Important take-home points:

1) Popularity of locale matters. Relatively fixed number of sessions, high variability in number of submissions. Likelihood of acceptance is probably high this year, given the chaos.

2) Acceptance for "regular sessions" varies a lot by area and typically within area varies from year to year (although some areas are typically low or typically high). For regular sessions, this is almost entirely a function of how aggressive and savvy the session organizer is, as organizers can ask for extra sessions. But also of area. Some areas get barely enough submissions to fill a session. The probability of acceptance is very high if you submit to an unpopular session topic. (Although in some cases, a highly specialized session topic may have been pre-planned around some papers and your chances of getting in are low if you don't fit that particular theme.) NOTE: Sections cannot get extra sessions, so in popular areas, the section sessions are usually more competitive than the regular sessions.

3) The system sucks. Organizers who get their work done promptly may stop looking at it by mid-February when the "second choice" papers come into their stack. Your probability of acceptance by your second choice is very low if your first choice organizer is slow and/or your second choice organizer finishes quickly. It is the "second choice" organizer who sends your paper to a roundtable. So you can just sit in limbo through no fault of your own if your second choice organizer got done early or does not understand the system. You have to contact the session organizer to solve the problem. It is also OK to contact ASA about problems. There is no other way to solve the problem and it can easily stay unsolved if you do nothing.

4) Regular sessions are not "better" than section sessions. To the contrary, section sessions can sometimes be higher visibility. It is really a lot a matter of luck and competition.

5) Good and bad experiences can be had in regular sessions, section sessions, and round tables. (I described many examples of good and bad experiences in all types of venues, and pointed out some major social movements papers that were first presented in round tables.)

6) If you want to go to a conference go, even if you present at a round table. It does not matter how famous or how lowly you are, you may get attention and you may not. A "good" outcome is that you connect with other people who find your work interesting and you find their work interesting. Even if they are all fellow grads, in a few years they will be your professional network. It isn't all about impressing full professors.

7) It is ok to contact a session organizer to ask whether they see your topic as fitting in to what they have in mind. They will not be able to tell how many submissions they have until after the submission deadline, so it isn't possible to game the system by looking for sessions which got few submissions. Instead you are trying to pick up vibes. It is inappropriate to sound like you are expected a pre-decision, but if your tone is right, you'll often get useful hints one way or the other. Some session organizers may not respond well, especially if they are in a popular area that gets 50+ submissions, but if your tone is right, you won't have done anything unprofessional, even if the response you get isn't helpful.
8) Often the "regular" session organizers and the "section" session organizers in an area are in communication with each other, and may swap papers around. It can be very helpful to communicate with both section and regular session organizers in your area to get their advice about which to submit to.

9) Session organizers can give critical feedback but they probably won't because it is a lot of work to write "reviews" of 5-50 papers all at once. Don't take this personally. And don't freak out if they do give critical feedback to explain why they did not accept your paper. Just try to get yourself forwarded to the second choice and/or a round table. If the criticism is valid, use it in revising the paper.