International Journal of Social and Humanities Sciences Research
JSHSR
Uluslararası Sosyal ve Beşeri Bilimler Araştırma Dergisi
Uluslararası Hakemli Dergi- International Refereed Journal
ISSN: 2459-1149

Received-Makale Geliş Tarihi 28.08.2025
Published-Yayınlanma Tarihi 30.11.2025
Volume-Cilt (Issue-Sayı), ss/pp 12 (125),2335-2341

Research Article /Araştırma Makalesi
10.5281/zenodo.17795175

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Aslıgül Sarıkamış Kaya
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2667-7688
Selçuk Üniversitesi, İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi, Konya / TÜRKİYE
ROR Id: https://ror.org/045hgzm75

Bridging the Gap: Governance Between Global and Regional Level

Bağlantı Kurmak: Küresel ve Bölgesel Düzey Arasında Yönetişim

ABSTRACT

In line with globalization of world politics, new actors such as supranational institutions, nongovernmental organizations, multinational companies and transnational interest groups have taken on increased role in policy-making process. The rise of new actors in political, economic and social affairs changed the mode of governing in world politics. With the reallocation of power and authority among new actors, state-centrism of international politics shifted to multicentrism of global politics and governance has become one of most frequent concepts of this new era. At the global level, governance is used to denote both formal and informal rules for interactions among states, international organizations, civil society institutions and transnational networks. Governance has mainly been analysed either in national or global domain. On the other side, regional governance studies are dominated by multilevel European governance, emphasizing the distribution of power and authority within the European Union. Although the interplay between global and regional levels are underestimated in the literature on governance, governance at these two levels is intertwined in today's multilevel politics. This study argues that existence of the gap between regional and global governance studies needs to be bridged for addressing global complex problems.
Keywords: Globalization, Global governance, Regional governance

ÖZET

Dünya siyasetinin küreselleşmesine paralel olarak uluslarüstü kurumlar, hükümet dışı örgütler, çok uluslu şirketler ve ulus ötesi çıkar grupları gibi yeni aktörler karar alma süreçlerinde artan bir şekilde rol almaktadırlar. Siyasi, iktisadi ve toplumsal meselelerde yeni aktörlerin yükselişi dünya siyasetindeki yönetişim şeklini değiştirmiştir. Güç ve otoritenin yeni aktörler arasında yeniden dağılımı ile uluslararası siyasetin devlet merkezli yapısı çok merkezliliğe doğru kaymış ve yönetişim kavramı bu yeni dönemde en sık tartışılan kavramlardan biri haline gelmiştir. Küresel seviyede yönetişim devletler, uluslararası örgütler, sivil toplum kuruluşları ve ulus ötesi ağlar arasındaki etkileşimin gerek resmi gerekse gayri resmi kurallarını ifade etmek için kullanılmaktadır. Yönetişim esas olarak ya ulusal ya da küresel alanda analiz edilmektedir. Öte yandan bölgesel yönetişim çalışmaları Avrupa Birliği içinde güç ve otoritenin dağılımını vurgulayan çok seviyeli Avrupa yönetişimi tarafından domine edilmektedir. Her ne kadar küresel ve bölgesel seviye arasındaki etkileşim yönetişim literatüründe yeterince ele alınmasa da her iki seviyedeki yönetişim de günümüz çok seviyeli siyasetinde iç içe geçmiş bir durumdadır. Bu çalışma, bölgesel ve küresel yönetişim çalışmaları arasındaki boşluğun küresel düzeydeki karmaşık sorunların çözümüne yoğunlaşarak kapatılması gerektiğini ortaya koymaktadır.
Anahtar Kelimeler: Küreselleşme, Küresel yönetişim, Bölgesel yönetişim.

1. INTRODUCTION

The 1990s witnessed dramatic changes in the world scene. The Cold War's end marked a new world order that was characterized by multipolarity, greater interdependence and economic liberalization. The changes taking place in international environment paved the way for globalisation wave that involves time and space compression, liberalization of world economy, mobility of factors of production, especially capital, homogenization of cultures and interconnectedness of the world through computers, satellites and internet. Hence, globalization disassociates social relations from territorial geography, aggregates transnational social, economic and cultural relations in a single global system of relations and links distant places and makes the world a single unit.

In response to repercussions of globalization, new actors like supranational institutions, non-governmental organizations, and transnational interest groups gained importance in decision-making process. The increasing role of new actors in political, economic and social affairs changed the mode of governing in world politics. With the reallocation of power and authority among new actors, state-centrism of international politics shifted to multicentrism of global politics. This changing mode of governing beyond nation state has been associated with the emergence of global governance.

In the field of international politics, the attractiveness of governance stemmed from this transformation of world politics, changes in the form of "statehood", and the extension of the spectrum of actors. In addition to these changes, global problem constellations such as financial crises, climate change and terrorism exacerbated uncertainties and complexities of globalization and increased the need for new systems of rules and forms of control at the international level (Brunnengraeber et.al., 2006). Consequently, global governance became an elusive concept that signifies an ongoing transformation of world politics.

In this context, this study provides a critical appraisal of literature on global and regional governance. It examines the interplay of literature on global and regional governance. The first part presents key concepts and main debates on globalization and emergence of global governance. The second part reviews the studies on theorizing global governance in connection with International Relations (IR) theories. The third part explores the governance debates in a regional domain with an emphasis on the European Union.

2. GLOBALIZATION AND THE EMERGENCE OF GLOBAL GOVERNANCE

The end of the Cold War brought forth new patterns of relations among states, new actors with respective strengths in one issue area over the others and also new problems. This "post-international politics", in Rosenau's sense of the term, resembled neither the Realist nor Liberalist positions of international politics. Changes taking place in international environment affected both international order and conduct of international politics.

This significant change in the substance and conduct of international politics was identified with globalization process. Definition of globalization is a difficult attempt since there is no consensus over its definition. In this respect, definitions of globalization by scholars, academicians are closely related with their perspectives of the world. Nevertheless, globalization can be seen as a process of increasing interdependence that involves time and space compression, liberalization of world economy, mobility of factors of production, particularly capital, homogenization of cultures, interconnectedness of the world through computers, satellites and internet.

Rosenau described this changing world politics as "fragmegrative" by merging the words of integration and fragmentation. In this fragmegrative world, the reconfiguration of state authority took place in three ways: transfer of authority upwards to transnational and supranational organizations, devolution of authority to local and subnational groups and the delegation of authority sidewards to non-governmental organizations (Rosenau, 1999, p. 293).

Nevertheless, the reconfiguration of state authority did not imply the end of nation state. On the contrary, nation state will remain one of the major actors of world politics. Yet, the coexistence of fragmentation and integration led to the emergence of new world order in which nonstate actors have gained importance. Hence, the international system in which this new world order exists has a dual character: on the one hand there is an interstate system of states; on the other hand, there is a multicentric system of diverse types of other collectivities. Within this so called "bifurcated" international system, redistribution of authority occurred, rather than the deterioration of authority (Rosenau, 1999, p. 294).

While the reconfiguration of state authority undermined the influence of national level, it paved the way for new linkages among global, regional and local levels. Hence, reorganization of international relations has been taking place in which the focus is shifting both upward and downward from the national level (Vayrynen, 2002, p .44).

Along with these changes, new challenges and problems like ethnic conflicts, civil wars, environmental damage, terrorism, weapons of mass destructions emerged and affected many aspects of international politics. Nonetheless, these problems are not limited to national boundaries, they are global. For this reason, multilateral, cooperative and international approaches are required for their solution (Clarke & Edwards, 2004, p. 7).

On that account, it is possible to state that global governance is directly related with the consequences of globalization. It indicates an essential change in which governance is exercised within and across the world. The declining importance of national states and the emergence nonstate actors like supranational institutions, nongovernmental organizations, transnational interest groups fostered to the emergence of global governance. Global governance stands for a mode of government by which states, international organizations, NGOs and transnational networks interact with each other on a multilateral basis. It is also a process by which new division of labour takes place among new actors. It includes both formal and informal rules and mechanisms which constitute the basis of new ways of doing things.

Indeed, the way in which international system is not a new phenomenon: the demand for international cooperation led to the establishment of international institutions in general and international regimes in particular. Both intergovernmental organizations and international regimes have been the elements of international system. Nevertheless, due to the intergovernmental character of these elements, governments continued to play a major role in international governance (Brühl & Rittberger, 2002, p. 7).

Global governance is distinguished from international governance in several aspects. While international governance implies the output of non-hierarchical network of interlocking international institutions, global governance includes transnational regimes as well as intergovernmental and international regimes and thus it is broader than international governance. Besides, international governance states and intergovernmental institutions are makers of norms and rules, global governance encompasses nonstate actors in addition to states and intergovernmental institutions as the markers of norms and rules. Subsequently, unlike the international governance, global governance is marked by enhancing involvement of nonstate actors in norm and rule setting (Brühl & Rittberger, 2002, p. 2).

As stated above, global governance is more encompassing than international governance; nevertheless, there is neither a consensus definition nor a common understanding of global governance. Rather than defining what global governance is, some scholars prefer to define it in terms "what global governance is not". Above all, it is not a form of government existing within the states. Likewise, it does not refer to "a single world order" or "top-down hierarchical structure of authority" (Karns & Mingst, 2004, p. 4).

Likewise, governance is different from governance. While government refers to "formal institutions that are part of norm and rule setting and monitoring compliance with rules and rule enforcement", thus the power of making binding decisions and allocation of values authoritatively, governance is concerned with "purposive systems of rules or normative orders apart from the regularities (natural orders) emerging from unrestricted interactions of self-interested actors in a state of anarchy" (Brühl & Rittberger, 2002, p. 5).

The blurring meaning of global governance resulted from disagreement about the definition of both global and governance. While global has been used to refer at least two different spheres: "top-level scale of human activity or the sum of all scales of activity", the governance has been used to denote " a specific mode of action whose logic differs from that of both markets and governments", or more encompassingly "all existing forms of collective regulation of social affairs, including the self-regulation of civil society, the coregulation of public and private actors, authoritative regulation through government" (Dingwerth & Pattberg, 2006, p. 188).

3. THEORIZING ON GLOBAL GOVERNANCE

Despite the previous studies on global governance, studies on global governance flourished in the Post-Cold War era. Several factors played role in the growth of global governance literature. Globalization process revealed the urgent need for multilateral cooperation and the provision of global public goods like financial stability, environmental protection etc. In other words, with the shift of state authority and power, the issue of governing became more difficult and volatile (McGrew & Held, 2003, p. 8). Besides, the increase of multinational and transnational firms and thus accrued influence of market forces and ramification of complex global problems played role in the rise of global governance literature. In this part of the paper, theoretical aspect of global governance in connection with conventional IR theories is analysed.

Mainstream theories of IR theories such as realism, neorealism or liberal institutionalism do not engage with the notion of "governance". They are mainly state centric in their basic orientation.[1] The cooperation of national governments is seen as the key for addressing systemic challenges and global problems. Except for state, no actor has been envisaged for the implementation of global governance (Vayrynen, 2002, p. 117). For example, from the perspective of neorealism, governance is no more than the "voluntary cooperation of states". Neorealism does not accept the cooperation of states for commonly agreed goals. According to neorealist understanding, states cooperate for pursuing their own interests. For neorealist, the erosion of the disappearance of state would mean the end of "international system" (Jachtenfuchs, 1997, pp. 41-42).

[1] Despite the limitations of conventional IR theories in exploring global governance, Samuel Makinda argued that British School of IR theory provided valuable insights in understanding global governance. In this regard, Hedley Bull's thinking on IR theory reflected some elements of global governance theory. Although Bull located the notion of international society at the core of his studies, he underlined that the importance of transnational relations. While Bull advocated the role of states in the maintenance of international order, he did not neglect the role of nonstate actors. On this basis, Bull's exploration of the roles of states and nonstate actors, Bull's analysis of international rules, norms and institutions and Bull's analysis of justice as the reconstruction of international order and the management of anarchy can be seen as his contributions to global governance. For a detailed account see Makinda, 2002, pp. 361-371).

An overview of academic studies on global governance illustrated that two general application of global governance in the academic literature. Firstly, it has been used as an "observable phenomenon" to capture "the –actual, perceived, or constructed- reality of world politics". Thus, it has been considered as "a heuristic device to capture and describe the confusing and seemingly ever-accelerating transformation of international system" and underlined "a plethora of forms of social organization and political decision making" which is neither oriented towards the state nor emanate from it (Dingwerth and Pattberg, 2006, p.191). As a concept, global governance does not subordinate nongovernmental organizations, transnational corporations to states and envisages a multi-actor perspective on world politics.

Besides, global governance involves plurality of mechanisms connecting activities of various actors horizontally. In other words, it includes intergovernmental negations as well as other less formal processes of coordination among public and private actors. What is more, unlike traditional views of IR theory which explore the notions of authority and legitimacy in parallel to state`s ability to advance its rational self-interest, a global governance approach pave way to the analysis of the emergence of new spheres of authority in world politics independently of sovereign states. Hence, global governance perspective allows for addressing the neglected aspects of conventional IR theory (Jachtenfuchs, 1997, pp. 189-191). It has been employed as a political concept denoting "a vision of how societies should address the most pressing global problems". It is also connected to the process of economic globalization and loss of national authority due to the globalization process (Jachtenfuchs, 1997, pp. 193-195).

On other side, Marxists scholars regarded global governance as the product of structures and dynamics of contemporary capitalism such as the general expansion of the capitalist economy and ideological and institutional dictates of neo-liberalism. According to Emadi-Coffin, some Marxist theories of IR are not capable of theorizing the "dynamics of global governance". Above all, they distinguish political and economic realm theoretically. Secondly, they assume a division between domestic and international, thirdly they are inadequate at explaining the roles of public and private in global governance, finally they cannot provide structural analysis of global governance (Emadi-Coffin, 2002, p. 19).

Rosenau explains the limits of IR theorizing on global governance as follows: Since study of IR is considered as the subset of political science in American IR approaches, states and anarchical system they sustain formed the boundaries of mainstream IR analysis. Despite the increasing authority and activation of NGOs, they are regarded as "peripheral to the centrality of state system". In a similar vein, analysis of IR scholars on a country, region, international organization or issue regime is based on state system. Studies and findings of mainstream IR theorists generally account "the nature, underpinnings, and conduct of governance in the world of states". The issues like complex dynamics of globalization, the pace of change are not paid attention by numerous IR scholars. For Rosenau, these scholars have constant, static world view. Consequently, most IR practitioners associate with transnational processes and actors as long as they provide input to the national agencies (Rosenau, 2000, p. 170).

Furthermore, conventional state centric IR approaches do not provide an account for the order and disorder, stabilities and instabilities that mark world affairs. For this reason, there is a need for new approaches that treats "globalized space as the locale of the epicentre" and that are "limited by territorial boundaries or sovereign rights." Although Rosenau criticizes the state centric IR approaches, he underlines that state is the one of the significant agents of "change and constancy" in world politics. In addition to the states, new collectivities and structures have developed which are as important as states. In order to encompass these new collectivities and structures, Rosenau offers "governance". In this view, processes of governance across the different levels can be examined effectively by theoretical formulations that are based on "rule system of governance". The governance perspective provides the comparison between the multicentric, and state centric worlds and analysis of authority embedded in horizontal networks and nongovernmental collectivities (Rosenau, 2000, p. 188).

As well as pointing out the limitations of conventional IR theories on global governance, Rosenau played a decisive role in popularizing and explaining the idea of global governance.

Rosenau's ideas on the changing patterns of world politics first revealed in the book called "Governance without government". This book has been accepted as the pioneering studies of global governance since it brought the notion of global governance to the scholarly stage. Nevertheless, the content of the book was far from defining this notion. Rather than global governance, the contributors of book refers to "international governance", "system governance", while Rosenau speaks of "governance of world politics", "governance on a worldwide scale", "governance of international orders" "governance in a global order" almost interchangeably in the introduction of the book (Hewson & Sinclair, 1999, p. 6).

Rosenau advocates a broad formulation of global governance. In his view, global governance includes "system of rule at all levels of human activity-from family to the international organization-in which the pursuit of goals through the exercise of control has transnational repercussions" (Rosenau, 1995, p. 13). In this definition of governance as "systems of rule", Rosenau emphasizes the "control or steering mechanisms as central to the notion of governance. In this sense, global governance is the aggregation of "myriad-literally millions of – control mechanisms driven by different histories, goals, structures and processes" (Rosenau, 1995, p. 16).

James Rosenau clarifies the concept of governance and indicates that it is more encompassing than government. In his definition of governance, Rosenau put forward the role of rules as such: "governance is […] a system of rule that is dependent on intersubjective meanings as on formally sanctioned…". This conceptualization of governance denotes that the functioning of governance is dependent on its acceptance by the majority. Unlike government, which can function in the case of opposition to policies, governance needs the support of majority (Rosenau, 1992, pp. 4-5).

Furthermore, Rosenau differentiates governance from government as follows: Although both governance and government denote "purposive behaviour", "goal-oriented activities" and "systems of rule", in contrast to activities of government backed by formal authority, governance refers to activities backed by "shared goals" that does not necessarily derive from legal and formally prescribed responsibilities. Stated in these terms, Rosenau makes it clear that governance is more comprehensive than the government in the sense that it includes non-governmental, informal mechanisms as well as governmental mechanisms (Rosenau, 1992, p. 4).

From the summary of Rosenau's conceptualization of governance, it can be stated that Rosenau's views reflect "governance in the world" that is based on the disaggregation of authority on a global scale. Rosenau sees the world as " disaggregated system of diverse transnational collectivities as a multi-centric world that competes, cooperates, or otherwise interacts with the state centric world and, as such, constitutes the new world order, an order that is so centralized that it does noy lend itself to either to hierarchy or coordination under hegemonic leadership" (Rosenau, 2000, pp. 171-172). Moreover, Rosenau differentiates "governance in the world" from "governance of the world". While the former refers to patterns of governance wherever they occur, the latter implies "central authority that is doing the governing" (Rosenau, 1997, p. 10).

Hence, Rosenau's view of global governance is based on a worldview in which nature of authority is fundamentally changing, the separation of international and domestic politics is blurred, and structures of global politics are changing constantly (Wilkinson, 2005, p. 7). Rosenau underlines that global governance does not only include formal institutions or organizations. Even though the UN system and national governments have a central role in the conduct of global governance, they are not sufficient. As stated above, for Rosenau, global governance includes "systems of rule at all levels of human activity" (Rosenau, 1995).

4. EXPLORING GOVERNANCE IN REGIONAL DOMAIN

If we conceive governance as system of rule that embrace mechanisms of control at all levels of human activity, thus using governance conceptualization of Rosenau, a variety of governance types can be observed at different levels. Nevertheless, the research on governance is limited to specific modes of national, regional and global governance. Very few studies are devoted to systematic investigation of the linking governance arrangements at different levels (Krahmann, 2003, p. 323).

From the viewpoint of Elke Krahmann, governance is a general phenomenon, and its main characteristics do not change at different levels. In this regard, primary characteristics of global governance such as the need for more collaboration among states and nonstate actors, the emergence of complex problems but limited resources and capabilities of governments in dealing with these problems can be seen as characteristics of national or regional governance. Hence, governance can be regarded as an analytical concept that allows for comparison across different levels (Krahmann, 2003, p. 330).

Due to the commonalities of governance at different levels like the disaggregation of authority and policy functions among governmental and nongovernmental actors, the preference for market solutions and the trend towards neoliberalism, Krahmann argued that governance can be seen as a universal phenomenon with different modes of implementation (Krahmann, 2003, p. 331).

In the analysis of regional governance, Krahmann noted that governance at the regional level has mainly been identified with the complex, multilevel decision-making of the EU. In the conceptualization of European Commission, governance denoted "rules, processes and behaviour that affect the way in which

powers are exercised at a European level, particularly as regards to openness, participation, accountability, effectiveness and coherence" (Commission of the European Communities, 2001).

Multilevel governance has been used to describing the non-state centric, multi actor system of EU governance marked by "multiple *loci* of public and private authority. Seen as such, multilevel governance is based on "the existence of overlapping competencies among multiple levels of governments and the interaction of political actors across those levels" (Marks et.al., 1996, p. 41). Instead of monopolization of state in policymaking, decision making competencies are dispersed by actors at different levels. In addition to states, European level actors such as European Parliament, European Commission are part of the EU policy making process. Also, political arenas are interconnected in the sense that subnational actors have influence both national and supranational arenas and establish transnational process. The separation of domestic and international politics is rejected; complex relation of domestic politics is likely to extend to European level (Marks & Hooghe, 2001, p. 4). Consequently, multilevel governance reflects two important characters of transnational policy making: mobilization of sub-national governments as actors and the emergence of a new meso level of governance; a level between supranational and intergovernmental decision making (Gavin, 2004, p. 7).

The common point of multilevel and global governance approaches is that both challenge the state centric theories of international relations on the ground that IR theories focus on relations between unitary state actors and thus do not reflect the reality. Nevertheless, while multilevel governance stresses on the formal institutions with the assumption of a high degree of community under the governed and concerned with the effectiveness of policy, global governance emphasizes the interaction between governments, corporations and civil society. Despite these differences, Brigid Gavin argued for applicability of multilevel governance "in the open perspective to a wider range of policies, for example regulatory policies, in the multilateral context" (Gavin, 2004, pp. 8-9).

Beyond the multilevel EU governance, Anthony Payne gave two other examples of regional governance in the world. He mentioned "hub and spoke" governance in North America in which the power of United States is decisive in determining the contours of governance in North America. Also, he noted "pre-governance" in Asia Pacific based on market-led regional, rather than full-fledged regional policy network seen in Europe or North America (Payne, 2000, pp. 212-214).

Against this background, it can be argued that the studies on governance at the regional level mainly focus on the analysis of multilevel EU governance. Due to the ambiguous characteristic of "region as an authoritative unit" and the lack of advanced form regional governance, governance at the regional domain has been mainly neglected in theoretical studies.

5. CONCLUSION

Being one of the most frequently used terms of social sciences, governance has been employed by different disciplines such as Politics, Economics and International Relations. Departing from the emergence of global governance literature in the post-Cold War period, this paper examines the nexus of global and regional governance. Broadly speaking, the study of global governance centres around the rise of nonstate actors, namely market forces and civil society actors, the reconfiguration of state authority, the growth of complex global problems and the failure of existing system in responding to them. Yet, the explanatory power of global governance does not go beyond describing the reconfiguration of state authority. Secondly, the employment of global governance as a aggregate concept leads to confusion and ambiguity. It is used for capturing and describing each and every aspect of global life. For this reason, it requires further studying and implementation to specific issue areas.

In contrast to aggregate and total conceptualization of global governance, the studies on regional governance are dominated by multilevel EU governance, which analyzes the distribution of power and authority among supranational, national, and subnational levels. Since it describes the specific characteristics of the EU, it cannot be generalized to apply to other regions in the world. Besides, the studies on EU governance are mostly inward-oriented; they emphasize the internal decision-making of the EU and neglect the interaction between the European and global levels.

REFERENCES

Brühl, T. & Rittberger, V. (2002). From International to Global Governance: Actors, Collective Decision-Making, and the United Nations in the World of the Twenty-first Century. Volker Rittberger (Ed.), In *Global Governance and the United Nations System* (p. 1–47). United Nations University Press.

Brunnengraeber, A., Dietz, K., Hirschl, B. & Walk, H. (September, 2006). Interdisciplinarity in Governance Research. GARNET Working Paper, No. 08/06.

Clarke, J.N. & Edwards, R.G. (2004). *Global Governance in the Twenty-First Century*. Palgrave.

Commission of the European Communities. (2001). European Governance: A White Paper. 25.7.2001 COM (2001) 428.

Dingwerth, K. & Pattberg, P. (2006). Global Governance as a Perspective on World Politics. *Global Governance, 12(2),* 185-203.

Emadi-Coffin, B. (2002). *Rethinking International Organization: Deregulation & Global Governance*. Routledge.

Finkelstein, L.S. (1995). What is Global Governance? *Global Governance, 1,* 367-372. https://doi.org/10.1163/19426720-001-03-90000007.

Gavin, B. (2004). Federalism and Global Governance. UNU-CRIS Working Paper.

Hewson, M. & Timothy, S. (1999). The Emergence of Global Governance Theory. Martin Hewson & Timothy J. Sinclair (Eds.), In *Approaches to Global Governance Theory* (p. 3-22). SUNY Press.

Jachtenfuchs, M. (1997). Conceptualizing European Governance. Knud Erik Jorgensen (Ed.), In *Reflective Approaches to European Governance* (p. 39-50). Macmillan Press.

Karns, M.P. & Mingst, K.A. (2004). *International Organizations: The Politics and Processes of Global Governance*. Lynne Rienner.

Krahmann, E. (2003). National, Regional, and Global Governance: One Phenomenon or Many? *Global Governance, 9(3),* 323-346.

Makinda, S. (2002). Hedley Bull and Global Governance: A Note on IR Theory. *Australian Journal of International Affairs. 56(3),* 361-371. https://doi.org/10.1080/1035771022000019697.

Hooghe, L. & Marks, G. (2001). *Multi-Level Governance and European Integration*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Marks, G., François, N., Leonard, R. & Jane S. (1996). Competencies, Cracks and Conflicts: Regional Mobilization in the European Union. Gary Marks, Fritz W. Scharpf, Philippe C. Schmitter & Wolfgang Streeck (Eds.), In *Governance in the European Union* (p. 40-63). Sage.

McGrew, A. & Held, D. (2003). Introduction. Anthony McGrew & David Held (Eds.), In *Governing Globalization: Power, Authority and Global Governance* (p. 1-24). Polity Press.

Payne, A. (2000). Globalization and Modes of Regionalist Governance. Jon Pierre (Ed.), In *Debating Governance: Authority, Steering and Democracy* (p. 201-218). Oxford University Press.

Rosenau, J. (1999). Toward an Ontology for Global Governance. Martin Hewson & Timothy J. Sinclair (Eds.), In *Approaches to Global Governance Theory* (p. 287−301). Oxford University Press.

Rosenau, J. (1997). *Along the Domestic-Foreign Frontier: Exploring Governance in a Turbulent World*. Cambridge University Press.

Rosenau, J. (2000). Change, Complexity, and Governance in a Globalizing Space. Jon Pierre (Ed.), In *Debating Governance: Authority, Steering and Democracy* (p. 167-200). Oxford University Press.

Rosenau, J. (1995). Governance in the Twenty-First Century. *Global Governance, 1(1),* 13-43.

Rosenau, J. (1992). Governance, Order and Change in World Politics. James N. Rosenau & Ernst-Otto Czempiel (Eds.), In *Governance without Government: Order and Change in World Politics* (p. 1-29). Cambridge University Press.

Väyrynen, R. (2002). Reforming the World Order: Multi and Plurilateral Approaches. Bjorn Hettne & Bertil Odén (Eds.), In *Global Governance in the 21st Century: Alternative Perspectives on World Order* (p. 106-146). Almkvist & Wiksell International.

Wilkinson, R. (2005). *The Global Governance Reader*. Routledge.