

from 1990 to 2015. The results here reveal little evidence for its hypothesized country-level variables: neither the quality of democracy, human development index, nor political institutions reaches statistical significance.

Chapter 8 narrates the failed presidential campaigns of two women with family ties: Hillary Clinton of the United States and Marine Le Pen of France. This chapter draws on extensive scholarship on Clinton's presidential bids, as well as a handful of sources from national outlets such as CNN and the *Wall Street Journal* (pp. 178, 179). The Le Pen case study similarly relies on English-language news sources such as the *Telegraph* and the *Guardian*. This chapter's focus on campaign-level factors such as scandals and debate performances contrasts with the previous chapters' emphasis on country-level determinants such as institutions. Returning to national factors, the authors conclude that the Clinton and Le Pen cases show that "the family path is not a viable path to executive office in stable, economically developed democratic countries with low levels of patriarchy, at least not globally powerful Western nations" (p. 199).

Chapter 9 reiterates the book's strengths as a quantitative global study. The book helpfully updates Jalalzai's original dataset, and its appendix provides paragraph-long biographies of the world's female presidents and prime ministers from 2010 to 2020. Some of the book's quantitative findings are consistent with extant research. They show once again that it is more difficult for women to become presidents than prime ministers; greater numbers of women legislators are associated with greater likelihoods of women chief executives; and the family pathway to power is less common than conventional wisdom might expect.

The classification of female presidents and prime ministers according to their pathways to power is foundational to the book's analysis and conclusions. The authors maintain that women chief executives should be coded as pursuing one of three paths to office because this strategy allows scholars to identify which variables drive specific paths (p. 25). They coded instances when women combined two or more of these paths in their early involvement in politics (pp. 6, 47). However, it is unclear whether any woman born into a political family should by default be classified as taking the family ties route. This coding rule also raises the broader question of why it might be more analytically useful to focus on how women initially entered politics, rather than which experiences provided the springboards to becoming chief executives.

Two prominent cases of women presidents in Latin America—Michelle Bachelet and Dilma Rousseff—are categorized as political activists rather than political careerists, illustrating this point (p. 57). Bachelet was briefly tortured during Chile's military dictatorship, and although she supported a return to democracy, she was not a nationally recognized leader of the democratic movement.

Most interpretations of Bachelet's rise to the presidency point to her serving as Minister of Health and Defense as the catalyst to her selection as the Concertación's presidential nominee. As a young person Rousseff also was imprisoned and tortured for three years during Brazil's military dictatorship, but these experiences hardly created opportunities for a presidential run. Her extraordinary performance as President Luiz Inácio da Silva's chief of staff instead provided a launching point for her presidential campaign. In short, coding these women as accessing presidential power via political activism may be misleading.

Deciding how to code cases to maximize their analytical usefulness remains a perennial challenge in global studies of women chief executives. This book nevertheless constitutes a notable attempt to detect global patterns in how women obtain chief executive power. In separate analyses of prime ministers and presidents, other scholarship theorizes how women come to lead major parties to govern in parliamentary regimes (Karen Beckwith, "Before Prime Minister: Margaret Thatcher, Angela Merkel, and Gendered Party Leadership Contests," *Politics & Gender* 11 [4], 2015) or how they become viable presidential candidates (Catherine Reyes-Housholder and Gwynn Thomas, "Gendered Incentives, Party Support and Viable Female Presidential Candidates in Latin America," *Comparative Politics* 53 [2], 2021). This book, in contrast, groups female prime ministers and presidents together and describes how country-level factors, such as level of democracy and political institutions, could determine which paths women take to become national leaders. Its quantitative description significantly contributes to the growing research on women and executive politics worldwide.

Native Bias: Overcoming Discrimination against Immigrants.

By Donghyun Danny Choi, Mathias Poertner, and Nicholas Sambanis. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2022.

312p. \$120.00 cloth, \$35.00 paper.

doi:10.1017/S1537592723000543

— Yang-Yang Zhou , University of British Columbia
yangyang.zhou@ubc.ca

In recent decades, high levels of immigration into advanced democracies have been met with increasing prejudice and discrimination by native-born populations. Macro- and micro-aggressions punctuate immigrants' lived experiences, from enduring suspicious stares and fearing that they might escalate to violence, to fielding questions about where we're *really* from and (relevant to this study) not being extended a helping hand in public spaces.

Host governments assume that the problem is the cultural and social distance between immigrants and natives. Thus, their solution is to implement coercive assimilation policies and programs like banning religious

head coverings in France or mandating language classes for immigrant children in Denmark. However, in their new book, *Native Bias: Overcoming Discrimination against Immigrants*, Donghyun Danny Choi, Mathias Poertner, and Nicholas Sambanis challenge this assumption: perhaps the root of the problem does not lie in ascriptive and cultural differences, and perhaps the two groups are more similar than they think. The authors use an innovative set of surveys and field experiments in Germany to pin down what precisely generates natives' bias against immigrants. If we know what drives it, we're in a much better position to fix it.

When social scientists have sought to explain anti-immigrant bias, they have tended to focus on one of two possible causes: the perceived economic threat that migrants might pose to the native-born or the cultural threat driven by differences in race, ethnicity, or religion. In this book, the authors draw on social identity theory and intergroup conflict research to theorize an alternative possibility: that the native-born perceive migrants as a threat to long-standing *civic norms*. These norms include, for example, not littering in public spaces, paying taxes, and contributing to the community. The authors argue that anti-immigrant bias is driven by fears—often unjustified—that newcomers do not share the norms about the meaning and practice of citizenship. So, when natives observe ascriptive differences in immigrants, they are also imprinting beliefs of differences in values and norms that, the authors point out, may not exist.

The key, therefore, to reducing discrimination and hostility toward minorities is to bridge this (mis)perceived gap between the norms, ideas, and values held among natives versus immigrants. In opposition to existing explanations of anti-immigrant bias, this book's argument implies that we should divert attention from focusing on ascriptive characteristics, such as race, ethnicity, or religion, and the prescriptions that go along with that focus, which tend to result in coercive assimilationist interventions that are designed to minimize differences between native and immigrants.

The authors tested their theory in Germany shortly after the arrival of a million Syrian refugees and, along with that arrival, a rise in the far-right anti-immigrant political party Alternative für Deutschland (AfD). Empirically, most of the literature relies on public opinion surveys asking natives explicitly about anti-immigration attitudes. The authors also use public opinion surveys (implicit association tests and conjoint experiments) to pinpoint which immigrant attributes are less acceptable (not knowing German, being Muslim, wearing a hijab) and to identify mechanisms. But the main empirical innovation is their creative use of embedded field experiments to uncover real-world discriminatory *behaviors* (the manifestations of anti-immigrant *attitudes*), thereby spotlighting the lived experiences of immigrants.

The main setup of these experiments is a seemingly ordinary social situation: a woman at a train station drops a bag of fruit—except, we learn that this woman is an actor, and there is not just one woman but instead multiple versions of this woman. Sometimes the woman is a white German native; other times, she is visibly from a minoritized immigrant background. Sometimes that same immigrant actor is wearing a hijab and is speaking on the phone in either German, Turkish, or Arabic. And it was not just one train station but more than 50 train stations. In total, this clever choreography with multiple treatment iterations occurred almost 3,000 times in front of 8,600 bystanders. The main outcome is centered on this question: Do any bystanders choose to help?

By measuring differences in assistance rates, the authors quantified levels of everyday discrimination. First, both the German native and non-veiled immigrant women were assisted at similar rates—around 76% of the time—but the veiled immigrant woman was assisted only 67% of the time. The magnitude of this gap is larger in East Germany, precisely where the AfD has been gaining support. Interestingly, the results do not change even if the veiled immigrant woman is speaking German, rather than Turkish or Arabic, suggesting that linguistic assimilation might not be the answer to reducing bias. What does make a difference is whether she sanctions another actor, a German man, who drops an empty coffee cup on the platform. In demonstrating that she shares the norm against public littering, her actions correct a commonly held misperception among native Germans that immigrants are more likely to litter. Another fascinating finding is that native German women tend to be more accepting of immigrant women who signal that they hold progressive gender norms.

Returning to the main research questions—Do natives' misperceptions around norm divergence drive anti-immigrant bias and can those misperceptions be corrected, without requiring immigrants to cast off their own cultural identity?—this book's findings confidently answer yes to both. However, if we return to the initial motivation of the book, which focuses on policies, programs, and interventions to reduce native bias and promote more inclusive behaviors, the picture becomes less clear. The treatments in the experiments involve immigrants demonstrably signaling their adherence to German norms: those are individual behaviors, not policies.

Although the authors caution against this interpretation of their results, it should be emphasized that the onus of reducing discrimination should not be on immigrants to more conspicuously signal their norm adherence in public spaces. In the book's conclusion, the authors discuss implications for policy design. They advocate for programs that target natives' misperceptions and stereotypes, as opposed to assimilationist policies targeting immigrants. But even if natives' observations

of immigrant norm adherence lessen bias, it is unclear how an intervention could be scaled up to a societal level. Results from the authors' survey, in which German natives watched videos of the choreographed experiment, showed that the positive effects of the immigrant actor's norm-enforcing actions did not generalize to immigrants as a whole. This suggests that similar interventions would need to overcome this exceptionalizing of a few "model immigrants."

Considering the policy implications of this book's important findings leads to additional avenues for future research. There is a rich and growing research community studying prejudice-reduction interventions that use intergroup contact, perspective-giving, and perspective-taking. These studies can also incorporate shared civic norms and cross-cutting identities. Beyond experimentally testing programmatic interventions, scholars could build on this book's theory by studying existing institutions and policies that might already create opportunities for demonstrating and observing civic norm promotion, such as places where immigrants vote and join school boards. In doing so, we could better understand the promise and limits of emphasizing shared values and norms as a way to change prejudicial attitudes and behaviors in the long term.

Scholars who study immigration, multiculturalism, prejudice-reduction and social identity, as well as those who are interested in the use of creative experimental methods in the social sciences, will find inspiration and optimism in this groundbreaking new book.

Outside the Bubble: Social Media and Political Participation in Western Democracies. By Cristian Vaccari and Augusto Valeriani. New York: Oxford University Press, 2021. 302p. \$99.00 cloth, \$27.95 paper. doi:10.1017/S1537592723000154

— Mária Žuffová , European University Institute
maria.zuffova@eui.eu

A Google Scholar search for the words "social media" and "participation" generates 2.5 million entries. More than half were written in the past 10 years, and at least one-third examine social media and participation in the US context. Because the United States has been central to studying social media and the internet more broadly, assumptions, methods, and techniques carried out there have been repeatedly applied to other Western democracies without paying due attention to the distinctiveness of their political and media institutions (see, for example, Rasmus K. Nielsen's Twitter account, May 30, 2022, https://twitter.com/rasmus_kleis/status/1531218022509199362).

Cristian Vaccari's and Augusto Valeriani's excellent book compensates for an Americanization of this research area. They argue that country context shapes the relationship between social media and participation. By conducting a representative survey of internet users' experiences of social media and political participation in eight Western

European countries in addition to the United States, the authors fill an important gap, add to the empirical evidence outside the United States, and provide a valuable comparative perspective. The surveys were conducted between June 2015 and March 2018, immediately after the general election in each investigated country. The number of completed interviews was 1,750 for all countries except for the United States, where it was 2,500. The authors investigated social media and participation in context by focusing on the role of electoral competition, party, and mass media systems. Yet, challenging the "contextual vacuum fallacy," as the authors frame "underdeveloped theorizing about the role of systemic characteristics in shaping the relationship between social media and participation" (see p. 30), is just one of the manifold contributions of the book. By offering sound empirical evidence, the authors successfully manage to dispute other widespread narratives as well.

The central claim of the book is that social media may promote political participation, which contradicts the arguments of established concepts and theories, such as Eli Pariser's concept of "filter bubbles" (*The Filter Bubble: What the Internet Is Hiding from You*, 2011) or Cass Sunstein's concept of "echo chambers" (*Republic.com 2.0.*, 2009). Those established theories provide a pessimistic account of the effects of social media on participation and claim that social media algorithms narrow the content that users encounter and isolate them from conflicting views. Whereas many take these claims for granted, Vaccari and Valeriani use them as hypotheses that can be empirically tested and ask new research questions that have the potential to generate a better understanding of the relationship between social media and political participation.

The authors focus on three political experiences on social media—encountering agreeing viewpoints, accidental exposure to political news, and electoral mobilization—and hypothesize that these experiences will positively influence political participation. They analyze political participation as a manifestation of selected political behaviors, such as contacting a politician to support a cause; signing petitions and subscribing to referenda; financing a party candidate, political leader, or electoral campaign; taking part in public meetings and electoral rallies; distributing political leaflets; and trying to convince someone to vote for a particular party.

The book is organized into six chapters. The first two chapters provide comprehensive literature reviews on social media (chap. 1) and political participation (chap. 2) that persuasively summarize key findings in both areas and assist the authors in introducing their hypotheses. Chapter 2 also briefly presents the methodology, which is presented in much more detail in an online appendix for those interested. Chapter 3 provides descriptive statistics of surveyed internet users and their experiences of social media in the nine countries studied. Finally,