the study of formal and informal rules. The editors define informal institutions as "shared rules, usually unwritten, that are created, communicated, and enforced outside officially sanctioned channels" (p. 5). The unofficial, unwritten character of those norms determines their informality, but enforcement defines their "institutional" nature—in contrast to a vast array of other patterns of behavior that may have typified social meanings but are excluded from the definition. This element seems to distinguish Helmke and Levitsky's definition from the broader understanding of institutions advanced by the sociological school of symbolic interactionism (e.g., Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann in *The Social Construction of Reality,* 1966).

The contributions to the volume dispel common misconceptions, for instance, that informal institutions are intrinsically detrimental to democracy, or that they only change very slowly. The introduction presents a typology based on whether existing formal institutions are strong or weak, and whether informal rules are consistent or inconsistent with the spirit of the law. The resulting four types (complementary, accommodating, substitutive, and competing informal institutions) provide a common framework that holds the book together. (Readers interested in a preview should check the piece published in *Perspectives on Politics* 2 [December 2004]: 725–40).

More challenging is the issue of how to identify informal institutions in empirical research. The editors offer valuable—but unfortunately brief—advice towards the end of the introduction (although the topic is also explored by Daniel Brinks in Chapter 10). Informal institutions can be documented through ethnographic research, or by predicting patterns of behavior consistent with hypothesized informal rules (including punishment for deviations) that can be established through comparative case studies or through the analysis of large-n samples.

Unfortunately, this brief review cannot do justice to the quality of the essays. The book is organized in four sections. The essays by Peter Siavelis (on power sharing in Chile), by Scott Desposato (on electoral markets and legislative behavior in two Brazilian states), and by Andrés Mejía Acosta (an insightful piece on ghost coalitions in Ecuador) reflect on executive–legislative relations. The essays by David Samuels (on campaign finance in Brazil), Michelle Taylor-Robinson (on clientelism and constituency service in Honduras), and Susan Stokes (on vertical accountability in four Argentine regions) depict the operation of informal institutions in the electoral arena. A set of chapters by Joy Langston (on the Mexican *dedazo*), John Carey and Siavelis (on electoral insurance in Chile), and Flavia Freidenberg and Levitsky (comparing informal party organization in Argentina and Ecuador) address the issue in relation to political parties. The fourth section features essays on informal institutions and the rule of law by Daniel Brinks (on the prosecution of police abuses in Argentina and Brazil), Todd Eisenstadt (on the use of informal agreements to solve electoral disputes in Mexico), and Donna Lee Van Cott (about community justice in the Andes). It is worth noting that the contributors are not mainstream dissidents but some of the best scholars among the institutionalist school of the last decade and a half. A brief but insightful essay by Guillermo O'Donnell (whose work in the mid-1990s ignited the debate on this subject) crowns the compilation.

This volume opens the road for a new political sociology, "a broad and pluralistic research agenda that encourages fertilization across disciplines" (p. 284). However, two challenges lie ahead. The first one is a better delimitation of the object of study. Central to the definition presented in the book is the idea that certain norms are "enforced outside officially sanctioned channels." However, enforcement is broadly understood to include "hostile remarks, gossip, [and] ostracism" (p. 26), which makes the denotation of the concept of informal institutions quite broad. And the reference to nonofficial channels seems to recode one key word (*informal*) into another (*unofficial*), which leaves the connotation of the concept somewhat unresolved. (Stokes's suggestive distinction between *game* and *grammatical* rules in Chapter 6 further complicates the problem by extending the meaning of "rules"). A second challenge is the development of criteria to identify relevant instances of the phenomenon. Most institutional puzzles can be solved by invoking some "informal institution," but this strategy would lead to a trivialization of the concept. Are informal institutions always to be evaluated with reference to a formal rule? It seems that every formal institution generates one or more related informal rules (an array of prescribed behaviors based on shared expectations about the interpretation of statutes, limits of enforcement, etc.), but not every informal rule has a formal counterpart. Thus, it is easy to find examples of weak formal institutions coexisting with strong informal ones, but I suspect that the opposite is not true (see pp. 274–81). In fact, this asymmetry may be critical for understanding issues of compliance and credible commitments because the development of "rational-legal" legitimacy at the formal level (to use Max Weber's terminology) may also require some degree of "traditional" legitimacy for complementary or accommodating informal norms.

Contested Citizenship: Immigration and Cultural Diversity in Europe. By Ruud Koopmans, Paul Statham, Marco Giugni, and Florence Passy. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005. 376p. $75.00 cloth, $25.00 paper.
DOI: 10.1017/S153759270707123X

— Nedim Ögelman, *University of Texas, Austin*

This is a well-written, rigorous, empirical contribution to scholarship on immigration and ethnic relations in post–World War II Europe. The study adds particular value through its grounded evaluation of basic assumptions

https://doi.org/10.1017/S153759270707123X Published online by Cambridge University Press

concerning multiculturalism. Ruud Koopmans and colleagues coded political claims of migrant, extreme-right, and pro-migrant/anti-racist actors in France, Germany, the Netherlands, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom, as reported in a prominent newspaper in each country. These data inform the authors' assessment of whether migrant group makeup, national conceptions of citizenship, or supranational institutions drive the various actors' political behavior. The authors conclude that different national citizenship models best explain variations in political claims making. Postwar migration to Western Europe generates intense political conflict, according to the authors, because it raises questions about basic aspects of national sovereignty, including border control, citizenship attribution, and the principles of nationhood.

The authors make their case in seven chapters bracketed by an introduction and methodological appendix. The introduction develops a framework for understanding diverse approaches to national citizenship based on how each conception addresses individual integration and cultural diversity. The typology distinguishes, on one dimension, between ethnic and civic-territorial attribution of individual citizenship. The second dimension differentiates between cultural monist and cultural pluralist approaches to differential group rights. The two dimensions yield four ideal-typical conceptions of citizenship: segregationist (ethnic attribution of citizenship and a cultural pluralist approach to group rights), assimilationist (ethnic attribution of citizenship and a cultural monist approach to group rights), universalist (civic-territorial attribution of citizenship and a cultural monist approach to group rights), and multiculturalist (civic-territorial attribution of citizenship and a cultural pluralist approach to group rights). The authors integrate their typology into a set of conceptual political opportunity models, which explain political contention as a function of the dynamic interaction between institutions and claims making.

Chapter 1 develops empirical indicators for individual access and differential group rights and uses them to assess the evolution of the five countries' citizenship configurations. The authors find clear differences among the five countries: Germany and Switzerland are relatively assimilationist, France relatively universalist, the Netherlands relatively multiculturalist, and the UK between France and the Netherlands. Germany and Switzerland, in adopting and upholding more civic-territorial approaches over time, have reinforced the view that liberal states cannot justify alienating large numbers of permanent-resident migrants from the polity, according to the authors.

Chapter 2 investigates the relevance of national versus postnational claims making and finds that most collective actors in all five countries made demands in a national context and did not project their organizations and strategies beyond the nation-state level. In fact, combined data on all five countries during the 1990s indicate a slight decrease over time in postnational claims making.

Chapter 3 assesses whether host-country political opportunities or migrant backgrounds better explain contentious politics and claims making in the five countries. The chapter concludes that host-country citizenship regimes best explain the level and form of migrant claims. Although migrants have reacted to exclusionary citizenship and high barriers to political integration with resilient transnational politics, the authors find that the Dutch multicultural model also has stimulated durable homeland identities and active diaspora politics more than in Britain and France. This finding challenges empirically the normative theories of multiculturalism by showing that policies formally and symbolically offering equality to ethnic and religious groups can in fact deepen polarization along communal lines and reproduce "segregation on a distinctly unequal basis" (p. 246).

Chapter 4 evaluates the importance of migrant claims for special cultural and religious rights compared to other migrant claims, focusing specifically on the compatibility of Muslim cultural claims and liberal democracy. The authors claim that religion is a particularly resilient part of migrant culture and that Islam is exceptionally resistant to the designs of the liberal nation-state. This incompatibility, according to the authors, drives public controversies in Western Europe concerning migrants' cultural group demands. Chapter 5 examines the extreme Right's contentious politics in opposition to migrants. The authors find that the political space that host countries provide for expressing anti-migrant grievances best explains the nature of extreme-right claims making. Chapter 6 analyzes anti-racist and pro-migrant mobilization to determine whether altruism or political opportunism better explains this activity. The chapter shows that pro-migrant supporters in the host society are not simply altruistic, but that they mobilize around migrant issues because these contentious issues best capture the conceptions of inclusive citizenship they wish to champion. Chapter 7 summarizes the authors' argument and offers ideas for future related research. The authors provide a detailed explanation for their content-coding methodology and take on various issues related to their data-gathering techniques in the appendix.

Overall, the argument that political opportunity structures based on national conceptions of citizenship in the five Western European countries best explain claims making on issues of migration is compelling. However, the explanation in Chapter 4 for Islam's exceptional role in migrant claims making undermines their fundamental theoretical argument and highlights some underlying, untested assumptions that warrant investigation. If religious identity is resilient and stable, as the authors argue in Chapter 4, then can host- and home-country agents

https://doi.org/10.1017/S153759270707123X Published online by Cambridge University Press

use institutional opportunities and claims making to influence it in the same way that political entrepreneurs work with other identities? If Muslim identity carries such weight in the authors' explanation of migrant mobilization in Western Europe, what does this imply about the role of Christian identity, whether in its secular or nonsecular form? Is religious identity a cultural superstructure limiting the extent to which the opportunity structures in a liberal democracy can alter behavior and shape immigrant integration patterns?

Evidence provided in Chapter 4 suggests that practical accommodations and corrective courses of action undertaken by the host state and society can even alter identity based on religious underpinnings, albeit over generations rather than months or years after policies are in place. The book points out that some of these host societies overcame their discriminatory biases toward their Jewish minorities after persecuting them for centuries. The fact that the UK has laws to prosecute people for blasphemy against Christianity but do not extend these laws to Islam (p. 157 and n. 8 in chap. 4) suggests some of the more civic territorially oriented and multiculturally tolerant liberal democracies have yet to dismantle discriminatory religious institutions. However, the critical case for hypotheses concerning the resilience and stability of religious identities in the liberal democracies of Western Europe might be France: Why in a state fitting the authors' universalist conception of citizenship do "mosques, minarets, and public calls to prayer readily become a public controversy and a French-style clash of cultures" (p. 156), but churches, steeples, and church bells do not?

The abovementioned issue notwithstanding, this book would add great value to graduate courses in comparative politics, political theory, and research methods. The authors engage major theoretical contributions on multiculturalism, social movements, immigrant politics, extremist politics, and immigration policy. They also explain links among theory, research design, data collection, and analysis clearly and effectively, and this will serve teachers well in helping students conceptualize original research. Using political claims analysis, the authors bridge the political-opportunity structure, resource mobilization, and framing strands of social movement theory and apply the derivative hypotheses effectively.

Opportunity models of collective action as conceived by John McCarthy and Mayer Zald, Douglas McAdam, Sidney Tarrow, Hanspeter Kriesi et al., and others have focused on institutions, structures, and processes *given* a well-formulated set of goals and grievances, but they have not explained how groups adopt particular political claims over others. The framing approach to social movements (by William Gamson, David Snow et al., David Snow and Robert Benford, for example) emphasized the constructed nature of collective identities and the significance of discursive strategies, but they did not systematically evaluate why various discursive strategies succeed or fail. Ruud Koopmans et al. bridge these two strands of social movement theory by integrating discursive variables into a political opportunity model; they specify discursive and institutional variables by focusing on citizenship, national identity, and migrants in five Western European countries; they have systematically collected claims-making data and institutional information across time, and they use this information to test their hypotheses. In doing so, the authors not only advance our understanding of the emergence and success of social movements, but also provide a welcome example of how social scientists can design effective empirical analysis.

Dictating Development: How Europe Shaped the Global Periphery. By Jonathan Krieckhaus. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2006. 244p. $27.96.

DOI: 10.1017/S1537592707071241

— David Howard Davis, *University of Toledo*

The purpose of this book is lofty: to understand the causes of economic development of the entire world. To be more specific, the study examines 91 countries outside Europe shaped by the colonial experience of the past 500 years. Krieckhaus looks at political science theories of ideology, bureaucracy, class, and education, as well as at economic theories of property rights and central policies. One of his first conclusions is that the settler counties of North America, the Cone of South America, and Australasia are far wealthier than the others. He goes on to examine the varying effects of different colonial powers, such as Portugal, Spain, France, or Britain, and whether the end of colonialism came in the nineteenth century or more recently.

Krieckhaus next analyzes data on the 91 countries using regression, finding in his optimal model for 1960 that income, health, education, property rights, and climate explain 65% of the variance (p. 67). In a disappointment for political scientists, he finds government policy less important. The author continues to examine the effects of colonialism, which contrary to much of the literature, are not strong. He describes the defensive modernization by Japan and, to a lesser extent, Thailand during the nineteenth century. Japan went on to colonize Korea and Taiwan.

The second half of the book has case studies of Mozambique, South Korea, and Brazil. He blames the failure of Mozambique on the Portuguese for exploiting agriculture, ignoring education, and blocking native leaders. War with South Africa was a further blow. The Korean chapter is remarkable in that Krieckhaus believes Japanese colonialism strengthened the government, fostered education, improved health, trained bureaucrats, encouraged native businesses, and constructed railways, hydroelectric dams, and industry. This contrasts with the conventional analysis that blasts the Japanese as ruthless exploiters. Brazil,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S153759270707123X Published online by Cambridge University Press