The Impact Of Governance On Globalization: A Study Of Emerging Intersections

Hadjer Khelalfa
Abbes Laghrour Khenchela University, Algeria, hadjer.khelalfa@univ-khenchela.dz
Research Lab LSRMPUDI

Received date: 23/04/2025 **Accepted date: 19/05/2025** **Publication date: 01/07/2025**

Abstract:

In the post-Cold War era, a time of profound shifts at both the national and global scales, a vibrant discourse has emerged around the themes of globalization and governance. This discourse necessitates a precise articulation of these concepts and a thorough examination of their interrelation. The focus of this analysis is to explore various perspectives on this subject and to delineate the conceptual debates that underpin the definitions of globalization and governance, which are central to our theoretical framework.

Accordingly, this article investigates the diverse entries and theoretical underpinnings of globalization and governance within a conceptual-theoretical framework that is consistent with the epistemological underpinnings of the topic. It also scrutinizes the principal theoretical debates and contemporary scholarly schools that have been instrumental in establishing the theoretical groundwork for these concepts.

Keywords: *Governance; Globalization; Approaches; Debate; Global Politics.*

* **Corresponding author: Hadjer Khelalfa, hadjer.khelalfa@univ-khenchela.dz**

Introduction:

The contemporary world is undergoing a profound knowledge and information revolution, which has catalyzed significant transformations and spawned new paradigms across various domains. This revolution is particularly noteworthy for its role in fostering the emergence of new concepts and ideas that align with the demands of this era.

Among these, governance and globalization stand out as recent additions to the realm of academic study, touching on political-economic and socio-cultural dimensions alike. These concepts have ignited extensive discussions on multiple fronts, ranging from conceptual precision to theoretical implications.

This article aims to illuminate the issues surrounding the definition of concepts and frameworks, as well as the theoretical approaches that elucidate both globalization and governance. This exploration is structured around several key inquiries: What are the predominant conceptual and theoretical debates surrounding globalization and governance?.

The discussion will unfold along the following dimensions:

1. The conceptual debate on the contents of globalization and governance:

2. The position of globalization and governance within theories and approaches of global politics:

3. The interplay between governance and globalization.

1. The Conceptual Debate on the Contents of Globalization and Governance:

The concepts of Globalization and Governance encompass numerous issues, primarily centered around the selection of the most apt terminology, the circumstances of their emergence, as well as their attributes and drivers. These elements reflect the diversity and variation in the intellectual perspectives of scholars, shaped by their respective intellectual affiliations and perceptions, which we aim to elucidate for each concept individually.

1.1. The Concept of Globalization:

The concept of globalization is inherently dialectical and enjoys a prominent presence across various fields of knowledge, marked by ambiguity, complexity, and a discrepancy between theoretical frameworks and actual phenomena. Globalization is often perceived as a series of post-Cold War developments aimed at dismantling barriers between nations.

Yet, the theoretical understanding of these changes has not kept pace with the rapid transformations on the global stage. This lag has left space for certain entities and groups to influence the direction of globalization and to shape

its theoretical and practical contours to further their expansionist aims and interests (Gharbi, 2009).

It is widely acknowledged among scholars that globalization is not a novel phenomenon but rather an age-old one. Its conceptualization did not solely arise at the conclusion of the Cold War due to various developments; rather, these developments predated the theoretical constructs and constituted a lived reality. The real issue stems from the accelerated pace of globalization and its increasing visibility.

Therefore, many researchers view globalization as an accumulative process—comprising smaller-scale globalizations that laid the groundwork for the contemporary global interconnectedness. The novelty lies in the recent acceleration, propelled by advancements in media, communications, transportation, and overall scientific progress (Youcef, 1997).

The terminology used to describe globalization varies—some refer to it as universality, globality, or planetarity. However, the term 'globalization' essentially translates the French 'Mondialisation,' which means to render something global, which in turn translates the English 'Globalization,' originally coined in the United States to denote the expansion and generalization of an entity to encompass all-encompassing dimensions.

Initially, discussions on globalization were confined to trade, finance, and economics but have since broadened to encompass a more systemic or regime-like framework with multifaceted dimensions extending beyond economic exchanges to include communication, politics, thought, and societal interactions.

Scholars concur that four principal elements have catalyzed the trend towards globalization:

-International Trade Liberalization: This process involves the integration and amalgamation of both advanced and developing economies into a unified global market. This market is accessible to all economic entities globally and operates under the principle of free competition.

-Influx of Direct Foreign Investments: Facilitated by the liberalization of global financial markets and propelled by a revolution in communications, driven by advanced technological tools and methods.

-Knowledge and Technological Revolution: This revolution is evidenced by the significant scientific and technological advancements that have contributed to a more interconnected global landscape.

-Expansion of Multinational Corporations' Influence: These corporations significantly impact global economic activities through their ability to leverage disparities in resource endowments across countries and their adaptability to geographic variations (Abdel ismail, 2001).

a. Definition of Globalization:

Amidst the multiplicity of terminologies, scholars from various disciplines including politics, economics, and sociology have proposed numerous definitions of globalization. Here are a few notable ones:

James Rosenau, an American political scholar, articulates globalization as: "A multifaceted relationship across economic, political, cultural, and ideological domains, characterized by the cross-border intermingling of industries, the proliferation of financial markets, and the homogenization of consumer goods, often influenced by the dynamics between migrant and resident populations." (Chouman, 1998)

Thomas Friedman, a political scientist, perceives the current phase of globalization as an extension of an earlier wave that initiated in the latter half of the 20th century, spurred by a significant surge in international trade.

Anthony Giddens, a prominent theorist on globalization, describes it as a complex amalgamation of processes shaped by political and economic forces that notably alter everyday life, particularly in developing nations, through the establishment of systems and supranational entities.

In contrast to these Western scholars, Arab intellectuals define globalization through lenses reflective of their own ideological standings and cultural perspectives. For instance, Burhan Ghalioun sees globalization as a dynamic new phase in international relations characterized by an intensified and accelerated dissemination of information and technological and scientific advancements, where external factors crucially influence the destinies of national entities and their peripheral components.

Michael Moussa defines globalization as: "The intensification of interactions and integrations among the activities of the human community, particularly in the economic sphere, on a global scale." (Grawitz, 1993)

From these definitions, it becomes evident that no single definition can encapsulatively describe globalization, given its multifaceted nature and various dimensions. Thus, for the purposes of this study, we propose an operational definition of globalization: "Globalization is a state characterized by transformative economic, cultural, and social patterns and systems, encompassing a set of prevalent values and customs, and the diminishing of religious, ethnic, and national disparities, all within the context of internationalizing the modern capitalist system through a Western liberal lens."

b. Levels of Approaching Globalization:

Exploring the levels at which globalization is approached highlights the perspective chosen by researchers based on their specific objectives and methodological frameworks. This has led to the identification of several distinct

levels of analysis. We will examine and analyze four main levels in subsequent discussions.

Level One: Globalization as a Concept for Theorizing

Globalization, when considered as a concept for theorizing, serves as a framework that organizes reality by capturing the essential and significant attributes of phenomena. This conceptualization necessitates the first categorization of impressions encountered by a researcher in any study. For globalization to function effectively as a theoretical construct, it must satisfy three essential criteria:

-Globalization must have a defined meaning.

-It should be applicable in practical operations.

-It must be abstract, meaning it should not contain any preconceived notions about specific content.

Moreover, globalization as a concept must perform functions of organization, assignment, and prediction. This efficacy is exemplified by researcher Jens Bartelson's observation that the concept of globalization has become a dynamic tool for the transformation and transition of ideas (Chalabi, 2007).

Level Two: Globalization as a Phenomenon

Considered as a phenomenon, globalization encompasses historical, social, economic, political, and cultural dimensions that have become distinctly crystallized through its developmental trajectory. This multifaceted phenomenon manifests in various forms, impacting diverse fields over time.

Level Three: Globalization as a Variable

In academic discourse, a variable is identified as an entity that is measurable—whether quantitatively or qualitatively, in strength or weakness, stability or fluctuation. Professor Mohammed Shelbi highlights that variables represent the observable aspects of phenomena, serving as the indicative and expressive markers of concepts.

Thus, globalization, as a variable, is associated with numerous factors and actors, providing a stream of data and indicators that are subject to change. These elements enable the explanation or prediction of varying phenomena.

Level Four: Globalization as a Process

Viewing globalization as a process entails recognizing it as a sequence of interconnected events that unfold with some regularity. This process comprises purposeful practices and activities executed consciously by the participating entities. Researcher Anthony Giddens emphasizes that globalization is not an

incidental evolution but a deliberate process orchestrated, facilitated, and promoted by specific states, governments, and multinational corporations.

1.2. The Concept of Governance:

The concept of governance engenders considerable discussion and is characterized by diverse, sometimes conflicting, definitions, as different organizations imbue it with meanings specific to their orientations and operational fields. It is imperative to explore the conceptual underpinnings of governance by examining its origins, definitions, and the various components that constitute its framework.

a. The Emergence and Development of the Governance Concept:

Governance initially took shape through the efforts of economists who devised a range of strategies to address the myriad economic challenges faced by nations. These strategies were encapsulated into a series of economic principles set forth by key international financial bodies, such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. These principles, which govern financial markets, currency exchanges, property, labor, and various management frameworks, are mandated for adherence by all participating countries (Tournier, 2007).

Economists have progressively refined the concept of governance by incorporating quantitative and mathematical methodologies in place of traditional qualitative standards. This evolution has facilitated the emergence of terminologies such as corporate governance, governance in the social field, and eventually, governance at the state or public sector level.

The concept of governance gained distinct clarity in the early 20th century, particularly in the United States within the economic sphere.

Ronald Coase, a leading figure of the Chicago School, significantly contributed to this with his seminal 1937 work, "The Nature of the Firm". Coase introduced governance as a pattern of internal coordination designed to minimize overall transaction costs in markets. He highlighted the significance of internal cooperative relationships within institutions, which not only reduce costs but also enhance pricing strategies.

The notion of governance underwent substantial evolution, particularly during the period from 1970 to 1980, when Coase’s ideas were further developed by proponents of new institutional economics. One notable economic thinker, Oliver Williamson, characterized corporate governance as a series of coordination mechanisms that regulate a company’s internal organization to achieve greater efficacy.

Williamson's theory suggested that companies could be organized in a less hierarchical manner to optimize effectiveness, emphasizing the dynamics of

authority both within and outside the organization and their impact on productivity.

Tracing the trajectory of governance in the economic domain reveals that although closely linked to economics, the concept owes much to political thought. This interaction can be delineated through two distinct stages:

First Stage: Coinciding with the liberal revolution of the 1980s, this era introduced new paradigms of political thought. With the diminishing role of the state, particularly in Anglo-Saxon regions, the concept of "functionalism" emerged, rooted in the principles of new public management, which advocated for a minimal and decentralized state structure.

Second Stage: The 1990s marked a period of intense deliberation over the role of the regulatory state in reaction to the principles of new public management. Researcher Pierre Calame emphasized that the crisis facing the state was not only structural and functional but also pertained to its ability to sustain legitimacy and devise public policies that resonate with the socio-economic demands of the time.

Thus, the transformations experienced by the world during the latter years of the 20th century have played a pivotal role in shaping the modern concept of governance. The shift in liberal theory towards institutional liberalism has underscored the importance of the private sector as a formidable competitor to the state. Moreover, the pervasive impact of globalization has intensified calls to reevaluate the traditional state governance models, paving the way for a broader participation of various actors in social, political, and economic domains. This evolution leads us to a comprehensive definition of governance.

b. Definition of Governance and Its Components:

Governance, known as "Governance" in English and "Gouvernance" in French, though modern in its current application across political, administrative, and economic spheres, traces its roots to ancient philosophical traditions. Its etymology harks back to the Greek era, derived from the verb Kubernan, meaning to steer or govern. Plato first used this term in reference to the governance of people. The term then migrated to Latin as "Kubernare," maintaining its original significance (Joumard, 2009).

In French, the term evolved to denote the art or method of governance and entered the English lexicon in the 14th century as "Governance." In France, its usage dwindled due to associations with the ancien régime and lay dormant for centuries, only to resurface in the 1970s under the guise of "Corporate Governance." It reemerged in the French discourse during the 1990s as a counterpart to the English "Governance."

As the concept permeated the Arabic language, its expressions diversified and expanded. Some interpretations equate governance with

government, while others suggest it implies 'good governance,' stemming partly from translation inaccuracies and partly from the conceptual intersections and overlaps in various contexts. Therefore, governance encompasses the management of political, economic, administrative, and social affairs through a framework that ensures citizens' rights and responsibilities are met, promoting participatory logic among diverse stakeholders where the state is one of many participants, not the sole actor.

This framework aims to uphold justice, equality, transparency, and efficiency in the utilization of resources, both natural and human. Hence, governance emerges from the functional interplay among its three pillars: the state, the private sector, and civil society. This tripartite model, referred to as the "governance triangle," was notably articulated by researchers Markus Lederer and Philip Muller (Ledrer & Muller, 2003).

Moreover, governance fundamentally relies on several critical pillars, including:

-Accountability: Ensuring that various institutions, both formal and informal, are held accountable.

-Transparency: Promoting openness in the discussion of topics and the unimpeded flow of information.

-Justice and Equality: Applying laws uniformly across all segments of society without discrimination and ensuring equal opportunities for all members of the community.

-Empowerment: Enhancing individual capabilities by fostering an environment that supports the achievement of personal objectives.

-Participation: Facilitating the involvement of all citizens in diverse aspects of societal life.

2. The Position of Globalization and Governance within Theories and Approaches of Global Politics:

Addressing the role of globalization and governance within the frameworks of global political theories necessitates an exploration of the diverse intellectual schools that interpret globalization, followed by an analysis of how various prominent theories of international relations conceptualize both globalization and governance.

2.1. Schools Explaining Globalization:

Hyperglobalists: This school, led by thinkers like David Held, views globalization as a legitimate and historical process endowed with its own internal logic and predictable outcomes. Hyperglobalists argue that globalization culminates in a global system governed by market dynamics and supranational institutions,

where diverse cultures converge towards a unified social pattern predominantly influenced by the liberal cultural paradigm. For hyperglobalists, globalization represents an inevitable and self-perpetuating march towards a unified global society (Robinson, 2007).

Skeptics: Critics such as Gordon, Hirts, and Thompson, perceive globalization as an extension of long-standing phenomena. They argue that the global economic system is less integrated and less oriented towards exchange than in previous times. Skeptics dispute the notion of the diminishing role of the state, asserting instead that national governments have consolidated power in response to global developments.

Transformationalists: Leading proponents including Giddens, Scholte, and Castells offer a nuanced perspective that diverges from the economic focus of the Skeptics. Transformationalists regard globalization as a complex, multi-dimensional process influenced not only by economic factors but also by the broader dynamics of modern capitalism, encompassing political, military, and industrial dimensions. They identify four principal dimensions of globalization: the global capitalist economy, the national state system, the global military order, and the international division of labor (Stefanovic, 2008).

2.2. International Relations Theories and the Globalization/Governance Duality:

Significant theories of international relations have articulated their acceptance or criticism of the concepts of globalization and governance, based on the foundational principles of each theory and the perspectives of their primary theorists. This research paper delves into the prominent competing theories: Realism, Liberalism, and World-System Theory.

a. Realist Theory:

Realism staunchly advocates for the primacy of independent political units or states as the formal and sovereign entities in the international system. It acknowledges that globalization influences various social, economic, and cultural domains; however, Realism contends that it does not override the international political framework that underpins independent political entities.

Realism concedes that entities such as international non-governmental organizations and multinational corporations contribute to interlinking different economic and social systems. Nonetheless, these entities are not seen as competitors to states, which remain the principal formal and sovereign actors.

Regarding governance, Realists uphold the balance of power as the optimal mechanism for managing international relations, positing that international governance's scope is primarily confined to fostering peace and stability among nations (Ben said, 2014).

b. Liberal Theory:

Liberalism, particularly through its institutional lens, accentuates the dynamic and encompassing impact of globalization on the international stage. It underscores that states are not the sole actors; rather, other significant and effective entities coexist alongside states. Globalization has facilitated the development of rules and institutions that transcend national boundaries, actively engaging in domains traditionally dominated by states.

Liberalism champions the notion of governance as embodying cooperation and exchange among nations and peoples, epitomized by the establishment of international arrangements such as the United Nations, and economic and financial institutions like the World Bank and the World Trade Organization.

c. World-System Theory:

Emanuel Wallerstein, an advocate of this theory, views globalization as an evolutionary phase of capitalism, with roots extending as far back as the international system itself. He argues that the global economy is steered by a Western liberal ideology that dovetails with the tenets of capitalism, asserting that governance is essentially an expression of the principles of the liberal international order.

3. The Interplay between Governance and Globalization:

Exploring the interplay between globalization and governance unveils how their interaction gives rise to the concept of "global governance." This concept has attracted significant attention in contemporary academic discourse, and this section aims to elucidate the pivotal issues emerging from this development in line with the study's focus.

3.1. The Concept of Global Governance:

Traditionally, governance was understood as the political interactions among local actors focused on resolving state-centric issues. However, as globalization accelerated, influencing diverse domains, the scope of governance expanded to encompass political interactions among international actors. This evolution gave birth to "global governance" or world governance, a novel philosophical approach designed to address multinational or regional challenges in the absence of a universal political authority (Finkelstein, 1995).

Global governance has emerged from various transformations in the international landscape, notably the increasing calls for transitioning from traditional international politics to a model of global politics. This shift is largely driven by heightened awareness of global challenges, particularly environmental threats, where individual states find themselves incapable of resolving transboundary issues alone. Consequently, this has necessitated the inclusion of

new stakeholders such as non-governmental organizations and multinational corporations.

Several influential definitions of global governance have been proposed. Political scientist James Rosenau describes it as "the governance process devoid of state sovereignty, intended to organize relations between states without the dominance of a supreme state authority." Researcher Thomas Weiss defines global governance as "the collective efforts to comprehend and address significant problems that surpass the capabilities of individual states." (Weiss, 2009)

Liberal scholars Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye characterize global governance as "the formal and informal procedures and institutions that govern collective activities, where the government is a component that acts with authority and establishes formal obligations. Global governance is not exclusively led by governments or international organizations endowed with state-delegated authority. Instead, it often involves collaborations with private companies and non-governmental organizations, often in cooperation with governmental agencies."

Despite varying perspectives and the intersections in these definitions, there is a consensus that global governance represents a collaborative process involving formal actors such as states and informal actors like non-governmental organizations and multinational corporations. This collective approach aims to tackle cross-border issues and establish an organizational framework that benefits all involved parties.

3.2. Models Explaining Global Governance:

The full articulation of the concept of global governance necessitates a robust theoretical framework. Several models have been developed to clarify this concept, particularly focusing on the potential future of the state under a dominant global governance framework. The three primary models developed are (Ziani & Ben said, 2010):

-Authoritative Coordination Model through a World State:

This model is based on a fundamental idea that, in the chaotic nature of the international system, there exists a sense of doubt and suspicion that characterizes the intentions of states. The mutual fear of confrontation or invasion between them remains a constant possibility.

Therefore, each state always prepares itself for the worst-case scenario, especially given the potential for other states to renege on their commitments and disregard agreed-upon rules and regulations. As a result, these rational actors find themselves unable to coordinate effectively unless deterred by a central authority that oversees and aims to resolve the inherent disorder within the international system and establish order.

Proponents of this model envision the central authority as a virtual global state, meaning that this state would not have a physical structure, organization, or centralized entity. Rather, it would exist through its ability to enforce necessary rules and regulations, addressing various issues that individual states are unable to confront on their own. In this model, the individual would belong to a global community where all transactions that were once national are now viewed and handled on a global level.

A criticism of this model is that its Kantian propositions are largely utopian, making it extremely difficult to implement in reality. This is due to the inherent selfishness of states and the imbalance of power among them, especially when comparing major powers to developing nations. Furthermore, achieving equality among states in this context would be very challenging.

- A Governance Model Without Global Government:

This model is based on the core principle that, in their pursuit of national interests, states are driven by rationality to engage in alliances and establish international institutions. These institutions aim to achieve collective goals while also advancing individual interests, which are equally important. Thus, the coordination of international activities is influenced by the degree to which states agree on the rules and standards that will guide their future actions.

This leads to the creation of mechanisms and forces that make adherence to these rules and regulations possible. According to proponents of this model, global governance is realized through the creation of institutions across all fields, where states relinquish part of their sovereignty and delegate authority to these global institutions to achieve various interests.

- A Governance Model Under the Umbrella of Hegemony:

This model draws its ideas from the realist school of thought, where the concept of hegemony involves the presence of a dominant power controlling the governance system. This view is supported by the realist thinker Kenneth Waltz, who, in his book Theory of International Politics, argued that the international system requires a dominant power to maintain stability.

Consequently, this model assumes that commitment can be achieved through the strength of this hegemonic umbrella, which could take the form of a powerful state capable of establishing binding rules and regulations for all nations and peoples. These states or peoples may feel secure under this umbrella as their interests are fulfilled within the context of this hegemony.

A criticism of this model is that the concept of hegemony may negatively impact the interests of other states, especially when the hegemonic state seeks to impose its own cultural or social model on other nations. This could

lead to the marginalization of groups based on religion, ethnicity, or language, resulting in global disorder and, in some cases, escalating into wars between states.

Thus, these three selected models are among the most prominent in analyzing and interpreting global governance, alongside other models that have offered logical explanations for the essence and development of the idea of global governance.

Conclusion:

After an extensive exploration of the conceptual and theoretical frameworks surrounding globalization and governance, it is evident that these concepts are profoundly interconnected and hold significant relevance among various academic disciplines due to the diversity in approaches and theoretical perspectives. This diversity fosters a range of viewpoints on the subject, with each scholar approaching globalization or governance from perspectives that resonate with their own intellectual backgrounds and affiliations.

Furthermore, it is important to recognize that despite its relative novelty, the concept of governance presents numerous research challenges across different levels of inquiry. The study has determined that the interactions between globalization and governance frequently overlap, forming a complex tapestry that merits further examination.

Bibliography:

1. Abdel Ismail, Abdel Said, Globalization and the Islamic World: Numbers and Facts, Libya, Dar Al-Andalus, 2001.
2. Ben Said, Morad, From International Governance to Global Governance: Ontological Transformations in the Analysis of Global Environmental Governance, Al-Mustaqbal Al-Arabi Review, 2014.
3. Chalabi, Mohammad, Methodology in Political Analysis: Concepts, Methods, Approaches, Tools, 5th ed, Algeria, Dar Houma, 2007.
4. Chouman, Naima, Globalization Between Modern Technological Systems, First Edition, Beirut, Al-Risala Foundation, 1998.
5. Finkelstein, Lawrence, What is Global Governance, Global Governance, Vol. 3, Winter 1995.
6. Gharbi, Mohammad, Challenges of Globalization and Its Effects on the Arab World, North African Economics, Issue 6, 2009.
7. Grawitz, Madeline, Methods of Social Sciences, translated by: Sam Ammar Damascus, Arab Center for Arabization, Translation, Authoring and Publishing, 1993.

8. Joumard, Robert, The Concept of Governance, National Institute for Research on Transport and Safety, Report No. LTE 0910, November 2009 http://hal.archivesouvertes.fr/docs/00/48/92/37/PDF/rapport_gouvernance_RJ_LTE 0910.pdf
9. Ledrer, Markus, Muller, Philip, Challenging Global Governance: Critical Perspective, Workshop at Harvard Law School, Harvard, CPOGC, 2003. http://csrc.nist.gov/organizations/fissea/2014conference/fissea_2014_conference_program_march_12_2014.pdf.
10. Robinson, William, Theories of Globalization, 2007. http://kisi.deu.edu.tr/timucin.yalcinkaya/Theories%20of%20Globalization.pdf.
11. Stefanovic , Zoran, Globalization: Theoretical Perspectives, Impacts and Institutional Response of the Economy, 2008. http://facta.junis.ni.ac.rs/eao/eao200803/eao200803-09.pdf.
12. Tournier, Charles, The Concept of Governance in Political Sciences, 2007. http://www.scielo.org.co/pdf/papel/v12n1/v12n1a04.pdf.
13. Weiss, Thomas G, What happened to the idea of world governance, International Studies Quarterly, Vol. 16, New York, 2009.
14. Youcef, Basil, Human Rights from Humanitarian Universalism and Political Globalization, Al-Mawqif Al-Thaqafi, Issue 10, Dar Al-Shu'un Al-Thaqafiya, Baghdad, 1997.
15. Ziani, Saleh, Ben said, Morad, Global Environmental Governance – Issues and Challenges, Batna, Dar Qana, 2010.