



# A folk theory of meetings – and beyond

A folk theory  
of meetings

Ib Ravn

*Department of Education, Aarhus University, Copenhagen, Denmark*

163

## Abstract

**Purpose** – Despite widespread frustration with meetings in organizations, they receive very little attention from academics. The purpose of this paper is to shed conceptual light on meetings and hence render them amenable to research and development.

**Design/methodology/approach** – From interviews with managers and employees, six common assumptions about meetings were extracted, termed a folk theory of meetings, which most office workers seem to carry in the back of their minds.

**Findings** – This folk theory holds meetings to be places for excessive talk, whether by a domineering leader or highly vocal participants, the purpose of which is to walk through the items on the agenda and dispose of each. This bleak and conservative concept of a meeting impedes intellectual as well as practical progress.

**Practical implications** – An alternative theory of meetings is proposed, one based on the group facilitation approach to social order in meetings. On this view, a facilitator can change meetings by controlling their form and process, providing direction, stimulating engagement and ensuring that the meeting creates value for its external stakeholders and meaning for its participants. If adopted in management training, this view of meetings – and the widely available facilitation tools that go with it – may render meetings at work the subject of conscious organizational development.

**Originality/value** – The proposed “folk theory of meetings” is novel, as is the contrast provided with the facilitation approach to meetings. Together, they constitute a reconceptualization that can be used to move meetings out of the organizational doldrums.

**Keywords** Management activities, Organizations, Group communication, Meetings, Group facilitation, Meeting management, Meeting facilitation, Folk theories, Transformative theory, Design principles

**Paper type** Conceptual paper

## 1. Introduction

Ask people about a movie they saw, and they will tell you about a good one. Ask them about a meeting they went to, and they will tell you about a bad one. Meetings are much maligned (Lencioni, 2004), and for good reason, apparently: in research on meetings, we asked employees in five knowledge-intensive corporations in Denmark how they rate their meetings, on a Likert scale from very bad (1) to very good (5). Their response was a middling 3.3, just above “neither good nor bad” (Ravn and Rokkjær, 2006).

If a customer satisfaction survey turned up results this poor, a private company would consider itself in big trouble. Yet, week after week, year in and year out, managers gladly expose their employees to such mediocrity in the 10 percent of their working

---

The author acknowledges his colleagues Nina Tange and Joan Rokkjær with whom he conducted the intervention project “Meetings that Create Meaning and Value”. Funding for this research was provided by the participating organizations, Vestjysk Bank and the Danish Ministry of Science. While HR and other personnel from these organizations helped adapt the proposed training program to the respective management groups, they played no role in the author’s use of data, concepts or theory.



---

hours that our results indicate they go to meetings. And why should not they? Meeting participants may grumble, but most everyone puts up with it.

Why is that? Why are meetings generally disliked, yet tolerated? We shall suggest that a major reason lies in the prevailing common-sense understanding of meetings. This “folk theory of meetings”, as we shall call it, holds that meetings are occasions where we gather to listen to our leader and to discuss items on an agenda. As will be argued in the present paper, this plain, almost humdrum, view of meetings ensures that they remain second-rate. This is obviously fatal to the flourishing of people and organizations.

An alternative perspective on meetings will be introduced, that of group facilitation. This is a practical approach to guiding the energies of people gathered to accomplish important tasks. Facilitation is typically used by trained professionals – facilitators or process consultants – who are hired to run workshops on special topics like strategy or innovation. However, because they focus on the form of meetings, facilitators are ideally suited to revitalize ordinary organizational meetings, languishing as they are because of our decades-long neglect of their very form.

## 2. Study design

Eliciting folk theories presents an empirical challenge because, as is their nature, they are rarely articulated, only implied. In the present paper, lay people’s deep understanding of meetings are inferred from three sources: an exploratory intervention study, called “Meetings that Create Value and Meaning” (MCVM), carried out in Denmark by the author and colleagues (Ravn, 2011), empirical studies undertaken by other researchers and reported in the scarce academic literature on meetings and, finally, the author’s personal experiences from consulting to scores of meeting planners and training hundreds of managers in meeting skills.

For the MCVM project, we recruited a government agency and a private corporation. In each, we provided brief training in meeting facilitation to 51 and 36 managers, respectively, involving two days of workshops with four months between, as well as one 75-minute, one-on-one coaching session per manager. Before this intervention, we collected data in the two organizations, observing 13 meetings, conducting 26 individual interviews with 13 managers and 13 employees, and administering a 29-item questionnaire to the involved managers’ regular meeting participants ( $n = 715$ ), in which each was asked to assess the meetings chaired by his or her own immediate superior.

The results of the pre-intervention research on meeting participants’ view of meetings informed our formulation, below, of the folk theory of meetings. It will be presented in the form of six interlocking assumptions about meeting culture, agendas, chairing, discussions, etc.

In the second part of the paper, we shall propose an alternative view of meetings based on the practice of group facilitation. Under the spotlight of group facilitation, the six folk-theory assumptions will be transformed into design principles that encapsulate the promises a meeting holds: what a meeting would look like if we abandoned the subconsciously operative folk theory and consciously acted to change meetings into something completely different. The prospects for each element of this “transformative” theory of meetings, as we shall call it, are spelled out by reference to post-intervention evaluation data from the MCVM project, where middle managers after the brief training in facilitation acted to change their meetings as each saw fit. Data on the managers’ post-intervention performance and thinking were obtained six

to 12 months after the intervention by observation of ten meetings, 19 interviews with managers and their employees and the same survey administered to the participating manager’s regular meeting participants ( $n = 637$ ).

All survey items used a Likert-like scale of five response categories with a neutral midpoint. The results reported as “positive” in this paper are the sum of the percentages of responses falling in the “4” and “5” categories, typically “to a high degree” and “to a very high degree”. Results reported here are at the  $p = 0.05$  level or better.

### 3. A folk theory of meetings

“Folk theories” are scientists’ way of describing the intuitive, unscientific understanding of phenomena that lay people often hold (Holy and Stuchlik, 1981). For example, folk physics involves the conviction that if you swing a small rock in a string above your head and let go, it will continue in a soft spiral until it lands. Folk biology often involves the assumption that a plant finds the materials needed for its growth in the soil, and solar energy only helps it put them together – when in fact it creates practically all of them through photosynthesis. More than merely isolated wrong ideas, folk assumptions coalesce into views of a domain that resist change and learning. Thus, educators take great interest in folk theories because it tells them what they are up against when teaching science.

For that reason, folk assumptions about meetings will interest the researcher who wants to understand why organizational meetings seem so impervious to change. Certainly, many other factors are relevant, economic, political, motivational, etc. but it can be safely argued that our culturally embedded and rarely challenged views of meetings need to be disembedded and challenged. The assumptions of the folk theory are listed in Table I and explained in the pages that follow.

#### 1. Meetings will be meetings

The first thing to notice is that there is not much serious thinking about meetings at all. Scholars of organization and society have barely discovered the meeting as an object fit for study. A quarter of a century ago, Schwartzman wrote what is still the only scholarly monograph on meetings (Schwartzman, 1989) and an accompanying paper,

Folk assumption	Expanded
1. Meetings will be meetings	If you work in an office, you go to meetings occasionally. Some are good, some are bad. That is just the way it is. You put up with them or try to stay away
2. The agenda is of prime importance	The agenda holds the key to the meeting. A bad meeting will be improved by a better agenda
3. The chairman executes the meeting	Pun intended. Chairing a meeting is running through a standard set of formal rituals. Not exciting and not supposed to be
4. The leader may speak as much as he pleases	When managers are chairpersons, they own the meeting and may speak at length to any and all points on the agenda
5. Meetings are for discussing things	Free-for-all discussions are the standard fare of meetings. Next to management orientation, this is what meetings are for: speaking our minds
6. Speak up or shut up	To speak you need to grab the floor. If, for whatever reason, you do not, you can remain silent forever. It is up to you. No one helps you

**Table I.**  
A folk theory of meetings: assumptions with explanations

“The meeting as a neglected social form in organizational studies” (Schwartzman, 1986). Only a few researchers have taken up her challenge (such as Volkema and Niederman, 1995; Bluedorn *et al.*, 1999; Rogelberg *et al.*, 2006). A search of Google Scholar (July 22, 2012) for “research on strategy” yielded 3,520 hits, “research on decision making”, 5,810 hits, “research on innovation”, 8,970 hits, “research on meetings”, 69 hits.

This academic neglect is reflected in the unthinking stance taken by many practitioners: when meetings are recognized and discussed at all, they are usually complained about and then acquiesced to. This acceptance is a key folk assumption about meetings: meeting will be meetings (see the list in Table I).

### *2. The agenda is important*

It is generally assumed that the mainstay of the meeting is the agenda. A typical response from an MCVN manager was that a good meeting [...]:

[...] is well-prepared, there is an agenda, reading materials are sent well in advance [...] the structure put down in the agenda is adhered to, and you can see from the agenda what the meeting is for; is it orientation or discussion or decision? You start on time, follow the agenda, there are clear conclusions along the way, what has been decided and what to follow up on, and you finish on time.

Thus, a good agenda is key to making a sick meeting well, because meetings are about discussing itemized topics on an agenda and dispensing with them, one after the other.

### *3. To chair a meeting is to take care of the agenda*

Walking everyone through the agenda is the chairperson’s responsibility. That’s what a chairperson is for, says this folk assumption. The typical chairperson never received any training in chairing a meeting and so does it by the seat of his pants. He calls the meeting a few days in advance, inviting the usual suspects and, to be on the safe side, a few more, making sure to enclose ample supplies of reading material. He opens the meeting when everybody has finally shown up, barges right in and starts with what seems salient, whether it is an item on the agenda or, in more informal meetings, merely in his own mind. He calls on some participants to speak and lets others chip in and eventually tries to wrap up the discussion or, if he is the impatient manager of the group, makes the required decision himself. Rushing now, he defers the last agenda items to the next meeting and closes the meeting late.

This is the composite picture emerging from project MCVN and it is probably fairly representative of the job done by chairpersons in a million small and mid-size meetings held every day in offices in Europe and North America. The self-evidence of this picture makes it ripe for inclusion in our list of folk assumptions: the chairman executes the meeting by pushing everyone through the grinder called the agenda.

### *4. Leaders speak*

The group leader dominates the meeting as a matter of course, sharing information, dispensing work instructions, initiating discussions, etc. typically speaking between a third and two-thirds of the time, depending on the type of meeting. Even in egalitarian Denmark, we very rarely observed meeting participants challenge their leaders’ right to speak as much as they please.

---

### 5. *Meetings are for discussions*

When the leader has finished speaking, the floor is open and everyone is expected to chip in with relevant points. The purpose of a meeting is often to share knowledge, coordinate action and make decisions, but the means by which this is done in the group is the free exchange of verbal input, known as a discussion or a debate. Often, of course, some contributions seem less than relevant: assorted opinions, emotion-laden reactions, hobby horses, ideas bouncing off the last speaker's remarks, etc. But they are admitted nevertheless, as everyone is free to say whatever is on their minds.

This pattern of communication encapsulates our fifth folk assumption: meetings are for discussing things. Discussions are an undisputed good. Besides listening to management information, what else would meetings be for, if not speaking our minds during discussions?

### 6. *Speak up or shut up*

Unless controlled by old-school leaders who call on participants before they can speak, discussions proceed by self-controlled turn-taking. You speak when there is a break in the flow of conversation or when the current speaker's remarks are coming to an end. This requires initiative and assertiveness on the part of meeting participants. When asked if his manager/chairman did anything to help meeting participants contribute, one MCVN respondent said:

I have to rely on myself *exclusively*. The chairman does *nothing* to help people. I've become used to that. That's the way it is, and it's going to stay that way. If you want influence around here, you have to get on your toes and speak up. If you don't, you can just keep quiet all through the meeting (emphases in original) (Ravn, 2011, p. 137).

Who speaks at meetings is co-determined by power, position, experience, interest, motivation and facility with public speaking. The fact that these qualifications are often unevenly distributed among meeting participants is rarely seen as a problem because, after all, "The floor is open, right? So, speak if you have something to say". If you do not speak you must have nothing to say. This translates into the plain folk assumption, our last: those who speak; those who do not can remain quiet.

In sum, the folk theory holds meetings to be leader talk and free-for-all discussions of agenda items of indeterminate consequence, minimally guided by a manager playing the uninspired role of conventional chairperson. Meetings are often flat and pointless, and participants are not particularly outraged by this.

## 4. An alternative

Consider now an alternative theory. Just as the folk theory is descriptive, but has strong normative implications ("Act as specified by these assumptions"), so the alternative theory will be more than merely descriptive (Baburoglu and Ravn, 1992). To put it ambitiously, this theory will be transformative (Ravn, 2005), meaning that in formulating it we intend to invite a transformation in meeting practices. The theory is built on six design principles, each of which replaces one of the folk assumptions. This theory undergirded our intervention in project MCVN, the brief training of managers in each organization. The exposition in the present section draws on data from the evaluation of that intervention.

---

The alternative theory rests on the idea that a meeting is the facilitated creation of meaning and value in a group of people. The term “facilitate” is key: it derives from the Latin *facilis*, “doable” or “easy to do”. In an organizational context it means to make it easy for a group to accomplish what it wants. “Facilitation is about process – how you do something – rather than content – what you do” (Hunter, 2007, p. 19). A facilitator works by expressing requests that induce meeting participants to communicate and behave in ways that the facilitator knows from experience will produce the results that they desire. A facilitator is useful if meeting participants could not have produced the same outcomes without her guidance.

By explicitly focusing on the process or form of a meeting, the facilitator brings into the foreground precisely the taken-for-granted routines and rituals that the folk theory of meetings has kept in the invisible background. While traditional chairmanship employs a combination of authoritarian tricks and parliamentary procedures that hail from industrial society with its emphasis on production, facilitation is a more recent approach better suited to the people aspects of modern work life.

To mention just one example, traditional chairmanship is not concerned with human motivation. How do you chair a meeting so people are not bored? Traditional manuals on meetings are silent on this, from Robert’s (1967) *Rules of Order* to more recent classics like *Mastering Meetings* (The 3M Meeting Management Team, 1994). On the other hand, it is part of a facilitator’s *raison d’être* to introduce processes that support meetings so participants are motivated, become involved, use their skills, have fun, and see the meeting as personally meaningful to them (Hogan, 2003b; Schwartz, 1994).

Facilitators are usually skilled professionals brought into facilitate special sessions like strategy workshops and staff seminars. In line with the seminal work by Doyle and Straus (1976), who suggested that any ordinary business meeting should be facilitated, we shall propose a transformative theory for meetings as facilitated (Table II), either by the group leader or by a person designated by the leader or elected by the group.

### *1. Meetings can be changed*

Meetings can be shifted from invisible background to foreground and spotlight if we so decide and if we possess the conceptual apparatus required. The discourse of facilitation enables us to see meetings in terms of the control of form for the purpose of furthering content, that is, meeting objectives. Thus, conceptualized, meetings may be subjected to organizational development.

After the MCVM intervention, one department head, who previously worked as a consultant and immediately recognized the facilitation tools we used in the training, said: “It’s frighteningly easy to do something about bad meetings”, the implication being: why did not we do it earlier?

Most people in project MCVM became more reflective of meetings; they were no longer taken for granted. One manager said:

I have become more conscious of the fact that you can change meetings and that there is a number of simple tools you can use to make the meeting a more fun experience, without any loss of content; quite the contrary, in fact.

Another manager spoke of his most important outcome:

The thing about structuring the meeting, and avoiding a lot of inefficient time. The structure forces people to be active. They need to commit themselves. They get a role to play.

Folk theory of meetings Folk assumptions (from Table I)	Alternative theory inspired by group facilitation	
	Design principles	Explained
1. Meetings will be meetings	A facilitator can change meetings by changing their form	We can pull meetings into the foreground and start working on them if we have the tools to do so. Distinguishing form from content and controlling form are first steps
2. The agenda is of prime importance	Focus and direction are what's important	Being a mere list of topics to be discussed, an agenda does not provide direction. It must specify what the discussion of each item is for: what is to be accomplished through the discussion
3. The chairman executes the meeting	A facilitator controls meeting form to create outcomes	A facilitator guides the meeting along by closely monitoring and supporting the conversation, using alternative, small-group forms of conversation to include everyone
4. The leader may speak freely	The leader must provide vision and stimulate group energy	For the meeting to create value and meaning, leaders must not wear out their people by excessive talk. The meeting is a platform for visionary and inspiring leadership
5. Meetings are for discussing things	Meetings are for barn raising and construction	Not just the exchange of assorted ideas and opinions, meeting talk is facilitated such that it helps us do our work better
6. Speak up or shut up	A facilitator uses processes that include everyone	As a matter of course, everyone participates in processes like the buzz dyad, silent reflection, the round robin and cherry-picking

**Table II.**  
A transformative theory  
of meetings as facilitated

*2. Focus is important, not blind loyalty to the agenda*

Having a well-written agenda is only a means to the end that everyone hopes for: that the meeting will be focused and directed towards an important end. A bare list of topics submitted for discussion, which is what constitutes a standard agenda, provides insufficient focus. Agenda items are usually listed as nouns, like ingredients in a recipe: "Fundraising", "Annual budget" or "Recommendations from the staffing committee". What is missing from this meeting recipe are, of course, the cooking instructions: what to do with the items? Generally, the person who composes an agenda assumes that the point of each item is self-evident, as if the meal intended is suggested by the list of its ingredients: potatoes, cream, parsley, ham, zucchini and cumin. Not so; neither meals nor meetings self-organize.

In MCVM we asked meeting participants if, going into a meeting, they knew what topics were to be discussed, and 64 percent responded in the positive. When asked if they knew what the discussions were supposed to lead to, only 34 percent said yes. In other words, only about half the time does knowing the agenda also involve knowledge of what is to be accomplished during the meeting.

For periodic meetings in the same group, a prepared agenda may not even be important, if focus and direction can be provided by other means. In one MCVM group, the agenda was composed jointly by the manager and the group during the first 5 minutes of the meeting. Explained the manager:

The agenda goes on the whiteboard, one-two-three-four. "I think this goes first, and then there are tangents, but we'll be okay". It takes a minute to put it on the board. Then we're sitting there and everyone knows we need to cover those items. I write out the four items and ask; "Is that what we're going to accomplish today?" "Right on", they say, and then we start, and we can all see the four agenda items.

### *3. A facilitator controls meeting form*

No longer chairperson of the meeting by birthright, the manager or project leader can choose to facilitate his own meeting or he can delegate the role to a sharp co-worker, preferably one skilled in meeting facilitation. Facilitation requires attention to form, managing requires attention to content: the demand on the leader-facilitator is high.

Rather than execute a long list of agenda items, the meeting facilitator asks what form and what processes are required to accomplish what's necessary, given the size of the group, their mental resources and the time available. From these factors a meeting program is designed that specifies what kind of outcome every agenda item needs to have and by what process it may be reached – management orientation, free debate, barn raising, small-group work, buzz dyads, silent reflection, rounds, cherry-picking or any other process known to the facilitators (Schuman, 2005; Hogan, 2003a; Elsborg and Ravn, 2007).

Initially, this requires more preparation than usual, but as the meeting facilitator develops her skills, it becomes second nature and suitable processes suggest themselves to her as the meeting progresses.

While the folk theory assumes the meeting chairperson is somewhat oblivious of the energy level in the room, dedicated as he is to walking the meeting through the agenda no matter what, the facilitator, in contrast, attends to form so as to enhance commitment and personal meaningfulness amongst participants. A middle manager tells of a particular full-day meeting that used to be completely dominated by PowerPoint presentations:

We were asked to find another seat in the room, and we were moved around several times. That allowed us to talk to various good colleagues. This meeting form, involving group work and café tables, is good and makes for pleasant variation. The small-group discussions mean that topics are discussed more by everyone, and the repeated re-groupings during the day reinforced this.

### *4. Meetings are for leadership*

From the facilitator's perspective, the purpose of the meeting is to create value for the meeting's external stakeholders and meaning for its participants. The meeting, then, is not a platform for the leader to talk about whatever concerns him, but for supplying the big picture, clarifying the group's mission, nourishing their energies and helping them do their work by making the required decisions and stimulating the motivation necessary for her people to accomplish great things.

Although it is rarely recognized as such, a meeting is often the primary venue for a manager to demonstrate his leadership skills. As most employees are only occasionally one-on-one with their leader, the meeting is where they see his leadership

---

skills on display. If he chatters away their time at the meeting, what will they think he is? Someone who wastes our time and energy. How can he possibly lead us?

One middle manager saw the boss play a new role:

She was a good moderator who could cut through long discussions. It was very nice to have the proceedings stay on course. The tight facilitation had a very positive effect on me, and it is my impression that it has contributed to increasing the respect for (and from) each meeting participant. I really congratulate her on that! Effective meeting management made for an exciting debate, and I left the meeting full of energy.

Another manager decided to use his meetings to inspire shared ownership:

I changed my department meetings. They were dead, I just talked non-stop. I wanted my people to feel they were a part of the department and share responsibility for our meetings so we function better as a department. It was important to me that it was their meeting. I asked them to take charge of the agenda on a rotating basis.

### *5. Meetings are for barn raising*

A frequent complaint about meetings is that they take too much time and lead nowhere. A contributing factor is the free exchange of ideas and opinions, which often prolongs a meeting excessively or leads it off course, because too much and too divergent input is being offered by eager participants.

Let us reframe the meeting, then: a meeting is not for discussing whatever is on our minds or scoring points in a debate. It is a construction site where contributions are welcome in so far as they help us raise our barn, that is, accomplish something useful and create value for our stakeholders.

While a traditional chairperson tries to moderate people's contributions by keeping a list of speakers, which ensures order of speaking but not that contributions are pertinent or constructive, a skilled facilitator will direct group communication more flexibly. She elicits contributions that add value rather than just another viewpoint, and she interrupts tangents and remarks she deems unhelpful or irrelevant. A facilitator closely monitors everyone's remarks and gently focuses them if they go astray, even to the point of stopping them in mid-sentence, if necessary. Thus, she dispenses with the folk assumption that any discussion-like input is acceptable and introduces the alternative design principle: "Everyone is free to bring the conversation forward". As a facilitator, it is her privilege and duty to judge input constructive or irrelevant and act accordingly, encouraging the former and politely refusing the latter.

An indication of the extent to which MCVm meetings provided either a forum for free-wheeling discussion or served to accomplish important work-related tasks can be seen from this survey item: the ability of the facilitator to take the group through all of the agenda (which involves helping participants being more focused in their contributions) rose from 77 to 86 percent. Likewise, the facilitator's skill at guiding the group constructively was seen to improve, from 61 to 65 percent.

### *6. A facilitator uses processes that include everyone*

While the conventional meeting lets people remain silent unless they step forward, a facilitator shows her responsibility for the meeting as a whole by designing and running it such that everyone gets to contribute. Meetings seem meaningless and endless only to the person not included in the conversation.

---

In project MCVM we taught facilitators to introduce processes that would give everyone the time to speak and the space to reflect. A facilitator may divide a large meeting into buzz dyads that share some experience or decide between alternatives, or she may ask everyone to be quiet for 2 minutes, so as to allow introverts to find and articulate ideas before being overtaken by extroverts and rapid speakers. A simple 10-minute round robin that lets the six or 12 people in a meeting present their thinking one at a time, while everyone listens, is a way of ensuring that the results of the buzz dyads or the silent reflection is shared. With 15 or more people in the group, the facilitator can choose to cherry-pick results rather than hear them all, thus avoiding the energy loss palpable in a room given to slavish reporting from all groups.

Inclusive processes such as these are well-known in management training and creative workshops (Elsborg and Ravn, 2007), but they are rarely used in bread-and-butter meetings. Why? Because up to now, meetings have been chaired, not facilitated. Inclusive processes are not part of the paradigm.

In MCVM, we found increased use of inclusive processes by facilitators after training. When asked about the extent to which their managers use such processes, meeting participants yielded a score that went from 6 percent before the intervention to 15 percent after. One manager emphasized:

[...] using different work methods during the meeting. That's legitimate now. Previously, it was only in project meetings you could do that sort of thing. Like saying, "Today, we'll do a stand-up meeting", or break the pattern in some other way. I have certainly used other processes across the board [at other meetings, too]. So we team up across the room, stand up, do buzz dyads, use post-its in many colors and sizes.

## 5. Conclusions

From our research, the literature and personal experience, we pulled together a number of common-sense understandings of meetings and formulated a folk theory of meetings. It posits that meetings are chaired events that walk through an agenda and allow leaders to talk as much as they please and participants to chip in with whatever is on their minds. We suggested that the existence of this hitherto unrecognized folk theory may account for the fact that meetings are much maligned, but endured by practically everyone, as if mediocre or poor meetings were a *sine qua non* of organizational life.

The beliefs expressed in the folk theory likely impede the development of the meeting as an institution. Group facilitation is a method for supporting and steering interactions at gatherings of people generally, and we suggested that the six design principles posited in the context of a transformative theory of facilitated meetings may help bring everyday organizational meetings into focus.

A facilitator helps the group accomplish its goals by controlling the form of the meeting, that is, by closely monitoring and directing communication at the meeting, discouraging rambling and wasteful, free-for-all discussions and inviting constructive contributions that bring the meeting forward. The meeting facilitator uses the tools of the process consultant, such as the buzz dyad, silent reflection, the round robin, cherry-picking, all of them tightly controlled to allow maximum input in a minimum of time.

Results from project MCVM suggest that it is possible for managers, after brief training in facilitation, to change their meetings from unthinking routine to objects of conscious organizational development.

---

**References**

- Baburoglu, O. and Ravn, I. (1992), "Normative action research", *Organization Studies*, Vol. 13 No. 1, pp. 19-35.
- Bluedorn, A.C., Turban, D.B. and Love, M.S. (1999), "The effects of stand-up and sit-down meeting formats on meeting outcomes", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 84, pp. 277-85.
- Doyle, M. and Straus, D. (1976), *How to Make Meetings Work*, Berkley, New York, NY.
- Elsborg, S. and Ravn, I. (2007), *Learning Meetings and Conferences in Practice*, People's Press, Copenhagen.
- Hogan, C. (2003a), *Practical Facilitation: A Toolkit of Techniques*, Kogan Page, London.
- Hogan, C. (2003b), *Understanding Facilitation: Theory and Principles*, Kogan Page, London.
- Holy, L. and Stuchlik, M. (1981), *The Structure of Folk Models*, A.S.A. Monographs 20, Academic Press, New York, NY.
- Hunter, D. (2007), *The Art of Facilitation*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.
- Lencioni, P.M. (2004), *Death by Meeting*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.
- Ravn, I. (2005), "Transformative theory in social research: the case of the learning conference", paper presented to the Danish Sociological Congress, Roskilde University, August 18-20.
- Ravn, I. (2011), *Facilitering: Ledelse af Møder der Skaber Værdi og Mening (Facilitation: Leading Meetings that Create Value and Meaning)*, Hans Reitzels Forlag, Copenhagen (in Danish).
- Ravn, I and Rokkjær, J. (2006), *Elsam/Nesa skabte mere effektive møder (Elsam/Nesa Created More Effective Meetings)*, Internal Report, DONG Energy, Fredericia, September 11 (in Danish).
- Robert, H.M. (1967), *Robert's Rules of Order*, Penguin, New York, NY.
- Rogelberg, S.G., Leach, D.J., Warr, P.B. and Burnfield, J.L. (2006), "Not another meeting! Are meeting time demands related to employee well-being?", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 91, pp. 86-96.
- Schuman, S. (2005), *The IAF Handbook of Group Facilitation*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.
- Schwartz, R.M. (1994), *The Skilled Facilitator*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.
- Schwartzman, H.B. (1986), "The meeting as a neglected social form in organizational studies", *Research in Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 8, pp. 233-58.
- Schwartzman, H.B. (1989), *The Meeting: Gatherings in Organizations and Communities*, Plenum, New York, NY.
- (The) 3M Meeting Management Team (1994), *Mastering Meetings*, McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.
- Volkema, R.J. and Niederman, F. (1995), "Organizational meetings: formats and information requirements", *Small Group Research*, Vol. 26 No. 1, pp. 3-24.

**About the author**

Ib Ravn received his PhD from the University of Pennsylvania's Wharton School of Business. He heads the research group Facilitating Knowledge Processes in Aarhus University's research program on Organization and Learning. He does research on knowledge sharing and its facilitation in meetings, conferences, networks and face-to-face in organizations generally, and he consults to private and public sector organizations in Denmark and abroad. He has published six books on science and society and on facilitation, amongst them *Learning Meetings and Conferences in Practice* (with Steen Elsborg, People's Press, 2007). Before rejoining academia in 2002 he worked for 13 years in the private sector as a consultant, a publisher and an administrator. Ib Ravn can be contacted at: [ravn@dpu.dk](mailto:ravn@dpu.dk)

---

To purchase reprints of this article please e-mail: [reprints@emeraldinsight.com](mailto:reprints@emeraldinsight.com)  
Or visit our web site for further details: [www.emeraldinsight.com/reprints](http://www.emeraldinsight.com/reprints)