

# Reviews

The reviews pages are edited by Tor Clark. If you have a book you would like to review or have come across a new book we should know about please get in touch. Also if you have recently had a book published and would like to see it reviewed, please contact Tor on [tclark@dmu.ac.uk](mailto:tclark@dmu.ac.uk)

---

## Reviews section introduction

By Reviews Editor Tor Clark, University of Leicester

**Welcome to the latest Journalism Education Reviews Section which has an appropriately ‘start of term’ focus on aspects of journalism which lecturers and educators will want to be discussing in the lectures and seminars of the 2018-19 academic year.**

Pioneering former Guardian editor Alan Rusbridger was at the centre and forefront of many of the most interesting and significant changes in journalism over the last 25 years, not least in turning his newspaper’s website into the one of the most-read journalism platforms in the world. His very recently published book *Breaking News: The Remaking of Journalism and Why it Matters Now*, is, says reviewer John Mair, part memoir and part manifesto. Students of the recent history of journalism and of its future will want to find out more.

Football journalism has grown and grown over the decades and has come to dominate journalism’s sports coverage. The phenomenon is examined in impressive depth by Roger Domenech in *From the Back Page to the Front Page*, offering us, as reviewer Professor Richard Keeble notes, a mirror on society as much as on journalism. With sports journalism – and football journalism in particular – now playing such a major part in journalism education, this new book offers excellent context for students and lecturers.

Well-known AJE event attendee Angela Phillips, working alongside Eiri Elvestad, has a new book out looking at that all too topical question of how social media is affecting journalism. Frances Yeoman picked up this text with trepidation, but was pleasantly surprised by the positive message it offered on the centrality of good journalism to its digital platforms.

And finally, to end at the end, as it were, journalism ethics expert (and co-editor of this journal) Professor Chris Frost, has enjoyed another new book, looking at the reporting of death, including how it too has been transformed by social media.

*Reporting Bad News: Negotiating the Boundaries Between Intrusion and Fair Representation in Media Coverage of Death* has been written by two AJE stalwarts, Sallyanne Duncan and Jackie Newton, and delves deeply into an often avoided area of journalism, which both academics have been researching for many years and which will be useful both practically and ethically to journalism students everywhere.

*Journalism Education* is always keen to review as many new books about journalism as possible so, if you would like to review a book which will be of use to journalism educators and students for the next edition of *Journalism Education*, please contact [tor.clark@leicester.ac.uk](mailto:tor.clark@leicester.ac.uk).

# Alan Rusbridger, *Breaking News, The Remaking of Journalism and Why it Matters Now* Canongate £20.00 September 2018

Review by John Mair

**Alan Rusbridger is a quiet giant of modern British journalism. Like it or loathe it, he and the Guardian that he edited set the agenda for the two decades. Phone hacking, Wikileaks, Snowden, The Panama Papers et al, the ‘Graun’ was at the heart of most of the big stories.**

Now he has written a memoir (of sorts) and a manifesto for the future of journalism. It is a cracking read as you would expect of a great writer. This is a tome that all journalism educators should buy (yes!), read and digest. As Rusbridger changed the way we perceived journalism-making it international, digital, inclusive and more do, this should change the way we teach what we call ‘journalism’

By definition, every journalism lecturer is teaching historical truths. One week out of modern newsroom and you are out of date. Keeping up with the New World requires hard work, stretch and imagination- Reading this book is a good start

On the very positive side of the AR register, he led the Guardian, blinking, into the digital future until it became the third most read news website in the English language, was garlanded for its exclusives and won a coveted Pulitzer Prize (the first for a British newspaper) in 2014. British award juries were more churlish. I have served on many-where they barely disguise their hatred of the paper.

Alan, like John Birt at the BBC, saw the future and it was digital. Simply, the internet was going to transform journalism and lead to the (near) death of print as a platform. ‘Dead Tree journalism’ was simply in the intensive care ward. His view, bolstered by the intellectual capital provided by Emily Bell, then of his paper and now at Columbia University, was very prescient

Right long term, less so short term.

The days of industry bodies claiming ‘print will come back’ seem a long time ago. They were whistling whilst the Titanic sunk. Where, now, is the Oldham Evening Chronicle?

Transformation took bravery and it took money. News and digital labs were set up to run alongside and away from the print Guardian. Whisper it gently but some of them manned by non-journalists, computer programmers even! Cue mutual suspicion. Eventually the two became totally integrated in the newsroom and Rusbridger adopted a policy of ‘digital/web first’ for all news. Free too-no pay wall. Thereby, lies the rub. Free news at the point of delivery! That set the market price at zero. It led to the Guardian/Observer bleeding money as the anticipated new flow of digital advertising revenue did not arrive in time to make up for lost print. Indeed, that point has only just been reached in 2018.

From the small acorn of Guardian Unlimited, the first online iteration, the ‘paper’ has expanded to the huge digital treasure trove it is today; full of content and good journalism, full of comment as well as sacred facts, full of innovations like data blogs and data journalism and longer form video and, multinational with Australian and American editions making it truly 24/7.

It is hard to remember a time before the Guardian Online. Also, hard to remember the last time I bought a print copy. Circulation of that is down to less than 140,000 in July 2018. Digital is now at 25 million monthly hits in the UK alone.

On the not so positive AR ledger side, the digital path ate up the reserves of the Scott Trust who ‘own’ the Guardian. The six hundred million pound legacy of owning and selling Auto Trader (a wonderful investment and a cash cow) was depleting year by year. Fleet Street sages, already up in arms over the Guardian’s expose of their dirty phone hacking laundry and the Leveson Inquiry, were getting ready to jump on the paper’s grave with some glee.

Rusbridger, who displays a surprising commercial savviness in this book, ignored the premature obituaries and continued to innovate ...and to spend. Solvency was just around the corner he promised. It was along corner. He left on a high in 2015 after winning the Pulitzer Prize for the Snowden revelations. That had required resolve with the British government arriving at the paper to smash up laptops with dangerous subversive info. Fortunately, digital copies existed in the US and elsewhere where governments were less ham fisted. Snowden saw the light of day worldwide.

Now AR is the head of house at Lady Margaret Hall in Oxford, still innovating, still disrupting the status

quo. I went to dinner there last term and met some students who had done a 'foundation year' to get into the elitist Oxbridge. One black young woman could not contain her excitement.

Post hoc, there has been somewhat of a thrashing of Rusbridger's reputation at the paper and wider afield. He lost the chairmanship of the Scott Trust - his reward for the long editorship - after a battle and a period of deadlock. Now he is just a contributor from down the M40. That is a pity. His lasting achievement is there in cyberspace for all to see.

The paper has survived on all platforms; thrived on some.

For educators, Rusbridger also offers lessons for all journalism on how to adapt and not die. British newspapers have been woeful in their embrace of the web. Woeful and wrong. Too little, too late. The audience and the advertisers have long drifted from them to there. Only niche publications like the FT and the Economist have truly survived the digital tsunami by lassoing their audiences behind a pay wall. Facebook and Google are the new Masters of the advertising universe. They have eaten the lunches of the legacy media tout court. The cadaver with little revenue and lost jobs is all that remains. Little strategy, little imagination. Where is the Rochdale Observer - in the newspaper graveyard that is where. The editor told me a decade back that his policy was to 'bung the paper on the net'. Not a wise move, then or now.

America has fared little better with only the New York Times and the Washington Post truly holding their heads above the digital tide; one by a clever semi porous paywall, the other thanks to a very wealthy sugar daddy from Amazon. Most have drowned. In July 2018, the New York Daily News announced the retrenchment of half of its' journalists, the latest chapter in the not so slow death of US City journalism.

So, what is there to learn from Rusbridger's Guardian Glory Days? Good journalism always shines through but needs imagination, will power and money. It also needs to be realistic. Some of the Rusbridger innovations like Open Journalism, creation of on-line communities were perhaps an idea too far - expensive ones too.

You always need to find a way to pay.. Rusbridger never solved that conundrum and his successors only just are at the price of rowing back in scale, range and ambition, simply begging from readers and lost jobs.

But, none of that takes away from Rusbridger's greatness as an editor. Buy this book, read it on any platform you can find. Pass it on to your students.

It is an important text; a bright light in a very foggy future.

**\*John Mair is the editor of twenty five books on journalism. The latest 'Anti-social media?'" (with Tor Clark, Neil Fowler, Raymond Snoddy and Richard Tait) will be published in the autumn by Abramis.**

## From the Back Page to the Front Page

by Roger Domeneghetti

Review by Professor Richard Keeble, University of Lincoln

**Rave reviews greeted the first edition of this text in 2014. Indeed, in tiny type, selected highlights from 17 reviews pack the first two pages of this updated edition, from Hugh McIlvanney through the likes of the *New Statesman* and Roy Greenslade to Professor Martin Conboy, of Sheffield University.**

It's easy to see why this study of the English media's coverage of football should have won such praise. In Domeneghetti's hands, the subject matter is vast. Not only are the histories of newspaper, magazine, radio, film and television reporting brought bang up to date but there are impressive sections on betting, the manufacture of heroes, novels about football, women's football, fanzines and even comics. The background research is awesome: I counted more than 240 references at the end while bottom-of-the page notes are used discreetly throughout to add not only intriguing information but often witty asides.

A journalist for almost 20 years on titles as different as *Daily Star Sunday* and the *Morning Star*, Domeneghetti, now a university lecturer, writes in a way that students might well seek to emulate. With the effortless ease and elegance of Liverpool's Mo Salah dribbling his way past defenders to tap the ball into the goal, he blends fact-packed historical narratives with sociological analyses and human interest profiles.

The section on Roy of the Rovers comic character (pp. 282-287) is typical of Domeneghetti's approach beginning with fascinating and detailed historical context - then moving on to explanation and analysis. He traces the origins of English comics to 1832 with the publication of *The Boys' and Girls' Penny Magazine*. It ran for just 23 issues but claimed a sale of 835,000 at its peak. *The Boy's Own Paper* was launched in 1879 by the Religious Tract Society to provide 'first class stories for boys of all backgrounds'. It spawned

a new wave of publications which presented an idealised image of masculinity: “The main characters were fair-minded, plucky, athletic and had upper lips of the stiff variety.” Then, in the 1950s, all changed with the birth of Roy of the Rovers in *Tiger*.

Roy Race went on to enjoy an amazing 44-year playing career (in various publications) for Melchester Rovers during which he won three European Cups, ten League titles and eight Cup Winners’ Cups. But Domeneghetti shows how the comic, while extraordinarily popular, reinforced sexist and xenophobic attitudes. “There was a place for women in his world but it was mainly on the periphery. When fans were occasionally shown watching Rovers on TV they were male with women (sister or mothers) only in the background, either disinterested or providing tea for their menfolk.” Moreover, Roy Race tapped into a worrying distrust of outsiders. “The comic’s implicit message was clear: abroad is a dangerous place and foreigners, just like women, are not to be trusted.” The chapter ends with this conclusion: “The biggest irony of all is that the most heroic of all English footballers – Roy Race – is also the most synthetic; he was the one who never existed at all.”

All that said, the handling of the references is somewhat idiosyncratic. They only appear bunched together at the end so it’s impossible to know while reading where the information comes from. Professor Stephen Wagg is interviewed at length (pp. 145-148) and his seminal text, *The Football World* (1984), is mentioned but it does not feature in the bibliography. There is a fascinating exploration of BS Johnson’s avant-garde novels (pp. 248-249) but the wonderful biography by Jonathan Coe, *Like a Fiery Elephant* (2005), is not referenced. The English businessman/spy, Edgar Sanders is misspelt as Saunders (p. 146). And while Domeneghetti says it is ‘now pretty clear’ Sanders did have links with British intelligence, this was also known at the time in 1949 after the *Daily Telegraph* inadvertently leaked the information.

These are minor quibbles. It was George Orwell who said that the football pools – along with fish-and-chips, tinned salmon, cut-price chocolate, art-silk stockings, the movies, the radio and strong tea – had helped avert revolution in Britain. Reading Domeneghetti’s super study one gets a sense of the importance of footie in the life and soul (and media) of the country – and how right Orwell was!

***From the Back Page to the Front Row: Football’s Journey Through the English Media, Glasgow: Ockley Books, 2017.***

## Misunderstanding News Audiences: Seven Myths of the Social Media Era by Eiri Elvestad and Angela Phillips

Review by Frances Yeoman, Liverpool John Moores University

**The difficulty with writing an academic volume about the myths of news in the social media era is that the evolution of those myths will always outpace publication.**

As they acknowledge in the conclusion of their excellent book, Eiri Elvestad and Angela Phillips set out to examine and challenge what was only recently the prevailing wisdom around journalism and democracy in the internet age – largely utopian ideas around the web’s democratising potential, the participant audience, the enfranchisement of marginalised communities and the creation of global citizens – and found themselves facing a very different climate by the time their book neared completion.

“In the final months of writing,” they note, “it has been an effort to side-step a new wave of myth-making, with almost daily news updated on stolen elections, oligarchs of the Internet with secret plans to manipulate data, and moral panics about fake news.”

They should be applauded for that effort. In avoiding the temptation to turn on a sixpence and repackage their ideas to fit our most recent (and perhaps fleeting) preoccupations, they have instead gathered a wealth of disparate academic research on digital news consumption, their own and that of many others, into a more durable and useful text that says much about the wider fundamentals of modern society and democracy.

Their central thesis is around the importance of ‘bridging media’ – mainstream outlets, especially public service media, which can generate a core shared reality around which myriad alternatives can orbit.

“Without the centre they cannot be a periphery,” they argue, only a series of unconnected, often mutually exclusive world views. That might sound both familiar and somewhat depressing. Yet *Misunderstanding News Audiences*, for all its critiques of the ‘Californian oligopoly’ and the myriad problems of our digital world, is fundamentally an optimistic book, in that it makes that case that we are not powerless against the

transformational force of the internet.

Journalism educators in particular can take heart from several of its themes. One is that the world still needs the journalists we educate and train. No, everyone is not a reporter, they argue, highlighting studies showing how uninterested in user-generated content many consumers are, and pointing out that while “the power of mobile technology in the hands of ordinary citizens has transformed witnessing,” it takes a journalist to interrogate, sift, curate and contextualise that mass of Tweets, viral videos and Instagram posts, just as reporters have always dealt with evidence and sources. Publishing is not the same thing as journalism.

Another theme is that our students still need us, to teach them how to do journalism but also how to consume it. The ‘digital native generation’, instinctively equipped to deal with the challenges of the internet, is a dangerous myth, Elvestad and Phillips contend. More than ever, in this era of information overload, young people need experienced and trusted adults to guide them. “We should not take it for granted that being born into the net generation brings with it the skills to navigate online,” they write, “any more than being born into the car generation ensures that their parents knew how to drive”.

As domestic news consumption habits become more private and personalised, thus reducing their socialising force – a parent might read the Guardian app on their phone rather than the paper at the breakfast table – that guidance will have to be more pro-active. The implication is we must teach our students how to identify quality news, as well as generate it. And if young people are not as devoted to news as we might like, lest we forget: young people have never really liked news anyway. The evidence put forward suggests today’s youth are not less trusting of the news media than older people, and are showing more signs of being prepared to pay for journalism. There is hope.

There are also many difficulties ahead, of course. They include, for the researcher and the educator, the dominance of US research in this field. This means our understanding of the evolving news landscape, and the readily-available resources for teaching about it, are skewed towards a market and a set of challenges not necessarily replicated elsewhere. Elvestad and Phillips make a valuable contribution towards correcting this by drawing on evidence from around the globe wherever possible, although more primary research still needs to be done outside the USA.

In addition to this important cultural corrective, they offer a concise, highly-readable digest of the literature on news audiences in the social media era, a diagnosis of what ails us and at least the beginnings of a prescription for improvement. No mean feat in a book of just 169 pages, which would be a useful addition to the reading lists of many students and lecturers alike.

**Misunderstanding News Audiences: Seven Myths of the Social Media Era** by Eiri Elvestad and Angela Phillips, published 2018 by Routledge, 180 pages, 9781138215191, £29.99.

## **Reporting Bad News: Negotiating the Boundaries Between Intrusion and Fair Representation in Media Coverage of Death, Sallyanne Duncan and Jackie Newton**

Review by Professor Chris Frost, Liverpool John Moores University

**Little charts a student’s progress through a good Journalism undergraduate course like their approach to ethics and the view on the balance between individual privacy and the right to publish and this is particularly true when that potential intrusion involves the death knock.**

Classes of first year students are often adamant that the death knock is wrong: insensitive, intrusive and unnecessary. By the third year, most have come to terms with the need for it; one or two may even have done one whilst on work placement. The few who still see it as wrong do not usually go into journalism.

Duncan and Newton’s new book, based on their extensive research published in several well-received papers, looks at the death knock and the poor reputation it has following highly-publicised examples, usually at places of disaster and mass death. The Manchester Arena bombing, reporting the Grenfell Tower disaster, Hillsborough and the Liverpool fans; all tragedies that attracted much criticism for the way they were reported and the methods some reporters used to get interviews. More can be added to make a long list, one

long enough and painful enough to make anyone condemn insensitive reporting.

It is this condemnation that Duncan and Newton hope to challenge by exchanging insensitivity for good practice. The aim of their new book is to:

*Turn this focus around by looking at what works in the relationship between journalists and the bereaved, survivors and the vulnerable. It is hoped that by examining good practice in contemporary death reporting, explaining its public service role and proposing a new model of ethical participation we can help change the wider perception of the practice. while offering journalists a tool with which to assess their actions."*

The book starts with an examination of the public approach to death over the past few centuries and the media's part in that as public mourning especially as it becomes more fashionable towards the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century. Huge outpourings of grief following the death of Princess Diana and other celebrities were noted as television brought us closer to people many had long admired from afar.

I've done death knocks whilst working as a reporter and felt much the same anxiety as others as I approached the door of parents whose child had just been killed, or the wife of a man who, along with three others, had been shot to death at work by a former colleague early on one Valentine's Day. *Reporting Bad News* interviews reporters dealing with even more gruesome stories such as Dunblane or Hillsborough. No more or less painful for the bereaved relatives, but far more difficult for witnesses and for the reporters than a simple murder or accident. Just writing the review brings back to me some of the horror of those and similar stories and leads me to tip my hat to Duncan and Newton for not only reporting such stories themselves in the past but for writing such an important book that involved gathering evidence by taking witnesses, the bereaved and journalists back through the most traumatic periods of their lives. It is not surprising that they have included a chapter about the need for trauma counselling and training for reporters.

It is Duncan and Newton's thesis, and one I have long supported, that sensitive reporting can be of benefit to the bereaved, giving them the opportunity to praise their loved ones. Cynics might say that every such story becomes a hagiography of the golden girl and boy who was as kind, thoughtful and generous as they were fun, and laughter-loving and were certain to enjoy a happy-ever-after future. But in the mind of the bereaved that is what they are and we should be as happy to tell their story about their loss as we should be to report the facts of the incident that caused their death.

The book goes into some depth in chapter six and seven about why a death knock might be important to the bereaved and considers how best to approach them both to minimize distress and maximise access. The bereaved should have considerable control over the memorializing of their loved one and many (but not all, as we should remember) want that opportunity. Duncan and Newton talk through how this is best achieved based on their research with a number of bereaved relatives and with reporters over several years. The book discusses interview techniques and the ethical issues they present. The book also discusses writing and looks at potential narrative styles, modes of representation and the different characters available. It also looks briefly at the use of image – a matter worthy of a book of its own.

Finally the book looks at better ways of training and educating students to both assist them in their future careers and to ensure better representation of death knock stories in the news. With this book on your bookshelf, and its research and advice in your mind, and the mind of colleagues, there will be better reporting of tragedies in the future allowing the public better understanding of the reality of disasters and the bereaved a better chance to commemorate their dead.

**Sallyanne Duncan and Jackie Newton, *Reporting Bad News: Negotiating the Boundaries Between Intrusion and Fair Representation in Media Coverage of Death*, Peter Lang, 222 pages**



# Style guide

**Please provide a title and an abstract and author details together with a 50-70 word biography for each author on a separate sheet to allow for anonymization. This sheet will be separated from the article before being sent to referees so please put the title only at the start of the article.**

- Sub-heads should be in bold
- Second order sub-heads should be in bold italic
- Please use single quotation marks (double quotation marks for a quote within a quote)
- Indent long quotes of two lines or more.
- Please do not use the enter button to insert space between paragraphs or headings.
- All illustrations, tables and figures should be sent separately either at the end of the MS Word file or as attached JPGs. Clearly label approximately where they should be placed with fig 1, table 1 etc.

**Citations and bibliographic references should be in Harvard style.**

## Part I: Citations

Place references in your work in the following order: Name, Date: page number(s)

For example,

1. Directly quoting an author

It is sometimes forgotten that 'English is one of the most flexible and expressive languages in the world' (Hicks, 1993, p.1)

He goes on to say, 'In brief, the reigning media consensus has been characterised either as overly liberal or leftist or as conservative, depending on the view of the critic' (McQuail, 1992, pp.255-6).

2. Indirectly quoting an author (where you sum up what is being stated in your own words). This must be grammatically correct, as well as accurate.

E.g.: Hargreaves (2003, p.47) believes that Henry Hetherington's populist journalistic techniques, employed by him in the 1830s, were the basis of tabloid journalism.

3. Referring broadly to ideas you have read in a publication (not to a specific point/quote). You don't need to cite page number in this case. E.g.: Franklin (1997) has highlighted the effects and reasons for so-called dumbing down in the media.

4. If the same person is referred to immediately after a previous citation, you can use *ibid*.

5. If there are more than two authors, you can use *et al*.

## Part II: Bibliographic References

A list of Bibliographic References is required at the end. Please provide the FULL name of the author (including first name) and provide references in alphabetical order of surname. With an author who has written a number of books and articles that have been cited, list them all separately, with the most recent first (see Manning).

Examples of how to present Bibliographic references for Journalism Education are given below

Bibliographic references

Franklin, Bob (2003) 'A Good Day to Bury Bad News?': Journalists, Sources and the Packaging of Politics in Simon Cottle (Ed.), *News, Public Relations Power*, London: Sage pp. 45-61

Hall, Stuart, Critcher, Chas, Jefferson Tony, Clarke John, and Roberts, Brian (1978) *Policing the Crisis. Mugging, the State and Law and Order*. London: Macmillan

Harcup, Tony (2004) in Susan Pape and Sue Featherstone (2006) *Feature Writing*, London: Sage.

# Information for contributors

**We accept original articles about journalism education and topics linked to journalism and education that are not offered for publication elsewhere at the time of submission. Articles for peer review should be in the range of 5000-7000 words.**

Articles for Comment and Criticism should be shorter at about 3,000 to 4,000 words.

The copy deadline for the next issue is: February 28, 2018 but material sent earlier would be appreciated. Articles should be submitted to the editors at [ajejournal@gmail.com](mailto:ajejournal@gmail.com) together with a 100-150 word abstract and 100 word bibliography. Comment and criticism articles can be more polemic and do not require an abstract.

## Presentation and submission:

A detailed style guide is available on the website and should be followed carefully but a redacted version is on the left. Articles should be produced in MS Word format, set in Times New Roman 12pt with the minimum of formatting. Please **do not** press the “enter” button to put a double space between paragraphs or add additional spaces and do not use specialist templates. Referencing should be in standard Harvard form. Please ensure surname and forename for all authors. Notes should be set as endnotes. All **tables and figures must be** produced separately either at the end of the article or in a separate file. Each should be clearly labelled Table 1:..... Table 2:..... Fig. 1:..... Fig. 2: etc and a note inserted in the text identifying approximately where it should be placed.

## Book Reviews:

Reviews of appropriate books should be approximately 400 words. We do not accept unsolicited reviews of books, but are always grateful to be given the opportunity to consider a review proposal. Please contact Tor Clark, the reviews editor, if you wish to submit a review. All book reviews should include author, title, ISBN number, publisher, number of pages and price.

## Copyright:

Authors should confirm they have cleared all copyrighted work for publication and agree that they will indemnify the editors against claims for defamation, copyright infringement or plagiarism. All authors will be asked to sign a contract confirming this.

## Process:

Papers are sent to at least two referees for comment. On return your paper will be accepted, accepted following editing as identified by the referees or refused. Comment and criticism pieces and book reviews will be decided by the editors but may be accepted on the basis that they are edited as identified.

## Proofs:

Once accepted, authors are expected to return proofs within 72 hours of receipt.

# Journalism Education

The Journal of the Association for Journalism Education

The Association for Journalism Education is a subject discipline membership association of journalism schools in higher education institutions in the UK and Ireland.

**Volume Seven, number one. Inside this issue:**

## Articles

**From Newsroom to Classroom: exploring the transition from journalism practitioner to journalism educator**, *Catherine Russell, University of Portsmouth and Sue Eccles, Bournemouth University,*

**Cuban journalism students: between ideals and state ideology**, *Anne Natvig, University of Oslo;*

**Gendering Worcester News**, *Barbara Mitra University of Worcester; Leisa Taylor, Women's Equality Party; Coral Milburn-Curtis, Green Templeton College, University of Oxford; and Jem McCarron Women's Equality Party;*

**Autoethnography: A methodology to integrate professional and academic learning in journalism education**, *Margaret Hughes, University of West Scotland,*

## Comment and criticism

**Identity Crisis v Ethical dilemmas: The Struggle of practicing journalism in a small hill town of India**, *Pradeep Nair;*

**International journalism development**, *Kenneth Pratt*

## Book reviews

**Breaking News: The Remaking of Journalism and Why it Matters Now** by Alan Rusbridger, reviewed by John Mair; **From the Back Page to the Front Page** by Roger Domeneghetti, reviewed by Richard Keeble; **Angela Phillips and Eiri Elvestad, Reporting Bad News: Negotiating the Boundaries Between Intrusion and Fair Representation in Media Coverage of Death** by Sallyanne Duncan and Jackie Newton reviewed by Chris Frost

ISSN: 2050-3930

Journalism Education is published by the Association for Journalism Education and you can contact the editors on [AJEjournal@gmail.com](mailto:AJEjournal@gmail.com)