

Spain's case is again taken up in the section on industry, trade, and growth, where its developmental arc over 60 years is juxtaposed with those of Argentina and Brazil by Jordi Catalan and Tomàs Fernández-de-Sevilla, while in the next contribution Alan Knight analyzes a 60-year Mexican trajectory, notably in light of the now-routine "East Asian model" for the developmental state. In both of these chapters the authors argue more for parallels than contrasts among the cases being compared, which can perhaps raise a reader's eyebrows: if these cases are mostly parallel, how does one explain within these periods the clearly divergent developmental arcs of Spain versus Latin America, or the far sharper forking paths of East Asia versus Mexico? Yovanna Pineda's Argentine analysis is far narrower and sharply focused on the mixed record there of the agricultural machinery industry, where an earlier "golden decade" of success was followed by clear declines, in part due to corruption, in part due to the failure of CONADE (the nation's development council) to maintain a Chilean-CORFO-like institutional independence and support. CORFO's own history next receives its well-deserved treatment in a fine analysis by Patricio Silva, who follows its arc from very strong beginnings, through a series of partial setbacks, compromises, and recoveries in the 1950s and 1960s, until its eventual (fatal?) politicization after Allende's 1973 election.

The book's fourth and final main section explores national identities and symbolic power, and it juxtaposes perhaps the oddest trio of readings, beginning with Mathias vom Hau's simple question: across Latin America, did "popular nationalism" rise in a manner linked to the growth of developmental states, as some have suggested? His answer for Mexico, Peru, and Argentina is "no": "the developmental state has not been a direct cause of popular nationalism" (p. 340), nor vice-versa, as a reader can infer. Parallels over time were more thus a matter of coincidence than of true sociopolitical linkages. Popular nationalism was driven mainly by anti-oligarchic coalitions in society, not by state-level developmentalism. Marshall Eakin then richly describes, explains, and shows the impact in Brazil of its widely

held "national ideology" of race-mixture, or *mestiçagem*, which, he argues, "played a key role in its economic development" (p. 366). Along the way, Eakin shows the century-long impact of Gilberto Freyre's ideas in creating (not merely fostering) that precise worldview, which in turn led to claims about "racial democracy" there and stifled the growth of U.S.-style black-rights activism: Brazilian patterns of "exceptionalism" are still visible today, if more muted. Brodwyn Fischer then provides the final chapter: a more focused study of the urban informal sector in Brazil. In some respects the most unusual contribution of them all, she pursues a kind of dialectical analysis of unlikely developmental or structural pairings. Brazil's "urban form—infrastructurally incomplete, legally ambiguous, shaped by rural economies and power relations" nonetheless was for decades "fertile ground" for Brazil's industrial development (p. 378).

The editors' own contributions are well written and superbly bracket and bind together the whole. Barely worthy of criticism are two items: I might have wished for yet more analyses of Spain itself in the book; and the text is very lightly peppered with typos and some non-cognate English usages that more careful copy-editing might have caught. Yet I stress that these are mere quibbles about so excellent an effort.

Street Citizens: Protest Politics and Social Movement Activism in the Age of Globalization, by **Marco Giugni** and **Maria T. Grasso**. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019. 241 pp. \$39.99 paper. ISBN: 9781108469265.

MICHAEL T. HEANEY
University of Glasgow and University of Michigan
michaeltheaney@gmail.com

Street Citizens: Protest Politics and Social Movement Activism in the Age of Globalization, by Marco Giugni and Maria Grasso, is the quintessential book on protesters in Western Europe. It systematically examines who protests, why they turn out, and how these tendencies vary across countries, issues, and

types of demonstrators. The analysis is based on a comparison of surveys of left-leaning protesters in seven countries (Belgium, Italy, the Netherlands, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom) over the five-year period from 2009 to 2013 with general-population surveys conducted around the same time. Protest surveys were administered as part of an internationally collaborative project called “Caught in the Act of Protesting”—involving the authors as well as other scholars—which is among the most extensive studies of street protesters ever conducted.

The book carefully walks through the results of the surveys and discusses how they speak to longstanding theories of social movements, political participation, and social psychology. Its results do not favor structural, cultural, or rational explanations, but support the view that these factors vary in how they weigh in diverse contexts. The text includes a cornucopia of findings, only a few of which are mentioned here due to space constraints. With respect to country differences, Italy and Spain stood out from other countries in terms of their strong potential for protest, possibly due the economic impacts of the Great Recession on southern Europe during the period of the study. Protesters in Italy and Spain were less likely than protesters in other countries to be directed to events through organizational channels, relying more on mass media for information about events. They had lower levels of trust and efficacy and reported greater anger than other protesters. Swedish demonstrators, in contrast, differed from those in other countries by being younger, having comparatively high levels of education, and maintaining relatively stronger connections with leftist parties and organizations.

With respect to the social and class bases of protests, the study found that demonstrators were especially likely to have come of age during the 1960s and 1970s—and were more likely to be highly educated and middle class than was the case for the population in general. Protest participation was more likely to be planned than to be spontaneous and was dominated by the most politically interested citizens, though protesters differed considerably in their degree of

commitment to the cause of their protest and co-identification with their fellow protesters. Social networks played a critical role in attracting marginally committed people into participating, even though the most dedicated activists usually did not require this kind of push. Relatively little evidence was uncovered of protest being driven by an emerging precariat—that is, individuals suffering from perpetual uncertainty in income and employment. These and other results point the authors toward the conclusion that there has been a *pluralization* of protest such that protesters are becoming increasingly similar to the general population. This conclusion suggests that scholars should downplay the distinction that has traditionally been drawn between economically based and culturally based social movements; these different kinds of movements are increasingly mobilizing similar types of protesters.

Considering the limitations of *Street Citizens* helps to reveal promising directions for future research. Perhaps the most serious limitation of the study is that it examines only left-leaning protesters and sets aside demonstrators on the right side of the political spectrum. This point is raised without the intention of being too critical of the book at hand. Indeed, the ambition of the study was quite broad, and limiting the work to protest on the Left may be reasonable, especially given that demonstrations are often a core element of leftist politics. Nonetheless, right-leaning demonstrators are street citizens as well. And they likely differ systematically from those on the Left in terms of their motivations, class status, mobilizing structures, and other relevant considerations. Studies that focus on grassroots mobilizing on the Right tend to use different methods from studies of mobilizing on the Left. Studies of movements on the Right rely more on interviews and ethnography than on protest surveys. Consequently, there is a need for future research to compare social movements on the Right and Left using a common methodology. Doing so could offer a valuable complement to the analysis in *Street Citizens*.

While *Street Citizens* earns distinction for the extensiveness and rigor of its

methodology and fieldwork, the analysis would have been more convincing if it had addressed more explicitly the problems that are unavoidable in a study such as this one. Most notably, there is an unevenness in the quality of fieldwork across countries. For example, in the Netherlands (a country of approximately 17 million people), the study drew upon surveys conducted at demonstrations in five distinct cities (Amsterdam, Haarlem, Rotterdam, The Hague, and Utrecht). However, in the United Kingdom (a country of approximately 67 million people), the study only had access to surveys in one city (London). This limitation certainly does not invalidate the results overall, but calling attention to it would help to make sense of anomalies that are evident in the findings. As a case in point, the authors observe on page 32 that the British are among the least willing to attend demonstrations. Yet the study's design excluded demonstrations in Scotland (a region of the United Kingdom), which was actively building a movement for independence and facing sectarian conflict between Catholics and Protestants during the timeframe of the study. A more geographically diverse design might have yielded a different result on this point (among others) by reflecting the variation embedded in British subnational politics.

The authors deserve credit for addressing the links between individual-level participation in social movements and political institutions, especially parties and elections (the focus of Chapter 4). However, the question arises as to whether these links can be evaluated reasonably by using only evidence collected through individual-level surveys. This analysis might have been augmented by matching survey data with organizational data on labor unions, associations, and political parties obtained through interviews, social media, and archival research. For example, content analysis of party platforms might have been combined with survey data on membership in political parties. Or tweets about a protest might have been compared with event-level survey averages. Such approaches might have opened pathways for multi-level analysis of the evidence, potentially deepening the extent to which it

captures historical and cultural variations among countries.

These criticisms notwithstanding, *Street Citizens* sheds considerable new light on the nature of protest and protesters, and it does so in a way that is rigorously comparative across space and time. As the authors point out, protest is one of the most accessible ways for people to raise their voices when they have significant concerns that they wish to bring to powerholders. They use protest in part to demonstrate solidarity with other people with whom they identify closely. Since protest is a flexible tool that can be applied in a wide variety of contexts by different types of groups, it is valuable to improve accuracy in understanding the motivations of protesters and the mechanisms through which they are mobilized. *Street Citizens* accomplishes this goal unambiguously. As such, it is a must-read for serious scholars of social movements and grassroots democracy.

Making Work More Equal: A New Labour Market Segmentation Approach, edited by **Damian Grimshaw, Colette Fagan, Gail Hebson, and Isabel Tavora**. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 2017. 383 pp. \$37.95 paper. ISBN: 9781526117069.

JENNIFER BAIR
University of Virginia
 jlb5md@virginia.edu

Making Work More Equal: A New Labour Market Segmentation Approach is a festschrift for the prolific British scholar of work and employment Jill Rubery. Rubery has taught at the University of Manchester business school since 1989, generating a steady stream of influential research on comparative employment systems, with a particular focus on gender. Much of this work has been collaborative with an international, interdisciplinary network of colleagues, many of whom are included in this volume.

The overarching theme of the volume, captured by the book's subtitle, is the relationship between inequality, employment, and labor market institutions. In their well-conceived introductory chapter, co-editors