according to Robertson. The opposition has become more cohesive and active, and the author identifies this as a potential catalyst for regime change. It is also worth asking whether the regime's techniques to manage protest, created during a period of relatively high oil prices and economic prosperity, would be sustainable during a domestic economic crisis. The reduction in elite competition has relied on a system of patronage funded by oil revenue and has honed the target for potential protesters' complaints. So, a decline in oil revenue, and thus patronage funds, may revive elite competition and enable the opposition to more effectively frame their grievances.

In sum, this book provides a theory of protest in hybrid regimes, which clarifies the impact and raison d'être of hybrid regimes, elaborates on explanations for contentious politics, and illuminates activism in contemporary Russia. It is a thought-provoking book that is worth reading.

Political Power and Women's Representation in Latin America. By Leslie A. Schwindt-Bayer. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010. 262p. $65.00.

doi:10.1017/S1537592711002970

— Maria C. Escobar-Lemmon, *Texas A&M University*

Across the globe, increasing numbers of women are winning election to national parliaments. Excitingly, these success stories are not confined to Northern Europe; women constitute 56% of the chamber in Rwanda and 39% in Angola and Costa Rica. Yet women are less than 5% of representatives in Lebanon, Belize, Mongolia, and Palau (http://www.ipu.org/wmn-e/classif.htm). Scholars of women in politics have devoted significant attention to explaining this variation. Recently, consensus has emerged that gender quotas, which mandate a fixed proportion of women on the ballot, rapidly increase women's representation, although quota design and enforcement affect outcomes. Other scholars have focused on what women do once elected. They have emphasized differences in legislator behavior, demonstrating, for instance, that female legislators are more likely to author bills in support of women's rights or to serve on women's, children's, and family committees.

Political Power and Women's Representation in Latin America unifies these bodies of literature. It integrates the four types of representation outlined in Hannah Pitkin's *The Concept of Representation* (1967) into a new theoretical framework in order to explain how formal representation (the rules) determines descriptive representation (composition of the legislature). Descriptive and formal representations determine substantive representation (e.g., types of bills authored). Formal, descriptive, and substantive, in turn, affect symbolic representation (how representative government is in the eyes of its citizens). This integrated framework is a major strength of the book.

On the basis of her analysis of all democratic elections since 1974 in 18 Latin American countries, Leslie Schwindt-Bayer concludes that culture and socioeconomics are relatively weak predictors of women's representation. Instead, institutional factors—aspects of formal representation (especially district magnitude and quota laws)—predict descriptive representation. The majority of the book examines substantive representation by drawing on a survey of legislators from Argentina, Costa Rica, and Colombia. These three countries constitute two cases of a quota law (Argentina's Chamber of Representatives and Costa Rica) and two cases of no quota law (the Colombian Chamber and Senate). Because she explicitly compares men and women, Schwindt-Bayer goes beyond describing female representatives' behavior to explain how it differs from that of male representatives.

The author begins by examining legislators' behavior: whom they believe they represent and which aspects of their job they prioritize. Not surprisingly, women place a higher value on representing women's interests and women's groups; however, men also say this is important. At the same time, female legislators gave responses similar to men on the importance of representing groups such as business owners, blue-collar workers, the poor, and minorities. The author concludes that in general, women are similar to men in their priorities (e.g., policymaking, speaking, distributing pork), except that women place greater weight on representing women's interests. An explicit measurement of legislator's priorities (both about aspects of their job and who they wish to represent) is a second major strength of the book. It makes subsequent tests of difference more credible because she controls for representative's preferences (among other things). Moreover, it allows her to speak directly to the question of whether gender-based differences in behavior emerge because of differences in preferences.

Schwindt-Bayer begins her analysis of legislator behavior by investigating differences in policymaking (bill sponsorship and cosponsorship, participation in committee and floor debates). This analysis reveals that women sponsor more women's issue bills in the Colombian Chamber and in Argentina, but there is no significant difference in Costa Rica or the Colombian Senate. She finds some evidence of women's marginalization into traditionally feminine policy domains, noting that even after controlling for interest, women sponsor fewer economic bills in Argentina and more health-related bills in the Colombia Senate. Legislator's responses to her survey about how often they participate in committee or floor debates do not reveal significant differences, except that women in Argentina and the Colombian Chamber say they are more vocal on women's issues.

In examining elements of a legislator's "homestyle," Schwindt-Bayer finds that men and women are more similar than different and that there is not evidence of

women's marginalization. For instance, legislators report spending similar amounts of time on constituency service, except for the Colombian Senate where men report spending more time than women. In almost all cases, male and female deputies report equal activity in terms of giving speeches in their district, making presentations, and talking to the press. However, women in all cases, except the Colombian Chamber, report spending more time working on behalf of female constituents.

While the election of female legislators has become a more common occurrence, that does not automatically guarantee women access to important power centers within their legislative bodies. Schwindt-Bayer finds that in all three countries, few women have held chamber and committee leadership posts and women rarely serve on the most powerful committees. Women appear to have done better in Costa Rica—but still have tended to be in "shadow" or less important posts. In most cases, when women do chair committees, it is primarily women's affairs or social issues committees. No woman has ever chaired the powerful budget committees, for example. Overall, the pattern of leadership (and committee) assignments points to greater marginalization of women in Argentina and Costa Rica than in Colombia. This is surprising given that women are more numerous in these countries, which have adopted quota laws. She argues that this is not a result of quotas but, instead, other aspects of the electoral rules. In Costa Rica and Argentina, parties have relatively greater power over legislators' careers and thus can coerce them to behave in particular ways. In Colombia's more personalistic system this is not possible, suggesting that the party system plays an important role in determining if women will be marginalized. This is a theme that merits additional investigation in future work, but is beyond the scope of the present work.

Finally, the author examines symbolic representation using survey data from 14 Latin American countries. While a country's electoral rules (formal representation) have a limited effect on whether government is viewed as representative, more women in the legislature (descriptive representation) predicts increased satisfaction with democracy and trust in the legislature. Greater substantive representation (more laws dealing with women's issues) increases satisfaction with democracy, trust in government and legislature, and decreases perceived corruption.

One could conclude that women's representation in legislatures is important since women do more to represent women's interests in substantive terms and aid in symbolic representation for both men and women. But, "[a]lthough male and female representatives enter Latin American legislatures with similar issue preferences and priorities for legislative activities, the empirical study in this book shows that male bias in the legislature can intervene and marginalize women into more traditionally female areas of legislative work and into activities that afford women less political power" (p. 190). This is a somewhat pessimistic conclusion because it suggests that women are still not full power players, and it is unclear how to end male bias in the institution so that women have an equal opportunity to exercise political power. While no one book will resolve all debates over the impact of women's increasing presence in legislative bodies, *Political Power and Women's Representation in Latin America* shifts the terms of the debate, prompting scholars to think about representation in new and more holistic ways.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Non-Western International Relations Theory: Perspectives on and beyond Asia. Edited by Amitav Acharya and Barry Buzan. New York: Routledge, 2009. 248p. $47.95.

International Relations Scholarship Around the World. Edited by Arlene B. Tickner and Ole Wæver. New York: Routledge, 2009. 354p. $42.95.
doi:10.1017/S1537592711002982

— Patrick Thaddeus Jackson, *American University*

While in graduate school, most of us reading journals like this one were taught a fairy tale about our field of study that went something like this: The systematic, scientific study of global politics was born in the early twentieth-century rejection of utopian visions of world peace by some American (and one or two British) thinkers, and the replacement of those utopian dreams by an effort to come to grips with the grimmer reality of interstate competition. Reality itself, we were told, was responsible for the development of the field of international relations, and even if we read or were aware of Stanley Hoffmann's 1977 essay declaring IR "an American social science," this did not fundamentally disturb the basic account of IR as striving for a relatively timeless set of insights. In consequence, we were taught, subsequent innovations in the study of global politics must consist of efforts to graft new insights onto that basic core, lest we accidentally move the field back into a pretheoretical state. Even if we derive inspiration from the reading of older texts and the raiding of foreign traditions, the basic direction of the field has to involve cumulation toward a comprehensive and classically objective "view from nowhere."

That this fairy tale does not really describe the historical origins of the study of global politics in the United States has been pretty definitively established by important recent works in the history and sociology of international