economic growth and development while political scientists tend to focus on the development of democratic elements such as rural elections. However, these sources are very problematic. While in the West, democracy is the source of legitimacy of the ruling party, democratic experiment never goes beyond the village level. While rapid economic development has drastically increased the living standard for most Chinese, it has also created tremendous and serious problems such as inequality and environmental disasters. In this context, the development of the welfare system indeed provides a missing link in explaining the legitimacy and thus the sustainability of the ruling party. Scholars often predict the collapse of the CCP, but no effective explanation has been developed to answer the question: Why has the CCP sustained and consolidated itself along with rapid modernization? Welfare matters in providing a solid base for Chinese society.

As a handbook, this volume has performed its mission. The readers will find it extremely insightful and useful in understanding welfare contemporary China and its historical roots. Nevertheless, scholarly speaking, the volume has its own weaknesses. These weaknesses are not vital, but can be improved and avoided in the future studies. First, as mentioned above, the volume does not address the issue of political legitimacy. This issue is important in addressing many important developments in China, including welfare. An obvious question is how the ruling party has the incentives to develop a welfare system. In answering this question, the contributors have focused too much on the rhetoric surrounding the "China dream." While there is nothing wrong to highlight this ideology, the rise of this ideology per se needs to be explained. Here, legitimacy matters. Second, while most chapters are solid, with tables and figures, some other chapters tend to focus on what the Chinese propaganda has said, and not enough attention was paid to the actual policy performance. China remains a mobilization society, and the regime's capability of mobilization is no comparison with other types of regime. While state mobilization often leads to the over-propaganda of policy, the gap between policy propaganda and enforcement is sometimes unusually big. Without taking account of policy enforcement, it will be misleading in understanding a given policy.

A more important matter is related to the concept of "citizenship" in China. In the West, the development of welfare has been closely associated with the concept of citizenship. One can argue that the process of welfare development is the process of development of citizenship, both as an idea and a set of national institutions. However, it is in these areas that China has not developed a modern welfare system. Welfare, as an idea applicable to everyone, does not exist. The institutions based on that idea continue to be fragile and highly decentralized. Despite great efforts in building welfare in the past decades, as discussed in this volume, there is no intention and dynamics for the current system to be unified at the national level. Chinese welfare so far is unified only at the city level. In other words, a Western type of universal citizenship is still absent in China. One can assume that if China does not develop welfare as a universal right for everyone in society, it will be extremely difficult for the country to develop into a modern welfare system.

YANG LIJUN
South China University of Technology
yanglijun@ipp.org.cn

John Gal and Idit Weiss-Gal (eds) (2017) *Where Academia and Policy Meet: A Cross-national Perspective on the Involvement of Social Work Academics in Social Policy*, Bristol: Policy Press, £70.00, pp. 304, hbk.
doi:10.1017/S0047279419000084

The editors recruited a remarkably diverse collection of researchers to provide a cross-national comparative perspective on social work academics' engagement in policy processes beyond

their roles as educators and researchers. Researchers from 12 countries on five continents utilized common instrumentation to survey social work academics in each country. Four distinct sampling techniques were used: in seven countries (Finland, Germany, Israel, Portugal, Puerto Rico, Spain, and Sweden) all social work academics were invited to participate; in three countries (Australia, South Africa, and United Kingdom) university administrators requested faculty participation; China used snowball data collection to bypass university administrators in order to avoid the possibility of coerced responses; and stratified random sampling was used in the United States. The online surveys were conducted in 2013 in Israel and in 2014–2015 in all other countries. All told, 1,551 social work academics participated, making this book a unique contribution to the literature, but readers should note that samples varied from a low of 43 in Australia to 396 in Germany. Only Finland and Israel reported response rates in excess of 50%.

The Policy Practice Engagement framework utilized in the national studies was explained in an introductory chapter. This framework has three components: opportunity, facilitation, and motivation, which informed the instrumentation developed for these national studies. In order for social work academics to be engaged in policy practice, they require access to policy formulation institutions (opportunity), support from their academic institution to engage in policy practice (facilitation), and individual preparation to engage in policy practice (motivation). Readers may note that this framework is most compatible with a western democratic style of government and less relevant in China where political participation is more muted. Surprisingly, the high degree of social inclusion in the Nordic states also mitigated the policy practice role for social work academics. Apparently, when social welfare policy is central to national politics and has broad public support, the advocacy role for social work academics wanes.

Following this introductory chapter are twelve country-specific chapters. Each of these chapters begins with a brief description of the welfare state history in the country, how it was changed by neoliberalism, globalization, and austerity, and how the social work profession has interacted in that specific national context with social welfare policy. Readers will learn how academic social work is organized in each country, how large the profession is, and the primary employment settings for social workers. Any variation in instrumentation that was required for the national context is explained fully. A standard research report followed with Method, Results, and Discussion in a repetitious pattern requiring some perseverance from the reader. This structure of the book precluded an ongoing comparative context in the country-specific chapters, which did little to make each chapter relevant and interesting to the reader. All cross-national comparisons are restricted to the concluding chapter.

Among the best features in this book are the social welfare histories of each country and the use of common instrumentation to facilitate cross-national comparisons. Considering the geographical and political diversity of the samples, the differences between national samples were modest. Levels of policy engagement were low to moderate in all countries, but especially low in China, Sweden, and South Africa. The low levels of policy engagement are attributed primarily to differences in the political processes in each country. In general, social work academics strongly supported a major social role in challenging existing power relations and addressing social problems. However, they perceived their influence on policy-makers to be low. Six national samples did report a higher influence on advocacy organizations, which suggests a more indirect influence on policy-makers. Social work academics try to influence policy primarily through public routes (e.g. protests, press interviews, and policy committees) rather than through their traditional academic roles such as preparing publications, writing positions papers, or advising policy-makers. Most social work academics are strongly supportive of social work practice and policy, but academics in Germany, Finland, and Sweden were oriented more toward the role of social critic than they were to practitioner support.

From a research perspective, readers are likely to wish that more care had been taken in development of the instrumentation used in this study. None of the six instruments were counter-balanced and internal consistency varied significantly between national samples. Only two instruments, the 20-item Level of Engagement in Policy Activities and the 5-item Perceived Impact on Policy-Makers and Advocacy Organizations had adequate consistency for valid cross-national comparisons. In the other four instruments, barely half of the variance in responses was explained in at least one country. Although this book is a unique contribution to what is known about international differences in social work and social welfare regimes, it is but a first step toward expanding what is known about the intersection of social work academics and policy practice. Many will appreciate this contribution, but most will still want to know more.

PETER A. KINDLE
University of South Dakota
Peter.Kindle@usd.edu

Kepa Artaraz and Michael Hill (2016) *Global Social Policy: Themes, Issues and Actors*, New York, NY: Macmillan, £26.99, pp. 248, pbk.
doi:10.1017/S0047279419000096

Since the publication of *Global Social Policy* (Deacon *et al.*, 1997), there has been growing academic attention to the importance of globalisation for social policy, building on Bob Deacon's pioneering work. The academic journal of the same name, published by Sage since April 2001, has also contributed greatly to the development of a distinct sub-discipline. The starting point of this latest contribution, with the same title as the book and the journal, traces a movement amongst social policy scholars from studying the national, through the rise of comparative analyses, to a focus on the global dimensions of social policy. The book addresses issues in the global governance of social policy, the role of global markets, supranational organisations and an emerging, if highly heterogeneous, 'global civil society'. It looks, specifically, at the global dimensions of certain social problems, ranging from poverty and inequality, through global health issues, employment, demographics, migration and, importantly, the 'wicked' problem of climate change.

Although more implicit than explicit, the book is a kind of textbook based on a module on the topic taught by the authors at the University of Brighton. Each chapter provides a rather basic introduction to the topic at hand, over-reliant on literature that blurs the boundary between academic texts and more popular writings, with extensive reference to writers such as Naomi Klein, Joseph Stiglitz, Jeffrey Sachs, and others. At other times, a single text is used as an authoritative introduction to the topic, as if preparatory reading for a student seminar. The book is peppered with 'stand-alone' boxes that address a particular theme or initiative, including: the global garments industry; tax avoidance and tax evasion; the Thai fishing industry; shock therapy in Bolivia; the World Social Forum; and others. The rationale for these boxes is never made clear and, again, often the reader is left wanting more information.

There is no original empirical work in the book, so that its added value, in academic terms at least, is rather limited. It is also rather too firmly rooted in a tradition of UK social policy scholarship, so that the importance of linking the study of global social policy to histories of imperialism and colonialism is hardly touched on, and scholarship from the so-called 'global South' is not given the attention it deserves. The book tends to neglect the increasing importance of 'world regions' for social policy outside of a rather limited treatment of the role of the European Union. The significance of the BRICS group of countries is barely touched