5-year Annual Meeting Registration Analysis
2020 drew participants from 88 countries
2019 drew participants from 81 countries

~3% NA (Guests)
Registration by Member Type

- **29% Students**: Highest participation among students over the previous 5 meetings.
- **58% Academics**: Decrease of almost 10% of academic members since Boston 2019.
- **1% Practitioners**: Decrease of over 200+ attendees over previous 5 meetings.
- **1% Emeritus**: Steady participation of 1% overall among the previous 5 meetings.

Approx. 10% Complimentary Guests
New Members Attending AOM 2020: Analysis

Highlights

- First-time attendees accounted for 26% of all registrants (1,887 of 7,222).
- The percentage of new members attending AOM was 20% in both 2019 and 2020.
- First-time attendee representation remained constant from 2019 to 2020.
- Half or more of all new members came from, primarily, five nations
  - US (22%), Germany (10%), UK (7%), China (6%), and Ghana (5%)
- Student member representation among new members rose significantly in 2020 (71%) of overall total.
  - 28% are Academic members and 1% are Executive members.
- Five divisions accounted for half or more of all new members in both 2020 and 2019
  - OB (12%), STR (11%), TIM (10%), ENT (9%), OMT (7%), and HR (7%)
Key Participation Takeaways

Highest non-US participation among last 5 years
• Europe is a driver for Annual Meeting participation

Highest student participation in recent years

Highest attendee participation observed in live PDW sessions
• Averaging 381 attendees
• Also, notable participation in top performing asynchronous session: "What is systematic about systematic literature reviews" (1089 registrants; 429 attendees)

Common goal: preserve early scholar participation
• Waived Registration (DIG guests increased to 20 per DIG) for overall aggregate: 370
• Scholarships offered (nearly 250 across 12 DIGs)
• Unique offerings for mentorship across PDWs

The Annual Meeting is the primary entry-point for members joining AOM regardless of format
Membership Stats

AOM MEMBERSHIP 2015-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>AGAD</th>
<th>EMER</th>
<th>EXEC</th>
<th>STU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>13,006</td>
<td>1,368</td>
<td>4,792</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>13,528</td>
<td>1,259</td>
<td>4,892</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>13,991</td>
<td>1,153</td>
<td>5,089</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>13,493</td>
<td>1,025</td>
<td>5,129</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>13,810</td>
<td>1,081</td>
<td>5,265</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>12,533</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>4,467</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Top 10 Sessions by Attendance

7-11 August 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Name</th>
<th>AOM Session Type</th>
<th>Sponsors</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meet the Editors (session 1)</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>PUBS</td>
<td>729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rise and Shine! How to Present Your Academic Research (session 6)</td>
<td>PDW (Workshop)</td>
<td>OMT, OB</td>
<td>439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Ways of Seeing Theory (session 3)</td>
<td>PDW (Workshop)</td>
<td>OMT, CMS, SAP</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What Is 'Systematic' About Systematic Literature Reviews? (session 527)</td>
<td>PDW (Workshop)*</td>
<td>MED, OMT, IM, ENT, OB, STR, RM</td>
<td>429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the Point of the Practical Implications? (session 4)</td>
<td>Symposium</td>
<td>AAT</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing in AMJ: Tips from the Editors (session 66)</td>
<td>PDW (Workshop)</td>
<td>PUBS</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB Division Plenary: COVID-19 and Organizational Behavior (session 147)</td>
<td>Plenary Session</td>
<td>OB</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing Inductive Qualitative Research in Prominent Academic Journals (session 179)</td>
<td>PDW (Workshop)</td>
<td>OMT, SAP, ODC, ENT, STR, RM</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancing Theory with Review Articles: How to Advance the Prospects for Publication (session 56)</td>
<td>PDW (Workshop)</td>
<td>OMT, OB, STR</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative Analysis Boot Camp V: Theoretical Hunches and How to Theorize from Data (session 58)</td>
<td>PDW (Workshop)</td>
<td>OMT, SAP, RM</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Asynchronous; all others Live Sessions*
AOM2020 Attendee Survey

High Level Observations
**Virtual Annual Meeting Survey**

**Participant Profile**
- 76% Program Participants; 19% Volunteer Leaders
- **Member Type** – Academic (66%), Students (30%), Executive (3%) Executives 3% Emeritus 2%
- **Meeting Frequency** - First-Timers (23%), Periodic (13%) – **Regular Attendees (61%)**
- **Membership Length** – 1 yr or less (19%), 2-4 years (22%), 5+ years (22%) **10+ years (37%)**
- **Career Level** – Early (44%), Mid (32%), Late (24%)
- **Gender** – F (52%), M (43%), T (1p), Other (4p), Prefer N.R. (4%)
- **US/CAN** – 50%

**Benchmarking - Virtual 2020 to In-Person 2018/2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2020 VIRTUAL</th>
<th>2019 Boston</th>
<th>2018 Chicago</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registration #s</td>
<td>7222</td>
<td>11201</td>
<td>11265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Participation</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Rate</td>
<td><strong>11.49%</strong></td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>5.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivations – Attendance Drivers Ranked (top 3 out of 7)</td>
<td>1. Present</td>
<td>1. Network</td>
<td>1. Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Stay up to Date w/ Research</td>
<td>2. Present</td>
<td>2. ...Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Satisfaction</td>
<td><strong>3.38/5</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.14/5</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.25/5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Virtual Annual Meeting Survey

- Overall Meeting Satisfaction
  (Somewhat Satisfied/Very Satisfied)
  - Member Type –
    - Executives (71.43%), Students (67.81%), Emeritus (66.66%), Academics (49.9%)
  - Meeting Frequency –
    - First-Timers (68%), Periodic (67%) – Regular Attendees 50%
  - US/CAN – 56.6%
  - Membership Length –
    - 1 yr or less (71%), 2-4 years (56%), 5+/10+ years (52%)

- Program Participants
  (vs. Attendees NOT on the Program)
  - ...generally more critical, less satisfied

![Graph showing program participants satisfaction comparison](image)
Virtual Annual Meeting Survey

- Observations...
  - **Strengths**
    - More Members Could Participate
      - Reduced Barriers - Limited Budgets/School type/Funding, Travel, Childcare, etc.
    - Extended Access to Content
      - Value-add of virtual, access to more ideas – not limited by time/physical distance
  - **Areas of Improvement**
    - Networking
      - Key driver for attendance, but difficult to translate to virtual environment
    - Author Feedback
      - Critically Important for Presenters; strong thoughts related to gap with asynchronous sessions
    - Asynchronous Sessions
      - “virtual poster session”, presenter/chat responsibilities, engagement/feedback, length of presentations, “generally ineffective...”
      - Sessions without Materials (virtual equivalent of the “empty room”)
    - General/Platform-Related
      - session limits/small #s of attendees, misc. platform issues, limited chat functionality, presentation of session files, notification system needed to keep chats active, ability to play videos at faster speed, disconnect between live zoom and chat – required manual refresh, chat and poll functions should operate within zoom instead of platform, navigation/UI, slow and clunky – page loading delays, platform not compatible with all browsers...

  - The availability of recordings is amazing. A huge benefit of this format. I think I have more access to more ideas than I ever have had at a physical meeting (VL)
  - The feedback received was significantly reduced. So were the opportunities for networking. (VL)
  - There were no comments/questions/feedback in any session I was involved with, which made it frustrating for all the effort that went into creating videos about my papers or sessions.