

# Impact Of Globalization On Social Policy Development Of Modern Democratic States

Dr. Naima Saeed<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Nuzhat Akram<sup>2</sup>, Dr. Muhammad Salim<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Assistant Professor Department of Criminology University of Karachi.

<sup>2</sup>Chief Education Officer, Pakistan Marine Academy.

<sup>3</sup>Assistant Professor Political Science University of Turbat.

## Abstract

Globalization has become a pervasive force that affects various aspects of society, including politics, economics, and culture. It has both positive and negative consequences, leading to significant social challenges and transformations. The interconnectivity and integration of nations through globalization have not only revolutionized international trade but have also profoundly influenced the development of social policies within democratic states. While globalization offers opportunities for economic growth and improved living standards, it also presents challenges in terms of equitable social policy development. The altering patterns of employment, such as the rise of the transnational economic patterns and increased labor market flexibility, have posed challenges to traditional models of social protection. This research article attempts to examine the impact of globalization on social policy development in modern democratic states. For this, the extent to which contemporary democratic states have achieved equitable socioeconomic growth through their social policy development is thoroughly assessed through the research.

**Keywords:** Globalization, Modern Democratic States, Democracy, Nation-state, State Sovereignty.

## Introduction

At the turn of the twenty-first century, globalization became a buzzword that gradually dominated popular, political and social discourse. It is now almost impossible to watch the television, read a book or a newspaper, surf on the internet, or partake in any social or political demonstration without encountering references to how ‘globalization’ has impacted people’s lives. It seems at globalization is variably credited as well as censured for an incredibly wide array of phenomena (Kallis, 2018). Social problems prevailing the world that range from floods to famine, from poverty to pollution, from neo-liberal challenges to economic interdependence, and from rural development to urban overcrowding are now commonly cited instances of challenging effects of globalization on social

policy development (Hay, 2020). Moreover, characterized by the socio-cultural interconnectedness, coupled with increasing integration of cross-border people and organization has not only transformed the dynamics of international trade, but it has also influentially affected the development of social policies with modern democratic nations. To Ku & Yoo (2013), as globalization forces continue to have expanded, so has states undergone umpteen transformation in terms of increased mobility of capital goods and labor, which has inevitably posed challenges as far as domestic social policy frameworks of democratic states are concerned. At the same time, such a transformation has brought about new social risks, thereby, accentuating concerns about the fairness,

pertinence and sustainability of social protection systems.

One perspective on globalization emphasizes that social policy development must be investigated from both a national as well as transnational perspective. Social institutions, social welfare and social relations are now intertwined when it comes to material processes that go beyond the boundaries of the nation-state, while their transformation now cannot be taken in account within the exclusively national framework. Recognizing these transnational links along with the dynamics they engender must commence from the appreciation of the modern pluralistic social governance structure around the globe, which is ‘multi-sphered’, ‘multi-tiered’ and ‘multi-actored’ (Sivakumar & Baskaran, 2014). On one side, globalization presents opportunities for modern democratic nations to ensure consistent economic growth, coupled with improved living standards and attractive investment, while on the other side, it brings challenges pertaining to equitability in terms of social policy development for all nations (Fjader, 2014).

One important ramification emanated from social policy development influenced by globalization is the development of welfare states. The altering patterns of employment, in addition to the rise of ‘gig economy’ and increased flexibility in the labor market have certainly posed challenges as far as traditional models of social protection are concerned. In this regard, democratic countries cannot get away with the need to adapt to the welfare systems to accommodate the changing nature of work, and address new forms of social risks so that inclusion of marginalized groups can be ensured (Zurn & De Wilde (2016). In this perspective, while globalization has verily contributed to the widespread economic growth and creation of wealth, it has also aggravated widened wealth and income gaps or disparities. The integration of global economic markets has ensued increased

competition among state institutions, relocation of industries and outsourcing, which have often led to job displacement and income inequality. Thus, the challenge for policymakers in establishing and subsequently implementing social policies lies in alleviating, if not completely eliminating, the adverse impacts of globalization on social mobility, so that equitable access of opportunities can be ensured (Hakeem et al., 2022).

Taking into view the above perspectives, this research article attempts to analyze the impact of globalization on social policy development for which the extent to which contemporary democratic states have been able to render equitable socio-economic growth is assessed. Besides, the challenges facing these democratic states in shaping inclusive and effective social policies are examined, so that social policy effectiveness through the results of implemented policy can be analyzed.

## **Literature Review**

### **Deciphering the Domains of Globalization**

Globalization involves a raft of processes and elements across a number of key domains that range from political and economic to social and cultural. In political terms, globalization is deemed to result of nation-state erosion as well as national sovereignty with the introduction of new international actors. The control of the state over its national economy has been somehow depreciated owing to the activities of private business enterprises like transnational corporations (TNCs), whose decisions influence global economic markets, whereas economic policy is increasingly being influenced by economic institutions at the multilateral level, such as the World Bank or IMF (Elad, 2015). On this economic level, the global economic control is regarded as being concentrated in the hands of transnational corporations, whose economic

activities are more influential than the GDP (Gross Domestic Product) of the state itself. In this sense, democratic countries are often compelled to cut taxes and tariffs if they are willing to attract foreign investment from these multilateral corporations. Moreover, the increasing wave of free trade agreements, such as NAFTA (North American Free Trade Agreement), are further reducing states' ability to devise economic policies that could result in the promotion of national interests (Guzel et al., 2021). Finally, on socio-cultural level, local institutions are seen as being increasingly submerged in a peculiar global mass cultural, which is described as 'McDonaldization'. This entails the replacement of national, traditional and indigenous cultures and social institutions by the global culture having the aspects of consumerism, thus, increasing the control of mass media by endangering minority languages as well as disappearing conventional socio-cultural practices (Sandra, 2013).

### **Relevance of Globalization with Social Policy Development**

Although the development of social policy has emerged comparatively later into the studies of globalization, its relevance with the modern political world has been productive and substantial. One major illustration of how globalization has impacted social policy development is to consider how it defies the prevalence of national welfare states. Therefore, social policy is particularly concerned with variation of how welfare services are disseminated, delivered, financed, and consumed within distinct political territories along with the impact of these service on social relations, social structure and standardized life of the general populace (Kamali & Jonsson, 2018). In essence, the phenomenon of globalization emanates attention to the manner whereby economies, societies and politics, including welfare systems

and labor markets, of different democratic states are intertwined with one another.

For instance, the global challenge of increasing public mobility internationally, some of which is apparent in the form of refugees, migrants and asylum-seekers, can be regarded as inhabiting inequitable development and geo-economic inequalities. In a similar vein, the distribution of employed and unemployed within such democratic countries are related to the investment decisions carried out by TNCs in relation to changing dynamics of global economy (Navarro, 2020). The 1997 financial crisis materialized in Asia manifested the interconnectedness of economics and the social consequences of economic crisis. The global response to the crisis drew attention of the need to bring reformation in institutions of global governance with a view to better regulating global financial transactions as a result of which more effective social protection systems can be developed (Jimenez et al., 2014).

### **Globalization and Nation-States**

Putting it simply, continual global changes have dictated terms under which national governments are bound to function. For the nation-states to sit at the helm of globalization, there is a dire need to liberalize world democracies. Unfortunately, the nation-states have limited powers to defy the unjust, hegemonic economic inequalities widespread as a result of dictating institutions, such as the IMF, World Bank and WTO (World Trade Organization). As a result, the sovereignty of nation-states has remained in limbo as powers have been shifted to these corporate and financial institutions. In this regard, Sandra (2013) charged that globalization has subject world democracies to a situation where their sovereignty and control over domestic economies have rapidly diminished. It is the 'Neoliberalism' that has snatched and smashed the models of development created by nation-states and replaced them with the one which possess the needs and demands of

supranational and transnational organization. It is further observed that the global economic environment has further imposed challenges on the governments to carry out free market reforms, which often produce political turmoil and social resistance within the boundaries of nation-states.

As Shaw (1999) stated: "Developing states are sometimes compelled to deploy forces to eliminate all forms of autonomous political activity, which generally means suspension of the constitution and replacement of the rule of law with a political authority that is arbitrary in nature. Therefore, in order to ensure high levels of economic growth along with inflows of foreign capital, states must intervene to bridle demonstrations and strikes. Repression is often associated with the evolution of coalition governments, military and industrial elites whose only motives are rapid economic growth and consistent political stability. These twin objectives are faced with a serious threat of popular movements around the globe".

If one gazes at the political and socio-economic upheavals that materialized in recent times, the above statement carries a lot of significance. Globalization ought to cushion the political and socio-economic environment and yet it is visible that the ground for implementation is in limbo. The political upheavals that emerges within nation-states result in a compulsion of elites to shift their economic assets out of their native countries, a condition that results in germination of economic predicaments, as the national currency begins loosening its grip and eventually ensues economic nosedive (Kamali & Jonsson, 2018). One excruciating truth is that under the capitalist system, the sole objective is to amass as much wealth through private investments, instead of attaching value to accumulating it for the sake of citizens within the nation-states. Therefore, globalization has led to an increase in the number of weak democratic states grappling with the demise of democracy in the absence of a strong democratic leader.

### **Navigating Globalization: Transnational Social Policy Responses for a Changing World**

The responses of social policy to globalization are strikingly diverse. They involve a number of actors acting together or singly, formally or informally, employing a range of techniques, and collaborating with a variety of multi-level and multi-range institutions. Insofar as these responses involve cross-national cooperation, this cooperation can take many different forms, including information exchange, the discovery of shared concerns and stances, joint action on particular problems, the coordination of national laws, policies, and practices, the coordination of policy positions, and group representation in other regional or international fora (Hakeem et al., 2022). In this regard, the importance of relationships between civil society and intergovernmental organizations hides the dominance of powerful states in international organizations and upholds the legitimacy of intergovernmental organizations with a liberalization agenda. All of this raises questions about the probability that in the near future progressive redistributive social politics or developmental social policy would take over as the predominant discourse or action at the supranational level. It does not, however, contest the necessity of a coordinated political backlash to demand an alternative to neoliberal principles and objectives.

One should not undervalue the value of the "levers" that can be used to advance a social development model within the framework of global social governance, whether it be by using the sustainable development model as an alternative to unrestrained market forces or by advocating for minimally acceptable global standards (Swank, 2005). Also noteworthy are the statements made by multilateral organizations that support a more progressive social policy.

While creating a viable political coalition with the ability to exercise more influence within

international institutions represents the global social democratic reform movement's biggest challenge, the viability of a single social model on a worldwide scale must be put into doubt. The same contradictions that plague current attempts to impose a social liberalist model globally would certainly cause any attempt to institutionalize a global social developmental model to fail (Yeates, 2002). Considering that regional accords by their very nature discriminate against non-member states and have the potential to develop into protectionist trade blocs, they might also involve potentially at odds policy objectives. Regional structures do, however, provide nations with a number of political benefits. They make it easier for nations to pursue their foreign policy goals. They also make it possible to build political collaboration more gradually and selectively. The extent and type of transnational collaboration can be agreed upon more easily and potentially more swiftly than in multilateral negotiations since regional formations frequently involve groups of nations with comparable cultural, legal, and political characteristics (George & Wilding, 2017). Additionally, they can give nations access to a wider range of policy options, especially for smaller and emerging nations in certain regional formations.

Nonetheless, there has always been a potential impact of trans-regional collaborations and mega-regionalism on transnational social policy collaboration. It highlights the role of civil society networks in pushing for a stronger social dimension in negotiations dominated by governments and business interests. Examples of such collaborations encompass EU-Gulf Cooperation Council, EU-Mercosur, Mercosur-SACU, SAARC-ASEAN, SAARC-EU, and EU-CARICOM (Chkopoia, 2022). However, the focus on trade relations and commercial collaboration within these collaborations poses challenges to the integration of social development issues.

### **Challenges Pertaining to Social Policy Development**

There is no denying the fact that contemporary democratic countries are grappling with umpteen challenges when it comes to establishing and implementing social policies in this era of globalization. One evident challenge is to maintain competitiveness in the global market, while ensuring that adequate social protection is provided. In this sense, the effects of globalization are that they have intensified competition among democratic nations for consistent economic growth and efficiency, which has more often transformed into erosion of social safety and social expenditure nets (Navarro, 2020), thereby, posing difficulties for policymakers in making a balance between economic objectives and social welfare priorities.

#### **Labor Market Transformation**

As far as labor markets are concerned, Globalization has inevitably brought about significant transformations by presenting both challenges and opportunities for social policy development in democratic states. According to George & Wilding (2017), one of the main challenges in labor market transformations is striking a balance between the flexibility demanded by globalization and the need to ensure decent work conditions, fair wages and social protection for workers. Moreover, the continual rise of precarious employment, often characterized by temporary contracts, part-time work, and self-employment, has ensued vulnerabilities for workers who often are deprived to accessing social benefits, job security and employment rights. At the same time, policymakers are contending with the task of adapting to labor market regulations with an aim to protecting workers in non-standard employment while also encouraging entrepreneurship and innovation (Swank, 2005).

Furthermore, the digitalization of work has had profound implications for social policy development. In this regard, the accentuated use

of automation, in addition to artificial intelligence and digital platforms has reshaped the manner in which work is being organized. Indeed, technological advancements have the potential to enhance productivity and create new opportunities; however, they also contribute to job displacement and skill gaps (Chkopoia, 2022). So far, democratic states have been foiled at ensuring facilitation of social policies for making a transition to a digital economy by providing opportunities for reskilling, upskilling and lifelong learning to ensure workers can adapt to changing labor market demands.

Another daunting challenge is the requisite need to address the growing polarization between high-skilled and low-skilled workers. As per the studies of Ergashey & Farxodjonova (2020) and Majidi (2017), globalization has led to a concentration of high-skilled jobs in certain sectors, often accompanied by rising wage inequality. At the same time, low-skilled workers face increased competition from global labor markets, which can lead to downward pressure on wages and limited social mobility. However, some countries have implemented active labor market policies that emphasize on providing training, job placement services and support for entrepreneurship. These policies particularly aim to enhance the employability of workers and promote smoother labor market transitions.

#### Social Exclusion and Inequality

Another importance challenge contemporary democratic nations are facing within the context of globalization is the aggravation or exacerbation of inequality and risk of social inclusion. Though economic growth and poverty reductions have been some positive implications of modern globalization, widening wealth and income gaps between and within democratic states is its adverse impact. When the concentration of power and wealth is in the hand of a few people, many individuals and communities would be left behind (Zurn & De Wilde, 2016). Moreover, it has been witnessed

that the economic integration of global markets has favored capital over labor, it has led to a steep decline in labor's share of income that contributed massively to wage stagnation for low-income and middle groups. As a consequence, democratic nations are laden with income inequality, which is posing challenges for ensuring inclusive economic growth and social cohesion.

Besides wealth and income gaps, globalization has led to disparities in terms of wealth distribution. The ability of corporations, capital mobility and high-net-worth individuals to engage in profit sharing and tax planning has resulted in a concentration of wealth among the wealthiest corporations and individuals (Ku & Yoo, 2013). This has subsequently restricted social mobility and economic opportunities for disadvantaged communities, while inequality across generations continue to perpetuate.

According to (Jahanger et al., 2022), inequality is directly associated with social exclusion, which refers to the vulnerability and marginalization of minority groups due to limited access to opportunities and resources enjoyed by fewer individuals and groups within democratic societies. Those who are deprived of necessary education, resources are skills to embrace changing dynamics of the global market are contending with exclusion and increased vulnerability from economic opportunities. Thus, there is a need for realization among democratic states to implement social protection policies in mitigating the adverse impacts of globalization. Adequate social safety nets, such as healthcare coverage, unemployment benefits and income support programs are necessary to introduce in order to protect nations from the adverse impact of economic shocks.

#### Compliance with International Standards

The emergence and subsequent prevalence of new international actors has brought about new norms and standards across the political world. The global economy is now

being driven by a new set of norms and values developed within the society, which has now become universal at some level. The concept pertaining to human rights, economic systems, accountability and transparency based on democratic credentials are the part of global agenda. This new agenda is accompanied by a whole new set of institutions, rules and regulations, and networks (Fjader, 2014). These institutions leave no stone unturned to continuously overhaul policymaking actions and aid in importance issues for all democratic and non-democratic states. This compliance with international standards under the auspices of society, economy and governance is posing challenges to democratic governments around the world.

Therefore, states and governments have no choice but to adhere to the standards laid by international community in the realms of administration or governance, labor, health, industries, and environment in order to meet the required economic standards set by global financial institutions. Also, the new standards have transformed the environment of states by intertwining them more profoundly (Zurn & De Wilde, 2016). Importantly, the new legal frameworks in the realm of international law have delimited and curtailed state sovereignty. These new values and standards form the basis of what is considered as the 'emerging framework of cosmopolitan law'. This set of law is subscribed by new means in a systematic manner; however, its points to the development of policies in the post-Westphalian global order sets down a new institutional framework, which works for the regulation and conduct of relations among global political communities.

### **Theoretical Framework**

The theoretical foundations for the interaction between globalization and the creation of social policies are complex and frequently under dispute. Neoliberal ideas contend that social

programs need to be restructured to improve efficiency, cut public spending, and encourage individual responsibility as a result of globalization, which is fueled by market forces and free trade (Hay, 2020). This point of view's proponents push for market-oriented changes, privatization, and deregulation while highlighting the importance of competition and flexibility in the delivery of social services. Scholars who emphasize the significance of social rights and welfare state regimes in determining social policy outcomes offer a counterpoint to this viewpoint. They contend that attempts to safeguard social rights, lessen inequality, and maintain social cohesion should go hand in hand with globalization. This viewpoint emphasizes the state's function as a protector and promoter of social rights.

The theoretical framework of social systems theory can also be a useful tool when examining how globalization has affected the creation of social policy in contemporary democratic democracies. The sociologist, Niklas Luhmann, and his social systems theory provides a thorough framework for comprehending the interactions between social systems, such as the state, economics, and society, and their reactions to outside influences, such as globalization (Kallis, 2018). Social systems theory aids in our comprehension of the dynamics between globalization and the numerous social systems involved in the formation of social policy. One way that globalization affects the economy is by making it easier for people to move across borders with their commodities, money, and labor. As a result, the state must adapt to shifting economic structures and deal with the social repercussions of globalization, such as income disparity and job insecurity. This in turn creates problems and opportunities for social policy development.

### **Methodology**

With the aforementioned context, this article concentrates on the core issues of globalization and its impact on social policy development. Therefore, this research advances the notion that significant social and economic decisions are currently being made at a global level rather than at the national level due to the influence of international institutions and capital. The study also aims to determine if developing nations' national social policymaking still offers prospects and potential.

The article, which focuses on some of the problematic and paradoxical themes that underlie globalization, is more of a work of critical thinking than a traditional academic paper. The paper expands the debates on globalization and policy making by focusing on peculiar aspects such as neoliberalism and adjustment, poverty reduction, NGOs and aid. The theoretical viewpoints and empirical case data used in this research support the claim made. Thus, this research focuses on particular issues and situations because it is challenging to attribute causes and identify the consequences of trends other than globalization. It is also vital to note that, in some circumstances, nation states' own difficulties are made worse by globalization.

The information gathered for this study is from secondary sources including government reports, studies from international financial corporations, article journals and books on globalization and social policy issue. Since the data used are from the databases of contemporary democratic countries, especially the ones that have adversely been impacted as a result of globalization tendencies, qualitative secondary analysis was deemed to be the most appropriate method to apply in this research.

### **Findings and Discussion**

From the above comprehensive analysis on the impact of globalization on social policy development in modern democratic states, it can be inferred that there is a growing recognition that

the decisions made by international forums, institutions, and agencies have an impact on people's opportunities in life as well as the structure of welfare states. Recent years have seen an increase in public awareness of the significance of these organizations and their social policies, which has led to the emergence of the discipline of "global social policy" as a new area of study.

Furthermore, how to guide 'globalization' in the public interest generally and in the interests of social welfare more specifically is one of the fundamental questions that policy-makers, activists, and academics are actively debating. There is now widespread agreement that the current system of global governance needs major reform, requiring extensive institutional and policy changes. However, as one might anticipate, there are a wide range of opinions and strategies regarding what the reforms' objectives should be and how they should be accomplished. In the confines of this chapter, we are unable to deal with the different specifics of policy arguments and disagreements (Guzel et al., 2021). However, it is feasible to identify certain important issues that are being discussed right now. challenges with regulatory reforms. Besides, the need to democratize global society is one of the more urgent concerns. Grassroots globalization forums, such as the World Social Forum and the World Water Forum, are a good platform to look for often-radical policy solutions. For those attempting to strengthen the role of such global social forums in the formulation of global policy, the widening divide between those who believe the current system can be changed and those who believe that radical change is necessary for the creation of a social order that is just for all people on the planet presents a challenge. This at least ensures that there will be plenty of room for strong contestation and argument for many years to come, even though it is highly unlikely that a



broad consensus on global social policy can be developed in the future.

It was further noted that the globalization had made the nation-state obsolete. In addition, Chomsky (1991) asserted the emergence of a new international governance structure created to advance the objectives of the emerging global corporate ruling class. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), the World Bank, IMF, the United Nations Organization (UNO), WTO were highlighted as *de facto* global institutions that dictate macroeconomic policy in the developing world. The fall of the Stalinist state system (East), the partial destruction of Keynesianism and the welfarist class compromise (West), and the containment and dissipation of radical anti-imperialist movements in the South (Chile, Jamaica, and Haiti) demonstrate that the nation-state is no longer the primary vector of historical development. The nation-state can now only do four tasks in terms of capital due to globalization or capitalism internationalization: supply labour and markets, eliminate business risks, establish guidelines for business relationships, and provide military security. It was further suggested that globalization has two significant implications for macroeconomic policy managers in Africa, the region of the world with the lowest level of globalization. First off, because decisions are frequently based on what is occurring elsewhere, African governments are often more implementers than innovators or strategic players. Second, as globalization advances, uncertainty and complexity in the formulation of national macroeconomic and social policies will rise. According to Shaw (1999), the foundations of Africa's economy in particular are frequently influenced by developments occurring elsewhere in the world.

Instead of being a planner, a direct investment, and a producer today, the state serves as a facilitator and coordinator. The greatest way to achieve this is by "providing supportive policy

environment and institutions," which is what it should do in order to foster investment, innovation, and growth. Hakeem et al., (2022) lists macroeconomic stability, undistorted prices, well defined and rigorously enforced property rights, and political institutions that support social consensus and political stability as being fundamental elements of the state. The United States and Australia's sanctions against Zimbabwe amply demonstrate the consequences of failing to act in accordance with Collier's claims. All in all, today's social policy in nation-states is characterized by a state that is only responsible for policing its population and preparing them for capitalist exploitation. It is challenging to suggest ideas for how national policy makers might approach developing policies given that globalization is now mostly characterized by expanding trans-state capitalism and rapid internalization of capital. When a nation is destitute, it is tough to confront global capitalism. The unfortunate truth is that poverty and sovereignty don't often go hand in hand.

## Conclusion

With the above exhaustive analysis and discussion on the impact of globalization on social policy development within the democratic nations, it can be concluded that for democratic states attempting to negotiate the shifting social, economic, and political landscapes, globalization has brought both opportunities and challenges. The problem from a variety of angles, including the difficulties modern globalization places on democratic states and the potential for social policy improvement has amply been discussed. The literature review emphasized a number of major topics and subheadings that provided insight into the difficulties democratic states face. These issues include the digital divide, social cohesion and multiculturalism, labor market dynamics, immigration and mobility, governance and accountability, economic inequality and poverty, gender equality and women's

empowerment, and migration and mobility. Each of these domains has distinct difficulties that call for serious thought and pro-active governmental responses. Thus, a thorough, proactive strategy that tackles problems, seizes chances, and supports the values of social justice, human rights, and sustainable development should be called for. For this, Democratic governments require to manage the challenges of globalization and create societies that are responsive, inclusive, and resilient in the face of global transformations through evidence-based research, informed policymaking, and collaborative initiatives.

## References

1. Chkopoia, S. (2022). The impact of globalization on the social policy development of modern democratic states. In *Regulating Human Rights, Social Security, and Socio-Economic Structures in a Global Perspective* (pp. 180-193). IGI Global.
2. Yeates, N. (2002). Globalization and social policy: From global neoliberal hegemony to global political pluralism. *Global Social Policy*, 2(1), 69-91.
3. Swank, D. (2005). Globalisation, domestic politics, and welfare state retrenchment in capitalist democracies. *Social Policy and Society*, 4(2), 183-195.
4. Kamali, M., & Jönsson, J. H. (Eds.). (2018). *Neoliberalism, Nordic welfare states and social work: Current and future challenges*. Routledge.
5. George, V., & Wilding, P. (2017). *Globalisation and human welfare*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
6. Navarro, V. (2020). *Neoliberalism, globalization, and inequalities: Consequences for health and quality of life*. Routledge.
7. Jimenez, J., Pasztor, E. M., Chambers, R. M., & Fujii, C. P. (2014). *Social policy and social change: Toward the creation of social and economic justice*. Sage Publications.
8. Shaw, T. M. (1999). *Globalization and the Dilemmas of the State in the South*. F. Adams, S. D. Gupta, & K. Mengisteab (Eds.). St. Martin's Press.
9. Hakeem, S., Ghauri, S. P., & Baig, M. A. (2022). GLOBALIZATION, DEMOCRACY AND SOCIAL SPENDING IN PAKISTAN: A TIME-SERIES ANALYSIS. *Journal of Economics*, 3(1), 67-71.
10. Sandra, B. (2013). Globalization, social policies, and the nation state. *Journal of Globalization Studies*, 4(2), 48-59.
11. Elad, C. (2015). The development of accounting in the Franc zone countries in Africa. *The International Journal of Accounting*, 50(1), 75-100.
12. Guzel, A. E., Arslan, U., & Acaravci, A. (2021). The impact of economic, social, and political globalization and democracy on life expectancy in low-income countries: are sustainable development goals contradictory?. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, 1-18.
13. Kallis, A. (2018). Populism, sovereignty, and the unlikely re-emergence of the territorial nation-state. *Fudan Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences*, 11(3), 285-302.
14. Sivakumar, N., & Baskaran, S. (2014). Globalization and nation state. *International Journal for Innovation Education and Research*, 2(8), 81-88.
15. Chomsky, N. (1991). Visions of righteousness. In *The Vietnam war and American culture* (pp. 21-51). Columbia University Press.

16. Hay, C. (2020). Globalization and its Impact on States.
17. Zürn, M., & De Wilde, P. (2016). Debating globalization: cosmopolitanism and communitarianism as political ideologies. *Journal of political ideologies*, 21(3), 280-301.
18. Ku, J., & Yoo, J. (2013). Globalization and sovereignty. *Berkeley J. Int'l L.*, 31, 210.
19. Fjäder, C. (2014). The nation-state, national security and resilience in the age of globalisation. *Resilience*, 2(2), 114-129.
20. Jahanger, A., Usman, M., & Balsalobre-Lorente, D. (2022). Autocracy, democracy, globalization, and environmental pollution in developing world: fresh evidence from STIRPAT model. *Journal of Public Affairs*, 22(4), e2753.
21. Ergashev, I., & Farxodjonova, N. (2020). Integration of national culture in the process of globalization. *Journal of Critical Reviews*, 7(2), 477.
22. Majidi, A. F. (2017). Globalization and economic growth: The case study of developing countries. *Asian Economic and Financial Review*, 7(6), 589.