

Reviews

Berit von der Lippe, Rune Ottosen (eds.): *Gendering War and Peace Reporting. Some Insights - Some Missing Links*. Gothenburg [Nordicom] 2016, 278 pages, EUR 32

reviewed by Julia Lönnendonker

The collection of essays *Gendering War and Peace Reporting*, edited by von der Lippe and Ottosen, examines the role of gender in war reporting. Reporting on war has traditionally been dominated by men: Not only are the majority of war reporters past and present male, but their sources, including politicians, high-ranking military, and civil servants, are also often men.

The editors consider whether the increasing presence of women – both as war reporters and as actors in the military and politics – has changed reporting from the front and whether the female perspective has led to a greater focus on the victims of war, rather than the technical and strategic aspects that dominated in the past. The answers to these questions remain unclear, and there is no deterministic link between gender and more ›peaceful‹ news. However, the forces that shape our collective perspective are still dominated by male voices to this day. Traditionally masculine stories still shape the rules of the game of war (cf. 9). Following an introduction from the editors, the collection consists of 15 articles. They are divided into four themed sections, each of which contains three or four chapters on gender and war and peace journalism through the lens of the respective theme.

In the introduction, von der Lippe and Ottosen explain the thematic association between gender and war and peace reporting, creating a basis that aids understanding of the various articles. The very brief introduction gives a rather trenchant overview of the topic, shining a light on the huge range of perspectives.

The ›A third gender or post-colonial flashback‹ section, in which the authors provocatively discuss the increasing number of Western female journalists in the Islamic world, is particularly thought-provoking. On the one hand, the increase in the number of female reporters can be seen as progress in terms of emancipation. On the other, Western female journalists working in the Islamic world are often seen as a kind of ›third gender,‹ viewed by the men who live there as both different from the local women and less threatening than male journalists.

While some Western female journalists use this to their advantage in gathering information, it also reinforces the traditional role of the Arab woman, in stark contrast to the modern, educated, Western woman. The authors describe the danger that liberal feminist ideas of gender equality could turn into »a nasty little weapon of imperialism« (12). Together with Judith Butler, the editors define gender and the heterogeneity of influences of gender of war and peace reporting as »an act that requires repetitive performance ›of a set of meanings already socially established; it is the mundane and ritualised form of their legitimation« (Butler 1999: 178)« (18).

The four thematic blocks that follow examine very different aspects of gender in war and peace reporting. This takes two forms: the results of scientific studies and the voices of practitioners reporting on their experiences in war and crisis zones. A very positive aspect is the well-organized structure of the volume, with each sub-chapter building on the last and helping to explain the next. Despite this, each chapter also works well as a standalone piece.

In the first thematic block, entitled »Gendering Professional Agencies,« Linda Steiner examines the dangers and forms of sexism to which female war reporters were subjected from a historical perspective. In her chapter »Gendered Narratives: On Peace, Security and News Media Accountability to Women,« Sarah Macharia demands that journalism become more professional in terms of gender consciousness. Based on a content analysis that was initiated by the United Nations Entity of Gender Equality (UN Women) to examine reporting on peace and security issues in 15 countries, she demonstrates that »women are barely present in peace and security print news produced in transitional and conflict countries« (55) and describes transnational »patriarchal capitalist norms in news media systems, shaping newsroom practices, approaches to news production and the content delivered« (59).

In the third chapter of the same thematic block, Lilian Ngusuur Unaegbu describes a pattern of discrimination against women in reporting about the terrorist organization Boko Haram in north-eastern Nigeria. Taking interviews with female journalists as her starting point, she shows that female journalists are banned from reporting on the topic, even though cultural and religious reasons mean that many Nigerian women would be more likely to talk to female journalists. In the final chapter of this section, entitled »Sexual Violence against Journalists in Conflict Zones, and Gendered Practices and Cultures in the Newsroom,« Marte Høiby questions the assumption that violence against male reporters is significantly different from violence against women and that female journalists therefore need particular protection. By putting the spotlight on the vulnerability of male journalists, too, she shows that security measures for journalists are influenced by a paradigm that has men as aggressors and women as victims. As a result, men's vulnerability is underestimated and women are discriminated against.

Eva Boller kicks off the second thematic block, »Women and Lack of Agency,« with her essay »There are no women«. The War in Libya in TV News.« In it, she shows that almost 60 percent of all television news stories transmitted in Germany, France, and the UK about the 2011 war in Libya did not feature a single woman. Furthermore, German television did not have a single female correspondent on the ground at the time – French television had just one, while the BBC had seven. According to Boller, the main reason for this lack of women in reporting is the strong focus on »reporting on the battlefield instead of reporting about the situation for the civilian population« (21).

In the next chapter, »War and Women's Voices: The Gender Approach of Afghanistan's Largest News Agency,« Elisabeth Eide looks at the representation of women in reporting by the largest Afghan news agency Pajhwok. She shows that, although women's issues are not generally a high priority, any coverage they do receive is usually by women themselves. Violence is a very prominent topic, and an analysis of the topics and keywords that arise confirms a strong link between violence and the lack of rights. Traditions are usually named as the reason behind the violence, while the ongoing war is rarely mentioned in this context.

The third chapter of this section is Desy Ayu Pirmasari's »Being a Female Journalist at the Frontline,« in which she shares her experiences as an Indonesian Muslim female reporter in a male-dominated news environment during the war in Libya. She explains the problems female reporters face in a culture that does not welcome strong, independent women.

In the final chapter of the section, »Good or Bad Agents? Western Fascination with Women and the Construction of Female Objects during the ISIS/ISIL Crisis,« Marta Kollárová challenges the traditional view of women as vulnerable objects that need protection by putting the spotlight on women in battle. Her focus is on the Western media's ambivalence towards women's role as soldiers: According to her, they often show reports about strong, pretty Kurdish women who heroically lead the fight against ISIS fighters, while representing women who join ISIS as ghostly creatures who are manipulated by ISIS propaganda and do not know what they are doing.

Sadia Jamil begins the third thematic block, »Postcolonial Perspectives Forever,« by shining a light on »Journalism Practice and Freedom of Expression« in Pakistan from the point of view of the two genders. In doing so, she focuses on discussing the challenge facing female Pakistani journalists from the perspective of postcolonial feminist theory. The next chapter by Berit von der Lippe, »Philanthropic War Narratives and Dangerous Protection Scenario(s),« uses Afghanistan to highlight the contradictions and paradoxes of embedded war reporting. Taking the visit by the Norwegian Defense Minister to a women's prison in the Afghan province of Faryab in 2009 as an example, she explains the difficult tightrope that has to be walked between »feminist philanthropy« and war reporting. The minis-

ter allowed the female reporters to photograph inmates without their veils and to publish the very intimate details they told her, thus endangering »the lives of those >we< claim to protect and empower« (23).

The next chapter, »Key Factors and Challenges to Understanding Women's Roles in the Peace Process in Afghanistan« by Quhramaana Kakar, attempts to explain how the role of women has developed in Afghanistan's misogynistic society. In the thematic block's final chapter, »Is Peace a Smiling Woman? Femininities and Masculinities in Conflict and Peace Coverage,« Kristin Skare Orgeret uses examples from Norwegian newspapers to examine how the concepts of gender, war, and peace are applied in reporting on international strategies for conflict and peace. She looks for alternatives to the »universal >white feminism« that she argues is constructed in the Norwegian newspapers. By linking her critical perspective with peace journalism, she attempts to enable more diverse representations of femininity and masculinity in conflict and the establishment of peace.

In the final thematic block entitled »Masculinities, Heroes and Victims,« the authors make the case for awareness of the constructions of femininity and masculinity in the media's war reporting. In his article »Masculinity, Iconisation and Fictional War Heroes in the GWT,« Rune Ottosen examines how the media distort the male experience in theatres of war, for example by discussing the traditional American hero as the basis of American war propaganda and its influence on Norwegian media. In his chapter »Why War – Still? Albert Meets Sigmund in the Ultimate Match-Up;« Toby Miller imagines a conversation between Albert Einstein and Sigmund Freud on the topics of war and peace. He then goes on to discuss how this depiction of masculine scientific and technological rationality influences contemporary reporting. In the final chapter, entitled »Subversive Victims,« Anette Bringedal Houge questions the assumption that only women are become victims of sexual abuse and rape in large numbers during times of war. As an example, she cites the war in Bosnia-Herzegovina, in which male prisoners on all sides suffered sexual violence. However unlike violence against women, this was never discussed in the media.

This brief overview of the individual articles shows the diverse range of topics covered in this collected volume. Each chapter contains a high density of information, yet is still easy to read despite the complexity of the issues covered. However, what is missing is a summary at the end that ties together and contextualizes the (often ambivalent) conclusions from the individual chapters. As it is, at the end of the final chapter, the reader feels a little lost among all the loose ends and has to spend time classifying and transferring the new knowledge himself. Ultimately, however, this is the only flaw in a very informative and well-structured compilation of articles dedicated to the topic of gender and war and peace reporting.

Translation: Sophie Costella

This book review first appeared in [rezensien:kommunikation:medien \(r:k:m\)](#).

About the reviewer

Julia Lönnendonker is a post-doctoral student at the Institute for Communication Studies at the Vrije Universiteit Brussel (VUB). Her research focuses on international and European journalism, foreign reporting, and European public life and identity, among other fields.

Hans Mathias Kepplinger: Totschweigen und Skandalisieren. Was Journalisten über ihre eigenen Fehler denken [Withholding information and creating scandal]. Series: edition medienpraxis, Vol. 15. Cologne [Herbert von Halem] 2017, 232 pages, EUR 21

reviewed by Guido Keel

Journalists make mistakes, just like any other profession. But long-serving Mainz-based communication studies expert Hans Mathias Kepplinger believes that these errors are more significant than most. In his view, they contribute directly to the loss of trust in the media – a problem for a democratic society that relies on its citizens being able to trust the media.

Journalists themselves thus bear some of the responsibility for this development. After all, according to Kepplinger, journalists have now become so alienated from society (cf. 173) that they see themselves as enlighteners who stand above the rest of society and work for the common good. They think they know better than others (cf. 171). In doing so, they employ two problematic practices: They create scandals out of essentially unproblematic events and they withhold facts that could explain a situation or lead to an alternative conclusion. In addition, they suffer from blind spots when it comes to putting (their own) journalistic mistakes up for discussion (cf. 113, 140ff.).

These are the hypotheses that Kepplinger pursues in his book. His analysis takes on a clear point of view: He does not investigate whether errors occur, but instead assumes that journalists make mistakes and tries to find out why. The case studies he chooses largely confirm his hypotheses – arguably making Kepplinger guilty of exactly the same actions as the journalists he pillories. But more on that later.

The investigation starts from the observation that the media in Germany are suffering a crisis of legitimation (cf. 10f.), receiving criticism on a range of issues from academics, the public, and fellow practitioners. This lack of credibility in the media has already been exhaustively described by other authors, notably Uwe Krüger in his book *Mainstream*. However, like others before him, Kepplinger also has to concede that the level of fundamental trust in the media in Germany remains relatively stable (cf. 22). When it comes to evaluating the specific journalistic quality seen today, the author's assessment is based on data from the period 1964 to 1995.

Kepplinger goes on to argue that the media have gained in power and begun to abuse this power – despite the fact that much of the public discourse is taken up with complaints about the media's general loss of significance. According to Kepplinger, this increase in the media's options for exercising influence lies in the

expansion of its legal privileges, the increase in range, especially of television, and the »decades-long reduction in opportunities for politicians to address the public independently and directly« (31) – all arguments that are undoubtedly questionable in an age of Facebook election campaigns and Twitter-happy heads of state.

Another cause, continues Kepplinger, is the change in how journalists themselves view their role (cf. 34ff.). He claims that more journalists now see their role as an active one, in which they emphasize information that fits in with their own world view. This hypothesis contradicts regular surveys of German journalists, which repeatedly find that they see their role as neutral communicators, reporting on things as they are, as by far their most important – much more important than aiming to shape the political agenda or influence public opinion (cf. e.g. Weischenberg/Malik/Scholl 2006: 102-110). Kepplinger thus finds an »abuse of power« (39) among journalists and asks whether journalists bear moral responsibility for the unintended side effects of their reporting.

Kepplinger therefore does exactly what he pillories journalists for doing: He creates scandal, in this case about the abuse of power of a professional group that plays a role in democracy, while also withholding information about investigations and points of view that contradict this finding. However, he also provides empirical evidence, which forms the core of his book.

Using eight case studies, the author investigates how journalists assess dubious practices and the arguments for and against these practices. In one of these practices, journalists create scandal by unduly adding to, combining, instrumentalizing, or abbreviating statements and by setting events inappropriately in or out of context. In the other, they withhold relevant facts in order to retain interpretational sovereignty or to prevent damage to reputations.

All the case studies come, at least indirectly, from German politics and are – coincidentally? – chosen so that all the victims of alleged journalistic mistakes are found at the right-wing, conservative end of the political spectrum: Wolfgang Schäuble, Bishop Tebartz-van Elst, Pegida, supporters of nuclear energy, Sibylle Lewitscharoff, Pegida again, supporters of nuclear energy again, Christian Wulff, Karl-Theodor zu Guttenberg, and Susanne Gaschke, who, although an SPD and therefore left-wing politician, is a media victim as the result of a controversial tax remission granted to a businessman.

Kepplinger states that his intention with these eight case studies is not to provide overall assessments, but to discuss obvious examples within them where a line has been crossed. This has the convenient side-effect of releasing him from any obligation to report fully on an issue or to evaluate controversial practices appropriately. Despite this, and although Kepplinger does not say so in as many words, the case studies undeniably give the impression that the scandalous abuse of power he claims to have identified among journalists is directed against right-wingers by left-wing journalists. The book does not mention any mistakes

made against left-wing actors and concerns at all. To quote Kepplinger himself once again, one could easily come to the conclusion that the author himself is the victim of a »hostile media effect« (118) that causes the worried to perceive negative reporting on their concerns as more negative than impartial observers do. This is a shame, as it detracts from the author's real objective: to find out how journalists themselves judge dubious practices.

The real knowledge value of the book lies in its investigation of the connection between the perception of whether a certain journalistic practice is legitimate and the approval or rejection of journalists with regard to arguments for or against a certain journalistic practice in general.

The survey of 332 editors from selected departments of daily newspapers on the eight case studies shows that journalists largely adhere to the professional standards and that the majority of journalists consider the actions that Kepplinger describes as »creating scandal and withholding information« as illegitimate (cf. 108). But it is not these professionals that Kepplinger is interested in: »The analysis focuses not on the journalists that follow the rules,« but on the arguments of the minority that condone dubious practices to a greater or lesser extent.

The results show that journalists endorse certain dubious practices in individual cases if they already have a negative opinion of the person or situation that has potentially been unfairly treated. For example, journalists with a negative view of nuclear energy tended to see the excessive scandal created around nuclear energy as more acceptable than their colleagues whose views were more neutral. Although journalists believed that standards of professional ethics applied in general, they saw these standards as irrelevant in some cases, depending on their views on the specific topic. The applicability of a standard was thus assessed based on the specific case in question (cf. 49). This opens up a gulf between ideal and practical application – something that is not atypical in journalism. Although journalists consider certain rules and standards to apply, they tend to qualify them when they contradict the journalist's own world view in a specific matter.

Kepplinger ends by drawing a credible conclusion, arguing that covering up errors in professional practice damages the public image of journalism. This insight, which has long been established in other professional fields, such as medicine and engineering, needs to enter into journalism. There is still a lot to do – work that is not made easier by journalists' view that they are already confronted with significant public criticism. Journalists need to face up to the findings that are presented in this book – without being distracted from the agenda that the author's subjective choice of case studies seems to suggest.

Translation: Sophie Costella

This book review first appeared in rezensionen:kommunikation:medien (r:k:m).

Literature

Weischenberg, Siegfried; Malik, Maja; Scholl, Armin: *Die Souffleure der Mediengesellschaft. Report über die Journalisten in Deutschland*. Constance [UVK] 2006

About the reviewer

Prof. Dr. Guido Keel is Head of the Institute of Applied Media Studies at Zurich University of Applied Sciences. The focuses of his research include quality in journalism, change in journalism, and journalism in non-European contexts.

Anna Jehle: Welle der Konsumgesellschaft. Radio Luxemburg in Frankreich 1945-1975 [The wave of the consumer society]. Series: Medien und Gesellschaftswandel im 20. Jahrhundert, Vol. 9. Göttingen [Wallstein] 2018, EUR 44,90

reviewed by Konrad Dussel

When covering the history of broadcasting, most writers limit themselves to cultivating a niche that understandably attracts little attention outside its narrow boundaries. But with her prize-winning dissertation under the supervision of Frank Bösch, Anna Jehle has now written a book that deserves broader appeal. Her history of CLR/CLT –Compagnie Luxembourgeoise de Radiodiffusion/Télédiffusion – and its French-language radio programming after the Second World War is not only an academic study of her chosen private broadcaster and the service it offers, but an attempt to locate a very specific media service in the context of its most important direct competitors and to analyze the interdependency between general economic, cultural, and media development – and it is done in a clearly structured, carefully developed, and fluently written way.

One of the many strengths of Jehle's book is its refusal to limit itself to the history of the ultimately French-dominated company and its radio programming, which was then primarily broadcast on long wave. Instead, the book repeatedly casts a glance at the key competitors: broadcasts by the French state and other broadcasters outside the country, with the Saarland-based private channel »Europe No. 1« the most significant after 1958. As Jehle not only translates all the French quotes, but also explicitly comments on the subtleties of the language in many cases, even those with little or no knowledge will get a lot out of this book.

In the past, there has been passionate debate about how to add the history of programming to the history of broadcasting – which up to then had been dominated by institutional history – without theorists contributing practical examples. Anna Jehle leaves out the theory and delivers a concrete paper that stretches across two chapters, around a third of her text. One chapter focuses on the programming and the way it is structured in general; the other on the news in particular. This is because, as she mentions in the chapter heading, she sees this as the »decisive factor in programming competition.« In both chapters, she ably links a look at the specific competition situations with one at creative individuals, specific programming offered, and the technical innovations that are also driving developments.

As well as presenting the institution and programming, the author does not forget the audience. The data and sources here are not sufficient to allow a comprehensive analysis like that in the other two fields, but Anna Jehle offers an interesting substitute. In one chapter, she investigates the way the Luxembourgish

broadcaster addresses target groups, accentuating both the role of women and, in changing times, the role of the new target group »young people.« In a second chapter, she provides a detailed examination of the various marketing campaigns the broadcaster has used, i.e. what it offers outside its purely broadcasting function.

Anna Jehle creates a dramatic finale for her book by waiting until the end to tackle the »crucial point of private commercial broadcasting,« the »business with advertising.« In the sixth and final chapter of the same name, she takes a long run-up, first looking at the contemporary market and listener research as an accompanying moment of price calculation for the various means of advertising. Only then does she turn her attention to the most important types of advertising and advertising customers. It is no surprise that this presents the biggest obstacles to research. Although she is permitted to report in some detail that L'Oréal was one of the most important users of advertising time in Luxembourg, no meaningful figures are available on how much money was involved and how the company's balance sheet looked in detail.

This overview in itself is enough to demonstrate the points of reference Jehle's book provides for so many different fields of interest. Were any more motivation to read it required, however, it is worth mentioning the central thread that runs through the book. The limited time frame of her investigation is not least due to the enclosed period of the »trente glorieuses,« or »Glorious Thirty,« – a period of rapid change that fundamentally transformed France both socially and economically. The new phenomenon of mass consumerism was one of its central features, demanding not only material changes, but a change in consciousness for broad sections of society. It is here that Anna Jehle pinpoints the subject of her investigation: »Under these conditions, ›Radio Luxembourg‹ was able to act as a component, as a catalyst and as an agent of mass consumerism« (20). The book repeatedly returns in detail to what this meant in practice.

Anna Jehle has undoubtedly written a piece of Western European broadcasting history that sets new standards. It only remains to be hoped that the obvious extension work will be tackled. Radio Luxembourg was not only hugely significant due to its French programming directed at France between 1945 and 1975 – its English programming was presenting a considerable challenge to the BBC long before that. In the 1960s, the same went for its new German-language programming and the neighboring German public broadcasters, who had become rather self-contained. This background also puts the novelty value of the 1980s German dual broadcasting system into perspective. The conflict between private commercial and public or state broadcasting organizations goes back much further in Europe, too – and Luxembourg has been home to one of the most important players on one side since 1933.

Translation: Sophie Costella

This review first appeared in [rezensionen:kommunikation:medien \(r:k:m\)](#).

About the reviewer

Dr. Konrad Dussel is apl. Professor for Modern History at the University of Mannheim. His research focuses on media history and the local and regional history of south-western Germany.

Matt Carlson: Journalistic Authority. Legitimizing News in the Digital Era.
New York [Columbia University Press] 2017, 256 pages, approx. EUR 25

reviewed by Katherine M. Engelke

Why should we listen to journalists? According to Matt Carlson, the answer to this question lies in their journalistic authority. Having found only superficial reference to this topic in the literature up to now, (cf. 3), Carlson addresses both it and another question – Where does journalism get its authority from? – in his book.

Journalistic Authority pursues two specific goals. Firstly, it aims to deliver a conceptual intervention by explaining in detail the individual components of the theory of journalistic authority. Secondly, it produces an analytical model that enables the current state of journalistic authority to be both recorded and criticized.

Carlson takes a holistic view of his research topic and applies a relational approach. He sees journalistic work as »a contingent relationship in which certain actors come to possess a right to create legitimate discursive knowledge about events in the world for others« (13). Arguments for why journalists should be listened to – arguments in favor of journalistic authority – are constantly (re)made, making it a continuous process. Carlson's relational theory is built on three fundamental principles: (1) The relationships that give journalism its authority are diverse and include actors both inside and outside news editorial offices; (2) these relationships depend on context; (3) authority cannot be explained by a single variable, but by interaction between a wide range of factors (cf. 23).

In line with the objectives of his book, Carlson dedicates each chapter to a different component of journalistic authority. Apart from the introduction and conclusion, the book is divided into two large sections. The first details how journalists legitimize their authority. More specifically, this is explained based on journalistic identity and the (disputed) way journalism is understood as a profession (Chapter 1); various forms of journalism and the influence of digitalization in particular (Chapter 2); and, finally, narratives about journalism, which Carlson also refers to as meta-journalistic discourses (Chapter 3).

In the second section, Carlson discusses the relationships between journalists who aim to achieve an authoritative position in society and other actors who recognize this position. In doing so, he focuses his attention on the audience (Chapter 4), the sources (Chapter 5), technology (Chapter 6), and public critics of journalism (Chapter 7). His reflections build comprehensively on relevant current and historical studies from journalism research, which he links to this topic in a useful and beneficial way. Furthermore, he is also inspired by other disciplines, building his theory based on approaches from fields as diverse as sociology, political science, and philosophy.

The work is framed perfectly by its introduction and conclusion. The introduction provides a comprehensive overview of authority in general (cf. 7ff.) and journalistic authority in particular (cf. 13ff.). The model of journalistic authority designed in the conclusion (cf. 183) mirrors the structure of the book and encapsulates the crucial aspects: group identity, textual practices, and the meta-discourse on the one hand, and the relationships between journalists and the audience, sources, technology, and critics on the other. This brief tabular summary is backed up by the complex and dynamic concept that Carlson has developed in the preceding chapters, with the various influences on journalistic authority both depending on and influencing one another. The reader could thus gain a good understanding of the relationship theory of journalistic authority by reading the introduction and conclusion alone.

Were he to do so, however, he would miss out on many interesting insights and explanations, as those two chapters of course cannot contain all the detail of the model's components. After all, many of the components provide interesting contributions to journalism research in their own right. Examples include the concept of meta-journalistic discourse (cf. 77ff.), on which Carlson has also published a journal article (Carlson 2016), and the (historicized) observations on technology as an actor in journalism (cf. 150ff.). Throughout the book, Carlson successfully underpins and illustrates his theoretical considerations with numerous concrete examples. This makes the book not only of interest to its target group of students and academics, but also easily accessible to practitioners and anyone interested in journalism.

One critical point worth mentioning is the overwhelming dominance of examples from the USA. However, Carlson himself is transparent in addressing this flaw, setting himself the challenge of developing his analytical model in such a way that it can be applied outside the American context, too – a goal that he achieves.

The fact that the research topic is worked through so comprehensively makes one stylistic shortcoming all the more irritating: The author uses end notes at the end of the book to refer to the literature used and to make further additions to his considerations. As a result, readers who want to understand the sources used and gain further explanation are forced to flip back and forth in the book, interrupting the reading flow.

There is no question that Carlson's book fills a gap in research and provides a foundation for many further connections. Journalistic authority and the concept developed here can both be used as a background and basis for investigating questions of trust or mistrust in journalism, the blurred line between journalism and advertising, and options for audience participation, to name but three examples.

Translation: Sophie Costella

Literature

Carlson, M.: Metajournalistic Discourse and the Meanings of Journalism. Definition Control, Boundary Work, and Legitimation. In: *Communication Theory*, 4, 2016, pp. 349-368

This review first appeared in [rezensionen:kommunikation:medien \(r:k:m\)](#).

About the reviewer

Katherine M. Engelke completed her doctorate in the DFG Research Training Group »Trust and communication in a digitalized world.« Since 2018 she has been a Lecturer and Researcher at the University of Münster's Department of Communication. The focuses of her research include journalism research, trust research, political communication, and terrorism and the media.