

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 121 · Number 2 · Summer 2006

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 © 2006 by The Academy of Political Science. All rights reserved.

into remaining silent, or are induced to articulate their support for ideas in which they do not believe because such views are deemed safe. Indeed, Downs argues that this tendency toward the expression of false preferences is potentially worse than not speaking at all, because it will bolster the ideological status quo on university campuses, and thus further entrench the power of those who support speech-restrictive codes.

MARK KEMPER
Bridgewater State College

It Takes a Candidate: Why Women Don't Run for Office by Jennifer L. Lawless and Richard L. Fox. New York, Cambridge University Press, 2005. 224 pp. \$22.99.

Women have made significant gains in the United States in terms of achieving equality in the professional world. So why, in the twenty-first century, are women still so underrepresented in the American political system? Although a number of scholars have explored the institutional and social barriers to women's representation in office, until now, no one has studied in a systematic and large-scale way how political ambition, the desire to seek office, may account for the sex differences in representation. In their book, Jennifer L. Lawless and Richard L. Fox have conducted groundbreaking research to understand why some people consider running for office and others do not. What their research reveals is that women's underrepresentation in office is due in large part to the fact that women are much less likely to be politically ambitious than are men. In an engaging, well-written, and thorough examination, these authors explore the causes of political ambition for men and women, and their findings reveal important and, in some cases, surprising results.

The first step to office holding is the desire to seek public office. Typically, studies of political ambition have focused on understanding the ambition of those who have entered a campaign or won office. However, these studies have missed those who could have run for office but never considered doing so. Why are some people willing to consider a run for office, whereas others are not? How does one go about studying the differences between those who do want to run and those who do not? In an ingenious approach, Fox and Lawless identify a sample of 3,800 men and women who are "swimming" in what scholars call the "eligibility pool" for political office. In other words, these respondents have the educational and professional backgrounds typically shown to situate individuals well for political office holding. The authors find that despite their relative equality to the men in the sample in terms of background qualifications, the women in the sample are much less likely to have considered running for office. They investigate what they call the "two-stage candidate emergence process" (p. 18) and find significant gender differences in considerations to run for office (the first stage), although less dramatic gender differences among those who have actually run for office (the second stage).

Using their comprehensive survey data coupled with in-depth interviews of a subset of the respondents, Lawless and Fox identify three primary explanations for the different levels of political ambition among these equally qualified potential candidates. Specifically, Lawless and Fox find that women are less likely than men to consider or to have ever considered office seeking because of family socialization, traditional masculine beliefs about politics, and gendered psychological orientations toward participation.

Although this study and others show that women continue to bear more of the responsibility for care of children and the home, for the professional women in the study, this was not the most significant familial factor shaping ambition. Instead, early family socialization was more important. Specifically, women were much less likely to have been encouraged by their parents to consider a run for office. Similarly, traditional, masculine orientations toward the political system mean that the parties and other important political activists are much less likely to ask women to run for office. Finally, and perhaps most surprisingly, women are less likely to seek office than men because they are more likely than men to believe that they lack the qualifications for office. This finding is most alarming for those who value and seek gender parity in office, because the women in this study were chosen *because* they were, by all traditional measures, quite qualified to run for office.

Lawless and Fox have identified through this important research a significant obstacle to women's representation: low levels of political ambition. Given that the youngest women in their sample have the lowest overall ambition, it seems unlikely that great progress toward equality in representation in the United States will occur soon.

ELIZABETH S. SMITH
Furman University

Women in the South African Parliament: From Resistance to Government by Hannah E. Britton. *Champaign, University of Illinois Press, 2005. 224 pp. \$35.00.*

This modest book describes the gendered transformation of the South African Parliament during the transition from apartheid in the 1990s. Hannah Britton interviewed dozens of women parliamentarians, many of whom shared with her their concerns about their new roles and their expectations in regard to these roles. The focus of the book is not on individual experiences, however, but rather on how the new female parliamentarians reshaped Parliament, and how the exigencies of political life in Parliament in turn reshaped the parliamentarians.

The book begins with a lengthy chapter on women in the South African struggle against apartheid. The author's exploration of the paradoxes of a liberation struggle within a patriarchal organization and society is well done, and a good introduction to South African women's organizations and their