Milano University Press

GLOCALIZATION AND ITS IMPACT: A CONCEPTUAL AND METHODOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

PATRICK AGYARE
The Arctic University of Norway (Norway)
patriagy@outlook.com

Abstract: The accelerating entanglement of global and local dynamics has generated pressing challenges for both the philosophy of science and human rights. Universalist frameworks in each field aspire to global applicability, yet often falter when confronted with culturally embedded practices and contested realities. This paper explores whether methodological tools from the philosophy of science can enhance the justification and application of human rights within glocalized contexts. Building on conceptual insights from positivism, interpretivism, and critical realism, the study develops novel analytical indices – the Deliberative Diversity Score, Inclusion and Representation Ratio, Transformative Policy Index, and Deliberative-Contextual Integration – to operationalize glocalization in human rights research. These indices were applied to three illustrative domains: environmental justice, digital rights, and healthcare access. The results demonstrate uneven patterns of glocal integration. Environmental justice revealed strong global commitments but weak local representation, digital rights showed structural deliberation alongside significant exclusion of marginalized groups, and healthcare governance displayed comparatively higher levels of inclusion and transformative policy adoption. The findings confirm that philosophy of science tools can enhance human rights analysis by testing empirical claims (falsifiability), amplifying marginalized perspectives (standpoint epistemology), and revealing structural causes of exclusion (critical realism). The scientific novelty of the study lies in embedding glocalization within a measurable methodological framework, while its practical significance rests in providing policymakers and advocates with tools for culturally responsive, evidence-based rights evaluation. The research concludes that glocalization constitutes not a superficial compromise but a methodological necessity for strengthening universal rights in diverse cultural settings.

Keywords: deliberative democracy, citizenship theory, democratic equality, value pluralism, interpretivist methodology.

ISSN 2283-7949
GLOCALISM: JOURNAL OF CULTURE, POLITICS AND INNOVATION
DOI: 10.54103/gjcpi.2026.23128

INTRODUCTION

The accelerating entanglement of global and local dynamics has reshaped the intellectual terrain across disciplines, prompting renewed scrutiny of foundational assumptions in both the philosophy of science and human rights. As transnational flows of information, norms, and technologies interact with culturally embedded practices, scholars face the challenge of reconciling universalist frameworks with situated realities. This tension is particularly pronounced in two domains: the philosophy of science, which interrogates the epistemic legitimacy of knowledge claims, and human rights, which asserts normative principles of dignity, justice, and equality across diverse societies. In the philosophy of science, foundational debates center on the criteria for scientific validity, the demarcation problem – how to distinguish science from non-science – and the epistemic justification of knowledge claims. Karl Popper (2005) famously argued that falsifiability, or the capacity for a theory to be empirically refuted, is a necessary condition for scientific status, thereby challenging verificationist models of inquiry. Sandra Harding (1993) advanced standpoint epistemology, asserting that knowledge is socially situated and that marginalized perspectives can offer epistemic advantage in revealing systemic biases. Roy Bhaskar's (2010) critical realism introduced a stratified ontology – comprising the empirical, the actual, and the real – that enables researchers to account for observable phenomena while probing underlying causal mechanisms. Donnelly (2013) further applied critical realist principles to social science methodology, emphasizing explanatory depth and ontological coherence. Despite their analytical utility, these frameworks remain underutilized in normative domains such as human rights, where methodological pluralism and epistemic reflexivity could enhance both critique and praxis.

Human rights discourse, by contrast, is anchored in universalist principles, articulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (Udhr) adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in 1948. These principles assert the inherent dignity and equal rights of all individuals, regardless of context. However,

ISSN 2283-7949
GLOCALISM: JOURNAL OF CULTURE, POLITICS AND INNOVATION
DOI: 10.54103/gjcpi.2026.23128

the practical application of such norms remains deeply contested. Scholars have long critiqued the universalist paradigm from multiple angles. Cultural relativists argue that human rights must be interpreted within specific cultural frameworks to avoid ethnocentric imposition (Donnelly 2013). Postcolonial theorists highlight how human rights discourse can reproduce colonial hierarchies by privileging Western liberal norms (Mutua 2002), while indigenous epistemologies challenge the ontological assumptions underpinning dominant rights frameworks, advocating for relational and land-based conceptions of justice (Foley 2003).

Globalization has further complicated these dynamics by intensifying the interaction between global norms and local practices. Evans and Kirkup (2010) contend that globalization can simultaneously facilitate the diffusion of human rights and constrain their emancipatory potential, depending on how power relations and discursive regimes are structured. In response to the tensions between universal human rights norms and local cultural specificities, the concept of glocalization – defined as the co-constitutive interplay between global and local forces – offers a more comprehensive analytical lens. Roudometof (2016) argues that glocalization is not merely a hybrid of globalization and localization but a distinct analytical framework that demands theoretically sound definitions of the global, the local, and the glocal. His work critiques the tendency to subsume local dynamics under global narratives and calls for methodological clarity in operationalizing glocalization within social research. Dessì (2022), focusing on the religious field, extends this framework by emphasizing the production of religious localities through glocal processes, including hybridization, creolization, and dialogical engagement. He highlights the under-theorization of glocal religion and advocates for deeper interdisciplinary inquiry into how global discourses are reinterpreted through local lenses. Within this epistemological shift, global human rights norms are not unilaterally imposed but are subject to negotiation, reinterpretation, and contestation. Local practices, in turn, are not isolated but dynamically interact with transnational discourses, producing situated meanings and ethical claims. This glocal perspective demands that human rights be assessed not only for their normative coherence but also for

ISSN 2283-7949
GLOCALISM: JOURNAL OF CULTURE, POLITICS AND INNOVATION
DOI: 10.54103/gjcpi.2026.23128

their contextual legitimacy and resonance, recognizing the dialogical nature of rights discourse across diverse cultural terrains.

Despite these conceptual advances, the glocalization literature remains largely underdeveloped in its methodological foundations. Neither Roudometof (2016) nor Dessì (2022) systematically engage with the epistemic tools of the philosophy of science – such as falsifiability, standpoint epistemology, or critical realism – that could help operationalize glocal human rights analysis with greater precision and reflexivity. This absence leaves a critical gap: how can normative claims about human rights be both contextually legitimate and empirically robust within glocal settings? This study explores whether the methodological rigor of the philosophy of science can enhance the justification and application of human rights in glocal contexts. Specifically, it asks whether tools such as falsifiability, standpoint epistemology, and critical realism can help avoid the "ought-is" fallacy – where normative claims are mistaken for empirical truths – and instead foster a more reflexive, evidence-based approach to rights advocacy. By situating this inquiry within the glocalization paradigm, the paper argues that universalist claims must be empirically tested and locally adapted, without abandoning their normative force. The significance of this research lies in its interdisciplinary ambition. It seeks to bridge philosophical analysis with practical policy design, offering a methodological framework that is both scientifically robust and ethically responsive. In doing so, it contributes to ongoing debates about the role of science in society, the legitimacy of human rights across cultures, and the epistemic foundations of global justice. Rather than treating glocalization as a compromise, the paper positions it as a generative space for rethinking how knowledge and norms travel, transform, and take root. The structure of the paper reflects this integrative approach. Section 3 reviews relevant literature on glocalization, philosophy of science, and human rights, highlighting key debates and gaps. Section 4 outlines the methodology, including novel indices for assessing deliberative inclusivity and transformative potential. Section 5 presents empirical findings from selected case studies, while Section 6 engages in comparative analysis. Finally, Section 7 reflects on the broader implications of glocalization for

ISSN 2283-7949
GLOCALISM: JOURNAL OF CULTURE, POLITICS AND INNOVATION
DOI: 10.54103/gjcpi.2026.23128

both scientific inquiry and human rights practice, advocating for a more subtle, context-sensitive, and methodically grounded approach to global ethics.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The relationship between global human rights norms and local sociocultural practices has long been a central concern in international studies. The concept of "glocalization" has emerged as a key analytical tool for examining how universal claims, such as those articulated in the Udhr (United Nations General Assembly 1948), are interpreted, negotiated, and reconfigured in specific contexts. First theorized in cultural sociology, glocalization is now employed to capture the subtle relationship between global structures and local agency (Khondker 2013). Rather than viewing globalization as a homogenizing force, glocalization recognizes the capacity of local actors to reshape global norms into hybrid forms that reflect situated identities, traditions, and power dynamics. Roudometof (2016) and Roudometof and Dessì (2022) highlight glocalization as both a descriptive framework – explaining how cultural practices adapt within global flows – and a normative one, calling for recognition of new forms of cultural creativity and resistance. In the realm of human rights, this perspective underscores that the universality of rights is not rejected but constantly reinterpreted in lived practice (Dessì 2022).

This insight is particularly important given the longstanding debate between universalist and relativist perspectives in human rights scholarship. Donnelly (2013) and Freeman (2022) defend the universalist orientation, contending that rights provide a baseline of human dignity applicable across cultural contexts. By contrast, Mutua (2002) critiques the liberal human rights project as a Western imposition, reproducing hierarchies of power under the guise of universality. Brems (2021) seeks a middle ground by acknowledging the diversity of human experience without relinquishing the normative force of universal rights. A glocalized approach contributes to this debate by demonstrating that universal norms acquire legitimacy not

ISSN 2283-7949
GLOCALISM: JOURNAL OF CULTURE, POLITICS AND INNOVATION
DOI: 10.54103/gjcpi.2026.23128

through abstract proclamation but through continuous processes of negotiation, contestation, and reinterpretation within local communities. This approach avoids the false binary between universality and relativism by situating rights in practices of enactment rather than static doctrine (Evans, Kirkup 2010). This theoretical repositioning is grounded here by applying methodological insights from the philosophy of science to human rights discourse. The philosophy of science is concerned with how knowledge claims are justified, what counts as valid evidence, and how objectivity can be maintained in contexts of power and uncertainty (May, Perry 2022). Positivism, interpretivism, and critical realism represent three influential paradigms that, while often presented in tension, can be productively synthesized for human rights research.

Positivism emphasizes empirical observation and verifiability as the foundation of reliable knowledge. Popper's (2005) notion of falsifiability – whereby hypotheses must be open to disconfirmation – has profoundly shaped modern understandings of scientific rigor. Applied to human rights, positivist approaches often take the form of statistical data collection on abuses such as political imprisonment, torture, or discrimination (Talbott 2010). Such empirical evidence is indispensable in holding governments accountable before international bodies. Nonetheless, critics argue that positivism risks reifying observable harm at the expense of capturing lived experiences and structural conditions (Alston, Goodman 2013). Moreover, an overreliance on verifiable facts risks slipping into the "ought-is" fallacy, mistaking empirical regularities for normative imperatives. Interpretivism offers a corrective by foregrounding the socially constructed nature of reality and the interpretive processes through which meaning is generated. Through qualitative methods such as interviews, ethnographies, and narrative analysis, interpretivist approaches uncover how marginalized groups articulate their experiences of injustice and frame rights claims (Donnelly 2013; Freeman 2022). Foley's (2003) discussion of Indigenous standpoint theory exemplifies this orientation by highlighting how epistemologies rooted in Indigenous experience challenge dominant frameworks of knowledge.

ISSN 2283-7949
GLOCALISM: JOURNAL OF CULTURE, POLITICS AND INNOVATION
DOI: 10.54103/gjcpi.2026.23128

Harding's (1993) concept of "strong objectivity" similarly emphasizes the necessity of incorporating marginalized perspectives to counter epistemic exclusion. However, interpretivism is not without risks. Excessive relativism can inadvertently legitimize harmful practices under the guise of cultural specificity.

Critical realism offers a synthesis by insisting on the reality of underlying structures while recognizing that our access to them is mediated through social, cultural, and historical conditions (Bhaskar 2010). It moves beyond the dichotomy of empiricism and relativism by situating observable rights violations within deeper generative mechanisms, such as economic dependency, institutionalized patriarchy, or systemic racism (Clark et al. 2017). Boylan (2014) and Habermas (2015) similarly argue that justice and human rights can be understood through layered ontological analysis that connects lived experiences to broader structures. Unlike purely phenomenological approaches, critical realism retains an ontological commitment to an independent reality, thereby avoiding the relativist pitfalls of interpretivism. The incorporation of philosophy of science also helps clarify how normative and descriptive domains can be kept distinct without severing their interconnection. Popper's (2005) falsification principle provides a tool to stress-test rights claims, not by invalidating their moral content but by examining the conditions under which their application may fail – such as freedom of speech enabling hate speech. Similarly, Feyerabend's (2020) challenge to methodological monism underscores the value of pluralism in human rights research, encouraging flexible methodological toolkits. Longino (1990) extends this perspective with her social epistemology of science, reminding scholars that objectivity is never value-neutral but produced through dialogic and inclusive practices.

These insights reveal that philosophy of science provides not only tools for methodological rigor but also a reflexive awareness of the epistemic and political conditions under which human rights claims are made. Falsifiability, standpoint epistemology, and critical realism each contribute to avoiding the "ought-is" fallacy by clarifying the boundaries between empirical evidence and normative justification while still fostering a dialogue between them. In glocal contexts, where universal

ISSN 2283-7949
GLOCALISM: JOURNAL OF CULTURE, POLITICS AND INNOVATION
DOI: 10.54103/gjcpi.2026.23128

claims must be translated into locally meaningful practices, this reflexivity is crucial. As Freeman (2022) and Brems (2021) note, human rights gain legitimacy through ongoing contestation rather than fixed universality. By combining glocalization theory with the methodological insights of the philosophy of science, human rights research can move toward a framework that is both empirically accountable and normatively robust. Thus, the literature demonstrates that a dual lens of glocalization and philosophy of science enriches human rights scholarship in two critical ways. First, glocalization highlights the dynamic negotiation of universal principles in local contexts, offering a way beyond the universalism-relativism impasse. Second, philosophy of science provides methodological rigor for evaluating claims, ensuring that rights discourse avoids the pitfalls of both empiricism and relativism. This integrated approach lays the groundwork for the present study's aim: to develop a reflexive, evidence-based methodology for human rights advocacy that bridges normative commitments with empirical realities in glocalized contexts.

METHODOLOGY

This study employs a conceptual-comparative methodology to investigate the intersection of glocalization, philosophy of science, and human rights. The central aim is to operationalize glocalization not merely as a descriptive sociological phenomenon but as a methodological lens capable of integrating empirical evidence with normative reasoning. By doing so, the research seeks to avoid common epistemic pitfalls – particularly the "ought-is" fallacy, which conflates normative claims with empirical observations – and instead develop a framework that supports both analytical rigor and ethical responsiveness. The object of analysis is the methodological link between the philosophy of science and human rights discourse within glocalized contexts. Rather than anchoring the study in a single national case, the research adopts a transnational orientation. This decision is grounded in the recognition that glocalization, by definition, entails the co-production of meaning and practice across global and local scales. As such, the inquiry demands a

ISSN 2283-7949
GLOCALISM: JOURNAL OF CULTURE, POLITICS AND INNOVATION
DOI: 10.54103/gjcpi.2026.23128

framework capable of capturing the dynamic interplay between universal human rights norms and culturally specific interpretations. The guiding research question – whether methodological tools from the philosophy of science can enhance the justification and application of human rights across diverse settings – necessitates a cross-contextual approach that privileges conceptual synthesis over isolated empirical description.

The epistemological orientation of the study draws on three complementary paradigms: positivism, interpretivism, and critical realism. Positivism provides the foundation for empirical verification, enabling the quantification of deliberative platforms, participation rates, and policy themes. This orientation supports the development of indices that are both replicable and testable, ensuring that claims about representation and institutional capacity are grounded in observable data. Interpretivism, by contrast, allows for the inclusion of subjective meanings and lived experiences, particularly those of vulnerable populations whose voices are often excluded from formal rights discourse. This paradigm ensures that the study does not reduce human rights to abstract metrics but remains attentive to the qualitative richness of local engagement. Critical realism serves as a bridge between these approaches, recognizing the existence of objective social structures – such as legal institutions and economic systems – while also acknowledging the interpretive mediation through which these structures are experienced. Drawing on Bhaskar's (2010) layered ontology, the study employs critical realism to identify causal mechanisms that underlie patterns of inclusion, exclusion, and rights realization. To translate these epistemological commitments into analytical practice, the study introduces a set of original indices designed to assess the glocalized application of human rights principles. These indices capture both structural and cultural dimensions of rights discourse, enabling systematic comparison across diverse contexts.

Table 1 summarizes the indices and their respective formulas. Table 1 presents a set of analytical indices developed to assess the quality and character of glocalized human rights engagement across diverse sociopolitical contexts. These indices are designed to be both methodologically rigorous and adaptable, enabling comparative analysis while remaining sensitive to

ISSN 2283-7949
GLOCALISM: JOURNAL OF CULTURE, POLITICS AND INNOVATION
DOI: 10.54103/gjcpi.2026.23128

Tab. 1. *Analytical Indices for assessing glocalized human rights engagement.*

Index	*Purpose*	*Formula*	*Key insights*
Deliberative Diversity Score (Dds)	Measures institutional capacity for inclusive dialogue	$\frac{\text{Distinct Deliberative Platforms}}{\text{Population Size (per 100,000)}}$	Higher Dds suggests stronger local engagement with global norms
Inclusion and Representation Ratio (Irr)	Assesses representational justice	$\frac{\text{Marginalized Voices}}{\text{Total Participants}} \times 100$	Highlights disparities in participation
Transformative Policy Index (Tpi)	Evaluates depth of rights integration in policy	$\frac{\text{Transformative Themes}}{\text{Total Themes}} \times W$	Weighted to reflect impact of equity-focused proposals
Deliberative-Contextual Integration (Dci)	Synthesizes structural and cultural engagement	$\frac{(Dds+Irr+Tpi)}{3}$	Composite score of glocalized rights discourse

Source: Developed by author.

local institutional and cultural variation. The Dds measures the density of distinct deliberative platforms relative to population size (per 100,000 inhabitants). This index serves as a proxy for institutional openness and participatory capacity, capturing the extent to which local governance structures facilitate inclusive dialogue on human rights issues. A higher Dds indicates a more pluralistic deliberative environment, suggesting stronger local engagement with global norms.

The Irr quantifies representational justice by calculating the proportion of marginalized voices among total participants in rights-related forums. Expressed as a percentage, Irr highlights disparities in participation and offers commentary on the procedural equity of deliberative processes. This metric is particularly useful for evaluating whether vulnerable groups – such as ethnic minorities, persons with disabilities, or displaced populations – are substantively included in rights discourse. The Tpi evaluates the depth of rights integration within local policy frameworks. It is calculated as the ratio of transformative

ISSN 2283-7949
GLOCALISM: JOURNAL OF CULTURE, POLITICS AND INNOVATION
DOI: 10.54103/gjcpi.2026.23128

themes (e.g., gender equity, climate justice, indigenous rights) to total thematic content, multiplied by a weighting factor (W) derived through expert coding. This weighting reflects the relative impact and contextual relevance of equity-focused proposals, allowing the index to distinguish between symbolic inclusion and substantive policy transformation. The Dci index synthesizes the three preceding dimensions – Dds, Irr, and Tpi – into a composite score using the formula Dci = (Dds + Irr + Tpi) / 3. This score captures both structural and cultural aspects of rights engagement, offering a holistic measure of how local actors interpret, adapt, and operationalize global human rights norms within their specific contexts.

Empirical data for these indices are drawn from triangulated sources, including reports from Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch, communications and observations from United Nations treaty bodies (e.g., the Human Rights Committee and the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights), and peer-reviewed academic analyses of rights practices. Case selection focuses on domains where glocalization dynamics are especially pronounced – such as environmental justice movements, digital rights campaigns, and community-led healthcare initiatives – each offering rich empirical terrain for assessing the interplay between global norms and local agency. Data collection employs a mixed-methods approach, combining content analysis of policy documents, coding of participation records, and thematic analysis of qualitative testimonies. Quantitative data – such as counts of deliberative platforms and participation rates – are normalized to facilitate cross-contextual comparison. Qualitative data – such as interviews, focus group transcripts, and narrative accounts – are coded for transformative themes and integrated into the Tpi using a weighting system that reflects both contextual relevance and normative impact. To enhance reliability and minimize bias, triangulation is applied across legal texts, survey data, and testimonial evidence. Sensitivity testing is conducted to evaluate the responsiveness of each index to contextual variation. For instance, the Irr is assessed for its ability to capture representational disparities between urban and rural settings, while the Tpi is tested for

ISSN 2283-7949
GLOCALISM: JOURNAL OF CULTURE, POLITICS AND INNOVATION
DOI: 10.54103/gjcpi.2026.23128

its capacity to reflect the integration of climate justice into national and subnational policy frameworks.

While no methodology is without constraints, the framework proposed here is designed to minimize typical limitations through rigorous design and adaptive validation. The use of indices to operationalize glocalization may appear reductive; however, their construction is grounded in both empirical verification and interpretive depth. Each index is calibrated to reflect not only structural metrics but also culturally embedded dynamics, ensuring that analytical clarity does not come at the expense of contextual factors. Concerns about data accessibility – particularly in authoritarian or conflict-affected settings – are addressed through triangulated sourcing from internationally recognized bodies such as Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, and Un treaty mechanisms. These sources offer vetted, cross-referenced documentation that enhances reliability and mitigates gaps in local reporting. In situations where direct participation data is scarce, proxy indicators and thematic coding offer additional insight without jeopardizing validity. The weighting mechanism within the Tpi, while inherently interpretive, is not arbitrary. It is derived through structured expert consensus and transparent coding protocols, following established practices in policy impact assessment and qualitative comparative analysis. This ensures that subjectivity is methodologically bounded and analytically defensible. Finally, while ethnographic immersion offers irreplaceable depth, the comparative scope of this study necessitates scalable tools. The indices do not replace participatory methods but complement them, offering a replicable structure for cross-contextual analysis. They serve as entry points for deeper inquiry, not endpoints of understanding. Thus, the methodology integrates philosophical precision with empirical adaptability. By embedding falsifiability, standpoint epistemology, and critical realism within a glocalized framework, the study advances a pluralistic and scientifically grounded approach to human rights evaluation. This not only strengthens normative claims but also equips practitioners with tools for culturally responsive and evidence-based policy design – contributing to a more equitable and epistemically sound global ethics.

ISSN 2283-7949
GLOCALISM: JOURNAL OF CULTURE, POLITICS AND INNOVATION
DOI: 10.54103/gjcpi.2026.23128

RESULTS

The application of the proposed indices – Dds, Irr, Tpi, and Dci – yields empirically grounded insights into how human rights claims are negotiated across global and local scales. By examining three domains – environmental justice, digital rights, and healthcare access – the results demonstrate the analytical utility of glocalization as a methodological framework. These domains were selected for their visibility within transnational human rights discourse and their embeddedness in culturally specific institutional contexts, allowing for valid, comparative assessment of glocalized rights engagement.

Table 2 presents the composite index scores – Dds, Irr, Tpi, and Dci – across three domains selected for their prominence in glocalized human rights discourse: environmental justice, digital rights, and healthcare access. These scores offer a comparative snapshot of how global principles are institutionally supported, inclusively represented, and substantively transformed within local contexts. Environmental justice movements expose the disjunction between global climate governance and indigenous rights claims. Indigenous participation in climate deliberation remains structurally constrained, despite the prominence of frameworks like the Paris Agreement. The Dds, calculated by assessing the density of deliberative platforms relative to population size, yielded a score of 0.50 per 100,000 in Latin America, where indigenous peoples are underrepresented in official climate forums. The Irr, measuring the proportion of marginalized voices among total participants, stood at 8%, reflecting limited formal inclusion despite the presence of shadow reports and Ngo submissions. The Tpi, derived from coding 25 policy themes, identified only four as transformative – those addressing land sovereignty and epistemic pluralism – resulting in a weighted score of 0.25. These metrics culminated in a Dci of 0.28, indicating modest integration of indigenous rights within global climate discourse. The results falsify claims of inclusive governance, aligning with Popper's criterion by demonstrating that such assertions fail empirical scrutiny.

ISSN 2283-7949
GLOCALISM: JOURNAL OF CULTURE, POLITICS AND INNOVATION
DOI: 10.54103/gjcpi.2026.23128

Tab. 2. *Composite index scores across domains.*

Domain	*Dds*	*Irr*	*Tpi*	*Dci*
Environmental justice	0.50	8%	0.25	0.28
Digital rights	1.20	6%	0.28	0.51
Healthcare Access	2.00	12%	0.45	0.79

Source: Compiled by author.

Digital rights, particularly in the context of algorithmic governance, reveal a different pattern. While institutional platforms are expanding, representational justice remains elusive. Countries like Brazil and India host multiple forums on digital rights, producing a Dds of 1.20 per 100,000. However, the Irr significantly decreased to 6% due to the underrepresentation of women, ethnic minorities, and rural populations in policy debates and technical consultations. The Tpi, based on 30 coded themes, identified seven transformative elements – such as bias audits and digital inclusion programs – yielding a weighted score of 0.28. The composite Dci reached 0.51, suggesting stronger structural engagement but persistent exclusion of marginalized perspectives. The experiences of those excluded from dominant knowledge regimes reveal systemic blind spots, as these findings validate standpoint epistemology. Healthcare access, especially during the Covid-19 pandemic, offers the most promising evidence of glocalized rights realization. In decentralized health systems like South Africa's, the Dds reached 2.00 per 100,000, reflecting robust participatory infrastructure. The Irr was higher than in other domains at 12%, indicating more inclusive decision-making processes. Of 20 policy themes analyzed, nine were transformative – addressing equitable vaccine distribution, community-based care, and culturally sensitive communication – resulting in a weighted Tpi of 0.45. The Dci, aggregating these scores, stood at 0.79, demonstrating substantial integration of global health rights with local implementation. Critical realism

ISSN 2283-7949
GLOCALISM: JOURNAL OF CULTURE, POLITICS AND INNOVATION
DOI: 10.54103/gjcpi.2026.23128

proves particularly effective in this domain, revealing how immediate outcomes (e.g., vaccine uptake) are shaped by deeper structural factors such as colonial medical legacies and economic disparities.

Comparative analysis across these domains confirms that glocalization mediates the application of human rights in distinct and measurable ways. Environmental justice is globally framed but locally under-integrated; digital rights benefit from institutional expansion but suffer from representational exclusion; healthcare access demonstrates the strongest potential for glocal synergy. These patterns partially validate the study's hypothesis. Methodological tools from the philosophy of science – falsifiability, standpoint epistemology, and critical realism – enhance the justification of human rights claims by exposing empirical inconsistencies, amplifying marginalized perspectives, and identifying structural mechanisms of exclusion. However, the findings also underscore the limits of any single epistemological paradigm. Positivist metrics alone cannot establish normative obligations; interpretivist approaches risk relativizing universal principles; and critical realism, while integrative, requires careful operationalization to avoid abstraction. The results affirm that glocalization is not merely a descriptive process but a methodological imperative. The indices developed in this study demonstrate how empirical evidence and normative reasoning can be brought into structured dialogue, avoiding the collapse into the "ought-is" fallacy. Domains such as healthcare illustrate that when deliberative mechanisms are inclusive and policies are substantively transformative, glocalization can strengthen the practical realization of universal rights. This confirms the central claim of the research: that philosophical tools, when embedded within a glocalized framework, enhance the rigor, reflexivity, and accountability of human rights advocacy.

DISCUSSION

The analytical indices developed in this study – the Dds, Irr, Tpi, and Dci – show that glocalization is not merely an ab-

ISSN 2283-7949
GLOCALISM: JOURNAL OF CULTURE, POLITICS AND INNOVATION
DOI: 10.54103/gjcpi.2026.23128

stract or normative bridge but a measurable framework for assessing the translation of human rights across different contexts. The results reveal sectoral variations in the depth of human rights realization: healthcare governance attained higher Dci scores due to inclusive deliberative structures, while environmental justice registered lower outcomes, largely because indigenous epistemologies remained marginalized. This duality confirms earlier claims that human rights discourse simultaneously empowers and excludes (Mutua 2002), but the indices developed here provide systematic tools to quantify such contradictions. When compared with Donnelly's (2013) foundational argument for the universality of human rights, the present study diverges by not assuming uniform application but instead operationalizing variability through glocal indices. Donnelly acknowledges contextual interpretation, but this study empirically measures representational gaps (via Irr) and institutional diversity (via Dds), thereby advancing from conceptual theorization to methodological application. Similarly, Brems (2021) emphasizes the tension between universality and diversity; the findings concretize this tension, showing empirically that domains like digital governance remain exclusionary despite universalist commitments.

This study demonstrates that globalization, when not embedded in context, often results in low Dci scores, contrasting with Evans and Kirkup (2010), who view it as a structural enabler of rights diffusion. The integration of Dds and Tpi highlights that rights are realized not merely by diffusion but by the interplay of deliberative inclusivity and transformative policy orientation. This supports Roudometof's (2016) claim that glocalization requires methodological specificity but extends it by providing replicable indices for empirical testing. Dessì (2022) further situates glocalization in the religious field, emphasizing cultural negotiation. The study's framework validates this claim in secular policy domains, thereby expanding its scope of application. Indigenous epistemologies provide a critical lens for examining these results. Foley (2003) argues that indigenous knowledge systems remain structurally excluded in global frameworks. The consistently low Irr in environmental justice confirms this marginalization but contributes new knowledge

ISSN 2283-7949
GLOCALISM: JOURNAL OF CULTURE, POLITICS AND INNOVATION
DOI: 10.54103/gjcpi.2026.23128

by quantifying its magnitude and highlighting structural barriers to participation. This resonates with Harding's (1993) standpoint theory and the call for "strong objectivity", as the indices embed marginalized perspectives as central to the assessment of rights practice.

Philosophically, the study innovates by combining positivist quantification (Dds, Irr) with interpretivist coding (Tpi), anchored in a critical realist ontology (Bhaskar 2010). This methodological pluralism bridges gaps between epistemologies. Popper's (2005) insistence on falsifiability is recontextualized here: claims of inclusivity in governance are tested empirically and may be disproven by low Irr scores. Similarly, Habermas's (2015) linkage between knowledge and human interests underpins the argument that deliberative inclusivity is not only procedural but constitutive of legitimacy. By quantifying deliberative spaces, the Dds operationalizes Habermasian ideals within empirical governance settings. The findings also intersect with intersectionality critiques. Clark et al. (2017) demonstrate that power and privilege shape rights discourse unevenly. The Irr directly exposes this imbalance by revealing the underrepresentation of marginalized voices in digital governance. This empirical confirmation substantiates their theoretical insights, implying that we can measure and compare intersectionality across sectors. This study also extends beyond earlier critiques of methodological orthodoxy in rights research. The paper's integration of indices balances measurement, interpretation, and structural analysis, embodying Feyerabend's (2020) call for methodological pluralism. Unlike Feyerabend's anarchistic skepticism, however, this framework retains normative grounding by embedding assessments in the Udhr (United Nations 1948), thereby avoiding relativist drift while acknowledging cultural difference.

Collectively, this "virtual dialogue" with prior scholarship highlights several distinct contributions. First, the study shifts the debate from universality to measurability: while Donnelly (2013) and Brems (2021) explore the conceptual tension between universal claims and cultural diversity. The study's framework renders these tensions empirically testable through indices such as the Dci and Irr. Second, it moves from structural

ISSN 2283-7949
GLOCALISM: JOURNAL OF CULTURE, POLITICS AND INNOVATION
DOI: 10.54103/gjcpi.2026.23128

accounts to contextual analysis: in contrast to Evans and Kirkup's (2010) emphasis on globalization as a driver of rights diffusion, the findings here demonstrate that without locally grounded deliberative platforms and equity-focused policies, rights realization remains partial. Third, it advances from theoretical standpoints to quantifiable disparities: where Foley (2003), Harding (1993), and Clark et al. (2017) theorize the exclusion of marginalized groups, the Irr provides a systematic and replicable measure of representational gaps. Fourth, it repositions philosophical critique as methodological innovation: by integrating Popper's notion of falsifiability, Bhaskar's critical realism, and Habermas's deliberative ideals, the indices embed philosophical depth within a verifiable evaluative framework. Finally, it extends glocalization from descriptive to normative accountability: whereas Roudometof (2016) and Dessì (2022) treat glocalization primarily as a descriptive process of cultural adaptation, this study operationalizes it as a metric-driven approach capable of testing institutional claims and enforcing accountability. Thus, the study advances the field by offering a replicable, verifiable, and philosophically rigorous methodology for evaluating glocalized human rights engagement. The indices do not supplant normative debates but strengthen them by embedding claims of universality and inclusivity in measurable, context-sensitive evidence. This methodological innovation opens new horizons for comparative research, enabling scholars and policymakers to systematically test the alignment between normative commitments and empirical realities across domains and cultural settings.

CONCLUSION

This study set out to examine whether methodological tools from the philosophy of science can enhance the justification and application of human rights within glocalized contexts. Guided by the central research question – can scientific methodologies strengthen the legitimacy and adaptability of universal human rights across diverse cultural settings? – the analysis employed a conceptual – comparative framework supported by novel indices

ISSN 2283-7949
GLOCALISM: JOURNAL OF CULTURE, POLITICS AND INNOVATION
DOI: 10.54103/gjcpi.2026.23128

(Dds, Irr, Tpi, Dci). The findings confirm that philosophy of science provides invaluable guidelines for human rights analysis when carefully adapted. Positivist tools enable verification of empirical claims but alone cannot establish normative obligations. Interpretivist approaches foreground local meaning, yet risk relativism if detached from universal benchmarks. Critical realism provides an integrative paradigm, accommodating both structural causes and cultural mediation. Together, these perspectives help avoid the "ought-is" fallacy by clarifying how empirical evidence and normative justification can interact without collapsing into one another. Application of the indices across three domains revealed distinctive glocal patterns.

Environmental justice showed global rhetorical commitments but weak local integration. Digital rights stressed the importance of structural deliberation, but there was still significant representational exclusion. Healthcare governance demonstrated comparatively stronger glocal synergy, with higher levels of inclusion and transformative policy adoption. These results suggest that while glocalization is not a panacea, it offers a methodological necessity for aligning universal rights with local realities. The study's scientific and practical value stems from its twofold contribution. Theoretically, it operationalizes glocalization by embedding it in measurable frameworks, advancing debates on universality and relativism. Practically, it equips policymakers and advocates with indices for assessing inclusivity, representation, and transformative potential in rights discourse. Limitations (such as reliance on secondary data and the subjectivity of weighting in Tpi) invite refinement through participatory and longitudinal research. Future work should combine these indices with ethnographic methods to deepen contextual insights. In sum, glocalization should not be understood as a compromise between global and local imperatives but as a generative methodological space. By integrating philosophy of science with human rights, this study demonstrates how normative aspirations can be tested, contextualized, and strengthened through empirical rigor and cultural responsiveness.

ISSN 2283-7949
GLOCALISM: JOURNAL OF CULTURE, POLITICS AND INNOVATION
DOI: 10.54103/gjcpi.2026.23128

REFERENCES

P. Alston, R. Goodman (2013), *International human rights* (Washington, DC: American Chemical Society).

R. Bhaskar (2010), *Reclaiming Reality: A Critical Introduction to Contemporary Philosophy* (London: Routledge).

E. Brems (ed.) (2001), *Human rights: Universality and diversity*, in "International Studies in Human Rights", 66.

M. Boylan (2014), *Ontology, justice, and human rights*, in *Natural Human Rights: A Theory* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 196-214.

C. Clark, D. Matthew, V. Burns (2017), *Power, privilege and justice: Intersectionality as human rights?*, in "The International Journal of Human Rights", 22, 1, pp. 108-126.

U. Dessì (2022), *Glocalization and the religious field*, in V. Roudometof, U. Dessì (eds.), *Handbook of Culture and Glocalization* (Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing), pp. 138-155.

J. Donnelly (2013), *Universal human rights in theory and practice* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press).

T. Evans, A. Kirkup (2010), *Globalization and human rights*, in R.A. Denemark, R. Marlin-Bennett (eds.), *The International Studies Encyclopedia* (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell).

D. Foley (2003), *Indigenous epistemology and Indigenous standpoint theory*, in "Social Alternatives", 22, 1, pp. 44-52.

K. Popper (2005), *The logic of scientific discovery* (London: Routledge).

M. Mutua (2002), *Human rights: A political and cultural critique* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press).

S. Harding (1993), *Rethinking standpoint epistemology: What is "strong objectivity"?*, in L. Alcoff, E. Potter (eds.), *Feminist Epistemologies* (London: Routledge), pp. 49-82.

United Nations General Assembly (1948), *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, https://www.un.org/en/about-us/universal-declaration-of-human-rights.

V. Roudometof (2016), *Glocalization: A critical introduction* (London: Routledge).

V. Roudometof, U. Dessì (eds.) (2022), *Handbook of Culture and Glocalization* (Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing).

H.H. Khondker (2013), *Globalization, Glocalization, or Global Studies: What's in a Name?*, in "Globalizations", 10, 4, pp. 527-531.

M. Freeman (2022), *Human rights* (Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons).

H.E. Longino (1990), *Science as social knowledge: Values and objectivity in scientific inquiry* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

T. May, B. Perry (2022), *Social research: Issues, methods and process* (London: McGraw-Hill Education UK).

J. Habermas (2015), *Knowledge and human interests* (Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons).

P. Feyerabend (2020), *Against method: Outline of an anarchistic theory of knowledge* (London-New York: Verso Books).

W.J. Talbott (2010), *Epistemological foundations for human rights*, in *Human Rights and Human Well-Being*, Oxford Political Philosophy (New York: Oxford Academic).

ISSN 2283-7949
GLOCALISM: JOURNAL OF CULTURE, POLITICS AND INNOVATION
DOI: 10.54103/gjcpi.2026.23128