Monika L. McDermott. *Masculinity, Femininity, and American Political Behavior.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2016 xiv, 256 pp. ($99.00 cloth, $47.95 paper).

The role of gender in United States elections has received nearly unprecedented attention during the 2016 campaign from academics and non-academics alike. With polls predicting the largest gender gap since 1996, explicit appeals to women based on gender by both Clinton and Trump featuring prominently in the final month of the campaign, and the frequently gendered narratives around the candidates in the media, a wave of research on gender in this election is surely forthcoming. In a timely monograph examining gendered personalities as politically salient, Monika L. McDermott offers scholars of gender and politics a more dynamic approach to the gender gaps in *Masculinity, Femininity, and American Political Behavior.* McDermott complicates the prevailing understanding of gendered political participation by decoupling gender from sex. Using Bem's Sex Role Inventory, McDermott analyses the partisanship and political engagement of Americans differentiated by gendered personalities distinctly from their gender identity in her Gender Personalities and Politics Survey (GPPS). The result is a highly readable challenge to the continued use of a conflated sex/gender construct to understanding cleavages in the contemporary electorate.

The book begins by presenting the theory that gendered personality does not conform to biological sex but rather functions on two continuums that are also distinct from gender identity and importantly shape political behavior. This theory asserts that masculine and feminine traits are stable personality dimensions akin to the Big Five factor structure in personality types that similarly influence individuals' partisanship, political engagement, vote choices, and ideology. Specifically she connects empirically masculine personality traits with higher levels of political engagement, affiliation with the Republican Party, and support for McCain and Republican House candidates. Feminine personality traits are linked with Democratic partisanship, support for Obama and Democratic House candidates, and a liberal ideology distinct from biological sex. McDermott asserts in the first chapter that American politics are infused with gender from political parties whose issue ownership reflects a gendered division of labor to institutions and elected offices perceived as masculine or feminine contingent on the role alignment with gender norms.

McDermott proceeds from the premise of gendered parties and issues and her empirical findings regarding the distinction between sex and gendered personality to demonstrate the salience for politics and political scientists. The original data and diligent analysis that systematically builds the evidence for the theory from the ground up is a substantial strength in this text. The GPPS combines Bem's Sex Role Inventory with questions addressing political participation, partisanship, ideology, and vote choice around both previous and hypothetical candidates. The empirical evidence of gender personality as distinct from sex provides grounds for reconsidering the existing paradigm around the gender gap. McDermott goes on to show scholarship would benefit from distinguishing a gender personality schema, which provides four gender types unrelated to biological sex (or perhaps gender identity, though this is less clear), from a gender conformity schema, which distinguishes conforming from cross-typed, androgynous, and gender undifferentiated. The four gender types based on two independent masculinity and femininity factors are salient to partisanship and vote choice with important

implications for accurate identification of swing voters and articulation of the gender gap. As McDermott shows, the explanatory power of sex disappears when gender personality is considered. Further, her data show that undifferentiated voters are a distinct group from both androgynous voters with strong but polarized party attachments and feminine voters with low levels of engagement. Undifferentiated voters are more likely to be persuadable by campaigns based on their weak partisanship and moderate levels of engagement. While masculinity drives political engagement, femininity proves to drive partisanship, thus understanding strength of party ties requires more nuance than a dichotomous gender measure can provide.

An individual's placement in the gender conformity schema influences their attitudes toward appropriate social and political roles based on gender. The acceptance of transgressing of gender norms importantly depends on one's own conformity rather than sex/gender. The implications for political candidates given the evidence of the double bind for women candidates is important as McDermott's findings suggest women candidates would be wise to appeal to androgynous, undifferentiated, and cross-typed voters in order of greatest likelihood of support for women demonstrating dominance via running for office.

For a text that takes disentangling the role of gender in politics seriously, it is disappointing there is not more precision of language with regard to gender and sex terminology nor inclusion of non-binary sex identities in the GPPS. This is an exceptionally minor critique however. Of greater concern is the minimal attention the author gives to the implications for future elections based on the connections between masculinity, political engagement, and strong Republican identification. Based on her findings, she logically concludes that shift toward masculine personality traits found elsewhere in demographic trend data is likely to improve the electoral prospects for the Republican Party in the future. This challenges existing scholarship on millennials partisanship and ideology, but this literature is not addressed.

Ultimately McDermott offers compelling evidence for more precision in data collection around gender as a political identity based on personality traits rather than sex. This theory is unlikely to be deployed by researchers who are not explicitly interested in gender as a construct. Despite the compelling evidence here, without a better shorthand most scholars are likely to continue to use sex interchangeably with gender and consider either a sufficient operationalization for the examination of gender-based political cleavages. Theorizing gendered politics would benefit from inclusion of McDermott's findings and more readily available survey data parsing out gendered personality from sex.

Megan E. Osterbur
Xavier University of Louisiana