

patriotism and monogamous love. However, Renshon specifically warns against extending the franchise to noncitizens, arguing that immigrants have a multitude of other ways to express preferences and influence politics besides the vote. It is naïve optimism, according to Renshon, that immigrants would be both knowledgeable and able to participate in politics before going through the rigors of naturalization to citizenship. It might also be risky to enfranchise people who have not formally become members of the polity and taken the oath of U.S. citizenship. Hayduk might respond that naïve optimism is precisely what the United States was founded on, and that this impulse is a good place to start. Hayduk has faith in immigrants to use their liberty wisely as voters. If we expect new Americans to be loyal—to have an emotional attachment to and to love the United States—we need to treat them fairly and provide room for agency rather than restriction. In short, we need to show them that we are worthy of being loved, and we need to love them first. Renshon's requirement of monogamous love of country for naturalized citizens is heady indeed, but speaks to no such test of faith, love, and patriotism for America's biological children. Some 100% Americans, such as Timothy McVeigh, could also use a lesson in practicing democracy, raising the importance of civic education for all in America. The important issues addressed in these two books are not easily resolved, but Renshon and Hayduk raise interesting questions and provide a compelling set of answers to illuminate how to think about politics in an increasingly diverse American polity.

### **Creating Gender: The Sexual Politics of Welfare**

**Policy.** By Cathy Marie Johnson, Georgia Duerst-Lahti, and Noelle H. Norton. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2006. 261p. \$55.00.  
DOI: 10.1017/S1537592707071071

—Luisa S. Deprez, *University of Southern Maine*

*Creating Gender* compels us to “make ordinary the analysis of gender in policymaking” (p. 228). As such, the authors “take up the question of how gender is created when policy is made” (p. 11) using an intimate and in-depth exploratory analysis of welfare policy in the United States to make their case. Their analysis is based on a “compound gender ideology framework” (p. 228), an original construction of the three authors designed to unravel and reveal gender ideology in the policymaking arena—specifically, the “adoption and implementation of the PRWORA (Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act)—welfare reform” (p. 11).

The authors' stated intents are twofold: to raise awareness of how policymaking processes mask gender, and to provide a framework to investigate and “measure the presence of gender ideology in policymaking” (p. 220). An analysis of PRWORA provides an important opportunity to look at gender constructs and the debates and presump-

tions behind them because as a “national policy (it) . . . redrew gender with new ideas about mothers, fathers, work, and family” (p. 220). Importantly, they contend, “(s)truggles over welfare policy constitute ongoing battles over gender” (p. 19) that also determine who in this society is valued and cared for and how care is provided.

To begin, the authors situate the complexity of gender through a review of seemingly disparate family court cases focused on a myriad of aspects of parental rights, among them burial site decisions, freedom of expression, and future parenting rights. This introductory excursion is essential to demonstrating how patterns that “shape gender . . . become part of the strictures that govern people's lives,” shaping “what people can and cannot do or be . . .” (p. 4–5). Hence, what the authors uncover and help us to understand is that it is precisely “[w]hen the behaviors, roles, and actions at stake determine the types of gender that people may adopt or ‘perform,’ (that) government creates gender through policy” (p. 220).

Chapters 4 through 6 provide an intimate look into the unfolding of PRWORA using the framework of analysis developed in Chapter 3 and foregrounded in Chapter 2. Chapter 7 employs the framework, using Wisconsin as a case study to examine implementation of welfare reform at the state level, and in Chapter 8, the framework is put into practice to measure “gender's influence in Congressional policymaking” (p. 187). The authors conclude that “[a]s political actors debate public policies, . . . they employ gender ideologies . . .” (p. 20), and that these gender ideologies permeate debates about welfare policy in the United States and reinforce structures of gender inequality.

The gender ideology framework developed by the authors is, I believe, unnecessarily complex and layered. The authors first classify social welfare policies into three gender paradigms—“normative models about the way men and women *should* live their lives and the kinds of choices that should be encouraged and discouraged through public policy” (p. 20). The three gender paradigms are complementarity, individuality (civic and corporative), and equality. For each of the gender paradigms, there is a Guiding Gender Principle (notions about biological essentialism and sex and social roles) and a corresponding Welfare Policy Orientation (kinds of behavior desired within a society). They then identify six “gender strands” (from left to right) and link them with six political ideologies (left to right). Out of this emerges a complex framework for analyzing policymaking processes and outcomes.

The difficulty with this framework is that, although its findings about gender and policymaking are rich, it is not easily reproducible, and a number of feminist policy analysts have explored gender and ideology in less cumbersome ways with similar outcomes. That said, I appreciated the power of their analysis of the gendered debate over PRWORA. Having also conducted an ideology-based analysis of previous welfare policy (*The Family Support Act of*

1988: *A Case Study of Welfare Reform in the 1980s*, 2002), I was intrigued by the overlay of gender strands onto political ideologies and the emergence of Welfare Policy Orientations from the Guiding Gender Principles and gender paradigms. The case study of Wisconsin's implementation of national welfare policy provides the reader with a detailed look at its harsh and punitive impact on women's lives.

Two other concerns arise from my reading. One is the authors' introduction of new and idiosyncratic words such as "feminal" and "feminalist orientation." The authors pioneer the word "femiale"—"the quality of being female" (pp. xiii, 14–15)—as a substitute for currently used words such as feminine and feminist. They are confident that femiale, when employed on a more universal basis, can move us beyond the seemingly restrictive understandings of feminist and feminine and broaden the conversation to include the concerns of women writ large, as biologically not socially constructed. Even though they defend this change at length in Chapter 3, I find it dubious.

My second concern regards the authors' contention that requiring women on welfare to work made them "masculine mothers" and breadwinners (Chapter 5). In 1996, welfare reform *did* require women on welfare to work. Unfortunately, this requirement undermined prior welfare policy that recognized both job training and postsecondary education as essential pathways to meaningful work. However, in PRWORA, meaningful work was not of concern to its architects. Of paramount importance was a job, any job, and women were forced into the marketplace to work, often for meager benefits. My concern here is that by describing women who work as masculine mothers and breadwinners, the authors presume that women who work do so only involuntarily and not for personal or professional aspirations and gain.

The kind of work women on welfare often do affords neither them nor their families security or stability; therefore, it is wrong to associate work with the "masculine role of breadwinning" (p. 117). In doing so, the authors set up an either-or dichotomy that belies the desire of (single) women, with or without children, to be the sole source provider. This categorization also assumes that all women on welfare wish to devote themselves exclusively to the role of stay-at-home mother. When women on welfare were, under prior welfare policy, able to enroll in postsecondary education, thousands did so with the intent of pursuing professional positions for themselves as well as seeking future financial security and stability for themselves and their families. Women have fought for too long and too hard to enter and achieve meaningful positions in the labor market to now see themselves as merely embracing masculine roles.

None of this is meant to minimize the book's well-documented exposure of harsh, retaliatory attitudes toward mothers in need of government assistance, attitudes that led to significant changes in the ways in which govern-

ment supports poor families. Dependency, albeit often brief, is mistakenly seen as the antithesis of the unwavering American belief in independence, self-reliance, and individualism. Yet as Virginia Sapiro so aptly reminds us, "the goodness or badness of dependency depends on who is depending on whom" ("The Gender Basis of American Social Policy," in Linda Gordon, ed., *Women, the State and Welfare*, 1990, p. 45).

Welfare scholars will discover rich findings in this book that supplement the increasing volume of work seeking to counter prevailing presumptions that current welfare policy is a success.

**No Child Left Behind and the Transformation of Federal Education Policy, 1965–2005.** By Patrick J.

McGuinn. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2006. 320p. \$40.00 cloth, \$19.95 paper.

DOI: 10.1017/S1537592707071083

— Peter W. Cookson, Jr., *Lewis & Clark College*

No Child Left Behind (NCLB) is an attempt by the federal government to regulate educational policy in the 50 states. By imposing on states a set of standards, benchmarks of yearly progress, and imposing sanctions on failing schools, the U.S. Department of Education has made a significant step from being more than a federal bully pulpit and a perch for fading politicians to a genuine ministry of education. This is ironic because the U.S. Constitution reserves to the states educational policy, except when it comes to enforcing civil rights. The strong bipartisan support for NCLB is a political, policy, and constitutional sea change in American history. How—and more importantly, why—did this happen?

In his new book, *No Child Left Behind and the Transformation of Federal Education Policy, 1965–2005*, Patrick J. McGuinn addresses this issue with the historian's eye for detail and the political scientist's ear for the subtext as well as the text of policymaking. He writes, "The new federal focus on student achievement is seen by many reformers as an essential precondition to school improvement efforts nationwide and to the campaign for greater equity in educational opportunity" (p. 196). His book reframes the debate over the federal intervention in educational policy and is an excellent example of how scholarship can inform contemporary policy and political controversies.

As one who has observed federal education policymaking from several different perspectives, I will confess that I have grown increasingly skeptical about the motives and efficacy of the federal government in improving schools, and I am deeply concerned that the testing regime imposed by NCLB is actually a huge step backward in our struggle to create more flexible, creative, and responsive schools. I am not entirely alone in this view; as the consequences of NCLB are felt at the grassroots level, teachers, parents, and politicians are raising fundamental questions. For this