

The first section of the book considers “Leadership From the Top,” and offers analysis of Congress, the presidency, and the court system. These chapters focus specifically on John Boehner’s tenure as Speaker of the House (Barbara Sinclair and Gregory Koger), contrasting leadership styles of Senate leaders Harry Reid and Mitch McConnell (Steven S. Smith), challenges faced by presidents in both domestic policy (Matthew N. Beckmann) and foreign policy (Philip B. K. Potter) leadership, and the ways in which federal judges engage in leadership (Charles M. Cameron and Mehdi Shadmehr). All address the need for more systematic and rigorous study in moving past a “great man” approach to defining leadership. For example, Sinclair and Koger look at Boehner’s time as Speaker through a principal-agent approach and conclude that members’ expectations can be more important than a leader’s personal traits in accomplishing items on the legislative agenda. In his chapter on presidents and domestic policy, Beckmann recognizes the inherent methodological weaknesses in a president-centered approach to the study of leadership (the infamous $n = 1$ problem), but argues that innovative research designs with original data are both possible and needed, as scholars should identify “specific individual-level factors that animate presidents’ decisions and impact, tracking the mechanism by which they do, and then gathering the fine-grained data that would reveal if they do not” (p. 82). Cameron and Shadmehr rely on a formal model grounded in game theory to argue that “great judges” do, in fact, exist, and that their leadership is “based on persuasion of followers whose obedience is entirely voluntary and based largely on a desire to undertake effective, coordinated action” (p. 132).

The next section considers “Leadership Across Institutions,” examining political parties (David Karol), interest groups (Timothy M. LaPira), the bureaucracy (John W. Patty), and the states (James Coleman Battista). Here, the authors delve into some of the topics largely missing from the political leadership literature. Again, the essays present a common theme concerning the challenges that leaders face in achieving political goals, as well as the need for more in-depth study: Parties lack formal membership and leadership is mostly informal; interest-group mobilization and maintenance are now easier, yet a lack of institutional norms pose challenges in deploying effective leadership; the actions and predispositions of bureaucratic leaders matter in how policy is implemented, even if they are faithful to the guidelines set out by elected officials; and leaders at the state level provide a larger data set to better explain the variances of challenges and opportunities faced by leaders in legislative and executive positions.

The final section of the book seeks to define leadership (William G. Howell and Stephanie Wolton), explain how the selection of political leaders shapes the environment in which they ultimately attempt to lead (Alan E. Wiseman), and answer the ultimate question, “What do political leaders do?” (Eric M. Patashnik). Howell and

Wolton sum up the goal of this volume with their definition of leadership, one that captures the nuances and complexities that have made studying leadership so challenging for political scientists, as leaders “distinguish themselves by the objectives they extol, the followers whose actions they orient and coordinate, and the ways in which they personify higher aims. Only when specific conditions are met is Leadership possible” (p. 261).

The depth and breadth of this work is impressive in that it provides the reader with a thorough summary of how political leadership has been studied to date, and offers many possible avenues for future research. The volume would also be an excellent fit for an undergraduate course on political leadership as it covers a broad range of topics that are seminal to the study of leadership within American politics. While no study can be all-inclusive, there are a few topics that were unfortunately not included, such as the news media, public leadership, and the roles of gender, race, and ethnicity when considering political leadership. On a related note, perhaps the most disappointing aspect is not in the volume’s content per se but its dearth of women scholars. The only woman contributor is the late Barbara Sinclair, though she was one of many women who have published extensively on this and related topics. Editors, as well as publishers, need to be more mindful of gender equity within political science publications to better reflect the changing demographics of the discipline.

Ultimately, *Leadership in American Politics* meets its objective in identifying the many methodological challenges in studying the concept of political leadership, as well as pointing out why a better scholarly approach is needed. The premise is ambitious, and perhaps overly optimistic, in its call to attract political scientists from a variety of methodological approaches to engage in this topic. One of the strengths, but also weaknesses, of the study of leadership in the last two decades has been its interdisciplinary focus. So many related yet disparate fields have carved out a perspective on defining leadership that a more traditional discipline like political science may resist embracing a soft term like “leadership.” However, as the editors and contributors show, the path forward in many of these specific areas can offer researchers a systematic and rigorous analysis that can provide insight into some of the most compelling human behavior, that of political leaders.

The Road to Inequality: How the Federal Highway Program Polarized America and Undermined Cities. By Clayton Nall. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018. 186p. \$99.99 cloth, \$24.99 paper. doi:10.1017/S1537592718003924

— Zachary Callen, *Allegheny College*

In recent years, political scientists have begun to pay more attention to both political geography and political

polarization. In *The Road to Inequality*, Clayton Nall brings these two threads together in a compelling analysis of the long-term impacts of the federal highway system on American cities. At its core, Nall's argument posits that federal highways are an exogenous force that altered the political dynamics of metropolitan areas, largely by enabling suburban areas surrounding central cities to become overwhelmingly Republican. Specifically, Nall argues that highways had both a catalyzing effect, speeding up the rate at which Republicans or likely Republicans moved to the suburbs, and a filtering effect, by only allowing some urban residents (notably those who could afford cars) to move to the suburbs.

The increasingly Republican nature of the suburbs has had long-term political effects, including on equality. Nall argues those long-term effects emerged due to transportation policy, which has become increasingly partisan in recent years. While highway spending tends to be supported by both Republicans and Democrats, Republicans are much more wary of spending money on mass transit options within central cities. Further, a great deal of transportation spending is locally determined, with local governments having significant input into the ways in which federal dollars are spent. Additionally, state and regional institutions are biased towards suburban representation. As a result, suburban governments are able to exert a surprising degree of influence over metropolitan transportation spending. Over time, this geographic polarization around transit policy has real impacts, as central cities struggle to provide needed transportation infrastructure to citizens. Less affluent citizens, who rely on public transit, are especially impacted by the results of this geographic polarization.

Nall builds this argument in two basic parts. In the first half of the book, he explores how highways have enabled partisan sorting. In building this argument, he makes exceptional use of innovative data and methods. For instance, he draws from travel time data collected by Rand McNally in order to explore how highways allowed suburban dwellers to commute more easily into central cities. He also makes excellent use of real estate advertising, historical surveys such as the Youth-Parent Socialization Panel Study, and other sources to carefully detail how highways not only encouraged suburbanization but specifically allowed suburbs to become heavily Republican. Then, in the second half of the book, Nall draws from a number of surveys across time to demonstrate that individuals' position on transportation policy is not merely self-interested and place based but actually motivated by partisanship. He turns to the General Social Survey and the Roper Center for Public Opinion Research data in particular, in order to illustrate how transportation policy is a partisan issue. Finally, he also relies on original survey work to further underscore his findings.

The author works diligently to replicate his findings across different data sources. Further, his description of

the data and his methods are always clear and insightful. He is similarly measured in his conclusions, expressing wariness about geographic sorting producing "echo chambers," which in turn fuel greater polarization. Finally, Nall ends his book by outlining how this geographic sorting has real impacts on the nature of transportation policy, which in turn impacts a whole range of other political issues.

In developing his argument, Nall makes a number of important contributions to the urban politics, public policy, and American political development literatures. First, the argument is an exceptional analysis of path dependence. The author takes the American highway system as an exogenous event that is introduced to American cities. From this originating event, he meticulously traces out the demographic and political changes that resulted from American highway policy. The book is a model for how to take a large political event and carefully measure its various intended and unintended political effects. Of course, path-dependent analyses are by no means new. However, this text is an exceptional illustration of how to do this work: Nall uses a range of data sources, carefully considers alternative hypotheses, and bounds his work in theoretical as well as temporal scope. By proceeding with such exhaustive care, he is able to wholly demonstrate the importance of the critical policy on which he focuses.

Related to his careful approach, Nall's work is also exciting for its unique approach to data analysis. The author combines historical research with quantitative techniques. In addition, he draws from a number of unique data sources as well as geographic information system (GIS) methods to push his argument as far as possible. Traditionally, American political development and, to a lesser extent, the urban politics literature draw heavily from qualitative case-study approaches. Of course, such detailed historical case studies have yielded fantastic histories and rich theoretical insights. However, Nall's work demonstrates the value of supplementing those qualitative approaches with quantitative tools as well. Notably, the author is able to rigorously consider causal relationships as a result of his quantitative research. Furthermore, the blending of quantitative and qualitative approaches allows him to effectively connect more individual-level behavior, such as voting, with the larger structural issues of highway construction. While he does not claim that highways ever caused voters to become Republican, he is able to tell a much richer story about the development of partisanship in American metropolitan regions as a result of the wide array of data from which he draws. In this way, he opens up new possibilities for future American political development research.

In addition, I want to underscore the value of Nall's interest in the built environment. In recent years, social scientists have paid more and more attention to urban

geography's role in shaping political behavior. Nall's work empirically underscores that the built environment does play an important, exogenous role in social phenomenon. However, the work is also measured, and it reminds readers that space's influence over social outcomes is not absolute. Hence, Nall's scholarship also makes important contributions to the political geography literature.

With that said, the text could use a larger theoretical discussion. The analysis of the American highway system and how it changed American politics draws from James Scott's (1999) *Seeing Like a State*. In this work, Scott turns his interest in large infrastructure projects into a rumination on state power. While Nall's focus is admittedly different, I was left curious regarding his broader understanding of such megaprojects. In some ways, these more abstract considerations move against his careful empirical work, and so I understand why he does not directly address them. I found myself especially interested in these questions since Nall, diverging from Scott, perceives that at least some megaprojects are shaped by local rather than national interests. However, this is a minor issue. In *The Road to Inequality*, Nall has produced an exceptionally smart and well-researched text that makes real contributions to the urban politics, political history, and public policy literatures.

Gendered Vulnerability: How Women Work Harder to Stay in Office. By Jeffrey Lazarus and Amy Steigerwalt. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2018. 236p. \$70.00 cloth. doi:10.1017/S1537592718003961

— Patricia A. Hurley, *Texas A&M University*

Jeffrey Lazarus and Amy Steigerwalt argue that “gendered vulnerability” accounts for a variety of legislative behaviors that distinguish female members of the U.S. Congress from their male counterparts. Gendered vulnerability refers to female candidates' perceptions that they are at risk of losing their bids for office. Women congressional candidates expect to be subjected to skepticism about whether women can do the job and other gender-related stereotypes, in part because women are socialized to doubt their own abilities. They face obstacles other than their perceptions, including frivolous news coverage of their appearance rather than the substance of the campaign, more primary challengers, and more serious general-election challengers than male candidates, simply because they are women. These doubts and obstacles are experienced by female incumbents as well, even when they have won previous elections by comfortable margins. The authors offer an extended argument for the existence of gendered vulnerability based on evidence from political science, psychology, and other fields on women in the workplace, interviews with former members of Congress and congressional staff, and vignettes about specific women in elections. Establishing that women in Congress

are subject to gendered vulnerability leads to predictions about how their legislative behaviors should be affected.

The authors ask whether women are more likely than men to engage in activities that would limit their electoral vulnerability, specifically those that David Mayhew (*The Electoral Connection*, 1974) identified as fostering reelection: credit claiming, position taking, and advertising. The authors also ask whether women members are more responsive to constituency interests. These activities are covered in four empirical chapters, in most instances using data from the 101st through the 110th Congress (1993 through 2009). The start date coincides with the gains in women's representation in Congress in the 1992 election. Quotations from the authors' interviews illustrate the analysis.

The findings of multivariate analyses indicate that women House members send more franked mail than do male representatives, although this is not true for senators. No gender differences are found with respect to spending on travel to the district for House members (a factor not examined for senators). Women Senate members (but not House members) employ more district staff than men, allowing for more casework. Analyses of earmarks in 2008 and the Obama Stimulus Package in 2009 show that women in both chambers procured more and higher dollar earmarks for their constituencies and that women in the House (but not the Senate) sent more stimulus dollars home. Moreover, women representatives were attuned to constituency need, with more stimulus aid going to districts with higher poverty rates.

Analyses of bill and resolution introductions and cosponsorships show women to be more active than men in both chambers. Evidence for whether women utilize more “messaging” bills than men (messaging is inferred, rather than coded directly)—and thus have more opportunities for position taking that they can advertise to constituents—is strong only for House members. Committee membership analysis shows women to be more likely than men to sit on committees with jurisdiction of direct relevance to constituencies, with Senate results that are far more robust than those in the House. In contrast, findings on the policy content of bills introduced are strong for the House (women more likely to introduce bills in areas of direct relevance to the district), but null for the Senate. DW-NOMINATE scores are used to create a measure of the proximity of roll-call voting to constituent preference, and both bivariate and multivariate analyses indicate that women members deviate less from constituency than do men, with stronger results in the Senate.

In general, women invest more time in communicating with constituents, secure more pork for the district, take more positions to send messages to constituents, and vote more in line with constituency preferences. Women are working to engage in activities with an electoral payoff, and benefiting the constituency in the process. Whether