

Section 1: MOC Division Survey Findings

Introduction

The MOC Division surveyed members in November 2018. Of the 1291 members, 298 responded, representing a 25.4% response rate of all members. This response rate was identical to that of the survey administered in 2013. Our response rate was relatively constant across our membership categories: 27.8% of US members, 16.8% percent of international members, 25.3% of academic members, and 20.4% of student members. The survey consisted of five major sections: (1) respondent profile information; (2) views on the activities at the Annual Meeting; (3) satisfaction with the divisions' programs, services, and leadership; (4) overall satisfaction with the division; and (5) open-ended questions about our identity that solicited suggestions for actions and changes in the division as well as comments on the distinctive features of the division.

This report is organized into three major sections. In Section 1, we summarize the MOC Division Survey Findings, organized along the five sections defined above. In Section 2, we focus on MOC Health and Governance Data. In Section 3, we review the progress we have made in the past five years and then articulate our goals and future actions for the MOC Division.

1. Profile of members

About two-thirds of our respondents reported having been members of the division for 7 years or less. Specifically, 44.4% reported they had been members for 0-3 years, 26.3 % for 4-7 years, 11.8% for 8-11 years, 5.1% for 12-15 years, and 12.5% for more than 15 years. *This distribution suggests that close to half of the respondents were not members of the division when the last five-year review was conducted.*

Demographics

Most respondents were academic members (69.8%), 26.4% were students, 3.1% were executives, and 0.7% were *emeritus* members. Those proportions are representative of the distribution of members in the division. The majority of respondents were from North America (67.2%), some from Europe (17.6%), Australia and Oceania (6.4%) and Asia (6.4%), a few respondents were from South America (1.4%), and no respondents reported being from Africa. While a little over 45% of our members are from countries outside the USA, only 32.8% of those responding to the survey were. *In other words, the MOC Division is more international than suggested by the profile of those responding to this survey. This under-representation of international members on this survey also suggests that we need to work harder to increase the engagement of this sector of our membership.*

Division Affiliations

A little over 67.7% of the respondents indicated that they view the MOC Division as their primary division (less than half of this group also identified strongly with another division/interest group). Of the 32.2% who did not consider MOC their primary division, 6.1% identified with the MOC Division almost as much as their primary division. *Thus, over two-thirds of the respondents identified strongly with the MOC Division.*

In response to an open-ended question about divisional affiliations, the majority of our respondents indicated primary or secondary affiliations with AOM's three larger divisions: the OB division (57 respondents or 36.5%), OMT division (27 respondents or 17.3%), and the STR division (17 respondents or 10.9%). The remainder of the respondents indicated secondary affiliations with other divisions and interest groups, including ENT, HR, and CM. The primary reason respondents said they belonged to the MOC Division was to "gain and share information related to research" (92.1% chose this as the first or second most important reason for belonging to this division). We note that 57.4% of respondents indicated that "gaining and sharing information relevant to teaching" was the least important reason for belonging to this division. *Perhaps reflecting the fact that cognition is a process that appears in many research streams, this description of our members suggests that the MOC Division is a bridging division, connecting individuals with a strong research focus from a variety of different research areas (different topics at different levels of analysis).*

2. Annual Meeting

Most respondents reported being familiar with the Annual Meeting. Only 6 % had never attended it. For the most part, respondents reported that they attended the Annual Meeting every year (71.5%) or only when they are on the program (13.4%). The most common reason for not attending the Meeting was lack of funding (55.4%).

Engagement with Annual Meeting Program

A large portion of the respondents reported being engaged in some aspect of the Annual Meeting program. For example, 73.7% of the respondents had served as reviewers, 76.7% had attended a professional development workshop (PDW), 68.7 % had presented at a scholarly session, 87.1% had attended regular conference sessions, and 82.3% had participated in other activities like social events and the business meeting. In contrast, a much smaller number of respondents reported having presented at professional development workshops (42.39% compared with 33.7% in 2013), served as a chair or discussant for a scholarly session (35.26% compared with 31% in 2013), or volunteered in some capacity (28.37% compared to 28.5% in 2013).

Satisfaction with Annual Meeting Program

On a five-point scale (1=not satisfied to 5=extremely satisfied), respondents reported moderately high levels of satisfaction with overall access to the program ($M = 3.84$, $sd = 1.00$) and for each of the program features. The highest levels of satisfaction were reported for PDWs ($M = 4.01$, $sd = 1.04$), for symposia ($M = 3.86$, $sd = 0.97$), and for social and networking opportunities ($M = 3.77$, $sd = 1.07$). The lowest levels of satisfaction reported were for traditional paper sessions ($M = 3.57$, $sd = 1.02$).

3. Program/Services and Leadership

Respondents were satisfied with the Division's programs and leadership with a few exceptions. On average, respondents were satisfied to very satisfied with the fairness and openness of the election process ($M = 4.05$, $sd = 1.03$), responsiveness of division officers to members' concerns ($M = 3.82$, $sd = 1.07$), selection process for awards and recognition ($M = 3.69$, $sd = 1.15$), activities that address the division's domain ($M = 3.69$, $sd = 1.06$), welcoming of members from various demographic groups ($M = 3.68$, $sd = 1.16$), sense of community within the division ($M = 3.57$, $sd = 1.14$), level of communication received from the division ($M = 3.54$, $sd = 1.12$), efforts

to foster relations and work collaboratively with other divisions ($M = 3.50$, $sd = 1.15$), ability of interested members to become leaders in the division ($M = 3.49$, $sd = 1.28$), opportunities to influence the division ($M = 3.43$, $sd = 1.21$), and efforts to reach out to international members ($M = 3.41$, $sd = 1.28$).

Respondents expressed lower satisfaction with opportunities outside of the Annual Meeting to network/collaborate with peers ($M = 3.01$, $sd = 1.33$), opportunities for members to receive mentoring ($M = 3.04$, $sd = 1.32$), encouragement from division leaders to form network communities for members ($M = 3.07$, $sd = 1.32$), usefulness of the website ($M = 3.21$, $sd = 1.10$), value of the listservs ($M = 3.21$, $sd = 1.14$), and quality of newsletter ($M = 3.35$, $sd = 1.08$). We return to a discussion of how we will work on these dimensions in Section 3.

4. Overall Satisfaction with the MOC Division

Overall, respondents reported being satisfied to very satisfied with the MOC Division ($M = 3.65$, $sd = 0.93$).

Comparing Levels of Satisfaction in 2018 and in 2013.

We compared mean levels of satisfaction reported in 2013 and 2018, and we looked for significant changes in the proportion of respondents who reported being satisfied, very satisfied, or extremely satisfied with the Annual Meeting, Programs/Services, and Leadership. For most of the items measured, there were no significant changes in the mean levels, or in the proportion of satisfied members. Only four of the satisfaction items were significantly different in 2018. The proportion (percent) of respondents who reported being satisfied, very satisfied, or extremely satisfied with a sense of community within the division increased significantly from 2013 (66.1%) to 2018 (75.7%), $z = 2.4$, $p = .02$ and with activities that address the division's domain increased significantly from 2013 (71.6%) to 2018 (78.9%), $z = 1.9$, $p = .058$. By contrast, the proportion (percent) of respondents who reported being satisfied, very satisfied, or extremely satisfied with fair and open elections decreased significantly from 2013 (76.1%) to 2018 (66.3%), $z = 2.4$, $p = .02$ and with selection process for awards and recognition decreased significantly from 2013 (60.1%) to 2018 (51.0%), $z = 2.2$, $p = .03$. This is despite the fact the mean levels of satisfaction for these two items increased marginally from 2013 to 2018 ($M_s = 3.84$ to 4.05 for fair and open elections and $M_s = 3.57$ to 3.69 for selection process for awards and recognition). In sum, while on average our respondents seem more satisfied with elections and awards, there are a greater number of members reporting dissatisfaction. This may be because, as reported in the 2013 report, the division made a decision to cut down on awards and recognitions in an effort to save money. Based on feedback from this member survey, we have decided to reverse this decision, adding three additional awards to our annual program. We are also taking steps to increase the transparency of our election process including communicating our call for self-nominations more broadly. Both of these efforts are discussed in more detail in the last section of this report

5. MOC Identity: Who are we and Who will we continue to be

We also took the five-year review as an opportunity to refine and refigure “who we are” as a division – in other words, to get a snapshot of our identity as a division of the Academy of Management. We used multiple opened-ended questions to ask our members to describe who

they perceive we “are” and “should be.” We then coded and compared these responses to respondents’ answers to similar questions from the last survey (2013).

Our coding indicated that respondents showed a high level of agreement in their open-ended answers to the three main components of the MOC Division’s identity. First, respondents indicated that the Division should continue to focus on *cognition* research and scholarship as our domain of interest. Second, respondents recognized MOC as a *diverse* and *inclusive* division, as it welcomes multi-disciplinary, cross-level research and a plurality of methods to study how individuals and organizations think, feel, and act. Third, respondents indicated that MOC continues to be a strong, *developmental*, and collaborative community. Below we elaborate on each of these three major themes.

- 1. Focus on COGNITION research and scholarship** – The respondents saw MOC as focusing squarely on how individuals and organizations think, feel, and act. Many of our respondent members reported that they study (or apply) cognition in the context of multiple phenomena across levels of analysis. In particular, respondents noted our focus on interpretive, social, and relational processes, as well as sensemaking, affect, identity, and positive organizational scholarship as central topics of the division. One respondent noted anonymously (in the open-ended section of the survey) that: “MOC is squarely focused on cognition-related research at its core, but is still a ‘big-tent’ division that is welcoming to a huge range of interests. This makes sense given the integral role of cognition in human experience.”
- 2. Purposively DIVERSE and INCLUSIVE** – As noted, MOC was seen as place for scholars focused on cognition. In focusing on this area, MOC is a division that spans and bridges disciplines, levels of analysis, and methods. Specifically, scholars in the division span the disciplines of psychology, sociology, and management, focus on micro, meso, and macro issues, and use quantitative and qualitative approaches. One respondent astutely commented, “Organizational life is messy and does not neatly fit into academic buckets. MOC is willing to look at the messiness holistically.”

With this diversity, respondents felt that MOC is an inclusive, open, and welcoming community for developing ideas. As one respondent noted, MOC is “a community that welcomes diverse perspectives, methods, etc. As a result, it is the division I consider my home.” Another commented that MOC “bridges different domains and provides a home for researchers that get put in boxes they don’t belong to.” When respondents were asked if they viewed the multi-disciplinary and cross-level focus as a strength or weakness, nearly all survey responders noted that it is a strength, particularly given that MOC is able to successfully build a strong community. One respondent emphasized: “MOC should remain a complex and multi-field division where you can come to discuss a wide range of interests in regards to cognition.”

- 3. Strong, DEVELOPMENTAL, and collaborative community** – Distinctive to MOC’s identity is that the division is friendly, open, supportive, developmental, and welcoming. Many respondents noted that the “in-the-rough” PDWs and opportunities to develop

one's work are core to MOC. For example, a respondent said that one of the unique things about MOC is that it is “a community of extraordinary scholars that are willing to help younger and more advanced researchers thrive and explore new ideas.” Many respondents also highlighted the energy and engagement of the members using words like “proactive,” “vibrant,” “and creative.” One person summed up this spirit of MOC: “It feels more accessible, open, happy, and alive than other divisions to me. ‘Youthful’ as a mindset (not as an age!).” In contrast to prior surveys, only one person noted that the “tight community was problematic, as it seemed clique-ish.” These responses suggest, then, that despite forming a strong community, new members feel welcomed and supported. A few respondents commented that they would like even more mentoring and access to senior scholars for developmental opportunities.

Section 2: MOC Division Health and Governance Data

Membership

Based on data taken from records as of July 1st of each year, our division membership has increased 5.3% since the last review, with an annual growth rate of 1.3%. While changes in our divisional membership largely track that of the Academy at large, a closer examination of the data shows that there is one important area in which our membership changes do not reflect those of the Academy. Specifically, while our US-based membership has not shrunk at the same rate over the past five years as the Academy (-0.8% for MOC and -2.4% for the Academy), our international membership has grown at a higher rate than the Academy (14.1% for the MOC versus 10.2% for the Academy). We also note that we are net positive, adding new members to the Division, compared to net negative membership growth for the Academy in general (annual average change: 0.7% for MOC, and -1.6% for the Academy). These numbers suggest to us that the division's work on attracting new international members is succeeding.

The fastest growing segment of our membership is *emeritus* members (29.4 % change over five years), but this group is a very small proportion of our total membership (1.7% of all members). The largest category of members is academic members, and this group has grown at an average annual rate of 1.2% or 4.8% over five years. Similar to the Academy, we have lost executive members, at an average of 5.8% each year. This group consists of about 5.5% of our membership in 2018, compared with 7.3% of our members in 2014, when we had the largest number of executive members (90 members in 2014). We also note that the number of student members in our division has increased over the five-year period (average annual rate is 3% or 12.3% over five years). Student members count for 30% of our total membership.

Our reflection on the changing membership composition of our division suggests that we have significant opportunities to make sure we are addressing the needs of our international and more senior members. In section 3 of this report we will discuss some specific actions we have planned to engage these two segments of our division's membership.

Annual Meeting

Below we discuss three aspects of the Annual Meeting – the professional development program, the main scholarly program, and social and community building events.

Professional Development Workshops

Our PDW program continues to be a core strength of the MOC Division. On our member survey, several respondents reported that the PDWs were their favorite part of MOC. In 2018, we sponsored or co-sponsored 21 PDWs, of which we were lead sponsor on nine. This is a dramatic increase in both co-sponsored and primary sponsored PDWs from our previous report. In 2013, we reported 13 and four PDW sessions, respectively. Importantly, reflective of our cross-disciplinary nature, we collaborated with 15 divisions/IGs on PDWs. These PDWs were run by over 100 volunteer organizers and scholars, representing 80 schools from around the globe.

The MOC Division is particularly proud of the “...In the Rough” series of workshops that we sponsor. “**Cognition in the Rough**” has been running for 21 years, and this year the authors of 30 papers got a chance to discuss their work with 19 senior scholars as well as fellow participants in this workshop. Inspired by the success of the Cognition in the Rough PDW, we have developed four additional “...In the Roughs” aimed at different groups in our membership.

In 2012 and 2013, we introduced “**Reviewing in the Rough**,” and “**Diamonds in the Rough**”. Both are focused on doctoral students and junior faculty. “Reviewing in the Rough” is a PDW aimed at developing participants’ reviewing skills, and “Diamonds in the Rough,” is a consortium in which participants receive feedback on research streams, learn about trends in research methods, and network with like-minded MOC members. To be as inclusive as possible, we considered the following selection criteria for participation in this workshop: participants who were at critical career junctures (e.g., dissertation proposal phase), participants who had not previously attended a doctoral consortium at the Academy, and geographic variety. These two PDWs have continued to thrive in the past five years. In 2018, 21 participants learned from three speakers and 10 facilitators in RIR. Participants worked closely with facilitators to hone their reviewing skills through a practice-focused workshop session. In 2018, we had 12 faculty facilitators, 14 junior faculty and post-doc facilitators, and 13 PhD students take part in RIR. They had active discussions about developing a research stream, managing multiple demands, and building academic relationships.

In the past five years, we also began offering two other PDWs focused on a broader set of MOC members (more experienced faculty, in addition to doctoral students and junior faculty): “**Teaching in the Rough**” (TIR), and “**Presenting in the Rough**” (PIR). TIR was introduced in 2015 to help instructors share favorite classroom-tested experiential exercises and activities about cognition-related topics. In 2018, we had a three rotation round-robin format whereby participations were given the opportunity to attend three different stations in which expert instructors provided interactive, 20-minute explanations/demonstrations of their activity/exercise. This session was facilitated by seven faculty members. Our newest “IR”, PIR was introduced in 2017 to bring together scholars interested in honing their skills at crafting and delivering presentations to a variety of audiences. In 2017, PIR kicked off with a panel of six presenters to an audience of 136 members. It continued in 2018, again with very positive feedback from members. We have assigned elected representatives-at-large to each of these

PDWs, and based on the positive feedback we have received, plan to continue offering each of these PDWs in the future.

Scholarly Program

We received 251 scholarly submissions in 2018 which is surprisingly similar to the 262 submissions received in 2013. While this number suggests that on the whole division submissions have been holding relatively steady, looking more closely at the breakdown of submissions demonstrates that our paper submissions decreased by 10.9% over the five-year period (from 184 to 164) between 2013 and 2018, while our symposium submissions increased 61.1% (from 54 to 87). Spreading out the time point for comparison even further demonstrates that our symposium submissions have tripled since 2009 (29 in 2009, and 87 in 2018). In 2018, we accepted 50% of the 164 papers submitted and 75% of the 87 symposium submissions. In this five-year period, acceptance rates for Paper submissions ranged from 43.7% (2015) to 67.6% (2016), with the average being 54%. Symposium submission acceptance rates also ranged widely from 66.1% (2014) to 91.3% (2017), with a five-year average acceptance rate of 78.6%. Across Papers and Symposia combined, the average acceptance rate in the five-year period ending 2013 was 56.7%, which is an increase of 5.7% since 2014. Starting in 2011, we made a conscious decision to accept a larger proportion of symposia than paper submissions. This was based in part on the increase in number of symposium submissions, the higher average reviewer ratings of symposia over papers, and the larger average attendance at symposium sessions, compared to paper sessions. Furthermore, we think the inclusion of a higher proportion of symposia relative to papers (provided they are of acceptable quality) enables more individuals to participate in the program, since each symposium typically has multiple contributors. This distribution of papers and symposia appears to be acceptable to our members, as our members' reported satisfaction with our Annual Meeting program components has increased, as reported above.

Community building events

While each of our "In the Roughs" is designed to help build "community," each year we hold several additional events aimed at building connections among members of the Division. "**Think about it...over a glass of wine**" is a social event designed to bring together participants from the day's various PDWs. In 2018, we held the first "**MOC Connecting: Sharing Expertise on MOC Hot Topics.**" Scheduled as a networking event between the Saturday MOC PDWs and the MOC Evening Social, this informal event gave members an opportunity to connect with established scholars in their MOC-related research areas. In this session, participants were able to talk through their research ideas, discuss what's currently hot in their field, and even make predictions about what will be the next big thing with an all-star list of scholars in their particular area of research. Several of our members reported enjoying this event. In fact, when asked what they liked best about our division, one survey respondent said: "I really enjoyed meeting the people at the Hot Topics event at AOM. It was excellent." In 2017, we created a session called "**Tuesday Coolness**", a showcase session, in which we have 10 to 12 of our most creative papers presented in a format that designed and tested to increase audience engagement. To build community, we have games, awards, and cool refreshments at this session.

Intermittently, we have also held a social hour preceding our business meeting to give members an opportunity to meet each other and members of the MOC Executive Committee. While these events are always well attended (and a significant proportion of our annual budget is dedicated to

food and beverage at these events), these events reach out only to those members of the division who attend the annual program. In Section 3 of this report we will discuss ways in which we will continue our community building efforts especially outside of the annual program.

Governance and Finance

Our division's Executive Committee is composed of elected members and appointed volunteers who help with important tasks such as managing our finances, keeping records, and managing our website and newsletter. Other members of the division can participate in divisional activities by volunteering for committees such as the Divisional Outreach and Integration committee, and, most importantly, by signing up as reviewers who give feedback on the quality of the papers and symposia submitted to the program. A little over 25% of our members responded to the member's survey in 2018, which was the same rate achieved in 2013. We have also maintained fairly steady member participation in our annual elections with between 24.3%-28.2% of our member base voting each year between 2013-2015. Our five-year average of 26.1% is slightly higher than the 25% participation of AOM as a whole that

Our finances have remained fairly healthy during the five-year period, with positive balances in each year. At the end of the last review period, we reduced expenditures on awards and on food and beverages for the Annual Meeting, deciding only to allocate available funds to food and beverage expenses for our signature events, Cognition in the Rough and Diamonds in the Rough. In the past three years, however, we have added to our list of signature PDWs – including Reviewing in the Rough, Teaching in the Rough, and Presenting in the Rough – and have made sure to fund all of our signature PDWs. In each year, the largest portion of our budget goes towards food and beverage expenses at the Annual Meeting. We anticipate that some of our outreach efforts such as workshops outside of the US will require additional funds, but we hope to cover costs for those programs with the help of local sponsors. In addition, with the addition of increased award categories, we also anticipate increased costs associated with award plaques. We are also looking into external sponsorship to help defray some of these costs.

Section 3: Goals and Future Actions for the MOC Division

Progress between 2013-2018

In 2013, our division identified five main goals for MOC to accomplish in the 2013-2018 time period. Specifically, the division aimed to increase membership, encourage volunteerism, reach out to members not attending the annual meeting, update communication platforms, and improve our financial position. We are happy to report that we made significant progress on all of these goals and outline this progress below.

Increased Membership. First, despite the division implementing all of the efforts outlined in our 2013 report (communicating our vision, expanding the in the rough series, and instituting an Ambassador program), our membership has increased only slightly from 1,232 (2013) to 1,307 (2018). As we move forward, we will continue to try to increase our membership. We believe that our efforts on both Tuesday Coolness and MOC Connecting will help attract new members and clearly communicate our mission. However, we note that over 63% of our survey respondents thought the current MOC Division size is a strength, with another 33.9% being neutral about the size. Only 3% of respondents (n=7) disagreed with the statement that “The size

of our division is a source of strength”. For this reason, while we aim to maintain or slightly increase our membership in the coming five years, we will be cognizant of making sure the division still feels like “home”.

Increased Volunteerism. In addition to other efforts, our thriving Ambassadors Program has helped to address our second goal of increasing volunteerism. We now have a clear pathway for members who seek to contribute to the MOC Division. The MOC Ambassadors Program was started in 2014 as an opportunity to reach out to and involve prospective MOC members beyond elected positions. Responding to the Academy of Management's internationalization and diversity and inclusion initiatives, the MOC Ambassadors Program particularly sought to provide a direct way to involve international scholars, doctoral students, and other new members with developing networks within the Academy. Our Ambassadors assist with the New Member Orientation and staff the MOC Division's Welcome Table at AOM, provide help to elected members of MOC with the "In the Rough" professional development workshops and with the organization of international conferences, contribute content and technical support to the MOC social media initiative, and serve on selection committees for division awards. At any given time, we have between 15-25 active MOC Ambassadors.

Outreach. We have worked to address the needs of those not attending the annual meeting via our Frontiers conference. The inaugural Frontiers conference was organized in collaboration with the TIM Division and was hosted at ETH Zurich, Switzerland on June 29-30, 2017. It was attended by 97 participants primarily from the US and Asia. The second MOC Frontiers conference on “Organizing, modelling, and categorizing in the digital era” is being hosted by Cass Business School on June 06-07, 2019 in London. We believe that we could do more in this vein and intend to do so, as we discuss in the final section of this report.

Update Communication Platform. In the past five years, we have also worked to update our communication platform. We have appointed a Chief Technology Officer who is in charge of the website and social media platforms. Unfortunately, the revised website was not “live” at the time of the members’ survey, and therefore we have little indication of its success as of yet. However, we believe its functionality and accessibility will make our communication and outreach efforts more effective.

Improve Financial Position. Five years ago we also set out to improve the division’s financial position. As a small division, our financial position is constrained. Luckily, our budgeting efforts in the early part of the review period left us with some surplus funds that we invested in our three new programs in an effort to better serve our current members and increase our membership: Tuesday Coolness, Presenting in the Rough, and MOC Connecting. These initiatives have been well received and have attracted a number of new MOC members.

Future Actions Beyond 2018

In addition to continuing to push forward on these five important areas, our current survey also revealed several additional opportunities for the MOC Division to better address the needs and interests of its members. These are described below.

- 1. International Outreach.** While our survey results indicate that international membership has grown at a higher rate than the Academy, our survey results also indicate that we especially need to reach out to those in Asia and Australia and the Oceania region. Our membership is predominantly from North America (67.2%) followed by Europe (17.6%) but this drops precipitously with Asia (6.42%) and Australia and Oceania (6.4%). In the next five years, we hope to further encourage membership and activity of members from participants in these areas. We will do this by personally reaching out to individuals in this area to ask them to get involved with the ambassadors program and to run for elected positions within the leadership of the division. Additionally, we are planning to hold our international Frontiers conference in this geographical region (Singapore) next year. The tentative dates of the conference are May 28-29, 2020 and the tentative theme is “Grand Challenges of the Future.” This conference will be hosted by Singapore Management University.
- 2. Increase Engagement of Senior Division Members.** Unfortunately, some of the lowest participation rates in divisional activities seem to be from our more mid-to-senior members. For instance, people who had been a member of MOC for 12-15 years were also our lowest survey responders (5.1%) to this survey, followed by the 8-11 years (11.8%) and 15+ years (12.5%). While some of this gap in engagement may be a natural evolution in the academic life-cycle, it may also be information to pay attention to. In the next five years, we hope to take steps to re-engage the more senior members of our division. We will do this by:

 - Reaching out to mid-to-senior members and offer them opportunities to bring them back into the fold as “experts” on our “in the rough” panels and in the MOC connecting networking session.
 - Investing effort in recognizing important “membership milestones” such as 10, 15, or 20-year memberships.
- 3. Continue and Improve Opportunities for Networking and Mentoring Outside of the Annual Meeting.** While our PDWs and Social Events provide a number of opportunities for members to network and gain mentorship at the Annual meeting, our members expressed relatively lower satisfaction with opportunities outside of the Annual Meeting to network/collaborate with peers ($M = 3.0$, $sd = 1.3$). In the next five years, we will be holding the Frontiers Conference in London (2019) and Singapore (2020)—both will include “Frontiers in the Rough” workshop in a format similar to our CIR PDW—to help address this concern, and we also intend to help engage those members who do not attend the Annual meeting or the Frontiers conference by exploring the option of recording/streaming some portions of the presentations.
- 4. Refocus our “Image”-related Efforts on what People are Already Valuing in Us.**

 - **We are a hub of diverse scholars who are multi-disciplinary and cross-level.** Our division, perhaps more than others, has representation from a broad range of disciplines and methodologies. Responses in our survey tell us that our members have other division memberships in virtually every other division. Perhaps reflecting the fact that cognition is a process that appears in many research

streams, the description of our members from the survey suggests that the MOC Division is a bridging division, connecting individuals with a strong research focus from a variety of different research areas (different topics at different levels of analysis).

- **We are inclusive.** One of the challenges of being a highly diverse division is making sure we are inclusive on all levels. Since its inception, the MOC Ambassadors Program has supported our move toward greater diversity and broader participation from members in the MOC leadership team, with several former MOC Ambassadors ultimately moving into elected or appointed leadership positions in the division. However, despite these efforts, our membership survey revealed that about 34% of respondents do not have a clear idea of how they can become more involved in the division. We will seek to remedy this by making these pathways clearer on our communication platforms and at the annual meeting. We will also work to make sure that announcements about open positions and awards go through a diverse array of channels.

We will also take steps to increase our inclusivity among PDW Facilitators in a variety of positions, studying a variety of phenomenon, with diverse racial, ethnic, and gender backgrounds, who are working in various places around the world. Specifically, we are making a concerted effort to make sure that our facilitators of the various “in the rough” series and MOC Connect demonstrate the diversity we value in our division. We want our facilitator pool to be as closely aligned as possible with the diversity of backgrounds, experiences, and scholarly interests of AOM members who are interested in MOC topics and fields.

We are aiming to be more mindful about diversity in all of our searches (i.e., facilitators, ambassadors, referrals, leadership candidates, awards granted) and to create the types of inclusive practices in our policies and programs in order to ensure our programming can continue to attract the variety of scholars to MOC who are interested in the work we do. For this reason, we are beginning to keep a detailed log of all award committee members, recipients, facilitators, and executive board members so that we can be sure that we are representing the diversity of our division. If we are falling short of our representativeness goals, we will immediately take action to correct it. We have made diversity and inclusion a permanent agenda item at our mid-Winter and AOM meeting going forward to ensure we are aware of our current numbers and are making progress toward our goals.

As an example, this year, our DIR organizers have set specific goals for gaining diversity in their list of facilitators, and have shared their process with other PDW organizers in MOC to set an example. We intend to continue these mindful recruitment practices consistently in the future. These goals are:

- **Gender:** Approximately 50/50 (We have been leaning much more toward females in recent years, so we will work to recruit more males)

- **Levels of Analysis:** 65% micro, 35% meso/macro (We have been leaning much more toward micro scholarship in recent years, so we will work to recruit more macro scholars)
 - **Research Methods:** Aim for 50% qualitative and 50% mixed/quantitative (We have attempted to build this balance by attracting more mixed methods/quantitative researchers in recent years.)
 - **Geographic Region:** 70% N. America vs. 30% Rest of the World. (Non-US scholars are leaning more macro and qualitative.)
 - **US underrepresented minorities** (African-American, Hispanic-American, Native American): We are working on recruiting 1-2 more scholars from these under-represented groups to support the work of our members who are interested in integrating diversity research with other MOC topics and to attract a more racially/ethnically diverse pool of scholars to our division.
- 4. Improving Financial Position.** In spite of our well-received initiatives outlined above, we are still finding ourselves with a constrained budget. Specifically, we believe that we will need to explore external funding options to defray the costs associated with our Annual meeting award spending and to provide adequate food and beverages at our social and business events. We are currently reaching out to a variety of academic and industry partners for sponsorship.
- 5. Increase Utilization of Communication Platform to build Community.** Members of our survey expressed lower satisfaction with a few dimensions that we believe we can focus on with our improved communication platform. Specifically, we received relatively lower scores on: Encouragement from division leaders to form network communities for members ($M= 3.1$, $sd= 1.3$), usefulness of the website ($M= 3.2$, $sd= 1.1$), value of the listservs ($M = 3.2$, $sd = 1.1$), and quality of newsletter ($M = 3.4$, $sd = 1.1$). We anticipate that our new communication platform and chief technology officer will enable us to improve on these metrics.
- 6. Increasing Transparency around Elections, Awards, and Recognition.** Despite marginally increasing mean levels of satisfaction overall, we found reduction in satisfaction in our election and award and recognition processes. In response, we intend to implement clearer procedures around our elections and awards and recognition processes. For instance, we will clarify the criteria for each award, separating the award for best paper and for best student-led paper (first author and leader of paper must be a student at the time of submission), increase membership diversity on our award committees, and provide greater guidance to these committees about the criteria for award winners. We also intend to communicate these procedures to our membership, as this will increase the transparency of our procedures. We will also send our best reviewer recognitions in an email to all members, send them a certificate to recognize their efforts, and post this information to the MOC website (which is made easier by our new communications platform).
- 7. Changing Division Governance.** In the past five years, we have greatly expanded our “in the rough” offerings. While our membership has been pleased with these new PDWs,

we are in need of more “representative-at-large” positions on our executive committee to ensure that these offerings run smoothly. To that end, we are working to add two new elected positions to the executive committee to accommodate these needs.