

that Kollman justifiably elects to leave outside the purview of this book).

These are, I think, important limitations on the effectiveness of the book's central arguments. That they emerge as concerns, however, is largely testimony to Kollman's achievement. It is only in the context of his careful attention to the varied purposes and manifestations of this class of lobbying strategies that the need to address these nagging issues becomes so clear. Kollman's study moves us well forward in understanding the logic of outside lobbying, even though the inevitable trade-offs of his approach leave ample room for future scholars to improve on it. This is an important book, one that should be part of any graduate seminar on interest groups and one that scholars of public opinion and policy-making should find stimulating as well.

Reform in the Making: The Implementation of Social Policy in Prison. By Ann Chih Lin. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000. 213p. \$39.50.

William A. Taggart, *New Mexico State University*

During the last quarter of the twentieth century there was an explosion in the use of institutional corrections unparalleled in the annals of American penology. The numbers tell the story well: Just before the new millennium almost 1.3 million adults were confined in state and federal correctional facilities, which represents a tripling of the population in just under 20 years. One consequence of such a policy, and there are many, is that eventually a large proportion of these inmates will be released back into society. Their prospects do not look promising in terms of our current knowledge about recidivism rates, and we can expect a large and, most likely, increasing number of these individuals to rejoin the ranks of the incarcerated. The reasons for this policy failure are undoubtedly traceable to a number of forces, although one probably need not look beyond the prison walls as a place to start searching for answers.

Ann Chih Lin's book is a timely and valuable addition to the literature for those seeking ways to break the recidivism cycle. By no means is her work offered as a panacea. Rather, it focuses on one critical component of every prisoner's experience that is generally overlooked, the implementation of correctional rehabilitation programs. To be sure, rehabilitation has been studied extensively, and the consensus, Lin notes, is that it does not work. Indeed, it was this conclusion that discredited the rehabilitation model of corrections and resulted in the more punitive approaches that partially account for the swelling prison population. It is therefore somewhat ironic, a point not lost on the author, that the field of corrections is once again looking seriously at rehabilitation.

Lin's thesis is that rehabilitative programs are implemented in an organizational context that has a profound effect on how they are delivered. Lin argues that asking "what works" with respect to program design, the question that has guided many evaluation studies in the past, overlooks the independent role implementation plays in shaping desirable policy outcomes. In fact, Lin points out, there are examples of all types of prison programs that work, but they are outweighed considerably by virtually identical programs at other institutions that do not work. This suggests it may be the prisons and not the programs that require closer inspection. It is to this arduous task that Lin devotes her attention through a detailed examination of rehabilitative programming at five medium-security, male prisons in the United States. Through the use of hundreds of interviews, site visits,

and archival research, she sets out to discover what works in terms of program implementation.

The book is organized into five main chapters, plus an introduction, conclusion, and methodological appendix. The introduction and first two chapters develop foundational materials needed to understand the implementation processes discovered in each facility, the subject of the next two chapters. The foundation is complex, and Lin does a skillful job of linking the various pieces. The central argument is that implementation is a product of two dimensions: institutional needs and institutional values. Successful implementation, Lin posits, is a function of values that encourage an open, communicative prison environment and needs that are directly or indirectly supportive of rehabilitative goals (p. 56).

These opening chapters also introduce the five medium-security prisons studied by Lin, four federal facilities and one state institution. These are not identified and were selected as typical of the norm. The case study approach, which obviously lacks generalizability, is an important and necessary mainstay of implementation research. Lin employs her two explanatory dimensions to create a typology that organizes the varieties of implementation she unearthed, both successful and unsuccessful.

Chapters 3 and 4 examine the five prisons. The first of these chapters focuses on the three cases of implementation failure and the next chapter on the two cases of success. The case studies are rich in detail and reveal that the implementation of prison programs is anything but "one size fits all." Even the two successes work for different reasons.

Chapter 5 is cast in comparatively narrower terms, although it tackles one of the toughest issues: whether program participation should be mandatory or voluntary. The concluding chapter touches on a number of themes, including a call for a greater emphasis on process evaluations that focus on program management and delivery. As Lin correctly points out, successful implementation does not guarantee declining recidivism rates, but implementation failures have little, if any, chance of helping.

Lin's book is a very useful addition to the literature. It suggests that program content is only part of the equation; what also matters is the institutional context in which programs are offered. Policymakers and high-ranking administrators should recognize that their visions of policy goals and priorities are not necessarily shared by either prisoners or prison personnel. Appropriate guidance, incentives, and flexibility are required to allow institutions to mold implementation processes to meet their particular, localized needs. For those interested in public policy generally, Lin offers an adaptable theoretical framework that appears to have other possible applications, such as in the field of education. For all readers it is a solid reminder that implementation does indeed matter.

Social Cleavages and Political Change: Voter Alignments and U.S. Party Coalitions. By Jeff Manza and Clem Brooks. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999. 342p. \$55.00.

Carole Kennedy, *San Diego State University*

This work is touted as the only book-length examination of the sociological model of vote choice in American politics since David Knoke's *The Social Bases of Political Parties* (1976), and it is, indeed, a well-researched examination of the role that race, class, religion, and gender play in our understanding of voter alignments in the United States. At the same time, I have concerns about some of the methodolog-

ical decisions made by the authors and the effect of these choices on their conclusions.

The text presents a systematic analysis of social cleavages in the American political system, how they have persisted and changed over the past decades, and their effect on voter alignments with the Republican and Democratic parties. Manza and Brooks do a particularly good job describing the evolutionary effect of race, class, religion, and gender on political alignments, using data from the National Election Studies starting in 1952 and continuing through 1996. A great contribution is the precise and illuminating operationalization of the concepts they study, especially with regards to the measurement of class and religious divisions in contemporary America. Their analysis is less convincing, however, in their multivariate models, which attempt to explain why the trends they identify have occurred.

Manza and Brooks suggest that some political scientists have denied the importance of social cleavages as a factor in American politics. I am not convinced that the couple of review articles cited as evidence of this disdain for the sociological perspective actually represent the reality of its place in research done in the political science and political sociology disciplines. The Michigan Model, for example, has endured as a robust model of vote choice and has always admitted the importance of sociological variables as the first element in the funnel of causality. Much contemporary research into partisan alignment and vote choice incorporates a respect for race, class, gender, and religious preferences as important variables to examine. The beauty of the Michigan Model is that it recognizes the power of these cleavages in predicting partisan identification but also identifies candidate-specific aspects that may cause people to deviate from their avowed partisan identification and vote for a candidate from a party other than their own. Although rational choice modelers of vote choice rely less on sociological variables, there is still an implicit acknowledgment of the role of social cleavages in helping to determine where specific and distinctive preferences originate.

Among the authors' strongest scholarly contributions are the refined and improved measures of class and religious identification. Manza and Brooks compose a multicategory class scheme based upon respondents' occupation and employment situation. This results in a sevenfold classification of class location that includes professionals (salaried and self-employed, such as lawyers, physicians, engineers, teachers, scientists, writers, editors, and social workers) and non-full-time labor force participants (homemakers, retirees, students, the disabled, and part-time workers).

Given that the authors have devised new measures of the class variable, it is not surprising that they find trends in class cleavages that have persisted over time rather than declined, as suggested by other scholars who use different and more simplistic operationalizations (i.e., dichotomous blue-collar versus white-collar classifications). Class cleavage, as Manza and Brooks measure it, has fluctuated since 1952, with a peak in the 1964 election, but has not diminished or become irrelevant. Similar refinement of measures is done for religion. Once again, a multicategory scheme is adopted for delimiting various Protestant denominations, which also results in a sevenfold classification: liberal Protestants, moderate Protestants, conservative Protestants, Catholics, Jews, other, and none.

The finding that class and religion are still important variables in understanding political alignments reminds me of the intellectual furor caused by *The Changing American Voter* (Norman Nie, Sidney Verba, and John Petrocik, 1979). It purported to find hitherto unrevealed capacities of American

voters to engage in issue-based voting, only to discover later that the "changes" in voter behavior were attributable, at least partially, to altered wording in the National Election Study questionnaires. This is not to dismiss completely the findings of either that study or this. Indeed, Manza and Brooks operationalize class and religion in a more sophisticated way than previous attempts and hence advance our understanding of class and religious cleavages over time. The critical reader will also note, however, that the distinctive findings with regard to the persistence of these cleavages in American politics have some basis in the authors' unique conceptualization and operationalization of those variables.

Among the major findings of the study is a renewed appreciation for the influence of social cleavages on political alignments. These have not declined in importance, they suggest, but have consistently been determinative factors from the 1950s until the 1990s. In relative terms, the authors identify the largest social cleavage to center on race, which is twice as large as the religious cleavage. The class cleavage is third in magnitude, and the gender cleavage is fourth. With regard to the class cleavage, professionals (as uniquely defined by the authors) moved from being the most Republican class in the 1950s to being the most Democratic class in 1996. Also, using their sevenfold classification of religion, liberal Protestants moved from being the most Republican religious group in the 1960s to a more centrist position in the 1990s. The great strength of the authors' approach is to control for alternative explanations for shifts in social cleavages and to present findings on how each cleavage affects partisan alignment relative to changes that affect the electorate as a whole. This gives a rich and illuminating portrait of trends over time, which supports the authors' contention that these cleavages are important determinants of shifting partisan alignments.

The authors' attempts to explain why changes have occurred are less convincing. They use a Bayesian approach to model selection (which is inadequately explained or justified in the text or footnotes) and purport to refute conventional wisdom and existing research into the causes of the gender gap in American politics. They choose a model based primarily upon methodological concerns rather than a theory-driven rationale. The models for explaining the effect of religion and gender cleavage on vote choice are selected according to their Bayesian information criterion (BIC), which is based upon Adrian Raftery, "Bayesian Model Selection in Social Research" (*Sociological Methodology* 25 [1995]: 111–93). Raftery promotes the use of Bayesian analytic techniques that purport to distinguish between nonnested multivariate models and to identify the model that best "fits" the data. This approach is explicitly rejected by Andrew Gelman and Donald Rubin in "Avoiding Model Selection in Bayesian Social Research" (*Sociological Methodology* 25 [1995]: 165–73). There is a legitimate and defensible difference of scholarly opinion regarding the utility of BIC measures in model selection, but the authors do not address this concern anywhere in the text. A simple illustration, however, shows how this omission mitigates the contribution made by the authors.

In the chapter on the gender gap, Manza and Brooks select among competing models of the emerging gender gap in presidential elections between 1952 and 1992. They select what they claim is the preferred model because it has the best fit using Raftery's index, with a BIC improvement of -2 . This model is then used as the basis of a framework to explain the gap as a function of labor force participation. This second model is selected only after discarding an alternative, to which the authors fail to assign a BIC score. In the first instance, the choice is based on a -2 improvement in BIC; in

the second instance, a rejection is made without explicit discussion of BIC.

My own research into the meaning of a BIC score found, on page 139 of the 1995 Raftery article, that a BIC difference of 0–2 indicates only weak evidence of any improvement in fit. A difference of 2–6 is considered positive evidence of an improvement, and a difference of 6–10 is considered strong evidence. Hence, the authors implicitly reject theoretical concerns in model selections, which directly contravenes the admonition in Raftery's 1995 article: "Statistical methods for model selection and accounting for model selection should be used only to address issues left unresolved by theory. Bayesian model selection is not an all-purpose panacea: strong theory, clear conceptualization and careful measurement remain vital for successful social research" (p. 157).

America's Congress: Actions in the Public Sphere, James Madison through Newt Gingrich. By David R. Mayhew. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000. 257p. \$30.00.

Sarah A. Binder, *George Washington University and The Brookings Institution*

America's Congress is a deceptively simple work. At its most basic, it is an exploration of the public moves of members of Congress over the course of American history. With a newly built database of 2,304 observations of members' publicly noted moves stretching back to 1789, Mayhew offers an innovative portrait of how and when American legislators have made their mark on the public record, as recorded by eminent historians of the middle to late twentieth century.

What makes this a deceptively simple work? Mayhew's aim and effect in writing *America's Congress* go far beyond his perceptive reading of the fascinating patterns uncovered. Instead, the book is really a call for a new way of studying Congress and legislative politics more generally. It is a commentary, Mayhew says, on political scientists' treatment of Congress, and it is an appeal to legislative scholars to rethink the dominant modes and methods by which they typically approach the task of explaining legislative behavior and outcomes. To understand how *America's Congress* makes this contribution, a more detailed exploration of Mayhew's mode and methods of inquiry is in order.

Mayhew explores the sorts of actions by members of Congress that "register in the collective public consciousness" (p. 10). He argues that by definition such actions should be considered consequential or at least potentially so, given their notice by politically aware citizens at the time. For Mayhew, these bits of publicly noticed action make up the stuff of public affairs, the central bits of political life in a democratic system. This approach to studying politics is akin, Mayhew states, to studying economics by exploring the public moves of Bill Gates and George Soros, a decidedly "supply-side account" (p. 25) of legislative politics not usually found in studies of Congress. It is an approach that encourages an historical perspective on Congress and its members, as Mayhew asks not only what sorts of public actions are undertaken by members but also in what mix and with what consequence for national politics and institutions over time. As he points out, scholars more typically rely on roll call votes to characterize members' historical modes of behavior, but such data fail to capture the richer mix of legislative behavior that occurs over time and that has a claim to being politically consequential.

The method for recording members' public moves bears a family resemblance to the well-known and pioneering method Mayhew used in *Divided We Govern* (1991) to

uncover landmark legislation enacted in the last half of the twentieth century. In *America's Congress*, he combs nearly forty general and era-specific histories of the United States written since 1950 to cull from their indices and texts which legislators have been noticed, when in their careers such notice takes place, and for what sorts of actions they are noticed. Mayhew appropriately showers readers with the richness of the mix of actions recorded, including Henry Clay's maneuvering to craft the Compromise of 1850, Preston Brooks's caning of Charles Sumner on the Senate floor in 1856, and Edward Kennedy's leadership of the fight against Robert Bork's nomination to the Supreme Court in 1987.

This is a methodological undertaking that will inspire awe in even the most hardy coder of legislative politics, and the result is an incredibly rich database that records in intricate detail the precursor moves to critical outcomes and junctures in America's national political life. Mayhew explicitly and honestly recognizes some of the drawbacks to his method, noting, for instance, some examples of conspicuously missing actions from the historical texts. The method may still generate some controversy, however. One might argue that legislators can make politically consequential moves without public or historical notice, and not all publicly noticed actions are necessarily consequential; such concerns could raise questions about the sorts of biases that may have worked their way into the data.

Any such weakness aside, Mayhew uncovers a treasure-trove of patterns in legislative life. One of the most striking observations is that less than half of members' public moves are directly related to passing legislation. "Taking stands" is an equally prominent mode of behavior and more often than not does not explicitly entail legislative action, such as the caning of Sumner for his antislavery views or former House Speaker Tip O'Neill's emergence as the chief Democratic spokesman against President Reagan and congressional Republicans in the 1980s. Such "oppositional" behavior is, Mayhew detects, a central mode of legislative life, a mode that comes predominantly from within the congressional majority party and that has been central to the formation of new parties throughout the course of American political life.

Mayhew's skillful reading of the data also leads him to important conclusions about the institutions of Congress and the presidency. The author draws a convincing portrait in chapter 4 that suggests the House, Senate, and presidency have become democratized over American history and at the same time have grown distinct and equal in influence and legitimacy. Mayhew's ability to detect and explain broad patterns in the evolution of the separation of powers is among the central and innovative contributions of this work.

Mayhew notes at the outset that the book is more an "exploration of the territory rather than a causal analysis" (p. 28). I think he understates the contribution of his work. By focusing on legislators' moves rather than, say, roll call votes, Mayhew makes a real theoretical innovation: He treats members of Congress as cue givers rather than cue takers. Taking gentle aim at legions of legislative scholars who have viewed legislators' policy preferences as exogenously given, Mayhew argues that legislative life is as much about opinion formation as it is about opinion expression (p. 18). That is why focusing on America's public sphere is such an important move theoretically: It forces students of American politics to look explicitly at the realm in which public opinion is molded and cast by legislators and political leaders. If members were simply cue takers, the public sphere would be unimportant. But if politics is also, as Mayhew argues, about the formation of public and elite preferences, then ignoring the sphere of