

# ROBERTSON'S AND RITZER'S CONCEPTIONS OF GLOBALIZATION

**Marija DRAKULOVSKA CUKALEVSKA**

PhD, professor, Faculty of Philosophy  
SS. Cyril and Methodius University Skopje  
E - mail: [marijad@fzf.ukim.edu.mk](mailto:marijad@fzf.ukim.edu.mk)

**Anica DRAGOVIĆ**

PhD, professor, Faculty of Philosophy  
SS. Cyril and Methodius University Skopje  
E-mail: [anica.dragovikj@fzf.ukim.edu.mk](mailto:anica.dragovikj@fzf.ukim.edu.mk)

## **Abstract**

This article was primarily concerned with offering an exposition of the basic tenets of two important thinkers of the globalization. Focus of interest are elements of the theories of R. Robertson and G. Ritzer that are relevant for the context of the development of social thought on the phenomenon of globalization. Ronald Robertson recognized globalization “as a concept that refers both to the compression of the world and the intensification of consciousness of the world as a whole” (Robertson, 1992, p.8). Robertson, as a result of the globalization constructed a glocalization based on the link between the global and the local. In Ritzer’s work, “globalization is the worldwide diffusion of practices, expansion of relations across continents, the organizations of social life on a global scale, and the growth of a shared global consciousness” (Ritzer, 2007, p.4). He described globalization by the processes of grobalization capitalism, americanization and McDonaldization which are present in all spheres of social life. The concluding part of the paper provides an overview of the two authors’ theories of the global society, emphasizing their contribution to the body of theoretical analyses of the phenomenon of globalization. Today, these two conceptions of globalization are most fundamental, most representative and prolific for the cultural interpretation in the global space.

**Keywords:** *globalization, glocalization, grobalization, Ronald Robertson, George Ritzer.*

## 1. Introduction

Today's world involves complex processes which have a key role in drawing the contours of the modern society and culture. These are processes which basically lead to the integration of the world. An idea for integration of the world has been present for a long time in sociological science. This idea has found its classical systematic formulation in Parson's functional approach. He analyzes modern societies from the aspect of one social system where the parts are integrated as a solid structure in whose frames every part has positive functional value.

In fact, this idea still dominates today as a key for understanding of the world, especially of the processes of globalization which basically referred to the integration of societies in one world society, "the hard integration of countries and nations in the world" (Stiglic, 2004, p. 23). Today, the concept of globalization is often used, though in many cases it is used in the wrong way, because the public has meager information of the processes which are referred to. So, we are not surprised that there are many disagreements as to the answers of questions such as: "What is globalization?"; "What is nature?"; "Which are the goods that it brought with itself, the goods that made it contra phenomenon?" It seems that the public often understands that globalization is something that has never existed never before, something that causes uneasiness and fear about what will happen tomorrow, affecting their existing way of life. Many people feel like they are being grabbed by powers over which they have no strength to control. Weakness is felt first as personal, and then as institutional. In many discussions of globalization, the idea that it is not understandable is confirmed, with uncertainty in its context in which the consequences are very unequal. In that sense, Anthony Giddens noted: "we are the first generation to live in global society, whose contours we can as yet only dimly see. It is shaking up our existing ways of life, no matter where we happen to be. Many of us feel in the grip of forces over which we have no control" (Giddens, 2002: 19). This theme presents more the discussions by ordinary people, who often experience it as something that is not good for the world as a whole, acquiring the feel of negative social phenomenon. In fact, every theoretical reconsideration of globalization begins from these and similar views. But, today globalization is a key characteristic of our living time. From this point, we are surprised at the increased interest from sociologist and other social supporters in adequately explaining the core of globalization as a process and its concrete importance for the mankind. Although various authors have held different perspectives on globalization, they have shared the notion of an increasingly important role of globalization in the time and space in which they acted. Today, we are faced with many understandings of the processes of globalization within the framework of sociological science. Among them, are the following: Globalization is something that concerns all of us now, in one or other way. It is a complex of processes, and not only one process. These processes enveloped all the areas of social life, penetrate even in the most intimate

parts of the human personality. That it is the fast spreading of trade and financial markets and investment, multinational companies, communications and information, tourism, travelling, whereby the world becomes smaller, and distances expires. In this way, globalization becomes a phenomenon for confrontation of modern societies, as they are transformed in places where the national characteristics have comparative importance in relation with global characteristics. Namely, our intention is not to make some long retrospect on the historical development of globalization. Globalization is a phenomenon whose historical roots are very old. Its development has a long and fascinating evolution that has moved from the appearance of the first civilizations in the Mediterranean Sea on the Close and Far East till today's modern society (Friedman, 1994). The increased effects of major religions and civilizations, wars and kingdoms, are methods for connecting the world, with an aim to making a unique world and universal tendencies to the mankind. Meanwhile, the evolution line of globalization was not equivalent, because in its moving there were moments that directly influenced its developing direction and intensity. The first of these moments was the industrial revolution and the processes of colonialism which led to expansion of globalization that lasted from the middle of XIX century till World War I. Some authors, as Saskia Sassen (Sassen, 2007), locate intensive globalization in the late XIX century, when millions of people migrated, when the trade became opened to all parts of the world and when organizations that set up new norms in the world's politics appeared. So, globalization is something that happens over a longer period of time and thus the contours of the world's society should be searched in the previous periods of the human history. Many authors think that, because of the Second World War and the Cold War, processes of globalization were stopped in the middle of the XX century. Meanwhile, globalization later became the moving power that had destroyed all blocks to separations in the world. In that way, processes of globalization transform the world's society on economic, politic and cultural level. Ronald Roberson, the most outstanding representative of the cultural theory for globalization, emphasizes that it is realized through all development of modernism and it is done through several phases; "a phase of origination, a primeval phase, an impetus phase, a phase of fight for hegemony and phase of uncertainty" (Robertson, 1992, p.53). The global cultural perspective of Ronald Roberson, in reference to his idea for 'general pictures for the world's order' is extraordinarily important, with the view of the possibility for involving analyses of the ways on which concrete societies formulate their features of participation in the modern interdependent world (Младеновски, 1998, p.248). One of the thinkers who connects the process of globalization with modernism is Anthony Giddens (Gidens, 1998, p.166). According to Giddens, "globalization as a consequence of modernism" is the process of spreading the western institutions and making new forms of interdependence in the world.

This brief historical retrospect of processes of globalization, clearly shows that, although with a few interruptions, these processes have wound through the centuries. Meanwhile, these processes are unequal, which means that globalization does not touch every point of the world with same strength. At the same time, globalization puts stress on the requirements of different ethno-cultural groups to more equally participate in different spheres of sociocultural life. However, intensive use of the concept of globalization mainly in academic circles has newer history. For example, in the English language, the noun 'globe' dates from the fifteenth century and signifies the round review of the planet, but, the word globalization, signifying a process, appeared in the English language for the first time in 1959 and the concept globality as a state in the 1980s (ШОПТЕ, 2008, pp.80-81). In addition to the English language, the concept of globalization is used in other languages. We see the concepts mondialisation on French, globalisierung on German, globalizaciòn on Latino-American and in many other languages.

Modern sociologist Jan Nederveen Pieterse gives a general overview of the debates around globalization and in that context, he situates the question of globalization in a wider context. He talks about consensus between sociologists, even on the view of some unimportant characteristics of globalization. He emphasizes the reconfiguration of the states, that it is always connected with regionalization. He claims that globalization provokes more controversy than consensus. According him, the most disputed questions in connection with globalization are questions around the idea that globalization, at its core, is an economic phenomenon, or, is it multidimensional phenomenon? There is disagreement of what, in fact, is globalization? Pieterse mentions a few questions which are disputable. Is globalization a recent or long-lasting process? Does globalization really exists or is it a myth or a rhetorical device? At its core globalization, is neoliberalism? Can the process of globalization be managed? (Pieterse, 2009, pp.7-8). Eventually, Jan Nederveen Pieterse argues that globalization is explained on different ways in different social sciences and in different periods of time.

Table 1. **Globalization in social sciences**

<i>Disciplines</i>	<i>Period</i>	<i>Agency, domain</i>	<i>Keywords</i>
Economics	1970s	MNCs, banks, technologies	Global corporation, world product, global capitalism
	2000s		New economy, dot.com
Cultural studies	1970s	Mass media, ICT, Advertising, consummation	Global village, CNN world, McDonaldisation, Disneyfication, hybridization
Political science, international relations	1980s	Internalization of the state. Social movements, INGOs	Competitor states, postinternational politics, global civil society
Geography	1900s	Space and place, relativiasion of distance	Global – local dialectics, globalization
Sociology	1800s	Modernity	Capitalism, national state, industrialization, etc.
Philosophy	1700s	Global reflexivity	Planetary ethics, universal morality
Political economy	1500s	Capitalism	World market
History, anthropology	5000 BCE	Cross- cultural trade, technologies, world religions, Evolution	Global flows, global ecumene. Widening scale of cooperation
Ecology		Global ecology, integration of ecosystems	Spaceship earth, global risk

Source: Pieterse Nedeerven, Jan. 2009. *Globalization and Culture: Global Mélage*. Lanhan: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, INC, pp 15-16.

## 2. Robertson's Conception for Globalization

Ronald Robertson has treated the question for globalization in sociological science and his ideas are extraordinarily important for analyses of global cultural perspective. He, at the beginning of his influential book *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture* wrote: "globalization is a concept which refers to the compression of the world and intensification of consciousness for the world as a whole. The processes and actions to which the concept of globalization now refers have been proceeding, with some interruptions, for many centuries, but the main focus of the discussion of globalization is on relatively recent times. In so far as that discussion of globalization is closely linked to the contours and nature of modernity, globalization refers quite clearly to recent developments." (Robertson, 1992, p.8). The way on which people realize the world, if it is a question of their local world or the world as a whole, undergoes different changes. New and different pictures of the world appeared, some of them articulated on level of ideology of globalism or anti globalism. All these 'general pictures about the world order', which might appear as an answer to globalization in the future will form the social theory of its own, an ideology and political culture and will represent the focal point of the social movements of the future. From this idea, two meanings of the concept globalization are connected. The first meaning refers to globalization as a subjective process for which the individual has a consciousness about the world, as one unique place. The second meaning represents globalization as a process according to which, the world really is connected on political, economic and cultural levels. This approach is shown as more adequate in defining globalization as a process, whose end is not in sight. On the base of these two meanings, Robertson builds his own theory for globalization, emphasizing the relations between the integral components of the 'global human situation'. These relations are keys in the reconsideration of global situation, particularly, between the societies (national state), world's system of societies, individuals and the humankind. With these components the processes of sociotativity, internationalization, individualization and generalization are notified, through which a knowledge is built for the existence of humankind and global world order. Globalization involves "comparative interaction of different forms of life" (Robertson, 1992, p.27).

From discussions for the global order, Robertson formulates types and subtypes of world order, presenting it as symmetric, asymmetric, centralized and decentralized. The main types of world order which Robertson emphasizes are: 1- a-Global community in which the world should and can be organized only in the form of relative closed societal communities. According this view, Robertson sees the world order as symmetric, where societal communities are relatively equal in terms of the worth of their cultural traditions, their institutions; 1-b- A unique world community which according its own nature can be signified as a global order; 2-a-

Global society in which the world is seen as an order composed from series of open societies between which exist important sociocultural change; 2-b-global society which he imagines that world order is based on the basis of the plan of world organization (Robertson, 1992, pp.78-79). Through the types and subtypes of world order, Robertson attempts to explain globalization as a process with a long history. According to him, "contemporary globalization involves a significant increase in global, including local, complexity and density" (Robertson, 1992, p.188). On that way he affirms his view that globalization can be explained with the help of glocalization. Namely, the concept of glocalization in business circles came out of the micro- marketing, exactly from marketing of goods and services in different local areas and markets (Robertson, 1995, p.28). That, in the opinion of Robertson, is a popular strategy of the capitalistic system in which there are more global markets adapted to the local markets and cultures or 'global localization' (Robertson, 1992, p.173). The first category according to Robertson refers to the local in the specific context of being a part of the whole. Glocalization is a unique explanation of the mutual existence of global and local, suggesting the integration of global and local. Yet, he adds, mixing of global and local in different geographic areas, originating the process of glocalization (Robertson, 2001, pp.465-466). The sense of his conception is the theses that globalization is a universal process which exists and functions with 'mixing of the universal with particular and particular with universal' (Robertson, 1992, p.100). In that sense, Robertson emphasizes that, on one hand, individuals and local groups adapted to the glocal world, and on the other hand, at the same time, they promote their own cultural specifications. From here, there are cultural symbols which on their content are glocal, so through them cultures became glocal.

Continuing his argument, Robertson emphasizes that the idea of glocalization involves the processes of homogenization, hybridization and creolization. Hybridization like globalization as a term refers to the process as old as history but its thematization as discourse and perspective is fairly new. Partly it is due to the accelerated pace of cultural mixing and widening of its scope 'in the wake of major structural changes, such as new technologies that enable new phases of intercultural contact' (Nederveen Pieterse, 2009, p.99). However, the term gained popularity in social sciences in the final decade of the XX century, mainly because it had been thoroughly popularized in the title of the book *Hybrid Cultures: Strategies for Entering and Leaving Modernity* by Nestor Garcia Canclini first published in 1995. Inspired in his study by the critical contributions of various disciplines like anthropology, sociology, art history and communication, each of which approaches the study in its own way, Garcia Canclini focuses on how studies of hybridization have altered the manner of speaking of identity, culture, difference, inequality, multiculturalism, and about conceptual pairings used to organize conflict in the

social sciences: tradition/ modernity, north/south, local/global. He also points out that that in the final decade of the twentieth century analysis of hybridization

becomes most extensive in the broad range of cultural processes. He formulates his definition of hybridization in the following way: I understand for hybridization socio-cultural processes in which discrete structures or practices previously existing in separate form are combined to generate new structures, objects and practices” (Garcia Canclini, 2005, xxv). Garcia Canclini chooses hybridization over mestizaje and syncretism because the term is not limited to racial mixtures, or religious fusion, or the combination of traditional symbolic movements (Garcia Canclini, 2005, p. 2). It is the emergence of new communication technologies, reorganization of the public and the private in metropolitan areas, and the ‘deterritorialization’ of symbolic processes that have generated hybrid cultures (Garcia Canclini, 2005, p.10). The strategies he refers to in the title of his book are not hegemonic strategies of the cultural elites; they are also found among rural people migrating to the city, and workers faced with new technology, who reconvert their skills and their knowledge to their new environment.

Nederveen Pieterse is a contemporary sociologist who has devoted much attention to the processes of hybridization. In his book *Globalization and Culture: Global Mélange* he points out that “globalization or the trend of growing worldwide interconnectedness has been accompanied by several clashing notions of cultural difference” (Nederveen Pieterse, 2009, p. 43). “He discusses the claims of three perspectives on cultural difference: cultural differentialism or lasting difference, cultural convergence or growing sameness and cultural hybridization or ongoing mixing, their wider theoretical assumptions and the kind of future they invoke”. Nederveen Pieterse also argues that each of these positions involves theoretical precepts and each represents a politics of difference – as lasting and immutable, as erasable and being erased, and as mixing and in the process generating new trans local forms of difference. Each involves different subjectivities and larger perspectives. He thinks that the first two perspectives are narrow assessments of globalization and instead argues for viewing globalization as a process of hybridization that give rise to global *mélange*. According to the principle of mixing result of the process of globalization is open and today’s globalization is at the same time process of easternization and westernization as well as many other influences. For Nederveen Pieterse hybridization is a perspective that is meaningful as a “counterweight to introverted notions of culture” and as a ‘critique of essentialism’. “He also makes a difference between structural hybridization, or the emergence of new practices of social cooperation and competition, and cultural hybridization, or new transcultural expressions”. These two kinds of hybridization are interdependent because ‘new forms of cooperation require and evoke new cultural imaginaries’ (Nederveen Pieterse, 2009, p. 89).



In relation with creolization, an anthropologist Ulf Hennerz speaks about biological characteristics of hybridization and in that, he uses the concept creolization. Creolization as a term is derived from the creole languages, most precisely in the Caribbean region and North America, with people and cultures which are a mixture of African and European culture. According to Hennerz, "the core of a concept of creole culture is a combination of varieties, mutual connection and inventiveness which is built in global relations center – surroundings" (Hennerz, 1996, p.67). Meanwhile, cultural hybridization and creolization are processes that emphasize the forms of cultural lending which produce something new and within that are positive processes of cultural creativity. However, as Hsin-Huang Michael Hsiao has noted, Robertson's multidimensional and culturally sensitive perspective has encouraged the sociologists to elaborate further on the notion of cultural globalization and contributed to becoming a legitimate field for research on cultural globalization (Hsiao, 2002, pp.49-50). Robertson's theoretical perspective for global world has great importance in sociology, because of the possibility for empirical research of the forms of globalization and global conscience, operationalized through interaction between individuals or groups which have different views for world's system (Ritzer, 2010, p.575). He, in critical opposition of Ritzer, emphasizes mutual fusion of global and local for understanding a relation between societies, individuals, systems and humankind.

### **3. Ritzer's Conception for Globalization**

George Ritzer, one of the most famous modern theoretician of globalization, stressed the possibilities for different and often opposite theories for globalization exactly for the fact that the study of globalization has a multidiscipline character and distinguishes the wider types of theories for globalization, economic, politic and cultural, although he accepts that there are many other ways for categorizing theories for globalization, each of which has strong and weak sides (Ritzer, 2007, p.7).

Globalization as westernization is one of the most exploited in the analyses of this question. Scholte notices that it is a specific kind of universalization, where the social structures of modernity, as are: capitalism, industrialism, rationalism, urbanism and individualism are spread through all world, in all areas the local context becomes their 'victims'. Globalization defined on that way is equaled with the concepts colonization, imperialism, Americanization, and westernization, even canceling its own identity. Today, these representations of globalization are often expressed in non- western countries, where it has developed a negative meaning. Accordingly, in these conceptualizations, globalization has become the main factor in the analyses of cultures and value systems. Ritzer, similar to Scholte, researches the processes

connected with globalization. He explains globalization through the processes of imperialism, colonialism, westernization and easternization, which in large measure, represent societies in the past and in present (Ritzer, 2009; 2011).

From the of concept imperialism, he understands methods which are used by a national state to gain control (and sometimes territory) over another state or geographic area. In that sense, Ritzer emphasizes that modern societies are confronted with the existence of cultural and media imperialism. Cultural imperialism appears because of one culture more or less dominating other cultures. Media imperialism, in the current world, appears as a result of domination of West media and technologies in less developed societies and cultures. Meanwhile, Ritzer emphasizes that colonialism is a consequence of this type of imperialism. Regarding colonialism, he stresses cultural colonialism, conceived as the spreading colonial power on cultural activities and institutions (especially in education and on media), or an asymmetrical influence on one culture to another. Colonialism conceived in this way imposes culture (in this case the west) as a mean of political and economic control over other parts of the world. Today, these processes are considered as a base for the appearance of the processes of westernization which, according to Ritzer, are the processes on economic, politic and cultural influence of West over other parts of the world. As an example of these processes he emphasizes technologies, the almost universal use of the English language, general life styles, and even food as elements that have important influence in non-western parts of the world. However, beneath this western influence in the world, Ritzer emphasizes economic and cultural influence of East upon West. These are processes of easternization, which, also have big influence on the western world. As examples of the eastern influence Ritzer points to in the presence of ethnic restaurants and kitchens (Chinese, Indian, Japonese), the popularity of yoga, vegetarianism, and the car industry (Toyota, Nissan, Honda, Hyundai), as well as the electronic industry (Sony, Panasonic) (Ritzer, 2009, pp.64-78).

George Ritzer (Ritzer, 2007) in the context of Robertson's glocal perspective in relation with interpretation of culture, affirms the theses that in fact cultural phenomena are interpreted through grobal perspective. In his book *Globalization of Nothing*, he presents the difference between 'glocalization and grobalization'. Here, he assimilates Marks' ideas concerning the capitalist economic system and the rationalization of Mark Veber, which constitute part of his conceptualizations. Above all, the focus of his interest is emphasizing a perspective of grobalization for understanding the relation between global and local in culture. The grobal perspective for Ritzer, is his idea of grobalization emphasizing the imperialistic ambitions of the nations, corporations, organizations and the wish to impose these ambitions into different geographic areas (Ritzer, 2007, p.15). For this author, "grobalization is a modern view to the world". It clearly directs on grobalization

which is characterized with transnational range of generally accepted cultural marks and practices. In that sense, there appeared different processes and sub processes which are in incomparable relation with globalization and are opposite with processes of glocalization. From this perspective “the world is developing more on similar or, even, on same way and individuals and groups have a relatively small ability to adapt in the globalised world. That is because of processes which are directly connected with globalization: capitalism, Americanization (spreading of American ideas, industry and capital all over the world) and McDonaldization (spreading the principles as a model for fast food in other parts of social life)” (Ritzer, 2007: 20, 21-30).

One last idea that is extraordinarily important for understanding Ritzer's view for globalization and homogenization is McDonaldization. Ritzer, in his influential book *The McDonaldization of Society*, defined McDonaldization “as the process by which the principles of the fast food restaurant are coming to dominate more and more sectors of American society, as well as the rest of the world (Ritzer, 2010, p.263). His conception McDonaldization includes the process which is based on four dimensions: *efficiency*, *calculability*, *predictability*, and *control*. According him, this process marks principles on which fast food restaurants function and they became dominant in many sectors, not only in American society, but in the other parts of the world. These are principles according to which McDonald's functions as a multinational company, and through which it reestablishes standardization, control and homogenization of cultures. From the discussions about McDonaldization, Ritzer through the principles of McDonald's- restaurants explains processes of homogenization and standardization of culture. As an example of that, he emphasizes a principle of efficacy. “Increasing efficiency is behind just - in time production, faster service, streamlined operations, and tight schedules everywhere- from the workplace, to Disney World, to the home. Efficiency is generally a good thing. It is clearly advantageous to consumers, who can obtain what they need more quickly with less effort. Similarly, efficient workers are able to perform their tasks more rapidly and easily. Managers and owners gain because more work done, more customers are served, and greater profits are earned” (Ritzer, 2013, p.54). Principle of calculability “involves calculating, counting, quantifying many different things. Calculability has several positive consequences, the most important being the ability to produce and obtain large amounts of things very rapidly. Customers in fast - food restaurants get a lot of food quickly; managers and owners get a great deal of work from their employees, and the work is done speedily” (Ritzer, 2013, p.72). Principle of predictability relates to rationalized society. For Ritzer, “to achieve predictability, a rationalized society emphasizes discipline, order, systematization, formalization, routine, consistency, and methodical operation. From the consumer's point of view, predictability makes for much peace of mind in day-to-day dealings. For workers, predictability makes tasks easier. In fact, some workers prefer effortless, mindless,

repetitive work because, if nothing else, it allows them to think of other things, even daydream, while they are doing their tasks” (Ritzer, 2013, p.87). Further, systems of McDonaldization have control over the consumers as well as over the workers through the use of the nonhuman technology. “Technology includes not only machines and tools but also materials, skills, knowledge, rules, regulations, procedures, and techniques. This technology is human and nonhuman. For Ritzer, a human technology is controlled by people; a nonhuman controls people” (Ritzer, 2013, p. 102). This technology involves not only maximum exploitation of workers, but controls consumers with the help of many control barriers, such as fixed menu-displays, limited options, uncomfortable seats, unapproachable toilets and drive-through windows. Also, the system of McDonaldization is characterized by irrationality and rationality, leading to dehumanization (Ritzer, 2007, pp.24-25). Meanwhile, these tendencies for homogenization in McDonald’s, as in many other western fast food restaurants (Burger, Pizza Hut, King), have social, cultural and economic functions which encroach upon the nonwestern countries and their cultures, and because of this they adapt themselves to their conditions. In these restaurants American food is not served, but there is an American style of management, adapted to the country and culture where it is located.

Jan Pieterse names this process ‘intercultural hybridization’ (Pieterse, 2009, p.53), the combined effects of homogenization and heterogenization of cultures in the conditions of intensive globalization. Those combined effects in cultures are connected with cultural hybridization, as noted by George Ritzer. He emphasizes the idea that “hybrid cultures include creative and innovative process which involves the combination of two or more elements from different cultures or parts of the world” (Ritzer, 2009, p.255). In this way, hybrid cultures play an important role in building the processes of glocalization which together with processes of globalization are part of the analyses of the globalization of culture. In this context, a short list of collected main characteristic of glocal and global perspective is offered in Table 2. These perspectives tend to reflect the use of the glocalization and globalization. They are helpful in clarifying globalization as a concept. This prevails not only in academic discussions but also in business use.

Table 2. **Main characteristics of glocal and grobal perspective**

	<i>Glocalization</i>	<i>Grobalization</i>
Conceptualization	Mixing of global with local and vice versa.	Putting on global in local.
Main reasons	Global markets adapted to local markets and cultures.	Imperialistic ambitions of nations, corporations and organizations are put on in all parts of the world.
Main consequences in culture	Interaction between global and local cultures, which lead to heterogenization of cultures. Appearance of glocal cultures.	Transnational expansion of together codex and practices, which lead to homogenization of cultures. Appearance of grobal cultures.
Key processes	Glocalization, hybridization and creolization.	Capitalism, Americanization and McDonalization.
Predictions for the future	Combination and interaction of glocal and grobal processes.	

Source: *Elaborated table from M.D.C. & A.D according to Ritzer (Ritzer, 2007, p.21).*

The concepts of local and grobal perspectives are of extraordinary importance for the investigation and interpretation of globalization of culture. Ritzer indicates that, in the sphere of culture, they are above all, different cultural models which exist in modern societies. Grobalization can be explained as a form of transcendental expansion of codex and practices, and glocalization involves the interaction between local and global cultural influences which create other types of cultural hybrids. It means that today's world consists of a combination and interaction of glocal and grobal processes.

## Conclusion

In the modern society, globalization appears as phenomenon of integration of the total social living in the direction of forming and transforming everyday life. It, at the same time, takes on the role of carrier of social changes, promoting its own wide possibilities for non-existence the geographical borders between societies, states and cultures. Globalization, conceived like that, has an important role for including societies, groups and individuals with their specific marks in one world society. Globalization appears as a leader of new interactions on global and local level. The relation of global and local is a result of processes of globalization. This article summarized the positions of two main theorists of the globalization: Ronald Robertson and George Ritzer. In their work, globalization was analyzed as a salient determinant of social life. The theories of those authors are presented here as dominant within the given periods of the development of social theory on globalization. From Robertson, we got his insistence on the importance of the globalization and global conscience, operationalized through interaction between individuals or groups that have different views of the world's system. The main points of Ritzer's thought on the other hand include globalization through the processes of imperialism, colonialism, westernization and easternization, which to a large measure, represent societies in the past and present. In fact, Robertson's and Ritzer's concepts emphasize the idea that local cultures are transformed by the processes of globalization, which means that separated cultures and their values will disappear. On the contrary, cultures have to live free, to be in continuous communication with other cultures, because this renews and rejuvenates them, giving them opportunities for evaluation of and adaption to processes which mark the epoch in which we live. Mario Vargas Ljosa indicates that in connecting conditions the world and more openness of the states to authentic cultural values all will value all that is good, will survive and will find its appropriate place (Ljosa, 2003, p.109). Undoubtedly, beneath the specific set of intellectual position of Robertson and Ritzer in relation of globalization, modern preoccupations in sociology are configured, which at the same time will be a challenge for new generations of sociologists.

**References:**

- Appadurai, A. (1990). Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy". In M. Featherstone (Ed), *Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity* (pp.295-311). London: SAGE Publications.
- Appadurai, A. (Ed), (2001). Globalization. Duke University Press.
- Apaduraj, A. (2008). Strah od malih brojeva. Beograd: Biblioteka XX vek.
- Canclini, G., N. (1995). Hybrid Cultures: Strategies for Entering and Leaving Modernity. University of Minnesota Press.
- Friedman, J. (1994). Cultural Identity and Global Process. London: SAGE Publications.
- Gidens, E. (1998). Posledice modernosti. Beograd: Filip Višnjić.
- Giddens, A. (2000). The Globalizing of Modernity. In D. Held, A. McGrew (Eds), *The Global Transformations Reader* (pp. 92- 108). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Giddens, A. (2002). Runaway World. London: Profile Books.
- Hannerz, U. (1996). Transnational Connections: Culture, People, Places. London: Routledge.
- Hsin-Huang M. H.(2002). Cultural Globalization and Localization in Contemporary Taiwan. In P.L. Berger and S.P. Huntington (Eds), *Many Globalization: Cultural Diversity in the Contemporary World* (pp.48-67). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ljosa, V., M. (2003). Kultura slobode. In O. Nušić, D. Veličković (Eds), *Glokalni svet* (pp. 99-111). Beograd: Alexandria Press.
- Pieterse, N., J. (2009). Globalization and Culture: Global Mélange. Lanhan: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, INC.
- Ritzer, G. (2007). The Globalization of Nothing 2. London: SAGE Publications.
- Ritzer, G. (2010). Globalization: A Basic Text. WILEY- BLACKWELL.
- Ritzer, G. (2011). Globalization: The Essentials. WILEY- BLACKWELL.
- Ritzer, G. (2013). The McDonaldization of Society. London: SAGE Publications.
- Ritzer, G., Dean P. (2015). Globalization: A Basic Text. West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons.
- Robertson, R. (1992). Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture. London: SAGE Publications.
- Robertson, R. (1995). Glocalization: time-space and homogeneity-heterogeneity. In M. Featherstone S. Lash & R. Robertson (Eds.), *Theory, Culture & Society: Global modernities* (pp. 25-44). London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Robertson, R. (2001). Globalization Theory 2000+: Major Problematics. In G. Ritzer, B. Smart (Eds), *Handbook of Social Theory* (pp. 458-471). London: SAGE Publications
- Sassen, S. (2007). A Sociology of Globalization. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Stiglic, D. (2004). Protivrečnosti globalizacije. Beograd: SBM-x.

Wallerstein, I. (1986). *Suvremeni svjetski sistem*. Zagreb: Cekade.  
Шолте, Арт J. (2008). *Глобализација*. Скопје: Академски печат