of my data, I then grouped the focused codes into a set of higher order themes/aggregate dimensions (Gioia et al., 2013). For example, the focused codes of *organization as an entity, organization as its people,* and *organization as affiliation* were grouped together to form the higher order theme “conceptualizing the organization.” This data structure is displayed and discussed in detail in the results section of this chapter (see Section 3.4). While these steps are presented in a linear fashion, the process was highly iterative as I traveled back and forth between the interview data, existing theory, and new insights (Locke, 2002).
I also conducted a supplemental analysis of participants’ proud moments to uncover the process by which the emotional experience emerged (RQ2). First, I created a data file that contained participants’ characteristics (i.e., participant interview ID; industry; job title) and summarized the content of their proud moments (e.g., “We saved a patient’s life”; “Client published a positive online review”; “Company moved employee to a new role instead of laying him off”). This format allowed for the comparison of pride-related events within and between participants (and industries). Next, I analyzed these proud moments in conjunction with participants’ descriptions of the nature of their organization. Over the course of the interviews, it became apparent that there was a connection between the content of participants’ pride and their understanding of the organization’s goals, values, and identity (which is supported by literature on self-referent pride, see Tracy & Robins, 2004; Stryker, 2004). By adding this data to participants’ profiles, I was able to directly identify patterns in the data between participants’ moments of pride and their descriptions of their organizations’ goals, values, and identity.

Additionally, I engaged in analytical memoing to try to connect the study’s data with ideas and theory (Charmaz, 2014; Locke, 2002). Memoing helped stimulate ideas about how the conceptual categories related to one another (Locke, 2002). While memoing allowed for the free flow of ideas (Locke, 2002), I also tried to develop ideas that were “orderly, progressive, systematic, and easily retrievable” (Strauss & Corbin, 1998: 220). Memoing began during the initial stages of data analysis and progressed through development of theoretical framework, with the memos becoming more defined and complex over time (Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

Lastly, I took a number of steps to help ensure the study met the field’s expectations for methodological rigor. First, I maintained an audit trail of my data consisting of interview transcriptions, documentary evidence, and analytical memos. All data were managed using a
qualitative data analysis software, NVivo. Second, “rich descriptions of the findings” (e.g.,
textual quotes, detailed codes) are presented throughout the Results (see Section 3.4) to provide
transparency (Bansal & Corley, 2011). Third, upon completion of the independent coding
process, secondary coding occurred (see Hollensbe, Khazanchi, & Masterson, 2008; Kreiner,
Hollensbe, & Sheep, 2009). Two doctoral students (unpaid, who were not involved in the study)
were provided with four interview excerpts and a detailed code dictionary (of note, these
passages were selected as they represented a wide range of codes). Using the pre-defined list of
codes (i.e., code dictionary), each coder independently assigned codes to the appropriate text. I
then analyzed their codes to assess agreement (or disagreement) with my original codes as well
as to identify additional codes that were assigned (beyond my original coding). Based on these
results, any disagreements were discussed in detail and resolved with the independent coder.

3.4 Results

The results of Study 1 are organized around the three overarching research questions: (1)
*What is the nature of organizational pride?* (2) *How does organizational pride emerge?* (3) *What
outcomes are associated with organizational pride?*

3.4.1 Nature of Organizational Pride

Several key themes emerged that relate to the structure and content of organizational
pride. Figure 1 displays the data structure that resulted from the grounded theory analysis
process described above. Specifically, this figure describes the content of the first-order codes
that surfaced from a close analysis of the interview text, the second order themes used to group
the first order codes, and the aggregate concepts designed to encapsulate these themes (Gioia et
al., 2013). Of note, these themes should not be interpreted as distinct construct dimensions;
rather, these themes are designed to describe different aspects of the affective structure and content of organizational pride.

Distinct Emotional Experience. The data from the qualitative interviews confirmed that organizational pride is a pleasurable emotion that is distinct from simply “feeling good” at work (Tracy & Robins, 2007d). First, in considering the affective structure of the construct, participants most often described feelings of organizational pride as intense and limited in duration, aligning with traditional understandings of discrete emotions (Elfenbein, 2007). This is likely because these feelings were indeed tied to specific events that come and go in the minds of employees (see Tracy & Robins, 2004). When describing a new business pitch win, a woman working at a marketing agency described the pride she experienced as a “short shot in the arm.” She went on further to elaborate on the fluctuations in her feelings:

“It's funny. I'm just now in the last 48 hours coming off of a huge win that was a huge deal. So, right now I'm totally high on the firm, right? I think it's great. But, if we had talked six months ago, I would have probably given you an earful about how miserable it was. And, so I think that ebbs and flows and I think that's pretty common. I think my colleagues would agree. One minute you're on, then the next you go through a lull if you're disgusted with the place. And, thank God something then comes around and turns you back into a fan.” [#18- Advertising/Female]

At the same time, there may also be a recall effect that can retrigger these feelings. As an example, a participant explained:

“When we get a new customer or someone who has been in a couple of times they will ask how long we’ve been there and I say “we just celebrated our 10th anniversary”; so, I think about it then. I think about it now and then but there is always something new to think about at work.” [#6-Food/Male]
Second, participants universally discussed their experiences of organizational pride with a positive tone. The language that they used conveyed a sense of fondness around their pride-eliciting events. Descriptions of organizational pride were often accompanied by other positive emotions such as happiness, excitement, and joy; however, when participants were asked to differentiate between pride and happiness, key distinctions emerged. Feeling *proud of* versus *happy for* one’s organization included performing at a high level/producing high quality work, the desire to engage others (i.e., tell others about the event), and recognition or validation from others (e.g., customers, family and friends). In this sense, pride in one’s organization is distinct from happiness in that it involves employees’ understanding of their organization as one that creates value and that others acknowledge this value (see Mascolo & Fisher, 1995). In trying to articulate the difference between the two emotions, a healthcare employee stated:

“If I’m happy, it might be because it was an easy day and nothing really eventful happened. But, if I’m proud it’s probably a lot of hard work and I accomplished something that either I hadn’t done before or just did a very good job at my job that day.” [#3-Health/Female]

Regarding telling others, an employee in the financial services sector explained:

“I feel like when I’m happy with what the team does, I will tell the team. I will express that to the team and let them know that I thought they did something good or well. But, when I am proud of what my team does I make sure I tell other people the great thing that they did.” [#2-Finance/Male]

And, emphasizing recognition from others, one participant stated:

“Pride is the vain part of happiness…I don’t think of pride as inherently bad but when trying to separate it from happiness it involves soaking up that someone else has noticed. When you do something that you think is good and other people see as good. [#6-Food/Male]
Taken together, the interview data support treatment of organizational pride as a distinct affective construct. It is a pleasurable emotional experience that goes beyond simply “feeling good” (i.e., positive affect) and is also unique from other positive discrete emotions such as happiness (see Brown & Marshall, 2001).

**Conceptualizing the Organization.** When participants described moments in which they were proud of their company or organization, their understandings of the organization were not limited to it as an entity in and of itself. Rather, many articulated their feelings in terms of being proud of the organization’s members (e.g., employees as a whole)—who were understood to be the very definition of the organization. Pride in the organization also equated to pride in one’s affiliation (e.g., employment) (akin to Blader & Tyler, 2009; Tyler & Blader, 2002). In this sense, “I am proud of my company,” “I am proud of my company’s employees” and “I am proud to work for my company” were all part of organizational pride. As an example of entity-based organizational pride, a professional in the healthcare sector stated:

> “I think there's some pride in the fact that we are playing in the market the way that we want to. We are staying true to who we want to be as a company …I think because it shows that the company could be more than just commercial products sold to the doctor. That there is an opportunity and that we've been validated outside of just that market.” [#11-Health/Female]

In comparison, an employee in the financial services industry emphasized her company’s employees when describing the pride she experienced during a social event:

> “It makes me proud when I can bring my partner to our annual picnic and he feels comfortable to talk to everyone at the firm, whether it’s Leader X or one of the assistants or an accountant. There is not differentiation between anyone and everyone was so welcoming to him and to me. And, then at the holiday party when you see people who have been working there for 10 years and the wives of coworkers are hugging each other, they are friends.” [#26-Finance/Female]

As an illustration of affiliation, a director from a beverage organization revealed:
“One of our board members was shot and it was touch and go. The outpouring of support from our office—cards, care packages, everyone rallying around to help this man and his family to get through this. It made me proud to be associated with a group of people who would drop everything to help this man and his family.” [Interview #23-Food/Male]

Of note, many participants conceptualized their organization in multiple ways when recalling pride filled moments. For example, a manager from a national restaurant group stated:

“I can work for plenty of other restaurant groups and probably do as financially well or better, but the fact that I can say I work for the best, that's what I take pride in the company. I understand that I’m obviously biased, but being in the industry this long and seeing where they are what they do and talking to other people I can say that confidently that I think they are the best at what they do.” [#8-Food/Male]

This passage reflects both affiliation-based (“I can say I work for the best”) and entity-based (“I think they are the best at what they do”) manifestations of organizational pride. As another example, an executive in the marketing industry referenced pride in her affiliation with the agency and its members when discussing pride that resulted from an annual meeting:

“Seeing everyone there, it is one of those it gets you thinking how we can leverage everything we have and everything we do. I felt proud to be part of that and proud of how everyone pitched in. People from the location X office were new and I was proud of how everyone incorporated them. There was a sense of being a great company being connected to.” [#12-Advertising/Female]

Careful consideration of the language that participants’ used to describe their organizations allows for a more meaningful and nuanced understanding of their organizationally-directed pride.

**Engaging Others.** Participants’ accounts of organizational pride also emphasized the highly social nature of the emotion (see Williams & DeSteno, 2008). Feelings of pride involved a desire to tell others about the organization’s and its members’ value creating actions (i.e., the “great” things the organization and its members were doing). This also included apprising others of the organization’s successes. Put simply, the data demonstrated that employees want others to
know when they are proud of their organization, and this engagement with others was central to the emotional experience. In defining what it means to be proud of the bakery for which she works, a woman explained: “…it’s not hiding in the kitchen which I sometimes do. It’s wanting to be out, wanting to talk to customers, wanting to talk to employees.” [#4- Food/Female]

Participants’ engagement with others revealed itself in two ways: (1) telling outsiders (e.g., customers) about the organization; and (2) sharing feelings of pride with colleagues. Regarding the first situation, those outside of the organization, including family and friends, can play an important role in employees’ experiences of organizational pride. A woman in the financial services industry detailed a time filled with pride when her company sent flowers to her uncle’s funeral:

“I definitely talked to my partner about it. I think I told my brother...I didn’t tell him ‘ha, ha, look what my firm did’ and I wasn’t comparing it to his firm. The company he works for was very understanding and gave him the whole week too but they didn’t send anything. It was nice to show them. My partner wasn’t surprised because he knows the firm well. I don’t know if my brother was surprised but it was nice to show them that I am in a good place too. Look, these are good people. They care and they sent flowers. I think he was happy and it did show him, it shined a different light on the industry or firm that I work for.” [#26- Finance/Female]

In relation to the internal aspect of engagement, organizational pride was experienced with colleagues through both informal and more formalized practices. For example, a woman who works at a hospital recalled a time when a child’s life was saved and how her colleagues also shared news of the event on social media:

“That night one of the physicians had put up a comment on Facebook ‘I feel so lucky and so proud to work with such an amazing group of individuals. And, she said ‘Thanks Doctor X,’ to one of our surgeons that we are all friends with. We were all commenting on it. Obviously you don’t talk about what happened [referring to patient confidentiality] but I saw that when I got home. It was sort of surreal.” [#1- Health/Female]
As another example, a participant described how he shared the news of his team engaging in a community service event, which was a source of pride for him in the company overall.

“When we came back to the office, it was on a Friday so we had the weekend to think about it and we talked about it at a team meeting so we let people know who couldn't be there or donated food that it was a good event. We shared some pictures. We had an internal newsletter where I wrote a little article about it and we put our picture there. We tried to capitalize on what we had done, and in a good way, we put that out there...hey other people, here's something that we did.” [#21-Health/Male]

This desire to engage others appears to be a distinguishing feature of the emotional experience, not simply an occasional outcome. Not a single respondent recalled hiding or trying to suppress their pride in any way. These findings also suggest that organizational pride may be highly “contagious,” which has important implications for how pride can spread throughout (or even outside of) an organization (see Hatfield, Cacioppo, & Rapson, 1994).

**Being the Best.** The idea of being the best was woven throughout participants’ narratives of organizational pride. This concept aligns with existing conceptualizations of pride that emphasize social status or being socially valued (e.g., Blader and Tyler, 2009; Mascolo & Fischer, 1995). In recounting their experiences, many participants often (without any prompting) described their organization as the best. Manifestations of this theme included employees’ characterizations of their company as number one or as superior to its competitors. Additionally, participants referred to the organization’s employees as being the best in the field and/or better than employees at competing organizations. For example, a man at an advertising agency stated:

“It’s definitely cool, it’s cool to work at one of the premier agencies in the world. And, when you get that validation from a big press paper you really feel like your peers and everyone around you are the best of the best.” [#29-Advertising/ Male]

As another illustration, a woman in healthcare emphasized her colleagues’ top-tier credentials (vs. others in the field):
“... I work with a lot of really intelligent people who have had a lot of training—nurses and doctors and like. So, I trust them when they make decisions about patient care. Whereas at a different hospital I might question their knowledge because I don’t necessarily know that they’ve had the best training. I know that the people I work with have had the best training because it’s a really difficult place to get a residency at. It’s a really difficult place to get a fellowship at. If you look at any of the credentials of any of the doctors I work with, they’ve been at some of the best places in the world for medicine and I’m spoiled by that.” [#1- Health/ Female]

Being the best was also tied to the work that the organization performs. For example, a man in financial services described his pride in delivering outstanding work and outperforming the firm’s competitors.

“We were at a client where they have a lot of trouble and there is literally every consulting firm you can think of is doing some work there and the other day, there were a couple of instances. One, we did a deliverable, we presented a deliverable and the person as we were walking through it with them, they were like ‘this is amazing, this is so much better than any of the other deliverables that we’ve gotten from the other consulting firms. We haven’t gotten any of this value from this organization or this organization and the work that they’re doing.’ And that kind of response really, you know, to me, made me feel pretty proud of what the team was doing and the higher level of work that we were able to put together than our competitors.” [#2- Finance/ Male]

Overall, these results reinforce the centrality of being the best to experiences of organizational pride. It is not just that being the best makes you feel proud; rather; feeling proud means that you feel you are the best in some way. These findings align with existing conceptualizations of pride including that of Tyler and Blader (2002; 2003; Blader & Tyler, 2009) who define pride as a reflection of status. While at the surface this may be akin to Tracy and Robins’ conceptualization of hubristic pride (2007b), there was not necessarily a sense of arrogance attached to these feelings. Additionally, the qualitative data suggest that there are many different ways to define “best.” Being the best could equate to being number one in an industry in terms of revenue but also could mean being the best that you can be. Illustrating this, a manager from a national restaurant group stated, “Our founder says his goal for the company is to be the best we can be. Not so much the richest or biggest but literally to be the best.” [#19-
Lastly, while there was evidence of this aspect of organizational pride from interviews across all four industries, this concept was most salient in highly competitive contexts. References to being the best were particularly dominant in interviews with employees from advertising and marketing agencies—a notoriously competitive field.

**Making a Difference.** Participants’ descriptions of organizational pride also encompassed their organization and its members making a difference in the lives of their internal (i.e., employees) and/or external (e.g., clients, community members) stakeholders. When employees feel proud of their organizations, they are recognizing that the organization is creating value, broadly defined (see Brickson & Akinlade, 2015a). Similar to “being the best,” employees perceived their organizations to be “making a difference” in many different ways. These references were present across industries and not limited to organizations with a social mission. They ranged from providing strategic guidance to clients to developing ethical HR policies to volunteering in the community.

From one perspective, making a difference involved the idea of the organization offering a product or providing a service that was meaningful in some way to others. In other words, the organization and its members were doing important work. The following passage demonstrates an employee from the mortgage industry’s pride in his firm when they successfully executed a transaction. Here he described the significance of his firm’s work:

“*It’s a really important thing to every person, every couple. It’s a very important thing to them. I wouldn’t equate this to the medical world—obviously that is health and far more important than anything that happens to an individual on a financial level. This is something where you know, someone is buying a house or if they are selling their house and buying a house this 45-60 day cycle involves movers, an inspector, attorneys, an appraiser, real estate agents. All of these things have to come together and if they don’t, you can leave someone temporarily homeless. And, with the horrible feeling of dread. In certain instances, if it’s not done well, you leave them homeless. If you don’t deliver them the mortgage and they can’t buy the house and the seller breaks the contract, they lose the house. It has to be done right and it’s extremely important to them.*” [#5- Finance/
Additionally, making a difference was also characterized in terms of the company’s ethics or “doing the right thing” for the company’s employees or customers. As an example, a woman in the financial services sector explained:

“There is pride in doing a good job but when I look at the company the things that I’m proud about are the morals of the company. That they care about the people who work here. That they want people to feel proud of the company and where they work.” [#14-Advertising/Female]

This also entailed participants’ pride in their organizations’ involvement in charity work or giving back to the community. In detailing the pride that resulted from his company’s annual holiday community service event, a man from a beverage organization stated:

“It helps foster the idea that there are those less fortunate than us and it goes beyond writing a check. We are physically doing something to support a cause. It’s more meaningful. We are doing it as a group together, fostering community. It’s not just sending a box around for a check. We are experiencing this together.” [#23-Food/Male]

This aspect of organizational pride helps to provide a more complete understanding of the content of the construct. Compared to more traditional understandings of pride that emphasize social status or being the best (e.g., Blader and Tyler, 2009), this suggests that feeling proud of one’s organization also involves a broader understanding of what it means to be a socially valuable organization (see Brickson & Akinlade, 2015).

**Summary.** These findings extend extant research on emotions, broadly, (e.g., Elfenbein, 2007) and self-conscious emotions, specifically, (e.g., Lewis, 2000; Tracy & Robins, 2004) by providing evidence of organizationally-directed pride in the workplace. These qualitative data confirm that organizational pride is a distinct emotional experience that goes beyond simply feeling “good.” Additionally, these results reveal the different ways in which employees conceptualize their organization when experiencing pride (i.e., entity-, member-, affiliation-
based) and advance our understanding of what is means to feel proud of one’s organization. Specifically, that organizational pride involves employees’ acknowledgement of their organization as the “best” and one that “makes a difference” as well as a desire to speak highly about the organization to others—all of which reflects employees’ understanding of their organization as one that creates value and/or is socially valued.

3.4.2 Antecedents of Organizational Pride

Beyond examining the nature of organizational pride, this study was designed to shed light on the process by which it emerges in the workplace (RQ2: How does organizational pride emerge?). During the course of the interview, participants were asked to describe specific times when they were proud of their organization. After identifying such moments, participants were asked to share details in a story-like manner so a comprehensive account of the incident could be captured. This included revealing details of when the event happened, who was part of the event, how the participant found out about the event or occurrence, etc. And, importantly, participants were probed to share why they were proud of their organization at that moment.

Goal, Value, and Identity Based Events. Overall, participants identified a very wide range of events or occurrences, involving both internal (i.e., employees) and external (e.g., customers) stakeholders, that triggered experiences of organizational pride. Such incidents spanned from winning industry awards to engaging in holiday community service activities to saving a patient’s life to receiving customer referrals. While the content of these events greatly varied, the data consistently demonstrated that employees were most proud of their organization when they believed it was adhering to what they perceived to be most important to the organization. This included acting in accordance with the organization’s goals, values, and
identity. And, conversely, they were not proud—often even embarrassed—when the organization violated its stated goals and values.

The first example in Table 2 illustrates a time when an account executive was proud of her agency when they won a new business pitch for a global client. In describing the event she emphasized the idea of winning and how this new business acquisition brought more attention to the agency. Specifically, she stated: "When you win business, it's easy to feel a lot of pride as a firm... It just felt good to work for a place that won big contracts and was reported on in the media and that kind of stuff." While it is easy to imagine that winning can make one proud, what is more interesting is when the content of this event is analyzed in conjunction with her understanding of what is most important to the organization. When asked what the agency values most, she quickly declared, "Right now the firm values growth the most. Growth in the areas, the shiny object areas right now." There is a clear connection between the agency’s priorities around growth and this moment in which the agency acquired a major, global client. And, the attention that this win brought to the firm likely qualified it as a "shiny object."

As another example, a manager from a credit union recalled a time of great pride in his bank when they paid off a member’s (i.e., credit union customer’s) loan. He described with enthusiasm when the bank reached its financial target and decided to celebrate this accomplishment by paying off the last loan that got them there. Prior to discussing this event, he emphasized the importance of the credit union’s members. When asked to articulate the credit union’s identity and/or what was most important to the organization he stated, "We are our members. There are no differences between employees and our customers. We all bank here. We treat our members the way we want to be treated." This pride-inducing act of celebrating the
credit-union’s success with its members directly aligns with the participants’ understanding of what is core to the organization—creating a positive member experience.

Taken together, this means that employees can react to the same type of events in very different ways. There is likely not one type of event (e.g., award, new client acquisition) that universally evokes a sense of pride amongst employees across organizations. Instead, the content of the event must be consistent with what is understood to be most important to the organization in order for an employee to have such an emotional reaction.

Validation from Outsiders. Consistent with the social nature of the emotional experience, positive recognition or validation from outsiders appears to play a significant, although perhaps not required, role in the elicitation of organizational pride. Participant narratives of their proud moments often involved receiving recognition from others. Table 3 details the most prominent forms of validation that emerged from the data. Most notably, participants discussed the praise or thanks that they received from external stakeholders, such as customers and clients. As an example, a manager of a bakery recalled with great pleasure a wedding that she planned at her shop (which serves as an event space in the evening). Her pride around the wedding was attributed to the “gushing” thanks and praise that she received from the bride and groom. It was their reaction that validated the wedding as a success and, consequently, brought about heightened feelings of pride in the bakery.

“They came in and automatically were gushing about how pretty everything looked and they were super nice. And, throughout the night the bride and the guests were great. They were all great, super thankful for everything, super complimentary.” [#4-Food/Female]
Similarly, customer referrals also brought about pride. While often connected with receiving thanks and praise, providing a referral was described as taking things a step further as the customer/client takes action to validate the organization’s performance.

Insert Table 3 here

Awards from the media or industry peers also prompted intense pride in one’s organization. Although, it was not the award in and of itself that generated pride; rather, the content of the award aligned with what was considered most important to the organization. The data in Table 3 (Awards) illustrates two different types of organizational awards. The first is an example of a healthcare organization that was recognized for its employment practices, particularly that of cultivating a diverse workforce. Here, the participant was not only proud that his organization supports diversity, but his emotional experience was enhanced by others’ recognition of the organization’s efforts. In comparison, another participant discussed with great passion his agency’s success at a prestigious award show. These awards specifically honored the agency’s creative work (vs. dollars or another metric that was not as important to the agency).

Lastly, family and friends also validated employees’ pride in their company. Participants’ feelings were often bolstered when close others shared in the observation of the event. For example, a manager at a national restaurant company described with excitement a time when the founder of the company approached him at a New Year’s Eve dinner when he was celebrating with his wife and friends. In this moment, his family and friends’ reactions helped to
generate a great sense of pride in the company. As another illustration, a financial services employee’s experience of pride was shaped by her father’s observation of her firm’s actions (sending flowers to her uncle’s funeral).

### 3.4.3 Outcomes of Organizational Pride

Extant literature documents the potentially strong effect of emotions on employees’ attitudes, thoughts, and actions (Elfenbein, 2007; Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). Accordingly, this study also investigated the outcomes associated with organizational pride (*RQ3: What outcomes are associated with organizational pride?*). Overall, the data supported the notion that pride, particularly in one’s organization, can be a powerful motivating force in the workplace (Elfenbein, 2007: 346; see also Williams & DeSteno, 2008). More specifically, the data demonstrated that organizational pride has implications for employees’ sense of self (e.g., motivation to work harder), their relationship with the organization (e.g., commitment), and relationships with external stakeholders (e.g., stronger customer relationships).

---

**Motivation to Work Harder.** The data revealed that organizational pride not only makes employees feel good but also makes them want to work harder. The emotional experience has a potentially strong effect on employees’ motivation and desire to be productive and/or perform at a higher level. For example, a sales manager at a global insurance company spoke with great pride about a time when his company treated their employees with respect during a restructuring (moving employees to new teams vs. laying them off). The pride associated with this event influenced his personal motivation—*“it literally makes me want to work harder.”*
This desire to work harder appeared to be a direct result of his positive feelings toward the company, not from a place of fear of losing his job. As another example, a director in the food sector explained that seeing the results of a company initiative targeted at children provided him the “passion to keep working and improving what I am doing.”

**Organizational Commitment.** The data also demonstrated that employees were more committed to their organizations as a result of their pride. A manager in the food services industry explained, “…if you are proud of where you work, you are going to want to stay there and develop and, in turn, grow and develop people underneath you.” Pride-eliciting events reinforced or bolstered employees’ loyalty to their company—even when competitors approached them with possibly better opportunities. A participant from the financial services sector stated, “It doesn’t change the way I look at my competitors but it makes me more loyal.” This data also helps to distinguish organizational pride from affective commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1990). While there is arguably conceptual overlap between the two constructs, there was evidence of a causal relationship—specifically that moments of pride increased employees’ affective commitment to their organization.

**Stronger Customer Relationships.** There was also evidence of stronger customer relationships as a product of employees’ pride, perhaps through a trickle-down effect. For example, a woman who works in the healthcare sector described how employees’ enthusiasm that results from pride-eliciting events “shows through” and “impresses the customers.” Similarly, a partner at a financial services firm explained that by encouraging employees to feel proud of the company for which they work, a higher level of employee engagement is generated which, in turn, results in “…people spending more time, dedication, commitment to what it is we are doing. And, more committed to our clients and our people themselves.”
**Negative Outcomes.** Of note, participants predominantly focused on the arguably positive outcomes of organizational pride. This is not to say that the emotional experience always generates attitudes, thoughts, or actions that benefit employees, their organizations, and stakeholders. Given the nature of the interview (i.e., the participant’s identity was not anonymous to the interviewer), participants may have been less likely to admit to actions that could be construed as wrongdoings. However, one participant acknowledged the stress and exhaustion associated with her feelings of pride, which is discussed in further detail in Future Research (see section 5.3).

### 3.5 Discussion

Study 1 advanced our understanding of the nature of organizational pride as well as helped shed light on the process by which it emerges and its effect on employees’ attitudes and behaviors. With regard to the construct’s nature, the qualitative data provided evidence for the affective structure of organizational pride—demonstrating that even when the organization is the target (vs. one’s self), it is a discrete emotion that is distinct from more basic emotions such as happiness. The data also revealed the highly social nature of organizational pride. As such, pride may be a “contagious” emotion that is more likely to be shared among colleagues or even with external stakeholders (Hatfield et al., 1994).

The study also exposed the content of organizational pride. First, the construct can arguably be organized into three categories depending upon how one conceptualizes the organization—as an entity, in terms of its members, or in terms of one’s affiliation. From this perspective, organizational pride involves being “proud of my company;” “proud of my company’s people;” and “proud to be an employee at my company.” Second, looking deeper into the construct’s content, three additional aspects appear to be central to the very definition of
what it means to be proud of your organization. One, organizational pride involves the desire to engage others and tell them about the great things the company is doing. Two, it includes recognizing the organization as “the best” (as defined the employee). Three, it encompasses an understanding that the organization is making a difference by creating something of importance.

Beyond the nature of the construct, this study also started to uncover how organizational pride emerges in the workplace. Through participants’ narratives of pride, this study identified a wide range of events that made employees proud of their companies. However, it is not the type of event (e.g., awards, company anniversary) that evoked pride. Pride was elicited when an event or occurrence aligned with what the participant believed was most important or core to the organization. This included organizational actions or events that directly or indirectly tie back to the organization’s goals, values, and/or identity. These findings align with emerging insights from Brickson and Akinlade’s multiple case-study research where they found that pride was elicited when employees believed their organization (i.e., law firm) was “living up to its identity claims” (2015b: 26). Additionally, validation from outsiders significantly strengthen employees’ feelings of organizational pride. This phenomenon reflects self-verification processes discussed in the literature at the intersection of emotions and identity theory (e.g., Stryker, 2004; see Brickson, 2013). Here, with the organization as the target of one’s pride, the reactions of others can verify that the organization is socially valued (see Brickson & Akinlade, 2015b; Dutton et al., 1994). In turn, this “stamp of approval” from outsiders, such as customers, family, or friends can intensify one’s experience of pride, and motivate employees to work harder. Ultimately, the positive feedback about the organization may encourage employees to help the organization pursue the same course of action so that they can experience these feelings of organizational pride again in the future (see Stryker, 2004).
Overall, this qualitative study provided insight into the nature, antecedents, and outcomes associated with organizational pride. To continue the development of theory on organizational pride, quantitative research is warranted to triangulate the results related to the nature of the construct as well as to more precisely assess the pattern of relationships with its antecedents and outcomes. In order to conduct such quantitative research, however, a psychometrically sound measure of organizational pride is needed—in particular, a measure that reflects the complexity of the emotional experience and appropriately encompasses the meanings associated with the construct.
CHAPTER 4. STUDY 2: SCALE DEVELOPMENT

4.1 Study Purpose and Hypotheses

The purpose of this second study was to develop and validate a psychometrically sound measure of organizational pride. This included the generation of a list of items, informed by the results of Study 1 and a review of the existing literature; evaluation of the content validity of these items; analysis of the measure’s factor structure; and assessment of the relationship between organizational pride and employees’ attitudes and behaviors. Additionally, a sample from China was used to examine the measure’s cross-cultural validity.

4.1.1 Review of Existing Measures

A search of the field’s top journals\(^1\) revealed seven quantitative scales that have been used to capture pride targeted at one’s organization or group (see Appendix B). Overall, existing measures of organizational (and group) pride lack a holistic perspective of the construct—offering a limited view of what is means to be proud. While pride is defined in a variety of ways across these measures, most (6 out of 7 of the scales) exclusively focus on or include pride in one’s membership—which is akin to the affiliation-based pride present in the qualitative data. For example, Vecchio’s (1995) measure of pride includes a single-item, “I am proud to be working for this organization.” Similarly, Blader and Tyler (2009) include the items, “I think that where I work reflects well on me” and “I am proud to tell others where I work.” Beyond pride in membership, three of the seven measures capture pride in the organization as an entity. As an example, Blader and Tyler’s (2009) measure of pride includes the item, “My company is well respected in its field.” Of the seven measures, only Tyler and Blader’s (2002) measure of

comparative pride taps into member-based pride (e.g., “How do the accomplishments of the students and faculty at UCB compare with the accomplishments of the students and faculty at other universities?”). Furthermore, existing measures capture others’ recognition and the idea of the organization being the best. For example, Turban, Lau, Ngo, Chow, and Si (2001) include the item, “I would receive respect from others if I worked at this firm.” Or in reference to being the best, Blader and Tyler (2009) include the item, “My company is one of the best companies in its field.” Yet, existing measures fail to capture another important component of organizational pride—that of making a difference. Noted in the Study 1 results section, employees’ understanding of their company and its employees as engaging in important work is a key way in which pride can be manifested.

Lastly, it does not appear that the development of any of the above mentioned measures resulted from a rigorous scale development process. Rather, the authors compiled items from existing scales and/or wrote original items, using the measure’s reliability as the key determinant of validity. As such, this study is the first to develop a measure of organizational pride that follows rigorous scale development procedures including a thorough literature review followed by critical incident interviews. This step is instrumental in accurately defining the domain of the construct and identifying any dimensions of the construct that may exist (see Liden & Maslyn, 1998). The qualitative interviews from Study 1, importantly, provided an in-depth assessment of the domain of the organizational pride construct.

Outside of management studies, most notably, Tracy and Robins (2007b) developed a measure of “authentic” and “hubristic” pride—two forms of self-referent pride (i.e., I am proud of myself). While this measure reflects the multi-faceted nature of pride, I do not believe it is suitable to evaluate organizationally-directed pride. First, the measure is designed to capture the
extent to which research participants feel a particular way about themselves (e.g., “I feel snobbish”; “I feel accomplished”). Such a format does not allow for a simple referent shift (e.g., “I feel proud of myself” to “I feel proud of my organization.”). Second, these two forms of “authentic” and “hubristic” pride were borne out of research conducted within the context of self-referent pride but did not clearly emerge in the inductive analysis of the Study 1—instead, the interview data revealed that there are other ways, and arguably more relevant ways, in which organizational pride should be conceptualized.

Overall, this review of existing measures further supports the need for a measure of organizational pride—in particular one that encompasses the multidimensional nature of the construct.

4.1.2 Multidimensional Nature of Organizational Pride

Building on the results of Study 1, a slightly modified definition of organizational pride was used for Study 2—“A pleasurable affective experience reflecting a member’s understanding of his or her organization as one that creates value and/or as socially valued.” This definition was expanded to include two ideas. One, that while organizational pride begins as a discrete emotion, it can become more state-like through continued exposure to pride-eliciting events. Two, this definition acknowledges that organizational pride can entail employees’ recognition of their organization as one that creates value in absence of verification or validation from others.

The literature review and Study 1 insights also informed the development of the construct’s multidimensional structure that was examined in Study 2. Specifically, I hypothesized that the construct’s structure was comprised of three primary factors or dimensions: entity-, member-, and affiliation-based organizational pride.

- **Entity-based pride:** A member’s understanding of the organization, conceptualized as a broader entity, as one that creates value. This dimension encompasses a member’s
perceptions of the organization’s actions as valuable and/or perceived as valuable by others (e.g., customers, community members).

- **Member-based pride:** A member’s understanding of the organization’s members as a group that creates value. This dimension encompasses a member’s perceptions of the organization’s members’ actions as valuable and/or perceived as valuable by others (e.g., customers, community members).

- **Affiliation-based pride:** A member’s understanding of his or her affiliation with the organization as valuable. This dimension encompasses a member’s perceptions of affiliation with the organization as valuable and/or perceived as valuable by others (e.g., customers, community members).

When defining the dimensions of a construct it is necessary to consider their relationship with the overarching construct. Drawing upon Law, Wong, and Mobley’s (1998) taxonomy of multidimensional constructs, I entered Study 2 with an understanding of organizational pride as a latent or superordinate construct. From this perspective, the above dimensions are different manifestations of organizational pride or the “different ways that the construct is realized” (Edwards, 2001; Law et al., 1998: 747). As such, these three dimensions should be theoretically and empirically connected by the underlying shared construct of organizational pride and correlated with one another (Law et al., 1998).

The findings from Study 1 also pointed to the centrality of employees’ desire to engage others, their recognition of the organization as one that is the “best,” and as one that “makes a difference” to the experience of organizational pride. Accordingly, items were written to capture the three primary dimensions framed around the conceptualizations of the organization (i.e., entity-, affiliation-, member-based pride) as well as to reflect employees’ desire to tell others about the organization, their understanding of the organization and its members as the best, and their perceptions that the organization and its members are making a difference (see Methods section 4.2.1 below).

4.1.3 **Discriminant Validity**
Acknowledging that the proposed construct of organizational pride is not the first construct in management studies to tap into employees’ feelings of pride, validating construct distinctiveness is a vital part of the scale development process. Specifically, I hypothesized that organizational pride is positively related to but also theoretically and empirically distinct from two key constructs of interest (Campbell & Fiske, 1959)—affective commitment and organizational identification.

**Affective Commitment.** Affective commitment has captured the attention of scholars for more than 50 years and is recognized as a central outcome for organizational life (Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002). Rooted in the earlier works of Kanter (1968), Buchanan (1974), and Mowday et al. (1979), the construct has come to be understood as an “employee’s emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in, the organization” (Allen & Meyer, 1990: 1). Affective commitment is one of three components of organizational commitment, representing a psychological state toward one’s organization that is comprised of both attitudinal and behavioral components (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Meyer & Allen, 1991). Antecedents of affective commitment generally fall into two categories—individual differences (e.g., self-efficacy) and work experiences (e.g., organizational support, perceptions of fairness, job involvement) (Meyer et al., 2002), whereas organizational pride (as a self-conscious emotion) is elicited by exposure to and experienced as a reaction to a specific identity-relevant event (i.e., what is perceived to be most important to the organization) (see Elfenbein, 2007; Tracy & Robins, 2004). Additionally, findings from Study 1 suggested that affective commitment is an outcome of organizational pride. That is, when employees feel pride for their organization their loyalty toward the organization also increases.
Hypothesis 1: Organizational pride is positively related to but also distinct from affective commitment.

Organizational Identification. Measures of social or organizational identification, particularly those that take a more affective perspective\(^2\), also include elements of organizational pride (e.g., Abrams, Ando, & Hinkle, 1998; Hall, Schneider, & Nygren, 1970; Huo, Smith, Tyler, & Lind, 1996; see Johnson, Morgeson, & Hekman, 2012 for review of measures). For example, Rotondi (1975) simply used a one-item measure to examine organizational identification, “I take pride in being part of this organization.” Likewise, Vandenberg, Self, and Seo (1994) include “I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization.” Johnson and colleagues argue that affective identification, a distinct form of social identification, is an individual’s “positive feelings about being one with a group” and, thus, involves feelings of pride and happiness (2012: 1144). They suggest that affiliation with a group (or organization) provides members with a sense of pride. In comparison, Ashforth and colleagues explain that organizational identification may or may not be associated with particular affective states and, when it is connected to emotional or affective experiences, they can be positive or negative in nature (Ashforth, Harrison, & Corley, 2008; Ashforth & Mael, 1989). For example, Ashforth et al. (2008) point to Dutton and Dukerich’s (1991) study of the New York Port Authority as an example of when organizational identification was tied to strong negative emotions—including that of anger. In considering this research on organizational identification in tandem with the literature at the intersection of emotions and identity (e.g., Stets & Trettevik, 2014; Stryker, 2004), it is likely that employees who identify with their organization are more likely to experience pride as they are more apt to recognize identity-related events (see Tracy & Robins,

\(^2\) There is a debate in the literature regarding whether organizational identification is an affective or cognitive (or both) based construct (see Johnson et al., 2012 for review).
Organizational identification, however, does not always equate to feeling proud of one’s organization.

*Hypothesis 2: Organizational pride is positively related to but also distinct from organizational identification.*

### 4.1.4 Convergent Validity

**Existing Conceptualizations of Pride.** For the purposes of testing convergent validity, I examined the relationship between Blader and Tyler’s (2009) measure of pride. This measure was selected because it was designed to evaluate employees’ pride in their company (vs. pride targeted at one’s university or group more generally) and it encompasses multiple aspects of the phenomenon (e.g., being the best, engaging others). I anticipated a high, although not a near perfect, correlation between the two measures. The new measure is designed to capture the phenomenon more completely by including employees’ perceptions of their organization’s people and the notion of the organization making a difference (neither of which are included in Blader and Tyler’s measure).

*Hypothesis 3: Organizational pride is positively related to but also distinct from Blader and Tyler’s (2009) measure of pride.*

### 4.1.5 Criterion-Related and Incremental Validity

Study 2 was also designed to identify organizational pride’s empirical associations with employees’ behaviors, although not necessarily causal relationships (DeVellis, 2012).

**Employee Engagement.** In the tradition of positive psychology (Frederickson, 2001; Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000), employee engagement is defined as a “positive, fulfilling work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption” (Schaufeli, Bakker, & Salanova 2006: 702; Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzalez-Romá, & Bakker, 2002). This
includes enhancement of one’s energy (vigor) as well as increased involvement (dedication) and engrossment (absorption) in one’s work (Schaufeli et al., 2006). Findings from Study 1 revealed that pride in one’s organization may refresh employees’ state of energy or being and reinvigorate their commitment to their work. For example, a woman who was proud of her company’s response to a personal issue explained, “When I got back, I definitely went to work over-time. I wanted to get back to work.” Accordingly, I hypothesized that organizational pride is positively associated with employee engagement.

_Hypothesis 4: Organizational pride is positively related to employee engagement._

**Organizational Citizenship Behavior.** Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB-O) refers to acts conducted by employees that are targeted at the organization, discretionary in nature, and are not part of a job description or formal reward system (Lee & Allen, 2002; Organ, 1988). Examples of such behaviors include promoting or defending one’s organization or voluntarily engaging in organizational meetings and activities (Coleman & Borman, 2000). Evidenced in Study 1, feelings of organizational pride can strengthen employees’ motivation to work harder for their company—which may include both in-role and extra-role aspects of their work. As an illustration, a manager in the financial services industry stated, “It’s important for employees to be proud so that they are invested emotionally. You want them coming to work because they truly enjoy it. If so, they will go above and beyond and do it on their own. They will even go clean a toilet if you ask. I’ve even cleaned a toilet, we all do.” Additionally, Blader and Tyler (2009) found a positive relationship between pride in one’s group, as an indicator of social identity, and extra-role behaviors.

_Hypothesis 5: Organizational pride is positively related to organizational citizenship behavior targeted at the organization._
Turnover Intentions. Employees’ desire to involuntarily leave their jobs (i.e., turnover intention) is often triggered by employees’ attitudes including job (dis)satisfaction and (decreased) commitment (Holtom, Mitchell, Lee, & Eberly, 2008). At the same time, employees’ organizational pride may also help to explain why employees refrain from leaving their jobs. Findings from Study 1 suggested that feelings of pride can reinforce employees’ commitment to their organization and decrease their likelihood of pursuing and/or accepting jobs at other companies. After recalling pride in his company’s treatment of its employees, a man from the financial services industry stated, “It makes me loyal. It doesn’t change the way I look at my competitors but it makes me more loyal.”

Hypothesis 6: Organizational pride is negatively related to turnover intentions.

Incremental Validity. To assess the new measure’s incremental validity, I also controlled for Blader and Tyler’s (2009) measure of pride when testing the criterion-related hypotheses above (H4-H6). I anticipated that this new measure of organizational pride explains variance in these outcomes above and beyond Blader and Tyler’s measure.

4.2 Methods

Rigorous measures, defined by strong reliability and validity, are crucial to producing high-quality research (Hinkin, 1995). Thus, the development of this new scale was a highly involved process that included deep theoretical reflection about the construct of interest as well as a series of empirical steps designed to assess the psychometric soundness of the new measure. The following details the steps taken as part of the scale development process.

4.2.1 Item Generation

Item generation was a critical step in this scale development process, with an in-depth understanding of the phenomenon of interest informing the development of the initial list of
items (DeVellis, 2012). Such rigor helps to ensure that the proposed measure appropriately will capture the essence of the construct (i.e., content validity) (Hinkin, 1998). Accordingly, a combined deductive and inductive approach was taken to develop the items (Hinkin, 1995; 1998). From a deductive perspective, I conducted a thorough literature review of pride, broadly defined and across discipline (e.g., Tangney & Tracy, 2011; Tyler & Blader, 2002). This also included creating a catalog of existing measures that tap into organizational pride (see Appendix B for summary). From an inductive perspective, I analyzed the qualitative interview data to identify key themes related to the nature of or conceptualizations of organizational pride (discussed in Chapter 3). Additionally, I adhered to the following guidelines in developing the items (Hinkin, 1998; Schmitt & Klimoski, 1991):

- Simplicity: Writing brief and straightforward items.
- Consistent Perspective: Limiting the perspective of each item (i.e., not trying to assess both behaviors and affect within a single item).
- Focus: Keeping a singular-focus within each item (i.e., avoiding “double-barreled” items such as “I am proud of my organization and I want to tell others how proud I am”).
- Generalizable: Writing items that are applicable to multiple organizational contexts.

I aimed to write an exhaustive list of items knowing that the items would be reduced and refined based on a series of theoretical and empirical evaluations (discussed in detail below) (DeVellis, 2012).

4.2.2 Content Validity

Upon developing a list of initial items, it was important to assess the extent to which the proposed items reflect the construct of interest (i.e., content validity) (DeVellis, 2012; Hinkin,
Specifically, two panels of expert judges were used to evaluate the content validity of the proposed measure (see Liden & Maslyn (1998) as an example utilizing this approach). First, I provided nine PhD students with a list of 110 items, the definition of the overarching construct (i.e., organizational pride) and three primary dimensions (entity-based, affiliation-based, member-based) and instructed them to assign each of items to the dimension to which they believe the item most closely aligned. They were also given the option to indicate “none” if an item did not align with any of the presented dimensions. Additionally, the judges were asked for recommendations regarding the language of the items (e.g., if any items are confusing or could be worded in a better way), to identify any aspects of the construct that were not being captured by the existing items. Based on the agreement ratings and judges’ specific feedback, the items were revised and/or dropped. The initial list of 110 items was revised and refined to 94 items.

A second, separate set of six practitioners (from a diverse set of industries) was asked to go through the same process with the refined set of 94 items. Including practitioners helped to ensure that the items reflected an understanding of the construct and captured language that is compatible with the workplace. The items were revised based on agreement ratings and feedback (e.g., if language was confusing), and redundancy, with 63 items surviving through this stage of development.

4.2.3 Participants and Procedures

Sample 1: Midwest University Undergraduate Students. A study was conducted among a sample of students from a large public Midwestern U.S. university to pre-test, refine, and explore the factor structure of the initial set of items. Subjects were recruited from the University of Illinois at Chicago’s Department of Managerial Studies Study Pool, which consists

---

3 The nine expert judges included two students from China, one from Korea, and one student from South Africa.
of more than 1,000 voluntary research subjects. All subjects were employed by a company or organization at least part-time (i.e., not self-employed). Average part-time work experience was 3 years 2 months; full-time experience 2 years 1 month. A total of 204 subjects participated in the research.

**Sample 2: Working Adults.** To supplement the first sample, a second study was conducted among a sample of working adults. Subjects were recruited from Amazon’s Mechanical Turk (https://www.mturk.com/mturk/). The IRB approved survey announcement was posted on the Mechanical Turk website for approximately one week inviting potential subjects to participate in the survey. Upon completion of the survey, subjects received a small financial compensation. All subjects were employed by a company or organization at least part-time (i.e., not self-employed). A total of 319 subjects participated in the research.

**Sample 3: Working Adults.** A third study was conducted among a sample of working adults to confirm the measure’s factor structure and assess discriminant, convergent, criterion-related, and incremental validity (Hinkin, 1998). Subjects were recruited from LinkedIn. All potential subjects received an IRB approved invitation to voluntary participate in an online survey and were offered the option to enter a drawing for one of ten $10 Amazon giftcards upon completion of the survey. A total of 161 subjects participated in the research.

**Sample 4: Chinese MBA Students.** A fourth survey was conducted among a sample of working adults enrolled in an executive-MBA program in a Chinese university to examine the measure’s cross-cultural validity. Subjects were recruited from a university in Beijing, China. A local research sponsor invited potential subjects to voluntary participate using an IRB approved script. Subjects were not financially compensated. A total of 200 subjects participated in the research. The survey was translated into the subjects’ local language (Mandarin Chinese) by a
native Mandarin speaker and reviewed by a local Chinese sponsor. The data were collected via paper and pencil.

Appendix C contains demographic characteristics and response rates for the final samples used for analysis purposes.

4.2.4 Measures

The following measures were used in the surveys with Sample 3 and Sample 4 to assess the construct’s reliability, factor structure, and validity. See Appendix D for the detailed items.

**Discriminant Validity.** Allen and Meyer’s (1990) eight-item measure of affective commitment measure was used to evaluate discriminant validity (e.g., “I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this company” and “I enjoy discussing my company with people outside it.”). Additionally, Mael and Ashforth’s (1992) six-item measure of organizational identification was included in the survey (e.g., “When someone criticizes the company, it feels like a personal insult” and “I am very interested in what others think about the company.”). Respondents rated their level of agreement with each item on a five-point scale ranging from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*.

**Convergent Validity.** Blader and Tyler’s (2009) five-item measure of pride was used to evaluate convergent validity (e.g., “My company is one of the best companies in its field” and “People are impressed when I tell them where I work.”). Respondents rated their level of agreement with each item on a five-point scale ranging from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*. This measure was also used to assess incremental validity.

**Criterion-Related Validity.** To examine organizational pride’s association with key outcomes, respondents were asked to complete Schaufeli and colleague’s (2006) nine-item measure of employee engagement (e.g., “At my work, I feel bursting with energy” and “At my
job, I feel strong and vigorous.”), Lee and Allen’s (2002) eight-item measure of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB-O) (e.g., “Attend functions that are not required but that help the company’s image” and “Keep up with developments in the company.”), and Kelloway, Gottlieb, and Barham’s (1999) four-item measure of turnover intentions (e.g., “I am thinking about leaving this company” and “I am planning to look for a new job.”) (Note: Turnover intentions was not collected in Sample 4). Employee engagement and turnover intentions were rated on a five-point scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. OCB-O was captured with a five-point frequency scale ranging from never to always.

4.2.5 Ethical Treatment of Respondents

All surveys were conducted in accordance with IRB standards and were voluntary (UIC IRB Protocols #2015-0854; #2015-1029; #2015-1110; #2015-1259).

4.3 Results

The following details the results of the scale development process. See Table 5 for a summary of these steps and results.

-----------------------------------------------
Insert Table 5 here
-----------------------------------------------

4.3.1 Pre-test of Items

Data from Samples 1 and 2 were used to pre-test and assess the list of 63 items that survived the content validity process (described above in section 4.2.2). After cleaning the sample (e.g., eliminating respondents who failed the quality checks; straight-lined their responses; completed the survey in an exceptionally short amount of time), a total of 276 respondents (Sample 1: 102; Sample 2: 174) were included in the analysis. Means and standard deviations
were run for all items, together and independently for Samples 1 and 2 to identify any differences in the sample.

Bearing in mind the goal of parsimony when developing a new measure (Hinkin, 1995), the results of the descriptive analysis were used to reduce the list from 63 down to 22 items. A number of criteria were considered when refining this list. First, items with a standard deviation less than .95 were removed to allow for greater variance (removed 14 items). Second, the repetitiveness of the items was assessed. While the initial list was intended to be exhaustive, this resulted in a number of items that were too repetitive in nature. For example, the original list contained the items "I am proud to work for my company" and "I am proud to be an employee of my company." I kept the item with the higher standard deviation (removed 6 items). Third, again in support of parsimony, I removed items that specified customers/clients. In the original list, I included two versions of many items to specify “others” and “customers/clients.” For example, the list contained the items, "It feels good to tell others where I work" and "It feels good to tell customers/clients" where I work.” These items were removed because of issues of redundancy and because not all jobs involve interactions with customers/clients (21 items were removed). Overall, this resulted in 22 items.

4.3.2 Exploratory Factor Analysis

After refining the list of items, I conducted an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) to initially assess the measure’s factor structure (Ford, MacCallum, & Tait, 1986). The clean data from Samples 1 and 2 were used for this purpose (n=276). The EFA included the following steps. First, a principal axis factoring (PAF) analysis was run without setting the number of factors. PAF was selected under the guidance of Conway and Huffcutt (2003), who suggest this is the best approach if “a researcher’s purpose is to understand the latent structure of a set of
variables” (p. 150). Analysis of the eigenvalues and scree test plot revealed three factors. The EFA was then rerun (PAF; 3 factors set; oblimin rotation). See Table 6 for detailed results of the factor analysis.

----------------------------------------------------
Insert Table 6 here
----------------------------------------------------

This exploratory factor analysis resulted in three factors that explained 71.28% of the variance. Eigenvalues for the three factors were 12.95, 1.57, and 1.16, respectively. These results provided initial support for a multidimensional construct; however, the content of the factors did not align with the three originally proposed dimensions of entity-based, member-based, and affiliation-based organizational pride. Specifically, 11 items loaded onto the first factor (loadings ranging from .708-.930), with 9 of the 11 items sharing the idea of employees wanting to talk about their company with others (e.g., “I want to tell others about the great things that my company is doing,” “I want to tell others how great it is to be a part of my company.”). Looking at the second factor that emerged, these 6 items (loadings ranging from .632-.862) tapped into employees’ understanding of their company and its people as making a difference or doing important work. Lastly, the third factor contained two items, “My company is recognized as the best by others” and “My company’s people are recognized as the best by others” (loadings .687 and .599, respectively). Clearly, both of these items captured employees’ perceptions of their organization—conceptualized as an entity and as comprised of its members—as being the best.

4.3.3 Item Refinement
Evidenced above, the factor analysis results demonstrated that the desire to tell others about the organization, perceptions of the organization as one that makes a difference, and acknowledgment of one’s organization as the best, comprise three distinct dimension of organizational pride. And, the different conceptualizations of the organization (i.e., as an entity, members, affiliation) are embedded across these three dimensions. All of these ideas were supported in Study 1 and included as arguably, sub-dimensions, in the initial list of items. In light of the factor analysis findings (and in conjunction with the qualitative insights), the resulting dimensions of the construct were:

- **Engaging Others**: A member’s desire to tell others about the organization’s and its members’ value creating actions (i.e., the “great” things the organization and it’s members are doing). This also includes the desire to tell others about the organization’s successes.

- **Making a Difference**: A member’s understanding of his/her organization as one that makes a difference. This includes the organization’s and its members’ involvement in important work (as perceived by the member).

- **Being the Best**: A member’s acknowledgement that others recognize his/her organization and its members as the best. This also includes members’ perceptions that the organization is better than others.

Based on these three dimensions, I carefully considered each item to decide whether it should be retained for the next set of analyses. While doing so, I aimed to develop a measure that fully captured the content of each of these dimensions and, at the same time, adhere to the importance of parsimony. Looking at the first factor (“Engaging Others”), I retained three items that theoretically captured the phenomenon of the dimension and empirically loaded highly onto the factor. The final items included: “I want to tell others about the great things that my company is doing”; “I want to tell others about my company’s successes”; “I want to tell others about the great things that the people in my company are doing.” Other items were dropped due to poor theoretical fit (e.g., did not tap into a employee’s desire to tell others about the organization; were too vague in nature) or due to redundancy. Taking the same approach for the
second factor, I retained the following three items: “My company does important work”; “The people in my company are making a difference;” “Being a part of my company enables me to do important work.” Lastly, I retained the two items that loaded onto the third factor and wrote one additional item, “My company is superior to its competitors” to more fully capture the theoretical meaning of the dimension. Lastly, items with a loading of less than .40 or that cross-loaded on multiple factors were eliminated (Hinkin, 1995). This resulted in a refined list of nine items (see Table 6).

4.3.4 Reliability

Using Sample 3, the reliability of the new nine item measure of organizational pride was evaluated by calculating Cronbach’s alpha (Cronbach, 1951). The coefficient alpha for the measure was .882, exceeding the recommended guidelines of .70. Additionally, there was evidence of strong reliability at the dimension level (Engaging Others: .866; Making a Difference: .899; Being the Best: .849).

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Insert Table 7 here

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

4.3.5 Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Sample 3 was also used to confirm the measure’s factor structure and demonstrate construct validity. A series of confirmatory factor analyses was conducted using MPlus. First, a CFA was run to confirm the second-order factor structure and examine the relationship between the three dimensions and the overarching factor of organizational pride. Figure 2 reports the factor loadings, confirming that the first order factors (i.e., dimensions) significantly load onto the higher-order factor (organizational pride) in a hierarchical fashion. Second, a 3-factor model
was run to confirm the three dimensional structure that emerged from the EFA ($x^2=45.323; CFI=.975; TLI=.963; RMSEA=.076; SRMR=.048$). Lastly, a 1-factor model was run, which did not demonstrate good fit ($x^2=343.33; CFI=.636; TLI=.515; RMSEA=.277; SRMR=.128$). Together, these three CFAs provide support for the new three dimensional measure.

-----------------------------------------------

Insert Figure 2 here

-----------------------------------------------

4.3.6 Discriminant Validity

Hypothesis 1 stated that organizational pride and affective commitment are positively related, yet distinct. The correlational analysis between the new measure of organizational pride and Allen and Meyer’s (1990) measure of affective commitment provided initial support for the construct’s distinctiveness ($r=.685, p<.01$). Confirmatory factor analysis using structural equation modeling was then run to test the hypothesized discriminant validity. A two factor model of organizational pride and affective commitment demonstrated acceptable fit ($x^2=242.189; CFI=.929; TLI=.917; RMSEA=.084; SRMR=.069$), supporting Hypothesis 1. The same procedures were used to assess the construct’s discriminant validity in relation to organizational identification. The correlational analysis between the new measure of organizational pride and Mael and Ashforth’s (1992) measure provided initial support for the construct’s distinctiveness ($r=.625, p<.01$). Additionally, a two factor model of organizational pride and organizational identification demonstrated good fit ($x^2=138.898; CFI=.962; TLI=.954; RMSEA=.062; SRMR=.056$), supporting Hypothesis 2.

4.3.7 Convergent Validity
In support of Hypothesis 3, a positive relationship was found between the new measure of organizational pride and Blader and Tyler’s (2009) measure of pride \( (r=.762, p<.01) \). Additionally, at the dimension level, Blader and Tyler’s measure had the strongest relationship with the “being the best” \( (r=.756, p<.01) \) and the weakest relationship with “making a
difference” \( (r=.463, p<.01) \).

4.3.8 Criterion-Related Validity

To assess criterion-related validity, I examined the empirical association (note: not casual) between the new nine item measure of organizational pride and selected constructs of interest. I also controlled for Blader and Tyler’s (2009) measure of pride to evaluate the construct’s incremental validity. In support of Hypotheses 4 and 5, there was a positive relationship between organizational pride and employee engagement \( (r=.661, p<.01) \) as well as with organizational citizenship behavior \( (r=.549, p<.01) \). In support of Hypothesis 6, organizational pride was negatively correlated with turnover intentions \( (r=-.466, p<.01) \). Additionally, the new measure of organizational pride significantly explained variance in each of these outcomes above and beyond Blader and Tyler’s (2009) measure of pride: employee engagement \( (\Delta R^2=.174; \beta=.711, p<.01) \); organizational citizenship behavior \( (\Delta R^2=.129; \beta=.586, p<.01) \); turnover intention \( (\Delta R^2=.060; \beta=-.719, p<.01) \).

4.3.9 Cross-Cultural Validity

Sample 4, comprised of working adults from China, (clean sample n=192) was used to examine whether the new nine item measure appropriately captures organizational pride in contexts outside of the U.S. First, the coefficient alpha was calculated to evaluate the measure’s internal consistency. The Cronbach alpha was .889, demonstrating strong reliability. Similarly, there was evidence of strong reliability at the dimension level (Engaging Others: .859; Making a
Difference: .800; Being the Best: .871). See Table 8 for descriptive statistics. Second, the analytical procedures that were run with the U.S. data were repeated with this Chinese sample. In support of measure’s construct validity, the 3-factor model demonstrated significantly better fit ($\chi^2=26.065; CFI=.996; TLI=.994; RMSEA=.021; SRMR=.036$) than the 1-factor model ($\chi^2=229.632; CFI=.631; TLI=.508; RMSEA=.198; SRMR=.115$). However, there was not support for a second-order factor structure (model did not converge).

4.4 Discussion

Overall, this study provided empirical support for a multi-dimensional measure of organizational pride. I entered Study 2 hypothesizing that the construct’s factor structure would be organized around the three different ways in which employees conceptualize their organization (i.e., entity-, member-, affiliation-based organizational pride). While the theoretical distinction between these three dimensions was supported in the content validity process, the exploratory factor analysis did not provide empirical support for this structure. Rather, the construct’s factor structure was comprised of the key themes that arose in Study 1 around engaging others, perceptions of the organization as one that makes a difference, and recognition of the organization as the best. These results suggest that the content of these three themes from Study 1 (i.e., “engaging others,” “being the best,” and “making a difference”) are more conceptually distinct in the minds of employees (vs. the originally proposed entity-, member-, and affiliation-based dimensions). It may also be the case that the originally proposed distinctions between entity- and affiliation- (e.g., “I am proud of my company” and “I am proud
to work for my company”) were too nuanced and not understood as discrete conceptualizations of the organization. At the same time, these three new dimensions (i.e., “engaging others,” “being the best,” and “making a difference”) still support the hypothesis that organizational pride is a latent (superordinate) construct—each representing a different way in which organizational pride is manifested by employees. And, the final nine item measure still captures different ways in which employees conceptualize their organization (e.g., “My company is recognized as the best by others”- entity; “I want to tell others about the great things that the people in my company are doing”- member; “Being a part of my company enables me to do important work”- affiliation).

Overall, this new nine item measure demonstrated strong reliability, both at the global construct and dimension level. The confirmatory factor analysis validated the construct’s higher-order and three-factor structure. And, as evidenced by these results, organizational pride was empirically distinct from conceptually related constructs including affective commitment and organizational identification. This study also, importantly, supported the measure’s incremental validity. The new measure of organizational pride explained variance in key employee attitudes and behaviors, when controlling for Blader and Tyler’s (2009) measure of pride. While the study design did not allow for casual interpretations, the results suggest that organizational pride influences employee’s engagement at work, their extra-role performance, as well as their intentions to remain with their organization.

Questions remain regarding the relevance of the measure outside of the U.S. Analysis of the data collected in China provided mixed support for the measure. While the measure demonstrated strong reliability, there was not support for the measure’s construct validity—particularly the higher-order factor structure. While the overall 3-factor model was significant,
the results of this model and the second-order model suggest that there is a potential issue with the item loadings for the “making a difference” dimension. This issue may be attributed to a number of factors including cultural differences in what it means to make a difference and/or translation issues. Future research is needed to more fully examine the construct’s content and factor structure in cultures outside of the U.S., including and beyond China.
5.1 Contributions

With this research, I attempted to answer the call for greater attention to the role of discrete emotions, including pride, in organizational life (Ashkanasy et al., 2014; Weiss & Beal, 2005; Weiss et al., 1999). I conducted an in-depth empirical investigation into employees’ pride in the organizations for which they work. In doing so, I tried to bring to light what lies beneath the word proud. Study 1 and Study 2 revealed that employees’ perceptions of their organization as the “best” and as one that “makes a difference,” as well as their desire to tell others about their organization are central to the experience of organizational pride. These findings provide a more holistic understanding of what it means to be proud of one’s organization and contributed to the development of a new empirical measure to capture such content.

This research extends knowledge of self-conscious emotions (Lewis, 2000; Tangney & Tracy, 2011; Tracy & Robins, 2004), perspectives at the intersection of emotions and identity theory (Stets & Trettevik, 2014), and emerging research on the relationship between organizational identity and pride (Brickson & Akinlade, 2015b) to identify key elements of the process by which organizational pride emerges. Study 1 emphasized the crucial alignment between organizational events and participants’ understanding of what is most important to the organization (i.e., organizational goals, values, identity). Importantly, this suggests that the same events can elicit very different emotional responses from employees across organizations. For example, winning “Agency of the Year” can evoke a strong sense of pride among employees at one advertising agency but not at another where being number one or winning is not understood to be core to the organization. The qualitative research also extended research on self-verification and emotions (Stryker, 2004). In the context of the workplace, reactions from
customers, family, friends, etc. can verify the organization as socially valuable (Dutton et al., 1994) (i.e., living-up to its role expectations) and generate feelings of pride.

A spectrum of outcomes as it relates to the employee, the organization, and external stakeholders also emerged from the semi-structured interviews. The qualitative data revealed that pride in one’s organization serves as a strong motivating force to work harder. This was also supported in Study 2, as a positive relationship was found between organizational pride and employee engagement as well as with citizenship behavior targeted at the organization. Additionally, participants in the qualitative research acknowledged that feelings of pride made them more committed or loyal to their employer. Similarly, the quantitative analysis demonstrated a positive relationship with affective commitment and a negative relationship with turnover intentions.

Lastly, I developed a psychometrically sound measure that encompasses the complexity of the emotional experience. The scale development process provided evidence of a statistically significant multidimensional (i.e., three-factor) model of organizational pride. This new measure can be used in future research to quantitatively examine key questions including the boundary conditions under which employees experience organizational pride as well as its influences on employees’ attitudes, thoughts, and behaviors.

5.2 Strengths and Limitations of the Methodological Design

A primary strength of this research is its multimethod design, which enabled the investigation of organizational pride from multiple vantage points. Beginning with the qualitative research, this is the first study to capture in-depth narratives of employees’ pride in the organizations for which they work. And, these narratives reflected experiences from multiple industries (i.e., Advertising/Marketing, Financial Services, Food & Beverage, Healthcare) and a
diverse set of study participants in terms of the types of jobs performed, the types of stakeholders involved in these experiences, and the status associated with these jobs. During these semi-structured interviews, I went beyond simply evaluating the degree to which employees feel proud to seek out the personal meanings that they attach to their emotional experiences. In doing so, I was able to more completely define what it means to be proud of one’s organization as well as advance our understanding of how employees come to experience pride. Overall, these interviews helped to bring greater conceptual clarity to the construct and, at the same time, generated many questions to address in future research.

This study is also the first to use rigorous scale development procedures to create a psychometrically sound measure of organizational pride. This process was informed by not only a thorough review of existing measures of organizationally-directed pride but also in-depth critical incident interviews (from Study 1). These insights enabled the generation of a rich list of items that were then refined based on feedback by two panels of judges that included academics and practitioners from the U.S., China, Korea, and South Africa. The new measure’s factor structure was evaluated via exploratory and confirmatory analyses among four diverse samples of working adults, including one from China. Additionally, I examined the new measure’s incremental validity (vs. existing measures of pride) and relationship with key employee outcomes including engagement, citizenship behavior, and turnover intentions.

At the same time, this research has its limitations. Scholars acknowledge the many challenges associated with studying and capturing emotions due to their temporary or fleeting nature (Ashkanasy, 2003). Study 1 relied upon participants’ ability to recall pride-eliciting events and the details associated with their emotional experiences. Overall, nearly all participants could readily identify and describe specific times that they were proud of their
organization. Some, however, had more difficulty when asked about the effect of organizational pride on their attitudes or actions. Additionally, as noted in the discussion section, participants’ confessions of what could be conceived as negative attitudes or actions toward stakeholders may have been suppressed due to the non-anonymous nature of the interview (i.e., the participant’s identity was not disguised from the interviewer). Participants may have not felt comfortable disclosing potentially socially undesirable information. To help overcome some of these challenges, future research should consider other methodological designs including experimental studies (e.g., Fong, 2006) that allow for the priming of organizational pride, ethnographic studies that enable real-time observation of employees’ emotional experiences (e.g., Pratt, 2000), or experience sampling method studies that capture the dynamic nature of organizational pride (e.g., Verduyn, Delvaux, Van Coillie, Tuerlinckx, & Van Mechelen, 2009).

With regard to limitations of Study 2, while data was collected from multiple samples, the data for each survey was from a single source perspective (employees). Thus, only empirical associations, not causations, could not be determined. Second, Lee and Allen’s (2002) eight-item measure was used to examine the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior (OCB-O) and organizational pride. Their measure was designed to tap into multiple dimensions of OCB-O; however, it did not enable an in-depth examination of the relationship between organizational pride and specific dimensions of OCB-O such as loyal boosterism (Moorman & Blakely, 1995). Third, while the study was designed to incorporate a cross-cultural lens, data was only collected from one country, China. I acknowledge that including data from one country does not equate to a full cross-cultural analysis.

5.3 Implications and Future Research
The findings from Study 1 and Study 2 revealed the influence of organizational pride on employees’ attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors, giving both scholars and practitioners reason to more seriously consider the role of pride in organizational life. By bringing employees’ attention to events that reinforce the organization’s goals, values, and identity, managers can cultivate a greater sense of pride. In doing so, this pride can make employees not only feel good but also shape the way in which they view their employer and the ways they interact with co-workers, inside, and stakeholders, outside, of the organization (e.g., customers). When employees are proud of the company for which they work, they may be more engaged in the work they do, more loyal to the organization, and more driven to perform at a higher-level. Additionally, as a highly social emotion, employees’ pride may be “caught” by others even outside of the organization, resulting in benefits such as strengthened company reputation, increased interest by potential employees in the organization as an employer, or greater customer loyalty. At the same time, managers should consider the “darkside” of employees’ pride—as there indeed may be circumstances in which there can be too much of a “good” thing.

It is my hope that this work inspires scholars to continue to investigate the intricacies and influence of organizational pride and serves as the foundation for future research. Here I offer a number of potential pathways of exploration. First, I believe we can advance our understanding of organizational pride by examining employees’ experiences in the context of leadership. There is likely much to be learned about the process by which pride emerges by taking a closer look at the role of leaders. The qualitative data suggest that there may be a trickle-down effect of pride from leader to followers. For example, a participant discussed the pride that he “picked-up” from his agency’s leadership:

“Twice a year we have a big all agency meeting. Leadership typically runs these meetings and you can just pick-up on their energy. They are very very proud. They have
been and they should be. They absolutely should be because it’s those guys at the top who really work their ass off and have turned the agency in such a great direction. I really mean that. And, in the internal memos and the interviews they give to the press papers, you can pick-up on a great sense of pride from those guys. It’s an energy, it’s almost a swag, well that’s the wrong word because it implies arrogance. It’s not so much that. But, they are very proud of everything they’ve been able to do and I do think it trickles down.” [#29-Advertising/Male]

Multi-level studies that dyadically analyze both leaders’ and followers’ organizational pride could help paint a more full picture of how employees come to feel proud of their organizations and/or sustain these feelings for longer periods of time (i.e., affective states). Future research could also address whether particular leadership styles are more likely to evoke employees’ feelings of pride. As an example, charismatic leaders may foster a sense of pride among their followers through their inspirational articulation of the organization’s vision and emphasis on the organization’s goals (Shamir & Howell, 1999). Or, employees may be more attuned to what’s most important to the organization as well as more aware of the organization’s successes when they have a higher-quality exchange relationship with their leader (Graen, 1976).

There is also much to explore as it relates to the effect of organizational pride on employees’ attitudes, thoughts, and actions. In particular, future research on the “darkside” of organizational pride could help to advance our understanding of the full range of consequences associated with the experience. Elfenbein (2007) warns that scholars should not fall prey to the illusion that “positive” emotions only generate positive outcomes. To this point, there is some evidence from the qualitative interviews that pride does not always make you feel exclusively good. As an example, a qualitative participant admitted that while she was proud of her organization for the way a recent company meeting was run, the “rah-rah” climate also led her to feel “overwhelmed” and “exhausted.” She explained that the meeting generated a great deal of stress for her as she contemplated whether the organization would be able to live-up to the
goals it set for its self. In this case, the annual meeting evoked a great sense of pride in the organization but simultaneously may have elicited anxiety. She also admitted that as a leader in the company she often feels pressure to “put on a public face to look proud of the company” or “put on more pride than I may actually feel.” This suggests that there is an opportunity to examine leaders’ experience of pride-related emotional labor and the consequences of “faking” pride for leaders, employees, and the organization overall (see Grandey, 2000).

In considering the potentially “contagious” nature of organizational pride (Hatfield et al., 1994), future research could also investigate the emotion at higher-levels of analysis. Ashkanasy (2003) offers a multi-level model of emotions that includes 5 tiers: (1) within-person; (2) between person; (3) interpersonal interactions; (4) groups; and (5) organizations. Using this model as a theoretical foundation, one could examine the processes by which team members share in experiences of organizational pride and the effect that heightened levels of the emotion can have on teams’ performance. A between teams analysis could prove to be insightful in this regard. Beyond teams, future studies could examine how pride permeates throughout an entire organization. Ethnographic qualitative research may help to identify particular practices that help to foster a shared sense of pride among all employees (Pratt & Kim, 2012). Or, a between-organizations analysis of organizational pride—possibly conceptualized as a climate—could help to assess its effect on organizational-level outcomes including social and financial performance, turnover, or even policies toward stakeholders.

Lastly, there is much to explore as it relates to the intersection of pride directed at one’s self vs. one’s organization. Future research could examine how and when particular events trigger both personal and organizational pride and how these two emotional experiences interact with one another to influence employees’ beliefs and behaviors. Furthermore, pride in one’s
team or profession may also serve to strengthen (or perhaps weaken) the effects of organizational pride. Acknowledging the importance of identity in the emergence of pride, future research should consider the interplay between organizational, group, individual-level identities (Ashforth, Rogers, & Corley, 2011; see also Brickson & Akinlade, 2015b).

5.4 Conclusion

Overall, this multimethod study was designed to provide greater conceptual clarity around the construct of organizational pride—including the nature, emergence, and function of pride in the workplace. The scale development research complemented the existing qualitative research by shedding light on the construct’s factor structure and influence on members’ attitudes and behaviors. By designing a psychometrically sound measure of organizational pride, scholars can capture the construct in a more theoretically and empirically holistic way in future research. In doing so, we can continue to advance our understanding of the role of discrete emotions, broadly, and of pride, more specifically, in organizational life.
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### Table 1. Study 1 Participant Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N=30</th>
<th>Industry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advertising/Marketing: 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial Services: 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Food &amp; Beverage: 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Healthcare: 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female: 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male: 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Upper Management: 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle Management: 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Level: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years with Company</td>
<td>Less than 3 years: 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-5 years: 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-10 years: 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 10 years: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company Size</td>
<td>Less than 100: 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100-999: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,000-9,999: 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 10,000: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holding Status</td>
<td>Private: 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public: 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Headquarters (or sole) Office: 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satellite Office: 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What’s Most Important to the Organization: <em>Descriptions of the Organization’s Goals, Values, Identity</em></td>
<td>Pride Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I think that there's huge growth plans in place. CEO X's vision is to be a $X firm in the next five to ten years.”</td>
<td>“I was part of a really big global team. We were pitching the business for Global Hotel Chain X, which had just moved their headquarters. It was a huge pitch. Probably one of the biggest pitches going on at the firm at the moment and we got to pitch alongside the COO. And that was a really proud moment. Because not only was the process pretty cool and the outcome was good, we won it. When you win business, it's easy to feel a lot of pride as a firm. That was a very prideful moment because months of hard work went into it. And I'm really proud of the agency. I think it's associated with wins.” [#18-Advertising/Female]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Right now the firm values growth the most. Growth in the areas, the shiny object areas, right now. That is what is being valued.”</td>
<td>“A little patient of ours, pretty much that was not expected to have any kind of complication, had the 1% or 5% complication that can happen...It ended-up being a very bad situation with a very good outcome... We just had all of the right people there at the right time... I was proud of the hospital] Because it took ten different kinds of people to be together, working together to help save this little girl’s life.” [#1-Health/Female]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“What distinguishes my hospital from other hospitals, and I think this is true for a lot of pediatric institutions, is the camaraderie between the doctors and nurses and even the people that empty the garbage in our hospital. Everyone is a team and you have to be when you are working with kids.”</td>
<td>“We had an internal goal of getting loan balances over $X. When we reached the goal, the senior management team got together and decided to pay off the loan that got us to the goal. We invited the member in and paid off their loan. We had a party and surprised them. I’m proud of an organization that does that, something you typically don’t see. We gave it back to our members.” [#24-Finance/Male]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“We are our members. There are no differences between employees and our customers. We all bank there. We treat our members the way we want to be treated.”</td>
<td>“Becoming the world’s premier agency is definitely top priority for everyone in a leadership role and that trickles down. So, that is priority number one right now.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“‘Definitely when we were named the best agency in the world. That was really cool- like ‘wow.’ That is really cool to be a part of this and it makes me happy. This gave us the ‘gold star’ which was really really cool.” [#29-Advertising/Male]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Evidence of Validation from Outsiders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of Validation</th>
<th>Illustrative Quote from Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Receiving Praise and</td>
<td>“They came in and automatically were gushing about how pretty everything looked and they were super nice. And, throughout the night the bride and the guests were great. They were all great, super thankful for everything, super complimentary.” [#4-Food/Female]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thanks</td>
<td>“They thanked us many times. The wife gave me a hug. They said that they really appreciated everything that we did…it was a person showing gratitude. The actual patients that we are serving are saying we are doing a good job.” [#3-Health/Female]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I am always proud when my friends talk about the gym. Whenever us girls get together it happens. Like in November, one of our friends was in town, and a couple of girls had taken my class earlier that week. They kept saying ‘it was so hard,’ ‘I miss Gym X,’ ‘I miss going everyday.’” [#30-Health/Female]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Referrals</td>
<td>“This person is exposing or referring or this person is actually singing our praises for no other reason really than she wants other people then to benefit for utilizing our services. That’s pretty awesome. I mean, that to me is great. When I see that, yeah, that makes me feel really proud. Absolutely.” [#5-Finance/Male]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“We get to know a lot of people who live in the hood, people I’ve gotten to know on a personal level as customers. The fact they feel comfortable having a personal relationship with the store and like us enough to keep coming back and to tell friends about us makes me proud of the store.” [#6-Food/Male]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards</td>
<td>“I think another kind of aspect for things that we're proud of here as far as awards and things like that...I mean there's a very active goal that we all have in terms of diversity and I think that's something that, at least at other places I've worked, wasn't necessarily something that people talked about...we're very interested as being listed as a top place to work and as far as diversity goes and things like that. So they do a good job about publicizing that sort of thing when we are recognized with that.” [#21-Health/Male]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“One of the biggest markers of creative success in advertising is your awards, the awards you win. Now, advertising has its own set of award shows. You know, these are a little- when you step back and look at advertising in general-these are little bit self-serving award shows. Nobody in the world, besides those in advertising, really pays attention or knows. But, they do generate a great source of pride within agency life. And, we have enjoyed tremendous success at these award shows.” [#29-Advertising/Male]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                        | “I was proud when a member of our staff was recognized by the members at the board meeting. I was happy to be able to tell this staff member that she was recognized at the meeting because no one had told her. I was proud that this
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family and Friends as Witness</th>
<th>“For New Years Eve we were at Restaurant X. I managed to wiggle in and get a reservation. When we were waiting for our table, Leader A walked in, in a tuxedo and going right to his table, but he stopped by and saw me waiting there. He was like ‘hey man, how’s it going?’ The fact that that guy knows who I am (laughing) is pretty awesome to me. My friends were like ‘oh, you know this kid.’ I’ve been recognized by this man and his partners, investing in me and promoting me and it all comes back to him and he knows me. Yeah, it increases my pride and certainly my confidence. It was a really cool moment when my wife got to see him and my friends got to see him.” [8-Food/Male]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Even family members, they love me, but I think it has a cold, Wall Street, cutthroat image and all anybody cares about is making money and increasing revenue. So, I think it showed, of course we want to make money and grow assets and have strong performance, but at the end of the day we are all people. It is not the most important thing. The fact that I am in an industry that has that image and Company X was the only employer, from what I’m aware of, that sent flowers and showed their concern and condolences. It showed the more personal or emotional. It showed a different side that most people don’t understand about the industry that I am in. It also felt good to know that they cared enough to do that because I obviously did not expect it. I think it made my dad proud too. I think he was proud that I worked for a firm that would do that.” [26-Finance/Female]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Evidence of Outcomes of Organizational Pride

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illustrative Quote from Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation to Work Harder</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“It really does. You work hard, you are working to basically build relationships, build a foundation, build long-term strategic plans and you want to know that if those don’t come to fruition because of something you can’t control, you want to believe that you are taken care of in that circumstance. So, it literally makes me work harder.” [#9-Finance/Male]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Day to day it is much easier to have passion for what you do. These kids’ stories give me passion to keep working and improve what I am doing...It’s inspirational to hear stories and share with others so they too will recognize that the program makes a difference in their lives.” [#23-Food/Male]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“When I got back, I definitely went to work over-time. I wanted to get back to work. I really appreciated what they did for me and I didn’t want them to think I was taking advantage of their sincere understanding. I got back on a Friday and I’ve had bronchitis all week but I kept coming into work. They kept saying, ‘Go home. You don’t need to come in.’ But, to me, I was working when I away but I felt so far removed that I needed to get back into the routine of things. I did work harder. I already had the respect for the firm so I don’t know if it increased it or I don’t know if it changed by loyalty to the firm because I already have it. But, it definitely made me want to work harder for the firm. And, it definitely made me want to work harder when I got back. I was sick and still going in and playing catch-up. I flew to City X and then City Y and then I am going back to City Y just to try to get as many meetings as possible. I don’t want them to think I by any means took advantage or didn’t appreciate what they did.” [#26-Finance/Female]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commitment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Oh, it retains [employees]. It makes them want to continue and move up and grow and develop. Again, in an industry where there are so many different options and places to work and you have guys who have worked at 10 different restaurants over a 15 year career and then they’ll come here and stay for another 10-15 years for the rest of their career. Like anything if you are proud of where you work, you are going to want to stay there and develop and in turn grow and develop people underneath you. You can’t move-up unless you have someone behind. I think people take as serious as moving up themselves, making sure the people behind them are developed properly and trained properly so they can move-up.” [#8-Food/Male]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“It makes me loyal. It doesn’t change the way I look at my competitors but it makes me more loyal. I get recruited all of the time. So far I have been very loyal.” [#9-Finance/Male]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stronger Customer/Client Relationships</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I think the sense that we have people that interact with customers that are very enthusiastic about the company that shows through. So if they talk to current customers or potential customers about our products and what we have to offer, the enthusiasm for the company definitely shows through. It impresses the customers.” [#11-Health/Female]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“I think where it could be good is exactly what we talked about—increasing folks’ engagement in the company, people spending more time, dedication, commitment to what it is we are doing. And, more committed to our clients and our people themselves.” [#2-Finance/Male]

“I think a lot of customers are loyal to the company and like ‘being part of the family.’ For our frequent diner members this is a great thing. Now, the fact that you are being recognized this huge honor. It was certainly a point of conversation with customers—especially with the old regulars. They love, so many people name dropping, ‘Oh, I’ve known Leader A nickname’—they call him ‘Leader A nickname’ like they are that close. But I think for them it was a cool thing. We all got to talk about it.” [#8-Food/Male]
### Table 5. Overview of Scale Development Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEP</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Data Collection/ Sample</th>
<th>Main Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test and item refinement</td>
<td>• Initially assess the psychometric properties of the measure, evaluate reliability, and further refine the list of items.</td>
<td>Online survey among (n=276): • Midwestern university students (Sample 1) • U.S. working adults (Sample 2)</td>
<td>Analysis of means, SDs and item content resulted in a total of 22 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploratory Factor Analysis</td>
<td>• Explore the initial factor structure of the items.</td>
<td>• Samples 1 and 2</td>
<td>Exploratory factor analysis revealed 3 distinct factors (engaging others; making a difference; being the best)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmatory Factor Analysis</td>
<td>• Confirm the factor structure (i.e., multidimensionality) of the measure.</td>
<td>Online survey among (n=153): • U.S. working adults (Sample 3)</td>
<td>Confirmatory factor analysis provided support for the new nine item, three-factor model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>• Assess the measure’s reliability.</td>
<td>• Sample 3</td>
<td>Alpha provided support for reliability of the new nine item measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct Validity</td>
<td>• Evaluate the extent to which the measure is related to and distinct from other constructs of interest.</td>
<td>• Sample 3</td>
<td>Correlational analysis provided evidence that organizational pride is positively related to but also distinct from affective commitment and organizational identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion and Incremental Related Validity</td>
<td>• Evaluate the extent to which the measure is associated with employees’ behaviors.</td>
<td>• Sample 3</td>
<td>Regression analysis provided evidence that the new measure explained variance in employee engagement, OCB-O, and turnover intentions (when controlling for Blader &amp; Tyler’s 2009 measure of pride)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-cultural Validity</td>
<td>• Evaluate the extent to which the measure appropriately captures organizational pride outside of the U.S.</td>
<td>In-person survey among (n=192): • Chinese MBA students (Sample 4)</td>
<td>Measure demonstrated acceptable reliability. However, the factor structure was not supported (via CFA).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 6. Exploratory Factor Analysis Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) I want to tell others about the great things that my company is doing</td>
<td>0.895</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) I want to tell others about my company's successes</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) I want to tell others about the great things that the people in my company are doing</td>
<td>0.794</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to tell others about the people in my company's successes</td>
<td>0.830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Redundancy with item #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to tell others how great it is to be a part of my company</td>
<td>0.930</td>
<td>-0.104</td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor theoretical fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It feels good to tell others where I work</td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor theoretical fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It feels good to talk about my company's people with others</td>
<td>0.754</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor theoretical fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am proud to tell others that I am an employee of my company</td>
<td>0.716</td>
<td>0.169</td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor theoretical fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It feels good to talk about my company with others</td>
<td>0.708</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor theoretical fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It feels good to think about my company</td>
<td>0.795</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor theoretical fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am proud of my company</td>
<td>0.726</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor theoretical fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) My company does important work</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.845</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) The people in my company are making a difference</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Being a part of my company enables me to do important work</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>0.632</td>
<td>-0.125</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My company is making a difference</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.862</td>
<td></td>
<td>Redundancy with #4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am making a difference by being a part of my company</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td></td>
<td>Redundancy with #5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others think my company is making a difference</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>Poor theoretical fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) My company is recognized as the best by others</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>0.173</td>
<td>0.687</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) My company's people are recognized as the best by others</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0.599</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My company is the best</td>
<td>0.531</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td></td>
<td>High cross-loading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My company is doing great things</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>0.532</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>High cross-loading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being a part of my company enables me to do great things</td>
<td>0.423</td>
<td>0.473</td>
<td>-0.160</td>
<td>High cross-loading</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New item (9): My company is superior to its competitors.
Table 7. Descriptive Statistics and Correlational Analysis: Sample 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n=153</th>
<th>MEAN (SD)</th>
<th>OP</th>
<th>EO</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>BE</th>
<th>PR</th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>OID</th>
<th>EE</th>
<th>OCB-O</th>
<th>TI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MEAN (.SD)</td>
<td>OP (.88)</td>
<td>EO (.87)</td>
<td>MD (.90)</td>
<td>BE (.85)</td>
<td>PR (.86)</td>
<td>AC (.90)</td>
<td>OID (.84)</td>
<td>EE (.91)</td>
<td>TI (.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP</td>
<td>3.78 (.67)</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.81 (.82)</td>
<td>3.84 (.80)</td>
<td>3.70 (.87)</td>
<td>3.96 (.74)</td>
<td>3.37 (.90)</td>
<td>3.66 (.74)</td>
<td>3.61 (.74)</td>
<td>3.79 (.71)</td>
<td>2.49 (.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EO</td>
<td>3.81 (.82)</td>
<td>3.78*</td>
<td>3.81 (.82)</td>
<td>3.84 (.80)</td>
<td>3.70 (.87)</td>
<td>3.96 (.74)</td>
<td>3.37 (.90)</td>
<td>3.66 (.74)</td>
<td>3.61 (.74)</td>
<td>3.79 (.71)</td>
<td>2.49 (.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>3.84 (.80)</td>
<td>.783*</td>
<td>.605*</td>
<td>.783*</td>
<td>.605*</td>
<td>.783*</td>
<td>.605*</td>
<td>.783*</td>
<td>.605*</td>
<td>.783*</td>
<td>.605*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
<td>3.70 (.87)</td>
<td>.763*</td>
<td>.505*</td>
<td>.763*</td>
<td>.505*</td>
<td>.763*</td>
<td>.505*</td>
<td>.763*</td>
<td>.505*</td>
<td>.763*</td>
<td>.505*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>3.96 (.74)</td>
<td>.762*</td>
<td>.609*</td>
<td>.762*</td>
<td>.609*</td>
<td>.762*</td>
<td>.609*</td>
<td>.762*</td>
<td>.609*</td>
<td>.762*</td>
<td>.609*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>3.37 (.90)</td>
<td>.685*</td>
<td>.679*</td>
<td>.685*</td>
<td>.679*</td>
<td>.685*</td>
<td>.679*</td>
<td>.685*</td>
<td>.679*</td>
<td>.685*</td>
<td>.679*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OID</td>
<td>3.66 (.74)</td>
<td>.625*</td>
<td>.649*</td>
<td>.625*</td>
<td>.649*</td>
<td>.625*</td>
<td>.649*</td>
<td>.625*</td>
<td>.649*</td>
<td>.625*</td>
<td>.649*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>3.61 (.74)</td>
<td>.661*</td>
<td>.625*</td>
<td>.661*</td>
<td>.625*</td>
<td>.661*</td>
<td>.625*</td>
<td>.661*</td>
<td>.625*</td>
<td>.661*</td>
<td>.625*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB-O</td>
<td>3.79 (.71)</td>
<td>.549*</td>
<td>.556*</td>
<td>.549*</td>
<td>.556*</td>
<td>.549*</td>
<td>.556*</td>
<td>.549*</td>
<td>.556*</td>
<td>.549*</td>
<td>.556*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI</td>
<td>2.49 (.27)</td>
<td>-.466*</td>
<td>-.489*</td>
<td>-.466*</td>
<td>-.489*</td>
<td>-.466*</td>
<td>-.489*</td>
<td>-.466*</td>
<td>-.489*</td>
<td>-.466*</td>
<td>-.489*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SD = Standard Deviation; Coefficient alpha in ( ) on diagonal.
Table 8. Descriptive Statistics and Correlational Analysis: Sample 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n=192</th>
<th>MEAN (SD)</th>
<th>OP</th>
<th>EO</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>BE</th>
<th>PR</th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>OID</th>
<th>EE</th>
<th>OCB-O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OP</td>
<td>3.79 (.77)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EO</td>
<td>4.02 (.94)</td>
<td>.827*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>3.90 (.81)</td>
<td>.831*</td>
<td>.564*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
<td>3.44 (1.00)</td>
<td>.838*</td>
<td>.490*</td>
<td>.563*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>3.57 (.90)</td>
<td>.715*</td>
<td>.508*</td>
<td>.521*</td>
<td>.739*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>3.28 (.67)</td>
<td>.543*</td>
<td>.446*</td>
<td>.469*</td>
<td>.423*</td>
<td>.509*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OID</td>
<td>3.75 (.83)</td>
<td>.514*</td>
<td>.469*</td>
<td>.446*</td>
<td>.376*</td>
<td>.426*</td>
<td>.587*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>3.68 (.77)</td>
<td>.555*</td>
<td>.486*</td>
<td>.505*</td>
<td>.409*</td>
<td>.394*</td>
<td>.546*</td>
<td>.576*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB-O</td>
<td>3.68 (.83)</td>
<td>.543*</td>
<td>.455*</td>
<td>.502*</td>
<td>.374*</td>
<td>.390*</td>
<td>.503*</td>
<td>.612*</td>
<td>.558*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SD= Standard Deviation; Coefficient alpha in ( ) on diagonal.
FIGURES

Figure 1. Data Structure: Nature of Organizational Pride

Second Order Themes
- Descriptions of OP as a positive experience
- References to the momentary nature of OP
- Statements distinguishing OP from happiness
- Defining the org in terms of an entity when describing OP
- Defining the org in terms of its people (as a group) when describing OP
- Defining the org in terms of one’s affiliation with it when describing OP
- Engaging with colleagues when proud of the org
- Telling those outside of the org (e.g., customers, clients) you are proud of the org
- References to the org as the best when describing OP
- References to the org as better than its competitors when describing OP
- References to the org as number when describing OP
- References to the org doing important work when describing OP
- References to the org and its members giving back to the community when describing OP

Aggregate Concepts
- Distinct Emotional Experience
- Conceptualizing the Org
- Engaging Others
- Being the Best
- Making a Difference

Descriptions (of OP) as (a positive experience)
References to the (momentary nature of OP)
Statements distinguishing OP from happiness
Defining the org in terms of an entity when describing OP
Defining the org in terms of its people (as a group) when describing OP
Defining the org in terms of one’s affiliation with it when describing OP
Engaging with colleagues when proud of the org
Telling those outside of the org (e.g., customers, clients) you are proud of the org
References to the org as the best when describing OP
References to the org as better than its competitors when describing OP
References to the org as number when describing OP
References to the org doing important work when describing OP
References to the org and its members giving back to the community when describing OP

Pleasurable Emotion
Transitory Nature
Distinct from Happiness
Org as an Entity
Org as its Members
Org as Affiliation
Sharing with Insiders
Telling Outsiders
Being the Best
Better Than Others
Being #1
Important Work
Giving Back
Figure 2. Higher-Order Factor Structure (Sample 3)

Figure 2. Results of second-order confirmatory factor analysis results for organizational pride. Circles represent the second-order factors (dimensions); Boxes represent items reflecting first-order factors (items). Numbers represent unstandardized factor loadings.

$x^2=45.716; CFI=.976; TLI=.966; RMSEA=.074; SRMR=.048$
APPENDICES

Appendix A. Study 1 Interview Protocol

Section A: Introduction and Personal Background
First, thank you for your willingness to participate in my study. As you know, I am a graduate student at UIC and this research is part of my dissertation project. Today my goal is simply to get your honest thoughts and opinions on a range of questions.

Specifically, I’ll be asking you a number of questions about different times when you felt proud of your company (name company). While a lot is known about why we feel proud of ourselves, we know very little about why employees feel proud of their company. And, I think this is important to understand because employees’ feelings of pride in their company may be linked to a wide range of outcomes. For example, pride could lead employees to feel more committed to their company or provide better service to customers. Or, maybe on the other hand, when employees are very proud of where they work they may be hesitant to change the way they are doing things or actually mistreat their customers. So, I’m interested in learning about when and why employees are proud of their company as well as how pride influences their attitudes and actions.

Of course, there are no right or wrong answers. And, at any point if you are not clear about what I am asking, feel free to stop me so I can clarify.

To begin, I like to learn more about what you do at [insert company]...

1. Briefly tell me about your role at [insert company]. For example, what is a typical week like for you?
   a. Do you work in a team or independently (who do you interact with)?

Section B: Nature of and Relationship with the Organization
Now I would like to learn more about [insert company] and your overall feelings toward the company.

2. When you think about your company and where you work, what are the first things that come to mind?

3. Thinking about [insert their company], how would you answer the question “Who are we as a company”? When you think about this question, try to think about what it most important to your company or what distinguishes it from other companies?

4. What do you see as your company’s…
   a. Top [strategic] goals or priorities?
   b. Values?

5. Overall, how connected do you feel to your company?
   a. Do you experience your organization’s successes and failures as your own?
Section C: Narratives of Organizational Pride

Now, let’s talk more specifically about time when you may or may not have felt proud of [insert company]...

6. In your own words, what does it mean to you if you tell someone you know, say a co-worker, friend or family member, that you are “proud” of your company? What words come to mind when you think of feeling proud of your company?
   a. How does this feeling differ from say feeling happy or excited for your company?

7. Please finish the following sentences up to three times.

“I am/was proud of my company when __________________________”
“I am/was NOT proud of my company when __________________________”

   a. Now let’s go through a few of these examples. Can you briefly tell me…
      i. Why you were proud of your company when…?
      ii. Why were not proud of your company when…?

Narrative: Most Proud Moment

8. Looking at the list you just created, I’d like to start by focusing on your most proud moment. Paint me a picture of the event so I feel like I was there...

   a. When did this event occur? How long had you been at the company?
   b. How did you hear about the event?
   c. Who was involved in the event?
   d. How often does this event happen?
   e. Why were you proud of the company?
   f. How did you feel? What words or phrases would you use to describe how you felt?
   g. Did you try to show your feelings of pride to others? If so, how and why?
   h. Or, did you try to hide your pride from anyone? If so, to whom, how, and why?
   i. How long did this feeling of pride last? Was the intensity of the pride consistent or did it change?
   j. Were others proud of the company as well? How could you tell that others were proud?

9. Still thinking about this time you felt most proud of your company that you just described, I want to learn more about the ways in which this feeling of pride impacted your attitudes and actions. In what ways, if at all, did your pride for [insert company] change your thoughts, feelings, or behaviors toward your...

   a. Company overall?
   b. Daily job?
   c. Co-workers?
   d. Customers or clients?
Section D: Other Targets of Pride

*For each, probe to see if the respondents think of this change in their attitude or action was positive or negative.

Section D: Other Targets of Pride [Note: This series of questions was not asked of all questions due to time constraints]

We have been talking about pride in your company and we are going to shift gears now and focus on a couple of other things that might make you proud.

10. Thinking about the work that you do, please briefly tell me about a time when you were proud of…
   a. Yourself at work?
   b. Your occupation?
   c. Your industry?

11. Thinking about when you feel proud of your company versus proud in [insert self, occupation, industry], how are these feelings different?
   a. Which is more intense for you? Why?

Section E: Closing

12. In what ways, if at all, does your company try to instill a sense of pride in its employees?

13. Do you believe the leaders of your company are proud? If so, how can you tell?

14. What would you recommend to organizations that seek to build feelings of pride among their employees? If you were a consultant, what might be some suggestions you would make?
   a. In what ways can encouraging employees to feel proud of their company be good?
   b. In what ways can encouraging employees to feel proud of their company be risky or problematic?

15. Are there any other issues that you’ve thought of during our interview that you think might be important for me to know about your feelings of pride in your company?

Demographic Survey

This is a brief survey for interviewer/participants to fill-out at the end of the interview.

Company information

1. Company name:
2. Company industry:
3. # of employees in company (approx.):
4. Is your company publically or privately held?:
Employee information

5. Position with your company:
6. Years with the company:
7. Do you work in your company’s headquarters or satellite office?:
## Appendix B. Summary of Existing Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Construct Definition</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vecchio (1995)</td>
<td>Pride in Organization: Not defined</td>
<td>1. I am proud to be working for this organization.</td>
<td>None provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blader &amp; Tyler (2009; Study 1): Based on Tyler et al. (1996)</td>
<td>Pride: Evaluations of the standing of one’s group (intergroup evaluative judgment)</td>
<td>1. I feel proud be a part of my work group. 2. My work group is highly respected within the company. 3. My work group is one of the most desirable within ____. 4. I work in one of the best work groups in ____.</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blader &amp; Tyler (2009; Study 2): Based on Tyler et al. (1996)</td>
<td>Pride: Evaluations of the standing of one’s group (intergroup evaluative judgment)</td>
<td>1. My company is one of the best companies in its field. 2. People are impressed when I tell them where I work. 3. My company is well respected in its field. 4. I think that where I work reflects well on me. 5. I am proud to tell others where I work.</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turban, Lau, Ngo, Chow, and Si (2001)</td>
<td>Pride in being an employee: Not defined</td>
<td>1. I would feel proud to be an employee of this firm. 2. I would receive respect from others if I worked at this firm. 3. My family would feel proud of me if I worked for this firm.</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler &amp; Blader (2002)</td>
<td>Autonomous pride: Evaluations of group status based on internal standards</td>
<td>1. I cannot think of another university I would rather attend. 2. I am proud to think of myself as a member of the UCB community. 3. When someone praises the accomplishments of a member of the UCB community, I feel like it is a personal</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Tyler & Blader (2002) | Comparative pride: Evaluations of group status based on external standards | 1. How does the reputation of UCB compare to the reputation of other universities?  
2. How does the work done by students and faculty at UCB compare to the work being done by students and faculty at other universities?  
3. How do the accomplishments of the students and faculty at UCB compare with the accomplishments of the students and faculty at other universities?  
4. How does the value of a UCB education compare to the value of an education from other universities? | .87 |
| Cable & Turban (2003) [Adapted from Turban et al. 2001] | Pride from organizational membership: Not defined | 1. I would feel proud to be an employee of this firm.  
2. I would be proud to tell others that I work for this firm.  
3. I would be proud to identify myself personally with this firm. | .94 |
Appendix C. Study 2: Sample Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sample 1: Midwest University Undergraduate Students</th>
<th>Sample 2: Working Adults</th>
<th>Sample 3: Working Adults</th>
<th>Sample 4: Chinese MBA Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clean Sample Size</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (% male)</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>43.17%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (mean in years)</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-Status (% full-time)</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
<td>96.7%</td>
<td>97.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Tenure</td>
<td>More than 6 months: 66.7%</td>
<td>Mean: 6 years 1 month</td>
<td>Mean: 6 years 3 months</td>
<td>Mean: 4 years 8 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Size¹</td>
<td>Not Asked</td>
<td>Large: 44.3%</td>
<td>Large: 54.9%</td>
<td>Large: 54.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Med: 32.3%</td>
<td>Med: 26.8%</td>
<td>Med: 35.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small: 23.6%</td>
<td>Small: 18.3%</td>
<td>Small: 8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Rate²</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1: Large=500+ employees; Mid-Size= 50-500 employees; Small: Less than 50 employees
2: Response rate for Sample 1 is based on 1,063 students who were invited to enroll in the university’s subject pool; A response rate from Amazon’s MTurk is not shown because it is not possible to know how many views the online posting received; Sample 3’s response rate is based on number of survey invitations sent out to potential respondents; Sample 4’s response rate is based on the number of students invited to participate in the survey.
## Appendix D. Study 2: Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Organizational Pride**     | Original measure            | 1. I want to tell others about the great things that the people in my company are doing (EO).  
2. I want to tell others about my company’s successes (EO).  
3. I want to tell others about the great things that my company is doing (EO).  
4. Being a part of my company enables me to do important work (MD).  
5. My company does important work (MD).  
6. The people in my company are making a difference (MD).  
7. My company is recognized as the best by others (B).  
8. My company’s people are recognized as the best by others (B).  
9. My company is superior to its competitors (B). |
| [Final measure for analyses purposes in Sample 3; 4] |                             |                                                                      |
| **Pride**                    | Blader & Tyler (2009)        | 1. My company is one of the best companies in its field.  
2. People are impressed when I tell them where I work.  
3. My company is well respected in its field.  
4. I think that where I work reflects well on me.  
5. I am proud to tell others where I work. |
| [Sample 3; 4]                |                             |                                                                      |
| **Affective Commitment**     | Allen & Meyer (1990)         | 1. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this company.  
2. I enjoy discussing my company with people outside it.  
3. I really feel as if this company’s problems are my own.  
4. I think that I could easily become as attached to another company as I am to this one.  
5. I do not feel like ‘part of the family’ at this company.  
6. I do not feel ‘emotionally attached’ to this company.  
7. This company has a great deal of personal meaning for me.  
8. I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to this company. |
| [Sample 3; 4]                |                             |                                                                      |
| **Organizational Identification** | Mael & Ashforth (1992)     | 1. When someone criticizes the company, it feels like a personal insult.  
2. I am very interested in what others think about the company.  
3. When I talk about the company, I usually say “we” rather than “they.”  
4. This company’s successes are my successes.  
5. When someone praises the company, it feels like a personal compliment.  
6. If a story in the media criticized the company, I would feel embarrassed. |
| [Sample 3; 4]                |                             |                                                                      |
| **Employee Engagement**      | Schaufeli, Bakker, & Salanova (2006) | 1. At my work, I feel bursting with energy.  
2. At my job, I feel strong and vigorous.  
3. I am enthusiastic about my job.  
4. My job inspires me.  
5. When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work.  
6. I feel happy when I am working intensely.  
7. I am proud of the work that I do.  
8. I am immersed in my work.  
9. I get carried away when I am working. |
| **Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB-O)**  
| [Sample 3; 4] | Lee & Allen (2002) | 1. Attend functions that are not required but that help the company’s image.  
| | | 2. Keep up with developments in the company.  
| | | 3. Defend the company when other employees criticize it.  
| | | 4. Show pride when representing the company in public.  
| | | 5. Offer ideas to improve the functioning of the company.  
| | | 6. Express loyalty toward the company.  
| | | 7. Take action to protect the company from potential problems.  
| | | 8. Demonstrate concern about the image of the company.  

| **Turnover Intentions**  
| [Sample 3] | Kelloway, Gottlieb, & Barham (1999) | 1. I am thinking about leaving this company.  
| | | 2. I am planning to look for a new job.  
| | | 3. I intend to ask people about new job opportunities.  
| | | 4. I do not plan to be at this company much longer.  |
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