

Running head: UNCIVIL MEETING BEHAVIORS (UMBs)

Incivility in Meetings: Consequences and Antecedents

Current status: In press at the Journal of Business and Psychology

Isabelle Odermatt

Universität Zürich, Switzerland

Cornelius J. König

Universität des Saarlandes, Germany

Martin Kleinmann and Maria Bachmann

Universität Zürich, Switzerland

Heiko Röder and Patricia Schmitz

Universität des Saarlandes, Germany

Author Note

Isabelle Odermatt, Martin Kleinmann, and Maria Bachmann, Psychologisches Institut, Universität Zürich, Switzerland. Cornelius J. König, Heiko Röder, and Patricia Schmitz, Fachrichtung Psychologie, Universität des Saarlandes, Saarbrücken, Germany. The order of the last two authors was alphabetically determined.

This study was supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation (Schweizerischer Nationalfonds, grant 100014-124580)

We thank Steven G. Rogelberg and Mark C. Bolino for his valuable advice into this study and Liselotte Spegelitz for her help with the data collection.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Isabelle Odermatt, Psychologisches Institut, Universität Zürich, Binzmühlestrasse 14/12, CH-8050 Zürich, Switzerland, or to Cornelius J. König, Universität des Saarlandes, AE Arbeits- und Organisationspsychologie, Campus A1 3, D-66123 Saarbrücken, Germany. E-mail: i.odermatt@psychologie.uzh.ch or ckoenig@mx.uni-saarland.de.

Abstract

Purpose The purpose of this study is to provide a deeper understanding of uncivil meeting behaviors (UMBs) by exploring their frequency, potential predictors, and perceived impact on meeting outcomes. Five forms of UMBs were identified and examined. Key situational variables (meeting characteristics) and individual differences (Big Five factors and the Dark Triad of personality) were explored as potential predictors of UMBs.

Methodology We collected data from two independent samples of meeting participants ($N_s = 345, 170$) via two online surveys. We used confirmatory factor analysis, correlations, hierarchical multiple regressions, and relative weight analyses to analyze the data.

Findings The findings demonstrated that attendees' perceptions of UMBs were linked to lower ratings of meeting satisfaction and effectiveness. In particular, the ratings were most affected by the observation of attendees who did not participate actively and who showed inappropriate interpersonal behavior. Results further suggest situational variables (meeting purpose and meeting norms) and individual differences (narcissism, psychopathy, and agreeableness) as potential predictors of UMBs.

Implications By showing the consequences of UMBs on meeting outcomes and by providing insights into potential causes of engagement in UMBs, this study offers valuable input for running and leading work meetings.

Originality/Value No previous study has empirically examined how different forms of UMBs affect meeting outcomes. Additionally, the paper introduces situational and personality variables that may act as potential predictors of UMBs.

Keywords: meetings, meeting satisfaction, workplace incivility, Big Five, Dark Triad

Employees spend significant amounts of their work time in meetings, thus making meetings a central component of many employees' work lives (Rogelberg, Leach, Warr, & Burnfield, 2006). The ability of meetings to generate high-quality outcomes is a joint function of all involved parties. Carozzi (1999) states that "without the courtesy and cooperation of attendees, not even the best planned and moderated meeting can succeed" (p. 55). However, meetings often provide individuals with an opportunity to engage in uncivil work behaviors, such as paying little attention to others' statements, undermining someone's credibility in front of others, addressing someone in unprofessional terms, or making demeaning remarks (Cortina, Magley, Williams, & Langhout, 2001). Indeed, meeting attendees often complain in surveys about one or more meeting attendees who engage in rude and discourteous behaviors like socializing during the meeting, engaging in personal accusations, showing disinterest in topics, interrupting the speaker, and arriving late (Di Salvo, Nikkel, & Monroe, 1989; Romano & Nunamaker, 2001). We describe these actions as "*uncivil meeting behaviors (UMBs)*."

Although recent research has demonstrated the importance of conducting more satisfying meetings (Rogelberg, Allen, Shanock, Scott, & Shuffler, 2010), previous research on UMBs is rather anecdotal and little research to date has empirically examined specific UMBs and their predictors and outcomes (for an exception regarding meeting lateness, see Rogelberg et al., 2014). Thus, we contribute to the meeting literature by systematizing the anecdotal evidence about UMBs (by identifying different forms of UMBs) and by examining the prevalence, the consequences, and the predictors of UMBs. Furthermore, we also contribute to the related literature on workplace incivility by answering the call by Schilpzand, De Pater, and Erez (2016) for more research on discrete uncivil behavior and by linking instigated incivility with personality traits such as the Dark Triad for the first time.

In the following sections, we first give a definition of UMBs. Second, we provide a conceptualization of UMBs by developing a general typology of different forms of UMBs.

Finally, we describe some conceptual similarities and differences with related constructs such as workplace incivility and general counterproductive workplace behavior (CWB). Following the above review, we present two independent studies: Study 1 explores base rates of observed UMBs, the relationship between UMBs and meeting outcomes, and situational predictors of UMBs. The focus of Study 2 is on instigated UMBs and their personality predictors (agreeableness, conscientiousness, and emotional stability, and the Dark Triad personality).

Uncivil Meeting Behaviors

We define UMBs as behaviors that occur during meetings and involve acting without regard for others, in violation of norms for respect in social interactions, and general meeting norms. In essence, UMBs include behaviors that violate common meeting norms for attending, contributing, and intruding (e.g., arriving on time, treating others respectfully, giving attention to the speaker, not intentionally overlapping in speaking, and avoiding disruption; Goffman, 1967; Volkema & Niederman, 1995) and that could be considered by meeting attendees as rude or inappropriate. Thus, UMBs can be understood as behavior that disrupts mutual respect in the meeting, even if what is considered uncivil in one organization or particular meeting may not be universally considered uncivil (Andersson & Pearson, 1999).

We propose that UMBs do not always include a clear intent to harm someone. Some attendees might engage in UMBs with the intent to harm other members, for example, showing disinterest in a topic or making fun of someone, with the goal of decreasing this person's self-esteem. Both behaviors, however, can also be the result of ignorance or oversight. In these cases, the resulting harm may be accidental rather than intentional. Nonetheless, when meetings are viewed as an exchange situation (cf. Blau, 1964), UMBs might lead to inequitable relationships that cause meeting dissatisfaction, which has important attitudinal and behavioral implications (Rogelberg et al., 2010). Furthermore, although many uncivil behaviors are considered relatively harmless, they can still negatively affect

organizational effectiveness and job satisfaction (Cortina et al., 2001; Lim, Cortina, & Magley, 2008). Additionally, when such daily hassles are cognitively appraised as threatening (e.g., offensive, inappropriate) and occur with some frequency over time, they can be harmful to employees' well-being (DeLongis, Coyne, Dakof, Folkman, & Lazarus, 1982).

We rely on previous meeting literature that describes common problems concerning attendee behaviors to operationalize UMBs (e.g., Carlozzi, 1999; Di Salvo et al., 1989; Myrsiades, 2000; Romano & Nunamaker, 2001; Streibel, 2003). Di Salvo et al. (1989) summarized problems in meetings into the following categories: Participant's nonparticipation, communication skills, egocentric behavior, interruptions, sidetracked, and negative attitudes and emotions. Romano and Nunamaker (2001) reported the following problems concerning attendee behavior: Interruptions, individuals dominate/aggrandize discussion, starting late, ineffective speakers/communication problems, poor attitudes or effort by participants, and lack of participation. Streibel (2003) reported the following main problems in meetings: Late arrivals and no-shows, weak participation, group dynamics and individual personalities, conversations on the side, too much talk, and not enough action. These previous findings from the meeting literature illustrate that UMBs mainly concern interaction behavior within meetings (e.g., whether members communicate respectfully with other members) but also the misuse of meeting time (e.g., lack of participation, using the meeting time for unrelated activities). Ultimately, UMBs can be summarized in five categories: *Absenteeism* comprises behaviors in which attendees are (partially) absent from the meeting (e.g., arriving late, leaving the meeting occasionally) and consequentially miss out on certain meeting content. *Unrelated activities* represent behaviors in which attendees deal with other things and focus on more than meeting content (e.g., conducting personal business during the meeting). *Nonparticipation* refers to the situation when attendees do not participate actively and seem to be disinterested (e.g., showing a facial expression of disinterest). In contrast to absenteeism, nonparticipation involves behaviors in which

individuals are physically present in the meeting but not involved in discussions. *Dominant communication behavior* refers to egocentric behavior during discussions (e.g., cutting others off, monopolizing the discussion). *Inappropriate interpersonal behavior* represents disrespectful verbal or nonverbal behaviors (e.g., making fun of others).

It is useful to distinguish UMBs from related constructs such as workplace incivility. Both, UMBs and workplace incivility (cf. Andersson & Pearson, 1999) are defined as low-intensity deviant workplace behavior with an ambiguous intent to harm. In addition, both behaviors violate workplace norms for mutual respect; whereas workplace incivility focuses more on general norms within the organization, UMBs focus more on norms about meetings. Additionally, both behaviors are expected to have negative consequences for organizational effectiveness as well as employee well-being and attitudes. However, although UMBs can share some conceptual similarities with workplace incivility, there are also some conceptual differences which we discuss below.

First, research on workplace incivility investigates instigators of workplace incivility directed towards employees (Schilpzand et al., 2016). UMBs, in contrast, are not directed towards employees but, instead, are often directed to an organizational setting, namely the meeting itself. Attendees, for example, engage in UMBs (e.g., nonparticipation, absenteeism) because the organizational goals or the way to achieve these goals are not compatible with their own. Second, the majority of workplace incivility research focuses on uncivil incidents that took place during a period of months to years and thus, examines the impact of incivility on employees' longer-term attitudes and behaviors (cf. Schilpzand et al., 2016). However, meetings constitute a discrete event where incivility episodes often have important immediate or short-term consequences. UMBs may affect meeting outcomes such as meeting satisfaction which in turn could influence other important work behaviors and attitudes (e.g., job satisfaction; Rogelberg et al., 2010). Third, incivility research usually focuses on dyads (e.g., incivility experienced by a supervisor, coworker, or customer; Schilpzand et al., 2016).

UMBs, however, investigate the potential impact of a group as a source of incivility. It is likely that there are differences in the effects of incivility when the source varies. Thus, UMBs provide insight into whether one uncivil group member is able to influence the performance of an entire group (e.g., meeting effectiveness) and how incivility negatively relates to group member's satisfaction (e.g., meeting satisfaction).

Another construct that has theoretical similarities to UMBs is CWB. Similar to UMBs, CWB involves deviant work behavior that violates core organizational and/or societal norms (Vardi & Wiener, 1996) and both behaviors are expected to have negative consequences for organizational effectiveness as well as employee well-being and attitudes. However, the conceptualization of UMBs is also different from CWB. First, whereas a crucial element in the definition of CWB is the intention underlying the misbehavior (Vardi & Wiener, 1996), UMBs do not always include a clear intent to harm someone. Second, CWB is extremely socially undesirable (e.g., theft, sabotage, alcohol abuse, etc.), so that it is usually not demonstrated publicly, because it will have immediate consequences. The nature and intensity of UMBs, however, are much more socially acceptable. Third, CWB refers to behaviors that are not tolerated by organizations. UMBs, however, are tolerated, even though the behaviors are a hindrance to organizations' goals, since it is part of the accepted behavioral repertoire. Finally, the non-observance of standards (i.e., UMBs) can be corrected much more easily in meetings, since it takes place in a public context. When such misbehavior is corrected immediately, the result is that potential negative effects are not incurred at all. For these reasons, UMBs represent a repertoire of behaviors which can be seen to extend beyond established classifications of CWB (cf. Robinson & Bennett, 1995; Sackett & DeVore, 2001; Vardi & Wiener, 1996) and thereby extends the classic conceptualization of CWB.

Study 1: Base Rate, Meeting Outcomes, and Situational Predictors

Base Rate

Research examining the actual frequency of occurrence of UMBs is limited. A preliminary investigation on the frequency of UMBs can be obtained by studying reviews that list common meeting problems or complaints from meeting attendees (e.g., Di Salvo et al., 1989; Romano & Nunamaker, 2001). Findings from Di Salvo et al. (1989), for example, indicate that UMBs occur quite often, as participants in this study mainly reported problems that could be considered as UMBs. Nevertheless, the results of such reviews do not adequately indicate the frequency of UMBs, as respondents are often asked to report meeting problems in general (e.g., Di Salvo et al., 1989), or to only report the two most personally bothersome problems that arise in meetings (e.g., Romano & Nunamaker, 2001). Accordingly, participants reported also, or exclusively, problems not directly referring to UMBs (e.g., no meeting goals or agenda, meetings are too lengthy). Thus, our first research question is exploratory:

Research question 1: How often can different forms of UMBs be observed in meetings?

UMBs and Meeting Outcomes

The likelihood of meeting effectiveness increases when a group remains focused and accomplishes the necessary tasks with minimal interpersonal disruption (Leach, Rogelberg, Warr, & Burnfield, 2009). Moreover, most tasks (e.g., decision-making, problem-solving) demand input and attention from all attendees, as this improves the quality of the outcomes and the commitment of participants to the final decisions (cf. Steiner, 1972). UMBs, however, can cause different process losses and ultimately hinder progress and goal accomplishment (Diehl & Stroebe, 1987; Mejias, 2007). When attendees engage in unrelated activities during the meeting, these attendees are less likely to provide valuable input, as their attention is selective and individuals are limited in the amount of information they can process within a given period of time (Miyake, Just, & Carpenter, 1994). Likewise, nonparticipation or the (partial) absence of some attendees can lead to a situation in which information critical for

generating solutions is missing, especially if attendees have different perspectives on an issue. Attendees who monopolize the group's time can negatively affect equal participation and preclude others from contributing, which decreases potential performance (Mejias, 2007). Attendees' inappropriate interpersonal behavior can hinder productivity by undermining consensus, and might further discourage some attendees from contributing their ideas to the group discussion for fear that they will be negatively evaluated by these attendees.

Furthermore, we also expect UMBs to have negative consequences for the well-being of individual attendees and for the quality of the relationships among meeting attendees. UMBs are likely to negatively affect both the proceedings of a group and its capacity to accomplish goals. From this, it might follow that individuals have to spend more time and energy in the meeting to counter these effects and thus might experience stress (Allen et al., 2012). Furthermore, the findings of Di Salvo et al. (1989) indicate that individuals perceive a meeting as a group effort, and are consequently resentful when individuals do not actively participate. Moreover, individuals perceive nonparticipation of other members mostly as a function of the individual's choice—for example, as an expression of apathy or avoidance of work/responsibility (Di Salvo et al., 1989). The general tendency toward such dispositional, internal attributions for behavior (Ross, 1977) might further exacerbate resentment (Rogelberg et al., 2014). In addition, rude and discourteous communication behavior can prevent the fulfillment of social and self-esteem needs (Malouff, Calic, McGrory, Murrell, & Schutte, 2012). Altogether, UMBs might also affect the “capability to work together interdependently in the future” (Hackman, 2002, p. 27). Based on these different theoretical and conceptual explanations, we propose the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 1: The observation of UMBs is negatively related to meeting satisfaction and perceived meeting effectiveness.

UMBs and Situational Variables

A further goal of Study 1 is to explore how situational variables might facilitate or inhibit UMBs. Research points to the importance of the environment as a stimulus for behavior (Martinko, Gundlach, & Douglas, 2002). Previous studies (e.g., Lau, Au, & Ho, 2003; Ostroff, 1993) indicate that situational variables often include factors that relate either to the nature of the task (e.g., task complexity) or to a shared perception of particular work setting features (e.g., group influence, group norm, organizational characteristics). Along these lines, we explore meeting purpose as a characteristic that relates directly to meeting structure. We also investigate two characteristics related to the perceptions that individuals attach to particular features of the meeting: the existence of meeting norms and the importance attributed to meetings in the organization.

Meeting purpose. The instrumental purpose of a meeting usually determines the activities attendees have to engage in (Volkema & Niederman, 1995). One of the most common meeting purposes includes information sharing (Romano & Nunamaker, 2001; Volkema & Niederman, 1995). In such information-sharing meetings, the announcement and exchange of information are in the foreground (Leach et al., 2009). Moreover, these meetings are generally not decisional – information is transmitted from one person to the rest of the group, and some information might provoke questions and clarifications (Volkema & Niederman, 1995). Another common meeting purpose includes problem-solving (Romano & Nunamaker, 2001; Volkema & Niederman, 1995). Leach et al. (2009) stated that meetings are often used to solve new or unusual issues and problems. In this case, employees may discuss issues associated with, new product lines and services introduced at the organization (Allen, Beck, Scott, & Rogelberg, 2014). In such problem-solving meetings, the flow of information is more multidirectional, and there are often unrelated foci as participants freely associate with each other's ideas. This type of meeting presents a more complicated structure for attendees, as they have to engage in a range of activities (e.g., contributing knowledge, negotiating). Finally, a common meeting purpose category is to routinely discuss the state of

the business (Allen et al., 2014; Leach et al., 2009). Leach et al. (2009) described that such meetings include primarily day-to-day monitoring or decision-making regarding issues identified previously, for example assigned tasks or coordinating activities. In terms of interaction and information flow, this type of meeting may share aspects with both of the other two meeting purposes (i.e. information-sharing and problem-solving) as it could include information-sharing as well as an open interaction among participants.

Generally, research suggests that individuals experience higher levels of internal motivation when they perceive their task to be worthwhile and important (Campion, Medsker, & Higgs, 1993). Thus, attendees might consider problem-solving meetings as more meaningful than information-sharing meetings and as a consequence, one might expect that attendees engage less in UMBs (e.g., unrelated activities, absenteeism, and nonparticipation) during these meetings. However, considering a meeting as a meaningful event may also promote some UMBs. Rogelberg et al. (2014) suggested that meetings are widely used in overt or subtle jockeying for power and status, and undermining status to demonstrate power; for example, someone arrives late to a meeting to demonstrate and reinforce his or her higher status by controlling others' time. In addition, in problem-solving meetings attendees have to introduce, negotiate, and challenge more views and opinions, which are associated with more collaboration and communication requirements, as well as more disagreement and conflicts (Angouri, 2012). As a result of these circumstances, attendees might engage more in dominant communication and abuse of others. In terms of meetings about routine issues, one might expect similar effects as for problem-solving meetings, given that these meetings also require a certain level of interaction among attendees (e.g., assigning tasks or coordinating activities). In terms of information-sharing meetings, one might expect different results for the different forms of UMBs. Due to the nature of these meetings, attendees might engage more in nonparticipation and unrelated activities, but be less involved in dominant communication

behavior and inappropriate interpersonal behavior as discussions are more limited in these meetings. In terms of this ambiguous situation, we pose the following research question:

Research question 2: How do UMBs vary as a function of meeting purpose?

Existence of meeting norms and the importance attributed to meetings in the organization. The important role that others (e.g., coworkers) and organizational norms play in individuals' work behavior is highlighted by the social influence model (Fulk, 1993) and the social information-processing model (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978). According to these models, social and organizational norms can include the imitation of observed behaviors and the application of the perception of appropriate behavior to one's own behavior. Recent studies have shown that the practice of using electronic devices during meetings is influenced by organizational norms and observing coworkers' behaviors (e.g., Rennecker, Dennis, & Hansen, 2010; Stephens & Davis, 2009). Research has also demonstrated that organizational or work unit absenteeism norms strongly influence individuals' decisions to engage in absenteeism (Bamberger & Biron, 2007). Felps, Mitchell, and Byington (2006) argued that when individuals observe others acting in a disruptive manner, these actions become more mentally accessible and lead to others lowering their inhibitions about behaving in a similar fashion. Cohen, Rogelberg, Allen, and Luong (2011) demonstrated that meeting ground rules which govern allowable meeting behaviors and interactions significantly predicted perceptions of meeting quality. Thus, we expect that the existence of meeting norms, that is, an agreement within a meeting group about what is acceptable and expected behavior, could reduce UMBs. However, the establishment of such meeting ground rules might be affected by the importance that the formal organization itself has attributed to meetings. Allen, Rogelberg, and Scott (2008) stated that organizations often have a particular meeting culture in which meeting behaviors and practices are well-learned and institutionalized. Accordingly, meeting attendance might also be affected by the perception of meeting importance. Thus, the following hypothesis is proposed:

Hypothesis 2: UMBs will be negatively related to (a) the existence of meeting norms and (b) the perceived importance attributed to meetings in the organization.

Method

Participants and Procedure

Participants consisted of employees working in a wide variety of organizations and who attend meetings as part of their jobs. Respondents were contacted through personal referrals, university alumni lists, flyers in organizations, phone books, and web sites. We provided compensations to participants in the form of tips for running good meetings. Through an online study, participants were asked to rate their most recent meeting attended in terms of UMBs, meeting design, and meeting outcomes. To help mitigate inadequate or selective recall, we limited questionnaire participation to people who had attended a meeting within the last seven days. On average, respondents reported attending a meeting 4.8 days ($SD = 3.7$) ago.

After screening for incomplete responses, we retained responses from 345 employed adults. Participants' mean age was 40.7 years ($SD = 11.6$) and approximately half of the sample (48%) was male. Over half of the participants (59%; $n = 204$) worked full time and the average tenure with their current work organization was 7.4 years. Of the 345 participants, 62% indicated that they supervise other employees. Participants worked in a wide variety of jobs in a broad range of industries. About 23% of participants worked in health and social services, 22% in the service sector, 21% in the public sector, 15% in the research and education sector, 9% in the banking and insurance sector, and 6% in the industrial sector. The organizations' sizes ranged from fewer than 50 employees (38%) to more than 1,000 employees (21%).

Measures

UMBs. Following a deductive approach to measure development, we used the theoretical positioning of the UMBs construct as the basis of the measure shown in Table 1.

Two of the authors created a list of items with the intention of capturing the construct's global content space, which involves five forms of UMBs: (a) absenteeism (b) unrelated activities, (c) nonparticipation, (d) dominant communication behavior, and (e) inappropriate interpersonal behavior. Two other authors then checked whether the items fit the categories (i.e., content validity assessment). We also presented the item list to participants of a research colloquium and asked for feedback. In the end, five items were deleted, in particular because they describe UMBs that could not be observed by others. Finally, we created 21 items that reflected the five forms of UMBs (see Table 1 for an overview). Respondents were required to rate how often they could observe that other meeting attendees engaged in different kinds of UMBs (from 1 = *never* to 5 = *all the time*).

To test our hypotheses, we calculated the UMBs total score, including the mean over all 21 items, as well as scales for each UMBs form. We conducted a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) to test the postulated and theoretically derived five-factor structure of UMBs. Since we anticipated the number of factors, as well as the items by which the factors would be represented a priori during scale development, the use of CFA instead of exploratory factor analysis was appropriate. CFA allowed us to test the pre-defined model by specifying the number of factors and their correlations as well as which items loaded on which factors (Fabrigar, Wegener, MacCallum, & Strahan, 1999). We used AMOS 18 (Arbuckle, 2007) to conduct the CFA. Parameter estimates were made under a maximum likelihood method. We used four fit indices to judge our model's fit to the data: (1) the chi-square/*df* ratio (χ^2/df), (2) comparative fit index (CFI), (3) root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), and (4) standardized root mean square residual (SRMR). The fit indices for the five-factor model were as a whole considered acceptable ($\chi^2[179] = 459.28, p < .001, \chi^2/df = 2.6, CFI = .89, RMSEA = .07, \text{ and } SRMR = .06$), although the CFI fell slightly below .90. The five-factor model also demonstrated a better fit to the data than a one-factor model with all 21 items loading onto a single factor, $\chi^2(189) = 1272.54, p < .001, \chi^2/df = 6.7, CFI = .59, RMSEA = .13,$

and SRMR = .10. Standardized loadings of the scale items on their respective factors were significant (all $ps < .001$), ranging from .48 to .86 (see Table 1). Results showed that items from the absenteeism factor had relatively low standardized factor loadings (.48 to .57). With the exception of absenteeism, all factors demonstrated good reliability (see Table 2). The low reliability and factor loadings for absenteeism are perhaps not surprising. Although all items of this scale dealt with meeting absence, the items ultimately captured different aspects. That is, individuals who engage in one behavior of this scale (e.g., came to the meeting late) did not automatically engage in another behavior of this scale (e.g., occasionally left the meeting). However, previous research indicates that lateness is an important theme in negative meeting behavior (Rogelberg et al., 2014); and in line with this, we chose to retain this factor.

Meeting satisfaction. To measure meeting satisfaction, we used a scale developed by Rogelberg et al. (2010). Participants were asked to indicate the extent to which six adjectives described their meeting (i.e., stimulating, boring, unpleasant, satisfying, enjoyable, and annoying). Ratings were made using a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). After reverse scoring negatively worded items, an average score was computed across the six items.

Perceived meeting effectiveness. We used a three-item measure from Leach et al. (2009) to measure perceived meeting effectiveness. Participants were asked to rate the effectiveness of their meeting in terms of “achieving your own work goals,” “achieving colleagues’ work goals,” and “achieving your department/section/unit’s goals.” The items were rated on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (*extremely ineffective*) to 5 (*extremely effective*). An average score was computed across the three items.

Meeting purpose. Following Leach et al. (2009), we measured and analyzed three meeting purposes: (a) information-sharing meetings (i.e., meetings primarily about announcing organizational, departmental, team and/or personnel news; $n = 138$); (b) problem-solving meetings (i.e., meetings primarily about new or unusual issues and problems; $n =$

104); (c) meetings about routine issues (i.e., meetings primarily about day-to-day monitoring or decision-making that work on issues identified previously, for example assigning tasks or coordinating activities; $n = 81$).

Existence of meeting norms. Perception of meeting norms that govern allowable behaviors in meetings were adapted from the Team Diagnostic Survey (Wageman, Hackman, & Lehman, 2005). We modified two items, which examine group norms, to apply to norms within a meeting: “It is clear what is—and what is not—acceptable meeting behavior” and “Members of this meeting agree about how members are expected to behave.” The two items were rated on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*).

Perceived importance attributed to meetings in the organization. To measure the perceived importance of meetings in the organization, three items were created: “In my organization, meetings are considered very important,” “In my organization, decisions are made by meetings rather than by individuals,” and “In my organization, people are encouraged to call meetings.” Ratings were made using a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*).

Participants background variables. We assessed a variety of demographic variables in this study. Participants were asked about their age, gender, tenure, hours worked, supervisor status, organization type, and organization size. Only variables shown to be related to both the predictor and outcome variables were included as control variables in the analyses following recommendations by Becker (2005).

Results and Discussion

Means, standard deviations, internal reliabilities, and intercorrelations among the principal study variables are shown in Table 2. Meeting satisfaction and perceived meeting effectiveness were substantially interrelated. However, this association is consistent with the assumption that meeting satisfaction is related to the level of goal achievement at the meeting (Briggs, Reinig, & de Vreede, 2006; Malouff et al., 2012).

Our first research question aimed to explore how often UMBs are observed in meetings. Results indicated that all UMBs were observed in meetings, but with varied frequency. Participants reported that they had mostly observed nonparticipation ($M = 1.79$, skew = 1.29), followed by dominant communication behavior ($M = 1.72$, skew = 1.37), unrelated activities ($M = 1.58$, skew = 1.63), absenteeism ($M = 1.37$, skew = 1.82), and inappropriate interpersonal behavior ($M = 1.14$, skew = 3.82). The proportion of "nonzero" responses (i.e. the proportion of responses that were higher than 1 = *never*) was 80% for nonparticipation ($n = 276$), 87.3% for dominant communication behavior ($n = 301$), 76.2% for unrelated activities ($n = 263$), 66.7% for absenteeism ($n = 230$), and 25.2% for inappropriate interpersonal behavior ($n = 87$). These results showed that the majority of the participants observed at least one behavior of each of the different UMBs in their meeting. An exception is inappropriate interpersonal behavior, which seems to be a comparatively low-frequency behavior. As expected, the five forms of UMBs were highly interrelated.

Hypothesis 1 stated that the observation of UMBs is negatively related to the perception of meeting satisfaction and meeting effectiveness. In support of our hypothesis, ratings of meeting satisfaction and perceived meeting effectiveness were negatively correlated with both UMBs total ($r = -.53$ and $-.43$, respectively) and all five forms of UMBs (r ranging from $-.20$ to $-.55$ and $-.20$ to $-.44$, respectively). We conducted hierarchical multiple regressions to further test the relationship between UMBs and meeting outcomes. We controlled for age and supervisor status in order to avoid possible confounding effects from these individual differences. Table 3 provides the results from regression analyses. Using meeting satisfaction as the criterion variable, we entered the block of control variables first into the regression equation. Next, we simultaneously entered the five UMBs factors into the regression equation. The block as a whole was significant and accounted for a large proportion of the variance in meeting satisfaction ($\Delta R^2 = .34$). Specifically, nonparticipation ($\beta = -.42$), inappropriate interpersonal behavior ($\beta = -.22$), and dominant communication

behavior ($\beta = -.11$) uniquely predicted meeting satisfaction over and above the control variables. Using perceived meeting effectiveness as the criterion variable, the results revealed that nonparticipation ($\beta = -.35$) and inappropriate interpersonal behavior ($\beta = -.22$) were significantly related to perceived meeting effectiveness, controlling for age and supervisor status. Together, this block of variables including the two controls accounted for 26% of the variance in perceived meeting effectiveness.

We additionally conducted a relative weight analysis (RWA; see Johnson, 2000; Tonidandel, LeBreton, & Johnson, 2009) to determine the relative importance of each of the UMBs variables in predicting the percentage of the contribution allocated to the meeting outcomes. RWA enables estimation of the relative importance of predictor variables that are correlated with each other. Unlike multiple linear regression coefficients, relative weights (RW) accurately partition variance that is shared among multiple predictor variables. We conducted RWA using a statistical tool called RWA-Web, which is available at <http://relativeimportance.davidson.edu/> (Tonidandel & LeBreton, 2015). After the RW are calculated, a bootstrapping method (Tonidandel et al., 2009) can be used to generate a 95% confidence interval (CI) around each weight to determine whether each predictor accounts for a significant amount of variance in the dependent variable. For the analyses, a variable with a 95% CI that contains a value of zero or below would indicate a predictor does not account for a significant amount of variance in the dependent variable at the $p < .05$ level. Table 3 presents a summary of RWA results. An examination of the RW revealed that nonparticipation, unrelated activities, dominant communication behavior, and inappropriate interpersonal behavior explained a statistically significant amount of variance in meeting satisfaction as none of the 95% CIs for the tests of significance contained zero, with the most important variables being nonparticipation (RW = .18) and inappropriate interpersonal behavior (RW = .10). The RWA results differ slightly from what was obtained from multiple regression analysis. Specifically, unrelated activities provided a statistically significant RW.

The lack of concordance in the significance of the regression coefficients and the RW is not uncommon (Tonidandel et al., 2009) and simply reflects that these two statistics are addressing slightly different research questions. The regression analysis tends to consider only incremental prediction, whereas RWA expresses non-trivial variance in the outcomes, even in the presence of additional, correlated predictors (Tonidandel & LeBreton 2011).

When perceived meeting effectiveness was the predicted variable, the regression weights and RW were in agreement in identifying nonparticipation and inappropriate interpersonal behavior as significant predictors. Again, nonparticipation accounted for the largest variance (47.18%) in predicting the meeting outcome variable.

In support of Hypothesis 2a, the existence of meeting norms was negatively associated with the UMBs total ($r = -.41$), absenteeism ($r = -.23$), unrelated activities ($r = -.35$), nonparticipation ($r = -.25$), dominant communication behavior ($r = -.31$), and inappropriate interpersonal behavior ($r = -.35$). In contrast, we did not find support for Hypothesis 2b. We found no significant relationship between perceived importance attributed to meetings in the organization and UMBs factors.

Our second research question aimed to investigate how UMBs varied as a function of meeting purpose. Our results showed that attendees in problem-solving meetings observed less UMBs total ($r = -.15$), absenteeism ($r = -.12$), unrelated activities ($r = -.11$), nonparticipation ($r = -.16$), and inappropriate interpersonal behavior ($r = -.11$) than in information-sharing meetings. Because the program RWA-Web also allowed testing whether a predictor's relative weight differs significantly across groups, we also tested whether there were differences in the magnitude of the relative weights as a function of meeting purpose. All CIs for the purpose comparison included zero, indicating that there were no statistically significant differences as a function of meeting purpose.

In sum, participants reported less satisfaction with meetings and perceived them as less effective when they observed more UMBs during the meeting. Considering the different

forms of UMBs, results from regression analyses and RWA indicate that nonparticipation and inappropriate interpersonal behavior affect outcome ratings more so than other types of UMBs. For inappropriate interpersonal behavior, this is perhaps not surprising, as these behaviors can harm an attendee's self-esteem, need for acceptance, and respect the most. The effect of nonparticipation might be more surprising, as this UMB does not reflect any ostensible rude behavior. However, the results imply that meeting members perceive the meeting as a group effort and consequently may have been dismayed when members did not participate or showed disinterest in discussed topics. Furthermore, results indicated that particular forms of UMBs are related to the contextual characteristics that have been hypothesized. For meeting purposes, results showed that in problem-solving meetings, attendees engaged in less UMBs than in information-sharing meetings. Study results also highlight the important role of perceived meeting norms. In contrast, no significant relationship was found for the importance attributed to meetings in the organization and UMBs. An explanation for the lack of observed relationship between these two variables might be that meeting behaviors and practices are more strongly influenced by closer work-based units (e.g., team or work group). The lack of finding, however, could also be due to the use of a single respondent design. In line with the meeting literature, we argued that meeting behaviors (i.e., UMBs) are affected by the importance that the formal organization itself has attributed to meetings and consequently, when meetings are perceived as important, fewer UMBs would be shown. At the same time, however, it is also conceivable that when a respondent perceives meetings as important, he or she might be more sensitive to UMBs, and these potential effects may cancel each other out.

Study 2: UMBs and Individual Differences

In this study we explored whether individual differences are related to UMBs as potential predictors akin to those found in other deviant behavior. To date, nearly no study has examined the association between personality variables and UMBs. The only exception being

a recent study by Rogelberg and colleagues (2014) who found that the percentage of meetings that were attended late was significantly correlated with conscientiousness. Moreover, research on instigated workplace incivility that focuses on perpetrators' characteristics as antecedents of perpetrators' uncivil conduct is also rare (Schilpzand et al., 2016). Previous research has shown that perpetrator characteristics such as higher levels of power (Cortina et al., 2001), trait anger (Meier & Semmer, 2013), and having a dominating or non-integrative conflict management style (Trudel & Reio, 2011) are positively related to instigated workplace incivility. Personality variables as perpetrator characteristics, however, have not been studied so far (cf. Schilpzand et al., 2016). Thus, we drew on empirical findings from related streams of research to inform our hypotheses. Specifically, we focused on the Big Five dimensions of agreeableness, conscientiousness, and emotional stability (cf. Berry, Ones, & Sackett, 2007; Mount, Barrick, & Stewart, 1998), and the Dark Triad personality traits narcissism, psychopathy, and Machiavellianism (O'Boyle, Forsyth, Banks, & McDaniel, 2012) due to their prominent roles in explaining CWB and/or individual performance in the workplace.

Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Emotional Stability

Individuals high in agreeableness are courteous, flexible, cooperative, forgiving, and tolerant (Barrick & Mount, 1991). Conscientiousness reflects the extent to which a person is careful, dependable, organized, planful, responsible, and persevering (Barrick & Mount, 1991). Emotional stability is defined by a lack of anxiety, hostility, depression, and personal insecurity (Barrick & Mount, 1991). All three personality traits are valid predictors of criteria that pertain to interpersonal performance, such as forming cooperative relationships and social facilitation such as teamwork (Mount et al., 1998). In addition, meta-analytic studies (e.g., Berry et al., 2007; Salgado, 2002) have demonstrated that these three personality traits are related to interpersonal CWBs (e.g., violence, gossip, making fun of others, cursing, and

being rude) and organization based CWBs (e.g., disciplinary problems, organizational rule breaking, and absence or lateness to work).

Considering the characteristics of agreeableness, we propose that the general tendency to be concerned with others' welfare and to maintain harmonious relationships with others lead individuals high in agreeableness to be less likely to engage in harmful or destructive interactions, and accordingly, engage in less UMBs such as dominant communication behavior and inappropriate interpersonal behavior. Previous research demonstrated that highly agreeable people are more likely to be cooperative than competitive (Hogan, Hogan, & Busch, 1984) and that they are unlikely to engage in deviant acts toward others even when they perceived a situation negatively (Colbert, Mount, Harter, Witt, & Barrick, 2004). Furthermore, the tendency to follow social rules (Goldberg, 1992) and to be concerned with group goals when engaging in task-related work activities may also stop agreeable people from engaging in absenteeism, unrelated activities, and nonparticipation as this could hamper the group from achieving their goals.

Regarding conscientiousness, we propose that conscientious individuals are generally less likely to engage in UMBs as they have higher self-discipline, and they control their work-related behaviors (Salgado, 2002). Additionally, traits associated with dependability pertain to the tendency to follow rules and conform to the norms of the organization. Moreover, conscientious individuals often show a high work-involvement tendency, leading to a higher likelihood of obtaining satisfying work rewards (e.g., recognition, respect, feelings of personal accomplishment). Furthermore, conscientious people may be able to control their behavior in spite of negative work situations (Colbert et al., 2004); thus, highly conscientious individuals may also be less likely to engage in dominant communication and inappropriate interpersonal behaviors.

Individuals scoring high in emotional stability are likely to be more relaxed and tolerant of stress (Barrick & Mount, 1991), which helps them behave less emotionally in

discussions (i.e., less inappropriate interpersonal behavior, less dominant communication behavior). People scoring low in emotional stability may be more inclined to become angry easily, be impulsive, and cope ineffectively, making it more likely that they might say something rude to others. Furthermore, the characteristics of anxiety, hostility, depression, and personal insecurity (i.e., low emotional stability) might hinder individuals from participating in discussions. In terms of unrelated activities and absenteeism, we cannot clearly predict the relative validity for explaining these two types of UMBs. In sum, theory and research on the links between personality traits and behaviors at workplace lead us to predict that the three Big Five traits will negatively predict UMBs.

Hypothesis 3: (a) Conscientiousness, (b) agreeableness, and (c) emotional stability will be negatively related to UMBs.

Dark Triad of Personality

The “Dark Triad” is a term used to describe a constellation of three socially undesirable personality traits: narcissism, psychopathy, and Machiavellianism (Paulhus & Williams, 2002). Narcissism connects several different but interrelated traits such as arrogance; exploitation and manipulation in interpersonal relationships; and excessive self-focus with self-absorption and self-admiration, as well as perceived feelings of superiority (Furtner, Rauthmann, & Sachse, 2011). The Machiavellian personality is defined by: pragmatic and cynical worldviews; self-beneficial behaviors; cold, strategic tactics to pursue one’s own goals; lack of empathy; and deception and interpersonal manipulation (Christie & Geis, 1970). Psychopathy is marked by a lack of concern for other people and social regulatory mechanisms, impulsivity, and a lack of guilt or remorse when their actions harm others (O’Boyle et al., 2012). Machiavellians, narcissists, and psychopaths are not openly disagreeable or disruptive, but their willingness to overlook principles of social exchange (e.g., reciprocity, Blau 1964) and lack of emotional commitment to others are likely to undermine the binding influence of interpersonal relationships (O’Boyle et al., 2012). Meta-

analytic findings (O'Boyle et al., 2012; Wu & LeBreton, 2011) have shown that Dark Triad personality traits increase the likelihood for engaging various CWBs, especially in interpersonal CWBs such as workplace incivility, bullying, and aggression. Furthermore, all three personalities proclaim a social dominance orientation (Hodson, Hogg, & MacInnis, 2009). Based on these findings, we propose that the high self-interest tendency and the lack of concern for other individuals lead those high in Dark Triad personality traits to be more likely to engage in different forms of UMBs.

Hypothesis 4: (a) Narcissism, (b) Machiavellianism, and (c) psychopathy will be positively related to UMBs.

Method

Participants and Procedure

We tested our hypotheses among a sample of employees from different organizations in Germany who had some level of meeting activity. Recruitment arrangements paralleled those for Study 1. All participants were asked to complete an online survey containing items that assessed the individuals' engagement in different forms of UMBs during the last year, as well as several personality items. Respondents were assured confidentiality and anonymity.

After screening for incomplete responses, we retained data from 170 employed adults. The mean age of the participants was 35.3 years ($SD = 9.8$); 64.1% were male. Participants' mean tenure with their organization was 4.8 years. The majority were employed full time (91.8%). Of the 170 participants, 52% indicated that they supervise other employees. About 41% of participants worked in the service sector, 26% in the industrial sector, 12% in the banking and insurance sector, 8% in health and social services, 7% in the research and education sector, and 2% in the public sector. The organizations' sizes ranged from fewer than 50 employees (29%) to more than 1,000 employees (34%).

Measures

UMBs. UMBs were measured with the same 21 items as in Study 1. In this study, however, respondents rated how often they had personally engaged in UMBs (e.g., “I occasionally left the meeting”), whereas in Study 1, respondents rated how often they observed UMBs by other attendees in a meeting (e.g., “Attendees occasionally left the meeting”). Respondents were asked to indicate how often they had engaged in UMBs over the past 12 months on a 6-point scale ranging from 1 (*I have not even considered it*) to 6 (*I did it three or more times*). To test our hypotheses, we calculated the UMBs total score, including the mean of all 21 items, as well as a mean score for each UMBs form. Again, Cronbach’s alpha for the absenteeism factor was problematic (see Table 4). We chose to retain this factor for the same reasons as in Study 1.

Big Five personalities. We measured agreeableness, conscientiousness, and emotional stability by using a short version (BFI-K; Rammstedt & John, 2005) of the Big Five Inventory (BFI; John, Donahue, & Kentle, 1991). Each personality characteristic was measured with four items. Ratings were made using a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (*totally disagree*) to 5 (*totally agree*) and means were computed.

Machiavellianism. For the assessment of Machiavellianism, we used a validated German short version (Cloetta, 1983) that is oriented at the Mach IV test (Christie & Geis, 1970), one of the most common measure of Machiavellianism in the Dark Triad literature (cf. Furnham, Richards, & Paulhus, 2013). The eight items were rated on a 6-point scale ranging from 1 (*very wrong*) to 6 (*very true*) and means were computed. Our internal consistency ($\alpha = .75$) is comparable to the reliabilities in the validating studies (cf. Cloetta, 1983).

Psychopathy. Psychopathy was assessed with the 16 highest-loading items from the Self-Report Psychopathy Scale-III (Williams, Nathanson, & Paulhus, 2003), which is the most commonly-used measure of psychopathy (cf. Furnham et al., 2013). Answers were given on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (*totally disagree*) to 5 (*totally agree*) and means were

computed. Due to the shortened scale (the original scale has 31 items) the slightly smaller reliability ($\alpha = .65$) seems also to be consistent with the original version.

Narcissism. Narcissism was measured with the well validated and widely used 16-item inventory based on Raskin and Terry's (1988) scale (Ames, Rose, & Anderson, 2006; Schütz, Marcus, & Sellin, 2004). For each item, participants chose one of two statements they felt applied to them the most. One of the two statements reflected a narcissistic attitude (*1*), whereas the other statement did not (*0*). We summed the total number of narcissistic statements the participants endorsed as an index of narcissism. Our internal consistency ($\alpha = .72$) is comparable to values in other studies (cf. Ames et al., 2006).

Participants background variables. We measured the same demographic variables (age, gender, tenure, hours worked, supervisor status, organization type, and organization size) as in Study 1.

Results and Discussion

Table 4 provides means, standard deviations, internal reliabilities, and intercorrelations for all study variables. Participants reported that they had mostly engaged in nonparticipation ($M = 3.45$, skew = .09), followed by unrelated activities ($M = 2.86$, skew = .51), dominant communication behavior ($M = 2.65$, skew = .63), absenteeism ($M = 2.13$, skew = .94), and inappropriate interpersonal behavior ($M = 1.47$, skew = 2.12). Interrelations among the UMBs factors showed a similar pattern as in Study 1.

Hypothesis 3 stated that UMBs would be negatively related to conscientiousness, agreeableness, and emotional stability. Results provided only minimal support for this prediction: Agreeableness was related to dominant communication behavior ($r = -.19$, $p < .05$) and inappropriate interpersonal behavior ($r = -.34$, $p < .01$). However, we found no significant relationships with conscientiousness and emotional stability.

Hypothesis 4 posited a positive relationship of the personality traits of the Dark Triad with UMBs. Findings partially supported this hypothesis: Machiavellianism was related to

inappropriate interpersonal behavior ($r = .16, p < .05$). Narcissism correlated with dominant communication behavior ($r = .26, p < .01$), while psychopathy was related to UMBs total ($r = .28, p < .01$) and four UMBs forms (r s ranging from .18 to .27; $p < .05$ and $p < .01$, respectively).

To compare the unique contribution of the personality traits in explaining the variance in the UMBs, separate hierarchical multiple regressions were conducted by entering the six personality traits simultaneously. Following recommendations concerning the use of control variables (Becker, 2005), we controlled for age and gender in order to avoid possible confounding effects from these individual differences. Table 5 provides the results from regression analyses. Results indicated that agreeableness, psychopathy, and narcissism only had a unique role in explaining the variance in two UMBs dimensions (i.e., dominant communication behavior and inappropriate interpersonal behavior).

Similar to Study 1, we conducted RWA to determine the relative importance of individual differences as predictors of UMBs. We used the same procedures as described in Study 1. Overall, the regression weights and relative weights analyses identified the same significant predictors (see Table 5). Agreeableness and psychopathy explained a statistically significant amount of variance in inappropriate interpersonal behavior as none of the 95% CIs for the tests of significance contained zero. However, when examining dominant communication behavior, the RWA results differed slightly from what was obtained in the multiple regression analysis. Specifically, narcissism did not produce a statistically significant RW. However, as Tonidandel et al. (2009) described, a lack of concordance in the significance of the regression coefficients and the RW is not uncommon, as discussed above.

In sum, results from regression analyses and RWA provided partial support for the assumption that individual differences impact how often individuals engage in UMBs. Results indicated that some of the variance in UMBs is explained by control variables (gender, age). Results, however, imply that the individual differences of agreeableness, psychopathy, and

narcissism predict dominant communication behavior and inappropriate interpersonal behavior. This is in line with our expectations, as both behaviors can embody how individuals approach and develop interpersonal relationships. People high on psychopathy and narcissism tend to have an emotionless behavioral style and they consistently focus on achievement, even if that achievement comes at the cost of harm to others (O'Boyle et al., 2012). Agreeable people are concerned with the welfare of others and in maintaining harmonious relationships with others (Tobin, Graziano, Vanman, & Tassinary, 2000) and are thus less likely to engage in both behaviors. Interestingly, we found no association of UMBs with conscientiousness, although previous research indicates that conscientiousness appeared to best predict individuals' overall performance (Barrick, Mount, & Judge, 2001) and meeting lateness (Rogelberg et al., 2014). An explanation therefore might be the low reliability of the conscientiousness scale. Furthermore, research suggests that there are many situational variables which inhibit or enable the behavioral expression of personality in the workplace (Tett & Burnett, 2003).

General Discussion

Two studies were conducted to investigate potential predictors and outcomes of UMBs. Using these two independent studies, we can offer several valuable insights to the literature. First, we provided an empirically based categorization of uncivil behavior in meetings (UMBs). Results from CFA support the existence of five different forms of UMBs (see Table 1). Second, we measured UMBs from two different perspectives (observation of UMBs by other attendees and self-reporting of UMBs); results from both studies imply that all forms of UMBs occur in meetings but with varied frequency. Thus, we can establish the prevalence of different forms of UMBs that have to date only been reported anecdotally (Di Salvo et al., 1989; Romano & Nunamaker, 2001). While inappropriate interpersonal behavior seems to be a comparatively low-frequency behavior; the other forms of UMBs showed a higher prevalence and were observed at varying levels in most of the meetings. Another

interesting finding is that in both studies the different forms of UMBs were correlated. This might be an indicator, therefore, that research should not address only one or two forms of UMBs in isolation but also examine UMBs as a more general phenomenon. Because our measure of UMBs covered a range of different behaviors, it can help future researchers take a broad approach to UMBs. A third central contribution of this article is that we have examined the consequences of individual UMBs for meeting satisfaction and perceived meeting effectiveness. Theoretically, we argued that UMBs can cause different process losses and ultimately hinder progress and goal accomplishments, resulting in attendees perceiving the meeting as less effective. Moreover, we argued that UMBs could influence the relationship quality among meeting participants because some UMBs could prevent the fulfillment of social and self-esteem needs of meeting attendees and that it is likely that some UMBs could be seen as avoiding work/responsibility. Empirically, the relationship between UMBs and meeting outcomes received substantial support – participants who observed more UMBs in their meeting reported less satisfaction with their meeting and rated it as less effective. These findings are important given the various behavioral and attitudinal implications that a negative experience with a meeting can have (Rogelberg et al., 2010). Fourth, we have identified theoretical potential predictors in the meeting context and empirically explored those predictors. Research points to the importance of several meeting design characteristics for meeting quality (cf. Odermatt, König, & Kleinmann, 2015, 2016). Our findings support this argument in that we have shown that the meeting purpose and existence of meeting norms seem to be important in explaining different forms of UMBs. A further main contribution of this study is that we have examined whether certain personality variables are related with engagement in UMBs. Although personality variables are widely discussed in predicting workplace behavior and/or individual performance in the workplace, little is known about the role that individual differences play in explaining behavior in meetings. Even though we found a mixed effect for the relationships between personality traits and UMBs, the results

provide evidence that personality traits affect employees' behavior in meetings and should therefore be considered in future research. Specifically, our results indicate that individual differences appear to predict mainly direct communication behaviors, such as cutting others off, interrupting others, monopolizing discussion, and engaging in inappropriate behaviors toward others (e.g., making fun of others, offending others). Collectively, the results also suggest that UMBs are likely to be a function of a host of personal and meeting factors. Thus, the present results are consistent with previous findings in the work behavior domain that indicate that behavior is likely determined by situational variables and individual differences (Martinko et al., 2002).

Overall, the current study contributes to both meetings scholarship and organizational misbehavior scholarship in two key ways. First, the comprehensive findings from these two studies advance our understanding of meetings research by showing that meetings indeed are a setting where individuals show different discourteous and rude behaviors. In the light of the negative consequences UMBs have for meeting outcomes, UMBs merit serious attention in organizational practice as well as in future research. Moreover, in the light of the increasing prevalence of meetings (Allen et al., 2008) and the fact that less intense forms of mistreatment can be precursors to more intense and violent acts (Baron & Neuman, 1996), UMBs should be considered cautiously as potential precursors to more intense, overtly aggressive acts in the workplace. Second, the findings from the current research complement previous research on workplace incivility. Generally, study results indicate that rude and discourteous behaviors in workplace interactions are nuanced. Study results also provide evidence of the important role of the group as source of incivility. Hence, the present research on UMBs also advances our knowledge of the consequences of incivility in the area of witnessed incivility. Meetings constitute a typical social setting where it is highly likely that uncivil incidents are witnessed by others. Moreover, meetings may be an especially incivility-prone environment given that meeting groups often need to reach a decision and debates may spike uncivil behaviors.

Given, that previous studies have shown that witnessing uncivil incidents elicits negative affect and has a negative impact on performance-related criteria (Porath & Erez, 2009), it is worthwhile to consider meetings and UMBs. The study results further point to the importance of considering immediate or short-term consequences of uncivil behaviors. According to Weiss and Cropanzano's (1996) affective events theory the cumulative experience of negative feeling such as low meeting satisfaction as a consequence of UMBs can influence general work attitudes and behaviors. Finally, results from Study 2 provide empirical evidence to consider personality traits as perpetrators characteristics that have previously been overlooked by research on instigated incivility.

Some study limitations warrant further consideration. First, the designs of both studies were cross-sectional, which prohibits conclusions regarding causality. Thus, future work may examine UMBs longitudinally to determine the predictors and outcomes with greater confidence. Second, all of the data were collected using a self-report questionnaire. Our results therefore may have been influenced by common method variance. Third, observed correlations in our sample in Study 2 might be inflated due to social desirability bias given that UMBs ratings rely on self-reports. Participants might underreport the extent to which they have engaged in UMBs. Thus, peer reports on UMBs could offer a more valid assessment method. Nevertheless, much of the extant CWB research has relied on participant self-reports, and the few studies that have used alternative measures (e.g., supervisor ratings) generally yielded results that are similar to those of studies that used self-report measures (e.g., Berry et al., 2007; Fox, Spector, Goh, & Bruursema, 2007). Furthermore, all surveys used were anonymous, and given the nature of our sampling approach, it was obvious to respondents that their employers would not be in any position to see individual survey responses (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). As such we feel it is reasonable to interpret participants' responses as valid indicators of the constructs we aimed to assess. Fourth, participants' ratings of UMBs in Study 1 may have been influenced by observation

errors. An individual's perception of how other attendees behave during meetings could be influenced by issues such as the individual's own level of participation. Furthermore, ratings could also be influenced by inadequate or selective recall, even when participants had to rate a meeting that took place within the last 7 days. To alleviate problems associated with common source variance and observation bias, it would be beneficial to supplement the analysis using data from all meeting attendees within a meeting or from external meeting observers. Fifth, the procedure by which the Big Five personality measures were obtained in Study 2 might be another weakness of this research. With regard to questionnaire length and potential response fatigue, we used a short version (BFI-K; Rammstedt & John, 2005), assessing each personality dimension with only four items. Although the trend in psychological assessment to use concise measures of core personality traits is growing (Jonason & Webster, 2010), we found insufficient reliabilities for conscientiousness and agreeableness. This might explain why some of our hypothesized relationships were non-significant and why the effects were rather weak.

The results of the current study suggest directions for future research. First, future work should continue to explore potential predictors of UMBs. Findings from different research streams examining work behavior and performance can guide such research, and potential predictors can address meeting leadership style (cf. Odermatt, König, Kleinmann, et al., 2016) as well as work attitudes (e.g., job satisfaction, commitment) and meeting attitudes. On this topic, Allen et al. (2012) argued that employees often view meetings as taking away from a limited valuable resource—their time. When people are required to attend a meeting, they have less time to do other job activities, and meeting participation may prevent completion of a primary task; consequently, they may feel stressed about getting their other work done on time (Allen et al., 2012). Thus, attendees might express negative feelings caused by meeting participation (e.g., feeling stressed due to the time loss, especially if they have no expertise to offer) by behaving uncivilly in a meeting. Second, it would be useful to

examine how individual and situational factors may interact to determine whether individuals engage in UMBs. For example, situational factors such as the meeting purpose may especially influence those individuals high in Dark Triad personality traits. For example, it is likely that Machiavellian personality which is defined by self-beneficial behaviors and cold, strategic tactics to pursue one's own goals do not play such an important role in information-sharing meetings compared to meetings where attendees have to introduce, negotiate and challenge views and opinions. Third, alternative research designs with data from multiple attendees would allow researchers to gain further insights into the role that individual differences play for UMBs. Not only might individual differences relate to the frequency with which individuals display UMBs, they may also relate to individual thresholds for what they perceive as an UMB and their reactions to the same objective reality. Fourth, it is necessary to examine potential mediators between UMBs and meeting outcomes to gain deeper insight into how and why UMBs relate to employees' perceptions of meeting outcomes. Theoretically it seems reasonable that some forms of UMBs potentially disrupt group cohesion as these forms especially violate the social and self-esteem needs of other attendees, whereas some forms of UMBs potentially produce process losses and hinder goal-directed meeting activities, progress and goal accomplishment (e.g., due to the lack of information-sharing, non-task discussion, production blocking). This suggests that different forms of UMBs may lead to detrimental outcomes for or via different mechanisms. Fifth, future research should examine in more detail how different forms of UMBs develop over the course of a meeting. Previous research has shown that the behavior of an individual in a group is likely to be influenced by other individuals (Campion et al., 1993). Moreover, increased anonymity in a group makes it more difficult to assess each individual's contribution (Jones, 1984), and this circumstance can facilitate feelings of unaccountability (Garcia, Weaver, Moskowitz, & Darley, 2002) and less output of effort toward goal achievement (Liden, Wayne, Jaworski, & Bennett, 2004). Thus, some forms of UMBs likely elicit the occurrence of other UMBs; for example, the

likelihood that attendees will engage in unrelated meeting activities might increase, if someone monopolizes the discussion. Thus, a longitudinal data analysis can further our understanding of how different forms of UMBs interact with each other and how these behavior patterns influence meeting outcomes. Sixth, extending the present research beyond face-to-face meetings and into virtual meetings given their uniqueness and frequency, would be particularly useful (Gilson, Maynard, Young, Vartiainen, & Hakonen, 2015). Finally, to increase generalizability, further research in other geographic areas of the world would be beneficial, as different cultures are likely to have different expectations and practices concerning the roles of meeting participants (Köhler, Cramton, & Hinds, 2012).

Our findings have several practical implications. Managers should be aware of the potential outcomes of UMBs, including the fact that UMBs could diminish the perceived quality of a meeting and may foster an uncivil organizational climate. Thus, meeting leaders should try to reduce the occurrence of UMBs. Intervening suitably when attendees show inappropriate behaviors might be effective in preventing such behaviors. If people know procedures can lead to discipline for inappropriate behaviors, such knowledge can be very effective in deterring this type of behavior (Johnson & Indvik, 2001). Furthermore, meeting groups should establish from the outset clear and explicit expectations regarding attendee behavior. Meeting norms are likely particularly important if attendees' personality make UMBs likely. Ground rules that govern allowable meeting behaviors and interactions may also prevent the occurrence of increasing UMBs, as previous research has shown that individuals align their own day-to-day work behavior with the observable behavior of others in the workgroup (Gellatly & Allen, 2012). Finally, meeting leaders should identify potential causes for committing UMBs (e.g., personal motives, inappropriate meeting design) as this provides a better understanding for potential interventions.

In conclusion, in two independent studies, we found empirical evidence that UMBs are fairly prevalent in meetings (with the exception of inappropriate interpersonal behavior)

and can impact attendees' ratings of meeting satisfaction and effectiveness. We also found evidence suggesting that situational characteristics and personality traits predict UMBs.

Considering the increasing prevalence of meetings and the time employees spend in meetings (Allen et al., 2008), incivility in meetings merits serious attention.

References

- Allen, J. A., Beck, T., Scott, C. W., & Rogelberg, S. G. (2014). Understanding workplace meetings: A qualitative taxonomy of meeting purposes. *Management Research Review*, *37*, 791–814. doi: 10.1108/MRR-03-2013-0067
- Allen, J. A., Rogelberg, S. G., & Scott, J. C. (2008). Mind your meetings: Improve your organization's effectiveness one meeting at a time. *Quality Progress*, *April*, 48–53.
- Allen, J. A., Sands, S. J., Mueller, S. L., Frear, K. A., Mudd, M., & Rogelberg, S. G. (2012). Employees' feelings about more meetings: An overt analysis and recommendations for improving meetings. *Management Research Review*, *35*, 405–418. doi: 10.1108/01409171211222331
- Ames, D. R., Rose, P., & Anderson, C. P. (2006). The NPI-16 as a short measure of narcissism. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *40*, 440-450. doi: 10.1016/j.jrp.2005.03.002
- Andersson, L. M., & Pearson, C. M. (1999). Tit for tat? The spiraling effect of incivility in the workplace. *Academy of Management Review*, *24*, 452–471. doi: 10.5465/AMR.1999.2202131
- Angouri, J. (2012). Managing disagreement in problem-solving meeting talk. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *44*, 1565–1579. doi: 10.1016/j.pragma.2012.06.010
- Arbuckle, J. L. (2007). *AMOS 18 user's guide*. Chicago, IL: SPSS.
- Bamberger, P., & Biron, M. (2007). Group norms and excessive absenteeism: The role of peer referent others. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *103*, 179–196. doi: 10.1016/j.obhdp.2007.03.003
- Baron, R. A., & Neuman, J. H. (1996). Workplace violence and workplace aggression: Evidence on their relative frequency and potential causes. *Aggressive Behavior*, *22*, 161–173. doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1098-2337(1996)22:3<161::AID-AB1>3.0.CO;2-Q

- Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The Big Five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 44*, 1–26. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.1991.tb00688.x
- Barrick, M. R., Mount, M. K., & Judge, T. A. (2001). Personality and performance at the beginning of the new millennium: What do we know and where do we go next? *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 9*, 9–30. doi: 10.1111/1468-2389.00160
- Becker, T. E. (2005). Potential problems in the statistical control of variables in organizational research: A qualitative analysis with recommendations. *Organizational Research Methods, 8*, 274–289. doi: 10.1177/1094428105278021
- Berry, C. M., Ones, D. S., & Sackett, P. R. (2007). Interpersonal deviance, organizational deviance, and their common correlates: A review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*, 410–424. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.92.2.410
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York, NY: John Wiley.
- Briggs, R. O., Reinig, B. A., & de Vreede, G. J. (2006). Meeting satisfaction for technology-supported groups: An empirical validation of a goal-attainment model. *Small Group Research, 37*, 585–611. doi: 10.1177/1046496406294320
- Campion, M. A., Medsker, G. J., & Higgs, A. C. (1993). Relations between work group characteristics and effectiveness: Implications for designing effective work groups. *Personnel Psychology, 46*, 823–850. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.1993.tb01571.x
- Carlozzi, C. L. (1999). Make your meetings count. *Journal of Accountancy, 187*, 53–55.
- Christie, R., & Geis, F. L. (1970). *Studies in Machiavellianism*. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Cloetta, B. (1983). Der Fragebogen zur Erfassung von Machiavellismus und Konservatismus MK [Questionnaire for the recording of Machiavellism and Conservatism KM].

Schweizerische Zeitschrift für Psychologie und ihre Anwendungen/ Revue suisse de Psychologie pure et appliquée, 42, 127–159.

- Cohen, M. A., Rogelberg, S. G., Allen, J. A., & Luong, A. (2011). Meeting design characteristics and attendee perceptions of staff/team meeting quality. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 15, 90–104. doi: 10.1037/a0021549
- Colbert, A. E., Mount, M. K., Harter, J. K., Witt, L. A., & Barrick, M. R. (2004). Interactive effects of personality and perceptions of the work situation on workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 599–609. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.89.4.599
- Cortina, L. M., Magley, V. J., Williams, J. H., & Langhout, R. D. (2001). Incivility in the workplace: Incidence and impact. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 6, 64–80. doi: 10.1037/1076-8998.6.1.64
- DeLongis, A., Coyne, J. C., Dakof, G., Folkman, S., & Lazarus, R. S. (1982). Relationship of daily hassles, uplifts, and major life events of health status. *Health Psychology*, 1, 119–136. doi: 10.1037/0278-6133.1.2.119
- Di Salvo, V. S., Nikkel, E., & Monroe, C. (1989). Theory and practice: A field investigation and identification of group members' perceptions of problems facing natural work groups. *Small Group Behavior*, 20, 551–567. doi: 10.1177/104649648902000411
- Diehl, M., & Stroebe, W. (1987). Productivity loss in brainstorming groups: Toward the solution of a riddle. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53, 497–509. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.53.3.497
- Fabrigar, L. R., Wegener, D. T., MacCallum, R. C., & Strahan, E. J. (1999). Evaluating the use of exploratory factor analysis in psychological research. *Psychological Methods*, 4, 272–299. doi: 10.1037/1082-989X.4.3.272
- Felps, W., Mitchell, T. R., & Byington, E. (2006). How, when, and why bad apples spoil the barrel: Negative group members and dysfunctional groups. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 27, 175–222. doi: 10.1016/S0191-3085(06)27005-9

- Fox, S., Spector, P. E., Goh, A., & Bruursema, K. (2007). Does your coworker know what you're doing? Convergence of self- and peer-reports of counterproductive work behavior. *International Journal of Stress Management, 14*, 41–60. doi: 10.1037/1072-5245.14.1.41
- Fulk, J. (1993). Social construction of communication technology. *Academy of Management Journal, 36*, 921–950. doi: 10.2307/256641
- Furnham, A., Richards, S. C., & Paulhus, D. L. (2013). The dark triad of personality: A 10 year review. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 7*, 199-216. doi: 10.1111/spc3.12018
- Furtner, M. R., Rauthmann, J. F., & Sachse, P. (2011). The self-loving self-leader: An examination of the relationship between self-leadership and the Dark Triad. *Social Behavior and Personality, 39*, 369–379. doi: 10.2224/sbp.2011.39.3.369
- Garcia, S. M., Weaver, K., Moskowitz, G. B., & Darley, J. M. (2002). Crowded minds: The implicit bystander effect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83*, 843–853. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.83.4.843
- Gellatly, I. R., & Allen, N. J. (2012). Group mate absence, dissimilarity, and individual absence: Another look at "monkey see, monkey do". *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 21*, 106–124. doi: 10.1080/1359432X.2010.546947
- Gilson, L. L., Maynard, M. T., Young, N. C. J., Vartiainen, M., & Hakonen, M. (2015). Virtual teams research: 10 years, 10 themes, and 10 opportunities. *Journal of Management, 41*, 1313–1337. doi: 10.1177/0149206314559946
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face interaction*. Oxford, UK: Aldine.
- Goldberg, L. R. (1992). The development of markers for the Big-Five factor structure. *Psychological Assessment, 4*, 26–42. doi: 10.1037/1040-3590.4.1.26

- Hackman, J. R. (2002). *Leading teams: Setting the stage for great performances*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Hodson, G., Hogg, S. M., & MacInnis, C. C. (2009). The role of "dark personalities" (narcissism, Machiavellianism, psychopathy), Big Five personality factors, and ideology in explaining prejudice. *Journal of Research in Personality, 43*, 686–690. doi: 10.1016/j.jrp.2009.02.005
- Hogan, J., Hogan, R., & Busch, C. M. (1984). How to measure service orientation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 69*, 167–173. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.69.1.167
- John, O. P., Donahue, E. M., & Kentle, R. L. (1991). The Big Five Inventory - Versions 4a and 54. Berkeley, CA: University of California, Berkeley, Institute of Personality and Social Research.
- Johnson, J. W. (2000). A heuristic method for estimating the relative weight of predictor variables in multiple regression. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 35*, 1–19. doi: 10.1207/S15327906MBR3501_1
- Johnson, P. R., & Indvik, J. (2001). Slings and arrows of rudeness: Incivility in the workplace. *Journal of Management Development, 20*, 705–713. doi: 10.1108/EUM0000000005829
- Jonason, P. K., & Webster, G. D. (2010). The dirty dozen: A concise measure of the Dark Triad. *Psychological Assessment, 22*, 420–432. doi: 10.1037/a0019265
- Jones, G. R. (1984). Task visibility, free riding, and shirking: Explaining the effect of structure and technology on employee behavior. *Academy of Management Review, 9*, 684–695. doi: 10.5465/AMR.1984.4277404
- Köhler, T., Cramton, C. D., & Hinds, P. J. (2012). The meeting genre across cultures: Insights from three German-American collaborations. *Small Group Research, 43*, 159–185. doi: 10.1177/1046496411429600

- Lau, V. C. S., Au, W. T., & Ho, J. M. C. (2003). A qualitative and quantitative review of antecedents of counterproductive behavior in organizations. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 18*, 73–99. doi: 10.1023/A:1025035004930
- Leach, D. J., Rogelberg, S. G., Warr, P. B., & Burnfield, J. L. (2009). Perceived meeting effectiveness: The role of design characteristics. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 24*, 65–76. doi: 10.1007/s10869-009-9092-6
- Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Jaworski, R. A., & Bennett, N. (2004). Social loafing: A field investigation. *Journal of Management, 30*, 285–304. doi: 10.1016/j.jm.2003.02.002
- Lim, S., Cortina, L. M., & Magley, V. J. (2008). Personal and workgroup incivility: Impact on work and health outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*, 95–107. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.93.1.95
- Malouff, J. M., Calic, A., McGrory, C. M., Murrell, R. L., & Schutte, N. S. (2012). Evidence for a needs-based model of organizational-meeting leadership. *Current Psychology, 31*, 35–48. doi: 10.1007/s12144-012-9129-2
- Martinko, M. J., Gundlach, M. J., & Douglas, S. C. (2002). Toward an integrative theory of counterproductive workplace behavior: A causal reasoning perspective. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 10*, 36–50. doi: 10.1111/1468-2389.00192
- Meier, L. L., & Semmer, N. K. (2013). Lack of reciprocity, narcissism, anger, and instigated workplace incivility: A moderated mediation model. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 22*, 461–475. doi: 10.1080/1359432X.2012.654605
- Mejias, R. J. (2007). The interaction of process losses, process gains, and meeting satisfaction within technology-supported environments. *Small Group Research, 38*, 156–194. doi: 10.1177/1046496406297037
- Miyake, A., Just, M. A., & Carpenter, P. A. (1994). Working memory constraints on the resolution of lexical ambiguity: Maintaining multiple interpretations in neutral

- contexts. *Journal of Memory and Language*, *33*, 175–202. doi: 10.1006/jmla.1994.1009
- Mount, M. K., Barrick, M. R., & Stewart, G. L. (1998). Five-factor model of personality and performance in jobs involving interpersonal interactions. *Human Performance*, *11*, 145–165. doi: 10.1207/s15327043hup1102&3_3
- Myrsiades, L. (2000). Meeting sabotage: Met and conquered. *Journal of Management Development*, *19*, 870–884. doi: 10.1108/02621710010379182
- O'Boyle, E. H., Jr., Forsyth, D. R., Banks, G. C., & McDaniel, M. A. (2012). A meta-analysis of the Dark Triad and work behavior: A social exchange perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *97*, 557–579. doi: 10.1037/a0025679
- Odermatt, I., König, C. J., & Kleinmann, M. (2015). Meeting preparation and design characteristics. In J. A. Allen, N. Lehmann-Willenbrock & S. G. Rogelberg (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of meeting science* (pp. 49–68). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Odermatt, I., König, C. J., & Kleinmann, M. (2016). Development and validation of the Zurich Meeting Questionnaire (ZMQ). *European Review of Applied Psychology*, *66*, 219–232. doi: 10.1016/j.erap.2016.06.003
- Odermatt, I., König, C. J., Kleinmann, M., Nussbaumer, R., Rosenbaum, A., Olien, J. L., & Rogelberg, S. G. (2016). On leading meetings: Linking meeting outcomes to leadership styles. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, advance online publication. doi: 10.1177/1548051816655992
- Ostroff, C. (1993). The effects of climate and personal influences on individual behavior and attitudes in organizations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *56*, 56–90. doi: 10.1006/obhd.1993.1045

- Paulhus, D. L., & Williams, K. M. (2002). The Dark Triad of personality: Narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy. *Journal of Research in Personality, 36*, 556–563. doi: 10.1016/S0092-6566(02)00505-6
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*, 879–903. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879
- Porath, C. L., & Erez, A. (2009). Overlooked but not untouched: How rudeness reduces onlookers' performance on routine and creative tasks. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 109*, 29-44. doi: 10.1016/j.obhdp.2009.01.003
- Rammstedt, B., & John, O. P. (2005). Kurzversion des Big Five Inventory (BFI-K): Entwicklung und Validierung eines ökonomischen Inventars zur Erfassung der fünf Faktoren der Persönlichkeit [Short version of the "Big Five Inventory" (BFI-K): Development and validation of an economic inventory for assessment of the five factors of personality]. *Diagnostica, 51*, 195–206. doi: 10.1026/0012-1924.51.4.195
- Raskin, R., & Terry, H. (1988). A principal-components analysis of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory and further evidence of its construct validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*, 890–902. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.54.5.890
- Rennecker, J. A., Dennis, A. R., & Hansen, S. (2010). "Invisible whispering": Restructuring meeting processes with instant messaging. In D. M. Kilgour & C. Eden (Eds.), *Handbook of group decision and negotiation: Advances in group decision and negotiation* (Vol. 4, pp. 25–45). New York, NY: Springer.
- Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal, 38*, 555–572. doi: 10.2307/256693

- Rogelberg, S. G., Allen, J. A., Shanock, L., Scott, C. W., & Shuffler, M. (2010). Employee satisfaction with meetings: A contemporary facet of job satisfaction. *Human Resource Management, 49*, 149–172. doi: 10.1002/hrm.20339
- Rogelberg, S. G., Leach, D. J., Warr, P. B., & Burnfield, J. L. (2006). “Not another meeting!” Are meeting time demands related to employee well-being? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*, 83–96. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.91.1.83
- Rogelberg, S. G., Scott, C. W., Agypt, B., Williams, J., Kello, J. E., McCausland, T., & Olien, J. L. (2014). Lateness to meetings: Examination of an unexplored temporal phenomenon. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 23*, 323–341. doi: 10.1080/1359432X.2012.745988
- Romano, N. C., Jr., & Nunamaker, J. F., Jr. (2001). *Meeting analysis: Findings from research and practice*. Paper presented at the 34th Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences, Maui, Hawaii.
- Ross, L. (1977). The intuitive psychologist and his shortcomings: Distortions in the attribution process. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 10, pp. 173–220). New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Sackett, P. R., & DeVore, C. J. (2001). Counterproductive behaviors at work. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil & C. Viswesvaran (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial, work, and organizational psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 145–164). London, UK: Sage.
- Salancik, G. R., & Pfeffer, J. (1978). A social information processing approach to job attitudes and task design. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 23*, 224–253. doi: 10.2307/2392563
- Salgado, J. F. (2002). The Big Five personality dimensions and counterproductive behaviors. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 10*, 117-125. doi: 10.1111/1468-2389.00198

- Schilpzand, P., De Pater, I. E., & Erez, A. (2016). Workplace incivility: A review of the literature and agenda for future research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 37*, 57–88. doi: 10.1002/job.1976
- Schütz, A., Marcus, B., & Sellin, I. (2004). Die Messung von Narzissmus als Persönlichkeitskonstrukt: Psychometrische Eigenschaften einer Lang- und einer Kurzform des Deutschen NPI (Narcissistic Personality Inventory) [Measuring narcissism as a personality construct: Psychometric properties of a long and a short version of the German Narcissistic Personality Inventory]. *Diagnostica, 50*, 202–218. doi: 10.1026/0012-1924.50.4.202
- Steiner, I. D. (1972). *Group process and productivity*. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Stephens, K. K., & Davis, J. (2009). The social influences on electronic multitasking in organizational meetings. *Management Communication Quarterly, 23*, 63–83. doi: 10.1177/0893318909335417
- Streibel, B. J. (2003). *The manager's guide to effective meetings*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Tett, R. P., & Burnett, D. D. (2003). A personality trait-based interactionist model of job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*, 500–517. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.88.3.500
- Tobin, R. M., Graziano, W. G., Vanman, E. J., & Tassinary, L. G. (2000). Personality, emotional experience, and efforts to control emotions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79*, 656–669. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.79.4.656
- Tonidandel, S., & LeBreton, J. M. (2011). Relative importance analyses: A useful supplement to multiple regression analyses. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 26*, 1–9. doi: 10.1007/s10869-010-9204-3

- Tonidandel, S., & LeBreton, J. M. (2015). RWA web: A free, comprehensive, web-based, and user-friendly tool for relative weight analyses. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 30*, 207–216. doi: 10.1007/s10869-014-9351-z
- Tonidandel, S., LeBreton, J. M., & Johnson, J. W. (2009). Determining the statistical significance of relative weights. *Psychological Methods, 14*, 387–399. doi: 10.1037/a0017735
- Trudel, J., & Reio, T. G. (2011). Managing workplace incivility: The role of conflict management styles—antecedent or antidote? *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 22*, 395–423. doi: 10.1002/hrdq.20081
- Vardi, Y., & Wiener, Y. (1996). Misbehavior in organizations: A motivational framework. *Organization Science, 7*, 151–165. doi: 10.1287/orsc.7.2.151
- Volkema, R. J., & Niederman, F. (1995). Organizational meetings: Formats and information requirements. *Small Group Research, 26*, 3–24. doi: 10.1177/1046496495261001
- Wageman, R., Hackman, J. R., & Lehman, E. (2005). Team Diagnostic Survey. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 41*, 373–398. doi: 10.1177/0021886305281984
- Weiss, H. M., & Cropanzano, R. (1996). An affective events approach to job satisfaction. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior* (Vol. 18, pp. 1–74). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Williams, K., M., Nathanson, C., & Paulhus, D., L. (2003). *Structure and validity of the Self-Report Psychopathy Scale-III in normal populations*. Paper presented at the 111th annual convention of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, Canada.
- Wu, J., & LeBreton, J. M. (2011). Reconsidering the dispositional basis of counterproductive work behavior: The role of aberrant personality. *Personnel Psychology, 64*, 593–626. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2011.01220.x

Table 1

UMBs items and factor loadings (Study 1)

Item	λ
<i>Absenteeism</i>	
1. Attendees occasionally left the meeting.	.52
2. Attendees left the meeting early without giving a reason.	.53
3. Attendees came to the meeting late.	.57
4. Attendees were absent from the meeting without giving a reason.	.48
<i>Unrelated activities</i>	
5. Attendees occupied themselves with other activities during the meeting (e.g., writing SMS, reading newspapers, etc.).	.60
6. Attendees had discussions that had nothing to do with the meeting.	.73
7. Attendees discussed private matters during the meeting.	.71
8. Attendees had side conversations among each other.	.76
<i>Nonparticipation</i>	
9. Attendees seemed to let their minds wander during the meeting.	.76
10. Attendees did not participate in the meeting, or participated only a little.	.63
11. Attendees showed obvious disinterest in the topics that were discussed.	.76
12. Attendees expressed disinterest with their facial expressions.	.85
<i>Dominant communication behavior</i>	
13. Attendees did not let other participants have their say.	.66
14. Attendees interrupted other attendees.	.72
15. Attendees monopolized the discussion.	.65
16. Attendees pushed themselves into the foreground.	.73
17. Attendees ignored other points of view during discussions.	.67
<i>Inappropriate interpersonal behavior</i>	
18. Attendees made fun of other attendees.	.62
19. Attendees showed up other attendees.	.86
20. Attendees offended other attendees.	.79
21. Attendees intimidated other attendees.	.62

Note. $N = 345$. λ = standardized factor loading. UMBs = uncivil meeting behaviors. English items were translated from original German items.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics, Reliabilities, and Correlations for Study 1 Variables

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1. Meeting satisfaction	4.00	0.79	(.87)															
2. Perceived meeting effectiveness	3.93	0.78	.65**	(.87)														
3. UMBs total	1.53	0.39	-.53**	-.43**	(.87)													
4. Absenteeism	1.37	0.42	-.20**	-.20**	.57**	(.56)												
5. Unrelated activities	1.58	0.60	-.30**	-.26**	.73**	.39**	(.79)											
6. Nonparticipation	1.79	0.73	-.55**	-.44**	.78**	.32**	.48**	(.83)										
7. Dominant communication behavior	1.72	0.62	-.35**	-.26**	.75**	.25**	.33**	.39**	(.81)									
8. Inappropriate interpersonal behavior	1.14	0.33	-.45**	-.37**	.68**	.27**	.37**	.43**	.53**	(.79)								
9. Meeting length (in min.)	99.20	57.48	.09	.00	.06	.18**	.07	-.03	.04	-.03	–							
10. Number of attendees	8.03	4.99	-.06	-.02	.24**	.23**	.25**	.32**	.01	.01	.22**	–						
11. Meeting purpose ^a	–	–	.03	-.03	.04	.07	.07	-.07	.03	.10	.06	-.16**	–					
12. Meeting purpose ^b	–	–	.14*	.18**	-.15**	-.12*	-.11*	-.16**	-.04	-.11*	.12*	-.01	-.40**	–				
13. Importance attributed to meetings	3.67	0.83	.23**	.21**	-.03	.03	-.07	-.03	-.01	-.03	.11*	-.04	.10	.00	(.70)			
14. Existence of meeting norms	4.17	0.85	.45**	.48**	-.41**	-.23**	-.35**	-.25**	-.31**	-.35**	.02	.03	.01	-.06	.18**	(.74)		
15. Age	40.72	11.60	.28**	.17**	-.10	-.10	-.18**	-.11*	.06	-.06	.12*	.06	.00	.12*	.10	.20**	–	
16. Supervise others ^c	0.62	0.48	.18**	.11*	-.03	-.03	-.11*	-.04	.10	-.09	.10	.05	.02	.15**	.12*	.16**	.47**	–

Note. *N* = 323 - 345. Alpha reliabilities are reported on the diagonal. UMBs = uncivil meeting behaviors.

^a Dummy coded: routine issues = 1, problem-solving/information-sharing = 0.

^b Dummy coded: problem-solving = 1, routine issues/information-sharing = 0.

^c Dummy coded: yes = 1, no = 0

* *p* < .05; ** *p* < .01.

Table 3

A Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis and Relative Weight Analysis (Study 1)

Predictor	Meeting satisfaction					Perceived meeting effectiveness				
	<i>b</i>	β	RW	95% CI	RS-RW (%)	<i>b</i>	β	RW	95% CI	RS-RW (%)
Age	.01	.21**	.05	[.02, .08]	10.80	.01	.10	.02	[-.02, .03]	5.81
Supervise others	.11	.07	.01	[.00, .03]	3.13	.06	.03	.00	[-.04, .01]	1.35
Absenteeism	.05	.03	.01	[-.00, .03]	2.15	-.04	-.02	.01	[-.03, .03]	4.28
Nonparticipation	-.44	-.42**	.18	[.12, .25]	43.30	-.37	-.35**	.12	[.05, .20]	47.18
Unrelated activities	.07	.05	.03	[.01, .06]	6.15	.03	.02	.02	[-.02, .04]	7.20
Dominant communication behavior	-.15	-.11*	.05	[.02, .09]	11.61	-.01	-.01	.02	[-.02, .05]	7.47
Inappropriate interpersonal behavior	-.52	-.22**	.10	[.05, .16]	22.86	-.51	-.22**	.07	[.02, .12]	26.71
R^2		.43					.26			
ΔR^2		.34					.23			
F		34.74**					16.67**			
F for ΔR^2		39.03**					20.81**			

Note. $N = 345$. All coefficients are reported for the final step. b = unstandardized regression weight; β = standardized regression weight.

RW = raw relative weight; 95% CI = bias corrected and accelerated confidence intervals as described by Tonidandel et al. (2009); CIs based on bootstrapping with 10,000 replications; RS-RW (%) = relative weight rescaled as a percentage of predicted variance attributed to each predictor.

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

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics, Reliabilities, and Correlations for Study 2 Variables

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1. UMBs total	2.57	0.80	(.86)													
2. Absenteeism	2.13	0.90	.68**	(.53)												
3. Unrelated activities	2.86	1.39	.72**	.36**	(.80)											
4. Nonparticipation	3.45	1.31	.79**	.42**	.54**	(.74)										
5. Dominant communication behavior	2.65	1.20	.74**	.40**	.26**	.39**	(.81)									
6. Inappropriate interpersonal behavior	1.47	0.70	.50**	.28**	.17*	.27**	.44**	(.69)								
7. Emotional stability	3.37	0.83	-.09	-.05	-.08	-.12	-.00	-.04	(.78)							
8. Conscientiousness	4.18	0.55	-.07	.02	-.04	-.10	-.06	-.08	.29**	(.61)						
9. Agreeableness	3.14	0.75	-.13	-.00	.02	-.06	-.19*	-.34**	.18*	.09	(.63)					
10. Machiavellianism	2.75	0.73	.13	.05	.08	.08	.11	.16*	-.24**	-.24**	-.29**	(.75)				
11. Psychopathy	2.22	0.39	.28**	.14	.21**	.18*	.23**	.27**	-.24**	-.25**	-.20**	.36**	(.65)			
12. Narcissism	7.23	3.12	.11	-.01	.05	-.05	.26**	.12	.22**	.05	-.12	.18*	.14	(.72)		
13. Gender ^a	0.64	0.48	.27**	.29**	.14	.12	.25**	.21**	.20*	-.23**	-.01	.08	.26**	.08	-	
14. Age	35.32	9.83	-.06	-.04	-.17*	-.12	.09	.13	.12	-.01	-.06	.00	-.23**	.08	-.11	-

Note. *N* = 170. Alpha reliabilities are reported on the diagonal. UMBs = uncivil meeting behaviors.

^aDummy coded: female = 0, male = 1.

* *p* < .05; ** *p* < .01.

Table 5

A Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis and Relative Weight Analysis (Study 2)

Predictor	UMBs total					Absenteeism					Unrelated activities				
	<i>b</i>	β	RW	95% CI	RS-RW (%)	<i>b</i>	β	RW	95% CI	RS-RW (%)	<i>b</i>	β	RW	95% CI	RS-RW (%)
Gender	.44	.27**	.06	[.02, .15]	44.61	.66	.35**	.09	[.04, .17]	74.62	.43	.15	.02	[-.01, .09]	22.36
Age	.00	-.04	.00	[-.01, .04]	2.25	.00	-.05	.00	[-.02, .04]	1.73	-.02	-.15	.03	[-.01, .09]	30.40
Emotional stability	-.12	-.12	.01	[-.01, .07]	6.69	-.16	-.15	.01	[-.01, .06]	7.02	-.17	-.10	.01	[-.01, .05]	8.55
Conscientiousness	.10	.06	.00	[-.03, .02]	1.16	.26	.16	.01	[-.01, .07]	6.82	.13	.05	.00	[-.04, .02]	0.91
Agreeableness	-.07	-.07	.01	[-.03, .08]	5.92	.03	.02	.00	[-.04, .02]	0.23	.11	.06	.00	[-.03, .04]	2.66
Machiavellianism	.00	.00	.00	[-.01, .05]	3.22	.03	.03	.00	[-.02, .03]	1.30	.06	.03	.00	[-.02, .04]	3.96
Psychopathy	.33	.16	.04	[.00, .12]	29.72	.07	.03	.01	[-.01, .06]	7.83	.41	.11	.02	[-.01, .10]	27.90
Narcissism	.02	.09	.01	[-.01, .07]	6.44	.00	-.02	.00	[-.03, .02]	0.44	.03	.06	.00	[-.02, .04]	3.26
<i>R</i> ²		.14					.12					.08			
ΔR^2		.06					.03					.03			
<i>F</i>		3.39**					2.78**					1.80			
<i>F</i> for ΔR^2		1.94					.96					.81			

Note. *N* = 170. All coefficients are reported for the final step. *b* = unstandardized regression weight; β = standardized regression weight.

RW = raw relative weight; 95% CI = bias corrected and accelerated confidence intervals as described by Tonidandel et al. (2009); CIs based on bootstrapping with 10,000 replications; RS-RW (%) = relative weight rescaled as a percentage of predicted variance attributed to each predictor.

* *p* < .05; ** *p* < .01.

Table 5 (continued)

Predictor	Nonparticipation					Dominant communication behavior					Inappropriate interpersonal behavior				
	<i>b</i>	β	RW	95% CI	RS-RW (%)	<i>b</i>	β	RW	95% CI	RS-RW (%)	<i>b</i>	β	RW	95% CI	RS-RW (%)
Gender	.32	.12	.01	[-.01, .08]	21.01	.52	.21*	.05	[-.02, .11]	28.04	.19	.13	.03	[[-.00, .07]	13.69
Age	-.01	-.10	.01	[-.01, .07]	18.42	.01	.08	.01	[-.05, .04]	4.88	.01	.15	.02	[-.01, .08]	9.42
Emotional stability	-.14	-.09	.01	[-.01, .07]	16.10	-.10	-.07	.00	[-.07, .01]	1.60	.00	.00	.00	[-.02, .02]	1.10
Conscientiousness	-.05	-.02	.00	[-.02, .05]	6.44	.08	.04	.00	[-.07, .01]	0.69	.04	.03	.00	[-.02, .01]	0.65
Agreeableness	-.05	-.03	.00	[-.02, .03]	2.65	-.21	-.13	.02	[-.02, .09]	13.90	-.26	-.28**	.09	[.03, .18]	43.46
Machiavellianism	.02	.01	.00	[-.02, .03]	3.85	-.08	-.05	.00	[-.07, .01]	1.39	-.01	-.01	.01	[-.01, .07]	3.68
Psychopathy	.32	.09	.02	[-.01, .08]	27.12	.45	.14	.03	[-.02, .09]	17.70	.41	.22*	.05	[.01, .14]	24.80
Narcissism	-.02	-.05	.00	[-.02, .04]	4.42	.09	.23**	.06	[-.01, .12]	31.80	.01	.04	.01	[-.01, .04]	3.20
<i>R</i> ²		.06					.17					.20			
ΔR^2		.03					.10					.15			
<i>F</i>		1.28					4.18**					5.08**			
<i>F</i> for ΔR^2		.82					3.33**					4.94**			