

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/233904110>

The Effect of Globalization on Local Industries: A Case of Mogadishu Manufacturers

Article · November 2012

CITATIONS

6

READS

49,982

3 authors, including:



Ali Yassin sheikh Ali

SIMAD University

68 PUBLICATIONS 722 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE



Abdirisak Osman

1 PUBLICATION 6 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

IJBMT

International Journal of Business
and Management Tomorrow

Published by **SPIRI** (*Society For Promoting International Research and Innovation*)



The Effect of Globalization on Local Industries: A Case of Mogadishu Manufacturers

Ali Yassin Sheikh Ali, Lecturer, Faculty of Business Study, Sudan University of Science and Technology, Somalia

Abdirisak Osman Nurre Awdini, Student, Faculty of Business and Accountancy, SIMAD University, Somalia

Hassan Dahir Mohamud Adan, Student, Faculty of Business and Accountancy, SIMAD University, Somalia

Abstract

The aim of this study was to investigate the effect of globalization on local industries, Mogadishu manufacturers as a case. Many authors have written about this phenomenon but in respect to Somalia globalization is hidden among other same problems, so this study tried to examine how the manufacturing sector in Mogadishu dealt with it.

The study first found that globalization had a negative effect upon manufactures, secondly raw materials were the most difficult issues facing the manufacturing sector, a majority of the respondents strongly agreed that they were dependent on imported raw materials from overseas the study thirdly found out that electricity was also a major obstacle too costly for these manufacturers. In contrast the study also revealed that these manufacturers have some favorable strength when it comes to marketing and sells, because they mostly agreed that they had a market for what they produce and consumers prefer their products more than imports.

Keyword: Globalization, Local Industry, Somalia

1. Introduction

The world is in a dynamic state of transition and transformation. The whole world is now moving towards an integration of a single global market, referred to as the Global Village in which everyone is free to live, sell and buy. This process of transition and transformation is called Globalization (Verick, 2006).

Globalization appeared in the English dictionaries only a quarter of a century ago what could be called globalization events were occurring as early as 2500 BC through large-scale contact and trading between European and Asian powers (Al-Rodhan, 2006).

In recent years, the creation of a global village has been seen as the engine of development for both the poor and already rich nations of the world, but it can also be understood in terms of satisfaction of basic needs; elimination of inequalities, reduction of unemployment levels, and minimization of poverty levels and so on. However, the economy of poor countries (mostly sub-Saharan African) remains in crisis, showing little or no signs of stability and closures are most frequent in the industrial sector due to the sophisticated foreign products competition (Adan, 2011).

Although it may be argued that globalization creates room for free access to the world market, the truth seems to lie in the assertion that only developed countries benefit from the deal because they put in place protective measures or standards to discriminate the quality and quantity of developing countries' goods and services entering their markets and at same time dictating poor economies to open their markets for foreign goods and services (Ibrahim, 2004).

The benefits of globalization have not been felt to the fullest in Somalia except for the increase in the communication services. The excessive openness of the market created a dumping ground for goods from the developed world. The inability by government to control the imported goods from competing with domestically produced same products worsened the position of the local industry whose production relies much on imported raw materials amidst the unstable exchange rates. This has gravely impacted on the manufacturing industry leaving it with no option but to further restructure, close up or scale down in production (Rucks, Blokland, White, & Bachelor, 2005).

Globalization was defined by many individuals and institutions in different corners of the world and in different perspectives. (Adan, 2011) Defines globalization is the integration of states, through increasing contact, communication, and trade, to create a common global culture for all humanity. Also (Nicholas, 2004) argues that globalization can be thought of as a process of integration of goods and capital markets across the world in which barriers to international trade and foreign investment are reduced Also (Kenneth L. Kraemer, 2002) defines globalization as the growing interconnectedness of the world through cross-border flows of information, capital, and people. However, in this study the researchers use the definition made by (Nicholas, 2004) because this definition is in line with the objectives of this study.

Globalization has also generated large international opposition over concerns that it has increased inequality and environmental poverty. There is a need to study the impact of globalization on economy. (Goyal, 2006).

Globalization has been the most fashionable term in the world economy during the last two decades (Ismihan, 2008). Globalization's affect in economic, social, cultural, political, and other aspects of contemporary life, this study only focuses on the economic aspects, using the manufacturing sector as a case. Furthermore, since the effect of globalization on local manufacturing sector is investigated the study does not attempt to measure the process of globalization as general but rather the degree to which it effect local manufacturing companies, in terms of the stiffer competition(dumping made by foreign giants) their operations face.

Globalization is the integration of economic, political, and cultural systems around the world which has an impact of almost every life on the globe; the world is getting closer and closer day after day due to the spread of the internet which is making the world seem like a small village. in the business context however globalization (along with its market liberalization) opened borders for goods to travel from one country to the other and as a result of this there are new competitors entering into formerly protected domestic market (Moekotte & Freye, 2008).

Globalization has both positive and negative consequences; it is positive to the development as it will give rise to new industries and more jobs in developing countries and it is negative in that it will force poorer underdeveloped countries of the world to do whatever the big developed countries tell them to do (Rucks, Blokland, White, & Bachelor, 2005).

For the least developed sub Sahara African countries such as Somalia globalization could mean a threat to the survival of local businesses those cannot compete with the foreign goods imported from the developed economies which might result in the close down of some local manufacturing firms, these developed economies had the opportunity to industrialize by wisely utilizing their resources while on the other hand under developed economies are not given such opportunities (Ibrahim, 2004).

In Somalia globalization has left local industries in an unfair competition with the foreign sophisticated technology made goods which has made them either close or restructure in one way or another. Furthermore, the unfair competition has resulted in the undermining of local production and growth in the incidence of dumping mainly for goods from the developed world which are heavily subsidized in their countries of origin.

Furthermore there is no effective government for over two decades which means no one protects the local manufacturing sector while most other poor countries have attractive and meaningful tax exemptions to local industries in order for them to compete favorably with these foreign dumping giants (Adan, 2011). This study is trying to examine the effect of globalization on local industries, Mogadishu Manufacturers as a case and has three objectives:

- To examine globalization and its effects on local industries of Mogadishu manufactures.
- To determine the major problems that local industries of Mogadishu manufacturing sector has with the globalization.
- To investigate the techniques used by local manufactures to deal with globalization effects.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Concepts of Globalization

According to, Kansal (2009) Globalization signifies a process of internationalization plus liberalization, in which the world has become a small village due to the concept of globalization. The competition has become intense in every field. Nations fight with game plan to sustain their economy, by introducing new policies and announcing incentives to support mainly their economic- indicators. After the world economy was open to attack, the Somali's economy has initiate to concentrate on the development of small industrial base, which had contribute positively to Somalia's GDP.

"Globalization" is perhaps the most popular term used to describe changes in the international environment since the end of the Cold War. Unfortunately, the term now is used so frequently that it has come to mean different things to different people. This lack of a precise definition of a term can make it difficult to discuss globalization's effects in a coherent way (Guay, 2007).

Globalization is a complicated issue. Each person interprets it differently. Whether the topic is economic, political or cultural; the one thing agreed upon is that there are some countries that are happy with the impact of globalization (Linda Holland Rucks, 2005).

Among the first rounds of globalization were the openings of trade barriers in many countries. The North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and the World Trade Organization (WTO) began to show their influence in the world economy (ibid).

Moekotte & Freye, (2008) assert that the world economy was actually more open and more integrated in the half century prior to World War than it is today. However, they also confess that even allowing for the propaganda of much of the globalization debate, by saying "there is no doubt that we are witnessing the appearance of a new economic era that is different from the past" (Moekotte, Wouter; Freye, Silke, 2008) furthermore go on by stating that there was essentially petty integration noticeable largely through free trade in goods and services between independent firms and through international movements of capital and relatively simple direct investment.

Globalization has definitely created opportunities for various parts of the economy to gain access to larger pools of resources as well as markets. While this may generally be perceived to have impacted positively on the beneficiaries, there are also indications that globalization has introduced new risks to environments that were hitherto closed to those risks (Ernest, 2004).

2.2 Effect of Globalization

The effect of globalization is on every corner of the world, all things around are made in somewhere overseas but it is not always necessary to import them all some can be made locally and this is the negative consequence of globalization However, there is strong empirical evidence suggesting that trade openness has adversely affected the poor and in fact led to deterioration in income distribution in developing countries.

Aryeetey, (2004) confirms this argument by stating openness to foreign trade can increase the poverty level and income distribution among countries is no longer equitable.

As real globalization started with human co-existence when man was created on the face of the earth it is inevitably clear that no one can live in isolation and on that base there must always be some kind of interdependence of mankind (IBRAHIM, MUSA JEGA, 2004).

The economic dimension of globalization is the most exciting and has been the driving force behind the political and social aspects. For instance, European powers found their ways into other parts of the world like Africa through the colonization of colonies which brought the footprints European industrial revolution. The sole logic of the colonization process was to create a more integrated world economy controlled by the metropolitan countries as a result of the revolutionary changes in the way production was organized in Europe that gave it a competitive edge over the rest of the world. The concept of globalization describes the nature in which the economies of different countries of the world are interrelated and integrated into a larger economic cooperative (ibid).

The concept of globalization implies, first and foremost, a stretching of social, political and economic activities across frontiers such that events, decisions and activities in one region of the world can come to have significance for individuals and communities in distant regions of the globe (Stohl, 2004).

The 'age of globalization' is over. There was a period in which that word globalization seemed to many people to capture the essence of what was going on around them. During the 1990s, activists and politicians, journalists and academics observed the spread of economic liberalization, the rise of new information and communication technologies, the increased salience of international organizations, and the resurgence of a cosmopolitan Human Rights agenda; and many of them believed that the world was opening up to a new form of interconnectedness, that a multi-layered, multilateral system of 'global governance' was emerging, which was set to transform the very nature of international politics (Rosenberg, 2005).

The term, globalization, which came to business as well as academic field recently as 1960s, soon became one of most frequently used terms in today's life.

2.3 Summary

This study discusses the literature related to the impact of globalization on domestic industries Moekotte & Freye, (2008) suggested that the world economy was actually more open and more integrated in the half century prior to World War than it is today. Moekotte & Freye, (2008) here point out that globalization has four factors pushing it. 1) Political and economical which aim of reducing the trade barriers and encourage international collaboration. 2) Technological factor which bombs the circulation of globalised trade. 3) Social integration. 4) Factor relates to competition foreign multinational firms fiercely.

As there is a fierce competition from foreign multinational giants and in these contemporary circumstances of Somali business specially manufacturing sector, then there is inevitably a need for a research like this one.

3. Methodology

This study was conducted through survey design because this study is explanatory study, the quantitative data was collected through questionnaire.

Research Population

This study focused on the population of Mogadishu manufacturers which are two main categories, manufactures of water and minerals and spongy manufactures. The list contains view firms which served as the target population of the study; this list was used because it is the only source available to the searchers.

Sampling Size

The sample size of this study consisted of 10 firms with 5 respondents each firm- A total of 50 respondents The factors such as the confidence that is needed in the findings' accuracy required for analysis will affect the size of the sample that needs to be collated, Other evidence from sampling size that the statistical analysis usually require a minimum sample size of 30 respondents (Saunders et al, 2009).

4. Findings and Discussions

4.1 Demographic Data of the Respondents

This part presents the background information of the respondents who participated in the study. The purpose of this background information was to find out the characteristics of the respondents and show the distribution of the population in the study. In total, 50 respondents filled in the questionnaire; 80% of the respondents were employees and 20% of the respondents were managers in Mogadishu manufactures

Table 4.1: the profile of the Respondents

Category	Frequency	Percent
Gender of the respondents		
a. Male	50	100 %
b. Female	0	0 %
Total	50	100 %
Age Of Respondent		
a. 25-35	46	92 %
b. 36-45	3	6 %
c. 46 and above	1	2 %
Qualifications of the respondents		
a. Master	2	4 %
b. Bachelor	11	22 %
c. Diploma	13	26 %
d. Secondary	12	24 %
e. Others	12	24 %
Total	50	100 %
Title Of Respondent		
a. Manager	10	20 %
b. Employee	40	80 %
Total	50	100 %
Experience Of Respondent		
a. 1 – 5 Years	18	36 %
b. 5 – 10 Years	28	56 %
c. 10 and above	4	8 %
Total	50	100 %

Source: Primary Data.

Gender of respondents

Table 4.1 shows 100% of the Managers and The Employees of the respondents are male. Thus, male have significantly dominated in this field of manufactures and there's no female that works in this sector.

Age of the Respondents

Table 4.1 demonstrates that Most of respondents aged at 25-35years (92%) which had relatively greater than the percentage of respondents aged in 36-45 years (6 %) 46 and above (2%) this implies, that majority of respondents are senior, fresh and energetic, promoting the production of the local industries towards foreign production in Somali manufactures are needed if motivated positively.

Qualifications of the Respondents

Table 4.1 point out that 4% of the respondents had Master degree qualifications from universities, 22% had Bachelor Degree, 26% of respondents Diploma certificates, 24% of the respondents had secondary certificates and 24% had other programs. This implies that the knowledge of the manufacturer employees in Somali Manufactures is underprivileged.

Title of the Respondents

Table 4.1 illustrates that majority of the respondents 80% are Employees and 20% are Managers from manufactures. This implies that the researchers focus on Employees than Managers According to their title.

Experience of the Respondents

Table 4.1 illustrates experience of the respondents, 36% had experience between 1 up to 5 years, 56% had experience 5 up to 10 years, 8% of the respondent had 10 years and above experience.

4.2 Data Analysis and Presentation

Rank	Questions	Mean	St. deviation	Interpretation
1	Globalization affects my firm positively.	1.76	0.87	Strongly disagree
2	Globalization affects my firm negatively.	3.18	1.044	Strongly Agree
3	My firm has foreign competitors.	2.52	1.092	Disagree
4	When there is no foreign competition domestic manufacturing becomes effective.	3.5	0.789	Agree
5	The firm depends more on imported raw material from overseas.	3.28	0.607	Strongly Agree

Table 4.2.1 First objective of the study is: To examine globalization and its effects on local industries
 Source: Primary Data 2012.

According to Table 4.2.1 in our first question, asked to the respondents was Globalization affects my firm positively. 24 respondents or 48% of the respondents said Strongly Disagree, 16 respondents or 32% of the respondents said Disagree, 8 respondents or 16% of the respondents said Strongly Agree, 2 respondents or 4% of the respondents said Agree, in the mean and Standard deviation are 1.76 and 0.870 respectively, Therefore, The majority of the respondents said Strongly Disagree.

The second question to Table 4.2.1, asked to the respondents was, Globalization affects my firm negatively. 7 respondents or 14% of the respondents said Strongly Disagree, 2 respondents or 4% of the respondents said Disagree, 25 respondents or 50% of the respondents said strongly Agree, 16 respondents or 32% of the respondents said Agree, and mean and Standard deviation are 3.18 and 1.044 respectively, Therefore, The majority of the respondents said strongly Agree.

The third question, asked to the respondents, My firm has foreign competitors. 18% of the respondents said Strongly Disagree, 38% of the respondents said Disagree, 16% of the respondents said Strongly Agree, 14 respondents or 28% of the respondents said Agree, and mean, median and Standard deviation are 2.54, 2 and 1.092 respectively, Therefore, The majority of the respondents said Disagree.

The fourth question, asked to the respondents was, when there is no foreign competition domestic manufacturing becomes effective. 2 respondents or 4% of the respondents said Strongly Disagree, 3 respondents or 6% of the respondents said Disagree, 13 respondents or 26% of the respondents said Strongly Agree, 32 respondents or 64% of the respondents said Agree, and mean and Standard deviation are 3.50,4 and 0.789 respectively, Therefore, The majority of the respondents said Agree.

The fifth question, asked to the respondents, Depends more on imported raw material from overseas. 1 respondent or 2% of the respondents said Strongly Disagree, 1 respondent or 2% of the respondents said Disagree, 31 respondents or 62% of the respondents said Strongly Agree, 17 respondents or 34% of the respondents said Agree, and mean and Standard deviation are 3.28 and 0.607 respectively, Therefore, The majority of the respondents said Strongly Agree.

Table 4.2.2 the second objective of this study is: To determine the major problems that local industries of Mogadishu manufacturing sector has with the globalization

Rand	Questions	Mean	St. Deviation	Interpretation
1	We have enough electricity power for our production facilities.	2.84	0.866	Disagree
2	Our employees have the required experience to meet with the quality standards of competitors from overseas.	3.32	0.913	Strongly Agree
3	My firm works below capacity.	2.10	1.035	Disagree
4	Production costs are substantially high so that per unit cost increase.	3.02	1	Strongly Disagree
5	Consumers prefer more local products than imports.	2.6	1.195	Strongly Agree

Source: Primary Data 2012.

According to Table 4.2.2: first question, asked to the respondents is, we have enough electricity power for our production facilities. 10% of the respondents said Strongly Disagree, 16% of the respondents said Disagree, 54% of the respondents said Strongly Agree, 20% of the respondents said Agree, and mean and Standard deviation are 2.84 and 0.866 respectively, Therefore, and The majority of the respondents said Strongly Agree.

Second question, asked to the respondents is, Our employees have the required experience to meet with the quality standards of competitors from overseas. 6% of the respondents said Strongly Disagree, 12% of the respondents said Disagree, 26% of the respondents said Strongly Agree, 56% of the respondents said Agree, and mean and Standard deviation are 3.32 and 0.913 respectively, therefore, and the majority of the respondents said Agree.

Third question of table 4.2.2 is, My firm works below capacity. 18 respondents or 36% of the respondents said Strongly Disagree, 15 respondent or 30% of the respondents said Disagree, 11 respondent or 22% of the respondents said Strongly Agree, 6 respondents or 12% of the respondents said Agree, and mean and Standard deviation are 2.10 and 1.035 respectively, Therefore, The majority of the respondents said Strongly Disagree.

Fourth question of table 4.2.2, Production costs are substantially high so that per unit cost increase. 10% of the respondents said Strongly Disagree, 18% of the respondents said Disagree, 32% of the respondents said Strongly Agree, 40% of the respondents said Agree, and mean and Standard deviation are 3.02 and 1 respectively, Therefore, The majority of the respondents said Agree.

Fifth question of to Table 4.2.2: was, Consumers prefer more local products than imports. 18 respondents or 36% of the respondents said Strongly Disagree, 15 respondent or 30% of the respondents said Disagree, 11 respondent or 22% of the respondents said Strongly Agree, 6 respondents or 12% of the respondents said Agree, and mean and Standard deviation are 2.10 and 1.035 respectively, Therefore, The majority of the respondents said Strongly Disagree.

Table 4.2.3 the third objective of this study is: To investigate the techniques used by local manufactures to deal with globalization effects.

Rank	Questions	Mean	St. Deviation	Interpretation
1	We fill just-in-time orders for our customers.	2.94	1.038	Strongly Agree
2	We have a demand for all we produce.	3.50	0.580	Agree
3	My firm has a competitive position in the market so that we have no problem with global competition.	3.14	0.926	Strongly Agree
4	Marketing staffs are capable of promoting the goods we produce.	3.32	0.844	Strongly Agree
5	The larger the amount we produce the lower the cost per item.	3.10	1.055	Strongly Agree

Source: Primary Data 2012.

The first question of the above table is: We fill just-in-time orders for our customers. 6 respondents or 12% of the respondents said Strongly Disagree, 10 respondents or 20% of the respondents said Disagree, 15 respondents or 30% of the respondents said Strongly Agree, 19 respondents or 38% of the respondents said Agree, and mean and Standard deviation are 2.94 and 1.038 respectively, Therefore, The majority of the respondents agree.

The second question of table 4.2.3 that we request to answer the respondents was, we have a demand for all we produce. 4% of the respondents said Disagree, 42% of the respondents said Strongly Agree, 54% of the respondents said Agree, and mean and Standard deviation are 3.50 and 0.580 respectively, Therefore, The majority of the respondents agree.

The third question of table 4.2.3 that we request to answer the respondents is, My firm has a competitive position in the market so that we have no problem with global competition. 6% of the respondents said Strongly Disagree, 18% of the respondents said Disagree, 32% of the respondents said Strongly Agree, 44% of the respondents said Agree, and mean and Standard deviation are 3.14 and 0.926 respectively, Therefore, The majority of the respondents Agree.

The fourth question of table 4.2.3 that we request to answer the respondents is, Our marketing staffs are capable of promoting the goods we produce. 1 respondent or 2% of the respondents said Strongly Disagree, 9 respondents or 18% of the respondents said Disagree, 13 respondents or 26% of the respondents said Strongly Agree, 27 respondents of 54% of the respondents said Agree, and mean and Standard deviation are 3.32 and 0.844 respectively, Therefore, The majority of the respondents Agree.

In our fifth question of table 4.2.3 that we request to answer the respondents was, The larger the amount we produce the lower the cost per item. 5 respondent or 10% of the respondents said Strongly Disagree, 11 respondents or 22% of the respondents said Disagree, 10 respondents or 20% of the respondents said Strongly Agree, 24 respondents of 48% of the respondents said Agree, and mean and Standard deviation are 3.10 and 1.055 respectively, Therefore, The majority of the respondents Agree.

4.3 Major Findings

The first objective of the study which was intended to examine the effect of globalization on local manufacturers in Mogadishu proved to be negative; the study had two questions which were in line with this objective whether globalization effects positively or negatively 48% of the respondents answered strongly disagree and 50%

strongly agree respectively to these two questions, so that it seems that Mogadishu manufacturers have greater difficulties with globalization.

The Major problems those local manufacturers have with globalization are really many, but this study found that raw materials are the most difficult issues facing the manufacturing sector, in a question related to this issue the respondents were asked if they are more dependent on imported raw materials from overseas in which 62% and 34% answered strongly agree and agree respectively which means that local manufacturing firms are more dependent on raw materials imported from overseas also there were other difficulties like electricity power for manufacturing facilities.

The techniques used by local manufacturers to deal with globalization effects are to decrease production cost so that per unit cost decrease, in one question the respondents were asked whether high production costs result in high per unit cost 32% and 40% of the respondents answered Strongly agree and agree respectively.

4.4 Discussions of the Result

The purpose of this study was to explore the effect of globalization and its influence on local industries, Mogadishu Manufacturers as a case. This study has three objectives: the first objective was To examine globalization and its effects on local industries of Mogadishu manufactures, the second objective was to determine the major problems that local industries of Mogadishu manufacturing sector has with the globalization and the third objective was to investigate the techniques used by local manufactures to deal with globalization effect After data presentation, interpretation and analysis the researchers found out indicators that local manufacturing sector in Mogadishu is generally vulnerable to globalization effect.

There are some studies which found out the similar findings of this study such as a study developed in Nigeria by (Ibrahim, M. J. 2008) which proves that globalization is burden to the underdeveloped economies.

On the other hand there are other studies which have different findings such (Asiedu, E., & Freeman., J. 2006) developed in the United States which found out that globalization has no significant effect on US small and Medeam Sized Interprises.

The different findings of some studies might cause these studies developed in deferent countries and different environments those have different cultures.

5. Conclusions

This study investigates the effect of globalization on local industries in selected manufactures the researchers attempt to examine three objectives the first objective of the study is to examine globalization and its effects on local industries of Mogadishu manufactures. The second objective that the researchers try to investigate is to determine the major problems that local industries of Mogadishu manufacturing sector has with the globalization. The third objective of the study is to investigate the techniques used by local manufactures to deal with globalization effects.

The process of globalization has submerged the growth and development potential of underdeveloped economies by establishing rules and principles that are in conflict with the requisite conditions of their evolutionary process. In addition, this has been detrimental to the effective use of economic resources of the underdeveloped economies and regenerating a cycle of underdevelopment and its concomitants such as poverty, famine, health hazards, and insecurity, among others.

Ali Yassin Sheikh Ali,
Lecturer,
Faculty of Business Study,
Sudan University of Science and
Technology,
Somalia

Abdirisak Osman Nurre Awdini,
Student, Faculty of Business and
Accountancy,
SIMAD University,
Somalia

Hassan Dahir Mohamud Adan,
Student,
Faculty of Business and
Accountancy,
SIMAD University,
Somalia

Reference

- Adan, M. (2011). The Impact of Globalization on Somali Culture: *Journal Of African Business.*
- Al-Rodhan, D. N. (2006). The Pillars Of Globalization. *University of Trier .*
- Aryeetey, Ernest. (2005). Globalization, Employment And Poverty In Ghana. *Institute of Statistical, Social and Economic Research, University of Ghana .*
- Asiedu, E., & Freeman., J. (2006). The Effect of Globalization on the Performance of Small and Medium Enterprises in the US. *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Study .*

- Ernest, A. (2004). globalization, employment and poverty in ghana: *Ghana economic journal*.
- Goyal, K. A. (2006). Impact of Globalization on Developing Countries. *International Research Journal of Finance and Economics* .
- Guay, T. R. (2007). Globalization And Its Implications For The Defense Industrial Base. *Faculty of Economics and Social Sciences* .
- Ibrahim, M. J. (2004). The effect of globalization on the development of underdeveloped economies. *Nigeria Journal of business Administration* .
- Intriligator, M. D. (2001). Globalization Of The World Economy: Potential Benefits And Costs And A Net Assessment. *Haas School of Business, UC Berkeley* .
- Ismihan, M. (2008). Globalization of National Economies. *Journal of Development Economics* .
- Ismihan, M. (2008). Globalization of National Economies. *Journal of Development Economics* .
- Kansal, D. R. (2009). Globalization and Its Impact on Small Scale Industries in India. *PCMA Journal of Business* , 135-146.
- Kenneth L. Kraemer, J. G. (2002). *Impacts of Globalization on E-Commerce Adoption and Firm Performance: A Cross-Country Investigation*. Center for Research on Information Technology and Organizations University of California, Irvine.
- Linda Holland Rucks, P. v. (2005). Globalization - Is it a Benefit or a Threat?
- Moekotte, W., & Freye, S. (2008). The impact of Globalization on SMEs. *Copenhagen Business School* , 9.
- Moekotte, W., & Freye, S. (2008). The impact of Globalization on SMEs. *Copenhagen Business School* , 9.
- Nations, U. (2010). Economic and Social Council. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, vol.113, pp.1245-80.
- Nicholas, C. (2004). *Globalisation and Economic Growth: A Historical Perspective*. London School of Economics: Blackwell Publishing Ltd 2004, 9600 Garsington Road, Oxford, OX4 2DQ, UK and 350 Main Street, Malden, MA 02148, USA.
- Rucks, L. H., Blokland, P. v., White, J. K., & Bachelor, J. L. (2005). Globalization -Is it a Benefit or a Threat? *Teaching and Learning Paper* .
- Verick, D. S. (2006). The Impact of Globalization on the Informal Sector in Africa. *College of Arts and Sciences* .
- Whichard, O. G. (2003). Measuring Globalization: The Experience of the United States of America: *Journal of Development Economics*.