

sources—government pamphlets, publicity campaign materials, program records, reports, press releases, and committee hearings—underscores the book’s state-centeredness. Also dynamics linking state and society discourses are often not evidenced.

Furthermore, each chapter’s civic narrative figure (and its associated institutional embedment) is presented more as an independent ideal, leaving one to wonder how and if the substance of one shaped another. How did the forgotten man or fallen woman of New Deal relief programs impact, if at all, the narrative of civilian protectors and associated OCD programs during World War II? Allen does better at highlighting interconnections across programs—for example, in the continuing strategies of scapegoating and adoption of racial and gendered claims of citizenship in the War Relocation Authority, as similar to those harnessed in the CCC during the Depression (pp. 176–177). However, the legacies or impact of the central ideational figures themselves across varied narratives are less attended to.

Family is an important connecting thread shaping the identified civic narratives and their ideals throughout—structuring citizenship, mobilizing affective popular support, and embedding racial, gender, and sexual inequalities in programmatic targets, benefits, and regulations. It is discussed sporadically but deserves more consistent prominence. Family ideals underpin several of the civic stories discussed, such as in the idealization of white male family breadwinners in narratives of forgotten men, anxieties over transient perverts, and valorization of Civilian Protectors (Chapters 1, 2, 5), or also in castigation of nagging wives, married women workers, and female promiscuity in “woman-blaming narratives” (Chapter 4). In this regard, the book misses several opportunities to directly engage with seminal works pertaining to family in and about this era (Elaine Tyler May, *Homeward Bound: American Families in the Cold War Era*, 1999; Suzanne Mettler, *Dividing Citizens: Gender and Federalism in New Deal Public Policy*, 1998; Stephanie Coontz, *Marriage, a History: How Love Conquered Marriage*, 2006). By paying attention to family as a central organizing heuristic, ideational continuities and change from one civic figure to the next could be more prominently displayed.

On the other hand, gender is another permeating feature that is well highlighted, dividing citizenship and civic stories over time and also, perhaps, shaping the format of the book. The “forgotten man,” “transient pervert,” and “citizen soldier” (Chapters 1, 2, 3) are presented as singular, male civic narratives that are targeted by distinct programs and discussed in individual chapters. However, feminine (negative) civic figures—such as “pantry snooper” (social worker), “meddlesome wives,” “married women workers,” or promiscuous female transients and/or prostitutes—are presented more broadly, less

targeted by single programs, and discussed across multiple chapters, many of which are combined in Chapter 4’s treatment of Woman-Blaming Narratives.

With regard to race, in most of the book the central civic story identified is presented as one constructed around a white (male or female) subject, whose whiteness Allen then meticulously demonstrates, also revealing how these narratives operated unequally, and discriminatorily, for African Americans and to a lesser extent for Mexican Americans (example OCD, p. 147). In this way illiberalism, or the non-white subject, appears to be far less of a central, formative force for state-building than liberalism or the white subject. However, Chapter 6 is a welcome exception and assembles a non-white civic narrative and thus demonstrates the formative impact of (also) non-white civic figures on national programs. Through the chapter’s analysis of Nisei loyal citizen soldiers and Kebei disloyal troublemakers, racially-specific Japanese-American masculine figures are shown to permeate the War Relocation Authority efforts, most directly illustrating the relevance of non-white civic narratives to nation-building. Here non-white civic figures appear not merely as overlooked dimensions of an otherwise white liberalizing state, but as central characters in an illiberal civic story.

In sum, the book is well written, rich in descriptive prose and discourse analysis and, although minimalist in its references to relevant literature, it would directly appeal to three sets of audiences: (a) historians, legal scholars, and political scientists with interests in the family, gender, and race and their collective impact on policy; (b) those interested in the role of emotions (and culture) in politics and policymaking; and (c), American political development scholars focused on civic ideals and their significance to state-building.

Timing and Turnout: How Off-Cycle Elections Favor Organized Groups.

By Sarah F. Anzia. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2014. 296p. \$90.00 cloth, \$30.00 paper. doi:10.1017/S1537592716002279

— Zoltan Hajnal, *University of California, San Diego*

Timing and Turnout takes us deep into the mechanics of local elections. At first glance that task might seem small, inconsequential, and appealing only to a select group of urban academics. But it would be a big mistake to dismiss this book on first glance. *Timing and Turnout* deals with local elections but it is fundamentally about representation and responsiveness—two of the most debated topics in politics today and two concepts that we should all care deeply about.

In *Timing and Turnout*, Sarah Anzia asks us to consider what the effects of election timing are for American democracy. The book begins by highlighting one of the core failures of our democracy—our inability to get

Americans to the polls. This is especially true at the local level where “voter turnout rates of 20%, 10%, or even lower are common” (p. 1). But as Professor Anzia critically notes, those average figures belie tremendous variation—even in the same location. In Palo Alto, California, for example, she notes that turnout in city elections dropped from an impressive 82 percent in 2008 to a dismal 38 percent in 2009. What explains these enormous shifts in participation in the same place? Election timing. The 2008 contest was held on the same day as the Presidential contest, while the 2009 election was held off-cycle.

If election timing can so radically alter who votes, what else can it do? That is essentially the project of the book. Does election timing impact election results? Does it shift policy outcomes? And equally importantly, how did all of this get to be in the first place? Or put more concretely, who decides when elections will be held?

Before embarking on what is very much an empirical tour de force, Anzia offers some compelling theoretical insights into these questions. Her theory is intuitive but also wholly innovative. She argues that those that have a large stake in an election outcome should turn out to vote at higher rates than others and that any turnout gap should grow larger as the difficulty of voting increases. Effectively that means that organized interests like teachers’ and municipal workers’ unions who have a clear stake in local elections should dominate when those contests are low turnout off-cycle elections and should hold substantially less sway when those contests are higher turnout on-cycle elections. Put more succinctly, democracy will reflect narrow interest groups preferences in off-cycle elections and will be much more likely to represent the interests of the broader public in higher turnout on-cycle contests.

That makes sense but is it in fact true? Here is where *Timing and Turnout* really shines. Anzia’s analysis of the effects of election timing is thorough and absolutely compelling. One chapter details the relationship between school board election timing and teacher salaries across eight states. Another section demonstrates the same relationship by focusing on variation in election timing and turnout within a single state. And yet another chapter tests the effects of timing on municipal employee salaries. What is impressive about the tests is the keen attention to the endogeneity of election timing. Often we see the effects of election timing after considering an impressive array of controls, including controls for the strength of teachers’ unions in each district and the pre-existing political ideology of residents in the district. Even more telling is Anzia’s leveraging of a quasi-experiment in Texas where some types of school districts were forced to move to on-cycle elections while others were not. By using district level fixed effects and comparing changes in policy in districts that were forced to change and those that were not, the book provides a clean causal estimate of the effects

of timing. All of this demonstrates beyond a shadow of doubt that off-cycle elections lead to a distressing distortion of democracy.

Importantly, Anzia does not just look at the present. She goes back in time to help us understand the origins of our flawed democracy. Here the book provides a persuasive accounting of how off-cycle elections came to be in the first place by documenting the frequent efforts of political parties to change the timing of local elections. By digging deep into the history of three major American cities and unearthing detailed election returns, Anzia is able to show how political parties consistently tried to manipulate election timing to their own advantage. Professor Anzia shows that this pattern is still evident today; through an analysis of state legislative bills on election timing that were introduced between 2001 and 2011 she finds clear partisan differences and the same efforts to alter election timing for political advantage.

There are some things that *Timing and Turnout* does not do. It does little to examine variation in the effect of timing across different levels of political offices. In the book we find that off-cycle elections at the school board level favor unions but others like myself have found that off-cycle elections at the city level favor more conservative, white voters. How can we explain these differences? One might also expect that the effects of off-cycle elections would depend on the partisan or political persuasion of a locality. In cities that are overwhelmingly Democratic or overwhelmingly Republican we might see few effects but in places that are more heterogeneous we might find particularly stark effects. And finally, one might want to look at the effect of timing on different outcomes. Although *Timing and Turnout* examines important policy outcomes, it ignores other equally important ones like minority representation, social spending, and the distribution of spending and services across different types of neighborhoods—all of which might also be linked to election timing.

Despite these ongoing questions, the lessons are clear. Timing is not a boring bureaucratic matter. Instead in this impressive book we learn that election timing is better understood as a tool to determine who has an advantage in the electoral process, a tool to sway policy outcomes, and more broadly, a tool to help determine who wins and who loses in local democracy. All of this makes *Timing and Turnout* not only an important addition to the literature on urban politics and American politics, but also a call to action for political reformers.

At the end of the day the basic facts outlined in the book are troubling. Some 70 percent of Americans favor holding local elections on the same day as national contests. Yet across the country, the vast majority of localities continue to hold off-cycle elections. An electoral institution that is widely unpopular, that effectively deters a third of the electorate from going to the polls, and that

is essentially hijacking democracy is still the norm in this country.

Fortunately reform may be possible. There is a growing movement to alter election timing around the country. Voters in Los Angeles and several other cities around the country have voted to shift to on-cycle elections. The legislatures in Arizona and California have made similar moves in recent years. Hopefully with the publication of this book, more will heed the call.

Work and the Welfare State: Street-Level Organizations and Workfare Politics. By Evelyn Z. Brodtkin and Gregory

Marston, Eds. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2013.

336p. \$36.95.

doi:10.1017/S1537592716002280

— Eva Bertram, *University of California, Santa Cruz*

In *Work and the Welfare State*, editors Evelyn Brodtkin and Gregory Marston and their collaborators have put together a valuable volume on the spread of workfare initiatives in western industrialized countries. The term “workfare” has been applied to a wide range of policies in recent decades; it is defined here as the “composite of policies and practices through which countries have promoted participation in the paid labor market and reductions in income assistance to those outside the labor market” (p. 6). In many European countries, workfare has entailed training and education to help workers adapt to changes in the labor market, while in others, such as the UK, the emphasis has been on job search activities. In the United States, workfare has typically entailed welfare-to-work policies aimed at welfare recipients, including work requirements backed by sanctions. Compounding the extensive and often confusing array of policies under the workfare label is an equally broad-ranging debate over the consequences of these initiatives. Some scholars argue that workfare has improved lives by increasing the participation of the poor in paid employment and decreasing reliance on welfare; others suggest that its effect has been to trap the poor in an insecure low-wage labor market while diminishing the social safety net.

Brodtkin and Marston’s work makes a bold and important intervention in this discussion. Through a close analysis of workfare practices adopted in six countries, the book’s authors search out the deeper patterns behind workfare’s expansion. They look beyond the obvious bases for crossnational comparison (policy components, spending levels, numbers served), to focus on the agencies and organizations that implement workfare and their impact on those served. At the street-level, they find, organizations have adapted to new governance structures (including devolution, decentralization, and privatization), and adopted new managerial strategies (including subcontracting, client assessment and sorting, and performance measures). They conclude that in recent decades, these strategies have

“tended to move in a common direction, quietly pushing back the welfare state’s boundaries and enlarging the zone in which market principles prevail” (p. 272). The argument is persuasive, and the volume makes a distinctive contribution to our understanding of workfare by doing three things particularly well.

To begin with, the analysis of these cases is effective in demonstrating that workfare is indeed shaped by the practices of “street-level organizations” (SLOs), in significant and under-recognized respects. Drawing on research in half a dozen countries, the authors contend that to understand what workfare is (and what it does to and for clients) requires careful study not only of formal policies, but of governance structures, managerial decisions, and practices among frontline workers in the agencies and organizations that carry out policies. For example, workfare policies often include ill-defined or even competing objectives, under tight budget constraints. This leaves the task of interpreting the policy and prioritizing among objectives—in short, “operationalizing” workfare—to frontline agencies. The practices they adopt determine to a large degree how workfare is experienced on the ground: Will program recipients receive adequate support and training or be compelled to go it alone as they are steered into an uncertain labor market? The organizations, in short, do not simply deliver policy, but also create it and determine its effects (both intended and unintended) on those who rely on their services. The role and impact of organizational practices cannot be fully captured by standard measures of formal policy outcomes, such as the numbers of clients offered job training or moved off the public assistance rolls. Though the call to focus on street-level operations in policy analysis is not new, it has received relatively little attention in assessments of workfare policies. This volume is a welcome contribution in this respect.

A second notable contribution is the breadth and depth of the comparative analysis provided by the fifteen authors and ten cases. The volume takes on one of the most significant developments in social policy in the past four decades—the shift toward work-based approaches to social assistance—and submits it to a comprehensive and crossnational analysis.

The case studies address initiatives in the United States, the Netherlands, Denmark, Germany, Australia, and the United Kingdom. The selection of cases runs across familiar typologies of western welfare states, to include countries with both more- and less-generous social welfare programs. Although the authors address different questions (from how immigrants are integrated to policies regarding disabilities), the case studies cover important shared territory. Each provides 1) a brief introduction to the character and trajectory of formal workfare policies; 2) an overview of key managerial reforms and strategies introduced in recent years; and