FIVE YEAR DIVISION REVIEW REPORT
ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR (OB) DIVISION
ACADEMY OF MANAGEMENT
2014-2019

Submitted by:

Sigal G. Barsade (Chair), Alexandra Gerbasi, Andrew Knight & Laura M. Little
OB Five Year Division Review Report Committee

On behalf of the OB Division Executive Committee
(please see list of elected and appointed 2019/2020 OB Division Officers in Appendix 2)

Contact Information
Sigal Goland Barsade (Committee Chair)
Department of Management
Wharton School of Business
University of Pennsylvania
2209 Steinberg-Dietrich Hall
Philadelphia, PA 19104
barsade@wharton.upenn.edu
(215)-898-1373

OB FIVE YEAR DIVISION REVIEW REPORT – TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Organizational Behavior Division has undertaken its five year review of the state of the Division and our report involves a description of: (a) the division metrics; (b) a general survey of the current membership - with quantitative and qualitative data; (c) an *in situ* survey with PDW and symposia and paper session participants rating their satisfaction of program sessions; (d) a review of our functions guided by the health and governance checklist; (e) a review of how the division met its targets from the last 5 year review; and (f) a plan for going forward for the next five years. In general, our members are significantly more satisfied overall than they were 5 years ago, and while many metrics did not change, almost none went down. Survey results indicated that there are many more things we can do, and our planning reflects this.

Division Metrics
The OB Division continues to be the largest division within the Academy of Management with 6,507 members as of October 30, 2019. Our membership has increased 4.03% over the past five years (compared to an increase of 4.26% for AOM). The biggest change to the composition of our membership is the relative increase in global members from 42% to 46% of overall membership.

Survey metrics summary (Who responded)
1,714 members responded representing a 26% response rate. We use a more conservative subsample of 1,524 who had fewer missing values, which represents a response rate of 21%. Both response rates compare favorably to the historic average response rate of 21% .Those who completed the survey were representative of the divisional membership with respondents having the following membership type: 69.32% academic, 27.39% student, 2.13% practitioner, and 1.16% emeritus.

Key Survey Question Areas
We describe the survey responses to questions asking about: (1) member satisfaction with the division, leadership and services; (2) community, identification and involvement in the division; (3) perceptions about the OB program at the Academy of Management meetings; (4) timing of the assistant professor job market and exploding job offers; (5) optional questions regarding demographics, including race and sexual orientation, to help us better understand inclusion; and (6) open-ended questions on capabilities and priorities for the future.

Health and Governance Checklist
Based on this checklist, the strengths of the Division are: its size and diversity, committed volunteers and membership, organizational structure and corporate governance, and strong AOM program. The areas for improvement are: keeping up our bylaws, other administrative updates and being sure to regularly check the guidebook, effectively serving our very diverse constituencies, keeping a strong focus on the financial health of the Division in the face of a reduced financial surplus, and increasing AOM costs.

Key progress following the 2014 Review
We reviewed progress made in the three main goals identified by the prior strategic review: (1) Enhance Community, (2) Enhance Professional Engagement, and (3) Enhance the Structure and Operation of Division Committees. We find that the Division has made very good progress towards each of these three goals, particularly in the structure and operation of the division. More work remains.

Looking forward from 2019 – Priorities for 2019-2024
The following are the priorities for the OB Division moving forward: Enhance the OB Division's ability to provide their members with: (1) Rigor, (2) Relationships, and (3) Relevance, and substantially leverage technology, financial stability, and micro-communities to do so.

OB FIVE YEAR SURVEY

The Organizational Behavior (OB) Division has undertaken its five-year review of the state of the Division. Appendices 1 and 2 provide, respectively, the Division's current domain statement and the names of Executive Committee members. In this report, we provide a description of: (a) division metrics; (b) a general survey of the current membership - with quantitative and qualitative data; (c) an *in situ* survey of PDW and academic program attendees rating their satisfaction with program sessions; (d) a review of our functions guided by the health and governance checklist; (e) a review of how the division met its targets from the last five year review; and (f) a plan for going forward for the next five years.

Division Metrics

The OB Division continues to be the largest division within the Academy of Management with 6,507 members as of October 30, 2019. Our membership has increased 4.03% over the past five years (compared to an increase of 4.26% for AOM). In terms of composition, domestic membership has declined less (-0.93%) than that of AOM overall (-1.38%), whereas our international membership has increased by 10.72% compared to 10.14% for AOM. Specifically, academic membership has increased by 4.54% and student membership has increased by 9.79% while emeritus membership has decreased by 0.81% and executive membership has decreased by 25.74%. Our 2019 membership is 66% academic, 28% student, 4% executives, and 2% emeritus, which is comparable to our 2014 membership which consisted of 65% academic, 27% student, 6% executives, and 2% emeritus. Thus, the main change to the composition of our membership is the relative increase in international members as 46% of overall membership, and the 25% drop in executive members (albeit from a very small number to begin with). We would also like to note that student members have increased by nearly 10% and are approaching one-third of our membership.

The OB program at the Academy has experienced a relatively stable number of submissions during the past five-year period, receiving approximately 1,200 submissions per year. However, it should be noted that while the number of submissions has stayed relatively stable, the number of symposia submissions has increased by 36% since 2015. Thus, in the last five years, the number of symposia acceptances has decreased by 22% and the overall number of accepted submissions has decreased by 7%. We are currently seeing an increase in the percentage of international reviewers for the annual conference program. In 2019, 52% of our reviewers were from outside of the United States (as compared to 46% in 2014). In 2019, 21% of members reviewed submissions to the OB division, which is quite a bit below the percentage of reviewers for the Academy overall at 33%. The primary reason respondents gave for not serving as a reviewer was lack of time (54%) - however, we conjecture that it may perhaps also relate to a diffusion of responsibility because of our size.

Membership Survey

Our survey was administered in August - October 2019 to 6,507 current members of the OB Division. In total, 1,714 responded, representing a 26% response rate. To be more conservative in our analyses, we used a smaller number of responses (1,545) in our analysis who did not have large amounts of missing data. The 1,545 number compares favorably to the historic average response rate of 21% and also to the average response rate for Divisions undergoing their five-year review this year (22%). When we report response rates to questions within the survey, we are referring to the more conservative, 1,545 number.

Those who completed the survey were representative of the divisional membership with respondents having the following membership type: 69.32% academic, 27.39% student, 2.13% practitioner, and

1.16% emeritus. In terms of tenure of membership, 31.35% of respondents have been members for fewer than three years, 25% between 4-7 years, 19% for 15+ years, 15% between 8-11 years, and 10% between 12-15 years. 57% of respondents were female. Approximately 68 percent (67.85%) of respondents completed their highest degree in North America, 18.54% in Europe, 8.17% in Asia, 3.24% in Oceania, 2.45% from the rest of the world.

Looking at the geographical residency of respondents, 65% reside in North America, 18% in Europe, 10% in Asia, 4% in Oceania, 2% in Africa, and 1% in South America. Thus, there were somewhat more survey responses from North America relative to our membership as listed in our division metrics (55% domestic). Thirty-seven percent (37%) of respondents were between the ages of 30-39, 23% between 40-49, 15% between 50-59, 13% between 18-29, 8% between 60-69, 3% between 70-79 and 1% over 80.

Our survey contained questions asking about a number of important areas of interest and concern to us: (1) member satisfaction with their connection & involvement with the OB division, (2) questions about the annual meeting, (3) satisfaction with program services and leadership, as well as overall membership satisfaction, (4) open-ended questions on capabilities and priorities for the future, and (5) questions we added this year about perceptions of the current early OB job market, exploding offers, and, to better address questions of inclusion, a set of demographic questions including gender, race, and sexual orientation. Some of the questions were asked in the previous five-year survey, so we are able to make cross year comparisons. Unless otherwise indicated, all responses in the survey are on a 1-5 scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5), or not satisfied (1) to extremely satisfied (5).

Member Satisfaction

Appendix 3 summarizes responses to the Divisional Survey items asking about members' satisfaction with the division, its services, and its leadership. In addition to an overall summary, Appendix 2 provides subgroup responses for respondents' demographic characteristics.

General Satisfaction with the Division. Overall satisfaction with the division—indicated by the item, "Overall, how satisfied are you with your membership in the OB division?"—significantly increased from 2014 (2019 mean = 3.27, 2014 mean = 3.12) with 82% of respondents indicating that they were satisfied or higher. This result suggests that the division, in terms of overall member satisfaction, is heading in a positive direction. There were no other differences in most of the other satisfaction sub-items from 2014 to 2019. Eighty percent of our respondents replied to this item.

When asked what they like best about membership in the OB Division, the top responses are were: information (opportunities, resources) and access to quality research and learning (37%), the people and community (16%), and networking/connections (13%). When asked what they most wanted to improve about the OB Division, top responses were about wanting the division to seem smaller/more intimate (23%), changing the structure/aspects of the OB Division programming at the AOM conference, including having a better review process for the program (17%), greater international awareness (14%), as well as greater inclusion and less elitism (13%). The biggest issue for "least like" continues to be the size of the Division, which seems to undermine a chance to connect with others and to have a sense of belonging and involvement. Approximately 53% of our respondents replied to all of these measures.

Satisfaction with Services and Division Leadership. Our survey examined satisfaction with specific services the OB Division seeks to provide to our members. There were no significant drops in mean level satisfaction for any of the items collected from 2014.

The <u>strengths</u> of the Division, where 80% or more of respondents indicated satisfied or higher, include:

- Activities that address the Division's domain (81%)
- Level of communication received from the division (84%)
- Selection process for awards and recognition (80%)
- Responsiveness of division officers to member concerns (82%)
- Fair and open elections (89%)

The greatest opportunities for the Division, where more than 20% responded report not satisfied or only somewhat satisfied, include:

- Opportunities outside of the Annual Meeting to network/collaborate with peers (45.5%)
- Encouragement from Division leaders to form network communities for members like me (41%)
- Sense of community within the Division (37%)
- Opportunities to influence the division (35%)
- Value of Connect@AOM Community Discussion (31%)
- Efforts to reach out to international members (30%)
- Ability of interested members to become leaders in the division (27%)
- Welcoming of members from various demographic groups (diverse in, for example, race/ethnicity, gender, age, nationality, sexual orientation, disability status, etc.) (26%)
- Efforts to foster good relations and work collaboratively with other divisions/interest groups (26%)
- Usefulness of website (25%)

With regard to communications, although our members are quite satisfied with the level of communication they are receiving from the division (84% are satisfied or higher), our Division's on-line presence offers an opportunity for improvement. Although a majority of members reported being at least "satisfied" with the Division's website (75%) and Connect@AOM (69%), these were among the lowest ratings across the survey. Moreover, when asked in a subsequent question about how frequently they open messages from Connect@AOM, 50% of members said that they open a quarter or less of messages they receive from AOM connect. As we describe in greater detail below, the survey data provided actionable avenues for enhancing the Division's on-line presence.

Examining satisfaction with the OB division leadership, there was no significant difference as compared to 2014, and 65% of members responded agree or strongly agree that "I have confidence that the leadership of the OB Division is steering the division in the right direction" (3% disagreed or strongly disagreed and 32% responded neutral).

Comparison to 2014. Comparing all the numbers above to 2014, there were no items that went significantly downward, and the items which were significantly higher from 2014 to 2019 were:
- Activities that address the division's domain (2014, M = 3.18; 2019, M = 3.29)
- Opportunities for members like me to receive mentoring (2014, M = 2.53; 2019, M = 2.78)
- Level of communication received from the division (2014, M = 3.18; 2019, M = 3.42)
- Fair and open elections (2014, M = 3.66; 2019, M = 3.78)

Community, Identification and Involvement in the OB Division

The challenge of creating community involvement and belonging among our members in such a large division is a theme that stretches back at least to our 2009 review; and, it continues still in 2019. Fifty-one percent (51%) of our members agree or strongly agree that the OB division size is a source of

strength (compared to 49% in 2014) and 32% agree or strongly agree that size is a source of weakness (which increased compared to 25% in 2014). This indicates that a subset of members feels a lack of a sense of community, identity, and involvement with the division, as indicated both empirically and by the qualitative comments associated with this question where 20% of participants mentioned it is difficult to connect/network in the division and challenging to experience a sense of community.

Sense of Community. Approximately 73% of respondents replied to this question. When asked about the extent to which they were generally satisfied with the sense of community within the OB Division: 63% of the OB Division members reported being at least satisfied (i.e., satisfied, very satisfied, or extremely satisfied), compared to 58% who responded at least satisfied in 2014, and 67% who responded at least satisfied in 2009. There was no significant difference between the *mean* level of sense of community in 2019 as compared to 2014.

Reasons for Belonging to the OB Division. 95% of our sample answered these questions, and most of our members (83%) identify with OB as their primary division (46% clearly so, and 37% said yes, but they identify with another division almost as much). The most highly ranked reason for belonging to the OB Division was to "gain and share information relevant to research" (73% ranked it first and another 19% ranked it second), followed by to "develop and maintain social connections" (15% ranked this first, 39% placed it second, and 18% ranked it third), and then "to gain and share information relevant to teaching" (6% ranked it first, 21% ranked it second, and 31% ranked it third). The changes from 2014 were that developing/maintaining social connections was ranked significantly higher, and an emphasis on teaching and practice was ranked significantly lower, again supporting our emphasis in our action steps below regarding enhancing relationships within the OB Division.

Identification. 96% of our sample answered these questions. Identification with the OB Division has risen since 2014 for the two most pertinent items: "I believe I am part of the OB division and its activities" (47% of the sample agreed or strongly agreed, compared to 33.1% in 2009 and 43% in 2014) and "I strongly identify with the OB Division's mission" (53% agreed or strongly agreed, compared with 41.7% in 2009 and 53% in 2014).

Involvement. With regard to opportunities for getting involved in the division, we have seen a positive significant difference over the past ten years: For the statement, "The OB Division provides good opportunities to get involved," 63% agreed or strongly agreed (compared to 57% in 2009 and 61% in 2014) (with 96% of our sample responding). In response to the question, "I wish I were more involved in the OB Division," 58% responded yes (59% in 2014). Given the large percentages of members seeking greater involvement and connection with the division, it seems opportune for the leadership to consider how to provide more of those opportunities for members (with 94% of our sample responding).

International Focus

In terms of satisfaction with the OB Division's efforts to reach out to international members (to which 54% of respondents responded), 73% of respondents are satisfied or higher (significantly higher than 2014 when 63% reported satisfaction with the Division's efforts to reach out to international members). However, when further investigating the demographics, 80% of North American members are satisfied with this question as compared to 55% of international members. Similarly, when asked to indicate agreement on whether the OB Division addresses the needs of its international members, 34% of respondents (strongly) agreed (with 51% neutral), while 12% disagreed and 3% strongly disagreed. Of the 35% who agreed, 63% of these respondents were based in North America and 36% of these respondents were based outside North America. Last, when asked whether the OB Division needs to include more of an international focus on the Academy program, 34% agreed or strongly agreed compared to 37% five

years ago. It is worth noting, however, that 20% (strongly) disagreed with this statement and that the majority (47%) were neutral. Approximately 83% of respondents replied to this question. Appendices 3 to 5 include comparisons based on respondents' regional location for survey questions about the division, participation in the AOM program, and satisfaction with the AOM program.

Given that our non-North American membership has been steadily increasing and offers us the opportunity to be a truly global division, we need to continue to be relevant to this group, and work on being receptive to meeting their needs. The data indicates additional challenges and opportunities for the division to become more receptive to meeting the needs of this group. This is particularly the case as North Americans are still more generally satisfied with the division across a variety of items and have greater participation in the program. Non-North American members are also statistically significantly less likely to say that they are satisfied with efforts to reach out to international members (mean = 2.65) as compared to the satisfaction that members outside of North America report (mean=3.30). In sum, North American members are more likely to think that the division's international focus is satisfactory than do non-North American members, although both groups see room for improvement.

Academy Meeting and the OB Program

Appendix 4 provides demographic breakouts for survey items that focus on participation in the OB Division's Annual Meeting activities. Appendix 5 provides demographic breakouts for survey items regarding respondents' satisfaction with aspects of the Division's Annual Meeting program.

Attendance at Meeting. 89% of respondents replied to the questions regarding the annual meeting. The annual meeting is the focal point of contact in our division, with 58.76% of respondents reporting that they attend the meeting annually, and 23.64% reporting that they attend only if they are on the program. Approximately nine percent (9.24%) said they attend once in a while, 4.58% responded that they never attend and 3.78% indicated they rarely attend. Lack of access to funding (34%, down from 54% in 2014), lack of time (20%, down from 31% in 2013), belonging to the Academy for benefits other than the Annual Meeting (6%), and a lack of interest in attending (4%) were the main reasons given for not attending the AOM meeting.

Participation at the Meeting. When questioning how active members are at the AOM meeting (to which 84% of our sample responded), we first addressed this question in the same way as in previous division surveys by asking the question about how active they were in the meeting over the previous five-year time period. Twenty-seven percent (27%) indicated they presented at a scholarly session (paper, symposium, etc.) every year, with 40% saying they had presented a few times, 13% presenting once, and 20% never in the previous five-year period. When considering whether members have attended conference sessions over the past five years: 44% reported attending a conference session every year, 39% a few times, 8% a few times, and 9% never over the five years. These numbers are generally the same for responses to "participated in other activities (social events, business meetings, etc.)," with 38% participating every year, 35% a few times, 11% a few times, and 16% never over the five years. Twenty-five percent (25%) of respondents indicated that they attend a PDW every year, with an additional 54% attending a few times or once (21% responded never) over the five-year period. We are also very interested in new questions added to this year's survey that were more specific about what members are actually doing at AOM in terms of participation in sessions. As such we asked them to recall how many sessions, and what types of sessions they went to in the last AOM Annual Meeting they attended. **Members reported attending 4.02 academic program sessions and participating in 1.28 program sessions. We were also interested in knowing how many sessions participants attended solely based on research interest (they were not a participant in the session or supporting someone else who**

was a participant), and found that 61% of the sessions attended were because of sheer academic interest.

Reviewing and Volunteering. 86% of respondents replied to the questions regarding reviewing and volunteering. Eighty percent (80%) of respondents had reviewed for the OB Division at least once in the last five years, with 20% reporting that they had never reviewed. Respondents were asked why they did not review: 15% reported that "I did not think I was qualified to review," 54% reported, "I did not have time to review," 22% "I reviewed for other divisions," and 8% "I was not aware of how to sign up to review." We also allowed a text entry where we received 83 responses--here, the qualitative reasons for not serving as a reviewer were: 1) Too busy (19), 2) Reviewed for other divisions (19), 3) Did not attend the conference/on leave (12), 4) Recently joined (11), 5) Don't like review process (5), and 6) wasn't invited/sent anything (5). Respondents were asked whether the OB Division's program reviewers offer useful feedback to improve their work. Thirty percent responded agree, while 26% responded disagree or strongly disagree (44% were neutral. Volunteering outside of reviewing is not common. 67% of membership reported having never volunteered, 7% volunteer all of the time and only 26% of respondents indicated that they volunteered in some capacity (described as: awards committee, social outing coordinator, etc.) every year or a few times.

Satisfaction with Program. 82% of respondents replied to the questions regarding their satisfaction with the program. In general, survey results indicate that our members are satisfied with the program overall. While there is no strong call for action, there is always room for changes and improvement. Seventy-five percent (75%) of participants agreed with the statement, "Generally speaking, the OB Division's overall program at the Academy meeting is interesting and useful to me." Respondents also reported general satisfaction (satisfied or strongly satisfied) with traditional paper sessions (77%), symposia (90%) and PDWs (92%). These numbers are higher than those reported in 2014, where 69% reported satisfaction with symposia, 70% were satisfied with traditional paper sessions, and 62% were satisfied with PDWs.

In response to the question "The OB Division's PDW sessions are more useful to me than the full AOM conference program," 48% agreed or strongly agreed; 15% disagreed or strongly disagreed (37% were neutral). Eighty percent (80%) of members were satisfied or higher with social and networking opportunities (65% in 2014), and 87% were satisfied or higher with overall access to the program (70% in 2009). In a new question this year, we asked about the value that members see in different types of PDW sessions. On average, members rated methods-focused workshops the highest on a 7-point scale (5.53), followed by topical research-focused sessions (5.3) and topical networking sessions (5.1). This was followed by career-focused sessions (4.7), teaching workshops (4.5) and life-skills sessions (3.68), but it is important to note that demographic minority-group respondents rated the career and life-skills sessions more highly.

Respondents were split on whether the OB Division needs a more diverse set of formats: 36% agreed or strongly agreed and 19% disagreed or strongly disagreed (45% were neutral). Thirty-four percent (34%) felt that the program needs to include more of an international focus, while 20% disagreed with the need to include a more international focus (46% were neutral).

Inclusion

This year we attempted to address issues of inclusion by, in addition to examining demographics based on career level or international status, adding the demographics of gender identity, sexual orientation and race (with race answered and coded as an open-ended question). We explained in the survey that we were asking these questions as part of our effort to gain a better understanding of whether we are meeting the needs of all of our members. We emphasized that answering the questions was completely optional. The analyses related to this data need to be treated very cautiously, however, because in addition to having an

initial 21% response rate overall of the membership to the survey, 54% of participants chose not to answer the race question, 44% of participants chose not to answer the sexual orientation question and 35% of participants chose not to answer the gender question. Appendices 3 to 5 include comparisons based on respondents' demographic characteristics for survey questions about the division, participation in the AOM program, and satisfaction with the AOM program.

Satisfaction with OB Division: Community, Networking, Influence, Communication and Processes
We find some significant differences between responses across differing demographic categories in this domain. Women are generally less satisfied, particularly with the level of community, networking, influence and opportunities to get involved, responsiveness of division officers to their concerns, or having access to the program (with women being more interested in getting more involved). Women also saw the size of the division as less of a strength and more of a weakness. With regard to sexual orientation, those who identified as LGB, or who chose not to answer, were more likely to be younger and North American or European, and were statistically less satisfied with the division as a whole, the sense of community, the welcoming of members from various demographic groups, the opportunities to influence the division, access to participation in the program, responsiveness of division officers to their concerns, and opportunities for getting involved.

Likewise, we found similar results regarding race, when comparing whites to all other racial groups. Due to sample size constraints, it's difficult to interpret differences between each of the 11 categories of race individually. However, collapsing all non-white members into one group yielded some differences between white and non-white members. They too wanted to get more involved in the division, felt less community, less satisfaction with networking opportunities, reported less opportunities for members like themselves to receive mentoring or encouragement from the division to form group for members like themselves, and perceived less outreach to international members. Women, LGB members, and non-white members all reported less overall satisfaction. We are reporting this data to gain a better understanding of how we are doing with inclusiveness, but given the constrained sample, we would like to reiterate that the results of the analyses should be perceived with caution.

Participation in and satisfaction with AOM Program
Per Appendices 4 and 5, there are less differences by gender, sexual orientation and race than there were for satisfaction items with the division (although more differences in membership type - student versus academic and international). Women served as reviewers less than did men and were less satisfied with plenaries and overall access to level of participation in the program. Non-white members were also less satisfied with their access to the program, social and networking opportunities, and were less likely to serve as a chair or discussant, present at a PDW and participate in other AOM activities such as social events or business meetings. With regard to gender orientation, there were no significant difference in participation in the program, but LGB members were less likely to be satisfied with PDWs and plenaries. Again, we are treating these analyses with caution given the possible sampling issues.

Timing of the Academic Job Market

Prompted by informal feedback regarding potential problems with particularly the junior/assistant professor academic job market, we included a set of questions in 2019 to solicit OB members' perspectives on the timing of job offers and the amount of time that schools give candidates to accept an offer once given. Approximately 50% of members responded to these questions.

With respect to the first issue, we asked members to indicate whether an early start for the OB assistant professor job market (July to October) led respondents to experience challenges and benefits in two

separate questions. Fifty-one percent (51%) of respondents indicated that this early start either caused no challenges (34%) or a few challenges (17%), and 49% indicated this early start caused some (22%), a lot (15%), or very many (12%) challenges. Two-thirds (2/3rds) of respondents indicated that the early start produced no (46%) or few benefits (21%). There was some limited evidence of differences in perceptions across career stage. Specifically, post-comps doctoral students, on average, indicated that they experienced some challenges from the early start (3.05); they also, however, had the highest average score for benefits (2.15).

We then asked which month of the year would be ideal for giving or receiving a job offer. Results indicated that nearly half of respondents believe the ideal timing of job offers is in November (20%), December (15%), or January (14%). An additional quarter of respondents see the ideal month as proximal to this window in either October (12%) or February (9%). The remainder of respondents are evenly distributed across the calendar year in small percentages.

For the second issue, we asked respondents to indicate the ideal length of time for job candidates to consider a job offer. More than three-quarters of respondents indicated that somewhere between one week and a month would be ideal—1-2 weeks (23%), 2-3 weeks (27%), 3-4 weeks (27%).

5-year Survey Qualitative Comments

To derive further insights into the state of the division and how to improve it, we conducted a systematic analysis of respondents' free response entries to the Divisional Survey. Several of the questions included space for respondents to provide open-ended thoughts or elaborations on their quantitative survey responses. We categorized these responses and used this analysis to further inform our strategic planning effort. Appendix 6 summarizes this analysis of the free responses on the Divisional survey.

Importantly related to our future actions, the following are respondents' suggestions for what the OB Division should focus on over the next 5 years (with 219 responses coded):

- *Research/Publications (45)*
- *Diversity/Inclusion (26)*
- *International Community (25)*
- *Education/mentoring (25)*
- *Awareness/attention to real-world issues (22)*

In-Situ 2019 AOM OB Division Survey

To further inform our 2019 strategic planning efforts, we added a new type of survey this year. Specifically, we sought to understand the experience of AOM Annual Meeting attendees through an *in-situ* survey. To do so, we engaged in an elaborate and time-consuming survey effort at AOM itself, enlisting the help of a dedicated corps of OB Division Volunteers to administer, and collect paper surveys at the conclusion of a subset of program sessions throughout the Annual Meeting. Our data collection effort entailed the following:

We surveyed attendees at every PDW session primarily sponsored by the OB Division held on Friday and Saturday of the conference (N = 34). For these sessions, we tracked the specific session number to enable assessing the quality of specific PDW topics.

We targeted for assessment a quasi-random sample of program sessions (i.e., symposia, paper sessions) on Monday and Tuesday. We sampled sessions to maximize representativeness (i.e., session types and

time slots), while preserving feasibility (i.e., all sessions located within the main OB Division hotel). For these sessions, we did not track the specific session; instead, we tracked the timeslot of the session in the program.

Sample Characteristics

We collected a total of 1,220 responses, including 761 from OB PDW sessions and 459 from other program sessions. Across the dataset, 80% of respondents indicated that the OB Division was their primary affiliation. Although respondents were distributed across career stages, the distribution was skewed toward earlier stage members: 18% pre-comps Ph.D. students, 30% post-comps PhD students, 22% assistant professors, 9% associate professors, 10% full professors and 1% total comprised of other students, non-academics, and post-doctoral scholars.

Although we targeted a balanced set of sessions across the AOM program, the number of completed surveys declined over the course of the program. We suspect this was due to a combination of declining attendance at sessions (as our survey results indicate) and to survey fatigue (i.e., people being asked to complete surveys at multiple sessions).

Key Insights and Implications if the In-situ survey

We focus here on a subset of the most important and actionable insights that we derived from the *in-situ* survey results, highlighting recommendations for how the OB Division might adjust its Annual Meeting program or planning in the future. First, overall, attendees are satisfied. Similar to the survey results above, attendees rated the sessions that they attended positively. At least from the perspective of those who attended sessions, the OB Division's program was satisfactory. Second, while paper sessions are still rated favorably, they are attended less frequently and rated least favorably as compared to symposia and PDWs. Moreover, attendees' ratings of paper sessions were more variable than PDWs or Symposia. This finding concurs with the Divisional Survey, which showed that Paper Sessions are the least valuable, while PDWs are the most valuable portions of the program. Last, session attendance seems to decline over the course of the AOM meeting. Consistent with popular wisdom, our survey results indicated that attendance at AOM program sessions declines from Saturday afternoon to Tuesday afternoon. In part, this is because there are fewer PDW sessions running concurrently compared to the academic program. However, it is also because of declining attendance toward the end of the program.

HEALTH AND GOVERNANCE CHECKLIST HIGHLIGHTS

Below we address highlights of our health and governance checklist, which is included as Appendix A.

Bylaws and Domain

In the areas of bylaws and domain, we are doing well, but could do better. We should review our bylaws more frequently and be sure that all incoming executive committee members do so. Our domain statement is good, but we may want to update to highlight even more powerfully the role of the "O" in organizational behavior, that is our ability to offer a unique contribution regarding attitudes, cognitions and emotions as they relate to people at work. In addition, we should be sure that we are keeping up with posting of our meeting minutes on the website.

Membership

Our membership has stayed strong, and we carefully monitor our membership statistics yearly and actively consider how our offerings relate to the various groups. In addition, we took the extra step in our five-year survey to ask more detailed questions about demographics, such as gender, race, and sexual orientation, so we could quantitatively track whether these factors lead to differences in meeting our members' needs. While the response rates of people answering these optional questions was low enough that we are not completely confident in the results, we did find that women were generally less satisfied and felt less included than did women, as did non-White respondents and those who identified as LGB (or who separately answered "no answer." Although we actively think about and offer services to all of our constituencies, we indicated that we *Need Improvement* because we think we can go farther in reaching out in terms of inclusion, including not only demographic minorities, but also senior faculty, teaching faculty and global faculty. We discuss what we plan to do in our part III Goals /Actions section under "Emphasizing Relevance - Inclusion."

Finances

Our review of the finance items on this checklist (numbers 6, 7, 8 and 16) indicated that our executive committee has good governance with an appointed treasurer, along with an appointed catering and events expert. We follow AOM financial policies and continue to operate in the black. We also have sponsorships that support awards and some events and have provided a travel stipend for student assistants at the annual conference. As per the encouragement of AOM policy we have drawn down most of our past years' surplus to offer more to our members, but as a result we now need to very carefully monitor to make sure we stay within our allocations, which will involve reducing expenses. We have appointed a finance committee (comprised of the OB Chair, Incoming OB Division Chair, our treasurer, event planner, our COO and two of our organizational behavior division representatives) to deal with this issue (prior to AOM 2020) to be sure we do so thoughtfully and successfully.

Treasurer and Event Planning/Catering Experts

Our division has a formal (appointed) office of Treasurer. This person is responsible for the financial aspects of the division. For example, the treasurer is in charge of accounts payable and receivable for the division, processing reimbursements, clarifying budget opportunities and threats for the committee, and otherwise managing the finances for the division. We also have a dedicated appointed executive committee member in charge of coordinating and paying for catering and logistics associated with the annual meeting and the mid-year executive committee meeting. These are considerable duties because our division is so large, and it would be an excessive load on just one person. These two committee members have separate duties, and coordinate significantly when needed.

Inflows

Our inflows consist of the AOM allocation and sponsorships that we bring in every year. The 'revenues' column in Appendix 7 are our sponsorships. We brought in $28,470 in outside sponsorships in 2019, and $19,060 in 2018. These significant sponsorships help pay for numerous awards and specific events at the annual meetings. While some sponsorships have changed or stopped over the last five years, we continue to add new ones when necessary and strive to keep the current ones engaged.

Outflows

Our major expenses are catering and logistics at the annual conference, and at the mid-year meeting. Annual meeting costs have risen during the last five years, and we have also added people and nights to

our mid-year planning meeting to better meet the needs of this large division. We also now offer four student travel stipends in exchange for help from these students at the annual conference. We have a nominating call that goes by email to the whole membership and a process within the committee for selecting and managing the students. This is another of the new initiatives the division has introduced in the last five years to meet our AOM-encouraged goal to spend more on the membership.

Appendix 7 indicates the division's financial summary for the last five years. We continue to operate in the black, but our year-end cash amounts have gone down from $87,750 in 2015 to $12,636 in 2019 (although we have not yet received 10k promised from Pepperdine University of which most of the money has been spent, and so this number should actually increase to above 22k surplus in 2019). We are in the process of reducing other expenses to make up for these increases, but have more work to do to bring our annual expenses into closer alignment with our annual allocation and revenues.

Summary of Financial Situation

We ran a surplus of funds in the division the last 20 years, which is generally a good thing financially. But in years past, we ran up against the now rescinded 'carry forward rule,' which penalized divisions for carrying too many funds forward and not spending on the membership. We thus received clear guidance from AOM that we needed to not carry forward as much and to instead, spend more on the membership. We agreed with the spirit of the rule and, based on AOM guidance and the needs of the division, undertook the initiative to update the structure of the executive committee. We added more representative-at-large positions, additional appointed positions, such as the chief operations officer, and expanded our mid-year meeting to better plan for strategy and execution of operations in this large division. We have also seen substantial increases in costs associated with the annual meeting. Together, these changes have increased our expenses the last few years.

Overall, the division is in a strong financial position. We have sufficient funds for our existing key activities and a solid base of sponsorships that contribute to our budget. The executive committee has two roles that deal directly with finances: a treasurer and a catering & events expert. Both are appointed members and both have been on the committee for over five years. The treasurer stays on top of the financial needs and trends of the division, and regularly communicates those things to the committee. We continue to operate in the black and maintain adequate financial reserves, but need to begin a more active strategy to be creative about trimming expenses and/or increasing annual inflows. We also need a more frequent and transparent reporting from AOM to be able to do so effectively.

Governance

Our governance structure was changed in 2015, and this change has served the division very well. There were a variety of changes motivated by the 2014 5-year strategic survey including: adding OB division representatives to help with workload and strategic planning (leading to a total of 6 OB Division reps), encouraging more members to volunteer and developing a volunteer coordinator role, adding a communications director, introducing a program developer team to help with the intense program demands, and adding student representatives to the executive committee. We have done all of these things and more – and it has made a positive difference in both our ability to spend time looking forward strategically, but also to our capacity to execute those strategic initiatives. We elaborate on all of the changes in the "PROGRESS AGAINST GOALS AND IMPROVEMENT THEMES IDENTIFIED IN PRIOR STRATEGIC REVIEW IN 2014" section below and so will not repeat them here.

We are also doing well on other aspects of governance such as elections, publicized recognition programs and travel stipends. Our survey indicated that 80% or more of our members indicated that there were "fair and open elections," that they were satisfied with responsiveness of division officers to members concerns

(82%) and that the selection process for awards and recognition were fair (80%) – and these three governance issues were 3 of the top five answers when our members were asked about their satisfaction with programs and services related to the OB Division.

Where the OB Division could be more effective is extending services to members beyond those provided at the annual meeting. While we are part of regional and international conferences, and do send out OB emails, we need to think about ways to be more effective in reaching out to our members outside of the AOM system. This is one of our goals in this year's report and we describe it in greater detail below.

PROGRESS TOWARDS GOALS SET IN 2014 STRATEGIC REVIEW

We list here the goals set out in the prior 2014 five-year strategic review, and assess the progress on these goals that has been made since then.

Priority 1 from 2014: Enhance Community

Enhancing a feeling of community was a top priority of the OB Division in the last report. The executive committee identified several specific activities through which the division could enhance a sense of community. With respect to the first activity, "Improve use of web-based technologies," adding a CTO with a team, and having a communications director helped us become more efficient and reliable in making sure our presence on OB Connects (which in itself is a new system) transitioned smoothly, and that we consistently communicate with our members. We created a volunteer portal and have also incorporated the new OB Connect platform, where questions are asked and answered and ideas, information, and documents are exchanged. The division also has increased its use of Twitter to promote recent articles published on OB-related topics. However, we have been hampered by the fact that our membership has not yet gotten used to OB Connect, with only 69% saying they are satisfied with it, and we could do more with social media. Having said that, our survey showed that what our members want, across career stages, is direct e-mail, and content via Linked-in, something we consider in our recommendations.

With respect to the second activity, "Support development of micro-communities," we began to do this through the Making Connections Committee (MCC) who established two new very successful events at AOM, OB Research Roundtables & Making Connections with OB Experts: A Networking Social, both of which support micro-communities by bringing together members who share an interest in specific topics. Moreover, the MCC has also launched OB Cafes, which are member-organized off-program events for people to discuss a particular topic. Having said that, the micro communities don't seem to continue past AOM. Thinking of how to support micro communities is part of our goal for this year's review and we elaborate upon it below.

Another part of enhancing community was to continue developing and maintaining linkages with non-North American members. We have made progress in reaching out and creating opportunities for international members within the Division. A major success has been the relaunch of our Global Committee. This committee has been very active and attuned to the needs of our international members. The committee has actively supported (without financial outlay) OB Division tracks in the specialized regional conferences held by the Academy outside North America (Slovenia and Mexico in 2019 and 2020), and affiliate conferences such as the Asia Academy of Management. The committee also organizes around four to five globally themed PDWs at the annual meeting that meet the needs of non-North American members such as applying for employment in North America and other parts of the world and

writing for non-native speakers. The division has actively publicized the role of the Global Committee on its website and recruited members from across the world.

The chair of the global committee has now been appointed as part of the executive committee of the division, and we have been purposeful in considering and nominating people for our executive committee. Indeed, this year the two nominees for the incoming 5-year OB leadership track are both from outside North America (England and New Zealand). In the Junior Faculty Workshop (JFW) and Doctoral Consortium (DC), we ensure that the needs and interests of international students and junior faculty are met through the inclusion of non-North American Faculty Fellows (for the JFW) and Round Table Hosts (for the Doctoral Consortium).

There was also an interest in increasing inclusiveness to different member types. We have done so through the selection of PDWs for the program, where we actively encourage a balanced range of research, teaching, and career-related development opportunities. We particularly highlight doctoral and junior faculty inclusion, as well as global inclusion. We could do, and plan on doing more going forward, in addressing the needs of women, LGBT, minority groups, senior faculty, teaching faculty, and practitioners. We are also trying to focus on the importance of respect and inclusion more broadly across all of our members for the upcoming (2020) AOM, we put out a specific call for a PDW that focuses upon inclusion within our own division that read as follows:

> "As part of our OB Division 5-year survey and strategic process, we identified a desire for community and inclusion as one of the ongoing primary interests and motivations of our OB Division members. To help encourage this, **we would like to have a practically oriented Professional Development Workshop (PDW) that focuses on inclusion – not in the abstract - but rather specifically targeted towards a better understanding and enacting of successful inclusion among our own colleagues within the Organizational Behavior Division.** When thinking about inclusion, our code of ethics offers a good initial guideline (and we put in the "**RESPECT FOR PEOPLE'S RIGHTS AND DIGNITY"** section from the AOM code of ethics.

Last, one of our strongest ways of creating community is through supporting and leveraging efforts of the Making Connections Committee (MCC)—the community-focused arm of the division—to achieve this objective. The MCC was established in 2009 for the purpose of strengthening bonds between and among members, thereby enhancing a sense of inclusiveness. The committee currently has a roster of 25 very active members. The head of the MCC is now an appointed member of the executive committee and comes to both the AOM and midyear meeting to strategize with the committee about this critical goal.

Since the last five-year review, the MCC has employed several new initiatives including, (1) two new community-enhancing programs—OB Ambassadors & Welcome-a-Member, (2) two events designed to foster micro-communities—OB Research Roundtables & Making Connections with OB Experts: A Networking Social, (3) an annual Sunset Cruise, and (4) a series of grassroots, member-organized, off-program events. Beyond these new initiatives, the MCC continues to organize a variety of PDWs designed to welcome new members, promote research excellence, facilitate career progression, and integrate research with practice, all with the overarching objective of making connections that help members feel "at home" in the division. Additional community-enhancing events organized by the division include the OB Doctoral Consortium, the OB Junior Faculty Workshop, the OB Division Social, and the Lifetime Achievement Award Coffee. The division also launched a Spotlight on OB Topic Event, which brings members together in a highly interactive format to discuss a particular topic (which we describe in more detail below).

In sum, the OB division has worked diligently to enhance a sense of community among our members, but our size creates challenges to the feelings of community our members desire. Indeed, while all this has happened, there was no significant change in members' survey ratings of community between 2014 and

2019 (although it did not go down). As such, and given our members indications that they still very much care about this, this is still one of our key priorities moving forward in this year's report, under the title of "Enhancing Relationships."

Priority 2 from 2014: Enhance Professional Engagement

The second priority in the 2014 strategic plan was to enhance the program, to strengthen the connection between science and practice, and to increase networking opportunities (both inside and outside of the meeting). Program enhancement was improved by increased autonomy from AOM in scheduling our PDWs, creating a more formal evaluation system for PDWs, developing creative ways to increase the number of people attending the Jr. Faculty and Doctoral consortia, and the creation of "Spotlight on OB" as a way to make the program more interesting. It is important to see from our in-situ survey that our members attending sessions are quite pleased with sessions and the overall program.

Our biggest attempt to increase the link between science and practice has been in the form of PDWs and through our plenary under the Spotlight on OB initiative mentioned above. "Spotlight on OB" was created as a way to increase professional engagement on a particular area within organizational behavior, to highlight the expertise of our membership, to enhance micro-communities, and to offer a link to practice. As part of this effort, a particular domain was chosen (Equality, Ethics, Inclusion over the last three years; Affect in 2020) as the division's "spotlight". Symposia focused on the spotlight topics were highlighted and promoted, and when possible, scheduled in the same room for two days at AOM. In addition, we attached a plenary session to these symposia that emphasized the connection between these topics and practice. The idea was for the outgoing division chair to spend the final year of the leadership track engaging people outside of the AOM meeting on the spotlight topic. "Spotlight on OB" has met many goals. While it is a good idea and has been a good learning experience, we are currently analyzing the pros and cons of continuing it as it did not have the level of impact we had been hoping for – particularly for the activities that were supposed to keep it going outside of AOM.

Last was the goal to increase networking opportunities, both inside and outside AOM. This was accomplished outside of AOM through the OB division being involved in small regional conferences and international conferences. Within AOM, much of what the Making Connection Committee did (described above) related to networking, including the very popular Making Connections with OB Experts: A Networking Social and the OB Research Roundtables. Plenty of thought and good work has gone into increasing professional engagement, but many of these issues still need to be advanced, which we do below through "Supporting Rigor" and "Supporting Relevance."

Priority 3 from 2014: Enhance the Structure and Operation of Division Committees

We have made excellent progress in enhancing the structure and operation of Division Committees thanks to plans made in the 2014 review and the execution by the various OB Division executive teams. Indeed, this is the priority in which the most progress has been made. The idea behind these structural and operational changes was because as a very large division, it was (and is) difficult to both run the program and activities for the Academy meeting and still think strategically. All of the changes that were made below based on the 2014 recommendations were done so as to both run the division more effectively, to allow time to think more strategically, and to better access the tremendous volunteer potential of our members.

First, we expanded elected officials to now have six OB Representatives-at-Large. This has allowed us to have a system in which we have a learning and mentoring role across our Doctoral and Jr. Faculty

consortia, as well as an OB division representative who handles PDWs during their first year on the executive committee, and Division awards in their second year. In the third year of service, one of the representatives-at-large takes the role of coordinating volunteers (and the new spreadsheet created to improve access), and two reps-at-large help the Division Chair with strategic initiatives. Examples have included strategic communications, helping to organize the plenary, and helping with this five-year survey and report.

We also expanded our appointed officers to include a Chief Operating Officer (COO) to assist with operational consistency. This is an ongoing role and the individual serves as the institutional memory for the division, keeping meeting minutes up-to-date and posting them, and organizing sponsorship and awards logistics. We added a Chief Technology Officer (CTO) to coordinate technology and social media. This role includes all outreach for the division and includes working closely with a Communication officer, which we also added, and subcommittees for social media and for meeting technology for the annual meeting.

We created a Program Development group, with a Program Developer Director, a Program Developer Associate Director, and two program specialists (for succession planning). This group of appointed volunteers is integral to managing the complex submission, review, and scheduling process for papers and symposium for the scholarly program at the annual meeting. The "behind-the-scenes" Program Development group has allowed continuation of institutional memory of AOM program processes and procedures, assisted in onboarding new Program and Symposia chairs, and has spent a tremendous amount of time assisting with the actual entry, reviewer assignment, and scheduling of papers and symposia.

We launched the Global Committee to help address the needs of our international members. The chair of this committee attends all Executive Committee meetings and also organizes PDW and regional conference participation, serving as an extra voice for members outside of North America. We also launched the Making Connections Committee. The Chair of this committee attends all Executive Committee meetings and organizes many initiatives which connect our members both inside of the annual meeting and beyond it, including social events, PDWs, and micro communities.

We codified and began standardizing roles for all positions, particularly important in maintaining consistency and knowledge in roles in which people are turning over yearly. To do so, we have created comprehensive 'on-boarding' documents which serve as guidebooks for the person incoming into a new role. We have also clarified that it is the responsibility of the person currently in the role to on-board the next in line for the role.

Last, we introduced and expanded the number of Student Representatives. These individuals attend all events at the annual meeting, including the executive committee meeting, and assist with strategic initiatives, including the plenary and the five-year survey. However, we believe this is an area in which we could better utilize the talents and interests of these members.

MOVING FORWARD: PRIORITIES FOR THE OB DIVISION 2020-2024

Based on the survey data, including the in-situ survey and the qualitative comments, as well as from a thorough discussion of the findings and future priorities by the OB executive committee, we offer 3 general priorities, with specific suggestions for the OB division going forward. To assist with dissemination to and feedback from members, we will have a special session at AOM 2020 to share survey findings and this report, and to encourage discussion from members about future directions of the

division. We have classified ideas under the three categories of enhancing Rigor, Relationships, and Relevance, ordered according to their importance from our members' rankings. While we have divided ideas into these categories, there are ideas that could fall under multiple categories, and we note three areas at the bottom of our priority list that clearly relate across all three categories.

Priority 1: Enhance Rigor

By rigor, we mean addressing the top need that our general membership reported--both this year and in prior years--as the most important reason they are members of the OB Division: "Gain and share information relevant to research." This was also the most frequent theme in responses to the open-ended question *What issues should occupy the OB Division's time over the next 5 years?* - "Research/Publications." We suggest the following recommendations for how the OB Division could enhance its support of rigor.

Create resources so that all Organizational Behavior faculty are knowledgeable about organizational behavior theory and methods. We are a "big tent" division with an increasing influx of scholars whose backgrounds and training were not originally in organizational behavior. These scholars thus can have less familiarity with foundational OB theory, as well as some organizational research methods, that are usually taught in OB doctoral programs. To help ensure we not only get the benefit of the diverse theoretical perspectives offered by these scholars (and of course continue our knowledge and integration of theoretical influences from other fields, such as psychology and sociology), but to also be sure that our field also maintains its rigor and knowledge base regarding OB theory and methods, we suggest creating opportunities within our PDW program. These programs could also perhaps be supplemented by online resources (e.g., webinars, podcasts), to better welcome and integrate scholars in our field whose training did not originate in organizational behavior. These PDWs could relate to research (both theory and method) as well as teaching and information about connecting with field sites and industry. We also suggest examining our domain statement to emphasize the importance of organizational behavior theory.

Develop prioritized and more flexible AOM Annual Meeting Programming
Because attendees rated the sessions that they attended positively in the in-situ survey, as well as more generally recalled in the Division's 5-Year Survey, we are in the fortunate position of having a good base upon which to make changes, and we do not require dramatic changes within our sessions to deliver value to members. However, the survey results highlighted opportunities to refine and prioritize Annual Meeting programming to maximize value to attendees.

One specific opportunity concerns the composition of the program with respect to session types. While still rated favorably by attendees, paper sessions were rated significantly less favorably and with more variability than either PDWs or Symposia. Meanwhile, the PDW and Symposium submissions have been increasing over time, yielding a higher rejection rate for these two portions of the program. Thus, there is an inconsistency here between the type of sessions members find most valuable and those with the highest rejection rates. One solution would be to move more of our program time to PDWs and symposia, from paper submissions. We could do this, as some other division have done, by inviting a set of defined Research Workshop-type submissions to the regular academic conference program. Doing so would enable some expansion of the number of hours available for the PDW program—the most highly valued portion of the conference according to the Divisional survey. As the currently second and third most highly rated PDWs are research topic-based conversations, they would fit well in the general program. However, at the same time, it is critical to remember that in terms of inclusion, paper sessions allow a larger number of unique people on the OB Division's program who may not have immediate access to the network of symposium sessions – and we definitely do not want to lose that access by strongly reducing paper sessions ourselves. However, there may also be a structural way to deal with this issue with technology, such as the development of a "symposium" creator, which our members could access prior to

AOM to help build symposia with other people interested in the same topics. This could also help with the desire for micro-communities (which we discuss below) and with the felt lack of cohesiveness.

In addition, to enhancing rigor in research conversations and to facilitate access to scholarly community, we are also suggesting that the last 10 minutes or so of all academic sessions involve members of the audience interacting with each other and with the speakers. This interaction can be formal or informal, and the OB Division will give guidance about how to do so. This will also help in enhancing relationships (discussed below). Related to this, we recommend that rather than choose a random person in the set of papers to be session chair – that we take the potential role of the paper session chair more seriously. This role provides a valuable opportunity to those not otherwise on the program and we intend to encourage anyone interested in volunteering for this role to do so. We will provide clear directions and innovative program structure suggestions for these volunteers. This will not only help increase the quality of the program, but can also help increase the relevance of AOM to our members, as we found that 24% of members only attend AOM if they are on the program, and in some cases, being on the program is a requirement to receive funding in support of attendance. We would also consider soliciting doctoral students for this role, as nearly one third of our membership is now doctoral students, and this could be a helpful way to get them integrated into the research community. We already plan on implementing these steps as suggestions in the upcoming 2020 AOM meeting.

Last, and very importantly, we suggest using Sunday during AOM in a better way. Since we are currently not allowed to schedule symposia and PDWs on that day (which in its own right seems problematic and we will be addressing with AOM), we suggest that the Division take a more active role in coordinating micro-community meetups, flash talks, skill-building workshops around specific methods or teaching, or anything else that enables us to use Sunday in a more productive way. We could also use Sunday as a time for Special Interest Groups to meet (see micro-communities below).

Improving the Review Process for AOM papers, symposia and PDWs. The review process for AOM papers is problematic because it is difficult to get people to review and the quality is highly variable. Not only does this make it difficult to use reviews to determine which papers to choose for the program, it also renders the feedback that authors receive less valuable. Indeed, our members recognize this and only 30% said that they agree or strongly agree that the OB Division's program reviewers offer useful feedback to improve their work (and 26% responded disagree or strongly disagree).

We suggest the creation of a special task force charged with re-thinking the conference review process in three respects. First, this task force should develop recommendations for how to engage more reviewers, especially those who are more senior in their careers. Second, the task force should identify how to improve the use of reviews for shaping the conference program. Third, the task force should focus on ways to improve the feedback that authors receive from the review process. For example, some initial ideas include requiring anyone submitting something to the OB division program to review at least 1 paper or symposia. In addition, we could use the AOM review process as an opportunity to teach rigor about the review process. We can also use the review process as a way to shape program quality. For example, adding evaluation questions about how innovative the symposia sessions format is will prompt session organizers to make them engaging. Adding a question to paper and symposia about the depth of knowledge shown in OB theory might also encourage the rigorous application of foundational OB concepts and theories.

With regard to PDWs, which are not reviewed by members, but rather by the executive committee, we suggest that given the growing number of PDWs that we have additional executive committee members involved in the choices of the PDWs. We suggest that the current and past OB reps-at-large from the PDW track do this together, so as to incorporate shared institutional memory. By teaming up across two years, we would create more consistency of knowledge and pass on experience in the PDW/Awards track

- similar to what is happening already very successfully in the Doctoral and Jr. Faculty consortia tracks. Likewise, the 2nd year rep who is doing the awards could get input from the previous awards chair in checking/determining the shortlisting of conference papers for the awards that are to be sent out to the committees, in this way supporting the 2nd year representative, so as to create a support system in the PDW/awards track.

Better shaping PDW programming, and changing its place in the program. To better customize our programming in PDWs, we should consider being clearer to our members about what types of topics we would like in our PDWs, including possibly having "tracks" - such as research, teaching, career, etc. We might also consider offering a way for part of the PDW program to be based on a vote of "the people's choice" PDW topics - perhaps through an online portal. This would not be necessarily for a specific session, but rather a specific topic, and we could identify this prior to the call for PDW proposals. Also, the data we gathered about satisfaction with PDWs will be helpful in selecting PDWs. It is also interesting to note, that with rigor in research as the first priority, that even in the PDW format, the PDW that people report being most satisfied with are methods-focused workshops (mean = 5.53 on a 7-point scale), followed by topical research-focused sessions (5.3) and topical networking sessions (5.1) - all having to do in some way with rigor in research.

Create opportunities to connect intellectually throughout the year, not just at the annual meeting. We suggest that in the attempt to build more rigor, relationships, and relevance that the division create monthly webinars, or other virtual platforms, that will address areas of research or opportunities for professional development. There are many examples, but one that was discussed is having a webinar for first time attendees to the annual conference to share tips for how to best navigate the meeting. In addition, creative use of technology platforms includes paper development workshops and encouraging the formation of on-line micro-communities. To do this effectively, it should be put under the supervision of one of the OB division representatives in their 3rd year of service on the executive committee.

Priority 2: Enhance Relationships

We would like to continue with our existing and new efforts in enhancing the sense of community within the Division. While this has been an emphasis over the past two five-year reports, we have not seen an empirical change in people's quantitative ratings of satisfaction with community. However, this is not unexpected in a division as large as ours, so our goal is to make the division psychology smaller, and more inclusive. To do so, we will continue with the excellent work that our various committees and communities have created, and we have some suggestions for things going forward.

Relationships at the AOM meeting. To help enhance both the OB identity, help create more accessible intellectual and social interaction, and to spark conversations, we suggest adding optional research interests to name badges either with ribbons or printed directly onto the name badges. We also suggest encouraging member originated social activities, with smaller numbers of people, such as those that were tried last year by the MCC committee, in which members sponsored their own events and "meet-ups" (e.g., coffee chats, dinners, city tours, running together, etc.). Also, we would like to focus on new networking connection opportunities for members who are not as comfortable with large receptions.

Relationships Outside of AOM Meeting. We would like to think much more about how to connect OB division members year-round. There was a suggestion of more dyadic pairing – for example, virtually mentoring junior scholars in OB that would occur year-round. Our website could promote "OB City Coffees" – in which people would sign up to meet for coffee with other OB scholars they know or don't know in their city and then we could post those pictures of our members at these coffees on our social media and website. These is something that could be pursued by the Making Connections Committee

under the same partnership with OB division representative we mentioned above who would be in charge in their 3rd year of helping to make connections outside of the OB division meeting.

Inclusiveness toward all types of members. We saw in our OB survey that there are some differences in satisfaction with the division, particularly around community, access, networking and involvement opportunities based on demographic factors (considering that the response rate was low, and so the data results must be viewed cautiously). We saw similar concerns with our non-North American membership that we address separately below. We should be actively soliciting greater involvement of diverse membership in volunteering and OB activities, encouraging cross-member interaction, and educating our members explicitly about implicit bias and how to be more inclusive. We have begun doing so this year with our call for a "practically oriented Professional Development Workshop (PDW) that focuses on inclusion – not in the abstract - but rather specifically targeted towards a better understanding and enacting of successful inclusion among our own colleagues within the Organizational Behavior Division." We are also looking to add an ethics/implicit bias session to our doctoral and junior faculty consortia. We will also continue to encourage and seek inclusive representation on the OB Division Executive Committee.

Priority 3: Enhance Relevance

As a division we would like to enhance our relevance to our members daily intellectual lives; we would like to enhance our relevance to the lives of our members across the globe, and to the lives of practitioners, leaders and employees and policy makers in the broader organizational world for whom our knowledge can be helpful. Specifically, what we mean by "relevance" is that the OB Division and its members are important to the success of (1) scholars in building their careers, (2) scholars as teachers of people who will both study and work in organizations (3) leaders, managers and employees at work and (4) policy makers as they design programs and systems in which people organize. An important part of making relevance happen within the division is to ensure that our scholars have the rigor noted above to also be able to understand organizational behavior theory and apply our constructs with direct relevance to the work context.

Continue to have an emphasis on being relevant to our international members. Given that our international membership has been steadily increasing, and it offers us the opportunity to be a truly global division, we need to work to continue to be relevant to members outside of North America. We should continue doing the things we are doing such as globally-themed PDWs and social events integrated with MCC, global speed-networking events, and being sure that we continue to have global representation on our OB Division Executive Committee. We plan to continue supporting our very committed Global Committee. Last, we recommend having a third-year organizational behavior representative do a strategic project for one year, where, together with the Global Committee, non-North American members are interviewed to get an even better sense of what would be useful to them.

Make clear our relevance to scholars in building their careers. We want to be relevant to scholars of all types, interests, career stages and locations. We will continue to increase PDWs aimed at different groups, with an emphasis in increasing our focus on more diverse groups, more on senior faculty and on teaching faculty who are not currently as represented, and will make deliberate efforts to invite PDW submissions with this focus (for instance, please also see our section above in Enhancing Rigor where we discuss special tracks in PDWs for teaching). In addition, we could consider having shorter consortia (perhaps a half day) and have a senior faculty consortium, or other subgroups that could benefit from connecting.

In addition, the majority of doctoral students and faculty prefer to have the job offers made primarily between October through February (with the most in November/December); as a division it is important that we help our members with this. Perhaps we could encourage AOM to incorporate this preference into

policies for schools participating in the AOM placement service. Schools who violate the policy could be prohibited from participating in the AOM placement service and from posting jobs on the AOM list serves. We may also want to begin an education campaign to help departments understand that this earlier job market is leading doctoral students to spend longer in their programs as they don't have the Fall to complete dissertations (not to mention longer and longer lead times for publications under review), which then not only costs doctoral students lost time and income by extending their time in doctoral programs, but is more expensive for many programs who pay to keep the doctoral students for the extra time in the program. All efforts in this direction would be accomplished in cooperation with other division and AOM as a whole.

<u>Make a more concerted effort to promote the connection between research and practice</u>, and the influence of OB scholarship on people who work in organizations, and on policy-makers. Perhaps this connection will be easier to do in the form of webinars during the year. Last year's Spotlight Plenary regarding inclusion did a great job integrating practitioners and academics, but it is a very difficult system to maintain outside of AOM. We could also try to help facilitate research opportunities between organizations and researchers It would be great to be able to better promote research that our members do, help create link a between our members and organizations interested in research - perhaps doing "pitch" sessions as a PDW for organizations interested in having research done in their companies; and perhaps look to partner with other divisions or our AOM journals who are also interested in these issues.

<u>Focus on the OB identity</u> . We care about organizations in the world and the people within them. We care about enhancing the "O" in OB, and we want to strengthen the collective identity of the OB division. Also, to make sure our division identity is clear we will review our domain statement, we might consider an OB Division tag line such as : The OB 3 Rs: Rigor, Relationships, and Relevance, and while resource intensive, perhaps we should consider sponsoring a midyear conference that is just based on OB (as compared to the many divisions involved at AOM).

Overarching Recommendations that Relate to Rigor/Relationships and Relevance

We have given many suggestions above to help enhance Rigor, Relationships, and Relevance in the OB Division, and those recommendations may be more or less useful to enact as the division moves forward. However, the following three recommendations influence all three of our priorities, and the first two, (1) improved use of technology and communications and (2) financial strategic planning, we see as particularly necessary to lay the foundations for many of the other recommendations. The third recommendation has been a consistent theme since the last strategic report, and if executed well could help across all three of the aims above.

Improve use of Communications & Technology

We suggest that one of our Organizational Behavior Division representatives spend his or her 3rd year strategic project time working with our CTO and technology committee, the OB Program team, and AOM to consistently and more creatively use technology to help support our goals of rigor, relationships and relevance. Our technology outreach in general is something we need to focus on more strongly. While members indicated in our survey that they are most interested in email and LinkedIn as communication mechanisms, we need to continue to have a greater presence on social media, the OB Division webpage and other ways to connect to anticipate member needs. Technology is also going to be critical in supporting the "between meeting" outreach we are interested in the form of webinars, podcasts, information repositories, micro-community and symposia connectors that we discussed earlier.

Focus on Strategic Financial Planning

While our financial situation has been good, over the past four years we have spent more than we brought in. This makes sense as we were instructed to spend down our surplus. However, we need to both psychologically and fiscally readjust as the surplus dwindles. Given the increasing costs of the AOM meeting, particularly related to catering, we will need to get more creative. We need to also be able to preserve our expanded midyear meeting - as this has allowed us to be much more strategic and innovative. However, as more people attend the mid-year meeting, including committee members from all over the world in support of our global mission, the midyear meeting has also become expensive and we will be discussing ways to deal with this. We will also need to work with AOM and the other divisions on creative solutions and to investigate whether the division allocation levels need to change. It is also critical that we receive greater support from AOM in timely and exact tracking of our expenses, so that we can more effectively track our costs. We have just formed an executive sub-committee to focus on the strategic financial issue as a whole.

Support Micro-Communities

There was a clear desire in the executive committee to focus on the creation of micro-communities – broadly defined – as a vehicle that could support rigor, relationships and/or relevance. As such, we suggest having it be the third-year strategic role of one of the OB representatives to head a micro-community committee to think of what practical and creative forms we can take to help support micro-communities and help them stay active between AOM meetings. One suggestion is to get information from the International Network for the Science of Team Science (INScitTS), a formalizing a system for the micro-communities based on INSciTS guidelines. INSciTS does require some structure, including regular meetings outside of the annual conference and a meeting at the annual conference plus an annual report of activities. Sunday at AOM could be a good time for these groups to meet, and the structure from INSciTS could be useful for us. In addition to staying in strong contact with the Making Connection Committee, the Global Committee and the Technology committee, the micro-community committee to be headed by the OB Division representative could help make sure the groups are operating effectively

CONCLUSION

This five-year strategic review, with its surveys, archival data gathering and strategic executive committee discussions, has been in process for over a year now, and has been of tremendous value in better understanding where we have been and where we are going as a division. There has been much progress on meeting the priorities described in the last review, and overall, our members are satisfied with the OB division across domains, and overall satisfaction has increased since the last review. However, we still have work to do as outlined in our new strategic priorities of Rigor, Relationships and Relevance. With our committed and talented executive committee, comprised of both elected and appointed members; our excellent current, and hopefully future, volunteers; and the interest and goodwill of our members, we look forward to even greater satisfaction across all of our diverse communities in our next review. We also want to very much thank our OB division members for their feedback provided through the five-year survey and in-situ survey, which were central to this report and our ability to plan going forward.

 END OF REPORT

APPENDIX A
Health and Governance Checklist

The purpose of this checklist is to monitor basic division/interest group health and governance. It is intended to stimulate conversation among the officers and prompt reflection. Copies of documents referenced in the checklist are **NOT** being requested. For each item please share an example that illustrates your answer or a quick idea for improvement, where applicable. Officers should expand on items calling for improvement in their report.

Bylaws and Domain	Yes	Yes, but needs improvement	No
1. The division/interest group's bylaws are up to date and periodically reviewed and revised, if necessary.		X	

Example/quick idea:
To help with our governance changes, the division bylaws were updated in 2015 to move from 3 to 6 OB Division Representatives. For this review, members of the executive committee have reviewed our bylaws and found that they are generally up to date and relevant.

There are some small issues to take care of that came out of reviewing the bylaws. For example, while newly appointed officers' terms begin the Monday after the end of the AOM meeting, we would like all officers and appointed officers to unofficially attend the Exec Committee Meeting on Sunday at AOM. This will allow newly appointed officers to be better informed moving forward.

There are also some details in the by-laws that need to be updated. For example, we offer more awards than are listed in the by-laws. Our executive committee will begin work on these changes now. Last, we will be adding a required review of the division by-laws as part of the onboarding process of any executive committee members, and we will review them more frequently than just during the five-year annual review.

	Yes	Yes, but needs improvement	No
2. The division/interest group's domain statement is current and activities reflect its full scope.	X		

Example/quick idea:
The group's domain statement is up to date. However, there is an interest in emphasizing the importance of the "O" in organizational behavior, underscoring that OB research has direct relevance to and occurs within organizations. The executive committee will discuss in 2020 whether this should be more clearly articulated in the division's statement.

	Yes	Yes, but needs improvement	No
3. The division/interest group conforms to all official Academy policies as detailed in the Division and Interest Group Chair's Guidebook.		X	

Example/quick idea:
We definitely conform to all official AOM policies and access many of the documents in the Division and Interest Group Chair's Guidebook but need to look at them more regularly and proactively, as

compared to being sent them from AOM when things need to happen. Also, we need to be more proactive to make sure that our website is updated with current information, meeting minutes, etc.… which is part of our recommendations for more proactive technology communication.

Membership	**Yes**	**Yes, but needs improvement**	**No**
4. Membership statistics are periodically reviewed to understand trends (growth, decline) and who the division/interest group is serving (students, academics, practitioners, emeritus, international, etc.)	X		

Example/quick idea:
We review our membership statistics carefully and annually as part of our executive meeting at AOM.

	Yes	**Yes, but needs improvement**	**No**
5. The division/interest group delivers programs/services for all member constituencies.	X		

Example/quick idea:
Yes – we actively reach out to all member constituencies in many ways. For example, in our call for PDW submissions, and in selecting PDWs for the program, we actively encourage a balanced range of research, teaching, and career-related development opportunities. Our focus here is also on actively speaking to the interests of students, new members and those who reside outside of North America. We further actively recruit the broad diversity of our membership to participate in our annual professional development programs (i.e., doctoral and junior faculty consortia). However, increasing community and outreach is always something we are trying to do better given how large of a division we are. Going forward, we intend to address even more strongly the specific needs of more senior faculty, teaching faculty, LGBT and other faculty who are in the demographic minority and practitioners.

Finance	**Yes**	**Yes, but needs improvement**	**No**
6. At least one person has responsibility for reviewing and understanding the division/interest group's financial reports.	X		

Example/quick idea:
Yes, our division has a formal office of Treasurer. This appointed executive committee member is responsible for the financial aspects of the division. For example, the treasurer is in charge of accounts payable and receivable for the division, processing reimbursements, clarifying budget opportunities and threats for the committee, and otherwise managing the finances for the division. We also have a dedicated executive committee member in charge of event planning and catering payment associated with the annual meeting and the mid-year executive committee meeting. We have two people involved as these are considerable duties because our division is so large, and it would be an excessive load on just one person. These two committee members have separate duties, but coordinate with one another as needed.

	Yes	**Yes, but needs improvement**	**No**
7. The division/interest group follows the Academy's financial policies, and routinely	X		

operates in the black.

Example/quick idea:
The treasurer routinely communicates with Randye Murnane at AOM on finance needs. We have run a surplus of funds in the division the last 20 years, which is generally a good thing financially. But in years past we ran up against the now rescinded 'carry forward rule,' which penalized divisions for carrying too much funds forward and not spending on the membership. We thus received clear guidance from AOM that we needed to not carry as much extra funds, and spend more on the membership. We agreed with the spirit of the rule and, based on AOM guidance and the needs of the division, undertook the initiative to update the structure of the executive committee.

We have now added more representative-at-large positions, more assigned positions such as the chief operations officer, and expanded our mid-year meeting to better plan for this large division. Of course, these changes have increased our expenses the last few years. We continue to operate in the black, but our year-end cash amounts have gone down from a high of $79,628 in 2014 to $18,773 in 2019. We have formed a finance committee to carefully and thoughtfully reduce expenses to make up for these increases, and create a sustainable path forward.

8. If feasible, the division encourages outside sponsorship to extend its resources.	X		

Example/quick idea:
We brought in $19,060 in outside sponsorships in 2019, and $24,900 in 2018. These significant sponsorships help pay for numerous awards and specific events at the annual meetings. While some sponsorships have changed or expired over the last five years, we continue to add new ones when necessary and keep the current ones engaged.

Governance	**Yes**	**Yes, but needs improvement**	**No**
9. Periodic planning takes place to consider how the division/interest group might meet new challenges and opportunities.	X		

Example/quick idea:
We see strategic planning to meet new challenges and opportunities as a very important part of being on the OB executive board. We intentionally have our executive board meetings focus on strategic aspects of meeting new challenges and opportunities (along with the general operations of the division). Further, at both our annual and midyear meetings we build in specific times to discuss strategic initiatives and new ways of doing things across the various roles. Indeed, one of the outcomes of the 2014 review was to change the governance structure in the form of more OB Division Reps, and the use of volunteer appointed members in many roles (which also had the benefit of greater member outreach and expertise) to allow the board to spend more time strategizing. In the coming years, we will also incorporate a review of our strategic goals from this report and our progress toward these goals during our executive committee meetings.

10. There is a climate of mutual trust and respect among the officers.	X		

Example/quick idea:

The OB Executive Committee is a group that is generally characterized by a climate of mutual trust and respect. Committee members support one another, value one another's perspectives and enjoy working with each other. However, our committee does not take this climate for granted and recognizes that it must be intentionally enacted. Of particular note is an incident that occurred during this five-year review period that involved an alleged inappropriate behavior. The matter was resolved informally but with preventative processes moving forward with guidance from AOM Ombudsman. The way this incident was handled is indicative of our culture, in that when issues arise we deal with them head on, seriously, appropriately and respectfully.

11. The respective roles of officers and key volunteers are understood and some level of orientation/guidance takes place.	X

Example/quick idea:
As described above, we systematically onboard new officers and key volunteers. We have worked to make the orientation comprehensive through the development of thorough "On Boarding Documents" that are updated yearly and passed from one officer to the next. Also, we make sure that at AOM and/or the midyear meetings each prior participant in a role speaks to the incoming participant.

12. The division/interest group actively attempts to involve members in volunteer and leadership positions, including international members and other underrepresented populations.	X

Example/quick idea:
We have a very strong push to involve our members in volunteer and leadership positions. For example, part of our formal structural changes was to increase the number of OB Division Reps and to greatly expand the appointed part of the OB Division executive committee. We also allocated one of our Representatives to manage the engagement of our large pool of volunteers. As part of that role we have centralized volunteer recruitment and tracking of volunteering activity to more efficiently match volunteers to tasks. The committee is sensitive to including members of underrepresented populations and those who reside outside of North America in the committee, appointed roles, and volunteer roles. Of the current 14 elected officers, 10 are women, 4 are from underrepresented populations, and 4 are either not from North America by birth, or currently work for a university outside of North America. Our two upcoming nominees for the five-year track are both in universities outside of North America (London and New Zealand). With regard to how our membership feels, over 72% of our members are satisfied with the ability of interested members to become leaders in the division.

13. The current governance and committee structure serves the division/interest group well.	X

Example/quick idea:
Our governance and committee structure are effective, particularly as a result of our restructuring from the 2014 Five Year Review. Our roles and documentation of those roles in our "Onboarding Documents" are very clear. These documents are updated yearly and given to the next person in the role. This allows us to institutionalize knowledge, and allows us to learn from our errors. We have also created OB Division Representative tracks that allow the knowledge for each of the areas to be passed down even more efficiently. In addition, we have done a lot of work creating a sense of continuity in one of the most challenging parts of the OB Division--the program team. Because of our size, it is particularly important to have that knowledge institutionalized. As such, we have a 4-person program

team that consists of faculty volunteers and is headed by the Program Developer Director. All decisions are made in conjunction with the program and symposium chairs. The addition of the two OB Division Reps at large, and the increased use of appointed members and volunteers from the last five-year strategic review has been a boon to the division, leading to better coverage of issues, constituencies, and the ability to allow the Executive Board to also have more time to think strategically.

14. The division/interest group has a fair and open process for nominations and elections.	X	

Example/quick idea:
We follow the nomination and election bylaw process stringently. To be better prepared for nomination decisions, we have begun to send out all the nominations prior to the midyear meeting to give committee members ample time to assess candidates. The five-year survey indicates that our members are satisfied with the fairness and openness of our election and nomination process with 89% saying that they are satisfied that the OB Division has "fair and open elections."

Programs/Activities	Yes	Yes, but needs improvement	No
15. The officers periodically consider adopting new programs and modifying or discontinuing others. They know the strengths and weaknesses of their programs.	X		

Example/quick idea:
Executive Committee officers actively evaluate and modify our programs. We have structured discussions of the programs at both the midyear meeting and AOM meeting, and often at other times of the year on calls. Officers know the strengths and weaknesses of their program and discuss them often. For example, we have seriously considered halting our junior faculty doctoral consortium as it was not attracting enough people and consuming significant resources. We decided as a group that the consortium was important, but we made important changes to maximize its value-add. Specifically, we shortened the consortium, scheduled it to avoid competing with other high-value sessions, and expanded our recruitment process to meet our inclusion and community goals in a better way. In addition, we are regularly updating and reevaluating whether it is worth continuing. This is just one example of our continuous improvement processes and after-action reviews.

16. Scholarships, travel stipends, or other funding programs are transparent and open to all who are eligible.	X	

Example/quick idea:
We now offer a few student travel stipends in exchange for help from these students at the annual conference. We have a call that goes by email to the whole membership, and a process within the committee for selecting and managing the students. This is another of the new initiatives the division has introduced in the last five years to meet our AOM-encouraged goal to spend more on the membership.

17. The division/interest group has well publicized recognition programs (for service, scholarly contributions, etc.) and the criteria for	X	

awards are transparent.

Example/quick idea:
Our award nominations and criteria are sent out directly in email to our members, and are on our OB website. We have an OB Division Representative whose sole responsibility is managing the majority of our awards. The Outgoing OB Division Chair has responsibility for awards that span one's career (i.e., lifetime achievement, mentoring, and a new societal impact award). In the process of this review noticed that we have two awards that have not been given out for many years that should be removed from our websites. Further, there is variance in the detail with which each award criteria are described. We are fixing this now. Over 80% of our members indicated from the survey that they are satisfied that our awards process is fair.

18. The division/interest provides opportunities and services to members with different interests, including teaching, research and practice-based interests.	X

Example/quick idea:
One of the best places we provide services to members with different interests is in our professional development program. We do so through our consortia that serve doctoral students and junior faculty, as well as our many PDWs serving multiple constituencies. One of the things we plan on doing more of going forward is addressing the needs of more senior faculty, teaching faculty and other specific demographic groups.

19. Services to members extend beyond those provided at the annual meeting.	X

Example/quick idea:
This is a domain that we need improvement. We do offer services in the form of being part of conferences that our division sponsors (not monetarily), including internationally, and regionally. We also do outreach through our direct emails and the AOM Connect platform. However, this content is informational, not successfully interactive. Other than that, we do not have a set of structures to connect with members actively outside of the annual meeting. This is one of our goals that came out of this years' review – and we see doing it through better technology/social media, attempting to create micro-communities, and greater opportunity for member interaction during the year.

20. The division/interest group carries out regular communication with members (minimally including a newsletter and up-to-date website).	X

Example/quick idea:
We are in touch with our members monthly through direct emails giving information about past or upcoming events, awards, or deadlines. Our website is up to date and members' profiles have been updated on the new website, but we could do a better job keeping our website continuously updated. There have been volunteers assigned for the Social Media Committee Chair, and other volunteers for LinkedIn, Instagram, Facebook and YouTube, there is a centralized volunteer recruitment form for AOM -OB activities, and marketing slides for OB division members about our social media have been created. However, we could do better with more opportunities of interactive communication (assuming our members want it – which given that they prefer email, may not actually be the case). We do not have an OB division newsletter, but instead sending out regularly planned emails to all of our members.

21. The division/interest group actively works to build community (communities of practice, listservs, collaboration activities, social and special events) etc.	X

Example/quick idea:
The division works hard to enhance a sense of community among our members, but because of our size, it is challenging. We have listed this as a continuing priority, but as of now some of the things we do to build community include:
(1) OB Ambassador Program – ambassadors are volunteers who host division events, greet attendees, strike up conversations, and introduce attendees to one another.
(2) Welcome-A-Member Program – a program designed to connect new members with more senior members to ask questions and seek advice.
(3) Micro-community building events – the OB Research Roundtables, the OB Networking Social, and OB Cafes are all events in which members are grouped based on a shared topical interest.
(4) Social events – the OB Division Social, the annual OB Division Sunset Cruise, the OB Networking Social, and the Lifetime Achievement Award Coffee are all opportunities for members to get together to socialize and make connections.
(5) Off-program events – grassroots, member-organized and driven events such as OB Drinks, OB Eats, and OB Escapes provide even more opportunities for members to connect while empowering our membership to plan activities that interest them.
(6) Community building based on career stage – New to OB? Navigating the OB Division and AOM, Halfway There But Now What? Advice for Pre-Dissertation Doctoral Students, OB Doctoral Consortium, The Productivity Process: Research Tips and Strategies from Junior Faculty OB Jr. Faculty Workshop.
(7) The OB Spotlight Plenary– an annual plenary that brings members together to discuss a particular topic in a highly interactive format within AOM.

22. The division/interest group actively strives to improve the annual meeting program by periodically reviewing program statistics to monitor meeting trends.	X

Example/quick idea:
Improving our Annual Meeting program is an ongoing focus. We have improved our ability to execute the program in an accurate, timely and robust way through the creation of a volunteer appointed program team, with a Program Team Director, Associate Director, and two program specialists. Their dedication and knowledge are invaluable to the OB Exec committee paper and symposia chairs in giving them data about how to think strategically about the program and we have particularly robust program statistics that are reviewed during the entire season of program creation, as well as twice a year with the executive committee as a whole. This allows us data and time to think strategically about the program. We also actively and yearly assess our PDW programs, particularly the doctoral and jr. faculty consortia we run.

23. Collaboration exists with other division/interest groups in the Academy.	X

Example/quick idea:
We are in contact with our peers and strive to be cooperative in helping in the creation of the program with joint symposia, some cross-division PDW events, as well as help in any cross-division initiatives

or goals that arise. We are also interested in other divisions' best practices, and have been delighted to share our own best practices (such as the concept of having an appointed volunteer program team).

APPENDIX 1
OB Division: Mission & Domain Statements

Mission Statement: The Organizational Behavior Division of the Academy of Management exists to advance the development of scholars and scholarship within the content domain of organizational behavior. Scholarship occurs in the practice of both research and teaching. Through scholarship, we strive to positively influence management thought and practice.

Domain Statement: Organizational behavior is devoted to understanding individuals and groups within an organizational context. The field focuses on attributes, processes, behaviors, and outcomes within and between individual, interpersonal, group, and organizational levels of analysis. Major topics include:

- individual characteristics such as beliefs, values, personality, and demographic attributes, and individual processes such as learning, perception, motivation, emotions, and decision making
- interpersonal processes such as trust, justice, power/politics, social exchange, and networks
- group/team characteristics such as size, diversity, and cohesion, and group/team processes such as development, leadership, decision making, and cooperation and conflict
- organizational processes and practices such as leadership, goal setting, work design, feedback, rewards, communication, and socialization
- contextual influences on individuals and groups such as organizational and national culture, and organizational identity and climate
- and the influence of all of the above on individual, interpersonal, group, and organizational outcomes such as performance, creativity, attachment, citizenship behaviors, stress, absenteeism, turnover, deviance, and ethical behavior.

APPENDIX 2
Elected and Appointed Officers of the OB Division Executive Committee (2019-2020)

ELECTED OFFICERS:

Division Chair	Sigal Barsade
Incoming Division Chair	Daan Van Knippenberg
Program Chair	Ron Piccolo
Incoming Program Chair	Rebecca Bennett
Past Division Chair	Cristina Gibson
Representatives at Large	
Track A	
PDW Chair	Shimul Melwani
Awards Chair	Uta Bindl
Strategic Initiatives	Andrew Knight
Track B	
Co-Chair Doc Consortium	Celia Moore
Co-Chair Doc Consortium	Keith Leavitt
Strategic Initiatives	Ashleigh Rosette
Track C	
Co-Chair Jr Fac Consortium	Sharon Hill
Co-Chair Jr Fac Consortium	Denise Loyd
Strategic Initiatives	Laura Little
APPOINTED OFFICERS:	
Chief Operating Officer	Brad Kirkman
Communications Officer	Nataly Lorinkova
Event Planner	Laura Erskine
Program Developer Director	Alexandra Gerbasi
Program Developer Associate Director	Jessica Methot
Program Developer Specialists	Eean Crawford
Program Developer Specialists	Lance Frazier
Chief Technology Officer	Darren Bharanitharan
Digital Specialist	Carys Chan
Making Connections Committee	Beth Campbell
Global Committee	Alex Newman
Treasurer	Bret Bradley

APPENDIX 3
Demographic Breakouts for Division Satisfaction Questions

		Respondent Gender	
	Overall	Male (N ranges from 252-438)	Female (N ranges from 273-538
Sense of community within the division	2.9	**3.06**	**2.85**
Activities that address the division's domain	3.29	3.34	3.32
Welcoming of members from various demographic groups	3.2	**3.39**	**3.12**
Efforts to reach out to international members	3.03	**3.2**	**2.95**
Efforts to foster good relations and work collaboratively with other divisions/interest groups	3.12	**3.24**	**3.05**
Opportunities outside of the Annual Meeting to network/collaborate with peers	2.68	**2.84**	**2.59**
Encouragement from division leaders to form network communities for members like me	2.77	**2.99**	**2.64**
Opportunities for members like me to receive mentoring	2.78	**2.94**	**2.69**
Level of communication received from the division	3.42	3.48	3.42
Usefulness of website	3.16	**3.28**	**3.11**
Value of Connect@AOM Community Discussion	3.02	3.09	3.02
Responsiveness of division officers to member concerns	3.37	**3.51**	**3.32**
Ability of interested members to become leaders in the division	3.11	3.19	3.13
Opportunities to influence the division	2.93	**3.07**	**2.9**
Fair and open elections	3.78	**3.92**	**3.76**
Selection process for awards and recognition	3.35	**3.49**	**3.32**
Overall, satisfaction with the division	3.12	**3.39**	**3.27**

Note. All but the last question asked "Please rate your satisfaction with the following programs and services related to the OB division:"

Scale: 1 = Not Satisfied, 2 = Somewhat Satisfied, 3 = Satisfied, 4 = Very Satisfied, 5 = Extremely Satisfied

If numbers in a pair are bold that indicates that they are statistically significantly different at, at least, $p < .05$.

* N's of additional available categories, transgender (N=0), genderqueer (N=2), choose not to disclose (N=22) and additional gender category (N=2) were too small to report differences

** Also, had option for prefer not to say. N=58

APPENDIX 3, continued
Demographic Breakouts for Division Satisfaction Questions

	Overall	Membership Type	
		Academic (N ranges from 425-792)	Student (N ranges from 130-252)
Sense of community within the division	2.9	**2.83**	**3.05**
Activities that address the division's domain	3.29	**3.23**	**3.44**
Welcoming of members from various demographic groups	3.2	3.19	3.24
Efforts to reach out to international members	3.03	3.02	3.03
Efforts to foster good relations and work collaboratively with other divisions/interest groups	3.12	3.10	3.11
Opportunities outside of the Annual Meeting to network/collaborate with peers	2.68	2.65	2.74
Encouragement from division leaders to form network communities for members like me	2.77	**2.72**	**2.93**
Opportunities for members like me to receive mentoring	2.78	**2.72**	**2.91**
Level of communication received from the division	3.42	3.39	3.48
Usefulness of website	3.16	3.14	3.18
Value of Connect@AOM Community Discussion	3.02	**2.97**	**3.16**
Responsiveness of division officers to member concerns	3.37	3.33	3.50
Ability of interested members to become leaders in the division	3.11	**3.05**	**3.30**
Opportunities to influence the division	2.93	2.88	3.06
Fair and open elections	3.78	3.77	3.82
Selection process for awards and recognition	3.35	3.30	3.49
Overall, satisfaction with the division	3.12	3.24	3.32

Note. All but the last question asked "Please rate your satisfaction with the following programs and services related to the OB division:"

Scale: 1 = Not Satisfied, 2 = Somewhat Satisfied, 3 = Satisfied, 4 = Very Satisfied, 5 = Extremely Satisfied

If numbers in a pair are bold that indicates that they are statistically significantly different at, at least, $p<.05$.

* N's of additional available categories, transgender (N=0), genderqueer (N=2), choose not to disclose (N=22) and additional gender category (N=2) were too small to report differences

** Also, had option for prefer not to say. N=58

APPENDIX 3, continued
Demographic Breakouts for Division Satisfaction Questions

		Regional Location	
	Overall	Other (N ranges from 213-404)	North America (N ranges from 369-817)
Sense of community within the division	2.9	2.92	2.88
Activities that address the division's domain	3.29	3.24	3.31
Welcoming of members from various demographic groups	3.2	**3.04**	**3.29**
Efforts to reach out to international members	3.03	**2.66**	**3.31**
Efforts to foster good relations and work collaboratively with other divisions/interest groups	3.12	**2.98**	**3.19**
Opportunities outside of the Annual Meeting to network/collaborate with peers	2.68	2.6	2.72
Encouragement from division leaders to form network communities for members like me	2.77	**2.66**	**2.83**
Opportunities for members like me to receive mentoring	2.78	**2.65**	**2.84**
Level of communication received from the division	3.42	**3.32**	**3.46**
Usefulness of website	3.16	3.1	3.19
Value of Connect@AOM Community Discussion	3.02	3.04	3.01
Responsiveness of division officers to member concerns	3.37	3.3	3.42
Ability of interested members to become leaders in the division	3.11	**2.98**	**3.18**
Opportunities to influence the division	2.93	2.82	2.99
Fair and open elections	3.78	3.69	3.83
Selection process for awards and recognition	3.35	3.26	3.39
Overall, satisfaction with the division	3.12	**3.20**	**3.31**

Note. All but the last question asked "Please rate your satisfaction with the following programs and services related to the OB division:"

Scale: 1 = Not Satisfied, 2 = Somewhat Satisfied, 3 = Satisfied, 4 = Very Satisfied, 5 = Extremely Satisfied

If numbers in a pair are bold that indicates that they are statistically significantly different at, at least, p<.05.

* N's of additional available categories, transgender (N=0), genderqueer (N=2), choose not to disclose (N=22) and additional gender category (N=2) were too small to report differences

** Also, had option for prefer not to say. N=58

APPENDIX 3, continued
Demographic Breakouts for Division Satisfaction Questions

		Primary Division	
	Overall	OB (N ranges from 85-163)	Other (N ranges from 470-880)
Sense of community within the division	2.9	**2.95**	**2.61**
Activities that address the division's domain	3.29	3.29	3.25
Welcoming of members from various demographic groups	3.2	**3.25**	**2.96**
Efforts to reach out to international members	3.03	3.05	2.92
Efforts to foster good relations and work collaboratively with other divisions/interest groups	3.12	3.13	3.08
Opportunities outside of the Annual Meeting to network/collaborate with peers	2.68	2.70	2.53
Encouragement from division leaders to form network communities for members like me	2.77	2.80	2.61
Opportunities for members like me to receive mentoring	2.78	2.78	2.75
Level of communication received from the division	3.42	3.43	3.37
Usefulness of website	3.16	3.15	3.23
Value of Connect@AOM Community Discussion	3.02	3.02	3.04
Responsiveness of division officers to member concerns	3.37	3.41	3.17
Ability of interested members to become leaders in the division	3.11	3.13	3.03
Opportunities to influence the division	2.93	2.95	2.84
Fair and open elections	3.78	3.76	3.93
Selection process for awards and recognition	3.35	3.33	3.43
Overall, satisfaction with the division	3.12	**3.31**	**3.01**

Note. All but the last question asked "Please rate your satisfaction with the following programs and services related to the OB division:"

Scale: 1 = Not Satisfied, 2 = Somewhat Satisfied, 3 = Satisfied, 4 = Very Satisfied, 5 = Extremely Satisfied

If numbers in a pair are bold that indicates that they are statistically significantly different at, at least, $p<.05$.

* N's of additional available categories, transgender (N=0), genderqueer (N=2), choose not to disclose (N=22) and additional gender category (N=2) were too small to report differences

** Also, had option for prefer not to say. N=58

APPENDIX 3, continued
Demographic Breakouts for Division Satisfaction Questions

	Overall	Sexual Orientation	
		Straight (N ranges from 453-843)	LGB (N ranges from 30-58)
Sense of community within the division	2.9	**2.97**	**2.55**
Activities that address the division's domain	3.29	**3.37**	**3.00**
Welcoming of members from various demographic groups	3.2	**3.28**	**2.86**
Efforts to reach out to international members	3.03	**3.13**	**2.62**
Efforts to foster good relations and work collaboratively with other divisions/interest groups	3.12	3.17	2.89
Opportunities outside of the Annual Meeting to network/collaborate with peers	2.68	2.72	2.59
Encouragement from division leaders to form network communities for members like me	2.77	2.82	2.56
Opportunities for members like me to receive mentoring	2.78	2.82	2.68
Level of communication received from the division	3.42	**3.49**	**3.11**
Usefulness of website	3.16	**3.22**	**2.91**
Value of Connect@AOM Community Discussion	3.02	3.07	2.81
Responsiveness of division officers to member concerns	3.37	**3.46**	**2.97**
Ability of interested members to become leaders in the division	3.11	**3.21**	**2.84**
Opportunities to influence the division	2.93	3.04	2.50
Fair and open elections	3.78	3.86	3.59
Selection process for awards and recognition	3.35	3.43	3.11
Overall, satisfaction with the division	3.12	**3.35**	**3.03**

Note. All but the last question asked "Please rate your satisfaction with the following programs and services related to the OB division:"

Scale: 1 = Not Satisfied, 2 = Somewhat Satisfied, 3 = Satisfied, 4 = Very Satisfied, 5 = Extremely Satisfied

If numbers in a pair are bold that indicates that they are statistically significantly different at, at least, p<.05.

* N's of additional available categories, transgender (N=0), genderqueer (N=2), choose not to disclose (N=22) and additional gender category (N=2) were too small to report differences

** Also, had option for prefer not to say. N=58

APPENDIX 3, continued
Demographic Breakouts for Division Satisfaction Questions

	Overall	Race	
		White (N ranges from 215-435)	Non-white (N ranges from 107-172)
Sense of community within the division	2.9	**3.03**	**2.83**
Activities that address the division's domain	3.29	3.42	3.28
Welcoming of members from various demographic groups	3.2	**3.46**	**2.97**
Efforts to reach out to international members	3.03	**3.35**	**2.76**
Efforts to foster good relations and work collaboratively with other divisions/interest groups	3.12	**3.31**	**2.87**
Opportunities outside of the Annual Meeting to network/collaborate with peers	2.68	2.76	2.62
Encouragement from division leaders to form network communities for members like me	2.77	**2.90**	**2.68**
Opportunities for members like me to receive mentoring	2.78	2.89	2.69
Level of communication received from the division	3.42	3.50	3.44
Usefulness of website	3.16	3.23	3.24
Value of Connect@AOM Community Discussion	3.02	3.00	3.21
Responsiveness of division officers to member concerns	3.37	**3.56**	**3.20**
Ability of interested members to become leaders in the division	3.11	**3.28**	**2.98**
Opportunities to influence the division	2.93	**3.09**	**2.77**
Fair and open elections	3.78	3.94	3.79
Selection process for awards and recognition	3.35	3.50	3.35
Overall, satisfaction with the division	3.12	**3.42**	**3.26**

Note. All but the last question asked "Please rate your satisfaction with the following programs and services related to the OB division:"

Scale: 1 = Not Satisfied, 2 = Somewhat Satisfied, 3 = Satisfied, 4 = Very Satisfied, 5 = Extremely Satisfied

If numbers in a pair are bold that indicates that they are statistically significantly different at, at least, $p<.05$.

* N's of additional available categories, transgender (N=0), genderqueer (N=2), choose not to disclose (N=22) and additional gender category (N=2) were too small to report differences

** Also, had option for prefer not to say. N=58

APPENDIX 4
Demographic Breakouts for Program Participation Questions

		Respondent Gender	
	Overall	Male (N ranges from 252-438)	Female (N ranges from 273-538
Served as a reviewer	2.77	**2.88**	**2.71**
Presented at a professional development workshop	1.81	1.81	1.84
Attended a professional development workshop	2.69	2.64	2.76
Presented at a scholarly session (paper, symposium, etc)	2.73	2.75	2.73
Served as a chair or discussant for a scholarly session	1.74	1.74	1.75
Attended a regular conference session	3.18	3.12	3.23
Participated in other activities (social events, business meetings, etc)	2.95	2.93	2.98
Volunteered in some capacity (awards committee, social outing coordinator, etc.)	1.61	1.64	1.61

Note. Asked "During the past five years, how frequently, on average, did you engage in each of the following Annual Meeting activities for the OB division?"

Scale: 1 = Never, 2 = Once, 3 = A Few Times, 4 = Every Year

If numbers in a pair are bold that indicates that they are statistically significantly different at, at least, $p < .05$.

* N's of additional available categories, transgender (N=0), genderqueer (N=2), choose not to disclose (N=22) and additional gender category (N=2) were too small to report differences

** Also, had option for prefer not to say. N=58

APPENDIX 4, continued
Demographic Breakouts for Program Participation Questions

	Overall	Membership Type	
		Academic (N ranges from 916-944)	Student (N ranges from 279-290)
Served as a reviewer	2.77	**2.88**	**2.49**
Presented at a professional development workshop	1.81	**1.98**	**1.34**
Attended a professional development workshop	2.69	**2.65**	**2.87**
Presented at a scholarly session (paper, symposium, etc)	2.73	**2.88**	**2.39**
Served as a chair or discussant for a scholarly session	1.74	**1.92**	**1.3**
Attended a regular conference session	3.18	3.21	3.18
Participated in other activities (social events, business meetings, etc)	2.95	2.97	2.95
Volunteered in some capacity (awards committee, social outing coordinator, etc.)	1.61	**1.72**	**1.35**

Note. Asked "During the past five years, how frequently, on average, did you engage in each of the following Annual Meeting activities for the OB division?"

Scale: 1 = Never, 2 = Once, 3 = A Few Times, 4 = Every Year

If numbers in a pair are bold that indicates that they are statistically significantly different at, at least, $p<.05$.

* N's of additional available categories, transgender (N=0), genderqueer (N=2), choose not to disclose (N=22) and additional gender category (N=2) were too small to report differences

** Also, had option for prefer not to say. N=58

APPENDIX 4, continued
Demographic Breakouts for Program Participation Questions

	Overall	Regional Location	
		Other (N ranges from 247-441)	North America (N ranges from 850-875)
Served as a reviewer	2.77	**2.63**	**2.84**
Presented at a professional development workshop	1.81	**1.58**	**1.92**
Attended a professional development workshop	2.69	**2.56**	**2.75**
Presented at a scholarly session (paper, symposium, etc)	2.73	**2.58**	**2.8**
Served as a chair or discussant for a scholarly session	1.74	**1.6**	**1.82**
Attended a regular conference session	3.18	**3.02**	**3.26**
Participated in other activities (social events, business meetings, etc)	2.95	**2.7**	**3.07**
Volunteered in some capacity (awards committee, social outing coordinator, etc.)	1.61	**1.39**	**1.72**

Note. Asked "During the past five years, how frequently, on average, did you engage in each of the following Annual Meeting activities for the OB division?"

Scale: 1 = Never, 2 = Once, 3 = A Few Times, 4 = Every Year

If numbers in a pair are bold that indicates that they are statistically significantly different at, at least, $p<.05$.

* N's of additional available categories, transgender (N=0), genderqueer (N=2), choose not to disclose (N=22) and additional gender category (N=2) were too small to report differences

** Also, had option for prefer not to say. N=58

APPENDIX 4, continued
Demographic Breakouts for Program Participation Questions

		Primary Division	
	Overall	OB (N ranges from 1021-1053)	Other (N ranges from 218-223)
Served as a reviewer	2.77	2.79	2.65
Presented at a professional development workshop	1.81	1.8	1.84
Attended a professional development workshop	2.69	2.69	2.67
Presented at a scholarly session (paper, symposium, etc)	2.73	**2.76**	**2.58**
Served as a chair or discussant for a scholarly session	1.74	1.75	1.71
Attended a regular conference session	3.18	3.17	3.24
Participated in other activities (social events, business meetings, etc)	2.95	2.97	2.83
Volunteered in some capacity (awards committee, social outing coordinator, etc.)	1.61	1.63	1.52

Note. Asked "During the past five years, how frequently, on average, did you engage in each of the following Annual Meeting activities for the OB division?"

Scale: 1 = Never, 2 = Once, 3 = A Few Times, 4 = Every Year

If numbers in a pair are bold that indicates that they are statistically significantly different at, at least, $p<.05$.

* N's of additional available categories, transgender (N=0), genderqueer (N=2), choose not to disclose (N=22) and additional gender category (N=2) were too small to report differences

** Also, had option for prefer not to say. N=58

APPENDIX 4, continued
Demographic Breakouts for Program Participation Questions

		Sexual Orientation	
	Overall	Straight (N ranges from 908-926)	LGB (N ranges from 59-63)
Served as a reviewer	2.77	2.78	2.76
Presented at a professional development workshop	1.81	1.85	1.77
Attended a professional development workshop	2.69	2.74	2.55
Presented at a scholarly session (paper, symposium, etc)	2.73	2.77	2.56
Served as a chair or discussant for a scholarly session	1.74	1.76	1.55
Attended a regular conference session	3.18	3.20	3.24
Participated in other activities (social events, business meetings, etc)	2.95	2.97	3.13
Volunteered in some capacity (awards committee, social outing coordinator, etc.)	1.61	1.65	1.53

Note. Asked "During the past five years, how frequently, on average, did you engage in each of the following Annual Meeting activities for the OB division?"

Scale: 1 = Never, 2 = Once, 3 = A Few Times, 4 = Every Year

If numbers in a pair are bold that indicates that they are statistically significantly different at, at least, $p<.05$.

* N's of additional available categories, transgender (N=0), genderqueer (N=2), choose not to disclose (N=22) and additional gender category (N=2) were too small to report differences

** Also, had option for prefer not to say. N=58

APPENDIX 4, continued
Demographic Breakouts for Program Participation Questions

	Overall	Race	
		White (N ranges from 461-471)	Non-white (N ranges from 176-182)
Served as a reviewer	2.77	2.77	2.65
Presented at a professional development workshop	1.81	**1.91**	**1.65**
Attended a professional development workshop	2.69	2.68	2.74
Presented at a scholarly session (paper, symposium, etc)	2.73	2.80	2.6
Served as a chair or discussant for a scholarly session	1.74	**1.83**	**1.55**
Attended a regular conference session	3.18	3.22	3.12
Participated in other activities (social events, business meetings, etc)	2.95	**3.03**	**2.81**
Volunteered in some capacity (awards committee, social outing coordinator, etc.)	1.61	1.70	1.58

Note. Asked "During the past five years, how frequently, on average, did you engage in each of the following Annual Meeting activities for the OB division?"

Scale: 1 = Never, 2 = Once, 3 = A Few Times, 4 = Every Year

If numbers in a pair are bold that indicates that they are statistically significantly different at, at least, $p<.05$.

* N's of additional available categories, transgender (N=0), genderqueer (N=2), choose not to disclose (N=22) and additional gender category (N=2) were too small to report differences

** Also, had option for prefer not to say. N=58

APPENDIX 5
Demographic Breakouts for Program Satisfaction Questions

		Gender	
	Overall	Male (N ranges from 275-432)	Female (N ranges from 339-554)
Professional Development Workshops (PDWs)	3.82	3.86	3.86
Traditional paper sessions	3.17	3.18	3.19
Symposia	3.62	3.63	3.66
Plenaries	3.39	**3.35**	**3.51**
Social and networking opportunities	3.39	3.48	3.39
Overall access to participation on the program	3.54	**3.67**	**3.51**

Note. Asked, "Please rate your level of satisfaction with the following features of the OB division's Annual Meeting program"

Scale: 1 = Not Satisfied, 2 = Somewhat Satisfied, 3 = Satisfied, 4 = Very Satisfied, 5 = Extremely Satisfied

If numbers in a pair are bold that indicates that they are statistically significantly different at, at least, $p < .05$.

* N's of additional available categories, transgender (N=0), genderqueer (N=2), choose not to disclose (N=22) and additional gender category (N=2) were too small to report differences

** Also, had option for prefer not to say. N=58

APPENDIX 5, continued
Demographic Breakouts for Program Satisfaction Questions

| | | Membership Type | |
| | | Academic (N ranges | Student (N ranges |
	Overall	from 867-874)	from 302-310)
Professional Development Workshops (PDWs)	3.82	**3.78**	**3.91**
Traditional paper sessions	3.17	3.15	3.20
Symposia	3.62	3.61	3.60
Plenaries	3.39	3.37	3.43
Social and networking opportunities	3.39	3.36	3.46
Overall access to participation on the program	3.54	3.52	3.58

Note. Asked, "Please rate your level of satisfaction with the following features of the OB division's Annual Meeting program"

Scale: 1 = Not Satisfied, 2 = Somewhat Satisfied, 3 = Satisfied, 4 = Very Satisfied, 5 = Extremely Satisfied

If numbers in a pair are bold that indicates that they are statistically significantly different at, at least, $p<.05$.

* N's of additional available categories, transgender (N=0), genderqueer (N=2), choose not to disclose (N=22) and additional gender category (N=2) were too small to report differences

** Also, had option for prefer not to say. N=58

APPENDIX 5, continued
Demographic Breakouts for Program Satisfaction Questions

		Regional Location	
	Overall	Other (N ranges from 247-393)	North America (N ranges from 407-806)
Professional Development Workshops (PDWs)	3.82	**3.68**	**3.89**
Traditional paper sessions	3.17	3.15	3.18
Symposia	3.62	**3.53**	**3.66**
Plenaries	3.39	3.37	3.41
Social and networking opportunities	3.39	**3.28**	**3.44**
Overall access to participation on the program	3.54	**3.42**	**3.6**

Note. Asked, "Please rate your level of satisfaction with the following features of the OB division's Annual Meeting program"

Scale: 1 = Not Satisfied, 2 = Somewhat Satisfied, 3 = Satisfied, 4 = Very Satisfied, 5 = Extremely Satisfied

If numbers in a pair are bold that indicates that they are statistically significantly different at, at least, $p<.05$.

* N's of additional available categories, transgender (N=0), genderqueer (N=2), choose not to disclose (N=22) and additional gender category (N=2) were too small to report differences

** Also, had option for prefer not to say. N=58

APPENDIX 5, continued
Demographic Breakouts for Program Satisfaction Questions

| | | Primary Division | |
	Overall	OB (N ranges from 602-973)	Other (N ranges from 116-197
Professional Development Workshops (PDWs)	3.82	**3.92**	**3.73**
Traditional paper sessions	3.17	3.16	3.18
Symposia	3.62	3.66	3.58
Plenaries	3.39	3.42	3.37
Social and networking opportunities	3.39	**3.47**	**3.32**
Overall access to participation on the program	3.54	**3.65**	**3.44**

Note. Asked, "Please rate your level of satisfaction with the following features of the OB division's Annual Meeting program"

Scale: 1 = Not Satisfied, 2 = Somewhat Satisfied, 3 = Satisfied, 4 = Very Satisfied, 5 = Extremely Satisfied

If numbers in a pair are bold that indicates that they are statistically significantly different at, at least, $p<.05$.

* N's of additional available categories, transgender (N=0), genderqueer (N=2), choose not to disclose (N=22) and additional gender category (N=2) were too small to report differences

** Also, had option for prefer not to say. N=58

APPENDIX 5, continued
Demographic Breakouts for Program Satisfaction Questions

| | | Sexual Orientation | |
	Overall	Straight (N ranges from 518-848)	LGB (N ranges from 52-62)
Professional Development Workshops (PDWs)	3.82	**3.90**	**3.42**
Traditional paper sessions	3.17	3.19	3.16
Symposia	3.62	3.69	3.47
Plenaries	3.39	**3.49**	**3.18**
Social and networking opportunities	3.39	3.47	3.35
Overall access to participation on the program	3.54	3.63	3.38

Note. Asked, "Please rate your level of satisfaction with the following features of the OB division's Annual Meeting program"

Scale: 1 = Not Satisfied, 2 = Somewhat Satisfied, 3 = Satisfied, 4 = Very Satisfied, 5 = Extremely Satisfied

If numbers in a pair are bold that indicates that they are statistically significantly different at, at least, $p < .05$.

* N's of additional available categories, transgender (N=0), genderqueer (N=2), choose not to disclose (N=22) and additional gender category (N=2) were too small to report differences

** Also, had option for prefer not to say. N=58

APPENDIX 5, continued
Demographic Breakouts for Program Satisfaction Questions

	Overall	Race	
		White (N ranges from 261-435)	Non-white (N ranges from 107-165)
Professional Development Workshops (PDWs)	3.82	3.95	3.93
Traditional paper sessions	3.17	3.15	3.29
Symposia	3.62	3.71	3.57
Plenaries	3.39	3.48	3.43
Social and networking opportunities	3.39	**3.56**	**3.35**
Overall access to participation on the program	3.54	**3.69**	**3.50**

Note. Asked, "Please rate your level of satisfaction with the following features of the OB division's Annual Meeting program"

Scale: 1 = Not Satisfied, 2 = Somewhat Satisfied, 3 = Satisfied, 4 = Very Satisfied, 5 = Extremely Satisfied

If numbers in a pair are bold that indicates that they are statistically significantly different at, at least, $p<.05$.

* N's of additional available categories, transgender (N=0), genderqueer (N=2), choose not to disclose (N=22) and additional gender category (N=2) were too small to report differences

** Also, had option for prefer not to say. N=58

APPENDIX 6
Summary of Free Response Answers within the OB Division's 5-Year Survey (2019)

Several questions on the 5-Year Survey included space for respondents to enter free-response text. When possible, the Division categorized this free-response text. This Appendix summarizes the categorized information for the following questions on the survey: #8, #9, #18, #31, #32, #33, #34, #35a-e, #36, #38, #39, #40, #41, #43, #47. The bracketed numbers indicate the category within the question, and the numbers after the colon indicate the count in each coding number. In this document the coding numbers are not listed numerically, but rather according to how many people were in each category from most to least.

8. Do you consider the OB division to be your primary division/interest group?
9. Please comment on your answer to the previous question, if desired.
(1) HR: 203,
(5) GDO: 96,
(2) MOC: 88,
(11) Conflict Management: 66,
(10) Research Methods: 36,
(6) OMT: 35,
(13) Careers: 20,
(4) Entrepreneurship: 19,
(7) SIM: 16,
(8) Management Consulting: 16,
(12) Strategy: 16,
(3) MED: 14,
(9) OCIS: 14,
(18) Organization Development and Change: 13,
(20) Diversity: 10
(14) TIM: 8,
(15) Education: 8,
(16) Supply Chain Management: 4,
(17) HCM: 4,
(19) International Management: 4

18. If you did not serve as a reviewer for the OB division last year, why was this the case?
(4) Too busy: 19,
(7) Reviewed for other divisions: 19,
(1) Did not attend the conference/on leave: 12,
(5) Recently joined: 11,
(6) Don't like review process: 5,
(8) Wasn't invited/wasn't sent anything: 5,
(2) Would not be helpful/not qualified: 4,
(10) Only review when submit something: 4
(9) Didn't want to: 3,
(3) Do not want to support AOM: 1

31. Some OB programs begin recruiting assistant professors in July-October which influences the OB assistant professor job market as a whole. To what degree have you (or if you are faculty, your department) <u>experienced concerns/challenges</u> over the past few years as a result of this early start in the OB assistant professor job market? à Please describe why
(4) Time/scheduling pressure: 106,

(7) Uncoordinated timing between schools/exploding offers: 76,
(6) Unrealistic for students: 44,
(1) Not too early/No issues: 33,
(8) Different in intl. job market: 26,
(3) Financial issues: 23,
(2) No experience: 9,
(9) Doesn't allow for proper interview process: 8,
(5) Other departments have better practices: 6,
(10) Organizational issues: 3

32. Some OB programs begin recruiting assistant professors in July-October which influences the OB assistant professor job market as a whole. To what degree have you (or if you are faculty, your department) experienced benefits/advantages over the past few years as a result of this early start in the OB assistant professor job market? à Please describe why
(8) Beneficial to meet with hiring committees (informally at AOM): 25,
(9) Nice to have early job security from candidate's POV: 24
(3) Get the hiring process done faster and more time for research: 24,
(1) Attract good candidates sooner: 22,
(2) No benefits from the hiring faculty's POV: 11,
(7) First-mover advantage: 9,
(4) More room for candidates not from the top schools (round 2 choices): 8,
(6) Too early for new grads: 8,
(5) Cost-effective: 2

33. In an ideal world, if you were able to "restart" norms about the timing of the assistant professor job market for all OB departments, when would be the best month for you to give/receive an assistant professor offer? à Please describe why.
(4) November/December: 51,
(1) September/October: 22,
(6) Different internationally: 20,
(2) January/February: 9,
(3) February/March: 8,
(5) Recruit throughout the year: 1,
(7) Any time in Fall Semester: 1,
(8) March/April: 1

34. From a fairness perspective, what is the minimum amount of time you think assistant professor job candidates should have between the time they receive an offer and are required to let the department making the offer know that they are accepting or rejecting the offer?
(6) Few weeks/a month: 25,
(1) 2 weeks: 24,
(9) There shouldn't be a limit/until they have all their offers: 24,
(5) Exploding offers are problematic: 22,
(12) Time cannot be too excessive: 19,
(7) Process should be more standardized: 18,
(10) 1-2 weeks: 17,
(8) Need more time when have family/personal factors: 16,
(11) Unspecified amount of time implied that longer is better: 12,
(2) Depends on how spread out the market is: 8,
(4) Can ask for more time: 7,

(13): More than 1 month: 4
(3) Few days: 2

35a. The OB division needs greater focus on real-world problems and practitioner issues.
(5) True, the gap is large: 33,
(1) Too specific/focused on theory: 11,
(4) More collaboration between practitioners and academics: 11,
(9) Other divisions are better suited for this: 9
(6) We are academics and should focus on theory: 8,
(2) Current focus is fine: 7,
(3) Need a balance between science and practice: 6,
(7) More focus on social impact issues/how the work adds value to society: 3,
(8) Quality of research should be improved, not focus: 2

35b. The OB division addresses the needs of its international members.
(7) Not qualified to answer this: 15,
(1) Yes more effort needs to be made: 12,
(5) US-centric: 10,
(8) There is inclusion: 7
(3) AOM is predominantly held in the US which can be hard for international members: 6,
(4) No the division favors international members: 3,
(6) Not enough international representation: 3,
(2) Need a balance: 1

35c. I find the OB division's website a useful source of information about the division.
(1) Didn't visit the website: 25,
(3) Doesn't use often: 11,
(2) Didn't know about it: 6,
(5) Information is outdated and lacks diversity: 6,
(4) Website is not user-friendly: 5,
(6) Uses and likes website: 2

35d. I believe the size of our division is a source of strength.
(3) It's too big that it has lost its sense of community: 18,
(4) More diversity and resources: 15,
(2) It's too big and people get lost in it: 14,
(6) I prefer another division because it's smaller: 10,
(1) It's too big: 9,
(5) Both a strength and a weakness: 7,
(7) Size as strength: 7

35e. I believe the size of our division is a source of weakness.
(1) Harder to connect/network and foster community: 45,
(3) Both a strength and a weakness: 14,
(7) Smaller divisions/subdivisions are better: 9,
(2) More competitive for papers and leadership roles: 8,
(5) Crowded and overwhelming: 8,
(6) Strength in numbers: 6,
(8) Yes: 6,
(4) No: 3,

(9) Easy to get lost/intimidating: 2

36. Do you agree with the following statement: "It seems that other divisions/interest groups have more to offer their members."
(2) Smaller divisions are closer/conducive to networking: 80,
(4) OB is too large/impersonal and exclusive: 47,
(5) Smaller divisions are more focused: 21,
(8) Other divisions offer more development/resources: 21
(1) Smaller divisions have more ways to be involved: 19,
(7) Smaller divisions are more welcoming: 14,
(3) Don't know: 11,
(6) OB has more breadth/power: 10

38. What do you like best about membership in the OB division?
(6) Information (opportunities, resources, listserv): 73,
(2) Access to quality research: 58,
(4) Networking/Connections: 53,
(8) It's my primary field: 39,
(12) The people: 38
(5) Diversity of topics: 38,
(1) Community: 25,
(11) PDWs: 23,
(9) Learning opportunity: 17,
(3) AOM sessions: 15,
(7) Constant communication: 9,
(10) Quality of the sessions: 8

39. If there is one thing you would most like to improve regarding the OB division, what would it be?
(4) More intimate events/smaller divisions: 90,
(1) Ability to make connections: 52,
(3) International awareness: 49,
(14) Changing structure of conference: 46,
(10) Improve communication/collaboration: 32,
(8) Nothing/not sure: 30,
(2) More inclusive: 27,
(11) More opportunities for involvement: 26,
(6) More support/mentoring: 24,
(12) Quality of reviewers/review process: 23,
(15) Elitist culture: 23
(13) Diversity/improvement of topics: 21,
(7) More social activities: 15,
(9) Transparency in leadership & award selection: 11,
(5) Hold conference outside the US: 8

40. What does the OB division need to do to best position itself for the future?
(1) Close the science-practitioner gap: 38,
(9) More global: 31,
(8) Focus on real world/organizational problems: 23,
(11) Maintain community & identity/deepen connections: 21
(2) Diversity & inclusion: 18,

(4) More member engagement: 16,
(5) Foster sub-groups: 15,
(3) Enhance research quality: 13,
(7) Partner with other groups: 10,
(6) Open science: 5,
(10) Digital communication (e.g. about the future): 5

41. What issues should occupy the OB division's time over the next 5 years?
(4) Research/Publications: 45,
(11) Diversity/Inclusion: 26,
(2) International Community: 25,
(12): Education/mentoring: 25,
(8) Real World Issues: 22,
(6) Social connectedness: 19,
(3) AI/Tech: 16,
(10) Focus on future: 9,
(7) Attention to individual: 8,
(9) Reorganization of conference: 8,
(1) Sustainability/Climate change: 5,
(5) Reducing elitism: 3,
(14) Corporate social responsibility: 3,
(15) Broader audience reach: 2,
(16) Generational differences: 2
(13) Sexual harassment: 1

43. What suggestions do you have for how the OB division might improve its use of technology and social media to improve more value to its members?
(8) Increase content on SM platforms (Twitter + LinkedIn mentioned most, suggest creating IG account): 21,
(5) Newsletter/Listserv Communication (suggests reorganization, option to opt out of certain comm.): 15,
(9) Virtual meetings/sessions: 8,
(4) OB division app: 6,
(6) Improve website: 6,
(7) TED-like talks/webinars/podcasts: 5,
(10) Groups on SM platforms: 5,
(1) AI/Machine Learning: 3,
(3) Slack/Additional Comm. Platform: 3,
(12) Feature work/research on SM platforms: 3
(2) Tech-focused sessions at conferences: 2,
(11) Translation into other languages: 1

47. Race
(9) White/Caucasian: 479,
(3) Asian: 74,
(6) Black: 28,
(7) European: 25,
(13) South Asian/Indian: 25,
(14) Latin: 17,

(2) African American: 16,
(8) Two or more races: 10,
(1) African: 8,
(11) Hispanic: 8,
(4) Asian American: 7,
(5) Anglo-Saxon/British: 7,
(12) Human: 6,
(17): Middle Eastern: 3
(10) Not disclosed: 2,
(15) Australia/Pacific Islander: 2,
(16) Native American: 2
(18) Chinese:

APPENDIX 7
Financial Summary for the OB Division

Year	Balance Forward	Allocation	Revenues	***Total Operating Account	Expenses	Year End
2019	43,932	74,097	28,470	146,499	133,863	12,636+
2018	69,924	75,164	19,060	164,148	120,216	43,932
2017	70,652	71,494	24,900	167,539	97,615	69,924
2016	87,750	69,305	17,650	175,189	104,537	70,652
2015	79,628	69,305	14,466	187,581	99,831	87,750

***No more separate endowment account. That amount is now in the operating account

+Awaiting a 10k sponsorship check used for spending in 2019 – so this would be more accurately represented as $22,636.