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History

• 2006 Standing Committee Report
• Creating of the Task Force on the Integrity of the Review Process
• Focus of the Plenary Session
  ➢ Report the findings of an association-wide survey
  ➢ Discuss the ramifications of the findings
Rationale

• 2006 findings looked at tenure/promotion and journal reviewing
• Task Force/Standing Committee discussions
  ➢ Concerns of members regarding competitive papers
  ➢ Standing Committee on Research input
  ➢ Impact on socializing new members into AEJMC
Methodology

• Creation of a survey instrument to tap into perceptions of AEJMC members regarding the integrity of the competitive paper reviewing process
  ➢ Extend the work of the 2006 study
  ➢ Offer some comparison to other communication associations’ competitive paper processes
  ➢ Better understand how AEJMC members perceived the competitive paper review process
Questionnaire

• Web-based survey of AEJMC members
  ➢ Carried out over a several week period immediately after the 2009 competitive paper results were announced
    ➢ Initial call May 21/Follow-up call June 1
    ➢ Closed June 7
  ➢ Consisted of three sections (demographics, competitive paper submission background, and integrity) asking 37 individual closed- and open-ended questions
Sample

- Open to all AEJMC members via the Internet
  - Self-selective sample
  - Questionable generalization
- An incentive to respond within 48 hours to the first call was a 2009 conference registration
- Yielded a sample of 582 AEJMC members or a 16.7% response rate
  - Similar to the 2006 response rate
Personal Demographics (%)*

- **Gender:**
  - Female 48.9 (44.6%)
  - Male 51.1 (55.4%)

- **Ethnicity:**
  - White 78.8 (76.4)
  - African-American 5.8 (5.8)
  - Hispanic/Latino 2.9 (1.7)
  - Asian 9.1 (3.4)
  - Native American 0.4 (0.4)

- **Highest Degree Held:**
  - Bachelor’s 1.0
  - Master’s 22.0
  - Doctoral 74.9
  - Other 2.0

- **Academic Classification:**
  - Student 17.9
  - Lecturer/Adjunct 2.0
  - Assistant Professor 26.7
  - Associate Professor 28.2
  - Professor 22.4

- **Academic Duty:**
  - Research primarily 14.0
  - Teaching primarily 27.6
  - Teaching & Research 48.5
  - Administration 6.8

- **Institution:**
  - Public 80.2
  - Private 19.4

*Respondent (AEJMC)
AEJMC Demographics

- **Years of AEJMC membership:**
  - $M = 11.35$
  - $Md = 8.00$
  - $Mo = 2.00$
  - Standard Deviation = 9.74

- **42.0%** Held Div/IG leadership position
- **25.6%** Served as Research Chair
- **92.6%** Submitted a competitive research paper to AEJMC
- Of those,
  - **97.2%** Submitted to Annual meeting
  - **43.8%** Submitted to Regional meeting
  - **35.6%** Submitted to an annual summer meeting
  - **35.0%** Submitted for a specialized meeting associated with AEJMC division interest group or commission
Divisions Submitted To

% Submitted

Advertising
Comm Tech
Comm Theory & Method
Cultural & Critical Studies
History
International Comm
Law & Policy
Magazine
Mass Comm & Society
Media Ethics
Media Management & Econ
Minorities & Comm
Newspaper
Public Relations
Radio/TV
Scholastic Journalism
Visual Communication
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*Multiple submissions allowed
Interest Groups/Commissions Submitted To*

% Submitted

- Civic & Citizen Journalism
- Commission on the Status of Women
- Entertainment Studies
- GLBT
- Graduate Education
- Internship & Careers
- Religion and Media
- Science Communication
- Small Programs

*Multiple submissions allowed; % range 1.5-9.4%

NOTE: Community Journalism Interest Group was inadvertently left off the survey
2009 Submission Data

- 50.3% report submitted to 2009 Boston AEJMC meeting
- 47.5% report serving as a competitive paper judge for 2009
- If not judging in 2009, have done so in past?
  - 48.6% for other AEJMC meetings
  - 86.0% for a national meeting
  - 38.0% for a regional meeting
  - 28.3% for a specialized meeting
Divisions Judged For*

% Judged

- Advertising
- Comm Tech
- Comm Theory & Method
- Cultural & Critical Studies
- History
- International Comm
- Law & Policy
- Magazine
- Mass Comm & Society
- Media Ethics
- Media Management & Econ
- Minorities & Comm
- Newspaper
- Public Relations
- Radio/TV
- Scholastic Journalism
- Visual Communication
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*Multiple submissions allowed
Interest Groups/Commissions Judged For

% Judged

- Civic & Citizen Journalism
- Entertainment Studies
- GLBT
- Graduate Education
- Internships & Careers
- Religion & Media
- Science Comm
- Small Programs
- Commission on the Status of Women

*Multiple submissions allowed*
Integrity of the Review Analyses

• Two major questions were asked of all respondents
  1. A list of 15 specific review criteria, first as how important the respondent each should be (“ideal”) in the process and then how they are in practice (the “reality of the process”)
  2. A rating of divisions and interest groups the respondent has submitted to on the integrity of their review processes from 1\text{lowest} to 7\text{highest}
Integrity Review Criteria Importance

- Reviewer Competence
- Evaluation Criteria Consistency
- Reviewer Ethics
- Methodological Bias
- Topic Favoritism
- Ethical Standards
- Reviewer Conflict of Interest
- Submission Process (electronic)
- Sufficient # of Reviewers
- Paper Acceptance Rates
- Too Little Time to Judge Papers

Ideally

In Practice
Reviewer Integrity Dimensionality

- Submitted to Factor Analysis to reduce the data and examine underlying factors

- Criteria employed
  - Eigenvalue > 1.00
  - Two or more items loading at $\pm 0.60$ or greater with no secondary loading greater than $\pm 0.40$

- Same four underlying factors found for both the “Ideal” and “In Practice”
Gender Perceptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideal</th>
<th>In Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bias</strong></td>
<td><strong>Bias</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female=Male</td>
<td>Female=Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethics</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ethics</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F=M Ethical Standards</td>
<td>F=M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer ethics</td>
<td>F=M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M included Reviewer Conflict of Interest</td>
<td>F=M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Evaluation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F=M Consistency of criteria application</td>
<td>F=M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Criteria</td>
<td>Submission Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M included Reviewer Competence</td>
<td>M included Sufficient Time to Judge Papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process</strong></td>
<td><strong>Process</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F=M Submission Process</td>
<td>F=M Acceptance Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient # of Reviewers</td>
<td>Sufficient # of Reviewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance Rates</td>
<td>Submission Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F included Reviewer Comments</td>
<td>M included Sufficient Time to Judge Papers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gender Perceptions

• Much like the 2006 study reporting gender differences in perception:
  ➢ Females rated all individual ideal and in practice criteria higher than did males
  ➢ Females rated each dimension higher than did males

• Although there were significant differences on many of the individual items and dimensions, their were very small on most.
Ideal Integrity Review Criteria Importance by Gender

- Reviewer Competence
- Evaluation Criteria
- Consistency of criteria application
- Methodological Ethics
- Methodological Bias
- Topic Bias
- Topic Favoritism
- Ethical Standards
- Reviewer Conflict of Interest
- Submission Process (electronic)
- Sufficient # of Reviewers
- Paper Acceptance Rates
- Reviewer Comments
- Too Little Time to Judge Papers

Females
Males
In Practice: Integrity Review Criteria Importance by Gender
AEJMC Unit Integrity

- Respondents were asked to evaluate divisions, interest groups, and commissions with competitive paper competitions they had submitted to on their review process integrity from $1_{\text{lowest}}$ to $5_{\text{highest}}$. 
## Divisional Integrity Scores

### Mean Integrity Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Integrity Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm Theory &amp; Methodology</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Technology</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural &amp; Critical Studies</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Comm</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law &amp; Policy</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magazine</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Comm &amp; Society</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Ethics</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Management &amp; Econ</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minorities &amp; Comm</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio/TV</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholastic Journalism</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Communication</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Mean Integrity Score ranging from 3 to 4.2.*
Interest Group/Commission Integrity Scores

Mean Integrity Score

- Civic & Citizen Journalism
- Community Journalism
- Entertainment Studies
- GLBT
- Graduate Education
- Internship & Careers
- Religion & Media
- Science Communication
- Small Programs
- Commission on the Status of Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Civic &amp; Citizen Journalism</th>
<th>Community Journalism</th>
<th>Entertainment Studies</th>
<th>GLBT</th>
<th>Graduate Education</th>
<th>Internship &amp; Careers</th>
<th>Religion &amp; Media</th>
<th>Science Communication</th>
<th>Small Programs</th>
<th>Commission on the Status of Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Compared to Other Communication Associations?

- When asked, respondents who have experienced other competitive paper competitions, they reported AEJMC to have:

  ![Bar Chart]
  - More Integrity
  - About the same Integrity
  - Less Integrity

% Responding
Perceptions of Divisions by Members Who Have Submitted to other Associations

- Advertising
- Comm Theory & Methodology
- Communication Technologies
- Cultural & Critical Studies
- History
- International Comm
- Law & Policy
- Magazine
- Mass Comm & Society
- Media Ethics
- Media Management & Econ
- Minorities & Comm
- Newspaper
- Public Relations
- Radio/TV
- Scholastic Journalism
- Visual Communication

Legend:
- More Integrity
- About Same Integrity
- Less Integrity
Perceptions of Interest Groups/Commissions Who Have Submitted to Other Associations

- Civic & Citizen Journalism
- Entertainment Studies
- GLBT
- Graduate Education
- Internship & Careers
- Religion & Media
- Science Communication
- Small Programs
- Commission on the Status
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- More Integrity
- About the Same Integrity
- Less Integrity
Summary

• While females and males differ in their perceptions of competitive paper review integrity, those differences are very small
• Respondents felt that AJEMC competitive paper review integrity was about the same as other communication associations
• No analysis yielded integrity scores below scale midpoints
Panel Discussion and Recommendations

- Julie Andsager
- Elizabeth Dougall
- Earnest Perry
- John Pauly
- Don Stacks
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