INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this volume is to offer an inter- and cross-disciplinary engagement with the themes of glocalization and culture. Glocalization has been employed in numerous disciplines and hybrid fields of study, including applied areas such as public health and architecture. However, this volume’s focus is restricted to the humanities and social sciences at large. This Introduction aims to sum up the current state of affairs in intellectual conversations about glocalization and to situate this handbook within the context of the ongoing scholarly production on this topic. In order to accomplish these objectives, after this introductory scholarly section the chapter is structured into three parts. In the first section, the discussion tracks the contours of the intellectual discussions on culture and globalization, and situates the terms ‘glocal’ and ‘glocalization’ in scholarly discourse. The discussion then moves on to locate glocalization within academia’s current division of labour. In this regard, special attention is placed on the different disciplinary perspectives on the theme of glocalization and culture. The acknowledgement of different interpretations constrains the temptation to engage in some sort of disciplinary imperialism. In this chapter’s final part, the discussion shifts to the description of this volume’s objectives, the scope of restrictions with regard to coverage of different subtopics and fields, and the organizational structure of this collection. In addition to brief descriptions of individual chapters, there is a further effort to situate the different parts of the volume within broader scholarly preoccupations.

From Global Culture to Glocal Cultures: Intellectual Trajectories CA 1945

In sharp contrast to its initial connection to the field of social or cultural anthropology, over the post-World War II era, culture has expanded its conceptual reach, gradually becoming one of the central problematics in social sciences. In fact, while anthropologists used the term to initially indicate ‘a way of life’ among pre-literate or colonial societies, culture has gradually become a major focus for other disciplines, too. By far the most widely known example is Sociology, where, since the 1980s, Cultural Sociology has emerged as one of the discipline’s most popular specialties (see Spillman, 2020). This transformation of the meaning of culture is closely related to the growth in the centrality of culture for the economy and society of most nations. The rise of the so-called ‘culture industries’, and the proliferation of media-based industries has amplified the uses of commercial products for the construction and reconstruction of identities, turning culture into a major research area both for business and the humanities.

Culture played a significant role in post-World War II modernization theories. This particular lineage leads all the way to the problematic of global or world culture as such. The gradual formation of the ‘Third World’ bloc of countries intensified the geopolitical competition between the ‘free world’ and the communist bloc. De-colonialization created new states that
had to choose between the competing geopolitical blocs of capitalist West and communist East, all the while facing the pressing issue of modernization. Up until the early twentieth century, modernity and modernization were widely viewed as products of Western civilization. That ceased to be the case in the second half of the twentieth century. The necessity of developing an attractive alternative to communism, as well as a suitable venue for progress, fostered the conceptual separation between modernity and the West. Modernity became the result of modernization, and, in theory, the process was open to all. Global modernization was the champion of the day; and it is not accidental that it is from within these lenses that globalization was initially formulated – at least according to Robertson’s (2014) own autobiographical recollection.

In the post-World War II era, modernization and development became a major research area. This particular specialty eventually transmigrated into globalization studies. The title of Timmons and Hite’s (2000) edited collection of previously published material on the topic is telling: *From Modernization to Globalization*. But the formative intellectual forces that shaped this transition did not belong to the so-called classical modernization theories (for an overview see So, 1990). Instead, it was the ‘Stanford school’ of world polity, or world society perspective, which most effectively championed the notion of global modernization (see Krücken & Drori, 2010). Since the 1970s, the world society perspective emerged as a viable alternative to older interpretations, and, to a considerable extent, it remains bound by several assumptions of the post-World War II problematic. Some of these assumptions include an almost uncritical acceptance of the Western origins of modernity and an empirical predisposition to focus on unidirectional flows from the West to the rest. The goal is to unpack the institutionalized culture of ‘modernity’ and to characterize social ‘actors’ (individual persons, as well as states and organizations) as products of that culture. World society scholars emphasize rationalization, universalism, belief in progress and individualism as foundational cultural assumptions that undergird global discourse and organization (Boli & Thomas, 1999). This deep culture supports a wide array of movements, initiatives and innovations, but proscribes many others. The world society perspective has been shaped by Durkheim’s strong legacy upon the notion of ‘culture’; that is, culture as an element of integration on a world scale. It also displays an understanding of culture as *deep* culture (culture = rules, scripts, models, and so on). This view is strongly reminiscent of twentieth-century structuralism (for an overview, see Buhari-Gulmez, 2010).

In contrast, Robertson (1992; Robertson & Lechner, 1985) offered a more culturally centred alternative to neo-institutionalism and structuralism. The presence of an alternative to the Stanford school has been occasionally referred to as the ‘Pittsburgh school’ of cultural globalization. The ‘globalization debates’ of the 1990s (Featherstone, 1990; Featherstone et al., 1995; King, 1991) provided an arena for proposing different interpretations for making sense of globalization (for a discussion see Roudometof, 2021a). While Lechner and Boli (2005) speak of ‘world culture’, the term ‘global culture’ (Featherstone, 1990) had already been introduced as a new catchword in the early 1990s. No complete unanimity exists on whether global culture is singular or plural, or whether it supersedes national cultures. Understandably, this issue has been of considerable significance for media and mass communication studies, where the expansion of post-national or transnational or global broadcasting has offered the opportunity for empirical explorations of these alternative scenarios. Traditional interpretations pitted proponents of Americanization, or cultural homogeneity, against those of heterogeneity (Marling, 2006; Ritzer, 2003a, 2003b; Tomlinson, 1991).
In *Globalization and Culture*, Jan Nederveen Pieterse distinguishes three main paradigms through which the growing awareness of cultural difference brought about by globalization can be approached: ‘cultural differentialism’, ‘cultural convergence’ and ‘cultural hybridization’. By cultural differentialism, the Dutch-born scholar means the perspective according to which differences between cultures will survive globalization, a framework well exemplified by the ‘clash of civilizations’ thesis; cultural convergence refers instead to the worldwide homogenization of societies and cultures, as exemplified by the ‘McDonaldization’ thesis; and, lastly, cultural hybridization refers to the idea that world cultures mix, and, indeed, have always mixed, with each other (Nederveen Pieterse, 2009, pp. 43–63). Besides providing a potential antidote to both cultural differentialism as the idea of a future dominated by cultural divisions, purity and nationalisms, and cultural convergence as the triumph of cultural imperialism, the cultural hybridization paradigm illustrated by Nederveen Pieterse helps to put into perspective the place occupied by glocalization and glocal cultures within globalization. That is, it brings attention to globalization as the worldwide multicentric process of cross-cultural interactions beginning in ancient history that has become more intense, especially in the contemporary phase due to the impact of the new communication technologies and the growing scope of specialized social systems, thus bringing about unprecedented (though unequally distributed) interconnectedness. And, against this background, the glocalization of culture can be understood as a hybridization requiring the interplay of both ‘global’ and ‘local’ factors.

In the social sciences and humanities, glocalization has been introduced mostly through Robertson’s (1992, p. 173, see also, Robertson 1994, 1995) work. Given the post-1989 popularization of globalization in the academic and popular press, the problematic of global–local relations emerged as a key research theme, with the most popular interpretations at the time suggesting the withering away of the local and the advent of global social integration. Going against such interpretation, Robertson (1995, p. 35) argued that ‘the global is not in and of itself counterpoised to the local’, but instead, ‘what is often referred to as the local is essentially included within the global’. Globalization involves the linking of localities and the very ‘invention’ of notion of locality as such. Accordingly,

the alleged problem of the relationship between the local and the global [can] be overcome by a deceptively simple conceptual move. Rather than speaking of an inevitable tension between the local and the global it might be possible to think of the two as not being opposites but rather as being different sides of the same coin. (Robertson & White, 2007, p. 62)

The ‘linking of localities’ and the ‘invention of locality’ (via Hobsbawm & Ranger, 1983) as partly an outcome of global forces have become widely popular ideas, quickly reproduced across disciplinary boundaries.

Robertson’s (1995) work contributed heavily to the introduction and popularization of the notion of glocalization. It is not coincidental that this particular book chapter has been cited (according to Google Scholar) over 6,600 times. As a result, the terms of the debate shifted from debating ‘global culture’ (in the early 1990s) to debating ‘glocal cultures’. This twist in intellectual conversations has amplified the role and significance of glocalization. The shift is reflected in the increase in the citation metrics of the term ‘glocalization’ over the post-1989 era (reported in Roudometof, 2015b, 2016b). It has further prompted the necessity for and the significance of this volume, which is the first-ever handbook on culture and glocalization in the social-scientific literature.
While enthusiasm dominated as a viewpoint in the 1990s over the notion of globalization, the decades that followed altered academia’s conventional wisdom considerably. In the aftermath of the 2008 Great Recession, as well as the more recent COVID-19 pandemic, scepticism around globalization has become widespread – as evidenced for example by Cave’s (2020) pointed question of whether local is better than global, a statement that would have been considered completely heretical in the 1990s. The notions of glocal and glocalization are a means for grasping an increasingly complicated reality. While glocalization does not seem to occupy a central stage within the original scholarly community that pioneered the study of globalization in the 1990s (see for example, Featherstone, 2020), over the last three decades, the concept has been employed by a wide array of authors (for an overview, see Roudometof, 2015b). This handbook exemplifies its applicability to multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary contexts. Robertson himself has revisited the topic and (jointly with Richard Giulianotti) articulated a typology of glocalization strategies. This typology includes relativization, accommodation, hybridization and transformation (Giulianotti & Robertson, 2004, 2006, 2007, 2009). But the appeal of glocalization extends even further; for example, note the not-so-coincidental deployment of glocal strategies in the context of climate change debates (Gupta et al., 2007); as well as its deployment for communication in health care systems (Tufte, 2012). The COVID-19 pandemic has increased the importance of glocal strategies for sustainable development (Goffman, 2020; Patel, 2020). An even more recent example is a special issue of *Glocalism*, co-edited by Ugo Dessì and Franciscu Sedda, which approaches glocalization from a cross-disciplinary perspective with a focus on ‘everyday life’ (Dessì & Sedda, 2020).

Roudometof (2016b) offers the most recent and comprehensive attempt to outline the field of glocalization studies. His critical introduction to glocalization argues for its analytical autonomy and proposes a working definition of this concept ‘as the refraction of globalization through the local’ (Roudometof, 2016b, p. 79). Roudometof (2015b, 2016b) has introduced the notion that scholarship has undergone a ‘glocal turn’, whereby research is increasingly addressing the problematic of glocalization in a variety of scholarly contexts. Robertson (2020) later adopted the idea, albeit without acknowledging that it was already in circulation. But irrespective of whether readers subscribe to Robertson’s or Roudometof’s (distinct, yet closely connected) interpretations, the intent of this handbook is to feature – to the extent possible – the current state of the art in the multitude of research programmes that are, one way or another, involved in the scholarly study of glocalization. As such, the present effort is predominantly descriptive, rather than prescriptive. The authors whose work is featured in this handbook’s pages have been exclusively selected on the basis of their past or present engagement with the subject matter, and not any a priori commitment to a specific approach or ideology.

As tends to be the case with edited collections, readers might feel that specific subfields have not been sufficiently addressed. That is inevitable, as the process of editing an academic handbook entails practical considerations and compromises that might circumscribe the editors’ original aims. For this particular volume, the editors feel that perhaps a major oversight is the absence of a chapter on glocalization and social movements. Ranging from protests (Castells, 2012) to riots (Auyero, 2001) to labour movements (Bebbington, 2001; Lindell, 2009) researchers have been able to use ‘glocal’ as a means for assessing the ability of social movements to build translocal coalitions and use them in order to succeed in the public domain. The popularization of information and communication technologies (ICT) and digitization has greatly amplified such trends (see Harsin, 2014; Waisanen, 2013). Moreover,
the relevance of glocalization for the cross-national or transnational dimensions of feminism and mobilization on issues of gender remains largely unexplored (for an exception, see Oh and Jang’s chapter in this handbook; also, Chubin, 2020).

**Glocalization and the Academic Division of Labour**

While Robertson’s work has been instrumental for the popularization of glocalization in the social sciences and the humanities, it is necessary here to address the origins and significance of the notion of ‘glocal’, as well as the disciplinary, inter-disciplinary and cross-disciplinary lenses that have had an impact upon the intellectual conversations about glocalization. By all accounts, the term came into existence around the late 1980s or early 1990s (Words to Watch, 1990; Roudometof, 2015a). The Japanese precursor idea of ‘global localization’ is conventionally cited as the central idea behind the notion of ‘glocal’ (Edgington & Hayter, 2012). By way of prefacing the following overview, it is important to point out that the survey of the literature does not vindicate the popular academic mythology that glocalization emerged within the context of management or business studies. Rather, the popularization of this terminology in these fields took place in step with its use in other disciplinary contexts (see Roudometof, 2015b). For example, there are indications that **dochakuka** was used in Japan as early as the 1960s in the context of discussions on the ‘indigenization’ of Christianity (compare with Ariga, 1963; Dessì, 2013, p. 150). In this regard, readers are advised to read Khondker’s brief remarks on the origins of glocalization (in his chapter in this volume – ‘Glocal Sports’) within the broader context discussed above.

Around the same time, but independently of Robertson’s writings, UK-based social geographer Erik Swyngedouw (1992, 1997, 2004; Swyngedouw & Baeten, 2001; Swyngedouw & Kaïka, 2003) pioneered a different notion of glocalization that involves the notion of glocal as a layer in a nested hierarchy of spaces. These layers may or may not be hierarchical, without having an effect upon the logic of the process. This notion of glocalization was further popularized by Sassen (2006) and received extensive acceptance within the field of global studies (for example, see Nederveen Pieterse, 2013; and for a more recent application of this strategy onto global studies’ methodological approaches, see Darian-Smith, 2017, p. 5). It is usually referred to as a ‘multi-scalar’ conception of social relations. This interpretation can and has been used to shed light on urban dynamics as well as the global and transnational processes that undermine nation-states in favour of cities and trans-border organizational and institutional structures. In Barber’s (2013) work, this line of reasoning is extended to its logical conclusion. Barber’s work has contributed towards a trend among scholars and journalists of re-evaluating the role of cities as pioneers of globalization at the expense of the nation-state, which is seen as incapable of the institutional and cultural flexibility required in the twenty-first century.

This interpretation is not entirely unproblematic though. The geographical understanding of space looks upon space as absolute (for example, measurable or objective) space. It does not take stock of ‘social space’ – in the sense that the relationships that are examined take place in space, but are not constitutive of space as such (Roudometof, 2015a). That is by no means a novel criticism. As early as the 1970s, humanist geographers were criticizing the absolute notion of space as ‘abstract’ and devoid of human input. Influenced by phenomenological perspectives, humanist geographers were led to the notion of a ‘sense of space’ and even introduced the concept of ‘place’ (instead of space) as a more appropriate unit of analysis. Geographers’ debates have not always been taken into account by sociologists or political
scientists (for further discussion, see Roudometof, 2019a). Rather, it was anthropologists who expressed a deep interest in exploring notions of social spatiality as a means of re-designing research sites. In response to the notion of globalization, anthropologists suggested that ‘local’ and ‘global’ do not necessarily refer to a spatially limited or bounded locale (Gupta & Ferguson, 1997; Moore, 2004; Tsing, 2005). These can be seen as concept metaphors for collectively imagined spaces.

In this connection, one should resist the temptation to consider the global and the local as mere physical locations, and approach them instead as processes. For Robertson, combining them to form the neologism ‘glocalization’ refers to the fact that globalization typically involves ‘the adaptation of panlocal developments to local circumstances’. In other words, this shows the nature of globalization as a ‘self-limiting process’, since all ideas and phenomena circulating globally ‘have to adapt to contexts and niches’ (Robertson, 2004; Robertson & White, 2007). This approach could lead to an understanding that ‘globalization is glocalization itself’ (Khondker, 2019, p. 93). In turn, such an interpretation does not afford the glocal any meaningful analytical autonomy (compare with Roudometof, 2016a). Instead, it has prompted criticism about the privileging of the global and, especially in anthropology and geography, a turn towards the supposedly rival concept of translocality (which is discussed at length both in the current chapter and throughout this handbook). However, it has also been suggested that taking seriously the impossibility of globalization as a homogenizing force does not necessarily lead to the conflation of globalization and glocalization, provided that globalization is considered at different levels of analysis (for example, at the intra-systemic, inter-systemic and discrete cultural-objects level). Such a move would also seem to offer ample room for the analysis of power and other factors underlying the process of glocalization (compare with Dessì, 2017, pp. 162–86). It should also be acknowledged that unanswered questions have emerged that are of critical importance for social scientists. That is, if both global and local are mutually constituent concepts, how is this done? What is the role of power in this process? To what extent are glocalization and diffusion identical or similar processes, as Robertson and White (2007, p. 62) suggest? Researchers have attempted to provide their own answers to these questions, often revising Robertson’s approach or modifying key aspects of his initial interpretation or developing their own theory or theories in response to Robertson’s interpretation.

Undoubtedly, the most vexing issue involves the role of power, which is an issue that occupies center stage in Ritzer’s (2003a, 2003b) interpretation. According to this interpretation, glocalization and the related notion of cultural heterogeneity are explicitly acknowledged as a theoretical option, at least in principle. Although this alternative is theoretically accepted, Ritzer nevertheless concentrates upon the negative aspects of capitalism. Ritzer’s conceptual opposite of glocalization is ‘grobalization’, which he defines as the ‘imperialistic ambitions of nations, corporations, organizations, and the like and their desire, indeed need to impose themselves on various geographic areas’ (Ritzer, 2003b, p. 73). However, Ritzer also has an implicit reading of glocalization as part of his overall perspective (which falls outside of the scope of the discussion here). For him, once a product or service has been touched by the global (and virtually everything has been by now touched in that way), it is better thought of as a mix of global and local, as glocal. In other words, it can never again be thought of as ‘purely local’ (if anything ever was purely local). A total cessation—impossible in the global age—of local interaction with global processes would be required for something to be considered ‘purely local’. (Ritzer & Ritzer, 2012, p. 802)
Unlike Robertson’s reading, in Ritzer’s understanding, the global and the local are mutually exclusive: one cannot exist within the other, as Robertson would have it. When the local is incorporated or subsumed by the global, then it morphs into the glocal. And the glocal is not ‘really’ local. Something is irrevocably lost. The spread of globalization means that the local disappears; all that is left is the glocal and that, of course, is insufficient for challenging capitalism. The key point is simply that it becomes impossible to understand the glocal as outside of the global, and once inside the global, then the system’s logic prevails.

While the introduction of power into the debate around glocalization is welcome, there are several important criticisms concerning Ritzer’s understanding of glocalization. First, glocalization is seen as a mere opposite to globalization – a viewpoint that ignores the literature in fields other than consumer culture research (for examples, see Roudometof, 2015a, 2016b). Second, Ritzer offers a Western-centred view of the world that is often related to a nostalgic desire to maintain the ‘exoticism’ of the Other, whereby ‘culture’ is used as an explanatory category that helps account for the difference in Others and in others alone (see Marling, 2006). Third, glocalization and globalization are analytically conflated (see Vizureanu, 2013). Lastly, the model suggests the futility of human action, thereby offering a pessimistic view of the social world. Despite all these criticisms, it is still possible, as suggested by Ritzer himself, to view his idea of globalization more simply as a way of conceptualizing the tendency toward homogenization within the process of globalization, with glocalization representing instead the trend toward heterogenization and hybridity (compare with, for example, Ritzer, 2010, p. 272).

From within the lens of world society, glocalization is seen as a process that complements the world society perspective’s traditional themes of loose coupling, incomplete diffusion and disjuncture (Drori et al., 2013a, 2013b, 2014; Roudometof, 2020). Diffusion is seen as a key mechanism for modernization and as a matter of mainly unidirectional flows (from the West to the rest). Diffusion occurs through its ‘theorization’ by the various ‘actors’ (a generic term that can include states, organizations and individuals) who are responsible for the adoption of models and blueprints. Drori et al. (2013b, p. 10) consider that ‘glocalization and theorization are similar’. Theorization is seen as a notion ‘that enables glocalization’, albeit only partially, because glocalization ‘involves translation—as in order to adjust ideas, structures, and models to new and different social and cultural domains’ (Drori et al., 2013b, p. 10). Translation is seen as a means for establishing equivalency of meaning (and of course this is a point that knowledgeable experts can extensively debate). Although the world society perspective’s notion of theorization ‘emphasizes top-down influence’ in the process of global diffusion, ‘the dynamic nature of transcendental glocalization is a rebound effect . . . where locally enacted ideas and models influence the globally theorized schemes’ (Drori et al., 2013b, p. 10). In other words, glocalization becomes a feedback loop that connects top-down and bottom-up influences. Based on such an abstraction, construction of equivalency across boundaries on a more macro level becomes possible: that is, social actors can extrapolate similarity between distinct entities or contexts; they can adopt and enact a globally theorized idea or model through processes of translation, adaptation, re-contextualization or modification in order to fit the local context; and lastly, it is further possible to have a rebound effect of such a locally adapted and enacted idea or model back into the more abstract or general theorized templates or blueprints of social action.

Of special significance for such a cyclical process is the notion of ‘cultural translation’. Originally developed by Czarniawska (2010, pp. 119, 133), its introduction was meant to
explain social processes that lead to ‘allomorphism’. The overall argument is meant to offer a complementary account to the world society perspective’s notion of institutional isomorphism by suggesting that cultural translation can offer a means of producing difference (for example, allomorphism) instead of similarity (for example, isomorphism). Hence, the extent to which it is theoretically meaningful to speak of ‘cultural translation’ that is capable of establishing an ‘equivalency of meaning’ across social and cultural contexts can certainly be debated (especially given the propensity for meaning mutation across cultural contexts, see for example, Gluck & Tsing, 2009). But it is worth recalling that, from within the postulates of the world society perspective, the above criticism is a moot point. As Buhari-Gulmez (2010, p. 254) observes, from the world society perspective, ‘culture is defined in cognitive and instrumental terms’, which in turn renders this approach ‘distinct from studies that focus on the expressive culture associated with language, music, food, art, and dress’. While the world society perspective is characterized by a strong commitment to the universality of Western modernity, such a viewpoint is not necessarily shared by others. World society critics typically assert that various local actors should be viewed as possessing far more power and influence than that conventionally assumed by the world society perspective.

Overall, as this section has sought to illustrate, scholarly work features several conceptual alternatives and distinct theoretical readings of glocalization. While these are often developed from within distinct research programmes, a shared explicit goal is to interpret processes of cross-cultural interaction in a manner that acknowledges local agency. Perhaps the most influential among these different alternatives is the notion of translocality – which is explored in greater depth in Roudometof and Carpentier’s chapter in this handbook, entitled ‘Translocality and Glocalization: A Conceptual Exploration’.

Scope, Organization and Major Themes

The coverage of fields in this volume’s Table of Contents reflects a twofold effort: on the one hand, the goal is to combine the conventional way of slicing up academic knowledge among major clusters of disciplines (humanities, social sciences, media and communication), while on the other hand, there is an effort to highlight a trans-disciplinary perspective that focuses on specific topics or areas or domains of scholarship (such as tourism, archaeology, youth, digital media, education, sports) as opposed to traditional disciplines. The necessity of such a trans-disciplinary outlook is dictated by the acknowledgement that research on several of these topics is increasingly inter-disciplinary; as a result, strict disciplinary boundaries are counter-productive. The volume’s final part is meant to build bridges between glocalization and related concepts (such as post-colonialism and translocality) and to chart new research frontiers (in social science methods, world society theory and cosmopolitanism studies). The emphasis placed on media and communication is by design: this is a research area where glocalization is of considerable scholarly relevance, especially since the advent of digital media (see Roudometof, forthcoming-a). The goal is to showcase the relevance of glocalization for this rapidly expanding field or fields of study.

Although the COVID-19 pandemic is not addressed in a dedicated chapter in this volume, the editors feel that the selection of topics covers the overwhelming majority of areas where glocalization has been applied thus far. Hence, in an indirect manner, it is possible for readers to detect the gaps in the literature where there is further room for application of the concept. Knowledge frontiers are more explicitly addressed in this volume’s final part, with the explicit
caveat that these reflect the editors’ own understanding. Our brief overview of the uses of the concept makes that quite clear. In the twenty-first century, the glocal turn (Roudometof, 2015b) has had a meaningful impact on the broad area of the humanities, which is covered in this handbook’s first part. Within this context, it is noticeable that not all disciplines have been equally willing or ready to incorporate glocalization as a conceptual tool. Fields such as the study of religions, language and literary studies, as well as the arts, are clear examples of how a longstanding familiarity with empirical cases of glocalization (one may just think of the fragmentation of Christianity, the local adaptations of colonial languages such as English and Spanish, and musical genres such as jazz and flamenco) may lead to a reflexive awareness of and meta-reflection on those dynamics. In other fields, this reception has been more implicit or even peripheral. For history and archaeology, this is perhaps not disconnected from a certain enduring tendency to identify the overall theme of globalization with the effects of Western modernization. In the case of philosophy there seems to be a sort of resilience to engage with the ‘foreign’ conceptual problem of the glocal in purely philosophical terms and without heavily encroaching on other fields.

Even though a historical outlook is obviously ingrained in the very possibility of approaching globalization as a longue durée process, history and archaeology as such have been less ready to adopt the concept of glocalization. While in this field, too, other terms (for example, hybridity) have been used to explore analogous dynamics, early examples of an explicit use of glocalization in history and archaeology trace back to little more than a decade ago in articles on Roman Britain (Pitts, 2008) and Mycenaean culture (Maran, 2011). Presented as a basic aspect of globalization by Tamar Hodos in her introduction to The Routledge Handbook of Archaeology and Globalization (Hodos, 2017) and deployed as a conceptual tool in some of its chapters (for example, Lilley, 2017), the explanatory relevance of glocalization has yet to be fully acknowledged in this field of studies. Still, a few years ago, for example, the editors of a special issue called ‘Glocal Archaeology’ for the Archaeological Review from Cambridge lamented that ‘its application to archaeology remains relatively overlooked’ (Fine & Thompson, 2018). In his chapter ‘From Bronzization to “World System”: Globalization and Glocalization across the Globe (2000 BCE–1500 CE)’, Matthew Cobb provides a detailed overview of the short history of glocalization in this field of research, and argues that the concept presents an advantage over hybridization and creolization. For Cobb, glocalization allows us to focus on ‘heterogeneity and the re-embedding of local culture’ without necessarily referring to core–periphery dynamics, thus also applying to instances in which power differentials play a limited role. Cobb also suggests, with examples concerning the adaptation of cultural objects from the Roman world in South Asia, that the heuristic value of glocalization could be enriched using a material transculturality perspective.

As a whole, the field of language and literary studies offers an example of a prompt reception of the concept of glocalization. As already noted elsewhere (Roudometof 2016b, pp. 115–6), in this case too, the debate on postcolonialism (for example, Bhabha, 1994) has contributed to an early interest on this topic, in connection with the spread of English and its local versions, and the issue of hybrid cultural identities. The question of glocal languages has inspired general approaches with attention to case studies (Coupland, 2010; Rubdy & Alsagoff, 2014), with a certain emphasis on Asia (Bhaduri, 2008; Eoyang, 2005; Kamada, 2014; Tong & Cheung, 2011). In the specific case of literature, as recalled by Sandhya Rao Mehta in her chapter ‘Weaving Literary Narratives: World Literature and its Glocal Moment’,
the impact of the glocal turn has been somewhat milder also due to the centrality of national literatures. In her detailed overview of the current debate, Mehta highlights a shift in world literature from Anglo-centrism toward the recognition of locality as something inscribed in a network of texts. With reference to the work of Roudometof (2016b) and Damrosch (2003), she elaborates on the opportunities provided by the creation of such ‘poetics’ from marginal spaces, providing petrofiction as an example of how world literature can combine a global and local outlook without renouncing criticality or attentiveness to equity and representation.

The concept of glocalization appears to have made small inroads into the field of philosophy. To be sure, this interpretive framework plays a meaningful role in early contributions such as Giacomo Marramao’s (2003) work on philosophy and globalization, and, to a lesser extent, Elena Pulcini’s (2013) reflections on responsibility and justice in the global age and Hwa Yol Jung’s (2009) approach to public philosophy. More recently, scattered references to the glocal are also found in Nader Chokr’s (2014) elaborations on the theme of cultural complexity and in the Philosophy of Globalization volume edited by Concha Roldán, Daniel Brauer and Johannes Rohbeck (2018). However, as suggested by Bruce Janz in his chapter ‘The Universal and the Individual, the Global and the Local: Philosophy’s Diverse Debts and Duties’, glocalization remains to date largely peripheral to philosophy’s core interests, especially because of its provenance from other disciplinary fields. And yet, Janz argues, philosophy has a certain familiarity with the tension embodied by the glocal, which connects to the question of how the universal is manifested in the human world. Against this backdrop, he identifies and discusses four main modalities of engagement between philosophy and the glocal, which includes: an analysis of the nature and applications of glocalization; an inquiry on how philosophy is implicated by its own places, flows and localities; an exploration of philosophy as an agent of glocality; and, finally, what Janz terms ‘philosophy-in-place’, that is, an engagement with concepts related to places and the production of more suitable ones.

A similar situation can also be seen in the field of legal studies. While explicit references to the glocalization of law have been relatively rare, legal scholars have been increasingly engaged with this notion in the areas of intellectual property rights and e-commerce (Chander, 2013; see also Birnhack, forthcoming), within the context of general discussions on ‘limitless law’ (Ferrarese, 2006), and with reference to the interplay of the World Bank, NGOs and states (Randeria, 2003). Other scholars have preferred to approach this issue from the perspective of ‘legal hybridity’ (Donlan, 2010; Palmer, 2012). Salvatore Mancuso’s chapter ‘Law and Glocalization’ is an attempt to shed light on how this conceptual problem has been approached so far within the context of legal studies, while also providing some suggestions for future research agendas. After a preliminary discussion of concepts that overlap to some extent with that of glocalization such as mixity, hybridity and diffusion, Mancuso focuses on the tension between and the combined effect of glocalism and grobalism in an age characterized by the progressive weakening of law’s territorial connotation. In particular, he notes how legal glocalism mitigates the effect of such dynamics, allowing the state to play a meaningful role in the process of legal development. For Mancuso, legal grobalism instead represents the other side of the coin, being essentially the way in which powerful states attempt to invade other jurisdictions. The Italian scholar notes that this trend is most probably going to become stronger in the coming years, not least because of the impact of the global economy, and that a balance between legal globalism and grobalism would indeed be desirable to avoid an overly disruptive effect.
The impact of the glocal turn in the sphere of the arts has been somewhat stronger, especially because of the practical implications in some of its disciplines. One may just think of the example of music, intertwined as it is with global flows and cultural hybridity. The glocal dimension of music has been studied with reference to different cultural areas, such as Central Africa (Oduro-Frimpong, 2009) and East Asia (Kim & Shin, 2010; Ma, 2002), global dynamics and consumer activism (Yazıcıoglu & Firat, 2008), music education (Richerme, 2013), and with attention to a variety of genres and theoretical aspects (Hebert & Rykowski, 2018). Other disciplines, too, have shown an interest in the glocal implications of art, including photography (Baetens, 2011), painting (Ming, 2014) and theatre (Ben-Shaul, 2008).

At the intersection of art and philosophy, the glocal has found recognition as part of a counter-hegemonic agenda (de Duve, 2007). In his chapter ‘Cosmos from the Global South: From Glocal to Decolonial Perspectives on Art’, Nikos Papastergiadis notes that, while in its introduction as a term, glocalization responded to the fears generated by the homogenizing aspect of cultural globalization, in the field of art, the hegemony of Western art had been subject from the very start to ‘institutional critique’. As a result, Papastergiadis claims, new streams of interest emerged in the 1990s, among which were a strong tendency to include artists from all parts of the world in the biennales, an emphasis on art as a transnational phenomenon as well as a gateway to cosmopolitanism, and a reclamation of the cosmic vision of Indigenous cultures. This chapter’s analysis reverberates in the discussion undertaken by Viviane Riegel in her chapter ‘Glocalization and the Post/Decolonial Perspectives: A Critical Dialogue’.

An interesting perspective on the intersection of the history of food, semiotics and the glocal is offered in this handbook by Franciscu Sedda and Simona Stano in their chapter ‘Food and Glocalization’. While Sedda has been one of the main players in the conceptualization of the glocal in the general field of semiotics (for example, see Sedda, 2005, 2014), in this chapter the two scholars show, with reference to examples such as the ‘Columbian exchange’, that the glocalization of food is dependent on several interwoven processes, including the ‘filtering’ and ‘purifying’ of imported foods, their ‘naturalization’, and finally their ‘incorporation’, which brings foods from foreignness to familiarity. All this, they observe, speaks of the crucial role played by food in the augmented interpenetration between different semiospheres, as well as of the ability of specific foods to innovate host foodspheres by integrating the structures of their languages. Food continues to play a major role in contemporary consumer culture – with McDonalds being perhaps the most well-known case of glocalization of food (Turner, 2003). The COVID-19 pandemic has offered the opportunity for some new innovative twists on the glocalization of food, most spectacularly in the case of the Korean-inspired do-it-yourself (DIY) dalgona coffee that first gained prominence during the social distancing orders in South Korea, eventually becoming an iconic ‘quarantine’ drink.

Moving into the second part of this handbook – the social sciences – the methodological approach is to structure the individual chapters thematically and to try, to the extent possible, to avoid the constraints imposed by disciplinary boundaries. While that is in line with the current cross-fertilization and cross-disciplinary character of social research, it is certainly not an ironclad rule, and is implemented pragmatically. This strategy allows the integration of different themes that are often seen through disciplinary lenses that impose significant scope restrictions.

The topic of tourism offers an excellent illustration. In their chapter ‘Glocalization and Tourism Experiences’, Joelle Soulard and Noel Salazar explore distinct facets of the nexus
between the two. Glocal lenses offer a means to interrogate the cultural dimension of tourism but glocalization also emerges as a factor that can be deployed in order to mitigate or negotiate obstacles and crises that emerge in the context of the tourism industry. It is important to highlight the pre-pandemic status of the sector – by 2020, international arrivals were expected to reach nearly 1.6 billion, of which 1.2 billion were intraregional and 378 million were long-haul travellers. Between 2010 and 2020, international arrivals were set to experience a 3.8% increase (UNWTO, 2014). These figures demonstrate not only the importance of this sector for the global economy but also the significant setback caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. It is also a certainty that the industry’s post-COVID-19 recovery is bound to use emergent and/or proven strategies. With these considerations in mind, the significance of glocalization for both cultural and economic processes becomes evident. Given the importance of glocalization for tourism, it is not surprising that glocal business strategies have been applied in order to articulate and promote successful tourism experiences – as Salazar (2005, 2010) has pointed out. Lastly, glocalization provides an impetus for transformative tourism experiences. On the one hand, tourism practitioners can provide culturally authentic tourism experiences and hence attract loyalty among their clients; on the other, they can cultivate positive relationships with local residents through the integration of elements from local cultures into their managerial strategies.

Perhaps the most interesting case of functioning as an interdisciplinary field bridging social sciences and humanities comes from the study of religions. Rather significantly, religion has occupied an important place in Robertson’s preparatory reflections of the theme of glocalization, as is shown, for example, by the way in which he explained Japan’s modality of global involvement in terms of the selective adaptation of external ideas based on specific aspects of local religious culture (syncretism, polytheism and ritual purity) (Robertson, 1987; compare with 1992, pp. 85–96). Since the time of its adoption within the study of religions in the late 1990s, glocalization has been used as a conceptual tool in several monographs: to make sense of religious micro-marketing strategies within American Christianity (Vásquez & Marquardt, 2003); to define different modalities of interpenetration between Orthodox Christian universalism and local particularism both synchronically and diachronically (Roudometof, 2014); to indicate how Japanese religions can achieve a global repositioning through the creative adoption of global ideas such as human rights and ecology (Dessì, 2013, 2017); to explain how John of God’s healing practices were reframed by relating them to elements of global culture familiar to foreign audiences (Rocha, 2017); and as a synonym for the strategic use of the master frames of human rights, democracy and justice by a new generation of Islamists (Karagiannis, 2018). These and other publications in this field, including ‘Glocal Religions’, a recent special issue of the journal Religions (Roudometof, 2018) and a growing number of articles, are reviewed by Ugo Dessì in his chapter, ‘Glocalization and the Religious Field’. Here, Dessì also shows how various scholars have approached the production of religious locality within globalization from alternative perspectives (for example, hybridity and bricolage), and how the term ‘glocalization’ has been used by religionists within the context of normative discourses, notably by Christian theologians. Dessì highlights ongoing weaknesses of this field of studies, such as an overemphasis on certain areas and traditions, a preference for synchronic perspectives, and a certain under-theorization of the concept, and suggests potential avenues for further research. Among these, he emphasizes the need to systematically explore the factors that facilitate or obstruct the glocalization of religion – including issues
of power, cultural resonance and changes in consciousness – and to clarify the relationship between glocalization and other dimensions of the globalization of religions.

As Yi Sun, Tzu-Yuan Stessa Chao and Jia Ling aptly elaborate in their chapter, the idea of the glocal also finds application in the field of urban studies. Starting from the assumption that glocalization is strictly linked to a process of reterritorialization and reassembling that gives rise to a variety of urbanisms worldwide, the authors focus on the WHO-promoted age-friendly city (AFC) initiative as actualized in Hong Kong and Chiayi City (Taiwan). Their comparative analysis shows how the implementation of WHO’s international agenda has been constrained in these two East-Asian locations by both the ‘local regulatory framework’ and ‘path-dependent characteristics in policymaking’. Specifically, the Hong Kong case is largely dependent on a laissez-faire approach and reveals the prominent role played by NGOs and charities; conversely, the Taiwanese case follows a ‘corporatist welfare-state’ approach in which the central government is largely responsible for framing the policies for the elderly and the city government coordinates this effort locally in close collaboration with non-government sectors.

In her chapter on the glocalization of crime, Gema Varona Martínez addresses a topic that is of considerable significance for scholars of international criminology and globalization. Crime is an activity that has gained extensive visibility in global media and has been one of the domains seeking to exploit the openings afforded by the developments of ICT. The ‘glocal’ has been invoked in discussions about Italian mafia connections (Sergi & Lavorgna, 2016) but also in research on international terrorism (Marret, 2008) and gangs (Van Hellemont & Densley, 2019). In her contribution, Varona Martínez relates the academic understanding of international, transnational and global crimes to the need for a better understanding of the interrelation between micro- and macro-victimization by incorporating a glocalized vision. Her contribution might carry implications for the future of glocalization as a concept within the field of criminology.

In their chapter on glocal education, Jean-Francois Emmanuel, Claire Ramsey and Nowfal Samkari address an area of deep concern and interest for academics worldwide, namely, the globalization of higher education markets and the quest for increased revenues among institutions of higher learning, which have together deeply affected the status and working conditions of the overwhelming majority of academics. As the authors show in their chapter though, the issues involved in the relationship between glocalization and education are multifaceted. Glocalization has led to the notion of glocal education, which is employed as a framework that aims to reconcile local and global perspectives. The objective is glocal competence, that is, the ability to be both globally minded and locally sensitive. It involves several glocal targets (ranging from entrepreneurs to educators to students) who stand at the crossroads between a globalized world and local interactions. Glocal competence is nurtured through global literacy, sustainability, local literacy, digital literacy, critical thinking, intercultural engagement, intercultural self-efficacy and language communication.

In his chapter on glocal sports, Habibul Haque Khondker offers an interpretation of the relationship between sports and glocalization largely aligned with the broader reading of ‘glocalization as globalization’ (Khondker, 2004, 2019; compare with Roudometof, 2016a). He offers a general reading of the relationship between globalization and popular culture, which relates to a number of themes covered in other chapters, as well as an overview of research into sports and, in particular, football (soccer) – with special reference made to the creative incorporation of these sports in Asian societies. Khondker provides a splendid summary of the
work undertaken by himself and Robertson (Khondker & Robertson, 2018) on cricket, as well as by Giulianotti and Robertson (2004, 2006, 2007) on football. Given the chapter’s particular orientation and scope, readers are treated not only to a discussion of sports but also to a more general perspective on culture and glocalization. Broadly speaking though, glocalization has established itself as one of the main research agendas in the social-scientific study of sports; that is, it is not just cricket and football that have been studied but also other sports, such as basketball (Cho, 2020), baseball (Chen, 2012) and even parkour (Puddle et al., 2019). For a more complete view of the state of the art on the problematic of sports and glocalization, readers might supplement this chapter’s discussion by looking into the works of Jijon (2013, 2017), Shor and Galily (2012), Ferrando (2010), Whitson and Horne (2006), Cho et al. (2012) and Horton (2011).

The handbook’s third part focuses on communication and media. This is a field where glocalization has a long history of being applied to – going all the way back to boyd’s (2005) initial statement on the emerging forms of participatory media and digital media. Glocalization is very much part of the broader and high-profile problematic concerning the ongoing debate over the relationship between the media and globalization (for relevant discussions, see Iwabuchi, 2018; Russell & Boromisza-Habashi, 2020). Within this broader problematic, the glocal emerges as a way of navigating between two opposite viewpoints. On the one side are the proponents of the thesis that contemporary societies have entered into a new historical stage characterized by mediatization (Couldry & Hepp, 2016); on the other, those highly sceptical of such claims (Hafez, 2007). Certainly, if cross-cultural currents are taken into account, research results suggest that there is considerable variability in the uses of ICT around the world (de Mooij, 2014), which in turn might be viewed as evidence suggesting that media studies demand an analysis that integrates the social into issues of media use that concern the ‘super-connected’ aspects of techno-social living (see Chayko, 2018; Fuchs, 2008). In light of this problematic, the chapters’ topics have been selected specifically for the purposes of bridge-building between the areas of communication and those of sociology, anthropology and political science.

The chapter on digital glocalization offers a splendid application of this problematic. In this chapter, Barrie Axford takes his departure point from the work of Robertson (1992, 1995), Giulianotti and Robertson (2006, 2009) and Roudometof (2016b) in order to offer an analysis of the recent developments in ICT usually referred to as ‘Web 3.0’ or digital media. His basic perspective builds on the thesis that glocalization is a contemporary form of hybridization that is amplified by the advent of digital media. Using contemporary populist politics as his example, he shows how media-related performativity enhances the appeal of populist ideas. For a full treatment of the relationship between glocalization and the new populism, readers might further glance at Axford’s (2021) book on the relationship between globalization and populism. In the second half of his chapter, Axford switches to an examination of sports and glocalization. In this section, the notion of mediatization is used in order to make the case that contemporary sports offer an instance of digital glocalization. In this regard, his analysis operates as complementary to Khondker’s chapter on glocal sports.

In his chapter on glocalization, cultures and organizations, Fabrizio Maimone examines the repercussions of glocalization on the area of digital marketing and multinational corporations (MNCs) in particular. MNCs occupy a privileged position in processes of socio-cultural change and offer rich research settings for unpacking the complexities of intercultural interaction (see also Hollensen, 2020; Maimone, 2017). In his chapter, Maimone’s aim is to transform
cultural glocalization into a model that can be used to analyse transnational and multicultural organizations and MNCs. The author adopts a complex, multi-paradigmatic and humanistic perspective that is often lacking in research on these topics. The goal is to illustrate the manner in which glocal cultural processes entangle with the organizational systems of enterprises. In the course of the chapter, Maimone features a model that captures the complex interplay among key dimensions of glocality.

In their chapter on K-Pop or Hallyu glocalization, Ingyu Oh and Wonho Jang offer a highly relevant analysis of K-Pop, which is one of the most widespread cultural phenomena of our time. Also referred to as ‘the Korean Wave’, Hallyu is a major feature of the twenty-first century’s ongoing processes of the glocalization of youth culture (Roudometof, 2019b). In their chapter, the authors approach glocalization in a twofold manner – there is the process of localizing the Korean Wave, and then of globalizing it. In line with the principles of glocal marketing, glocalization is taken to mean the successful localization of a foreign global product to such an extent that the original developers might opt for its local variant instead of the so-called ‘original’ version. Seen in this light, glocalization is a highly proactive counter-trend to ‘top-down’ globalization. It is important to note that their use of glocalization is fundamentally close to the goals often proclaimed by researchers who advocate the notion of translocality (as observed in the chapter by Roudometof and Carpentier). It should be noted that, in addition to their splendid analysis, this chapter offers a highly informative sketch of the cross-disciplinary field of Hallyu studies, which might be extremely useful to scholars outside of Asia.

In the chapter on the glocalization of film and the movie industry, Bala A. Musa undertakes an examination of the uses of glocalization in one of the most popular cultural industries worldwide. In earlier work, Musa (2019) explored the role of the film industry in the social and economic development of Nigeria and Africa. In this chapter, he explores the multitude of ways that agents from the South and the East have countered Hollywood and reshaped the global film industry – to the point of having a ‘foreign’ movie, such as Korean director Bong Joon-ho’s film Parasite (2019), gain universal acclaim at the Oscars. Specific examples (Third Cinema, Cinema Novo and New Wave Cinema) are used to showcase the coexistence and cross-fertilization among different regional movie sectors. The chapter addresses the economic, cultural, political and technological factors that both mirror and counteract the ‘Hollywood’ star-system and infrastructure (such as in the case of Nollywood and the well-known venerable Indian and Chinese cinema industries). It also analyses the implications of the industry’s cultural shift towards greater levels of cooperation and coordination between national and transnational levels.

In his chapter on the glocalization of news production, Jonathan Ilan addresses the interplay between glocalization and the recent growth of global and/or transnational news broadcasting. As Norris and Inglehart (2009) have demonstrated in their major international survey – and, as de Mooij’s (2014) work affirms – the ‘national filter’ persists in spite of the rise of international, global or transnational forms of broadcasting. In fact, news might be conceived of as glocalized in large part because players in the marketplace cannot afford to ignore local news (for examples, see Roberts, 2019; Sariyati, 2016). The contemporary quest for audience and profit maximization has propelled (international or global, as well as national and local) news organizations to adopt a strategy of glocalized news production. The chapter offers an overview of the current glocal news networks, addressing both the impact of new entrants as well as existing rivalries among them. As a result, news production is designed to combine
international appeal with a tailoring towards local market demands. Additionally, glocalization affects both the internal dynamics of news organizations and in their complex relations between the local and global players. The chapter concludes with an overview of current trends and suggestions for future paths in the study of glocalization and news production.

In their chapter on *Netflix in Italy*, Paolo Sigismondi and Giovanni Ciofalo present both an overview of broader trends in the entertainment industry as well as an application of these dynamics in the case of Italy. Their chapter offers a complementary argument to Musa’s chapter on the glocalization of the film industry by focusing on how firms glocalize their products in order to maximize their returns in the digital markets of the twenty-first century. Netflix is a widely known and highly regarded company that has gained a reputation as an international player in a short span of time. In their analysis, the authors explore the mediascape of the entertainment industry while pushing forward the original research agenda set out by Sigismondi’s earlier work (2012, 2019). They show, in painstaking detail, the inner workings of this process – and thus offer a particularly relevant application of the reality that has made Robertson (2013) declare that today only the glocal exists.

The handbook’s fourth (and final) part is devoted to new research frontiers, which tends to be a vague label. Taking stock of the developments in the social sciences at large as well as within the literature, our selection of topics for this part reflects a twofold objective. On the one hand, we need a reassessment of the relationship between glocalization and related concepts; on the other, we must examine the future(s) of glocalization within highly active and ongoing research agendas. The chapters on the relationship among translocality, post-coloniality and glocalization are a means for assessing the former; while the chapters on the entertainment industry, social science methodology and the world society perspective are a means for assessing the latter.

In their chapter on *translocality and glocalization*, Victor Roudometof and Nico Carpentier explore the close elective affinity between these two terms. Drawing on Appadurai’s work (1990, 1995), the notion of translocality has been quite influential in terms of agenda-setting in the disciplines of anthropology and geography, as well as in several other fields (Brickell & Datta, 2011; Freitag & von Oppen, 2010; Greiner & Sakdapolrak, 2013; Kraidy & Murphy, 2003; McFarlane, 2009). One of the major differences between glocalization and translocality is that the former has certainly been far more popular than the latter – at least according to Google Scholar. In their chapter ‘Translocality and Glocalization: A Conceptual Exploration’, the authors explore the affinity between the two concepts and highlight the extent to which translocality has been used to flag an agency-centred process of building ‘local-to-local’ linkages. In this regard, the concept has been successful among those more sceptical of using glocalization to describe such linkages or who see glocalization through the lenses of a ‘global-to-local’ relationship. Additionally, translocality has been eager to challenge the once dominant perspective of transnationalism by suggesting that the transnationalism is only a subset of translocal connections. While the above offers particular divergences between the two concepts, the close elective affinity between them is undeniable. The authors of this chapter conclude by suggesting that this turn of events might be seen as emblematic of the emergence of a new conceptual vocabulary for twenty-first century social sciences. Both translocal and glocal are part of this new vocabulary – and because terms undergo the continuous process of being tested and revised in the field, it is not unusual to have terms with such a close affinity.
In their chapter on *glocalization and world society theory*, Ravit Mizrahi-Shtelman and Gili S. Drori engage the topic from within the lenses of the world society or world polity perspective, which to this day remains perhaps the most successful approach to global modernization. Their chapter opens with a brilliant overview of the historical tenets and conceptual elaboration of the world society perspective. This broad overview should be particularly relevant to readers not necessarily familiar with its long history and distinguished record of empirical research. Glocalization is interpreted within the contours of Meyer’s (2007) own engagement with the broader problematic of globalization (which is discussed at greater length in Roudometof, 2020). Coming from a broadly defined neo-institutional tradition, the authors analyse the engagement and interpretation of the notion of glocalization in the context of world society’s research agenda.

Giampietro Gobo, in his chapter on the *challenges of methodology in a glocal world*, interrogates a topic of major significance for all social science practitioners – how to reconcile the universalistic traditions of Western social science with the challenge posed by the rise of Indigenous Methodologies. It is important to note here that Gobo’s chapter engages directly with the methodological oeuvre of the post-colonial agenda and complements Riegel’s chapter in this handbook. In the context of his fascinating presentation, Gobo invokes examples from research in quite distinct socio-cultural contexts and adeptly illustrates the interplay between context and methods. Gobo invokes the example of the Fulla doll to illustrate his proposal for creolizing methodology. This idea follows Hannerz’s (1992, pp. 264–6) notion of creolization, which supplements the more broadly circulated notions of glocalization and translocality. Creolization has been typically evoked in the Caribbean context, but in his chapter, Gobo employs this idea along lines similar to methodological glocalism (Holton, 2009). For Gobo, cross-cultural encounters between two local methodological cultures have the potential to create an inter- or trans-localized methodology. This is perhaps a reason anthropologists in particular have implicitly found the notion of translocal to be highly relevant to their field research (as Roudometof and Carpentier argue in their own chapter in this handbook). Ultimately, for Gobo, the final fusion (or hybrid or mestizo) between methodologies is an outcome based on dialogical and symmetric relationship derived of hegemonic methodological claims.

In their chapter on *youth cosmo-cultures*, Vincenzo Cicchelli and Sylvie Octobre creatively apply a cosmopolitan perspective to one of the main features of twenty-first century social life – the glocalization of the world’s youth cultures and subcultures (Kjeldgaard & Askergaard, 2006; Roudometof, 2019a). In their contribution, the authors expand upon their past work on this topic (Cicchelli & Octobre, 2018) through an innovative interpretation of the Korean Hallyu (that is, K-pop) phenomenon. Their chapter nevertheless adopts a very different approach than that of Oh and Jang; the two chapters offer complementary but distinct readings of a prime example of cultural glocalization. In addition to bridge-building between glocalization and cosmopolitan studies, their approach offers an interpretative paradigm for the interrogation of glocal youth cultures. Knowledgeable readers can engage creatively with their approach, especially with regard to whether K-pop participants consider themselves to be cosmopolitan amateurs.

In the handbook’s final chapter, Viviane Riegel interrogates the relationship between glocalization and the widely discussed perspective of *post-colonial or de-colonial studies*. Post-colonialism is of course by no means new to academia (Bhambra, 2007; Go, 2016; Roudometof, 1994; Young, 2016). But while initial ideas go back several decades (Gilroy,
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1993; Hall, 1992; Said, 1978; Todorova, 1997), in the twenty-first century, there is renewed interest in ‘Southern’ perspectives (Connell, 2007; de Sousa Santos, 2014). For these perspectives, the ‘South’ is no longer defined in terms of socio-economic disadvantage (as in the original North–South distinction popular in the twentieth century). The South is a *topos* of those excluded and marginalized, as Papastergiadis makes clear in his own chapter in this volume. As de Sousa Santos (2016, pp. 18–9) writes:

The global South is not a geographical concept, even though the great majority of its populations live in countries of the Southern hemisphere. The South is rather a metaphor for the human suffering caused by capitalism and colonialism on the global level, as well as for the resistance to overcoming or minimising such suffering. It is, therefore, an anti-capitalist, anti-colonialist, anti-patriarchal, and anti-imperialist South. It is a South that also exists in the geographic North (Europe and North America), in the form of excluded, silenced and marginalised populations, such as undocumented immigrants, the unemployed, ethnic or religious minorities, and victims of sexism, homophobia, racism and islamophobia.

The dialogue between the notion of glocal and that of post- and anti-colonial perspectives is an important yet rather under-developed theme in current scholarship. As Pothier (2014) insinuates, the radical resistance of the past might find its contemporary equivalent to contemporary strategies of intellectual appropriation. In her chapter, Riegel offers an insightful overview of different perspectives and highlights the extent to which location still matters when it comes to anti-colonial ideals. The different currents of scholarship are then related to the problematic of this volume.

In its engagement with post-colonial and Southern theory, this chapter might be a prelude to ideas that are worthy of further future exploration (for further discussion, see Roudometof, forthcoming-b). After all, a key task of academic scholarship is to critically reshape conventional understandings of scholarly fields of knowledge; and, certainly, post-colonial scholarship has increasingly sought to appropriate and employ the label ‘global’ as a means of ‘de-colonizing’ the curriculum of the social sciences (see for example, Susen, 2020; and the Global Social Theory website).

**Concluding Remarks**

This introductory chapter has set out to present a broad look at the state of the art on the topic of glocalization. In this chapter’s opening section, we sought to offer a brief overview of the intellectual pathways that gradually contributed to glocalization, assuming a prominent place in academic scholarship. Next, we addressed the different interpretations or readings of glocalization – as these have emerged in the course of intellectual contributions from diverse research agendas. We have sought to balance our presentation between offering a bird’s-eye view of several intellectual trajectories involved in the study of glocalization on the one hand, and a thematic account of this handbook’s contents on the other. The intertwining between the two is a deliberate feature of our presentation in this introductory chapter.

The handbook also offers an overview of various fields and subfields in which the notion of glocalization can be explored. Glocalization is particularly relevant in a post-pandemic world. While the ‘end of globalization’ (King, 2017) might have been prematurely announced, it is nevertheless true that a variety of interpretations suggest increased complexity beyond simplistic visions of ‘one-worldism’. These interpretations range from post-globalization (Flew,
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2021) to localization (Livesey, 2018), or the ‘new’ globalization or neo-globalization (Steger & James, 2019). In spite of their differences in terms of foci and predictions, these converge to suggest a new intellectual phase. Some of the trends highlighted by these interpretations pre-date the pandemic. Still, the pandemic has significantly accelerated pre-existing trends. In a post-pandemic world, glocalization will be a highly suitable conceptual vehicle, applicable to numerous cases and fields.

As this introduction’s conceptual overview suggests, the intellectual conversation on glocalization has been impacted by diverse research agendas that come from different disciplines and fields of study. As a result, research and scholarly work have increasingly adopted a cross- or inter-disciplinary perspective necessary for dealing with the uncertainties that are omnipresent in our current age of increased complexity. This is also reflected in the selection and organization of the current volume – the editors have not sought to legislate or superimpose a single vision or perspective on ‘what is glocalization?’ (see Roudometof, 2021b) or what it should be or how it should be interpreted, but instead fostered the presentation of diverse perspectives from different regions of the globe and from different disciplines. It is our sincere hope that the multi- and inter-disciplinary endeavour promoted by this volume, which itself constitutes an example of the various glocalizations of knowledge, will contribute to the continued development of reflections and discussions on glocal culture.

Lastly, glocalization is but one of the new terms that have been introduced into social-scientific vocabulary in the second half of the twentieth century. As suggested elsewhere (Roudometof, 2021a), this new vocabulary registers the ability of the social sciences to introduce new terminology as a means of capturing ongoing trends in the ‘real world’. In the twenty-first century, increased and/or generalized use of this vocabulary becomes a matter of urgency and responds to real-life contingencies. Being part of this new vocabulary, glocalization is here to stay – its uses limited only by our own imagination and creative capacity.
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