Making Meetings More Meaningful: An Exploration of Meeting Science in Libraries

Journal of Library Administration, 2021

Julie Leuzinger^a and Sian Brannon^{b*}

^a*University Libraries, University of North Texas, Denton, TX, United States;* ^b*University Libraries, University of North Texas, Denton, TX, United States*

Julie.Leuzinger@unt.edu ORCID: 0000-0003-0268-5499

*Corresponding author: Sian.Brannon@unt.edu ORCID: 0000-0001-6102-1428

Word count: 5986

This is an Accepted Manuscript version of the following article, accepted for publication in Journal of Library Administration. Leuzinger, J. & Brannon, S. (2021). Making Meetings More Meaningful: An Exploration of Meeting Science in Libraries. *Journal of Library Administration*, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01930826.2021.1924533>. It is deposited under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Making Meetings More Meaningful: An Exploration of Meeting Science in Libraries

The term “meeting science” first appears in the 2015 publication *The Cambridge Handbook of Meeting Science*, edited by Allen, Lehamann-Willenbrock, and Rogelberg. The field looks at actual meetings and their components, usually through observations and surveys. As meetings occur in virtually every library environment, it behooves an investigation. There is a lack of empirical studies for meeting science in libraries. This article adds to the growing body of research in the area, explored from a library perspective. The authors investigate the predictors of success for productive meetings, librarian perceptions of effective meeting leadership, and best practices for meeting leadership.

Keywords: meeting science; management; survey, meetings

Introduction

Say the word “meeting” and few will look at you with excitement. Some might with dread, others with disdain. But – why is this so? Meetings can be valuable, but they must be done correctly. Done incorrectly, there is a great waste of resources, including time, space, and salaries.

For the purposes of this research, the researchers are using Steven Rogelberg’s definition of a ‘work meeting’:

a work meeting is defined as a gathering of two or more employees for a purpose related to the functioning of an organization or a group (e.g., to direct, to inform, to govern, to regulate). The gathering can occur in a single modality (e.g., a video conference) or in a mixed- modality format (e.g., mostly face- to- face with one participant connected via telephone). Typically, meetings are scheduled in advance (some notice is provided) and are informally or formally facilitated by one of the attendees. Meetings can be extremely brief (five minutes) to a full day in length. (Rogelberg, 2019, p. 4)

Also, for ease of understanding, this article will use the terms “facilitator,” “leader,” “manager,” or “supervisor” interchangeably to represent the person who is charged with convening and leading the meeting.

Drawing heavily from Rogelberg’s contributions, the researchers hope to add to the growing body of “meeting science” research. The field looks at actual meetings and their components, usually through observations and surveys. As meetings occur in virtually every library

environment, it behooves an investigation. Unfortunately, there is a lack of empirical studies for meeting science in libraries. Therefore, the exploratory research questions for this article are:

- What are the predictors of success for productive meetings in academic libraries?
- What are academic librarian perceptions of effective meeting leadership?
- What are “best practices” for meeting participation and leadership?

Literature Review

The origins of meeting science can be traced back to Helen Schwartzman’s exploration of meetings “as a legitimate topic of investigation” (1986). Prior to 1986, meetings were simply viewed as a means to study other things, such as negotiations. She suggests a shift away from using meetings to study group dynamics and instead, focus on how and why meetings are used, their effect on employees, and their impact on the organization (Schwartzman, 1986). Many scholars begin to shift their attentions to the meetings themselves based on Schwartzman's research, by studying the impact on employees, perceptions of meetings, and leading more productive meetings (Allen & Rogelberg, 2013; Bluedorn, Turban & Love, 1999; Luong & Rogerberg, 2005; Nixon & Littlepage, 1992; Perking, 2009). However, the term “meeting science” does not appear in the literature until 2015 in *The Cambridge Handbook of Meeting Science* where several researchers investigate the psychology of meetings from meeting preparation, pre-meeting activities, different aspects of the meetings themselves, what constitutes a successful meeting, and the various types of meetings that can occur in the workplace (Allen, Lehmann-Willenbrock, & Rogelberg, 2015).

Predictors of Success for Productive Meetings

Regardless of the literature supporting the theory that meetings are “unproductive and costly,” they are still a part of the culture in most organizations (Cohen et al., 2011). As mentioned above, dread and disdain are common feelings when heading into a meeting. However, the literature reveals there are some predictors of success for productive gatherings that include:

- Meeting leadership discouraging negative meeting behaviors, such as side conversations among participants (Allen et al., 2015).
- Colleagues showing up on time has a positive impact on group member’s well-being and therefore creates a more productive environment (Rogelberg et al., 2014).
- Positive, appropriate humor is a sign of camaraderie among team members and can be an indicator of a rewarding meeting experience (Lehmann-Willenbrock & Allen, 2014; Maxwell, 2014; Pouthier, 2017).

Setting ground rules for meetings can help with much of the above (Kjellberg & Saxton, 2005), including encouraging employees to react authentically in meetings; therefore, they are not doing both the emotional labor of hiding their feelings while also attempting to contribute productively to the creative or decision-making process (Shanock et al., 2013; Starzyk, Sonnentag, & Albrecht, 2018). Moreover, when supervisor support is perceived as high, meetings are more effective, and employees are more engaged in interacting positively in meetings (Yoerger, Crowe, & Allen, 2015).

Predictors for success frequently occur before the meeting ever takes place, including determining if a meeting is even necessary (Odermatt et al., 2017). Studies have shown that employee perception of meeting leadership is impacted by who they invite to the meeting. Simply inviting individuals because they are part of the organizations leadership may not be best choice given contributions to the meeting may result in a feedback loop of discussing, “common

knowledge rather than unique knowledge” (Geimer et al., 2015; Odermatt et al., 2015; Wodak, Kwon, & Clarke, 2011). So, who is on the guest list will depend on why you are having the meeting in the first place, be it for decision-making or advising (Littepage, 2015). An individual’s skill set should complement the meeting goals (Hostager et al., 2003; Myrsiades, 2000). Inviting too many individuals to a meeting can also impact meeting productivity and success; therefore, only invite those with the expertise needed to carry out the task at hand (Lehmann-Willenbrock, Allen, & Belyeu, 2016).

Additionally, having an agenda, selecting an appropriate location, and considering the environment set the tone for a productive meeting (Cohen et al., 2011). Building in time for pre-meeting small talk has been shown to correlate positively with meeting success (Yoerger, Francis, & Allen, 2015). All the above do not guarantee meeting success, but it is imperative that they are considered so a meeting has a good chance for success.

Employee Perception of Effective Meeting Leadership

Several studies focus on the meeting itself; however, it is not surprising that the meeting facilitator has the greatest impact on employee perceptions of meetings overall. The employee relationship with the supervisor outside of this setting markedly affects how they regard the effectiveness of the meeting (Mroz & Allen, 2015). Unfortunately, most leadership studies do focus solely on participant survey data, which can be flawed due to the biases mentioned, thus more studies are needed that compare this data with observational studies, given reality can be vary widely from perception (Hoogeboom & Wilderom, 2015).

Meetings can be viewed as positive and empowering after the fact when employees feel they have been given information to do their jobs (Allen, Lehmann-Willenbrock, & Sands,

2016). Additionally, employees are more engaged when they see meetings as relevant to their work and generally view a well moderated meeting as one that is respectful of their time and workload (Allen & Rogelberg, 2013; Odermatt et al., 2017). Meetings are also seen in a positive light if they are run properly, are productive, and are not seen as interruptions to their work (Rogelberg et al., 2006).

One study focusing on facilitator style revealed that leaders who were “relationship-oriented,” as opposed to task focused, yielded a more favorable perception of meeting leadership. This could include greeting members as they arrived, asking open-ended questions, calling on participants by name, summarizing their comments to ensure understanding, and the ability to build consensus, thus establishing a good rapport with participants (Hostager et al., 2003; Malouff et al., 2012). Another study even posits that *Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs* can be applied to organizational meetings and that an employee’s impression of a meetings success is dependent on their “social, self-esteem, and self-actualization needs” being met (Malouff et al., 2012). Overall, supervisors should keep in mind that their behavior in meetings affects an employee’s view of the entire organization (Baran et al., 2012).

Research shows that meetings can have a lasting impact on employee satisfaction and emotional well-being. Both positive and negative behaviors on the part of the attendees and leadership are among the most influential factors in meeting satisfaction overall (Lehmann-Willenbrock, Allen, & Belyeu, 2016). Therefore, one can infer that a facilitator is seen as more capable or skilled if they steer meeting participants to positive meeting behaviors.

Best Practices for Meeting Participation and Leadership

While many best practices can be gleaned from the above discussion on productive meetings and meeting leadership, some additional items should be considered. Given employees tend to view meetings in a positive light when the meeting is pertinent to their duties, using an agenda as a tool to clarify how the meeting applies to their work has proven useful, they also help make meetings more productive (Allen et al. 2012; Gruenberg, 2015; Rutledge, 1984). Therefore, agendas should be specific in outlining what the group needs to achieve during the meeting along with how long it should take to address each task. Additionally, meeting facilitators should ask for participant feedback on the agenda and disseminate the agenda early so attendees can come prepared (Baran et al., 2012; Geimer et al., 2015). One study on meeting design revealed that in addition to fully considering the agenda and attendees, special attention should be given to the environment including, the room size, temperature, and lighting. Additionally, when appropriate, the organizer should provide beverages and/or snacks (Cohen et al., 2011). Also, of import, the facilitator should make use of technology that benefits the group and makes work more productive (Boule, 2008; Costello & Del Bosque, 2010; Paul et al., 2013; Wilson, 2008).

Best practices should include expectations for both participants and leadership. Meeting participants should “Come prepared, ask for and give clear feedback, develop and monitor clear strategies, build on others [ideas], link with group goals, and participate” (Myrsiades, 2000).

Given the evidence that participant behavior has a long-lasting impact on colleagues, studies suggest that attendees need to police and correct their own behavior, and personally elect to take part in meeting citizenship behavior (Lehmann-Willenbrock, Allen, & Belyeu, 2016).

Best practices for meeting leaders should include:

- Modeling positive and cooperative behavior

- Clearly stating meeting objectives
- Finding solutions
- Encouraging participation
- Ensuring meeting stays on target while keeping pace and watching time
- Addressing poor meeting behaviors (Myrsiades, 2000)
- Building consensus
- Creating a positive mood overall (Lehmann-Willenbrock, Allen, & Belyeu, 2016)

As mentioned above, meeting leaders should take note of poor meeting behaviors and discourage them as soon as possible. For example, one of the negative impacts of lateness is encouraging future lateness if there are no consequences; therefore, scholars suggest starting on time even if everyone is not there as a best practice (Leach et al., 2009). Conversely, they should also identify good behavior, providing praise and recognition, that can even have a positive effect on the group overall. Finally, organizations should consider including good meeting citizenship into their performance review cycle, thereby further encouraging and rewarding positive meeting behaviors. This not only impacts the meeting at hand, but the productivity of the organization overall (Lehmann-Willenbrock, Allen, & Belyeu, 2016).

One should also consider what occurs after a meeting to ensure meetings improve in the future and there is appropriate follow through. Best practice should include a recap at the end of the meeting regarding what was discussed, decided, and action items, this can include a discussion of how participants thought the meeting went (Kello, 2015). Anonymous surveys after can yield more fruitful results for the meeting leader than directly asking attendees (Lehmann-Willenbrock, Allen, & Belyeu, 2016). While meeting minutes are considered useful and can help keep a meeting on track, there is no evidence that they have any impact on employee perception

of effectiveness (Cohen et al., 2011), unlike the above-mentioned agenda. However, they are practical for post-meeting reference on action items.

Method

The overall design of this research was gathering quantitative data through a questionnaire, using descriptive statistical methods for most analysis, and inductive content analysis for thematic review of the qualitative text in open-ended survey question responses. Content analysis had periodic inter-rater reliability checks for consistency of themes.

Participants

Participants were recruited through opportunity and snowball sampling through dispersal of recruitment emails directly to 23 separate library-related email listservs, and through requests to administrators of 51 state library associations (including District of Columbia) to distribute to their constituents. Distribution resulted in 328 respondents.

Desired participants were any adult employed in an academic library. After confirming this and agreeing to the informed consent notice, participants could complete the rest of the survey.

Survey

The questionnaire (contained in the Appendix) consisted of 32 questions, broken down by the following types:

- Multiple choice/Likert scale: 7
- Ranking: 4
- Quick answer (yes/no): 15

- Open-ended response: 3
- Demographics: 3

Topics covered included meeting purpose, type, characteristics, preferences, and considerations for innovative practices. The constructs included and the organization of the questions are influenced by Rogelberg’s work (2019).

Results

Personal meeting experiences

Participants were asked to consider meetings they attend in their own libraries. Overall, respondents indicate their library’s meetings rate as “moderately useful” (52.7%) and “very useful” (22.3%).

When considering the amount of time in their typical work weeks dedicated to meetings, respondents indicated the most frequent amount of time spent in meetings is low, at 1-4 hours (43.5%), followed by 5-8 hours per week (33%). A quarter of respondents spend more than 20% of their work week in meetings. When looking at whether the respondent was a supervisor, non-supervisors spend 1-4 hours per week in meetings, and supervisors spent more. The size of the library had a small discernable effect. Libraries with over 100 employees had more people spending over 20% of their time in meetings than any other size of library.

Further, the meetings that the respondents attend most often start and end (Table 1) on time.

<u>Starting on time</u>	<u>%</u>		<u>Ending on time</u>	<u>%</u>

Always	8.8		Always	3.4
Most of the time	68		Most of the time	57.2
About half the time	12.2		About half the time	21.7
Sometimes	7.3		Sometimes	15.3
Never	3.7		Never	2.4
Total	100		Total	100

Table 1. Frequency of meetings starting and ending on time.

In meetings respondents attend, there are usually prepared agendas, with agendas appearing in over ½ of meetings 83% of the time. Decisions are made half of the time or less, and the same is true of the presence of action items (Table 2). When comparing the presence of agendas to likelihood of decisions being made or presence of action items – those meetings with prepared agendas were more likely to have decisions and action items.

<u>Decision-making</u>	<u>%</u>		<u>Presence of action items</u>	<u>%</u>
Always	2.1		Always	1.8
Most of the time	28.4		Most of the time	26.2
About half the time	36.6		About half the time	29.9
Sometimes	31.4		Sometimes	38.4
Never	1.5		Never	3.7
Total	100		Total	100

Table 2. Frequency of decision-making and presence of action-items in meetings.

Reasons to have meetings

Participants were asked to indicate whether they consider any of some specified situations as a good reason to have a meeting. Ranked in order of affirmation, it appears that meetings are most purposeful for solving important problems, making collective decisions, and discussing improvement. For each meeting purpose below, over half of respondents believe that it is a good reason to have a meeting.

1. Solving important problems
2. Making collective decisions
3. Discuss ways to improve
4. Budget planning
5. Identifying key challenges
6. Process evaluation
7. Human resource issues
8. Presenting new ideas for feedback
9. Evaluation of changes
10. Identifying new opportunities
11. Disseminating and interpreting policy
12. Calls to action
13. Celebration of victories
14. Forecasting

When asked to input their own thoughts on why meetings should be held, respondents' reasons can be broken down into these themes, similar to the list above:

- Committee work

- Connecting/teambuilding
- Human resources issues
- Planning
- Policy and procedure creation, refinement, and change
- Sharing information and communication
- Training and development

Sharing information and communication were the most frequently stated justifications for meetings, and this included updates, check-ins, and dissemination of critical information.

Another benefit of having a meeting for this purpose is becoming aware of projects and happenings outside of one's own work area. There was frequent mention of the importance of meetings in team building and building relationships. One respondent said that meetings are beneficial for "establishing real-time colleague connections."

Interesting reasons for having meetings that were not specifically reflected above include to "consolidate interest in a new endeavor," committee work, and "vendor meetings educating us on products." Lastly, one respondent observed that "celebration of victories" was not appropriate: "For victory celebrations, I'd have a party, not a meeting!"

Ranking Importance of Various Meeting Components and Qualities

In multiple questions, respondents were asked to rank choices of various components of meetings.

In thinking about meetings in general, these qualities were ranked in order from most important to least important and mirror the findings in the above literature review:

- Meeting goals are clearly defined

- Agenda and necessary materials provided in advance of the meeting
- Appropriate people are invited to the meeting
- Attendees provide input to agenda
- Technology and meeting room are appropriate

Regarding meeting length and the leader, respondents ranked these qualities in order of importance from most to least:

- Meeting leader is prepared
- Meeting starts on time
- Attendees arrive on time
- Meeting was an appropriate length

During the meeting, there are considerations for participation, listening, and discussion.

Respondents rated these as most important to least:

- Discussion stayed on topic
- All perspectives were taken into consideration
- Attendees listen to each other
- Attendees are encouraged to participate
- There are no complaints

Lastly, in considering what happens after a meeting, respondents believe that the following are important from most to least:

- When meeting ends, there are clear action items and responsibilities
- After meeting ends, the attendees follow up on what they were tasked with

- After meeting ends, the leader follows up on responsibilities of others
- When meeting ends, there is an agreed upon summary of what took place

Meeting Pet Peeves

Librarians have a lot of “pet peeves” when it comes to meetings in general, but by far, the largest outcry in responses was poor meeting leadership. Meeting conveners have a lot of responsibility, but when they allow things to get off track, or if they let someone dominate a conversation (thus prohibiting other participation), it indicates poor meeting leadership skills. Along this vein, one respondent indicated that “going down a rabbit hole of opinions that turn into a low-key argument/discussion ... makes the rest of the attendees feel awkward.”

The next largest meeting pet peeve is whether a meeting is necessary in the first place. Whether it’s rehashing old topics, “endless discussions with no action items, decisions, or assignments,” or “holding a meeting when a 2 sentence email would do the job,” librarians wish that meetings leaders would respect their time, and not waste it.

Poor meeting preparation is another highly reported pet peeve. Lack of agendas, when attendees don’t give (or don’t read!) documents in advance, not arranging for appropriate technology, or inappropriate scheduling (4pm on Fridays...) are not ways to set up a successful meeting from the start.

The last group of pet peeves have to do with the people attending the meetings – our colleagues and their lack of “common courtesy boundaries that we should have learned in kindergarten.” When attendees arrive late, are distracted, do not participate, exhibit “non-verbal discourteous behavior” like eye-rolling or not following through, meetings will tend to be more unproductive.

Discussion

Innovative Meeting Techniques

Respondents offered many innovative concepts for improving meetings. These included:

- Use “pre-meeting surveys to get attendees’ opinions on issues to inform the meeting.”
- Record meetings and store them for a specific time period, allowing for review.
- If you are discussing a specific library location or services, hold your meeting in that location.
- When some attendees are joining remotely, employ an “owl” to “pivot the camera to the person speaking in the room” so they can see who is speaking.
- Using a Pomodoro timer for limiting discussion and moving the agenda along.
- Employ real-time collaborative notetaking – multiple people can do it simultaneously ensuring nothing is missed and things get corrected quickly.
- Have “working meetings” – Instead of just talking about a project in a meeting, have meetings where participants actually work on the smaller parts of said project, perhaps using the “Think-Pair-Share” method.
- Use an “Action Priority Matrix” to prioritize action items, and potentially eliminate unnecessary discussions.
- Have the facilitator send out a quick video recap of meeting, answering questions that weren’t handled during the meeting.

Many of the recommendations discussed above mirror the results of meeting design studies conducted by researchers in both psychology and business (Cohen et al., 2011; Geimer et al., 2015).

Improving Meetings

There are a few general things that can be done to improve meetings. In addition to paying attention to meeting “pet peeves,” it may behoove a group to establish a set of meeting “norms” for meeting etiquette and participation. This may inhibit interruptions, unwelcome attitudes, and allow for more participants.

Professional development or training could be a solution on an organizational or individual level. Investing in training for meeting facilitators as part of onboarding should be top priority, given this aspect of work has such an impact on both employees and the organization overall (Rogelberg et al., 2010). Additionally, simply learning good business presentation skills can be useful for employees at any level (Kovacs, 2018).

A few quick things anyone could do to improve meetings include ensure technology will work BEFORE the meeting starts, limiting generic updates that could have been shared by email (perhaps one minute per person), and to allow for videoconferencing to include more remote attendees who are relevant to the topic.

Before meeting negativity has a chance to set in, create an atmosphere conducive to meeting success – start off positively. Think about having food, doing recognition at the beginning of the meeting, or letting someone pick background music. Maintaining a positive mindset can be contagious (Rogelberg, 2019).

Awareness of Poor Leadership

You might not be aware that you are a bad meeting facilitator. Rogelberg (2019) gives some good indicators you are not facilitating well:

- Attendees are on their phones during the meeting
- Attendees are having side conversations
- The leader is doing most (or all) of the talking
- A few people monopolize discussion.

If you are still unsure, consider asking someone not up or down the chain of command from you (maybe a peer from another division) to sit in one of your meetings and make notes of these behaviors in order to provide you with some unbiased feedback.

Agendas

Overwhelmingly, respondent suggestions related to agendas. Meeting leaders should ask for agenda items and distribute them (and related materials) BEFORE meetings so attendees can prepare; at least one day in advance is preferred. Agendas should be realistic, with anticipated time limits on each item, in order to complete all necessary business. Further, you could prioritize items on the agenda – make sure the most important things are discussed *first*. This takes some advanced planning, wherein a facilitator could apply a strategic planning technique to an agenda, or a POP: a “Purpose, Outcomes and Plan” (or Process). This method can help with keeping a meeting on target by defining the purpose and determining the needed outcome to achieve business goals (Kjellberg & Saxton, 2006).

Many complaints are about not sticking to agendas. In this case, it is prudent to assign someone as a “traffic cop” to keep conversations on point, moving side conversations and off-

topic discussions to a “parking lot” for a future time, thus keeping to the meeting’s objectives. Meetings could be made more interesting by making them “walking” or “standing” meetings. It is thought you might be more inclined to stick to the agenda if you are being active.

Interestingly, one respondent suggested: “at one of the places I worked, one couldn’t schedule a meeting room without presenting the person who scheduled rooms with an agenda.”

Conclusion

Much of this discussion has been focused on issues with meetings and suggestions on how to improve. That does not mean that all meetings are bad. Meetings offer opportunities for team building, transparency in processes and decision making, and employee engagement. They give library employees a chance to show leadership skills, and keep the business of the library moving.

For further research, it would be interesting to compare results from the library field to other professions – are the issues the same? Next steps could involve research specifically on “leading” meetings – how do leaders view their own skills? Meeting science methodologies such as field study and observations could be employed.

Although much of what has been written here is not surprising, it bears repeating often. Meetings would improve if meeting leaders heed even just a few of the best practices and suggestions. However, one of the limitations to this study, was the lack of questions soliciting information on how to be a good meeting participant. This information had to be inferred from the negative comments as well as relying on past research from other fields covered in the literature review. While meeting leadership can make or break a meeting, given the evidence that

participant behavior has a long-lasting impact on colleagues, this could also be another aspect for further research.

Although the researchers specifically asked, “What are some innovative things you have experienced that make meetings more effective?” some answers were not considered by the coding team as directly “innovative.” Nonetheless, the ideas reflected in those answers bear repeating as qualities of meetings that are desired by academic librarians. These include:

- Having a defined purpose for the meeting
- Starting meetings on time even when all parties haven’t arrived in order to not penalize the punctual
- Limiting meetings to 90 minutes maximum, and include breaks for meetings longer than one hour
- Having mutual agreements on proper meeting behavior
- Inviting only those relevant to the meeting to attend
- Assigning someone to take minutes and ensure distribution (or public posting) after the meeting
- Asking attendees directly to participate
- Ending with assigned action items that will be placed first on agenda at next meeting for progress review
- Ending meetings on time

Overall, the best piece of advice coming from the survey responses was: before any meeting, consider whether an email would work just as well. Let’s all agree to only meet when it’s necessary. Cancelling a meeting is not a crime.

References

- Allen, J., Lehmann-Willenbrock, N., and Sands, S. (2016). Meetings as a positive boost? How and when meeting satisfaction impacts employee empowerment. *Journal of Business Research*, 69: 4340–47.
- Allen, J., Lehmann-Willenbrock, N., & Rogelberg, S. (2015). *The Cambridge Handbook of Meeting Science*. Cambridge University Press.
- Allen, J., & Rogelberg, S. (2013). Manager-led group meetings: A context for promoting employee engagement. *Group & Organization Management*, 38: 543–69.
- Allen, J., Sands, S., Mueller, S., Frear, K., Mudd, M., & Steven G. Rogelberg. (2012). Employees' feelings about more meetings: An overt analysis and recommendations for improving meetings. *Management Research Review*, 35: 405–18.
- Allen, J., Yoerger, M., Lehmann-Willenbrock, N., & Jones, J. (2015). Would you please stop that!?: The relationship between counterproductive meeting behaviors, employee voice, and trust. *Journal of Management Development*, 34: 1272–87.
- Baran, B., Shanock, L., Rogelberg, S., & Scott, C. (2012). Leading group meetings: Supervisors' actions, employee behaviors, and upward perceptions. *Small Group Research*, 43: 330–55.
- Bluedorn, A., Turban, D., & Love, M. (1999). The Effects of stand-up and sit-down meeting formats on meeting outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84: 277–85.
- Boule, M. (2008). Changing the way we work. *Library Technology Reports*, 44: 1–36.

- Cohen, M., Rogelberg, S., Allen, J., & Luong, A. (2011). Meeting design characteristics and attendee perceptions of staff/team meeting quality. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 15: 90–104.
- Costello, K., & Del Bosque, D. (2010). For better or worse: Using wikis and blogs for staff communication in an academic library. *Journal of Web Librarianship*, 4: 143–60.
- Geimer, J., Leach, D., DeSimone, J., Rogelberg, S., & Warr, P. (2015). Meetings at Work: Perceived effectiveness and recommended improvements. *Journal of Business Research*, 68: 2015–26.
- Gruenberg, M. (2015). Both sides now: vendors and librarians--It's in everyone's best interest to require an agenda to make an important meeting with a vendor more productive. *Against the Grain*, 27: Article 37.
- Hoozeboom, M., & C. Wilderom. (2015). Effective leader behaviors in regularly held staff meetings: Surveyed vs. videotaped and video-coded observations. In J. Allen, N. Lehmann-Willenbrock, & S. Rogelberg (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Meeting Science* (pp. 381-412). Cambridge University Press.
- Hostager, T., Lester, S., Ready, K., & Bergmann, M. (2003). Matching facilitator style and agenda structure in group support systems: Effects on participant satisfaction and group output quality. *Information Resources Management Journal*, 16: 56.
- Kello, J. (2015). The science and practice of workplace meetings. In J. Allen, N. Lehmann-Willenbrock, & S. Rogelberg (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Meeting Science* (pp. 709-734). Cambridge University Press.

- Kjellberg, B., & Saxton, E. (2005). How to avoid death by meeting: strategies for better meetings. *Serials Librarian*, 50: 21-26.
- Kovacs, G. (2018). Towards a comprehensive inventory of efficiency in business presentations. *Society & Economy*, 40: 479-92.
- Leach, D., Rogelberg, S., Warr, P., & Burnfield, J. (2009). Perceived meeting effectiveness: The role of design characteristics. *Journal of Business & Psychology*, 24: 65-76.
- Lehmann-Willenbrock, N., & Allen, J. (2014). How fun are your meetings? Investigating the relationship between humor patterns in team interactions and team performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 99: 1278-87.
- Lehmann-Willenbrock, N., Allen, J., & Belyeu, D. (2016). Our love/hate relationship with meetings: Relating good and bad meeting behaviors to meeting outcomes, engagement, and exhaustion. *Management Research Review*, 39: 1293-1312.
- Littlepage, G. E. (2015). Information utilization in meetings. In J. Allen, N. Lehmann-Willenbrock, & S. Rogelberg (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Meeting Science* (pp. 533-555). Cambridge University Press.
- Luong, A., & Rogelberg, S. (2005). Meetings and more meetings: The relationship between meeting load and the daily well-being of employees. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 9: 58-67.
- Malouff, J., Calic, A., McGrory, C., Murrell, R., & Schutte, N. (2012). Evidence for a needs-based model of organizational-meeting leadership. *Current Psychology: A Journal for Diverse Perspectives on Diverse Psychological Issues*, 31: 35-48.

- Maxwell, L. (2014). To meet or not to meet? That is the question. *Law Library Journal*, 106: 645–47.
- Mroz, J., & Allen, J. (2015). It's all in how you use it: Managers' use of meetings to reduce employee intentions to quit. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 67: 348–61.
- Myrsiades, L. (2000). Meeting sabotage: Met and conquered,” *Journal of Management Development*, 19: 870.
- Nixon, C.T., & Littlepage, G.E. (1992). Impact of meeting procedures on meeting effectiveness. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 6: 361–369.
- Odermatt, I., König, C., & Kleinmann, M. (2015). Meeting preparation and design characteristics. In J. Allen, N. Lehmann-Willenbrock, & S. Rogelberg (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Meeting Science* (pp. 49-68). Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- Odermatt, I., König, C., Kleinmann, M., Nussbaumer, R., Rosenbaum, A., Olien, J., & Rogelberg, S. (2017). On leading meetings: Linking meeting outcomes to leadership styles. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 24: 189–200.
- Paul, S., Sutanonpaiboon, J., Griffin, C., & Mykytyn, P. (2013). Input information complexity and information processing in electronic discussions: An experimental investigation. *Information Systems Management*, 30: 336–51.
- Perkins, R. (2009). How executive coaching can change leader behavior and improve meeting effectiveness: An exploratory study. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice & Research*, 61: 298–318.

- Pouthier, V. (2017). Gripping and joking as identification rituals and tools for engagement in cross-boundary team meetings. *Organization Studies*, 38: 753–74.
- Rogelberg, S. (2019). *The surprising science of meetings: How you can lead your team to peak performance*. Oxford University Press.
- Rogelberg, S., Allen, J., Shanock, L., Scott, C., & Shuffler, M. (2010). Employee satisfaction with meetings: A contemporary facet of job satisfaction. *Human Resource Management*, 49: 149–72.
- Rogelberg, S., Leach, D., Warr, P., & Burnfield, J. (2006). “Not another meeting!”: Are meeting time demands related to employee well-being? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91: 83–96.
- Rogelberg, S., Scott, C., Agypt, B., Williams, J., Kello, J., McCausland, T., & Olien, J. (2014). Lateness to meetings: Examination of an unexplored temporal phenomenon. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 23: 323–41.
- Rutledge, D. (1984). Chairing the university committee: The elements of successful meetings. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 10: 285.
- Schwartzman, H. (1986). The Meeting as a neglected social form in organizational studies. *Organizational Behavior*, 8: 233–258.
- Shanock, L., Allen, J., Dunn, A., Baran, B., Scott, C., & Rogelberg, S. (2013). Less acting, more doing: How surface acting relates to perceived meeting effectiveness and other employee outcomes. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, 86: 457–76.
- Starzyk, A., Sonnentag, S., & Albrecht, A. (2018). The affective relevance of suggestion-focused and problem-focused voice: A diary study on voice in meetings. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 91: 340–61.

- Wilson, V. (2008). Post-Secondary students prefer IM to E-Mail for personal and social communication. *Evidence Based Library & Information Practice*, 3: 61–64.
- Wodak, R., Kwon, W., & Clarke, I. (2011). Getting people on board: Discursive leadership for consensus building in team meetings. *Discourse & Society*, 22: 592–644.
- Yoerger, M., Crowe, J., & Allen, J. (2015). Participate or else!: The effect of participation in decision-making in meetings on employee engagement. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice & Research*, 67: 65–80.
- Yoerger, M., Francis, K., & Allen, J. (2015). So much more than “chit-chat”: A closer look at premeeting talk. In J. Allen, N. Lehmann-Willenbrock, & S. Rogelberg (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Meeting Science* (pp. 153-174). Cambridge University Press.

Appendix – Survey Questions

On average, how many hours in a typical work week do you spend in meetings? (0, 1-4, 5-8, 9-12, 13-16, 16-19, 20+)

For how many of these meetings are you the leader or coordinator? (Always, Most of the time, About half the time, Sometimes, Never)

Which of these are good reasons to have a meeting? (Yes, No, I don't know)

- Process evaluation
- Discuss ways to improve
- Calls to action
- Forecasting
- Budget planning
- Human resource issues
- Identifying key challenges
- Disseminating and interpretation of policy
- Celebration of victories
- Solving important problems
- Making collective decisions
- Evaluation of changes
- Identifying new opportunities
- Presenting new ideas for feedback
- Other (list as many as you'd like)

Thinking about meetings you participate in at your library...

- How often do meetings you attend START on time? (Always, Most of the time, About half the time, Sometimes, Never)
- How often do meetings you attend END on time? (Always, Most of the time, About half the time, Sometimes, Never)
- How many of your meetings have prepared agendas? (All, 3/4, 1/2, 1/4, None)
- How often are decisions made in meetings you attend? (Always, Most of the time, About half the time, Sometimes, Never)
- How often are there clear action items with defined responsibility in meetings you attend? (Always, Most of the time, About half the time, Sometimes, Never)
- How would you rate your library's meetings overall, on average? (Extremely useful, Very useful, Moderately useful, Slightly useful, Not at all useful)

Thinking about meetings IN GENERAL...

Please rank these in order of importance

- _____ Meeting goals are clearly defined
- _____ Attendees provide input to agenda
- _____ Agenda and necessary materials provided in advance of meeting
- _____ Appropriate people invited to meeting
- _____ Technology and meeting room are appropriate

Please rank these in order of importance

- _____ Meeting starts on time
- _____ Attendees arrive on time
- _____ Meeting leader is prepared
- _____ Meeting was an appropriate length

Please rank these in order of importance

- _____ All perspectives were taken into consideration
- _____ Attendees listen to each other
- _____ There are no complaints
- _____ Attendees are encouraged to participate
- _____ Discussion stayed on topic

Please rank these in order of importance

- _____ When meeting ends, there are clear action items and responsibilities
- _____ When meeting ends, there is an agreed upon summary of what took place
- _____ After meeting ends, the leader follows up on responsibilities of others
- _____ After meeting ends, the attendees follow up on what they were tasked with

What are some innovative things you have experienced that make meetings more effective?

What is your biggest meeting "pet peeve"?

Which of these most closely approximates your position? (please pick the closest one)
(Librarian, Library staff, Middle management, Library administration)

Do you supervise librarians or staff? (Yes, No)

How many total employees work at your library? Include all library staff working for your campus regardless of physical location. (1-10, 11-25, 26-50, 561-99, 100+)