

this “othering” construction of development’s targets. Statements by NGO and government staff trade in familiar tropes as they impute laziness or a lack of awareness to local populations. Conversely, however, some also question both such tropes (pp. 154–55) and the entire enterprise of intervening on behalf of others (pp. 156, 161). Dodworth frames this chapter as a contribution to what she calls “representational theory” (p. 143). An engagement with the rich critical literature on empowerment and participatory development may have sharpened this discussion.

The final empirical chapter surveys a variety of issues arising around what Dodworth calls “informational relations” (p. 170); in essence, the collection of data and various reporting and monitoring activities. Such activities are shown to be not only burdensome but also sites of resistance, when the sharing of data and information is refused. NGOs may do so because they may not wish to validate competitors in their attempt to set themselves up as coordinators and monitors on behalf of the local state. But the targets of NGOs’ interventions may be reluctant to share information too; for instance, when it comes to reporting “human rights” violations such as violence or rape. This refusal ultimately amounts to resistance to the kind of interventions that the sharing of such information enables because reporting to political authorities or involving the police or the legal system may be dangerous and undesirable (p. 191).

In Dodworth’s framing, the interesting material summarized in plain language here shows “six legitimization practices . . . : *extensivity/territoriality*; *state relations*; *voluntarism*; *representation*; and the *materiality* of information” (p. 8; emphases in the original). It makes sense to interpret the various claims to represent others discussed in chapter 6 as indicative of a practice aimed at legitimization. But it is far from clear how various statements by NGO staff concerning a variety of problems around information gathering—chapter 7’s title is “Reporting Has All Sorts of Issues!”—are indicative of, far less amount to, a “practice.” Simply naming such issues around information the practice of “materiality of information” does not help the reader understand how and why it could and ought to be understood thusly. The same applies when NGOs’ declarations regarding the breadth and depth of their operations are designated the practice of “extensivity/territoriality,” when aligning with the state (or failing to do so) is referred to as the practice of “state relations,” and when the use of volunteers is declared the practice of “voluntarism.”

To the extent to which such activities and claims make NGOs out to be competent and reliable partners to a variety of audiences that include local state authorities, beneficiary communities, and their own headquarters and donors, it is furthermore unclear whether “legitimation” is the best way of describing this. On this count, the effort devoted to shoehorning the book’s interesting empirical material into

“six legitimization practices” ultimately comes at the expense of attention to the nuances of the strategic deployment of such claims, the receptions of such activities, and what might make them (fail to) resonate with different audiences.

More broadly, much of the considerable space that the book dedicates to expounding on its analytical framing is taken up by offhand gestures in many different directions that, to this reviewer, tend to obfuscate rather than elucidate the empirical material—if it meaningfully connects to it at all. The reader repeatedly learns, for instance, that “state-society divisions do not hold much water” (pp. 9, 91, cf. 27). But, with no substantive discussion of how we might then think about “the state” or “society” or whether we should use these concepts at all, the book swiftly reverts to treating them as distinct entities when discussing different ways that NGOs position themselves vis-à-vis “the state”—declarations about their coproduction and the designation of the result as the “non/state” (p. 9) notwithstanding. Although Pierre Bourdieu’s work receives a more substantial discussion (pp. 30–33), its use in the book boils down to the questionable assertion that “the Tanzanian district had all the hallmarks of a Bourdieusian field” (p. 45), essentially qua being an important administrative level. Michel Foucault is ostensibly enlisted because his notion of power is “not *attributive*, to individuals or institutions, but is *relational*” (p. 29; emphases in the original). Yet, a few lines down, “Foucauldian analysis” is (confusingly) faulted for “affording covert forms of power to an implied elite” (p. 29). Dodworth then claims that “the book tempers the urge shared by Foucault and Bourdieu to reduce legitimization to the transmission of state-generated ideology” (p. 35). Although it is unclear on what the allegation of such an urge might be based, it is clear that Foucault emphatically rejected centering an analysis of power on either ideology or the state.

It is, to this reader, hard to make sense of the book’s analytical framings and broader arguments because they are set out by way of such broad-brush declarations and assertions with little substantive resonance in the empirical discussion. The book’s strength is instead its rich documentation of the struggles and dilemmas of development NGOs operating in a particular Global South setting. On this score, it is a worthwhile read.

Group Interests, Individual Attitudes: How Group Memberships Shape Attitudes Towards the Welfare State.

By Michael J. Donnelly. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021. 288p. \$100.00 cloth.

doi:10.1017/S1537592723000105

— Benjamin Leruth , University of Groningen
b.j.leruth@rug.nl

Welfare policy studies have become a genuine subfield of public policy over the past several decades. Attitudes toward redistribution policy are an ever-more salient issue

that has sparked interest across disciplines of social sciences, especially in Europe. In *Group Interests, Individual Attitudes*, Michael J. Donnelly makes an important contribution to this field of study by offering a new heuristic theory that is supported empirically by a strong mixed-method approach.

The book focuses on two core questions: (1) What drives support for redistributive taxation and spending? and (2) why is ethnic diversity associated with inequality and a lack of redistribution? Arguably, these two questions can be addressed using a wide range of methods and data, from well-established large-N surveys (European Social Survey, World Values Survey, and Eurobarometer, just to name a few) to more qualitative-driven research consisting of interviews or focus groups. The usual qualitative-quantitative divide has often been criticized for offering a biased vision of complex social realities. Donnelly is well aware of these shortcomings: the author's arguments therefore rely on both quantitative data and mostly exploratory interviews conducted with activists, politicians, and interest group officials in two countries (the United Kingdom and Slovakia). The analysis is also partially expanded to three other countries (more on the case selection later).

Donnelly develops a heuristic theory of group membership and of attitudes toward redistribution (chap. 2). Eight hypotheses are tested in this book, relating to widespread variables such as the salience of ethnic or regional inequalities, or the role of institutions in shaping redistributive preferences. These variables are covered quite extensively in chapters 4–9. Although Donnelly bases most of the empirical findings on his original fieldwork, he also uses well-established studies to contextualize and support his argument. As such, the book uses a wealth of empirical data to provide an answer to the two core questions mentioned earlier and to support the heuristic theory presented in chapter 2.

This excellent book gives the reader a lot to unpack, both theoretically and empirically. The theory, hypotheses, and empirical observations are all presented in a convincing and accessible manner; therefore, they do not require an in-depth knowledge of the subject matter to comprehend, despite its very complex nature. It is methodologically outstanding, if not flawless. Some readers might feel uneasy at times because the book consistently cuts across traditional disciplinary boundaries, but Donnelly just as consistently manages to bring us back on track by asking the right questions, reminding the reader of where we stand in the broad argument being made, and drawing the lessons to be learned throughout each chapter. In other words, the book's narrative makes up for its complex mixed-methods and interdisciplinary approach.

There is only so much one can do and cover within the framework of a single research project, but one might criticize the book for being too Eurocentric at times. Five countries are covered in the book: most of the empirical

analysis compares the United Kingdom to Slovakia, but additional analyses focus on Canada, Germany, and Italy. The justification for these case studies makes sense, yet one sentence caught my attention: as a case study, the United Kingdom is used to investigate the longer-term and more ingrained effects of group inequality, given the country's "stable regional and ethnic politics (at least up until June of 2016)" (p. 52). This can be a drawback: as we are all aware (and Donnelly acknowledges, on p. 200), Brexit created a significant shock that affected and continues to affect Britain's domestic politics, especially in terms of migration. These changing dynamics could be addressed by scholars studying group attitudes, and therefore using Donnelly's contributions as a starting point for their analysis. Another challenge is the limited ability to generalize the findings of this study. Although elements of the analysis expand the book's geographical scope by using larger studies such as the European Social Survey, I would have liked to see a broader reflection on the empirical findings that not only cuts across the traditional worlds of the welfare state but also addresses how they will stand the test of time. These limitations are, however, well-acknowledged by Donnelly in the concluding chapter (section 10.5).

At times, I was a bit confused by the methodological complexity of the study and risked being overwhelmed by the wealth of data it offered. This might not come as a surprise, given that Donnelly breaks the mold by using complex mixed methods to investigate a complex issue. Perhaps, however, some data could have been presented in a more straightforward way. The sources of the data in the empirical analyses (chaps. 4–9) are also not always clear. The reader should carefully read appendices A and, most importantly, B before moving from chapter 3 to chapter 4. Placing this material in the appendices might have been an editorial decision to make the book more appealing to a wider audience, of course, but I found such an abrupt separation of data unexpected and slightly disconcerting. What I really missed, however, is more use of the interviews conducted by the author and more information about the questions asked and their usefulness within the framework of this research.

However, I consider these two critiques as trivial because *Group Interests, Individual Attitudes* is a genuinely impressive contribution to the existing literature on preferences toward redistribution. Whatever their discipline and level of expertise on the topic (including methodological expertise), everyone will learn a lot from this book. Those readers who find some chapters a bit too technical because of differences in disciplines should turn to the concluding chapter 10, which offers a comprehensive and most accessible summary of the findings. This chapter superbly manages to bring all the pieces of this complex puzzle together.

More fundamentally, what genuinely impressed me is how Donnelly manages to make such a dense issue so

appealing and comprehensible, especially to a non-expert audience, although the book certainly does not target the general public! This is a book I would recommend to most academics, including those working in completely different disciplines, because it is a model of storytelling and what I would call “accessible interdisciplinarity.” In the concluding paragraphs, Donnelly explains that, in addition to presenting a heuristic theory of group memberships and welfare attitudes, a broader objective of the book is to let the reader reflect on how disciplines such as psychology, sociology, political science, and economics “can and should speak to each other” (p. 203). This objective is certainly met.

Interdisciplinary studies used to be met with much criticism, especially by older generations of academics who might have perceived disciplinary boundaries as a means to protect themselves. Certainly, interdisciplinarity requires considerable effort from researchers, especially because most academic institutions still tend to train social scientists within existing disciplinary boundaries. Yet, through this book, Donnelly demonstrates that interdisciplinary studies can not only offer a more accurate picture of complex social realities but also remain comprehensive and appealing to a wide audience that cuts across academic fields.

The Informal Regulation of Criminal Markets in Latin

America. By Hernán Flom. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2022. 300p. \$99.99 cloth.

doi:10.1017/S1537592723000452

— Yanilda María González , Harvard University
yanilda_gonzalez@hks.harvard.edu

Within political science the study of the determinants of drug violence and the prevalence of criminal governance has become a burgeoning and exciting field. Even among the many excellent books on these subjects over the past decade, Hernán Flom’s *The Informal Regulation of Criminal Markets in Latin America* is poised to become essential reading for understanding variation in levels of violence in Latin America, the world’s most violent region. Whereas much of the literature focuses on how state actions shift the incentives of criminal groups or on the quasi-state functions of criminal organizations, Flom “brings the state back in” by offering a framework for understanding how partisan turnover and fragmentation shape politicians’ incentives to control their police, which in turn shape police and politicians’ incentives to regulate drug trafficking (albeit through informal means). Flom tests this theoretical framework with rich and ambitious comparative analysis in Argentina and Brazil, leveraging subnational variation between two metropolitan areas within each country—São Paulo and Rio de Janeiro in Brazil and Greater Buenos Aires and Rosario in Argentina—as well as considerable within-case temporal variation.

The point of departure for Flom’s analysis is the striking variation in patterns of violence across four large metropolitan areas in Latin America, despite the prevalence of drug trafficking in all four contexts. He identifies four types of relationships between the state (politicians and police) and criminal groups: (1) coordinated coexistence, or explicit or implicit agreements between politicians/police and criminal actors; (2) protection rackets in which police and politicians extract rents from criminal groups for protection from rivals and the state itself; (3) particularistic negotiation, or uncoordinated bribe extraction from criminal groups by police officers or units without protection from politicians; and (4) particularistic confrontation, which entails indiscriminate attacks by police against drug trafficking organizations. The first two types generate relatively low levels of violence by both the state and criminal groups, whereas the latter two types result in high levels of violence and corruption.

Flom argues, and demonstrates convincingly, that these patterns of violence and state–criminal-group relationships are a function of the political incentives facing executives to grant police high levels of autonomy and to professionalize or politicize their police forces. Through rich case studies, Flom provides compelling evidence of how these political factors explain variation in levels of violence, a relationship that remains underexplored in the literature. He demonstrates, for instance, that low partisan turnover in São Paulo’s governorship and high partisan fragmentation in the legislature incentivized governors to professionalize the police, resulting in an enduring pact with the state’s dominant criminal organization, the PCC; this yielded some of the lowest homicide rates among Brazilian states. By contrast, high partisan turnover and fragmentation in Rio de Janeiro meant that politicians had few means by which to constrain police autonomy, yielding particularistic confrontation and high homicide rates for decades.

Flom’s theoretical framework and impressive comparative analysis make important contributions to several literatures, which should broaden the book’s appeal beyond scholars of security and policing. The book opens the “black box” of the state to lay bare the political calculations undergirding state responses to—and, at times, complicity with—Latin America’s high rates of violence. A key challenge for democracy in Latin America since the “third wave” of democratization has been precisely the inability of democratic governments throughout the region to rein in rampant crime and violence. Flom’s analysis points to one factor that may hinder the ability of democracies to meaningfully address crime and violence, highlighting how ordinary democratic politics may shift political leaders’ incentives toward extracting rents and otherwise concentrating power, rather than curbing drug violence and strengthening the rule of law. Relatedly, the book also elucidates a democratic dilemma regarding state responses to violence. On the one hand, political competition may