International Journal of Political Science and Public Administration

Vol. 6, Iss. 1 (2025), pp 251 – 262, June 25, 2025. www.reviewedjournals.com, ©Reviewed Journals

GLOBALIZATION AND THE GLOBAL SOUTH: STRUCTURAL FORCES AND PATHWAYS TO EQUITABLE TRANSFORMATION

Abdiweli Mohamed Hussein [1] & Prof. Samuel Alfayo Nyanchoga, PhD [2]

[1] *PhD Candidate, Tangaza University, Nairobi, Kenya*
https://orcid.org/0009-0009-7375-7294

[2] *Lecturer, Tangaza University, Nairobi Kenya*

Accepted: June 12, 2025

ABSTRACT

This study explored the multifaceted impact of globalization on the Global South, focusing on regions across Africa, Latin America, Asia, and parts of the Middle East. Drawing on theoretical frameworks including dependency theory, world-systems theory, and neoliberalism, it critically examined globalization's influence across economic, political, cultural, and environmental domains. The findings revealed a dual dynamic: while globalization spurred economic growth through foreign investment, technology transfer, and access to global markets, it also deepened structural dependency, deindustrialization, and sovereign debt crises. Politically, globalization eroded national autonomy through neoliberal conditionalities imposed by institutions such as the IMF and World Bank, yet simultaneously catalyzed the emergence of dynamic civil societies and regional coalitions. Culturally, it contributed to Western hegemony and identity erosion, while also enabling the global dissemination of Southern art, music, and literature. Environmentally, globalization drove resource extraction and ecological degradation, exacerbated by unmet climate finance pledges to the Global South. The study utilized exclusively secondary data sources, including academic literature, policy reports, and international organization publications. It concluded that globalization's outcomes in these regions were profoundly ambivalent—generating both opportunities and systemic vulnerabilities. Recommendations include reforms of global institutions, advancement of South–South cooperation, equitable trade arrangements, debt justice, and inclusion of indigenous and local perspectives in governance. Ultimately, the study called for a socially transformative approach to globalization—anchored in justice, equity, and sustainability—to foster more inclusive development across the Global South.

Key Words: *Globalization, Global South, Dependency Theory, World-Systems Theory, Neoliberalism, Economic Growth, Structural Dependency, Political Autonomy, Civil Society, Cultural Identity, Environmental Degradation, South-South Cooperation, Debt Justice, Sustainable Development.*

CITATION: Abdiweli, M. H., & Nyanchoga, S. A. (2025). Globalization and the global south: Structural forces and pathways to equitable transformation. *Reviewed International Journal of Political Science & Public Administration*, 6 (1), 251 – 262.

INTRODUCTION

Globalization is a complex and multifaceted process that has reshaped international relations, economies, and cultures by increasing interconnectedness and interdependence among nations (Held et al., 2024). For countries in the Global South—which include regions across Africa, Latin America, South and Southeast Asia, and parts of the Middle East—globalization has opened new economic opportunities through expanded trade, investment, and technological exchange (UNCTAD, 2023). These linkages have enabled some countries to participate in global value chains, access foreign direct investment, and stimulate growth in sectors like manufacturing and services. However, globalization has also introduced vulnerabilities, such as increased exposure to global market fluctuations, the imposition of external policy conditions, and the risk of marginalization within the global economic order (Rodrik, 2023). As such, globalization acts as both a catalyst for development and a structural force that shapes uneven development trajectories across the Global South.

At the regional level, several emerging economies have harnessed globalization to foster industrialization, infrastructure development, and improved standards of living. Nations such as Vietnam and Kenya exemplify this trend, attracting foreign capital and technology transfers that have driven urbanization and created employment opportunities, particularly in export-oriented sectors (OECD, 2023). Despite these gains, the benefits of globalization remain unevenly distributed within countries, often accentuating inequalities between urban and rural populations. Traditional sectors, including agriculture and artisanal manufacturing, have been adversely affected by increased competition from imports, leading to the decline of livelihoods for many rural communities (World Bank, 2023; Mkandawire, 2022). This uneven development underscores a core paradox: while globalization can fuel national economic growth, it often exacerbates socio-economic disparities and marginalizes vulnerable populations.

The historical legacy of colonialism continues to shape the Global South's experience of globalization, reinforcing patterns of structural dependency and economic subordination. Dependency theory highlights how former colonies remain locked into roles as exporters of raw materials and primary commodities, while importing manufactured goods from the Global North, perpetuating unequal terms of trade and systemic disadvantage (Prebisch, 2021; UNCTAD, 2023). The adoption of neoliberal economic policies—promoted through structural adjustment programs by the IMF and World Bank—further entrenched these dependencies by advocating deregulation, austerity, and export-led growth at the expense of social welfare and state capacity (Okere & Nyong, 2023). Such policies constrained policy autonomy and deepened economic vulnerabilities, complicating efforts to achieve self-directed and inclusive development.

World-systems theory complements this critique by conceptualizing globalization as a stratified global economy, wherein wealth and decision-making power are concentrated in "core" countries of the Global North, while "peripheral" and "semi-peripheral" countries in the Global South supply labor and raw materials under unequal exchange conditions (Wallerstein, 2022). Even rapidly growing economies such as China and India remain constrained within this global hierarchy, as innovation, capital flows, and institutional influence are largely concentrated in Northern centers (Rodrik, 2023). This structural stratification hinders meaningful upward mobility for many Southern nations, sustaining global economic inequalities despite aggregate growth and increasing integration.

Politically, globalization has significantly affected the sovereignty and governance of Global South states. Integration into international institutions such as the WTO, IMF, and World Bank has brought new standards of accountability, transparency, and reform that have challenged authoritarian governance and supported democratization efforts in some contexts (Choudry & Kapoor, 2022). However, these same institutions frequently impose neoliberal conditionalities and austerity measures that limit policy space, prioritize creditor interests, and undermine social protections (Bhattacharya et al., 2022). As a result, national sovereignty has become conditional and often subordinated to external economic mandates, complicating efforts to balance domestic priorities with global obligations (Sharma, 2022).

Culturally, globalization produces simultaneous processes of homogenization and hybridization. On one hand, the global diffusion of Western media, consumer culture, and digital platforms can displace local languages, identities, and traditions. On the other hand, globalization enables the global circulation and reinvention of cultural expressions from the Global South, such as Nollywood cinema, Latin American music, and diasporic storytelling (Appadurai, 2023; Mbembe, 2022). Technological globalization has further accelerated connectivity and innovation, exemplified by mobile money platforms like Kenya's M-Pesa and telemedicine initiatives in India (World Bank, 2023). Nonetheless, a significant digital divide persists, with rural and marginalized communities lacking access to reliable infrastructure, digital literacy, and fair data governance—issues that exacerbate existing inequalities and raise concerns about "digital colonialism" (UNDP, 2023; Fuchs, 2021). Environmentally, globalization has intensified resource extraction and ecological degradation in many parts of the Global South, exposing these regions to disproportionate climate risks while often lacking sufficient financial and technological support for adaptation and mitigation (UNECA, 2022; IPCC, 2023).

Statement of the Problem

Globalization had reshaped the development landscape of the Global South, introducing both opportunities and systemic challenges. While some countries benefited from foreign direct investment, access to international markets, and technological diffusion, many remained structurally marginalized within global economic systems. The promise of shared prosperity was undermined by persistent trade imbalances, external debt burdens, and an overreliance on commodity exports, which exposed nations to global price volatility and economic shocks (UNCTAD, 2023; Rodrik, 2023). These outcomes suggested that globalization, as practiced, reinforced historical patterns of dependency rather than reversing them (Prebisch, 2021; Figueroa-Helland & Lindgren, 2020).

Politically and institutionally, countries in the Global South lost significant policy autonomy due to structural adjustment programs and conditionalities imposed by the IMF and World Bank. These externally driven reforms often prioritized fiscal austerity, market liberalization, and privatization over domestic development goals, weakening public institutions and social protections (Stiglitz, 2017; Bhattacharya et al., 2022). Moreover, the lack of adequate representation in global governance institutions—such as the UN Security Council and Bretton Woods institutions—further diminished the political agency of Southern nations, restricting their capacity to influence international norms and policies (Okere & Nyong, 2023).

Culturally and environmentally, globalization led to homogenization and exploitation. The widespread dissemination of Western media and consumer culture displaced indigenous languages, traditions, and knowledge systems, raising concerns about identity erosion and cultural alienation (Appadurai, 2023; Mbembe, 2022). At the same time, extractive development models—driven by multinational corporations and weak environmental oversight—resulted in ecological degradation, biodiversity loss, and heightened vulnerability to climate change, especially as Global North countries failed to fulfill climate finance commitments (IPCC, 2023; UNECA, 2022). These cumulative challenges highlighted the urgent need for a critical assessment of globalization's impact on the Global South and the development of alternative frameworks rooted in justice, sustainability, and self-determination.

Research Objectives

- To examine the structural impact of globalization on the economic, political, and cultural systems of countries in the Global South.
- To explore alternative pathways and policy strategies for achieving equitable and sustainable development within a globalized world order.

Justification of the study

This study was justified by the urgent need to critically examine the uneven effects of globalization on the Global South, where integration into global systems has often reinforced rather than resolved structural inequalities. Despite the perceived benefits of expanded trade, foreign investment, and technological transfer, many countries in Africa, Latin America, Asia, and the Middle East remained locked in roles as raw material suppliers, burdened by unsustainable debt and limited influence in global governance (UNCTAD, 2023; Rodrik, 2023). Previous studies tended to emphasize economic growth while overlooking the broader socio-political, cultural, and environmental consequences of globalization, which have included weakened sovereignty, identity erosion, and ecological degradation (Prebisch, 2021; Wallerstein, 2022). By applying dependency theory and world-systems analysis, this study offered a more comprehensive framework for understanding how historical and institutional dynamics shape contemporary development challenges in the South. The research was therefore timely and essential in informing efforts to reform global governance, enhance South–South cooperation, and promote more equitable and sustainable pathways for the Global South in the face of mounting global crises.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Dependency Theory

Dependency theory emerged in the 1960s and 1970s as a critical response to modernization theory, which posited that impoverished nations would eventually "catch up" to wealthy countries by following similar technological and economic trajectories. Dependency theorists argued that global capitalism creates and sustains a structural dichotomy between the industrialized "core" (predominantly in the Global North) and the underdeveloped "periphery" (chiefly in the Global South). Raúl Prebisch, an Argentine economist and former Executive Secretary of the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC), was a key proponent of this theory. He asserted that the terms of trade consistently disadvantage primary producers in the Global South. His research demonstrated that, over time, the prices of basic commodities from the periphery declined relative to the prices of manufactured goods from the core, resulting in a persistent pattern of worsening trade conditions (Prebisch, 2021). This trend suggested that economic integration into the global market fostered dependency and divergence rather than convergence.

Andre Gunder Frank, another prominent advocate of dependency theory, expanded on this analysis with his concept of the "development of underdevelopment." He contended that the historical processes of colonialism and the global expansion of capitalist systems had systematically conditioned the South to remain dependent on the North for capital, technology, and markets (Frank, 1969). Frank argued that the economies of the Global South were incorporated into the global capitalist system not for autonomous development, but to serve the interests of the metropoles. As such, the South's economic development was constrained by external structures—trade, investment, and finance mechanisms—that ensured a continual outflow of resources to the North. Furthermore, dependency theorists maintained that foreign aid and international loans often reproduced these dynamics, entrapping nations in cycles of indebtedness and economic subordination (Dos Santos, 2022). This critical perspective challenged the assumption that globalization inherently leads to shared prosperity; instead, it underscored its role in perpetuating historical inequalities.

Recent work by Figueroa-Helland and Lindgren (2020) extends the theory by illustrating how multinational corporations and global financial institutions utilize regulatory regimes, intellectual property frameworks, and tax havens to extract surplus value from the Global South. While globalization has broadened access to markets and technologies, it has also reinforced disparities—as reflected in Africa's marginal position in global value chains and Latin America's persistent reliance on extractive industries. Scholars have also highlighted the role of internal elites in sustaining dependency by aligning with transnational interests rather than pursuing sovereign, developmental priorities (Amin, 2023). Thus, dependency theory remains a potent analytical tool for understanding the continued underdevelopment of the Global South in a globalized world, cautioning that without structural transformation and regional solidarity, globalization may further entrench the very inequalities it purports to overcome.

World-Systems Theory

World-systems theory, developed by sociologist Immanuel Wallerstein in the 1970s, offers a macro-sociological framework for analyzing global inequality from a historical and structural perspective. The theory fundamentally conceives of the global economy as a unified, interconnected capitalist system characterized by a tripartite division of labor among core, semi-periphery, and periphery regions (Wallerstein, 2004). Core countries—primarily located in North America, Western Europe, and parts of East Asia—specialize in capital-intensive, high-technology industries, possess political stability, and exert significant influence over global institutions. In contrast, peripheral countries—largely in Africa, Latin America, and South Asia—depend on exporting raw commodities and low-wage labor, leaving them vulnerable to global price fluctuations and external shocks. The semi-periphery, comprising nations such as Brazil, India, and South Africa, occupies an intermediate position, simultaneously exhibiting both exploitative and dependent characteristics.

Wallerstein's framework asserts that this hierarchy is dynamic and perpetuated through a fusion of economic coercion, military dominance, and institutional arrangements that uphold core interests. International financial institutions, such as the IMF and World Bank, often promote policies—like structural adjustment programs—that require peripheral nations to liberalize trade, privatize public enterprises, and reduce social spending (Harvey, 2020). These reforms disproportionately benefit transnational corporations and financial markets centered in the core while curtailing policy autonomy and weakening domestic capacity in peripheral states. From this vantage point, globalization does not equitably dismantle borders but instead amplifies unequal exchanges, reinforcing the structural advantages of the core at the expense of peripheral development. Peripheral countries are thus constrained to serve functions that sustain the global economy without enabling local transformation.

Contemporary scholars have drawn on world-systems theory to shed light on current manifestations of digital colonialism, environmental exploitation, and global labor stratification. Sassen (2018) argues that digital globalization reproduces core-periphery hierarchies by concentrating data, capital, and innovation in select hubs, while outsourcing hazardous labor and environmental degradation to the Global South. The extraction of rare earth minerals in the Democratic Republic of Congo—often under perilous and exploitative conditions—supports the smartphone and renewable energy industries in the Global North (Nixon, 2022). Similarly, textile factories in Bangladesh and electronics assembly lines in Vietnam are embedded in global supply chains that offer limited opportunities for upward mobility. World-systems theory remains a vital analytical tool, offering a structural critique of globalization by demonstrating that the global capitalist order is fundamentally unequal—not due to internal deficiencies in the Global South, but as a result of its systemic design.

Neoliberalism and Globalization

Since the 1980s, neoliberalism has served as the dominant global economic philosophy, forming the ideological foundation of contemporary globalization. Rooted in the theories of economists such as Friedrich Hayek and Milton Friedman, neoliberalism advocates market supremacy, individual entrepreneurial freedom, and minimal government intervention in economic affairs (Harvey, 2005). This philosophy gained international prominence during the debt crises of the 1980s, when numerous countries in the Global South sought financial support from the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank. These institutions—cornerstones of the Bretton Woods system—attached stringent conditions to their loans, commonly known as Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs). SAPs mandated austerity measures, privatization of state-owned enterprises, trade liberalization, and deregulation. Although ostensibly intended to restore macroeconomic stability and promote growth, these reforms often resulted in extensive social dislocation, the erosion of public services, and rising inequality across the Global South (Stiglitz, 2017).

From a neoliberal standpoint, globalization is seen as a pathway to development through comparative advantage and trickle-down economics. However, empirical evidence tells a more complex story. In many African, Latin American, and South Asian countries, the liberalization of trade and capital flows has exposed domestic industries to intense competition from multinational corporations, triggering deindustrialization, rising unemployment, and the proliferation of informal labor (Rodrik, 2018). The drive toward privatization has frequently transferred essential public services—such as water, education, and healthcare—into the hands of foreign investors, leading to commodification and reduced accessibility for marginalized communities (Bayliss & Fine, 2020). These policies have not only constrained state capacity but also eroded national sovereignty, compelling governments to prioritize fiscal austerity and investor confidence over social welfare and equitable development. As a result, globalization under a neoliberal paradigm has exacerbated structural vulnerabilities and dependency in the Global South, rather than promoting inclusive prosperity.

Moreover, neoliberal globalization extends beyond economic arrangements to encompass intellectual and cultural hegemony, projecting Western norms and consumption patterns as universal ideals. This is evident in the way global institutions promote standardized development models, often marginalizing indigenous knowledge systems, traditional governance structures, and alternative development paths (Escobar, 2020). Environmental degradation constitutes yet another consequence, as Global South nations are pressured to intensify resource extraction and expand export-oriented agriculture to satisfy international demand—frequently at the expense of biodiversity and climate resilience. The carbon-intensive model advanced by neoliberal globalization disproportionately burdens countries that contribute the least to climate change but are most vulnerable to its impacts (UNEP, 2023). Neoliberalism thus operates not only as an economic strategy but also as a hegemonic project—shaping the Global South's participation in the world economy and redefining its notions of progress and modernity. Fully understanding globalization requires a critical interrogation of the power structures and ideological forces that sustain its current trajectory.

METHODOLOGY

This study employed a qualitative research design to examine the complex impacts of globalization on the Global South across economic, political, cultural, and environmental dimensions. The qualitative approach enabled a detailed exploration of structural and contextual factors shaping globalization's outcomes in diverse regions such as Africa, Latin America, Asia, and the Middle East.

Due to the geographic scope and historical breadth, the study relied entirely on secondary data sources. These included academic books and journal articles, policy reports, statistical databases, and publications from reputable international organizations such as the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), World Bank, and International Monetary Fund (IMF). These secondary sources provided comprehensive and credible information necessary for a holistic understanding of globalization's multifaceted effects.

Data collection involved systematic document analysis, including thematic coding and cross-comparison across sources to identify key trends and insights. Triangulation was applied to enhance validity by corroborating information from diverse texts and institutional reports, thus minimizing bias and ensuring a balanced representation of perspectives. While the reliance on secondary data limited primary contextual insights, careful source selection ensured methodological rigor. The analysis was guided by theoretical frameworks such as dependency theory and world-systems theory to interpret the structural inequalities inherent in globalization processes. Ethical research standards were maintained through proper citation and respectful use of all referenced materials.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Economic Impact

Globalization has had varied economic results for the Global South, generating substantial possibilities as well as severe obstacles. Countries like Vietnam, Bangladesh, and India have used global trade liberalization and foreign direct investment to cultivate export-oriented sectors such as garments, textiles, and information technology services. These industries have propelled infrastructure development, employment generation, and technological transfer, therefore contributing to comprehensive economic growth. Nonetheless, these advantages have typically been concentrated among urban elites and foreign investors, while rural communities and local workers are often sidelined, highlighting the inequitable distribution of globalization's benefits.

Simultaneously, several nations have seen increased economic susceptibility as a result of globalization-induced changes. Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs) instituted by the IMF and World Bank in the 1980s and 1990s required trade liberalization, austerity measures, and privatization, which compromised native businesses unable to compete with inexpensive imports. This resulted in industrial deterioration, heightened unemployment, and the proliferation of informal economies in nations such as Zambia, Ghana, and Nigeria. The loss of economic sovereignty restricted governments' capacity to formulate development strategies tailored to their own local requirements, hence increasing their vulnerability to external shocks and economic instability.

Furthermore, increasing debt loads have emerged as a significant issue for several Global South nations. By 2023, more than 60% of low-income countries experienced financial difficulty, mostly due to loans associated with infrastructure, health emergencies, and climate adaption initiatives under stringent conditions. Countries like Kenya and Sri Lanka faced significant budgetary limitations as debt servicing absorbed critical resources, diverting investments from crucial social sectors and prompting austerity measures that often incited societal unrest. The absence of transparency in debt management, particularly with non-traditional lenders, has intensified financial dependence, demonstrating that without fair debt restructuring and robust regulatory frameworks, globalization may reinforce economic inequalities instead of promoting sustainable, inclusive growth.

Political Impact of Globalization on the Global South

Globalization has profoundly influenced the political sovereignty of governments in the Global South, often diminishing their capacity for autonomous decision-making. Global financial institutions, such as the IMF and World Bank, have imposed stringent policy prescriptions on borrowing nations through mechanisms such as Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs). These conditions frequently included reductions in public expenditure, deregulation, and liberalization, significantly constraining national governments' authority over their own development agendas (Stiglitz, 2017). For instance, Ghana, Tanzania, and Zambia were compelled to reduce subsidies for education and healthcare, privatize state-owned enterprises, and lower tariffs—thereby undermining their policy autonomy and their ability to pursue long-term national objectives (Mkandawire, 2020). Although these reforms aimed to stabilize economies and promote growth, the erosion of budgetary control and the contraction of public sectors ultimately limited governments' capacities to respond to citizen needs and promote equitable development. Moreover, these externally driven mandates often compromised the legitimacy of domestic political leadership, as policy choices were perceived as being shaped by foreign institutions rather than accountable democratic processes. As a result, the sovereignty of Global South nations was weakened, with their developmental trajectories increasingly aligned with the policy preferences of external actors.

Despite these constraints, globalization has also opened new channels for democratic engagement and international advocacy within the Global South. The rise of global civil society, facilitated by internet access and international human rights frameworks, has empowered non-state actors to challenge authoritarian regimes and advance political reform. Movements such as the Arab Spring in Tunisia and Egypt, though rooted in domestic grievances, gained visibility and momentum through global networks, media coverage, and transnational solidarity initiatives (Howard & Hussain, 2013). Furthermore, international NGOs, diaspora communities, and regional organizations have contributed to advancing democratic governance, electoral reform, and human rights accountability in various contexts. However, the democratic potential of globalization has been undermined by the structural exclusion of the Global South from major decision-making forums within global governance institutions. The United Nations Security Council still lacks permanent representation from Africa and Latin America, while voting power in the IMF and World Bank remains disproportionately skewed in favor of wealthy Northern nations (Bhattacharya et al., 2022). Consequently, although globalization has enabled greater international engagement and opportunities for democratization, it has simultaneously reinforced entrenched power imbalances that limit the political agency of Global South states on the world stage.

Cultural Impact of Globalization on the Global South

Globalization has significantly shaped the cultural landscapes of the Global South, often through processes of Westernization and cultural homogenization. The proliferation of Western consumer culture—transmitted via television, fashion, fast food, and internet platforms—has contributed to the erosion of numerous indigenous languages, traditions, and artistic forms. In countries such as Kenya, India, and Brazil, urban millennials increasingly gravitate toward Western ideals portrayed in Hollywood films, global fashion brands, and social media influencers—frequently at the expense of their own cultural heritage (Tomlinson, 2019). Indigenous languages have been marginalized in favor of English or French, which are perceived as gateways to economic advancement; however, this linguistic shift has led to the decline of native tongues and the cultural expressions they sustain. Traditional rituals, oral storytelling, and communal celebrations have diminished in visibility as global media content has eclipsed local broadcasting. Educational institutions and popular culture have often privileged Western epistemologies and historical narratives, marginalizing indigenous knowledge systems. This trajectory has sparked concerns about cultural alienation, particularly among younger generations, who face challenges in reconciling ancestral traditions with the assimilated norms of global modernity.

Nevertheless, globalization has also fostered cultural revitalization, innovation, and intercultural exchange, enabling communities in the Global South to reassert their identities on global platforms. Through the internet and global media, cultural products such as Nigerian Afrobeat music, Indian Bollywood films, South Korean K-pop, and Latin American telenovelas have reached worldwide audiences, illustrating the vibrancy of non-Western cultural expressions (Pieterse, 2020). These developments represent not only cultural exports but also acts of resistance to Western cultural dominance. Artists such as Burna Boy, Yemi Alade, and Davido channel their music to address postcolonial struggles, affirm African identity, and advocate for social change—blending indigenous rhythms with global styles. Filmmakers and novelists from Latin America and Southeast Asia have reclaimed historical narratives through storytelling, challenging the stereotypes propagated by dominant global media. These cultural dynamics reflect the process of hybridization, wherein local and global forces interact to produce new, dynamic cultural forms rather than straightforward replications of Western influences. Thus, while globalization has posed significant threats to cultural diversity, it has also opened pathways for creative expression, cultural solidarity, and the global recognition of Southern perspectives.

Technological Impact of Globalization on the Global South

Globalization has facilitated substantial progress in technological accessibility and innovation across the Global South. Countries such as Kenya have emerged as pioneers in digital financial inclusion through the introduction of M-Pesa, a mobile money platform that revolutionized banking for millions lacking access to conventional financial institutions (Jack & Suri, 2016). The rise of e-learning platforms—such as BYJU's—alongside government-supported initiatives like SWAYAM, has significantly expanded educational access in

India, particularly during the COVID-19 pandemic. In South Africa, the adoption of telemedicine and mobile health applications improved healthcare delivery in remote regions, exemplifying the localization of global technological flows (WHO, 2021). These innovations allowed developing countries to bypass traditional phases of technological evolution, increasing efficiency and inclusivity in sectors such as agriculture, education, and healthcare. International partnerships and foreign direct investment have also played critical roles in nurturing digital entrepreneurship and startup ecosystems across Africa, Latin America, and Southeast Asia. In this regard, globalization has functioned as a conduit for technological progress that, when adapted locally, yielded tangible development gains.

However, the technological benefits enabled by globalization have been unevenly distributed, deepening existing disparities and perpetuating a persistent digital divide. Rural communities and vulnerable populations often remain excluded due to inadequate infrastructure, erratic electricity supply, low literacy rates, and the prohibitive costs of digital devices or internet access (UNCTAD, 2022). For instance, while urban centers in Nigeria and Indonesia have experienced rapid smartphone penetration, many remote regions still lack basic internet connectivity. Moreover, the spread of advanced technologies has frequently been hindered by strict intellectual property protections and the absence of robust knowledge-sharing frameworks. As a result, nations in the Global South continue to depend heavily on imported hardware and software from the Global North, limiting their ability to cultivate sovereign digital ecosystems. The lack of localized capacity-building has also led to the deployment of foreign technologies without adequate training or adaptation to local sociocultural contexts. This gap has constrained the long-term transformative potential of globalization-fueled technological innovation. Without inclusive digital policies and sustained investment in indigenous innovation ecosystems, the empowering promise of technology in the Global South remains only partially realized.

Environmental Impact of Globalization on the Global South

Globalization has significantly contributed to the exploitation of natural resources in the Global South, often with severe environmental consequences. Multinational corporations, driven by global market demand for raw materials, have invested heavily in mining, logging, and large-scale agriculture across regions such as the Amazon Basin, the Congo Basin, and Southeast Asia. These activities have led to deforestation, soil degradation, biodiversity loss, and the pollution of water sources—severely impacting both ecosystems and the livelihoods of indigenous communities (Barlow et al., 2021). In Brazil, illegal logging and cattle ranching—frequently linked to global beef and soy markets—have accelerated Amazonian deforestation. In the Democratic Republic of Congo, cobalt and coltan mining for global tech supply chains has caused not only ecological degradation but also humanitarian crises, including child labor and forced displacement (Amnesty International, 2022). Many of these extractive operations have been facilitated through trade agreements or lax environmental regulations, with host governments often prioritizing short-term economic gains over sustainable practices. Consequently, globalization has reinforced a development model in which the Global South functions as a resource frontier for the consumption demands of the Global North—with limited local benefit and substantial environmental harm.

Moreover, globalization has deepened climate injustice, as the Global South bears the brunt of climate change impacts despite contributing minimally to historical carbon emissions. Countries across Africa, South Asia, and the Pacific Islands are experiencing rising sea levels, extreme weather events, prolonged droughts, and increasing food insecurity, yet often lack the infrastructure and financial capacity to adapt or respond effectively (IPCC, 2023). While the Paris Agreement and subsequent COP negotiations have included climate finance commitments—such as the $100 billion annual pledge from developed nations—these promises have routinely gone unmet or delayed, particularly in relation to loss and damage funding (UNFCCC, 2023). The Global North’s slow delivery on climate finance has not only amplified ecological injustice but also eroded trust in global governance institutions. In addition, carbon offset markets and green technology transitions have frequently reproduced global inequalities, with land in the Global South being repurposed for biofuel plantations or carbon sinks to fulfill the emissions reduction goals of the Global North (Fairhead et al., 2012). Environmental activists and scholars in the South have increasingly called for climate reparations and a fundamental transition away from extractivist development models toward ecologically just alternatives. Yet, in the absence of structural reform in global environmental governance, the ecological costs of globalization continue to be disproportionately borne by vulnerable communities in the Global South.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings revealed that globalization had a multifaceted impact on the Global South, presenting both opportunities for growth and significant challenges. Economically, globalization facilitated increased trade, foreign direct investment, and integration into global markets, which benefited key sectors such as manufacturing and services in countries like India, Bangladesh, and Vietnam. These developments spurred employment growth, technological diffusion, and enhanced communication and entrepreneurial prospects. Politically, globalization also empowered local civil society actors and transnational advocacy networks, enabling more effective resistance to authoritarianism and social injustices. This demonstrated globalization's potential to support both economic development and political engagement in parts of the Global South.

However, the economic gains were often undermined by persistent structural dependency and vulnerabilities. Many countries experienced escalating external debt burdens as they borrowed to finance development and crisis response, often under restrictive conditions imposed by international creditors. Structural Adjustment Programs and neoliberal reforms contributed to deindustrialization and weakened domestic industries, while socio-economic inequalities deepened within and between countries. Politically, national sovereignty was compromised as governments adjusted policies to meet external demands, prioritizing creditor interests over inclusive development and social welfare. These constraints frequently fueled social unrest and political instability, illustrating the limitations imposed by globalization on policy autonomy.

Culturally, globalization produced complex dynamics of erosion and revitalization. On one hand, Western consumer culture and media led to the decline of indigenous languages, traditions, and local artistic expressions, particularly among younger generations. On the other hand, cultural products from the Global South—such as Afrobeat music, Bollywood films, and Latin American literature—gained global prominence, serving as forms of cultural resistance and hybridization. This dual process highlighted the agency of Global South communities in actively shaping global culture, rather than being passive recipients of Western influences.

Environmental impacts of globalization further compounded challenges for the Global South. Resource extraction intensified, leading to deforestation, biodiversity loss, and pollution, often driven by multinational corporations responding to global demand. The region also faced disproportionate climate change effects—such as droughts and floods—despite minimal historical contributions to global emissions. The failure of the Global North to fulfill promised climate finance deepened environmental injustice, leaving many vulnerable countries ill-equipped to adapt or mitigate these changes. Overall, dependency and world-systems theories provided essential lenses to understand how historical and systemic inequalities continued to marginalize the Global South within the globalized world, underscoring the need for structural reforms and inclusive global governance.

Globalization impact on the Global South has been ambivalent, producing both notable opportunities and serious challenges. While economic integration, technological diffusion, and cultural exchange expanded in countries like India, Vietnam, and Bangladesh, these benefits were unevenly distributed and accompanied by rising debt burdens, structural dependency, and growing inequalities. Politically, globalization eroded national sovereignty through conditional lending and externally imposed reforms, even as it empowered civil society and transnational advocacy. Culturally, it led to both the erosion of indigenous identities and the global rise of Southern cultural expressions as acts of resistance. Environmentally, intensified resource extraction and climate vulnerability disproportionately affected the South, worsened by unmet climate finance commitments from the Global North. These findings underscore the need for structural reforms and inclusive global governance to ensure that globalization fosters equitable, sustainable, and sovereign development in the Global South.

The study recommended the following;

- Reform Global Governance: Increase the representation and voting power of Global South countries in institutions like the IMF, World Bank, and WTO. Reform conditionality frameworks to respect policy autonomy and include local voices in decision-making, while promoting inclusive multilateralism through the UN and other agencies.
- Strengthen South–South Cooperation and Fair Trade: Support regional integration initiatives such as AfCFTA, MERCOSUR, and ASEAN to reduce dependency on the Global North. Reform intellectual property laws to enable technology transfer and foster innovation. Advocate for fair trade policies that remove export subsidies and discriminatory barriers to create more equitable global market access.
- Enhance Environmental Accountability and Climate Finance: Advocate for binding international environmental standards that hold corporations accountable for ecological damage. Ensure developed countries fulfill climate finance commitments, including funding for adaptation, mitigation, and loss and damage. Link debt relief initiatives with climate resilience funding to support vulnerable countries.
- Promote Cultural Preservation and Inclusive Development: Invest in indigenous language preservation, heritage education, and creative industries that sustain local identities. Encourage cultural initiatives that resist homogenization and strengthen community-rooted development, preserving cultural diversity amid globalization.

REFERENCES

Bhattacharya, D., Khan, T.I., & Salim, R. (2022). *Southern Perspectives on Reforming the Global Financial Architecture*. South Centre Policy Brief No. 115.

Capra, F., & Luisi, P. L. (2020). *The Systems View of Life: A Unifying Vision*. Cambridge University Press.

Chandler, D. (2021). *Resilience in the Anthropocene: Governance and Politics at the End of the World*. Routledge.

Díaz, M., & Seery, E. (2020). *Alternatives to Neoliberalism in Latin America: The ALBA Experience*. Oxfam Discussion Papers.

Donais, T. (2020). *Inclusive Peacebuilding: Recognizing and Reconciling Diverse Interests*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Enloe, C. (2017). *The Big Push: Exposing and Challenging the Persistence of Patriarchy*. University of California Press.

Escobar, A. (2020). *Designs for the Pluriverse: Radical Interdependence, Autonomy, and the Making of Worlds*. Duke University Press.

Ikenberry, G. J. (2021). *A World Safe for Democracy: Liberal Internationalism and the Crises of Global Order*. Yale University Press.

IPCC. (2023). *Sixth Assessment Report (AR6): Climate Change 2023*. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

IOM. (2023). *World Migration Report 2023*. International Organization for Migration. https://www.iom.int/wmr-2023

Martens, J., & Seitz, K. (2020). *Civil Society and Global Governance: The Role of Transnational Social Movements*. Global Policy Forum.

OECD. (2023). *Climate Finance Provided and Mobilised by Developed Countries in 2016–2021*. OECD Publishing.

Patrick, S. (2021). *The Sovereignty Wars: Reconciling America with the World*. Brookings Institution Press.

Sharma, S. (2022). *Trade Justice and the Global South: Rethinking Development and Equity*. Third World Network.

Shepherd, L. J. (2020). *Gender, Violence and Security: Discourse as Practice*. Zed Books.

Tooze, A. (2021). *Shutdown: How COVID Shook the World's Economy*. Viking.

UNDP. (2023). *Human Development Report 2023: Breaking the Gridlock*. United Nations Development Programme. https://hdr.undp.org

UNECA. (2022). *Agenda 2063: The Africa We Want*. United Nations Economic Commission for Africa.

UNFCCC. (2023). *COP28 Summary and Outcomes Report*. United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change.

World Bank. (2023). *International Debt Report 2023*.