

campaigns' accounting and minimized the chances of facing an audit.

This new regulatory environment encouraged the growth of dedicated political firms, which consolidated the market for tasks that had previously been performed by a hodgepodge of campaign staff, unofficial advisers, and side projects of commercial advertising and market research firms. Sheingate's key insight is that the FEC's effort to expose the inner workings of campaigns encouraged the shifting of campaign work outside of the campaign organization itself and into privately owned intermediary firms, where it once again became opaque to the prying eyes of regulators. This adaptation, of course, came with a cost to candidates in the form of reduced control over the content of campaign messages and the conduct of campaign activities.

This line of thought—on the consulting industry's consequences, rather than its causes—leads Sheingate into the book's most speculative territory, but also some of its most interesting. In the concluding chapter, he wrestles with the implications for American politics of the existence of a class of privatized, profit-motivated campaign service professionals.

One cannot help but notice in Sheingate's descriptions of the work of early consulting firms a distinctly rightward tilt. Industry pioneer Campaigns Inc's successful (and lucrative) public relations campaign against the scourge of "socialized medicine" stands out, but time and again we see consultants working to defeat left-wing proposals or candidates that might have cut into their corporate clients' profits. This ideological asymmetry persists in the industry today: My own work with Zac Peskowitz has shown that firms that work for Republican candidates earn higher markups than do firms that work for Democrats.

In somewhat crude economic terms, consultants and the services they provide are a means of substituting capital for labor in the production process of electoral competition. It is hard not to draw the conclusion that the vanishing of the old ward heelers and block captains and their replacement by paid mass media as the dominant electoral expense therefore privileges the interests of the owners of capital over those of the owners of labor. Although individual consultants are an ideologically diverse lot, a system of campaign services provided for profit inevitably produces stronger inducements to work in politics for those whose ideological commitments align with wealthy interests.

Sheingate's careful historical analysis shows that the development of a business of politics in its present form was not an inevitable consequence of advances in mass communication technology. Rather, its formation was enabled and its growth accelerated at key points by institutional developments. A hopeful interpretation of this institutional rather than technological origin story is

that, of course, institutions can be changed. A Manafort-free world is possible.

**Leadership in American Politics.** Edited by Jeffery A. Jenkins and Craig Volden. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2017. 328p. \$39.95 cloth.

doi:10.1017/S1537592718003894

— Lori Cox Han, *Chapman University*

Scholars within the discipline of political science, like many others within the social sciences and humanities, continue to debate the concept of "leadership." No universal definition has yet to emerge, as it is a fluid and malleable term dependent on relevant context. In the current political environment, there is perhaps no better time for political scientists to seek a better understanding of "political leadership" and all that it entails, including the scope and, in some cases, limits of actions that can be taken by political leaders at all levels of government. To that end, *Leadership in American Politics*, edited by Jeffery A. Jenkins and Craig Volden, offers an expansive examination of political leadership that provides new avenues of inquiry related to the challenges faced by leaders across the political spectrum. According to the editors, the goal is to "draw renewed attention to the causes and consequences of the actions that public leaders take" (p. 1).

Often, theories about leadership have focused on specific traits, skills, styles, or personality characteristics that leaders possess, or certain situations that allow officeholders to show leadership through their actions. Within political science, it is often in the study of the presidency, as opposed to legislative and judicial positions, that one finds a focus on leadership. This edited volume, however, shows the potential to look beyond the White House, as studying leaders in all political arenas takes into consideration how leadership can be applied to the American political process as part of the unique dynamics within democratic governing institutions. The essays included provide both theoretical and empirical analyses of not just the president but leaders in Congress, the court system, political parties, interest groups, the bureaucracy, and state governments as well, seeking "to start new debates and develop new literatures" (p. 6) in helping political science to reach its full potential in understanding leadership within American politics.

Jenkins and Volden conclude the introductory chapter with five "lessons" that should be heeded by anyone accepting the challenge of pursuing research in this area: Build on a coherent definition and common terminology; understand that there is no single model of effective leadership; a fundamental theory of leadership must be developed; leaders in American politics operate within a complex and constraining landscape (not simply as powerful individuals); and, context and conditionality are crucial in empirical studies of leadership (pp. 6–8).

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 Stephane 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