Maturity or Gender? An Abductive Approach to Study Workplace Meeting Effectiveness

Petr Šimáček[1], Věra Králová[2], Tereza Mňuk[2] and Pavel Král[1]
[1]Department of Social Sciences, Faculty of Management, Prague University of Economics and Business, Prague, Czech Republic
[2]Department of Management, Faculty of Management, Prague University of Economics and Business, Prague, Czech Republic

petr.simacek@vse.cz
vera.kralova@vse.cz
mnuk.tereza@gmail.com
pavel.kral@vse.cz

Abstract: Meetings are an integral part of organisational life, and their effectiveness is essential both for organisations and their employees. Meeting literature provides a rich overview of various factors impacting meeting effectiveness; however, the content of meetings is neglected as an important factor of meeting effectiveness. The content of the meeting can be assessed through related tasks, which form the central tenets of stratified systems theory. Stratified systems theory posits that a specific job position category is associated with a particular time horizon and characteristic tasks. Therefore, we used stratified systems theory as an appropriate framing for the research to test how the fit between the meeting content (characteristic tasks) and the employee's time horizon contributes to perceived meeting effectiveness. The study draws on a quantitative research design. Data were collected via a survey of seven organisations in different industries in the Czech Republic (n=96). Regression models and ANOVA were used as methods for data analysis. The findings reveal that neither an employee's time horizon per se nor the fit between meeting content (characteristic tasks) and the employee's time horizon influence perceived meeting effectiveness, which does not support the main hypothesis. However, the data revealed three other interesting findings, which we elaborated on using an abductive approach. First, by controlling all possible discriminating factors (such as job position category, education, age, and characteristic tasks), we found that women operate within a shorter time horizon. Second, women perceive meetings as more effective. Third, while we found a fit between the employee's time horizon and job position category, we did not find a fit between the employee's time horizon and meeting content (characteristic tasks) nor a fit between the job position category and meeting content (characteristic tasks), which challenges stratified systems theory. The research results contribute to meeting effectiveness literature by challenging the role of job position categories and meeting content. However, in the first place, the results open up a space for a fruitful research inquiry into gender studies and stratified systems theory.

Keywords: Meeting effectiveness, Stratified systems theory, Gender role, Content of meetings, Employee's time horizon

1. Introduction

Meetings are central to organisational life, and the time spent in meetings increases over time (Mosvick and Nelson, 1987; Tobia and Becker, 1990; Elsayed-Elkhouly, Lazarus and Forsythe, 1997; Leach *et al.*, 2009). Effective meetings promote work engagement (Lehmann-Willenbrock, Allen and Belyeu, 2016; Allen, Tong and Landowski, 2020), job satisfaction and well-being (Rogelberg *et al.*, 2006), and improve business performance (Kauffeld and Lehmann-Willenbrock, 2012; Rogelberg, Shanock and Scott, 2012). On the other hand, ineffective meetings significantly predict emotional exhaustion and intention to quit (Shanock *et al.*, 2013; Lehmann-Willenbrock, Allen, and Belyeu, 2016). Therefore, meeting effectiveness has attracted attention, and researchers have scrutinised various factors that impact meeting effectiveness concerning meeting design characteristics (Leach *et al.*, 2009; Cohen *et al.*, 2011; Allen *et al.*, 2012), meeting leadership (Allen and Rogelberg, 2013; Mroz, Schreiner and Allen, 2020), the interaction process (Volkema and Niederman, 1995; Kauffeld and Lehmann-Willenbrock, 2012; Shanock *et al.*, 2013; Král, Králová and Šimáček, 2023), and communication (Allen, Lehmann-Willenbrock and Landowski, 2014; Yoerger, Allen and Crowe, 2018).

Although meeting content is an important factor in meeting effectiveness (Köhler, Cramton and Hinds, 2012; Allen *et al.*, 2014), there is surprisingly little evidence on how exactly the content contributes to meeting effectiveness. Meeting content should reflect the job position (Leach *et al.*, 2009). Narrative evidence suggests that meetings are perceived as ineffective if their content does not correspond to participants' maturity, i.e., the meeting content either cognitively exceeds the maturity of a participant, or the content is too simple for the participant. However, empirical evidence is missing.

This study delves deeper into the under-researched domain of meeting content. Using a deductive approach and stratified systems theory, in which each stratum reflects a managerial maturity layer, we first test how the

fit between the meeting content and the employee's time horizon contributes to perceived meeting effectiveness. The tested fit has shown a non-significant effect on perceived meeting effectiveness; however, the data revealed interesting and unexpected insights that drove post-hoc analyses. Thus, using the abductive approach (Sætre and Van de Ven, 2021), we elaborated on findings to discover that women perceive differently not only meeting effectiveness but also the time horizons for work-related tasks. We also challenge the tenets of stratified systems theory and call for its revision.

2. Meeting Effectiveness and its Predictors

Meeting effectiveness describes the extent to which meetings help achieve the goals of the meeting attendees, the organisation unit, and the organisation itself (Rogelberg *et al.*, 2006). Although this definition considers an objective achievement of organisational or individual goals, most conceptualisations are based on a subjective evaluation of meeting-related aspects. The most frequently used measurement of meeting effectiveness (Rogelberg *et al.*, 2006) has six items, of which three evaluate achieving goals and three evaluate other meeting-related results.

Previous research has mostly focused on structural (e.g., meeting design characteristics) and process predictors (e.g., interactions) of meeting effectiveness. For example, Leach *et al.* (2009) found several design characteristics (in particular, agenda use and quality of facilities) to be important in predicting perceived meeting effectiveness. Cohen *et al.* (2011) grouped meeting design characteristics into four groups according to characteristics (temporal, physical, procedural, and attendee characteristics), where the importance of a meeting facilitator was emphasised. Other scholars scrutinised different types of behaviour that negatively affect meeting effectiveness (e.g., Shanock *et al.*, 2013; Lehmann-Willenbrock, Allen and Belyeu, 2016).

However, scarce attention was devoted to how the content of the meeting influenced meeting effectiveness. In general, a meeting is effective if the meeting is perceived as relevant to the participants (Allen and Rogelberg, 2013; Geimer *et al.*, 2015). One of the relevant criteria is the nature of the work-related tasks, which are for the meeting agenda (Allen, Tong and Landowski, 2020). Tasks in general, particularly the nature of the tasks in relation to a job position, form the central tenets of stratified systems theory (Jaques, 1986, 2016). Therefore, this research employs stratified systems theory to study meeting effectiveness concerning work-related tasks.

3. Stratified Systems Theory as a Perspective on the Content of the Meeting

The content of the meeting can be assessed through related tasks with particular time horizons, which form the central tenets of stratified systems theory. Stratified systems theory posits that a specific job position category is associated with a particular time horizon (strategic and tactical) and characteristic tasks (Jaques, 1986, 2016; Jaques, Bygrave and Lee, 2001). The strategic horizon breaks down into fewer or more tactical horizons and can be reached by a series of tactical horizons. While tactical horizons could significantly vary in length among the participants within the same stratum, the strategic horizon remains stable and constant within the same stratum (Jaques, Bygrave and Lee, 2001). Thus, we focused on the strategic planning time horizon (termed simply “time horizon” in the following text).

3.1 Hypotheses Development

Stratified systems theory suggests that an individual's career in an organisation evolves through different states of cognitive functioning. As their cognitive functioning matures and grows, they reach higher strata in organisations. Each stratum is linked to a specific organisational layer and reflects the employee´s overall maturity. The stratum is determined by the job position, the time horizon and the characteristic tasks (see Table 1). The employees' time horizon is given by the time needed to complete the longest task or sequence of tasks in the employee's role within a given stratum (Jaques, 1986; Jaques, Bygrave and Lee, 2001). The target time horizon is central because there is a need to be both horizontally and vertically aligned across the strata (Jaques, Bygrave and Lee, 2001; Jaques, 2016). Therefore, it is crucial to meet settled milestones and behave with a certain level of accountability. This approach fixes not just each manager´s own time horizon but also ensures the lateral and vertical alignment of the time horizons of each manager´s subordinates with the manager´s own, and aligns the time horizons of all the subordinates with each other (Jaques, Bygrave and Lee, 2001).

Workplace meetings serve as a tool for organisational coordination (Jarzabkowski and Seidl, 2008) through which accountability is executed (Okhuysen and Bechky, 2009). Coordination of strategic tasks may differ from the perspective of the time horizon. Employees with different lengths of time horizons could perceive meeting

effectiveness differently because employees with a shorter time horizon could perceive meetings as an interruption from other job tasks that they have to execute (Luong and Rogelberg, 2005; Rogelberg *et al.*, 2006; Beadle and Knight, 2012). Moreover, if the content of the meeting concerns long-term goals, they may perceive the meeting as ineffective, because they are not necessarily participants (Jett and George, 2003), while employees with a longer time horizon could perceive meetings as more beneficial to their long-term projects because they can incorporate recommendations and continuously react to ongoing changes in the environment. Therefore, we posit the initial hypothesis:

H1: The employee's time horizon influences perceived meeting effectiveness.

Stratified systems theory suggests that workers should perform tasks according to the level of complexity they can handle (certain strata) (Jaques, 2016). Only if workers are working on the tasks assigned to their stratum, can they feel motivated and satisfied at work, leading to a positive perception of their work effectiveness. Consequently, determining an employee's specific role corresponding to the current level of their maturity is crucial for the effectiveness of the entire organisation (Nickerson and Silverman, 2003). This challenge becomes even more pronounced when all employees have to meet in one type of meeting – the routine meeting.

The content of routine meetings should reflect the employees' level of maturity (stratum) and related characteristic tasks that mirror a certain strategic planning time horizon because employees should perform the tasks according to the cognitive functioning levels they can handle (Jaques, Bygrave and Lee, 2001; Espinosa, Lerch and Kraut, 2004). Thus, they would perceive tasks as more significant for accomplishing their goals (meeting the time horizon), which enhances their work engagement and leads to higher task performance (Christian, Garza and Slaughter, 2011). Assume an employee is working at a lower level than their cognitive development currently allows. In that case, the employee cannot exercise their abilities effectively and is bored and frustrated. Conversely, assume the employee is in a role that is currently too ambitious for them, i.e. for which their cognitive maturity is not sufficient. In that case, they feel stressed, lost, and ineffective – not because of the amount of but because of the quality of the work. Employees can be successful in their roles when they have the cognitive ability to do a job of particular complexity, objective knowledge, and commitment and will consistently behave in the manner required for the role (Jaques, 2020).

Research has only been concerned with participant relevance (Allen and Rogelberg, 2013; Geimer *et al.*, 2015), and there is no empirical evidence concerning task adequacy to the meeting attendee's maturity. The perception of time allocation, importance, autonomy, attention demands, and the complexity of each task can differ between meeting attendees (Taber and Alliger, 1995). Meeting interactions, which determine perceived meeting effectiveness, also depend on individual skills, group cohesion and the variability of the participants (Hackman and Morris, 1975; Taber and Alliger, 1995; Espinosa, Lerch and Kraut, 2004). According to the logic of stratified systems theory, a meeting will be perceived as effective if the meeting content reflects the task that is adequate to the participants' maturity and mirrors a certain time horizon. In particular, the meeting content must reflect the maturity or stratum of the participants. Therefore, we hypothesise:

H2: The fit between the employees' time horizon and the meeting content given by job characteristic tasks positively influences perceived meeting effectiveness.

Table 1: Extended strata built upon stratified systems theory (Jaques, 1986, 2016)

Stratum (Maturity)	Employee's strategic time horizon	Characteristic tasks (meeting content)	Job position category
I	1 day – 3 months	Carrying out precisely assigned work,	Executives (e.g., assistant)
II	3 months – 1 year	Organisation of work within the set guidelines	First-line manager (e.g., head of an accounting office)
III	1 – 2 years	Work planning according to the current trends, responsiveness, and adjusting the job content	Second-line manager (e.g., department manager)
IV	2 – 5 years	Making decisions based on acquaintances' systems, their knowledge and subsequent comparison	General manager (e.g., general manager factories)

Stratum (Maturity)	Employee's strategic time horizon	Characteristic tasks (meeting content)	Job position category
V	5 – 10 years	Shaping the future direction (creating the future instead of just forecasting the development)	Branch CEO (e.g., CEO of a national branch)
VI	10 – 20 years	Shaping direction worldwide, changing institutions from the outside	CEO of the division (e.g., executive vice president 14 branches)
VII	20 – 50 years	Building institutions and theories, their implementation into society as a whole	CEO of a corporation (e.g., multinational CEO corporation)

4. Methods

4.1 Sample and Procedure

A survey research design was used to test the effect of the meeting content and the employees' time horizon on perceived meeting effectiveness among regular workplace meeting attendees. Respondent-driven sampling was used (Heckathorn, 2011; Heckathorn and Cameron, 2017). This sampling approach provides asymptotically unbiased estimates about populations where it is difficult to list population members and yields more representative samples than larger samples recruited via convenience sampling or a self-selection approach (James, 2006; Heckathorn, 2011). The sample was selected from organisations providing internships to students at a prominent business school.

Representatives (CEOs in small organisations and HR managers in large organisations) from seven organisations were approached to recruit approximately 15 (if possible) employees, each from their organisation, who would regularly attend workplace meetings. The representatives were asked to send the questionnaire to participants in different positions (specialists, lower and middle managers) with varying levels of expertise and to include participants of both genders and various age groups. This procedure yielded 96 returned and completed questionnaires, which indicates a response rate of over 90%.

The respondents ranged in age from 21 to 58 (M = 36.09; SD = 9.34), with 39 males (40.6%) and 57 females (59.4%). Most of the participants have a university degree (70.8%), 5 participants had higher professional education (5.2%), 23 had high school education (24%), and there were no participants representing primary education.

4.2 Measures

The questionnaire consisted of the scales previously validated in meeting literature, or adopted scales from Jaques's (1986, 2016, 2020) stratified systems theory. Pre-testing the instrument proved a good understanding of the questionnaire items.

Perceived meeting effectiveness was measured by Rogelberg *et al.* (2006) 5-item questionnaire, where the sixth item, "achieving your department–section– unit's goals," was excluded because employees on lower job levels cannot correctly evaluate this statement. Participants were asked to rate the meeting effectiveness of the typical meeting they attended. Responses were rated on a 5-point scale (from extremely ineffective to extremely effective). An average score was computed across the six items (α = .82, M = 3,68, SD = .79).

Employee's time horizon was accessed with four related items according to stratified systems theory (Jaques 1986, 2016, 2020). Meeting attendees were asked to evaluate the longest time spent with a particular work-related task or a task sequence (e.g., projects) in terms of the following: "time horizon planning," "time horizon of the longest task or project," "the longest time horizon allocated by a supervisor to a particular task accomplishment" and "the longest particular time horizon." Responses reflected strata (seven categories; category 1 = one day to three months; category 7 = 20 to 50 years) according to Jaques (1986) (see Table 1). An average score was computed across the four items (α = .83, M = 2,12, SD = .83).

Meeting content was assessed through characteristic tasks of the typical attendees. Responses were aligned to seven categories according to particular strata (Jaques, 1986; see Table 1).

The fit between the employee's time horizon *and the meeting content*–characteristic tasks was operationalised as an absolute value of the difference between the average value of meeting content–characteristic tasks and

the average value of the employee's time horizon. This approach allows us to identify the fit between job position category perception and the real inclusion of the given position in the organisational structure. A perfect fit yields zero value, and the higher value is the misfit between the employees' time horizon and meeting content.

The job position category was based on Jaques's (1986) strata (seven categories in Table 1).

Demographic characteristics, such as *gender* (1=woman), *age*, and *education* level, were measured as control variables. Another control variable represented important meeting design characteristics with the effect on perceived meeting effectiveness. These meeting design characteristics comprised the *length of the typical meeting* (Luong and Rogelberg, 2005; Leach *et al.*, 2009), *meeting facilitator-lead* (Cohen *et al.*, 2011), *meeting size* (Leach *et al.*, 2009; Geimer *et al.*, 2015), and *perceived participant's relevance* (Allen and Rogelberg, 2013). Additionally, the growing number of online and hybrid meetings enabled us control the form of the meeting.

5. Results

Regression models and ANOVA were conducted using Stata (ver. 16.1) to test the hypotheses. Multicollinearity did not affect the regressions because the correlation matrix revealed low correlations across the variables (see Table 2). Following the research framework, we used a set of hierarchical regression models. Table 3 presents a set of five regression models representing perceived meeting effectiveness as the result of the employee's time horizon and the fit between the employee's time horizon and meeting content (Models 1-5). Model 1 tested only the control variables concerning demographic characteristics. Model 2 tested the control variables representing both demographic and meeting design characteristics. Model 3 yielded regression results for the control variables and the employee's time horizon. Model 4 yielded regression results for the control variables and fit between meeting content and employee's time horizon. Model 5 included all the variables of the research framework.

Gender significantly affected each model, and women perceived meetings as more effective. Similarly, meeting size had a significant effect on each model. Meetings with fewer participants were evaluated as more effective. The other control variables did not significantly affect any of the models. Models 3 and 5 yielded non-significant results for the hypothesised effect of the employee's time horizon on perceived meeting effectiveness. Therefore, H1 did not find support. H2, which predicted that the fit between meeting content and the employee's time horizon would positively influence perceived meeting effectiveness, was not supported by the results yielded in Models 4 and 5.

The results revealed that neither the employee's time horizon per se nor the fit between meeting content and the employee's time horizon influence perceived meeting effectiveness, which does not support the main hypotheses. However, the data revealed interesting insights that drive hunches for post-hoc analyses using an abductive approach concerning differences among genders (Sætre and Van de Ven, 2021).

Table 2: Variables: Means, standard deviations, reliability coefficients, and correlation matrix

Variables	Mean	SD	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	j	k
Dependent variable													
a) Perceived meeting effectiveness (*α=.82*)	3.68	.079	1.00										
Independent variables													
b) Employee's time horizon (*α=.83*)	2.12	.832	-0.16	1.00									

Variables	Mean	SD	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	j	k
Dependent variable													
c) Meeting content	3.10	.901	0.01	0.14	1.00								
d) Fit between meeting content and employee's time	1.22	.873	-0.07	-0.29**	0.55**	1.00							
Control variables													
e) Gender (woman = 1)	.59	.494	0.27**	-0.26*	-0.09	0.05	1.00						
f) Age	36.08	9.338	0.16	0.19	0.06	-0.03	0.08	1.00					
g) Education	4.03	1.269	-0.06	0.27**	0.02	-0.19	-0.15	-0.07	1.00				
h) Meeting length (minutes)	85.36	79.99	0.06	0.24	0.04	0.15	0.14	0.23*	-0.28**	1.00			
i) Meeting facilitator led	4.26	.954	0.18	-0.07	-0.03	-0.03	0.05	0.19	-0.04	0.23*	1.00		
j) Meeting size	8.29	3.705	-0.23*	-0.04	-0.19	0.02	0.13	0.01	-0.24*	0.23*	0.08	1.00	
k) Perceived participant's relevance	3.65	.598	0.14	0.04	-0.12	-0.15	0.04	0.11	0.04	0.15	0.24*	-0.02	1.00
l) Meeting form	2.59	.625	-0.09	0.21*	0.28**	0.06	-0.19	-0.04	0.14	0.01	0.06	0.02	-0.02

Variables	Mean	SD	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	j	k
Dependent variable													
Online	.07	.262											
Offline	.26	.441											
Hybrid	.67	.474											

Note: Variables: age, meeting length, and meeting size were continuous. Education was measured on a 6-point ordinal scale. The facilitator-led meeting was accessed with a 5-point scale (1 – "Never" to 5 – "Always"). Perceived participant's relevance was accessed with a 4-point scale (1 – "No participant is relevant" to 4 – "All participants are relevant"). The meeting form was treated as a categorical variable with consequent transformation to dummy variables.

P-values in parenthesis.

* p<.05

** p<.01

Table 3: Linear regression model for perceived meeting effectiveness

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Hypothesised relationship					
Employee's time horizon *(H1)*			-.167		-.214
			(.116)		(0.055)
Fit between meeting content and time horizon *(H2)*				-.069	-.127
				(.433)	(.178)
Control variables					
Gender (women)	.419*	.444**	.382*	.448**	.374*
	(.012)	(.007)	(.020)	(.006)	(.022)
Age	.012	.008	.007	.004	.008
	(.176)	(.368)	(.392)	(.604)	(.377)
Education	-.004	-.043	.024	-.019	.018
	(.948)	(.515)	(.724)	(.772)	(.786)
Meeting length		.001	.114	.088	.133
		(.950)	(.109)	(.202)	(.067)
Meeting facilitator lead		.128	.117	.135	.107

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
		(.138)	(.174)	(.177)	(.211)
Meeting size		-.063**	-.072**	-.072**	-.073**
		(.005)	(.001)	(.001)	(.001)
Perceived participant's relevance		.112	.121	.101	.094
		(.406)	(.359)	(.457)	(.479)
Meeting form					
Offline		-.552	-.512	-.482	-.469
		(.102)	(.122)	(.151)	(.156)
Hybrid		-.378	-.359	-.365	-.305
		(.223)	(.240)	(.239)	(.320)
R^2	.062	.1451	.1739	.1553	.1820

Note: The dependent variable is *Perceived meeting effectiveness* in all the above models.

In the meeting form, dummy variables were created as variables with the online form as a reference variable.

P-values in parenthesis.

* p<.05

** p<.01

5.1 Post-Hoc Analyses

First, while women were not discriminated against in job position category (F=.94;p=.33) and were involved in the same characteristic tasks as men (F=.83;p=.37), we found that women operate within a shorter time horizon (see Table 4). This statement is supported by one-way ANOVA results (F=6.72, p=.011). Moreover, while we found the alignment between the employee's job position and the employee's time horizon (Model 6), we did not find any alignment between the employee's time horizon and meeting content (Model 7 + 8), which challenges stratified systems theory. Additionally, one-way ANOVA (F=1.91, p=.115) does not report any alignment between the employee's time horizon and task characteristics.

Table 4: Linear regression model for employee's time horizon

	Model 6	Model 7	Model 8
Gender (women)	-.445**	-.387*	-.298†
	(.003)	(.020)	(.057)
Age	.022**	.019*	-.002
	(.006)	(.023)	(.873)
Education	.112*	.161*	.158**
	(.049)	(.013)	(.009)
Meeting content		.089	.031
		(.316)	(.720)
Job position category			.399***
			(.000)
Pseudo R^2			

Note: The dependent variable is the *employee's time horizon*.

P-values in parenthesis.

$^{\dagger}<.1$

* p<.05

** p<.01

***p<.001

6. Discussion

Primarily, this study contributes to the conversation searching for the relationship between the meeting content and meeting perceived effectiveness (Rogelberg *et al.*, 2006; Allen, Tong and Landowski, 2020), which has previously been neglected in research on workplace meetings. We studied how the employee's time horizon and the fit between meeting content and the employee's time horizon influence perceived meeting effectiveness. Although the hypotheses were not supported, we suggest that meeting content requires further attention. The results might be insignificant due to inconsistencies in stratified systems theory, to which we have to contribute.

First, while we found a fit between the employee's time horizon and job position category, we did not find a fit between the employee's time horizon and meeting content (characteristic task), nor did we find a fit between the meeting content and job position category. This finding challenges stratified systems theory, which may not be coherent with the recent business environment and context according to the globalisation and importance of fast responses in the last three decades. Consequently, the employee´s time horizon, especially in higher strata, might not mirror the current state. Thus, we call for revising the alignment of characteristic tasks with employees' time horizons and job position categories. Second, many employees work in interdisciplinarity teams, and they have no strict characteristic tasks according to strata and there might be overlays between strata. Consequently, there is a need to determine whether the theory corresponds to practice and that there are no discrepancies.

Additionally, the data revealed interesting insights that drove the post-hoc analyses. The abductive approach brought further contributions concerning the differences between genders in the workplace. First, in previous studies, gender (women) has shown a non-significant effect on perceived meeting effectiveness (Leach *et al.*, 2009; Cohen *et al.*, 2011; Geimer *et al.*, 2015; Lehmann-Willenbrock, Allen and Belyeu, 2016). In contrast, our finding revealed gender as a significant predictor of perceived meeting effectiveness, whereas women perceive meetings as more effective. Second, even though women were not discriminated against in the job position category or the characteristic tasks of their job positions, they operate in a shorter time horizon. This finding could successfully drive the research on the role of women in management.

7. Limitations and Future Research

Our study has two limitations referring to the sample size. First, only seven organisations were included in the sampling, and the final sample comprised 96 respondents. Thus, more organisations across sectors should be included, and more participants should be involved for higher sample representativeness and findings generalisation. Second, the distribution of the job position category in the sample represented mostly strata I to IV. Stratum V had only one respondent, and strata VI to VII were not included. Thus, the results can be generalised with caution only for lower strata (I to IV).

Our findings also suggest that revisiting stratified systems theory is required. We propose that time horizons and characteristic tasks should be revised, with an emphasis on the fit between them. Including new forms of organising (Puranam, Alexy and Reitzig, 2014) could yield a fresh theory for the current context. Finally, the results open a space for a fruitful research inquiry into gender studies in management, for example on the role of women's time management in women's leadership styles (Burke and Collins, 2001; Shen and Joseph, 2021).

8. Conclusion

This study provides a perspective on workplace meetings based on stratified systems theory. We found no evidence that the employee's time horizon nor per se the fit between meeting content and the employee's time horizon influenced perceived meeting effectiveness. However, post-hoc analyses revealed important findings according to gender differences. Women operate within a shorter time horizon and perceive meetings as more effective. Finally, while we found the fit between the employee's time horizon and job position

category, we did not find the fit between the employee's time horizon and meeting content or the fit between meeting content and job position category, which challenges stratified systems theory.

Acknowledgement

Founding: This work was supported by IGS (grant number: IG632013)

References

Allen, J.A. *et al.* (2012) 'Employees' feelings about more meetings: An overt analysis and recommendations for improving meetings', *Management Research Review*, 35(5), pp. 405–418. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1108/01409171211222331.

Allen, J.A. *et al.* (2014) 'Understanding workplace meetings: A qualitative taxonomy of meeting purposes', *Management Research Review*, 37(9), pp. 791–814. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1108/MRR-03-2013-0067.

Allen, J.A., Lehmann-Willenbrock, N. and Landowski, N. (2014) 'Linking pre-meeting communication to meeting effectiveness', *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 29(8), pp. 1064–1081. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-09-2012-0265.

Allen, J.A. and Rogelberg, S.G. (2013) 'Manager-led group meetings: A context for promoting employee engagement', *Group & Organization Management*, 38(5), pp. 543–569. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601113503040.

Allen, J.A., Tong, J. and Landowski, N. (2020) 'Meeting effectiveness and task performance: meeting size matters', *Journal of Management Development* [Preprint]. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-12-2019-0510.

Beadle, R. and Knight, K. (2012) 'Virtue and meaningful work', *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 22(2), pp. 433–450. Available at: https://doi.org/10.5840/beq201222219.

Burke, S. and Collins, K.M. (2001) 'Gender differences in leadership styles and management skills', *Women in Management Review*, 16(5), pp. 244–257. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1108/09649420110395728.

Christian, M.S., Garza, A.S. and Slaughter, J.E. (2011) 'Work engagement: A quantitative review and test of its relations with task and contextual performance', *Personnel Psychology*, 64(1), pp. 89–136. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01203.x.

Cohen, M.A. *et al.* (2011) 'Meeting design characteristics and attendee perceptions of staff/team meeting quality.', *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 15(1), pp. 90–104. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021549.

Elsayed-Elkhouly, S.M., Lazarus, H. and Forsythe, V. (1997) 'Why is a third of your time wasted in meetings?', *Journal of Management Development*, 16(9), pp. 672–676.

Espinosa, J.A., Lerch, F.J. and Kraut, R.E. (2004) 'Explicit versus implicit coordination mechanisms and task dependencies: One size does not fit all.', in E. Salas and S.M. Fiore (eds) *Team cognition: Understanding the factors that drive process and performance.* Washington: American Psychological Association, pp. 107–129. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1037/10690-006.

Geimer, J.L. *et al.* (2015) 'Meetings at work: Perceived effectiveness and recommended improvements', *Journal of Business Research*, 68(9), pp. 2015–2026. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2015.02.015.

Hackman, J.R. and Morris, C.G. (1975) 'Group tasks, group interaction process, and group performance effectiveness: A review and proposed integration', *Advances in experimental social psychology*, 8, pp. 45–99. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60248-8.

Heckathorn, D.D. (2011) 'Comment: Snowball versus respondent-driven sampling', *Sociological methodology*, 41(1), pp. 355–366.

Heckathorn, D.D. and Cameron, C.J. (2017) 'Network sampling: From snowball and multiplicity to respondent-driven sampling', *Annual review of sociology*, 43, pp. 101–119.

James, H.S. (2006) 'Self-selection bias in business ethics research', *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 16(4), pp. 559–577.

Jaques, E. (1986) 'The development of intellectual capability: A discussion of stratified systems theory', *The Journal of applied behavioral science*, 22(4), pp. 361–383.

Jaques, E. (2016) *Requisite organization: A total system for effective managerial organization and managerial leadership for the 21st century*. 2. Routledge.

Jaques, E. (2020) '50 Thoughts about Leadership and People Systems', *ROII Requisite*, 6 March. Available at: https://www.requisite.org/50-thoughts-about-leadership-and-people-systems/ (Accessed: 12 June 2023).

Jaques, E., Bygrave, C. and Lee, N. (2001) 'Aligning multiple time horizons and multiple functions in strategic planning and budgeting', *The International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 9(3), pp. 257–271. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1108/eb028935.

Jarzabkowski, P. and Seidl, D. (2008) 'The role of meetings in the social practice of strategy', *Organization Studies*, 29(11), pp. 1391–1426. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840608096388.

Jett, Q.R. and George, J.M. (2003) 'Work interrupted: A closer look at the role of interruptions in organizational life', *Academy of management Review*, 28(3), pp. 494–507.

Kauffeld, S. and Lehmann-Willenbrock, N. (2012) 'Meetings matter: Effects of team meetings on team and organizational success', *Small group research*, 43(2), pp. 130–158. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496411429599.

Köhler, T., Cramton, C.D. and Hinds, P.J. (2012) 'The meeting genre across cultures: Insights from three German–American collaborations', *Small Group Research*, 43(2), pp. 159–185. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496411429600.

Král, P., Králová, V. and Šimáček, P. (2023) 'The impact of interactions before, during and after meetings on meeting effectiveness: a coordination theory perspective', *Measuring Business Excellence* [Preprint].

Leach, D.J. *et al.* (2009) 'Perceived meeting effectiveness: The role of design characteristics', *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 24(1), pp. 65–76. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-009-9092-6.

Lehmann-Willenbrock, N., Allen, J.A. and 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(10), pp. 1293–1312. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1108/MRR-08-2015-0195.

Luong, A. and Rogelberg, S.G. (2005) 'Meetings and more meetings: The relationship between meeting load and the daily well-being of employees.', *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 9(1), pp. 58–67. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2699.9.1.58.

Mosvick, R.K. and Nelson, R.B. (1987) *We've got to start meeting like this: a guide to successful business meeting management*. Scott Foresman Trade.

Mroz, J.E., Schreiner, E. and Allen, J.A. (2020) 'Formal leadership in workplace meetings', in *Managing Meetings in Organizations*. Emerald Publishing Limited.

Nickerson, J.A. and Silverman, B.S. (2003) 'Why firms want to organize efficiently and what keeps them from doing so: Inappropriate governance, performance, and adaptation in a deregulated industry', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 48(3), pp. 433–465. Available at: https://doi.org/10.2307/3556680.

Okhuysen, G.A. and Bechky, B.A. (2009) '10 coordination in organizations: An integrative perspective', *Academy of Management Annals*, 3(1), pp. 463–502. Available at: https://doi.org/10.5465/19416520903047533.

Puranam, P., Alexy, O. and Reitzig, M. (2014) 'What's "new" about new forms of organizing?', *Academy of Management Review*, 39(2), pp. 162–180. Available at: https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2011.0436.

Rogelberg, S.G. *et al.* (2006) '"Not another meeting!" Are meeting time demands related to employee well-being?', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(1), pp. 83–96. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.1.83.

Rogelberg, S.G., Shanock, L.R. and Scott, C.W. (2012) 'Wasted time and money in meetings: Increasing return on investment', *Small Group Research*, 43(2), pp. 236–245. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496411429170.

Sætre, A.S. and Van de Ven, A. (2021) 'Generating theory by abduction', *Academy of Management Review*, 46(4), pp. 684–701.

Shanock, L.R. *et al.* (2013) 'Less acting, more doing: How surface acting relates to perceived meeting effectiveness and other employee outcomes', *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 86(4), pp. 457–476. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12037.

Shen, W. and Joseph, D.L. (2021) 'Gender and leadership: A criterion-focused review and research agenda', *Human Resource Management Review*, 31(2), p. 100765. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2020.100765.

Taber, T.D. and Alliger, G.M. (1995) 'A task-level assessment of job satisfaction', *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16(2), pp. 101–121.

Tobia, P.M. and Becker, M.C. (1990) 'Making the most of meeting time', *Training & Development Journal*, 44(8), pp. 34–39.

Volkema, R.J. and Niederman, F. (1995) 'Organizational meetings: Formats and information requirements', *Small group research*, 26(1), pp. 3–24.

Yoerger, M., Allen, J.A. and Crowe, J. (2018) 'The impact of premeeting talk on group performance', *Small Group Research*, 49(2), pp. 226–258.