NEGOTIATIONS AS AN INSTRUMENT OF GLOBAL GOVERNANCE: THEORETICAL APPROACHES AND PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

ПЕРЕГОВОРИ ЯК ІНСТРУМЕНТ ГЛОБАЛЬНОГО ВРЯДУВАННЯ: ТЕОРЕТИЧНІ ПІДХОДИ ТА ПРАКТИЧНІ ІМПЛІКАЦІЇ

Olha Vyhovska

PhD in Political Science, Associate Professor Acting Director of the Academy of Teaching,
Professor of the Department of International Relations of the 'Karazin Institute of International Relations and Travel Business' V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University,
e-mail: vyhovska@karazin.ua,
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8635-9991

Ольга Виговська

кандидат політичних наук, доцент, в.о. директора ННІ «Академія вчительства»,
профеcор кафедри міжнародних відносин ННІ «Каразінський інститут міжнародних відносин та туристичного бізнесу» Харківський національний університет імені В. Н. Каразіна, ,
e-mail: vyhovska@karazin.ua,
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8635-9991

***Abstract.** The article examines negotiations as a key instrument of global governance in the context of the transformation of the international political system. The author analyzes theoretical approaches to understanding negotiations: liberal institutionalism, realism, constructivism and game theory. It is analyzed that negotiations in the modern global environment go beyond traditional interstate diplomacy, covering multilevel interactions involving states, international organizations, corporations and civil society. A comparative analysis of practical cases of negotiations on vaccine distribution (COVAX/TRIPS Waiver), climate change (COP26-COP28), regulation of artificial intelligence and cybersecurity, global taxation and migration agreements is presented. The author identifies the main challenges to the effectiveness of negotiations: power asymmetry, populism, disinformation campaigns, and fragmentation of global governance. Particular attention is paid to the prospects of digitalization of negotiation processes, in particular, the use of virtual platforms, blockchain technologies and artificial intelligence tools. The article offers recommendations for strengthening the inclusiveness, transparency and adaptability of negotiation practices in global governance. The results of the study emphasize the need for an interdisciplinary approach and innovative strategies to effectively address global challenges in the twenty-first century.*

***Keywords:** global governance, negotiations, multilateral diplomacy, power asymmetry, digital tools, blockchain diplomacy, information security, intercultural communication, global challenges, international relations.*

***Анотація.** У статті досліджено переговори як ключовий інструмент глобального врядування в умовах трансформації міжнародної політичної системи. Проаналізовано теоретичні підходи до розуміння переговорів: ліберальний інституціоналізм, реалізм, конструктивізм та теорію ігор. Проанілзовано, що переговори в сучасному глобальному середовищі виходять за межі традиційної міждержавної дипломатії, охоплюючи багаторівневі взаємодії з участю держав, міжнародних організацій, корпорацій і громадянського суспільства. Представлено порівняльний аналіз практичних кейсів переговорів щодо розподілу вакцин (COVAX/TRIPS Waiver), боротьби зі зміною клімату (COP26–COP28), регулювання штучного інтелекту й кібербезпеки, глобального оподаткування та міграційних угод. Визначено основні виклики ефективності переговорів:*

асиметрія влади, популізм, дезінформаційні кампанії та фрагментація глобального врядування. Особливу увагу приділено перспективам цифровізації переговорних процесів, зокрема використанню віртуальних платформ, блокчейн-технологій та інструментів штучного інтелекту. В статті запропоновані рекомендації щодо зміцнення інклюзивності, прозорості та адаптивності переговорних практик у глобальному врядуванні. Результати дослідження підкреслюють необхідність міждисциплінарного підходу та інноваційних стратегій для ефективного врегулювання глобальних викликів у XXI столітті.

Ключові слова: *глобальне врядування, переговори, багатостороння дипломатія, асиметрія влади, цифрові інструменти, блокчейн-дипломатія, інформаційна безпека, міжкультурна комунікація, глобальні виклики, міжнародні відносини.*

Introduction. In today's world, negotiations have become one of the central mechanisms of global governance, which ensures coordination of actions of various actors in response to transnational challenges. Climate change, pandemics, cybersecurity threats, mass migration and digital transformation have created conditions under which no country can effectively address global issues on its own. Negotiations are a key tool for developing collective solutions, aligning interests, and reaching legitimate compromises. At the same time, multilateral negotiation processes are becoming increasingly complicated due to the asymmetry of resources between participants, the rise of populism and nationalism, the intensification of information wars, and the challenges of the digital age.

Therefore, the need for a theoretical rethinking of the role of negotiations in global governance and a practical analysis of their effectiveness in the current environment is becoming increasingly important. The article aims at analyzing negotiations as a phenomenon of global politics, identifying key challenges for modern negotiation processes, assessing the impact of digital technologies on the dynamics of negotiations, and offering recommendations for their optimization. The interdisciplinary approach allows us to consider negotiations not only as a process of reaching agreements, but also as a space for constructing new norms, identities and strategies of global interaction.

The purpose of the study is to provide a comprehensive theoretical and practical understanding of negotiations as an instrument of global governance in the context of the transformation of the international political system; to analyze key theoretical approaches to the negotiation process; to identify the main challenges facing modern negotiation practices; and to formulate recommendations for improving the effectiveness of multilateral negotiations in the context of digitalization, growing power asymmetries and the evolution of global challenges.

Literature review. The issue of negotiations in global governance has long been in the focus of international relations researchers, especially in the context of the changing nature of the international system in the post-bipolar period. The classic works of R. O. Keohane (1984) and J. S. Nye (2001) laid the foundation for understanding negotiation as an important element of the institutional order that helps stabilize cooperation between states even in the absence of centralized authority. They emphasized that international organizations and regimes are a kind of "catalyst for negotiations" because they provide transparency, information exchange and coercive mechanisms.

At the current stage of globalization, studies of the legitimacy of negotiation processes and governance mechanisms are of particular importance. In this context, M. Zürn (2021) proposes the concept of "contextualized legitimacy", which reveals the contradictions between global norms and the growing desire of states to preserve sovereignty. Zürn emphasizes that the success of negotiations depends not only on the achievement of formal agreement, but also on the level of recognition of their results by various stakeholders.

In the field of analyzing negotiation strategies in complex multilateral environments, the works of G. O. Faure and I. W. Zartman (2021). They propose models for managing the multidimensional complexity of negotiations, pointing to the need for adaptability, flexibility, and

multi-level communication in achieving results in a global context. Their approach is particularly relevant in negotiations related to climate change, digital security, or global health.

Another important topic is the impact of technology on negotiation processes. The works of R. Adler-Nissen and A. Drieschova (2021) have shown that digital technologies not only change the form of negotiations (for example, the spread of "track-change diplomacy"), but also transform the very logic of reaching agreements, requiring participants to develop new skills in manipulating digital platforms and responding quickly to information challenges.

A separate set of studies, presented by W. L. Bennett and S. Livingston (2020), examines negotiations through the prism of information security and disinformation campaigns. They emphasize that negotiations in the digitalization era are becoming vulnerable to manipulation, erosion of trust, and targeted erosion of legitimacy through the use of information technology. This calls for new approaches to protecting negotiation processes and enhancing transparency.

Authors	Main input	Research focus	Relevance for modern negotiations
Keohane (1984), Nye (2001)	Institutionalism and the role of international organizations	Cooperation in the absence of centralized authority	Ensuring predictability and stability of negotiation processes
Zürn (2021)	The legitimacy of global governance is tested	Legitimization of decisions and contradictions of sovereignty	Addressing the crisis of confidence in negotiation mechanisms
Faure & Zartman (2021)	Complexity management models	Multilateral negotiations in conditions of high uncertainty	Strategic management of diversity of participants and interests
Adler-Nissen & Drieschova (2021)	Digitalization of negotiation processes	The impact of technology on the structure and dynamics of negotiations	Innovative negotiation formats and new challenges for diplomacy
Bennett & Livingston (2020)	Information security of negotiations	Disinformation, deep fakes, information wars	Protecting the legitimacy and transparency of the negotiation process

The table provides a consolidated analysis of current views on the negotiation process. Thus, we can summarize that the modern scientific literature forms a multidimensional vision of negotiations in global governance: from institutional strengthening of cooperation and legitimization of decisions to complexity management, technological adaptation and countering information threats.

Main results of research. Global governance is a comprehensive system of norms, mechanisms, institutions, and procedures that coordinate the behavior of various actors at the international level to respond to cross-border challenges (Zürn, 2021). In the twenty-first century, the problems of security, climate change, global pandemics, migration flows, and digital transformation have become so large and complex that they have gone beyond the sovereign capabilities of individual states, creating the need to develop joint solutions through mechanisms of international cooperation, compromise, and coordination.

One of the key features of modern global governance is the growing role of non-state actors, including transnational corporations, international organizations, academic institutions, regional associations, social movements, and non-governmental organizations (Young, 2020). Their participation in negotiation processes contributes to the multimodality and flexibility of the global system, but at the same time makes it difficult to reconcile interests due to asymmetries in resources, legitimacy, and political influence. The negotiation process is no longer exclusively a sphere of interstate relations: it is increasingly becoming a networked process, where decisions are formed at the intersection of different levels of interaction - global, regional, national and local.

Negotiations in global governance are not only a technical tool for reconciling positions, but also a key mechanism for the evolution of the international order. According to Fischer and Ury (1991), negotiations are a basic form of peaceful settlement of differences in situations of divergent interests, where there is a desire to avoid escalation of the conflict. Negotiations perform a number of critical functions in the system of global governance:

• Consensus - facilitating the agreement of common policies and strategies in a multilateral environment (Zürn, 2021).

• Institutional - the creation and transformation of international regimes and norms governing specific areas of global interaction (Young, 2020).

• Communicative - maintaining an ongoing dialogue between public, private, and civil society actors to develop a common vision of global issues.

• Preventive - preventing conflicts through early detection of threats and development of collective response mechanisms.

• Legitimizing - ensuring recognition and support for decisions through inclusive and transparent decision-making procedures.

Thus, negotiations in global governance serve not only as a tool for reaching short-term agreements, but also as an important factor in shaping long-term architectures of international norms and rules. They allow the international system to adapt to new challenges, strengthen mutual trust between actors, and contribute to the stability of the global order.

In the context of the growing complexity and interdependence of the modern world, negotiations are increasingly acting as a factor of constructive governance through diversity, which is becoming crucial for the sustainable development of the international community in the twenty-first century.

The analysis of negotiations in global governance requires an interdisciplinary approach that combines the concepts of international relations, political philosophy, sociology and psychology. The main theoretical paradigms can be summarized as follows:

• Liberal institutionalism argues that international institutions reduce transaction costs, promote predictability, and create conditions for repeated negotiations, which creates an environment of trust (Keohane, 1984; Moravcsik, 1997).

• Realism emphasizes that negotiations reflect the existing balance of power. The outcome of negotiations is a function of the parties' power, not just arguments or morality (Mearsheimer, 2018).

• Constructivism sees negotiations as a process of social construction of reality, where identities, narratives, norms, and discourses play an important role. Negotiations become a tool for building collective understanding (Wendt, 1999; Adler, 2005).

• Game theory is used to model negotiation situations, especially in conditions of uncertainty and strategic confrontation. Classical models such as the Prisoner's Dilemma, the Chicken Game, and the Coordination Game allow analyzing the behavior of actors and seeking equilibrium in the face of conflicting interests (Axelrod, 1984).

The synthesis of these approaches allows us not only to describe but also to critically reflect on the role of negotiations in the modern global order, where the process of reaching an agreement is no less important than its content.

Negotiations in the practice of global governance: cases, mechanisms, limitations

The COVID-19 pandemic has demonstrated both the potential and the limits of negotiation mechanisms in global governance. Despite multilateral diplomacy under the auspices of the WHO, negotiations on vaccine distribution, patent protection, and access to medical technologies have shown significant asymmetries of influence and interests (Hale, Held, & Young, 2021). In particular, the COVAX initiative, which was supposed to ensure equitable access to vaccines, was limited by insufficient funding and the dominance of national strategies (Zürn, 2021).

In the World Trade Organization (WTO) negotiations on the temporary abolition of intellectual property rights (TRIPS Waiver), a conflict arose between the countries of the Global North and the Global South. This case illustrates the difficulty of balancing economic interests with the global ethical dimension (Adler-Nissen & Drieschova, 2021). The negotiations not only

reveal a conflict of interest, but also demonstrate the competition of narratives: "global solidarity" versus 'economic pragmatism'.

Climate negotiations, in particular within the framework of the Conference of the Parties to the UN Framework Convention (COP), have become a symbol of the complex architecture of global governance. Agreements, such as the Paris Agreement (2015) or the COP26-COP28 agreements, reflect the need for long-term, multi-level negotiations involving not only governments but also cities, corporations, and civil society organizations (Young, 2020).

The peculiarity of these negotiations is that they are increasingly moving into the realm of "track-change diplomacy" - flexible, digitally supported discussion formats, where even editorial changes act as political signals (Adler-Nissen & Drieschova, 2021). In this way, the text of the agreement becomes a space of struggle for meaning, not just a subject of agreement.

The participation of countries with different levels of responsibility for emissions, different vulnerabilities to climate change, and different financial capacities makes a "perfect compromise" impossible. However, it is negotiations that ensure the legitimacy of agreements, even when the results are compromised or postponed (Faure & Zartman, 2021).

У глобальному політичному середовищі, що дедалі більше набуває конфронтаційного характеру, переговори стають інструментом не лише вирішення, а й управління конфліктами. Зокрема, новий виток переговорів щодо контролю над штучним інтелектом, кібербезпекою чи енергетичним переходом демонструє посилення елементів стратегічного протистояння (Kydd, 2021).

In the G7, G20, or security conferences, negotiations are increasingly becoming a tool for demonstrating positions rather than reaching agreements. This is the phenomenon of the so-called "signaling diplomacy," where symbols, sequencing of arguments, and positioning in the information field become more important.

Despite the importance of negotiations, their effectiveness is limited by a number of factors:

- Unequal access to the negotiation process (especially for low-income countries);
- Lack of mechanisms for implementing the agreements reached;
- High level of politicization of multilateral institutions;
- Fragmentation of the global order and competition between universal and regional formats (Zürn, 2021; Coleman & Ferguson, 2021).

In particular, negotiations in the UN or WTO often face institutional "paralysis" due to the principle of consensus and veto. Thus, there is a shift towards alternative, more flexible formats: "coalitions of the willing", networking platforms, or informal clubs (Hale et al., 2021).

Comparative analysis of negotiation cases in global governance

Case	Participants	Subject of negotiations	Negotiation format	Result	Key restrictions
COVAX / TRIPS Waiver (2020–2022)	WHO, WTO, countries of the Global South, G7, pharmaceutical corporations	Distribution of vaccines, temporary abolition of patents	Intergovernmental negotiations within WHO and WTO	Partial access to vaccines, delayed decision on TRIPS Resource	Asymmetry, economic nationalism, corporate influence
Climate negotiations (COP26–28)	UN, member states, EU, China, USA, environmental NGOs	Emission caps, green finance, climate justice	Multilateral negotiations, networking platforms, public consultations	Gradual updating of commitments, support for vulnerable countries	Lack of enforcement mechanisms, North-South divide, fossil energy lobby

Case	Participants	Subject of negotiations	Negotiation format	Result	Key restrictions
Negotiation about AI/cybersecurity (2021–2024)	US, EU, China, India, transnational corporations	Regulation of artificial intelligence, cyber, digital standards	Expert groups, informal coalitions, "club diplomacy"	Partial codes of ethics, framework agreements	Geopolitical competition, blurred legal norms, technological gap
G20 negotiations on global taxation (2021)	G20, OECD, low-tax countries, multinationals	Setting a global minimum tax	OECD expert groups, policy summits	Agreeing on a global tax minimum (15%)	Opposition to tax havens, uncertainty of implementation
EU-Tunisia/Turkey migration agreements (2020–2023)	EU, Tunisia, Turkey, UN agencies, human rights organizations	Controlling migration flows, supporting refugees	Bilateral negotiations, hybrid diplomacy	Financial agreements, flow restrictions, criticized for ethical violations	Power inequality, limited transparency, conflict of legal norms

Having analyzed the negotiations presented in the table, we can conclude that most cases demonstrate asymmetry between the participants (resource, political, technological), negotiations are becoming multi-actor - including governments, corporations, international organizations and NGOs, and the role of flexible and informal negotiation formats (the so-called "track II diplomacy" or "club diplomacy") is growing. Negotiations acquire certain peculiarities depending on the context in which they are taking place. Environmental and tax negotiations are more focused on long-term framework agreements, while negotiations on migration or cybersecurity are more fragmented and ad hoc. Participants in the negotiation process face a number of constraints: lack of enforcement mechanisms, competition of norms and regimes (between national, regional and global levels), politicization and fragmentation of global governance.

One of the main obstacles to fair and effective negotiations in global governance remains the asymmetry of power between countries, actors and regions. Developed countries, large transnational corporations, and international organizations have significantly more resources, institutional influence, and communication capabilities than countries in the Global South or local communities (Zürn, 2020). This inequality is manifested not only in the formal representation of interests in international negotiations, but also in the processes of agenda setting, access to expertise, funding for delegations, and the ability to ensure compliance with agreements reached. Structural inequality means that negotiations often reproduce existing hierarchies in the global system rather than becoming a tool for real democratization of global governance. This leads to a crisis of confidence in multilateral negotiating institutions, which are increasingly perceived as serving the interests of a limited number of the most influential actors.

An additional factor complicating the negotiation process is the rise of populism, nationalism, and the erosion of multilateralism. Over the past decade, the political rhetoric of "sovereignty first," which has become particularly popular among political elites in the United States, the United Kingdom, Brazil, and some Central and Eastern European countries, has led to a decline in the effectiveness of multilateral negotiation mechanisms. Striking examples of this were the US withdrawal from the Paris Climate Agreement in 2025, the Brexit process, and criticism of the WHO during the COVID-19 pandemic (Lake, 2021). Populist diplomacy often reduces multilateral negotiations to a tool for domestic political positioning, where the desire for instant popularity prevails over long-term global interests. This creates a domino effect of disintegration of global solidarity and contributes to the spread of isolationism in international relations.

The information security of negotiation processes is becoming a particularly acute problem in the context of the spread of disinformation, fake narratives, and deep fake technologies. Modern negotiations are no longer confined to closed conference rooms: much of the battle for legitimacy and influence takes place in the public information space. Undermining trust in information through the deliberate dissemination of false materials or manipulation of the content of negotiations contributes to political polarization, discrediting negotiating platforms, and delaying decision-making (Bennett & Livingston, 2020). In such an environment, even successfully reached agreements can be called into question, and negotiations can turn into an arena of information attacks and counterattacks.

Despite these challenges, the digitalization of negotiation processes opens up new opportunities to improve the efficiency of global governance. The use of virtual platforms for negotiations (Zoom diplomacy), digital document management technologies, electronic signatures, and blockchain solutions for registering agreements creates the prospect of transparency, accessibility, and efficiency in the negotiation process. Blockchain technologies can ensure the immutability of the text of agreements, track their implementation, and protect them from unauthorized interference (Bjola & Pamment, 2021). At the same time, the analytical capabilities of artificial intelligence open up new horizons for predicting negotiation behavior, modeling scenarios, and optimizing communication strategies.

The prospects for the successful development of negotiations in global governance depend on the ability of the international community to integrate digital tools without losing the basic principles of democracy, inclusiveness, and trust. Effective digital diplomacy should combine innovative technologies with ethical standards and ensure equal access to negotiation platforms for all participants, regardless of their economic power or technological level of development.

Conclusions. The analysis of case studies of negotiation processes in the field of global governance shows that negotiations are not only a technical tool for reaching agreements, but also a political process that reflects the configuration of power, interests, and normative ideas about justice, solidarity, and responsibility. Negotiations serve as an arena where new rules of engagement are formed, and at the same time as a field of struggle for the meaning, legitimacy, and future of the global order.

Modern negotiation processes are becoming increasingly complex, multilevel and hybrid, requiring new approaches to their analysis and practical implementation. They increasingly go beyond classical diplomacy, including digital platforms, network structures and innovative communication formats.

Defining trends in the evolution of negotiations

1. Multi-actor and polycentricity. Negotiations are no longer the exclusive prerogative of states - the influence of non-governmental actors, corporations, municipalities, and international expert communities is growing (Young, 2020).

2. Digitalization of negotiation processes. The use of remote communication platforms (Zoom, e-deliberation tools) changes the dynamics of influence, pace and transparency of negotiations (Adler-Nissen & Drieschova, 2021).

3. Symbolic and narrative component. Negotiations are increasingly becoming a platform for symbolic actions, where it is not only what is agreed, but also how the arguments are presented, by whom and when (Kydd, 2021).

4. Shift to "club diplomacy" and flexible formats. In the context of growing distrust of the UN or WTO institutional structures, informal coalitions and mini-lateral forums are playing an increasingly important role (Hale et al., 2021).

Recommendations for improving the effectiveness of negotiations in global governance:

Recommendation	Justification
Strengthening the institutional memory of the negotiations	Creating open archives of the negotiations will increase transparency, trust and allow for the learning of previous experiences.

Recommendation	Justification
Inclusion of different actors	Involving representatives of the Global South, local communities and youth organizations will make the negotiations more legitimate and relevant.
Humanizing negotiations	Recognizing emotional, cultural and ethical issues as a legitimate part of the negotiation process can reduce conflict and promote cooperation.
Preparing the next generation of negotiators	Investing in training programs in negotiation theory, intercultural communication, and digital diplomacy will be key to shaping effective strategies for the future.
Hybrid Diplomacy	Combining traditional diplomacy with digital tools, data analytics, and artificial intelligence will create new formats for effective complexity management.

In a world where global challenges - environmental, security, migration, technological and humanitarian - increasingly require collective action in the absence of a centralized global authority, negotiations are becoming critical as a universal mechanism for reaching agreement. In the context of polycentrism and fragmentation of the global system, negotiations are becoming not just a technical tool for coordinating interests, but a true art of managing across differences, taking into account the diverse national strategies, cultural codes, economic capabilities, and value orientations of actors. In this context, negotiations allow not only to avoid escalation of conflicts, but also to create platforms for long-term partnerships, consolidation of efforts in solving global problems, and formation of new norms of international interaction.

Negotiations of the 21st century have the potential to become the basis for constructive political co-creation of a new global order based on the principles of cooperation, inclusiveness and shared responsibility. They are the key to overcoming structural inequalities, restoring trust between actors, and adapting international institutions to the new challenges of the digitalization and post-truth era. That is why the study, development and improvement of negotiation practices is of strategic importance for the future of international relations, where the ability to negotiate in a diverse environment will determine stability, security and prosperity on a global scale.

References.

1. Adler-Nissen, R., & Drieschova, A. (2021). Track-change diplomacy: Technology, discourse, and the making of international agreements. *International Organization, 75*(2), 225–248.
2. Bennett, W. L., & Livingston, S. (2020). *The disinformation age: Politics, technology, and disruptive communication in the United States.* Cambridge University Press.
3. Bjola, C., & Pamment, J. (2021). *Digital diplomacy and international organizations: Autonomy, legitimacy and contestation.* Routledge.
4. Coleman, P. T., & Ferguson, R. (2021). *Making conflict work: Harnessing the power of disagreement.* Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
5. Faure, G. O., & Zartman, I. W. (2021). *Negotiating in complex negotiations: How to manage complexity in negotiation.* Springer.
6. Fisher, R., Ury, W., & Patton, B. (2022). *Getting to yes: Negotiating agreement without giving in* (4th ed.). Penguin Books.
7. Hale, T., Held, D., & Young, K. (2021). *Gridlock: Why global cooperation is failing when we need it most* (Updated edition). Polity Press.
8. Kydd, A. (2021). International negotiation and conflict resolution. In W. R. Thompson (Ed.), *Oxford research encyclopedia of international studies.* Oxford University Press.
9. Lake, D. A. (2021). International legitimacy lost? Rule and resistance when America is first. *Perspectives on Politics, 19*(1), 41–57. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592720001172
10. Pouliot, V. (2020). *International practices: Negotiating rule and order.* Cambridge University Press.

11. Sebenius, J. K., & Singh, M. (2020). Are there persistent negotiation effects? Tracking and explaining bargaining outcomes in the US Congress. *Negotiation Journal, 36*(4), 385–409.
12. Young, O. R. (2020). *Institutional interplay and global environmental change.* MIT Press.
13. Zürn, M. (2021). *A theory of global governance: Authority, legitimacy, and contestation.* Oxford University Press.