

The Academy of Political Science

475 Riverside Drive · Suite 1274 · New York, New York 10115-1274
(212) 870-2500 · FAX: (212) 870-2202 · aps@psqonline.org · <http://www.psqonline.org>

POLITICAL SCIENCE QUARTERLY

Volume 117 · Number 3 · Fall 2002

No part of this article may be copied, downloaded, stored, further transmitted, transferred, distributed, altered, or otherwise used, in any form or by any means, except:

- one stored electronic and one paper copy of any article solely for your personal, non-commercial use, or
- with prior written permission of The Academy of Political Science.

Political Science Quarterly is published by The Academy of Political Science. Contact the Academy for further permission regarding the use of this work.

Political Science Quarterly

Copyright © 2002 by The Academy of Political Science. All rights reserved.

tious about multilateral arrangements that interfere with our ability to produce stable peace in volatile areas. Because of our global military role, the United States sometimes has interests and vulnerabilities that are different from those of smaller states . . .” (p. 160). That is a qualification to a commitment to multilateralism large enough to make even Bush National Security Adviser Condoleeza Rice happy. That the world presents dilemmas in practice sometimes awkwardly subsumed in principles does not diminish the importance of the principles, however. Nye has done us an important service in laying out the moral and empirical principles behind multilateral approaches to foreign policy.

LISA ANDERSON
Columbia University

The Private Roots of Public Action: Gender, Equality, and Political Participation by Nancy Burns, Kay Lehman Schlozman, and Sidney Verba. Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press, 2001. 453 pp. Cloth, \$55.00; paper, \$27.95.

This major book covers an important juncture in the study of American political participation and gender at the end of the twentieth century. While it's long been observed that women have been less active and attentive to politics than men, the authors summarize the changes and stability over time in the relationship between gender and different forms of participation, and they delve deeply into seeking explanations for the gender differences that persist. This book is required reading for anyone interested in gender and social and political behavior, and for scholars and students of political participation.

While the authors examine the substantial survey trend data, their in-depth analysis focuses on the multiwave 1989–1990 Citizen Participation Study, beginning with an initial brief survey of a sample of 15,000, which enabled them to oversample African American and Latinos, as well as activists. At the end, the study interviewed a modest sample of married couples, enabling the authors to examine and link household characteristics and their hierarchy to political participation. This research goes substantially beyond what Verba, Schlozman, and Brady reported from the 1989–1990 surveys in *Voice and Inequality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics*.

This review cannot do justice to the book's rich data and analysis. The data show that the gap in political participation and related gender differences has been closing, but not substantially overall, though there is now no gap for voting. So it is as important as ever to identify the sources of these differences. While these sources are well-known in the participation literature (education and socioeconomic status, mobilization, sense of political efficacy), the authors assess them in a most analytical and compelling way. They demonstrate persua-

sively that differences in three factors—resources (time, money, and civic skills), recruitment (or mobilization, being in a social network that leads one to be targeted by requests for political activity), and psychological orientations to politics (especially political interest, information, and efficacy)—largely explain why men participate more than women. This participation difference in their data was 0.31 on an eight-point participation scale, including protest activity and making a campaign contribution. This is not an enormous difference but one that is large enough to matter in a struggle for scarce resources and equality in influencing and benefiting from government actions. The difference, as well as the substantially larger gender difference among Latinos, is fully accounted for when the three factors are controlled in multivariate analysis.

Specifically, it is how women differ from men in the amount or level of these factors that matter and not how resources, recruitment opportunity, and psychological orientation have different consequences for men and women. The authors make a strong case for estimating multivariate regression models separately by gender to determine to what extent there may be inequalities in the mechanisms or processes by which these factors augment participation. These generally do not occur. The main inequality remains in people's different levels of civic skill, opportunity, and motivation, and not in how the same levels of these give more advantage to men than women. One exception may be, according to the married couples data, that women's participation benefits from the say that women have in family discussions, whereas men get a boost from their control over family financial discussions.

The book has the usual types of problems associated with multivariate survey analysis (that is, inadequate measurement, including that of control variables that have to account fully for alternative explanations; the direction of causal inference in the case of estimating the effects of psychological orientations that may themselves be affected by participation in politics; and omitted variables that affect both participation and the purported influences on participation). But overall, the book's findings and conclusions put the burden on its critics. The book challenges—if not demolishes—some myths or common wisdom. It shows that the lore of soccer Moms outparticipating working mothers can only be found for more highly educated women. Moreover, having a wife who spends more time at home appears to lead men to participate more, without affecting the wife's civic engagement. Men's political participation does not just benefit from experiences in social organizations but also in organizations that are tangentially involved in politics, challenging arguments about how organizations are supportive of participation through purely social mechanism without any explicit link to politics. Gender and racial/ethnic group consciousness does not lead to higher levels of political participation per se, though it is associated with more gender and racial issue-focused participation. Being a victim of gender discrimination appears to enhance, not diminish participation. Perhaps the most compelling and far-reaching finding is that women in a politically encouraging environment, where women are visibly situated in political

office or positions, is associated with greater participation among women. Participation is an individual-level phenomenon, but what happens in elite-level politics and the broader political and institutional context matters for the behavior of women and others less engaged in political life.

ROBERT Y. SHAPIRO
Columbia University

At Home Abroad: Identity and Power in American Foreign Policy by Henry R. Nau. *Ithaca, NY, Cornell University Press, 2002. 314 pp. \$29.95.*

This book seeks to bridge the gap between two major schools of thought: realism, which sees U.S. foreign policy as driven by material factors, and constructivism, which emphasizes the influence of ideas on American behavior abroad. As the subtitle suggests, Nau argues that U.S. foreign policy can only be understood by taking into account both power-related considerations and America's sense of its own identity.

Realism, with its focus on national security and the balance of power, has been the dominant perspective among students of international politics in this country for half a century. As an explanation for U.S. foreign policy, however, it has not enjoyed such an exalted position. Constructivism, on the other hand, is a relatively new approach to the study of international relations generally, but analysts of U.S. foreign policy specifically have long been interested in the ways that American ideals and identity affect the country's international behavior. For example, many scholars have seen "American exceptionalism"—the belief that the United States is different from and morally superior to other countries—as responsible for producing the extremes of isolation and intervention that have characterized the history of U.S. foreign relations. Other observers have viewed "cultural distance"—the degree to which America's culture is similar to or different from the cultures of other states—as a crucial source of U.S. attitudes and behaviors.

Nau builds on these ideas to construct a framework for understanding relations between the United States and other countries. Two factors comprise the framework. First is the distribution of power, equal or unequal. Second is the convergence or divergence of national identities. According to Nau, unequal power and convergent identities yield hierarchy, represented by the U.S.–NATO relationship. Unequal power and divergent identities produce U.S. hegemony, reflected in American relations with most of the developing world. Equal power and convergent identities yield security community, illustrated by U.S. relations with its partners in the G-7. Finally, equal power and divergent identities produce what Nau calls double-track anarchy, characterized by both the balancing of power and economic engagement. This outcome is reflected in U.S. relations with Russia and may be reflected in future U.S. relations with China.