

Original article

UDC 347.214.2:656

doi: 10.46684/2026.1.4

EDN: RNWNRO

## Globalization rankings: Between objective assessment and political narrative. Analysis of methodological limitations

**Sergei V. Kolankov**

Emperor Alexander I St. Petersburg State Transport University (PGUPS); Saint Petersburg, Russian Federation; kolankov@mail.ru;

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9895-6427>

**ABSTRACT** The paper discusses the concept of globalization, its types, and methods for assessing the level of globalization, and identifies the features of the methodology for calculating four main globalization indices. The purpose of the study is to determine the role of globalization indices in characterizing the development of individual countries. The objectives of the study are to identify the advantages and disadvantages of the existing methods for calculating globalization indices, and identify the differences between the two concepts: the purpose of calculating an index and the results of globalization. The target of the research is the globalization process; the subject is the methodology for assessing indices of the level of globalization. Research materials and methods: The author used publicly available information materials, including previously published scientific articles, websites of developers of globalization indices, and materials from international organizations. The research was carried out using the methods of logical analysis, comparison, and analysis of scientific literature. Results: The study involved a critical analysis of the methodology for calculating the four most widely used indices of the level of globalization, and identified their advantages and disadvantages. A pattern has been revealed that the most dynamically developing countries are not the leaders of the globalization rankings. Conclusions: It is proposed to identify various indices of the level of globalization based on their specific focus; to avoid using a calculation methodology that combines indicators characterizing various results of globalization that are not relevant to the specific focus of the corresponding index; and not to use globalization indices as a tool for characterizing the level of economic development.

**KEYWORDS:** globalization; indices; rankings; economic development; integration; assessment

**For citation:** Kolankov S.V. Globalization rankings: Between objective assessment and political narrative. Analysis of methodological limitations. *BRICS Transport*. 2026;5(1):4. <https://doi.org/10.46684/2026.1.4>. EDN: RNWNRO.

Научная статья

## Рейтинги глобализации: между объективной оценкой и политическим нарративом. Анализ методологических ограничений

**С.В. Коланьков**

Петербургский государственный университет путей сообщения Императора Александра I, Санкт-Петербург; kolankov@mail.ru;

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9895-6427>

**АННОТАЦИЯ** Рассмотрены понятие «глобализация», ее виды, методы оценки ее уровня. Определены особенности методики расчета четырех основных индексов глобализации. Цель исследования – определить место индексов глобализации при характеристике развития отдельных стран. Задачи исследования – выявить достоинства и недостатки существующих методик расчета индексов глобализации, определить отличия двух понятий: цель расчета индекса и результаты глобализации. Объектом исследования является процесс глобализации; предметом – методика оценки индексов уровня глобализации.

© Sergei V. Kolankov, 2026

© Translation into English "BRICS Transport", 2026

Использованы общедоступные информационные материалы – ранее опубликованные научные статьи, сайты разработчиков индексов глобализации, материалы международных организаций. Применены методы логического анализа, сравнения, анализа научной литературы.

Выполнен критический анализ методики расчета четырех наиболее широко используемых индексов уровня глобализации, выявлены их достоинства и недостатки. Установлена закономерность, в соответствии с которой наиболее динамично развивающиеся страны не являются лидерами рейтингов глобализации.

Предложено выделять различные индексы уровня глобализации исходя из их целевой направленности, не совмещать в методике расчета показатели, характеризующие различные результаты глобализации, не соответствующие целевой направленности соответствующего индекса, не использовать индексы глобализации в качестве инструмента характеристики уровня экономического развития.

**КЛЮЧЕВЫЕ СЛОВА:** глобализация; индексы; рейтинги; экономическое развитие; интеграция; оценка

**Для цитирования:** Коланьков С.В. Рейтинги глобализации: между объективной оценкой и политическим нарративом. Анализ методологических ограничений // Транспорт БРИКС. 2026. Т. 5. Вып. 1. Ст. 4. <https://doi.org/10.46684/2026.1.4>. EDN: RNWNRO.

## INTRODUCTION

The current situation in economies of the world is characterized by various trends, with globalization being one of them.

Globalization is generally understood as a process of economic, political and social integration of countries in various fields, such as economy, technology, transportation, etc. Integration means reducing or eliminating border barriers to movement of money, goods, services and people between countries, making national economies more open [1, 2].

The globalization process can be viewed as building universal mechanisms for the entire world, including trade and information networks, global currencies, payment systems, insurance systems, quality management procedures, standards, transport systems, cultural exchange, and migration processes, that contribute to the creation of a global market of goods, work and services in order to improve efficiency in all spheres of life.

Modern globalization is commonly viewed [2] as a wave-like process, where integration of the world economy is followed by its disintegration, which is in line with the Kondratiev's waves [3]. The first globalization wave is related to the Great Geographic Discoveries and the Industrial Revolution which began in England and ended in 1914 due to the outbreak of the World War I.

In 1914, the disintegration of the world economy began through the division of the warring parties into two camps. After the WWI, Great Britain lost its role of the global leader, while the United States had not yet

gained sufficient financial and industrial power. The situation was exacerbated by the Great Depression of 1929–1933 and became even worse with the rise of the Nazi party to power in Germany and the subsequent outbreak of the World War II in 1939.

The second wave of globalization began with the end of the World War II and the establishment of the Bretton Woods system for managing international monetary relations and trade settlements in July 1944. This was supported by the Second Industrial Revolution which began with a boom in the automotive industry, oil production and refining, and continued with production of computers, telecommunications technology, biotechnology, and industrial digitalization. The United States led the way for the second wave of globalization driven by financial and economic instruments. Rail transport retained its role during globalization, but railway networks had been built in the United States and Europe by that time, and the main railway construction and reconstruction projects were concentrated in Russia and China. For Russia, this is to a great extent related to rerouting exports and imports from the West to the East and South due to the sanctions policy of unfriendly countries.

## ASSESSING THE LEVEL OF GLOBALIZATION

There are various ways for assessing the level of globalization, but the most common one is to use globalization indices<sup>1, 2, 3</sup> [4–10]. Nearly all globalization

<sup>1</sup> Humanities portal. URL: <https://gtmarket.ru/>

<sup>2</sup> KOF Globalisation Index. ETH Zurich | KOF Swiss Economic Institute. URL: <https://kof.ethz.ch/en/forecasts-and-indicators/indicators/kof-globalisation-index.html>.

<sup>3</sup> Guide to Using the Index. The Centre for the Study of Globalization and Regionalization. URL: <http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/csgr/index/>.

indices are constructed from various sub-indices and metrics that are subject to three adjustments for the sake of comparability. First, they are normalized, i.e. converted from absolute to relative values by being divided by the gross domestic product or population. These values are then subject to panel normalization, where, for instance, a maximum of a variable is set equal to one, while the other values are set within the range from zero to one. After that, the values of the variables are adjusted for a scale factor, with the value of indicators in the first (base) year set to 100%.

A fairly large number of globalization indices have been developed and are currently in use, with four main ones being the A.T. Kearney/FP Index, KOF Globalization Index, CSGR Globalization Index, and GlobalIndex.

### Kearney/FP INDEX

Paper [4] notes that chronologically, the first globalization index was proposed by A.T. Kearney (a consulting firm) in partnership with *Foreign Policy* magazine. The index encompasses the following four aspects of globalization: economic integration (volume of trade and foreign direct investment (FDI)); technological connectivity (the number of Internet users, the number of Internet hosts, and the number of secure servers); the intensity of personal contacts (international travels and tourism, international telephone traffic, and personal money transfers); and political integration (membership in international organizations, personal and financial participation in the United Nations (UN) peacekeeping missions, international treaties, and government aid). Foreign direct investment (FDI) is given an importance weight of 3, volume of trade is given an importance weight of 2, and the remaining indicators are given an importance weight of 1.

A.T. Kearney are currently focused on rankings of cities. The latest globalization index included 72 countries accounting for 97% of the gross domestic product and 88% of the population of the world and was based on the data for 2005. This version of the A.T. Kearney/FP Index was topped by Singapore, Hong Kong, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Ireland, Denmark, the USA, Canada, Jordan, and Estonia, while Pakistan, Bangladesh, Turkey, China, Brazil, Venezuela, Indonesia, Algeria, India, and Iran brought up the rear. Russia ranked 62nd [5]. Since by that time China and India were confidently emerging as the leading global economies, Jordan and Estonia were among the outsiders, and Singapore, Hong Kong, and Ireland were nowhere near the economic power of the United States, it can be concluded that the globalization index is irrelevant for characterizing the development of national economies.

Nevertheless, when analysing the current situation, experts at A.T. Kearney and *Foreign Policy* magazine put forward the following four potential scenarios for the development of the global economy [5]:

1. “Globalization 3.0” involving continued integration which will correct the various systemic deficiencies that have been repeatedly pointed out in various publications.

2. “Polarization” which marks a return to historical normalcy in which rising geopolitical tensions and economic rivalries will divide the global economy into competing blocs of countries. It is notable that A.T. Kearney refers to Polarization (which is also mentioned as Regionalization) as a return to historical normalcy. Perhaps, this is an implicit recognition of the fact that as a system, globalization has a major deficiency: uneven distribution of benefits among countries, as well as cultural differences, including attitudes toward traditional values. Correcting this deficiency may result in lower benefits for globalizing countries, making globalization itself of little interest to them.

3. “Islandization”, in which nationalism (the term used by the authors) gains ground in key economies around the world, leading to dramatic protectionist measures and drastically reducing global economic flows. While for A.T. Kearney this looks like an undesirable development, the examples of China, Russia (after 2005–2010), Indonesia, and Malaysia, which refused to follow the globalization prescriptions of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and adopted reasonable protectionist measures to protect their national economies, suggest otherwise. Protectionist policies have been long pursued by globalizers themselves — the United States and the leading European countries.

4. “Commonization” signifying the fall of consumer capitalism which defined the recent past. The recent trends involving the break-up of the established standard of living of the “golden billion” suggest that this kind of scenario is not only possible, but it has already begun to unfold in West European countries. Naturally, this is absolutely not acceptable for their populations and political elites.

### KOF INDEX

Since 2002, the KOF Swiss Economic Institute has been measuring the globalization level index ( $I_{GL}$ ) to assess a degree of a country’s integration into the global space as a weighted average value [4–7]:

$$I_{GL} = 0,36 \cdot I_{EG} + 0,39 \cdot I_{SG} + 0,25 \cdot I_{PG}, \quad (1)$$

where  $I_{EG}$  is the economic globalization index;  $I_{SG}$  is the social globalization index; and  $I_{PG}$  is the political globalization index; and the importance weights for eco-

conomic, social, and political globalization are 0.36, 0.39 and 0.25, respectively.

$I_{GL}$  is calculated using 24 indicators grouped into the three categories (sub-indices). The Economic Globalization sub-index is measured using two sub-indices: Actual Flows and Restrictions on Economic Flows. Their composition is somewhat broader compared to the A.T. Kearney/FP Index.

The Social Globalization sub-index takes into account three sub-indices: Personal Contacts; Information Flows; and Cultural Affinity. What makes this method of calculation different from that used by A.T. Kearney is the number and content of indicators. For example, instead of the number of Internet hosts and the number of secure servers in the A.T. Kearney index, the KOF index uses information about a percentage of households that have a TV set and the total export and import of newspapers and periodicals.

The International Correspondence and Foreign Population metrics are used to measure the Personal Contacts.

The calculation of the Cultural Affinity sub-index, which is not taken into account in the A.T. Kearney Index, uses the number of McDonald's restaurants, the number of IKEA stores, and trade in books. It is certainly doubtful whether the number of restaurants and stores can be interpreted to reflect the cultural affinity of peoples, but it is obvious that taking into account the scope of the presence of McDonald's in any country is ambiguous.

On the one hand, the well-known McDonald's Index shows the number of Big Macs that can be bought with the average wage in a given country. While this reflects the purchasing power of wages, it disregards the local cost of production, differences in workforce productivity, or trade profit margins, in particular due to differences in the prestige of visiting outlets that are referred to as fast food venues (the low-end price segment) in some countries and as restaurants (the high-end price segment) in others. However, on a first approximation, the comparison is acceptable.

Here we see that the dominance of the American way of life is imposed on others and national cultural traditions are suppressed. The obtrusiveness that provokes rejection in many countries has become one of the major features of the modern globalization. It is difficult to say why IKEA stores were chosen for this group, as in 2000, the Swedish company had stores in 24 countries only. Italian fashion houses, French perfume makers, Swiss watchmakers, South Korean electronics manufacturers, Brazilian coffee makers, Indian tea makers, and so on could have been equally well chosen for the purpose.

In general, it can be stated that as a basis for its methodology, the KOF Index uses the ESG (Environmental, Social, and Governance) concept, where economic globalization indicators are used for Environmental, and political globalization indicators are used for Governance.

The method for the calculation of the globalization index does not include any benchmark value (which is certainly correct) and merely reflects the fact that this state is variable. Nevertheless, questions arise.

Pepers<sup>1</sup> [6] indicate that according to data for 2024, the USA ranked 27th (behind Estonia on the 23rd position), despite its leading role in the process, including through the use of the Navy, whose fleet could be sent, according to one of the former White House press secretaries, even "to the shores of Belarus". Although she found it difficult to answer the question of which sea she was talking about, hardly anyone doubts that in order to achieve its global goals, the United States is always ready to resort not only to economic sanctions, but also to military force, and also that the US ambassador is the most important person in many countries.

In the context of the development of their own countries, the fact that in the published ranking, Russia (74) and Belarus (77) rank behind Ukraine (47), China (81) is between Vietnam and the Dominican Republic, Brazil (85) is between Kazakhstan, Oman and Mongolia, and India (94) is between Guatemala and Trinidad and Tobago, followed by Indonesia (96), commands respect. If we seek a numerical ratio between the level of globalization and economic development, then, according to the available data, ranking 60th to 100th among the 208 countries included in the ranking is optimal, unless, of course, we are talking about the initiators of the process that count on making undue super profits. South Africa, ranking 60th in the KOF Index, appears to retain good prospects for economic development. However, this is not a dogma, as Malaysia, for example, ranks 24th.

The KOF indices include other rankings of questionable credibility as well. For example, in terms of the Corruption Perceptions Index (reflects the frequency and size of bribery), Belarus (114–120) and Russia (154) rank behind countries known for their widespread corruption, such as Sierra Leone, Swaziland, and Uganda, as well as Ukraine (105). The United States ranks 28th (2025 study). It should be noted here that the index is determined by the international non-governmental organization Transparency International<sup>4</sup> on the basis of a combination of publicly available statistics and results of a global survey (! — so, if you need to tweak something, you can

<sup>4</sup> Recognized as an undesirable organization in the Russian Federation.

always survey selected experts<sup>1</sup>). To make the picture complete, it should be added that in March 2023, the Prosecutor General's Office of Russia designated the international non-governmental organization Transparency International as undesirable organization due to "the interference in the internal affairs of the Russian Federation".

According to another index, the AML index, one of the well-known "money laundries" — the offshore zone of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines — ranks 19th. The United States ranks 66th, which is higher than the majority of the BRICS countries<sup>2</sup>. To ensure this, it is sufficient to pass appropriate laws, making what was previously a criminal offense a compliant activity. An example is the U.S. laws regarding lobbying which remains prohibited in some states. In the early 2010s, in the United States, there were approximately 500 registered large lobbying groups, and in 2016, there were 11,172 lobbyists. Besides, there are lobbyists exempt from mandatory registration, for example, those who earn less than \$3,000 per client per quarter. There is also a separate category known as "friends of the court" (Latin: *amici curiae*), who are not legally considered lobbyists but lobby for desired judicial decisions.

According to the data cited in [6], in the 2014 and 2016 rankings, the USA ranked 18th and 16th, respectively, in terms of political globalization, i.e., it dropped two positions down in two years. Considering the number of US military bases across the world (data varies widely across sources, from 750–800 to over 1,000) and the country's influence in virtually all international organizations, we can argue that the United States should unquestionably rank first in this respect, regardless of the intricacies of the method used to calculate the globalization index.

## CSGR INDEX

The CSGR Globalization Index is calculated by the Centre for the Study of Globalization and Regionalization of University of Warwick, UK<sup>3</sup>. The key methodological premise used in constructing this index is the assumption that economic ( $I_{EG}$ ), social ( $I_{SG}$ ), and political ( $I_{PG}$ ) characteristics equally affect the level of globalization. Therefore, no importance weight is assigned to these sub-indices, and expression (1) is transformed as follows:

$$I_{WG} = I_{EG} + I_{SG} + I_{PG} \quad (2)$$

Sub-index  $I_{EG}$  is calculated as follows:

$$I_{EG} = 0,418 \cdot I_T + 0,092 \cdot I_{FDI} + 0,22 \cdot I_{PI} + 0,27 \cdot I_{NRI} \quad (3)$$

where  $I_T$  is the variable of trade;  $I_{FDI}$  is the variable of foreign direct investment;  $I_{PI}$  is the variable of portfolio investment; and  $I_{NRI}$  is the variable of non-resident income.

Sub-index  $I_{EG}$  is determined as a weighted average sum of sub-indices Globalization of People, which is calculated using the number of foreign population in the country, inflow of foreign population, workers remittances, and international tourism in the country, and Globalization of Ideas, which takes into account the levels of telephone communications and development of the Internet, exported and imported films, sales of newspapers and books, and levels of international correspondence.

Sub-index  $I_{PG}$  is defined as a weighted average sum of three indicators: the number of embassies in the country, membership in international organizations, and participation in UN missions.

Another specific feature of the CSGR Index is that it takes into account geographic and demographic characteristics of countries.

## GlobalIndex

The method for measuring the GlobalIndex, which is collaboratively calculated by Otto-Friedrich University, Bamberg, and Leipzig University, Germany, is generally similar to those discussed above<sup>5</sup> [8] and can be expressed by the following formula:

$$I_G = 0,31 \cdot E_G + 0,31 \cdot ST_G + 0,31 \cdot C_G + 0,07 \cdot P_G \quad (4)$$

where  $E_G$  is the economic globalization sub-index;  $ST_G$  is the socio-technical globalization sub-index;  $C_G$  is the cultural globalization sub-index; and  $P_G$  is the political globalization sub-index.

In total, the GlobalIndex is measured using 31 variable indicators. Each of the first three sub-indices in expression (4) is made up of two sub-indices that have equal importance weights (50 per cent each). For example, the economic globalization sub-index is determined as the arithmetic mean of sub-indices Economic Flows and Economic Restrictions;  $ST_G$  is determined as the arithmetic mean of two sub-indices that describe telephone traffic, Internet traffic, foreign population, the number of cable television subscribers, international tourism, the number of newspapers, including foreign ones, and radios; and  $C_G$  consists of two sub-indices Logic of Expansion, and Values and Standards.

Political Globalization sub-index PG is measured as a weighted average sum of three sub-indices:

$$P_G = 0,36 \cdot I_E + 0,36 \cdot I_{IO} + 0,28 \cdot I_{UN} \quad (5)$$

<sup>5</sup> GlobalIndex 2002: Definitions and Sources [on-line]. URL: <http://www.transeurope-project.org/globalindex>.

where  $I_E$  is the sub-index Embassies in Country, an absolute value;  $I_{IO}$  is the sub-index Membership in International Organizations, an absolute value; and  $I_{UN}$  is the sub-index Participation in U.N. Security Council Missions, i.e. the number of UN peacekeeping operations in which a country took part, an absolute value.

An analysis of the indicators used to measure sub-indices for further integration in the GlobalIndex highlights the following.

The measurement of the Hidden Import Barriers uses surveys of small, medium-sized and large business owners published by the World Economic Forum (its major event being the Davos forum<sup>6</sup>), its bias in favour of transnational corporations and political elites of the so-called “free world” being well known. In many countries, the results of the survey will hardly be considered credible.

The minimum values of the Taxes on International Trade indicator, which includes import duties, export duties, profits of export or import monopolies, exchange profits, and exchange taxes, reflect the level of globalization due to reduced barriers to the entry of goods, work, and services from abroad to a country along with dollarization of the economy, but do not reflect the need for protective measures to preserve domestic manufacturers, better conditions, and opportunities for opening new companies in the country. Neither the United States and Western Europe, nor the Asian Tigers have neglected these opportunities and by protecting their own markets they have achieved significant success.

Authors of paper [8] from Universities of Bamberg, Oxford, Duisburg-Essen, and Bielefeld state that the use of the Cultural Globalization sub-index, which includes the sub-indices Logic of Expansion (what a term!) and Values and Standards, in the GlobalIndex assessment method reflects the premise that “Western culture, like no other, is characterized by belief in growth and progress”. At the same time, the authors note rationalism, universalism, strong belief in the importance of knowledge-based scientific evidence, mass education, and human rights, all of which are Western values that should become global.

Without questioning the importance of education, in particular, education of girls and scientific knowledge which are given prominence in GlobalIndex, these beliefs should be supplemented by the principle of the preservation of cultural characteristics of different peoples, respect for religion, and inadmissibility of destruction of state sovereignty for the sake of globalization. The goal is not globalization, but growth of the well-being of peoples on the basis of

economic and cultural development. Perhaps in this case, “values and standards” will not be measured, among other things, by an index compiled by a non-governmental organization included in Russia’s list of undesirable organizations. Some of them have attractive names.

We can also note that the so-called panel normalization of indicators/variables is used to account for country differences and changes over time. The general form of the formula used for the purpose can be represented as follows:

$$y = \frac{|V_i - V_{\max}|}{V_{\max} - V_{\min}}, \quad (6)$$

where  $y$  is the indicator/variable obtained by panel normalization;  $V_i$  is the value of the indicator/variable in the subject year for a given country; and  $V_{\max}$ ,  $V_{\min}$  are the indicator’s/variable’s maximum and minimum values over the observation period for all countries, respectively.

In GlobalIndex, expression (6) is additionally multiplied by 10.

When using globalization indices, and attempting to upgrade them, we should keep in mind the fundamental methodological principle of constructing any indicators: no indicator or a system of indicators can characterize the essence of economic phenomena in an absolutely proper and fair manner.

The indices discussed above are not the only ones. For example, there are also indices of global and regional trade integration [9], international rankings of the EAEU<sup>7</sup>, the Ernst & Young (EY) Globalization Index, and some others [11–14].

## CONCLUSION

Russia fails to keep up with globalization and is on the sidelines due to the poor investment climate, publications<sup>1</sup> [15] from early 2013 conclude. The following data are provided with reference to Ernst & Young’s indices: the average score among 60 countries is 4.9; Hong Kong, which ranked first, has a score of 7.81; China ranked 44th (3.53), and Russia ranked 48th (3.24). At the same time, it is stated that “in BRICS, GDP growth rates will be higher than in the other countries included in the index... 4.1% per year in Brazil, 3% in Russia, 6.7% in India, and 6.6% in China, compared to the global average of 2.8%”.

Paper [16] provides the following poverty level data with reference to the World Bank (Table 1).

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.weforum.org>

<sup>7</sup> [https://eec.eaeunion.org/comission/departement/dep\\_makroec\\_pol/rankings.php](https://eec.eaeunion.org/comission/departement/dep_makroec_pol/rankings.php)

Table 1

Percentage of the population with income  
below \$1 per day, %

Region (country)	Year		
	1981	2002	2015
China	63.8	14	1.1
South Asia	51.5	31.2	15.7
Latin America and the Caribbean	9.7	8.9	7.5

At the same time, we can note that in terms of the level of globalization, many countries of South Asia and Latin America rank higher than China.

This leads to a simple conclusion: the country's position in rankings is not that important; what matters is its economic performance. This statement is supported by the development of many countries over the 12 years after the publication of works<sup>1</sup> [15], as their economic performance does not correspond to their levels of globalization.

We can note that rankings are currently not only used as an economic analysis tool, but have become a real form of power and political struggle. In particular, this was possible due to the use of a required set of indicators for constructing globalization indices and opinions of experts who can be selected and motivated in a certain way. Therefore, we cannot fully agree with the opinion found in paper [17] that the KOF index, in particular, allows for valid international comparisons.

At the same time, the assessment of globalization should not be discontinued, as it is a tool that can provide a numerical evaluation of the integration of countries in global or regional terms, as well as assess whether the process is beneficial for individual countries by comparing the dynamics of the globalization index and basic economic performance indicators of a country.

It is difficult to assess the rate of globalization due to the contradictory nature of the process as it both promotes economic growth of some countries and preserves the backwardness of others [18].

We can agree with the opinion expressed in paper [19] that methods for calculating indices are subjective and involve simplification of complex processes, which, given the use of limited data, distorts the real state of

affairs, and also that calculation of indices “does not reduce the need to improve the national approach to ensuring the competitiveness of the economy”. The assessment of the rate of globalization confuses two concepts: the goal of the process and the outcomes it achieves. In order to determine an index to be measured, we should determine what type of globalization we are talking about, and thereby avoid using a given indicator without a definition. Whether it is economic (financial and economic) globalization, political globalization, social globalization, technological globalization, etc., we should evaluate a specific globalization index. In other words, measures that are used in calculations as sub-indices should become globalization indices. And the other indicators used in the above calculations should be classified as outcomes that characterize certain aspects of the social and economic development of a country. This should rely on official data, such as information from the United Nations and its agencies, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), the African Union, the Arab League, similar associations in South America, the European Union, and regional associations. It is inadvisable to use information from non-governmental organizations because many of them have brought discredit on themselves by approaching data collection and interpretation in a biased manner.

A comprehensive globalization index constructed as a weighted average value of specific indices dilutes the purpose of assessing the process, because when a calculation method uses indicators irrelevant to the index's specific focus they may distort the final result. Attempts to construct a comprehensive globalization index by taking into account “appropriate” indicators will lead nowhere. Here, we should keep in mind the fundamental methodological point that no evaluation indicator or a system of indicators can characterize the state of affairs in a complex economic system in an absolutely accurate and fair manner. Any tendency to increase their number will result in more inconsistency and lack of a single focus in the system.

Globalization indices as such are not of great value and should be treated as a certain step in the scientific conceptualization of the process. They will only become informative when compared with economic and social outcomes, both positive and negative, that various countries achieve through globalization. Global indices are secondary; what matters most is the development of a country's economy.

## REFERENCES

1. Obolenskiy V. Openness of national economies: The world and Russia. *World Economy and international relations*. 2017;61(10):5-15. DOI: 10.20542/0131-2227-2017-61-10-5-15. EDN: ZNIGVL. (In Russ.).
2. Drobot G.A. Globalization: concept, stages, contradictions, assessments. *Social and humanitarian knowledge*. 2008;(2):105–127. EDN: MUNFIL. (In Russ.).
3. Kondratiev N.D. *Major cycles of the conjuncture and the theory of foresight*. Yakovets Y.V, compiler. Moscow. Economics Publishing House. 2002:768. EDN: QTGOAJ. (In Russ.).
4. Cherkashina T.Y. Globalization indices: indicators and logic of construction. *Sociology: Methodology, methods, mathematical modeling*. 2011;(33):136-165. EDN: PEOKIX. (In Russ.).
5. Kearney A.T. *Foreign Policy Magazine: The Globalization Index, 2007*. URL: <http://www.atkearney.com/index.php/Publications/globalization-index.html>.
6. Beschastnova N.V., Vagizov R.A. Assessment of the globalization of world economic relations based on the calculation of the globalization index. *Economy and society*. 2016;4-1(23):239-243. EDN: WDKXIN. (In Russ.).
7. Gichiev N.S. Integral index of globalization. *Regional problems of transforming the economy*. 2014;(5):79-84. (In Russ.).
8. Raab M., Ruland M., Schönberger B., Blossfeld H.-P., Hofäcker D., Buchholz S., Schmelzer P. GlobalIndex: A Sociological Approach to Globalization Measurement. *International sociology*. 2008;23(4):596-631. DOI: 10.1177/0268580908090729. EDN: JMWBEL.
9. Gurova I.P. Measuring global and regional trade integration. *Eurasian economic integration*. 2009;3(4):60-73. EDN: RQPEBV. (In Russ.).
10. Shadura-Nikiporets N.T. Methodological aspects of assessing globalization: sectoral level. *Russian entrepreneurship*. 2013;7(229):78–83. EDN: QAENFL. (In Russ.).
11. Ramazanov I.A., Shalnova O.A., Shvaiko V.V. Consumer behavior in the era of global markets and new information technologies. *Marketing in Russia and abroad*. 2017;(2):31-41. EDN: YGUPQN. (In Russ.).
12. Ivanov V.G. Validity of cross-country comparative ratings and global benchmarks from the standpoint of the theory of complex systems in international relations. *RUDN Journal of Political Science*. 2017;19(3):290-295. DOI: 10.22363/2313-1438-2017-19-3-290-295. EDN: ZHYYZJ. (In Russ.).
13. Osmova M.N. *Globalization of the world economy: textbook*. Moscow. Infra-M. 2006:376. (In Russ.).
14. Gurova I.P. Foreign direct investment and economic globalization. *Symbol of science*. 2016;10-1(22):56-60. EDN: WXDDXF. (In Russ.).
15. Lyutova M. Ernst & Young: Russia is not keeping up with globalization. *Vedomosti*. 2013 Jan 21. URL: [https://www.vedomosti.ru/politics/articles/2013/01/21/globalizaciya\\_mimo\\_rossii](https://www.vedomosti.ru/politics/articles/2013/01/21/globalizaciya_mimo_rossii). (In Russ.).
16. Saprykina V.Y. Globalization of the world economy and socio-economic inequality. *Russian entrepreneurship*. 2011;8-1:10-16. EDN: NYBRKT. (In Russ.).
17. Makhnovskiy D.E. Using the KOF globalization index in international comparisons. *Trends in the development of science and education*. 2020;64-3:39-42. DOI: 10.18411/lj-08-2020-82. EDN: TNMQGW. (In Russ.).
18. Lantsov S.A. Economic and political aspects of globalization. *Political Expertise: POLITEX*. 2006;2(4):75-80. EDN: KVIKFP. (In Russ.).
19. Fainberg E.I. Index of people-saving and future generations: a new approach to assessing national competitiveness. *Economics and management: Problems, solutions*. 2025;4(2):133-139. DOI: 10.36871/ek.up.p.r.2025.02.04.013. EDN: MQJRJR. (In Russ.).

## ЛИТЕРАТУРА

1. Оболенский В. Открытость национальных экономик: мир и Россия // *Мировая экономика и международные отношения*. 2017. Т. 61, № 10. С. 5–15. DOI: 10.20542/0131-2227-2017-61-10-5-15. EDN: ZNIGVL.
2. Дробот Г.А. Глобализация: понятие, этапы, противоречия, оценки // *Социально-гуманитарные знания*. 2008. № 2. С. 105–127. EDN: MUNFIL.
3. Кондратьев Н.Д. Большие циклы конъюнктуры и теория предвидения / Н.Д. Кондратьев; сост. Ю.В. Яковец. М.: Экономика, 2002. 768 с. EDN: QTGOAJ.
4. Черкашина Т.Ю. Индексы глобализации: индикаторы и логика построения // *Социология: методология, методы, математическое моделирование*. 2011. № 33. С. 136–165. EDN: PEOKIX.
5. Kearney A.T. *Foreign Policy Magazine: The Globalization Index, 2007*. URL: <http://www.atkearney.com/index.php/Publications/globalization-index.html>.
6. Бесчастнова Н.В., Вагизов Р.А. Оценка глобализации мирохозяйственных связей на основе подсчета индекса глобализации // *Экономика и социум*. 2016. № 4-1(23). С. 239–243. EDN: WDKXIN.
7. Гичиев Н.С. Интегральный индекс глобализации // *Региональные проблемы преобразования экономики*. 2014. № 5. С. 79–84.
8. Raab M., Ruland M., Schönberger B., Blossfeld H.-P., Hofäcker D., Buchholz S., Schmelzer P. GlobalIndex: A Sociological Approach to Globalization Measurement // *International Sociology*. 2008. Vol. 23. No. 4. P. 596–631. DOI: 10.1177/0268580908090729. EDN: JMWBEL.
9. Гурова И.П. Измерение глобальной и региональной торговой интеграции // *Евразийская экономическая интеграция*. 2009. № 3 (4). С. 60–73. EDN: RQPEBV.
10. Шадур-Никипорец Н.Т. Методические аспекты оценки глобализации: отраслевой уровень // *Российское предпринимательство*. 2013. № 7 (229). С. 78–83. EDN: QAENFL.
11. Рамазанов И.А., Шальнова О.А., Швайко В.В. Поведение покупателей в эпоху глобальных рынков и новых инфор-

мационных технологий // Маркетинг в России и за рубежом. 2017. № 2. С. 31–41. EDN: YGUPQN.

12. *Иванов В.Г.* Валидность межстрановых сравнительных рейтингов и глобальных бенчмарков с позиций теории сложных систем в международных отношениях // Вестник РУДН. Серия: Политология. 2017. Vol. 19. № 3. P. 290–295. DOI: 10.22363/2313-1438-2017-19-3-290-295. EDN: ZHYYZJ.

13. *Осьмова М.Н.* Глобализация мирового хозяйства: учеб. пособие: Инфра-М, 2006. 376 с.

14. *Гурова И.П.* Прямые иностранные инвестиции и глобализация экономики // Символ науки. 2016. № 10-1(22). С. 56–60. EDN: WXDDXF.

15. *Лютлова М.* Ernst & Young: Россия не успевает за глобализацией // Ведомости. 21 января 2013. URL: [https://www.vedomosti.ru/politics/articles/2013/01/21/globalizaciya\\_mimo\\_rossii](https://www.vedomosti.ru/politics/articles/2013/01/21/globalizaciya_mimo_rossii).

16. *Сапрыкина В.Ю.* Глобализация мировой экономики и социально-экономическое неравенство // Российское предпринимательство. 2011. № 8-1. С. 10–16. EDN: NYBRKT.

17. *Махновский Д.Е.* Использование KOF-индекса глобализации в международных сопоставлениях // Тенденции развития науки и образования. 2020. № 64-3. С. 39–42. DOI: 10.18411/lj-08-2020-82. EDN: TNMQGW.

18. *Ланцов С.А.* Экономические и политические аспекты глобализации // Политическая экспертиза: ПОЛИТЭК. 2006. Т. 2. № 4. С. 75–80. EDN: KVIKFP.

19. *Файнберг Е.И.* Индекс народосбережения и будущих поколений: новый подход к оценке национальной конкурентоспособности // Экономика и управление: проблемы, решения. 2025. № 2(155). Т. 4. С. 133–139. DOI: 10.36871/ek.up.p.r.2025.02.04.013. EDN: MQJRZI.

## Bionotes

**Sergei V. Kolankov** — Dr. Sci. (Econom.), Associate Professor, Professor of the Department of “Construction of Roads of the Transport Complex”; **Emperor Alexander I St. Petersburg State Transport University (PGUPS)**; 9 Moskovsky pr., St. Petersburg, 190031, Russian Federation; ORCID: 0000-0002-9895-6427; kolankov@mail.ru.

## Об авторе

**Сергей Вячеславович Коланьков** — доктор экономических наук, доцент, профессор кафедры «Строительство дорог транспортного комплекса»; **Петербургский государственный университет путей сообщения Императора Александра I (ПГУПС)**; 190031, Россия, Санкт-Петербург, Московский пр., 9; ORCID: 0000-0002-9895-6427; kolankov@mail.ru.

The author declares no conflicts of interests.

Автор заявляет об отсутствии конфликта интересов.

The article was submitted 13.12.2025; approved after reviewing 02.02.2026; accepted for publication 27.02.2026.

Статья поступила в редакцию 13.12.2025; одобрена после рецензирования 02.02.2026; принята к публикации 27.02.2026.