

Factors in the Decision to Attend the Annual Meeting

Preliminary Report on a Survey of the ASA Membership, Spring 2016

August 1, 2016

John W. Curtis, Director of Research

Summary of Findings

(All of these points are explored in greater detail in the full report.)

1. Among regular members, most of them faculty members, the relative emphasis placed on three cost factors (airfare, conference hotel, and alternative lodging) represents a difference between those who attend the Annual Meeting on a regular basis and those who do not typically attend.
2. Student members report the importance of similar cost considerations with even greater frequency.
3. Survey results indicate that members who attend the meetings regularly, both faculty and students, emphasize presenting their own work as important. Members who do not typically attend place a greater value on teaching-focused sessions. The difference suggests that some members find the availability of teaching sessions at the meetings insufficient, and do not attend as a result.
4. Survey respondents across the board consider discriminatory laws or policies in the conference city or state to be an important factor in deciding whether to attend.
5. Respondents generally note the importance of easy and safe travel by foot near the meeting site but do not place the same level of value on public transit.
6. Regular members value fair labor practices at the conference hotel. Regular members who attend regularly appear to have a stronger commitment than non-attenders to specifically union labor in conference hotels. Neither factor is as salient among student members.
7. Section events are highly important for regular members who attend the meetings, but less so among non-attenders and students.
8. In terms of meeting timing, there is not a great deal of satisfaction with the current timing of the Annual Meeting but a clear alternative does not emerge. A meeting later in the fall seems to be ruled out, but a further examination of all the responses to the other two seasonal alternatives presented in the questionnaire would be in order.
9. Three past meeting locations are identified as undesirable by a substantial proportion of respondents: Las Vegas, Atlanta, and Anaheim/Los Angeles. However, despite many individual complaints to the contrary, it's not just about "the heat."

Factors in the Decision to Attend the Annual Meeting

Preliminary Report on a Survey of the ASA Membership, Spring 2016

August 1, 2016

John W. Curtis, Director of Research

In 2015 ASA President Paula England appointed a Working Group on the Timing and Cost of the ASA Annual Meeting. After two meetings in 2015 and the preparation of a *Footnotes* article detailing the criteria used in Annual Meeting site selection and responding to other frequent questions about the meeting, the Working Group resolved to carry out a survey of the membership on the relative importance of various factors in the decision to attend the meeting. The survey questionnaire was drafted in spring 2016 and open for data collection from April 11 through May 16. The questionnaire was distributed by e-mail to all current ASA members as of March 31, 2016; 2015 members who had not yet renewed as of that date; and non-member paid attendees of the 2015 Annual Meeting in Chicago. The survey population totaled 13,774 individuals with valid e-mail addresses and garnered responses from 3,917, a rate of 28.4 percent. Table 1 provides descriptive characteristics of the full survey population and the respondents. In the remainder of this report, survey responses are weighted to adjust for differences in response rate among different categories of ASA members (including the non-member 2015 attendees). An appendix follows the report with a detailed description of the methodology and a copy of the questionnaire. This preliminary report provides tabulations on the core elements of the survey questionnaire.

Factors in the Decision to Attend the Annual Meeting

The core of the questionnaire is a set of 32 items presented as “factors in deciding whether or not to attend ASA annual meetings.”¹ Respondents were asked to rate each factor as “not important,” “somewhat important,” or “very important.” Tables 2-4 provide a complete listing of the factors as they appeared in the questionnaire, with the proportion of respondents who rated each “very important.” The tables are separated by member categories since regular members (most of whom are faculty) and student members (nearly all of them graduate students) find themselves in different career and resource situations. The third membership category

¹ One additional questionnaire item allowed respondents to name another factor important in their decision. Some 1,315 respondents provided additional factors or qualifying remarks in the form of open-ended comments that have not yet been reviewed.

groups together associate and retired members with the non-member meeting attendees; although it would be possible to split these categories, the numbers of respondents become very small for meaningful analysis. Each of these member categories is further divided in the tables by meeting attendance status. Respondents were asked whether they had attended the 2015 Annual Meeting, whether that was their first, and whether they typically attend the meetings. On the basis of these items, respondents were divided into four categories: regular meeting attendees (46 percent), occasional attendees (28 percent), first-time attendees (8 percent), and “non-attenders” (18 percent). To simplify the presentation in the tables, first-time attendees are included in the “occasional” category.

This section presents highlights of the full tabulations, divided by member category. For regular and student member respondents, three sub-tables are presented in the respective following sections: The factors most frequently rated “very important” among the regular attendees; those most frequently named by non-attenders; and the factors with the largest disparity between those two groups. The final part of this section presents corresponding tables for the other survey respondents of the factors named most frequently by regular attendees and non-attenders; a table of the differences between those two categories is not included due to the relatively small number of respondents.

Regular Members

As noted above, this section presents highlights of the factors most frequently rated “very important” by regular members, with a further division by frequency of meeting attendance. Table 2 at the back of the report includes full results for all items and all categories.

Table 2a.
Most Important Decision Factors for Regular Members Who Attend Regularly

Factor	Percent
Being on the program as a presenter, presider, or discussant	74.1
Availability of funding from my institution	72.1
Discriminatory laws or policies in the conference city or state	56.2
My own institution’s fall start dates	52.8
Ability to travel safely by foot near the conference hotel	50.6
Ability to travel easily by foot near the conference hotel	50.0
The conference hotel’s commitment to fair labor practices	48.7
Attending scholarly sessions	46.9
Attending section events	46.0

Table 2a lists the decision factors most frequently named as “very important” by regular members who attend the Annual Meeting on a regular basis. These can be viewed as factors in favor of attending the meeting for this group. The presentation of only the nine most frequently named factors in this table is arbitrary, although it does reflect something of a break in the tabulation before the next most-frequent item. The most important factors for these regular members are clear: appearing on the program and the availability of institutional funding. We can infer that the former is a positive factor, while the availability of funding may be a potential negative even though these respondents manage to attend in most years. Other factors important to this group have been well established over the years: local discriminatory laws or policies; travel by foot (but not public transit, which was a separate item) near the site; fair labor practices at the conference hotel (distinct from unionized labor, which is discussed below); and the importance of section events.

Of note are several items that do *not* appear in this table. There are four specific cost factors listed in the questionnaire, focused on airfare, rooms in the conference hotel(s), alternative accommodations nearby, and the cost of the conference city more generally. All of these are certainly factors in the decision of these regular members who attend regularly, with between 26 and 41 percent of respondents rating them “very important.” But they are not among the most frequently named factors for this group, and they are named with less frequency than by non-attenders, as we see next.

Table 2b.
Most Important Decision Factors for Regular Members Who Do Not Attend

Factor	Percent
Availability of funding from my institution	65.4
Cost of airfare	64.4
Attending scholarly sessions	62.4
Cost of rooms in the conference hotel(s)	60.7
Cost of alternative accommodations near the conference	56.6
Ability to travel safely by foot near the conference hotel	52.2
My own institution’s fall start dates	48.9
Being on the program as a presenter, presider, or discussant	47.8
Discriminatory laws or policies in the conference city or state	45.5
Ability to travel easily by foot near the conference hotel	44.3

Because Table 2b lists the factors most frequently rated “very important” by the respondents who typically do not attend the meetings, this list can be viewed as a set of salient

reasons that regular members choose not to attend. Again, the cutoff for what to include here is arbitrary, but the full results are available in Table 2. Availability of funding is at the top of Table 2b as well, and it is notable that three of the four cost factors make the list. Being on the program is on this list, presumably indicating that when members are not on the program they choose not to attend. (The frequency with which this is named by non-attenders is lower than among the regular attenders, however.) The “discriminatory laws or policies” item is here, as well, although its interpretation is unclear: since there is an existing policy not to hold meetings in such locations and that policy has been applied for many years, there is not a clear rationale to decide not to attend on that basis.

Table 2c compares the selections of regular attendees and those who do not typically attend, which helps point out several critical factors. (The decision of how many items to include here is again arbitrary, but the table does produce some instructive results.)

Table 2c.
Decision Factors with the Largest Disparity among Regular Members

Factor	Non- Attenders	Regular Attendees	Diff.
Cost of airfare	64.4	34.9	29.5
Being on the program as a presenter, presider, or discussant	47.8	74.1	26.3
Cost of alternative accommodations near the conference	56.6	34.6	22.0
Attending sessions focused on teaching	32.7	11.7	21.0
Cost of rooms in the conference hotel(s)	60.7	40.7	20.0
The conference hotel’s commitment to union labor	22.1	42.1	20.0
Serving on an ASA committee or editorial board	10.3	27.9	17.6
Attending scholarly sessions	62.4	46.9	15.5
Ability to drive to and around the conference location	15.3	1.5	13.8
Availability of funding through a grant	38.4	26.8	11.6

Probably the most salient items in Table 2c are the three cost factors: airfare, conference hotel rooms, and alternative accommodations. Each of these three items has greater significance for the non-attenders than the regular attenders, which strongly suggests that the cost of attendance is an important factor in decisions on whether to attend a given meeting. Regular attendees take cost into consideration and decide to go, but a substantial proportion of members (and presumably non-members, as well) look at the costs of attendance and choose to stay home. This is not news by any means, but it is an important reminder of the continuing challenge of making meeting attendance affordable for a broad spectrum of sociologists. (The general cost of

the conference city is rated very important by 26 percent of regular attendees and 35 percent of non-attenders. It is a factor for both, but not among the most important for either.)

There is also a disparity in ratings on three non-cost items that is of particular interest. Among non-attenders, 33 percent rate attending sessions on teaching as very important, whereas just 12 percent of regular attendees do so. Both groups judge attending scholarly sessions very important with greater frequency than teaching sessions, but this is even more the case among the non-attenders. And as noted above, appearing on the program is important to both categories of respondents, but quite a bit more so for the regular attendees. One interpretation of this confluence of item responses is that the regular members who attend do so significantly as a forum to make a presentation, presumably most often of their own research. Other members value sessions on teaching more highly and do not attend; it may be that they find the teaching-focused offerings at the meeting insufficient. This interpretation certainly bears further examination.

Two further observations emerge from Table 2c. Regular members who attend regularly appear to have a stronger commitment than non-attenders to specifically union labor in conference hotels, 42 percent to 22 percent. Conversely, although only a small minority of members demonstrate an interest in driving to the meeting, that interest is higher among the non-attenders. Coupled with the response regarding the cost of airfare, it seems that non-attenders might prefer to drive to the meeting and choose not to attend based on the cost of long-distance travel.

Student Members

This section presents a summary of responses from student members similar to that in the previous section. Students make up about one third of the ASA membership, and the survey results presented here are weighted to reflect that proportion. Most student members are graduate students, which is the case for nearly all of the survey respondents. Tables in this section are again broken out by meeting attendance status, and the full results for students are available in Table 3 at the back of the report.

Table 3a.
Most Important Decision Factors for Student Members Who Attend Regularly

Factor	Percent
Being on the program as a presenter, presider, or discussant	82.8
Availability of funding from my institution	76.9
Cost of alternative accommodations near the conference	67.1
Cost of airfare	66.1
Being on the job market	64.8
Cost of rooms in the conference hotel(s)	56.8
Discriminatory laws or policies in the conference city or state	54.4
Ability to travel easily by foot near the conference hotel	54.0
Ability to travel safely by foot near the conference hotel	48.7
Attending scholarly sessions	48.2

Among students who attend the meetings regularly (Table 3a), being on the program and availability of institutional funding are again the most salient decision factors, and in proportions even greater than among regular members. The difference from regular members is immediately apparent, however, in the presence of three cost factors (airfare, conference hotel, and alternative accommodations) among the most important. These students seem to find a way to get to the meeting, but they are clearly concerned with the cost of doing so. Another difference is the importance of attending for those students who may be on the job market—as it seems most of these respondents are.

Table 3b.
Most Important Decision Factors for Student Members Who Do Not Attend

Factor	Percent
Availability of funding from my institution	85.6
Cost of airfare	80.8
Cost of rooms in the conference hotel(s)	73.2
Cost of alternative accommodations near the conference	67.7
Being on the program as a presenter, presider, or discussant	66.7
Attending scholarly sessions	66.3
Availability of funding through a grant	60.2
Being on the job market	57.1
Discriminatory laws or policies in the conference city or state	50.1

With the exception of funding through a grant, all of the factors identified most frequently as “very important” by student respondents who do *not* typically attend the meetings (Table 3b) are the same as those who *do* attend. Being on the program appears on the list for

non-attenders with lower frequency than among attenders, and therefore appears in Table 3c as a disparity.

Table 3c.
Decision Factors with the Largest Disparity among Student Members

Factor	Non- Attenders	Regular Attendees	Diff.
Attending scholarly sessions	66.3	48.2	18.1
Availability of funding through a grant	60.2	42.3	17.9
Cost of rooms in the conference hotel(s)	73.2	56.8	16.4
Being on the program as a presenter, presider, or discussant	66.7	82.8	16.1
Cost of airfare	80.8	66.1	14.7
Attending sessions focused on teaching	27.8	14.0	13.8
Interviewing job candidates	25.0	12.0	13.0
Ability to travel easily by foot near the conference hotel	42.0	54.0	12.0
Ability to travel easily by public transportation near the conference hotel	35.3	46.3	11.0

Table 3c reinforces the observations from the preceding tables and suggests a financial interpretation with regard to students. Cost factors are of critical importance to all potential student attendees, with the cost of airfare and the conference hotel of particular salience for those who end up not attending. In addition, non-attenders cite (the lack of) funding through a grant as an important factor in the decision not to attend the meeting. In essence, those students who can marshal the resources and keep costs down attend the meetings, while those who can't don't. Again, this is not news, but it reinforces the importance of financial considerations in the decision to attend the meeting, and with higher levels of importance for students than for regular (faculty) members.

It's also important to note that the teaching versus (research) presentation dynamic is present among the student respondents, as well. Non-attenders note the importance of teaching-focused sessions more often, even if it is still a minority who do so. By contrast, the regular attendees cite the importance of a presentation on the program with near unanimity.

Associate or Retired Members and Non-Members

Nearly 10 percent of ASA members are in the associate category, and an additional 5 percent are retired. This survey was also extended to a group of non-members who attended the 2015 Meeting in Chicago, who comprise a further 4 percent. Taken together, these three

categories form a substantial proportion of both the survey population and respondents. Separately, the three categories are too small to subdivide further for meaningful analysis. Combining them allows us to produce an analysis, although we lose some clarity regarding the decisions of individuals in different situations in the process. This section presents the most frequently named decision factors among combined associate and retired members and non-member meeting attendees, divided between those who have attended regularly and those who do not attend. See Table 4 for the full list.

Table 4a.
Most Important Decision Factors for Other Respondents Who Attend Regularly

Factor	Percent
Availability of funding from my institution	60.3
Ability to travel safely by foot near the conference hotel	54.7
Being on the program as a presenter, presider, or discussant	52.2
Ability to travel easily by foot near the conference hotel	51.2
Discriminatory laws or policies in the conference city or state	51.0
Attending scholarly sessions	49.0
The conference hotel's commitment to fair labor practices	45.7
Cost of rooms in the conference hotel(s)	43.6
Cost of airfare	39.6

For these other respondents who regularly attend meetings, the important decision factors (Table 4a) are similar to those identified by regular members, albeit at generally lower levels of frequency. Institutional funding is important to this group as it is to the other member categories. Two of the cost factors, conference hotel rooms and airfare, also make the list, as they do for students but not those regular members who typically attend meetings. Being on the program and attending scholarly sessions are still important to this group, and they also join other respondents in voicing support for avoiding discriminatory laws and policies and supporting hotel fair labor practices.

Table 4b.
Most Important Decision Factors for Other Respondents Who Do Not Attend

Factor	Percent
Cost of airfare	56.8
Attending scholarly sessions	55.2
Availability of funding from my institution	50.9
Cost of rooms in the conference hotel(s)	49.7
Discriminatory laws or policies in the conference city or state	46.7
Being on the program as a presenter, presider, or discussant	41.4
Cost of alternative accommodations near the conference	39.4
Ability to travel safely by foot near the conference hotel	39.0
The conference hotel's commitment to fair labor practices	36.8

The factors listed in Table 4b for other respondents who do not typically attend meetings are similar to those appearing previously, if in somewhat different order. Cost and availability of funding are rated more important than other factors by this group, as well.

One final notable factor that does *not* appear in any of these tables is “the heat.” A later section of this report provides a list of locations identified as undesirable by respondents. Those locations were accompanied by extensive comments that have yet to be reviewed thoroughly, but it is clear that heat and humidity are a frequent complaint with regard to specific meeting locations. Yet tables 2 through 4 also make it clear that “weather conditions (e.g., heat and humidity)” are rated a “very important” factor in the decision to attend by only a small proportion—well below 10 percent—of survey respondents.

Timing of the Meeting

The survey questionnaire includes a number of items concerning specific aspects of the timing of the Annual Meeting. These are presented in full in Table 5, again broken out by membership category and meeting attendance. In each case, respondents are presented with a statement and options to “agree,” “agree somewhat,” “disagree somewhat,” and “strongly disagree.” The table presents the percent of respondents who select “agree,” although the result of significance testing indicated there is for the full range of valid responses on each item. (Significance testing is for differences by meeting attendance within each membership category.) The following sub-sections discuss two elements of the questionnaire, scheduling conflicts and

potential alternative dates. A final sub-section notes additional information from the questionnaire that remains to be analyzed.

Scheduling Conflicts

The questionnaire asked respondents to evaluate the timing of the Annual Meeting generally, and the degree to which the current timing (typically the second or third week of August) conflicts with three different aspects of their working lives: university or college start dates; administrative responsibilities; and interviewing job candidates. (Conflicts with children's schooling are considered later in the questionnaire.) Full results are in Table 5 and discussed here in turn.

The first general statement ("The current timing ... makes it easy for me to attend") is phrased positively. Agreement with this statement is low, from only 19 percent of regular members, 25 percent of students, and 34 percent of other respondents. Among regular members there is a slightly higher level of agreement from those who regularly attend, but that level is still only 20 percent.

Regarding "conflict with my university or college's start dates or first day of class," the second item indicates that more than a third (34 percent) of regular members experience such conflicts. About 30 percent of students also report that conflict, as do 19 percent of other respondents (many of whom are retired).

The other two aspects of work, administrative responsibilities and interviewing job candidates, present lower levels of timing conflict for respondents.

Alternate Dates

The questionnaire poses three different potential timings for the annual meeting by season of the year; the items are phrased differently and therefore require individual interpretation.

The first alternative presented is "earlier in the summer (June or July)," rated on whether that timing would be more difficult for attendance. A small, but not insubstantial proportion of respondents would experience more difficulty attending earlier in the summer: 23 percent of regular members (and 27 percent among those regular members who attend regularly), 20 percent of students, and 28 percent of other respondents.

The second alternative timing offered is "later in the fall (September-December)," also posed as whether those months would be more difficult. Much larger proportions of respondents

agreed that this timing would be more difficult: 40 percent of regular members and fully 45 percent of those who attend regularly; 40 percent of student members; and 36 percent among other respondents.

A final alternative, “in the winter/spring (January-May),” is presented for whether it would make attendance easier. There is a small but noticeable proportion of respondents who would prefer this alternative. About 21 percent of regular members, higher at 23 percent among those who do not typically attend, would prefer this alternative. Fewer students are in support, at 18 percent without a significant difference by current meeting attendance. Similarly, 19 percent of other respondents would prefer this alternative.

Summarizing these two aspects of questionnaire response, regarding conflicts and preferences for alternative dates, there is not a great deal of satisfaction with the current timing of the Annual Meeting but a clear alternative does not emerge among the options presented. A meeting later in the fall seems to be ruled out, but a further examination of all the responses to the other two options seems to be in order.

College Fall Start Dates

The questionnaire includes additional items indirectly related to the timing of the Annual Meeting. Respondents on nine-month appointments are asked to specify when their college or university resumes activities in the fall. The results are shown in Table 6. The most frequent fall start date for regular and student respondents is the third week of August, reported by one third of all respondents and particularly (40 percent) among regular members, most of whom are active faculty members. The next largest proportion of respondents, about 25 percent, resumes the fourth week of August, with the highest proportion among students at 28 percent. The majority in the “other respondents” category is roughly evenly divided among the fourth week of August, first week of September, and third week of August. Other dates are not as concentrated among respondents.

Children’s School

Respondents were also asked whether they have a school-age child or school-age children living in their household, and those with children were asked about conflicts with the ASA Meeting and school start dates. About a quarter of respondents have school-age children at home, and the results for both items are in Table 7. The majority of responding parents (65 percent) report that the ASA Meeting conflicts with their child’s school at least occasionally. Conflicts

are more frequent for student parents at 74 percent, with 44 percent of them reporting frequent conflicts. (It should be noted that the number of student parents is small.) Nearly half of other respondents with children—also a relatively small group—said that ASA does not conflict with school.

Parents were also asked for their child’s school fall start dates, and once again the largest proportion among regular and student members send their children back to school in the third week of August. Among other respondents the most frequently reported start date is the first week in September, which likely explains why fewer among them report a conflict with the ASA meeting dates. About a quarter of parents who are regular or student members also report a starting date in the first week of September. The fourth and second weeks of August are each reported by 11 to 19 percent of responding parents.

Locations Identified as Undesirable

Survey respondents were provided with an opportunity to name “locations where meetings have been held previously where you would not return or chose not to attend because of the location.” More than 1,000 respondents said they had such a location in mind, and about 980 provided an open-ended response. Unfortunately we did not anticipate this volume of response on this item, and the responses were collected as open-ended comments that mix together locations with reasons why they are undesirable. As a result, the tabulation presented in Table 8 is only partial, from those respondents who named a location within the first ten words of their response, and is unweighted. Many respondents identified two or three negative locations, so the total number of locations shown in Table 8—which happens to be 980—does not reflect all respondents who commented.

There are three locations that clearly stand out as undesirable for the respondents who commented on this item: Las Vegas, site of the 2011 meeting that was moved from Chicago due to labor issues there; Atlanta, most recently visited in 2003 and 2010; and Anaheim, the site of the 2001 meeting. (A few respondents named Los Angeles, of which Anaheim is a suburb and which was also a site in 1994, and a handful of others referred to Orange County or Disneyland. These are included in the Anaheim/Los Angeles count in Table 8.) (It should be noted that attendance for the 2011 Las Vegas meeting was relatively high, much higher than at the Atlanta meeting the previous year.)

The next three locations named as undesirable—albeit at much lower frequency—are the sites of the three most recent meetings: New York City (2013), San Francisco (2014), and Chicago (2015). Based on a cursory review of extensive comments, these respondents cite the expense of these cities as a negative feature. However, meetings in these three cities have regularly produced the highest attendance figures.

Most other past meeting locations receive at least a mention as undesirable, but for only a handful of respondents. A complete analysis of all responses to this item might reveal somewhat more detail, although it seems unlikely that these frequencies regarding specific locations would change substantially.²

ASA 2015 in Chicago

Survey respondents were asked whether they had attended the 2015 Annual Meeting in Chicago, and those who had were then asked to evaluate the meeting’s usefulness and also specific factors in their decision to attend that year.³ The full responses, broken out by member category and meeting attendance, are presented in Tables 9 and 10 and highlighted here. (There are no “non-attenders” in these two tables, since all of these respondents attended at least one meeting.)

Evaluation of the Meeting

Respondents were presented with six statements about the 2015 meeting in Chicago, as listed in Table 9, and asked their level of agreement with each (“agree,” “agree somewhat,” “disagree somewhat,” or “strongly disagree”). The table gives the proportion who selected “agree.” All of the statements are phrased positively.

Among regular members, as might be expected, all six statements evoked a stronger positive response from the respondents who attend regularly, although on one item that difference is not statistically significant. About 59 percent of regular attendees agreed that the 2015 meeting was “a good investment of my time,” and the same proportion would recommend the meeting to graduate students. It’s worth noting that the proportion of regular members who

² I did run a second tabulation using a somewhat different approach and came up with very similar frequencies. Further analysis would require thorough coding of the open-text responses.

³ There are 79 survey respondents who completed the questionnaire saying they did not attend the 2015 meeting, but who were registered for that meeting. (It is possible that they later canceled their registration and this is not reflected in the available data.) The tabulations here are based on the survey response regarding 2015 attendance, since those who responded “no” did not see further questions about the 2015 meeting.

agreed that “the meeting was a good investment of my money” is much smaller, at 39 percent of regular attenders and 24 percent of those who attend occasionally. Cost is clearly an ever-present factor in evaluations of the meeting, even for those who attend.

Student respondents are slightly less enthusiastic about the 2015 meeting, and the differences between regular and occasional attendees are not statistically significant for most items. The agreement with “a good investment of my money” is notably low at 28 percent. The two items where there is a difference, “relevant to my career” and “contributed to ...professional networks,” display somewhat contradictory results. One interpretation of this difference might be that there is relevant content even from just one meeting, but that building networks requires repeated attendance.

Factors in the Decision to Attend

The reduced list of 2015 factors detailed in Table 10, seven items compared with the 32 presented to all respondents, does not provide the level of detail discussed above for the decision to attend meetings in general. Cost is not included here as a “factor,” so the only cost item for Chicago is the one discussed above. Even so, this section does produce useful results. As in the other “decision factor” section, respondents were asked to rate the importance of each item (“not important,” “somewhat important,” or “very important”) in their decision to attend the meeting. The table reports the proportion of respondents who rated each item “very important.”

Among regular members, presenting in a session and networking with colleagues stand out as the most highly-rated items, with networking reported at a slightly higher frequency. Regular attendees place greater emphasis on presenting than do occasional attendees, but the opposite is true for attending sessions as a non-presenter. Both categories of regular members rate professional development as secondary, and only a very small proportion assign high importance to finding a job, visiting exhibits, or meeting with a publisher. (The proportion on the last of these is higher among regular attendees, even if small.)

Student members also gave high marks to presenting in a session and networking at ASA 2015, with the former reported slightly more frequently. The difference between regular and occasional attendees in the emphasis on presenting in versus attending sessions is the same as among regular members. Students give much more credence to professional development as a reason to attend. And the proportion who cite finding a job as an important factor is much higher than among regular members, if still a minority at 32 percent.

For the other respondents who attended in 2015, the pattern of responses is similar to that among regular members, if at lower levels of frequency. Presenting and networking are the most-cited reasons to attend, with networking getting the edge in importance among the regular attendees. A minor point of note is that visiting the exhibits receives a slightly higher rating from this group, although still quite small at 15 percent.

Appendix. Survey Methodology

Following discussion in person and by conference call, the Working Group on the Timing and Cost of the ASA Annual Meeting drafted a questionnaire in February and March of 2016 that focused on factors in the decision to attend the meeting. The draft questionnaire was presented to the ASA Council in March and finalized at the end of that month. The ASA Research Department carried out the survey on behalf of the Working Group.

The population of interest for this survey was the ASA membership. Since it was early in the 2016 membership year, I extracted records for all current 2016 ASA members as of March 31, 2016, along with the final membership data for 2015. In addition, I included non-members who attended the 2015 ASA Annual Meeting in Chicago, with the exception of those who received complimentary registration. The combination of these three groups produced 14,167 contacts with e-mail addresses on file, but 393 of these e-mail addresses subsequently resulted in undelivered survey invitations. The total population with valid e-mail addresses was thus 13,774. The survey questionnaire was distributed via e-mail invitation and completed online using SurveyGizmo software. The invitation resulted in 3,933 responses, but 16 individuals declined to participate after opening the questionnaire. The final response was 3,917 or 28.4 percent.

I compared survey respondents to non-respondents and found that the response rate was lower among 2015 members who had not yet renewed and the non-members who attended ASA 2015. The response rate was also lower among members who did not attend the 2015 meeting and among student and associate members. Among regular members, the response rate at the lowest income levels (under \$30,000 annually and unemployed) was lower. I accordingly weighted the tabulations to adjust for non-response by the combination of membership category—including a category for non-member 2015 attendees—and dues (income) level among regular members. I completed the analysis using Stata 14.1 with post-stratification adjustments to the sampling weights to sum to the population size in each combination of membership and dues category.

Table 1
Characteristics of Member Population and Survey Respondents

	Member Population	Survey Respondents	
		Unweighted	Weighted
Number	13,774	3,917	3,917
Member Category	Percent		
Regular	49.4	61.5	49.4
Student	32.0	23.0	32.0
Associate	9.7	7.2	9.7
Emeritus/Retired	5.4	6.3	5.4
Non-member	3.5	2.1	3.5
Gender			
Woman	51.2	56.7	56.3
Man	42.9	39.1	37.8
Genderqueer	0.5	0.7	0.8
Transgender	0.2	0.3	0.3
Other	0.1	0.1	0.0
Multiple	0.0	0.1	0.1
No response	5.1	3.2	4.7
Race or Ethnicity			
African American or Black	6.2	5.0	4.9
Asian/Asian American	7.9	5.4	5.8
Hispanic/Latino(a)	5.0	4.4	4.8
Native American	0.3	0.2	0.2
White	61.2	71.4	68.1
Other	3.2	2.8	3.0
Multiple	4.0	4.1	4.5
No response	12.3	6.7	8.8
Age			
19-29	12.8	9.7	13.4
30-39	30.0	29.0	31.1
40-49	18.5	21.9	19.2
50-59	11.1	12.7	11.0
60-69	10.0	12.5	10.7
70+	7.4	8.4	7.3
No response	10.2	5.8	7.4

Note: Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Source: Working Group survey of the ASA membership, 2016

Table 2. Factors in the Decision to Attend the ASA Annual Meeting, Regular Members by Annual Meeting Attendance

Factor	Percent Identifying as Very Important				# Resp.	Diff. Sig.
	Non-Attenders	Occasional Attendees	Regular Attendees	All Respondents		
Availability of funding from my institution	65.4	72.7	72.1	71.6	2,288	*
Availability of funding through a grant	38.4	29.2	26.8	28.8	2,093	*
My institution expects me to attend the annual meetings	11.6	5.6	15.9	12.1	2,168	*
Cost of airfare	64.4	53.9	34.9	44.3	2,297	*
Cost of rooms in the conference hotel(s)	60.7	55.6	40.7	47.7	2,302	*
Cost of alternative accommodations near the conference	56.6	47.1	34.6	41.0	2,252	*
Cost of conference city more generally	35.4	30.9	26.1	28.7	2,271	*
My own institution's fall start dates	48.9	51.3	52.8	51.9	2,263	n.s.
Weather conditions (e.g., heat and humidity) at the conference site	6.2	5.9	6.8	6.5	2,250	n.s.
Easy air connections from my place of residence to the conference site	25.3	20.8	19.1	20.3	2,268	n.s.
Ability to drive to and around the conference location	15.3	4.2	1.5	3.9	2,265	*
Ability to travel easily by foot near the conference hotel	44.3	47.3	50.0	48.5	2,300	n.s.
Ability to travel safely by foot near the conference hotel	52.2	48.7	50.6	50.2	2,289	n.s.
Ability to travel easily by public transportation near the conference hotel	32.7	35.7	30.1	32.2	2,291	n.s.
Easy access from the airport to the conference hotel	39.3	33.7	28.8	31.5	2,297	*
Hotel accessibility for those with disabilities	20.5	15.1	17.5	17.1	2,067	n.s.
The "feel" of the conference city	25.2	21.2	23.2	22.8	2,233	n.s.
The conference hotel's commitment to union labor	22.1	34.46	42.1	37.5	2,231	*
The conference hotel's commitment to fair labor practices	37.9	41.9	48.7	45.4	2,250	*
Discriminatory laws or policies in the conference city or state	45.5	50.3	56.2	53.1	2,253	*
Availability of appropriate and affordable child or elder care	7.9	8.2	10.0	9.2	2,084	n.s.
Being on the program as a presenter, presider, or discussant	47.8	66.6	74.1	68.8	2,272	*
Attending scholarly sessions	62.4	53.0	46.9	50.5	2,277	*
Attending sessions focused on teaching	32.7	23.3	11.7	17.7	2,244	*
Attending section events	34.5	26.6	46.0	38.6	2,252	*
Attending a concurrent meeting (e.g., ABS, SSSP, SWS)	15.8	12.6	16.5	15.2	2,204	n.s.
Meeting with editors, publishers, or exhibitors	18.0	10.6	21.5	17.6	2,223	*
Serving on an ASA committee or editorial board	10.3	11.2	27.9	20.7	2,101	*
Being on the job market	24.1	19.5	21.4	21.1	2,077	n.s.
Interviewing job candidates	8.7	9.3	12.4	11.0	1,999	*
The timing of family vacations	28.7	30.6	23.7	26.4	2,216	*
The timing of summer field work	20.0	22.9	21.0	21.5	2,183	n.s.

Notes: Occasional attendees include those attending for the first time. Test for significant differences is based on all responses, not only "very important." * Significant at $p < .05$; n.s. = Not significant. **Source:** Working Group survey of the ASA membership, 2016

Table 3. Factors in the Decision to Attend the ASA Annual Meeting, Student Members by Annual Meeting Attendance

Factor	Percent Identifying as Very Important				# Resp.	Diff. Sig.
	Non-Attenders	Occasional Attendees	Regular Attendees	All Respondents		
Availability of funding from my institution	85.6	86.8	76.9	82.5	824	*
Availability of funding through a grant	60.2	56.6	42.3	51.7	729	*
My institution expects me to attend the annual meetings	32.3	22.5	29.6	27.6	736	n.s.
Cost of airfare	80.8	79.5	66.1	74.3	826	*
Cost of rooms in the conference hotel(s)	73.2	70.1	56.8	65.5	822	*
Cost of alternative accommodations near the conference	67.7	72.0	67.1	69.0	813	n.s.
Cost of conference city more generally	41.0	47.3	39.0	42.5	819	*
My own institution's fall start dates	32.6	37.9	40.4	37.7	814	n.s.
Weather conditions (e.g., heat and humidity) at the conference site	2.2	2.0	2.8	2.4	806	n.s.
Easy air connections from my place of residence to the conference site	23.2	19.1	20.4	20.5	808	n.s.
Ability to drive to and around the conference location	8.6	4.8	2.7	4.8	812	*
Ability to travel easily by foot near the conference hotel	42.0	56.2	54.0	52.1	822	*
Ability to travel safely by foot near the conference hotel	46.0	54.9	48.7	50.3	817	n.s.
Ability to travel easily by public transportation near the conference hotel	35.3	44.4	46.3	43.1	819	n.s.
Easy access from the airport to the conference hotel	35.1	35.5	35.7	35.5	817	n.s.
Hotel accessibility for those with disabilities	29.1	23.3	21.0	23.8	694	n.s.
The "feel" of the conference city	14.2	15.6	19.0	16.7	798	*
The conference hotel's commitment to union labor	28.9	34.4	37.0	34.3	767	n.s.
The conference hotel's commitment to fair labor practices	37.7	41.2	43.6	41.4	782	n.s.
Discriminatory laws or policies in the conference city or state	50.1	45.2	54.4	50.1	792	n.s.
Availability of appropriate and affordable child or elder care	16.3	16.3	17.1	16.6	669	n.s.
Being on the program as a presenter, presider, or discussant	66.7	73.4	82.8	75.7	791	*
Attending scholarly sessions	66.3	50.3	48.2	53.1	795	*
Attending sessions focused on teaching	27.8	17.0	14.0	18.2	763	*
Attending section events	32.8	29.2	40.9	34.8	784	*
Attending a concurrent meeting (e.g., ABS, SSSP, SWS)	23.1	23.1	21.3	22.3	739	n.s.
Meeting with editors, publishers, or exhibitors	17.4	8.0	9.8	10.9	710	*
Serving on an ASA committee or editorial board	8.5	8.5	13.7	10.6	640	n.s.
Being on the job market	57.1	50.2	64.8	57.8	730	*
Interviewing job candidates	25.0	11.2	12.0	14.6	479	*
The timing of family vacations	18.4	19.0	23.8	20.8	741	n.s.
The timing of summer field work	33.7	32.3	30.2	31.8	729	n.s.

Notes: Occasional attendees include those attending for the first time. Test for significant differences is based on all responses, not only "very important." * Significant at $p < .05$; n.s. = Not significant. **Source:** Working Group survey of the ASA membership, 2016

Table 4. Factors in the Decision to Attend the ASA Annual Meeting, Associate/Retired Members and Non-Members, by Annual Meeting Attendance

Factor	Percent Identifying as Very Important				# Resp.	Diff. Sig.
	Non-Attenders	Occasional Attendees	Regular Attendees	All Respondents		
Availability of funding from my institution	50.9	61.6	60.3	59.0	539	*
Availability of funding through a grant	33.1	34.9	28.1	32.4	506	n.s.
My institution expects me to attend the annual meetings	10.1	9.7	14.2	11.2	491	n.s.
Cost of airfare	56.8	44.7	39.6	45.7	560	*
Cost of rooms in the conference hotel(s)	49.7	42.0	43.6	44.1	561	n.s.
Cost of alternative accommodations near the conference	39.4	41.0	35.9	39.1	542	n.s.
Cost of conference city more generally	30.5	22.3	21.3	23.7	552	n.s.
My own institution's fall start dates	19.8	29.4	28.7	27.2	509	n.s.
Weather conditions (e.g., heat and humidity) at the conference site	6.0	4.9	6.0	5.5	543	n.s.
Easy air connections from my place of residence to the conference site	19.6	26.4	18.0	22.4	543	n.s.
Ability to drive to and around the conference location	10.5	5.4	4.3	6.1	543	*
Ability to travel easily by foot near the conference hotel	28.6	46.2	51.2	44.0	554	*
Ability to travel safely by foot near the conference hotel	39.0	51.3	54.7	49.7	553	*
Ability to travel easily by public transportation near the conference hotel	29.5	37.0	30.9	33.6	551	n.s.
Easy access from the airport to the conference hotel	31.3	33.4	37.2	34.1	552	n.s.
Hotel accessibility for those with disabilities	29.3	14.9	13.8	17.7	505	*
The "feel" of the conference city	20.2	25.6	31.3	26.3	540	n.s.
The conference hotel's commitment to union labor	30.6	30.4	36.5	32.3	530	n.s.
The conference hotel's commitment to fair labor practices	36.8	37.7	45.7	39.9	530	n.s.
Discriminatory laws or policies in the conference city or state	46.7	48.6	51.0	48.9	541	n.s.
Availability of appropriate and affordable child or elder care	7.4	6.8	3.9	6.1	494	n.s.
Being on the program as a presenter, presider, or discussant	41.4	68.6	52.2	58.1	535	*
Attending scholarly sessions	55.2	59.1	49.0	55.3	543	n.s.
Attending sessions focused on teaching	20.8	12.7	8.3	13.1	523	*
Attending section events	23.8	26.3	33.5	28.0	531	n.s.
Attending a concurrent meeting (e.g., ABS, SSSP, SWS)	4.9	12.1	12.6	10.8	510	n.s.
Meeting with editors, publishers, or exhibitors	14.0	14.6	20.8	16.3	524	n.s.
Serving on an ASA committee or editorial board	7.7	5.6	12.5	8.1	503	n.s.
Being on the job market	11.5	13.2	10.2	12.0	497	n.s.
Interviewing job candidates	3.6	5.9	2.4	4.4	478	n.s.
The timing of family vacations	25.5	28.9	24.1	26.8	529	n.s.
The timing of summer field work	16.5	19.2	14.1	17.1	500	n.s.

Notes: Occasional attendees include those attending for the first time. Test for significant differences is based on all responses, not only "very important." * Significant at $p < .05$; n.s. = Not significant. **Source:** Working Group survey of the ASA membership, 2016

Table 5. Statements About Meeting Timing, by Member Category and Annual Meeting Attendance

Statement	Percent Agreeing with Statement				# Resp.	Diff. Sig.
	Regular Members	Non-Attendees	Occasional Attendees	Regular Attendees		
The current timing of the annual meetings makes it easy for me to attend.		18.1	15.5	20.4	18.6	2,204 *
The annual meetings often conflict with my university or college's start dates or first day of class.		39.9	32.9	34.2	34.3	2,118 n.s.
The annual meetings often conflict with my administrative responsibilities.		19.5	20.8	21.2	20.9	1,853 n.s.
The current timing of the annual meetings does not work well for interviewing job candidates.		19.8	24.6	18.5	20.4	983 *
Meeting earlier in the summer (June or July) would make it harder for me to attend.		10.9	18.8	27.1	22.8	2,076 *
Meeting later in the fall (September-December) would make it harder for me to attend.		34.3	31.5	45.2	39.7	2,176 *
Meeting in the winter/spring (January-May) would make it easier for me to attend.		23.2	23.7	18.9	20.8	2,121 *
Student Members	Non-Attendees	Occasional Attendees	Regular Attendees	All Respondents	# Resp.	Diff. Sig.
The current timing of the annual meetings makes it easy for me to attend.		25.9	24.0	25.0	24.8	761 n.s.
The annual meetings often conflict with my university or college's start dates or first day of class.		29.2	27.9	21.1	29.5	729 n.s.
The annual meetings often conflict with my administrative responsibilities.		8.9	12.1	15.3	12.8	454 n.s.
The current timing of the annual meetings does not work well for interviewing job candidates.		18.8	22.4	27.6	24.1	166 n.s.
Meeting earlier in the summer (June or July) would make it harder for me to attend.		16.1	18.3	22.4	19.5	714 n.s.
Meeting later in the fall (September-December) would make it harder for me to attend.		39.2	38.4	40.9	39.6	740 n.s.
Meeting in the winter/spring (January-May) would make it easier for me to attend.		20.5	17.8	17.5	18.3	722 n.s.

See notes at end of table.

Table 5 (cont.)

Statements About Timing of the Meeting, by Member Category and Annual Meeting Attendance

Associate or Retired Members and Non-Members	Percent Agreeing with Statement				# Resp.	Diff. Sig.
	Non-Attendees	Occasional Attendees	Regular Attendees	All Respondents		
The current timing of the annual meetings makes it easy for me to attend.	35.4	33.3	33.9	33.9	472	n.s.
The annual meetings often conflict with my university or college's start dates or first day of class.	14.6	19.0	20.6	18.8	359	n.s.
The annual meetings often conflict with my administrative responsibilities.	8.4	10.3	12.8	10.8	344	n.s.
The current timing of the annual meetings does not work well for interviewing job candidates.	14.8	12.7	22.0	16.0	161	n.s.
Meeting earlier in the summer (June or July) would make it harder for me to attend.	16.2	30.0	30.7	27.8	430	n.s.
Meeting later in the fall (September-December) would make it harder for me to attend.	23.8	40.6	36.0	36.2	446	*
Meeting in the winter/spring (January-May) would make it easier for me to attend.	12.1	21.5	17.4	18.6	442	n.s.

Notes: Occasional attendees include those attending for the first time. Test for significant differences is based on all responses, not only those in agreement. * Significant at $p < .05$; n.s. = Not significant.

Source: Working Group survey of the ASA membership, 2016

Table 6. Fall Start Date for Individuals with Nine-Month Appointments, by Member Category

	Percent of Respondents			
	Regular Members	Student Members	Other Respondents	All Respondents
July	0.3	0.0	1.2	0.4
1st week of August	3.2	2.3	5.8	3.4
2nd week of August	10.6	10.1	12.2	10.7
3rd week of August	39.6	29.8	20.1	32.8
4th week of August	23.4	27.5	22.9	24.6
1st week of September	12.8	15.6	21.6	15.3
2nd week of September	5.6	8.0	6.8	6.6
Later September	3.8	6.0	5.5	4.8
October	0.7	0.5	1.3	0.7
Other	0.1	0.2	2.7	0.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number of Respondents	1,927	614	216	2,757

Notes

Other respondents include associate or retired members and non-members.

Source: Working Group survey of the ASA membership, 2016

Table 7. ASA Meeting Conflicts with Child's School, Parents by Member Category

ASA Meeting Conflicts with Child's School	Percent of Respondents			
	Regular Members	Student Members	Other Respondents	All Respondents
Often	38.2	43.9	28.8	37.5
Occasionally	27.5	30.5	23.4	27.2
Does not	34.3	25.6	47.8	35.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number of Respondents	753	82	94	929

Child's School Fall Start Date	Percent of Respondents			
	Regular Members	Student Members	Other Respondents	All Respondents
July	0.2	1.2	0.0	0.3
1st week of August	4.3	4.8	2.2	4.0
2nd week of August	14.6	14.3	11.0	13.9
3rd week of August	33.3	36.9	20.1	31.6
4th week of August	16.9	11.9	18.8	16.5
1st week of September	27.5	23.8	37.7	28.7
2nd week of September	2.4	4.8	6.1	3.4
Later September	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.2
Other	0.6	2.4	3.2	1.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number of Respondents	753	84	98	935

Notes

Other respondents include associate or retired members and non-members.

Source: Working Group survey of the ASA membership, 2016

Table 8. Locations Mentioned as Undesirable for ASA Annual Meetings (Partial Tabulation)

Location	% of Named	
	No.	Locations
Las Vegas	311	31.7
Atlanta	202	20.6
Anaheim/Los Angeles	108	11.0
New York	61	6.2
San Francisco	45	4.6
Chicago	37	3.8
Miami	26	2.7
Seattle	25	2.6
Montreal	19	1.9
Denver (and Colorado)	17	1.7
West Coast	15	1.5
Cincinnati	12	1.2
Philadelphia	10	1.0
Canada	9	0.9
Detroit	9	0.9
Orlando	8	0.8
Washington DC	8	0.8
New Orleans	6	0.6
California	5	0.5
Pittsburgh	5	0.5
South	5	0.5
East	4	0.4
San Antonio	4	0.4
Toronto	4	0.4
Boston	3	0.3
Houston	3	0.3
Florida	2	0.2
International	2	0.2
Texas	2	0.2
Arizona	1	0.1
Austin	1	0.1
Dallas	1	0.1
Hawaii	1	0.1
Hilton	1	0.1
Midwest	1	0.1
Mississippi	1	0.1
North Carolina	1	0.1
Phoenix	1	0.1
"Republican states"	1	0.1
St. Louis	1	0.1
Sunbelt	1	0.1
Vancouver	1	0.1
	<hr/> 980	

Table 9**Evaluation of ASA 2015 in Chicago, by Member Category and Annual Meeting Attendance**

Regular Members		Percent Agreeing with Statement			
Statement	Occasional Attendees	Regular Attendees	All Respondents	# Resp.	Diff. Sig.
The meeting was a good investment of my time.	38.4	58.7	55.4	1,268	*
The meeting was a good investment of my money.	24.3	38.6	36.2	1,247	*
The program content was relevant to my career.	39.1	48.2	46.7	1,250	n.s.
The meeting contributed to building my professional networks.	28.7	54.8	50.5	1,253	*
I would recommend this meeting to colleagues.	27.3	51.6	47.7	1,242	*
I would recommend this meeting to graduate students.	34.9	59.0	55.2	1,252	*

Student Members		Occasional Attendees	Regular Attendees	All Respondents	# Resp.	Diff. Sig.
Statement						
The meeting was a good investment of my time.		49.5	50.4	50.0	460	n.s.
The meeting was a good investment of my money.		26.9	28.3	27.8	454	n.s.
The program content was relevant to my career.		57.4	44.9	49.9	457	*
The meeting contributed to building my professional networks.		36.1	50.2	44.6	451	*
I would recommend this meeting to colleagues.		43.1	49.1	46.7	448	n.s.
I would recommend this meeting to graduate students.		41.9	52.0	47.9	453	n.s.

Associate or Retired Members and Non-Members		Occasional Attendees	Regular Attendees	All Respondents	# Resp.	Diff. Sig.
Statement						
The meeting was a good investment of my time.		57.7	55.4	56.5	218	n.s.
The meeting was a good investment of my money.		35.8	35.5	35.6	214	*
The program content was relevant to my career.		31.8	41.6	36.9	214	n.s.
The meeting contributed to building my professional networks.		30.1	40.5	35.4	208	*
I would recommend this meeting to colleagues.		35.0	49.1	42.3	208	n.s.
I would recommend this meeting to graduate students.		35.8	58.0	47.1	205	*

Notes: Includes 2015 attendees only. Occasional attendees include those attending for the first time. Test for significant differences is based on all responses, not only those in agreement. * Significant at $p < .05$; n.s. = Not significant.

Source: Working Group survey of the ASA membership, 2016

Table 10**Factors in the Decision to Attend ASA 2015 in Chicago, by Member Category and Annual Meeting Attendance**

Factor	Percent Identifying as Very Important			# Resp.	Diff. Sig.
	Occasional Attendees	Regular Attendees	All Respondents		
Regular Members					
To present in a session(s)	57.4	63.1	62.2	1,251	*
To attend a session(s)	41.1	31.3	33.0	1,257	*
Professional development	36.8	38.9	38.6	1,234	n.s.
Networking with colleagues	51.9	72.2	68.9	1,261	*
To find a job	10.8	7.0	7.6	1,187	n.s.
To visit the exhibits	7.2	10.0	9.5	1,230	n.s.
To meet with a publisher	11.3	18.5	17.3	1,215	*
Student Members					
To present in a session(s)	66.3	72.6	70.1	442	*
To attend a session(s)	45.7	28.4	35.5	457	*
Professional development	52.7	55.3	54.2	450	n.s.
Networking with colleagues	53.3	70.2	63.3	452	*
To find a job	28.1	34.8	32.1	417	*
To visit the exhibits	4.6	2.7	3.4	436	n.s.
To meet with a publisher	3.2	3.7	3.5	403	n.s.
Associate or Retired Members and Non-Members					
To present in a session(s)	58.8	53.4	56.1	210	n.s.
To attend a session(s)	52.0	38.5	45.1	217	n.s.
Professional development	33.7	33.3	33.5	211	n.s.
Networking with colleagues	42.8	64.6	53.9	216	*
To find a job	7.4	4.9	6.1	201	n.s.
To visit the exhibits	10.2	19.7	15.1	210	n.s.
To meet with a publisher	5.7	19.5	12.7	199	*

Notes: Includes 2015 attendees only. Occasional attendees include those attending for the first time. Test for significant differences is based on all responses, not only "very important." * Significant at $p < .05$; n.s. = Not significant.

Source: Working Group survey of the ASA membership, 2016

Timing and Cost of the ASA Annual Meeting

Introduction

Page exit logic: Non-participant

IF: Question "Do you consent to completing this questionnaire regarding the ASA Annual Meeting?" is one of the following answers ("No") **THEN:** Jump to [page 9 - Thank You!](#) Flag response as complete

The Working Group on the Timing and Cost of the ASA Annual Meeting is carrying out this survey to better understand member decisions about attending the Annual Meeting. Your responses will be helpful even if you have not attended a recent meeting.

This survey is being carried out by the ASA Research Department on behalf of the Working Group. All responses will be held in strict confidence in accordance with the ASA Code of Ethics, and will be reported only in the form of aggregate tabulations or anonymous comments. The questionnaire should take no longer than 15 minutes to complete. If necessary, you may pause and return to the questionnaire. If you have questions about the survey or technical difficulties, please contact ASA Research at research@asanet.org

Completing the questionnaire will not provide you with any direct benefit, but it will assist the Working Group and the ASA Council in planning future ASA Annual Meetings. You may choose not to complete this questionnaire without any repercussions, and you may choose not to respond to any individual items. To begin, please answer the following:

Do you consent to completing this questionnaire regarding the ASA Annual Meeting? *

- Yes
- No

Logic Show/hide trigger exists.

Did you attend the 2015 ASA meeting in Chicago?

- Yes No Prefer not to respond

Logic Hidden unless: Question "Did you attend the 2015 ASA meeting in Chicago?" is one of the following answers ("Yes")

Was that the first ASA Annual Meeting you've ever attended?

- Yes No Unsure

Do you typically attend ASA annual meetings?

- Yes, most years Only occasionally No
- Unsure or does not apply

AM 2015 Chicago

Page entry logic:

This page will show when: Question "Did you attend the 2015 ASA meeting in Chicago?" is one of the following answers ("Yes")

Please indicate your agreement with the following statements about the **2015 ASA Meeting in Chicago** (*please select one response for each*):

	Agree	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree	No Opinion
The meeting was a good investment of my time.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The meeting was a good investment of my money.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The program content was relevant to my career.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The meeting contributed to building my professional networks.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I would recommend this meeting to colleagues.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I would recommend this meeting to graduate students.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

How important were each of the following to you in deciding to attend the **2015 ASA Meeting in Chicago**? (*Please select one response for each*)

	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Very Important	No Opinion
To present in a session(s)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To attend a session(s)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Professional development	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Networking with colleagues	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To find a job	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To visit the exhibits	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To meet with a publisher	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Attendance Factors

How important are the following factors in deciding whether or not to attend ASA annual meetings? (*Please select one response for each*)

	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Very Important	No Opinion
Availability of funding from my institution	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Availability of funding through a grant	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My institution expects me to attend the annual meetings	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Cost of airfare	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Cost of rooms in the conference hotel(s)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Cost of alternative accommodations near the conference	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Cost of conference city more generally	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My own institution's fall start dates	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Weather conditions (e.g., heat and humidity) at the conference site	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Easy air connections from my place of residence to the conference site	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

And how important are the following factors in deciding whether or not to attend ASA annual meetings? (*Please select one response for each*)

	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Very Important	No Opinion
Ability to drive to and around the conference location	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ability to travel easily by foot near the conference hotel	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ability to travel safely by foot near the conference hotel	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ability to travel easily by public transportation near the conference hotel	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Easy access from the airport to the conference hotel	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Hotel accessibility for those with disabilities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The “feel” of the conference city	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The conference hotel’s commitment to union labor	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The conference hotel’s commitment to fair labor practices	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Discriminatory laws or policies in the conference city or state	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Attendance Factors (cont'd)

How important are the following additional factors in deciding whether or not to attend ASA annual meetings? (*Please select one response for each*)

	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Very Important	No Opinion
Availability of appropriate and affordable child or elder care	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Being on the program as a presenter, presider, or discussant	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Attending scholarly sessions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Attending sessions focused on teaching	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Attending section events	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Attending a concurrent meeting (e.g., ABS, SSSP, SWS)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Meeting with editors, publishers, or exhibitors	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Serving on an ASA committee or editorial board	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Being on the job market	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Interviewing job candidates	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

And finally, how important are these factors in deciding whether or not to attend ASA annual meetings? (*Please select one response for each*)

	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Very Important	No Opinion
The timing of family vacations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The timing of summer field work	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Is there another factor important in your decision whether or not to attend the ASA Annual Meeting?

Does your organization provide funding for attending the ASA Annual Meeting? (*Please select one response.*)

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Full funding | <input type="radio"/> Partial funding, but only if I present a paper |
| <input type="radio"/> Full funding, but only if I present a paper | <input type="radio"/> Partial funding, but only if I appear on the program |
| <input type="radio"/> Full funding, but only if I appear on the program | <input type="radio"/> No funding |
| <input type="radio"/> Partial funding | <input type="radio"/> No opinion or does not apply |

Employment

LOGIC Show/hide trigger exists.

In which sector are you currently primarily employed? (*Please select one response.*)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="radio"/> College or university employee | <input type="radio"/> For-profit organization |
| <input type="radio"/> Student | <input type="radio"/> Self-employed |
| <input type="radio"/> K-12 school or school district | <input type="radio"/> Retired |
| <input type="radio"/> Federal government | <input type="radio"/> Not currently working for pay or profit |
| <input type="radio"/> State or local government | <input type="radio"/> Other (please specify) |
| <input type="radio"/> Not-for-profit organization | <input type="text"/> |
| | <input type="radio"/> Prefer not to respond |

LOGIC Hidden unless: Question "In which sector are you currently primarily employed? (Please select one response.)" is one of the following answers ("College or university employee")

What is your current position? (Please select one response.)

- Professor
- Associate Professor
- Assistant Professor
- Full-time non-tenure-track faculty member
- Part-time non-tenure-track faculty member
- Postdoctoral fellow
- Non-faculty researcher
- Non-faculty professional employee
- Administrator
- Other (please specify)
- Prefer not to respond

LOGIC Hidden unless: Question "In which sector are you currently primarily employed? (Please select one response.)" is one of the following answers ("Student")

Which category best reflects your status? (Please select one response.)

- Full-time graduate student
- Part-time graduate student
- Full-time undergraduate student
- Part-time undergraduate student
- High school student
- Other (please specify)
- Prefer not to respond

LOGIC Hidden unless: Question "In which sector are you currently primarily employed? (*Please select one response.*)" is one of the following answers ("K-12 school or school district")

What is your current position? (*Please select one response.*)

- High school teacher
- Elementary school teacher
- Elementary or secondary principal
- Counselor or other non-teaching professional
- District administration
- Other (please specify)
- Prefer not to respond

LOGIC Hidden unless: Question "In which sector are you currently primarily employed? (*Please select one response.*)" is one of the following answers ("Federal government", "State or local government", "Not-for-profit organization", "For-profit organization", "Other (please specify)")

Is your position full-time or part-time? (*Please select one response.*)

Full-time

Part-time

Prefer not to respond

Timing

If you have a nine-month appointment, in which week do you typically return to work in the fall? (*Please select one response.*)

- 1st week of August
- 2nd week of August
- 3rd week of August
- 4th week of August
- 1st week of September
- 2nd week of September
- Some other date (please specify):
- Does not apply

LOGIC Show/hide trigger exists.

Do you have a school-age child or school-age children living in your household?

Yes

No

Prefer not to respond

LOGIC Hidden unless: Question "Do you have a school-age child or school-age children living in your household?" is one of the following answers ("Yes")

To what degree do the annual meetings conflict with your child(ren)'s school schedules? (*Please select one response.*)

- The meeting often conflicts with my child(ren)'s school schedule
- The meeting occasionally conflicts with my child(ren)'s school schedule
- The meeting does not conflict with my child(ren)'s school schedule
- No opinion

Logic Hidden unless: Question "Do you have a school-age child or school-age children living in your household?" is one of the following answers ("Yes")

In what week does the child (or do the children) in your household typically begin school in the fall? (*Please select one response.*)

- 1st week of August
- 2nd week of August
- 3rd week of August
- 4th week of August
- 1st week of September
- 2nd week of September
- Some other date (please specify):
- Does not apply

The ASA meetings are typically held in either the second or third week of August, with an attempt to rotate between the earlier and later weeks (although this is not always possible). Please rate your agreement with the following statements as they apply to the timing of the annual meeting. *(Please select one response for each item)*

	Agree	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
The current timing of the annual meetings makes it easy for me to attend.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The annual meetings often conflict with my university or college's start dates or first day of class.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The annual meetings often conflict with my administrative responsibilities.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The current timing of the annual meetings does not work well for interviewing job candidates.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Meeting earlier in the summer (June or July) would make it harder for me to attend.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Meeting later in the fall (September-December) would make it harder for me to attend.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Meeting in the winter/spring (January-May) would make it easier for me to attend.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments

LOGIC Show/hide trigger exists.

Sometimes members have bad experiences in meeting locations, or sometimes they choose to skip a meeting simply because of the meeting's location. Are there locations where meetings have been held previously where you would not return or chose not to attend because of the location?

Yes

No

No opinion

LOGIC Hidden unless: Question "Sometimes members have bad experiences in meeting locations, or sometimes they choose to skip a meeting simply because of the meeting's location. Are there locations where meetings have been held previously where you would not return or chose not to attend because of the location?" is one of the following answers ("Yes")
What location(s) is that, and why?

Finally, please provide any comments you might have about the timing, location, or cost of the ASA Annual Meeting:

Thank You!

Thank you for taking the time to respond. The Working Group on the Timing and Cost of the ASA Annual Meeting will review the results of this survey and report to the ASA Council in August. Please watch for further information via *Footnotes* and other ASA media.