

**FIVE-YEAR (2016-2020) DIVISION REVIEW REPORT  
STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT DIVISION  
ACADEMY of MANAGEMENT (AoM)**

**February 10, 2021**

**Submitted to the Division and Interest Group Relations (DIGR) Committee,  
AoM by:**

**STR Division Review Committee**

Ram Ranganathan, Executive Committee Member  
Metin Sengul, Executive Committee Member  
Timothy B Folta, STR Division Chair

**In collaboration with**

Samina Karim, Past Chair  
Heather Berry, Chair Elect  
Michael Leiblein, Program Chair  
Louise Mors, Assistant Program Chair  
Michael Holmes, Secretary  
Paul Drnevich, Treasurer

*Contact Information:*

Timothy B. Folta  
Management Department  
University of Connecticut  
2100 Hillside Road, Room 341  
Storrs, CT. 06269-1041  
+1 (860) 486-3734  
[timothy.folta@uconn.edu](mailto:timothy.folta@uconn.edu)

*The STR Review Team would like to thank Michael McShane for invaluable support in data collection and reporting.*

## INTRODUCTION

This document reports the results of the Strategic Management (STR) division's 5-year review for the 2016-2020 period. It includes a review of the division's accomplishments, a list of potential priorities for the future, an assessment of the division's metrics, and results from a survey of our current members.

## DIVISION DOMAIN STATEMENT

The division encourages and supports the development and dissemination of knowledge relevant to general managers and those who study, shape, or influence the strategy of organizations, as well as effective teaching of these issues. Division scholars seek to understand and predict when and why some firms perform better than others over time. The division covers several topics associated with strategic decision-making processes, their antecedents/context, and their consequences. Examples of the first subject include behavioral strategy; boundaries of the firm; corporate governance; corporate strategy; economics of strategy; non-market strategies; innovation and strategic renewal; strategic formulation, implementation and planning; and strategic processes. Examples of the second subject include alliances, networks, M&A and other inter- or intra-organizational relationships when they have relevant implications for strategic decisions; business models; competitive and cooperative interactions; industry dynamics; internal resources and capabilities; strategic management of critical inputs; and strategic leadership and upper echelons. Examples of the third subject include firm performance and firm/competitive heterogeneity. The division is also interested in the effect of government policy on any of these areas or phenomena. The common level of analysis is the organization. To the extent that they are relevant to the strategic decision-making process, the levels of analysis can also include (among others) units, groups, teams, or individuals within the organization, organizational ecosystems, product markets, factor markets, geographic units, and industries, as well as combinations of these.

## DIVISION PRIORITIES OVER THE LAST 5 YEARS

We begin with a brief summary of the key priorities of the division over the last five years, including emergent priorities tied to Covid-19.

- **Refined Domain Statement.** We altered our Domain statement to better reflect the nature of strategic management and the areas under study. (see above).
- **Revised Division Name.** We altered our division name from BPS to STR in August 2018, as reflected in the division bylaws (see Appendix A).
- **Improved Emphasis on Diversity and Inclusion in Consortia Guidelines.** We revised our guidelines for selecting consortia co-chairs and panelists (see Appendix B).
- **Addition of Membership Engagement Committee.** The committee was established to help raise membership, enthusiasm, and a sense of identity for division members (see Appendix C).

- **Award Changes.**
  - In 2016 we instituted a Distinguished Scholar Award to be disseminated for the first time in 2018. It went unawarded because the recipient was not able to attend the meeting. In 2020, we revised the award to the Distinguished Scholarship Award (See Appendix D), with two initial awardees.
  - In 2020 we instituted conference paper awards for each of the eight research tracks.
  - We instituted conference paper awards for each of the eight research tracks.
  - In 2020, we revised our Award Committee policy to (a) reflect improvements in handling of conflicts of interest among committee members and (b) increase the number of members from six to ten (See Appendix E).
- **Improved Outreach to Regions Traditionally Underrepresented.** At the 2018 mid-Winter Executive Committee Meeting, it was announced that there would be increased emphasis on the division's global outreach.
  - The initial steps in this plan involved sending STR representatives to conferences and workshops held in developing regions. Consequently, officers attended (a) the Strategic Management in Latin America conference in Sao Paulo (2019), the Africa Academy of Management's Faculty Development Workshop in Cairo (2019) and its Doctoral and New Faculty Consortia in Lagos (2020). Our involvement included giving talks about conducting research and publishing, as well as mentoring specific scholars to help them develop their working papers.
  - In 2020, the division received a grant from AOM's Strategic Project Fund in 2020, which enabled us to pursue our first regional paper development workshop in Santiago Chile. Most of the targeted individuals are (a) not current members of AOM, (b) lack the resources to travel to the annual conference, or (c) are underrepresented on the program or divisional activities for other reasons. One key aim was to increase membership. While the April 2020 workshop was postponed because of Covid-19, we held a virtual version in January 2021 with around twenty-four participants.
  - Other virtual workshops are planned in 2021 in Turkey, Australia, and Korea. We have 1-2 Global Representatives "on the ground" at these workshops.
- **Improved Representation in Academy Journals.** We contacted AoM officers with the goal of having fair representation and review process for the full breadth of STR scholarship. They reached out to journal editors and AMJ continued discussions with us and updated keywords based on our suggestions. Also, the new AMD editors asked STR for suggestions for Associate Editors and Editorial Review Board members. We hope to start conversations with other AoM journals.
- **Emergent Priorities Tied to Covid-19.** Covid-19 ushered in all sorts of challenges for members, and we did our best to be responsive to their intellectual, social, and psychological needs. We launched several "STRonger

Together” initiatives between March – July 2020 to keep the STR community connected and engaged.

- STRonger Together initiative to build online presence for outreach
  - Completed new STR website
  - Launched STR YouTube channel
  - Launched STR Instagram channel
  - Launched STR Twitter account
- STRonger Together Initiatives for Intellectual Growth –
  - 3 Research Symposia (also available on YouTube\_
  - 24 Meet the Scholar Interviews with top scholars in the field (also available on YouTube)
  - PhD Workshops – 67 PhD students received feedback on research from 30 established faculty
  - 163 Coffee Wish Conversations – 84 junior scholars with 50 senior scholars.
  - 7 Virtual PDWs
- STRonger Together Initiatives to Improve Social Engagement
  - 3 Café PhD Conversations
  - 2 Café Regional Conversation
  - 10 Café Cultural Conversations – by language communities
- STRonger Together Initiatives Attending to Psychological Health
  - 6 Café Zoom Conversations on working from home strategies.
  - Pet pals photo booth of members being stronger together with their pets.
- **Building Initiatives Outside the Annual Conference.** Our Covid-19 response was received well, and it became apparent that we could serve members outside the annual conference. Consequently, beginning in August 2020 we instituted a series of initiatives aimed at continually serving the intellectual and social needs of members. Some of these were continued from the 2020 STRonger Together Initiatives noted above, some initiatives were dropped, and some new initiatives were created. We also altered the division structure to better attend to non-conference initiatives.
  - STRonger Together Initiatives aimed at intellection growth
    - Meet the Scholar (also available via podcasts)
    - Research Symposia for each of the eight research tracks
    - Regional workshops in Chile, Turkey, Australia, and Korea; and officer participation at the African Academy of Management
  - Social Initiatives. Our Membership Engagement Committee has instituted the following virtual initiatives consistent with their mission to improve membership, enthusiasm, and a sense of identity for division members.
    - Exercise groups
    - Bar trivia
    - Cultural cafes for France, Turkey, Greece, Italy, Catalan, Hungary, Scandinavia
    - Writing retreats to help learn reviewing techniques, and be a more efficient writer.

## POSSIBLE STRATEGIC PRIORITIES OVER NEXT FIVE YEARS

This section details some possible strategic priorities for the division over the next five years. These have been generated based partly on the feedback from the membership survey, and partly based on officer sentiment about current or emergent opportunities. It should be obvious how each of these might affect the creation and dissemination of strategic management knowledge, the primary emphasis of this division.

- **Increase emphasis on off-conference programing.** The Covid-19 pandemic was illuminating to our leadership that there is little reason to bound division efforts around conference activities. Indeed, survey results suggest most members want a balance of conference and off-conference division activities. Members desire regular intellectual stimulation to improve their research and teaching skills; regular social engagement to improve their networks and opportunities for mentoring; and increased opportunities to draw mental and psychological strength from colleagues. It is our firm belief that even when the pandemic ends, these opportunities will persist, and we strongly encourage future leadership to continue to find opportunities outside the annual conference. The sampling of initiatives detailed in the previous section are obviously just a start to this transformation.
- **Improve presence of strategic management scholarship in AoM journals.** There is strong member sentiment that AoM journals are not as inclusive of macro-strategy work as they should be, particularly given that STR constitutes the second largest division in the AoM. Discussions should continue with AOM and journal editors to improve the presence of macro-strategy scholars on editorial boards.
- **Improve focus on diversity and inclusion to enhance division governance.** We have made good strides in adding emphasis on diversity in our consortia guidelines, but more progress is needed. A few areas where the division might institute formal policies include:
  - Voting and nomination slates
  - Off-conference panels, workshops, or other initiatives
- **Improve outreach to emerging regions.** There are many individuals who cannot regularly attend the annual conference because of travel expenses. There are many more who may not value attendance because they are less interested in research and more interested in teaching. There are many who may not have access to advanced training. Finally, there are many who do not find the mentorship needed to improve their academic research. The division should consider off-conference initiatives which might attend to these various needs.
- **Improve access to alternative career paths.** Covid-19 has altered the demand for strategy PhD's. It is clear many graduates will have a difficult time finding faculty positions, as the market will likely take years to clear. Moreover, not all graduates desire faculty positions. The division should consider building awareness of careers with alternative paths, which include post-doctoral training, think-tanks, consulting firms, or operating firms.

- **Improve access to practical insight.** Strategic management is a discipline having strong practical implications, yet the work traditionally presented at the annual conference is not so practical. Our survey suggests many are looking for a more explicit link to practice, so the division might consider initiatives in this regard.
- **Improve professional development initiatives around teaching.** Survey results and anecdotal evidence suggest members desperately want more help in becoming excellent teachers. Access to syllabi, mentors, tutorials on online or effective teaching or the use of simulations are all opportunities which might be pursued.
- **Allocation of division finances and better transparency for members.** The division has accumulated a balance of over \$350,000, and it has been steadily increasing over the last five years. Effort should be made to determine a reasonable financial balance to maintain as a buffer. Financial commitment should be made to pursue opportunities, some of which are spelled out here. Moreover, members should be regularly aware of division finances, to give them a voice in how the money is spent.

## DIVISION REVIEW METRICS

This section details how the division has evolved in terms of size, membership composition, activity engagement, governance, and finances.

### State of the Division

The STR division is the second largest division by membership, constituting 29% of the Academy of Management. As of July 1, 2020, the division had 5,410 members, growing all years (+0.51% in 2016, +0.49% in 2017, +6.84 % in 2018, +5.46% in 2019), except for 2020, when the division experienced a -6.64% decrease in membership in the midst of the pandemic.

In comparison, AoM growth rate in the same period was +2.4% in 2016, +0.8% in 2017, -0.9% in 2018, +1.9% in 2019, and -8.2% in 2020. These numbers therefore suggest that STR's drop in 2020 is related to a general AoM trend and that, contrary to the last 5-year period, STR's membership was growing faster than AoM. This is reflected in the growth of STR membership from 26% to 29% in this period.

New membership (referring to only those who were never AOM members before) has increased slightly with an average annual growth of +1.87% over the last five years, compared to an overall AoM growth of -1.67%.

The average annual growth rate of STR was +1.4 in 2016-2020 (and +4.2 in 2016-2019, prior to the pandemic), compared to -1.2% in 2011-2015, +2.3% in 2006-2010, and +8.5% in 2001-2005. A natural comparison is the other two large AoM divisions, OMT and OB. STR is growing faster than both. Their average annual growth in 2016-2020 is, respectively, -1.64% and -1.76%, in line with the overall AoM figure of -1.67%. STR's growth rate in this period also compares favorably with the mid-size divisions that experienced high-growth in the previous 5-year period, like IM (-6.30%) and ENT (+0.75%); it however trails TIM (+2.40%).

The growth pattern varies significantly by member type. US academic members have declined for both STR and AOM with annual average percentage change of -1.29% and -2.39%, respectively. The number of division's emeritus members, both US and non-US, seems to be tapering off over the last five years (STR=+0.58% vs. AoM=+1.28%). On the other hand, division's US executive and US student members has grown (+3.36% and +4.92%) in sharp contrast with AoM's members (-7.71% and -2.65%). In parallel, the number of non-US student members has grown much faster for STR (12.65%) than for AoM (0.26%) and non-US executive members declined much slower for the division (-1.2%) than for AoM (-8%). Starting 2018, there are more non-US members than US members for the first time in the division history.<sup>1</sup>

These figures highlight a successful 5-year for the division in terms membership size and growth, especially given the fact that STR is one of the oldest and most established divisions of AoM. That said, we will discuss some actions in this report that may help to maintain and increase division's membership in the next 5-year period.

## Membership Distribution

The division's distribution of academic, emeritus, executive and student members roughly mimics that of the AoM. In line with the Academy as a whole, Academic members (STR=68.8% vs. AoM=68.2%) and Student members (STR=25.4% vs. AoM=24.7%) represent the two largest member types. Compared to the last 5-years review, student membership of STR has caught up with AoM. Students comprise more of STR than AoM as a whole.

The composition of US vs. non-US members are quite similar. 67.9% of division's US members are academics, 24.9% students, 4.6% executives, and 2.6% emeritus. In comparison, 68.4% of non-US members are academics, 27.6% students, 3.4% execs, and 0.6% are emeritus. These patterns are in line with AoM membership.

A comparison with the other main divisions at the AoM can help put these figures in context. Table 1 provides such a comparison with two other large divisions (OB and OMT), three mid-size divisions (ENT, IM, TIM), and the AOM.

In terms of number of members, STR was the only large division that has experienced growth, increasing the number of members to nearly 29% of AOM membership.

In terms of membership decomposition by type, STR has a distribution similar to OB and OMT, TIM, and the AOM average. Specifically, academic members make 68.82% of STR membership (vs. the range of OB, OMT, TIM, and overall AOM for this metric is 66.17-68.61%), students 25.42% (vs. 24.71-27.54%), executives 4.14% (vs. 3.98-5.21%), and emerita 1.62% (vs. 1.09-2.26%).

In the 2016-2020 period, the number of academic and emeritus members remained stable with only -0.39 and +0.58% annual average percentage change, respectively. Number of executives went up by +1.39%. Even though this is a low number and executives make a small percentage of STR membership (4.14%) similar to other divisions, it should be noted that STR was the only division other than TIM that experienced growth in this category. Annual average percentage change in student

---

<sup>1</sup> Starting in 2018 there are more non-US members than US members for the first time in the STR division's history dating back to 2003. That's the furthest back that AOM has readily accessible data. In 2003, there were 2,544 BPS/STR members from the U.S. and 1,359 non-U.S. members. Based on those figures and the trend going forward, we feel confident in saying that BPS/STR did not have more non-U.S. members than U.S. members at any time prior to 2003.

members was an impressive +7.08%, compared to +2.11% growth in ENT and 4.76% in TIM and declines experienced by IM (-9.85%), OB (-1.73%), OMT (-2.57), and overall in AOM (1.14%).

Finally, in terms of geographic distribution, non-US members now constitute the majority of STR members like other divisions (except OB) and the AOM average.<sup>2</sup> In the 2016-2020 period, STR's average annual percentage change in non-US membership of 2.86% is only exceeded by TIM (2.95%). All other divisions (except ENT) experienced negative growth.

**TABLE 1.**  
**Membership size and decomposition for STR, AOM, and Selected Divisions**

	<i>Membership, as of July 1, 2020</i>						
	STR	ENT	IM	OB	OMT	TIM	AOM
<b>Number of members</b>	5,410	1,626	2,048	6,053	3,941	3,300	18,739
<b>as a % of AOM</b>	28.87%	8.68%	10.93%	32.30%	21.03%	17.61%	

	<i>Percentage of Membership by Type, as of July 1, 2020</i>						
	STR	ENT	IM	OB	OMT	TIM	AOM
<b>By member type:</b>							
<b>Academic</b>	68.82%	70.30%	77.93%	66.17%	68.61%	67.27%	68.23%
<b>Emeritus</b>	1.62%	1.12%	3.32%	2.09%	1.98%	1.09%	2.26%
<b>Executive</b>	4.14%	3.40%	3.17%	4.02%	3.98%	5.21%	4.81%
<b>Student</b>	25.42%	25.17%	15.58%	27.54%	25.43%	26.42%	24.71%
<b>By geography:</b>							
<b>US</b>	48.47%	46.89%	44.97%	54.40%	42.27%	40.30%	48.22%
<b>Non-US</b>	51.53%	53.11%	55.03%	45.44%	57.73%	59.70%	51.78%

	<i>Annual Average Percentage Change, 2016-2020</i>						
	STR	ENT	IM	OB	OMT	TIM	AOM
<b>Division membership</b>	1.40%	0.75%	-6.30%	-1.76%	-1.64%	2.40%	-1.67%
<b>By member type:</b>							
<b>Academic</b>	-0.34%	0.56%	-5.46%	-1.49%	-0.89%	1.69%	-1.45%
<b>Emeritus</b>	0.58%	0.65%	0.75%	1.43%	-1.84%	0.00%	1.28%
<b>Executive</b>	1.39%	-4.35%	-12.32%	-7.13%	-7.23%	1.04%	-7.84%
<b>Student</b>	7.08%	2.11%	-9.85%	-1.73%	-2.57%	4.76%	-1.14%
<b>By geography:</b>							
<b>US</b>	0.13%	-0.89%	-6.84%	-2.50%	-2.77%	1.62%	-2.67%
<b>Non-US</b>	2.86%	2.31%	-5.84%	-0.84%	-0.78%	2.95%	-0.70%

Percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

## Activity Engagement

The STR division's members are actively engaged in the annual AoM meetings. From 2016 to 2020, 11% of papers submissions, 6% of the PDWs submissions and 7% of symposia submissions, on average, came from the STR division. STR paper submission growth averaged +5.9% annually for the 5-year period (vs. AoM=+4.5%), with peaks of +22.2% growth from 2017 to 2018. Overall, the division's paper submissions are up

<sup>2</sup> In terms of numbers of members, US (2,622) is followed by UK (275), China (247), and Canada (238), and Germany (230).



+25.9% (from 1,028 to 1,271) relative to 2016. In contrast, the average annual growth rate for symposia and PDW submissions was slightly higher for the division than for the AoM as a whole (Symposia: STR=+13.9% vs. AoM=+10.5%; PDW: STR=+6.4% vs. AoM=+4.7%). Overall, the general activity reinforces the division's reputation for high quality and robust program content.

STR has a smaller share of members signing up as reviewers compared to AoM (STR=23.6% vs. AoM=35.6%), even if it has experienced a high average annual reviewer growth rate of +9.1% over the last 5 years, as exhibited in Table 2. This increase is much higher than the annual AoM growth rate (+4.3%). Given the lower rate of increase in number of submissions (+6.6%), we observe a slight increase in the number of reviewers per submission from an average of 1.34 in the period between 2011 and 2015, to an average of 1.42 in the period between 2016 and 2020.

**TABLE 2.**  
**Number of reviewers and submissions, Annual Meeting, STR Division**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Reviewers</b>	<b>Δ%</b>	<b>Submissions</b>	<b>Δ%</b>	<b>Reviewers/Submissions</b>	<b>Δ%</b>
2011	1,133	14%	707	-8%	1.60	24%
2012	1,053	-7%	827	17%	1.27	-21%
2013	973	-8%	767	-7%	1.27	0%
2014	1,065	9%	787	3%	1.35	7%
2015	1,043	-2%	882	12%	1.18	-13%
<b>2011-2015</b>	<b>1,053</b>		<b>794</b>		<b>1.34</b>	
<b>2016</b>	1,028	-1%	790	-10%	1.30	10%
<b>2017</b>	1,217	18%	759	-4%	1.60	23%
<b>2018</b>	1,335	10%	938	24%	1.42	-11%
<b>2019</b>	1,320	-1%	954	2%	1.38	-3%
<b>2020</b>	1,455	10%	1,021	7%	1.43	3%
<b>2016-2020</b>	<b>1,271</b>		<b>892</b>		<b>1.42</b>	

STR officers are concerned about the number of reviewers signing up, and believe those that do sign up are burdened with a high volume of reviews. Many reviewers never turn in reviews, and the numbers reflected in Table 2 are inflated because many sign-up after reviews have been assigned. The low proportion of reviews / submission places the quality of the program in jeopardy. We suspect we are not the only division suffering this fate and believe it is important that AOM might do more to energize the members around reviews.

## Elections

Percentage of STR members who voted in the elections has ranged from 20.31% (in 2019) to 25.3% (in 2020) during the past 5 years, consistently below the AoM average in all of these 5 years. The division's election process is fully compliant with Academy rules – nominations and elections run through AoM system. The division actively solicits nominations from the membership and also, seeks out nominees from diverse constituencies.

Each year, STR holds elections for one Assistant Program Chair position and six Executive Committee positions. The Assistant Program Chair progresses through a five-year term as an officer in the Division: Assistant Program Chair, Program Chair, Division Chair Elect, Division Chair, and Past Division Chair. The Executive Committee

members serve two-year terms. Together, the officers and the Executive Committee members constitute the policy-making body of the STR Division.

STR develops a slate of candidates for each of these positions both by (a) allowing the current officers and Executive Committee members to propose nominees and (b) soliciting nominations from the STR membership at large. Through this process, the current STR officers and Executive Committee members put forth (1) at least two candidates for the new Assistant Program Chair and (2) 12 candidates for the new Executive Committee members each year. The STR membership then votes on these candidates to select the new Assistant Program Chair and the new Executive Committee members each year.

During the past five election cycles, STR has put forth 12 candidates for Assistant Program Chair. Nine of these individuals (75%) were nominated by the membership at large. In addition, during the same election cycles, STR has put forth 60 candidates for the Executive Committee positions (12 each year). Forty-two of these individuals (70%) were nominated by the membership at large. Three Assistant Program Chair candidates (25%) and 19 Executive Committee member candidates (32%) were affiliated with institutions outside the U.S.

Of the five individuals who were elected Assistant Program Chair in the last five years, three (60%) were nominated by the membership at large. Of the thirty individuals who have served on the Executive Committee in the last five years, twenty (67%) were nominated by the membership at large and, separately, ten (33%) were affiliated with institutions outside the U.S. Two out of six elected Assistant Program Chairs (33%) in the six-year period between 2015-2020 period were from non-U.S. institutions.

STR also has sought to increase gender diversity in its officers and Executive Committee members. Six of the 12 candidates (50%) for Assistant Program Chair were female, and three of the five individuals (60%) who were elected to this position were female. Similarly, 24 of the 60 candidates (40%) for Executive Committee positions were female, and 17 of the 30 individuals (57%) who were elected to the Executive Committee were female.

In addition, there are four appointed officers in the STR Division that are not elected by the membership: Treasurer, Secretary, Membership Engagement Chair, and Communications Director. The latter two positions were created during the last five years, and STR solicited nominations from the membership at large for both positions. Currently, two of the individuals (50%) holding these four positions are affiliated with institutions outside the U.S.

Lastly, starting in 2020, STR began accepting nominations from the membership at large for its Research Committee, Awards Committee, Teaching Committee, Membership Engagement Committee, and Global Representatives. This change is intended to further increase STR members' involvement in selecting the leaders of the STR Division.

## **Finances**

Over the past five years, the STR division has continued financial management policies that were established in the mid-1990s. The goals of those policies are based on maintaining a strong balance of funds and financial reserves to support sustainable spending on initiatives and programs that maximize the academic and career development of our broad and diverse membership over the long term. As indicated in Appendix F, the financial balance was \$292,544.41 at the end of 2019, and a peek at the 2020 budget suggests a balance in excess of \$350,000. At the end of 2015, the balance

was around \$215,000 (\$104,432 plus \$112,000 endowment), so the division has increased its balance by around \$135,000 over the five-year period. Obviously, expenses are not matching revenues. This presents an opportunity for the division to increase allocation to strategic initiatives. (Note, the in 2018 AoM changed the accounting of how they handled our endowment, and now include it with the entire balance.)

## MEMBERSHIP SURVEY: RESULTS AND IMPLICATIONS

A customized survey was distributed to the current membership between October 16 and November 19, 2020; 970 members responded, yielding a 16.5% response rate. Survey is included in Appendix G, and full survey responses to quantitative items in Appendix H. The following section reports the survey results and discusses their implications.

### Member Profile

**Demographics:** 65% of the respondents were male and 33% female. White (63%) and Asian (25%) respondents accounted for nearly 89% of the responses. Most of the respondents have an age between 30 and 39 (30%), with 65% of the respondents being below 50. 25% of the respondents were Assistant Professors, 21% Associate Professors, 19% Full Professors and Endowed Chairs, 18% Doctoral students, and 5% Instructors. This pattern was echoed in the time the respondents obtained (or were in the process of obtaining) their doctoral degree: 21% of the respondents were still doctoral students, 19% obtained their doctoral degree less than 5 years ago, 17% 5-10 years ago, and 40% more than 10 years ago (2% did not currently hold or pursue a doctoral degree).

In terms of membership tenure, 33% have been members for less than three years, 21% have been members for four to seven years, 16% have been members for eight to eleven years, 10% have been members for twelve to fifteen years and the remaining 20% have been members for more than 15 years. In terms of geographical residence, the majority of respondents (54%) resided in North America, with 29% residing in Europe, 10% residing in Asia, and the remaining 7% elsewhere.

In terms of major research areas, all eight tracks of the division were prominently presented. Top 3 areas were Knowledge, learning and innovation strategy (36%), Corporate and international strategy (33%), and Industry, competition and strategic entrepreneurship (32%). Among the additional research areas mentioned by the respondents, the most common areas were CSR, research methods, strategic human capital, and strategy process.

In terms of major teaching areas, three-quarters of the respondents listed Strategic Management. Corporate Strategy (31%) was the most represented specialization, followed by Competitive Strategy (29%) and Entrepreneurship (25%). International Business (21%), Organizational Behavior (10%), and Leadership (9%) also prominently featured. Among the additional teaching areas mentioned by the respondents, the most common areas were CSR, non-market strategy, research methods, and technology and innovation management.

On average, respondents spent 47% of their effort on research, 29% on teaching, 17% on service, and 7% on other activities (e.g., administrative work at their institution, consulting, course work and/or job market (for PhD students), corporate work (for practitioners), editorial work/ reviewing, mentoring, volunteer work, and responsibilities at home and at their institutions amplified due to the pandemic). Apart from some

members enjoying their retirement, such ‘other’ activities tend to be time consuming and take on average 29% of the effort of the members who engage in them (24% of the respondents). 51% of the respondents allocate a majority ( $\geq 50\%$ ) of their effort to research and 17% of the respondents allocate a majority of their effort to teaching (both with a median of 60%).

Finally, we compared the survey respondents with the STR membership to assess the representativeness of the survey (see Table 3). Comparable data were available for membership type and geographic location. Academic members were over-represented in the survey. Emeritus members were under-represented by 0.79 percentage-points (49%), executive members by 1.86 percentage-points (45%), and student members by 4.63 percentage-points (18%).

**TABLE 3.**

**Survey respondents vs. STR membership**

	Survey respondents	STR membership	$\Delta$
<b>N</b>	970	5,410	
<b>By member type:</b>			
<b>Academic</b>	76.11%	68.82%	+7.29
<b>Emeritus</b>	0.83%	1.62%	-0.79
<b>Executive</b>	2.28%	4.14%	-1.86
<b>Student</b>	20.79%	25.42%	-4.63
<b>By geography:</b>			
<b>North America</b>	53.68%	53.46%	+0.22
<b>Outside North America</b>	46.32%	46.54%	-0.22

***Involvement with the Division:*** Overall, our members appeared to be greatly attached to the STR division. More than three quarters (77%) of the respondents considered STR to be their primary division/interest group, with a full 41% claiming no strong allegiances with any other division. Only 15% of the respondents indicated that they mostly identify with a division other than STR. When loyalties were shared (for both those that cite STR as primary as well as those that do not), respondents most commonly identify with the ENT (33%), TIM (23%), OMT (21%), and IM (11%) divisions. HR, OB, and SIM are also mentioned (around 5% each). Respondents who reported that their primary affiliation was outside the STR division overwhelmingly mentioned having one or more research and/or teaching areas better matching to other division(s) as the primary reason.

The ability to gain and share information relevant to research is a key factor in attracting members to the STR division. A full 89% of the survey respondents ranked this criterion as first or second in importance. The opportunity to develop and maintain social connections also ranked highly (1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> for 49% of the respondents). Members also value the possibility to gain and share information relevant to teaching (1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> for 26% of the respondents) and to learn more about a domain that is new to them (1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> for 22% of the respondents). The chance to gain and share information relevant to training and management practice was a weaker draw (1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> for 16% of the respondents).

## **Member Activities**

***Attending the Annual Meeting:*** STR members continue to be highly interested in attending the AoM Meetings. 56% of respondents indicated that they attend the meetings regularly, even if they are not on the program. This is higher than the corresponding proportion in the 2015 survey (47%). This suggests that the attachment of

STR members to the division goes beyond the presentation of their own research in the program.

The most common reason why STR members do not attend the AoM Meetings is a lack of access to funding to support conference attendance (52%). Among attending respondents, 13% cover the costs with personal money. This problem was also highlighted in the 2010 and 2015 STR surveys. As with the previous surveys, we continue to emphasize that STR Division may want to suggest to the AoM the possibility of using part of its funds to support, at least in part, members who would like to participate but cannot for financial reasons (e.g., students, or members from less developed economies).

***Annual Meeting's Activities:*** Table 4 displays the frequency of responses to the question: "During the past five years, how frequently, on average, did you engage in each of the following Annual Meeting activities for the STR Division?"

While attracting reviewers to STR has been an issue in the past, the proportion of members who indicated that they have never served as a reviewer, or have served only once, during the past five years, has declined from 32% in 2015 to 26% in 2020.<sup>3</sup> Similar trends are observed in the most frequent reviewer category: 43% of the responding members indicated that they review every year, an increase from the 36% percent reported in the 2015 survey. Despite these positive trends, as noted earlier in this report, the STR leadership believes there are not enough reviewers, and those that sign up frequently do not complete their reviews.

Overall, responses also indicated that STR members were more involved across all the major conference activities in the 2016-2020 period compared to the 2011-2015 period. For instance, in 2016-2020, the proportion of members who attended a PDW every year was 27% (up from 20% in 2011-2015), while those who attended a regular conference session every year was 45% (up from 40% in 2011-2015).

Social events also continue to be attractive, with 73% attending every year or a few times over the past 5 years (compared to 71% in the 2011-2015 period). Although social events are not the primary reason for respondents to attend the annual meeting, most STR members attend them regularly, suggesting that social events have an important function once members are on site.

## **Member Evaluation**

***General Satisfaction with the Division:*** Overall, our members reflect positively on the division. 77% of respondents indicated they were satisfied with their STR membership; 37% are very or extremely satisfied.

To capture additional insights, we asked respondents for open-ended comments on what they liked best about their membership and possible improvements for the division.

---

<sup>3</sup> Percentages are calculated by dividing the number of respondents who selected a specific answer by the total number of survey respondents who provided an answer to that question. In other words, we do not include survey respondents who skipped the question. This differs from the official AoM report, where such respondents are included and reported under the answer "N/A". This may suggest that there was an additional "Don't know" option, which was in effect not available.

**TABLE 4.**  
**Engagement with Annual Meeting Activities for the STR Division \***

	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>Total</b>
Served as a reviewer	109 15%	78 11%	228 32%	307 43%	722
Presented at a professional development workshop	323 46%	108 15%	203 29%	74 10%	708
Attended a professional development workshop	136 19%	121 17%	267 37%	197 27%	721
Presented at a scholarly session (paper, symposium, etc.)	156 22%	94 13%	273 38%	200 28%	723
Served as a chair or discussant for a scholarly session	374 52%	79 11%	212 30%	52 7%	717
Attended a regular conference session	73 10%	61 8%	269 37%	328 45%	731
Participated in other activities (social events, business meetings, etc.)	132 18%	67 9%	247 34%	282 39%	728
Volunteered in some capacity (awards committee, social outing coordinator, etc.)	449 65%	75 11%	117 17%	52 8%	693

\* 1=Never, 2=Once, 3=A few times, 4=Every year

The most common responses to “What do you like best about membership in the STR Division?” (N=306; 32% of the respondents) are:

- Sense of community and social connections;
- Information about current and future events, divisions activities, other regions, other people’s research;
- Networking opportunities;
- Access to research that is novel and relevant;
- Communication and newsletter;
- Annual meeting; and
- Division-specific elements, including its leadership team.

In response to question “If there is one thing you would most like to improve regarding the STR Division, what would it be?” (N=318; 33% of the respondents), division’s members primarily mentioned the following areas for improvement:

- Inclusiveness of the division in terms of greater involvement of members located outside the U.S. and/or at institutions other than R1/R2 universities and non-research faculty;
- Practical relevance;
- Diversity and novelty of perspectives ideas, tools, methods, topics promoted by the division;
- Mentoring and career development;
- Teaching support and recognition;
- Transparency and frequency of division’s communications;

- Opportunities for collaboration among members;
- Number of off-conference activities, including webinars and workshops.

### ***Opinion on Relative Emphasis on Conference versus Non-Conference Activities***

We queried members' preferences regarding how the division should allocate its efforts in the future. This was prompted by the Covid-19 pandemic, when we realized that virtual efforts might help us meet many member needs in the absence of an in-person gathering. This invites further scrutiny into whether division leadership should continue to pursue initiatives outside the annual conference. The following question was asked, which prompted 726 responses, detailed below:

*Prior to this year, our division allocated nearly all of its effort toward the annual conference. Going forward (even beyond the Covid-19 crisis), how would you recommend the STR leadership allocate their effort across conference and non-conference activities:*

Answer Choices	Responses	
100% conference, 0% non-conference	7.99%	58
75% conference, 25% non-conference	50.14%	364
50% conference, 50% non-conference	35.81%	260
25% conference, 75% non-conference	6.06%	44

86% of respondents believe that the division should devote between 25% and 50% of effort and resources to non-conference activities. This is an enormous departure from what the division did prior to the Covid crisis. It is noteworthy that the respondents were informed that “the division allocated nearly all of its effort toward the annual conference”, so the responses suggest members are seeking a change. Moreover, the question clearly asks about division activities beyond the crisis, so they do not want this change to be temporary (i.e., tied to Covid). Future leaders should carefully consider these views when prioritizing strategic initiatives.

***Satisfaction with the Annual Meeting Program:*** The survey results highlight members' satisfaction with the STR annual meeting program. Table 5 displays the frequency of responses to the question: “Please rate your level of satisfaction with the following features of the STR division’s annual meeting program.”

PDWs are the most popular category in the conference program with STR members, with 88% of respondents satisfied (21% expressing extreme satisfaction). Symposia rank second with 86% of respondents satisfied (15% indicating extreme satisfaction) and plenary sessions rank third with 80% of respondents satisfied (13% indicating extreme satisfaction). Among paper sessions, it surprises us that Discussion Paper Sessions and Traditional Paper Sessions are almost equally popular, with 75% of members being satisfied, very satisfied, or extremely satisfied with the former and 73% with the latter.<sup>4</sup> We suspect that the respondents were not aware of the differences between these two types of sessions, because anecdotal evidence suggests much more satisfaction with being assigned a Traditional Paper Session. An alternative explanation is that participants do actually enjoy the more interactive nature of the Discussion Sessions. This should be investigated more thoroughly. Overall 85% of respondents expressed satisfaction with

---

<sup>4</sup> See footnote 1.

access to participation on the program, and 78% of them show appreciation for social and networking opportunities. It is worthwhile noting that all of these percentages are higher compared to the 2015 survey.

**TABLE 5.**  
**Satisfaction with the STR Division's Annual Meeting Program \***

	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>Total</b>
Professional Development Workshops (PDWs)	17 3%	58 9%	203 33%	217 35%	129 21%	624
Traditional paper sessions	50 8%	125 19%	279 42%	149 22%	63 9%	666
Discussion paper sessions	42 7%	112 18%	271 43%	152 24%	53 8%	630
Symposia	23 4%	63 10%	235 38%	202 33%	89 15%	612
Plenaries	30 5%	89 15%	229 39%	164 28%	78 13%	590
Social and networking opportunities	43 7%	99 15%	243 38%	176 28%	79 12%	640
Overall access to participation on the program	34 5%	70 10%	279 42%	184 28%	101 15%	668

\* 1=Not satisfied, 2=Somewhat satisfied, 3=Satisfied, 4=Very satisfied, 5=Extremely satisfied.

***Satisfaction with the STR Division's Activities:*** Table 6 displays the frequency of responses to the question: "Please rate your satisfaction with the following:"

Overall STR members are overwhelmingly satisfied with the activities that address the division's domain, with 84% of members who responded to this question giving positive feedback.<sup>5</sup> 72% of respondents are also satisfied with the sense of community within the division, a substantial improvement from the previous period where 44% of respondents had indicated that they were not satisfied. In order to investigate the sources of these responses, we examined the level of satisfaction with the division with respect to: (1) teaching; (2) diversity; (3) collaboration; (4) communication; and (5) leadership.

(1) *Teaching:* 32% of respondents indicate that they are less than satisfied with activities that help them improve the content and delivery of their courses. Anticipating the need to better focus the division's teaching-related efforts, we asked survey respondents an additional question focused on teaching and how the STR division could help. Specifically, we asked STR members how likely they would be to attend teaching related PDWs on a variety of topics. The different topics members responded to were: case-based teaching, case writing workshop, teaching simulations, online teaching, teaching innovations, new course and module development, bridging the strategy formulation and implementation divide in the classroom, and bringing research into the classroom. Here, most of the interest was given to the topic of bringing research into the classroom (with 78% of respondents being interested, very interested, or extremely interested) and to the topic of teaching innovations (with 75% of respondents being interested, very interested,

<sup>5</sup> See footnote 1.



or extremely interested). Given the pandemic, it was not surprising that 72% of respondents also expressed interest in online teaching. A majority of survey respondents (>50%) expressed an interest in all the remaining topics, except for bridging the strategy formulation and implementation divide in the classroom (0% of respondents).

**TABLE 6.**  
**Satisfaction with the STR Division's Activities \***

	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Sense of community within the division	61 8%	145 20%	276 38%	187 26%	64 9%	733
Activities that address the division's domain	19 3%	97 13%	295 40%	238 32%	97 13%	746
Activities that help members improve the content and delivery of their courses	58 9%	153 23%	261 39%	151 23%	43 6%	666
Welcoming of members from various demographic groups	62 9%	119 18%	220 33%	177 27%	88 13%	666
Efforts to reach out to international members	53 8%	130 20%	213 33%	152 24%	92 14%	640
Efforts to foster good relations and work collaboratively with other divisions/interest groups	62 9%	112 17%	261 39%	165 25%	69 10%	669
Encouraging participation in Academy and division-specific activities	38 5%	79 11%	271 37%	231 32%	113 15%	732
Opportunities outside of the annual meeting to network/collaborate with peers	85 12%	162 23%	249 35%	137 19%	79 11%	712
Encouragement from division leaders to form network communities for members like me	103 15%	148 22%	233 34%	138 20%	64 9%	686
Opportunities for members like me to receive mentoring	112 18%	142 23%	210 34%	99 16%	48 8%	611
Level of communication received from the division	29 4%	67 9%	297 39%	222 29%	147 19%	762
Quality of newsletter	24 3%	81 11%	284 39%	212 29%	134 18%	735
Usefulness of website	35 5%	116 17%	255 38%	179 27%	85 13%	670
Value of Connect@AOM Community Discussion	63 11%	87 15%	251 43%	108 19%	71 12%	580
Responsiveness of division officers to member concerns	26 5%	58 12%	178 37%	134 28%	86 18%	482
Ability of interested members to become leaders in the division	57 10%	102 18%	214 38%	123 22%	66 12%	562
Opportunities to influence the division	76 13%	117 20%	232 39%	125 21%	47 8%	597
Fair and open elections	23 3%	52 8%	221 33%	205 31%	168 25%	669
Selection process for awards and recognition	42 7%	72 12%	235 39%	167 27%	94 15%	610

\* 1=Not satisfied, 2=Somewhat satisfied, 3=Satisfied, 4=Very satisfied, 5=Extremely satisfied.

(2) *Diversity*: As a large and diverse division, STR continues to face challenges with engaging members from various demographic groups although there are encouraging trends as well: 27% of respondents indicate that they are less than satisfied with division efforts to welcome diverse members. Among respondents who are not male, this proportion rises to 35% and among respondents who are not White, this proportion is 30%. Similarly, 28% of respondents indicate that they are less than satisfied with division efforts to reach out to international members. Among non-North American respondents this percentage rises to 36%. That said, almost 70% of international (non-North American) respondents who responded to the prompt about opportunities to influence the division, indicated that they are satisfied with such opportunities. This was comparable and indeed slightly higher than the corresponding North American respondents (approximately 67%). Fostering diversity and increasing engagement with international members have been, and continue to be, a priority for the STR division.

(3) *Collaboration*: STR members appear to be very satisfied with the division's effort at integration with other divisions at the AoM and within the AoM as a whole. Among members, 74% of respondents are satisfied with the efforts to foster good relations and work collaboratively with other divisions, and 84% are satisfied with the encouragement to participate in Academy and division-specific activities.

However, the STR division faces challenges with respect to the opportunities it creates for fostering collaboration among members outside the annual meeting. An important fraction of our respondents indicate that they are less than satisfied with opportunities outside of the annual meeting to network/collaborate with peers (35%), encouragement from division leaders to form network communities (37%), and opportunities to receive mentoring (41%). Although these proportions are substantially lower than what was reported on the previous survey (48%, 49%, and 51% were the corresponding percentages in 2011-2015), these results will continue to inform our action plan going forward.

(4) *Communication*: Overall, STR members appear to be much more satisfied with the division's communication efforts compared to the previous reporting period. Among members, 87% of respondents are satisfied with the level of communication received from the division (74% in 2011-2015), 86% are satisfied with the quality of the newsletter (76% in 2011-2015), and 78% are satisfied with the website's usefulness (69% in 2011-2015). Although the respondents across the two periods are not the same, this may be interpreted as an indicator that the division's communication initiatives have had a positive impact.

(5) *Leadership*: Overall the satisfaction of STR members with the leadership of the STR division, in terms of both responsiveness and opportunities for participation, has increased. Overall 83% of members say that they are satisfied, very satisfied, or extremely satisfied with the responsiveness of division officers to member concerns. This is almost 10 percentage-points higher than the corresponding metric for the previous period. Satisfaction with the election process and the selection process for awards and recognition is also quite high and growing (89% and 81% of respondents ranking these as satisfactory or better, respectively compared to 86% and 76% for the previous period). 72% indicate that they are satisfied with the ability of interested members to become leaders in the division, a number that has increased from 66% in 2015. Although the percentage of members that were not satisfied with the opportunities available to influence the division has declined from 41% to 33% between 2015 and 2020, this could be an area for further improvement.

Additionally, we also surveyed the members' satisfaction with the diversity in the STR

Division's leadership. Specifically, we asked them, "In your opinion, does the diversity of the STR leadership in the following categories reflect the diversity of the STR membership?" for the following eight categories: age, disability, ethnicity, gender, geographic location, nationality, race, and sexual orientation. Table 7 displays the frequency of responses to this question.

**TABLE 7.**  
**Satisfaction with the diversity in STR Division's leadership\***

	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>Total</b>
Age	36 6%	110 19%	364 63%	65 11%	575
Disability	59 11%	169 31%	269 50%	40 7%	537
Ethnicity	51 9%	145 26%	306 55%	59 11%	561
Gender	23 4%	87 15%	370 65%	85 15%	565
Geographic location	67 12%	161 29%	287 51%	49 9%	564
Nationality	60 11%	149 27%	307 55%	46 8%	562
Race	56 10%	167 30%	283 51%	51 9%	557
Sexual orientation	45 9%	120 23%	306 59%	52 10%	523

\* 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Agree, 4=Strongly agree.

Overall, the results indicate that a majority of members are satisfied with the diversity in the STR Division's leadership across all the categories that were surveyed. Among these categories, respondents expressed the least satisfaction with the representation of members with disabilities in the division's leadership (58%) followed by geographic location<sup>6</sup> (59%), race<sup>7</sup> (60%), and ethnicity<sup>8</sup> (65%). Satisfaction in the diversity of STR leadership was highest for sexual orientation (68%), age (75%) and gender<sup>9</sup> (81%).

***Assessing new Initiatives during the pandemic:*** With the ongoing pandemic and the increasing infeasibility of holding a face-to-face AOM annual meeting, the STR Division had introduced a whole range of new initiatives called "STRonger Together" during

<sup>6</sup> Satisfaction rate is lower for non-North American respondents (49%) compared to North American respondents (70%). Among non-North American respondents, the satisfaction is almost identical for European and Asian respondents which are the two biggest location categories outside of North America. Not surprisingly, satisfaction with the diversity in the nationality of STR leadership (62% overall and 55% for non-North American respondents) is similar to satisfaction with the diversity in their geographic location.

<sup>7</sup> Satisfaction was almost identical between White and non-White respondents.

<sup>8</sup> Satisfaction with the ethnicity of STR leadership is slightly lower for non-White respondents (63%) than for White respondents (67%).

<sup>9</sup> However, this number decreases to 74% for respondents who are not males.

April to August 2020. These initiatives were targeted at fostering virtual interactions. We queried members on their satisfaction with the seven distinct categories of initiatives carried out. Table 8 reports the frequency of responses to the question “Please rate your satisfaction with the following STR division STRonger Together initiatives held during April-August 2020:”, with responses indicated for: Café Conversations for Working from Home/PhD/Regions, Workshops pairing PhD students with faculty for feedback, Café Cultural Conversations (around common cultures), Coffee Wish Conversations pairing junior faculty with senior faculty, Virtual Research Symposia, Meet the Scholars interviews & conversations and Virtual PDWs.

**TABLE 8.**  
**Satisfaction with the STR Division’s STRonger Together Initiatives \***

	1	2	3	4	Not attended	Total	Attendees’ satisfaction †
Café Conversations for Working from Home/PhD/Regions,	13 2%	21 3%	100 14%	63 9%	522 73%	719	83%
Workshops pairing PhD students with faculty for feedback	14 2%	21 3%	70 10%	67 9%	546 76%	718	80%
Café Cultural Conversations (around common cultures)	11 2%	29 4%	63 9%	50 7%	563 79%	716	74%
Coffee Wish Conversations pairing junior faculty with senior faculty	13 2%	18 3%	61 9%	64 9%	561 78%	717	80%
Virtual Research Symposia	12 2%	26 4%	140 20%	121 17%	417 58%	716	87%
Meet the Scholars interviews & conversations	11 2%	26 4%	108 15%	139 19%	432 60%	716	87%
Virtual PDWs	16 2%	23 3%	131 18%	110 15%	434 61%	714	80%

\* 1=Not satisfied, 2=Moderately unsatisfied, 3=Moderately satisfied, 4=Extremely satisfied.

† Proportion of members moderately or extremely satisfied, conditional on attendance.

As can be seen from the responses in Table 6, a majority of members had not attended the STRonger Together Initiatives (the Not Attended proportion varies from 58% to 79% across the seven categories of activities). This was not surprising given both the disruptive nature of the pandemic on our personal lives as well as the short time in which these activities were put together. However, among the members that did attend one or more of these initiatives, the response was overwhelmingly positive and consistent across the initiatives ( $\geq 74\%$  satisfaction for each of the categories). Among these initiatives, attendance was substantially higher for the Virtual Symposia (42%), for Meet the Scholars interviews and conversations (40%) and for Virtual PDWs (39%).

***Assessing satisfaction with activities that the division offers:*** In order to determine where the STR Division could focus future efforts, we also surveyed the members’ assessment of whether the attention to the current set of activities was sufficient. Table 9 reports the frequency of responses to the question “In your opinion, the current offering of the STR division for the following activities is:” for sixteen different activities.

**TABLE 9.**  
**Assessment of current offering of STR Division's activities\***

	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>No opinion</b>	<b>Total</b>
Webinars by senior scholars	126 18%	303 43%	48 7%	230 33%	707
Online workshops and symposia	142 20%	316 45%	23 3%	223 32%	704
Local workshops and symposia	172 24%	214 30%	14 2%	305 43%	705
Curated research collections and reading lists	175 25%	211 30%	16 2%	301 43%	703
Availability of PhD syllabi	211 30%	146 21%	12 2%	332 47%	701
Availability of other syllabi (MBA, executive, undergraduate)	212 30%	156 22%	13 2%	320 46%	701
Teaching advice networking	152 22%	204 29%	15 2%	329 47%	700
Mentor program for junior scholars	164 23%	226 32%	19 3%	290 41%	699
Advice network for various stages of career	163 23%	235 34%	22 3%	279 40%	699
Expanded newsletter or website with research summaries	101 14%	284 41%	38 5%	276 39%	699
Expanded newsletter or website with teaching advice and items	113 16%	250 36%	27 4%	304 44%	694
Online discussion groups based on research topics of interest	163 23%	213 31%	22 3%	298 43%	696
Online discussion groups based on teaching topics of interest	118 17%	209 30%	24 3%	344 49%	695
Local communities with regular meetings (online)	176 25%	160 23%	20 3%	339 49%	695
Local communities with regular meetings (in person)	162 23%	146 21%	24 3%	362 52%	694
Meet a local colleague network	188 27%	133 19%	17 2%	351 51%	689

\* 1=Not sufficient, 2=Sufficient, 3=Too much.

As can be seen in Table 8, a large proportion of members who responded did not have an opinion on the STR Division's current offerings (ranges from 33% to 52% no opinion). Among the members who expressed an opinion, the largest percentage of members reporting insufficient focus on an activity was 30% for availability of course syllabi, for both PhD as well as MBA and other executive/undergraduate courses. Along similar lines, 24% of the respondents indicated an insufficient focus on research collections and reading lists.

About 25% of member respondents perceive that activities focusing on local

communities and local networks such as workshops, symposia and in-person as well as online meetings are insufficient. 23% indicated that activities mentoring junior scholars could be increased and a similar percentage indicated that the division could perhaps increase its focus on providing an advice network for different career stages.

### ***Assessing representation of STR Division in AOM journals***

Going beyond the Academy of Management Conference, we also assessed whether STR Division research is adequately represented in the Academy of Management Journals and whether strategic management is reflected in the AOM journals' editorial staff. More than a third of members answering this question indicated that STR Division is under-represented in the AOM journals and their boards. 15% of responding members provided additional details clarifying their answer. A content analysis of these details revealed the following main themes in members' concerns (almost ALL the comments we read through hinted at one or more of these themes):

- Limited space in AMJ/AMR for strategy papers
- Overrepresentation of micro-OB topics and scholars in Academy journals and boards
- Insufficient number of Associate editors in AMJ/AMR who are strategy focused scholars
- Insufficient number of Editorial board members in AMJ/AMR who are strategy focused scholars

We also asked respondents to evaluate the distinctive contribution of strategic management as a field. The respondents (N=267) highlighted several distinctive contributions: the fact that it is a comprehensive, integrative and interdisciplinary study of firm performance (broadly defined), which involves several important factors, such as competition, firm heterogeneity, and governance. It is also a field with clear managerial and practical implications.

***Action Suggestions for the next 5 years:*** We also asked two open-ended questions, which were meant to suggest long-term and short-term priorities for the division. These suggestions inform the following section of this report.

First, we asked about the long run. Responses to "What issues should occupy the STR division's time over the next 5 years?" (N=330; 34% of the respondents) highlighted a number of common themes:

- Impact on society (e.g., climate change, sustainability);
- New technologies (e.g., AI, block chain, and digitization);
- Pandemic's impact on teaching, research, practice, and community;
- Diversity and inclusion in society, companies, field of management, and in the division;
- Real world relevance of strategy research;
- Building new generations of managers and scholars;

Next, we asked about the short run. In response to the question "What can the STR division do tomorrow morning that would increase its effectiveness?" (N=246; 25% of the respondents), members made a number of suggestions that center around the following points:

- Create more forums and opportunities for interactions;
- Make the division more inclusive by increasing opportunities for scholars that are junior and/or from outside R1/R2 universities;
- Elicit new members from under-represented groups and regions;
- Increase presence of strategy research and scholars in AOM journals;
- Organize more off-conference activities;
- Increase relevance to practice and involvement of practitioners;
- Gather and promote more research and teaching content;
- Enhance mentoring and career development offerings;
- Provide support for childcare during AOM conferences (when held in-person);
- Contemplate ways to increase effectiveness of Q&As especially in large AOM sessions;
- Increase transparency and channels of communication between the division leadership team and members;
- Support making strategy journals open access, ease of data sharing, replication studies, and null findings.

The content of the remaining responses was very diverse and, as a result, did not align with any one general category or form a separate category.

## SUMMARY

We believe this accounting of division activities, membership statistics, and membership views triangulate on a set of possible priorities the division might enact in the future. Given annual changes to leadership, we are reluctant to strongly recommend any particular priorities, but believe the alternatives provided at the beginning of the report to be coherent and consistent with the objective of enhancing creation and dissemination of strategic management knowledge. We would be remiss, however, if we did not emphasize the opportunities in front of our next generation of division leaders. The Covid-19 pandemic has drastically altered the way we engage one another, and economic fallout from the crisis will reverberate for the next five years. These open up opportunities to virtually engage our members outside the annual conference. These escalate the asymmetry in access to training across the globe, making it incumbent upon leaders to place increased emphasis on reducing these asymmetries. These decrease the potential demand for our PhD members at universities, inviting attention to prepare some for alternative career paths.

## **APPENDICES**

Appendix A – STR Consortia Guidelines

Appendix B – STR Consortia Guidelines

Appendix C – STR Membership Engagement Chair Description

Appendix D – STR Distinguished Scholarship Award

Appendix E – Awards Committee Responsibilities and Process

Appendix F - STR Division Five Years Historical Actual Finances

Appendix G – STR Division Review Survey 2020

Appendix H – STR Division 2020 Survey results



## **APPENDIX A – Constitution of the STR Division (Revised: August 2018)**

### Article I - NAME

The name of this organization shall be the Strategic Management Division of the Academy of Management, hereinafter referred to as the Division.

### Article II - PURPOSE

The general purpose of the Division is to promote scholarship and advances in the field of strategic management, and to aid in the extension of knowledge in this field to profit and nonprofit organizations. Strategic management deals with management of the total enterprise. It is concerned with enterprise formation and development, with entrepreneurship, with competition and cooperation among firms or business units, with the formulation of corporate and business objectives, strategies, and policies, with the design of organizational structures, systems and procedures for the implementation of strategy, and with those characteristics of leadership essential to the accomplishment of this purpose.

The specific activities of the Division will include:

- (1) Encouraging and supporting research related to strategic management
- (2) Promoting and conducting the interchange of information, concepts, ideas, and research results among those interested in strategic management
- (3) Promoting and conducting the interchange of information and views on issues and approaches to the teaching of strategic management
- (4) Such other activities and services as are deemed useful by the officers and membership in advancing the state of knowledge and practice in the field of strategic management

### Article III - MEMBERSHIP

Membership in the Division shall be open to members in good standing of the Academy of Management with interest in the Division's purposes.

### Article IV - OFFICERS AND THEIR RESPONSIBILITIES

Section 1. The officers of the Division shall consist of a Past Chair, a Chair, a Chair-Elect, a Program Chair, an Assistant Program Chair, a Treasurer, a Communications Director, a Secretary, and such other appointed officers as approved by the Executive Committee.

Section 2. The Past Chair serves as a counselor to the Chair and, as Chair of the Nomination Committee, is responsible for conducting and certifying the annual election.

Section 3. The Chair succeeds the Past Chair at the STR Annual Business Meeting. The Chair shall be the chief executive officer of the Division and shall administer all affairs of the Division with policy guidance from the Executive Committee, the Chair of the Academy of Management, and its Professional Division Policy Committee. The Chair is responsible for the conduct of the Division's activities in a manner that will assure the accomplishment of

## **APPENDIX A – Constitution of the STR Division (Revised: August 2018)**

the Division's purposes, subject to the policy guidance of the Executive Committee, the Division's Constitution, and the bylaws of the Academy. The Chair will appoint the Communications Director and Treasurer, when appropriate; the Regional Liaison Representatives called for in Section 6 of Article IV; the Chair and Membership of all Standing Committees, unless otherwise specified; and such *ad hoc* committees as are necessary, all subject to the approval of the Executive Committee. The chair coordinates all existing Division Committees. At the annual meeting of the Academy of Management, the outgoing Chair presides over the Division's business meeting and reports on the status and progress of the Division, before passing the baton to the new Chair.

Section 4. The Chair-Elect succeeds the Chair at the STR Annual Business Meeting. During her or his tenure, the Chair-Elect serves in the absence of the Chair and assists the Chair as necessary. The Chair-Elect will coordinate and supervise the Division's Awards that are not associated with program submissions (e.g. the Dissertation Award, the Irwin Award, and the Distinguished Scholar, Distinguished Service, and Emerging Scholar Awards, in the years they are awarded).

Section 5. The Program Chair, if elected, (or the new Chair-Elect) succeeds the outgoing Chair- Elect at the STR Annual Business Meeting of each year. The Program Chair shall be responsible for planning and supervising the Division's program at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management subject to the guidelines established by the Program Chair of the Academy of Management, as well as those of the Executive Committee of the Division. The outgoing Program Chair will maintain responsibility for the entire program, fulfilling all duties of this office until the end of the Academy of Management's Annual Meeting, even after passing the office formally to the new Program Chair at the STR Business meeting.

Section 6. The Assistant Program Chair succeeds the Program Chair at the STR Annual Business Meeting. The Assistant Program Chair will continue to fulfill all duties of this office until the close of the AoM Annual Meeting, despite formally passing the office on to his or her successor at the STR Business meeting. The Assistant Program Chair helps the Program Chair develop and administer the annual program in whatever way possible. In addition to providing general assistance to the Program Chair, the Assistant Program Chair is responsible for planning and supervising the Division's Professional Development Workshops at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management, subject to the guidelines established by the Program Chair of the Academy of Management, as well as those of the Executive Committee of the Division. The Assistant Program Chair is also responsible for coordinating and supervising the selection of the winners of all the conference best paper prizes given by the STR Division. He or she is also responsible for coordinating all of the food orders at the conference site for the STR Program as well as its pre-conference program.

Section 7. The Treasurer is appointed for a three-year renewable term. The Treasurer shall maintain the Division's financial records, prepare annual budgets, and report to the Executive Committee on the financial status of the Division. Approval of all expense reimbursement requests shall require the joint approval of the Treasurer and the Chair. All reimbursement requests should be submitted first to the Treasurer, who will review them in terms of the spending guidelines established by the Executive Committee, the bylaws of the Academy, and reasonableness for the items claimed. If acceptable, the Chair will also approve the request and will forward it to the appropriate officer of the Academy for payment. If a request is not acceptable for any reason, the Treasurer and Chair shall discuss the matter with the individual submitting the request. If the explanation is satisfactory to both, they will approve and process the request. If either or both remain unsatisfied, the matter shall be held over until the next Executive Committee meeting and shall be resolved by a majority vote of that Committee, subject to the bylaws of the Academy and the guidelines previously established by the Executive Committee.

## **APPENDIX A – Constitution of the STR Division (Revised: August 2018)**

Section 8. The Communications Director is appointed for a three-year renewable term. The Communications Director shall organize the Division's communications with its members. The Communications Director is expected to contribute to timely communication with Division members about Division activities. In this role, he or she has primary responsibility for overseeing and managing the content of the Division's website, maintaining its social media presence, and sending relevant information to members via email. He or she also is expected to understand and leverage the Connect@AOM platform and other communications tools deemed appropriate.

Section 9. The Secretary is appointed for a three-year renewable term. The Secretary shall keep Division archives, including records of its annual Business Meeting, Executive Committee meeting, amendments to the Constitution, and other items at the request the Executive Committee. He or she also shall assist the Assistant Program Chair in the selection of consortia and workshop co-chairs requiring Executive Committee approval, shall assist the Past Division Chair with annual elections and committee nominations, and shall carry out such other duties as specified by the Division Chair. He or she will also be responsible for gathering information and publishing STR's biannual Newsletter.

### Article V - EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Section 1. The policy-making body for the Division shall be the Executive Committee, composed of the Past Chair, Chair, Chair-Elect, Program Chair, Assistant Program Chair and twelve members of the Division elected for two year staggered terms. Normally six Division members are to be elected to the Executive Committee each year for two-year terms. The Chair is the presiding officer of Executive Committee Meetings.

Section 2. All activities of the Division shall be under the review of the Executive Committee.

Section 3: All non-officer members of the Executive Committee will be appointed to at least one subcommittee. Two permanent subcommittees are charged with (1) Assisting the Program Chair, and (2) Assisting the Assistant Program Chair. The Chair will also establish subcommittees responsible for New Initiatives and Recurring Problems regularly and as needed, subject to Executive Committee approval. In each year that the Division is responsible for conducting its 5-year survey, there will be a subcommittee appointed to assist the Chair with this task. The Chair is responsible for making all subcommittee appointments. When the subcommittee size and requirements allow, subcommittees should include at least one Executive Committee member in their second year and at least one Executive Committee member in their first year to provide for task continuity.

Section 4. The Executive Committee must be convened at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management. The Executive Committee will also meet once during the winter to conduct Division business. Usually, the Chair will convene the Executive Committee, but a written call for an Executive Committee meeting supported by at least five Executive Committee members can convene such a meeting or cause a ballot to be issued for vote by the Division membership.

Section 5. All issues will be deemed approved or disapproved by a simple majority of a quorum of the Executive Committee members (12) and division officers (5). A quorum is defined as nine (9) members for meeting and all members for ballots petitioned under the provisions of Section 4.

Section 6. The Executive Committee shall serve as the Nominating Committee. When

## **APPENDIX A – Constitution of the STR Division (Revised: August 2018)**

serving as a Nominations committee, it will be chaired by the Past Chair.

### **Article VI - COMMITTEE STRUCTURE**

**Section 1.** The committees of the Division shall include the: (1) Executive Committee, (2) Teaching Committee, (3) Research Committee, (4) Awards Committee, (5) Newsletter Committee, and (6) Global Representatives Committee. No person can serve simultaneously on any two committees.

**Section 2.** The membership of the Executive Committee, its duties and manner of operation are specified in Article V.

**Section 3.** The Teaching Committee is composed of the Chair, Chair-Elect, Program Chair and a minimum of four appointed members serving two-year terms. Normally, one half of the members will be appointed each year. The Chair of the Teaching Committee shall be the Chair-Elect or her/his appointee. The Teaching Committee shall promote improved teaching of policy and strategy and will promote and conduct efforts that lead to such improvement. Ordinarily, the Teaching Committee will serve as a policy-maker in this area and will work through task force groups it appoints to conduct such activities as it deems appropriate.

**Section 4.** The Research Committee is composed of a minimum of sixteen appointed members serving two-year terms. Normally, one-half of the members will be appointed each year. The Chair of the Research Committee shall be the Chair of the Division or her/his appointee. The Research Committee will be involved in evaluating the best conference papers and best dissertations for awards in processes facilitated by the Division Chair-Elect (for dissertation awards) and the Assistant Program Chair (for best conference paper awards) or their appointees.

**Section 5.** The Newsletter Committee is composed of the Chair, Program Chair, Communications Director, and Secretary. This committee approves all copy for the Newsletter and develops guidelines, subject to the approval of the Executive Committee, for publication of the Division's Newsletter.

**Section 6.** The Global Representatives Committee is composed of the Chair, the Communications Director, and as many appointed Global Representatives as deemed necessary by the Chair. Each representative will be appointed for a term of three years. The Global Representatives shall be appointed at the winter Executive Committee meeting. It shall be the duty of the Global Representatives to promote the Division's interests at the regional meetings held in their respective regions, to support and encourage other activities and developments within their regions that are of benefit to the Division, including case competitions, and to report relevant news from their region to the Communications Director and Secretary.

### **Article VII - ELECTION PROCEDURES**

**Section 1.** The elective officers are the Assistant Program Chair and the elected members of the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee shall act as the Nominating Committee. Nominees for the position of Assistant Program Chair must have served as an elected member of the Executive Committee. In addition, the Past Division Chair shall organize and oversee an open nomination process for division members. Additional nominations for positions on the Executive Committee can be made each year by written or electronic petition attested to by ten (10) members in good standing of the Division. Additional nominations for the position of Assistant Program Chair can be made each year by written

## **APPENDIX A – Constitution of the STR Division (Revised: August 2018)**

or electronic petition attested to by twenty (20) members in good standing of the Division. This nomination process must remain open for at least 30 days and it must be completed prior to the winter Executive Committee meeting. The Past Division Chair is responsible for encouraging members to participate in the nomination process.

Section 2. Two candidates are required for each Executive Committee position and a minimum of two candidates for the position of Assistant Program Chair. In addition to the candidates nominated by the division membership, the Executive Committee will have the possibility of proposing additional individuals to complete the ballot.

Section 3. The Past Chair will submit a ballot to the membership as soon as possible. A plurality of all ballots returned to the Past Chair will constitute election to the open offices.

Section 4. A Chair cannot be nominated to the Assistant Chair position until at least two years after her or his term of Past Chair has expired.

Section 5. The positions of Past Chair, Chair, Chair-Elect, Program Chair, and Assistant Program Chair terminate as of the Annual STR Business meeting each year. Membership on the Executive committee begins at the Annual STR Business Meeting and terminates two years later. Appointed positions and committee memberships normally terminate at the Annual STR Business meeting commensurate with their established length of service.

Section 6. The election must be completed prior to July 1 but will generally follow Academy of Management election procedures and timelines. The results will be deemed official when documentation has been presented to the Chair by the Past Chair.

Section 7. A two-thirds (2/3) vote of the Executive Committee shall be required to remove an Officer or Executive Committee member from office prior to the expiration of the term for which that person has been elected. In addition, two percent (2%) of the voting STR membership may petition the Executive Committee to remove any elected official. The petition shall be voted upon by the STR Executive Committee.

Section 8. Should an elective officer, including the Chair-Elect, the Program Chair, or the Assistant Program Chair, or any elected member of the Executive Committee be unable to complete his or her term, the Chair will nominate a member of the Division. Nominees for any elective officer position to be filled during the term must have served in an elected position for the division. A plurality vote by the Executive Committee is required to approve the nomination. The replacement shall serve until the next normal election where the executive committee will nominate a permanent replacement to be elected by division members.

### **Article VIII - PUBLICATIONS**

Section 1. A Newsletter will be published, at a minimum, in the fall and the spring by the Division to facilitate communications and report all relevant Division activities to the entire membership.

Section 2. The Newsletter Committee will be responsible for initiating and maintaining the Newsletter.

Section 3. To accomplish its general purpose, the Division will publish whatever articles, papers, notes, and other materials as the Executive Committee deems necessary, subject to

## **APPENDIX A – Constitution of the STR Division (Revised: August 2018)**

the publications policy of the Academy of Management.

### Article IX - MEETINGS

There shall be an annual business meeting of the Division held concurrently with the annual meeting of the Academy of Management. Special meetings may be held as deemed necessary by the Division's Officers.

### Article X - RATIFICATION AND AMENDMENTS

Section 1. This constitution will be ratified by a majority of all members who vote through ballot sponsored by the Executive Committee of the Division.

Section 2. Amendments to the Constitution shall be by a two-thirds vote of the Division members present at the annual business meeting of the Division or by a majority vote of all members who vote during an election sponsored by the officers of the Division.

## APPENDIX B – STR Consortia Guidelines (Revised: August 2018)

On behalf of the STR division and its members, thank you for your efforts as a consortium organizer. The consortia are key elements of our STR Professional Development Workshop (PDW) program each year, and are widely appreciated and enjoyed by our members. In years past, concerns have been raised about leader succession and panel participation in these consortia. Toward that end, the STR Executive Committee (EC) has established a policy on consortia leadership succession and faculty panel selection. This document outlines the division's policy and provide some other general guidelines for consortia leaders.

The division sponsors at each annual conference five consortia for various stages of STR members' career: the Doctoral Consortium (for mid-stage doctoral students), Dissertation Consortium (for later-stage doctoral students), New Faculty Consortium (for junior faculty), Mid-Career Consortium (or Workshop), and Teaching Consortium (organized by the Teaching Committee). These are collectively referred to below as the "five consortia".

### Consortia Leadership Succession

Consortia chairs serve in pairs, with each co-chair serving a two-year term. The terms are staggered to provide continuity. The Executive Committee, in consultation with the continuing consortia chairs, selects a new co-chair and panelists for each consortium each year. These selections are made at our summer meetings each August, or shortly thereafter by mid-September, with the selected chairs organizing their respective consortia for the next two years, and the panelists serving for the next year's consortia.

Consortia chairs and panelists are selected from among a slate of nominees provided by current and outgoing consortia chairs, STR members, and the EC. The continuing chair of each consortium plays a lead role by providing a list of "preferred" nominees to the EC. However, the EC will consider (and possibly select) other nominees. Because those selected sometimes decline to serve, the continuing chairs should provide several nominees and an order of preference. The EC will provide a rank-ordered list of 3 candidates for incoming consortium co-chair for each consortium.

The Assistant Program Chair will have a conversation with consortia chairs about these guidelines and general expectations for consortia. Also, the Assistant Program Chair will be the point of contact between the EC and consortia chairs – a natural point of contact since the Assistant Program Chair is in charge of all PDW activities.

### *Guidelines for Co-Chair Selection*

- ✓ Nominees should have academic visibility in the Strategy field.
- ✓ There will be no common institutional connections, either in terms of Ph.D. granting school or current or past work affiliation between the incoming and continuing co-chairs for each consortium. Those who graduated from the same school as the continuing chair, work at the same institution as the continuing chair or previously worked at the same time at the same institution, work at the institution where the continuing chair received his or her Ph.D., or who received PhDs at the continuing chair's institution are ineligible. For the purpose of identifying co-chairs, "institution" normally refers to a university (not just a school or faculty within a university).
- ✓ The rank order list of three co-chair nominee suggestions should include individuals from different continents. STR historical data on co-chairs, panelists and participants show that there is consistently higher and more representative geographic diversity in panelists and participants when co-chairs are from different continents. When necessary, members of the EC should add nominees to the list to increase geographic diversity among co-chairs.
- ✓ Because the Doctoral Consortium and the Dissertation Consortium are sharing a considerable part of their activities (dinner, joint afternoon panel), the rule of non-overlap

## APPENDIX B – STR Consortia Guidelines (Revised: August 2018)

in schools should be implemented, in collaboration with the Assistant Program Chair and the division's Secretary, across the two consortia. That is, there should be no overlap between the four co-chairs in past or current institutions.

- ✓ There will be minimal similarities in terms of research topics, disciplinary training or disciplinary preferences, methodological approaches, etc. between nominees and continuing co-chairs. This is critical in order to keep the consortia open to people with different views. Strategy's success has been partly a function of its openness and multi-disciplinary orientation, and it is important to maintain and reinforce those values.
- ✓ For the Teaching Consortium, there should be diversity of teaching interests and expertise, both in terms of subject matter and in terms of the types and levels of the courses taught (e.g., undergraduate, masters, executive education, and doctoral).
- ✓ Over time, the leaders should be reflective of the division's membership in terms of gender, geographic location, and research and teaching interests.

The outgoing and continuing co-chairs for each consortium should provide the EC with a list of prospective candidates for incoming co-chairs in time for the summer Academy meeting. It is the responsibility of the outgoing Assistant Program Chair to remind the incoming Assistant Program Chair and continuing co-chairs about these activities, and to send this document to the incoming Assistant Program Chair and the consortium co-chairs.

### **Consortia Panelist Selection**

Once the incoming co-chair has been notified and agrees to serve, the consortia co-chairs (the continuing and incoming chairs) should provide the EC with a list of prospective panelists for the following year's Academy meeting. This will typically happen after the meeting in August. The EC's policy is not designed to undercut consortia chairs in panel selection. Rather, it is to ensure that the selection process remains true to the guidelines and that the disparate needs of our membership are met. The process is as follows:

- ✓ The continuing and incoming co-chairs of each consortium will prepare a list of two to three times as many names as the number of panelists the consortium is expecting to use, to be vetted for the next consortium. This list should be emailed to the incoming Assistant Program Chair.
- ✓ Consortia chairs should specify their preferences regarding how many panelists they would like to include as part of their program and what roles they will play. For each of their panel nominees, they should suggest a role (or two). They should also indicate their preferred choices among the names provided.
- ✓ The incoming Assistant Program Chair is responsible for working with other EC members to evaluate the list of prospective panelists to ensure that the selections meet the spirit of the guidelines below (e.g. flagging the institutional overlaps, etc.). When a proposed list lacks gender, geographic or research discipline diversity, the Assistant Program Chair should work with the co-chairs to increase the diversity of prospective panelists.
- ✓ The Executive Committee will then review this list and vote to approve it (subject to the guidelines below). While the EC will make an effort to accommodate the preferences of the consortia chairs, it reserves the right to make additional nominations, or to solicit nominations from the STR membership. This is not to place restrictions on the consortia chairs, but rather to provide a remedy for the kinds of problems that have occurred in the past and to address any future process concerns.

### ***Guidelines for Panelist Selection:***

The following guidelines should be followed to the extent possible to help balance the panel in each consortium. Nominees will be evaluated against these guidelines and any issues will be noted concerning the guidelines below prior to providing the list of candidates for the EC vote.



## APPENDIX B – STR Consortia Guidelines (Revised: August 2018)

- 1) Nominees should have academic visibility in the Strategy field.
- 2) Ideally, no panelist should serve more than twice in a 5-year period for any of the five consortia. For instance, if a panelist served on the Doctoral Consortium in a given year (Y) and on the New Faculty Consortium in any of the four subsequent years, then they may not serve as panelist for any of the five consortia until five years after the first instance (Y+5). Further, no-one should serve as panelist for two consecutive years in the same consortium.
- 3) Because some important journals have few (associate) editors with strategy expertise, an exception to the rule in the preceding paragraph can be made for a dedicated Editors' panel if a consortium features one. That is, (associate) editors of a given journal may be used repeatedly if drawing on other editors would be less useful to the consortium participants. However, journal (associate) editors are subject to the rule in the preceding paragraph for participation in any other panel of the five consortia.
- 4) There should be minimal commonality in institutional connection, in terms of either Ph.D. granting school or work affiliation, between panelists and with co-chairs. Co-chairs should use judgment if nominating panelists who graduated from or work at the same university but in different schools (for instance, one panelist was in a department of economics or sociology in the School of Arts and Science while another panelist or a co-chair was at the separate Business School). There should not be more than two panelists (including the co-chairs for this purpose) from a given university even if they are from different schools. However, as mentioned above, any university overlap between the two co-chairs must be avoided.
- 5) There should be minimal similarities (unless, of course, a consortia chooses to focus on a particular topic/theme) in terms of research topics, disciplinary training or disciplinary preferences, teaching interests, methodological approaches, etc. between panelists and with co-chairs. This is critical in order to keep the consortia open to people with different views. The STR division's success has been partly a function of its openness and multi-disciplinary orientation, and it is important to maintain and reinforce those values.
- 6) The choice of panelists should broadly reflect the division's makeup in terms of gender, geographic location, type of institution, and research and teaching interests. The STR division has tremendous diversity, with large and small schools, public and private universities, a broad array of methodologies and theoretical perspectives, and wide geographic dispersion.
  - a) In terms of gender, about 30% of the division's members are women as of 2018, and this proportion is increasing (29% in 2015, 25% in 2011). Accordingly, the co-chairs should aim to have a good balance of women and men on the panel.
  - b) In terms of geographic diversity, the division averages over 60% of its submissions and 50% of its reviewers from outside North America (proportions are both rising). These numbers indicate that other continents contribute a growing share of top scholarship to and engagement with the division. Thus, the co-chairs should make a determined effort to include panelists from all parts of the world.
  - c) The panelists should represent diverse research and teaching areas and topics, theoretical perspectives and methods.
- 7) Finally, at least one member of the EC will serve as a co-chair or panelist for each consortium. That person will be a full and regular member of the panel, but will also speak to attendees about the role of the EC in the STR division.

## **APPENDIX B – STR Consortia Guidelines (Revised: August 2018)**

### **Other Consortia Chair Responsibilities**

#### **Double-Booked Panelists**

Double-booking is a continual problem for consortia. Most of the visible researchers that are sought-after for consortia are also sought-after for other PDW sessions. When a panelist is booked into a consortium and another PDW session at the same time, it undercuts the person's ability to contribute to the consortium. No panelist can be booked into more than one PDW session at a time, and no person can be listed on more than two PDW sessions in total, with journal editors' participation in editors' panels (only) excepted. That is, if a panelist agrees to serve in a consortium, he or she must agree to stay the full time in that consortium, and not leave in the middle of it to work another session.

Consortia co-chairs can meet this requirement by noting in the email invitations that panelists will be expected to stay the entire time at the consortium. If a prospective panelist cannot promise that participation in the STR consortium will take priority over other PDW activities, another person should be asked to serve. The Assistant Program Chair will also check for panelists who are double booked as the AOM scheduling gets underway, and will take action to resolve this if it occurs.

#### **Consortia Content**

The content of consortia also needs to reflect the division's membership, with a balance of perspectives (process vs. content, economics vs. sociology vs. traditional strategy, etc). It is a great idea to openly discuss some of the burning issues of the field, but in order to have a fair discussion both the discussion and the panel need to be balanced.

Consortia activities should reflect the broad interests of our membership. Toward that end, consortia leaders should strive to balance topics of research, teaching, career and life balance issues, etc. Consortia leaders should feel free to do whatever they feel is adequate, but should keep in mind that too much emphasis on one dimension is likely to alienate some participants.

#### **Consortia Budgets**

The EC allocates budgets to the consortia that are typically spent on catering, or in some cases, offsite dinners with consortia participants. Budget amounts will vary from year-to-year. Consortia co-chairs should work with the Assistant Program Chair (responsible for the catering budget and orders for the Academy meetings) to stay within these budgets.

Usually by mid-spring, the catering information becomes available, and co-chairs can begin to plan the catering order with the Assistant Program Chair. Depending on the division's overall budget and the costs of division events that will be held at the conference venue, information will become available about whether the division can pay for consortium dinners and what budget is available for these. Any limitations will be communicated to the co-chairs. (For instance, depending on the budget available, drinks may be covered, partly covered, or not covered.)

Food and beverages catered by hotels are extremely expensive, so for consortia dinners, an idea that has worked well in the past is to book the dinner at a restaurant within walking distance of the conference hotels. The consortium will get much better service, food and beverage for the money that way. It is often useful to find a STR member in the city of the conference to help with recommendations, and co-chairs should work with the STR division's Treasurer to determine the best way to pay the restaurant. A deposit can be made in advance of the meetings. With a little creativity and planning, the division can save money while improving the overall experience for consortium attendees.

To effectively manage the increasingly stretched budget, the co-chairs should consider off-site venues for the consortia (e.g., nearby universities), and correspond with the Assistant Program Chair and the division's Treasurer to decide whether an off-site venue is effective in terms of

## **APPENDIX B – STR Consortia Guidelines (Revised: August 2018)**

costs and logistics. To be included in the approved off-site list, these venues need to be identified in the fall prior to the annual meeting.

Where possible, the organizers of the Doctoral Consortium and those of the Dissertation Consortium should look into arranging a joint dinner of the two consortia. This is to allow interaction among the respective participants. Co-chairs across the two consortia should then coordinate to find a suitable venue and seek a better deal from the restaurant for the combined dinner.

### **Feedback from Participants**

Consortia co-chairs should plan to institute a system of feedback that will allow for improvement of consortia activities over time. Surveys of both participants and panelists, soliciting suggestions from both, will do much to improve the consortia, and the results can be passed on to the next year's leaders and the Assistant Program Chair. Leaders should feel free to design their own feedback systems, however some suggested questions include:

- Feedback about specific sessions, requesting numerical ratings but providing space for written comments;
- Feedback on the range of topics discussed, and suggestions for future topics;
- Feedback on the most useful features of the program, and suggestions for new features;
- Suggestions about future faculty panelists.

Feedback should be obtained immediately at the end of the consortium or within a week of the annual conference's end, and shared with the Assistant Program Chair and with the division's Secretary. For this purpose, the co-chairs should arrange a short survey, or at the minimum ask participants to provide verbal feedback and compile it after thorough follow-up to ensure enough participants respond.

### **Documentation**

Please keep the Assistant Program Chair informed about the organization of the consortium. Be sure that the Assistant Program Chair also receives copies of all documentation. Additionally, please keep copies of all documentation to pass along to next year's consortia leaders. Thanks again for your support of our STR consortia.

## **APPENDIX C - STR Membership Engagement Chair Description (Revised: Spring 2018)**

---

The Membership Engagement Chair is expected to attend the entire annual meeting. The activities coordinated by the person serving in this position include:

1. Recruiting a group of STR Ambassadors (these are PhD student volunteers, typically we need 25-30), and assigning them to various tasks during the meetings, and coordinating their activities.
2. Designing and ordering STR branded “swag”
  - a. Responsibility for coordinating designing and ordering t-shirts for STR ambassadors
  - b. Responsibility for creating/ordering stickers and (possibly) an STR Division giveaway for the annual meeting
3. Organizing and advertising offsite events for members at the annual meeting
  - a. Coordinating one or more off-site events for STR members at the annual meeting
  - b. May involve working with local organizers and other volunteers
  - c. These events have been popular in the past. If the price for the event is in the range of \$20-\$40, we can anticipate attendance of over 75 members.
  - d. Organizing these events requires planning and communication on how participants can register and pre-pay.
  - e. Coordinating communication about the activities to members, including working with the Communications Director and preparing an email to send from the Division Chair
4. At the annual meeting:
  - a. Local organization and participation in the offsite event(s)
  - b. Serving as the STR division contact for the AOM membership committee. Help solicit division representatives to staff new member events at the annual meeting (e.g. these include the new member hospitality suite, new member orientation, and possibly others as announced by the AOM membership committee)
  - c. Assisting in finding division representatives to staff the AoM’s New Doctoral Student Consortium
  - d. Coordinating STR Ambassador participation in various STR events, to hand out stickers and giveaways, drink tickets, leading members from hotels to offsite events, etc. (Possible events include the STR doctoral, dissertation, new faculty, mid-career, and teaching consortia, Managing your Dissertation workshop, Jr Faculty paper development workshop, plenary session, business meeting, STR social, and any offsite events, also the AOM new student doctoral consortium and the new member events)
  - e. Picking up the division ribbons for lanyards and distributing those and stickers, etc. to division officers and EC members to wear and to hand out
5. Participating in the STR Executive Committee’s two annual executive committee meetings. One is at the annual AOM meetings in August. The other (the Winter meeting) is usually held in early March at a location that varies annually. Travel to the winter meeting is partially subsidized by the STR division.
6. Recommending and implementing new initiatives that will engage current members and attract new ones to the division.
7. Assisting with identifying your own replacement at the end of the term, and helping with a smooth transition.

## **APPENDIX D - STR Distinguished Scholarship Award (Revised: Spring 2020)**

### **Criteria for Award:**

The STR Distinguished Scholarship Award shall be awarded biannually for a discovery of major importance in strategic management. The award recognizes an individual or individuals that have either made a specific theoretical or empirical discovery or have developed a core set of ideas that fundamentally advanced research and understanding in the field of strategic management. Thus, priority is given to the discovery's importance to the field, with secondary priority weighted toward more recent discoveries, rather than the accumulation of disparate body of work. Individuals who are or have been active participants of the division are eligible.

In choosing among the nominees, the Awards Committee will assess how the development of the field would have differed if it did not have the benefit of the contribution (i.e., was it a next logical step in the scientific progress or did the individual(s) do something that was really unexpected?).

### **Process of Nomination and Selection:**

Nominations for the STR Distinguished Scholarship Award will be sought from the STR Division membership, as well as from the STR Award Committee, prior winners of the Award, STR Executive Committee and Officers, and prior STR Chairs.

The STR community should nominate individuals who meet the criteria for the award and highlight what is the discovery of major importance in strategic management. No self-nominations are accepted.

## APPENDIX E –Awards Committee Responsibilities and Process

---

1. Responsibilities of Awards Committee (note that the committee may be split into subcommittees for different awards)
  - a. Distinguished Award
    - i. Even Years: Distinguished Scholar Award (given at “STR Distinguished Scholar Presentation & Breakfast” session)
    - ii. Odd Years: William D. Guth Distinguished Service Award (given at STR Business Meeting)
  - b. Irwin Educator Award
    - i. Even Years: Focus on MBA/exec impact.
    - ii. Odd Years: Focus on PhD/doctoral impact.
2. Membership of Awards Committee:
  - a. Executive Committee (EC) votes on list of senior scholars to serve as members of the Awards Committee. The EC may approve changing the size of the committee.
  - b. Division Chair-Elect (DCE) appoints an Executive Committee Member to serve as Committee Chair for the Awards Committee (or subset of committee choosing the Distinguished Award or the Irwin Award).
  - c. The Committee Chair will coordinate the process (e.g. voting, discussions, gathering information) involving the senior scholars. The senior scholars will have voting rights, and the Committee Chair will vote only in cases of ties.
3. Process for Awards Committee
  - a. Pre-Nomination Period
    - i. DCE sends email to committee members in October or November to alert them to their upcoming responsibilities, and introduces committee Chair.
    - ii. DCE collects nominations from the STR membership until mid-January. Nominations from prior years remain in the pool of nominations. Potential winners of the awards must be able to accept their awards at the annual AOM conference, thus, awards are not given posthumously; this may eliminate some nominations from consideration.
    - iii. Committee Chair emails committee members in early December to detail the process and timeline
    - iv. Committee Chair distributes nominations to committee members and requests additional nominations.
  - b. Post-Nomination Period
    - i. Committee Chair emails members the full list of nominations, requesting they rank top 5 candidates. This step can be done by email without a committee discussion, based on data available from Division Secretary (on nominations from prior years) and whatever data each member chooses to gather for him/herself. If committee members have a keen interest in a discussion before selecting their top finalists, or want to collect and swap some basic info on nominees prior to selecting their top three choices, then that could be arranged.
    - ii. Committee Chair narrows list to 3-4 candidates (i.e. finalists) receiving the most votes from the members. This should be done by early February.
    - iii. Recusal rules (apply when discussing and voting on finalists to choose a winner): Committee members and Committee Chair should declare any potential conflicts (such as family or financial tie, supervision relationship, current or ex-colleague or fellow PhD student, co-supervision, co-authorship etc.) and privileged information as becomes relevant in the selection process and recuse themselves from the final deliberations and voting. In the case of recusals, the DCE may serve as a replacement on the Committee or may ask other officers or Executive Committee members to serve who do not have potential conflicts.

## APPENDIX E –Awards Committee Responsibilities and Process

- iv. Members do due diligence, gathering supporting materials on each finalist. This should be done by mid-February.
  - Depending on the number of committee members and finalists, it may make sense to have one or two committee members tasked with following up on each finalist.
  - For Irwin MBA even years: the focus is on collecting evidence of teaching impact, and the committee solicits letters of support from persons outside the committee (e.g. the candidate's department chair or associate dean).
  - For Irwin PhD odd years: there is no need to contact the finalists' schools. Instead the committee looks to more Internet sources of information to understand the candidate's PhD mentoring. A committee member can also follow-up *very confidentially* with a few of the candidate's PhD students.
- v. Committee discusses each candidate.
- vi. The committee evaluates the evidence and selects the recipient of each Award, plus a rank-ordering of the finalists. The committee members will be asked to write 2-3 sentences highlighting the motivation of their choice (e.g. anything they deem memorable about the winning candidate and worth disseminating with the large public). Direct quotes (preserving anonymity of the committee members) will be used in the newsletter announcing the recipient of the award.
- vii. The DCE presents the selection to the Executive Committee, which must approve the selection.
- viii. Potential winners of the awards must be able to accept their awards at the annual AOM conference. The DCE contacts each candidate to ascertain if the candidate will be able to attend the annual AOM meeting to receive the particular award. If a candidate is unable to accept the award at the annual AOM conference then the DCE presents the next ranked finalists to the Executive Committee for approval.
- ix. The winner is announced in the spring STR newsletter.
- x. Handing out the awards:
  - The "Distinguished Scholar Award" (on even years) is given at the annual AOM conference in an "STR Distinguished Scholar Presentation & Breakfast" session)
  - The "William D. Guth Distinguished Service Award" (on odd years) is given at the annual AOM conference at the STR Business Meeting)
  - Irwin Educator Award is given at the annual AOM conference in an "STR Irwin Educator Award Reception")

## APPENDIX F – STR Division Five Years Historical Actual Finances

	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	FIVE (5) YEAR AVERAGE
<b><u>RESERVE &amp; ALLOCATION</u></b>						
Balance forward	47,788.02	70,919.15	62,790.68	201,939.42	217,299.41	120,147.34
Division allocation	56,644.00	56,512.00	56,468.00	60,644.00	75,245.00	61,102.60
<b>Total operating funds</b>	<b>104,432.02</b>	<b>127,431.15</b>	<b>119,258.68</b>	<b>262,583.42</b>	<b>292,544.41</b>	<b>181,249.94</b>
<b><u>REVENUE BY YEAR</u></b>						
Sponsorships & advertising	24,000.00	(4,000.00)		3,080.00	3,500.00	5,316.00
Endowment						0.00
Grants	0.00	0.00	30,000.00			6,000.00
Misc income - PDW	2,475.00	0.00	0.00	3,101.55		1,115.31
<b>Total revenue</b>	<b>26,475.00</b>	<b>(4,000.00)</b>	<b>30,000.00</b>	<b>6,181.55</b>	<b>3,500.00</b>	<b>12,431.31</b>
<b><u>EXPENSE BY YEAR</u></b>						
Advertising/promotion					573.60	114.72
Audiovisual	1,973.75	1,300.00	1,410.00			936.75
Audiovisual am				177.84	300.00	95.57
Awards	5,034.00	8,412.60	3,155.26	2,114.75	1,770.25	4,097.37
Bank fees/ret cks/chgbacs	59.41		500.00			111.88
Contributions expense	500.00	500.00	0.00	500.00		300.00
Endowments			0.00			0.00
Entertainment			0.00	1,000.00		200.00
Expense other	0.00	0.00	6,000.00			1,200.00
Expenses reimbursed	0.00	500.00	0.00		500.00	200.00
Events & catering	37,760.71	34,898.81	45,144.47	4,952.71	4,033.66	25,358.07
Events am catering				35,083.64	37,349.69	14,486.67
Acknowledgement/gifts, give-aways, etc.				1,019.18	0.00	203.84
General admin			0.00			0.00
Personnel/prof fees/ wages	7,000.00	0.00	(5,484.82)			303.04
Postage & delivery	0.00	11.45	4.99	30.00	0.00	9.29
Printing production	500.00	0.00	0.00			100.00
Professional development	0.00	2,500.00	0.00			500.00
Space rental			0.00	92.20		18.44
Supplies/office	500.00	0.00	0.00			100.00
Transportation			0.00			0.00
Travel	6,660.00	12,517.61	9,295.66	10,756.01	10,961.59	10,038.17
<b>Total expense</b>	<b>59,987.87</b>	<b>60,640.47</b>	<b>60,025.56</b>	<b>55,726.33</b>	<b>55,488.79</b>	<b>58,373.80</b>
<b>Fund net</b>	<b>70,919.15</b>	<b>62,790.68</b>	<b>89,233.12</b>	<b>213,038.64</b>	<b>240,555.62</b>	<b>135,307.44</b>
Endowment activity			112,706.30			22,541.26
Interest (2%)				4,260.77	4,811.11	1,814.38
<b>Balance forward</b>	<b>70,919.15</b>	<b>62,790.68</b>	<b>201,939.42</b>	<b>217,299.41</b>	<b>245,366.73</b>	<b>159,663.08</b>



## APPENDIX F – STR Division Five Years Historical Actual Finances

### Degree to which the division supplements allocation & total operating funds

	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	FIVE (5) YER AVERAGE
% of revenue generated compared to allocated funds	47%	-7%	53%	10%	5%	22%
% of revenue generated compared to total operating funds	25%	-3%	25%	2%	1%	10%

### *Degree to which meeting expenses consume resources*

% of annual meeting exps compared to annual allocation	79%	79%	88%	12%	8%	53%
% of annual meeting exps compared to total operating funds	43%	35%	42%	3%	2%	25%

### *Surplus and Carryover*

Year-end net as a % of total annual revenue	54%	51%	60%	79%	81%	65%
% of balance forward as compared to total operating funds	46%	56%	53%	77%	74%	61%

### *Operating expense as compared to dollars available*

expense as a % of allocation	106%	107%	106%	92%	74%	97%
expense as a % of total operating funds	57%	48%	50%	21%	19%	39%
expense as a % of total annual revenue	46%	49%	40%	21%	19%	35%

## **APPENDIX G – STR Division Review Survey 2020**

Dear ,

We would like your input, please! The STR division is conducting a member survey as part of the Academy of Management's requisite five-year review process. This is an opportunity to reflect on your experiences and perceptions about the division, and to share your ideas for new and innovative member services.

STR officers and volunteer leaders will use the results of this survey to help us understand the current state of the division and to identify strategic goals and actions for our future. Survey analyses and respondent reflections will be included in a final report submitted to the AOM Board of Governors. The report and its results will be shared with all division members.

Please do take this opportunity to share your thoughts. The survey should take no more than 15 minutes to complete. All responses will be confidential and only grouped data will be reported. The deadline for participating in the survey is November 16, 2020, at 12:00AM EST. Click the button below to start the survey now.

Thank you in advance for your participation!

Best wishes,

Timothy B. Folta  
STR Division Chair

## APPENDIX G – STR Division Review Survey 2020

### Profile

---

1. Approximately how many years have you been a member of STR?

- 0-3 years
- 4-7 years
- 8-11 years
- 12-15 years
- 15+ years

2. What is your membership type?

- Academic
- Student
- Executive/Practitioner
- Emeritus

3. In which world region do you currently reside?

- Asia
- Middle East
- North Africa and Greater Arabia
- Europe
- North America
- Central America
- The Caribbean
- South America
- Sub-Saharan Africa
- Australia and Oceania

4. What is your age?

- 18-29
- 30-39
- 40-49
- 50-59
- 60-69
- 70-79
- 80 and above

5. What is your gender?

- Female
- Male
- Transgender female-to-male
- Transgender male-to-female
- Gender non-conforming
- I prefer not to report my gender
- I prefer to report my gender this way: \_\_\_\_\_

6. What is your race? (Please select all that apply)

## APPENDIX G – STR Division Review Survey 2020

- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Asian
- Black or African American
- Hispanic or Latino
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- White
- Other

7. If you teach at a college or university, what is your rank or rank equivalent to that of the US system?

- Doctoral Student
- Instructor, Lecturer, Adjunct Professor or equivalent
- Assistant Professor or equivalent
- Associate Professor or equivalent
- Full Professor or equivalent
- Endowed Chair or Professorship
- Practitioner (industry, consulting, government)
- Other (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_

8. When did you obtain your doctoral degree (PhD, DBA, etc.)?

- Pending (still a student)
- Less than 5 years ago
- Between 5 to 10 years ago
- More than 10 years ago
- I do not currently hold or pursue a doctoral degree

9. What are your major research areas? Please select all that apply.

- Behavioral strategy
- Corporate and international strategy
- Industry, competition and strategic entrepreneurship
- Knowledge, learning and innovation strategy
- Nonmarket strategy
- Organization structure, networks and relational strategies
- Resources, capabilities and strategic factor markets
- Strategic leadership, TMT and corporate governance
- Other (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_

10. What are your major teaching areas? Please select all that apply.

- Competitive strategy
- Corporate strategy
- Entrepreneurship
- International business/management
- Leadership
- Organizational behavior
- Strategic management
- Other (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_

## APPENDIX G – STR Division Review Survey 2020

11. Over the last 12 months, what percentage of your effort have you spent on each of the following:

- Research [%]
- Teaching [%]
- Service [%]
- Other [%]

12. Related to the previous question, please specify what “other” area you have spent effort and time over the last 12 months?

13. Please rank order why you belong to STR from 1 - 5, with 1 representing the most important reason and 5 representing the least important reason. You may drag and drop each option into your desired order.

- Gain and share information relevant to research
- Gain and share information relevant to teaching
- Gain and share information relevant to training and management practice
- To learn more about a domain that is new to me
- Develop and maintain social connections

14. Do you consider STR to be your primary division/interest group?

- Yes, definitely
- Yes, but I identify with another division almost as much (please indicate in the next question).
- No, I identify mostly with another division (please indicate in the next question).
- No, but I identify with this division almost as much as my primary division (please indicate in the next question).

15. Please comment on your answer to the previous question, if desired.

16. If STR division is NOT your primary affiliation, please answer, “My primary affiliation is outside the STR division because....” \_\_\_\_\_

### Programs/Services and Leadership

---

17. In considering the STR Division, please rate your satisfaction with the following:

- Sense of community within the division
- Activities that address the division’s domain
- Welcoming of members from various demographic groups (diverse in, for example, race/ethnicity, gender, age, nationality, sexual orientation, disability status, etc.)
- Efforts to reach out to international members
- Efforts to foster good relations and work collaboratively with other divisions/interest groups

## APPENDIX G – STR Division Review Survey 2020

- Opportunities outside of the annual meeting to network/collaborate with peers
- Encouragement from division leaders to form network communities for members like me
- Opportunities for members like me to receive mentoring
- Level of communication received from the division/interest group
- Quality of newsletter
- Usefulness of website
- Value of Connect@AOM Community Discussion
- Responsiveness of division officers to member concerns
- Ability of interested members to become leaders in the division
- Opportunities to influence the division
- Fair and open elections
- Selection process for awards and recognition

### Satisfaction Overall

---

18. Overall, how satisfied are you with your membership in the STR division?

- Not satisfied
- Somewhat satisfied
- Satisfied
- Very satisfied
- Extremely satisfied

19. What do you like best about membership in the STR division?

\_\_\_\_\_

20. If there is one thing you would most like to improve regarding the STR division, what would it be? \_\_\_\_\_

### Open Ended

---

21. What issues should occupy the STR division's time over the next 5 years?

\_\_\_\_\_

22. What can the STR division do tomorrow morning that would increase its effectiveness? \_\_\_\_\_

### Annual Meeting & Submissions

---

23. How frequently, on average, do you attend the Academy's Annual Meeting?

## APPENDIX G – STR Division Review Survey 2020

- Pretty much every year; I give priority to the AOM annual meeting even if I am not on the program
- Only when I am on the program
- Once in a while
- Rarely
- Never

24. If you do attend the Academy's Annual Meeting, what is your primary source of funding to cover your costs of attendance?

- Funds from your institution
- Personal money
- Other forms of support (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_

25. If you do not attend the Academy's Annual Meeting, why do you not attend? Please check all that apply.

- I do not have access to funding
- I do not have time to attend
- I'm not interested in attending
- I belong to the Academy for benefits other than the Annual Meeting

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

- Served as a reviewer
- Presented at a professional development workshop
- Attended a professional development workshop
- Presented at a scholarly session (paper, symposium, etc.)
- Served as a chair or discussant for a scholarly session
- Attended a regular conference session
- Participated in other activities (social events, business meetings, etc.)
- Volunteered in some capacity (awards committee, social outing coordinator, etc.)

27. Please rate your level of satisfaction with the following features of STR division's annual meeting program.

- Professional Development Workshops (PDWs)
- Traditional paper sessions
- Discussion paper sessions
- Symposia
- Plenaries
- Social and networking opportunities
- Overall access to participation on the program

### Annual Meeting: PDWs

---

28. How interested are you in attending teaching-related PDWs on the following topics?

- Case-based teaching

## APPENDIX G – STR Division Review Survey 2020

- Case writing workshop
- Teaching simulations
- Online teaching
- Teaching innovations
- New course and module development
- Bringing research into the classroom

### Off-Conference Activities

---

29. Please rate your satisfaction with the following STR division 'STRonger Together' initiatives held during April-August 2020:

- Café Conversations for Working from Home/PhD/Regions,
- Workshops pairing PhD students with faculty for feedback
- Café Cultural Conversations (around common cultures)
- Coffee Wish Conversations pairing junior faculty with senior faculty
- Virtual Research Symposia
- Meet the Scholars interviews & conversations
- Virtual PDWs

[Scale: Extremely Unsatisfied, Moderately unsatisfied, Moderately satisfied, Extremely satisfied, I have not attended this type of activity]

30. In your opinion, the current offering of the STR division for the following activities is:

- Webinars by senior scholars
- Online workshops and symposia
- Local workshops and symposia
- Curated research collections and reading lists
- Availability of PhD syllabi
- Availability of other syllabi (MBA, executive, undergraduate)
- Teaching advice networking
- Mentor program for junior scholars
- Advice network for various stages of career
- Expanded newsletter or website with research summaries
- Expanded newsletter or website with teaching advice and items
- Online discussion groups based on research topics of interest
- Online discussion groups based on teaching topics of interest
- Local communities with regular meetings (online)
- Local communities with regular meetings (in person)
- Meet a local colleague network
- Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

31. Prior to this year, our division allocated nearly all of its effort toward the annual conference. Going forward (even beyond the Covid-19 crisis), how would you recommend the STR leadership allocate their effort across conference and non-conference activities:

- 100 conference, 0% non-conference



## APPENDIX G – STR Division Review Survey 2020

- 75% conference, 25% non-conference
- 50% conference, 50% non-conference
- 25% conference, 75% non-conference

### Additional Feedback

---

32. In your opinion, is strategic management sufficiently represented in the Academy journals (for e.g. AMJ, AMR, AMP, etc.) and their editorial staff?

- Yes
- No
  - If No, please specify additional details\_\_\_\_\_

33. In your opinion, what are the distinctive contributions of the strategic management field (for example, as compared to disciplines such as economics or sociology or related fields such as entrepreneurship, innovation management, or international business)? \_\_\_\_\_

34. In your opinion, does the diversity of the STR leadership in the following categories reflect the diversity of the STR membership?

- Age
- Disability
- Ethnicity
- Gender
- Geographic location
- Nationality
- Race
- Sexual orientation

## APPENDIX H – STR Division 2020 Survey Results

1. Approximately how many years have you been a member of STR?

Answer Choices	Responses	
0-3 years	33.13%	320
4-7 years	20.91%	202
8-11 years	15.63%	151
12-15 years	9.94%	96
15+ years	20.39%	197
<b>Answered</b>		<b>966</b>
<b>Skipped</b>		<b>3</b>

2. What is your membership type?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Academic	76.11%	736
Student	20.79%	201
Executive/Practitioner	2.28%	22
Emeritus	0.83%	8
<b>Answered</b>		<b>967</b>
<b>Skipped</b>		<b>2</b>

3. In which world region do you currently reside?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Asia	9.84%	95
Middle East	0.93%	9
North Africa and Greater Arabia	0.62%	6
Europe	28.91%	279
North America	53.68%	518
Central America	0.10%	1
The Caribbean	0.21%	2
South America	2.28%	22
Sub-Saharan Africa	1.24%	12
Australia and Oceania	2.18%	21
<b>Answered</b>		<b>965</b>
<b>Skipped</b>		<b>4</b>

4. What is your age?

Answer Choices	Responses	
18-29	6.35%	61
30-39	30.21%	290
40-49	28.65%	275
50-59	21.77%	209

## APPENDIX H – STR Division 2020 Survey Results

60-69	10.63%	102
70-79	2.19%	21
80 and above	0.21%	2
<b>Answered</b>		<b>960</b>
<b>Skipped</b>		<b>9</b>

### 5. What is your gender?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Female	32.99%	316
Male	65.14%	624
Transgender female-to-male	0.00%	0
Transgender male-to-female	0.00%	0
Gender non-conforming	0.10%	1
I prefer not to report my gender	1.46%	14
I prefer to report my gender this way:	0.31%	3
<b>Answered</b>		<b>958</b>
<b>Skipped</b>		<b>11</b>

### 6. What is your race? (Please select all that apply)

Answer Choices	Responses	
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.74%	7
Asian	25.43%	239
Black or African American	3.83%	36
Hispanic or Latino	6.70%	63
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0.21%	2
White	63.19%	594
Other	4.26%	40
<b>Answered</b>		<b>940</b>
<b>Skipped</b>		<b>29</b>

### 7. If you teach at a college or university, what is your rank or rank equivalent to that of the US system?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Doctoral Student	17.68%	166
Instructor, Lecturer, Adjunct Professor or equivalent	5.01%	47
Assistant Professor or equivalent	24.92%	234
Associate Professor or equivalent	21.41%	201
Full Professor or equivalent	18.53%	174
Endowed Chair or Professorship	8.63%	81
Practitioner (industry, consulting, government)	1.28%	12
Other (please specify)	2.56%	24

## APPENDIX H – STR Division 2020 Survey Results

**Answered 939**  
**Skipped 30**

8. When did you obtain your doctoral degree (PhD, DBA, etc.)?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Pending (still a student)	21.18%	204
Less than 5 years ago	18.80%	181
Between 5 to 10 years ago	17.34%	167
More than 10 years ago	40.50%	390
I do not currently hold or pursue a doctoral degree	2.18%	21
	<b>Answered</b>	<b>963</b>
	<b>Skipped</b>	<b>6</b>

9. What are your major research areas? Please select all that apply.

Answer Choices	Responses	
Behavioral strategy	24.97%	240
Corporate and international strategy	33.19%	319
Industry, competition and strategic entrepreneurship	31.95%	307
Knowledge, learning and innovation strategy	36.00%	346
Nonmarket strategy	12.59%	121
Organization structure, networks and relational strategies	23.41%	225
Resources, capabilities and strategic factor markets	20.08%	193
Strategic leadership, TMT and corporate governance	29.14%	280
Other (please specify)	13.74%	132
	<b>Answered</b>	<b>961</b>
	<b>Skipped</b>	<b>8</b>

10. What are your major teaching areas? Please select all that apply.

Answer Choices	Responses	
Competitive strategy	28.68%	265
Corporate strategy	30.52%	282
Entrepreneurship	24.57%	227
International business/management	21.10%	195
Leadership	9.09%	84
Organizational behavior	9.63%	89
Strategic management	75.43%	697
Other (please specify)	16.34%	151
	<b>Answered</b>	<b>924</b>
	<b>Skipped</b>	<b>45</b>

## APPENDIX H – STR Division 2020 Survey Results

11. Over the last 12 months, what percentage of your effort have you spent on each of the following:

Answer Choices	Average Number	Total Number	Responses	
Research [%]:	47.55978261	43755	98.71%	920
Teaching [%]:	31.31121281	27366	93.78%	874
Service [%]:	18.77990431	15700	89.70%	836
Other [%]:	21.05280528	6379	32.51%	303
<b>Answered</b>				<b>932</b>
<b>Skipped</b>				<b>37</b>

12. Related to the previous question, please specify what “other” area you have spent effort and time over the last 12 months?

**Answered 271**  
**Skipped 698**

13. Please rank order why you belong to STR from 1 - 5, with 1 representing the most important reason and 5 representing the least important reason. You may drag and drop each option into your desired order.

	1		2		3		4	
Gain and share information relevant to research	70.27%	643	18.69%	171	5.90%	54	1.75%	16
Gain and share information relevant to teaching	5.01%	45	21.02%	189	30.59%	275	27.25%	245
Gain and share information relevant to training and management practice	4.05%	37	11.60%	106	23.85%	218	35.01%	320
To learn more about a domain that is new to me	5.29%	48	17.20%	156	21.06%	191	19.40%	176
Develop and maintain social connections	16.65%	156	32.23%	302	19.10%	179	15.47%	145

	5	Total	Score	
Gain and share information relevant to research	3.39%	31	915	4.51
Gain and share information relevant to teaching	16.13%	145	899	2.72
Gain and share information relevant to training and management practice	25.49%	233	914	2.34
To learn more about a domain that is new to me	37.05%	336	907	2.34
Develop and maintain social connections	16.54%	155	937	3.17
<b>Answered</b>				<b>945</b>
<b>Skipped</b>				<b>24</b>

## APPENDIX H – STR Division 2020 Survey Results

14. Do you consider STR to be your primary division/interest group?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes, definitely	41.16%	391
Yes, but I identify with another division almost as much (please indicate in the next question).	35.58%	338
No, I identify mostly with another division (please indicate in the next question).	15.47%	147
No, but I identify with this division almost as much as my primary division (please indicate in the next question).	7.79%	74
<b>Answered</b>	<b>950</b>	
<b>Skipped</b>	<b>19</b>	

15. Please comment on your answer to the previous question, if desired.

**Answered 441**  
**Skipped 528**

16. If STR division is NOT your primary affiliation, please answer, “My primary affiliation is outside the STR division because....” \_\_\_\_\_

**Answered 202**  
**Skipped 767**

### Programs/Services and Leadership

17. In considering the STR Division, please rate your satisfaction with the following:

	Not Satisfied		Somewhat Satisfied		Satisfied		Very Satisfied	
Sense of community within the division	7.70%	61	18.31%	145	34.85%	276	23.61%	187
Activities that address the division’s domain	2.41%	19	12.28%	97	37.34%	295	30.13%	238
Activities that help members improve the content and delivery of their courses	7.37%	58	19.44%	153	33.16%	261	19.19%	151
Welcoming of members from various demographic groups (diverse in, for example, race/ethnicity, gender, age, nationality, sexual orientation, disability status, etc.)	7.90%	62	15.16%	119	28.03%	220	22.55%	177

## APPENDIX H – STR Division 2020 Survey Results

Efforts to reach out to international members	6.75%	53	16.56%	130	27.13%	213	19.36%	152
Efforts to foster good relations and work collaboratively with other divisions/interest groups	7.92%	62	14.30%	112	33.33%	261	21.07%	165
Encouraging participation in Academy and division-specific activities	4.85%	38	10.08%	79	34.57%	271	29.46%	231
Opportunities outside of the annual meeting to network/collaborate with peers	10.83%	85	20.64%	162	31.72%	249	17.45%	137
Encouragement from division leaders to form network communities for members like me	13.22%	103	19.00%	148	29.91%	233	17.72%	138
Opportunities for members like me to receive mentoring	14.34%	112	18.18%	142	26.89%	210	12.68%	99
Level of communication received from the division	3.70%	29	8.56%	67	37.93%	297	28.35%	222
Quality of newsletter	3.08%	24	10.40%	81	36.46%	284	27.21%	212
Usefulness of website	4.51%	35	14.95%	116	32.86%	255	23.07%	179
Value of Connect@AOM	8.12%	63	11.21%	87	32.35%	251	13.92%	108
Community Discussion	3.34%	26	7.46%	58	22.88%	178	17.22%	134
Responsiveness of division officers to member concerns	7.34%	57	13.13%	102	27.54%	214	15.83%	123
Ability of interested members to become leaders in the division	9.73%	76	14.98%	117	29.71%	232	16.01%	125
Opportunities to influence the division	2.94%	23	6.66%	52	28.30%	221	26.25%	205
Fair and open elections	5.41%	42	9.27%	72	30.24%	235	21.49%	167
Selection process for awards and recognition								

	Extremely Satisfied		N/A		Total	Weighted Average
Sense of community within the division	8.08%	64	7.45%	59	792	3.07
Activities that address the division's domain	12.28%	97	5.57%	44	790	3.4
Activities that help members improve the content and delivery of their courses	5.46%	43	15.37%	121	787	2.95
Welcoming of members from various demographic groups (diverse in, for example, race/ethnicity, gender, age, nationality, sexual orientation, disability status, etc.)	11.21%	88	15.16%	119	785	3.17

## APPENDIX H – STR Division 2020 Survey Results

Efforts to reach out to international members	11.72%	92	18.47%	145	785	3.16
Efforts to foster good relations and work collaboratively with other divisions/interest groups	8.81%	69	14.56%	114	783	3.1
Encouraging participation in Academy and division-specific activities	14.41%	113	6.63%	52	784	3.41
Opportunities outside of the annual meeting to network/collaborate with peers	10.06%	79	9.30%	73	785	2.95
Encouragement from division leaders to form network communities for members like me	8.22%	64	11.94%	93	779	2.87
Opportunities for members like me to receive mentoring	6.15%	48	21.77%	170	781	2.72
Level of communication received from the division	18.77%	147	2.68%	21	783	3.51
Quality of newsletter	17.20%	134	5.65%	44	779	3.48
Usefulness of website	10.95%	85	13.66%	106	776	3.24
Value of Connect@AOM	9.15%	71	25.26%	196	776	3.06
Community Discussion						
Responsiveness of division officers to member concerns	11.05%	86	38.05%	296	778	3.41
Ability of interested members to become leaders in the division	8.49%	66	27.67%	215	777	3.07
Opportunities to influence the division	6.02%	47	23.56%	184	781	2.92
Fair and open elections	21.51%	168	14.34%	112	781	3.66
Selection process for awards and recognition	12.10%	94	21.49%	167	777	3.33
					<b>Answered</b>	<b>794</b>
					<b>Skipped</b>	<b>175</b>

### Satisfaction Overall

18. Overall, how satisfied are you with your membership in the STR division?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Not satisfied	3.64%	29
Somewhat satisfied	18.95%	151
Satisfied	40.03%	319
Very satisfied	29.49%	235
Extremely satisfied	7.90%	63
<b>Answered</b>		<b>797</b>



## APPENDIX H – STR Division 2020 Survey Results

**Skipped 172**

19. What do you like best about membership in the STR division?

**Answered 306**  
**Skipped 663**

20. If there is one thing you would most like to improve regarding the STR division, what would it be?

**Answered 318**  
**Skipped 651**

Open Ended

---

21. What issues should occupy the STR division's time over the next 5 years?

**Answered 330**  
**Skipped 639**

22. What can the STR division do tomorrow morning that would increase its effectiveness?

**Answered 246**  
**Skipped 723**

Annual Meeting & Submissions

---

23. How frequently, on average, do you attend the Academy's Annual Meeting?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Pretty much every year; I give priority to the AOM annual meeting even if I am not on the program	56.01%	429
Only when I am on the program	25.59%	196
Once in a while	9.53%	73
Rarely	3.52%	27
Never	5.35%	41
	<b>Answered</b>	<b>766</b>
	<b>Skipped</b>	<b>203</b>

24. If you do attend the Academy's Annual Meeting, what is your primary source of funding to cover your costs of attendance?

## APPENDIX H – STR Division 2020 Survey Results

Answer Choices	Responses	
Funds from your institution	83.00%	615
Personal money	13.09%	97
Other forms of support (please specify):	3.91%	29
	<b>Answered</b>	<b>741</b>
	<b>Skipped</b>	<b>228</b>

25. If you do not attend the Academy's Annual Meeting, why do you not attend?  
Please check all that apply.

Answer Choices	Responses	
I do not have access to funding	52.22%	223
I do not have time to attend	45.20%	193
I'm not interested in attending	13.35%	57
I belong to the Academy for benefits other than the Annual Meeting	10.54%	45
	<b>Answered</b>	<b>427</b>
	<b>Skipped</b>	<b>542</b>

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

	Never		Once		A few times	
Served as a reviewer	14.53%	109	10.40%	78	30.40%	228
Presented at a professional development workshop	43.36%	323	14.50%	108	27.25%	203
Attended a professional development workshop	18.13%	136	16.13%	121	35.60%	267
Presented at a scholarly session (paper, symposium, etc)	20.74%	156	12.50%	94	36.30%	273
Served as a chair or discussant for a scholarly session	49.60%	374	10.48%	79	28.12%	212
Attended a regular conference session	9.69%	73	8.10%	61	35.72%	269
Participated in other activities (social events, business meetings, etc)	17.51%	132	8.89%	67	32.76%	247
Volunteered in some capacity (awards committee, social outing coordinator, etc.)	59.87%	449	10.00%	75	15.60%	117

	Every year		N/A		Total	Weighted Average
Served as a reviewer	40.93%	307	3.73%	28	750	3.02
Presented at a professional development workshop	9.93%	74	4.97%	37	745	2.04
Attended a professional development workshop	26.27%	197	3.87%	29	750	2.73
Presented at a scholarly session (paper, symposium, etc)	26.60%	200	3.86%	29	752	2.72

## APPENDIX H – STR Division 2020 Survey Results

Served as a chair or discussant for a scholarly session	6.90%	52	4.91%	37	754	1.92
Attended a regular conference session	43.56%	328	2.92%	22	753	3.17
Participated in other activities (social events, business meetings, etc)	37.40%	282	3.45%	26	754	2.93
Volunteered in some capacity (awards committee, social outing coordinator, etc.)	6.93%	52	7.60%	57	750	1.67
					<b>Answered</b>	<b>758</b>
					<b>Skipped</b>	<b>211</b>

27. Please rate your level of satisfaction with the following features of STR division's annual meeting program.

	Not Satisfied		Somewhat Satisfied		Satisfied		Very Satisfied	
Professional Development Workshops (PDWs)	2.28%	17	7.79%	58	27.25%	203	29.13%	217
Traditional paper sessions	6.70%	50	16.76%	125	37.40%	279	19.97%	149
Discussion paper sessions	5.65%	42	15.07%	112	36.47%	271	20.46%	152
Symposia	3.12%	23	8.55%	63	31.89%	235	27.41%	202
Plenaries	4.07%	30	12.06%	89	31.03%	229	22.22%	164
Social and networking opportunities	5.77%	43	13.29%	99	32.62%	243	23.62%	176
Overall access to participation on the program	4.58%	34	9.42%	70	37.55%	279	24.76%	184

	Extremely Satisfied		N/A		Total	Weighted Average
Professional Development Workshops (PDWs)	17.32%	129	16.24%	121	745	3.61
Traditional paper sessions	8.45%	63	10.72%	80	746	3.08
Discussion paper sessions	7.13%	53	15.21%	113	743	3.1
Symposia	12.08%	89	16.96%	125	737	3.44
Plenaries	10.57%	78	20.05%	148	738	3.29
Social and networking opportunities	10.60%	79	14.09%	105	745	3.23
Overall access to participation on the program	13.59%	101	10.09%	75	743	3.37
					<b>Answered</b>	<b>748</b>
					<b>Skipped</b>	<b>221</b>

### Annual Meeting: PDWs

28. How interested are you in attending teaching-related PDWs on the following topics?

	Uninterested		Somewhat uninterested		Somewhat interested	
Case-based teaching	16.49%	122	16.49%	122	36.49%	270
Case writing workshop	24.86%	182	20.36%	149	30.19%	221

## APPENDIX H – STR Division 2020 Survey Results

Teaching simulations	18.91%	139	21.22%	156	32.24%	237
Online teaching	12.57%	93	15.14%	112	34.73%	257
Teaching innovations	11.50%	85	13.67%	101	31.39%	232
New course and module development	13.57%	100	17.37%	128	36.36%	268
Bridging the strategy formulation and implementation divide in the classroom	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0
Bringing research into the classroom	9.05%	67	12.57%	93	37.30%	276

	Interested		Total	Weighted Average
Case-based teaching	30.54%	226	740	2.81
Case writing workshop	24.59%	180	732	2.55
Teaching simulations	27.62%	203	735	2.69
Online teaching	37.57%	278	740	2.97
Teaching innovations	43.44%	321	739	3.07
New course and module development	32.70%	241	737	2.88
Bridging the strategy formulation and implementation divide in the classroom	0.00%	0	0	0
Bringing research into the classroom	41.08%	304	740	3.1
			<b>Answered</b>	<b>744</b>
			<b>Skipped</b>	<b>225</b>

### Off-Conference Activities

29. Please rate your satisfaction with the following STR division 'STRonger Together' initiatives held during April-August 2020:

	Extremely unsatisfied		Moderately unsatisfied		Moderately satisfied		Extremely satisfied	
Café Conversations for Working from Home/PhD/Regions,	1.81%	13	2.92%	21	13.91%	100	8.76%	63
Networkshops pairing PhD students with faculty for feedback	1.95%	14	2.92%	21	9.75%	70	9.33%	67
Café Cultural Conversations (around common cultures)	1.54%	11	4.05%	29	8.80%	63	6.98%	50
Coffee Wish Conversations pairing junior faculty with senior faculty	1.81%	13	2.51%	18	8.51%	61	8.93%	64
Virtual Research Symposia	1.68%	12	3.63%	26	19.55%	140	16.90%	121
Meet the Scholars interviews & conversations	1.54%	11	3.63%	26	15.08%	108	19.41%	139
Virtual PDWs	2.24%	16	3.22%	23	18.35%	131	15.41%	110

	I have not attended this type of activity		Total
Café Conversations for Working from Home/PhD/Regions,	72.60%	522	719
Networkshops pairing PhD students with faculty for feedback	76.04%	546	718

## APPENDIX H – STR Division 2020 Survey Results

Café Cultural Conversations (around common cultures)	78.63%	563	716
Coffee Wish Conversations pairing junior faculty with senior faculty	78.24%	561	717
Virtual Research Symposia	58.24%	417	716
Meet the Scholars interviews & conversations	60.34%	432	716
Virtual PDWs	60.78%	434	714
	<b>Answered</b>	<b>721</b>	
	<b>Skipped</b>	<b>248</b>	

30. In your opinion, the current offering of the STR division for the following activities is:

	Not sufficient		Sufficient		Too much	
Webinars by senior scholars	17.82%	126	42.86%	303	6.79%	48
Online workshops and symposia	20.17%	142	44.89%	316	3.27%	23
Local workshops and symposia	24.40%	172	30.35%	214	1.99%	14
Curated research collections and reading lists	24.89%	175	30.01%	211	2.28%	16
Availability of PhD syllabi	30.10%	211	20.83%	146	1.71%	12
Availability of other syllabi (MBA, executive, undergraduate)	30.24%	212	22.25%	156	1.85%	13
Teaching advice networking	21.71%	152	29.14%	204	2.14%	15
Mentor program for junior scholars	23.46%	164	32.33%	226	2.72%	19
Advice network for various stages of career	23.32%	163	33.62%	235	3.15%	22
Expanded newsletter or website with research summaries	14.45%	101	40.63%	284	5.44%	38
Expanded newsletter or website with teaching advice and items	16.28%	113	36.02%	250	3.89%	27
Online discussion groups based on research topics of interest	23.42%	163	30.60%	213	3.16%	22
Online discussion groups based on teaching topics of interest	16.98%	118	30.07%	209	3.45%	24
Local communities with regular meetings (online)	25.32%	176	23.02%	160	2.88%	20
Local communities with regular meetings (in person)	23.34%	162	21.04%	146	3.46%	24
Meet a local colleague network	27.29%	188	19.30%	133	2.47%	17
Other (please specify)						

	No opinion		Total
Webinars by senior scholars	32.53%	230	707
Online workshops and symposia	31.68%	223	704
Local workshops and symposia	43.26%	305	705
Curated research collections and reading lists	42.82%	301	703
Availability of PhD syllabi	47.36%	332	701
Availability of other syllabi (MBA, executive, undergraduate)	45.65%	320	701
Teaching advice networking	47.00%	329	700

## APPENDIX H – STR Division 2020 Survey Results

Mentor program for junior scholars	41.49%	290	699
Advice network for various stages of career	39.91%	279	699
Expanded newsletter or website with research summaries	39.48%	276	699
Expanded newsletter or website with teaching advice and items	43.80%	304	694
Online discussion groups based on research topics of interest	42.82%	298	696
Online discussion groups based on teaching topics of interest	49.50%	344	695
Local communities with regular meetings (online)	48.78%	339	695
Local communities with regular meetings (in person)	52.16%	362	694
Meet a local colleague network	50.94%	351	689
Other (please specify)			13
		<b>Answered</b>	<b>710</b>
		<b>Skipped</b>	<b>259</b>

31. Prior to this year, our division allocated nearly all of its effort toward the annual conference. Going forward (even beyond the Covid-19 crisis), how would you recommend the STR leadership allocate their effort across conference and non-conference activities:

Answer Choices	Responses	
100% conference, 0% non-conference	7.99%	58
75% conference, 25% non-conference	50.14%	364
50% conference, 50% non-conference	35.81%	260
25% conference, 75% non-conference	6.06%	44
<b>Answered</b>		<b>726</b>
<b>Skipped</b>		<b>243</b>

### Additional Feedback

---

32. In your opinion, is strategic management sufficiently represented in the Academy journals (for e.g. AMJ, AMR, AMP, etc.) and their editorial staff?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	65.45%	468
No	19.16%	137
If No, please specify additional details:	15.38%	110
<b>Answered</b>		<b>715</b>
<b>Skipped</b>		<b>254</b>

## APPENDIX H – STR Division 2020 Survey Results

33. In your opinion, what are the distinctive contributions of the strategic management field (for example, as compared to disciplines such as economics or sociology or related fields such as entrepreneurship, innovation management, or international business)?

**Answered 267**  
**Skipped 702**

34. In your opinion, does the diversity of the STR leadership in the following categories reflect the diversity of the STR membership?

	Strongly disagree		Disagree		Agree		Strongly agree	
Age	6.26%	36	19.13%	110	63.30%	364	11.30%	65
Disability	10.99%	59	31.47%	169	50.09%	269	7.45%	40
Ethnicity	9.09%	51	25.85%	145	54.55%	306	10.52%	59
Gender	4.07%	23	15.40%	87	65.49%	370	15.04%	85
Geographic location	11.88%	67	28.55%	161	50.89%	287	8.69%	49
Nationality	10.68%	60	26.51%	149	54.63%	307	8.19%	46
Race	10.05%	56	29.98%	167	50.81%	283	9.16%	51
Sexual orientation	8.60%	45	22.94%	120	58.51%	306	9.94%	52

	Total	Weighted Average
Age	575	2.8
Disability	537	2.54
Ethnicity	561	2.66
Gender	565	2.92
Geographic location	564	2.56
Nationality	562	2.6
Race	557	2.59
Sexual orientation	523	2.7
<b>Answered</b>	<b>576</b>	
<b>Skipped</b>	<b>393</b>	