

## CULTURAL GLOBALIZATION: TRENDS AND CAUTIONS

**Author's Name:** Maryam Tijjani Abba

**Affiliation:** Department of Marketing, Federal Polytechnic Bauchi, Nigeria

**E-Mail:** [tijjaniabbahmaryam@gmail.com](mailto:tijjaniabbahmaryam@gmail.com)

**DOI No. – 08.2020-25662434**

### *Abstract*

*The article, here, examines terms such as cultural globalization in contrast with local culture, comparing the arguments for and against contemporary trends toward cultural [homogeneity](#) that will eventually make human experience everywhere essentially the same, akin to a single world culture and the argument that an overarching global culture will not actually exist, no matter what changes occur in human existence. It uncovers the salient significance of cultural globalization. The merit of the article is in its x-ray of global carriers of cultural globalization such as food, entertainment, clothing, transportation, sports, religion, politics and the negative effects on economic growth of Nigerian agricultural and textile industries.*

**Keywords:** Cultural globalization, global carriers of culture, homogeneity, human experience, local culture.

### INTRODUCTION

Cultural globalization refers, specifically, to the idea that there is now a global and common mono-culture – transmitted and reinforced by the internet, popular entertainment, transnational marketing of particular brands and international tourism – that transcends local cultural traditions and lifestyles, and that shapes the perceptions, aspirations, tastes and everyday activities of people wherever they may live in the world (Manfred, 2003; Al-Rodhan & Stoudmann, 2006; Axford, 2013).

Cultural globalization is occasioned by the [efficiency](#) or appeal of [wireless communications](#), [electronic commerce](#), popular [culture](#), and international travel. Again, [globalization](#) has been seen as a trend toward [homogeneity](#) that will eventually make human experience everywhere essentially the same, akin to a single world culture.

Contrastingly, the term *local culture* is commonly used to characterize the experience of everyday life in specific, identifiable localities. It reflects ordinary people's feelings of appropriateness, comfort, and correctness—attributes that define personal preferences and changing tastes. Given the strength of local [cultures](#), it is difficult to argue that an overarching global culture actually exists. Jet-setting sophisticates may feel comfortable operating in a global network disengaged from specific areas, but these people [constitute](#) an insignificant minority; their numbers are insufficient to sustain a [coherent](#) cultural system. It is more important to ask where these global operators maintain their links, what kind of relative networks they depend upon, if any, and whether there is a change in lifestyle or a permanent condition. For most people, place and locality still matter (Manfred, 2003; Robin & Paul 2000; Axford, 2013; Friedman, 1994.).

Unfortunately, it has been argued that because a global culture does not exist, any search for it would be [futile](#). It is more productive to focus on particular aspects of life that are affected by the globalizing process.

## STATEMENT OF PROBLEMS

Noticeable today is that young people no longer take an interest to own culture (Raikhan, Moldakhmet, Ryskeldy & Alua, 2013). In addition, less attention is paid to the development of the art of the country in its own unique way. For instance, in Nigeria, the agricultural and textile industries are moribund because of the common place economic cultural globalization.

The Nigerian rice industries produce rice which is not sold in Nigeria. Foreign rice is made to be better by cultural globalization. The agricultural sector is not left behind, the shrinking of millions of rural people to migrate to cities in search of work. They are attracted by urban lifestyle. At the same time, the middle-class citizens focused on western standards of living which tends to look for more qualified and prestigious jobs which they feel is not at home, but say, in the US or western Europe (Kravchenko, 2001).

Global interaction rather than insulated isolation has been the basis of economic progress in the world. Trade, along with migration, communication and dissemination of scientific and technical knowledge, has helped to break the dominance of rampant poverty and the pervasiveness of nasty, brutish and short lives that characterized the world. And yet, despite all the progress, life is still severely nasty, brutish and short, for a large part of the world population. The great rewards of globalized trade have come to some, but not to others (Barnet & Cavanagh, 1986). This simply means that globalization is not shared equally.

Many countries have experienced serious drawback in their economic sector. In Nigeria, made in Nigeria goods are hardly patronized. People prefer consuming foreign rice made in Italy to consuming the locally made there by staling the Nigerian economy through importation. However, our fabric industries are dying each day, due to less patronage. People prefer to go for foreign used goods in our market which they claim are more qualitative.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### Trends and Cautions of Cultural Globalization

Broadly, the obvious benefits of cultural globalization, good examples of cultural globalization are, for instance, the trading of commodities such as coffee or avocados. [Coffee](#) is said to be originally from Ethiopia and consumed in the Arabic region. Nonetheless, due to commercial trades after the 11th century, it is nowadays known as a globally consumed commodity. [Avocados](#), for instance, grown mostly under the tropical temperatures of Mexico, the Dominican Republic or Peru. They started by being produced in small quantities to supply the local populations but today guacamole or avocado toasts are common in meals all over the world (Anderson & Cavanagh, 2000, Axford, 2013).

At the same time, books, movies, and music are now instantaneously available all around the world thanks to the development of the digital world and the power of the internet. These are perhaps the greatest contributors to the speed at which cultural exchanges and globalization are happening. There are also other examples of globalization regarding traditions like [Black Friday in the US](#), the Brazilian Carnival or the Indian Holi Festival. They all were originally created following their countries' local traditions and beliefs but as the world got to know them, they are now common traditions in other countries too (Apple, Kenway, & Singh, 2005).

The most visible impacts of globalization are definitely the ones affecting the economic world. Globalization has led to a sharp increase in trade and economic exchanges, but also to a multiplication of financial exchanges. In the 1970s world economies opened up and the

development of free trade policies accelerated the globalization phenomenon. Between 1950 and 2010, world exports increased by 33-fold. This significantly contributed to increasing the interactions between different regions of the world (Axford, 2013).

This acceleration of economic exchanges has led to strong global economic growth. It fostered as well a rapid global industrial development that allowed the rapid development of many of the technologies and commodities, we have available nowadays.

Knowledge became easily shared and international cooperation among the brightest minds speeded activities up. According to some analysts, globalization has also contributed to improving global economic conditions, creating much economic wealth (that was, nevertheless, unequally distributed – more information ahead). At the same time, finance also became globalized. From the 1980s, driven by neo-liberal policies, the world of finance gradually opened. Many states, particularly the US under Ronald Reagan and the UK under Margaret Thatcher introduced the famous “3D Policy”: Disintermediation, Decommissioning and Deregulation. The idea was to simplify finance regulations, eliminate mediators and break down the barriers between the world’s financial centers. And the goal was to make it easier to exchange capital between the world’s financial players. The financial globalization contributed to the rise of a global financial market in which contracts and capital exchanges multiplied (Abrahamson, 2004).

On the other hand, cultural globalization is not without its negative impact on local cultures. For instance, specific cultural characteristics from some countries are disappearing. From [languages](#) to traditions or even specific industries. That is why according to [UNESCO](#), the mix between the benefits of globalization and the protection of local culture’s uniqueness requires a careful approach (Friedman, 1994; James & Steger, 2014).

This is not all, income inequalities, disproportional wealth and trades that benefit parties differently are problems caused by cultural globalization. In the end, one of the criticisms is that some actors (countries, companies, individuals) benefit more from the phenomena of globalization, while others are perceived as the “losers” of globalization. As a matter of fact, a [recent report from Oxfam](#) says that 82% of the world’s generated wealth goes to 1% of the population.

Also, the massive development of transport that has been the basis of globalization is also responsible for serious environmental problems such as greenhouse gas emissions, global warming or air pollution. It has contributed to the depletion of natural resources, [deforestation](#) and the destruction of [ecosystems](#) and loss of [biodiversity](#). The worldwide distribution of goods is also creating a big garbage problem, especially on what concerns [plastic pollution](#) (Held, McGrew, Goldblatt & Perraton, 1999).

### THE THEORIES OF CULTURAL GLOBALIZATION

Ogunbameru, Adisa and Adekeye (2018) outlined the theories of globalization as follows: Economic and political explanations of globalization will not suffice to capture the real essence of globalization. Vesajoki (2002), once agreed that globalization cannot continue to be exclusively defined in terms of economic and political development; rather, its social and cultural effects must also be addressed. Therefore, after thorough review of literature, globalization can be analyzed economically, politically and culturally (Ritzer, 2011). At this level of analysis, global interaction of cultures can produce three possibilities: cultural

homogenization, cultural heterogenization and cultural hybridization. For the purpose of this study, cultural hybridization was applied to back up the study.

### **CULTURAL HYBRIDIZATION (COMBINATION THESIS)**

While some scholars have argued for the obliteration of local cultures in place of more dominant ones – convergent thesis; others decry such claim, instead, accentuate the increasing relevance of local cultures leading to perpetual disparity between cultures – divergent thesis. Still some others favour creative adaptation, as local cultures integrate new cultural elements while retaining their core cultures – hybridization thesis (Appadurai, 1996; Boli & Lechner, 2001). This mixture of global and local cultures produces ‘unique hybrid cultures that are not reducible to either the local or the global culture’ (Ritzer, 2011). Robertson (2001) calls this process “*globalization*”.

### **THE MAJOR PROPONENTS**

The work of Appadurai (1996), truly open academics’ eyes to the possibility, and even the reality, of cultural combination thesis. Global situation is interactive rather than singly dominated (Jason & Rebecca, 2011) or distinctively differentiated. We no longer see the continuous possibility of Americanization, Japanization or Indonesianization; rather we now have AmeriChina, ChinaNiger or even AmeriJapanChina. Global flow of culture takes on distinctive meaning after contact with local cultures. This is exactly Appadurai’s argument in his explanation of his new vocabulary – ‘*scapes*’. He explains dialectical theory of globalization in his cultural flow studies. According to him, these *-scapes* carry on different meanings as they land on different geography (or more specifically different culture). This is made possible because of the fluidity, irregularity and variability of the *-scapes* as they flow across the globe or even over other *-scapes*.

In ‘*Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimension of Globalization*’, Appadurai (1996) describes five “landscapes” through which ‘*-scapes*’ flow on a global scale. He sees global flow, not as homogenizing force, but as ever changing and flowing ethno-, techno-, finance-, media- and ideo- (all) *-scapes*. *Ethnoscap*es constitute ever moving refugees, tourists, immigrants, exiles, guest-workers and other moving persons. *Technoscap*es involves the flow of both mechanical and informational technology across borders that were previously resistant to such movement. *Finanscap*es refers to the flow of capital: through currency markets, national stock exchanges, and commodity speculations, swiftly across nation-states. *Mediascap*es is the transmission and production of information around the world as well as the images that these media disseminate. *Ideoscap*es like mediascapes, are concatenations of images, especially and largely political images, often produced by states or by very strong movement that wish their voices to be heard. It should be noted that in Appadurai’s landscapes, (virtually) no nation has control over these flows. Also, these global flows occur not only through the landscapes but also increasingly in and through the *disjunctures* among them (Ritzer, 2011). Although these *-scapes* flow across the world thereby tending towards producing a homogenized world; the *-scapes* have different effects in various cultures, leading to heterogenised world. This eventually results in the creation of unique combined cultures in different nations across the globe.

### **CONCLUSION**

Globalization is neither good nor bad. Rather, certain aspects of the complex, and multi-faceted

process of globalization have impacts that can be viewed in different ways depending on the values at stake. Individual free choice is important, but so is a society's ability to make decisions according to what is best for all of its members. The free market is important, but so is the ability of governments to deal with problems when the free market fails. Local democratic accountability is important, but so is international agreement on problems that can only be solved with cooperation far beyond the direct control of individual citizens. The major consequences of globalization have been: the transmogrification of traditional religions and belief systems; the beginning of the disintegration of the traditional social fabrics and shared norms by consumerism, cyber-culture, newfangled religions and changing work ethics and work rhythms; the fast spreading anomie forcing an ever increasing number of individuals to fall back upon the easily accessible pretentious religious banalities, and attributing to religion the creation and acceleration of extremist, fundamentalist and terrorist tendencies in the third world countries. It is fair to say that the impact of globalization in the cultural sphere has, most generally, been viewed in a pessimistic light. Typically, it has been associated with the destruction of cultural identities, victims of the accelerating encroachment of a homogenized, westernized, consumer culture. This view, the constituency for which extends from (some) academics to anti-globalization activists

(Shepard & Haydock 2002), tends to interpret globalization as a seamless extension of – indeed, as a euphemism for – western cultural imperialism. Values can play a role in defining globalization. A definition of globalization as "Americanization" or, perhaps, the "McDonaldization," of the world presents globalization as a process driven by American consumer culture that rolls over other cultures. On the other hand, another definition of globalization would highlight its cross-cultural impact, taking into account the nature of globalization as a way cultures interact and learn from each other. It is very important to mention here that every culture of the world have been affected by the monopoly of western culture. So, the planning of the west to homogenize the world in order to rule over it became successful through the instrument and means of globalization. First, they captured market then gradually and slowly every field was controlled by them.

Every nation in the world has its distinct culture and values which is transmitted to them by their ancestors which can be called one's cultural heritage. Though, globalization has some good dimensions also but mostly its benefit goes to well of countries of the world especially to west. Today there is identity crisis one's identity is under threat, globalization created a materialist culture, where everybody is concerned with his own interest and benefit, nobody is bothering about others. A culture of consumerism and pop culture affected other cultures of the world that were having a glorious and best civilization and cultural values which were based on humanity, tolerance, world brotherhood, social justice, egalitarianism, etc. West first used market and captured it then try to use all other means in order to expand its influence and monopoly over other countries of the world. They propagated after the down fall of Soviet Union in 1991. It was emphasized by the west to the world that we have the best system of governance and declared communism as evil or political pathology. They emphasized that if you want to succeed then you need to follow our economy that is capitalist economy, our polity that is liberal democracy, our culture that is civic culture. Even they used a term for the under developing and disadvantaged nations that term is "White Man's Burdon".

There is total decay and degradation of human values due to bad effects of the western culture.

There is one of the best example which I cited here of children's behaviour with their parents those parents who bear everything for their children but at last children stay away from their beloved parents after getting a job they go for marriage then they cut off all relations with parents, parents need their help in old age but they don't bother. Materialist culture also caused rapes, murders, suicides, dacoits, robbery and corruption, etc. And it would be not wrong to quote that it caused a total moral decay. Although it is being said that globalization created homogenization and mix culture but it is totally wrong because in actuality what we see is only western culture which is dominating everywhere. Therefore, it can be said after having a glance on globalization in terms of culture, is nothing but the expansion of capitalistic economy, liberal democracy, and western culture which is the main slogan of the west to destroy and finish other cultures of the world. Be it Islamic culture, Hindu culture, Sikh culture, communist culture, Buddhist culture what so ever the culture it maybe it was affected by the western culture. There is only one umbrella or remedy that we have to follow, which is to follow our cultures if the influence of the western culture remains, then the time will come one's recognition and identity will come to an end.

Therefore, it is good to be citizen of the world but before it is most important to be the obedient citizen of its own country. Religion is the best instrument which we can use in order to protect ourselves from the influence of western culture. It is also noteworthy to mention that westernization is not a way of modernization rather it is a way which leads us away from our cultural heritage. India's culture was regarded best example of unity in diversity but it was also affected by the western mores and values. It is natural that if there will be a power in few hands then there are most chances that culture will flourish and survive. Due to the great technology which affluent countries possess they use their technology to capture the wealth and resources of the developing countries. African countries can be cited as the example where the major resources are being controlled by the west because African countries don't possess a good technology.

## REFERENCES

1. Abrahamson, M. (2004). *Global cities*. New York, USA: Oxford University Press
2. Al-Rodhan, R. F. N. & Stoudmann, G. (2006). *Definitions of globalization: A comprehensive overview and a proposed definition*. Geneva: Geneva Centre for Security Policy. Retrieved from <http://www.gcsp.ch/e/publications/Globalisation/index.htm>.
3. Anderson, S. & Cavanagh, C. (2000). *Top 200: The rise of corporate global power*. Washington, DC: Institute for Policy Studies.
4. Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
5. Apple, M. W., Kenway, J. & Singh, M. (Eds.). (2005). *Globalizing education: Policies, pedagogies, and politics*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
6. Axford, B. (2013). *Theories of globalization*. Malden, MA: Polity Press.
7. Boli, J. & Lechner, F. J. (2001). Globalization and World Culture. *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioural Sciences*. Elsevier Science Ltd.
8. Friedman, J. (1994). *Cultural Identity and global process*. London: SAGE.
9. Held, D., McGrew, A., Goldblatt, D. & Perraton, J. (1999). *Global transformations: Politics, economics and culture*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
10. Kravchenko, A. (2001). *Kulturologya* (3rd ed.) Moscow: Academic Project, pp. 89-92.



11. Manfred, B. S. (2003). *Globalization: A very short introduction*. Oxford University Press.
12. Ogunbameru, O.A., Adisa, A.L., & Adekeye, D.S. (2018). *Cross-cultural management: A multi-disciplinary approach*. Obafemi Awolowo University Press Ile-Ife, Nigeria.
13. Ritzer, G. (2011). *Sociological Theory* (8<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
14. Robertson, R. (2001). Globalization theory 2000: Major problematic. In George Ritzer and Barry Smart (eds.) *Handbook of Social Theory*. London: Sage. 458-471.
15. Vesajoki, F. (2002). *The Effect of Globalization on culture: A study of the experiences of globalization among finish travelers*. Cultural Anthropology Master's Thesis, University of Jyvaskyla, Department of Ethnology, Jyvaskyla.