

For those seeking a critical and in-depth assessment of the literature on China's population, the features of the book that make it excellent as an introductory text for undergraduates or non-specialists become a limitation. The even-handed coverage of key debates such as the one over the impact of the one-child policy is an example. The presentations of opposing arguments are largely summaries with little effort to weigh the evidence or make an assessment. While this helps make the book more accessible, it also limits its usefulness as a resource for specialist readers.

Similarly, while the tendency to rely on a relatively small selection of published studies when covering specific topics helps make the book readable, it means that the chapters are not exhaustive literature reviews like one might find in a state of the field article. Along with the heavy focus on state policy as the primary explanation for change and lack of consideration of historical or comparative context, this means that to have a more complete picture, the book would need to be supplemented with additional readings that offer alternative interpretations and embed China's recent experience in broader context.

Glocalization: A Critical Introduction, by **Victor Roudometof**. New York: Routledge, 2016. 206 pages. \$51.95 paper. ISBN: 9780415722438.

GILI S. DRORI

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem
gili.drori@mail.huji.ac.il

Resulting from its popularity in scholarly research and corporate strategy alike, "glocalization" grew to become a "fuzzy" concept with many meanings, debatable origins, and, according to Victor Roudometof's review, at least six discipline-specific definitions. And still, for sociologists, the origin of the term *glocalization* is incontestably the writings of Roland Robertson (1994, 1995). Robertson's coining of the term is embedded in the context of discussions of globalization in the 1990s, which were mired in debates about the nature of state power in an era of expanded international, transnational, and

global action and organization; whether globalization is a bottom-up or a top-down process; whether globalization equals Americanization; and, the most futile of all debates, whether the world is "flat" or "spiky"—namely, whether globalization drives worldwide convergence or divergence.

Therefore, argues Roudometof in *Glocalization: A Critical Introduction*, Robertson's introduction of the term *glocalization* comes in response to the limits of globalization debates, which, voluminous and heated as they were, reached an impasse and became mired in binary conceptualizations. The neologism *glocalization* challenges the principal binary of global/local and reinstates a sense of the complexity that comes from the co-constitution of these two "ideal type" categories of the global and the local. The importance of the term for sociological analyses of global and transnational processes comes from this challenge to globalization studies.

Roudometof's book puts analytic order into the many discussions that elaborate on the complexities of globalization captured in the term *glocalization*. Throughout the book, Roudometof differentiates between globalization and glocalization: globalization is described as the compression of the world and is primarily a process of worldwide diffusion, whereas "glocalization [is] globalization refracted through the local" (p. 146) and therefore challenges the hegemony of the global. Roudometof also follows with an analytic distinction between (1) glocalization as a process, (2) glocality as a condition, and (3) glocalism as a worldview.

The book is organized into two parts and includes eight chapters. In Part I, following a discussion of the term's origins (Chapter 1), Chapters Two through Four are devoted to conceptual formulation and to differentiation from alternative concepts—from creolization, domestication, and, most centrally to Roudometof's arguments, Ritzer's globalization (2003; also, Ritzer and Richer 2012). The chapters of Part II are devoted to "engagements" of glocalization, glocality, and glocalism with sociological discussions of space, locality, and modernity (Chapter 5); culture, identity, and belonging (Chapter 6);

and transnationalism and cosmopolitanism (Chapter 7).

Taken together, these chapters articulate a comprehensive social theory of glocalization that is closely aligned with world society theory (see Meyer et al. 1997). They convey the Robertsonian spirit, which is also reflected in his recent works (for example, Robertson 2014a, 2014b), that the valorization of both local authenticity and consensual international metasovereignty is analytically fruitless. This is also echoed in Zygmunt Bauman's claims that "globalizing and localizing trends are mutually reinforcing and inseparable" and that "the global scene needs to be seen as a matrix of possibilities" (1998:45, 43).

Building on such pensive discussions of glocalization, Roudometof devotes his concluding Chapter Eight to the limits of "the glocal turn": as much as Roudometof's book celebrates glocalization, it also admits to the limits of glocalization scholarship and research, specifically in sociology. Roudometof notes several such limitations. He argues that the elegance of the term masks its complexity and drives its careless application. He adds that "awareness of the autonomy of glocalization which is not realized in practice [is] leading to different forms of analytic reductionism" (p. 145). And he calls on scholars to "rethink, perhaps unthink, the very nature of the local" (p. 148). Therefore, after setting a solid foundation for this concept to not only replace the concept of globalization but also to open doors for studying glocal complexities, Chapter Eight makes Roudometof's goal clear: to urge "the scholarly community to gain sufficient detachment from glocalization in order to be in a position to meaningfully interpret and appreciate the concept without engaging in glocalist polemics" (p. 152).

And yet Roudometof leaves little room in his book for such potential expansions of glocalization and fails to imagine, inspire, or dare to prescribe paths, however tentatively, for future research directions. Roudometof only briefly notes the need to explicate the forms and characteristics of glocalization, the implications of glocalization for the construction of multiple layers of transnationality, and the relations between glocalization and global power inequality. Here,

Roudometof misses an opportunity to engage with contemporaneous writings with similar goals, namely to regenerate the conceptual development of glocalization and to expand into new sites for glocalization research. In the past few years, much of this effort has occurred in organization studies, with or without explicit use of the term *glocalization* (see Gond and Boxenbaum 2013; Ansari et al. 2014; Drori et al. 2014), and also linking such glocal processes with institutionalist terminology of diffusion, translation, and agency, all of which would match Roudometof's account of world society theory.

Roudometof titles the book, and also positions it, as an introduction—not a textbook about glocalization but a foundation for further studies of glocal phenomena. Seeing the fragmentation of the scholarship on glocalization, the book keeps to its goal "to advance the *theoretical* understanding of glocalization" (p. 148; italics in original). And Roudometof's detailed essayist writing surely wrestles with the principal issues pertaining to glocalization, from the conceptual ties with hybridity to the relations between the practical endorsement of glocalization and its scholarly foundations. Most importantly, Roudometof calls not to dismiss glocalization because of its many interpretations. I join his call: The challenge is to use this "introduction" to spur empirical research on the complexities of transnational and global processes and to further conceptualize this potent idea.

References

- Ansari, Shahzad, Juliane Reinecke, and Amy Spaan. 2014. "How Are Practices Made to Vary? Managing Practice Adaptation in a Multinational Corporation." *Organization Studies* 35(9):1313–41.
- Bauman, Zygmunt. 1998. "On Glocalization: Or Globalization for Some, Localization for Some Others." *Thesis Eleven* 54(1):37–49.
- Drori, Gili S., Markus A. Höllerer, and Peter Walgenbach. 2014. "Unpacking the Glocalization of Organization: From Term, to Theory, to Analysis." *European Journal of Cultural and Political Sociology* 1(1):85–99.
- Gond, Jean-Pascal, and Eva Boxenbaum. 2013. "The Glocalization of Responsible Investment:

- Contextualization Work in France and Quebec." *Journal of Business Ethics* 115(4):707–21.
- Meyer, John W., John Boli, George M. Thomas, and Francisco O. Ramirez. 1997. "World Society and the Nation-State." *American Journal of Sociology* 103(1):144–81.
- Ritzer, George. 2003. "Rethinking Globalization: Glocalization/Globalization and Something/Nothing." *Sociological Theory* 21(3):193–209.
- Ritzer, George, and Zach Richer. 2012. "Still Enamoured of the Glocal: A Comment on 'From Local to Grobal, and Back.'" *Business History* 54(5):798–804.
- Robertson, Roland. 1994. "Globalisation or Glocalization?" *The Journal of International Communication* 1(1):33–52.
- Robertson, Roland. 1995. "Glocalization: Time-Space and Homogeneity-Heterogeneity." Pp. 25–45 in *Global Modernities*, edited by M. Fatherstone, S. Lash, and R. Roberston. London: SAGE.
- Robertson, Roland. 2014a. *European Glocalization in Global Context*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Robertson, Roland. 2014b. "Situating Glocalization: A Relatively Autobiographical Intervention." Pp. 25–36 in *Global Themes and Local Variations in Organization and Management: Perspectives on Glocalization*, edited by G. S. Drori, M. A. Höllerer, and P. Walgenbach. New York: Routledge.

Theory in Action: Theoretical Constructionism, edited by **Peter Sohlberg** and **Håkon Leulfsrud**. Boston: Brill, 2017. 203 pp. \$28.00 paper. ISBN: 9781608468348.

BARRY MARKOVSKY
 University of South Carolina
 barry@sc.edu

As editors Peter Sohlberg and Håkon Leulfsrud describe it, "The subject of this book is sociological theory in application and theoretical construction work. . . . [W]e concentrate on the way in which the social world can be theoretically understood and constructed through the notion of theoretical operations" (p. 1). They characterize *Theory in Action: Theoretical Constructionism* as a book on theoretical methods in which their contributors bring varying perspectives to bear on issues pertaining to understanding

and constructing theories. This is a genre with too few past exemplars. Unfortunately, it is a mischaracterization. No obvious substantive or methodological threads connect the chapters in this book, and there is nothing resembling a coherent approach to understanding and constructing theories. In short, there is no "ism" reflecting the promise of the titular "theoretical constructionism."

I was very interested to review this book, as my work aligns well with its expressed purposes. Since the late 1970s, I have engaged in many activities related to theory construction and theory analysis. This includes delving into philosophies of science and knowledge; studying logic and math, the languages of science; building, honing, and empirically testing several formal theories; presenting and publishing work on a number of related issues; teaching required PhD-level courses on these topics; and currently executing a grant-funded project to create web tools that facilitate building, evaluating, disseminating, and integrating theories.

The collection at hand is truly a mixed bag, and I cannot do justice to all of its contents. I will note three chapters that stood above the rest. Each cast some old ideas in a new light, and each demonstrated much greater attention than the remaining eight chapters to clear exposition and sound reasoning. Co-editors Sohlberg and Leulfsrud's Chapter One, "Theory and Theoretical Operations," discussed a number of properties and distinctions that they have observed in works deemed "theoretical" in sociology: descriptive, explanatory and/or predictive, static versus dynamic, theorist-focused versus phenomenon-focused, individually versus collectively developed, and so on. This typology-building is interesting and insightful, but I would like to have seen something more: the establishment of standards by which to gauge the logical and semantic integrity of those theoretical products and a rationale for why taken-for-granted criteria in other sciences are seemingly not even worth mentioning as relevant for sociological theorizing.

Roar Hagen's Chapter Eight ("Abduction—Assessing Fruitfulness and the Construction of Scientific Concepts") is well