

# Exploring the Landscape of Virtual Academic Conferences: A Scoping Review of the 1984–2021 Literature

Agnieszka Olechnicka<sup>1\*</sup>, Adam Ploszaj<sup>1</sup>, Ewa Zegler-Poleska<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Science Studies Laboratory, Centre for European Regional and Local Studies EUROREG, University of Warsaw, Warsaw, Poland

\* [a.olechnicka@uw.edu.pl](mailto:a.olechnicka@uw.edu.pl)

## Abstract

This study presents an overview of the literature on virtual academic conferences, which have gained prominence due to the COVID-19 pandemic. We conducted a scoping review analyzing 147 documents covering the literature available up to October 5th, 2021. We examined the development of the field focusing on the evolution of virtual academic conferences, main themes in the literature, and its methodological and theoretical approaches. The results indicate that the existing literature on virtual academic conferences is mainly descriptive and lacks a theoretical framework. Future research should focus on developing a solid theoretical framework to guide empirically and methodologically robust studies on virtual academic conferences. We emphasize the importance of recognizing their advantages and disadvantages from the perspectives of different groups of scholars. This will be a crucial step in establishing a framework for identifying and addressing dilemmas in online scholarly communication according to the responsible research and innovation approach.

Keywords: virtual conferences, academic conferences, scholarly communication

## Introduction

As gatherings of professionals, conferences have been the object of interest in various areas of research, including event management, management studies, higher education, and regional studies. Conferences are temporary clusters of interactions or hotspots of intense knowledge exchange (Maskell et al., 2006).

Moreover, conferences are venues for various activities ranging from information exchanges to the enactment of technological possibilities (Garud, 2008). More recent developments in conference studies consider them as key sites of knowledge creation, public performance, legitimation, and protest (Craggs & Mahony, 2014). The return on investment from conferencing has also received scrutiny (Edelheim et al., 2018).

Academic conferences are a crucial element of scientific work and scholarly communication. Their essential role as a meeting space became apparent during the COVID-19 pandemic and the ensuing travel restrictions. However, multiple authors have noticed that despite the long tradition and essential role of conferences in science, academic meetings have been largely neglected as a subject of research (Hansen & Budtz Pedersen, 2018) even in areas studying science. For example, a typology of academic events has been only recently provided (Hansen et al., 2020).

Among the few studies exploring academic events a prominent topic is their epistemic and social role. Knorr-Cetina (1995) considers scientific meetings in high-energy physics as places of consensus formation. Similarly, Craggs and Mahony (2014) analyze conferences as places producing epistemic communities. Along this line, Hansen and Budtz Pedersen (2020) postulate conceptualizing and evaluating academic events as open marketplaces that facilitate the conversion of credibility.

Primarily concerned with the social functions of academic conferences, Gross and Fleming (2011) contribute to their understanding as “key sites for the social orchestration of academic knowledge and the intrusion of sociality into forms of social knowledge production.” Overall functions of conferences have been conceptualized by Jacobs and McFarlane (2005), who integrated insights from science studies and sociocultural theory. According to these authors, conferences are formalized arenas where procedures of science are examined and held accountable; they provide space for managing interpretive flexibility and for operating closure mechanisms. On the other hand, conferences function as communities of practice and places of knowledge-building.

Similar to the lack of research on academic conferences in general, virtual academic conferences (VCs) have not been extensively studied until the COVID-19 pandemic, when they became the only feasible

mode to gather scholars. For this reason, the topic of academic VC has been attracting growing attention in many disciplines forced to organize meetings in virtual mode. This growth has also resulted in a stronger interest in VC as an object of study. While VCs as professional development events have already been thoroughly described over a decade ago by Anderson (2010), even recent works argue that virtual conferences have not received much attention because of their newness (Fang & Daniel, 2021). The extant reviews on academic conferences and their virtual modes are limited (González-Santos & Dimond, 2015; Sá et al., 2019).

Parallel to the recent proliferation of virtual conferences, the amount of literature documenting and discussing these events has also rapidly grown. This unprecedented growth demands closer examination. Our literature review aims to capture the characteristics of this burgeoning body of works and provide an overview of potential research niches. In particular, we aimed to answer the following research questions:

- (1) How are virtual conferences defined?
- (2) What are the main themes discussed in the literature on VCs?
- (3) What data and methods are used in published research on VCs?
- (3) What theoretical approaches to VCs are employed?

We conduct a scoping review with elements of mapping review, providing a narrative description of the current state of research on VC, based on a comprehensive search (Grant & Booth, 2009). We categorize the existing literature, assessing its quantity and quality. We do not perform a formal quality assessment but focus on identifying gaps in the literature where more research is needed.

## **Data and methods**

We searched Scopus, Web of Science databases, and arXiv and OSF preprints repositories with combinations of keywords “conference” and “virtual” and their synonyms and related terms, using truncation and Boolean operators. As we focused on academic conferences, we refined the search to

exclude records concerning other types of meetings, such as business events and remote healthcare, telemedicine, or teaching seminars. Our inclusion criterion was that the academic virtual conferences must be the main topic of the publication with no restrictions to the type of publication. As exclusion criteria, we defined: (1) educational virtual events focused on pupils or undergraduate students, (2) remote healthcare and telemedicine meetings, (3) business, and industry online events being the main topic, (4) non-English language of publication. Otherwise, the investigation included all indexed types of publications with no restriction on publication date. The final query used in this study was written as follows (this example uses SCOPUS syntax):

```
(TITLE-ABS-KEY ( "videoconferenc*" OR "webconferenc*" OR "virtual conferenc*" OR "video conferenc*" OR "web conferenc*" OR "on-line conferenc*" OR "online conferenc*" OR "digital conferenc*" OR "remote conferenc*" OR "e-conferenc*" OR "hybrid conferenc*" OR "virtual seminar*" OR "video seminar*" OR "web seminar*" OR "on-line seminar*" OR "online seminar*" OR "digital seminar*" OR "remote seminar*" OR "e-seminar*" OR "hybrid seminar*" OR "virtual congress*" OR "video congress*" OR "web congress*" OR "on-line congress*" OR "online congress*" OR "digital congress*" OR "remote congress*" OR "e-congress*" OR "hybrid congress*" OR "virtual scientific event*" OR "video scientific event*" OR "on-line scientific event*" OR "online scientific event*" OR "hybrid scientific event*" ) AND TITLE-ABS-KEY OR ( "scientific" OR "academic*" ) AND NOT TITLE-ABS-KEY ( "teach*" OR "student*" OR "patient*" OR "telemed*" OR "educat*" OR "industry" OR "care hom*" OR "telehealth" OR "physician*" OR "interview*" ))
```

Following the scoping review methodology, we conducted multiple structured searches (Grant & Booth, 2009). Through an iterative process of testing and refining the search combined with the snowballing procedure (Gough et al., 2017), we identified 296 documents for further selection. Additionally, we screened the included articles' backward (references) and forward citation reference lists to identify relevant complementary literature sources. Then we sequentially examined the title and abstract of each publication as well as the content when needed. As a result of this selection, we obtained 92 documents. An update of this process conducted in October 2021 resulted in further 55 documents.

After these steps, our final set included 147 documents and covered the literature available up to October 5th, 2021. We have offered the entire set of publication metadata online as a Zotero Group “Virtual Academic Conferencing 1984–2021” ([https://www.zotero.org/groups/4832623/virtual\\_academic\\_conferencing\\_1984-2021](https://www.zotero.org/groups/4832623/virtual_academic_conferencing_1984-2021)).

We collected full texts of the publications and imported PDF files into MaxQDA 2020 (VERBI Software, Berlin, Germany) to conduct a content analysis, combining deductive and inductive approaches. For that purpose, we created a coding framework. We predefined the set of codes accordingly to our research questions. We annotated each of the codes with a detailed memo for common understanding within the coding team. After the initial coding phase, each code was further re-coded inductively, and several subcodes were applied to analyze the retrieved fragments.

## Results

### Types of publications and venues

To compare the pre- and during-pandemic trends, we divide the collected 147 publications into two groups: (1) published until 2019 inclusive, i.e., before the pandemic, and 2) published in 2020 and 2021, during the pandemic. The former group comprises 35 items published in 1984–2019, the latter 112 published in 2020 and 2021. The latter group includes eight papers with publication date 2020, but apparently submitted early enough not to concern the pandemic (Abbott, 2020; Arnal et al., 2020; Black et al., 2020; Ekstrom et al., 2020; Fellermann et al., 2020; Guerra Amorim & Tucci, 2020; Le et al., 2020; Spilker et al., 2020).

The majority of documents analyzed (121; 82%) were published in academic journals; the remaining were: 10 conference papers, 8 preprints, 3 blog posts (BLOG@CACM, LSE Impact Blog, eLife Labs), 2 magazine articles (“ACM Interactions,” “The Bulletin of the Ecological Society of America”), 1 book chapter, 1 report, and 1 working paper. Types of publications were verified and corrected manually, as several records appeared miscategorized after the Zotero import.

Most venues were represented once, with several exceptions of journals: *Nature* (7), *PLOS Computational Biology* (4), *Elementa: Science of the Anthropocene* (3), Educational Technology and Society (3), and *eLife* (3). Furthermore, six of eight preprints appeared in the “Computer Science” section in arXiv. Note that despite the prevalence and variety of journals represented in the collection, most items are editorial materials and similar non-refereed publications. Among 91 items for which the journal specified the type or section, only 20 were listed as research papers, whereas the majority 71 items were listed under various headings such as commentaries, editorials, news, etc. For example, three *Nature* publications were listed as news, one as a comment, and three in sections providing advice on scientific careers. Similarly, all four *PLOS Computational Biology* publications were editorials in the “Ten simple rules” guide series.

### Temporal dimension – before and after COVID-19

Although the first publications about virtual conferences appeared as early as the 1980s, it was not until the COVID-19 pandemic that a huge wave of interest in the topic was generated (see Fig 1). 2020 represents an important caesura in publications on virtual conferences in the academy.




Fig 1. Publications included in the review per year

The pre-pandemic part of the collection (1984-2019) includes 35 documents: 29 journal publications, three conference papers, one report, one book chapter, and one magazine article. Regarding the subject matter of publication venues, we categorized these documents into several groups. Most (22; 63%) were published in venues representing a range of social sciences and computer sciences. More than half (19) of the documents appeared in venues representing education and computer sciences as well as the nexus of these areas, such as educational technology (a report by Green (1998) also belongs to this group). Three were published in library and information science journals (Baird & Borer, 1987; O’Haver, 1995; Peuler & McCallister, 2019); one review article was published in a journal focused on hospitality and tourism (Sox et al., 2017). Among the remaining 14 documents, four (11% of all) appeared in medical journals, including an article in the *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association* (Lecueder & Manyari, 2000). Two documents represented chemistry, including one in the *Journal of Chemical Information and Computer Sciences* (Bachrach, 1995), and one was published in *PLOS Computational Biology* (Gichora et al., 2010). Again, the nexus of the subject matter and informational technology is noticeable. Three documents were published in venues focused on environmental issues: *Conservation Biology* (Fraser et al., 2017), *The Bulletin of the Ecological Society of America* (Hampton et al., 2017), and *Elementa: Science of the Anthropocene* (Parncutt & Seither-Preisler, 2019). Multidisciplinary *Nature* and *Science* were represented once each.

The post-COVID-19 (2020–2021) group comprises 112 documents, the vast majority of which (92) were published in journals. The remaining 20 items include eight preprints, seven conference papers, three blog posts, one magazine article, and one working paper. Concerning subject areas, most were published in medical journals, with 27 items (24%). The next largest groups are the social sciences (19), particularly education, including educational technology (6); biological sciences – 18 (16%); and computer sciences – 17 (15%). Other notable, though smaller, groups were environmental and ecology – 8 items and multidisciplinary venues – 7.

The most noticeable characteristic of the analyzed collection is the prevalence of social and computer sciences venues in the pre-pandemic period (63%), which later changes in favor of medical and biological sciences (40%). In the pandemic period, social and computer sciences' share is still substantial, but reduced twice (32%), while medical increases twofold (from 11% to 24%) and expands to various branches; biological increases even more (from 3% to 16%). At the same time only four documents appeared in journals dedicated to science studies or science of science: two in *Scientometrics* (Falk & Hagsten, 2021b; Mubin et al., 2021) one in the *Journal of Responsible Innovation* (Braun et al., 2020) and one in the *British Journal for the History of Science* (Robinson et al., 2020). However, the last document is a case study of the conference “British Society for the History of Science.”

### **VC definition, evolution, and uptake**

In that one of our goals was to provide an overview of virtual conferences, we did not establish a prior definition of VC. Thus, our inclusive search strategy resulted in a collection of literature that covers a range of interpretations of the notion of virtual conference. Some of the collected works notice a difficulty in defining what a virtual conference is (Wilkinson & Hemby, 2000) and the need to define terms such as ‘online conferencing’ (Ball, 2000). Upon closer examination, it appears that only about a dozen publications provide an explicit definition of VC, of which only a few are more detailed (T. Anderson, 1996; Sá et al., 2019; Thatcher et al., 2011). However, in many other works, the implicit understanding of VC can be gleaned from the description of the event reported. Understandably, defining VC is more elaborated in earlier publications, when virtual events were a novelty; recent publications tend to address it in a cursory manner.

VC evolution concurrent to technological developments we discerned in our collection is consistent with the trends reported in (L. Anderson, 2010). The two works from the 1980s (Baird & Borer, 1987; Tombaugh, 1984) discuss early beginnings of text-based computer conferencing as the then-emerging form of computer-mediated communication. Next, papers published in the 1990s and 2000s provide examples of introducing VC in various areas, such as chemistry education (Bachrach, 1995; O’Haver, 1995), distance education (T. Anderson, 1996), psychiatry (Batra et al., 1999), political science (Ball,



2000), cardiology (Lecueder & Manyari, 2000), and ergonomics (Thatcher, 2006). Additionally, a guide by Green (1998) is based on experience in organizing conferences in the area of learning technologies.

VC are usually characterized in comparison to their face-to-face (F2F) predecessors. This strategy is not particularly fruitful, as F2F academic conferences are still an understudied topic. However, several publications attempt to utilize the comparison to gain more insight. For example, Jones (2000) offers a taxonomy of comparative factors related to both types of conferences, and Schwarz et al. (2020) propose to systematize academic interactions and the corresponding digital formats. Meanwhile, (Sá et al., 2019) review the advantages, limitations, and potentials of F2F and VC. Another issue is distinguishing VC from other types of mediated communication (Sá et al., 2019; Schwarz et al., 2020; Thatcher et al., 2011; L. J. L. Veldhuizen et al., 2020).

A comprehensive definition provided by T. Anderson (1996) characterizes VC as a structured, time-bound professional development activity using technologies to support communication and interaction between geographically distributed participants, taking place synchronously, asynchronously, or both. Generally, the literature appears to share this understanding of VC and some discrepancies arise due to the three major dimensions of virtual events: technology, time, and location.

A typology proposed by Fraser et al. (2017) consists of four virtual conference models: (1) pure virtual, in which participants interact online from external locations linked by a conference virtual network; (2) one hub and node, in which a central hub hosts and streams the conference to nodes – smaller external venues; (3) multihub and node, involving multiple international hubs within a similar time zone; (4) multilateral hub and node, comprising multiple hubs across multiple time zones.

### **Topics and threads**

Thematically, the analyzed collection of articles is fairly homogeneous. Three-fourths of the papers address the issue of virtual conferences in a general way, covering many aspects in a single article, attempting to approach the phenomenon holistically and often with a practical guidebook attitude. More than half (53.1%) of the items can be characterized as describing lessons learned based on the experience of conference organizers. At the same time, most of these articles (44.9% of the total) are

based on experiences from one conference or one conference series (e.g., a cyclical conference moved to virtual during the pandemic). Only a small fraction of lessons learned papers are based on experiences from different virtual events (Bottanelli et al., 2020; Carr & Ludvigsen, 2017; Forrest et al., 2020; Green, 1998; Hampton et al., 2017; M. L. W. Jones, 2000; Meyer et al., 2021; Mikhridinova et al., 2021; Rubinger et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2020; Weissgerber et al., 2020; Wilkinson & Hemby, 2000). Lessons-learned articles, as a rule, are often clearly advisory in nature and are cross-cutting, addressing various aspects of the organization and operation of virtual conferences. These articles provide tips and “simple rules” for organizers of future virtual conferences, and less frequently, for participants.

One in four articles (25.9%) can be characterized as presenting general thoughts on VC and are not based on experience from any specific event or events or any systematic analysis. These articles have the characteristics of news, essays, or editorials – they openly have no scientific pretensions. Often such articles have a broad spectrum of addressed topics, such as the lessons-learned group discussed above. General articles frequently discuss the challenges of holding a virtual conference, point out advantages and disadvantages, as well as divagate on future directions for online meetings or scholarly meetings in general.

A small part of the analyzed collection of papers has a clear thematic focus, which, by the way, often correlates with the more scientific nature of these articles (but not always). One theme stands out in this group, i.e., the environmental aspects of virtual conferences, sometimes in comparison with traditional conferences, sometimes as a proposal of solutions to be implemented. The environmental thread, especially in the context of the carbon footprint of virtual conferences, appears more often as one of the enumerated advantages of virtual conferences, but only a few articles explicitly focus on this issue (Caravaggi et al., 2021; Coroama et al., 2012; Ekstrom et al., 2020; Fellermann et al., 2020; Jäckle, 2021; Klöwer et al., 2020; Lester, 2007; Parncutt & Seither-Preisler, 2019; Rubinger et al., 2020).

Another distinct theme concerns the study of engagement and the social functions of conference attendance. As with the thread on the carbon footprint of conferences, the social interaction thread is very often mentioned as an advantage or disadvantage of a particular type of conference, but only a few

papers focus on this issue (Caravaggi et al., 2021; Coroama et al., 2012; Ekstrom et al., 2020; Fellermann et al., 2020; Jäckle, 2021; Klöwer et al., 2020; Lester, 2007; Parncutt & Seither-Preisler, n.d., 2019; Rubinger et al., 2020).

In addition, in the case of few articles, one can speak of specific narrow topics concerning virtual conferences. These are articles describing the reactions of conference organizers to the pandemic, presenting statistics on the cancellation of conferences, the transition to a virtual or hybrid form, or analyzing the determinants of these decisions, or show what the consequences are of canceling a conference (Falk & Hagsten, 2021b; Lessing et al., 2020; Weissgerber et al., 2020), pricing of virtual conferences (Falk & Hagsten, 2021a), discuss questionnaire methodology to assess the participants experience of virtual conferences (Hohlfeld et al., 2021), or present specific technical setups for VC, usually focused on enhanced engagement and interaction (Park et al., 2020; B. Rogers et al., 2018; Song et al., n.d.; Wang et al., 2020; Wu et al., 2021).

Because the advantages and disadvantages of virtual conferences constitute one of the main topics covered by the analyzed collection, we decided to have a closer look at this specific element and coded the papers accordingly. We found that 58% of the items analyzed discuss advantages or disadvantages (or both). The advantages and disadvantages of virtual conferences are discussed from diverse perspectives and distinct levels of detail. However, recurring themes and arguments can be distinguished. The advantages of virtual conferences can be divided into the following groups (ranked according to the number of publications that discuss a particular advantage):

- More inclusive and democratic scholarly communication (discussed in 67 papers);
- Costs and time savings (63 papers);
- Environmental reasons (49 papers);
- Enhancing collaboration and maintaining the scientific endeavor or professional development (42 papers);
- Flexible and tailor-made attendance possibilities (40 papers);
- Higher quality of the scholarly discussion (39 papers);

- Higher research community participation and scalability of virtual meetings (35 papers);
- Content availability (15 papers);
- Safety and health (14 papers);
- Lower organizational burden (14 papers),

Similarly, the disadvantages of virtual conferences can be divided into the following groups:

- Lack of or limited social interaction during virtual events (58 papers);
- Lesser or uneven conference engagement (42 papers);
- Overwhelming technology dependence (31 papers);
- Planning and organizational burden (26 papers);
- Security issues (26 papers);
- Lower scientific value (22 papers);
- Professional isolation and lower collaboration opportunities (21 papers);
- Endangering participants' well-being (17 papers);
- Higher requirements toward participants (12 papers).

### **Data and methods in reviewed publications**

A characteristic feature of the analyzed publications is their relatively lightweight methodological sophistication. To start with, slightly more than half (55.8%) of the publications contain any explicit reference to the method or data used. For the rest of the set, the nature of the text indicates that the work is based on the authors' personal experience, mainly as organizers of virtual conferences. However, usually the methodology is not explicitly indicated but implicitly contained in the text. To some extent, this ambiguity can be explained by the fact that many papers in our collection are published as opinion pieces, notes, or editorials.

Surveys were by far the most widespread way of collecting data in the analyzed set of articles, with 36% of articles based on survey data. The surveys are almost exclusively post-conference evaluation surveys conducted after a single event, based on a non-random sampling. Sample sizes are somewhat

on the smaller side. Out of 53 survey-based articles, 28.3% employed sample sizes of less than 100 (the smallest sample size is as low as 22). Furthermore, proper reporting on sample size is often missing. For 22.6% of survey-based articles there is no sample size information. In addition, in some articles, sample sizes are reported approximately (“about 200” or “nearly two hundred responses”). The largest sample size is 2120 (Gao et al., 2020), however, it is a non-random convenience sample survey in which participation has been solicited via social media platforms. Target populations are rarely described in an explicit way, sometimes being implicit, that is, equal to the participants of a given event. Consequently, response rates are rarely reported.

More complex survey designs are rare. Pre- and post-surveys are used to compare the expectations and experiences of participants of conferences that have been moved virtual (McDowell et al., 2020; Misa et al., 2020). Repeated surveys are used to trace changes that occur during multi-day events (Dunn et al., 2021; Mikhridinova et al., 2021). Other authors compare post-surveys of in-person pre-pandemic conferences with their pandemic virtual editions (Stamelou et al., 2021; Terhune et al., 2020). A few articles are based on surveys collected for more than one event (L. J. Veldhuizen et al., 2020) or for different editions of a periodical event (Ho et al., 2011; Thatcher et al., 2011). One of the other articles from a pre-pandemic wave of virtual conferences papers stands out considering survey design. (Wilkinson & Hemby, 2000) compare opinions of randomly sampled participants of two virtual conferences and two control groups composed of non-participants randomly selected from the population of members of associations organizing those conferences (total sample size: 267).

A distinct group of papers uses registration and organizational data on one or more conferences. For single conference papers, this kind of data is used primarily to present demographic information on conference participants. For multiple conference papers, registration and organizational data uses are more creative. Based on data on 587 conferences, the probability of conferences switching to virtual during the pandemic has been modeled (Falk & Hagsten, 2021b). The same authors used a smaller data set of 76 virtual conferences to analyze the variation in conference fees (Falk & Hagsten, 2021a). However, typically this kind of data is used to present changes, for instance, the number of participants by country, in an annually held conference(s) (Harabor & Vallati, 2020; Sarabipour, 2020; Stamelou et

al., 2021; Thatcher et al., 2011) or different responses to pandemic, for instance,, postponed, canceled, etc. – in a larger sample of conferences (Ha et al., 2021; Mubin et al., 2021).

Roughly one in ten articles use data automatically collected from servers. This kind of data is typically employed to report usage statistics of conference websites, virtual conferencing software, or related communication and social media channels (e.g., (Le et al., 2020). The potential of this type of data seems to be underused in the analyzed literature. Not only are they relatively rarely used, and if they are, the use is usually purely descriptive. The work of (Wu et al., 2021) stands out against this background as it creatively combines the use of automatically obtained data with survey data. The other interesting approach is presented by (Reinhard et al., 2020), who count the number of questions addressed to individual panelists based on the video recordings of conference panels.

The use of quantitative data in the collected collection of articles is usually very basic, limited to giving counts or percentages. Only a few articles (about 5 % of the set) use more serious methods of analysis, such as significance testing or regression analysis (Dunn et al., 2021; Falk & Hagsten, 2021b; Gao et al., 2020; Hameed et al., 2021; Terhune et al., 2020; Wilkinson & Hemby, 2000; Wu et al., 2021).

Qualitative research methods are also rarely used adequately in the analyzed set of articles. Only a few articles are based on formal interviews (Ho et al., 2011; Jauhiainen, 2021; Kirchner & Nordin Forsberg, 2021; Pedaste & Kasemets, 2021), while a few others refer to “informal interviews” or “unsolicited feedback from participants.” Similarly, specific methodological approaches to the analysis of qualitative data are rarely indicated. Among them individual articles refer to participant observation (Jauhiainen, 2021; G. Sharma & Schroeder, 2013), autoethnography (Black et al., 2020) and abductive content analysis (Pedaste & Kasemets, 2021). Also, a few articles use mixed methods, some of them referring explicitly to this approach (Ho et al., 2011), and others use mixed methods without directly invoking the term (e.g., Jauhiainen, 2021).

Five papers use systematic or scoping literature review as their main method. As many as three of them belong to the group of pre-pandemic articles (Sá et al., 2019; Sox et al., 2017; Spilker et al., 2020). The

remaining two review articles published in the pandemic wave of papers focus on extracting good practices from the literature (Lortie, 2020; Rubinger et al., 2020).

### **Theoretical frameworks**

Within our sample, just twenty papers relate to the existing theories, concepts or theoretical approaches. In general, the authors' strategies are characterized by a lack of depth in applying the theories. Four inspiring examples which investigate virtual conferences from various theoretical perspectives are worth discussing in more detail (Carr & Ludvigsen, 2017; Spilker et al., 2020; Thatcher et al., 2011; Wu et al., 2021).

Thatcher et al. (2011) analyzed the CybErg conference series using the virtual settlement theory framework (Q. Jones, 1997). The authors focused their investigation on four conditions required to build an online community: a common-public space allowing interaction of all community members, a level of sustainability and stability of community membership, a variety of contributors in terms of field of interest, biographical indicators etc., and a level of interactivity among community members. The paper's final part discusses the findings on the background of the four-stages online community evolution approach proposed by Gongla and Rizzuto (2001), namely: a building stage, an engaged stage, an active stage, and an adaptive stage of the online community (Thatcher et al., 2011).

On the other hand, the paper by Wu et al. (2021) was grounded in the psychological concept of self-efficacy in which four potential sources of self-efficacy development: mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, verbal persuasion, and emotional and physiological states were distinguished (Bandura, 1993). The authors investigated virtual conference attendees' behavior and psychological conditions by studying the mastery experience, competence, and engagement of 150 participants of the Taiwan e-Learning Forum in 2020. Based on the collected information, the authors proved the correlation between mastery experience and competence in virtual conferences and the level of engagement in online academic meetings (Wu et al., 2021).

Carr and Ludvigsen (2017) offered the analytical stance known as cultural historical activity theory (CHAT), which is formulated around five ideas: object-oriented activity and mediation by tools and

signs; historicity; multivoicedness of activity; contradictions as a source of change; and a zone of expansive learning. The CHAT framework explains drivers for change in socio-technical systems based on the analysis of tensions, disturbances, and contradictions existing in the given system. The authors assumed VC to be complex socio-technical systems and analyzed the multifaceted interactions among VC elements to redesign future scientific online events. The empirical portion of the paper was based on a content analysis of 256 statements by participants of a series of online conferences organized by the Centre for Educational Technology at the University of Cape Town (Carr & Ludvigsen, 2017).

The systematic literature review on the learning effects and knowledge-building of technology-enhanced conferences (Spilker et al., 2020) is the specific example of theory application to the VC paper. The study's broader background relates to continuing professional development of academics in communities of practice or social networks. The authors incorporated the Value Creation Framework (VCF) (Wenger et al., 2011) to present the results of conference attendance on the proliferation of digital professional competencies of academics. The VCF allows assessing the value creation in communities of practice and social networks that participants and organizers of the conferences embody. The paper is structured accordingly to the five cycles of the VCF that correspond with five types of value created during technology-enhanced conferences: immediate value refers to participation in the networked learning activity, potential value refers to the knowledge capital that the network generates, applied value refers to the transformation of practices, realized value refers to the application of knowledge capital and its impact, and reframing value refers to the redefinition of strategies and discounts at both individual and institutional levels.

The above examples confirm no clear tendency to focus on particular theories in the papers analyzing the VCs. The authors' approaches vary significantly. We can, however, distinguish five theoretical aspects deployed in the selected literature to investigate issues of VCs: (1) developing and maintaining virtual communities, (2) process of communication within networks, (3) innovation process, (4) functioning of the global system of knowledge production, (5) technological development.



The first group embraces the theories related to **developing and maintaining scholarly communities** and their ability to create added value in terms of learning and production of knowledge, practices, and standards. The previously discussed concepts of virtual settlement theory (Thatcher et al., 2011), CHAT (Carr & Ludvigsen, 2017) and VCF in a community of practice (Spilker et al., 2020), we can supplement with the concept of community of inquiry adopted to education field (T. Anderson, 1996).

According to this concept, online academic conferences are perceived as virtual communities, contributing to permanent professional development during and beyond the event moment. Virtual conferences provide opportunities to actively integrate participants and create a community of learners (T. Anderson, 1996) or spaces of collective learning (Sá et al., 2019). VCs are seen as a potential arena for elected tribes formation in the context of the professional collaboration of scholars (Reinhard et al., 2020).

The second group consists of concepts related to **a communication process within networks**. Tombaugh (1984) evaluated one of the earliest examples of VCs (in the form of an e-mail exchange) as a formula of computer-mediated scholarly communication from a social psychology perspective. Tombaugh employed equity theory, where an equitable relationship exists when all participants are receiving relatively equal and fair rewards from the relationship (Hatfield et al., 1978). In particular, he used equity theory to prove that it is yet impossible to achieve an equitable relationship in the case of computer-based communication, with one of the reasons being low mutual trust resulting from a deficiency of nonverbal and paraverbal cues.

The geographical and physical proximity concept invokes similar arguments recalled in several papers. Remote participation disrupts professional network creation, development, sharing, and the application of knowledge, as well as degrades politeness in communication (Jauhiainen, 2021; Niner & Wassermann, 2021; G. Sharma & Schroeder, 2013). Tuckman's group development theory (Tuckman & Jensen, 1977) might also fall into this category. Moreover Chou et al. (2012) propose guidelines facilitating successful VCs according to the four stages of group development theory: formation, setting ground rules, managing conflict, and enhancing group performance.

The third group incorporates the **notion of innovation** or connotes the peculiarities of innovation processes. First, some of the proposed VC definitions explicitly refer to Christensen's types of innovation from business theory (Christensen, 1997). The VCs as disruptive or low-end innovations are considered in opposition to F2F conferences. All papers drawing attention to the trust building in the networks (see group 2) could be counted in this group as well (L. Anderson, 2010; D. Sharma, 2021). Moreover, a review of hospitality and tourism papers on VCs used diffusion of innovation theory (E. M. Rogers, 2003) as an analytical framework (Sox et al., 2017). Jauhainen (2021) explored the outcomes of the SHIFT conference organized via a 3D virtual platform, proposing a model of innovation development, including contexts of physical, virtual, and extended realities and interactions between humans and machines. Meanwhile, Braun et al. (2020) proposed using the responsible research and innovation approach (RRI-heuristic), applying the anticipation, inclusion, reflection and responsiveness (AIRR) approach to identify and reflect on the dilemmas involved in the virtualization of the research.

The fourth group of concepts relates to the **global system of knowledge production characteristics**. Goebel et al. (2020) refer to Latour's work (1987) on the impact of the scholarly migration on the knowledge production to deliberate opportunities and challenges given by the virtualization of conferences. Furthermore, Hansen and Pedersen (2018) acknowledge that the concept of credibility cycles (Latour & Woolgar, 1986) provides a helpful framework for studying how attending events influence the individual scholar's scientific potential. Shelley-Egan uses Urry's (Urry, 2003) concept of "meetingness" to discuss reduced mobility of scholars due to the pandemic and its consequences on the knowledge production (Shelley-Egan, 2020).

Several authors underline inequalities in opportunities and involvement in the global knowledge system. Luczaj and Holy-Luczaj refer, for instance, to the concept of Global North vs. Global South divide, metropolises vs. non-metropolises approach, and the centers-peripheries theory of Wallerstein, drawing attention to the asymmetrical spatial relations among and within countries or groups of countries (Luczaj & Holy Luczaj, 2020).

Goebel et al. organize their paper around the concept of decoloniality as a critique of Eurocentric frames of the global knowledge production system (Goebel et al., 2020). Niner and Wasserman (2021) and Goebel et al. (2020) also recall the concept or culture of “othering,” pulling together diverse academic practices that exclude and marginalize non-white, non-Western, and female academics from societies, editorial boards, and international conferences. The authors speculate whether moving from F2F to virtual meetings could counteract various types of othering (Goebel et al., 2020; Niner & Wassermann, 2021).

The fifth group of concepts uncovered in VCs collection refers to the **peculiarities of technological development**. Thatcher (2006) deployed media richness theory (Daft & Lengel, 1986) and social presence theory (Short et al., 1976) to discuss the enablers and inhibitors of participation in the CybErg VCs series. Media richness theory focuses on the correspondence between the communication qualities of a particular medium and the requirements of a specific task. “Rich” communication media allow to clarify ambiguity, provide immediate feedback, and incorporate various cues and language diversity. Social presence theory assumes that different communication media vary significantly in the degree of the psychological experience of being socially present, which depends on the number of communication channels available to convey information and cues to other social participants. Thus, F2F would be a “richer” medium and assure a higher degree of “social presence” than VCs (Thatcher, 2006).

Falk and Hagsten (2021b) used the unified theory of acceptance and use of information technology (UTAUT) (Venkatesh et al., 2003) to disclose the factors responsible for the decision to organize a virtual conference instead of cancelling or postponing the planned event. According to this theory, the use of information systems depends on performance expectancy, effort expectancy, social influence, and facilitating conditions. The first three factors relate to intended behavior, while the fourth determines usage (Falk & Hagsten, 2021b). In addition, Braun et al. (2020) recall computational turn in the social sciences and “solutionism” to stress the practices in constant need of new (online) technologies and their influence on scholarly results.

Additional numerous concepts are evoked in the selected VCs collection, including Boyer's scholarship classification system (Lessing et al., 2020), ethical theory (Parncutt & Seither-Preisler, 2019), the feminist stance (Black et al., 2020), risk assessment theory (Parncutt & Seither-Preisler, 2019), sustainability (Niner & Wassermann, 2021), and the concept of the four dimensions of academic events (Falk & Hagsten, 2021b). Four dimensions relevant for the examination of VCs are offered by Falk and Hagsten (2021b), including size, focus, participants, and tradition.

## **Discussion and conclusion: Toward a virtual conference research agenda**

The proliferation of academic literature on virtual scientific conferences during the COVID-19 crisis is evident. Most of the reviewed literature was published during the first 1.5 years of the global pandemic, therefore representing trends prevailing in this period, such as switching to online modes and organizing fully online events. However, it is noteworthy that this field had been evolving long before the pandemic, which laid the foundation for the rapid expansion and adaptation of the virtual mode.

The VCs phenomenon is highly dynamic, which means that technologies and technical solutions applied for the VCs' needs are becoming increasingly sophisticated; likewise, the expectations for social interaction reinforcement during VCs are also growing (Hampton et al., 2017). The early papers on VCs recommended introducing video and voice technologies to boost social interactions during virtual events (Bachrach, 1995). Nowadays, the authors draw attention to the necessity of the introduction of new solutions such as virtual and augmented reality, gamification, interactive sessions, and avatar-based video (Bonifati et al., 2020; J.-Y. Chou & Camerlink, 2021; Stamelou et al., 2021), boosting motivation for new forms of networking among participants (Levitis et al., 2021), complement participants' skills and their habits' change (Lawrence et al., 2000).

The wider introduction/use of virtual conferences in scholarly communication stems from two factors. The first is the lack of travel and gathering, and the second is the intermediation of technology interface in scholarly communication. These two circumstances cause a series of interconnected positive and negative effects on academic life. A further analysis of the advantages and disadvantages of VCs recognized in the paper is crucial to deepen understanding of virtual conferences. This knowledge may

effectively contribute to designing research-informed scientific policies that respond to the challenges of today.

Based on insights from the debate, we expect the online component to remain a vital element of scholarly communication. However virtual conferences became increasingly important in the digital age, 'offline' meetings will continue to resonate in the field of scientific endeavor. The pandemic experience served as a forced laboratory, highlighting that it is logistically feasible to organize and hold conferences completely online. The question already on the agenda of acknowledged scientific associations regards new intermediate forms of scholarly gathering, such as alternating in-person and virtual conferences. Considering the pros and cons of various conferencing modes is crucial in this context. Broader incorporation of hybrid forms of scholarly communication might lead to negative effects of participants' stratification depending on the type of involvement or to new forms of exclusion. Opening traditional conferences for virtual participation might introduce a two-class scientific society where virtual attendees (who are unable or unwilling to fly more, presumably mainly early career scientists) are disadvantaged compared to onsite participants (Fellermann et al., 2020). Thus, a research agenda for various and sometimes competing forms of scientific conferences ought to be developed and realized. A useful framework to identify and consider the dilemmas involved in going online represents the responsible research and innovation approach (Braun et al., 2020).

Our review has demonstrated that the theoretical layer of the research related to VCs is thin. In the literature, authors have displayed a fragmented use of selected theories to describe the paper's general context. Other than a few examples, selected papers rarely mention a theoretically based empirical model or framework and hardly ever discuss the research findings within a theoretical framework. It is exceedingly rare for a work to present a theoretical framework specifically designed for understanding scientific conferences (e.g., Hansen et al., 2020). Consequently, the existing literature on VCs is largely descriptive in nature without a clear increase in knowledge or understanding of the phenomenon. Research on VCs in science is still at an early exploratory stage. Thus, the creation and dissemination of a solid theoretical framework for studying the phenomenon is a crucial task of contemporary science.

The outcomes of this review stress the need for further research to better comprehend how VCs are described and defined. In addition, studies are needed regarding the weak and strong points of VCs, which theoretical concepts might be employed in VC analysis, and what data and methods can be used to investigate them. We showed that studies on the functions, development, and impact of conferences in science studies are weakly developed; however, they combine various research areas (González-Santos & Dimond, 2015). Therefore, we recommend that the next steps in research on scholarly VCs should focus in particular on advantages and disadvantages from the point of view of various groups of scholars to understand how conferences are utilized by particular groups of individuals (conference roles, demographic characteristics, stage of career, factors, and the level of vulnerability to exclusion) and whether VCs magnify or diminish existing divisions.

### **Data Availability Statement**

We have offered the entire set of publication metadata online as a Zotero Group “Virtual Academic Conferencing 1984–2021” available at

[https://www.zotero.org/groups/4832623/virtual\\_academic\\_conferencing\\_1984-2021](https://www.zotero.org/groups/4832623/virtual_academic_conferencing_1984-2021).

### **Funding**

This work was supported by the National Science Centre Poland under Grant 2018/31/B/HS4/03997.

### **Conflict of interest**

The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

### **References**

- Abbott, A. (2020). Low-carbon, virtual science conference tries to recreate social buzz. *Nature*, 577(7788), 13–13. <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-019-03899-1>
- Anderson, L. (2010). *Online Conferences: Professional Development for a Networked Era*. Information Age Publishing.

- Anderson, T. (1996). The Virtual Conference: Extending Professional Education in Cyberspace. *International Journal of Educational Telecommunications*, 2, 121–135.
- Arnal, A., Epifanio, I., Gregori, P., & Martínez, V. (2020). Ten Simple Rules for organizing a non-realtime web conference. *PLoS Computational Biology*, 16(3), 1–13.  
<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1007667>
- Bachrach, S. M. (1995). Electronic Conferencing on the Internet: The First Electronic Computational Chemistry Conference. *Journal of Chemical Information and Computer Sciences*, 35(3), 431–441. <https://doi.org/10.1021/ci00025a011>
- Baird, P. M., & Borer, B. (1987). An experiment in computer conferencing using a local area network. *The Electronic Library*, 5(3), 162–169. <https://doi.org/10.1108/eb044749>
- Ball, W. J. (2000). Academic virtual conferencing—The case of the teaching politics virtual conference. *Social Science Computer Review*, 18(2), 147–159.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/089443930001800204>
- Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived Self-Efficacy in Cognitive Development and Functioning. *Educational Psychologist*, 28(2), 117–148.  
[https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep2802\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep2802_3)
- Batra, A., Bartels, M., Aicher, L., Hefler, T., & Buchkremer, G. (1999). Psychiatrists meet on the web: The chance for a virtual congress. Results and experiences from the First International Internet Congress on Psychiatry 1997. *European Psychiatry*, 14(1), 57–62. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0924-9338\(99\)80718-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0924-9338(99)80718-4)
- Black, A. L., Crimmins, G., Dwyer, R., & Lister, V. (2020). Engendering belonging: Thoughtful gatherings with/in online and virtual spaces. *Gender and Education*, 32(1), 115–129. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540253.2019.1680808>
- Bonifati, A., Guerrini, G., Lutz, C., Martens, W., Mazilu, L., Paton, N., Salles, M. A. V., Scholl, M. H., & Zhou, Y. (2020). Holding a Conference Online and Live due to COVID-19. *arXiv:2004.07668 [Cs]*. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2004.07668>
- Bottanelli, F., Cadot, B., Campelo, F., Curran, S., Davidson, P. M., Dey, G., Raote, I., Straube, A., & Swaffer, M. P. (2020). Science during lockdown – from virtual

- seminars to sustainable online communities. *Journal of Cell Science*, 133(15).  
<https://doi.org/10.1242/JCS.249607>
- Braun, R., Blok, V., Loeber, A., & Wunderle, U. (2020). COVID-19 and the onlineification of research: Kick-starting a dialogue on Responsible online Research and Innovation (RoRI). *Journal of Responsible Innovation*, 7(3), 680–688.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/23299460.2020.1789387>
- Caravaggi, A., Olin, A. B., Franklin, K. A., & Dudley, S. P. (2021). Twitter conferences as a low-carbon, far-reaching and inclusive way of communicating research in ornithology and ecology. *Ibis*, 163(4), 1481–1491. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ibi.12959>
- Carr, T., & Ludvigsen, S. R. (2017). Disturbances and Contradictions in an Online Conference. *International Journal of Education and Development Using Information and Communication Technology*, 13(2), 116–140.
- Chou, C. L., Promes, S. B., Souza, K. H., Topp, K. S., & O'Sullivan, P. S. (2012). Twelve tips for facilitating successful teleconferences. *Medical Teacher*, 34(6), 445–449.  
<https://doi.org/10.3109/0142159X.2012.668241>
- Chou, J.-Y., & Camerlink, I. (2021). Online conferences as an opportunity to enhance inclusiveness in animal behaviour and welfare research: A case study of the ISAE 2020 virtual meeting. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science*, 241, 105369.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2021.105369>
- Christensen, C. M. (1997). *The innovator's dilemma: When new technologies cause great firms to fail*. Harvard Business School Press.
- Coroama, V. C., Hilty, L. M., & Birtel, M. (2012). Effects of Internet-based multiple-site conferences on greenhouse gas emissions. *Telematics and Informatics*, 29(4), 362–374. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2011.11.006>
- Craggs, R., & Mahony, M. (2014). The Geographies of the Conference: Knowledge, Performance and Protest: Conference Geographies. *Geography Compass*, 8(6), 414–430. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gec3.12137>



- Daft, R. L., & Lengel, R. H. (1986). Organizational Information Requirements, Media Richness and Structural Design. *Management Science*, 32(5), 554–571.  
<https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.32.5.554>
- Dunn, E., Lok, I., & Zhao, J. (2021). *Can Virtual Conferences Promote Social Connection?* PsyArXiv. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/37n6u>
- Edelheim, J. R., Thomas, K., Åberg, K. G., & Phi, G. (2018). What do conferences do? What is academics' intangible return on investment (ROI) from attending an academic tourism conference? *Journal of Teaching in Travel & Tourism*, 18(1), 94–107.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15313220.2017.1407517>
- Ekstrom, M., Lewis, S. C., Waldenström, A., & Westlund, O. (2020). Commentary: Digitization, climate change, and the potential for online workshops. *New Media & Society*, 22(2), 378–383. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444819856928>
- Falk, M. T., & Hagsten, E. (2021a). The uneven distribution of fees for virtual academic conferences. *Journal of Convention and Event Tourism*, 0(0), 1–19.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15470148.2021.1975593>
- Falk, M. T., & Hagsten, E. (2021b). When international academic conferences go virtual. *Scientometrics*, 126(1), 707–724. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-020-03754-5>
- Fang, Y., & Daniel, E. I. (2021). An Emerging Model for Virtual International Academic Conference in Architecture, Engineering, and Construction. *Frontiers in Built Environment*, 7(August), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fbuil.2021.701755>
- Fellermann, H., Penn, A. S., Fuchslin, R. M., Bacardit, J., & Goñi-Moreno, A. (2020). Towards low-carbon conferencing: Acceptance of virtual conferencing solutions and other sustainability measures in the alife community. *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Artificial Life: How Can Artificial Life Help Solve Societal Challenges, ALIFE 2019*, 21–27. [https://doi.org/10.1162/isal\\_a\\_00133.xml](https://doi.org/10.1162/isal_a_00133.xml)
- Forrest, A. R. R., Repetto, G. M., & Reichardt, J. K. V. (2020). Human genetics and genomics meetings going virtual: Practical lessons learned from two international

- meetings in early 2020. *Human Genomics*, 14(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40246-020-00275-3>
- Fraser, H., Soanes, K., Jones, S. A., Jones, C. S., & Malishev, M. (2017). The value of virtual conferencing for ecology and conservation: Virtual Conferencing. *Conservation Biology*, 31(3), 540–546. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.12837>
- Gao, F., Wei, L., Chen, Q., Shang, W., Yang, Z., Wen, Y., Yan, S., Hu, H., Zhang, R., Li, N., & Zhao, H. (2020). Current situation and trends of online academic activities for oncologists during the COVID-19 pandemic: A multicenter survey. *Annals of Translational Medicine*, 8(23), 1559–1559. <https://doi.org/10.21037/atm-20-5051>
- Garud, R. (2008). Conferences as Venues for the Configuration of Emerging Organizational Fields: The Case of Cochlear Implants. *Journal of Management Studies*, 45(6), 1061–1088. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2008.00783.x>
- Gichora, N. N., Fatumo, S. A., Ngara, M. V., Chelbat, N., Ramdayal, K., Opap, K. B., Siwo, G. H., Adebiji, M. O., El Gonnouni, A., Zofou, D., Maurady, A. A. M., Adebiji, E. F., de Villiers, E. P., Masiga, D. K., Bizzaro, J. W., Suravajhala, P., Ommeh, S. C., & Hide, W. (2010). Ten Simple Rules for Organizing a Virtual Conference—Anywhere. *PLoS Computational Biology*, 6(2), e1000650. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1000650>
- Goebel, J., Manion, C., Millei, Z., Read, R., & Silova, I. (2020). Academic conferencing in the age of COVID-19 and climate crisis: The case of the Comparative and International Education Society (CIES). *International Review of Education*, 66(5–6), 797–816. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11159-020-09873-8>
- Gongla, P., & Rizzuto, C. R. (2001). Evolving communities of practice: IBM Global Services experience. *IBM Systems Journal*, 40(4), 842–862. <https://doi.org/10.1147/sj.404.0842>
- González-Santos, S., & Dimond, R. (2015). Medical and Scientific Conferences as Sites of Sociological Interest: A Review of the Field: Conferences as Sites of Sociological Interest. *Sociology Compass*, 9(3), 235–245. <https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.12250>

- Gough, D., Oliver, S., & Thomas, J. (2017). *An Introduction to Systematic Reviews*. SAGE Publications.
- Grant, M. J., & Booth, A. (2009). A typology of reviews: An analysis of 14 review types and associated methodologies. *Health Information & Libraries Journal*, 26(2), 91–108. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-1842.2009.00848.x>
- Green, L. (1998). *Online Conferencing: Lessons Learned*.
- Gross, N., & Fleming, C. (2011). *FOUR. Academic Conferences and the Making of Philosophical Knowledge* (C. Camic, N. Gross, & M. Lamont, Eds.; pp. 151–180). University of Chicago Press. <https://doi.org/10.7208/9780226092102-006>
- Guerra Amorim, C. E., & Tucci, S. (2020). Let's stream! A beginners' guide to livestreaming scientific conferences. *Evolutionary Anthropology: Issues, News, and Reviews*, 29(3), 90–93. <https://doi.org/10.1002/evan.21830>
- Ha, E. S., Hong, J. Y., Lim, S. S., Soyer, H. P., & Mun, J. H. (2021). The Impact of SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) Pandemic on International Dermatology Conferences in 2020. *Frontiers in Medicine*, 8(August 2021). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmed.2021.726037>
- Hameed, B. Z., Tanidir, Y., Naik, N., Teoh, J. Y.-C., Shah, M., Wroclawski, M. L., Kunjibettu, A. B., Castellani, D., Ibrahim, S., da Silva, R. D., Rai, B., de la Rosette, J. J. M. C. H., Tp, R., Gauhar, V., & Somani, B. (2021). Will “Hybrid” Meetings Replace Face-To-Face Meetings Post COVID-19 Era? Perceptions and Views From The Urological Community. *Urology*, 156, 52–57. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.urology.2021.02.001>
- Hampton, S. E., Halpern, B. S., Winter, M., Balch, J. K., Parker, J. N., Baron, J. S., Palmer, M., Schildhauer, M. P., Bishop, P., Meagher, T. R., & Specht, A. (2017). Best Practices for Virtual Participation in Meetings: Experiences from Synthesis Centers. *The Bulletin of the Ecological Society of America*, 98(1), 57–63. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bes2.1290>
- Hansen, T. T., & Budtz Pedersen, D. (2018). The impact of academic events—A literature review. *Research Evaluation*, 27(4), 358–366. <https://doi.org/10.1093/reseval/rvy025>

- Hansen, T. T., Pedersen, D. B., & Foley, C. (2020). Academic Events: An Empirically Grounded Typology and Their Academic Impact. *Event Management*, 24(4), 481–497. <https://doi.org/10.3727/152599519X15506259856598>
- Harabor, D., & Vallati, M. (2020). *Organising a Successful AI Online Conference: Lessons from SoCS 2020* (arXiv:2006.12129). arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2006.12129>
- Hatfield, E., Walster, G. W., & Berscheid, E. (1978). *Equity: Theory and research*. Allyn and Bacon.
- Ho, C. P., Kimura, B., & Boulay, R. (2011). *Retrospective Analysis of a Virtual Worldwide Conference for eLearning*. 5(1), 11.
- Hohlfeld, O., Guse, D., & De Moor, K. (2021). A Questionnaire to Assess Virtual Conference Participation Experience. *2021 13th International Conference on Quality of Multimedia Experience (QoMEX)*, 197–200. <https://doi.org/10.1109/QoMEX51781.2021.9465406>
- Jäckle, S. (2021). Reducing the Carbon Footprint of Academic Conferences by Online Participation: The Case of the 2020 Virtual European Consortium for Political Research General Conference. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 54(3), 456–461. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096521000020>
- Jacobs, N., & McFarlane, A. (2005). Conferences as learning communities: Some early lessons in using ‘back-channel’ technologies at an academic conference – distributed intelligence or divided attention? *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 21(5), 317–329. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2729.2005.00142.x>
- Jauhiainen, J. S. (2021). Entrepreneurship and Innovation Events during the COVID-19 Pandemic: The User Preferences of VirBELA Virtual 3D Platform at the SHIFT Event Organized in Finland. *Sustainability*, 13(7), 3802. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13073802>
- Jones, M. L. W. (2000). Collaborative virtual conferences: Using exemplars to shape future research questions. *Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Collaborative Virtual Environments*, 19–27.

- Jones, Q. (1997). Virtual-Communities, Virtual Settlements & Cyber-Archaeology: A Theoretical Outline. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 3(3), JCMC331. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.1997.tb00075.x>
- Kirchner, K., & Nordin Forsberg, B. (2021). A Conference Goes Virtual: Lessons from Creating a Social Event in the Virtual Reality. In U. R. Krieger, G. Eichler, C. Erfurth, & G. Fahrnberger (Eds.), *Innovations for Community Services* (Vol. 1404, pp. 123–134). Springer International Publishing. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-75004-6\\_9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-75004-6_9)
- Klöwer, M., Hopkins, D., Allen, M., & Higham, J. (2020). An analysis of ways to decarbonize conference travel after COVID-19. *Nature*, 583(7816), 356–359. <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-020-02057-2>
- Knorr-Cetina, K. (1995). How Superorganisms Change: Consensus Formation and the Social Ontology of High-Energy Physics Experiments. *Social Studies of Science*, 25(1), 119–147. <https://doi.org/10.1177/030631295025001006>
- Latour, B. (1987). *Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers Through Society*. Harvard University Press.
- Latour, B., & Woolgar, S. (1986). *Laboratory Life: The Construction of Scientific Facts*. Princeton University Press.
- Lawrence, D., Roy, R., & Chawdhry, P. K. (2000). Real and Virtual Conferences. In A. Sloane & F. van Rijn (Eds.), *Home Informatics and Telematics* (Vol. 45, pp. 33–43). Springer US. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-35511-5\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-35511-5_3)
- Le, D. A., MacIntyre, B., & Outlaw, J. (2020). Enhancing the Experience of Virtual Conferences in Social Virtual Environments. *Proceedings - 2020 IEEE Conference on Virtual Reality and 3D User Interfaces, VRW 2020*, 485–494. <https://doi.org/10.1109/VRW50115.2020.00101>
- Lecueder, S., & Manyari, D. E. (2000). Virtual Congresses. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 7(1), 21–27. <https://doi.org/10.1136/jamia.2000.0070021>
- Lessing, J. N., Anderson, L. R., Mark, N. M., Maggio, L. A., & Durning, S. J. (2020). Academics in Absentia: An Opportunity to Rethink Conferences in the Age of

- Coronavirus Cancellations. *Academic Medicine*, 1834–1837.  
<https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000003680>
- Lester, B. (2007). Greening the Meeting. *Science*, 318(5847), 36–38.  
<https://doi.org/10.1126/science.318.5847.36>
- Levitis, E., Van Praag, C. D. G., Gau, R., Heunis, S., Dupre, E., Kiar, G., Bottenhorn, K. L., Glatard, T., Nikolaidis, A., Whitaker, K. J., Mancini, M., Niso, G., Afyouni, S., Alonso-Ortiz, E., Appelhoff, S., Arnatkeviciute, A., Atay, S. M., Auer, T., Baracchini, G., ... Maumet, C. (2021). Centering inclusivity in the design of online conferences—An OHBM-Open Science perspective. *GigaScience*, 10(8), 1–14.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/gigascience/giab051>
- Lortie, C. J. (2020). Online conferences for better learning. *Ecology and Evolution*, 10(22), 12442–12449. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.6923>
- Luczaj, K., & Holy Luczaj, M. (2020). Live streaming at international academic conferences: Cooling down the digital optimism. *Elementa: Science of the Anthropocene*, 8, 38.  
<https://doi.org/10.1525/elementa.435>
- Maskell, P., Bathelt, H., & Malmberg, A. (2006). Building global knowledge pipelines: The role of temporary clusters. *European Planning Studies*, 14(8), 997–1013.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09654310600852332>
- McDowell, L., Goode, S., & Sundaresan, P. (2020). Adapting to a global pandemic through live virtual delivery of a cancer collaborative trial group conference: The TROG 2020 experience. *Journal of Medical Imaging and Radiation Oncology*, 64(3), 414–421.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1754-9485.13047>
- Meyer, M. F., Ladwig, R., Dugan, H. A., Anderson, A., Bah, A. R., Boehrer, B., Borre, L., Chapina, R. J., Doyle, C., Favot, E. J., Flaim, G., Forsberg, P., Hanson, P. C., Ibelings, B. W., Isles, P., Lin, F., Lofton, D., Moore, T. N., Peel, S., ... Weathers, K. C. (2021). Virtual Growing Pains: Initial Lessons Learned from Organizing Virtual Workshops, Summits, Conferences, and Networking Events during a Global

- Pandemic. *Limnology and Oceanography Bulletin*, 30(1), 1–11.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/lob.10431>
- Mikhridinova, N., Badasian, A., Aldaghamin, A., & Wolff, C. (2021). Transforming Conferences to an Online Format: Framework and Practices. *2021 IEEE International Conference on Smart Information Systems and Technologies (SIST)*, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SIST50301.2021.9465947>
- Misa, C., Guse, D., Hohlfeld, O., Durairajan, R., Sperotto, A., Dainotti, A., & Rejaie, R. (2020). Lessons learned organizing the PAM 2020 virtual conference. *ACM SIGCOMM Computer Communication Review*, 50(3), 46–54.  
<https://doi.org/10.1145/3411740.3411747>
- Mubin, O., Alnajjar, F., Shamail, A., Shahid, S., & Simoff, S. (2021). The new norm: Computer Science conferences respond to COVID-19. *Scientometrics*, 126(2), 1813–1827. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-020-03788-9>
- Niner, H. J., & Wassermann, S. N. (2021). Better for Whom? Leveling the Injustices of International Conferences by Moving Online. *Frontiers in Marine Science*, 8, 638025.  
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2021.638025>
- O'Haver, T. C. (1995). CHEMCONF: An experiment in international online conferencing. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 46(8), 611–613.  
[https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1097-4571\(199509\)46:8<611::AID-ASI9>3.0.CO;2-W](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-4571(199509)46:8<611::AID-ASI9>3.0.CO;2-W)
- Park, K., Oh, G., Cho, K., & Pack, S. (2020). On the Requirements and Architecture of All-in-One Platform for Virtual Conferences. *2020 International Conference on Information and Communication Technology Convergence (ICTC)*, 1669–1671.  
<https://doi.org/10.1109/ICTC49870.2020.9289368>
- Parncutt, R., & Seither-Preisler, A. (n.d.). *Live streaming at international academic conferences: Doing rather than talking*. 3.
- Parncutt, R., & Seither-Preisler, A. (2019). Live streaming at international academic conferences: Ethical considerations. *Elementa: Science of the Anthropocene*, 7, 55.  
<https://doi.org/10.1525/elementa.393>

- Pedaste, M., & Kasemets, M. (2021). *Challenges in Organizing Online Conferences*. 14.
- Peuler, M., & McCallister, K. C. (2019). Virtual and Valued: A Review of the Successes (and a Few Failures) of the Creation, Implementation, and Evaluation of an Inaugural Virtual Conference and Monthly Webinars. *Journal of Library & Information Services in Distance Learning*, 13(1–2), 104–114.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1533290X.2018.1499240>
- Reinhard, D., Stafford, M. C., & Payne, T. C. (2020). COVID-19 and Academia: Considering the Future of Academic Conferencing. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10511253.2020.1871047>
- Robinson, S., Baumhammer, M., Beiermann, L., Belteki, D., Chambers, A. C., Gibbons, K., Guimont, E., Heffner, K., Hill, E.-L., Houghton, J., Mccahey, D., Qidwai, S., Sleight, C., Sugden, N., & Sumner, J. (2020). Innovation in a crisis: Rethinking conferences and scholarship in a pandemic and climate emergency. *The British Journal for the History of Science*, 53(4), 575–590. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007087420000497>
- Rogers, B., Masoodian, M., & Apperley, M. (2018). A virtual cocktail party: Supporting informal social interactions in a virtual conference. *Proceedings of the 2018 International Conference on Advanced Visual Interfaces*, 1–3.  
<https://doi.org/10.1145/3206505.3206569>
- Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of Innovations, 5th Edition*. Simon and Schuster.
- Rubinger, L., Gazendam, A., Ekhtiari, S., Nucci, N., Payne, A., Johal, H., Khanduja, V., & Bhandari, M. (2020). Maximizing virtual meetings and conferences: A review of best practices. *International Orthopaedics*, 44(8), 1461–1466.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s00264-020-04615-9>
- Sá, M. J., Ferreira, C. M., & Serpa, S. (2019). Virtual and Face-To-Face Academic Conferences: Comparison and Potentials. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 9(2), 35–45. <https://doi.org/10.2478/jesr-2019-0011>
- Sarabipour, S. (2020). Virtual conferences raise standards for accessibility and interactions. *eLife*, 9, e62668. <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.62668>



- Schwarz, M., Scherrer, A., Hohmann, C., Heiberg, J., Brugger, A., & Nuñez-Jimenez, A. (2020). COVID-19 and the academy: It is time for going digital. *Energy Research and Social Science*, 68. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2020.101684>
- Sharma, D. (2021). The World of Virtual Conferencing: Is the Pandemic Paving the Path? *Journal of Neurosurgical Anesthesiology*, 33(1), 7–9. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ANA.0000000000000737>
- Sharma, G., & Schroeder, R. (2013). Mixing real and virtual conferencing: Lessons learned. *Virtual Reality*, 17(3), 193–204. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10055-013-0225-x>
- Shelley-Egan, C. (2020). Testing the Obligations of Presence in Academia in the COVID-19 Era. *Sustainability*, 12(16), 6350. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12166350>
- Short, J., Williams, E., & Christie, B. (1976). *The Social Psychology of Telecommunications*. Wiley.
- Song, J., Riedl, C., & Malone, T. W. (n.d.). *Online Mingling: Supporting Ad Hoc, Private Conversations at Virtual Conferences*. 16.
- Sox, C. B., Kline, S. F., Crews, T. B., Strick, S. K., & Campbell, J. M. (2017). Virtual and Hybrid Meetings: A Mixed Research Synthesis of 2002-2012 Research. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 41(8), 945–984. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1096348015584437>
- Spilker, M., Prinsen, F., & Kalz, M. (2020). Valuing technology-enhanced academic conferences for continuing professional development. A systematic literature review. *Professional Development in Education*, 46(3), 482–499. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2019.1629614>
- Stamelou, M., Struhal, W., ten Cate, O., Matczak, M., Çalışkan, S. A., Soffietti, R., Marson, A., Zis, P., di Lorenzo, F., Sander, A., Deuschl, G., de Visser, M., & Bassetti, C. L. A. (2021). Evaluation of the 2020 European Academy of Neurology virtual congress: Transition from a face-to-face to a virtual meeting. *European Journal of Neurology*, 28(8), 2523–2532. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ene.14702>

- Terhune, K. P., Choi, J. N., Green, J. M., Hildreth, A. N., Lipman, J. M., Aarons, C. B., Heyduk, D. A., Misra, S., Anand, R. J., Fise, T. F., Thorne, C. B., Edwards, G. C., Joshi, A. R. T., Clark, C. E., Nfonsam, V. N., Chahine, A., Smink, D. S., Jarman, B. T., & Harrington, D. T. (2020). Ad astra per aspera (Through Hardships to the Stars): Lessons Learned from the First National Virtual APDS Meeting, 2020. *Journal of Surgical Education*, 77(6), 1465–1472. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsurg.2020.06.015>
- Thatcher, A. (2006). Building and maintaining an online academic conference series. *International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics*, 36(12), 1081–1088. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ergon.2006.09.009>
- Thatcher, A., Straker, L., & Pollock, C. (2011). Establishing and maintaining an online community of academics: Longitudinal evaluation of a virtual conference series. *International Journal of Web Based Communities*, 7(1), 116. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJWBC.2011.038129>
- Tombaugh, J. W. (1984). Evaluation of an International Scientific Computer-Based Conference. *Journal of Social Issues*, 40(3), 129–144. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1984.tb00196.x>
- Tuckman, B. W., & Jensen, M. A. C. (1977). Stages of Small-Group Development Revisited. *Group & Organization Studies*, 2(4), 419–427. <https://doi.org/10.1177/105960117700200404>
- Urry, J. (2003). Social networks, travel and talk1. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 54(2), 155–175. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0007131032000080186>
- Veldhuizen, L. J. L., Slingerland, M., Barredo, L., & Giller, K. E. (2020). Carbon-free conferencing in the age of COVID-19. *Outlook on Agriculture*, 49(4), 321–329. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0030727020960492>
- Veldhuizen, L. J., Slingerland, M., Barredo, L., & Giller, K. E. (2020). Carbon-free conferencing in the age of COVID-19. *Outlook on Agriculture*, 49(4), 321–329. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0030727020960492>

- Venkatesh, V., Morris, M. G., Davis, G. B., & Davis, F. D. (2003). User Acceptance of Information Technology: Toward a Unified View. *MIS Quarterly*, 27(3), 425–478. <https://doi.org/10.2307/30036540>
- Wang, D., Vishwanath, A., Sitaraman, R., & Mareels, I. (2020). *Organizing Virtual Conferences through Mirrors: The ACM e-Energy 2020 Experience* (arXiv:2008.08318). arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2008.08318>
- Weissgerber, T., Bediako, Y., de Winde, C. M., Ebrahimi, H., Fernández-Chiappe, F., Ilangovan, V., Mehta, D., Paz Quezada, C., Riley, J. L., Saladi, S. M., Sarabipour, S., & Tay, A. (2020). Mitigating the impact of conference and travel cancellations on researchers' futures. *eLife*, 9, e57032. <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.57032>
- Wenger, E., Trayner, B., & Laat, M. de. (2011). *Promoting and assessing value creation in communities and networks: A conceptual framework*. Open Universiteit, Ruud de Moor Centrum. <https://research.manchester.ac.uk/en/publications/promoting-and-assessing-value-creation-in-communities-and-network>
- Wilkinson, K. L., & Hemby, K. V. (2000). An Examination of Perceptions of the Use of Virtual Conferences in Organizations: The Organizational Systems Research Association (OSRA) and The Association for Business Communication (ABC) Members Speak Out. *Information Technology, Learning, and Performance Journal*, 18(2), 13–23.
- Wu, J.-Y., Liao, C.-H., Cheng, T., & Nian, M.-W. (2021). Using Data Analytics to Investigate Attendees' Behaviors and Psychological States in a Virtual Academic Conference. *Educational Technology & Society*, 24(1), 75–91.