

Instead, Greer's theory and results often *appear* to corroborate previous findings, with the main difference being an application of existing theory to the additional case of African-born blacks. For example, Greer reports that African blacks have more faith in the American Dream than native-born blacks, who in turn have more faith than Afro-Caribbeans. But she attributes these differences to the greater availability of "exit options" for Afro-Caribbeans than Africans and the fact that her African sample is much more heavily foreign-born and the Afro-Caribbean sample largely either raised in the United States from childhood or are second-generation (p. 91). Both these ideas are probed extensively in the literature on segmented assimilation and in Reuel Rogers' research on Afro-Caribbean political incorporation. Greer adds the intriguing possibility that experience with ethnic conflict in Afro-Caribbeans' countries of origin renders them less sensitive to racial issues in the United States, but the idea is not developed or tested empirically.

There are important differences between Greer's ideas and earlier work, most notable of which is the expectation that the groups' sense of common interests will vary by issue type. Still, the argument is too often hinted at, alluded to vaguely, or posed in a question form, rather than stated outright. For example, on page 5, Greer states that "[t]he simultaneous acceptance of a shared racial identity and preservation of a distinct ethnic identity is the essential element in better understanding coalition building, representation, policy stances, and political participation of blacks as a pathway to the American Dream in twenty-first-century American politics." It is not till somewhat later (p. 36) that Greer provides a statement of the main thesis, and even here we learn only that there will be instances of pan-racial solidarity and inter-ethnic difference. The first chapter could have been a more helpful guide if it had provided more thorough elaboration of the theory of black elevated minority status, distinguished it from other theories, and noted specific determinants of political unity between black groups. Instead, crucial distinctions between unifying issues concerning interracial distinctions with whites and dividing issues that tap inter-ethnic differences are not specified until Chapter 4.

The book also might have been strengthened through more effort to integrate its various endeavors. Given that foregrounding and articulating the theory of elevated minority status occupies most of the introductory and first chapters, it is surprising to find that the first research question Greer sets out to investigate is how union membership influences native and immigrant black political participation (pp. 5-6, 35-36, and Ch. 3). Much of Chapter 5 assesses whether there are smaller inter-ethnic differences among blacks on issues the union has weighed in on than those on which it has not. These are important questions in their own right,

but they are theoretically and thematically tangential to the book's main argument.

Moreover, the goal of studying the political impact of union membership on the populations in question would appear to work at cross-purposes with the book's main goal. If Greer is correct that "[u]nion memberships can provide a collective identity derived from members' common interests and solidarity" (p. 45) then the use of the union sample to answer the book's other questions is problematic. Greer argues that the union sample allows her to control for class and occupation (p. 44), but it is not explained why this is desirable, and it seems questionable to rule out actual socioeconomic differences between black ethnic groups as sources of inter-group political divides by design. It also seems to conflict with the goal of extending Michael Dawson's (1994) theory, since the black utility heuristic is invoked in large part to account for black political unity despite increasing intra-black socioeconomic heterogeneity.

Even if it were desirable to control for class, basing the argument largely on a survey of a union with an explicitly primary dedication to social justice issues (p. 46) would be a liability in light of "[t]he underlying motivation of this study [which] is to examine the content of the composition and attitudes of blacks in America" (p. 86). Public opinion researchers can empathize with the challenges of surveying hard-to-reach minority groups, and no one would expect a truly random sample of the city's black ethnic populations. But the selection and socialization effects implicit in union membership make it very difficult to sort out how the findings presented in this book might generalize beyond the sample. Perhaps the inter-ethnic differences presented are all the more remarkable given the nature of the sample, and some corroboration from General Social Survey data in Chapter 5 is reassuring, but heavy reliance on the union survey means the empirical results cannot give reliable support to the book's hypotheses.

*Black Ethnics* calls attention to important questions about the prospects for pan-black racial coalitions in American politics and provides a sense of how and why their viability may vary across issue domains. It will likely spur more researchers to study these topics and will serve as a helpful guide for those who do.

#### **Political Tone: How Leaders Talk and Why.**

By Roderick P. Hart, Jay P. Childers, and Colene J. Lind. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2013. 304p. \$75.00 cloth, \$25.00 paper. doi:10.1017/S1537592714003636

— Justin S. Vaughn, *Boise State University*

For more than four decades, Roderick P. Hart has successfully accomplished what so many try and fail to do: He has stood astride the dynamic gulf separating humanistic and social scientific approaches to the study of

leadership and communication. In doing so, he has simultaneously mastered and shown respect for the close textual analysis favored by many in the humanities, while also remaining cautious in his causal inferences, favoring an overtly empirical approach to the placement of rhetorical artifacts in their specific contexts. Those familiar with Hart's work will not be surprised to see these hallmarks of it continue in his most recent book, *Political Tone*, which he coauthored with Jay P. Childers and Colene J. Lind, both fellow communication scholars and former students of his.

The chief task of the book is to identify and observe political tone, the concept (though, as the subtitle indicates, explaining the concept's dynamics is a clear concern, as well). The authors weave a web of metaphor and description—tone is described in different places as especially subtle, impertinent, and abiding (p. 220); as irrepressible but often mysterious (p. 11); as the amorphous understanding that “leaks out” (p. 21) of a text to reflect the author of said text's understanding of the political world—to accompany their central understanding of their phenomenon: Tone is a tool that people use (sometimes unwittingly) to create distinct social impressions via word choice (pp. 9–10). In other words, political tone is how what is said is actually said (p. 24).

Having defined tone, the remainder of the book is predicated upon a complex assumption: that tone is the product of individual word choices that cumulatively build up to produce patterned expectations telling an audience something important about the speaker's outlook on things (p. 12). From this intellectual platform, Hart, Childers, and Lind put forward a tripartite argument about political tone: Not only is it a “handy barometer” of how politicians cope with changing circumstances; tone is also a “subtle yet tangible force” that can be observed and evaluated scientifically as well as heuristically and, in doing so, can help explain Americans' reactions to political events (p. 21), which the authors describe as both intuitive and inchoate.

*Political Tone* marks the continuation of a 15-year project focused on capturing what the authors call “the tonalities of American politics” (p. 19). To do so, they content-analyze texts from a wide range of genres—including campaign and policy speeches, debates, advertising, print and broadcast coverage, and letters to the editor—using computer-assisted text analysis. Specifically, their research presented utilizes DICTION 6.0, a java-based software program developed by Hart and Craig Carroll, which employs nearly three dozen word lists, comprised of approximately 10,000 search words, to discern a range of measurements that indicate systematically the *way* Americans talk politics. At the heart of these indicators are five master variables—certainty, optimism, activity, realism, and commonality—that represent the five things, according

to the authors, that one would most want to know about the tone of a text if that was all that could be learned. These variables are constructed by combining conceptually linked sets of standardized measures, as are five additional custom dictionaries created for the purposes of the investigations specific to the goals of *Political Tone*: patriotic terms, party references, voter references, leader references, and religious terms.

The use of this approach to operationalize tonal observations from these genre sources enables Hart and colleagues to track dynamics about the ways in which political elites and the masses alike present their thoughts. Doing so further allows the authors to determine not only how language affects our perceptions but also how political institutions and personal circumstances affect a rhetor's tone. The analyses of the book focus individually on eight separate forces, evenly divided between the dual categories of “broad-based societal forces” (p. 23) and personal factors, which impact the rhetorical choices of politicians. The societal forces include national diversity, party politics, modernity, and institutional development, while the personal circumstances are more idiosyncratic, based upon the authors' understanding of four recent national politicians and how matters peculiar to their lives affected their word choice, or, as the authors put it, how they played the hands dealt to them (p. 23). For example, one chapter examines how President Bill Clinton coped with the Monica Lewinsky scandal, while another assesses the role that Sarah Palin's “overweening ambition” (p. 24) played in her own word choice and the effects it had on the mass public.

The bulk of the book is comprised of eight stand-alone, chapter-length analyses, and while all of them are thoughtful and useful, it is the half that focuses on the broader social context that truly succeeds. Though illuminating, the essays in the second half of *Political Tone* trade away complexity in narrative for innovation in method, resulting in unique and persuasive interpretations of recent political history that fail to control for the leading and occasionally obvious alternatives. Nevertheless, Hart, Childers, and Lind's efforts to communicate with the social sciences using its own vocabulary should appeal to political scientists, as will their emphasis on replicable data, systematic operationalization of core concepts, and application of tests of statistical significance before declaring conclusions (p. 19). That said, the nature of the work may leave some readers, particularly those attuned to the traditional question > theory > hypotheses > data > analysis model of inquiry, looking for more, as the book, despite its strong intellectual foundation and impressive scope, remains what the authors call “basic research.” That is, there is no central theoretical argument motivating its research, nor do the authors develop a comprehensive

model from which obvious generalizations easily spring. As they note, “Our work is descriptive and we operate in a space somewhere between rigorous hypothesis testing and textual description” (p. 24).

Potential readers would do well, however, to consider that self-assessment as candid and humble, rather than as justification for overlooking this book. In the very least, it provides a thorough introduction to a research program (intellectual as much as software) that could be applied to countless current and future questions in political science. Much more than that, though, Hart, Childers, and Lind have provided careful, compelling evidence concerning the role that tone plays in political discourse and learning, and have contributed new and valuable knowledge to several areas of research in American politics, including but not limited to political parties, media, political knowledge, and our most recent presidents. Because of this, *Political Tone* will be of interest not only to scholars toiling in the relevant interdisciplinary fields but also to faculty and students alike interested in those subjects, as well as in political communication and leadership more broadly.

**Black–Latino Relations in U.S. National Politics: Beyond Conflict or Cooperation.** By Rodney E. Hero and Robert R. Preuhs. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013. 266p. \$85.00 cloth, \$28.99 paper.  
doi:10.1017/S1537592714003648

— Jacqueline Chattopadhyay, *University of North Carolina at Charlotte*

Studies of black–Latino relations in American politics have focused extensively on the mass and local levels (e.g., Edward Telles et al., eds., *Just Neighbors? Research on African American and Latino Relations in the United States*, 2011), and have found compelling though not uniform evidence of intergroup conflict (one oft-cited example being Nicolas Vaca, *The Presumed Alliance: The Unspoken Conflict between Latinos and Blacks and What It Means for America*, 2004). Against this backdrop, Rodney Hero and Robert Preuhs take up the “central goal of describing and assessing” black–Latino elite relations in national politics, seeking to illuminate “whether those relations are most often characterized by conflict, independence, cooperation, or something else” (p. 1).

*Black–Latino Relations in U.S. National Politics* dexterously achieves these objectives, uncovering extensive “nonconflict”—specifically “independence”—among black and Latino national elites. A “non-zero sum” dynamic entailing “basic agreement of ideology but difference of interests” (pp. 95, 19), independence is not overt cooperation (pp. 24, 68, 125). While periodically demonstrating “a modicum of mutual support” (p. 145), black and Latino elites largely “emphasize particular policy areas and advocate specific outcomes on their own . . . apart from one another” (p. 22). Having delineated this

alternative to the conflict-coalition dichotomy, Hero and Preuhs assess its foundations. Without foreclosing other explanations, they convincingly tie independence and nonconflict to federalism, particularly the policy questions, and distinct roles of party, ideology, and logrolling, in national versus urban politics. Through the data, questions, and findings it offers, the book makes important contributions to research on minority politics and representation broadly writ.

The authors’ first contribution is specifying five materials as data to systematically observe black–Latino elite relations. Chapters 3 and 4 study materials from black and Latino national advocacy groups: *testimony at congressional hearings* (1970–2000); Supreme Court *amicus briefs* (1974–2004); and *scorecards* (1997–2004) from the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) and National Hispanic Leadership Agenda (NHLA). While testimony partly reflects congressional invitation (pp. 58, 66), brief filing is self-selecting. Scorecards may even better capture group priorities (p. 100). Chapter 5 turns to black and Latino congressmembers’ *roll call votes* (1995–2004), which may reveal conflict not found in testimony, briefs, and scorecards if the electoral connection makes representatives more “ beholden to, localized geographic interests than are . . . advocacy groups” (p. 115). Chapter 7 studies *public statements* on welfare reform, education, voting rights, immigration, and free trade from the Congressional Black Caucus (CBC), Congressional Hispanic Caucus (CHC), and advocacy groups. The authors acknowledge questions of whether elites reflect citizen-level politics, perhaps more amply than necessary given the book’s goals. The data well suit the book’s aim of analyzing “black–Latino relations within (national) governing institutions” rather than within the mass public (p. 45).

Quantitative and qualitative analyses find some overlapping elite attitudes and behaviors. While not always appearing at the same hearings, black and Latino groups state similar positions when both testify (p. 68). They consistently support the same side in Supreme Court cases (p. 71) and state similar positions in briefs (pp. 85, 88, 90, 92, 93). NAACP and NHLA preferences match across the 9.6% of votes appearing on both groups’ scorecards (pp. 106–7). Over 56% of the analyzed roll call votes that the NAACP and NHLA rated from 1997 through 2004 evidence cooperation; 42% show independence (p. 143). Advocacy group, CBC, and CHC policy remarks also evidence an “absence of conflict and some cooperation” (p. 212).

Nonetheless, national elites do not neglect group-specific interests. Amicus briefs present “clear . . . cooperative activity” in a case not mainly about race (p. 85), but reveal black and Latino groups privileging different considerations—en route to similar positions—in two