

Global Social Policy: An Application of Welfare State Theory

^{1*} Dr Muhammad Iqbal, ²Dr Muhammad Habib, ³ Hassan Ahmed

¹ Assistant Professor, Department of Social Sciences, Newports Institute of Communication and Economics, Karachi, Pakistan

² Associate Professor, Department of Social Sciences, Newports Institute of Communication and Economics, Karachi, Pakistan

³ Lecturer, Department of Political Science, Haji Abdullah Haroon Government College, Lyari, Karachi.

E-mail: muhammadiqbalsah@yahoo.com, habib3341@gmail.com, hassanahmed074@gmail.com

Abstract: This research delves into the complex landscape of Global Social Policy (GSP), exploring its evolution and challenges in the context of global political dynamics. The study employs a theoretical foundation rooted in Welfare State Theory, examining the transition from national to global welfare frameworks. The problem statement highlights dilemmas arising from the "competition state" model and neoliberal hegemony, compounded by the absence of a cohesive global movement for GSP. The research objectives involve synthesizing theories of national welfare state development, analyzing GSP's evolution, investigating political determinants, exploring transnational alliances, and offering policy implications. The literature review traces the evolution of Welfare State Theory, emphasizing the intersection of industrialization and GSP. Marxist perspectives navigate dilemmas in the globalizing phase, scrutinizing capitalism's flux, the welfare state crisis, neoliberal hegemony, and regional dynamics like the EU paradox. Global social transfers are examined through a Marxist lens, probing their role in responding to global capitalism's inherent challenges. The influence of political institutions, including major international entities, is explored, underscoring their impact on GSP. The research methodology employs secondary qualitative analysis, drawing from diverse sources to unravel GSP complexities. The analysis and results reveal important findings, challenging deterministic economic explanations and emphasizing the intertwining of political dynamics in shaping GSP globally.

Key Words: *Global Social Policy, Welfare State Theory, Marxist Perspective, Neoliberal Hegemony, Political Institutions.*

Introduction

In the field of political science and international relations, a holistic analysis of global social policy emerges as an essential area of study. Global Social Policy (GSP) has become a focal point of scholarly exploration, reflecting the transformative dynamics in the global political landscape. The burgeoning literature on GSP underscores its distinct nature compared to national welfare states (Lemert, 2021). GSP's uniqueness lies in its dependence on an intricate interplay of international organizations and transnational actors, as articulated by Pinker, (2022). Defined by Deacon (2013) as mechanisms, policies, and procedures orchestrated by intergovernmental and international bodies, GSP aims to influence national social policies and establish a supranational or global social policy. As societies grapple with challenges such as inequality, healthcare, education, and economic disparities, 'Welfare State Theory' serves as a theoretical foundation for critically assessing the role of the state in fostering equitable social policies.

This research is not confined to specific geographical boundaries but strives to identify universal principles that form the basis of global social policies, with a primary emphasis on promoting social justice and equality. The research aspires to contribute to a deeper understanding of the practical application of Welfare State Theory in the expansive domain of global social policy. By navigating through theoretical foundations and exploring their manifestations in diverse national contexts, the objective is to illuminate the intricate

dynamics that shape the global landscape of social welfare.

Research Background

Deacon's tripartite classification of global social redistribution, regulation, and rights provides a theoretical foundation for understanding the multifaceted dimensions of GSP. Examples such as the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria, core labour standards, and the United Nations Global Compact exemplify the tangible manifestations of GSP (Bourn, 2014). However, the fragmented and piecemeal structure of global social governance, as highlighted by Dean (2014), introduces complexities. This fragmentation, exacerbated by the prevailing neoliberal hegemony, poses challenges to realizing an expansive vision of GSP. The theoretical lens through which national welfare states have been understood provides a scaffold for comprehending the emergence and development of GSP. The three dominant approaches, i.e. economic development, class struggle, and political institutions that have characterized the study of national welfare states (Kuivosalouet al., 2022) are pivotal in elucidating the forms and constraints of GSP. The research background, while drawing on empirical evidence, is primarily theoretical in nature. It seeks to systematically explicate why GSP assumes specific forms distinct from national welfare states. By applying theories of national welfare state development to GSP, the research aims to provide insights into the nature, potential future trajectory, and constraints on the development of GSP.

Problem Statement

The transition from national to global welfare frameworks poses intricate challenges, necessitating a comprehensive problem statement. While theories of economic development offer insights into the preconditions for GSP, the realization of these developments is intricately tied to political factors. Class struggle, political mobilization, and the evolving role of political institutions become critical determinants in shaping the contours of GSP. The emergence of the "competition state" model, coupled with neoliberal hegemony, introduces complexities that necessitate a reassessment of social democratic visions for GSP (Parkhurst & Abeysingh, 2016). The absence of a cohesive global movement compounds these challenges, raising fundamental questions about the feasibility and efficacy of GSP within the contemporary global landscape. The problem statement seeks to unravel the dilemmas inherent in the transition to global welfare paradigms (Fay, 2014). As national governments grapple with economic interdependence, the reconfiguration of welfare states becomes imperative. The "competition state" model challenges traditional social democratic aspirations for GSP, emphasizing alignment with competitive economic imperatives. This dilemma confronts global social democrats, compelling them to reconcile their vision with the prevailing pro-market consensus (Robertson, 2018). The challenges are exacerbated by the absence of a unified global movement, leaving a void in cohesive advocacy for GSP. This problem statement establishes the foundation for scrutinizing the intricate interplay between theoretical frameworks, political realities, and the evolving nature of GSP in a world characterized by global interdependencies and political intricacies.

Research Objectives

This research attempts to meet the below articulated objectives:

1. To examine and synthesize theories of national welfare state development, focusing on economic development, class struggle, and political institutions.
2. To conduct a comparative analysis of the evolution of GSP and national welfare states, identifying similarities, disparities, and unique characteristics.
3. To investigate the political determinants influencing the development and trajectory of GSP, with a particular focus on class struggle, political mobilization, and global political institutions.
4. To investigate the complexities and dilemmas associated with forging transnational alliances between developed country workers, farmers, and those in developing countries.

To offer policy implications derived from the research findings, providing recommendations for policymakers, international organizations, and advocates involved in the development of GSP.

Literature Review

Evolution of Welfare State Theory

The genesis of welfare state theory can be traced to the early to mid-20th century, notably gaining momentum in the aftermath of World War II. The foundational thinkers, influenced by the profound social and economic changes of the time, sought to conceptualize the role of the state in addressing societal needs. One of the seminal approaches to welfare state theory was functionalism, as articulated by scholars like Deacon (2013) and Kaasch et al., (2019). This perspective posited that the welfare state emerges organically in response to the burgeoning needs of industrial society. Grounded in the Durkheimian tradition, it viewed structural-functional differentiation as a linchpin of modernization. The key tenets revolved around the increasing specialization and division of labor accompanying economic growth and industrialization.

Early welfare state theorists, guided by a functionalist lens, contended that the welfare state materializes in response to the exigencies of industrial society (Beck, 2018). Embedded within the Durkheimian tradition, functionalism postulates that structural-functional differentiation is integral to modernization. The crux lies in the escalating specialization and division of labour concomitant with economic growth and industrialization.

As societies underwent industrialization, processes of urbanization and heightened labour mobility contributed to the erosion of traditional familial roles, leading to the decline of "ascriptive bonds." In this milieu, human relationships shifted from close informal ties to more exchange-based interactions. These societal transformations brought forth a myriad of challenges, including precarious working conditions, unbridled labour contracts, and questions about income security for vulnerable groups like the disabled, children, the elderly, and the unemployed (Seidman, 2016). In response to these burgeoning challenges, the state assumed a pivotal role. Rather than being inherently against the market, the state became a key player in facilitating the market. Its institutional capacity burgeoned alongside the extension of market relations. This dynamic relationship aimed at controlling, supplementing, or substituting for market mechanisms, illustrating the state's essential role in mitigating the socio-economic repercussions of industrialization (Blumer, 2017).

However, an exploration of circumstances where economic or technological development results in greater integration among certain industrial economies unveils potential implications for welfare provision. Instances of international cooperation, such as reciprocal agreements on social security and portable health arrangements, often manifest regionally. A noteworthy example is the European Union (EU), where the explicit project of creating a single European

market has propelled social policy integration (Benton & Redclift, 2013).

Industrialization and its Relevance to Global Social Policy

The nexus between industrialization and welfare state theory forms a cornerstone in understanding societal transformations over the course of the 20th century. The evolution of welfare states, historically tethered to economic development and industrialization, unfolds as a multifaceted narrative of societal adaptation to profound shifts. The contours of industrialization extend beyond economic realms to encompass processes of urbanization and heightened labour mobility (Bourn, 2014). These dynamics usher in transformations in familial structures, eroding traditional bonds and reshaping societal fabric. The shift towards more exchange-based relationships, away from close informal ties, becomes a salient feature of societies traversing the path of industrialization.

With industrialization's inexorable march, a spectrum of social challenges comes to the fore. Factories, while propelling economic growth, alter working conditions, increasing the likelihood of industrial accidents. Unrestrained labour contracts, often entailing long working hours, surface as issues demanding societal attention (Craib, 2015). Simultaneously, questions regarding income security emerge for segments outside the realm of employment, including the disabled, children, the elderly, and the unemployed. In response to these burgeoning challenges, the state assumes a pivotal role. Far from being antithetical to the market, the state is portrayed as a facilitator, actively engaging with and, at times, intervening in market dynamics. This intervention becomes imperative as the state, with its burgeoning institutional capacity, steps in to control, supplement, or substitute for market mechanisms in navigating the socio-economic ripples of industrialization (Robertson, 2018).

Rather than positioning itself against market forces, the state aligns its objectives with the facilitation of the market. The development of the welfare state unfolds parallel to the extension of market relations, highlighting a symbiotic relationship where the state's institutional capacity evolves alongside the expanding market dynamics. The state emerges as a key player in not only mitigating social challenges but also in sustaining and supporting the burgeoning market (Lemert, 2021).

Nevertheless, a Prof examination reveals circumstances where ongoing economic or technological development forges closer integration among select industrial economies, raising implications for future welfare provision. International cooperation surfaces, often regionally, with reciprocal agreements on social security and portable health arrangements exemplifying this phenomenon.

A crucial avenue where industrialization and GSP intersect is in the realm of global social transfers. Industrialized nations extend support to industrializing or mainly agrarian countries through mechanisms that transcend mere economic aid. The development of regional alliances becomes a catalyst, with geographically adjacent countries fostering economic interdependence. The EU, with its common trade policies and initiatives like the single currency, exemplifies how regional alliances shape social policy integration (Bourn, 2014). The broader question looming amidst these intersections is whether the evolving landscape of capitalism in its globalizing phase necessitates a para

Marxist Dilemmas in the Globalizing Phase

The globalizing phase of capitalism ushers in a myriad of dilemmas for Marxist theorists, unravelling contradictions deeply embedded in the interplay between global socio-economic structures and the tenets of Marxist ideology. This section critically engages with the multifaceted predicaments confronting Marxist perspectives in navigating the complexities of a world undergoing profound transformations.

Capitalism in Flux

As capitalism undergoes a phase of unprecedented global integration, Marxists grapple with the intricate dance between capital accumulation and the imperatives of a global socio-economic equilibrium. The dialectics of capitalism, historically scrutinized within national borders, now demand a re-evaluation of Marxist frameworks in the face of transnational dynamics (del Mar Alonso- Almeida et al., 2014). While social transfers historically served the dual role of meeting the needs of capitalism and legitimizing the system within national confines, the global context introduces new layers of complexity. Marxist theorists confront the challenge of reconciling the redistributive potential of global social transfers with their role in sustaining a system inherently predisposed to inequality (Deacon, 2013).

The Crisis of the Welfare State

The global economic crisis of 2007-2008 serves as a crucible for Marxist reflections on the crisis of the welfare state in a globalized era. Marxists contend with the paradox of a system that, while attempting to resolve crises of national capitalism, engenders a global economic meltdown (Sieidman 2016). This crisis prompts a critical interrogation of the welfare state's role and efficacy within the evolving contours of global capitalism.

Neoliberal Hegemony and State Power

Neoliberal hegemony emerges as a formidable force shaping the globalizing phase. Marxist theorists

confront the ascendancy of neoliberal ideologies that prioritize market forces and constrain social policy. The erosion of state power "upwards" and "downwards," as observed by Avaricik (2018), introduces dilemmas regarding the state's capacity to act as a counterforce to global capitalist dynamics. While social transfers historically played a mitigating role within national frameworks, their adaptation to global dynamics raises questions about whether they serve as genuine instruments of socio-economic equilibrium or merely as mechanisms to remove barriers to competition and enhance the single market.

Regional Dynamics and the EU Paradox

The European Union (EU) presents a paradoxical terrain for Marxist analysis. While the EU embodies aspects of regional social policy integration, Marxist theorists delve into the nuances of "positive" and "negative" forms of integration. The EU's trajectory prompts critical examinations of whether regional dynamics align with or deviate from the imperatives of global capitalism (Fay, 2014). The adaptability of welfare states in the face of flexible labour markets becomes a focal point of contention, with Marxists navigating the delicate balance between systemic needs and societal welfare.

As the globalizing phase reshapes socio-economic realities, Marxists delve into whether social transfers can transcend their historical role as palliatives within national boundaries to become instruments fostering global socio-economic equilibrium. This imperative prompts critical inquiries into the feasibility and desirability of a global welfare framework.

Global Social Transfers and Marxist Perspective

Global social transfers represent a pivotal facet in the intricate tapestry of global social policy, transcending traditional welfare state boundaries. As nations increasingly interconnect in a globalized milieu, the concept of social transfers assumes prominence in the discourse surrounding economic cooperation, solidarity, and the redistribution of resources on an international scale (Lemert, 2021). Marxist thinkers delve into the contradictions inherent in social transfers, dissecting their dual role in meeting the accumulation needs of capitalism while legitimizing the system by addressing certain needs of the working class.

The state, in its pursuit of serving the accumulation needs of capitalism, simultaneously finds itself compelled to address the socio-economic needs of the working class within the system. This tension, an enduring motif in Marxist literature, reached a zenith in the discussions surrounding the apparent crisis of the welfare state in the 1970s and 80s (Pinker, 2022). The advent of economic globalization in the 1980s ushered in a phase wherein barriers to international

trade and investment were substantially diminished. Marxists grappled with the evolving dynamics of capitalism in its globalizing trajectory (Bourn, 2014). While attempts were made to resolve earlier crises of national capitalism, the culmination in the 2007-2008 global economic crisis prompted profound reflections on the role of the welfare state in a globally interconnected economic landscape.

Global Social Transfers as Capitalism's Response

Marxist analyses raise critical questions about whether the development of global social transfers is a response to inherent crises within global capitalism. The reduction of barriers to international trade and investment, characteristic of the globalizing phase, may be seen as an attempt to address the challenges posed by capitalism on a global scale. Social transfers, in this context, become both a mechanism for sustaining capitalism and a strategy for managing its inherent contradictions. His perspectives intersect with the regional dynamics of social policy integration (del Mar Alonso- Almeida et al., 2014). The European Union (EU) stands out as an example where social policy integration is not solely about positive forms creating common standards but also about negative forms driven by efforts to remove barriers to competition and enhance the single market. Marxist scholars scrutinize these dynamics, probing the extent to which regional social policy integration aligns with or deviates from the imperatives of global capitalism (Craib, 2015).

In a global context, the Marxist lens directs attention to how social transfers respond to the needs of new social risk bearers. The flexibilities of contemporary global markets and evolving societal structures necessitate adaptations in welfare provisions. As the Marxist discourse converges on global social transfers, it prompts critical inquiries into whether there is an inherent imperative for some form of global social policy (Robertson, 2018). The globalizing phase of capitalism presents challenges and opportunities, and Marxists scrutinize whether social transfers can transcend their role as palliatives within national boundaries to become instruments of global socio-economic equilibrium. Scholars navigate the tension between the needs of capitalism and the imperatives of addressing social inequalities on a global scale (Beck, 2018). Future trajectories in the realm of global social policy, when viewed through the Marxist lens, demand a nuanced understanding of how social transfers can be harnessed to navigate the complexities of a world where economic, social, and political interdependencies are increasingly pronounced.

Global Institutions and Welfare States

Scholars have underscored the pivotal role of political institutions in shaping national welfare states, emphasizing factors such as sequencing, path

dependency, and institutional configurations (Fay 2014). Craib's insights (2015) on political constitutions concentrating power with the executive branch highlight their association with larger welfare states. Conversely, fragmented political systems, exemplified by the USA, tend to produce smaller welfare states due to more opportunities for anti-welfare groups. The landscape of Global Social Policy (GSP) is equally influenced by international political dynamics. Kuivosalo et al., (2022) stated on the non-narrow, constitutional institutionalization of GSP actors. The United Nations (UN) system, although serving as a structured framework, features a multiplicity of intergovernmental and nongovernmental entities engaged in horizontal relationships. However, the existing UN-based global social governance exhibits fragmentation, potentially impeding the progression of GSP. The dynamics of major international institutions, including the International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Bank, World Trade Organization (WTO), World Health Organization (WHO), and International Labour Organization (ILO), significantly impact GSP (Elliot, 2021). Notably, the "iron triangle of liberalism", comprising the IMF, World Bank, and WTO, operates with considerable influence, reflecting neoliberal ideologies. The power asymmetry, particularly the USA's dominance in voting shares, emphasizes the potential for veto power within these institutions (IMF, 2016a).

The historical path dependency and veto authority exercised by the USA in the IMF exemplify the challenges of transforming these institutions into more egalitarian entities (Dean, 2014)). Despite the democratic appearance of the WTO, powerful states exploit various measures to influence weaker counterparts, and the negative impact of agreements like TRIPS and GATS on social policies has been documented (Berten & Heisering, 2017)). The emergence of middle-income countries, the BRICS, has influenced global governance but has yet to significantly reshape GSP approaches. Recent developments, however, reveal shifts in the practices of international institutions, such as the World Bank's move towards a more comprehensive anti-poverty and social protection strategy (Kaasch et al., 2019). This literature review provides a comprehensive overview of the intricate interplay between political institutions and GSP, laying the groundwork for an in-depth exploration of their impact on the evolution and future trajectories of global social policies.

The discourse within economically advanced nations, focusing on the financial viability of welfare states post the 2007-8 financial crisis and the imperative for fiscal consolidation, suggests a limited prospect for a substantial increase in international redistribution unless backed by a robust political movement (Pinker, 2022). However, forming global coalitions advocating for Global Social Policy (GSP) proves challenging. As previously argued, the efficacy of the global movement

against neoliberalism hinges on developing a more defined agenda. Notably, the primary beneficiaries of extensive GSP are the most impoverished citizens of low-income countries, often possessing minimal influence on the global stage (Fay, 2014). While inklings of a desire for greater global redistribution exist in developed nations and emerging middle-income countries, the current political climate implies a gradual pace of progress.

The unique nature of GSP, distinct from national welfare states, necessitates analyzing it through diverse concepts and approaches. This article posits that employing broad theoretical frameworks from the literature on national welfare-state development provides insights into the forms and motivations behind GSP. The analysis suggests that the existing GSP forms remain incremental, minimalist, and fundamentally neoliberal in the absence of a potent global political movement advocating for more extensive GSP (Pinker, 2022) While the material basis for GSP's development exists with the global integration of capitalism, the current fragmentation of social policy responsibility across institutions, coupled with the dominance of powerful states, limits the realization of progressive GSP goals. The political resistance, stemming from attempts to curtail the expansion of national welfare states in advanced capitalist nations, further impedes proposals for substantial global social redistribution, regulation, and rights. Building a more progressive and extensive GSP emerges as a political undertaking (Aravacik, 2018).

Research Methodology

This study adopts a secondary qualitative analysis to delve deeply into the multifaceted realm of Global Social Policy (GSP). The secondary qualitative analysis method is chosen for its capacity to provide a nuanced exploration of intricate socio-political phenomena by scrutinizing existing qualitative data. For data collection, this research relies on a comprehensive array of secondary sources, including scholarly articles, books, reports, and other published materials related to GSP. This diverse pool of existing literature serves as the foundation for uncovering the evolution, challenges, and intricate dynamics associated with global social policies.

The data analysis employs a structured secondary qualitative analysis framework. This method involves a meticulous review and interpretation of qualitative data extracted from the chosen secondary sources. The objective is to discern recurrent themes, patterns, and nuanced insights embedded in the existing literature on GSP. By employing qualitative analysis techniques, this research seeks to reveal underlying factors influencing the nature and progression of GSP, along with the challenges it encounters in the global political landscape. This research methodology underscores the value of harnessing existing qualitative data to generate novel insights into the complexities of GSP.

The emphasis on secondary qualitative analysis aligns with the need for an exhaustive exploration of theoretical frameworks and historical perspectives surrounding global social policies.

Analysis and Results

As we dissect the intricate web of global social policy (GSP), our empirical analysis delves into the nuances illuminated by the existing literature. Through a comparative lens, we juxtapose our findings with the scholarly discourse, evaluating divergences and convergences that shape the evolving landscape of GSP. While literature emphasizes the role of industrialization in GSP emergence, our findings introduce a more nuanced narrative. Contrary to deterministic economic explanations, our analysis reveals the intertwining of political dynamics in shaping GSP's global manifestations. Marxist dilemmas, viewed critically, underscore the limitations of economic-centric perspectives, prompting a re-evaluation of GSP's trajectory beyond traditional paradigms.

Political Mobilization and Class Struggle

Literature accentuates the importance of political mobilization, attributing the development of welfare states to organized working class movements. In contrast, our findings illuminate the multifaceted nature of political influences on GSP. The power resources model, while relevant, encounters complexities in the global context (Lemert, 2021).

Influence of Globalization

The literature review echoes the narrative of globalization leading to welfare state retrenchment at the national level. In contrast, our analysis transcends this binary perspective. The competition state emerges as a pivotal concept, posing challenges to traditional social democratic aspirations. The leftward shift post-2007 financial crisis prompts a global re-evaluation of social justice, yet the absence of a cohesive global movement impedes a unified response to neoliberal hegemony. Political institutions, focal in welfare state theories, extend their influence globally (Blumer, 2017). While the literature centres on the UN as a key global institution, our analysis highlights its limited efficacy due to fragmentation, mirroring challenges at the national level.

Neoliberal Hegemony and Emerging Challenges

The "iron triangle" of liberalism, comprising the IMF, World Bank, and WTO, dominates the literature. Our analysis unveils the intricate power dynamics within these institutions, emphasizing the continuing influence of the USA. Emerging challenges, including the rise of middle-income countries, introduce complexities requiring a thorough examination of neoliberal frameworks and their global impact. Comparing our findings with the existing literature, a

synthesis emerges (Berten & Leisering, 2017). The fragmented global landscape demands a cohesive counter-hegemonic bloc, echoing calls for a common strategy. The imperative of global social justice becomes evident, not as an abstract ideal but as a tangible political project. Bridging theory and empirical insights, our analysis propels GSP discourse beyond theoretical boundaries, urging collective efforts for equitable and just global societies.

Discussion

In delving into the intricate tapestry of global social policy (GSP), our research, rooted in secondary qualitative analysis, unfolds a narrative that synthesizes empirical insights with the rich literature on the subject. The evolutionary trajectories outlined in existing theories of economic development and Marxist perspectives provide a theoretical scaffold for understanding GSP. Our empirical findings, especially those exploring Marxist dilemmas in the globalizing phase, contribute a layer of complexity. The interplay of economic determinants, political mobilization, and evolving class struggles emerges as a dynamic force, challenging deterministic narratives that often dominate traditional economic models. Political mobilization, a focal point in much of the literature, takes centre stage in this research.

The power resources model, as articulated by Dean (2014), gains prominence, emphasizing the importance of left parties and organized workers' movements. However, our findings introduce a critical dimension – the formidable challenges of organizing transnationally. While the post-2007 political landscape hints at a potential leftward shift, the synthesis of cohesive global movements remains a challenging endeavor. Institutional dynamics, as illuminated by institutionalist perspectives, come to the forefront in our research. The literature, centred on the United Nations (UN) as a coordinating force, encounters the stark limitations imposed by power differentials among nations.

The dominance of the United States in key institutions, notably the IMF, underscores the geopolitical realities that shape GSP (Seidman, 2016). Our findings resonate with the literature's discourse on institutional configurations influencing policy outcomes. The "iron triangle" of liberalism, a focal point in existing literature, asserts its dominance, yet our research delves into the intricacies of power within these institutions (Craib, 2015). The effective veto power of the United States and the evolving role of emerging economies present nuanced challenges. The call for a counter-hegemonic bloc, echoing through the literature, gains urgency in light of our empirical insights. Our research has set the stage for redefining GSP discussions, urging policymakers, scholars, and advocates to confront the complexities of a rapidly evolving global landscape. The synthesis of findings and literature points towards the need for a

comprehensive, cohesive global movement to address the challenges and opportunities inherent in shaping equitable and just global societies.

Conclusion

In weaving together the threads of our exploration into global social policy (GSP), our research delves deep into the intricate landscapes of theory, history, and contemporary dynamics. This synthesis brings forth a nuanced conclusion, distilling key insights gleaned from empirical analysis and contextualizing them within the broader scholarly discourse. The evolution of GSP, reflective of the intricate dance between economic forces, political mobilization, and institutional configurations, paints a vivid picture. The theoretical frameworks, whether anchored in economic development models, Marxist lenses, or institutionalist perspectives, offer a conceptual scaffold. Our empirical insights, grounded in nuanced qualitative analysis, extend these theoretical underpinnings, assessing the challenges and prospects entwined in the ongoing globalizing phase. Political mobilization, a linchpin in GSP deliberations, emerges as a pivotal factor, echoing the resonances found in existing literature. However, our study illuminates the formidable hurdles in orchestrating transnational attempts, thereby, challenging the assumption of a cohesive global movement. The intricate power dynamics within institutions, particularly the "iron triangle" of liberalism, present a complex tableau that shapes the trajectory of GSP. As we interlace our empirical revelations with the rich fabric of existing literature, a compelling narrative unfurls – GSP is, at its core, a political venture. It beckons a collective effort to bridge divides among disparate global forces, fostering a shared comprehension of the imperatives for social equity in our increasingly interconnected world. Our findings propel the discourse beyond theoretical abstractions, urging a recalibration of GSP discussions towards actionable, real-world outcomes.

Recommendations

Building upon the insights distilled from our research, we put forth a set of recommendations to guide future pursuits in the realm of GSP:

Fortifying the Global Movement

First and foremost, it is essential to cultivate a robust global movement championing GSP. Despite acknowledged challenges, future studies should concentrate on the assessment of forging transnational alliances that transcend ideological, national, and social schisms. A common understanding of the importance of social equity can serve as a unifying force.

Advocacy for Institutional Reform

Secondly, it is suggested to advocate for reforms within key international institutions, especially those wielding substantial influence over GSP. In this

regard, initiatives should strive to rectify power imbalances and enhance the representation of developing countries, fostering a more inclusive decision-making process.

Engagement with Middle-Income Countries

Importantly, it is insinuated to realise and acknowledge the evolving role of middle-income countries and strategically engage them in shaping GSP. Encourage these nations to blend their economic prowess with a commitment to equitable policies, contributing to a comprehensive approach to global social justice.

Innovative Political Mobilization Strategies

Also, it is fundamental to develop inventive strategies for political mobilization, recognizing the diverse socio-political landscapes globally. Leverage digital platforms and civil society networks to amplify voices, creating a groundswell of support for GSP.

Continued Research and Dialogues

Lastly, there is an indispensable need for forging an ongoing research and dialogues on GSP dynamics. Encourage interdisciplinary collaboration to explore emerging trends, assess the impact of geopolitical shifts, and refine strategies for advancing global social justice.

References

- Berten, J., & Leisering, L. (2017). Social policy by numbers. How international organisations construct global policy proposals. *International journal of social welfare*, 26(2), 151-167.
- Aravacik, E. D. (2018). Social policy and the welfare state. In *Public economics and finance*. Intech Open.
- Dean, H. (2014). *Welfare rights and social policy*. Routledge.
- Koivusalo, M., Fergusson, R., & Leisering, L. (2022). *Understanding global social policy*. Policy Press.
- Pinker, R. (2022). *Social theory and social policy*. Taylor & Francis.
- Deacon, B. (2013). *Global social policy in the making: The foundations of the social protection floor*. Policy Press.
- Parkhurst, J. O., & Abeysinghe, S. (2016). What constitutes "good" evidence for public health and social policy-making? From hierarchies to appropriateness. *Social Epistemology*, 30(5-6), 665-679.
- Del Mar Alonso-Almeida, M., Llach, J., & Marimon, F. (2014). A closer look at the 'Global Reporting

Initiative'sustainability reporting as a tool to implement environmental and social policies: A worldwide sector analysis. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 21(6), 318-335.

- Lemert, C. (2021). *Social theory: The multicultural, global, and classic readings*. Routledge.
- Elliott, A. (2021). *Contemporary social theory: An introduction*. Routledge.
- Kaasch, A., Koch, M., & Martens, K. (2019). Exploring theoretical approaches to global social policy research: Learning from international relations and inter-organisational theory. *Global Social Policy*, 19(1-2), 87-104.
- Robertson, R. (2018). Social theory, cultural relativity, and the problem of globality. In *Sociology of Globalization* (pp. 61-67). Routledge.
- Benton, T., & Redclift, M. (2013). *Social theory and the global environment*. Routledge.
- Beck, U. (2018). *The reinvention of politics: Rethinking modernity in the global social order*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Bourn, D. (2014). *The Theory and Practice of Development Education: A pedagogy for global social justice*. Routledge.
- Blumer, H. (2017). What is wrong with social theory?. In *Sociological methods* (pp. 84-96). Routledge.
- Craib, I. (2015). *Modern social theory*. Routledge.
- Seidman, S. (2016). *Contested knowledge: Social theory today*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Fay, B. (2014). *Social theory and political practice (RLE social theory)*. Routledge.