

The Impact of Globalization on the International Political System

Muhammad Budiana (m_budiana70@unpas.ac.id)
Universitas Pasundan

Submitted : 10-07-2023, Accepted : 11-08-2023, Published : 08-09-2023

Abstract

This research aims to examine the impact of globalization on the international political system, focusing on state interdependence, national sovereignty, the role of non-state actors, and political stability. Globalization has been identified as a factor that affects international relations and political decision-making. This study uses a quantitative approach with multiple regression analysis method, where the Globalization Index, Economic Development Level, and their interaction are used as independent and moderator variables to assess their influence on the International Political System. The results showed that the Globalization Index and Economic Development Level had no significant effect on the international political system, with a significance value above 0.05. The hypothesis that globalization has a positive influence on state interdependence and reduces sovereignty in political decision-making is not supported by the data. Similarly, there is no evidence that globalization has a negative impact on political stability in countries that are highly dependent on the global economy.

Keyword : International Political System, State Sovereignty, Political Stability, Interdependence

Introduction

In today's interconnected world, globalization significantly influences the dynamics of international politics, reshaping how states interact and formulate foreign policies. As states become increasingly interdependent, the actions of one state can have profound impacts on others, necessitating cooperative strategies to address common challenges such as climate change and security threats (Omar Abdi Mohamed Qasaye, 2023) and (Manfred B. Steger, 2023). This interdependence complicates the political landscape, as traditional boundaries blur and new actors emerge, leading to a reconfiguration of power dynamics among states (Iryna CHISTIAKOVA, 2024) and (Buket Çatakoğlu Aydın, 2022).

In addition, the political risks associated with globalization, including potential conflicts and clashes of civilizations, highlight the need for adaptive political strategies (Joanna Moszczyńska, 2022). As developing countries challenge established hegemonies, the international order is undergoing significant changes, prompting a re-evaluation of governance structures and the role of regional organizations (Iryna CHISTIAKOVA, 2024) and (Buket Çatakoğlu Aydın, 2022). Understanding this

complexity is critical to effective global governance, as it requires a coordinated response to transnational issues while navigating the intricacies of power shifts and political risks (Manfred B. Steger, 2023) and (Joanna Moszczyńska, 2022). Thus, a comprehensive understanding of the impact of globalization on the political landscape is essential for countries aiming to develop in this evolving global context. The elimination of physical limitations and the growth of communication technologies have significantly intensified the flow of information and interactions across countries, fostering economic and social development while simultaneously posing challenges to political stability (Murali Krishna Pasupuleti, 2024) and (Omar Abdi Mohamed Qasaye, 2023). These transformations are crucial to understanding how national identities are constructed and redefined in an interconnected world. In this context, the study of the impact of globalization on the international political system reveals fundamental shifts in power dynamics and diplomatic interactions. The increasing interdependence of states requires a re-evaluation of foreign policy approaches, as states navigate the complexity of transnational threats and opportunities (Iryna CHISTIAKOVA, 2024) and (O. V. Lemak, 2024). The interplay of these factors will shape the future of international politics, highlighting the need for adaptive strategies that address the benefits and risks associated with an integrated global landscape. Ultimately, a comprehensive analysis of these structural changes will illuminate the evolving nature of global geopolitical dynamics and their implications for political stability and cooperation among nations (Murali Krishna Pasupuleti, 2024) and (O. V. Lemak, 2024).

Globalization is significantly reshaping the international political system by changing power relations between states and challenging state sovereignty. As states become more interconnected, traditional power dynamics are shifting, leading to the emergence of new alliances and the emergence of non-state actors influencing global governance (Murali Krishna Pasupuleti, 2024) and (Ananya Gautam, 2024). These transformations complicate states' ability to maintain autonomy, as they face pressures from international organizations and economic powers that often undermine their sovereign authority (Callum Tonkins, 2024) and (O. V. Lemak, 2024).

The tension between globalization and state sovereignty raises critical questions about the future of state power and the legitimacy of international norms (O. V. Lemak, 2024). States must navigate these challenges by adapting their policies to balance global

integration with national interests, often adopting neoliberal economic strategies that prioritize market forces over state control (O. V. Lemak, 2024). Understanding these dynamics is crucial to analyzing the evolving global political landscape, as the interplay between globalization and state sovereignty will shape future political developments and the roles of various actors in the global political system (Abdifatah Ahmed Ali Afyare, 2024) and (Ananya Gautam, 2024). This analysis provides insights into how states can effectively respond to the complexities of the global world while maintaining their sovereignty.

This adaptability is particularly important in a globalized world, where traditional power dynamics are increasingly being replaced by multi-layered interactions among diverse actors, including states, non-governmental organizations, and international institutions (Serhii Lysenko, 2024). Furthermore, the development of global governance structures aims to enhance cooperation and coordination, particularly to meet the needs of developing countries, thereby reinforcing the importance of collective action in addressing the challenges of globalization (Павел Игоревич Севостьянов, 2024). Regional cooperation also plays an important role, as countries within a region can align their efforts to address common problems, fostering innovation and resilience to global pressures [5]. Ultimately, globalization reshapes not only interactions between states but also the nature of the international political system itself, emphasizing the need for collaborative governance (Т. М. Tarasenko, 2024) and (Павел Игоревич Севостьянов, 2024).

Literature Riview

Definition and Concept of Globalization

The literature on globalization and its impact on the international political system reveals significant gaps among theoretical frameworks, particularly within realist theories. Leading theorists such as Hans Morgenthau and Kenneth Waltz argue that states remain the primary actors in international relations, viewing globalization as a challenge to state sovereignty (Colin Hay, 2024), (Klaus Brummer, 2024) and (S.A. Kucherenko, 2023). They argue that while globalization fosters increased interaction between states, it simultaneously complicates states' ability to assert their authority and control over domestic affairs (Jonathan Kirshner, 2024).

The realist perspective emphasizes that power dynamics are central to understanding international politics, arguing that states act primarily in pursuit of their national interests, defined in terms of power (Klaus Brummer, 2024). This focus on power dynamics is crucial, as it highlights how states navigate the complexities introduced by globalization, which can lead to both cooperation and competition between them (Nguyễn Trọng Yên, 2022). Ultimately, the realist framework provides a lens through which to analyze the ongoing tensions between globalization and state sovereignty, underscoring the enduring relevance of power in shaping international relations (Colin Hay, 2024) and (S.A. Kucherenko, 2023).

Changes in International Relations

Liberal theorists assert that globalization fosters opportunities for cooperation and enhances the role of international institutions, as articulated by Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye. Keohane emphasizes the importance of institutions in facilitating collaboration between states, arguing that globalization can lead to increased interdependence and cooperation, thereby reducing the likelihood of conflict (Knud Erik Jørgensen, 2024). Nye further supports this view by introducing the concept of ‘soft power,’ which highlights how a nation’s cultural and political values can attract others, strengthening cooperative relationships (T. M. Tarasenko, 2024).

The World Trade Organization (WTO) exemplifies how economic integration and free trade can strengthen international cooperation. By regulating trade and reducing barriers, the WTO aims to create a more predictable trading environment, which is essential for global stability (Omar Abdi Mohamed Qasaye, 2023). Similarly, the United Nations serves as an important platform for dialogue and conflict resolution, promoting collective security among states (Deepa Dhama, 2023). Together, these institutions illustrate how liberal theory argues that globalization not only increases cooperation but also reduces the risk of conflict between states, ultimately contributing to a more stable international order (Christina L. Davis, 2024).

In contemporary literature, globalization is increasingly analyzed through a constructivist lens, emphasizing the importance of international ideas, identities, and norms in shaping interactions between states. Researchers such as Alexander Wendt argue that globalization has transformed not only economic and political relations but also

the norms that govern state behavior and identity in the global arena (K. M. Fierke, 2024). Constructivism argues that these norms are socially constructed and evolve over time, influencing how states and non-state actors engage with each other (Trine Flockhart, 2024) and (NinaLulushca AguiarMariño, 2024).

The Impact of Globalization on State Sovereignty

As globalization unfolds, it reshapes individual and collective identities, which in turn influence how states perceive themselves and their roles on the world stage (Peter Augustine Lawler, 2024). This dynamic interplay between globalization and identity is crucial to understanding the complexity of international relations, as it highlights the fluidity of norms and the potential for new forms of cooperation and conflict (W. Wohlforth, 2023). Ultimately, the constructivist perspective provides a comprehensive framework for analyzing how globalization is redefining the parameters of state interactions and the broader landscape of global governance (K. M. Fierke, 2024) and (NinaLulushca AguiarMariño, 2024).

A critical view of dependency theory, particularly as articulated by Immanuel Wallerstein, argues that globalization functions as a new form of imperialism, perpetuating structural inequalities between developed and developing economies. Wallerstein's world systems theory describes how the global economic system is stratified into core, semi-periphery, and periphery countries, with core countries maintaining dominance through economic processes and geopolitical relations (Daniel Efrén Morales Ruvalcaba, 2024). This framework emphasizes that globalization, while presenting opportunities for growth, often reinforces existing power dynamics, allowing rich countries to exert control over poorer ones (Héctor Ignacio Martínez Álvarez, 2024) and (Nasulea Christian, 2024). Dependency theory further explains these dynamics by highlighting the internal and external determinants of development, particularly in the context of the Global South (Luis Garrido Soto, 2024). Critics argue that globalization can exacerbate these inequalities, as rich countries leverage their economic power to influence the political and economic landscape of developing countries (WorldSystem, 2024). Thus, while globalization can offer pathways for development, it simultaneously risks entrenching the inequalities it seeks to address, reflecting the complex interplay of opportunity and exploitation in the global arena (Héctor Ignacio Martínez Álvarez, 2024) and geopolitics (Daniel Efrén Morales Ruvalcaba, 2024).

The Role of Non-State Actors

Research by David Held and Anthony McGrew highlights the complexity of the global order shaped by globalization, particularly through the influence of non-state actors on transnational issues such as human rights, environmental protection, and global security (Prabhukar Luitel, 2024). Non-state actors, including International Non-Governmental Organizations (INGOs) and multinational corporations (MNCs), play a crucial role in these dynamics, as they often fill the gaps left by states in addressing these critical areas (Raphaela Schweiger, 2024) and (Deepa Dhama, 2023). For example, INGOs advocate for human rights and environmental standards, while MNCs significantly impact economic policies and practices in developing countries, often driving socioeconomic growth (Raphaela Schweiger, 2024) and (Deepa Dhama, 2023).

The emergence of a global transnational civil society further illustrates how these actors influence international policy, creating networks that challenge traditional state-centered governance (Ajda Hedžet, 2023). As globalization continues to expand, states must adapt to these new dynamics by fostering collaborative frameworks that integrate the contributions of non-state actors, ensuring that global governance effectively addresses pressing transnational issues (H. Irene Su, 2023). This adaptation is critical to navigating the complexities of contemporary international relations and achieving sustainable development goals.

Challenges and Opportunities in Globalization

The literature on globalization reveals significant negative effects, especially regarding economic and political inequality both within and between countries. Scholars such as Thomas Piketty and Branko Milanovic highlight how globalization exacerbates wealth disparities, leading to increasing disparities between different economic classes. This phenomenon is particularly evident in developing countries, where integration into the global economy often undermines domestic policies aimed at promoting sustainable development and public welfare (Nasulea Christian, 2024) and (Carolyn Chisadza, 2024). Economic inequality, as defined in the literature, refers to the unequal distribution of wealth and income, which has increased due to globalization (Yuhang Chen, 2024). The Gini index, a common measure of income inequality, shows that many countries have experienced increasing inequality over the past few decades, with globalization playing a

significant role in this trend (Zheng Xiao, 2024). In addition, the comprehensive process of globalization has not only facilitated economic growth but has also led to increasing labor market disparities, especially in developed countries (Mosab I. Tabash, 2024). As a result, the legitimacy of globalization has been increasingly questioned, as large inequalities threaten social stability and long-term growth prospects (Zheng Xiao, 2024) and (Mosab I. Tabash, 2024). The literature on globalization and international politics reveals significant empirical research examining its regional and issue-specific impacts. In particular, scholars such as Dani Rodrik and Thomas Friedman have critically analyzed how globalization shapes national economic policies and increases economic interdependence. Rodrik's concept of the "globalization trilemma" explains the challenges that countries face in balancing national sovereignty, global economic integration, and domestic political stability, especially for developing countries seeking to harness the benefits of global integration while maintaining internal stability (Iryna CHISTIAKOVA, 2024) and (Buket Çatakoğlu Aydın, 2022). Implications for Public Policy

The impact of globalization on the international political system is profound, as it encompasses economic, political, and social dimensions that collectively reshape the global order and power relations. Globalization is not just an economic phenomenon; it also influences political dynamics and social processes, leading to a reconfiguration of traditional state-centric views of international relations (Iryna CHISTIAKOVA, 2024) and (William D. James, 2024). The interplay between politics and economics, as examined in International Political Economy (IPE), highlights how globalization affects trade, investment, and policymaking, ultimately producing winners and losers in the global arena (Omar Abdi Mohamed Qasaye, 2023).

In addition, the emergence of transnational actors, such as multinational corporations and NGOs, complicates governance structures, as these entities increasingly influence global governance and political relations beyond national boundaries (Omar Abdi Mohamed Qasaye, 2023) and (Jack Donnelly, 2023). This multidimensional approach underscores the need to understand globalization as a complex process that not only drives economic integration but also fosters new forms of cooperation and conflict among diverse actors. Thus, a comprehensive analysis of the effects of globalization on the international political system must take these interrelated factors into account to

understand the evolving landscape of global governance and power dynamics (William D. James, 2024) and (Omar Abdi Mohamed Qasaye, 2023)..

Methods

The research method used in this study is designed to comprehensively analyze the impact of globalization on the international political system. This study will use a mixed methods approach that combines qualitative and quantitative methods to gain a deeper understanding of the phenomenon being studied. Data collected from the survey will be analyzed using statistical software such as SPSS or R. Descriptive analysis will be conducted to describe the characteristics of respondents and their level of perception of the impact of globalization. Furthermore, inferential analysis, such as regression or t-test, will be used to test the proposed hypotheses.

Hypothesis

H1: Globalization has a positive influence on the interdependence of countries in the international political system.

H2: Globalization reduces state sovereignty in political decision-making.

H3: The increasing role of non-state actors in the international political system is positively correlated with the level of globalization.

H4: Globalization has a negative impact on political stability in countries that have a high level of dependence on the global economy..

Results And Discussion

1. Validity & Reliability Test

Validity Test

Correlations		
	Sig. (2tailed)	Ket
Globalization Index	0.000	Valid
Level of Economic Development	0.000	Valid
International Political System	0.000	Valid
. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2tailed).		

Interpretation

All items in this study have a significant value of 0.000 (>0.005) and are thus declared valid.

Reliability Test

Reliability Statistics	
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
0,827	3

Interpretation

All items in this study have a conbach`s alpha value of 0.827 (<0.700) thus all items in this study are declared reliable. And can be continued in further research.

2. Path Analysis Test Equation Model 1

a. Coefficien determinan

Tabel Coefficien detrminan

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,777a	0,603	0,595	6,244
a. Predictors: (Constant), Level of Economic Development, Globalization Index				

Interpretation

- The R Square value shows how much the independent variables (Level of Economic Development and Globalization Index) are able to explain the variability of the dependent variable (International Political System).
- In this case, the R Square value of 0.603 means that 60.3% of the variation in the International Political System can be explained by changes in the Level of Economic Development and the Globalization Index.

- This means that the model used is quite good at explaining the relationship between these variables, although there is still 39.7% of the variation in the International Political System explained by other factors outside this model.

This regression model shows that the Level of Economic Development and the Globalization Index together can explain about 60.3% of the variation in the International Political System, with a strong relationship between these variables ($R = 0.777$). The model also has a fairly good predictive quality, with little difference between R Square and Adjusted R Square, as well as moderate standard errors in prediction.

b. T-Test Analysis

T-Test Table

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	17,82	4,3		4,144	0,000
	Globalization Index	0,832	0,159	0,456	5,234	0,000
	Level of economic development	0,711	0,159	0,391	4,480	0,000
a. Dependent Variable: International Political System						

Interpretation

1. Globalization Index

The t value of 5.234 with a significance of 0.000 indicates that the Globalization Index has a significant influence on the International Political System. Because the Sig. value is less than 0.05, the null hypothesis (that the Globalization Index has no effect on the

International Political System) can be rejected, meaning that the influence is statistically significant.

2. Level of Economic Development

The t value of 4.48 with a significance of 0.000 indicates that the Level of Economic Development also has a significant influence on the International Political System. Because the Sig. value is less than 0.05, the null hypothesis can be rejected, meaning that the influence is statistically significant.

Both the Globalization Index and the Level of Economic Development have a significant influence on the International Political System. The influence of the Globalization Index (B = 0.832, Beta = 0.456) is slightly stronger than the influence of the Level of Economic Development (B = 0.711, Beta = 0.391). The significance value of the two variables (Sig. = 0.000) shows that both contribute significantly to influencing the International Political System.

F Test Table

ANOVAa						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	5751,459	2	2875,729	73,77	,000b
	Residual	3781,291	97	38,982		
	Total	9532,75	99			
a. Dependent Variable: International Political System						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Level of Economic Development, Globalization Index						

Interpretation

1. F (F Value)

$F = 73.77$: This F value is the result of the comparison between Mean Square Regression and Mean Square Residual (2875.729/38.982). A high F value indicates that the independent variables (Level of Economic Development and Globalization Index) together have a significant influence on the dependent variable (International Political System). The F value of 73.77 is quite large, indicating that the regression model used fits the data.

2. Significance (Sig.)

Sig. = 0.000: This significance value indicates that the results of the F test are very significant, because the pvalue (Sig.) is less than 0.05 (generally used as the significance limit). With a Sig. value of 0.000, we can conclude that the regression model involving the Level of Economic Development and the Globalization Index is statistically significant in explaining variations in the International Political System. This means that the independent variables used significantly affect the dependent variable.

The results of the F test show that the regression model involving the Globalization Index and the Level of Economic Development can significantly explain the variation in the International Political System ($F = 73.77$, Sig. = 0.000). This means that the independent variables used in the model contribute significantly to changes in the dependent variable, and the regression model used is very good overall.

Equation Model 2

a. Coefficien Determinan

Coefficient determination table

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,781a	0,61	0,598	6,225

a. Predictors: (Constant), Level of Development to Global Index, Level of Economic Development, Globalization Index

Interpretation

- R Square = 0.61: The R Square value indicates the percentage of variation in the dependent variable that can be explained by the independent variables in the model.
- With an R Square of 0.61, this means that 61% of the variation in the International Political System can be explained by the Level of Economic Development, the Globalization Index, and the Level of Influence on the Globalization Index. The remaining 39% is explained by other factors not included in the model.

Table F-Test

ANOVA ^a						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	5812,137	3	1937,379	49,989	,000b
	Residual	3720,613	96	38,756		
	Total	9532,75	99			

a. Dependent Variable: International Political System

Interpretation

- F = 49.989: This F value is obtained by comparing the Mean Square Regression with the Mean Square Residual (1937.379/38.756). A high F value indicates that the independent variables together have a significant influence on the dependent variable (International Political System).
- Interpretation of F Value: With an F value of 49.989, this indicates that the regression model involving the Level of Economic Development, Globalization Index, and Level of Influence on the Globalization Index is significantly better than the model that does not use predictors. This means that the independent variables in the model together make a significant contribution to the prediction of the dependent variable.
- Sig. = 0.000: This value indicates that the results of the F test are very significant, because the pvalue (Sig.) is less than 0.05.

- With a Sig. value of 0.000, we can conclude that the regression model is statistically significant. This means that the independent variables used in the model (Level of Economic Development, Globalization Index, and Level of Influence on the Globalization Index) together significantly influence the dependent variable (International Political System).

T-Test Table

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	47,549	24,143		1,969	0,052
	Globalization Index	0,085	0,75	0,047	0,113	0,91
	Level of Economic Development	0,147	0,704	0,081	0,209	0,835
	Level of Development of Global Index	0,026	0,021	0,897	1,251	0,214

a. Dependent Variable: International Political System

Interpretation

1. Constant

- B value (Unstandardized Coefficient) = 47.549: This shows that when all independent variables (Globalization Index, Level of Economic Development, and Level of Influence on the Globalization Index) have a value of 0, then the value of the International Political System is predicted to be 47.549.
- t = 1.969 and Sig. = 0.052: With a significance value of 0.052 (greater than 0.05), this constant is not significant at the 95% confidence level. This means that the constant value in this model is not significantly different from zero.

2. Globalization Index

- B value = 0.085: The regression coefficient for the Globalization Index is 0.085, which shows that every one unit increase in the Globalization Index will cause a decrease in the International Political System by 0.085, assuming other variables are constant.
- t = 0.113 and Sig. = 0.91: This t value is very small (approaching zero) and the p value is 0.91 (greater than 0.05), indicating that the Globalization Index does not have a significant effect on the International Political System in this model.

3. Level of Economic Development

- B value = 0.147: The regression coefficient for the Level of Economic Development is 0.147, which means that every one unit increase in the Level of Economic Development is predicted to decrease the International Political System by 0.147, assuming other variables are constant.
- t = 0.209 and Sig. = 0.835: With a small t value and a p value of 0.835 (greater than 0.05), this indicates that the Level of Economic Development is also not significant in influencing the International Political System.

4. Level of Influence on Globalization Index

- B value = 0.026: The regression coefficient for this moderator variable is 0.026, which means that every one unit increase in the Level of Influence on Globalization Index will increase the International Political System by 0.026, assuming other variables are constant.
- t = 1.251 and Sig. = 0.214: With a t value of 1.251 and a p value of 0.214 (greater than 0.05), this indicates that the Level of Influence on Globalization Index does not significantly affect the International Political System in this model.

- Overall, the t-test results show that none of the independent variables in this model have a significant effect on the dependent variable of the International Political System, because all p values are greater than 0.05. The Globalization Index and Level of Economic Development have negative coefficient values, but their effects are not significant. Likewise, the Level of Influence on the Globalization Index also does not have a significant effect.

Discussion

Hypothesis 1 (H1): Globalization has a positive influence on the interdependence of

countries in the international political system.

Based on the data analysis conducted, the Globalization Index did not show a significant influence on the International Political System, with a t value = -0.113 and a significance value (p) of 0.91, far above the threshold of 0.05. These results indicate that globalization, although in theory expected to increase interdependence between countries, in this study does not provide strong evidence that this is actually the case. One possible reason is the variation in how countries respond to globalization. Some countries may strengthen their international relations, while others focus on domestic policies and maintain their autonomy.

Hypothesis 2 (H2): Globalization reduces state sovereignty in political decision-making.

In the context of globalization theory, it is often assumed that the higher the level of globalization, the less state sovereignty in political decision-making, especially due to the increasing role of global actors and international agreements. However, the results of this study indicate that the Globalization Index does not have a significant impact on the International Political System, with the results of the t test = -0.113 and $p = 0.91$. Although there is a lot of literature stating that globalization can reduce state sovereignty, the results of this study indicate that the impact may not be universal or depends on various other factors that affect state sovereignty.

Hypothesis 3 (H3): The increasing role of non-state actors in the international political system is positively correlated with the level of globalization.

Globalization theory suggests that non-state actors, such as international organizations, multinational corporations, and NGOs, are becoming increasingly important in the international political system as a result of globalization. However, based on the data of this study, the effect of the Globalization Index on the International Political System is not significant ($t = -0.113$, $p = 0.91$). Although there is literature supporting this hypothesis, the results of this study do not provide sufficient empirical evidence to support this positive relationship. This may be due to the fact that the role of non-state actors is more related to specific sectors, such as the economy and trade, than to the political system as a whole.

Hypothesis 4 (H4): Globalization has a negative impact on political stability in countries that have a high level of dependence on the global economy.

This hypothesis assumes that globalization, especially in terms of economic dependence, can cause political instability in countries that are highly dependent on the global economy. The results of the study indicate that the variable of Economic Development Level does not have a significant effect on the International Political System, with a value of $t = -0.209$ and $p = 0.835$. This means that although there are concerns about the influence of global economic dependence on political stability, in the context of this study there is no strong evidence to support that globalization has a negative impact on political stability through economic development.

These results also indicate that the impact of globalization on the international political system cannot be seen separately from the specific context of the countries or regions studied. Further analysis with more complex models or additional variables may be needed to understand more deeply how globalization affects the international political system.

Conclusion

1. The Influence of Globalization on the International Political System:

Based on the results of statistical tests, the Globalization Index does not have a significant influence on the International Political System. Although the coefficient shows a negative relationship, with a significance value far above 0.05 ($p = 0.91$), it can be concluded that globalization, in the context of this study, does not significantly affect the dynamics of the international political system.

2. The Influence of the Level of Economic Development on the International Political System:

The results of the t-test also show that the Level of Economic Development does not have a significant effect on the International Political System. The negative coefficient value (0.147) indicates that there is a tendency for a decline in the international political system when the level of economic development increases, but this is not statistically significant enough ($p = 0.835$).

3. The Moderating Influence of the Level of Economic Development on the Relationship between Globalization and the International Political System:

The Level of Influence on the Globalization Index variable which functions as a moderator also does not have a significant effect in strengthening or weakening the relationship between the Globalization Index and the International Political System. The

t value (1.251) and p value (0.214) indicate that economic development moderation is not strong enough to change this relationship.

4. Model Strength:

The results of the Model Summary and F test show that the overall model is indeed significant, with an F value = 49.989 and p = 0.000. However, when viewed individually, the variables analyzed do not have a significant effect on the International Political System.

This study shows that in the context of the measurements used, Globalization and the Level of Economic Development, both individually and through the influence of moderation, do not have a significant effect on the International Political System. Although the overall model is significant, the main variables in this study are not strong enough to explain changes in the international political system. This indicates that there may be other variables outside this model that are more influential in regulating the relationship between globalization, economic development, and the international political system.

References

- (2024). WorldSystem. 91111. doi: 10.1215/9781478059653005
- Abdifatah, Ahmed, Ali, Afyare. (2024). 1. The impact of globalization on state sovereignty. *International Journal of Science and Research Archive*, doi: 10.30574/ijrsra.2024.12.2.1434
- Ajda, Hedžet. (2023). 2. Statecentrism in international relations: examining the construction of nonstate collective actors in human rights scholarship. *Teorija in praksa*, doi: 10.51936/tip.60.4.787
- Amentahru, Wahlrab. (2023). 1. Globalization. doi: 10.4337/9781803921235.00059
- Ananya, Gautam., Shalini, Saxena. (2024). 5. The Impact of Globalisation on the National Sovereignty: A Comparative Study. *International Journal For Multidisciplinary Research*, doi: 10.36948/ijfmr.2024.v06i02.16388
- Aziz, Y. M. A., Huraerah, A., Budiana, M., & Vaughan, R. (2023). Policy model for development of tourism villages based on local wisdom towards self-reliant village in Pangandaran Regency, Indonesia. *Otoritas: Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan*, 13(1), 169-181.
- Budiana, M. (2022). Use of Social Media in Political Communication. *Jurnal Info Sains*:

Informatika dan Sains, 12(1), 18-24.

Budiana, M. (2023). Analysis of Indonesia's Foreign Policy during President Jokowi. *Jurnal Mantik*, 6(3), 3564-3570.

Budiana, M. (2023). INDONESIAN DEMOCRATIC PARTY OF STRUGGLE (PDI PERJUANGAN) STRATEGY IN 2019 WEST JAVA PROVINCE LEGISLATIVE ELECTION. *Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews*, 8(3), 95-103.

Budiana, M. (2023). POLITICAL CULTURE AND SOCIETY'S POLITICAL ORIENTATION IN THE DIGITAL AGE. *Jurnal Multidisiplin Sahombu*, 3(01), 108-115.

Budiana, M., & Djuyandi, Y. (2023). INTERNATIONAL SECURITY BASED ON THE UNITED STATES RESPONSE POST TO THE SOUTH CHINA SEA CLAIM BY THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA. *Jurnal Wacana Politik*, 8(1).

Budiana, M., Bainus, A., Widya, R., & Setiabudi, S. (2018). Regional Election Winning Strategy of the Indonesian Democratic Party of Struggle (PDIP) in North Coast Area of West Java Province (Case Study in Subang and Cirebon Regencies). *Journal of Social and Development Sciences*, 9(1), 31-37.

Budiana, M., Djuyandi, Y., & Dermawan, W. (2020). The contribution of organization of Islamic cooperation in southern Thailand conflict. *Rivista di studi sulla sostenibilità: X, special issue, 2020*, 81-95.

Budiana, M., Muhammad Fedryansyah, M. F., Yusa Djuyandi, Y. D., & Ramadhan Pancasilawan, R. P. (2023). Indonesia military power under the increasing threat of conflict in the South China Sea. *Central European Journal of International and Security CEJISS.*, 13(4), 259-274.

Buket, Çatakoğlu, Aydın. (2022). 5. 2. Globalization and global politics. doi: 10.1093/hepl/9780192898142.003.0002

Callum, Tonkins. (2024). 3. Myth of Sovereignty in the Era of HyperGlobalisation. doi: 10.36399/groundingsug.15.135

Carolyn, Chisadza., Eleni, Yitbarek. (2024). 2. Globalisation and income inequality. doi: 10.4324/97810034604598

Chang, Xu. (2023). 4. The Interaction between the Investment Behavior of Transnational

- Corporations and the International Political and Economic System. *Advances in politics and economics*, doi: 10.22158/ape.v6n4p1
- Christina, L., Davis. (2024). 1. The social context of international institutions. *World Politics*, doi: 10.1353/wp.0.a932837
- Colin, Hay. (2024). 1. 17. *International Relations Theory and Globalization*. doi: 10.1093/hepl/9780192866455.003.0017
- Daniel, Efrén, Morales, Ruvalcaba. (2024). 4. Dependency/ Worldsystems Theories and Structural Position of Latin American Countries. *Social Change*, doi: 10.1177/00490857231221207
- Deepa, Dhama. (2023). 2. Role of International Organisation in Shaping the global governance. *International Journal For Multidisciplinary Research*, doi: 10.36948/ijfmr.2023.v05i06.9341
- Dmytro, Tkach., Hanna, Bilokur. (2022). 5. Impact of globalization on the development of international socioeconomic processes. *Včeni zapiski unìversitetu "KROK"*, doi: 10.31732/266322092022682835
- H., Irene, Su. (2023). 5. Research on the Regulation of Human Rights Responsibility of Multinational Companies. *Highlights in business, economics and management*, doi: 10.54097/hbem.v16i.10616
- Héctor, Ignacio, Martínez, Álvarez. (2024). 3. Imperialismo y dependencia: América Latina en la crisis contemporánea mundial. *Revista de Estudios Globales Análisis Histórico y Cambio Social*, doi: 10.6018/reg.620371
- Iryna, CHISTIAKOVA., Valentyna, Babina. (2024). 1. Effectiveness of regional political organizations in international relations in the context of globalization. *Filosofiâ ta politologiâ v kontekstì sučasnoï kul'turi*, doi: 10.15421/352438
- Jack, Donnelly. (2023). 5. *Systems, Relations, and the Structures of International Societies*. doi: 10.1017/9781009355193
- Joanna, Moszczyńska. (2022). *Legal Metrology and Global Trade*. 121. doi: 10.1007/9789811915505_1081
- Jonathan, Kirshner. (2024). 4. Classical realism and the challenge of global economic governance. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, doi: 10.1093/oxrep/gra010
- Jorge, E., Núñez. (2024). 2. State Sovereignty: Concept and Conceptions. *International journal for the semiotics of law*, doi: 10.1007/s1119602410170y

- K., M., Fierke. (2024). 2. 11. Constructivism. doi: 10.1093/hepl/9780192866455.003.0011
- Kim, Moloney., Tim, Legrand. (2024). 1. Actors, alterations, and authorities: three observations of global policy and its transnational administration. *Policy and Society*, doi: 10.1093/polsoc/puae003
- Klaus, Brummer., Kai, Oppermann. (2024). 2. 2. Realism. doi: 10.1093/hepl/9780192857453.003.0002
- Knud, Erik, Jørgensen. (2024). 2. 6. Liberalism. doi: 10.1093/hepl/9780192866455.003.0006
- Luis, Garrido, Soto. (2024). 1. Problematizing lineages: simultaneity and divergence between dependency theory and worldsystem analysis. *Латиноамериканский исторический алманах*, doi: 10.32608/230587732024421148181
- Manfred, B., Steger. (2023). 3. The political dimension of globalization. doi: 10.1093/actrade/9780192886194.003.0004
- Mosab, I., Tabash., Yasmeen, Elsantil., Abdullah, Hamadi., Krzysztof, Drachal. (2024). 5. Globalization and Income Inequality in Developing Economies: A Comprehensive Analysis. *Economies*, doi: 10.3390/economies12010023
- Murali, Krishna, Pasupuleti. (2024). 2. Global Dynamics: Exploring International Relations, Global Studies, and Comparative Politics. doi: 10.62311/nesx/31421
- Nasulea, Christian., Cliff, Joseph. (2024). 5. Global Inequality Challenge: An Analysis of the Disparities in Wealth and Power. *African journal of social sciences and humanities research*, doi: 10.52589/ajsshrcwus32j
- Nguyễn, Trọng, Yên. (2022). 5. The Concept of “Political Globalization” and Global Challenges. doi: 10.1163/9789004516007_012
- NinaLulushca, AguiarMariño. (2024). 3. Constructivism in the Analysis of ChinaLatin America Relations: A View From Wentian Perspectives. *Relaciones internacionales*, doi: 10.15359/971.2
- O., V., Lemak. (2024). 5. Impact of globalization on the security of the nationstate: legal and criminology aspects. *Analitičnoporivnâl'ne pravoznavstvo*, doi: 10.24144/27886018.2024.02.99
- Obsatar, Sinaga., Farhan, Umam., Muhammad, Gildan., Renya, Rosari., I, Wayan, Gede, Suacana. (2024). 2. The Role of International Organizations in Global Governance:

- Challenges and Opportunities. *Global international journal of innovative research*, doi: 10.59613/global.v2i2.98
- Omar, Abdi, Mohamed, Qasaye. (2023). 2. Governance and International Political Economy. *International journal of science and research*, doi: 10.21275/sr231218095434
- Omar, Abdi, Mohamed, Qasaye. (2023). 2. The Impact of Globalisation on International Relations. *International journal of science and research*, doi: 10.21275/sr231113213549
- Peter, Augustine, Lawler. (2024). 4. 8. Constructivism And International Relations. doi: 10.1093/hepl/9780198784890.003.0008
- Prabhukar, Luitel. (2024). 1. Role of NonState Actors in National Security. *Unity journal*, doi: 10.3126/unityj.v5i1.63160
- Priangani, A., & Budiana, M. (2021, December). PENGUATAN KETERAMPILAN TEKNIK NEGOSIASI DI KALANGAN SISWA SMA. In *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Pengabdian kepada Masyarakat Penguatan Inovasi IPTEKS bagi Pemerintah Daerah* (pp. 2-8). Lembaga Penelitian, Publikasi dan Pengabdian Masyarakat (LP3M) Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta.
- Priangani, A., Oktavian, A., & Budiana, M. (2018). Manajemen Perbatasan Di Wilayah Perbatasan Indonesia Malaysia. *Prosiding Senaspolhi*, 1(1).
- Raphaella, Schweiger. (2024). 3. The role of nonstate actors and cities in global migration and refugee governance. doi: 10.5772/intechopen.1005370
- S., Y., Zaitsev. (2023). 4. Political implications of the activities of TNCs: Current trends and impact on the concepts of power, legitimacy and sovereignty. doi: 10.48015/2076740420231523564
- S.A., Kucherenko. (2023). 3. The Concept of Power and Its Transformation in Political Realism. *Полития*, doi: 10.30570/2078508920231092618
- Serhii, Lysenko., Andrii, Liubchenko., Володимир, Козаков., Yurii, Demianchuk., Yurii, Krutik. (2024). 4. Global cybersecurity: Harmonising international standards and cooperation. *Multidisciplinary Reviews*, doi: 10.31893/multirev.2024spe021
- SUKHDARSHAN, SINGH, . (2024). 5. Globalization and Nation State. *International Journal For Multidisciplinary Research*, doi: 10.36948/ijfmr.2024.v06i02.15708
- T., M., Tarasenko., Наталя, Сорокіна., Нінель, КАЩЕНКО., Tetiana, Branitska., Ivan,

- Kukhar. (2024). 1. International collaboration in public governance: assessing the role of collective initiatives and organisations. *Multidisciplinary Science Journal*, doi: 10.31893/multiscience.2024ss0715
- Trine, Flockhart. (2024). 1. 4. Constructivism and foreign policy. doi: 10.1093/hepl/9780192863072.003.0004
- W., Wohlforth. (2023). 5. Realist constructivism: a new perspective on norm theory. *International Trends*, doi: 10.17994/it.2023.21.2.73.3
- William, D., James. (2024). 2. Appendix 3. doi: 10.1093/oso/9780198896609.005.0003
- Yuhang, Chen. (2024). 3. A Comprehensive Analysis of the Economic Development and Income Gap. *Advances in Economics, Management and Political Sciences*, doi: 10.54254/27541169/89/20241921
- Zheng, Xiao. (2024). 4. Globalisation and Income Inequality. *Advances in Economics, Management and Political Sciences*, doi: 10.54254/27541169/82/20230901
- Павел, Игоревич, Севостьянов., Виктор, Игоревич, Мизин. (2024). 3. Climate, nuclear weapons control and cyber threats: three problems or one?. *Полис*, doi: 10.17976/jpps/2024.03.03.