salience (through priming) is important to how people form broad evaluations such as trust because most people do not consider all aspects of government performance. However, affective polarization can affect issue salience in two ways. It can lead to motivated reasoning in partisans’ assessments of real-world conditions and to choices in what issues to weight more or less heavily. This strain of argument has important implications for how we think about opinion formation and the multitude of ways in which partisan identities can enter into this process.

Third, Hetherington and Rudolph make an interesting argument about why trust in government can be an important explanatory variable of people’s opinions even if trust is not a stable attitude. The authors note that the focus on stability as a measure of attitude centrality has limitations, especially when people have ambivalent feelings; liking some parts of the government but disliking others. Moreover, instability can be generated by changes in context between the international and domestic arenas. Hetherington and Rudolph emphasize how these evaluations of trust are nonetheless central to people’s willingness to make ideological sacrifices on policies.

Throughout this book, the authors tackle a complicated subject and explore many steps in the chain of the broader argument. While they offer compelling evidence about affective polarization and the polarization of trust, the importance of issue priming, affective polarization and partisan assessment of conditions and partisan weighting of issues, and the links between trust in government and support for policies that require ideological sacrifice, the one missing link in the chain is the last step, showing that public consensus leads to action by Congress. The authors allude to this step with reference to research from 1987 that shows that when there is consensus among the public, members of Congress are most likely to pass laws (p. 214). However, in the context of greater partisan conflict in Congress today relative to 1987, and more primary election concerns, it is not obvious that even greater public consensus over policy solutions would preclude partisan conflict and gridlock.

LAUREL HARBRIDGE
Northwestern University


Jennifer Hadden’s book achieves a rare feat for academic studies: it is expansive in its ideas and empirical investigation of them, carefully and cogently structured, and a pleasure to read. Hadden investigates the history and evolution of transnational advocacy networks in the climate change regime.
She leverages natural variation—the emergence of competing networks—to investigate the inner workings of the Climate Action Network (CAN) and the more recently established climate justice network. In so doing, she develops the main argument of the book: advocacy organizations choose tactics based on their relationships.

Hadden offers a relational theory of advocacy in which “network embeddedness” is the key explanatory variable. Organizations are more likely to choose contentious forms of action if they are linked to other organizations that do the same. Similarly, more “conventional” organizations will eschew contention and use mainstream advocacy tactics when they are connected similarly conventional organizations. Birds of a feather flock together. She describes three causal effects of network embeddedness. Ties with other organizations give rise to information sharing, resource pooling, and peer pressure, all of which influence the choice of tactics. These effects are illustrated with qualitative evidence drawn from interviews.

Hadden provides extensive empirical evidence to illustrate the bifurcation of the climate advocacy network into two factions. Using membership lists from major transnational climate coalitions, she maps shared membership in the advocacy coalitions. The change in the structure of the network between 2006 and 2009 is stark: a previously unified network has subdivided into three main clusters. The two main groups, CAN and the climate justice movement, differ along several axes, as detailed nicely in Chapters 4 and 5. CAN is a decidedly pragmatist organization, targeting its lobbying and advocacy efforts exclusively on the diplomats negotiating within the intergovernmental process. It is a relatively top-down organization, with a few large organizations dominating the positions and workings of the CAN. Substantively, it focuses on the science of climate change as the justification for urgent climate action. Its aim is incremental progress. The climate justice movement was born, in part, out of frustration with this “light green” approach. It draws members and messages from the global justice movement, broadening the frame to encompass critical issues of decentralized solutions and societal transformations.

Hadden’s book has several strengths. The contribution to the CAN literature is significant. She demonstrates the inner workings of two different CANs, and the contrasts in organizational procedures, strategies, and tactics are stark. As Hadden notes, “scholars have traditionally paid less attention to divided networks than to their more consensual cousins” (p. 167). In turn, this work is important for understanding the dynamics of accountability in civil society. Second, it provides a readable and thorough account of the evolution of civil society activity around climate change. This is an excellent resource for scholars and students alike. Third, and perhaps most impressively, Hadden’s book
uses a wide range of quantitative and qualitative methodologies, to great effect. She provides a surprisingly readable “network analysis toolkit” that provides the reader with precisely enough background to understand her analysis without burdening the reader with unnecessary technical details. The 15-page methods appendix is evidence of the rigor of the study and will certainly provide thought-provoking material for junior scholars.

The shortcomings of her work are few in comparison to its strengths. While the emphasis of the theory is on the impacts of network embeddedness on organizational tactics, in reality, the book is much broader than this and should be presented as such. It is a history of climate activism, from its very beginnings to the present—an important resource for those interested in understanding an integral component of the climate regime. Second, although the appendix demonstrates the extensive nature of her fieldwork, the findings from these interviews could be more prominently displayed. Nonetheless, Networks in Contention will clearly make a lasting contribution to the field.

JESSICA F. GREEN
New York University


Why and when are some (minority-party) legislators more influential than others? In this impressive work, Jennifer Hayes Clark examines whether minority-party members are able to play a role as active participants in the legislative processes of their states. Are they locked out at the committee assignment, cosponsorship, floor consideration, roll call voting, or final passage stage of the legislative process? Do they receive equal treatment compared with majority-party members? What contextual factors condition these relationships?

The research design is ambitious and careful. Clark has mastered the art of crafting scripts to scrape from the multiple and various data formats maintained on state websites the information needed to tally the legislative history of all bills (and to categorize them), the roll call votes of legislators, their sponsorship activities, and much more, typically for 10 years or more per legislature. The design is also cognizant of potential data limitations. For instance, polarization is measured using elite surveys to preclude bias arising from the legislative process.

Results are remarkably robust across stages of the legislative process. Consistent with institutional theories, minority members achieve more