

CrossRef DOI of original article:

# 1 Research of Social Inequality of the Population in the Regions of 2 Kazakhstan

3 Nursaule Zh. Brimbetova

4 Received: 1 January 1970 Accepted: 1 January 1970 Published: 1 January 1970

5

---

## 6 **Abstract**

7 Under the conditions of the negative impact of global economic, geopolitical, climatic and  
8 epidemiological risks the income gap between different social strata of the population in  
9 different regions of the Kazakhstan is growing. Therefore, the reduction of social inequality of  
10 the population is an important problem. The purpose of the article is to study theoretical and  
11 practical issues of social inequality and develop recommendations for its reduction in  
12 Kazakhstan. The hypothesis of the study is the assumption about the growing inequality of the  
13 population living in different regions of Kazakhstan. The article summarizes the theoretical  
14 views of scientists on the problems of inequality, examines the dynamics of key indicators  
15 reflecting the standard of living of the population in the regions of Kazakhstan. The  
16 conclusion is made about the strengthening of social inequality of the population living in  
17 different regions of the country. Measures have been developed to reduce it.

18

---

19 **Index terms**— social inequality, income of the population, inclusive development, region, socio-economic  
20 development, poverty

## 21 **1 Introduction**

22 In the last decade of the XXI century, a deep technological and structural transformation is taking place in the  
23 world economy, in the process of which new high-tech industries and efficient jobs for highly qualified workers  
24 are emerging. This leads, on the one hand, to economic growth, on the other, to an increase in income inequality  
25 of various social groups of the population. Thus, the incomes of workers in highly paid sectors of the economy  
26 are growing, while those employed in traditional industries that preserve backward technologies are declining.  
27 Many researchers confirm the idea that economic growth not only contributes to poverty reduction, but is also  
28 accompanied by an increase in social inequality (Kanbur, 2000). This leads to the conclusion that the problems  
29 of inequality and economic growth are interrelated.

30 Indeed, in modern conditions, the development of the world economic system and individual national economies  
31 cannot be called sustainable when most of the world's wealth belongs to 1% of the population, the so-called  
32 "golden billion". Thus, according to the updated criteria of the World Bank (3.2 and 5.5 US dollars per day),  
33 almost half of the world's population lived below the poverty line in the world -3.4 billion people ??World Bank,  
34 2023). At the same time, according to analysts, starting from 2020, in just one quarter of the global pandemic,  
35 the total wealth of the world's billionaires increased by 27.5%, amounting to 10.2 trillion US dollars.

36 Inertial development under this scenario leads to the fact that economic growth is limited by the exhaustion  
37 of natural resources, accompanied by an increase in the number of poor segments of the population, a decrease  
38 in demand for products. As a result, there is a deepening of differentiation of countries and regions, an increase  
39 in unemployment, poverty and poverty, marginalization and increased uncontrolled migration of the population.

40 The digital economy facilitates human access to social goods and services. If a society has an additional  
41 resource -access to infrastructure and communications, the Internet, it has increased opportunities to meet its  
42 needs (access to water, food, housing, energy resources, health services, education).

43 But along with positive trends, the expansion of digitalization in all sectors of the economy, the development  
44 of Big Data will eventually lead to the formation of a new oligarchic stratum of society ??Harari, 2019, p.13]

## 2 II. LITERATURE REVIEW ON THE PROBLEM OF SOCIAL INEQUALITY AND INCLUSIVE DEVELOPMENT

---

45 and to the new digital dictatorship, the socalled "network Netocracy" (Bard & Zoderkvist, 2004). Thanks to  
46 full access to information and manipulation of information, it acquires unlimited power in the management of  
47 society. At the same time, vulnerable social strata appear in society that do not possess digital skills and do not  
48 benefit from Internet resources. These strata of society are gradually becoming the poorest population. With  
49 the development of digital technologies, a significant part of the population of many countries will be forced out  
50 of the labor market, which will lead to an increase in unemployment, lower incomes, job cuts, and a decrease in  
51 the middle-class stratum.

52 In other words, despite digitalization and automation of processes in all spheres of the economy and human  
53 life, the problems of inequality are increasing in all countries. And everyone knows that an increase in the  
54 stratification of society can lead to serious social conflicts regarding the distribution of resources in the country  
55 and negatively affects economic, social and political stability.

56 Kazakhstan is no exception. In our country with a developing economy, large differences in spatial development  
57 and the predominance of extractive industries, the problems of social inequality are very acute. Under the  
58 influence of global challenges, income differentiation in Kazakhstan has increased significantly. According to  
59 experts, in 2021 in Kazakhstan, the number of rich people with a fortune of more than 30 million US dollars  
60 increased by 33%. At the same time, the share of poor households with incomes below the subsistence minimum  
61 increased to 5.2% compared to 4.3% in 2019, and in rural areas amounted to 6.3% (EEC, 2019).

62 Therefore, the problem of overcoming social inequality of the population is relevant in Kazakhstan.

63 The purpose of the article is to study theoretical and practical issues of social inequality and develop  
64 recommendations for its reduction in Kazakhstan.

65 An attempt is made on the basis of generalization of theoretical views of scientists on the problems of inequality  
66 and analysis of the dynamics of social indicators in the regions of Kazakhstan to confirm the hypothesis about  
67 the growing inequality of the population living in different regions of the country. It was made the conclusion  
68 about the need for constant monitoring of social indicators in the regions of the country, the development of a  
69 National Program to combat poverty in Kazakhstan in areas differentiated by region was proposed. The methods  
70 of system research, generalizations, economic-statistical, index, scoring and ranking were used.

## 71 2 II. Literature Review on the Problem of Social Inequality and 72 Inclusive Development

73 Many theorists, economists and analysts have been researching the phenomena of economic growth, social  
74 development and inequality for many years. The subject of the scientists' research was mainly factors of economic  
75 growth or recession, and unstable development (Kuznets, 1963;Lewis, 1954;Holmes, 1999;Fujita, Krugman, 1995).  
76 However, institutional and social causes of economic inequality in different territories of the country and different  
77 social strata of the population have been poorly investigated.

78 Later, more attention was paid to the problems of spatial inequality. Thus, the famous scientist Krugman  
79 associated economic development with the growth of urbanization and inequality in its early stages of development  
80 (Krugman, 1991). According to his theory, economic growth is promoted by structural changes in the urban  
81 economy, allowing it to take advantage of increased profits and the economy of urbanization. This theory  
82 was supported and developed by other scientists. In particular, Ross proved that urbanization accelerates the  
83 process of redistribution of labor from rural to urban areas ??Ross, 2000). Behrens K. and Robert-Nicoud F. it  
84 was revealed that the growth of cities and a large concentration of the population are associated with growing  
85 inequality (Behrens & Robert-Nicoud, (2014). Scientists Baum-Snow N. and Pavan R. identified a positive  
86 relationship between the size of a city and wage inequality over the past decades and found that intra-group  
87 inequality in large cities is an important driving force of this relationship (Baum-Snow, 2012).

88 Of interest are empirical studies by a number of authors on spatial inequality on the example of the provinces  
89 of China. Thus, to assess territorial inequality, these authors analyzed the influence of independent variables  
90 measuring the level of globalization, decentralization and the location of production on gross domestic product  
91 (GDP) per capita (Tsui, 1993;Zhou & Qin, 2012). Other scientists who study the issues of concentration of  
92 factors of production and consumer market in the regions of developed countries also attach great importance to  
93 solving the problem of territorial inequality (Wei, Fang, 2006).

94 Thus, the geographical concentration of material, financial and human capital to a certain extent confirms the  
95 territorial inequality in the distribution of human benefits.

96 In the future, research papers began to trace the uneven distribution of income and poverty, excessive  
97 differentiation in access to health services, education (Granberg& Zaitseva, 2002; Grigoriev & Parshina,  
98 2013;Andreeva et al., 2017). In the studies of Ukrainian authors, special attention is paid to social inequality,  
99 but the results obtained do not give a real idea of inequality in both income and property ownership (Feofanova&  
100 Feofanov, 2017).

101 Generalization of theoretical views on the problems of inequality allowed us to draw a number of conclusions.

102 Firstly, theoretical research and practice of world development indicate an increase in socioeconomic inequality  
103 of countries, their individual territories, cities and villages.

104 Secondly, despite many studies, there is no consensus on the causes of regional inequality and living standards

105 of different segments of the population. Nevertheless, many scientists argue that an increase in inequality can be  
106 both an engine of economic growth and have a negative impact on the sustainability of development.

107 Thirdly, increasing differences in the social development of countries and their individual territories, large  
108 discrepancies in the economic well-being and political interests of the population can contribute to the disruption  
109 of overall social stability and be a destabilizing factor Fourth, one of the main problems of our time is the  
110 inequality of the population in various aspects: by the place of settlement on the territory of the country; by  
111 income level, distribution of national wealth; by the degree of accessibility to public goods and social services  
112 (health, education); by the provision of effective jobs, infrastructure, drinking water, etc.

113 Fifthly, the strengthening of social stratification leads to the radicalization of people's views and, accordingly,  
114 to an increase in social tension.

115 Thus, in many countries, there is a need to smooth out regional differences on the basis of a new, scientifically  
116 based development model.

117 In developing countries, such as Kazakhstan, the problems of regional inequality have not yet been adequately  
118 addressed. The key issues of regional inequality in the regions of Kazakhstan of various types -raw materials,  
119 industrial, agro-industrial, service -are poorly investigated.

120 The emergence of new conditions, factors and threats to stable socio-economic development makes it necessary  
121 to change approaches in Kazakhstan's economic policy to solve the problem of social inequality.

122 From our point of view, the conceptual model of Inclusive Growth meets the real conditions for maintaining  
123 social stability in society. It compares favorably with other theories, its implementation involves solving the  
124 problem of reducing inequality and rational distribution of resources and benefits.

125 The basis of the country's economic policy based on the principles of inclusive development should be not  
126 so much the increment of national wealth and its rational distribution, but comprehensive sustainable economic  
127 growth, ensuring an increase in income and quality of life for all categories of the population in all regions of the  
128 country, increasing their access to social benefits and the level of security. That is, if we switch to an inclusive  
129 development model, every person in society should be able to meet the needs of their life and human capital  
130 development: access to water, food, housing, energy resources, health services, education. An additional resource  
131 necessary for the life of people in modern society is access to infrastructure and communications, primarily  
132 broadband Internet.

133 The development of the economy, according to the inclusive development model, becomes possible with the  
134 expansion of the influence of informatization and digitalization of all processes and spheres of human activity,  
135 the formation of the network nature of the economy, the strengthening of the role of knowledge and innovation.

136 The main drivers of inclusive development from a regional perspective are schematically presented in Figure  
137 1.

138 The implementation of this model will require increasing the role of state and local authorities in stimulating  
139 the creation of effective jobs and income growth of the population, more even participation in economic processes.  
140 Thus, inclusive development will contribute to the achievement of social justice.

### 141 **3 Resources and Methods**

142 The social inequality of the population in the regions was measured by methods and indicators that allow assessing  
143 the level of poverty, the income gap between rural and urban residents, differences in the provision of doctors,  
144 housing, the number of vulnerable people with disabilities by regions of the country and different layers of society.

145 The object of the study were the regions of Kazakhstan.

### 146 **4 a) Indicators of social inequality**

147 The selected indicators characterizing regional differences in the levels of social development are presented in  
148 table ??.

### 149 **5 Table 1: Indicators of social development of the regions of 150 Kazakhstan**

151 No.

152 Indicator The content of the indicator, units of measurement where X n -the value of the current indicator; X  
153 max -the maximum value of the indicator; X min -the minimum value of the indicator. of the indices and their  
154 scoring allow ranking the regions of Kazakhstan according to the level of social inequality of the population.

155 One of the important issues that need to be addressed to reduce differences in the social development of regions  
156 is gender equality. Therefore, for a more complete assessment of the level of social inequality, the dynamics of  
157 wage differences between men and women in the regions of Kazakhstan is analyzed.

158 The critical point in social inequality is the poverty of rural residents, whose number in Kazakhstan reaches  
159 42%. Therefore, the authors focus on the analysis of dynamics and regional differences in household incomes of  
160 the city and village.

161 The analysis of the totality of these indicators allows the authors to assess the level of social justice in the  
162 regions of Kazakhstan.

163 **6 c) Sources**

164 The information base of the study was made up of foreign and domestic literary sources, regulatory legal acts of  
165 the

166 **7 IV. Analysis of the Dynamics of Social Indicators in the  
167 Regions of Kazakhstan**

168 The object of the study to assess the differences in the levels and dynamics of social indicators were the regions of  
169 Kazakhstan -14 regions and 3 cities of republican significance. The results of calculations of indicators of social  
170 development of the regions of Kazakhstan in 2021 are presented in Table 2.

171 Based on the indicators of social development using the index method according to formulas (1) and ( ??), the  
172 authors carried out their point normalization and ranking of the regions of Kazakhstan. The ranking of regions  
173 made it possible to identify those in which the highest level of social inequality of the population is observed,  
174 requiring radical measures to reduce it. The results of the assessment of the level of social development and the  
175 rating of the regions are presented in Table 3.

176 The analysis of social indicators clearly demonstrated the continuing inequality of the regions of Kazakhstan.

177 A clear picture of the social inequality of the population in the regions of Kazakhstan is provided by the  
178 analysis of household incomes used for consumption in the context of urban and rural areas. The bottom line  
179 is that the higher the rate of use of income for consumption, the lower the ability of households to receive  
180 educational, medical and other services, the smaller the share of income used for the expansion or development  
181 of the economy. Calculations of real household incomes used for consumption in urban and rural areas by regions  
182 of the country, on average per capita and their comparative dynamics for 2016-2021. presented in table 4. In  
183 general, judging by the above indicators, there is a positive trend in the growth of household incomes used for  
184 consumption in the regions of Kazakhstan. However, income growth is offset by an increase in inflation in the  
185 consumer market, which reinforces the trend of increasing poverty of the population. In addition, there are still  
186 large differences in household incomes used for consumption, both by regions of the country and by cities and  
187 villages, which indicates the continuing social inequality of the population.

188 Analysis of the level of gender equality is of great importance from the perspective of overcoming poverty and  
189 social modernization of society. Gender equality implies equal access of people to the sphere of employment and  
190 social services, regardless of gender and age, as well as their place of residence. To a large extent, women suffer  
191 from inequality, which is manifested in the following:

192 women receive less pay; -have less control over resources; -have fewer opportunities to get an education due  
193 to employment in the household; -have less access to high-paying jobs in the public and commercial sectors of  
194 the economy; -as a rule, they have less representation in the government; -have a large work load associated with  
195 both work in the sectors of the economy, as well as with the birth and upbringing of children, employment in the  
196 household.

197 Women from socially vulnerable categories of the population who face the problem of finding stable employment  
198 are experiencing particular difficulties. Unemployment and the associated decline in the standard of living of the  
199 population increase the risk of an increase in various forms of violence against women. At the same time, the  
200 creation of equal opportunities for women ensures their active participation in the political, economic and social  
201 life of the country.

202 The study of the level of gender equality in the regions of Kazakhstan was conducted by comparing the  
203 differences in the provision of men and women with jobs and decent pay for their work. For these purposes,  
204 the ratio of the average monthly nominal salary per employee among men and women for 2016 and 2021 is  
205 calculated (Table 5). 3. Until 2018. there was a South Kazakhstan region, from which the city of Shymkent and  
206 the Turkestan region were separated These data show that in Kazakhstan there is a gender asymmetry in the  
207 amount of wages, which is largely due to the fact that women make up the majority in the public sector, where  
208 wages are relatively low.

209 V.

210 **8 Results and Discussion**

211 **9 a) The level of poverty in the regions of Kazakhstan**

212 An assessment of regional differences in social indicators showed that the largest gap was in the level of poverty  
213 (the proportion of the population with incomes below the subsistence minimum). Thus, the gap between the  
214 maximum indicator in the Turkestan region and the minimum in Astana reached 8.1 times. At the same time,  
215 the gap in per capita nominal monetary incomes of the population is much smaller -3.6 times. This is due to the  
216 fact that there are more numerous households in the Turkestan region.

217 The agro-industrial regions (Akmola, Almaty, Kostanay, Turkestan regions) have the lowest provision of doctors  
218 for the population. In terms of housing security, the best situation is observed in the cities of republican  
219 significance (Almaty, Astana and Shymkent) and in the oil-producing Atyrau region. At the same time, the  
220 largest number of people with disabilities is observed in industrial regions (Karaganda and North Kazakhstan  
221 regions).

222 The five leaders in social well-being included two megacities (Astana and Almaty), two oil-producing regions  
223 (Atyrau and Mangystau regions) and the industrial Karaganda region. But intraregional problems are also  
224 observed in the leading regions. For example, Atyrau region is the leader in terms of average wages. Only 3% of  
225 the population of this region have incomes below the subsistence minimum, the coefficient of funds is 3.78. In  
226 the Mangystau region, the coefficient of funds is also one of the best in the country -3.28. At the same time, the  
227 median income in these oil-producing regions is one of the lowest, and the gap between the median and average  
228 per capita income in Atyrau region is 5 times, and in Mangystau -3 times, which is the highest among the regions.  
229 This indicates a large gap in income and standard of living among the population employed in the core industry  
230 (oil production), and among people employed in other sectors of the economy of these areas.

231 Turkestan region has one of the lowest coefficients of funds, but at the same time the lowest level of per capita  
232 and median income, the highest proportion of the population with an income below the subsistence minimum,  
233 a large proportion of the population with disabilities. It can be said that relative "equality in poverty" persists  
234 in the region. Given that the Turkestan region is the most densely populated region of Kazakhstan, the high  
235 level of the poor population in this region has a great impact on the severity of the poverty problem in the whole  
236 country. Of the 1 million poor population in Kazakhstan as a whole, 25% of its population falls on the Turkestan  
237 region. The paradox is that the demographic potential of this region is one of the largest in the country, but  
238 its economic potential remains low. The region is an outsider in most economic indicators, it has the lowest  
239 indicators of gross domestic product per capita, investment, budget security, housing, higher education, and the  
240 highest proportion of the population with vulnerable, unstable employment (46%).

## 241 **10 b) Differences in household income per capita used for 242 consumption in urban and rural regions of Kazakhstan**

243 A comparative analysis of household incomes per capita used for consumption in urban and rural areas of the  
244 regions of Kazakhstan allowed us to conclude that higher household incomes on average per capita per month were  
245 in Almaty (218 US dollars) and urban areas of industrial regions: East Kazakhstan (200 US dollars), Karaganda  
246 (210 US dollars) and North Kazakhstan (207 US dollars). In rural areas of these regions, incomes were lower:  
247 in Almaty (155 US dollars), Karaganda (171 dollars) and North Kazakhstan regions (169 US dollars). The  
248 worst situation for this indicator in urban areas was in Shymkent (112 US dollars), Turkestan (122 US dollars),  
249 Kyzylorda (130 US and Zhambyl (137 US dollars) regions. To some extent, such low per capita incomes are  
250 explained by the large number of people in the households of these regions. In rural areas low incomes were  
251 in Turkestan (104 US dollars), Zhambyl (118 US dollars) regions, as well as in raw material producing regions:  
252 Aktobe (120 US dollars), Atyrau (121 US dollars), West Kazakhstan (125 US dollars), Kyzylorda (128 US dollars),  
253 Mangystau (124 US dollars) regions 5 .

254 The gap we calculated between the maximum and minimum indicators of household income per capita used  
255 for consumption indicates inequality in the levels of social development across the country's regions, which in  
256 2018-2020 tended to increase and only slightly decreased in 2021 (1.9). In particular, a large gap is observed  
257 between the indicators of Almaty, the cities of East Kazakhstan, Karaganda regions and Turkestan region.

258 In rural areas, the regional gap is slightly lower (1.6), which is explained by equally low incomes in rural  
259 areas of all regions. A paradox can be noted -in the regions of the oil-producing regions (Atyrau and Mangystau  
260 regions), which are among the five leaders in social well-being, critically low household incomes per capita used  
261 for consumption have developed in rural areas.

262 The analysis showed that the growth of household incomes used for consumption was not accompanied by a  
263 corresponding increase in savings. These trends are typical for Aktobe (city and village), Almaty (village), Atyrau  
264 (city), West Kazakhstan (city and village), Mangystau (city and village), North Kazakhstan (city) and Turkestan  
265 (city) regions. In three cities of republican significance, the growth of consumption expenditures is estimated as  
266 moderate, which indicates the continuing opportunities for progressive social development of households.

267 In general, it can be concluded that household incomes used for consumption are significantly lower in rural  
268 areas than in the city.

## 269 **11 c) The level of gender equality**

270 A comparative analysis of the average monthly nominal wages of men and women in Kazakhstan showed that  
271 a lower wage for women compared to the national average in 2016 was observed in Zhambyl (265 US dollars),  
272 North Kazakhstan (268 tenge), Akmola (271 US dollars) regions and Turkestan (279 US dollars). In 2021, the  
273 situation in the amount of wages has changed significantly for the better, especially among women. Despite the  
274 persistence of gender inequality in society, the economic aspect of this phenomenon tends to equalize. Thus,  
275 in the Almaty region, women's wages were 2.1% higher than men's wages. In Turkestan, Zhambyl regions and  
276 Shymkent, women receive salaries almost on a par with men. However, in most regions, gender wage inequality  
277 persists, and in oil and gas producing regions, men's salaries are almost 1.5-2 times higher. This means that  
278 despite the increase in women's wages over the past 6 years in 10 regions, gender inequality remains significant,  
279 which reduces the opportunities for inclusive social development.

280 There are many reasons for the persistence of gender inequality. First of all, women's labor, as a rule, is  
281 involved in lower-paid sectors of the economy, which is why women in our country as a whole have lower wages.

## 13 CONCLUSION

---

282 Women in Kazakhstan have to combine work with household management, with the birth and upbringing of  
283 children, so it is more difficult for them to compete with men for effective jobs. Women are still insufficiently  
284 involved in Government, political and public structures.

285 Thus, the main reasons hindering the achievement of gender equality in Kazakh society are as follows:  
286 unbalanced remuneration of men and women; -lack of specialized knowledge and skills among women  
287 entrepreneurs; -weak activity of women in the economic sphere.

288 The difference in the levels of economic activity of men and women is primarily shown by the unemployment  
289 rate. The share of unemployed women in 2021 was 53.3%, with the highest rate observed in Almaty (57.7%),  
290 Karaganda (58.9%) and Mangystau regions (64.9%). Therefore, despite the higher proportion of women in the  
291 total population of the country (51.48%), their contribution to the formation of gross domestic product (GDP)  
292 remains quite low compared to the contribution of men.

293 In Kazakhstan, the situation is gradually improving due to the State importance of gender equality issues.  
294 According to the UNDP, Kazakhstan fulfills its obligations on gender equality, encourages measures that open up  
295 more opportunities for women to participate in decision-making, be more competitive in the labor market, occupy  
296 leadership positions in business and unite against gender-based violence. Thanks to these measures, Kazakhstan  
297 has risen by 15 positions in the field of gender development and ranked 65th out of 146 countries in the ranking  
298 of the Global Gender Gap Index in 2022. Including in the field of education, the country rose from 63rd place in  
299 2020 to 27th in 2022, in health and survival -from 74 to 44, in women's participation in economic activity -from  
300 37th place in 2022 to 29 in the same period. However, in the field of women's political empowerment, Kazakhstan  
301 ranked 103rd in 2022 against 93rd in 2017 (UNDP, 2023).

302 The process of ensuring gender equality is still one of the rather complex phenomena. Therefore, ensuring  
303 gender equality, including in the context of the regions of Kazakhstan, implies further improvement of the  
304 institutional framework in order to strengthen state guarantees for the provision of equal opportunities for men  
305 and women in the exercise of their rights.

## 306 12 VI.

## 307 13 Conclusion

308 The conducted research allows the authors to draw the following conclusions and suggestions. a) Reduction of  
309 social inequality in Kazakhstan requires constant monitoring of social and economic levels in the regions. We  
310 propose a methodological approach that can become a reliable tool for public authorities when developing regional  
311 programs and making managerial decisions on the development of the country's regions. It allows you to get a  
312 general picture of the social differences between regions in general and on individual grounds. The indicators  
313 complement each other, allowing not to smooth out the picture, but to identify individual contradictions within  
314 and between regions. In Kazakhstan, it is necessary to improve the institutional foundations of macroeconomic  
315 and regional policy in the direction of taking regulatory measures for a more equitable distribution of resources  
316 between territories and layers of society, strengthening social support measures for the population in various  
317 aspects: to ensure access to public goods and social services, to provide effective jobs, infrastructure. b) Today,  
318 significant risks for the implementation of the principles of inclusive regional development in Kazakhstan are the  
319 imperfection of the institutional framework. For example, in the National Project "Strong regions -the driver  
320 of the country's development", only 3 out of 20 indicators are focused on socio-economic development. At the  
321 same time, this document does not provide indicators for increasing the income of the population, providing  
322 high-quality medical, educational and other public services. In other words, it can be stated that this program  
323 document of Kazakhstan on the development of regions has a low level of inclusiveness and does not yet meet  
324 the goals of reducing social inequality in the regions. Therefore, it is necessary to develop a National Program to  
325 combat poverty throughout Kazakhstan with measures and mechanisms differentiated by region. c) In order to  
326 fully solve the problems of poverty in rural areas, it is recommended, along with strengthening the stimulation of  
327 agricultural production, to actively introduce a mechanism of local self-government. d) It is possible to overcome  
328 large regional differences in the levels of socio-economic development, reduce the poverty of the population and  
329 ensure the transition of the regions of Kazakhstan to an inclusive development model by using the existing  
330 potential in the following areas: Kazakhstan, Zhambyl, Kostanay, Kyzylorda and Pavlodar regions (regions of  
331 moderate severity in terms of poverty), it is necessary to ensure employment by creating new jobs through  
332 the diversification of the local real sector, the creation of new industries, as well as increasing investment in  
333 healthcare, which will ensure increase the quality of life population. -Youth unemployment is a critical risk of  
334 increasing poverty in Almaty, Karaganda, Mangystau regions, the cities of Almaty and Shymkent. In Almaty,  
335 the problem of employment of the population of Almaty can be solved through the formation of the Almaty  
336 agglomeration, which provides for the construction, together with the Singapore Company, of four structurally  
337 united satellite cities G4-City along the Almaty-Kapshagai highway, as well as as a result of the administrative  
338 division of the Almaty region and the separation of the Zhetysu region from its composition with the center in  
339 Taldykorgan. -In Shymkent, where there is a high population density and a large proportion of the poor, a more  
340 complete and effective use of local resources is a priority. -In the Mangystau region, the growth of unemployment  
341 is associated with unfavorable climatic conditions and low social attractiveness of the village. Here, poverty  
342 reduction in rural areas is possible through the creation of new oil refineries, small and medium-sized businesses,

---

343 and the development of camel breeding. -In the Karaganda region, poverty reduction should be associated with  
344 the technological modernization of city-forming enterprises, economic diversification, the development of the  
345 digital services sector, the activation of small and medium-sized businesses, which will eventually contribute to  
the creation of new jobs and income growth of the population. <sup>1</sup>

Republic of Kazakhstan, official statistical data: Bureau of National Statistics of the Agency for Strategic Planning and Reforms of the Republic of Kazakhstan, demographic statistics data: Standard of living statistics (<https://stat.gov.kz/official/industry/64/statistic/7>), Social security statistics (<https://stat.gov.kz/official/industry/66/statistic/8>); Health statistics (<https://stat.gov.kz/official/industry/63/statistic/8>);

Figure 1:

346

---

<sup>1</sup> Bureau of National Statistics (2021) Regions of Kazakhstan (2021). In Ed. ShaimardanovZh. N, Astana, 451.

## 13 CONCLUSION

---

2

No.	Regions and Cities	Average per capita nominal monetary income of the population, US dollar	The proportion of the nominal population with incomes below the subsistence minimum (poverty level), %	Median income of the population, US dollar	The ratio of funds (the ratio of 10 percent of the most well-off population), times	The number of persons with disabilities per 1000 people	Availability of housing, sq. m for 1 person	Availability of doctors, per 1000 people of the population, people
1	Akmola	283	5,9	135	5,94	40	23,6	2,6
2	Aktobe	266	3,5	119	5,22	31	23	4,5
3	Almaty	226	4	135	5,38	32	21	2,5
4	Atyrau	583	3	116	3,78	35	24,2	3,1
5	West Kazakhstan	297	3,9	118	4,48	36	22,5	3,3
6	Zhambyl	209	5,8	105	3,86	40	18	3,0
7	Karaganda	326	3	169	6,9	49	23,5	4,7
8	Kostanay	283	3,5	143	5,06	33	22,5	2,9
9	Kyzylorda	214	5,8	113	4,23	38	20,9	3,5
10	Mangystau	363	5,7	115	3,28	39	27,3	3,4
11	Pavlodar	320	3,9	146	6,51	37	22,6	4,0
12	NorthKazakhstan	272	6,7	157	6,67	49	22,2	3,1
13	Turkestan	160	12,2	97	3,42	47	19,1	2,9
14	East Kazakhstan	310	6,5	174	6,78	40	21,2	4,4
15	Astana city	450	1,5	158	4,73	22	30,6	7,6
16	Almaty city	416	4,9	173	7,45	26	29	6,9
17	Shymkent city	189	5	98	3,22	33	25,8	4,5
The gap between the maximum and minimum values of indicators		3,6	8,1	1,8	2,3	2,3	1,7	3,1

Note: calculated according to the following sources of statistical information: Standard of living statistics (<https://stat.gov.kz/official/industry/64/statistic/7>), Social security statistics (<https://stat.gov.kz/official/industry/66/statistic/8>); Health statistics (<https://stat.gov.kz/official/industry/63/statistic/8>); Statistics of the housing stock of the Republic of Kazakhstan (<https://stat.gov.kz/edition/publication/collection>).

Figure 2: Table 2 :

---

**3**

No.	Regions and cities	Index	Rating
1	Akmola	3,54	14
2	Aktobe	4,49	7
3	Almaty	3,44	15
4	Atyrau	5,21	3
5	West Kazakhstan	4,14	11
6	Zhambyl	3,10	16
7	Karaganda	5,12	4
8	Kostanay	4,16	10
9	Kyzylorda	3,62	13
10	Mangystau	4,86	5
11	Pavlodar	4,39	9
12	North Kazakhstan	3,63	12
13	Turkestan	2,37	17
14	East Kazakhstan	4,47	8
15	Astana city	7,99	1
16	Almaty city	6,53	2
17	Shymkent city	4,58	6

Note: Calculated according to the indicators of Table1.

Figure 3: Table 3 :

4

Regions and cities	Household income used for consumption in urban and rural areas, US dollars								The growth rate of household income used for to 2016, in % consumption	
	2016		2018		2020		2021		City	Village
Akmola	130	113	158	133	170	145	175	155	154,7	150,9
Aktobe	121	109	128	106	141	115	154	120	112,5	124,6
Almaty	137	147	161	145	181	154	181	160	156,2	123,5
Atyrau	128	100	139	107	132	120	142	121	121,2	141,9
West	129	97	140	106	141	114	152	125	104,8	139,7
Kazakhstan										
Zhambyl	97	78	115	94	127	107	137	118	154,2	160,9
Karaganda	154	121	176	140	188	157	210	171	143,6	153,0
Kostanay	121	107	133	113	152	129	175	155	147,9	141,5
Kyzylorda	92	88	119	100	122	111	130	128	155,4	148,9
Mangystau	126	108	136	112	133	120	137	124	124,2	130,7
Pavlodar	121	119	146	138	164	148	190	164	159,2	147,5
North Kazakhstan	142	123	185	138	184	152	207	169	126,2	146,6
Turkestan 2	85	77	90	85	98	94	122	104	135,7	144,5
East	158	110	182	134	188	135	200	156	140,5	145,0
Kazakhstan										
Astana city	151		166		163		191		126,9	
Almaty city	183		205		206		218		132,8	
Shymkent city 2	112		127		110		112		115,2	
Republic of Kazakhstan	139	107	158	116	162	126	176	136	137,9	138,9
max	183	147	205	145	206	157	218	171		
min	85	77	90	85	98	94	112	104		
Max/min (gap)	2,1	1,9	2,3	1,7	2,1	1,7	1,9	1,6		

Note:1. Calculated according to the Bureau of National Statistics of the Agency for Strategic Planning and Reforms of the Republic of Kazakhstan. URL: <http://www.stat.gov.kz> 2.

Figure 4: Table 4 :

---

**5**

Regions and cities	Average monthly nominal salary, US dollars	Men	Women	2016	The ratio of women's and men's salaries, %	Average
Republic of Kazakhstan	514	361		70,2		652
Akmola	344	271		78,7		491
Aktobe	397	299		75,4		559
Almaty	349	299		85,6		471
Atyrau	1 050	539		51,3		1 144
West Kazakhstan	572	329		57,4		592
Zhambyl	310	265		85,2		453
Karaganda	440	301		68,4		642
Kostanay	353	283		80,1		492
Kyzylorda	407	308		75,6		518
Mangystau	1 006	464		46,1		1 005
Pavlodar	427	311		72,8		568
North Kazakhstan	314	268		85,4		435
Turkestan 2	345	279		80,8		466
East Kazakhstan	403	311		77,2		566
Astana city	685	544		79,4		888
Almaty city	548	463		84,4		756
Shymkent city 2	-	-		-		461

Note:

1.

Figure 5: Table 5 :



### 347 .1 Acknowledgment

348 This study has been funded by the Committee of Science of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the  
349 Republic of Kazakhstan (grant "Priorities and mechanisms of inclusive regional development of Kazakhstan in  
350 the context of overcoming the economic recession" AP09259004).

351 [Krugman ()] , Paul R Krugman . *Geography and Trade* 1991. Cambridge: MIT Press.

352 [Yu ()] *21 lessons for the XXI century*, Harari V Yu . 2019. Moscow, Sinbad. p. 416. (In Russian)

353 [Eec ()] 'About the standard of living of the population in the Eurasian Economic Union'. Eec .  
354 [http://www.eurasiancommission.org/ru/act/integr\\_i\\_makroec/dep\\_stat/econstat/](http://www.eurasiancommission.org/ru/act/integr_i_makroec/dep_stat/econstat/)  
355 Documents/householdincome\_2017.pdf *Analytical review* 2019. 14.

356 [Andreeva et al. ()] 'An empirical approach to comparing social orders'. A A Andreeva , K A  
357 Ionkina , T T Sanishvili . 10.38050/2078-3809-2017-9-2-51-71. <https://doi.org/10.38050/2078-3809-2017-9-2-51-71> *Scientific research of the Faculty of Economics* 2017. 9 (2) p. .

359 [Tsui ()] 'Decomposition of China's regional inequalities'. K Y Tsui . *Journal Comp. Economics* 1993. 17 (3) p. .

360 [Ross ()] *Development Theory and the Economics of Growth*, J Ross . <https://gdsnet.org/RosBookJune1999.pdf> 1999. p. 455. The University of Notre Dame

362 [Lewis ()] 'Economic Development with Unlimited Supplies of Labor'. W A Lewis . 10.1111/j.1467-9957.1954.tb00021.x. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9957.1954.tb00021.x> *Manchester School of Economics and Social Studies* 1954. 22 (2) p. .

365 [Grigoriev and Parshina ()] 'Economic dynamics of the countries of the world in 1992-2010: uneven growth'.  
366 L Grigoriev , E Parshina . 10.1016/S1574-0056(00)80016-0. *Bulletin of St. Petersburg University. Ser. 5: Economics* 2013. 4 p. .

368 [Zhou and Qin ()] *Empirical analysis on income inequality of Chinese residents*, Y Zhou , Y Qin . 2012. Berlin:  
369 Springer.

370 [Wei and Fang ()] 'Geographical and structural constraints of regional development in Western China: A study  
371 of Gansu Province'. Y H D Wei , C Fang . *Issues Stud* 2006. 42 (2) p. .

372 [Granberg and Yu ()] 'Growth rates in the national economic space'. A Granberg , Zaitseva Yu . *Economic issues*  
373 2002. 9 p. .

374 [Undp ()] *Implementation of gender equality in Kazakhstan*, Undp . <https://www.undp.org/ru/kazakhstan/gendernoe-ravenstvo> 2023.

376 [Kanbur ()] *Income distribution and development. Handbook of income distribution*, 1, Ch, R Kanbur .  
377 10.1016/S1574-0056. <https://doi.org/10.1016/S1574-0056> 2000. 13 p. .

378 [Holmes ()] 'Localization of Industry and Vertical Disintegration'. T J Holmes . *Review of Economics and Statistics* 1999. 81 p. .

380 [Feofanova and Feofanov ()] 'Microeconomic and macroeconomic aspects of inequality in Ukraine'. I V Feofanova  
381 , L K Feofanov . *Problems of the economy* 2017. 1 p. .

382 [Bard and Zoderkvist ()] *Netocracy. The New ruling elite and life after Capitalism*, A Bard , J Zoderkvist . 2004.  
383 St. Petersburg: Stockholm School of Economics. p. 256.

384 [Poverty and Inequality Platform (version 20230328\_2017\_01\_02\_PROD) [data set ()] *Poverty and Inequality  
385 Platform (version 20230328\_2017\_01\_02\_PROD) [data set*, <https://pip.worldbank.org/home> 2023.  
386 World Bank.

387 [Kuznets ()] 'Quantitative Aspects of the Economic Growth of Nations: VIII. Distribution of Income by Size.  
388 Part 2'. S Kuznets . <http://piketty.pse.ens.fr/files/Kuznets1963.pdf> *Economic Development  
389 and Cultural Change* 1963. 11 (2) p. .

390 [Behrens and Robert-Nicoud ()] 'Survival of the fittest in cities: agglomeration, polarization, and inequality'.  
391 K Behrens , F Robert-Nicoud . 10.1111/eco.12099. <https://doi.org/10.1111/eco.12099> *The  
392 Economic Journal* 2014. 124 (581) p. .

393 [Baum-Snow ()] 'Understanding the City Size Wage Gap'. N Baum-Snow , RonniP . 10.1093/restud/rdr022.  
394 <https://doi.org/10.1093/restud/rdr022> *Review of Economic Studies* 2012. 79 p. .

395 [Fujita and Krugman ()] 'When is the economy monocentric: von Thunen and Chambertin unified'. M Fujita ,  
396 P Krugman . *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 1995. 254 p. .