

have thus benefited from a clearer articulation of how, when, and why the state might be compelled to become more involved in such work.

This critical remark aside, *Ending Gender-Based Violence* provides an empirically rich and theoretically engaging contribution to the scholarship on violence against women. Its findings stand to inform both scholars and policy makers about how to address such violence in stratified societies where gaps persist between formal guarantees and the lived realities of citizenship and belonging.

**The Motivation to Vote: Explaining Electoral Participation.** By André Blais and Jean-François Daoust. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2020. 156p. \$34.95 cloth.  
doi:10.1017/S1537592722000196

— J. Scott Matthews , Memorial University  
scott.matthews@mun.ca

In *The Motivation to Vote*, André Blais and Jean-François Daoust advance a parsimonious account of electoral participation focused on a handful of attitudes and beliefs that are relatively proximal to the turnout decision. Their model combines two stable predispositions (political interest and belief that voting is a civic duty) with two more variable, election-specific judgments (caring about the election outcome and perceived ease of voting) to explain whether those who are eligible to vote—and for whom voting is not legally compulsory—decide to do so at a given opportunity. The authors test their model primarily through analysis of a single cross-national source of survey data—the Making Electoral Democracy Work (MEDW) dataset—that, if not exactly purpose-built for the book, is nonetheless ideally suited to the task. The bulk of this short book (the main text is 109 pages, including many tables and figures) consists of a systematic investigation of the components of the model using the MEDW data, with each of the four attitudes treated in separate chapters, first as a dependent variable to be explained and then as an independent variable in a model of voter turnout. Spoiler alert: the model passes the authors' many tests rather convincingly. Two additional chapters consider a pair of alternative, though not exactly rival, explanations of voter turnout, asking, first, "Is Voting a Habit?" (chap. 7), and second, "Does It All Depend on Context?" (chap. 8). The book concludes, after a broad summary of the findings, with speculations on how the model might be adapted to other contexts (e.g., where voting is compulsory), suggestions for future research, and brief (but awfully important) recommendations for policy makers eager to motivate turnout.

With due respect to both authors, this book could easily be understood as part of a long-running dialogue between Blais—without doubt the most prolific student of electoral participation—and Riker and Ordeshook's "A Theory of

the Calculus of Voting" (*American Political Science Review*, 62 [1], 1968). Indeed, Blais and Daoust themselves invite that interpretation (see, e.g., p. 43). Relative to Riker and Ordeshook's model, we might say Blais and Daoust omit  $P$  (the probability of casting the pivotal vote) and add, alongside  $D$  (the duty to vote), a second symbolic gratification,  $I$  (political interest). In any case, this book could be profitably read alongside Blais's earlier monograph on these matters, *To Vote or Not to Vote? The Merits and Limits of Rational Choice Theory* (2000).

*The Motivation to Vote* can also be read as a complement to Brady, Verba, and Schlozman's influential resource model of political participation ("Beyond SES: A Resource Model of Political Participation," *American Political Science Review*, 89 [2], 1995); this interpretation is also suggested by Blais and Daoust (p. 104). Brady and colleagues would, of course, not be surprised by the central importance of political interest to the turnout decision: they saw voting as a key exception to the general importance of resources to political participation (as Blais and Daoust acknowledge on p. 7). At the same time, *The Motivation to Vote* provides a richer view of the motivational foundations of electoral participation, particularly in its careful analysis of the role of civic duty.

*The Motivation to Vote* is a very hard book to criticize. Most critical intuitions that occurred as I read the book were eventually satisfactorily addressed. It's possible that my difficulties criticizing the work reflect a shortage of imagination on my part, or it may be that Blais and Daoust have simply written a very good book. For more than one reason, I prefer the latter interpretation.

Indeed, the book has many strengths. One that deserves special mention is the research design. As noted, Blais and Daoust rely on the MEDW dataset, which consists of two waves of surveys of electors during 24 elections across five countries (four in Western Europe plus Canada) at subnational, national, and supranational levels of government. The standardization of measurement and sample recruitment across the surveys is an obvious and important virtue. The overall inferential logic is roughly that of the most-different systems design: if the model holds up across diverse contexts, then we're safe (or safer) concluding that system-level differences are irrelevant. Although high-income, Western democracies may not seem like the most diverse sample, it is important to remember the diversity of contexts that the 24 surveys capture (i.e., national elections, EU elections, and subnational elections involving governments with vastly different responsibilities).

Blais and Daoust's thorough investigation of the components of their model also turns up a host of noteworthy findings regarding how interest, duty to vote, caring about the outcome, and ease of voting relate to and interact with each other as they drive electoral participation. About one-quarter of those who say they have no interest at all in politics vote, whereas one-quarter who express maximal

interest abstain (p. 36). Political interest is strongly related to duty, but the unique variance in duty accounts for a sizable share of the variation in turnout explained by Blais and Daoust's model (pp. 51–52). Caring about the outcome, quite sensibly, matters much less to the turnout decisions of those who regard voting as a duty, and overall, duty is more important than caring (pp. 59–60). Ease of voting matters to turnout, although its effect is notably smaller than that of the model's motivational variables (p. 70).

No book is perfect. For those in political science for the drama, I must report that there are not many big surprises here; none of the key variables in this study is new to the field. The authors' commitment to applying a uniform structure to the core empirical chapters makes this part of the book somewhat repetitive. Some readers may be irked that the authors decline to present a more fully specified demographic model of turnout: they consider only age and education, and for perfectly defensible reasons. Nevertheless, this doesn't make me any less curious about how, for instance, income and gender relate to interest and duty in the MEDW dataset.

I had an equivocal reaction to the chapter on the role of habit (chap. 7). Blais and Daoust make an important contribution in presenting a clear-eyed discussion of what the concept of habit entails in the realm of voter turnout. In short, mere persistence in turnout does not make a habit; rather, it is the automaticity of the behavior that is crucial (pp. 71–73). I am certain the authors are right that turnout is not a habit in this sense. At the same time, some of the original empirical tests in the chapter (especially in tables 7.3 and 7.4) are almost certainly underpowered, involving models that contain multiple overlapping interactions consisting of variables that we know, from elsewhere in the book, may be highly correlated.

Admittedly, this quibble about statistical power is pretty small beer. Overall, *The Motivation to Vote* is an excellent and important book. Its theoretical value lies in its systematic presentation and thorough unpacking of the proximal causes of voter turnout at the individual level. For anyone seeking to explain variation in turnout, whether across individuals and contexts or over time, this book identifies the key attitudes that, in all probability, must be affected if a given variable is to have any influence on the decision to vote.

**Unequal Neighbors: Place Stigma and the Making of a Local Border.** By Kristen Hill Maher and David Carruthers. New York: Oxford University Press, 2021. 368p. \$99.00 cloth, \$39.95 paper. doi:10.1017/S1537592722000755

— Angie M. Bautista-Chavez , Arizona State University  
angie.bautista-chavez@asu.edu

*Unequal Neighbors* joins recent and emerging accounts of the US-Mexican borderlands that complicate simple narratives about borders. Kristen Hill Maher and David Carruthers decenter and disaggregate the state: they are

attentive not only to government entities and interests but also to the role of business interests, cross-border trade, tourism industries, news organizations, and border crossers. Unlike approaches concerned with the physical manifestation of borders, the authors are interested in mental images of borders and the implications of those images for communities on either side. They ask: What are the processes by which people attach meaning to places and to what effect?

The authors integrate frameworks from across various interdisciplinary literatures, including research on borders, territorial stigma, and geographies of inequality. Although the book is not about the politics of immigration, the analytical approaches in *Unequal Neighbors* resonate with recent and emerging research regarding immigration policy and enforcement. By examining the processes that produce racialized stereotypes of “good neighborhoods” and “bad neighborhoods,” *Unequal Neighbors* joins recently published articles and books that challenge binary understandings of borders, migration, and citizenship. For example, Rebecca Hamlin's book *Crossing: How We Label and React to People on the Move* (2021) examines the production and maintenance of the migrant/refugee binary and hierarchical categorizations of people. Both *Unequal Neighbors* and *Crossing* explicitly interrogate *who stands to gain* from binary and stigma production.

The book is organized into eight chapters. Chapter 1 reviews the book's central arguments. First, *Unequal Neighbors* argues that stigmas are produced through relational processes. Second, stigmas have spatial manifestations or what the authors term “place stigma.” In the context of borders, place stigma plays a role in producing and maintaining asymmetric borders. Third, asymmetric bordering occurs whenever people construct spatial lines demarcating distinction and inequality. Finally, even transborder crossings and collaboration can serve to reinforce inequalities across borders.

*Unequal Neighbors* examines the San Diego and Tijuana border region, which is a politically salient location for both the United States and Mexico. The two countries also have a unique bilateral relationship, especially with respect to historical conflict, economic interdependencies, and, of course, migration (see chap. 2). Although the findings may be context specific, the theoretical frameworks, research design, multimethod data collection, and multipronged data analysis can be fruitfully used in other contexts.

The book draws on a variety of sources, including interviews with residents, organizations, and entrepreneurs in San Diego and Tijuana, as well as quantitative and qualitative analyses of news media content. The data collected also extend across time, allowing the authors to trace the development, contestation, and persistence of place stigma. For example, scholars interested in public opinion formation or how the media shape understandings of place can turn to chapter 4 in which the authors