

In sum, Whittington's examination of judicial supremacy is excellent. The book provides a wonderfully written and informative account of the historical and political bases for the development of judicial review and is animated with examples and anecdotes that reinforce the arguments developed within each section and that enliven the prose. In addition to his comprehensive examination of the constitutional history leading to Chief Justice Marshall's assertion of judicial review, Whittington has also provided an excellent overview of the literature on the presidency and uses that literature to frame his discussion of presidential assertions of judicial supremacy for their own political benefit. In short, his analysis is a pleasure to read and an excellent contribution to our understanding of judicial supremacy within our separated political system.

Frank Cross takes us in a different direction in his interesting examination of *Decision Making in the U.S. Courts of Appeals*. Cross provides a comprehensive analysis of how appeals courts judges individually and as members of appellate panels make decisions in cases before them. He begins his analysis by discussing the different models of judicial decision making that have been developed in the judicial politics literature and in studying the United States Supreme Court in particular. Discussing the attributes of the legal and attitudinal models, Cross sets out the task of analyzing the degree to which appellate courts judges' decision making seems to be in line with either. Through his analysis, he finds evidence to support both models, but particularly stresses the importance of legal variables in decision making. Beyond the legal variables, he also finds individual judge ideology to be consistently important. And, not only did he find ideology to be prominent at the individual level but it also had important panel effects.

Cross's examination of appeals court decision making is expansive. Throughout the book he analyzes the roles of both law and ideology, and continues on to examine judicial background and litigant, panel, and procedural effects on decision making. His extensive discussion of the courts of appeals database and thorough explanations of his modeling decisions make the book particularly accessible to readers not familiar with the database or statistical modeling generally. Indeed, the primary weakness of the book is also its strength. Cross's somewhat basic modeling choices may limit our understanding of how particular variables interact with one another to affect appeals courts decisions in a more nuanced manner than is suggested in the text. However, the work does provide a wide-ranging and general assessment of decision making from which future research can develop.

By necessity, a book of such breadth cannot probe each topic to exhaustion and it is not Cross's goal to do so. As a result, the reader is left with perhaps as many questions as answers, but toward the author's stated goal of providing a jumping off point for future theoretical and empirical research, this is, of course, beneficial. And, as work on

Supreme Court decision making has illustrated (Lee Epstein and Jack Knight, *The Choices Justices Make*, 1998; Forrest Maltzman, James Spriggs, and Paul J. Wahlbeck, *Crafting Law on the Supreme Court: The Collegial Game*, 2000), as well as work examining dissensus on these same federal appeals courts (Virginia A. Hettinger, Stefanie A. Lindquist, and Wendy L. Martinek, *Judging on a Collegial Court: Influences on Federal Appellate Decision Making*, 2006), much could be gained in that future work by examining not only the final votes of these judges and/or panels but also the process through which the decisions emerge.

Central to the arguments in each of these fine books is that the courts operate within a separated political system. Both works advance our understanding of how that crucial institutional arrangement results in a conversation between the branches, whether in terms of a president's outright assertion that he is constrained to enforce the law as the Supreme Court defines it, or in terms of the potential for legislators' preferences to constrain decisions made on the courts of appeals. I highly recommend both books.

**The Impact of Women in Congress.** By Debra L. Dodson.

New York: Oxford University Press, 2006. 295p. \$95.00 cloth, \$29.95 paper.

DOI: 10.1017/S1537592707072404

— Jilda M. Aliotta, *University of Hartford*

This book provides an important contribution to the emerging literature on the impact of women legislators, particularly women in Congress. Following in the tradition of Sue Thomas (*How Women Legislate*, 1994), Cindy Simon Rosenthal (*Women Transforming Congress*, 2002), and Michelle Swers (*The Difference Women Make*, 2002), Debra Dodson explores the relationship between descriptive and substantive representation of women. Using a modified garbage can model (Michael Cohen, James G. March, and Johan P. Olson, "A Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice," *Administrative Science Quarterly* 17 [1972]: 1–25) as her theoretical framework (p 32–33), Dodson argues that this relationship will be probabilistic rather than deterministic. Her study asks the question: What factors mediate the relationship between the presence of more women in Congress and enactment of policies supporting women's issues?

Dodson takes advantage of the "natural quasi-experiment" (p. 4) created by the transition from the 103d Congress following the election "year of the woman," 1992, to the 104th Congress following the election year of the "angry white man," 1994. As she points out, it is unusual to have two Congresses so radically different in leadership and ideological tenor in such close proximity. Thus, they constitute an ideal "laboratory" in which to investigate the impact of institutional and contextual factors on the relationship between descriptive and substantive representation (p. 85).

Dodson further argues that one reason previous research has resulted in inconsistent findings is “the failure to capture the texture of the process” (p. 25). Thus, her study is primarily qualitative. Three in-depth legislative case studies constitute the core of her study. The subjects of these case studies—reproductive rights, women’s health, and health care generally—are well chosen since they provide a basis for comparison among different types of women’s issues. Interviews with women members of Congress across three points in time allow Dodson to track the impact of partisan and institutional changes on their objectives and their behavior. These data are supplemented with interviews with lobbyists and congressional staff and with quantitative analysis of interest-group voting indices.

Across the three case studies, the relationship between descriptive and substantive representation proved to be a complex one. While a clear relationship emerged, it was neither linear nor deterministic. Although nearly all of the female members of Congress interviewed for the study expressed a desire to represent women, as well as to represent their districts, this desire was not always reflected in their behavior. Not surprisingly, there was disagreement among women members of Congress over what constitutes representing women. This was particularly true for the 104th Congress, which included several conservative Republican women members. Among the three issues studied, only women’s health received nearly uniform support.

Secondly, women in Congress were often subject to competing institutional and partisan pressures. For example, especially during the early days of the 104th Congress, moderate Republican women were under pressure from their party leadership to follow party discipline. These representatives needed to weigh a complex set of incentives. Their choices would influence their future effectiveness across a range of issues.

Finally, as relatively new members of Congress, women often lacked the advantages of institutional power. In both 103d and 104th Congresses, women were less likely to be represented in leadership and to serve on key committees. As a result, they were often not in a position to advocate effectively for women’s issues. Thus, even during the 103d Congress, when their party held the majority, Democratic women were thwarted in their ability to enact legislation favorable to women because they rarely held insider status. The Republican leadership of the 104th Congress was more open to integrating women into positions of institutional power. However, this integration was not an unmitigated victory for those seeking increased substantive representation of women since it brought with it increased pressure to follow party discipline.

One particularly intriguing finding involved the impact of the electoral gender gap. Throughout the period under study, the gender gap served as a resource that women members in Congress could use to persuade others, par-

ticularly the predominantly male leadership of their parties, of the importance of supporting women’s issues.

The study also suggests that for partisan legislative bodies like the U.S. Congress, Rosabeth Moss Kanter’s concept of critical mass (*Men and Women of the Corporation*, 1977) may need to be refined. Dodson notes that in the area of reproductive rights, women legislators moved from a critical mass in the 103d Congress to tokens in the 104th. While their numerical strength remained constant, their access to institution power changed dramatically due to the shift in party control and to an increase in conservative, pro-life women legislators (pp. 148–49).

In short, Dodson provides an important contribution to the emerging picture of the impact of women in public office. Her study nicely complements Michelle Swers’s book. While both studies focus on the 103d and 104th Congresses, they provide distinct snapshots. These works in combination demonstrate the importance of studying women’s impact from a variety of perspectives using a variety of methods.

**Republicans and the Black Vote.** By Michael K. Fauntroy. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 2007. 180p. \$49.95.

**Race, Republicans, and the Return of the Party of Lincoln.** By Tasha S. Philpot. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2007. 211p. \$65.00 cloth, \$22.95 paper. DOI: 10.1017/S1537592707072416

— Peter W. Wielhouwer, *Western Michigan University*

These two books examine important themes in one of the more dynamic aspects of American party coalitions: the complex relationship between African Americans and the Republican Party. Michael Fauntroy examines broadly the relationship’s ebb and flow, emphasizing the policy, political, and rhetorical elements of the party’s conflicted orientations toward the black electorate. Tasha Philpot develops a general theory of changes in party images, testing it in light of recent GOP efforts to appear more racially diverse.

Philpot develops a compelling theory of political-party image change, testing it against the backdrop of the 2000 and 2004 Republican national conventions’ efforts to portray a party of racial and ethnic diversity. She analyzes media coverage of and public responses to those efforts, using multiple methodologies; the overall result is a thorough and readable book appropriate for graduate reading lists in public opinion, political parties, elections, and race and ethnicity.

Fauntroy undertakes a more comprehensive historical treatment of the relationship between African Americans and the Republican Party, examining “how the GOP’s public policy positions have developed, as well as how their use of political symbolism has resulted in dismal levels of black support for the party” (p. x). The result is a balanced and nuanced discussion of race–party intersections from both groups’ perspectives. The historical exposition is akin to peeling an onion; succeeding sections of the book reveal the layered complexity of the relationship and why African