



**3rd International Conference
on Public Policy (ICPP3)
June 28-30, 2017 – Singapore**

Panel T03P13 Session 1

Globalization, Politics, and Public Policy

Title of the paper

The Good, Bad and Ugly Face of Globalization: Opening the Borders
for International Workers

Author(s)

Johnathan Ordonez Gaitan, Ph.D. (18')

University of Milan, Italy

[*johnathan.ordonez@unimi.it*](mailto:johnathan.ordonez@unimi.it)

Date of presentation

Thursday, June 29th of 2017

Abstract

The current concept of globalization, as seen in modern economics, pushes for open economies, free markets or integration of borders. This paper evaluates how globalization affects the job market, migration and commerce worldwide. The origins of a globalized economy in the form of Free Trade Agreements (FTAs) and economic integration is explained. Furthermore, an evaluation of the effect of migration on the wages and labor market of the recipient countries is examined: in the short-term period, the demand of labor force does not adjust to the supply of the labor force, reducing the economic growth and displacing the local workers by immigrants. The opposite effect happens in longer periods of time. In the end, the challenges of this new generation of “global citizens,” in the construction of a globalized society, is presented.

Keywords: Globalization, Migration, Economic Integration, Free Trade Agreements, Labor Market

Total word count: 7.545

Introduction

After the end of the 20th century the world has been experiencing severe changes rapidly. Global warming, global terrorism, or global migration are just some of the problems that globalized societies face nowadays. The following paper explores some of the characteristics of this global world. It is divided into five chapters. Chapter number one explores the genesis of a globalized economy in the form of Free Trade Agreements (FTAs) and economic integration. Since a globalized economy necessarily means global trade and trade facilitation, the first chapter analyze how regional interactions and trade agreements foster a global economy. The second chapter studies more in detail how globalization affects global market and migration. The closure of wage gap was an expected result of the integration of the labor market; however, domestic inequality has been the unexpected consequence of it. Accordingly, this chapter revises how migration affects the net wages and the labor market in the short term and long term, both from developing countries to developed countries, and within developed countries. The third chapter explains border development and local integration as examples of consolidated globalized regions. In this sense, a categorization of regional integration is presented and explained, as well as the different types of open-border policies that lead to new forms of border cooperation and integration in many regions of the world. The fourth chapter deals with the scientific approach of globalization. This section explores three main problems that is found in the scientific literature regarding globalization and migration: a conceptual problem, a theoretical problem and a methodological problem. The fifth and last chapter studies the creation of a global citizenship. In this section, the idea of a global citizen is explored, underlining the importance of educating a new generation of young professionals to face the challenges of a globalized civilization in the 21st century. Conclusions are reported at the end of the paper, highlighting the unsolved challenges that globalization brings to the generations to come.

1. Integrating Economies: Free Trade Agreements in Globalized World

The current concept of globalization, as it is seen in political science, economics and sociology, entails the creation of open economies, free market, international migration and the abolition of national borders. After the collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War, the vision of a “New World” was ferociously presented by the presence of global capital (multinational companies) and politicians around the world. Joe Kennedy and John Kennan, two of the most prominent apologists for globalization, proposed the creation of a “Global Village,” implying that it will be inevitable to standardize our political and economic system into a global one (Kennan, 2013; Kennedy, 2004). In this sense, globalization has pushed the expansion of free markets and countries to engage into a more interconnected economic and political condition. Therefore, the integration of economies is a direct result of globalization nowadays.

The literature on integration has proliferated in the last couple of decades. The most basic conception of integration describes a process where many countries enhance their political, social or economic relations through supranational institutions (Dunning & Robson, 1987; Schneider, Johnson, & Wichmann, 1999). However, even though integration strengthens the connection of the countries in many areas, it puts special attention on economic development and Free Trade Agreements (FTAs). Moreover, as countries deepen their connections in the economic area they also engage into other aspects of development, such as environmental protection, migration, and security, defined by the political interests and needs of their respective governments (Dunning & Robson, 1987; Ethier, 1998; Hurrell, 1995).

Accordingly, at the national level, a globalized economy has affected the job market everywhere. The signature of FTAs was the benchmark of the new international economy under the framework of globalization (Francois, van Meijl, & van Tongeren, 2005; Koopmann, 2006). In fact, the literature on globalization approaches this new form of economic and political relations between and within regions as an enhanced version of economic integration through the FTAs. In fact, economic globalization has focused on promoting free trade by the elimination of trade barriers in a specific region. This notion started to gain strength during the Plan Marshall after the World War II. In the European case, globalization acquired the form of economic integration through the formation of a Common Market, establishing the creation of the *four liberties*: free circulation of people, capital, goods, and services (Haas, 1971, p. 610).

Scholars see globalization as the initial step of more solid and stable relations between countries that are economically connected. Integration due to globalization, in this sense, has

fostered the union of regions, creating what is known as *regionalism*. According to Ramon Torrent (2003 & 2009), regionalism has its origins when combining global factors brought by globalization –that modify the structures of international economic policies-, with local or economic policies –that take into account the local characteristics of a particular region (Devlin, Estevadeordal, & Torrent, 2003; Torrent, 2009). In other words, globalization has created market-driven forces and policy-driven initiative that are developing stronger trade, production, investment and financial interdependencies between the region’s constituent economies. Globalization, therefore, has taken the form, in its first stages, of economic trade between countries of the same region, and in a later stage, between regions across the world.

Although FTAs and globalized economies increase the level of interaction between countries within a particular region, the countries still maintain, however, their classic structure of a nation-state (De Lombaerde & Schulz, 2009; Schiff & Winters, 2003). It is in this interconnected relations that new organizations are created to manage the elevated levels of commerce and trade between countries (Gibb, 2009; Mattli, 1999; Schiff & Winters, 2003).

Despite the different scholarly corollaries about globalization, the literature seems in fact to describe the behavior of individual states joining efforts to create larger areas of political, economic or social influence in a specific region. The degree of regional integration depends on many variables, being the most important perhaps on the willingness of the states to share their power –namely their national sovereignty.

2. Labor Market in a Globalized Economy: The Problem with Migration

In the last couple of decades immigration has significantly increased worldwide, increasing the presence of foreign workers in the developed world as well. The economic and social impact of migration in developed countries, due to an open border policies, FTAs and globalization, is still debated in many academic circles. Some branches of the media portrait that migration negatively affects job opportunities of local workers of the developed countries. Others suggest that migration is important because they fill essential jobs that are rejected by local workers. Many social scientists, mainly economists, have analyzed the net effect of migration on employment and wage (Borjas, 2000; Liebig & Sousa-Poza, 2004; Robson, 1981). However, they have failed to find consistent effects of immigrants on employment and wages in the labor market of developed countries.

Recent studies have tried to analyze the effect of immigrants from a broader perspective in the developed economies (Peri, 2016). For example, Giovanni Peri (2016) examines the impact

of immigration on income per worker, and on employment in long periods of time. Having consistent results with the previous studies, Peri found no significant effect of immigration on the job growth in developed economies. In other words, economies absorb immigrants by expanding the labor market rather than by displacing the local workers. Although the opposite effect happens in short periods of time,¹ the effect emerges in the medium to long periods as businesses adapt to capital change (more supply of labor work) to take advantage of the new available labor hand created by immigration. Finally, immigration has been associated with an increased average of work-hours per person, and a reduction in skills per workers *vis-à-vis* college educated workers in the developed economies. However, these two conditions have opposite and barely equal effect on labor productivity.

In fact, globalized economies are clearly contributing more and more to increase economic integration of labor markets, closing the wage gap between workers in advanced and developing countries, especially through the spread of technology. However, globalized economies also play a crucial role in increasing domestic income inequality (Kawachi, Kennedy, Lochner, & Prothrow-Stith, 1997; Mishra & Ratti, 2014). Erecting protectionist policies to prevent the effects of globalization, nonetheless, is not a good response. In this scenario, policymakers must instead focus on what can be done to help workers adjust to a changing world. It is true to say that we are far from a global labor market, as evidenced by a wide disparity in wages. Several studies (Bua, Pradelli, & Presbitero, 2014; Kohli, 2004; Mahler, 2004) find that the median wage for jobs in advanced countries is two and a half times the wage level for jobs with similar skill levels in the most advanced developing countries, and five times the level in low-income countries. The paradox is that this gap is narrowing in part due to globalization. From 2000 to 2010 (the years of the worst global recession since 1930s), the average real wage rose by about 0,5% per year in advanced countries, compared to about 1,5% in Africa and Latin America, and almost 8% in developing Asia (Aguiar & Bils, 2015; Blundell & Preston, 1998; Oishi, Kesebir, & Diener, 2011; Reardon & Bischoff, 2011).

Migration, trade, foreign investment, and the spread of technology –all channels of globalization- work to induce wage convergence in interconnected and mutually reinforced ways. Increased migration probably plays only a small role in wage convergence. The stock of emigrants from developing countries is just 2% of their population, so emigration has little role in raising wages by limiting the growth in labor supply in developing countries. Academic

¹ In a short-term period, businesses do not have the time to adjust their productive capacity to the increment of the supply of labor force; therefore, immigrants do reduce the growth and stability of developed economies, creating a displacement of local workers by immigrants.

studies have found that immigration has modest long-term effects on wages in advanced countries. The reasons could be many: immigrants account for 10% of the labor force; migrants are imperfect substitutes and even complement each other, as migrants increase aggregate demand for the services of the native workers, and finally, migrants reduce the price of services consumed by native workers (Kanbur & Rapoport, 2005; Marchiori & Schumacher, 2011; McKenzie & Rapoport, 2007; Shen, Docquier, & Rapoport, 2010).

These forces of globalization have been associated with both rising living standards and a deterioration in income distribution in advanced countries: low-skilled wages have remained flat or even declined, while high-skills wages have increased sharply. Labor income fell as a share of the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) by 3,5% points from 1993 to 2010 (Barham & Boucher, 1998; Kanbur, 2015; Taylor, 1979). And Gini coefficients, which provide an aggregate measure of income inequality, rose from the mid-1980s to the mid-2000s in all G-7 countries, except France (Lu & Wang, 2013; Stark, Taylor, & Yitzhaki, 1988).

Inequality has also increased in many developing countries. According to the International Labor Organization (ILO), of 28 developing countries, 21 of them experienced increased income inequality from the early 1990s to the mid 2000s. As in advanced countries, openness to trade and foreign investment have increased the relative return to skilled labor and capital, while reducing the relative return to unskilled labor. Indeed, some analyses (Howell & Fan, 2011; Jones, 2011; Liebig & Sousa-Poza, 2004) find that trade and financial liberalization episodes, or openness in general, have contributed to worsening income inequality, at least in the middle-income countries. The link between openness and inequality depends in the part on the policies adopted, as well as the structures of the economy and the initial income distribution.

The debate about migration and the labor market in the developed countries (mainly the United States and the European Union) is influenced by the perception of migration itself. The perception is that most of migrants are poor and with low labor qualifications. Logically, as the aggregated supply of cheap labor force increases, it affects negatively the wages and employment level of the less educated locals. Little focus has been put, however, to the effect of qualified workers (mainly from the United States and Europe) to other developed countries. In fact, studies show that the profile of international workers does not match with the stereotype of poor and uneducated migrants (Collier, 2013; Docquier & Marfouk, 2006; Grogger & Hanson, 2012). First, around 10% the labor work that migrates to OECD countries come from other OCED countries. Moreover, the number of migrant college students is greater than native

students in almost every OECD country.² This means that the new generation of migrants will be as qualified as the native labor force, expanding the labor market until a new equilibrium is found and diminishing the income inequality as well.

3. Opening or Integrating Borders? In the Search a New Approach

The roles of borders in a context of globalization have been subject to scientific inquiry in the last decades. Although the concept of borders is not recent,³ the scholarship started to focus on how they influence the economic development in the age of globalization (Ceglowski, 1998; Yeung, 1998). Accordingly, as borders began to change, at least politically, during the formation of the European Union (allowing the free circulation of people and goods), paradoxically, many new borders were born in the 1990s after the designation of the Soviet Union.

In fact, due to globalization the characteristics of the borders are changing. The evolution of this change is never unidirectional, but rather flexible and dependent on many factors that shape their nature. Due to commercial relations, customs unions and FTAs, there are many possible ways in which borders shape the economic, political and social life of many countries. From a policy perspective, the literature regarding globalization has addressed this issue by trying to analyze the impact of different types of economic and social policies in a region where borders represent an important factor of the territory (Leibenath, Korcelli-Olejniczak, & Knippschild, 2008; Perkmann & Sum, 2002). In fact, some efforts in the literature are indeed found to describe border relations in the framework of regionalism. Sotnikov and Kravchenko (2013) defines border relations as “joint action aimed at establishing and deepening the economic, social, scientific, technical, environmental, cultural and other relations between local communities and their representative bodies.” (Sotnikov & Kravchenko, 2013, p. 96). In a sense, open or closed border policies relates to how borders shape the life of people who live around them. Therefore, globalization is also shaping the way local governments are responding

² In some countries, the number of college-educated immigrants is four times greater than the college-educated people among natives. For more information about the qualification of immigrants in the OCED countries, refer: “Income Maximization and the Selection and Sorting of International Migrants”, to Grogger, J and G Hanson (2011),

³ Border studies, as a scientific discipline, started from the geopolitical tensions between European countries, their colonial expansion, and many wars during the late 19th and early 20th century. For more information about the historical development of borders, refer to “Imagined, Negotiated, Remembered: Constructing European Borders and Borderlands.” (Besier & Stoklosa, 2012).

to cooperation across borders and, hence, to migration from people who go from one country to the other.

Furthermore, since borders do shape the economic and social life of people who live around them, a new type of relation is formed due to local cooperation by many countries. In these cases, *Horizontal Integration* takes place, which depends more on the policies implemented locally (at the border level) rather than the classic integration paradigm carried out at the central level of the countries. As a novel approach, the definition of Horizontal Integration implies the possibility for local communities around the borders of countries to cooperate (at a first stage) and develop policies that would foster such cooperation into deeper integration, at a later stage. Using, therefore, the existing literature of border cooperation and regionalism, we can say that Horizontal Integration is the process in which the local actors at the border zone (either public or private, or both) of two or more neighboring countries engage into economic, social and political arrangements with the scope of creating an integrated area in which common policies can be implemented for the development of the local cities.

Since the ultimate objective of horizontal integration would be the creation of a common area where development policies can be applied, then the space created as a result is called *Horizontally Integrated Space* (HIS). In essence, a HIS is a cross-border area in which development policies are created and implemented. It is measured by the existence of cross-border development policies, notwithstanding their type but rather their existence and application in a border area with common problems.

4. The Problems of Globalization: What the Literature Does Not Answer

So far the literature on globalization has shown that state relations either in the economic or the political spheres depend on many factors, from a historical dispute over territories to economic well-being. With the implementation of the FTAs and border cooperation, cities at the border level with different geography, population, economic performance, political identity, social problems, local market characteristics, infrastructure, etc. have started to engage in various forms of integration. However, even though globalization has interconnected many regions of the world, there is no fundamental or basic agreement in the scholarship regarding a unified concept of integrated zones in the context of a globalized economy. In other words, there is a severe limitation when comparing economic performances in many countries due to open border policy models worldwide, precisely because each model responds to different conditions, causes and has different characteristics according to the region in which they are

implemented. The challenges that face the literature in integration and globalization are related to the nature itself of the research topic, especially when trying to define crucial variables when a comparison between models or experiences is still very weak, or novel in the best of the cases.

This chapter focuses on the main problems and weaknesses found in the literature about globalization. Given the multidisciplinary approach to the topic of globalization, there are at least three problems related to the literature: a concept problem, which includes the area of studies and the difficulties to conceptualize it; a theory problem, which entails the lack of a consistent theoretical framework and the possibility to apply the theories in other contexts; and a methods problem, which opens the debate of whether the quantitative or qualitative approach are the best to apply for the phenomenon.

4.1 The Problem of the Concept

The first problem found in the literature is the concept itself. Either in the scholarship of political science, or international relations, or economics, or sociology, the concept of “globalization” (and all its possible corollaries) is sometimes too wide in the academic literature. Some scholars have indeed acknowledged that this problem is so keen that the concept itself must be rethought in the area of academic research (De Lombaerde, 2011; Sbragia, 2008).

As the literature proliferated after the 1990s, many scholars debated what kind of effects (economic, political, social, cultural, etc.) globalization have in rich and poor countries. Therefore, the scholarship proceeded with different approaches of what globalization was and why countries should adapt to it (Goyal & Staal, 2004; Malamud, 2010; Nye, 1968; Sbragia, 2008). There are no consistent efforts to unify concepts; in fact, the literature has only produced more corollaries to the terms, origins and effects, creating many epistemological voids. Even if the term itself is considered as an “umbrella concept,” for it leads to many other political and economic manifestation in power relations between states, it still needs a solid conceptual analysis. The concept of globalization, economic integration, regional studies or cross-border integration should never, therefore, in a rigorous scientific analysis, be taken for granted.

Despite the lack of consensus about the concept, most of the literature has given great importance to how the concepts of state sovereignty and migration have changed the last decades due to globalization. For example, both economic and political integration are now seen as one of many forms of regional organizations. Notwithstanding the fact that globalization may lead to the creation of regional organizations in any integration process, the main claims of this paper regarding the conceptual problem are twofold. The first one is that globalization

should not only be understood regarding macro-state or macro-regional relations, but also as an integration process at the local (border) level, and the second is that not all regional organizations, as a result of a globalized economy, are the same in every place. Thus, they are not always comparable.

The literature, moreover, divides the integration process due to globalization into three different levels according to the regions (UGLAND, 2009). The first one is the supranational regions (which involves a group of countries); the second are the subnational regions (different regions within an existing country), and the third is the cross-border regions (defined as the territory that covers two or more countries). The supranational regions are the most common units of analysis in the literature of political science and international relations, while the subnational regions are studied more by economics and local politics. Furthermore, globalization has made the boundaries of local and global very dim, creating a new academic debate about the nature of cross-border regions and the relationship between countries within the context of globalization (Perkmann & Sum, 2002; Rosenow, 2009).

Finally, as said before, the vast majority of research in global studies, or in economic integration and regionalism has put more emphasis on macro-regions interactions rather than micro-region interactions. This tendency has, therefore, overlooked some crucial features when studying how globalization and open border policies affect integration at the border level, such as the homogeneity or heterogeneity of the bordering cities, among other important things. There might be interesting cases when comparing experiences with other regions worldwide regarding economic integration and trade agreements, like the ones in the East and Southeast Asia, Africa, and the Euro-regions in the European Union (Perkmann & Sum, 2002; Sbragia, 2008).

4.2 The Problem of the Theory

The second problem found in the literature is the one of the lack of a consistent theoretical framework. The existing theories of globalization and regional studies are not “competing” theories; insofar they do not try to explain the same phenomenon in different ways. Instead, they seek to analyze and study different aspects of globalization or regionalism from a broader perspective. The theoretical problem is similar to the conceptual problem addressed before. Given a conceptual variety of the phenomenon, the theoretical implications for globalization are also vast.

The fundamental problem with the theory is that most of the literature have the propensity to use the economic integration and trade agreements (specially in the field of economics) as a

standard model of understanding globalization (McLennan, 2003; Peet, 2005; Shohat & Stam, 1994). This *bias* towards the economic understanding of the phenomenon is somewhat understandable since most the effect that globalization has is on the economic development of the countries. The problem with this, however, is that the vision of globalization can become misleading or too narrowed, independently of which scientific discipline dominates the current paradigm from which the others are analyzed.

This bias is confirmed in the literature when scholars consider their region of study as “special” when they compare it with other regions whose economic conditions are better due to the globalized economy –i.e. the OCED countries, or the European Union as an integrated area. In fact, the study of the European integration process, and its relative success, as a byproduct of globalization has created an overemphasis of scholarship about globalization and the “West.” To some scholars, this *Eurocentric bias* has “contaminated” the globalization debate for many decades (De Lombaerde, 2011; Sbragia, 2008). Even many of the specialists in economic or political integration (mainly those in defense of the classic functionalist and neo-functionalist schools) were aware of their bias and tried to explain the integration phenomenon using the theoretical framework that the European integration theory itself has produced.

The “Europeanization” in the literature of globalization has created a difficulty in using a standard theoretical framework for analyzing other regions, or to study anything that could be used as a standard definition for “globalization.” As a response to this theoretical problem, there seems to be two recent attitudes that use comparative analysis and that pose themselves as “competing theories” towards the many corollaries of globalization theories. The first proposal tends to elevate the FTAs and migration as the “ground models,” and it is concern to explain their variations. The second proposal compares *de facto* many economic growth models of the developing countries with the ones of the developed countries, and they appear as either *incomplete* (like Latin America and Africa) or *flexible* (like Asia) (Breslin, Higgott, & Rosamond, 2002, p. 11).

However, even in this perspective, most of the existing studies use the economic development of the developed countries as a comparative model for other parts of the world. As a result, this approach has put the OCED model, without wanting, as the center of the analysis of any comparative study, creating more fragmentation in the existing academic literature (Breslin et al., 2002).

4.3 The Problem with the Methods

The third problem with the literature is the empirical methodology to analyze the cases of economic development or economic and political integration due to globalization. There seem to be two broad approaches on the methodological issue. The first has to do with the selection of cases (both single and multiple cases), and the other is about the methodological tools that the different fields of social science have to offer to understand the phenomenon.

When it comes to case selection, the options are also two: the first one is to study a single case/country, usually with an emphasis on the economic perspective on developing countries through history. With single-case studies, the researcher goes in depth into a single case, trying to explain phenomena that occur in that case but without being capable of drawing general conclusions about the problem. This type of case selection is most seen in the field of international relations and sociology. The second option is multiple case studies. In a multi-case research, the researcher tries to find a more general explanation of the phenomenon through quantitative methods. In the topic migration, this method is often used by economists who study the economic impact of trade agreements within a formal integration framework. Between these two ends of the continuum, there is the *comparative case study method*, that uses small *Ns* compared to the qualitative approach, but more than one case to a comparison between cases can be performed. The general problem with the case selection is that, as mentioned before, the literature has been monopolized mainly by the scholarship produced in the West, and the many forms that globalization has taken in the western country, for example, the integration process in the European Union, or the economic growth in the OCED countries. This fact, however, does not allow to explore and understand integration models outside Europe, for example, making some research questions difficult to answer. Whether to go for a single-case study, or multi-case study, or even a comparative case study will depend on the researcher. However, given the current status of the literature, it becomes difficult for the researcher to choose cases that: i) could be interesting enough as to develop theoretical advances without necessarily referring to the developed countries experiences, ii) could be comparable to other cases in other regions of the world, iii) could help develop a general globalization theory applicable to every case (McLennan, 2003).

The second big problem with the methodology is the kind of tools needed (used) to analyze and understand globalization and migration. One big part of the scholarship sees migration as an economic phenomenon that should be studied “synergistically” along with other disciplines in social sciences (Fligstein, Polyakova, & Sandholtz, 2012; Manners, 2011; Nye, 1968). This assumption, however, is methodologically problematic. It is problematic because it assumes

that states should be considered as a single unit of analysis or systems, and thus the tools of political science and comparative economics are more useful than the tools provided by international studies or international relations. Most of the methods found in the literature, therefore, are not consistent neither with the scope of the research nor with the cases of study. Therefore, the lack of cases to compare between regions, plus the complexity of the economic models have led most researchers to choose single-case studies (De Lombaerde, Söderbaum, Van Langenhove, & Baert, 2010; Hettne, 2005; Pedersen, 2002). Scholars who choose single-case studies, logically, avoid applying general concepts and hypotheses that can be used in other cases. This tendency has provoked in the academic literature an over-specialization in specific regions rather than cross-regional comparative analyses.

Very recently the scholarship has shifted into more case-study methods. This method seems to be more attractive for social scientists since it allows a “within-case” analysis and process tracing, which place a relevant role to the specific actors and institutional change due to globalization. Moreover, the reason why the scholarship tends to choose case-study methods is not only because of the complex characteristics of the migration phenomenon but also because of the tradition itself in the methodology used in the fields of international relations or political science. In other disciplines, like economics or international commerce, the use of hypotheses, data sets, and statistical techniques have allowed researchers to give the studies of migration an over-economic profile, leaving aside other important features like history, culture, and identity.

As a summary, both problems concerning the methods (either the case selection or the tools of analysis) require a more in-depth thinking from the academia. It seems that the atomization of the studies in globalization and migration has neglected the possibility to use different tools from different disciplines to study a single phenomenon. It for sure will require more analysis and answers.

5. Global Citizens: Towards the Construction of a Globalized Society

Since globalization is reducing the importance of borders, the idea of global citizenship requires tying civic and political engagement and geography. The most voted interpretation given by the scholarship of changing configuration of citizenship due to globalization is the possibility that citizenship is a changed institution (cite). The problem here is that a tension between the local/national citizenship and global citizenship is created. In fact, an interesting feature of globalization is that, while the world is being internationalized, it is also being localized at the same time (cite). The world is becoming smaller as the local community

(village, town, city) takes on greater and greater importance. Terms such as “glocalization” is becoming more popular. Some scholars (Giulianotti & Robertson, 2007; Roudometof, 2005, 2014) pointed out the paradox and introduced the concept of *technopoles*, meaning the promotion by the government of a partnership between the public and the private sector. If true, global citizenship may be the “glue” that holds these separate entities together. In other words, global citizens are people who can travel within these various boundaries and somehow still makes sense of the world through a global lens (Bauman, 1998; Drori, Höllerer, & Walgenbach, 2014). However, the lack of a recognized globalized world can put the initiative of global citizens themselves to create rights and obligation. These two elements can, according to the theory, contribute to the creation of nation-states. Therefore, new concepts of “human rights” are increasingly being universalized across nations and governments.

Together with the growing awareness of the impact of a global society on the environment, there is a rising feeling that citizen rights may extend to include the right to dignity and self-determination. In other words, if national citizenship does not foster these new “rights,” then global citizenship may seem more accessible. In order to construct a global citizen, it is necessary for the state to create awareness of a wider world and a sense of their own role as a world citizen. The responsibilities of a global citizen include: respect of diversity, participation in the community at a range of levels (from the local to the global) and act to make the world a more equitable and sustainable place.

To create global citizenship, people need to be flexible, creative and proactive. This new generation should be able to solve problems, make decisions, think critically, communicate ideas effectively and work within international teams and groups. These skills are recognized as essential to succeed in many areas of the 21st century. Moreover, these skills and qualities cannot be developed without the use of active learning methods through which people learn by doing and by collaboration with others. Education, in this sense, becomes a crucial asset not only because it represents a transmission of culture, but also because it provides an alternative view of the world. With the interconnected and interdependent nature of the world, the global is not abstract; it is part of our everyday lives as the interdependence increases in time. The sense of global citizenship increases socially and culturally through the media and telecommunications, and through travel and migration. It also increases economically through trade, environmentally through sharing one planet, and politically through international relations and systems of regulation.

Conclusions

The opportunities that globalization offers a new generation of young professionals are enormous. But so too are the challenges. Globalization has created new ways for countries to connect and relate to each other economically, culturally, socially and politically. Throughout the paper we have seen how globalization affects many important aspects of the modern world: economy, migration and citizenship.

Regarding a globalized economy, the theoretical reference in which the world entails into its economic, social and political relations comes in the form of trade agreements and economic integration. In both ways, economic integration that globalization pushed forward refers to market-driven forces and policy-driven initiative that are developing stronger trade, production, investment and financial interdependencies between the region's constituent economies. In terms of the classic factors of production, we saw that migration, trade, foreign investment, and the spread of technology –all channels of globalization- work to induce wage convergence in interconnected and mutually reinforced ways. In fact, migration play an important role in wage convergence. The forces of globalization have been associated with both rising living standards and a deterioration in income distribution in advanced countries: low-skilled wages have remained flat or even declined, while high-skills wages have increased sharply. Moreover, as time progresses, the economic demand in the labor market expands, absorbing the exceeding offer of labor work caused by migration.

Finally, a construction of a global citizenship seems also necessary in the process of construction of a globalized civilization. For the creation of a global citizenship, people need to have flexibility, creativity and proactivity. This new generation of young professionals should be able to solve problems, make decisions, think critically, communicate ideas effectively and work within international teams and groups. These skills are recognized as essential to succeed in many areas of the 21st century.

Bibliography

- Aguiar, M., & Bils, M. (2015). Has consumption inequality mirrored income inequality? *American Economic Review*. <http://doi.org/10.1257/aer.20120599>
- Balassa, B. (1961). The Theory of Economic Integration: An Introduction. *The Theory of Economic Integration*, 173–183.
- Barham, B., & Boucher, S. (1998). Migration, remittances, and inequality: estimating the net effects of migration on income distribution. *Journal of Development Economics*, 55(2), 307–331. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3878\(98\)90038-4](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3878(98)90038-4)
- Bauman, Z. (1998). On Glocalization: or Globalization for some, Localization for some Others. *Thesis Eleven*, 54(1), 37–49. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0725513698054000004>
- Besier, G., & Stoklosa, K. (2012). *Imagined, Negotiated, Remembered: Constructing European Borders and Borderlands*. (K. Katajala & M. Lahteenmaki, Eds.).
- Blundell, R., & Preston, I. (1998). Consumption Inequality and Income Uncertainty. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 113(2), 603–640. <http://doi.org/10.1162/003355398555694>
- Borjas, G. J. (2000). Economics of migration. *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 40(1), 38–39. <http://doi.org/10.2307/2086905>
- Breslin, S., Higgott, R., & Rosamond, B. (2002). Regions in comparative perspective. In *New Regionalisms in the Global Political Economy* (pp. 1–19). http://doi.org/10.4324/9780203361672_chapter_1
- Bua, G., Pradelli, J., & Presbitero, A. F. (2014). Domestic public debt in Low-Income Countries: Trends and structure. *Review of Development Finance*, 4(1), 1–19. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.rdf.2014.02.002>
- Ceglowski, J. (1998). Has globalization created a borderless world? *Business Review*, 17–27.
- Cervantes, G. (2011). El Mercado Común Centroamericano. *Mediterráneo Económico*, 22, 261–269.
- Collier, P. (2013). *Exodus: How Migration is Changing Our World*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- De Lombaerde, P. (2011). The Good, the Bad and the Ugly in Comparative Regionalism: A Comment on Sbragia. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 49(3), 675–681. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5965.2010.02151.x>
- De Lombaerde, P., & Schulz, M. (2009). *The EU and world regionalism: The makability of regions in the 21st century*. *The EU and World Regionalism: The Makability of Regions in the 21st Century*. Retrieved from <http://www.scopus.com/inward/record.url?eid=2-s2.0-84900115959&partnerID=tZOtx3y1>
- De Lombaerde, P., Söderbaum, F., Van Langenhove, L., & Baert, F. (2010). The problem of comparison in comparative regionalism. *Review of International Studies*, 36(3), 731–753. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210510000707>
- Dent, C. (2008). *Northeast Asian Regionalism: Learning from the European Experience*. New York: Routledge.
- Devlin, R., Estevadeordal, A., & Torrent, R. (2003). *Bridges for Development: Policies and Institutions for Trade and Integration*. (R. Devlin & A. Estevadeordal, Eds.), *Policies and Institutions for Trade and Integration* (Vol. 1). Washington, D.C.: Interamerican Development Bank. <http://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004>
- Docquier, F and A Marfouk (2006), “International migration by educational attainment (1990–2000)”, in C Ozden and M Schiff (eds.), *International Migration, Remittances and Development*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Drori, G. S., Höllerer, M. a., & Walgenbach, P. (2014). Unpacking the glocalization of organization:

- from term, to theory, to analysis. *European Journal of Cultural and Political Sociology*, 1(February 2015), 85–99. <http://doi.org/10.1080/23254823.2014.904205>
- Dunning, J. H., & Robson, P. (1987). Multinational Corporate Integration and Regional Economic Integration. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, XXVI(2), 103–125. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5965.1987.tb00308.x>
- Ethier, W. J. (1998). The New Regionalism. *The Economic Journal*, 108(449), 1149–1161. <http://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0297.00335>
- Fligstein, N., Polyakova, A., & Sandholtz, W. (2012). European Integration, Nationalism and European Identity. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 50(SUPPL.1), 106–122. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5965.2011.02230.x>
- Francois, J. F., van Meijl, H., & van Tongeren, F. (2005). Trade Liberalization in the Doha Development Round. *Economic Policy*, 20(42), 349–391. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0327.2005.00141.x>
- Gibb, R. (2009). Regional integration and Africa’s development trajectory: Meta-theories, expectations and reality. *Third World Quarterly*, 30(4), 701–721. <http://doi.org/10.1080/01436590902867136>
- Giulianotti, R., & Robertson, R. (2007). Forms of Glocalization: Globalization and the Migration Strategies of Scottish Football Fans in North America. *Sociology*, 41(1), 133–152. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0038038507073044>
- Goyal, S., & Staal, K. (2004). The political economy of regionalism. *European Economic Review*, 48(3), 563–593. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S0014-2921\(02\)00329-X](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0014-2921(02)00329-X)
- Grogger, J and G Hanson (2011), “Income Maximization and the Selection and Sorting of International Migrants”, *Journal of Development Economics* 95(1): 42–57.
- Hettne, B. (2005). Beyond the “New” Regionalism. *New Political Economy*, 10(4), 543–571. <http://doi.org/10.1080/13563460500344484>
- Howell, A., & Fan, C. C. (2011). Migration and Inequality in Xinjiang: A Survey of Han and Uyghur Migrants in Urumqi. *Eurasian Geography and Economics*, 52(1), 119–139. <http://doi.org/10.2747/1539-7216.52.1.119>
- Hurrell, A. (1995). Regionalism in Theoretical Perspective. In *Regionalism in World Politics: Regional Organization and International Order* (pp. 37–73).
- Jones, K. (2011). *Who’s Afraid of the WTO? Who’s Afraid of the WTO?* <http://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195166163.001.0001>
- Kanbur, R. (2015). Globalization and inequality. *Handbook of Income Distribution*, 2, 1845–1881. <http://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-444-59429-7.00021-2>
- Kanbur, R., & Rapoport, H. (2005). Migration selectivity and the evolution of spatial inequality. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 5(1), 43–57. <http://doi.org/10.1093/jnlecg/lbh053>
- Kawachi, I., Kennedy, B. P., Lochner, K., & Prothrow-Stith, D. (1997). Social Capital, Income Inequality, and Mortality. *American Journal of Public Health*, 87, No. 9, 1491–1498.
- Kennan, J. (2013). Open borders. *Review of Economic Dynamics*, 16(2). <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.red.2012.08.003>
- Kennedy, J. (2004). *Building Without Borders: Sustainable Construction for the Global Village. Natural Building Series.*
- Kim, S. S. (2004). Regionalization and Regionalism in East Asia. *Journal of East Asian Studies*, 4(1), 39–67. <http://doi.org/10.5555/jeas.2004.4.1.39>
- Kohli, U. (2004). Real GDP, real domestic income, and terms-of-trade changes. *Journal of International Economics*, 62(1), 83–106. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinteco.2003.07.002>
- Koopmann, G. (2006). Doha development round perspectives. *Intereconomics*, 40(4), 235–240. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10272-005-0154-3>
- Leibenath, M., Korcelli-Olejniczak, E., & Knippschild, R. (2008). *Cross Border Governance and Sustainable Spatial Development: Mind the Gaps!* (B. Muller & W. Erbguth, Eds.). Springer.

- Liebig, T., & Sousa-Poza, A. (2004). Migration, self-selection and income inequality: An international analysis. *Kyklos*, 57(1), 125–146. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.0023-5962.2004.00246.x>
- Lu, Y., & Wang, F. (2013). From general discrimination to segmented inequality: Migration and inequality in urban China. *Social Science Research*, 42(6), 1443–1456. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2013.06.006>
- Mahler, V. a. (2004). Economic Globalization, Domestic Politics, and Income Inequality in the Developed Countries: A Cross-National Study. *Comparative Political Studies*, 37(9), 1025–1053. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0010414004268849>
- Malamud, A. (2010). Latin American Regionalism and EU Studies. *Journal of European Integration*, 32(6), 637–657. <http://doi.org/10.1080/07036337.2010.518720>
- Manners, I. (2011). Symbolism in European integration. *Comparative European Politics*, 9(3), 243–268. <http://doi.org/10.1057/cep.2010.11>
- Marchiori, L., & Schumacher, I. (2011). When nature rebels: International migration, climate change, and inequality. *Journal of Population Economics*, 24(2), 569–600. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s00148-009-0274-3>
- Mattli, W. (1999). Explaining regional integration outcomes. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 6(1), 1–27. <http://doi.org/10.1080/135017699343775>
- Mckenzie, D., & Rapoport, H. (2007). Network effects and the dynamics of migration and inequality: Theory and evidence from Mexico. *Journal of Development Economics*, 84(1), 1–24. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2006.11.003>
- McLennan, G. (2003). Sociology, Eurocentrism and Postcolonial Theory. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 6(1), 69–86. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1368431003006001561>
- Mishra, A. V., & Ratti, R. A. (2014). Taxation of domestic dividend income and foreign investment holdings. *International Review of Economics and Finance*, 31, 218–231. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.iref.2014.01.018>
- Nye, J. S. (1968). Comparative Regional Integration: Concept and Measurement. *International Organization*, 22(4), 855. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818300013837>
- OEA. (1994). *El Desarrollo de Regiones Fronterizas en Centroamérica*. (IICA, Ed.) (1st. Editi). Washington D.C. Retrieved from <https://www.oas.org/dsd/publications/Unit/oea13s/oea13s.pdf>
- Oishi, S., Kesebir, S., & Diener, E. E. (2011). Income Inequality and Happiness. *Psychological Science*, 22(9), 1095–1100. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0956797611417262>
- Pedersen, T. (2002). Cooperative hegemony: power, ideas and institutions in regional integration. *Review of International Studies*, 28(4), 677–696. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210502006770>
- Peet, R. (2005). From eurocentrism to americentrism. *Antipode*, 37(5), 936–943. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.0066-4812.2005.00542.x>
- Peri, G. (2016). Immigrants, Productivity, and Labor Markets. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 30(4), 3–30. <http://doi.org/10.1257/jep.30.4.3>
- Perkmann, M., & Sum, N.-L. (2002). Globalization , regionalization and cross-border regions : scales , discourses and governance. *Loughborough Univeristy Institutional Repository*, 1–22.
- Reardon, S. F., & Bischoff, K. (2011). Income inequality and income segregation. *American Journal of Sociology*, 116(4), 1092–1153. <http://doi.org/10.1086/657114>
- Robson, P. (1981). *The economics of international migration*. *Population bulletin of the United Nations Economic Commission for Western Asia* (Vol. 20). [http://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-7218\(11\)03002-4](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-7218(11)03002-4)
- Rosenow, K. (2009). The europeanisation of integration policies. *International Migration*, 47(1), 133–159. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2435.2008.00499.x>
- Roudometof, V. (2005). Transnationalism, Cosmopolitanism and Glocalization. *Current Sociology*, 53(1), 113–135. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0011392105048291>

- Roudometof, V. (2014). Nationalism, globalization and glocalization. *Thesis Eleven*, 122(1), 18–33. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0725513614535700>
- Sbragia, A. (2008). Review article: Comparative regionalism: What might it be? *Journal of Common Market Studies*. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5965.2008.00809.x>
- Schiff, M., & Winters, L. A. (2003). *Regional Integration and Development. Integration The Vlsi Journal* (Vol. 82). <http://doi.org/10.2307/20033699>
- Schneider, C., Johnson, D. T., & Wichmann, T. (1999). *Dynamics of Regional Integration Contributions to Economics*.
- Shen, I. L., Docquier, F., & Rapoport, H. (2010). Remittances and inequality: A dynamic migration model. *Journal of Economic Inequality*, 8(2), 197–220. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10888-009-9110-y>
- Shohat, E., & Stam, R. (1994). *Unthinking Eurocentrism : multiculturalism and the media. Sightlines*.
- Sotnikov, Y., & Kravchenko, I. (2013). Cross-Border Cooperation Development of Ukraine: Forms and Instruments of Competitiveness Increase. *Economics & Management*, 18(1), 95–101. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=buh&AN=95278206&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Stark, O., Taylor, J. E., & Yitzhaki, S. (1988). Migration, remittances and inequality. *Journal of Development Economics*, 28, 309–322. [http://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3878\(88\)90002-8](http://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3878(88)90002-8)
- Taylor, P. J. (1979). Political geography. *Progress in Human Geography*, 3(1966), 139–142. <http://doi.org/10.1177/030913257900300108>
- Torrent, R. (2009). La Integración Regional ante un Nuevo Cambio de Paradigma: Reflexiones desde una perspectiva histórica comparada. *ADAPCCA*, 1–113. <http://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004>
- UGLAND, T. (2009). Regionalization and Global Governance: The Taming of Globalization? – Edited by A.F. Cooper, C.W. Hughes and P. De Lombaerde. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 47(1), 206. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5965.2008.01838_8.x
- Vayrynen, R. (2003). Regionalism: Old and new. *International Studies Review*, 5(1), 25–51. <http://doi.org/10.1111/1521-9488.501002>
- Yeung, H. W. (1998). Capital, State and Space: Contesting the Borderless World. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 23(3), 291–309. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.0020-2754.1998.00291.x>