

This is the supplemental material for the author's accepted manuscript of an article published in *IEEE Engineering Management Review* as an Early Access article on October 2, 2026. This manuscript has not been formatted or copyedited by IEEE and may differ from the final paginated version.

Citation:

S. Blacher, "Skip-level meetings: Benefits, risks, and design considerations informed by bypassed managers' experiences," *IEEE Eng. Manag. Rev.*, early access, Oct. 2, 2026, [doi: 10.1109/EMR.2026.3740096](https://doi.org/10.1109/EMR.2026.3740096).

© 2026 IEEE. Personal use of this material is permitted. Permission from IEEE must be obtained for all other uses, in any current or future media, including reprinting/republishing this material for advertising or promotional purposes, creating new collective works, for resale or redistribution to servers or lists, or reuse of any copyrighted component of this work in other works.

Supplemental Material

Methodology

The information here further describes the methodological approach, design, implementation, and justification for the underlying empirical research that was conducted as part of the PhD dissertation [1]. In qualitative research, sample adequacy is determined primarily by the study's purpose, the specificity of the participant group, the richness of the data collected, and the requirements of the chosen analytic approach rather than by statistical representativeness [2–3]. Empirical guidance on qualitative sample size has largely been derived from interview studies; for example, code and thematic saturation have often been observed within approximately 9–17 interviews, while meaning saturation may require approximately 24 [2, 4]. Although the present study used an asynchronous, predominantly open-ended survey, these findings offer relevant contextual guidance for assessing qualitative sample adequacy.

A sample of 25 was considered appropriate for the exploratory purpose of the study given the focused participant population and the breadth and depth of the qualitative data generated. Practical resource constraints were also considered, consistent with qualitative sampling guidance [5]. The participants' responses produced more than 23,000 words of narrative data, with a mean of over 900 words and a median of over 850 per participant, indicating substantial engagement with the predominantly open-ended questionnaire (see below). Responses frequently included explanations, examples, contextual qualifications, and comparisons rather than only brief judgments. Accordingly, sample adequacy was assessed based on the depth, breadth, recurrence, and interpretive sufficiency of the resulting data in relation to the study's aims, rather than participant count or interview-derived saturation thresholds alone [3, 5].

Following data cleaning, the finalized dataset was analyzed manually with attention to participants' subjective experiences and sense-making, interpretation of responses within their individual and organizational contexts, and researcher reflexivity, integrated throughout the analysis rather than applied as a separate analytic phase. The analysis was iterative and incorporated both deductive and inductive processes.

Analysis began with familiarization through holistic reading of responses and initial consideration of potentially relevant notions, expected and emergent themes. Survey questions, the original research questions, and literature-informed aspects provided deductive starting points for initial coding. These included relatively straightforward contextual or implementation attributes, such as age group, organizational size, meeting format, and participants' inclusion or exclusion from SLMs, as well as more interpretive topics, such as stakeholders' behavior, employee voice, perceived advantages or disadvantages, and misalignment concerns. Additional codes were generated inductively when relevant notions appeared in participants' accounts even when they had not been explicitly solicited by a survey question.

Responses were considered both within participants and across the sample. When a participant addressed the same issue across different questions, those responses were considered together so that coding and interpretation reflected their broader account rather than isolated statements. For example, views about being included or excluded from SLMs could be expressed in questions about current meeting format, preferred format, perceived advantages or disadvantages, or desired changes. The analysis therefore preserved the contextual relationship among different portions of each participant's response while enabling cross-case comparisons.

Some codes were comparatively direct translations of participants' descriptions, such as whether a participant was included or excluded or whether preparation or follow-up occurred.

Others required greater interpretation of richer text, such as assessments of employee voice or managers' openness to feedback. A small number of derived codes required particularly holistic interpretation. Most notably, overall sentiment toward the specific SLM implementation and overall sentiment toward the general concept of SLMs were derived from the weight and context of each participant's responses as a whole rather than from individual statements. This distinction allowed, for example, identification of participants who criticized their specific implementation while still supporting SLMs conceptually.

Codes were then examined both within individual cases and across participants to identify recurring patterns, contrasts, relationships among aspects, and exceptional cases. Candidate themes were developed both deductively, by examining issues anticipated from the research questions and literature, and inductively, when previously unanticipated patterns emerged from the data. Themes were iteratively reviewed against the underlying responses and against one another to assess whether they were sufficiently supported, whether related themes should be combined, whether broader themes should be separated, and whether additional themes were warranted. Themes were subsequently defined and named, and findings were interpreted while considering participants' contexts, potentially interacting themes, relevant literature, and alternative explanations.

The process was iterative rather than strictly linear and continued until a coherent set of themes and findings was developed. The primary coding, theme development, and interpretation were completed by the author before complementary external checks, described in the main manuscript, were conducted.

Relevant skip-level meetings were defined as participants' direct managers intentionally meeting participants' direct reports to gather feedback, answer questions, or provide

organizational insights, regardless of meetings' format or whether participants were included or excluded from such meetings, while excluding unintentional meetings (e.g., random breakroom chats), meetings that are not led by the participants' manager (e.g., organization-wide meetings), or meetings narrowly focused on purposes other than general bi-directional feedback (e.g., meetings aimed at discussing a new product design). A relevant prior role was defined similarly to the current role criteria (e.g., at least a year in a first-tier management role for a company with at least 100 employees), except it could have occurred at any time within the past five years.

Participants were recruited using LinkedIn and UserInterviews.com. Those who indicated they had skip-level meetings in current roles were asked to refer to their current role. Those who did not but had them in relevant roles within the past five years were asked to refer to that role. Participants who had both recent work environments with and without such meetings were also asked to compare experiences. Those with no recent relevant role involving skip-level meetings were asked about their perceptions of the general concept rather than its specific implementation.

Participants were asked about their national backgrounds and to estimate the national origins of their direct reports and direct managers. Since migrants tend to adapt culturally over time [6], yet no reliable source was found indicating how long this adaptation takes, and to account for participants' cultural context, an intuitive threshold of 13 years was defined. Participants who reported being foreign-born but had migrated to the U.S. more than 13 years prior were considered U.S.-cultured. Naturally, this threshold did not apply to participants' estimates of the countries of origin of their direct reports and managers, as they were not expected to know the migration year of these stakeholders when relevant.

Participants who completed all required engagement were offered a \$100 gift card incentive, which was deemed to align with ethical standards without significantly influencing

results [7-8], while accounting for the higher average salaries in participants' roles. Participants were not explicitly asked about their overall sentiment towards the implementation of skip-level meetings, if such existed, in their referenced work environments or towards the general concept of skip-level meetings. Instead, overall sentiments were derived from other responses (e.g., the positive or negative value they find in such meetings, and whether they feel they help or disturb them in their leadership). Each participant's responses to the questions presented overall clearly tilted towards either a general positive or negative sentiment about the concept of skip-level meetings and, if relevant, the specific implementation in their referenced work environments.

The survey began with an online informed-consent statement (see the Survey section below), which participants were required to affirm before proceeding to the subsequent survey questions. Some of the questions were condition-tied, meaning they would be presented in a specific version, or not presented at all, to an individual based on their responses to earlier questions on the survey. The conditioning described verbally in the Survey section below was implemented automatically via SurveyMonkey's conditioning/branching features. This ensured that the questions were tailored to each participant and minimized the energy required of respondents, thereby supporting engagement.

Sample Demographics

Selected demographics of the final sample are described in Tables 1 and 2:

Table 1*Selected demographics of the sample*

Attribute	n	%
Age		
25-34	7	28
35-44	14	56
45-54	4	16
Gender (self-described)		
Men	21	84
Women	4	16
Number of employees in the referenced organization		
101-300	3	12
301-1000	5	20
1001-5000	6	24
More than 5000	11	44
Size of participants' team in the referenced role		
2-5	6	24
6-10	9	36
11-15	7	28
20-25	1	4
N/A ^a	2	8
Form of Work ^b		
Mostly hybrid (2-3 days of physical presence in an average week)	10.5	42
Mostly remote (max. 1 day of physical presence in an avg. week)	10.5	42
Mostly onsite (at least 4 days of physical presence in an avg. week)	2	8
N/A ^a	2	8

Table 1 (continued)

Attribute	n	%
Existence of skip-level meeting		
Exist in current & prior roles	12	48
Exist in the current but not in the prior role	1	4
Exist in current role while prior role N/A ^c	8	32
Do not exist in the current role, but yes in prior	2	8
Do not exist in either current or prior roles	0	0
Do not exist in the current role while prior role N/A ^c	2	8
The cadence of skip-level meetings in the referenced role ^d		
Weekly or more frequently	2	8.33
2-6 weeks	10.5	43.75
Quarterly	6.5	27.08
Annually	1	4.17
Ad-hoc or inconsistent	1.5	6.25
N/A ^a	2.5	10.42
Skip-level meeting format in the referenced role ^e		
One-on-one, the participant is excluded	14.08	58.1
Team-unit setting, the participant is included	0.83	3.4
Multi-team, the participant is included	7.33	30.2
1-on-1 w/ participant included or Team/Multi-team w\ participant excluded	0	0
N/A ^a	2.76	8.3

^a Participants without skip-level meetings in a current or recent relevant role were not asked about this. ^b

One participant's team split between remote & hybrid, granting half a point to each. ^c These participants had no relevant prior role. ^d Cadence reported along with "ad hoc" counted only as cadence; one case with only one team member having weekly skip-levels among more than ten was not considered cadence and granted half a point to "N/A"; one case had different cadences for senior vs. mid-level team members, granting half a point to Monthly and Quarterly each; another had a sometimes-cancelled quarterly

cadence, granting half a point to Quarterly and Inconsistent each; and another indicated a quarterly opportunity used by only a few, granting half a point to Quarterly. ° Two participants had a mix of formats, splitting their points across them; another described a team-unit format, but it was unclear if others were included in such meetings, so the point was divided between “Team-setting” & “Multi-team”; another stated that only 1 team member among more than 10 had skip-level meetings, in a 1-on-1 format, thus, a fraction of a point was added to 1-on-1.

Table 2*Stakeholders' cultural backgrounds*

Participant's culture ^a	Participant's manager origin ^b	Team members' origins ^b	n	%
USA	USA	Mostly USA, 1 from Asia	2	8
		USA	2	8
		Mostly Asians, one West European	1	4
		S. America, E. Europe, India & US	1	4
		USA & Europe ^c	5	20
		Mostly US, some Oceania & Africa	1	4
		Mostly US, some India & E. Europe	1	4
	India	Mostly India & China, 1 from USA	1	4
		US, India, and China	1	4
		Mostly US, some Europe & S. America	1	4
	Hong Kong	USA, S. America, and India	1	4
	Colombia	USA, India, and Middle East	1	4
	Europe ^c	USA & Europe ^c	1	4
	Asian American ^d	USA, India, and China	1 ^d	4 ^d
	N/A (have not had such meetings, were not asked)		2	8
Argentina	USA	Mostly USA, one from S. America	1	4
Mexico ^c	India ^c	Mostly USA, some from India	1 ^c	4 ^c
Vietnam	USA	USA, Vietnam, India	1	4
Total			25	100

^a Based on a 13-year cutoff for participants. ^b Estimates. ^c Ambiguous. ^d Ambiguous. If referring to

birthplace, as asked, then it likely implies countries associated with high workplace power distance [10] ^c

The only case with both leaders considered foreign-cultured.

The most conservative interpretation of second-tier managers' national origins, in this study's context, which would somewhat reduce the strength of the exploratory association between stakeholders' origin culture and participants' perceptions or sentiment, as will be discussed later (though still leaving an exploratory association), means interpreting the "Asian American" manager as U.S.-born, rather than Asian-born, which would most likely mean coming from a lower power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and/or self-protectiveness culture, and the "European" manager as born in a high power-distance, uncertainty avoidance, and/or self-protectiveness country, such as some Eastern European countries [9-11]. A less conservative interpretation would involve considering one or both managers as the opposite of their conservative interpretation. A less conservative interpretation would further strengthen the identified relationship between stakeholders' cultural origin and participants' perceptions or sentiments.

Survey

INFORMED CONSENT FOR
---How are skip-level meetings perceived by first-tier US Tech leaders?---

You are invited to participate in a research study to investigate perceptions of first-tier managers (like you) in the US Tech industry about meetings, or the absence of them, between such managers' team members and these team members' 2nd-level managers (your direct manager). Insights might fill a significant academic and practical knowledge gap about such meetings and improve how leaders, followers, and organizations work.

The study is based on an anonymous survey which does not collect identifying information. Furthermore, information is collected and processed in environments with security measures in place, including encryption and password protection. While your email was required to grant you access to the survey in Survey Monkey and ensure that no more than a single response is submitted per email, the email (or IP) is not saved with an individual's content of survey responses or associated with such individual responses participants submit. Beyond the raw information being anonymous and protected, insights will be mostly used in an aggregated way while potentially including select paraphrases of individual responses, which will be non-identifiable.

This study is being conducted by [REDACTED] under the supervision of [REDACTED]. You were selected as a possible participant because of your fit, considering aspects such as the size of your employer, your role, age group, gender, national origin, etc.

If you decide to participate, you will be asked to candidly, openly, and meaningfully answer a mostly open-ended survey, estimated to take about 45 minutes to complete, within a week from being invited to it. Upon successful completion, you will be presented with a code that you can choose (if you wish to) to send back to [REDACTED] within a week from survey completion, which signals your eligibility to receive a \$100 prepaid Visa card. Within a week of sending the code, you should receive an invite to redeem the incentive directly with another platform. You will have 5 days to redeem the incentive once that invite is sent. To redeem, you will need to consent to the card's related terms and conditions. Not following the steps within these time frames may void the eligibility for the reward. Once the card is issued to you with the incentive platform, the obligation to provide the incentive will be considered fulfilled, and [REDACTED] will not be further responsible for anything related to the card.

The survey will require you to provide candid and meaningful input about your perceptions, opinions, and feelings related to your work environment, which may also involve negative aspects that may be less comfortable for you to share, even if anonymously and in secure environments. Any identifying information that you may accidentally or deliberately share as part of your input, despite being asked not to, will not be disclosed. Please answer the questions candidly and meaningfully so that your responses can potentially significantly and correctly support organizational science and practical work.

Information collected through your participation, after processing, may be used as a source for a PhD dissertation, publication in a professional journal, presentation at professional meetings, etc. To further clarify, no identifiable information about you or your employer will be included.

You may withdraw from participation at any time without penalty, and you may withdraw any data that has been collected about you as long as that data is identifiable.

Your decision whether or not to participate will not jeopardize your future relations with [REDACTED].

If you have any questions, I urge you to ask them now, yet whenever you want to ask, [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] will be happy to answer them. You may save this form to keep.

For more information regarding your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Committee/Institutional Review Board by phone or e-mail at [REDACTED].

1. Do you agree with the consent statement?

☐ No

☐ Yes

Only answering "Yes" allowed progression to the next question.

** Do not provide any identifying information, such as name, organization name, email, etc., throughout the survey.*
** Please answer candidly and meaningfully. Providing false or superficial responses can hinder the research's findings.*

2. Age Group:

- ☐ 18-24
- ☐ 25-34
- ☐ 35-44
- ☐ 45-54
- ☐ 55-64

3. Gender:

4. Currently live in the US

- ☐ No
- ☐ Yes

5. Moved to the US within the last 13 years:

(Don't round up/down, please. For example, if you moved to the US 12 years and 11 months ago, then that should count as "Yes".)

- ☐ No
- ☐ Yes

- Answering 18-24 or 55-64 on question 2 or “No” to question 4 disqualified the respondent.
- Answering “No” to question 5 skips the next page.

6. In which country or geographical area were you born?

7. In which country/s or geographical area/s have you lived in the 13 years immediately preceding moving to the US? If multiple, please list all separated by commas:

(Don't round, please. For example, a country you lived in until 12 years and 11 months ago should be included since you lived in it in the last 13 years.)

8. For how long have you been working as a first-tier manager in your **current role**?

- ☐ Less than a year
- ☐ 12-24 months
- ☐ More than 2 years

9. Is it your first role as a first-level manager?

- ☐ No
- ☐ Yes

- Answering “Less than a year” to question 8 and “Yes” to question 9 disqualified the respondent.
- Answering “Yes” to question 9 skipped the next page and hid question 12.

10. How many **total** years of experience do you have as a first-level manager?

- ☐ Less than a year
- ☐ 12-23 Months
- ☐ 2-5 Years
- ☐ More than 5 years

Answering “Less than a year” disqualified the respondent.

- The definition of “your team members” or “people directly reporting to you” in the following questions is: People in your team for whom you are the **ONLY** full manager and whom you manage both administratively as a people manager and as a technical manager. If you provide technical leadership to some people in your team, but they do not report to you administratively, or vice versa, or if you have team members who also report to other managers, please exclude them from answers -

- These are not screening questions anymore. There is no "acceptable" or "unacceptable" answer. -

11. In your **current** role, has your **direct** manager (this refers to the manager you directly report to, not to higher levels managers) met your team members (see definition above) for an intentional “skip-level” meeting, regardless of whether you are excluded from it or present in it, in the last 12 months to get their input about organizational issues, answer questions, or provide insights about the organization directly? This can either be meeting them as a team, 1-on-1, or combined with other teams under your manager’s “chain of command”.

The question does not refer to unintentional meetings, such as random breakroom chats, or meetings that your manager does not lead (such as organization-wide meetings), or meetings focused on a specific functional purpose, such as discussing a new feature or product, progress on delivery, a new workplace tool or policy, etc.

☐ No

☐ Yes

12. Please answer the question about the existence of skip-level meetings as defined in the previous question, but about a **past** similar (first-level manager in US Tech) role that you held in the last 5 years that meets both conditions:

a. The role was **in an organization/company larger than 100 employees**.

b. You had that role in that organization for **at least 12 months**.

☐ No

☐ Yes

☐ I haven't held a similar (first-level manager) role for at least 12 months in US Tech before

☐ I held such a role in the past, but not in the last 5 years or it was in an organization not larger than 100 employees.

- Question 36 was disabled by default at this point.
- Answering “Yes” to question 11 or 12 and “No” to the other enabled question 36.
- If question 11 was answered “Yes” and question 8 was not answered “Less than a year,” then a statement asking to answer the questions on the next page in the context of the current role was added to the top of the next page.

- If question 11 was answered “Yes”, question 8 was answered “Less than a year”, and question 12 was not answered “Yes”, then a statement asking to answer the questions on the next page in the context of the current role was added to the top of the next page.
- If question 11 was answered “Yes”, question 8 was answered “Less than a year”, and question 12 was answered “Yes” then the following statement was added to the top of the next page: “Please answer the following questions in the context of your **past** role for which you answered "Yes" to having skip-level meetings in the previous question (consider the context of that past specific work environment, manager, team, and organization):”.
- If question 11 was answered “No” and question 12 was answered “Yes” then the following statement was added to the top of the next page: “Please answer the following questions in the context of the **past** role for which you answered "Yes" to having skip-level meetings in the previous question (consider the context of that past specific work environment, manager, team, and organization):”.
- If question 12 was answered “I haven’t held...” and question 8 was answered “Less than a year,” then the respondent was disqualified.
- If both questions 11 and 12 were answered “Yes,” then the page that contains questions 37 through 41 was hidden.
- If question 11 was answered “No” and question 12 either had no response or had a response that was different from “Yes,” then the survey skipped to the page that starts with question 37.

** Please answer candidly and meaningfully. Providing false or superficial responses can hinder the research's findings.*

Please answer the following questions in the context of your **current** role:

Please answer the following questions in the context of your the **past** role for which you answered "Yes" to having skip-level meetings in the previous question (consider the context of that past specific work environment, manager, team, and organization):

13. Number of employees in the entire organization/company:

- ☐ 1-100
- ☐ 101-300
- ☐ 301-1,000
- ☐ 1,000-5,000
- ☐ More than 5,000

14. What has been the team's form of work during the most recent 12 months of that role (this question refers to your own form of work and the form of work of most of the other team members. If your form of work does not match the form of most team members, or if that form changed in the relevant 12 months, please mark "Other"):

- ☐ Onsite: 4 days or more of physical presence at the office in an average week
- ☐ Remote: Maximum 1 day per average week of physical presence at the office
- ☐ Hybrid: 2 or 3 days of physical presence at the office in an average week
- ☐ Other (please specify)

15. How many team members (for whom you are the only manager and whom you manage both administratively and technically) directly report to you?

Enter a numeric value

16. To the best of your knowledge, what is the national origin composition of your team (from where in the world did they come)? If you can only partially answer, please do so and call out that the remaining part is unknown. If you cannot answer at all, please state so, and explain if possible. There is no expectation for accuracy but a guesstimate.

(For example: "Most are from X and the rest are from Y and Z")

17. To the best of your knowledge, what is the national origin of your direct manager (where in the world are they originally from)? There is no expectation for accuracy, only a guesstimate.

18. Does such a meeting recur roughly regularly in some frequency? What frequency (monthly, quarterly, annually, etc.)? Or is it an ad-hoc meeting without some roughly stable/predictable recurrence pattern?

19. In what form do these meetings take place

- ☐ Your manager meets your team together, without people from other teams.
- ☐ Your manager meets your team members in a 1-on-1 format.
- ☐ Your manager meets your team along with other teams under your manager's "chain of command". How many people do such meetings include? Please enter an estimated average number or range in the comment box if you choose this answer.
- ☐ Other. Please specify the form in the comment box.

Please describe (specifically if you selected one of the 2 bottom options):

If question 13 was answered 1-100, then the respondent was disqualified.

This is the "heaviest" page of questions. Please be meaningfully and candidly engaged. After this page, there are only 2-3 more questions to finish the survey.

20. What do you think and how do you feel about such meetings in the way they happen in that specific work environment and context of yours (do not focus on the general concept of such meetings but on your specific case and environment in the relevant role)? Please try to describe both your opinion as well as emotions as openly and candidly as you can and explain, if possible, the reasoning and what drives these opinions/feelings. Even if you cannot explain the reasoning/drivers behind your opinions/feelings, please still describe such opinions/feelings.

21. Would you do anything related to these meetings differently if it was up to you? It can be about the mere existence of such meetings, frequency, attendees, content, preparation, follow-up, or anything else that you would do differently about them.

22. What is usually discussed in such meetings? Please aim to cover all types of content and topics addressed.

23. What actions usually happen, if any, before such meetings? For example, is there an agenda communicated in advance? Do you meet with your team members and/or manager to prepare (an agenda or anything else), or are there some kind of other pre-meeting activities? Please describe all relevant activities.

24. In such meetings, do your team members occasionally (not very rarely) proactively speak up? If yes, do they only speak up about pre-decided discussion topics (if there are such) or do they occasionally raise other issues?

25. What actions usually happen, if any, after such meetings? For example, do you meet with your team members and/or with your manager to discuss and follow-up, or there is some kind of other activities that follow such meetings? Please describe all relevant follow-up activities and what they intend to achieve.

26. Do such meetings include you or are you excluded by design from such meetings? What do you think and feel about that (being included/excluded)? Please describe both your opinion as well as emotions about being present / excluded as openly and candidly as you can.

27. Please try to explain the reasoning or what drives these opinions/feelings you mentioned in the previous question. Even if you cannot come up with reasoning or drivers of opinions/feelings, please leave them in your answer. They may exist, even if you cannot explain them.

28. If you are usually present in such meetings, would you prefer to be excluded? Or if you are usually excluded, would you prefer to be present? Why?

29. Regardless of whether you are included or excluded from such meetings, what do you think are the advantages vs. disadvantages of including you in such meetings?

- Continued from previous page:

30. Regardless of whether you are included or excluded, what do you think are the advantages vs. disadvantages of excluding you from such meetings?

31. In your opinion, do you think such meetings, **the way they are/were performed in your specific environment and case** (do not focus on the general concept of such meetings), overall have more positive value, more risk or negative value, or do they have neither (they are neutral)? Why? Please describe the main positive and the main risks / negative values in your opinion, and whether positive overweights negative, negative overweights positive, or none overweights the other

32. What do you estimate that your team members think or feel about such meetings? Please elaborate as much as possible about positive and negative perceptions and feelings. If you identify different perceptions/feelings among different team members, please describe the differences. If you identify common attributes that certain team members who think or feel a certain way share (such as a certain age group, gender, national origin, etc.), please describe that.

33. How does your manager conduct themselves during these meetings? Particularly, what can you describe about each of the following aspects during such meetings?

- Their humility and openness to input, including concerns and ideas.
- The value they assign to input and what they do with such input.
- Their transparency in candidly answering questions/concerns while providing significant context to your team members.

34. Do you notice any changes in behavior, performance, or other aspects, among team members immediately after such meetings? Any common attributes among team members who are influenced in a certain way (age group, gender, national origin, etc.)?

35. In a bigger picture (not immediately), how do you think your team members are influenced in the following aspects? If you identify common attributes about team members who are influenced in a certain way (age group, etc.), please describe:

- Stress.
- Productivity / Performance.
- Understanding of organizational direction, goals, and context of work, constraints, and limitations.
- Identification with the organization and/or pride in working in it.
- Intentions about staying in their role.
- Their innovation.
- Motivation, engagement, and commitment.
- Friction or misalignment between team members and you and/or between you and your manager. Alternatively, better alignment and atmosphere?
- Feeling valued by the organization and its leadership.

36. When you think about having these meetings vs. not having them when comparing between your current and past role what do you think about such meetings or their absence? Did you find having them or not having them was more beneficial? Why?

For respondents who received this page and question, the next page with questions 37 through 41 was skipped.

** This is the "heaviest" page of questions. After this page, there are only 2 more questions to finish the survey. Please answer candidly and meaningfully. Providing false or superficial responses can hinder the research's findings.*

If you've held your current role as first-level manager for at least 12 months in a company/organization with more than 100 employees, then please answer the following in the context of your current role. If you haven't, then answer in the context of your most recent first-level tech manager role that you had for at least 12 months in a company/organization with more than 100 employees:

37. Number of employees in the entire organization/company:

- ☐ 1-100
- ☐ 101-300
- ☐ 301-1,000
- ☐ 1,000-5,000
- ☐ More than 5,000

38. Would you like such meetings to exist in your work environment? Why?

39. What do you estimate would be the positive value of having them?

40. What do you estimate would be the risks or negative value of having them?

41. Would you like to be included or excluded from such meetings? Why?

Respondents who answered 1-100 to question 37 were disqualified.

This is the last page of questions! Just a little more candid and meaningful engagement, and that's it!

42. Do your team members talk about work issues with your manager regardless of such meetings? If yes, does it lead to any misalignment with you as their direct manager?

43. Finally, in your opinion, do or would such meetings help you lead your team or interfere with your leadership? Why?

* Please do not close this page before reading and poter

Thank you for completing the survey!

To redeem the \$100 incentive, if you choose to do so, please send the following code to the researcher [REDACTED] within a week from now to prove completion (the code is not tied to your survey response submission, meaning sending the code to the researcher will not enable linking your identity to the content of your survey response): [REDACTED]

Please redeem the incentive only if you feel that your responses were meaningfully engaged and candid. Unmeaningful or false responses may have limited to negative influence on findings and conclusions of the research and/or require using the limited incentive budget to mitigate with additional participants.

Supplemental Material References

- [1] S. Blacher, “Skip-level meetings: Perspectives of skipped first-tier US tech leaders,” Ph.D. dissertation, Anderson Univ., Anderson, SC, USA, 2025.
- [2] M. Hennink and B. N. Kaiser, “Sample sizes for saturation in qualitative research: A systematic review of empirical tests,” *Soc. Sci. Med.*, vol. 292, Jan. 2022, Art. no. 114523, doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2021.114523.
- [3] O. A. Moore, H. Aguinis, and T. R. Darden, “Defining, assessing, and reporting saturation in qualitative research: Review and recommendations,” *Leadersh. Q.*, vol. 37, no. 2, Apr. 2026, Art. no. 101950, doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2026.101950.
- [4] A. Wutich, M. Beresford, and H. R. Bernard, “Sample sizes for 10 types of qualitative data analysis: An integrative review, empirical guidance, and next steps,” *Int. J. Qual. Methods*, vol. 23, pp. 1–14, 2024, doi: 10.1177/16094069241296206.
- [5] S. Rahimi and M. Khatooni, “Saturation in qualitative research: An evolutionary concept analysis,” *Int. J. Nurs. Stud. Adv.*, vol. 6, 2024, Art. no. 100174, doi: 10.1016/j.ijnsa.2024.100174.
- [6] J. Yiend et al., “Biased cognition in East Asian and Western cultures,” *PLoS One*, vol. 14, no. 10, 2019, Art. no. e0223358, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0223358.

- [7] B. Abdelazeem et al., "The effectiveness of incentives for research participation: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials," *PLoS One*, vol. 17, no. 4, Apr. 2022, Art. no. e0267534, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0267534.
- [8] S. D. Halpern et al., "Effectiveness and ethics of incentives for research participation: 2 randomized clinical trials," *JAMA Intern. Med.*, vol. 181, no. 11, pp. 1479–1488, 2021, doi: 10.1001/jamainternmed.2021.5450.
- [9] GLOBE Project, "2004, 2007 studies," *GLOBE Project*. Accessed: Aug. 19, 2026. [Online]. Available: https://www.globeproject.com/study_2004_2007?page_id=data
- [10] G. Hofstede, "The cultural relativity of organizational practices and theories," *J. Int. Bus. Stud.*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 75–89, 1983, doi: 10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8490867.
- [11] G. Hofstede, *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions and Organizations Across Nations*, 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA, USA: SAGE Publications, 2001.