Journalism Studies Division Business Meeting ICA 2018
Minutes from the business meeting at the 2018 annual convention of ICA, Prague, Czech Republic, 27 May 2018 (5 pm).

1. Opening
Outgoing Chair Henrik Örnebring opens the annual business meeting of the Journalism Studies Division.

2. ICA News

2.1 Board Meeting highlights
- ICA to update/expand its Mission Statement and Ethics Statement: Compared with others associations’ statements the ICA’s are fairly skeletal. A task force was implemented (and is chaired by Lee Humphreys).
- Motion to reduce the 5-full paper submission maximum to 1 first-authored paper: The motion was withdrawn but a taskforce was formed to come up with alternative suggestions. The motion only targets full papers, not panel submissions. The members in the room feel that, generally, it is a good idea to limit the number of full paper submissions per submitter, but a limit to 1 paper was perceived as being too strict. Two points were highlighted in members’ contributions to the discussion: The need to differentiate between panels and papers, and the possible (positive) implications for the reviewer load.
- Motion to hand out two additional registration waivers (to Tier B and C countries, one of which is for a student): The criteria upon which these waivers will be given out is now to be discussed. Henrik highlights that this is a concrete way of supporting ICA’s internationalization.
- Prague conference had 3 300 attendees

2.2 ICA 2019 annual conference:
The 2019 conference in Washington D.C. will be held 24–28 May 2018. The theme for the conference is “Communication Beyond Boundaries”. Patricia Moy dropped by to inform the meeting that next year’s conference will be shifted one day (Friday to Tuesday). The reason being that the Washington Hilton is booked until Thursday, thus there will be no meeting or sleeping rooms available until Thursday evening. Preconferences need to be offsite, postconferences are encouraged. There will be a second hotel (the Omni Shoreham Hotel, 20 minutes away by foot), and a shuttle will be contracted. The Hilton will accommodate all divisions’ and interest groups’ panels. New requirement for panels: They have to be composed of panelists from at least two countries and two divisions. Expected room fees: 179 USD per night.

3. Journalism Studies Division News

3.1 Officers’ elections (fall 2017):
Keren Tenenboim-Weinblatt takes over as a Chair and thanks outgoing Chair Henrik Örnebring for four years of dedicated service.
Seth C. Lewis was elected Vice Chair in autumn 2017 and thus will serve as the Program Planner for the ICA conferences in 2019 and 2020. Seth will take over Keren’s duties as Division Chair in 2020.

Alla Rybina was elected Graduate Student Representative and takes over from Natacha Yazbeck, who organized this year’s graduate students’ colloquium together with Alla Rybina and Raul Ferrer. Keren extends her gratitude to Natacha for her service. Next year’s colloquium will be organized by Alla (together with the incoming Student Representative who will be elected later this year).

### 3.2 Officers elections (fall 2018):

In fall 2018, the division will elect a new Secretary (2-year term) and a new Student Representative (1-year term). Anyone interested in one of these positions is warmly encouraged to reach out to the Division Officers.

### 3.3 State of the Division:

#### Membership:
The Journalism Studies Division has 626 members as of 05/2018 (+44 members since 08/2016). It is the 4th largest Division of ICA.

#### Budget (revenues):
- Membership fees from ICA: 3,681 USD
- Routledge sponsorship: 670 USD
- Sponsorship for the graduate student colloquium: 3,150 USD

#### Expenses:
- Journalism Studies reception: 3,000 USD
- Top Student Paper Awards: 600 USD
- Graduate student colloquium: 3,000 USD

### 4. Conference paper and panel competitions

#### 4.1 Submissions:
The Journalism Studies Division received 289 full papers (2017: 256) and 31 panel proposals (2017: 24), thereof 7 theme panels (“Voices in Journalism Studies”), for the 2018 conference.

#### 4.2 Review process:
- 187 reviewers
- 3 reviews per paper
- Semi-automated reviewer allocation (thanks to a tool developed by Christian Baden!)

#### 4.3 Acceptance rate:
- 45% for full papers (130 accepted full papers)
  - Equal acceptance rate for faculty and student papers
  - 25 paper sessions and 16 posters for one poster session
- 39% for panels (12 accepted panels)

The quality of submissions was outstanding this year, which means that even papers with good reviews had to be rejected.
A big thank you to those who signed up to review!

5. Graduate student colloquium preconference
The Graduate Student Colloquium Preconference was organized by Natacha Yazbeck, Raul Ferrer, and Alla Rybina. It had been organized for the 4th time, and again was a great success. The Division leadership recommends to continue with this format and to keep the round table as a part of it.

The call circulated in fall 2017 and resulted in 24 submissions from 13 countries (5xUSA, 3xChina, 2xAustralia, 2xAustria, 2xGermany, 2xIsrael, 2xUnited Kingdom, 1xBelgium, 1xBrazil, 1xBulgaria, 1xDenmark, 1xNew Zealand, 1xSwitzerland). All submissions were reviewed by JSD Officers Henrik Örnebring, Keren Tenenboim-Weinblatt, Natacha Yazbeck, and Nina Springer.

17 participants attended the colloquium.

The following people served as respondents:

Special thanks to Raul Ferrer who raised 3,150 USD to help cover the expenses. Please find more information about the pre-conference on http://ica-phd-colloquium.news.

Special thanks to preconference donors:
• University of Stavanger
• University of Oregon, School of Journalism and Communication
• University of British Columbia Graduate School of Journalism
• Nanyang Technological University
• Karlstad University
• Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism at the University of Oxford
• Boston University
• Hong Kong Baptist University
• LMU Munich
• Oslo Metropolitan University
• University of Vienna
• University of Missouri School of Journalism
• Cardiff University
• USC Annenberg School for Communication and Journalism
• Sage
• Routledge

6. Information and Discussion Items

6.1 Member survey: Submission formats
Last year, the discussion item was raised whether ICA’s JSD should start to accept extended abstracts for future conferences. Responding to this initiative, a survey was launched to hear the members’ opinions on whether or not to accept extended abstracts for future ICA conferences. The survey was fielded in April to May 2018.
Participants: 129 members completed the survey
Participant’s experience: 17% (grad + PhD) students, 10% Post-Docs, 21% less than 5 yrs. as faculty, 12% 5-10 yrs. as faculty, 24% 11-20 yrs. as faculty, 13% 21 yrs. + as faculty, 2% Other, N/A
Average ICA attendance: 6.5 conferences (range: 0–35 conferences)
Geographical representation: 1% Africa, 12% Asia, 4% Australia, 45% Europe, 35% North America, 3% South America, 1% N/A

Results:

![Bar chart showing submission format preferences]

Reasons provided to continue with the current practice (full papers + panels):
Quality considerations, the uniqueness of the conference, higher reviewer load (if abstracts were accepted), external “force” to write a paper, institutional considerations (funding, promotion)

Reasons provided to accept abstracts (fully or on a limited basis):
Time pressure, publication cycle, greater diversity, usable feedback, extended abstracts as sufficient for evaluation

Take-aways and suggestions:
➔ There is support for the current practice, but also, a majority thinks that we should accept abstracts to the annual conference in some form.
➔ Pilot in 2019: Extended abstracts will be accepted for the 2019 conference for panels dedicated to “work in progress” (most likely in a high-density-session style: briefer presentations, more room for discussion)

Agreement from the members in the room. Additional questions and comments:
• How will it affect slot allocation? Keren: Currently, abstracts count the same as full papers for calculating the number of slots divisions get at the conference. The number of slots the division gets will therefore depend on the combined number of paper and abstract submissions.
• How will it affect acceptance rate and will there be different acceptance rates for papers and abstracts? Keren: We don’t know yet—it will depend on the number and quality of submissions in each category. However, since we will program only a limited number of “work-in-progress” panels, it is likely that the abstracts will be more competitive and the paper acceptance rate will be higher.
• The “work in progress”-panels are likely to be less coherent than the regular paper sessions.
• It will not be considered as good practice if a full paper is slightly adapted to submit an additional abstract in order to increase chances of getting accepted.
• The pilot will be evaluated in the 2019 business meeting, where members are encouraged to share their impressions (with the submission and review practice as well as with the presentations attended or held).

6.2 The reviewer gap

Out of the 187 members who volunteered to review, 79 did not submit to JSD. However, out of the 384 first authors who submitted to JSD (either panel proposals or full papers), 276 did not volunteer to review. [Disclaimer: Some of these submitters may have been new to the division or students.]

The JSD Officers suggest to implement an (additional) “opt out” process: Everyone who submits to JSD also commits to reviewing. In addition, there will still be a member survey for members to opt in to serve as reviewers (as was the usual practice). Keren and Seth will explore the possibility of implementing a mechanism into the submission system (however, it seems that the ICA is moving to a new submission system—there will be updates on this in a newsletter later this year).

Agreement from the members in the room. Additional comments and concerns raised: This practice may impact the quality of reviews and one-time-submitters not dedicated to JSD might not be committed enough to submit their reviews on time—delinquent reviewers hurt the submitters (who most likely did their share in reviewing). It would be helpful to build in an additional quality control mechanism at the end of the review process, such as a bigger reserve of last minute reviewers.

Keren encourages the members to contact the officers if there are further suggestions or concerns.

6.3 Public Engagement Award?

The purpose of such an award would be to recognize and also encourage activities and initiatives that connect Journalism Studies scholarship to public discussions and policy formation. The aim is to increase the public relevance of Journalism Studies scholarship through such an institutional award.

Principles for nominations could be that the activities are based on peer-reviewed research and that the committee takes into account different modes of engagement in diverse geographical settings.

Thoughts from the members in the audience:
• Mode for nominations (self-applications, recommending the work of others, ...)?
• How to take into account important scholarly work that is not peer-reviewed, such as reports from Data and Society, the Tow Center, Reuters Institute....?
• Could practitioners’ work be included as well?
• “Public Engagement” should be broadly defined: science communication, collaborations with practitioners, people influenced by journalism, etc. ...

The officers suggest establishing a task force to propose parameters for the award and look into other ways of increasing public engagement. Keren encourages the members to reach out to the Officers; they themselves will also reach out to members in the next couple of weeks.

7. Division Awards

7.1 Top 3 Faculty Paper Award Winners
The awards go to:

1. Lei Guo (Boston U)  
“The rise of non-official voices in China: Intermedia agenda setting in a controlled media environment”

2. Janet Lo (Hong Kong Baptist U), Meily Cheung (Hang Seng Management College), and Shu Yan Lam (Hang Seng Management College)  
“Who has a say in political election? Framing in the era of big data”

3. Caroline Fisher (U of Canberra), Eileen Culloty (Dublin City U), and Jee Young Lee (U of Canberra)  
“Regaining control: Citizens who follow politicians on social media – a six country comparison”

7.2 Top 3 Student Paper Award Winners
The awards go to:

1. Martin Riedl (U of Texas, Austin)  
“Negotiating sociomateriality and commensurability: Human and algorithmic editorial judgment at social media platforms”

2. David Cheruiyot (Karlstad U), Raul Ferrer Conill (Karlstad U), and Stefan Baack (U of Groningen)  
“Fact-checking and journalism discourse: The perceived influence of data-driven non-profits in Africa”

3. Aviv Barnoy (Ben Gurion U of the Negev)  
“Verification in the age of post-truth: A mix method study”

7.3 Top Poster Award
Selected based on paper reviewer scores. The award goes to:

Isabella Glogger (U of Koblenz-Landau) and Lukas Otto (U of Koblenz-Landau)  
“Journalistic views on hard and soft news: A factorial survey on journalists’ understanding of a popular concept”
7.4 Top Reviewer Award
This is a newly introduced award to honor outstanding reviewers. The winner is chosen by the program planer based on the quality of her/his reviews.
The award 2018 goes to:

Christian Baden *(Hebrew U of Jerusalem)*
Christian reviewed 13 (!) full papers for JSD, thereof 7 (!) were last minute reviews. And yet, he provided constructive and detailed feedback on all of those. The division is very grateful to have such an outstanding reviewer—thank you for all your work, Christian!

7.5 Gene Burd Outstanding Dissertation in Journalism Studies Award
Nine dissertations were nominated for this award.
The Outstanding Dissertation award goes to

Allie Kosterich *(Rutgers U)*
“Rapid Institutional Change, Professional Journalists and the Rise of the News Nerd”
Supervisor: Matthew Weber

“Allie Kosterich’s dissertation *Rapid Institutional Change, Professional Journalists And The Rise of the News Nerd,* is an exceptionally rigorous and compelling look at how technological and economic changes are impacting professional training, practices, and identities in journalism. The committee was especially impressed by the methodological diversity and creativity of the work, which blends interviews, analysis of Linkedin profiles, job postings, and industry publications, to make sense of how skills and practices become entrenched in the industry.”

The award worth 1 000 USD is sponsored by the Urban Communication Foundation and was presented by Committee Chair Adrienne Russell.

Committee members: David Domingo, Francis L. F. Lee, Celeste Gonzalez de Bustamante, Mervi Pantti, Matthew Powers, Sue Robinson, Silvio Waisbord.

An honorary mention goes to the 2018 finalist:
Syed Saif Shahin *(Bowling Green State U)*:
Supervisor: Stephen D. Reese (U of Texas, Austin)

7.6 Journalism Studies Division Book Award
The Journalism Studies Division book award goes to:

Cambridge University Press.

“Using a rich analytical mix of news content, memoirs, interviews, ethnography and secondary sources, *Losing Pravda* offers a grand, nuanced, detailed and sophisticated tale that wrestles with much of the familiar scholarly terrain on journalism—about professionalism,
ethics, truth-telling, objectivity, the social and public good—and turns it on its head by inviting us to consider how different it looks in the Soviet/post-Soviet imaginary. For creativity, depth, insight, criticality & sheer bravado, we give this award to Natalia Roudakova.”

The award was presented by the committee chair Barbie Zelizer.
As committee members served: Thomas Hanitzsch, Chris Peters, David Ryfe

7.7 Wolfgang Donsbach Outstanding Journal Article of the Year
The committee received 11 nominations, representing 5 journals: Digital Journalism (1), International Journal of Press/Politics (2), Journal of Communication (3), Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly (2), and Journalism Studies (3)

The Outstanding Journal Article award goes to:


Selection of comments from judges which highlight its major contributions:
• This is a highly impressive and innovative paper, elegantly written, exploring the timely issue of audience fragmentation and duplication.
• This article is an excellent example of a comparative study (on audiences for once!) and the use of network analysis in this domain.
• The findings convincingly question audience fragmentation/filter bubble arguments, based on rigorous research
• Outstanding piece of research. Original and significant framing in terms of news fragmentation/duplication in the context of democratic theory and the public sphere.

Honorary mentions go to the 2018 finalists:


The award was presented by Committee Chair Karin Wahl-Jorgensen.
As committee members served: Laura Ahva, Lilie Chouliaraki, Cherian George, Zvi Reich

7.8 International Journal of Press/Politics Best Book Award
The award goes to

“(…) the book provides a powerful example of what truly comparative research can look like, with clear contributions based on an impressive combination of methods as well as intellectual engagement with work from across media sociology, journalism studies, and media effects research illustrating how political communication research can be enriched by engaging with adjacent and overlapping fields.”

The award was presented by Committee Chair Rasmus Kleis Nielsen. As committee members served: Peter van Aelst, Henrik Örnebring

**Congratulations to all award winners!**

Business meeting closes at 6:30 pm.

Stockholm, 02 June 2018

Nina Springer

(Secretary)