

cites the 2003 *Virginia v. Black* case as a step forward by the Supreme Court toward protecting minorities from racially intimidating speech. Furthermore, his reliance on the Fourteenth Amendment creates its own constitutional problems, the most glaring being that the Supreme Court has never applied the equal protection clause to regulate private behavior. And courts have traditionally applied the Fourteenth Amendment using different levels of scrutiny based on race, gender, or other categories. Is Cortese arguing that racial hate speech should be given greater scrutiny than gender-based hate speech? Still, it's a fascinating legal theory that is worth exploring; readers who want more should investigate the work of legal scholar Richard Delgado, who wrote the foreword and upon whose work Cortese leans heavily.

In the end, Cortese despairs of relying solely on the law to remedy the problem. Instead, he calls for individuals and the media to commit themselves to fostering a climate of diversity and tolerance and offers a checklist of ways for individuals to challenge hate speech. This book is useful for individuals seeking ways to combat hate speech, for legal scholars interested in critical race theory, and for teachers looking for a provocative supplementary text for a class in censorship or free speech.

KATHLEEN K. OLSON  
*Lehigh University*

■ *The Paper and the Pew: How Religion Shapes Media Choice.* Myna German. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2007. 119 pp. \$23.95 pbk.

Religion and media studies are ripe with inquiry. Both religious studies and media studies explore how meanings are created and the world is interpreted, and when the fields are combined through a strong ideological framework they can

yield some significant insights concerning how audience worldviews compete with encoded media messages to create meaning out of the world.

Myna German enters this landscape with the book *The Paper and the Pew: How Religion Shapes Media Choice*, which is essentially her dissertation from the University of South Africa, complete with the grammatical and typographical errors. In both works she hypothesizes that Mormons and Orthodox Jews use the newspaper differently from other believers, which is a reasonable and interesting argument. If religion is a system of meaning making, it makes sense that the faithful may read the paper differently.

But rather than produce a study that adequately addresses the collision of religion and media, the book suffers from fatal conceptual and methodological flaws. To start, German reduces Orthodox Jews and Mormons from complex believers to statistical minorities who, she argues, simply insulate themselves from the mainstream. The framework fails to acknowledge their religions as ideological beliefs through which people live, love, and learn. Instead, the work interprets the primary beliefs of Mormonism and Orthodox Judaism as if they center primarily on avoiding the majority beliefs.

German's study does not appear to recognize religion as a means to *understand* the mainstream—the faithful don't avoid it so much as they engage with it differently, creating and relying on unique worldviews. Before the study can speculate how these faiths influence how media are used, it needs to acknowledge that the reasons why these persons believe what they do may not really be related to being in the ideological minority.

The study of religion and media calls for a framework and methodology that adequately addresses how religion shapes meanings made from media. German gave questionnaires about how people use the media to Jews, Mormons, and Methodists

(her control group, speciously assuming that Methodists are adequate "mainstream" believers to compare to Jews and Mormons). The work interprets the questionnaires through a uses and gratifications framework, which German posits can reveal how and why we use the media we choose. The work gives uses and gratifications too much credence, though: the best she can do with it is identify a correlation, not explain it. While uses and gratifications may provide a useful starting point in the inquiry of religion and media, the book would have benefited from a methodological approach that explored how meaning is shaped by religion.

To do that, German needs to abandon her audience surveys that reduce religious faith to an impotent descriptive factor and instead adopt a framework that recognizes religion's complexity. She almost does this by acknowledging reception theory as a good model for the study in that it "studies the meaning [and] semiotics, [sic] attached to media viewing rather than developing quantitative characteristics of an audience." She dismisses it, though, as a "challenge" to uses and gratifications, ultimately treating qualitative analysis as a vice. The study would be stronger if she recognized reception analysis as a completion of, if not a complement to, uses and gratifications.

Further, it is hard to believe her framework was rigorously evaluated before publication. The problems with her literature review are legion. For example, the work relies little on contemporary, peer-reviewed media and audience studies and too heavily on the dictionary, conference papers, and studies from the 1940s through the 1980s. It was a particularly unpleasant surprise to see a significant part of the framework built around 1980s surveys of newspaper usage, as if the past twenty-five years of changes in ownership, content, structure, and other competing media haven't significantly affected how people read the paper.

Still, even if the framework was up to date and accurate, and was reviewed more vigorously, the reader would still be forced to ask, "If the study isn't going to explore how meanings are made, or how religion affects the way texts are interpreted, then what is the point of studying religion and media at all?" German should dive into the meaning-making process of religious faith and explore how what we believe influences how we read media. Such studies in religion and media call for a solid qualitative methodology—to approach it any other way is at best a missed opportunity and at worst a wasted effort to tell us something significant about religion, or media, or both.

It's worth noting that her results are inconclusive—the study was unable to verify and validate her hypotheses. A stronger methodology, though, would uncover that there really are inherent differences between how Mormons, Jews, and Methodists use media. We just cannot discern those differences in this work.

JAMES Y. TRAMMELL  
*St. John Fisher College*

■ *Radio: A Complete Guide to the Industry.* William A. Richter. New York, NY: Peter Lang, 2006. 285 pp. \$69.95 hbk. \$25.95 pbk.

William A. Richter has penned an outstanding practical guide to the radio industry. Richter combines his skills as an educator and veteran broadcaster to provide a highly informative and readable textbook that covers the rich history of radio broadcasting from its earliest beginnings to its current position in the media landscape.

This volume is unique because it goes beyond the typical references most other textbooks make and provides details about minor players and events that had a

Copyright of *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* is the property of Association for Education in Journalism & Mass Communication and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.