ISOJ 2020: Day 4, Research Panel

Power, privilege and patriarchy in journalism: Dynamics of media control, resistance and renewal

---

Chair: Alfred Hermida, professor and director of the Graduate School of Journalism, University of British Columbia (Canada), guest editor of *#ISOJ Research Journal*

- *Insights, issues and ideas on power, privilege and patriarchy in journalism*, Alfred Hermida
- *"We Are the 200%": How Mitú Constructs Latino American Identity Through Discourse*, Ryan Wallace, University of Texas at Austin
- *Alternative professional journalism in the post-Crimean Russia: Online resistance to the Kremlin propaganda and status quo*, Olga Lazitski, University of California, San Diego
- *#MarchForOurLives: Tweeted teen voices in online news*, Kirsi Cheas, Maiju Kannisto, and Noora Juvonen, University of Turku, Finland
- *Send her back: News narratives, Intersectionality, and the rise of politically powerful women of color*, Carolyn Nielsen, Western Washington University
- *Participatory journalism and the hegemony of men*, Mark Poepsel, Southern Illinois University-Edwardsville

---

Amy Schmitz Weiss Good afternoon, everyone, thank you all for joining us today as we come together virtually for our fourth day of ISOJ online. We hope you've enjoyed the panel so far today. Before we begin our research panel, I'd like to do a few housekeeping reminders. The research panel is going to be interpreted to Spanish. So if you'd like to join and watch in Spanish, click the interpretation, glow in the meeting options down below and select the Spanish language channel. Please also note that we're live streaming on ISOJ.org and Knight Center YouTube channel in case you have any tech issues with Zoom. Please remember to follow and use the ISOJ2020 hashtag to stay connected with the conference on social media. We are so glad to have with us today this amazing research panel on "Power, privilege, patriarchy in journalism: the dynamics of media control, resistance and renewal." This panel features articles from the special issue of the ISOJ Journal, guest edited by Dr. Alfred Hermida, professor and director of the Graduate School of Journalism of the University of British Columbia in Canada, and now I'm going to turn it over to Dr Hermida.

Alfred Hermida Hello and welcome to this ISOJ 2020 research panel. I am honored to be a guest editor for the special issue of the ISOJ journal and to be here with you all. Thank you to Amy, to Rosenthal, really to the whole of the ISOJ team for organizing, what to my mind, is really the best journalism conference on the planet.

And today we have a stellar range of papers. They address pressing, timely, relevant challenges, but also opportunities for journalism. Before we get to the presentations, I want to set the context for this research and where it came from. So I want to take you back to February, take you to a place called Burns Lake in British Columbia. This is where

members of the indigenous community there at the Wet'suwet'en Nation were contesting the building of a pipeline on their traditional territory. This is the coastal gasoline pipeline. Here's a story from CBC from February. Now the story of indigenous communities resisting resource development on their traditional lands is something that's repeated across Canada and across the U.S. What happened in February here in British Columbia is that Canada's national police force, the RCMP, arrived on the traditional territory of the Wet'suwet'en to enforce an injunction against the opponents of this pipeline.

So there was a controversy over the pipeline, but there was another controversy in the media. And that was all about how to refer to the individuals who were fighting this pipeline, who mostly came from the indigenous community. In the media protests like this, are called protest. The activists are called protesters, much like they were in the CBC story. But in other outlets, there was a different way of referring to them. The indigenous protesters were called land defenders, such as in this story by Al Jazeera. And this terminology sparks a debate about how the media represents indigenous communities in Canada. The Wet'suwet'en Nation had never ceded that territory to any colonial government to the settler colonial government in Canada, and they argued and media scholars argued that the term land defender was a way of acknowledging their history and their connection to the land. And that by calling the protesters, that was a way of saying that they did not have a legitimate claim to their traditional territory.

Of course, this debate is set against the background of decades of marginalization and misrepresentation of indigenous communities in the media in Canada. And it was an example of how the language that journalists use, the decisions they make in terms of how to refer and frame events like this, shape the story. The language used by journalists reflects power structures and biases built into media structures. My UBC colleague Candis Callison has spoken about this, and it's partly the focus of her book with my other UBC colleague, Mary Lynn Young, "Reckoning Journalism Limits and Possibilities." This book examines journalism's role in amplifying dominant narratives and how journalism serves to preserve a status quo that doesn't necessarily reflect or serve the struggles of its diverse audiences. My colleague Candis was very vocal when the Wet'suwet'en protest were ongoing in terms of the language that journalists were using, really questioning that the way these events are represented to show the inherent power relations, systemic structures of power built into not just society but also into the media and shaping how journalists think about who they report, whose voices are heard and what issues make the news and what doesn't.

And this leads to a question that we'll be addressing in this panel in terms of who is journalism for, who is benefited, who is harmed with it. Of course, you know, these debates around who journalism is for are not new. Back in the 1970s, Herbert Gans and his analysis of the Nightly News, and Newsweek, and Time essentially concluded that the news reflects a white male order, that essentially journalism as a structure supports the social order of public, business and professional upper, middle class, middle-aged white male of society. So we have journalism then as a form of elite discourse that promotes and reinforces particular hierarchies and structures of power, essentially of whiteness and maleness of journalism.

Of course, in the intervening four decades since the publication of Gans's book, this white male order of the news has been challenged and contested, but also it's persisted and resisted. Some of the challenges that have been coming towards this established maleness and whiteness of journalism have gained greater visibility and voice through social media, spaces occurring outside of institutional journalism. So in that book,

#HashtagActivism, Jackson, Bailey and Foucalt Welles explore this, looking at the power of hashtag activism to advocate, mobilize and communicate the use of Twitter, particularly by historically disenfranchized populations, to articulate counter narratives through these social media spaces.

And these issues are becoming ever more present, as we're seeing with the rise of social media from Occupy Wall Street to Black Lives Matter to Me Too. These movements have leverage in spaces outside of the media, social media to connect marginalized communities and to articulate these counter narratives. So it's time not just to question the whiteness and male of journalism, but really a time to change the way things are happening in journalism, to acknowledge the evidence of racism, gendered coverage, bias in newsrooms as well as in the classrooms. This special issue of the ISOJ journal and this research panel aims to contribute to this discussion, taking a critical look at these issues of power, privilege and patriarchy.

The five papers you're going to hear from today, they take up this challenge. They ask difficult questions and offer fresh insights into not just the issues facing journalism, but what journalism could be. We'll be starting off with a paper from Ryan Wallace. Our aim here with all these papers is to advance the conversation around systemic issues of power, systemic issues of privilege and of patriarchy in journalism's institutional forms, norms and practices. Thank you for listening. And with that, I will hand you over to Ryan Wallace, University of Texas at Austin. "We are the 200%: How Mitú constructs Latin American identity through discourse." Thank you.

Ryan Wallace Good afternoon. Thank you so much for joining us for this research panel. My name is Ryan Wallace. I'm a doctoral candidate here at the University of Texas at Austin. Today, I'm going to talk to you about a research project I've been working on for this past year titled "We are the 200%: How mitú constructs Latino American identity through discourse." Last summer, when the call for paper for this special issue came out, it asked us to think about how power, privilege and patriarchy are imbricated in journalism. They asked us to not only look at how these are embedded in mainstream media, but also how these discourses impact communities and representation of various identities. In trying to reimagine what journalism could be and how it could reflect and serve increasingly diverse and global publics, I looked to the media that my own community consumed and found a particularly relevant example in mitú.

As a digital native, mitú is an online only publication with a significant presence across social media platforms. While it is considered ethnic media in that it is produced by and for a Latinx audience, it has a significant reach connecting with more than 90 million readers each month. Through both its discourse and organizational structure, being co-founded by Latina Beatriz Acevedo and having diverse leadership, mitú proves to be an interesting case study for investigating how contemporary journalism is being reimagined in the United States, challenging social, cultural power structure, privilege across cultural context and even patriarchy.

Acknowledging the increasingly multicultural city of the United States and the Latinx population, Mitú speaks to what they call the 200%, youth who are 100% American and 100% Latino. This particular audience not only impacts the company's strategies regarding social media, but also shapes the news content that Mitú creates. Beyond informing these audiences about the news, Mitú creates a space for information, entertainment, community and ultimately finding a way to articulate your own Latinx identity.

In order to better understand this publication and its various channels, I went through more than five years of articles, Instagram posts and YouTube videos using a method called the Critical Discourse Analysis. While this method focuses more on broad strokes, it does offer the advantage of being able to develop a thick description of the publication and know prevailing trends in content and their overall discourse. This helped me approach my two key research questions, which were to what extent does Mitú construct the Latino American identity, and how does Mitú's discourse challenge patriarchy and other ideological notions of hegemony?

One of the most interesting findings that came from analyzing their social media is best illustrated through Mitú's mascot, Guacardo. As an anthropomorphized version of one of the U.S.'s most notable imports from Latin America, Guacardo serves as a symbol not only for the publication but also its diverse audience. Building heavily in intertextual cues from popular American culture, Guacardo's character can be viewed as an extended metaphor for Latin America and significant participation in both the production and consumption of popular American culture. As a notable point of reference for the publication, Guacardo, interestingly, has a rather amorphous identity. Without an accent and origin story or uniform cultural ties, Guacardo illustrates a uniquely Latino American identity, one that lacks racial or national ties outside of the U.S. But perhaps more importantly is that Guacardo does not perform a particular gender and that his parodies allow him to be individuals of all identities.

Similarly Mitú's social media content and news publication also creates space for the diverse identities within the Latinx community. To borrow on cultural icons like famous singer songwriter Selena Quintanilla Pérez to discuss Latinidad, they deconstruct gendered topics within the Latino community and they actively construct a new culture to combat inequalities against women, people of color, and the LGBTQ+.

Interestingly, in analyzing Mitú's news content to better understand how it discusses power, privilege and patriarchy, I found that it does something many mainstream publications do not. It confronts these topics by name. Its articles often tackle these topics as well as their Latinx counterparts, like machismo, colorism and toxic masculinity, and some even engage Mitú's own journalists to reflexively consider their own positionality in the conversation. Rather than adopting traditional journalistic news values like objectivity and balance, Mitú often opts for the personal stories that articulate many shared experiences throughout the Latinx community.

And my study revealed that Mitú's content is actively creating a new Latino American identity by providing Latinx millennials with ways of seeing their similarities rather than their differences, but at the same time they're excluding many Latinos from their conversations. By using Spanish and references to popular Latinx media like telenovelas in their content, they may be missing out on reaching newer generations of Latino Americans that do not share these same experiences. And by focusing on the Hispanic population of Latino Americans, they're also often leaving Brazilians out of this new identity.

While the publication is making great strides in re-envisioning what journalism could be for diverse audiences, its divergence from traditional journalistic news values may leave room for criticism and could potentially result in narrow echo chambers where particular viewpoints are being discussed.

Thank you so much for the opportunity to share my research with you, and I hope you all stay healthy during these uncertain times. If you have any questions, please feel free to reach out. And I hope that you get my article a read. Thank you.

Olga Lazitski Hello, everyone. My name is Olga Lazitski, and I'm a PhD candidate at UC San Diego. So today I'm going to be talking about the journalistic community that I call alternative professional journalism, and this is the case study that I conducted in Russia.

So I want to start by showing you this footage of the arrest of Ivan Safronov. He's a former journalist who also covered military and space industries. Two months ago he joined Russia's space agency, Roscosmos, and on July 7, a couple of weeks ago, he has been detained by the Federal Security Service on suspicion of treason. Safronov's arrest shocked his colleagues. A lot of Russian journalists came to the FSB prison to protest against absurd accusations and demand to release Safronov. They've been claiming that journalism is not a crime, and that's what's written on this postcard that you see on the slide. Safronov's supporters are sure that his prosecution is an attempt to get rid of him for what he has been doing while he worked as a journalist.

One of the journalists who supported Safronov wrote, "What's happening with Safronov is a direct prosecution for doing journalism. It's a very bad signal indicating that actually anyone who says something that security services don't like can be arrested for treason or something else." Yury Dud, another journalist who also has his online show and millions of subscribers, also wrote in support of Safronov. "When you see the news about searches in the journalists' apartments, when journalists have to pay huge fines for criticizing the government or when they arrest journalists, it's wrong to think that it's not a problem. In most of the cases, they prosecute journalists who consider regular people more important than the state. When injustice happens to you, those journalists will be the first ones who will try to help you." And another journalist, Ivan Golunov, who got arrested on false charges last summer wrote, "Last night, before going to bed, I was watching the video of my arrest. When I woke up, I saw another video which showed the arrest of another journalist who was absolutely lost and disoriented as I was when they arrested me. I don't want this feeling of confusion and disorientation to become the main feeling of Russian journalism in the nearest future.".

So back in June 2019, when Golunov was arrested, his colleagues the same way they do it now in support of Safronov, launched a massive online and offline campaigns and organized street protest that promptly moved well beyond the journalist communities and even beyond Russia. Eventually, a Moscow court dropped all charges against Golunov.

And I was in Moscow myself last summer when they arrested the Golunov. I was collecting demographic data, observing editorial work of journalists and interviewing a lot of them. So in regards to the Golunov case, it felt to me like I was witnessing and sensing a very, very important turning point that showed that the Kremlin is actually not omnipotent as it wants everybody to believe. Golunov's release was the first victory over the state for the journalistic community in Putin's Russia. What makes this victory even more important is the role of a particular journalistic community that I call alternative professional journalism, or APJ. All the quotes and support of Safronov that I shared with you earlier are from the people who I identify as professional, alternative professional journalists, or APJ's.

And what has influenced the emergence of this community? Well, first of all, of course, technological advances, and second, political conditions of the Putin regime, increasing pressure of the state propaganda after 2014 became the last straw for many journalists

who before the Ukraine crisis worked for the mainstream outlets. A lot of professionals just couldn't tolerate the intensifying censorship anymore, and they either quit journalism at all or decided to organize their role in alternative projects. So why does it matter? Studying APJ can help us understand the ways in which journalism can reconfigure power relations within the society, in non-democratic regimes, and contribute to the development of vibrant public spheres in non-Western contexts.

As I already mentioned, my study is based on the ethnographic data that I've been collecting in Russia from June 2018 to October 2019. My research focused on three questions. Who are the people who practice APJ? How do they do the work, and how does the audience consume and use their work? In response to the first question, my ethnographic data points to two groups of APJ's. The first group is comprised of accomplished, famous professionals in their forties who left mainstream outlets around 2014 and found asylum in alternative projects, professional asylum. And the second group is young dreamers in the 20s who grew up watching journalism produced by those who are mentoring them now. In response to the second question, my data identifies a set of professional norms and values shared by the informants. Both groups of APJ's share the same professional ethos, particularly cherishing the value of professional autonomy. In order to maintain that autonomy, they developed their own strategies to deal with the structural constraints. Journalistic role concepcion, is also the way the journalists perceive and talk about the rules and norms that they're supposed to follow in their practices. However, sometimes in the real-life environment, especially in Russia, journalists have to perform something different and that's what's considered to be low performance.

So I found a revealing discrepancy between the way the journalist discursively construct their journalistic norms and the way they perform their profession. An important conflict that my data identified might be the tension between the neutral observer role and the civic activist role. Their professionalism derives from three different traditions: the U.S. normative tradition, elements of civic journalism and practices of Soviet journalism.

So for the sake of time, I'm going to focus only on the U.S. normative tradition here, commitment to it, to the tradition of impartiality, active, critical journalism and public interest reporting was adopted during the short golden era of post-Soviet journalism. As one of my informants explained, and here is the quote that you can see on the slide, "I'm all for objectivity and impartiality, regardless of what personal opinion or emotional experience I have about any issue, even though we are not fans of the current political regime, but when it comes to the text, I need viewpoints of all sides of the story." Another journalist justifying he role conception of objectivity, said, "The outlet where I'm working just thinks that people have the rights that have to be respected. If you say that in prison, human rights are not obeyed, you are not an oppositioner, you are just a normal human being who wants other people to be treated with dignity. It's not about politics." So interestingly, denying issues of human rights as political, this reporter tries to renounce herself from the possibility to be labeled as activist, which would, of course, be in opposition to her conception. But however, her professional practices that I was observing reveal traits of civic journalism.

To the third question, to the last question, this study identified some common patterns of media consumption and shows that the gap between state propaganda messages and real life experiences made people curious about alternative content, and they started to search this content online and even produce this content themselves. Satisfying audiences' needs and interests is very important for APJ, particularly for the subscription based outlets. The editor of one of those outlets told me that his viewers are "hostages of their habits" who

want to get a particular agenda, and his point is, "My viewers are charged to believe that Putin is the executioner. They want to endlessly hear that. And of course, it's hard to keep the balance between what we want professionally and what our viewers expect to see.".

In the Golunov case, expectations of his protesters and their supporters revealed an important conflict between journalists' roles of neutral observers and civic activists. People who rallied in response, they were hoping that the protests would have stamped into the public movement against police brutality. However, when Golunov was released, Meduza, his outlet called upon the public not to attend the protests that were planned for the next day. Meduza's editor in chief back then wrote, "We fought off the attack on our guy. Thanks, everyone. This is our common victory, a result of the incredible cooperation of the people. But we are not practicing activism, and we don't want to be the heroes of resistance. Sorry." So this statement caused public dissatisfaction. The fact that the public has chosen alternative professional journalists as the leaders of the public resistance said a lot about the mobilizing potential and growing influence in the public sphere.

The findings spark a set of questions ignited by the theme of ideology of the Russian APJ. In Western context, interestingly, scholars who studied alternative media tend to align themselves with a political ideology, right wing or left wing, neither of these ideologies would make sense in contemporary Russia. Instead, I argue that the ideology of Russian ABJ's is objectivity. They religiously believe in the norm of objectivity that they almost never fully experienced, but have been always striving for. This idea gives them hope for professionalism and the way that they imagine it that this professionalism is achievable. They shield themselves by this discourse of objectivity that serves them as a way to separate their professional group from the mainstream journalists who adhere to a different model and as a way to discursively position themselves outside of the system, but not in opposition to it, not as a counterpropaganda with another political chart.

Besides that, the ideology of objectivity also serves as a way to protect themselves by avoiding accusations of activism and biases against the regime that might attack them at any time. And unfortunately, that's exactly what's happening in Russia today, as we saw in the beginning of my talk.

Thank you so much for your attention. I'm really looking forward to our discussion later. Thank you.

Mark Poepsel Thank you, Olga. I'm up next. It's always fascinating to see research done in places where journalists are threatened. My name is Mark Poepsel. I'm an associate professor at Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville. The premise of my exploratory theoretical piece is that there are patriarchical norms of masculinity, providing men with power far too often abused in the news industry with a negative influence in newsrooms, on content and indirectly on society in general. And there are examples of hegemonic patriarchy at work. Women dominate J schools, but not yet newsrooms. News organizations tend to be boys clubs where women have to follow norms that give preference to men in order to try to succeed. And it's not just a vague sense of male hegemony or male power that's more or less oppressive depending on the newsroom or the nation, men have more of the jobs, take more of the pay and hold more leadership roles. This fosters broader male hegemony in various forms of oppression in the world over.

Academic research has shown that even where there are gains in the number of women added to newsrooms, women may still be seen as outsiders. They may have to act as one

of the boys, and the influence on content may be limited. To site just a few studies from European scholars, the research supports what is observed in day-to-day experiences in newsrooms around the world. An anecdote to help drive home the point, when women journalists wish to show general support for the fact that women possess basic human rights, they are accused of being unprofessional for not following the objectivity norm. But that norm tends to privilege white, male and often moneyed point of view. The image here on this slide depicts Megan Devlin once cautioned by her managers against attending the first women's march in Vancouver in 2019. She went anyway, but it creates a disconnect where she is perceived as going against industry norms in order to make a most basic statement about the rights of people in her gender category.

So what can we do? This paper looks at participatory journalism research with the goal of finding inroads to counter the hegemony of men. Why participatory journalism? Because it's a disruptive force in the industry already challenging news norms. So the first core concept under the participatory journalism framework is the idea of boundary studies. Three main ideas are proposed in this, again, exploratory theoretical piece.

Number one, social networking platforms can be used as boundary objects. Boundary objects in the literature have different meanings for journalism professionals and audiences. Journalists look to social media, as one example, for sources. Citizens look to social media for influence. Journalists can seek out women who challenge the hegemony of men in media and society in general for comment on stories of all types, not just stories about women's rights.

Number two, we can set up participatory projects to partner with women's groups. We do it for all sorts of other groups. Why not women's groups? Do we more readily suspend objectivity when partnering with right wing groups who profess disdain for professional journalism? Why?

Number three, some professional journalists see boundaries as areas to be policed. Expect opposition and the reinforcing of barriers. It's not getting into newsrooms that's the trick. It's sustained influence on norms. That's the goal. And the second core concept for participatory journalism work is reciprocity. Focus here on sustained reciprocity, which means in community groups, people sometimes aid one another without the immediate expectation of payback. The goal is to create long-term relationships and a sense of shared trust in communities when news organizations badly need that trust and when audiences badly need something to trust in.

Ultimately, the field of professional journalism is fighting for its life. If you had to choose, would you rather protect the old boys network within newsrooms or the ability to provide survival information for your audience? Would you prefer to serve democracy by informing the public or to preserve the patriarchal power of men and certain notions of what it means to be a man or what masculinity should mean? The dominance of men and masculinity based norms can be shed to preserve other norms for a net gain in newsroom culture. When we look at the disruptive force of participatory journalism practices, there are opportunities not to destroy the authority of professional journalism, but to reinforce it under a new normative regime, which privileges community, long-term survival, trust and women's rights as human rights. Thank you.

Kirsi Cheas Right. Good afternoon. So my name is Kirsi Cheas and I will be copresenting with Maiju Kannisto, and we're from Finland. Our presentation builds on our paper, "March for Our Lives: Tweeted Teen Voices in Online News." In February 2018, a school shooting

in Parkland, Florida led to a new student movement advocating for stricter gun laws. Many of the Parkland students have identified themselves as part of a mass shooting generation, referring to their experience of having lived their entire lives in the shadow of mass shootings and in anticipation of them. By calling themselves a mass shooting generation, they reframed the larger gun debate along generational lines. Our article and this related presentation focuses on how this generation Parkland has transformed and reframed public discussion on gun violence through their Twitter activism.

Twitter enabled generation Parkland to participate in U.S. debates without third parties, such as media outlets. Social media was their most potent organizing tool and a way for them to get their angry voices heard. However, ideological biases of the news media have continued to affect coverage and play a role in the framing process, and there are still generational powered hierarchies that shape the media and voice of generation Parkland.

Our presentation will briefly discuss, first of all, how Parkland youth used social media to get their voices heard. Second of all, how the tweeted teen voices became such an ideological divisions shaping the coverage in different online news media. And third, how intergenerational power hierarchies were negotiated in the coverage of the generation Parkland. You can find information about our methods and sample in the article.

We examined online news articles and tweets indicated in the stories published by different media in the United States, such as the Miami Herald, New York Times, CNN, Fox News, Breitbart News, and the South Florida Sun Sentinel. Our principal method was frame analysis. And you'll find more information about the method in this article as well.

Let me start with the question of whether and how journalists were willing to use depleted frames of the generation Parkland in the coverage. According to our study, the tweets and other social media posts by Parkland youth shaped the news media's coverage of the Parkland shooting. Social media allowed students to avoid common media narratives and focus attention on legislation. The Parkland youth have made a fair point that the media should not own their narrative. It is their story, and thus it should be told by them and not by anyone else.

One of the voices that soon went viral belonged to Emma González, who gave a speech at the anti-gun rally on February 17, 2018, where she confidently declared that they are going to be the last mass shooting generation. The media frame sponsored by the NRA, the right-wing politicians such as the constitutional rights and guns don't kill people do frames, were claiming that tougher gun laws do not decrease that violence. By countering this phrase with the phrase "we call bullshit," González introduced the "never again" frame and its potential to shake traditional approaches to gun violence to the lived experience of the generation Parkland.

The "never again" frame challenged the common frames that limited discussion to the issues like mental health, constitution and guns not being the issue. Instead they addressed the value of the experience of the youth who had been involved in the shootings. Let me now pass it on to Maiju.

Maiju Kannisto Thanks, Kirsi. I'm Maiju Kannisto from the University of Turku, Finland, and now I'll continue with our analysis.

Our analysis reveals that the media attention on the Parkland shooting coincided with the Parkland youth's speak activity on Twitter as well as the duration of the coverage and

tweeting activity, I'd like to illustrate this point by showing you this figure about the peak tweeting activity after the March for Our Lives activists and then compare it to the timeline of the news coverage related to the Parkland shooting. The Parkland shooting commanded more attention than previous school shootings. A student walkout on March 14 and the March for Our Lives rally on March 24 attracted a lot of volume of media attention, pushing the coverage rate up from the initial peak.

This leads me to our next point, which is the share of different sources included in the online news coverage. I think the graph perfectly shows that the share of tweets by the Parkland students was substansive. In the coverage of The New York Times, CNN and Breitbart News, the students tweets had the highest share. Taking into consideration the journalistic tendency to rely on official news sources, it is remarkable how clearly the voices of the underaged Parkland students were heard in news coverage.

Let's now turn to how the tweeted voices became subject to ideological divisions, shaping the coverage in different online news media. Based on our findings, Kyle Kashuv, a conservative student who became an advocate for gun rights, was frequently quoted in conservative Fox News and well-tried Breitbart News coverage. Whereas the student activist of March For Our Lives advocating for stricter gun laws were cited and their causes promoted more frequently in the more liberal press. This is hardly surprising and reflects persistence of the traditional ideological boundaries in different news media outlets.

In most media, the young age of the Parkland students did not undermine their credibility, and their Twitter and other social media activism was also takem seriously. The most radical form in which the capacity and authenticity of the generation Parkland were underestimated was expressed by Breitbart News, which repeated the claim that the March for Our Lives activists were puppets who had been manipulated and coached by the Democratic Party and gun control advocates.

While using Twitter to participate in political debate, the Parkland activists were exposed to negativity and belittling by both social media and online media outlets. Delaney Tarr, a March For Our Lives activist, describes the position of student activists, "We've been propelled onto the national stage, where we are open to a level of criticism that no teenager should face. We are treated simultaneously like adults and children, neither respected nor understood."

Let's summarize briefly what we have looked at. Our study has shown that the Parkland students use of social media, Twitter in particular, has significantly shaped the media coverage concerning the Parkland shooting and its aftermath. However, while the liberal media have taken the students arguments and tweets quite seriously, others have expressed suspicions about the educational advantages. Do other youth activists pertaining to the Generation Z have similar possibilities as the generation Parkland to challenge the power hierarchy of generations? The use of tweeted teen voices can help journalists in their efforts to create inclusive and in some ways intergenerational coverage. Even the teens clearly have things to say they need to be taken seriously as full members of the democratic society. Well, that's from us. Thanks very much.

Carolyn Nielsen Thanks. Hi, I'm Carolyn Nielsen. I'm a professor in the Department of Journalism at Western Washington University. My research focuses on how journalists report and write about race and racism. So about a year, almost exactly a year ago, last July, when our president tweeted that four newly elected women of color in Congress's most racially diverse class in history should, quote, "go back and help fix the totally broken

and crime infested places from which they came." And then three days later, at a North Carolina Trump rally, the crowd began to chant, "send her back, send her back" for many minutes in regard to Representative Ilhan Omar. I thought to myself, well, how are journalists going to write about this?

Historically, we know, from decades worth of studies, have done a very poor job of calling out racism and particularly done a poor job of understanding intersectional oppression, which is very relevant in the context of the rise of politically powerful women of color who, of course, face bias at the intersection of race and gender. And for people like Ilham Omar, also as a Somali born naturalized citizen and one of the first two Muslims elected to Congress, so facing bias at four different intersections there.

So I decided to analyze coverage to see how journalists were going to make sense of this. To do that I used critical race theory, which really shows how journalism norms reinforce whiteness as the default and serve to veil racism. A couple of the key tenets of critical race theory that are important to this study is that critical race theory recognizes racism as part of everyday life, not something aberrant, not something unusual, which is kind of the opposite of newsworthy. Critical race theory understands that objectivity and neutrality are questionable constructs that favor dominant group perspectives. Stories told from the perspective of people living oppression have the power to invalidate stereotypes, so they can be very powerful, although decades worth of journalism scholarship shows that those people's voices are the ones most often missing from coverage. People who are marginalized are most often missing from coverage. This theory also posits that whiteness is treated as normative and people of color are described in terms of what they are not. And finally, it understands racism is something that is within systems of institutions that are broader than interpersonal racism.

So based on that, I asked some questions about news coverage, which has usually portrayed racism as something that occurs with testy encounters between two people rather than something that's manifest in systems. I also wanted to look at journalism more broadly. There's been a lot of scholarship that looks at what we call legacy or traditional journalism, which is just the facts, occasionally both sider-ism, reliance on elites and adherence to objectivity that treats racism as questionable was exceptionally racist and that really is harmful. So I wanted to see how this was going to play out in different types of journalism. My work seeks to look at the broadening journalism landscape born of digital affordances that has allowed new players to come onto the scene, and I really feel that we shouldn't presume that those new players are going to adopt traditional values of legacy journalism, especially when they outwardly declare that they do not.

So I looked at three different kinds of journalism. I looked at legacy journalism, traditional journalism in The Washington Post coverage of this. And I also look at Vox, which describes itself as explanatory journalism. Explanatory journalism isn't new, but Vox has created or describes itself as "only explanatory journalism" that seeks to bring context and make things understandable for the audience. And it talks about going for the light and not the noise. Right. And then I looked at BuzzFeed News, which is what scholars refer to as Journalism 3.0, which really seeks to look at what the audience is talking about and cover those topics, rather than editors sitting around the table deciding what the audience needs to know, and it also seeks to amplify the voices of the oppressed. So those are three different models, BuzzFeed, Vox and The Washington Post.

And across those, I looked at a couple of different questions. So the first one I looked at was whether or not the outlets would describe the tweet and the chant as racist, whether

they would use the term "racist." And part of this was spurred by something that had happened just a couple of months before when the Associated Press made a big change to its style, like it was a big change that it made national news. The Associated Press came out and said, "hey, journalists, stop using these terms like "racially insensitive" and just call things racist," and that was really kind of a sea change in journalism. So I wanted this kind to be a test of that.

So my study looked at whether or not these news outlets actually called out racism. I also looked at whether they portrayed Representative Ilhan Omar's identity as intersectional or whether they focused on one characteristic of identity. I looked at whether coverage portrayed the president's racist actions as interpersonal or part of a larger system. And then I compared these. So what did I find?

One of the things I think that's really interesting is there is a very sharp departure from previous years. We found that coverage across the board called the tweet and the chant racist, labeled them racist, which was really a big difference from what we've seen previously. However, there quite a bit of nuance there. So the Vox coverage was absolutely the most skittish about applying the term "racism" or "racist," and it used it sort of falsely synonymously or interchangeably with offensive. And those aren't the same thing. And it said that the attacks were targeting liberal congresswomen, so it sort of made the target their political stances rather than their lived identities. BuzzFeed consistently labeled the tweet and the chant as racist in its coverage and talked more about how it was harming individual people of color rather than how it was manifest in systems. But the Post coverage was actually very direct, and so this is different than what we've seen before in legacy journalism. Post coverage described the president's tweets as racist. Historically raced rhetoric, race engendered, racist and xenophobic, and racist and Islamaphobic, and The Post was the only publication, the only coverage to note xenophobia and Islamophobia. The Post coverage also talked about how the president's tweet violated Twitter's hate speech policy and also talked about how it violated federal workplace employment discrimination policies. And it was the only coverage to call out those things, which are showing them as part of a larger system.

In terms of portraying Representative Omar's identity fully, intersectionality, they all failed. So Vox coverage and BuzzFeed coverage really made a lot of false equivalencies, comparing attacks on her to attacks on Hillary Clinton, who is as a white woman, or late Representative Elijah Cummings, a Black man, or Julian Castro who is a Latino man. Right. These are not the same. But they kind of said, "oh, look, Trump targeted these people for this reason and these people for this reason." And it it really didn't work, and it showed that they had a real lack of understanding the multiple ways that Representative Omar has been targeted. The Post coverage did not use false equivalencies, but it focused a lot on her race. Overall in terms of systemic or interpersonal, how that was understood, Vox, again, was really portraying it as intrapersonal, this political feud between Representative Omar and Trump and not really anything larger than that. BuzzFeed coverage was talking about kind of the ripple effect on the population, people who were feeling scared about this overarching white nationalism wave that was being fueled. And only the Post coverage really provided the historical context and explained why chanting send her back is problematic and xenophobic and scary.

So what we see in the end is that these new types of journalism are claiming new values, but they're not necessarily asserting those new values in this particular case. Maybe not walking the talk. Vox was not explanatory or contextual. It was really typical horse race political coverage of something that's implications were much deeper than what was

portrayed. And we see that legacy journalism was producing systemically aware coverage and directly labeling racism. The overall problem is still this failure to understand intersectionality and the deep journalism desire to put people in these tidy boxes that really don't work. And the reason why this is important is because, as we know from critical race theory, when we produce coverage that reflects real journalism values of showing the fabric of diversity of our society, it has the potential to disrupt these dangerous racial stereotyping narratives that turn into crowds chanting things and sometimes worse, sometimes violence. So a little bit of good news from traditional journalism and a little bit of let's question our assumptions from new outlets that are promising something new and maybe not delivering that.

Alfred Hermida Thank you all for a wonderful range of presentations, some common themes emerging in the papers and different perspectives around the role of journalists, the perspectives they take, the notion of objectivity. And I look forward to the Q&A and going deeper into some of the issues and themes that came up in your research. Thank you.

Amy Schmitz Weiss Alright, well, before we jump into the Q&A, first of all, thank you all for such amazing presentations and great research. The research featured from this panel is available for free in the latest issue of the journal that's on the ISOJ site at ISOJ.org/research. We encourage you to check it out. I'd like to give a big thank you to two special people, Philippe and Ian, for their help on the journal production stage in this process, too.

Now, before we jump to the Q&A, I just have two special announcements to make. So first, the next call for the ISOJ papers is now open. I know we're talking about the current one. We're all looking forward to the future. That means we will be accepting papers on any topic related to online journalism next year. So that means we won't have a special theme, so anything can be submitted related to the topic of online journalism. So get those ideas going. You can see the call for papers up on ISOJ.org/research. We'll be taking extended abstracts between now and September, so I hope all of you watching will consider to submit and be in this place next year in submitting and presenting your work.

Second, the other announcement to make is that we award every year the top paper award for the article that receive the top scores from the judges. And so we are happy to announce that this year's top paper award goes to we need a drum roll that it will go to Ryan Wallace from UT Austin for his research article on We Are the 200%: How Mitú Constructs Latino American Identity Through Discourse. Congratulations, Ryan. Your award plaque is on its way to you.

Ryan Wallace Thank you so much. Thank you so much, I really appreciate it. This paper, as like a research object, looking at Mitú was something that was really personal to me. And it really resonated with the media that I consumed growing up and consume now. I was not sure if everybody would get the Guacardo references and looking at an anthropomorphized avocado, but I'm really glad that it really resonated with some other researchers and individuals. And I hope that this inspires everybody else to start looking at ethnic media and Latino journalism in the United States. It's really important, and I think it can help us reimagine what journalism can be.

Amy Schmitz Weiss Thank you so much and congratulations again, and I am going to turn it over to Alfred now for the awesome Q&A that's going to take place. Send your questions in so we can have time to discuss.

Alfred Hermida Thank you, Amy. Thank you all for your presentations and congratulations, Ryan, on the top paper. It was a difficult choice. All the submissions, all the papers are very, very strong, but I really enjoyed your paper on Mitú and getting the references. It was very enlightening and certainly pointing that we need a lot more research in this area.

So now I have questions. You can put your questions in the chat. One that's come up already is actually from one of our panelists, Mark, talking to Ryan. But I think this applies to all of us, thinking we've seen the rise of activism, of social movements, this idea of "cancel culture," which is not a term I particularly do like, but in the context of the wave we're seeing of activism, Mark wants to know, and Ryan, this is addressed to you, but everybody could jump in, whether activism could be a tool in showing publications that these patriarchal hegemonies, the whiteness, the maleness of journalism, that these approaches are no longer viable? A way of voting essentially by saying your practices are not in step with how we see the world and what we want to see happening. So, Ryan, I'll open it up to you, but other panelists can jump in.

Ryan Wallace I posed this question to Mark, and he gave some insightful backend answers on Twitter, but I think that it's something that we should really consider in looking at how news publications, may and often are kind of exempted from this sort of cancel culture. It's kind of like a change in administration might be called for, or a change in an editor and somebody is quickly removed, but we're not really questioning how patriarchy and these sorts of power and privilege are embedded deeply into legacy media. I kind of want to hear what Mark has to say on this one.

Mark Poepsel I just think that "cancel culture" is such a fraught term because the idea is like, how are people, like, permanently cancel? Who gets to cancel? And I would really defer to Maiju, Kirsi and Carolyn for talking about how online social movements can just take the power away from mainstream news organizations, so once you take power away from a patriarchal hegemonic body, then they have to wake up and pay attention, if for no other reason than to figure out how do I get my power back as a white, somewhat upper class, mediocre male speaking. Maybe not autobiographically, but maybe somewhat autobiographically. So Maiju, Kirsi and Carolyn, please take this, because your papers, I think, give us great examples for how power can be challenged.

Carolyn Nielsen I'll jump in for a second. I was just noting when Ryan was describing this phenomenon, of course, The New York Times Tom Cotton op-ed came to my mind and what we saw was, oh, OK, heads rolled, editor ousted, or ousted himself. But a lot of this came about from an unprecedented groundswell of activism from Black journalists and their allies within the newsroom, which is something that, if it's happened before, we haven't necessarily heard about it. So it was a public struggle. And so the solution there was, OK, the editor's gone. But that implies somehow we've rooted out the problem, which, of course, we have not. And so if we really interrogate those systems, we see that the same problems exist, and they're not fixed by one person being hired or one person being fired.

Maiju Kannisto Like we were seeing in our research that there were these positive opportunities for activist movements by using Twitter. But however, the ideological divisions were still strong because news media outlets, they gave a voice to this huge activist movement, but then again, they chose to whom, they gave the opportunities to speak up, and then again, the message was affected on the ideological orientation of the

news outlet. So there are positive opportunities. They got their voice and they got their message heard, and as our research shows, they shaped the news coverage. And they managed to prolong the coverage of the Parkland shooting. Like normally it's just two weeks, and then the news is old. But now, it was remarkably much longer, and they managed to change the debate.

Mark Poepsel That one was sustained, I mean, for a year, which is almost unheard of, almost unprecedented.

Kirsi Cheas Yeah, I was just going to add to what Maiju said earlier, and I was thinking of the Black Lives Matter movement and the responses to that. A lot of people have been saying, like, "we need to listen to those people. If we are privileged and other people are not then we actually have to really stop and listen and not assume that we already know what they're saying." And I think this kind of applies to our research also in the sense that in many contexts, the journalists did consider the voice of the activists, but just not quite enough, because the same ideologies that had been shaping the coverage the whole time were still there. So we, I think, still encouraging further listening to their voice and what they really have to say and not just not just listening superficially, so to speak.

Alfred Hermida I think I'd like to follow up on the points you have all raised, so in the recent book by my colleagues Candis Callison and Mary Lynn Young, "Reckoning," they talk about the crisis in journalism largely being represented as a business issue or technological issue. But they talk about the crisis of journalism being in the lack of representation of marginalized communities, gender coverage, coverage of indigenous communities and speaks much more to the issues we've talked about in terms of how what will be considered alternative voices are being represented and heard. So my question to all of you is what are the obstacles in front of this to to address these systematic issues of systematic racism, the systematic gender bias? To shift away from the "oh, it's a bad apple in our newsroom" or we need to make a couple of people changes? What are the obstacles there to this systematic change, and what can we as researchers do to try to encourage that?

Carolyn Nielsen I'll jump in. Journalism has an intersectionality problem, and both as people who teach journalism and as people who research in this field, we can all do more to bring awareness to that, both in our scholarship and in our teaching. When we're talking about systemic inequality and systemic bias, which is something that we haven't really heard about in news coverage until somewhat recently. In my recent book, I analyzed more than 1,700 news articles from the election of Obama through a year after Ferguson, and not one of them mentioned systemic racism. That wasn't a term that we heard. Now we're hearing it quite a bit more. But there is still is kind of a lack of understanding of what that means, and without an understanding of real intersectional representation, we're looking at systems that target race, but not other aspects of marginalized identity. And the people whose identities live at those intersections are facing the most bias and the most obstacles. Journalism likes to put people, like I said, in these tidy boxes. It's a very kind of black or white, good or bad. You're this. You're that. Without really understanding people's full lived experience. And until we come to understand that better, I don't really think things are going to improve.

Ryan Wallace I'll jump in after Carolyn too. I think that giving these sorts of problems like systemic racism a name is something that's really powerful and talking about it actively in news discourse could be something that journalists could start doing to integrate this more into their own work. One of the things that I find most interesting in Mitú is that they

actually call out things like pigmentocracies, colorism, machismo, these sorts of ideas in Latin American culture directly by name. And that's not really something that we're seeing in legacy media. So I think that that could be something that other publications could really take from this, and we, as researchers, could be calling out. I think that our research, what we're doing here is raising the flag and saying, look, this is what needs to be done, and these are the publications that are leading the way. And I think we need more research like that.

Mark Poepsel I wanted to reference a couple of the earlier presentations this morning and say it struck me that if you can't speak freely about women's issues in your newsroom, then you're not really free. And so what scholars can do is when we do our newsroom studies and we take the temperature of the culture of newsrooms today, we can ask if women and people of color feel confident that they can be themselves in those spaces. And if they can't, then we've at least diagnosed the problem and can track the problem in a more longitudinal way. And that's something that helps to be outside of the newsroom to do because you're not within arm's reach of getting fired for being the messenger and pointing out the systemic oppression. User privilege is sort of the, you know, maybe the tweet for that.

And then in terms of broader culture, you know, the double bind that women politicians find themselves in, where they have to be caring women, but also masculine enough to be seen as leaders, if we, sort of to follow Ryan's paper, if you sort of alter the societal definition of what masculinity is even good for and how men and masculinity should be defined, then you can start to see, what my paper is all about, is the inside out potential for change. Newsrooms in collaboration with broader publics.

Alfred Hermida Olga, I'd like to ask you, how does masculinity feature in terms of both journalism and the sort of the alternative journalists as they present themselves?

Olga Lazitski That's very interesting. It's a very interesting question. Well, as a matter of fact, 50% of alternative professional journalists are female and about 50%, in my sample, are my male. And I don't include that within my paper just for the safety reasons of my informants, but I think in my further work, I will analyze it, of course, in more detail. But I'm not sure how to proceed with that to keep their identities discreet. But from from my personal interactions, from my experience with them, it's not an issue in Russia. It's not an issue, I guess, when you're fighting something bigger than that, you kind of identify yourself with the... They don't identify themselves with the resistance. Right. But they have the bigger enemy. So they're kind of, in this sense, they're gender blind.

Alfred Hermida Thank you. I'd like to bring in a question that came in on the chat, and the question is around basically if media publications serve the interests of those who benefit from them, you know, does it matter whether it's a patriarchal hierarchy or matriarchal hierarchy? How does that feature into who those publications serve and who benefits from them?

Mark Poepsel So the power of the press belongs to the one who owns the press, and we have reams of field theory to talk about how it was a bigger box of the social, political and political economic reality that surrounds what anybody in the field of journalism can do. And I think it's difficult for those inside of newsrooms to push back on their publishers who pay their bills, and so that's just another reason to sort of lean heavily on the potential for crowds and for social movements. It's not a perfect answer. I don't have a perfect answer, because if I were a working journalist, as I was, you know, 15 years ago, I would have a

very hard time bringing up these issues and fighting about these issues, because it would probably mean fighting through a hierarchy. It would be an executive producer, a news director, a general manager on the broadcast side of things. Yeah, it's not easy.

Alfred Hermida Just to follow up on that and asking you all. So now that we're seeing this trend towards much more reader engagement, subscriptions, reader funding, a shift away from advertising as a model, this ties in back to the question we had around "cancel culture," where's the opportunity there in terms of both from the readers perspective to affect change and publications to be responsive if they're increasingly relying on the readership to support them financially?

Carolyn Nielsen To go back to the Tom Cotton example, I recall reading that The New York Times lost more subscriptions in a given period, I don't remember the amount of period, right after that happened than it had previously. And I do think there is this small ability for the audience to vote with its dollars. But I don't give that so much power, honestly. The news cycle is very fast, there's lots of churn. I just, I don't know that cancel culture can reach the level of a news organization. Perhaps it can. Maybe someone will prove me wrong, but it just seems like with things moving so quickly, it seems unrealistic.

Ryan Wallace One of the examples I was going to bring in is that I think that we underestimate the power that changing an editor can have, and we're like, OK, the publication will just continue to move on status quo. I always tell my students to look at Teen Vogue, and the male students in my class look at me very questionably. But Teen Vogue has had some recent editorial changes with females of color, and these journalists are pushing really important political stories, economic stories, stories about race and ideology and lived experiences. And so I think that looking at who are our editors and what sort of power they wield is also something that's really, really important.

Alfred Hermida Thank you. Another question that's come in address to Mark, but I think it's something we could all take on is how do newsroom leaders ask women about patriarchal control in newsrooms, especially if women, and this could apply to journalists of color as well, if they don't feel comfortable in the workspace or fear, they may suffer consequences as they speak out? What kind of strategies could be used to have honest conversations in the newsroom to tackle some of the whiteness and maleness in journalism?

It's one of the jobs of social scientists to tackle taboos and to talk about things people don't want to talk about and do so with informed consent, but with people who are anonymous in their sharing so that they don't have to talk to their boss about it. I mean, that's one of the places where it's really powerful to be a social scientist and to be able to go into places and ask those questions. And you set an agenda by the questions you ask as a researcher. That's how I was brought up in my graduate programs.

Alfred Hermida Anyone else who would like to jump in?

Ryan Wallace I would also say in the stories that individuals pitch, I had an editor that did not particularly like my science angle when I first started as a reporter, and every story that I ever wrote, it could have been about fashion or about like dyes in clothing or about economics, and I would always find a way to tie science back in. And eventually those stories will make it through. And I think that, like my practical advice would be for journalists not to be afraid to let their own positionally and their lived experiences to inform

their journalism. I think that it can not only help improve the gaps in their own reporting, but also help them connect with audiences in a much deeper way.

Mark Poepsel That's the same advice that Nikole Hannah-Jones had in her session where she was discussing just pursuing different angles of the same story until you get to tell the stories that you know are super important.

Alfred Hermida I'd like you all to think in terms of for researchers who might be watching this or for early career scholars, for doctoral students, who might be watching this. Some of us, in terms of directions for future research, based on the work you've already done, what are the questions that came out of your research that we still want to address and handle to give a steer to people interested in developing more scholarly work in this area?

Carolyn Nielsen I'm particularly interested in emerging models of born digital journalism and widening journalism scholarship so that we're not always looking or applying the same set of values to particular news organizations. Particularly, I've got a lot of pushback for researching BuzzFeed News, but BuzzFeed News is quite good. And in fact, Ta-Nehisi Coates says they're doing the best reporting on race in the country. So I think for people who are beginning or early in their careers, take your own path and don't just follow standards that other people have been doing for years and years and years, and be open to the idea that things might be changing.

Olga Lazitski I guess in my own research, since it's situated within different political and cultural context, so I'd like to see how things are going to be unfolding, because we are in this particular moment when this community of journalists that I'm study, they are playing a huge political role within the illiberal context. So I would like to first look at these structural issues with this particular community and then, of course, go deeper within the newsrooms to see how their relationships within newsrooms are unfolding, and how their lived experiences are informing their fight with something bigger than that.

Maiju Kannisto I think I'm interested about, because they are also always expectations when new technologies are arriving, that there will be more democratic access to everybody and a better world. And now when technology has changed a lot of journalism, I'm interested in these ethical questions. And I I'm quite hopeful because there have been constraints, and there has been a lot of debates about, for example, about mass shootings and how to cover them. And there has been a big change recently that the attention has has been turned from perpetrator to the victims and survivors. And there has been these ethical, like global, debates, and this has also been successful in changing the news practices and how to cover these mass shootings. And they have been global debates, so I'm interested in these global ethical debates.

Kirsi Cheas I'd like to add to that also the methodological aspect. I think it's very important for the researchers also to be very open to the materials that we're analyzing, because a lot of times there are assumptions at work. And when we were starting out this research, there were assumptions in the research literature that, for instance, the school shooting victims are not heard at all, and that there was this big separation between social media and legacy media. And yet when we analyzed the materials, we actually found that the legacy media was really attentive to the Parkland kids and their tweet posts and all that. So the methodological approach is very important because that allows the research to be transparent and reliable.

Alfred Hermida Thank you. We have another question to follow up on that came in the chat room, which is to speak a little bit more about your experiences in researching, doing research in these areas. What motivated you to study these issues? When did you realize something needed to be done, and what did you learn in the process of looking at these issues of patriarchy, of privilege in the media?

Mark Poepsel I had a graduate student who was interested in entertainment studies and who asked me to chair her thesis. Someone who'd been a student of mine from being a junior in her undergraduate program. Her name was Madeline Gerard, and we coauthored a paper that was an entertainment studies paper, and then she wrote a thesis that had to do with intersectionality as represented in film and specifically in Marvel movies. And so it didn't necessarily start from my journalism studies area, but I basically took things that we had worked on that I had learned about in the process of trying to be a good thesis chair and combine them with, you know, my other major research area of interest in participatory journalism and asked "how might we"? It's almost an entrepreneurial question. You know, the world needs to change, and who's to say it's not us to change it? How might we approach these questions with the privilege that we have?

The hegemony of men and masculinities approach is really good for putting the pressure back on men to change and not just treating women's movements like a thing that women do, and then men are, you know, sort of begrudgingly pulled along in little fits and starts. It's a means of expressing full participation for men and changing mindsets about masculinity. And even in that area of a critical feminist theory, instead of critiquing masculinities, it's about critiquing men, because ultimately it's individuals who benefit. Individuals who will have to change. And if you have enough individuals with positions of power in news organizations attend and listen to ISOJ, you might be able to effect greater change faster. And that's part of the goal.

Carolyn Nielsen I'm a white woman who writes about racism in the news, and so I researched something that I don't live. But my research interest is actually born of my experience as a journalist for more than a decade, covering communities of color and watching how newsroom decisions have been made. And really very early in my career, seeing things that did not reflect the values I was taught to uphold, seeing that the practicedidn't mirror what the SPJ code of ethics was calling on us to do, and understanding pretty quickly whose lives and traumas were seen as valuable and whose were to be ignored. I came into journalism very idealistically. I think I research still a little bit idealistically, and I want us to uphold the best things that journalism can be.

Ryan Wallace I would say I entered this research a little bit more from a personal perspective, not seeing myself necessarily represented in news media. I was born with white hair. I have green eyes. My last name is Wallace. Not everybody knew, at first, that I'm Hispanic and Latino, and I grew up in a household where we spoke Spanish as our first language before English. And so the media that I always consumed was bilingual. I watched Hispanic television, Latino journalism, but also I would watch what was also on the television with my friends and read newspapers like The New York Times. So seeing this gap in my own identity and what I was consuming and seeing that I was sometimes the other, I think that really informed my perspective in seeing what sort of publications are trying to speak to me and to the people that are within my own community.

And there's a story in my Mitú article that I talked about the Instagram post and the article that most resonated with myself was actually about fideo soup, which I grew up eating every week with my family. And my family is strange, they put bananas in the tomato soup

because it makes it sweet. And I thought it was just my family, but apparently Latinos all over the United States and all over Latin America do it with different ingredients. And so that for me was the first time I felt seen. It is really funny, a really small story, but it was something that was really cool and impactful when I was doing this research.

Alfred Hermida Thank you, Ryan. Thank you for sharing that.

Olga Lazitski Well, I first started researching something completely different, so I was a journalist myself. I started working as a journalist in 2000, so I had been working for the national Russian news network. I was working for a couple of international outlets. I had been working for 14 years. And then the Crimean crisis happened, so 2014 happened. And at that point I was a news editor for one of the Russian national news shows on the national network. And I just decided that, well, it's not right to keep reproducing this system of hierarchy that I just have to quit. And I was not the only one. So a lot of people who were working with me at the time, a lot of my colleagues, decent colleagues, they left. And they either quit journalism at all, or they started researching what the propagandistic efforts, or they started doing their own alternative projects.

So I started researching propagandistic efforts of Putin's regime. But then I decided that it's too boring. Like everyone was studying propaganda. There is nothing. It's so obvious. So I decided just to give credit to the people who are trying to stay decent, to kind of oppose this system of hierarchy, which is very, very strong still in Russia. So the outlets I'm studying, they're very small. They're just growing right now. They're not that influential as the mainstream media. But I have hope, like I think that the game changers are them. So that's how I ended up studying what I'm doing right now. So I totally relate, and these are people who are my friends and my colleagues.

Kirsi Cheas I was just going to add that Miaju and I are actually from Finland, and we ended up studying Parkland school shooting in the U.S. media. In case you were wondering why, we were working for North American studies at the time, but also we thought it was an interesting approach because we were from Finland where school shootings are not common at all, whereas in the U.S. they're unfortunately very common. So I think we really had a unique opportunity to relate. It was shocking for us. The whole context, I think, was shocking for us, and I think that gave us this kind of outside perspective that helped us to question things that American scholars, or journalists, perhaps don't think about in the same way, because there maybe too used to this. At the same time, we could perhaps understand the request of the young generation saying this is enough, because for us it was completely and very, very difficult understand how we can have so many shootings in schools. So I just think this cross0national perspective can be very fruitful, even if it might seem odd that Finish scholars are studying American school shootings. But it's actually not odd. I think it's just fruitful.

Alfred Hermida Maiju, is there anything you'd like to add?

Yeah, I think it would just be this process that I've been learning a lot, because there have been so many questions that you ask, and then like one question leads to more questions. Like when you open up the whole U.S. gun culture, and looking from outside it's very different and very odd. So I think this has been, like when we are studying news outlets, but this has been a journey for U.S. gun culture and the U.S. media system and a lot of context.

Alfred Hermida Thank you. And so we're almost out of time, we have some questions we haven't got to so apologies for those of you who submitted some questions. As chair of the session, I'll take the last question. I want to go around and ask you all to share a key take away from your research, either something that scholars can take back into the classroom, into their research, or that journalists can take into their newsrooms. And Ryan will start with you as the winner of the top paper.

Ryan Wallace Thank you. I think I've kind of already touched on it. I think that the most important takeaway would be to let your own positionality inform your journalism. I think that that's really something that resonated with Mitú and talking about publications like Teen Vogue. And I think that that's something that all journalists can do, is look at where they themselves are positioned in society, what sorts of privileges and disadvantages they also are a part of, and then try to make their stories reach around that, and try to not only look at the same types of sources, but maybe opening up the doors. And talking about the Parkland shooting, I wondered if journalists could not perhaps have elevated the voices of other people with less social capital than the students that were already talking about it.

Alfred Hermida Thank you, Ryan, and each of you, 30 seconds. A key takeaway to share.

Mark Poepsel If you have white male privilege, interrogate it and then use it.

Carolyn Nielsen Understand intersectionality. Learn about it. Ask yourself questions about how and why you are putting people in tidy boxes that don't reflect the full picture of their identities.

Olga Lazitski I think always remember where there is hegemonic power, there is always resistance. And journalism is powerful. Journalists, regardless of the constraints in the system that they have to work within, they are powerful. And it's up to you guys, up to really good professional journalists who are serving the public, to decide how to serve and how to do public good.

Kirsi Cheas I would just say simply listen and don't assume, and I think that applies as much to journalists interviewing sources, not assuming that someone's privileged or underprivileged, and as researchers studying the media, not assuming that someone is doing something better than the other, but really listening and reading and trying to capture the actual experience that is there.

Maiju Kannisto And as a media scholar, just thinking of the different strengths of different media. Like Twitter has different strengths than what media and news and journalism can have, so like Twitter is a place for anger and hope and coordination of action. But when you are doing the news, you have a different task. And tweets can lead you for another way, and you need to ask questions and not just use tweets of the people.

Alfred Hermida Thank you all very much. Thank you for your time, for sharing your insights, for sharing your rich research and for contributing to this discussion. Really appreciate it. And of course, big thank you to Rosental, to Amy, to Mallary, to the entire ISOJ team for putting on an amazing event. ISOJ really is the best journalism conference on the planet bar none, and I'm really glad we're able to do this virtually this year. So thank you all very much for your research. Thank you for tuning in. Thank you for the questions and for watching and onwards. Thank you.

Mallary Tenore Thank you so, so much. This was wonderful and, you know, one of the really unique aspects of ISOJ is that it brings together journalists and journalism educators, and so I think there's a lot of knowledge that can be shared and gained at that professional and academic intersection. And this panel was a great reflection of that. So I want to extend a big congratulations to all of you for your research, which, as Amy mentioned, has been published in the 10th edition of the ISOJ Research Journal, and also want to give an especially big congrats to Ryan Wallace for winning the top paper award. Congratulations. Very well deserved. So thank you.

And for those of you who are with us, I just want to remind you about our last panel of the day, which starts at 4 p.m. Central, and it will be focused on product management. So we've got a great lineup of speakers and they're going to be looking at how news organizations can become more audience driven, or data driven, and more product focused. So check out ISOJ.org for more details, and thank you so much for joining us. We'll see you soon.