

Globalization and management

Štros, Danimir; Coner, Maja; Bukovinski, Daniel

Source / Izvornik: **Ekonomski vjesnik : Review of Contemporary Entrepreneurship, Business, and Economic Issues, 2014, XXVII, 425 - 436**

Journal article, Published version

Rad u časopisu, Objavljena verzija rada (izdavačev PDF)

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://urn.nsk.hr/urn:nbn:hr:145:178000>

Rights / Prava: [Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International/Imenovanje-Nekomercijalno-Bez prerada 4.0 međunarodna](#)

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2024-12-21**



Repository / Repozitorij:

[EFOS REPOSITORY - Repository of the Faculty of Economics in Osijek](#)



Danimir Štros
Municipality of Brdovec
Trg dr. Franje Tuđmana 1,
10292 Šenkovec
danimir@brdovec.hr
Phone: +38513315886

Daniel Bukovinski
Municipality of Brdovec
Trg dr. Franje Tuđmana 1,
10292 Šenkovec
d.bukovinski@brdovec.hr
Phone: +385995373211

UDK 339.9765.012.4
Review article

Received: September 9, 2014
Accepted for publishing: December 9, 2014

Maja Coner
Municipality of Brdovec
Trg dr. Franje Tuđmana 1,
10292 Šenkovec
maja@brdovec.hr
Phone: +38513315885

GLOBALIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

ABSTRACT

Globalization as an ongoing process allows and promotes the development of economy of big countries as well as developing countries that are seeking their place in the global market. Interactive communication has been enabled between people, companies, civil society organizations and other institutions, whose needs can be met over the internet anywhere in the world and at any time.

Also, professional and competent human resources are needed and therefore it is necessary to invest in new knowledge, innovation, new technologies and lifelong learning. In this environment, management sets its strategic goals through which it will be able to carry out the plans for the sale of products or services. Nowadays, a manager has to have interdisciplinary skills and lifelong education because only in this way it is possible to respond to the constant and rapid changes in the world.

We are witnesses that Europe has reunited in order to compete with the less developed countries with their products and services. Europe has long refused to accept the managerial style of governance, particularly in public administration and is therefore far behind the U.S., but also the Third World countries. Until recently, European public administration was more focused on the implementation of laws and regulations and less on managerial governance of the U.S. type.

Global environment requires the continuous research, monitoring competition, innovation and the ability to change rapidly.

Keywords: globalization, management, innovation, technologies, competitive, interdisciplinary.

1. Introduction

This article deals with globalization as a global process of modernization of society. This process, like any other, can be observed from two aspects: the positive and the negative aspect.

In globalization there is national economy and united economy (EU), and each wants to sell their products and services on the market in its own manner. National economies try to help their businesses to sell their product or service with various incentives and subsidies, but there are also other businesses in the global market without the support of the national government.

The management job in global terms is very demanding, responsible and uncertain. Organizations that have no will to change policies in terms of global market forces do not participate in the global market and they lose their market position. Due to the new sophisticated technology, managers and management must constantly learn about new findings that appear in the market and make sound decisions in accordance with them.

Globalization should not be a big problem for entrepreneurship; the challenge for them is to create more innovative solutions and flexible behavior so that they can impose their product or service. The organization and management in whole must keep pace with constant changes, and analyze themselves and the competition using SWOT analysis, making strategic plans, short-term or long-term strategies.

This paper will also present the hypotheses about pros and cons of both society and the individuals involved in entrepreneurship.

2. Globalization as a process

Globalization is the last stage in a constant process of social change; the term began to be used twenty or more years ago as an explanation for the new wave of change in the economy, technology and society.

Most authors agree that globalization is not something new; it is an old process that began a hundred years ago (Hirsh, Thompson, 1999), specifically in the late 18th century, at a time when Europe was swept with a wave of social change. Since industrialization became the main social process that shapes

society, the main feature of this period is the exponential rate of social change. In traditional societies, the changes proceeded significantly slower and generations of people lived in largely unchanged conditions.

The speed of change is becoming greater and today we can expect big changes not only from one generation to another, but also within one generation. For example, in some families occupation was passed down from generation to generation. However, today we can expect that one individual changes several professions during life.

Social sciences describe these processes using different concepts. Industrialization, modernization, and postmodernism were or are still slogans such as globalization is today. However, we cannot exclude the possibility that the use of this concept in the social sciences is also subject to fashion trends. Using new concepts largely reflects the transparency of the major forces and processes that shape society.

Industrialization was the first term which social sciences used to describe the great transformation of society during which industrial production has become the main form of production. This change was so profound that the term industrial revolution was used not only to describe the transition from manufacture to industrial production but also to describe the broader structural changes. The consequences were enormous productivity growth and changes in the whole range of areas like occupational structure, work organization, professional skills, patterns of consumption and culture in general.

The concept of **modernization** is used to describe a wider range of change in which society becomes more complex, urbanized and differentiated, and the production and social organization are increasingly based on science. In social sciences, the concept of modernization is particularly used to describe the process by which the "third world countries" develop; countries that have lagged behind in the process of change, industrialization and modernization (Inkeles, Smith, 1974). The fact that since the beginning of industrialization undeveloped countries gradually modernize and industrialize shows that industrialization and modernization was a global process from the start.

The concept of globalization is quite important for the **post-industrial society**; it was first developed by Daniel Bell in the sixties and was related to the most developed societies, which transformed into

a new stage of development after industrialization and modernization. This new phase is characterized by significant changes in the structure of production, namely the transition from the industrial development to the tertiary sector (services sector). Bell referred to the structure of employment as the main empirical indicator of the transition from one phase to another. When the number of employees in the service sector outgrows the number of employees in the industry, the country enters the post-industrial phase. In such a system, knowledge replaces capital, innovation replaces tradition and ideas replace manual labor as the main source of power and growth. Even though it was obvious that the development of post-industrialization was universal, the analytical schemes did not show that. Most attention was given to the internal changes that have happened in highly developed societies, new technologies, new industries, new structures of interest, information technologies, etc. It can safely be concluded that the tendency of globalization was inherent (present) in the processes of industrialization and modernization. Conceptually, industrialization and modernization cannot be equated with the notion of globalization. The industrialization and modernization can be developed in an isolated social system, such as a nation-state or any part of the world.

Globalization, on the other hand, is a process of industrialization and modernization, which is expanding globally and has an integrating function. Therefore, Croatia should draw attention to higher education and new technologies because only in this way will its economy be competitive and able to engage in the process of globalization. The influx of foreign capital opportunities opens development abilities that will result in new hires and filling the budget.

3. Definitions and position of globalization

The intense and general debate on globalization is dominated by three typological points of view: neo-liberal, reformist and radical.

Advocates of **neoliberal viewpoint** follow the classical liberal principle that the market is a fundamental force that pushes overall human benefits, freedom, democracy and peace.

Neoliberalism especially relies on theoretical ideas of free trade, from which it follows that the state border should not be an obstacle for effective allocation of resources in the world economy.

Yet in the last decades of the twentieth century, in the context of pronounced economic globalization, neo-liberals have not only revived but sharpened classical liberal settings against proactive government intervention as guiding and limiting factors of market operations. States are not, in their opinion, capable of controlling globalization. Global markets should be left to operate without formal restrictions and the only necessary function of governments of multilateral institutions consists of facilitating and supporting the globalization of neo-liberal orientation. For example, they harmonize (adjust) technical standards among the countries where the population of a country is against neoliberal arrangements, they exert pressure in order to ultimately implement arrangements, however that does not mean that the public sector allows routing of market trends on a global scale.

For neo-liberals, globalization is only possible under the condition of immense repression of regulation and abolition of state restrictions that inhibit the movement of money, goods, services and capital. They also advocate the abolition of government control of prices and wages and proclaim privatization as a measure that narrows down the maximum state ownership of productive resources. They insist on reducing government expenditures that guarantee prosperity and hold that market arrangements play a key role in pension policy, health care and other areas of social security. In short, they reject the national strategy of economic management which operated from the 1930s to 1970s (Milani, 1999: 169, 186).

Neoliberalism is undoubtedly dominant conceptual and political framework of contemporary globalization. It is not a collection of doctrinal abstractions; it is an approach which is in the service of the dominant class power and countries in today's world. Since the early eighties, many governments, especially the governments of the most powerful countries, saw a chance for neoliberal policies in globalization. Hence it is not surprising that multilateral institutions, such as the International Monetary Fund, the World Trade Organization and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, associate globalization with liberalism. It is not surprising that business associations (the

International Organization of Employers, World Economic Forum) figure as a sort of bastions of neoliberalism.

The dominant viewpoint of economic theories, while relying on strong power centers of neoliberal conception of globalization, is praising the virtues of free global markets and considers them to be a kind of new universals. Neoliberal notion of globalization shaped up as a kind of conceptual and practical political orthodoxy. But only in the 20th century have the neo-liberal ideas been generally accepted as unquestionable.

Reformism or global social democracy is seen as the strongest competitor of neoliberal globalization policies. This approach is based on the traditions of Keynesian economics, the New Deal and the Great Society in the United States, as well as the heritage of Western European welfare state in the period of 1945. Reformists as well as liberals believe that capitalism can be a powerful driver of social welfare, but unlike liberals, they believe that achieving these positive results requires the establishment and implementation of a specific circuit of public policy. In their opinion unbridled capitalism produces substantial personal, social and environmental injustices and global markets can fail, and it is therefore necessary to introduce a series of adjustments in the form of political intervention of public institutions. Reformists advocated a diverse range of policy measures to promote the positive and negative potential suppression of capitalism. They advocate for the control of trans-boundary movements of resources so that they can reduce harmfulness of market instability, social inequality and environmental cost of economic growth. They introduced various official guarantees for minimum standards (basic income, work safety, environmental control), in order to protect the most vulnerable social layers from the devastating consequences of unbridled capitalism and other measures that limit the power of corporations.

The old school reformism focuses on government measures as a key instrument of progressive diversion of capitalism. But it is increasingly shown that national strategies are no longer appropriate means of managing global capitalism (Waters, 1995: 97). So many contemporary reformists recognize the need for global public policy of the state in which institutions play a key role. This, for example, means that the reformist programs should strive for enforceable rules of behavior for global companies and

global environmental regulation that seeks global economic unity.

Some reformists believe that the international bodies such as the International Monetary Fund should create mechanisms to establish greater stability and fairness in the global financial markets. Global institutions should follow programs that would improve the state of deprived social classes. In the late nineties certain achievements were recorded on "reformist challenges" to neoliberalism. The International Labor Organization called for stronger protection of labor in global capitalism, and the UN Development Program had identified a global reform proposals contained in the Report on Human Development. Even the World Bank, under the chairmanship of James Wolfensohn since the mid-nineties, has accepted a rhetoric that respects the meaning of reformist initiatives.

The reformist approach to globalization has become evident in various segments of civil society action. Thus, for example, the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions insisted on such international politics and institutions to guide the process of globalization in the service of needs and aspirations of the people. Numerous non-governmental organizations are calling for reform of multilateral economic institutions in order to combat the negative globalization.

In socio-theoretical circles, political science and political scene there is a debate about the necessity of renewal of social democracy in line with the new global realities. Thanks to this stride of reformism, regardless how weak and "superficial" it still is, neoliberal approaches today do not have such a strong position as during the eighties.

Radicalism, as opposed to reformism, which generally accepts globalization flux and its main driving forces (the capitalist mode of production, modern technology, rationalization application of knowledge, the indispensable function of the market), advocates a reversal of globalization, but in entirely different structural foundations (Robertson, 1992). Judging by radical starting points and intentions this position is not homogeneous. In fact, two versions of radicalism are at work.

One is formed by those who wish to stop globalization and return to a lost, pre-global state, and its proponents are therefore referred to as **traditionalists**. In their opinion, globalization destroyed the legacy of previous social orders and therefore de-

globalization is the only way to restore economic security, ecological balance, cultural integrity and democracy. Because globalization in that sense is inherently harmful and irreversible, the only thing that remains is stopping and reversing the trend.

Traditionalist intercession of deglobalization, on behalf of a better past, manifests itself in various forms: economic nationalism, religious, environmental radicalism, etc. Economic nationalists emphasize the crucial importance of re-establishing an undeniable state of self-determination of countries and their separation from the global economic network. Religious revivalists evoke "lost locality" to revive the original views and forms of their religion, which does not mean that every religious response to globalization is fundamentalist-inspired. Radical environmentalists advocate the return of the pre-modern harmony with nature, glorifying self-sufficiency of local communities and in this regard critically reject the majority reformist view of sustainable development.

The second variant of radicalism, quite different from the reactive traditionalism, is constituted by actors, groups or movements that are related to globalization in a proactive manner. They do not advocate stopping globalization, but its continuation on assumptions of critical analysis of one-dimensional development. Reformist strategies are being considered inappropriate because they do not reach the deep structural causes that produce troubles of contemporary globalization. "Global socialists", for example, refer to capitalism as to irreparable wrong and seek to shape a "post capitalist globalization". Traditional socialist strategy, that is, proletarian capture of state power, is being considered obsolete and, instead, they promote a general global movement of workers, women and other oppressed people as an appropriate way to establish a post-capitalist and socially exploitation-free world. Certain postmodernist critics of contemporary society perform in the sight of this proactive radicalism. They reject the rationalist structure of knowledge and exclusive identity politics that had been prevalent in the former process of globalization. Global politics claim to be a favorable circumstance for a vigorous resurrection of greater pluralism of knowledge, identity and culture. In all, a radical stance on globalization attracted fewer followers than neo-liberalism and reformism. In short, radical responses to globalization did not, despite their remonstrating and anticipating force, achieve any lasting impact

on official institutions (national or supranational), market or wider circles of world power.

4. Globalization in the context of transition

The typological sketch of the prevailing views about globalization, taken from the book by Jan Aart Scholte, *Globalization - A critical introduction*, is a suitable analytical framework for understanding how globalization works in general and for its specific echoes in different social environments (Scholte, 2000: 35-40). It is therefore useful for countries that are both nominally and actually characterized by the transitional social processes.

Globalization in its recent intensity and transition in its motives, actions and the consequences are historically concurrent facts, and because of this simultaneity the question of how the typical viewpoint of globalization is reflected in the transitional situation is raised.

First. The changes that feature the last decade of the twentieth century and that led to the collapse of the socialist system were caused by endogenous and exogenous reasons.

Endogenous reasons are contained in the very nature of these systems, their economic and political logic and the ideology that legitimized them (Huntington, 1991, Dahrendorf, 1990). They were brought to the economic meltdown by a model of development and modernization that has relied on the state determined production, exchange and consumer activity, the centralized planning and restraining "free market forces", and on the regulation of the economic sphere as a basic structural factor of social progress. It is a model commonly referred to as "modernization from the above". Political reasons for the collapse lay in the order of a one-party rule that restrained "free political forces" and unhindered manifestation of political differences, rights and freedoms. Such government monopoly merged with the state apparatus, gagged and completely absorbed the sphere of civil society, which is formed by a plurality of social actors and their public interest work. The final act of the collapse of this ruling model is marked by a request for the establishment of civil society as a necessary condition for a multiparty parliamentary order. In the name of such ideological and, according to Popper, historical picture of human development and history, the

order could be reproduced or somewhat reformed, but only as long as its dominant actors had enough unchallenged power and loyal followers to successfully call on the “historical necessity” of the illusion of linear progress in equality (Furet, 1997, Lefort, 2000).

The exogenous reasons effect, that is often forgotten, has equally influenced the collapse of the socialist system and the design of post-socialist and transitional situations. All of these reasons are of course associated with global development trends and circumstances after the Second World War and, in particular, the modernization turns of the seventies. Techno-economic progress of highly developed Western societies at the same time provided a high economic competitiveness at the international level and the war of consumer products at the internal level. Redistributive formula of the welfare state has successfully maintained a liberal balance between labor and capital for decades, between social and market principles, and the institutionalization of conflict kept the society safe from the radicalism of anti-systemic movements. The crisis of the seventies upset this balance, but it increased the economic power of developed centers in relation to the periphery and semi-periphery. However, the rise of power based on absolute market and neoliberal reduction of social spending growth, started to assert itself as the main brake to successful participation in the competitive market.

The market may proclaim as canon, even as the highest principle of any prosperity and the only way of modernization of every society. Under its protection the global relations are shaped and the barriers that hinder the free circulation of capital, labor, services, information and cultural and consumer patterns are broken down. The radicalization of liberal modernity, long referred to as “internationalization” is reaching the stage of globalization or modernization (Hutton/Giddens, 2000: 7-50). Globalization is here, to paraphrase Giddens and Beck, a radicalization of late-modern liberalism. Radicalization is so dominant that, judging by the leading ideas imagination, it has no real alternative. Long developed institutions of the welfare state are now being questioned, and the ideas and actually existing forms of socialism, which are proclaimed by the conservative neoliberals as “evil empire”, are losing the last remnants of its alternative appeal, so it is no longer able to be rehabilitated by very serious programs of reform, liberalization or “glasnost”. They have just

softened the assumptions of a meltdown and helped to accept the neoliberal globalization as an inevitable condition for a possibility of the transition turn.

What Dahrendorf called “revolutions”, and what seems to be a synonym for post-communist or transition situation, is taking place in accordance with the conditions, normative ideas and demands of globalized neo-liberal revolution, which some authors prefer to qualify as a “neo-liberal counter-revolution” (Martinussen, 1997). This agreement was not raised as a matter of choice between more options, but as an unquestionable accepting of the global dominant, real and ideal framework to fit in if one wants to jump in post totalitarian social situation. Routinely used phrase “structural adjustment” is just a euphemism for barely countable and still unfinished series of turning procedures which represent a shift between two completely different systemic worlds, a world of blocked socialist modernization and a world of neoliberal modernization of global reach. It requires privatization and desocialization, a minimal state and the rule of law, deregulation and free trade, open society and deterritorialization, fiscal discipline of the state and a virtually unlimited freedom of the private financial sector, relentless favoring of growth parameters and reducing mass contingents of redundant employees, active participation in shaping the world consensus and relativization of traditionally conceived sovereign power, etc. Elites and actors who have come to power through the election in the “new democracies” accessed these dense system turns as declared and interest motivated advocates of neoliberal ideology and accelerate dealing with the legacy of the communist period. Ideological compromised and relentless deconstruction of the communist heritage have accounted for almost unconditional imposition of neo-liberal paradigm as a remedy for all, for such arrangement that will enable the smooth enrichment enterprising capable minority in a short period and thus the general prosperity of the majority. So without previously developed liberal democratic political culture, a jump was made to systemic arrangements in which the social question has become the main victim of “liberated Prometheus” privatization, in which capitalist ideology harmonized market interest replaces socialist utopia of equality overnight, and in which basic civic virtues of respect for the law mean almost nothing in front of a final legitimate possibility of acquiring, accumulating and corrupt robber-ownership

(Dragičević, 2001; Štajner, 2001).

Consequently, there are two parallel streams of action and thought in the transition process: a current globalization stream of neo-liberal modernization and a communitarian-traditionalist stream. The former works in the direction of “market fundamentalism” because its rationality is so prevalent that it simply does not allow dissent, and the latter pulls in the direction of patrimonial localization which does not allow any thought of the disintegration of the community. The challenges of neoliberal globalization, which had exogenously stimulated the transition shift, simultaneously opened the way for the post-communist modernization and demodernization and multiplied troubles of social fragmentation that cannot be restrained by any rhetoric of populism or good old values. It is therefore logical that optimism of quick and prosperous structural adjustment gives way to an affirmative-relativistic perception of globalization, accepting her “epochal” character, but with a somewhat more moderate and socially equitable figure.

Second. This affirmative-relativistic notion coincides with what Scholte defined as reformist stance on globalization. Generally speaking there is no essential difference between the globalization reformism that is theoretically and politically evident in developed countries and reform strategies that were formed in the transition countries. And in both cases, it is the effort to abandon or mitigate the dogma of self-regulating markets and regulatory restrain its devastating social consequences. In both cases almost all the basic postulates of liberal development model are accepted, but its ultraliberal paroxysms, which have, according to some moderate critics, taken on the form of one-dimensional thinking and single-mindedness, are rejected (Todd, 1998).

The necessity of abandoning this unidimensionality, which means expediency of a reformist shaping of globalization, is recognized even by the leading protagonists of the international institutions that largely decide on development programs and criteria in today's world. In this sense, the eloquent attitude of Michel Camdessus, the Director of the International Monetary Fund, sounds quite reformist: “As for us, the International Monetary Fund, nothing has changed. I have always advocated the theory of three hands: the invisible hand of the market, the hand of justice (the state) and the hand of solidarity. Those three hands should act together” (Latouche, 2001: 168).

By no means denying the market, the reformers advocate the rehabilitation of the two other sectors: public economics and various associations, voluntary work and alternative enterprises.

Theoretically it is the nearest stance to the long and unjustly forgotten Karl Polanyi, who has, contrary to the radical liberal separation of economy and society, advocated the view that the integration processes are taking place through three models: through exchanges or markets via redistribution, through reciprocity or through mutual aid (Latouche, 2001: 168). Fear of universal social disintegration, which motivated even the United Nations to seriously tackle the issue of social development in the time of reign of the neo-liberal paradigm, is just one of the practical evidence of justification of this hypothesis and a testimony of reformist relation to globalization. One should not forget that in highly developed Western countries political and social movements (parties, unions and civil society actors) are acting with a long reformist tradition, which break down neither capitalism nor the market, but are, in this context, fighting for a fairer redistribution of resources, goods and social development achievements. In other areas, moderate active and stable reformism historically proved to be one of the key factors for the balanced development of liberal democratic societies.

From this logic the so-called third path is derived by the British New Labor, which is, along the theoretical elaboration sociologist Anthony Giddens, one of the most consistent reformist responses to the challenges of globalization (Giddens, 1999). It is both the reformist abandoning of “old” reformism (nationalization, high public expenditure, passive welfare state, etc.) and adjusting to “flexibilities” of the modern market (growth demands, economic stability with steady growth, the European Union, globalization, etc.). To simply put it, this is a reformist conception that is based on the idea of overcoming the “literal” neo-liberalism and traditional social-democracy, and its main determinants of the program are: a radical center, a new democratic state (state without enemies), an active civil society, a democratic family, a new mixed economy, equality as inclusion, positive well-being, social investment state, cosmopolitan nation and democracy (Giddens, 1999: 73).

The radical center is actually a sort of a junction or rational reconciliation of pervasive markets and stable social issues that cannot be abstracted in any

fiction or quantifications of global growth. Transitional reformism is in an unenviable position because, on the one hand, it has to prove its declared openness to the world and co-operative efficiency in the implementation of all applicable rules of “global game”, and on the other hand, if it wants to preserve its legitimacy, it is obliged to follow the strategy of redistributive welfare and justice. It turned out that in the current circumstances it is very difficult to reconcile or to satisfy these two logics, that this is possible only if one of them ascribes priority importance.

Therefore, the transition formula, which attempts to perform socially liberal interventions that give reformist appeal, cannot make a single modernization step without simultaneously narrowing the entire sphere of inherited or newly-created social benefits and rights that do not fit into the global scale of development. Thus it happens that a coalition of reformism and social liberalism, which is based on good diagnosis of the majority social interests and expectations in the post-communist situation, more successfully meets the general criteria of globalization than the specific requirements of social development. It broke the tendency of authoritarian distortion of the transition that is justifiably called democratic dictatorship or democrature, but has done very little or nothing on degradation of the neoliberal-client privatization, the reduction of social inequalities, increase of employment, nor investment in scientific and educational resources as key factors that advance global “knowledge economy” (Dragičević, 2001). Reformist practice is far behind widely accepted reformist ideas of globalized modernization. Also in areas of rich reformist tradition, this gap is one of the major sources from which not only strategies of intransigent critical discourse are powered but also social mobilization strategies of practical dispute.

Third. Apparently it comes to those streams of thought and action, which more or less explicitly and declaratively act as a radical stance on globalization. It is in a transition context, as elsewhere in the world, indicated by already standardized terms: anti-globalism, anti-globalization movement, globalization groups, alternatives to globalization, etc. This terminology had been accepted in the past decade as a significant new addition to the rhetoric of public jargon and practice of civil society.

These terms suggest that the protagonists of radical point of view completely reject globalization and are utopian and illusionist opponents to an economic, social, political and cultural process that permanently works on the interdependence of the modern world. But regardless of the unambiguous message to the very terms, this is not correct, or at least not correct in a general sense. For all their apparent uniformity, anti-globalization opinion, as noted by Pierre Bourdieu, is still very chaotic. It is a chaotic response to conservative dogmatism that predatory capitalism wants to revive in new and seemingly civilized attire (Bourdieu, 2001). It only has one feature in common: its majority trend focuses on immediate action and not on hold, on the mobilization pressure rather than the reformist adaptation, on practical measures against rising inequality rather than on economic growth as the dominant variable relationship between North and South, the developed and the developing. And it should be noted that the anti-systemic social movements, regardless of the type of organization and the degree of radicalism, together constructed historical world of modern capitalism, that they entered a social and political dimension in its development, without which it would have had a much crueller figure that still provides a utopian appeal for it. It is this utopian allure of capitalist “society of abundance” that is one of the main reasons why socially radical globalization ideas, movements and initiatives don’t have a particular momentum, mass mobilization and public impact in the transition context. Proponents of radical attitudes and actors have almost no influence on these arrangements. They do not even participate in them, but appear as alternative groups in civil society area, the groups that do not fight for social power and political power, but for daily or long-term goals that remain out of sight of the established power and authority. One could say that in the transitional context and conditions of a still underdeveloped civil society they tend to follow a tendency of the modern world marked by the sociologist Ulrich Beck, as part of his theory of reflexive modernization, as forming sub-politics.

It is about diminishing of the political in the traditional sense, about finding the political as creating and self-creating policy that does not cultivate or renew old hostilities, and does not gain from them, or does not sharpen the means of power, but invents new forms of content and coalition (Beck, 2001: 208). From this perspective a radical stance

on globalization is derived; it transcends the division on the left and right parties and views development in the perspective of world civil society in which the instrumental power of the free market and its masters does not lose any sense of equality and fairness. It affects the globalization from below and its imposition from above, not at peace with the growing tendency of economic despotism. Radical anti-globalists of that trend do not advocate locally-communitarian hostility toward globalization and are entirely lost by their ideas of revival of tradition as a form of identity preservation. On the contrary they use the local and global opportunities to critically observe the modernization potential of globalization and believe that they have to be immediately, without hesitation, universally drawn to the purposes of redistribution, peace and solidarity. And it is, considering the means and ends, a quite different, truly "alternative globalization". This alternation, realistically speaking, is too heavy for so-called vital pragmatic and urgent tasks of transition and therefore it is not surprising that in such circumstances a stronger anti-globalization movement is not possible.

5. Globalization and Management

Increasingly rapid development of new sophisticated technologies and methods of organization poses increasing demands for rapid adjustment and action on the behalf of management. They are only possible to achieve through continuous improvement and education of managers on all levels in order to be in line with global requirements and resist the challenges of the global economy. This comprehensive cyclical process affects all parts of society from manufacturers, through service providers and distributors to end users - the consumers. It is causal in its character because on the one hand consumers are changing businesses and behavior of producers, and on the other hand the manufacturers are using their products and services to affect habits, desires, lifestyle, needs and even customer awareness. One can even say that this is a process that incorporates almost all segments of society and social exchanges, delves into them and creates a global image through marketing tools. The task of the management in such conditions is to find solutions that would be optimal to meet all of these needs in a global society, but also to provide profit to the company they

manage.

Within their core functions as complex decision makers, managers should find solutions for multiculturalism, multinationality, habits and life styles of their employees, and develop strategies which would reconcile these differences to successfully accomplish their goal. Professional literature leads to similar findings and conclusions: the author E. G. C. Collins, in his *Management of the 21st Century*, describes globalization as a finding for organizations that business must be directed towards the international environment, not only towards the local. Organizations and their management should take into account the changes that occur outside the organization and the problems of defining their business environment. Environment (Robbins, 1995: 219) is defined as a complex area consisting institutions that affect the performance of the organization and over which the organization has little control. Environment of the organization can be seen as macro and micro environment. The task of the management is to act on these two segments in their decisions.

The macro environment does not directly interact with the organization, but the management tends to affect it through strategic planning decisions, taking into account the previously described differences. The micro environment is in close interaction with the organization and affects the organization itself. Policy making and internal organizational structure are tools through which the management affects this environment. Furthermore, according to some authors, the environment is split into static and dynamic environment. The static environment creates significantly less uncertainty for managers in comparison to the dynamic one. Uncertainty poses a threat to the effectiveness of the organization and the management seeks to minimize it, and one way to achieve that is to adjust the organizational structure.

Management plays a key role in the globalization process because their decisions contribute to the creation of a global image because consumer habits transcend national boundaries.

6. Conclusion

Nowadays it is extremely important to take care of the business environment in the global market, along with potential development within the company. Globalization is part of the present and the management should focus on it despite its flaws and shortcomings. Adapting to the new conditions is necessary if one wishes to successfully operate and develop the company's products and services in the global market.

The Internet, which made the whole world available to each individual, provides great opportunities for creating and developing businesses.

Through entrepreneurial initiatives, the availability to business partners becomes unlimited and immediately enforceable using virtual offices and similar ventures. Organizational adaptation has to be fast and efficient, focusing on organizational culture.

Only those who adapt to the times and who make their business decisions based on continuous consumer research can hope to achieve business success.

REFERENCES

1. Albrow, M. (2000). *Society and Social Diversity, The Challenge of Governance in the Global age*. OECD.
2. Alderson, S. A. (1999), „Explaining Deindustrialization: Globalization, Failure, or Success“, *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 64, No. 5, pp. 701-721.
3. Axford, B. (1995). *The Global System-Economic, Political and Cultural*. New York.
4. Barber, R. B. (1995/96). *Jihad vs. McWorld, How Globalization and Tribalism Are Shaping the World*. New York: Ballantine Books.
5. Brown, L. R. (2001). *State of the World 2001*. New York/London: W. W. Northon & Company, World-watch Institut.
6. Burnham, J. (1960). *The Managerial Revolution*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
7. Castells, M. (1997). *The Power of Indentity*. Oxford: Blackwell Pub New Delhi: Sage Publications.
8. De Soysa, I., Oneal J. R. (1999), „Boon of Bane? Re Assessing the Productivity of Foreign Direct Investment“, *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 64.
9. Farazmand, A. (1999), „Globalization and Public Administration“, *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 59.
10. Galbraith, J. K. (1970). *Nova industrijska država*, Zagreb: Stvarnost.
11. Hampton, K., Wellman B. (2000). *Cyberspace and Everyday Life*. Annual Meeting ASA, Washington DC, August 12-16.
12. Hirsh, Thompson P., Thompson G. (1999). *Globalization in Question*. Polity Press.
13. Holton, J. R. (1998). *Globalization and the Nation State*. New York: ST. Martin Press.
14. Inglehart, R. (1995), „Changing Values, Economic Development and Political Change“, *International Social Science Journal*, Vol. 145.
15. Inkeles, A., Smith D. H. (1974). *Becoming Modern-Individual Change in Six Developing Countries*. Harvard University Press.
16. Jacobs, M. (1997). *Greening the Millennium The New Politics of the Environment*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
17. Lay, V., Sabol G. (2001). *Public Awareness Survey on Water Environmne Preservation-Master Plan, The Study for Water Pollutio Reduction on the Sava River Basin in the Republic Croatia*. Zagreb: Institute of Social Sciences Ivo Pilar.
18. Lay, V. (1998). *Održivi razvoj i obrazovanje*. Zagreb: Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu.
19. Leisink, P. (1999). *Globalization and Labour Relations*. Edward Elgar Pub.
20. Mishkin, F. (1999). *International Experiences with Different Monetary Policy Regimes*. Natonal Bureau of Economic Research, Working Paper 696.
21. Orr, W. D. (1992). *Earth on Mind - On Education, Environmnet and the Human Prosspect*. Washington DC: Clovelo Calofornia, Island Press.
22. Pierson, C. (1996). *The Modern State*. London, New York: Routledge.
23. Scholte, J. A. (2000). *Globalization - A critical introduction*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.
24. Sekulic, D. (1997), „The Creation and Diddolution of the Multinational State: The Case of Yugoslavia“, *Nations and Nationalism*, Vol. 3 (2).

25. Silbert, H., Klodt H. (1999). Toward Global Competitions and Constrains, u knjizi The Future of the Global Economy: Toward a Long Boom. Paris, OECD.
26. Therborn, G. (2000), Globalization, Dimensions, Historical Waves, Regional Effects, Normative Governance, International Sociology, Vol. 15 (2).
27. Waters, M. (1995). Globalization. London/New York: Routledge.

Danimir Štros
Maja Coner
Daniel Bukovinski

GLOBALIZACIJA I MENADŽMENT

SAŽETAK

Globalizacija kao proces koji još traje uvelike je omogućila razvoj gospodarstava, kako onih velikih tako i zemalja u razvoju koje traže svoje mjesto na svjetskom tržištu. Omogućena je interaktivna komunikacija između osoba, tvrtki, udruga civilnoga društva i srodnih institucija koje mogu bilo gdje u svijetu i u bilo koje vrijeme zadovoljiti svoje potrebe internetskim putem.

Potrebni su i kompetentni ljudski resursi, stoga je nužno ulagati u nova znanja, inovacije, nove tehnologije i cjeloživotno obrazovanje. Menadžment u takvom okruženju postavlja svoje strateške ciljeve preko kojih ostvaruje i planove za plasman proizvoda ili usluge. Menadžer u današnje vrijeme mora imati interdisciplinarna znanja i vještine te se cjeloživotno obrazovati jer jedino tako može odgovoriti na stalne ubrzane promjene u svijetu.

Svjedoci smo da se Europa ujedinila kako bi mogla konkurirati svojim proizvodima i uslugama zemljama Trećega svijeta. Europa se dugo nije htjela prihvatiti menadžerskoga stila upravljanja, posebice u javnoj upravi, stoga je u zaostatku za SAD-om i zemljama Trećega svijeta. Naime, sve donedavno europska javna administracija bila je više usmjerena na provođenje zakona i podzakonskih akata, nego na menadžersko upravljanje kakvo postoji u SAD-u.

U globalnom okruženju potrebna su kontinuirana istraživanja, praćenje konkurencije, inovativnost i brze promjene.

Ključne riječi: globalizacija, proces, menadžment, inovacije, tehnologije, konkurentnost, interdisciplinarnost.