

References:

1. Allen R (1993) *Differential diagnosis of arthritis in childhood*. *Baillières Clinical Paediatrics* 1:665–694.
2. Balagué F, Dutoit G, Waldburger M. (1998) *Low back pain in schoolchildren: an epidemiological study*. *Scand J Rehabil Med*. 1998;20(4):175–9.
3. Chou R, Qaseem A, Owens DK, Shekelle P. (2011) *Diagnostic imaging for low back pain: advice for high-value health care from the American College of Physicians*. *Ann Intern Med*. 2011;154(3):181-9. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7326/0003-4819-154-3-201102010-00008>.
4. Fassa A.G, Facchini L.A, Dall'Agnol M.M, Christiani D.C. (2005) *Child labor and musculoskeletal disorders: the Pelotas (Brazil) epidemiological survey*. *Public Health Rep*. 2005;120(6):665-673. doi:10.1177/003335490512000615
5. James S.L., Abate D., Abate K.H., et al. (2017) *Global, regional, and national incidence, prevalence, and years lived with disability for 354 diseases and injuries for 195 countries and territories, 1990-2017: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2017*. *Lancet* 2018; 392: 1789-858.
6. Kamper S.J., Henschke N., Hestbaek L., Dunn K.M., Williams C.M.(2014) *Musculoskeletal pain in children and adolescents*. *Braz J Phys Ther*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/bjpt-rbf.2014.0149>
7. *Prevalence of arthritis according to age, sex and socioeconomic status in six low and middle income countries: analysis of data from the World Health Organization study on global AGEing and adult health (SAGE) Wave 1*.
8. S. L. Brennan-Olsen, S. Cook, M. T. Leech, S. J. Bowe, P. Kowal, N. Naidoo, I. N. Ackerman, et al. (2017) *BMC Musculoskeletal Disorders*. 2017. (<https://bmcmusculoskeletdisord.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12891-017-1624-z>).
9. Sills J.A. (1997) *Non-inflammatory musculoskeletal disorders in childhood*. *Archives of Disease in Childhood*. [Online]: <https://adc.bmj.com/content/77/1/71.info>
10. Waddell G. *The back pain revolution*. 2nd ed. London: Churchill Livingstone; 2004.
11. World Health Organization. *Guidelines on community-level interventions to manage declines in intrinsic capacity*. Geneva: WHO; 2017 (<https://www.who.int/ageing/publications/guidelines-icope/en/>).

SRSTI 04.51.21

<https://doi.org/10.51889/2021-1.1728-8940.22>

O.W. Adeleke¹ A.T. Abzhaliyeva

International Information Technology University
Kazakhstan

GLOBALIZATION AND SOCIAL INEQUALITY IN NIGERIA

Abstract

Globalization creates social inequality and instability, it poses threat to sovereignty and territorial integrity not just in the post-colonial countries of Asia and Afrika, but also in the current Westphalia state system. Globalization often tacitly embolden demands for new states. Meanwhile, neo-liberalism that works in the well-established market economies in the West has failed to meet the target in the emerging markets of the developing economies. Although globalization comes with both enriching and impoverishing impacts, yet the impacts are known to be disruptive and contribute to domestic instability. On the one hand, globalization is correlated with rising inequality and, in separate cases such as Nigeria, a worsening standard of living. It is against this backdrop that this volume combines secondary data along with empirical survey to study the effects of

globalization on inequality and instability in the country. The article will also consider the asymmetries in the systems of wealth distribution between Nigeria and its trade partners.

Keywords: Globalization, social inequality, economic liberalism, developing countries

О.В. Аделеке¹ А. Т. Абжалиева

*Халықаралық Ақпараттық Технологиялар Университеті
Қазақстан*

НИГЕРИЯДАҒЫ ЖАҒАНДАНУ ЖӘНЕ ӘЛЕУМЕТТІК ТЕҢСІЗДІК

Аңдатпа

Жаһандану әлеуметтік теңсіздік пен тұрақсыздықты тудырады, ол тек Азия мен Африканың постколониалдық елдерінде ғана емес, сонымен қатар қазіргі Вестфалияның мемлекеттік жүйесіндегі егемендік пен аумақтық тұтастыққа да қауіп төндіріп отыр. Жаһандану мемлекеттерді жаңа талаптарға итермелейді. Батыста қалыптасқан нарықтық экономикада неолиберализм, дамушы елдердің нарықтарында мақсатына жете алмады. Жаһанданудың мемлекетті көтеруге немесе құлдыратуға әкелетіні белгілі, ал бұл әсерлер жойқын және ішкі тұрақсыздыққа ықпал етеді. Бір жағынан, жаһандану теңсіздіктің артуына әкеліп, Нигерияның өмір сүру деңгейінің нашарлауына ықпал етті. Дәл осы мәселе зерттеу материалының нысанына айналып, түрлі эмпирикалық әдістер арқылы жан-жақты талданады. Сонымен қатар, мақалада Нигерия мен оның сауда серіктестері арасындағы байлықты бөлу жүйелеріндегі ассиметриялар да назарға алынады.

Түйінді сөздер: Жаһандану, әлеуметтік теңсіздік, экономикалық либерализм, дамушы елдер.

О.В. Аделеке¹ А. Т. Абжалиева

*Международный Университет Информационных Технологий
Казахстан*

ГЛОБАЛИЗАЦИЯ И СОЦИАЛЬНОЕ НЕРАВЕНСТВО В НИГЕРИИ

Аннотация

Глобализация порождает социальное неравенство и нестабильность, она создает угрозу суверенитету и территориальной целостности не только в пост-колониальных странах Азии и Африки, но и в нынешней государственной системе Вестфалии. Глобализация часто негласно подталкивает к требованиям новых государств.

Между тем неолиберализм, который работает в устоявшейся рыночной экономике на Западе, не смог достичь цели развития развивающихся стран. Хотя глобализация имеет как обогащающие, так и обедняющие последствия, тем не менее известно, что эти воздействия носят разрушительный характер и способствуют внутренней нестабильности.

С одной стороны, глобализация коррелирует с ростом неравенства, а в отдельных случаях, как и Нигерии, с ухудшением уровня жизни. Именно на этом фоне этот статье объединяет вторичные данные с эмпирическими исследованиями для изучения воздействия глобализации на неравенство и нестабильность в стране. В статье также будут рассмотрены ассиметрии в системах распределения богатства между Нигерией и ее торговыми партнерами.

Ключевые слова: Глобализация, социальное неравенство, экономический либерализм, развивающиеся страны.

Introduction

All around the globe, federations are facing difficult social challenges in the era of globalization. Globalization generates pressures for reform in the institutions of economic, political and intergovernmental relations of both developed and developing countries. Contemporary Nigeria is a state engulfed by both social inequality and instability, to which there are no clear-cut solutions in sight. In the country and at the heart of the social instabilities and insurgents, apparently making things fall apart is a frontier space populated by a generation of young men (of wildly different cultural identities and political outlooks) expelled from, and deeply suspicious of, institutions of authority that they perceive to lack credibility, functional adequacy, and legitimacy. Thus, the crisis of youth can be expressed in a multiplicity of forms: a crisis of identity, of rights, of social exclusion, of masculinity, of deprivations, of employment and so on [1].

The effects of globalization

Those who strongly advocate economic openness also claim that a renewed commitment to liberalization holds the key to making globalization work for the poor, thereby overlooking the disruptive effects of neo-liberal capitalism. The mainstream economists often debate whether and where incomes declined in real terms during the era of rapid neo-liberal globalization [2]. Whatever rise in real incomes, which occurred mostly in East Asia and parts of Latin America, the period since the 1997 Asian financial crisis and the global economic slowdown since 2007 have certainly reduced real incomes for the majority of the world. There is little debate, however, about rising relative income inequality under globalization. According to the UN Development Programme, in 1960 20% of the world's people in the richest countries had 30 times the income of the poorest 20%; in 1997, 74 times as much" [3]. The polarization of assets and income is startling. The world's three richest people hold more assets than the combined GDP of a group of less developed countries with a total population of 600 million people [3]. The income of the 200 richest people in the world exceeds the combined income of the poorest 2.5 billion people [3].

It is no longer a secret that international trade is notorious for reinforcing income inequalities. Where exports are growing faster than global GDP, they have an increasingly important bearing on income distribution, while world trade shares mirror income distribution patterns. It is estimated that for every \$1 generated through export activity, \$0.75 goes to the world's richest countries. Low-income countries receive around \$0.03. Until that time when developing countries capture a far larger share of exports, trade will continue to fuel widening gaps in absolute income. When they enter global markets, poor countries face tariffs sometimes four times higher, on average, in industrial countries than those faced by other industrial countries. Precisely those areas—such as labor-intensive manufacturing and agriculture—where developing countries enjoy the strongest potential advantage attract the most punitive tariffs. Nowhere else other than in agriculture are the double standards more staggering. While developing countries open up their economy, or liberalize, industrial countries spend \$1 billion a day subsidizing overproduction and export dumping, destroying on an epic scale the livelihoods of vulnerable smallholder farmers in the process [2]. The advocates of economic openness assure that a renewed commitment to liberalization holds the key to making globalization work for the poor. Confidence in that evidence is often reflected in policy terms and conditions on trade liberalization attached to IMF-World Bank loans and in the advice of northern governments to their southern counterparts. One recent IMF review of seven Poverty Reduction and Growth Facility programs revealed that each loan from both of the institutions came with seven trade policy conditions attached. Regardless of the 1997 financial collapse in East Asia, the IMF's rescue loans again came heavily laden with import-liberalization requirements [2]. At the same time, the economic opportunities opened up by globalization in countries in transition are also threatening to established structures of power and wealth. The managers of public parastatal and even private enterprises discover that they no longer have access to state-provided resource flows, a source of rents and patronage to sustain coalitions among economic and political elites. Structural adjustment policy (SAP) administered by multi—lateral agencies have produced a surplus of

unemployed college graduates, declines in employment in privatized state industries, and deep generational differences. SAP is characterized by MMT as wrongheaded and counterproductive, introducing austerity measures when the economy is in crisis. Whereas money is the fuel of the economic engine, the SAP austerity measures are only exposing the economy to monetary shortage at a time when the economy mostly needs money [4].

For Nigeria in particular, liberal economy has failed to serve as the key to unlocking the long-stymied economic potential. Here liberalized economy is perceived within the wider context by Pierre Dardot and Christian Laval on post-financial crisis: neoliberalism is a “stranglehold of a system of norms and treaties that benefit the oligarchy while immiserating the rest of us” [5]. Not least, the Nigerian trade pattern is a reflection of dynamics of global capitalism and the legacy of centuries of violent colonialism. In similar patterns with Nigeria, most African countries continue to trade with countries from the global North and increasingly China and other BRIC countries in a kind of asymmetrical global trade that takes the form of Africans exporting raw materials and agricultural commodities and importing higher value-added products, with the value added remaining in the more advanced economies, thus perpetrating social-economic inequality between developing and advanced economies [6]. Within many developing countries, globalization is exacerbating social inequalities at various levels. Income gaps based on access to markets, productive assets, social inclusion and education are widening, acting as a brake on poverty-reduction efforts. At the same time, integration into global markets is reinforcing other forms of deprivation, notably in relation to gender.

Methods

The object of study: The citizens’ views on the contributions of globalization in their community.

Subject of research: the impact of globalization on the economic and social situations in the society.

The purpose of the research: to determine to what extent the citizens in two geographical zones—North and South West Nigeria —agree that globalization contributes to inequality and instability. The general hypothesis is the assumption that there are correlations between global liberalism and social inequality.

To test the hypotheses and implement the research objectives, the following tasks were set:

- to analyze to what extent Globalization contributes to widespread inequality;
- to analyze to what extent Globalization contributes to nationwide instability.
- to test whether liberalization of economy does more good than damage to the economy.

Based on the object, subject, purpose and hypothesis of the study, as well as the theoretical and methodological basis of the study, the following views were identified:

- how globalization contributes to inequality.
- how globalization contributes to instability.
- why government should seek economic solutions from local specialists.
- that government should always prioritize national interests above all.

General characteristics of the study

The main setting for the study was the Nigerian community in Almaty. The study involved 110 selected respondents from the South and Northern parts of Nigeria.

65% of respondents were between the ages of 30-50 years,

35% were aged 25-30,

80 % were men,

20% women

70% completed tertiary education,

10% had some professional training after leaving school,

15% completed high school only,

88% have specific place of work,

60% were married

2 women were full time housewives.

22 people from the group work in multinational companies in Kazakhstan.

The selection model of the respondents was voluntary in nature, participants were duly informed before meetings were organized. Testing was voluntary and anonymous.

The Research progress:

The whole study took the form of conversation with the respondents first to ascertain that they understand the questions and the purpose of the study. The conversation took place in a group format for 20 minutes. Several meetings at several intervals and days were organized spanning May-July 2019. There was noticeable enthusiasm among the respondents. Respondents from the North and South were scheduled at different times for reliability. Religious affiliations did not affect respondents' views, as the living conditions back at home. The second step of the study was to decode and analyze the scores for each response and put these in percentages. The third step of the study consisted in the mathematical processing of the data.

To further advance understandings of the direct effects of globalization context and inequality, we explore people's views and to what extent they agree with the efficacy of global liberalism and support for globalization in the South and Northern Nigeria, two major contrasting regions in terms of economy and stability in the country. The two cases do much to highlight the complexity of global liberalism context, which is defined in different ways. Context has been framed concretely as economic prosperity, but also loosely as "the prevailing cases of inequality," "the insecurity climate of the times," and "the larger instability consequences." The larger social instability in the society, however, may combine contradictory elements that do not neatly fit onto a single region, making it difficult to consistently pin down whether liberalization practices in the country has clearly brought about much economic prosperity and equal opportunities for all. We analyzed responses to four survey items tapping into citizens' views on global liberalism (see Table 1). Because we are most interested in their support for globalization (those who express the greatest support for globalization practices), we separate out those respondents who indicated strong agreement with each statement. First, we compare the magnitude of strong support for globalism in the South versus North to see if there are zonal differences and if these align with expectations from prior studies.

Table 1. Survey Questions Measuring Support for Globalization, 2020

[Response options to Questions 1-4: strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, strongly disagree.]

We want to know your views on whether globalization has brought the expected prosperity to the country.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:

1. Globalization contributes to widespread inequality.
2. Globalization contributes to nationwide instability.
3. Government should seek economic solutions from local specialists.
4. Government should always prioritize national interests above all.

The "South West and Northern Nigerian Globalization Survey, 2020" was designed and implemented by the author.

Table 2. Survey Questions Measuring the Effects of Globalization

A context-centered explanation on the effects of globalization also offers insight into the aggregate survey results from the North. Northerners, who have never enjoyed any career opportunities, exhausted by insurgents, would be more opposed to the whole idea of globalization.

We began with the popular assumptions, drawn from the literature, that strong support for globalism should be more observable in the South, for the simple reason that many people there are employed by the multi-national corporations concentrated in the South. Cross tabulations of survey responses, however, reveal slightly higher rates of strong support for globalization among respondents in the S (see Table 2). South Westerners are somewhat less likely to strongly agree that “globalization contributes to inequality” (by six percentage points), but more strongly agree that “globalization contributes to instability” (by five percentage points), and that government should always prioritize national interests (by four percentage points). As indicated by the asterisks next to the relevant figures in the table, cross zonal differences are statistically significant for all three of these statements, meaning the chance that the difference is a random occurrence is less than five percent

Table 2. Survey Questions Measuring Support for Globalization (%), 2020

	S	N	Zonal Difference
1. Strongly agree that Globalization contributes to inequality	36.07	41.93	5.86**
2. Strongly agree that Globalization contributes to instability.	30.13	25.07	5.06**
3. Strongly agree that Government should always prioritize national interests above all	34.99	30.93	4.06**
4. Strongly agree that Government should rely more on local specialists.	28.33	32.27	3.94

*p < .05 **p < .01

Research Result

To account for these results, we return to the central theme of this paper: global liberalism context. More Southerners are likely to express support for globalization precisely because of their direct experience with the benefits of education, industries and employment opportunities — initiated by politicians in the past. In the South particular context, the practice of egalitarian society with more attention paid to education, industry and socially responsible governance often activates latent tolerance and peaceful coexistence across the zone. The practice of social exclusion and deprivation pervasive in the north is intolerable in the south where people actively vote out politicians whose performances are below expectations. More than 30% from both zones strongly support the need for government to always prioritize national interests above all. The disparity between those who strongly agree that government should rely more on local specialists is less than 4%

The main results of the study are reflected in the findings.

1. The general hypothesis that there are correlations between global liberalism and inequality was confirmed.

2. The hypothesis that global liberalism causes social instability was confirmed.

3. The particular hypothesis that liberalization of the economy does more damage than good was confirmed.

4. Generally, the respondents were disillusioned by the context of globalization and Liberalization, they therefore strongly agree that the government should always prioritize national interests above all; government should rely more on local specialists.

Discussion

Our interpretations of the survey match Maigari and Dantani's sociological study on the theme of globalization. They found that on the whole, deregulations of the downstream sector of the Nigerian oil industries in the Niger Delta region, one of the forces of globalization creates mass destitution by intensifying unemployment, brings abject poverty, loss of soil fertility, leading to irrevocable environmental pollution and soil degradation. The outcome was the intensification of militance operations in the region-fueled secessionist movement by the youths of the oil producing communities. Further still, trade liberalization—a rule by the globalist game allows the intrusion of small arms and light weapons into the country by the secessionist movements and Boko haram insurgents who want to establish an Islamic state in the country. Possession and application of arms and logistics by the secessionists, therefore pose serious challenges to the corporate federalism in Nigeria [7]. Additionally, the contagious effect of globalized media that spread the philosophy and successes of other secessionist movements elsewhere aides the process of agitations for separatism. It is remarkable that despite all these odds, the Nigerian state continues to exist under a unified and indivisible country. In the context of globalization and instability, few Nigerians express strong support for key global practices. Even where we do find statistically significant zonal differences—on the view that globalization contributes to instability in the country—the zonal differences never reach 10 percent. For most questions, regional difference hovers around four-to-five percentage points. Thus, while southerners are a little more supportive of globalization than northerners, the difference is relative and support remains low in both zones.

Conclusion

Global capitalism precipitates inequality that has resulted in disquieting instability now posing great threat to the existence of the country as a unit.

We have thus, demonstrated herewith that there is no difference of opinion in the fact that global capitalism has exhibited an amazing capacity to increase material abundance, yet instability has been much a part of its history. That economic instability has ranged from deep depression to hyperinflation. Capitalism is always moving between those extremes in one direction or the other. It has shown it can even go in both directions at the same time.

Eliminating economic turmoil would make the part about material abundance much more enjoyable. In order to salvage the Nigerian economy, we propose a novel economic paradigm that is capable of unlocking the country's long-stymied economic potentials and provide a rapid social and economic development. Described here as: 'Central Bank Sovereignty', the paradigm offers a blueprint fiscal reform to any country however poor to end poverty at all fronts and solve all other structural problems without using debts, or any form of taxations to fund government spending.

The idea is so simple and straightforward that it is difficult to imagine why it wouldn't work in any country. The premise of the proposed CBS is to shift from the debt-based monetary system, and adopt an income-based monetary system. It would be possible to end poverty at all fronts, as well as achieve social inequality without using debts and without redistributing anything. With CBS system in place, it would be possible to achieve a stable and sustainable economic growth without inflation, but with minimum impact on the environment, as our economic output would be determined by our demography only.

Indeed, it would be possible to ameliorate the environment and prevent further degradation. All of these would be achieved, without any further regulations. While this proposed monetary system would not create a Utopia, it would, however, solve many problems and ameliorate many more. As a system, it would produce an economy of equity and justice—described here as 'Utopia Reality'.

References:

1. Watts M. J., (2017). *Precarious Life, Violence & Poverty under Boko Haram & MEND. In the Political Economy of Everyday Life in Africa. James Currey an imprint of Boydell & Brewer Ltd. PO Box 9, Woodbridge Suffolk IP12 3DF (GB). www.jamescurrey.com.*
2. Watkins K., (2002) *Making globalization work for the poor. Finance and Development. Quarterly magazine of the IMF. March 2002, vol. 39 n. (1).*
3. (UNDP, (1999) *New contributions to the analysis of poverty: methodological and conceptual challenges to understanding poverty from a gender perspective. UN report published 1999.*
4. Edoh T., (2003) *Poverty and the survival of Democracy in Nigeria. In Nigerian Journal of political and Administrative Studies. Makurdi Aboki Publishers vol 1, n. (1), pp30–45.*
5. Pierre D., Christian L., (2013). *The New Way of the World: On Neo-liberalism. Research gate Verso. Sept., 2013*
6. Jay S. (2019). *History from above in Africa. Jacobin magazine. Issue 8, Feb. 2019.*
7. Abdullahi MM., Umar D., (2018). *Globalization and Federation in Peril: Renewed Agitations for Statehood and the Future of Nigerian State ISSN 2283-7949. Glocalism: Journal of Culture, Politics and Innovation. DOI:10.12893/gjcp. 2018. (2.5) available at www.glocalismjournal.net Retrieved 22 June, 2019.*

XFTAP 11.15.82

<https://doi.org/10.51889/2021-1.1728-8940.19>

Ж.Ж. Қуанышбаева¹, О.О. Карибаев¹, Қ.А. Қантаева¹

¹ Абай атындағы Қазақ ұлттық педагогикалық университеті
Қазақстан

ҚАЗАҚСТАН ҚОҒАМЫНДАҒЫ САЯСИ МӘДЕНИЕТТІҢ ҚҰҚЫҚТЫҚ АСПЕКТІЛЕРІ

Аңдатпа

Мақалада авторлар Қазақстанның саяси мәдениеттің құқықтық табиғатының өзекті мәселелері қарастырады. Саяси мәдениеттің құқықтық табиғатының теориялық аспектілерін, халықтың саяси мәдениетін қалыптастыру мен дамытудың құқықтық ерекшеліктерін ашып көрсеткен. Қоғамның саяси мәдениетінің кемелдену өлшемі ретіндегі саяси сананың құқықтық аспектілері; халықтың құқықтық мәдениетін тәрбиелеудің кешенді-саяси сипаттамасы айқындалған. Авторлар саяси мәдениеттің құқықтық аспектілері жеке адамның, мемлекет пен қоғамның әлеуметтік-саяси байланысы мен өзара іс-қимылын білдіретіндігін, және мұндай бағалау құқықтық мәдениеттің жүйелік-саяси сипаттамасы ретінде қызмет ететіндігін қарастырған. Сонымен қатар, мақалада пікірталас мәселелеріне де назар аударылған. Саяси ғылымда соңғы уақытқа дейін Қазақстан Республикасының саяси мәдениетін қалыптастыру және дамыту сияқты мәселе іс жүзінде зерттелмегендіктен, оның Қазақстан мемлекетіндегі саяси басымдықтарының проблемасы да табиғи түрде туындаған жоқ. Сонымен қатар, бұл мәселе, оның зерттелмегендігімен, Қазақстанның теориясы мен практикасы үшін өте өзекті және маңызды.

Кілт сөздер: саяси мәдениет, саяси сана, құқықтық аспектілер, мемлекет, қоғам.