Post-Soviet Neoliberal Governmentality: A Study of International Organization's
Educational Policy in Post-Rose Revolution Republic of Georgia

Patrick Dooley

A Thesis

in

The Department

of

Education

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree of Master of Arts (Educational Studies) at

Concordia University

Montreal, Quebec, Canada

April 2014

CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY

School of Graduate Studies

This is to certify that the thesis prepared

By: Patrick Dooley

Entitled: Post-Soviet Neoliberal Governmentality: A Study of International
Organization's Educational Policy in Post-Rose Revolution Republic of Georgia

and submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts (Educational Studies)

complies with the regulations of the University and meets the accepted standards with
respect to originality and quality.

Signed by the final examining committee:

          Dr. Joy Barakett   Chair

          Dr. Adeela-Arshad Ayaz   Examiner

          Dr. Richard Bisaillon   Examiner

          Dr. Naseem Ayaz   Supervisor

Approved by   Dr. Richard Schmid
          Chair of Department or Graduate Program Director

          Joanne Locke
          Dean of faculty

Date   April 7th, 2014

ABSTRACT

Post-Soviet Neoliberal Governmentality: A Study of International Organization's Educational Policy in Post-Rose Revolution Republic of Georgia

Patrick Dooley

Since the Rose Revolution in 2003, international organizations have been central in the shaping of educational policy in the Republic of Georgia. I look to analyze the educational policy of international organizations working Georgia from the point of view of governmentality. I argue that pervious research had failed to address the issue of education in Georgia beyond a basic concept of power. Through my analysis, I argue that a distinctly post-Soviet neoliberal governmentality emerges that differs from other concepts of governmentality. I argue that a distinctively post-Soviet neoliberal governmentality has emerged that renders Georgian governable for a specific position within the global assembly line.

Table of contents

Chapter 1

Introduction

In the 2003, the Republic of Georgia underwent its first non-violent transition of power when the supporters of the pro-western Mikheil Saakashvili peacefully ousted the government of Eduard Shevardnadze. This event is generally known as the Rose Revolution. The occasion was deemed in the West as the triumph of Western values in a former Soviet Republic, and the start of a realignment of former Soviet republics towards the Western sphere of influence (Fairbanks Jr., 2004, 124). When in power, the Saakashvili government quickly introduced reforms in an array of fields ranging from neoliberal economic reforms to massive constitutional changes designed to enhance the role of the President (Lazarus, 2013).

These reforms were greeted with great acclaim by western states and international organizations, and were praised as an example for other so-called developing states (World Bank, 2006). In consequence, Georgia saw a tremendous increase of aid from the donor community owing to of a greater degree of confidence in the Saakashvili government, which funded these different projects (Lazarus, 2013, p. 16).

In this thesis I address the shift in educational policy in Georgia after the Rose Revolution in 2003. The focus of my research is the role of international organizations, such as USAID and the World Bank, in shaping the educational policy of Georgia at the public school level. I analyze documents regarding education policy released by these organizations from 2003 to 2013, in order to locate the strategies and techniques that rendered the subjects governable. I address three key areas of policy:

- Educational decentralization
- Unified National Exams
- National curriculum policy

My central question is how have international organizations, like the World Bank and USAID shaped educational policy to make individuals more governable? I argue that a distinctively post-Soviet neoliberal governmentality has emerged that renders Georgian governable for a specific position within the global assembly line. Thus, I am looking to map out the rationalities that moral justify and conceptualize the usage of power by international organizations in shaping educational policy in Georgia and the technologies they use to implement and monitor these policies.

I will be answering this question through four chapters. The first chapter provides background for my research question. I make a brief historical overview of Georgia from the Soviet occupation to independence through to the Rose Revolution. I also outline some of the economic and social reforms that have been implemented to make Georgia more 'European' and western oriented. Lastly I provide a review of the previously completed research regarding Georgian education policy. In this chapter I state that within this literature there has not been a serious inquiry into how power is practiced the post-Rose Revolution educational system.

In my second chapter, I will be providing both conceptual and methodological overviews for the approach used to my key question: how international organizations make subjects more governable through educational policy in the Republic of Georgia. I will first outline a concept of power that will guide My analysis of Georgian educational policy. I argue that traditional understanding of power being strictly repressive does not appropriately reflect the dynamics of power when power functions in shaping a field of possibilities that involves pressure and oppression. Secondly, I will address the concept of governmentality as it is articulated by Michel Foucault to provide a context how power is

exercised. I focus upon the shifting nature of governing from sovereignty to population. Thirdly, I will conceptualize what Foucault means when he refers to government so to distinguishing it from state-centric understanding of the idea of government. Fourthly, I will address the relevance of governmentality to educational policy. Based upon my conceptual model, I analyze governmentality by making the analytical distinctions between three concepts: political rationalities, technologies of government, and programs of government. Then I take a look at detailing the three different distinctions. Fifthly, I address the diverse varieties of governmentality that have been articulated by different authors. In my last chapter, we shape the methodological framework. I am using a mix of methodological approaches for both discourse and descriptive analysis.

In my fifth chapter, I will be analyzing the educational policy in documents of international organizations. I analyze three key areas of policy to locate their distinct political rationalities and the technologies that enable them to be operated. I argue that each individual policy holds a different modes of government, however a strategic alliance unites them in shaping conduct through a distinctly post-Soviet neoliberal *governmentality*. Whereas other authors (Lemeke, 2001; Peters, 2004; Rose and Miller, 1992) argue that neoliberal rationalities conceptualized a notion of civil society, this rationality does not account for civil society. Instead, it conceptualizes the country as a single entity that partakes a highly specific role within the global assembly line. In conclusion I make my conclusion and draw up guidelines how the research should be carried out.

Chapter 2

Historical Overview

In this chapter, I will provide some context to my research question. As the Republic of Georgia's history and circumstances are hardly common knowledge outside of its borders, this section will provide a historical overview of Georgian history. In doing so, it will showcase a history starting at the annexation of Georgia by the Soviet Union shortly after electing its first democratic government in 1921 to the 2003 Rose Revolution that ushered in the present neoliberal regime.

In the second part of this section, I outline some of the economic and social reforms implemented by the post-Rose Revolution regime. I will discuss the massive deregulation of the economic system in Georgia and the corresponding economic reforms that have been implemented to push Georgia towards the Western sphere of influence.

The third part of this section, I will provide overview of the research completed on the Georgian education system. I note that there is a lack of research, and furthermore a lack of methodological diversity that looks to understand the power relations in educational policy produced by international organizations.

Georgian Historical Overview: From the Soviet Union to Rose Revolution

The Republic of Georgia is a country located next to the Black Sea in the Southern Caucuses Mountains. Georgia is a unique country in that it shares very little in common with its neighbors due to geography, language, and religion. Being located in the Southern Caucasus with large mountains surrounding the entire country helped isolate it from invaders and preserve the culture. The languages that are spoken and the alphabet

is part of the Kartvelian language family that is almost exclusively used in Georgia minus small pockets of populations along the Georgian border. It is an overwhelmingly Georgian Orthodox Christian country, which is a central symbol to the national identity. The significance of religion is heightened by the fact that Georgia is surrounded by Muslim neighbors of Turkey, Azerbaijan, Iran (below Christian Armenia), and the Northern Caucasus. These factors have contributed to a general isolation of Georgia.

Due to it's small size, Georgia had a long history of gaining sovereignty and then losing it to neighbors, like the Ottoman and Persian Empires. The most notable colonizer has been Russia/Soviet Union that has largely dominated Georgia since the 17th century which has been occasionally interrupted by either Georgian resistance or other colonial powers. Before Georgia's independence in 1991, the most prolonged and substantial domination of Georgia was under the former Soviet Union that annexed Georgia after a brief period of independence from 1918 to 1921.

Under Soviet control, Georgia's primarily agricultural economy underwent a process of collectivization controlled by a planned economy that was resisted in many parts of the country (van der Leeuw, 1998, p 141). This was a means of consolidating the Soviet state power to observe and discipline the population. Nonetheless, a degree of autonomy was given to various Soviet republics that were largely structured upon ethnic lines of pre-existing countries that were annexed by the Soviet Union. As result, language and cultural difference were enabled to sustain. Slezkine (1994) states that the Soviet Union functioned like an apartment building: different rooms but one landlord. The tenants are allowed to arrange the rooms and deal with the landlord accordingly to ensure some degree of autonomy and to quell resistance. As a result, national sentiment in

7

Georgia was able to survive along with different republics (Jones, 2006, 248). As a result, Georgia was able sustain a strong national identity. Furthermore, Georgia did not undergo substantial Russification in terms of urbanization policies but instead saw a decrease of ethnic minorities and encouragement of Georgian language. Secondly, economically Georgia was drastically more liberal in contrast to other republics, which helped spur a state-centric "gray economy' that saw the growth of corruption through all sectors of the state. This resulted in a collapse of Georgian economic performance and failure to meet economic targets specified by the central government (Cheterian, 2008, p 159). This began the disintegration of the economy that was accelerated under *Perestroika* and *Glasnost* reforms of the late eighties.

The collapse of the Soviet Union throughout the late eighties and into the early nineties saw Georgia become an independent country, and this saw the collapse of the state-apparatus as a functional entity. Territorially, Georgia faced two major secessionist movements in South Ossetia and Abkazia plus the western region of Adjara was not controlled by the central state. Internally, Georgia suffered from a civil war between different factions led by personalities. The most notable two were led by Zviad Gamskhurdia who led nationalists largely from Svaneti in the north west of the country and Eduard Shevardnadze the former Soviet Foreign Affairs Minister who was supported largely former members of the Soviet elite backed by the paramilitary group *Mkhedrioni* and the National Guard (Cheterian, 2008, 696).

The country underwent the collapse of the role of the state and fracturing of the country into different groups that ran their individual territory under a clientelistic policy that provided little else but the assurance of safety. As van der Leeuw accounts,

individuals were compelled to join one of the different groups to ensure their safety and receive access to certain markets. The state merged with these groups in terms of economics and security, and the line between the state and paramilitary/mafia groups was blurred (1998, 156). The central state sole role was to broker the different regional elites that contended for resources for their own benefit (Cheterian 2008, p. 693). Georgia was effectively a feudal state controlled by different principalities for their own personal gain.

Even with the victory and some degree of consolidation of power by Shevardnadze, his regime was representative of a coalition of different groups that found it in their self-interest to have Shevardnadze in power. The state suffered from the inability to enforce rule of law, fight corruption, provide social services, maintain democracy, or improve living standards. During the Shevardnadze regime, elections suffered from mass ballot box stuffing and unfair press control. The privatization process led to the former Soviet elite retaining their control. Income levels fell to between $14 and $20 a month and over fifty percent of people lived below the poverty line (Aydin, 2011). The state largely functioned in a nominal fashion with very little power. The issue of corruption that was symptomatic of the inability of the state to function or hold any role in society became the defining issue of the resentment of the population (Nodia, 2003, p. 282). During his regime, over 40 per cent of the civil service was comprised of individuals from Sherardnadze's native Guria region despite being only 3 per cent of the population (Aydin, 2011, p. 41). The issue of the lack of state-authority helped propel a group of western educated politicians led by the former Justice Minister Mikheil Saakashvili known as Mississippdaleulni (translates to drinkers from the Mississippi) to begin protesting against the Shevardnadze regime (Jones, 2006, p.264). Overall, Georgia

was an archetypal failed state that was laden with crime, poverty, corruption, and no democracy.

As a result of mass discontent and the ability of Saakashvili's followers to mobilize discontent, the Shevardnadze government was peacefully overthrown, which is an event commonly referred to as the Rose Revolution (Nodia, 2004, p. 238). The Rose Revolution was greeted with great attention and excitement because it was viewed as a rejection of the Soviet past and the influence of Russia. It was coupled with other Revolutions in Ukraine, Kyrgyzstan, and Serbia that signaled a desire to align with American foreign policy, have transparent democracy, and liberalize the economy (Cherterian, 2008, 689). Shortly afterwards, elections were held at the parliamentary and presidential level that resulted in an almost one-party state system, whereby Saakashvili had almost absolute control over the state-apparatus (Fairbanks JR, 2004).

What made the Rose Revolution most interesting to the West was the scope of the revolution. It did not result in the banishment of the former elite that was replaced with another but it was what Cherterian characterized as a "real revolution" where a paradigm shift occurred involving every aspect of governance (2008: 695). Almost every facet of the state was reformed on the premise of a complete break from the previously semi-feudal fractured state where the state was incapable or unwilling to respond to public demands. Broad sweeping reforms were implemented ranged from new security apparatuses, the laws on economic interactions, social policy, and foreign policy.

The overwhelming narrative of these policy changes was making Georgia to be a modern consumerist European country that broke from the mold of other former Soviet

republics that were considered weak-states. As Saakashvili stated in an addressed to the nation,

> "Georgia does not forget to regain its place in the European family, in the European civilization which it deserves but which was lost several centuries ago. As a country of ancient Christian civilization, we must regain this place." (Saakahvili speech quoted from Chetarian, 2008, p. 696)

This is part of a broader re-imagining of Georgia under Saakashvili as a failed state that has reformed itself into a new frontier market (Schueth, 2010, p. 52).

Post-Rose Revolution

With Saakashvili's regime firmly in power, it undertook extensive reforms that were unique in a post-Soviet context. Whereas previous post-Soviet Republics had undertaken economic reforms in the aftermath of the collapse of the Soviet Union, they had done so under the gaze of Russian influence (to the exclusion of the Baltic Republics) and the reforms had been marked by corruption, monopolization of key industries, and no democracy. The reforms implemented by the Saakashvili regime entirely embraced the neoliberal agenda.

Key in helping shape these reforms has been the role of international organizations in both funding and advising the Georgian government. Georgia has been a major recipient of aid from both USAID and the World Bank along with other major donor organizations. For international organizations, their investment in the country represents a very important litmus test of their ability to keep post-Soviet republics in the sphere of Western influence and help shape Western values of democracy and free

markets in the country. A Foundation for International Relations and Foreign Dialogue (FRIDE) report underlines the importance of Georgia to international organization, which states,

> "If Georgia's democratic development were to fail during the next ten to fifteen years, it would prove a severe blow to the concept of democracy promotion. Seldom have so much effort and funding from the international community been directed to democracy promotion in a country that is open to democratic change but which lacks a clear EU membership perspective" (2009, p.1).

Thus, international organizations view Georgia not just as one of many impoverish former Soviet republics holding very minimal economic clout, but rather they see it as an integral project for promoting Western culture and economics.

Essential to securing these loans has been abiding to the standards and stipulations imposed by these organizations. Lazarus (2013) argues that international organizations like the World Bank and USAID, have linked democracy and good governance a means of asserting a neoliberal agenda in Georgia. By this, he means that international organizations expect a government to cut their spending, be more transparent, and cut down on corruption to make the country more democratic. He argues that international organizations have focused upon implementing and improving technocratic efficiency to promote the neoliberal agenda of cutting trade barriers, loosening labor restrictions, and restricting union activity (p. 6). Because of Georgia's successful implementation of policies recommended by international organizations products of the former Soviet nomenklatura products of the former Soviet nomenklatura, they have become a major recipient of aid money (p.16). According to the World Bank, Georgia received over six hundred million dollars in aid money in 2010 from members of the Development Assistance Committee (World Bank Data Bank, n.d.). This embracement of neo-

liberalism comes as little surprise in light of the fact that the leaders of the revolution were largely western educated that were not products of the former Soviet elite, and instead embraced Western knowledge and values. As a result of this confidence among international organizations in the Georgian government aid strategies under the Saakashvili regime have shifted from funding civil society to directing it straight to the state (Lazarus, 2013, 16).

The area where the new regime's most radical shifts towards neo-liberalism have been is in its radically reformed economic policy. The government's economic policy is best summarized by the Economic Freedom Act, which states that all tax increases are subject to referenda and budget deficits are limited to 3 per cent of GDP (Georgian Times). According to Forbes Magazine (2008), Georgia was the fourth most tax-friendly regime in the world. Also, the number of regulatory licenses and permits has been reduced from 909 to 159 between the years of 2003 to 2008 (Lazarus, 2013, p. 10). The government's most radical reform involves both security and economic policy where they have made movement towards decriminalizing economic crime (Democracy and Freedom Watch). As consequence of the major macro economic shifts in Georgia, international organizations have viewed it as a model for other so-called underdeveloped countries, and took great interest in the country and invested likewise.

An interest of the state and international organizations has been education policy. Education in Georgia has become a central area of investment for both the state and international organizations because of Georgia's lack of natural resources. It is viewed as a key area for providing economic development in a country that is impoverished and lacking any key natural resources. Education has become a central institution in making

Georgia become a "European" and "modern" society by developing its economy. As a USAID report states,

> "The Government's Constraints Analysis, conducted this year under the auspices of the Prime Minister's office, evaluated 11 factors, including human capital. It identifies Georgia's human capital as one of only two binding constraints on the country's abilities to improve competitiveness and hence economic growth. This acknowledgement translates into substantial pressures on the education sector to improve outcomes." (USAID, 2011, p.4.)

Education is seen by both the state and international organizations as the institution that can possibly push Georgia towards the West culturally and economically and break it from other former Soviet states thereby becoming 'modern.' Thus, I would like to address the role of education in Georgia and the research completed on the subject.

Georgian Education

At the present research in English about Georgia is rather minimal. Much of the research regarding Georgia focused on issues of linguistics and foreign policy. This is a result of the high profile war that Georgia had in 2008 with Russia (Asmus, 2010) and the fact that Georgian is in its own linguistic family (Hewitt, 1995). In contrast, Georgia's domestic policy, specifically its education policy has not attracted a great deal of interest in the English-speaking world. The few published works and commentaries within Western media have framed the post-Rose Revolution reforms as a product of an apolitical anti-corruption agenda that have offered very minimal critique or worked outside the liberal paradigm. Furthermore, there is almost no research on the role of international organizations in shaping education policy. Therefore, the scholarship

regarding Georgia educational policy has been lacking. Nonetheless, there is some nascent research that analyzes the shifts in Georgian educational policy

Much of research's attention has been focused on the reform implemented at the higher educational level. Due to widespread and open corruption at the university level, the Saakashvili regime implemented a number of reforms to counter this problem. Rostiahshvili (2012) and Orkodashvili (2010) address this issue. Both argue that corruption at the university level contributed negatively to the access, equality, and quality of the higher educational system. The implementation of the Unified National Entrance Exam was intended to help rid corruption at the university level. It ensured that one could not bribe one's way into the university and ensured grants were given to those deserving of them. Because the tests were standardized and controlled by the central government, the entrance exam is credited with encouraging more ethnic minorities to enter university by getting rid of corruption that favored Georgian students (Orkodashvili, 2010, p. 31). Another area of change was in the implementation of the accreditation procedures for universities as some were viewed as mismanaged and were used for illegal purposes. These reforms led to the shut down of the State Technical University in 2007 because of the university's widespread corruption practices (p. 32).

Research into the reforms at the public school level is also minimal at this point, however the issue of educational decentralization has attracted some attention. Kim (2009) addresses the issue of educational decentralization. She states that there is a neoliberal rationality behind the process of educational decentralization, but she frames the reforms as part of a broader democratization of Georgia. She holds that the reforms are means of ensuring minimal corruption. She refers to it as "shock-therapy democracy"

(p. 17) that alludes to the privatization process that was undertaken after the collapse of the Communist system in the former USSR. By swiftly cutting down on red tape, educational decentralization is supposed to make the education system more transparent and less prone to corruption.

Matiashvili (2008) addresses the process of educational decentralization before and after the Rose Revolution. She notes that the Shevardnadze regime began implementing educational decentralization in partnership with the Open Societies Georgian Foundation (OSGF) that was intended to provide more local control over education policy and finances (p. 123). However, the project was scrapped after the Saakashvili regime gained power. Instead, the Saakashvili government chose to implement a program supported by the World Bank that would decentralize the financial control but not control over other areas like policy and teacher training (p. 128). The reason the Saakashvili regime rejected the initial OSGF plan was largely because it desired a break from the previous regime in terms of policy and the financial incentive was greater with the World Bank (p. 131).

As reviewed, the research into educational policy changes after the Rose Revolution is not abundant. What is most problematic about the minimal amount of literature regarding education is the absence of methodological diversity. The research into Georgian education simply reviews what happened with a very little superficial critique. Instead of asking what the broader effects of reforms are, like post-secondary educational reform or educational decentralization, they simply look at it from the functional level of whether or not it was effectively implemented. As a result, the conversation is narrowly defined by vague terms like 'democracy' or 'transparency' that

do not question broader issues of power relationships, especially between international

organizations and the Georgian educational system.

This result has led to a lack of serious scrutiny of the educational policy after the

Rose Revolution. Much like the rhetoric surrounding the Revolution itself, educational

policy shifts have been regarded as part of a broader 'democratization' process that is

apolitical (Matiashvili, 2008; Orkodashvili, 2010; Rostiahshvili, 2012). The standard

narrat transformation of the Rose Revolution ive found in academic texts (Fairbanks Jr.

2004, Jones, 2008, Wheatley 2005) and international organization reports (UNESCO,

2007; USAID, 2009; USAID, 2010; World Bank, 2006; World Bank, 2012) about the

Rose Revolution hold that the previous regime had run a highly corrupt and poorly

organized semi-feudal state where rule of law was ignored and mafia-like groups

essentially ran the country. The transformation of the Rose Revolution is believed to have

helped the Georgian state make the transition from a state that was lost in a post-Soviet

reality of corruption and decay to one that offered a perfect example for other emerging

nations of market and labor deregulation (World Bank, 2006). With the exception of

Lazarus (2013), the problem is that 'democratization' is viewed in neutral and

depoliticized terms that do not address how the power dynamics have changed. It simply

sees this new governance as part of a linear progression towards modernity. No serious

questions are posed as to how power is exercised and upon what rationalities these new

education policies rest. Thus, I look to have greater insight to the role of power,

education, and international organizations in Georgia.

Chapter 3

Theoretical Overview

In this chapter, I will provide both a conceptual and methodological overview of the approach that I employ to elucidate how international organizations make subjects more governable through educational policy in the Republic of Georgia. The conceptual framework has been inspired by Michel Foucault's work from the late seventies, specifically from his lectures "Security, Territory, Population." My conceptual framework by structuring the nature of my inquiry it will inform the methodological perspective that I intend on answering how international organizations shape subjects through educational policy.

I will first approach the conceptual framework of my analysis. I will first outline my concept of power that I intend to use throughout my analysis of educational policy and how it makes subjects of individuals. I argue that the traditional understanding of power as being strictly repressive does not appropriately reflect the dynamics of power as power functions in shaping a field of possibility that involves pleasure and oppression.

Secondly, I will address the concept of governmentality as Michel Foucault articulates it. This helps provide greater context to how power is practiced and how the nature of governing has evolved. It focuses upon the nature of governing from sovereignty to population. Thirdly, I will conceptualize what Foucault means when he refers to "government". This will help clarify this concept, and most importantly help remove the state-centric understanding of government. Fourthly, I will address the relevance of governmentality to educational policy. I state that there has been a growing interest in governmentality among scholars because the concept helps unravel the naturalness and taken-for-granted understanding of governance, plus showcases the all-encompassing nature of power

Based upon my conceptual model, I look to analyze governmentality by outlining the analytical distinctions between three concepts: political rationalities, technologies of government, and programs of government. In terms of political rationalities, I make the distinction between ideologies and a political rationality. I define political rationalities as how power is conceptualized and justified discursively. Secondly, I address technologies of government. Although there is far less attention given to this concept, technologies of government are incredibly important because they show that political rationalities are implemented and sustained. Lastly, I address programs of government that are defined as the actual measures taken to implement political technologies that are underlined by political rationalities.

In my last section on governmentality, I address the different varieties of governmentality that have been articulated by different authors. I first address the concept of liberal and neo-liberal governmentality that reflects the circumstances under which Foucault originally coined the term. I argue that liberal governmentality reflects the strategies that ensure subjects exercise their freedom in a specific fashion. Secondly, I address the concept of illiberal governmentality, which do not make the same division on what is a political space and what is a civil space. However, I state that illiberal governmentality reflects numerous circumstances and situations that are widely different in terms of political rationalities, technologies of government, and political programs.

In my last section, I will provide my methodological framework. I will be using a mix methodological approach of both discourse and descriptive analysis. I argue that political rationalities are best approached with discourse analysis for the obvious semiotic link. Technologies of government and programs of government will be approached using

descriptive analysis because policy is a program in itself while the technologies of government tend to be overt in policy

Approaching power

To understand how international organizations shape educational policy, I consider this question from a very specific understanding of power. Although educational policy can be both oppressive and exploitive that does not necessarily mean that it appears as such. Ideologies like Marxism and liberalism that emerged during the modern period emphasize the dehumanizing and oppressive qualities that are reflected in the misuse of power. For example, liberal thinkers, like Rousseau and Mill emphasized that freedom is exercised through the individual, and thus the measure of freedom is showcased through the ability of the individual to express their will. Likewise, Marx spoke about the exploitative nature of capitalism through a classist society that constructed a false consciousness, which caused individuals to act against their own interests. The measure of freedom of a society was the capacity for workers to be free from the exploitation of capital. Both as ideologies are problematic.

Both ideologies make a distinction between what is ideal and natural from what which is a violation of that ideal. As a result, they construct a singular understanding of the self, e.g. the individual in liberalism and classes in Marxism. This is what Foucault refers to as "the order of the self", whereby an ideology attempts to articulate a singular idea of what the self is. Thus, ideologies organize critiques upon the violations to these 'orders of the self." In so doing, they impose a judicial understanding of power where

power is a force of prohibition (Foucault, 1994, 309). I would like to move beyond this paradigm of power because of the restrictive qualities within it. Both imply that human nature is in itself singular and power is abused when it deviates from the static conception of what that self is.

I do not begin with an ideological premise, but rather I see power being exercised through the making of the subject, i.e. subjectivity. In conceptualizing what power is, I see power not simply as an act of violence or violation of what ought to be. Power is exercised through shaping actions, and therefore helping to construct the self. This does not preclude violence, however what it does say that the subject's actions are always inscribed in power, and therefore help limit the possibilities of action (Foucault, 1994, p. 138). Foucault summarizes his idea when he says,

> "What makes power hold good, what makes it accepted, is simply the fact that it doesn't only weigh on us a force that says no; it also traverses and produces things, it induces pleasure, forms knowledge, produces discourse. It needs to be considered as a productive network that runs through the whole social body, much more than as a negative instance whose function is repression." (Foucault, 2003, 307).

I can understand power as shaping the field of possibilities of the subject, as opposed to functioning simply as an oppressive conception of power.

In looking at how power shapes the field of possibilities, I am not looking to define power. Foucault states that power is engendered in all relationships as opposed to it having a specific cause or origins (Foucault, 2007, p. 2). The focus of studying power is how power makes a person into a subject instead of looking to understand the essence or source of power. Thus, I am more concerned with how power is expressed through

practices than attempting to conceptualize what power is (Foucault, 1994, p. 134). The question arises then: how is the individual shaped?

Governmentality

Answering the question of the subjectivism of the individual directs leads to Foucault's concept of governmentality. This concept of governmentality is first noted during his lectures series that he called "Security, Territory, Population" during the winter of 1978 at the College de France on the fourth and fifth week. Foucault historically shapes the changing focus of governing from that of sovereignty to population.

This question begins to emerge around the sixteenth century when "the art of governing" began emerging according to Foucault (1994: 229). This issue of the art of governing developed with the introduction of the political economy into political practices (p. 234). This means the introduction of household management into the practices of governing. The sovereign must see that the common good and enrichment must encompass the entirety of the population. It is explained to be a transition from the ruler governing to ensure "an end that is "convenient" for each of things are to be governed" (p. 237). Foucault summarizes it by saying,

> "…whereas the end of sovereignty is internal to itself and possesses its own intrinsic instruments in the shape of its laws, the finality of government resides in the things it manages and in the pursuit of perfection and intensification of the processes it directs…" (p. 237)

The transition is that of concern for maintaining territorial control to the management of population, i.e. the things. Governmentality implies that population becomes the main field of intervention and the object of technologies of government (p. 43). This theoretical inquiry led to the mass expansion of governmental apparatuses and targeted technologies to make the movement of the population intelligible and more optimal. The government then becomes concerned not simply with itself but also with a diverse array of fields ranging from the wealth, health, etc. of the population (p. 241). Population also becomes the source of wealth that must work accordingly at the right place and on the right object (Foucault, 2007, 69). Governmentality leads to the development of an administrative apparatuses that include institutions, procedures, analyses, calculations, tactics, and new forums of knowledge connected to the management of the population (Foucault, 1994, p. 244).

Governmentality, as a neologism, can appear vague and somewhat misleading to what specifically Foucault means. Some clarity must be extended to the specific idea of government that Foucault referred to.

The difference between the state and governance

Much of the work of Michel Foucault is marked by an incredible degree of complexity and difficulty. This can help explain to some degree why Foucault's work remains somewhat in niche within educational policy circles. The concept of governmentality had attracted a great deal of attention among scholars interested in

Foucault, however some degree of confusion exists concerning the term because the ambiguous nature of the term which can be misleading. The common confusion regarding the term largely centers upon a mistaken assumption that govermentality simply refers to the government in the conventional sense, as opposed to an older conception that Foucault is speaking about.

The concept of government, like other concepts that are used interchangeably such as 'the state' or 'the sovereign' is understood to be a unified actor that holds the sole legitimacy to use violence within a limited space of territory. Historians of state formation locate the growth of the state in the absorption of institutions of discipline, like education and health plus note the introduction of national languages and common coinage as means to uphold the state as a unified actor (Rose and Miller, 1992, 176). However, an analytical distinction must be made between this concept of the state and Foucault's understanding of government.

Foucault's understanding of what the notion of government means differs greatly from this state-centric conception. In his second lecture centered on governmentality during the "Security, Territory, Population" lectures, he poses the question of whether or not one can look beyond the state to analyze power? This leads Foucault to look at the history of the notion of the term (Foucault, 2007, p.120). He determines that the term encompasses a wide variety of matters and interactions, however it does not mean to govern a state, a territory, or a political structure. To govern implies to govern over people, i.e. population (p.122). Foucault rejects a juridical-institutional model of the state where a state is the sole governor. Rather, to govern regards problems of self-control, household management, and directing the soul. Thus, governing is the "conduct of

conduct" that ranges from the conduct of government to the conduct of the soul, which means governing is defused and exercised in a diverse array that constructs a network of power (Lemke, 2001, 3).

Therefore, a single center of power or a single source of power cannot be located. However, this does not mean that we cannot analyze power. As argued by Rose and Miller, power creates multiple centers as opposed to having a singular source (1992, p. 185). We must locate those different centers that use differing techniques, strategies, and calculations to render the population manageable.

Approaching Educational Policy and Governmentality

Over the past twenty years, interest in Foucault's concept of governmentality has spawned a tremendous amount of research in a host of fields, such as accounting, health, urban planning, and criminal policy. Likewise, researchers in education have been increasingly attracted to the concept of governmentality and have employed it in a number of circumstances (Fimyar, 2008; Olssen, 2006; Peters, 2004; Tikly, 2003). This has been referred to by many scholars as 'the Foucault effect', which hints to the publication of a compilation of essays in 1991 of the same name that included the essay wherein Foucault originally coined the term from the "Security, Territory, Population" lectures. As a result, an area of research dubbed as 'governmentality studies' has emerged that crosses a number of different areas of research including education.

Governmentality studies have not become mainstream or dominant within the academy as a result of its rejection of positivist modes of analysis. Instead they look to

understand the 'genealogy of the present' that seeks to comprehend how the present came into being and what truths have been privileged (Fimyar, 2008, p. 8). The concept of governmentality is ideal for approaching my research question of how educational policy makes individuals into subjects in Georgia because it moves away from conventional frameworks to understanding governing. Governmentality looks to change the nature of the questions conventionally asked. As Rose states about approaching governmentality as a conceptual model,

> "To adopt a particular point of view which brings certain questions into focus: that dimension of our history composed by the intervention, contestation, operationalisation and transforma- tion of more or less rationalized schemes, programmes, techniques and devices which seek to shape conduct so as to achieve certain ends." (1999, 20, cited in Fimyar 2008, 14)

As such, conceptually governmentality helps open up new questions that are not typically addressed. It helps unravel the 'naturalness' and 'taken-for-granted' understanding of governing (Firmyar, 2008, p. 4). It shows that governing does not simply reside within the traditional political arena but encompasses all aspects of life (Lemke, 2001, p. 2). As such, it provides a more fuller and comprehensive analysis.

In terms of conceptualizing what is education among researchers interested education and governmentality, there is an understanding that education centers (conventional and unconventional) become a domain of intervention of political rationalities and technologies of government. Thus, education becomes a significant discipline and practice to the governing a population.

For the purposes of addressing educational policy constructed by international organizations in Georgia as seen through a governmentality lens, I will make the

analytical distinctions between political rationalities, technologies of government, and programs of government that were defined by Miller and Rose (1992) but also elaborated upon by other thinkers (Dean, 1999; Fimyar, 2008; Tikly 2003). In making these analytical distinctions, I hope to make a more clear analysis of governmentality and its different aspects. In so doing, I understand education policy be the undertaking of programs of government using technologies of government that are grounded in particular political rationalities (Tikly, 2003, p. 165-166). As such, I will describe the three aspects of governmentality and function that they play in making subjects governable within an educational milieu.

Political Rationalities

As stated above in regards to my conception of power, I do not view power as repressive and functioning within a juridical concept of power. As a result, I critique ideologies as inadequate for understanding power because they do not acknowledge the non-repressive practices of power and they have a singular understanding of the self. We need to then re-approach the ways in which in power is discursively understood, i.e. the intellectual process of reality. I turn to the concept of rationalities in my bid to understand how power is discursively constructed.

Within governmentality research, the concept of political rationalities has found wide interest from almost all scholars interested in the concept (Dean, 1999, Gordan, 1991, Harris, 1999, Rose and Miller, 1992). The concept looks to understand how power is not exercised in a spontaneous fashion but rather holds specific characteristics that

interlink different acts of power. Rose and Miller (1992) provide a rather succinct definition of what political rationalities are:

> "The changing discursive field within which the exercise of power is conceptualized, the moral justification for particular ways of exercising power by diverse authorities, notions of the appropriate forms, objects and limits of politics, and conceptions of proper distribution of such tasks among secular, spiritual, military and family sectors" (p. 175)

Both Rose and Miller elaborate further on this definition by positing three key characteristics of political rationalities. The first is that political rationalities hold a moral form. That is, political rationalities define how power should be exercised and consider the ideals and principles of power (p. 178). The second is that political rationalities hold an epistemological characteristic that conceptualizes the nature of the subject or object that is being governed, such as students, the economy, etc. Lastly, they hold a distinctive idiom that is not simply rhetorical but is an intellectual apparatus that renders reality thinkable (p. 179).

A distinction should be made between the concepts of political rationalities and ideologies. While ideologies attempt to articulate an intrinsic idea of rationality that is contrasted to irrationality, the concept of political rationalities as an analytical concept do not attempt to speak of pure or false knowledge. Instead they analyze the discursive means whereby power becomes "rational" (Lemke, 2001, p. 8). As Foucault argues, political rationalities are attempts to contrast what is rational to what is not by "…examining how forms of rationality inscribe themselves in practices or systems of practices, and what role they play within them…" (1994, p 251). In this way, they differ greatly from ideologies.

Despite the distinctions made between political rationalities and ideologies, many thinkers (Fiymar, 2008, Lemeke, 2003, Tikley, 2003, Rose and Miller, 1992) have labeled different rationalities, or general concepts of governmentality with terms typically associated with ideologies, e.g. neoliberal, illiberal, etc. This simply denotes the different methods of governing as opposed to an ideological approach.

Technologies of Government

The majority of the research on governmentality has focused on the issue of rationalities (Rose and Miller 1993, Dean 1999, Gordan 1991). Technologies of government have not attracted as much attention, however the concept merits equal consideration. The technological apparatus is vital to the augmentation of the programs that are defined by rationalities. At the most essential level, they are the mechanisms that put political rationalities into effect (Tikly, 2003, 165). As stated by Rose and Miller

> "If political rationalities render reality into the domain of thought, these 'technologies of government' seek to translate thought into the domain of reality, and to establish 'in the world of persons and things' spaces and devices for acting upon those entities of which they dream and scheme." (1990, p. 8)

As such, they are an integral aspect to understanding how power is exercised.

Technologies of government manage and ensure the implementation of rationalities. Complex security apparatuses are organized ensuring that a "common good" can be realized by making governmental programs and rationalities operable. The political technologies function in a heterogeneous fashion through complex assembly of

functions ranging from financial regulation to legal and architectural perimeters (Rose and Miller, 1993, p. 183). Technologies of government target both the technologies of the self and the body, where "conduct is shaped, directed and regulated" (Dean, 1996, p. 64) Thus, they function both within the macro and micro. They exist within a plurality of functions that aim to monitor, measure, regulate, and augment the subject under surveillance.

The central concern of this heterogeneous apparatus of technologies of government is population as the space of intervention. The knowledge that is obtained enables a 'problem' or 'deviation' to be rendered intelligible, and thus permitting an intervention that can diagnose, manage, and solve the problem. As Foucault says while speaking about statistics and other technologies of government, "Statistics, by making it possible to quantify these specific phenomena of population, also shows that this specificity is irreducible to the dimension of the family" (Foucault, 1994, 241). The example of literacy is an obvious one. A vast array of census data is compiled and organized by specialists within education, health, psychology, economics etc. that determine whether a segment of a population is declared illiterate. This census data acts as illumination of society that showcases the population holds its own regularities, and thus by obtaining knowledge of those consistencies the state is able to make interventions. A whole variety of interventions occur where literacy campaigns are organized and curriculum test projects begin to be later reevaluated for the possible construction of a mass curriculum, and great funding is provided for adult literacy. Thus, the knowledge that is ascertained through the vast array of technologies is mediated and

consumed by experts from a range of social sciences that determine the modes of interventions.

Programs of Government

Political rationality and technologies are brought into actuality through programs of government. Tikley states programs of government are where both the rationalities and technologies of government are implemented and translate into actual measures that affect the individual (Tikley, 2003, p. 165). In many ways, programs of government are the most obvious and visible affect of governmentality with which we interact with on a daily level be it state educational policy to health NGOs organizing AIDS testing. It is an inherently problematizing activity that measures reality against the ideal, and finds need for change. Thus, programs of government look to shape particular locations and interactions in a way that realigns reality with the ideal (Rose and Miller, 1992, 181). This results in governmental programs reorienting and subjugating the population (Dean, 1999, p. 22)

When speaking about programs of government, we should not simply see them as the wishes and desires of those governing, As argued by Rose and Miller, programs of government hold a specific knowledge that enable power to be exercised legitimately. This results in an assembly of social studies disciplines (psychology, economics, sociology) becoming part of the apparatus for formulating what is ideal by providing an intellectual basis for the program's interventions. Also, the programs must conceptualize the space which it is intervening in. Thus, policy must define wherein it is intervening

(the economy, the body, etc.), and thus renders how a matter can be intervened and augmented (1992, 182).

Different Governmentalities

As a result of the growth of interest in the concept of governmentality specifically within research regarding education, there has been a number of scholars who have defined different varieties of governmentality. In doing so, they have set out to define different governmentalities by their political rationalities and the corresponding technologies of government and political programs. Due to differing locations, economic circumstances, etc. the differing political rationalities hold distinctly different qualities, but generally two varieties of governmentalities have been noted: liberal and illiberal governmentalities.

The original circumstances that Foucault spoke of governmentality reflected the liberalism found in Europe. The concept reflects the emergence of 'the art of government' that shifting a mode of governing from a focus of sovereignty to population. Thus, the project of governance became one of endowing subjects with rights but ensuring those rights are exercised within a limited field of possibility through an assembly of technologies of government that monitor, measure, and augment (Foucault, 1994, 244). As such, liberalism places limitations on power of political authorities and the aspiration of a totalizing administrated society dies. Different realms are deemed to be political, like the state and the state institutions while all other areas are deemed to be part of civil society (the family, business, charity, etc.) that are deemed non-political. Liberal

governmentality looks to manage that 'non-political' space not interrupting that dichotomy but the proliferation of independent agents (educators, doctors, social workers, parents) that regulate conduct (Rose and Miller, 1992, p. 180). The welfare, health, and economic wealth of the population become the central concern of liberal governmentality (Fimyar, 2008, p. 6). Thus, individuals are subjugated to exercise their freedom to ensure these ends. This sees a proliferation of programs, calculations, and strategies that encourage self-esteem, self-improvement, and prudent financial management that seek to shape conduct.

With the advent of neoliberalism, the focus has been with ensuring subjects fit in the neoliberal reality. As such, the conduct is shaped to be one of a *homo economicus* that emphasis 'choice' where one becomes an entrepreneur (Tikly, 2003, p. 164). Despite Marxist critiques of neoliberalism as the downsizing of the state, this does not imply less governance (Larner, 2000, p. 13). As Lemke argues,

> "…since the accumulation of capital presumes technologies of production and forms of labor that enable to put to use a multiude of human beings in an economical profitable manner" (2000, p. 10).

This means that neoliberalism does not simply function in absences of the state but rather demands individuals be subjugated to act within neoliberal perimeters. Thus, the neoliberal mode of govermentality is the dominant mode identified within the so-called developed world where we have see the growth of the knowledge economy a long with wide spread austerity.

Although elements of liberal and neoliberal governmentality have been attributed to non-Western circumstances, there has been a critique of that characterization being

applied in post-colonial and post-Soviet circumstances. The argument is that liberal dichotomy of what is political and what is civil is not protected (Tikly, 2003, p. 163). Subjects are constructed not to exercise responsible freedom but rather to be obedient which depending on the circumstance can divide certain groups so as to exclude certain groups, i.e. racist or nationalist governments (Fimyar, 2008, p. 11). Due to the fact that vague terms like post-colonial and post-Soviet reflect a diverse array of circumstances and differing degree of liberalization, it is almost impossible to speak about a singular illiberal governmentality as the political rationalities, technologies of government, and political programs vary greatly compared to liberal governmentality. However, this does not say that in illiberal circumstances that governmentality cannot be appropriate conceptual framework for analysis.

Thus, what we see that there exist numerous varieties of governmentality that reflect differing locals, political systems, historical circumstances and economic conditions. However, the concept itself does help to unravel the political dynamics of the different contexts.

Methodology

Based upon my conceptual framework of governmentality, I would like to provide a methodological framework. I will be analyzing policy documents regarding education contrived international organizations, like USAID and the World Bank. I will be attempting to locate the three aspects of governmentality of political rationalities, technologies, and programs of government that I defined above. The concept of

governmentality was not intended to be used explicitly for methodological purposes by Foucault, and as such the methodology used by differing scholars within governmentality studies is wide and diverse. They range from genealogical studies (Dean; 1999; Rose, 1991; Rose and Miller 1992) to more descriptive empirical work (Fimyar, 2008, Tikly, 2003) however there remains a tremendous amount of methodological maneuvering room.

For my purposes, I will be using a mixed methodological approach to reflect my units of analysis. As my research is at its essence policy analysis, I am hoping to provide structured analysis that helps provide greater clarity. As the corpus of data is rather small, I do not believe that that it would be ideal to approach this issue with a genealogical approach because the analysis would appear incomplete. Instead, I will analyze the different units of analysis with different methodological approaches

In approaching political rationalities, I will address them using discourse analysis. Political rationalities are how power is conceptualized and justified discursively. As such, it is semiotically defined and so logically I would use discourse analysis so as to locate the patterns and hidden rules to understand how power is conceptualized and justified. I define discourse analysis as the examination of argumentative structures and the practices that these utterances made in writing, speaking, or any other communication (Hajer, 2005, 66). I will look to address three aspects of a discourse to provide a fuller narrative of what it is: metaphor, story line, and discourse coalitions. Metaphors are two or three short words, like "under-development" and "unskilled labour" that symbolize the key ideas of the discourse. Story lines provide the context of a problem and a broader narrative that foregrounds action. Lastly, discourse coalitions are the groups of actors that

share the story lines and the same period of time, like USAID and the World Bank in

Georgia (Hajer 2005). As such, I will be able to have a greater understanding of what the

political rationalities within education policy that are used by international organization

are.

The technologies of government will be addressed using a descriptive approach.

Although in different analyses, technologies of government are approached differently, I

feel that because the policy documents that I will be analyzing tend to be far more overt

in stating how they will go about monitoring, manage and augment behavior that I am

able to use descriptive approach. Thus, I will focus more of explaining of specific

technologies are used and how they shape behavior.

Lastly, the policy documents that I will be analyzing are in fact the political

programs. However, I will help clarify what specific claims to knowledge these document

have and how they conceptualize their space of intervention.

Chapter 4

A Post-Soviet Neoliberal Governmentality

In this chapter, I will analyze policy documents from international organizations regarding educational policy in the Republic of Georgia. I look to understand how these policies render subjects more governable. I will analyze two international organizations' policies: USAID and the World Bank during the post-Rose Revolution period of 2003 to 2012. I chose these two organizations because they are the principal architects of educational policy in Georgia. I will supplement my analysis with governmental documents, previous USAID and World Bank documentation, and other scholarly work to provide greater context to the policy shifts that occurred after the Rose Revolution. I will look at how international organizations distinctly shaped educational policy by analyzing the political rationalities and technologies of government they used to render a population manageable through their policies.

I will analyze three major areas of policy:

- Educational decentralization
- Unified National Exams
- National curriculum policy

I will analyze them as unique policies, because although policies overlap both in terms of the sorts of interventions they make and the rationalities that ground them, I assume that governing is both heterogeneous and contradictory, and therefore I believe the differing areas of policy deserve their own attention. This will help showcase the unique, centrifugal, and complex fashion of governing that occurs instead of an overly centralized and ideological approach to understanding the dynamics of power. However, I hold that the different policies hold a strategic alliance that enables us to speak of a post-Soviet neoliberal reality.

In my analysis, I will provide a historical overview of Georgia's educational policy in terms of what it replaced. Likewise, I will detail the specifics of the policies. In so doing, I will outline the political rationalities that underline the policies according to the conceptual framework that I have provided. Furthermore, I will detail the heterogeneous and complex technologies of government interventions made through these policies. Lastly, I will look to analyze these policies conceptually from the idea of programs of government in terms of what their claims to knowledge are and how they conceptualize the space in which they are intervening.

Following my methodological section, I will be approaching political rationalities and technologies of government within a mixed methodological approach. I will approach political rationalities within a discourse analysis focusing on the metaphor, story line, and discourse coalitions. In terms of analyzing the political technologies, I will be using a descriptive methodology because the political technologies are inscribed in the different policy documents.

Educational Decentralization

One of the major complaints regarding educational policy in post-Soviet Georgia was that it was hyper-centralized. According to the Center for Strategic Research and Development of Georgia, there was a belief across all sectors that local governing structures in Georgia, including at the educational level, held no power. Any laws that existed were strictly nominal and held very little influence (2011, p. 2). The issue of corruption was deemed the main culprit for Georgia's economic and social lag. Because

of the lack of administrative and institutional reform during the post-Soviet years, the administrative red tape afforded a tremendous amount of room for corruption and abuse of power. This helped proliferate a shadow economy where teachers, professors, school administrators, and government workers were able to profit due to the lack of oversight and administrative complexity (World Bank, 2006). Thus, one of the central areas of concern for international organizations involved in Georgia was the decentralization of the educational system.

Decentralization was viewed as a means of ensuring both local management and prudent financial control. Although initially local management was emphasized as the central concern before the Rose Revolution with a plan to be implemented by the Soro's Foundation, the final educational decentralization plan implemented by the Georgian government emphasized the issue of financial decentralization (Matiashvili, 2008, p. 123). This decentralization process was marked by the stress placed on ensuring efficiency, transparency, and fiscal sustainability with the objective of eradicating waste and corruption (Parjanadze, 2011). It is assumed that through empowering individuals who deal with the problems, they will be able to effectively eradicate them under the proper auditing and monitoring systems. With corruption being marked as the main issue for Georgia's underdevelopment, educational decentralization was viewed as the ideal solution to help counter corruption (USAID, 2011, p. 19).

In the World Bank report, *Education System Realignment and Strengthening Project*, the World Bank lays out the object of decentralizing education. Under the section on transparency, the report outlines how financing for schooling should change to a per capita financing model where individual schools would receive vouchers from the

central government's budget to administer themselves. The amount of the voucher would be determined by whether it was an urban, rural, or mountain school (a large segment of the Georgian population is located in mountains that are inaccessible for large parts of the year making it distinct from other rural areas) so as to accommodate the differing circumstances (2006, p. 24). Every school has a board of trustees of elected teachers, parents, a student representative, and possibly a local-government nominee. The board of trustees selects the school director, approves the budget, and oversees and advises school management. These boards of trustees are assisted by Educational Resource Centers that collect data, conduct research, and organize training, workshops and seminars to ensure that the board of trustees is effective and properly managing the school (World Bank, 2011, p. 5). As such, individual schools are empowered to make the necessary changes that are most demanding, such as school infrastructural improvements and staff changes.

The World Bank support and funding for this initiative of educational decentralization was complimented by laws passed by the Georgian government and implemented by the Ministry of Education that outlined in greater detail the mechanisms of the decentralization and oversight of the program. The major consequence in terms of this law was that all schools became individual legal entities that are subjected to business transparency laws that demand that all spending must be declared (Law on General Education chapter 5). Therefore, individual schools became legal entities that are audited to ensure their spending is both transparent and efficient. We must then understand educational decentralization from the viewpoint of governmentality, not simply as a noble act of transparency, but rather as a distinct intervention of accounting and budgetary technology that shapes conduct.

Educational decentralization in the circumstance of Georgia represents the expansion of accounting and budgetary political technologies that exercise a specific power. I do not contest the fact that these differing political technologies do provide greater transparency, however I argue that they shape conduct. As Miller and O'Leary say,

> "Accounting would then no longer be viewed as becoming, or having capacity to become, an increasingly refined technical apparatus. It would also no longer be viewed as neutral but rather seen, once the veils of current misperception have been drawn back to clear reflect and to serve certain economic or political interests." (1987, 236)

These political technologies are both individualizing and totalizing in that they shape the field of possibility for both the individual and the population in imposing norms and standards. The inefficiencies or violations of the individual or the population are rendered visible through these technologies (p. 239). Through the quantification of human behavior through spreadsheets, spending requests, and other mechanisms, the movements of either an individual or the population as an entity are made visible. This visibility that accounting provides makes conduct augmentable to fulfill a rationality.

The rationalities for the decentralization of the education process is clarified in the retrospective 2011 report of *the Consolidation Education Strategy and Action Plan* that states that the underlining principle of the policy was the "decentralization of the system of management and guarantee of independence and autonomy to educational institutions." The question arises: how does one exercise "independence and autonomy"? Looking through other World Bank documentation, the concept of "efficiency" is constantly used in reference to decentralization. A loan document regarding educational

projects in 2006, in which decentralization was listed as one of the objectives, stated that it was "efficiency in financial resources" that was the intended purpose of the program (World Bank, 2006, p. 6). A narrative of autonomy within the possibilities of efficiency emerges that is grounded within the neoliberal rationality that shapes the self as a *homo economicus* (Lemeke, 2001; Peters, 2003; Tikly 2003). In so doing, 'efficiency' assumes the role of the norm that is inscribed in all measures of what ought to be.

Thus, we must understand educational decentralization not as the advent of an absolutely transparent system, but rather as the growth of certain political technologies, like accountancy, budgetary measures, etc., that is totalizing in shaping the individual and the population. Furthermore, it makes the movement of both the individual and the population intelligible so that it can monitor, measure, regulate, and augment. We should see educational decentralization as not strictly a neutral mechanism, but as one that shapes, conduct measure, regulate, and augment. We should see educational decentralization as not strictly a neutral mechanism but one that shapes conduct.

Unified National Entrance Examination and standardized testing

The issue of higher educational reforms post-Rose Revolution have attracted the most amount of attention of any of the reforms implemented (Lomaia, 2006; Orkodashvili, 2010; Rostiahshvili, 2012), because it showcased the most drastic of reforms. Among these scholars, the introduction of the Unified National Exam was deemed to be a tremendous success in breaking the cycle of corruption and was viewed as a model for other developing nations.

Prior to the Rose Revolution, higher education facilities were viewed as extremely corrupt. With the collapse of the Soviet Union, university professors' salaries dropped to one-tenth of their initial amount to around twenty euro a month. Those salaries were usually delayed and paid late. As a result, a shadow economy emerged as a means for professors to supplement their income. Students looking to get into the most esteemed universities, like Tbilisi State University or Ilia Chavchavadze State University would be forced to pay upwards of five to fifteen thousand American dollars if they wanted to get accepted, whereas fifteen to twenty percent of students would get accepted through the conventional fashion (Lomaia, 2006, p. 164). Thus, as a result of the collapse of the Soviet Union and the corresponding collapse of the salaries of former government employees like professors and university administrators, universities in Georgia became a hotbed for corruption. One World Bank report summarized the corruption as:

> "One of the most disturbing implications of the system fueling corruption, nihilism and conformism at practically all levels is that it, intentionally or unintentionally, inculcates the same sort of attitudes in the young people's minds." (2001, 164).

As such, the university entrance circumstances were riddled by corruption in Georgia prior to the Rose Revolution.

The process to begin reforming the university entrance process first was mentioned before the Rose Revolution in the 2001 *Educational System Realignment and Strengthening Program Report* that stated that it wanted to reform the methods of examination and provide greater data regarding students. The report stated that the first phase of this aid package would involve "creating a national system to assess the results of student learning in core areas." (p. 164). Shortly thereafter, the Rose Revolution

occurred and that saw a regime come in, which was committed to eradicating corruption and which began working with the World Bank to reform higher education.

As a result of this aid program, Georgia implemented in 2005 the *Unified National Entrance Examination*. Although previously there had been standardized tests to gain entrance into universities, they were organized according to different universities, whereas the Unified National Entrance Examination was standardized across the country, and mandated examination centers were set up so that students were monitored to ensure no cheating or bribery occurred (Orkodashvili, 2012, p. 31). The test is a mixture of curriculum-based tests and skill/aptitude measuring, whereas previous testing under the Soviet Union and post-independent Georgia were pure knowledge based tests (p. 32).

Although *the Unified National Entrance Examination* gets the bulk of attention, it is not the only usage of standardized testing used by international organizations. The USAID report on *the New Education Project* released in 2011 outlines in detail the key spaces in which interventions will be made to illuminate the regularities of students in Georgia. In section B subsection one, the document outlines the need to implement standards and assessment tests in literacy throughout the country. The corresponding details regard the need to hire international experts to review all aspects of formal literacy education. Also, a corresponding solution is found within mathematics education in subsection two. Here emerges again one of the main political technologies of international organizations: standardized testing.

International organizations, like the World Bank and USAID utilize standardized testing as a political technology so to make the population's movement intelligible, which

in this case are students that are registered in public schooling. The information gathered is organized on a myriad of levels. Certain geographical areas are deemed to be less educated than other areas and classified as troubled. Within smaller geographical spaces, certain schools are identified to be of higher quality, and therefore their teachers are recognized as higher preforming. Students are ranked and defined according to their performance, e.g. excelling students or struggling students. Thus, they become subjected to the governmental programs, such as resource programs, or become tracked for potential scholarships to study abroad in donor countries (Graham and Neu, 2004). Standardized testing functions as an audit to rank and organize schools, teachers, and students that enable the management of pedagogical practices by allowing international organizations to measure their programs.

Standardized testing, like other political technologies, also holds a disciplinary function along with constructing knowledge. Standardized testing helps introduce surveillance upon both students and teachers where curriculum is limited and controlled, as standardized testing is based upon it. Thus, it ensures self-regulation upon the teachers by ensuring that they do not deviate from the standardized curriculum. Likewise, it ensures that regimental disciplinary practices emerge to ensure success on testing for all invested parties. We should understand the expansion of standardized testing, like the *Unified National Entrance Exam* and other standardized testing as a political technology that functions to gather information and holds a disciplinary power to shape conduct.

National curriculum policy

With the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, the Georgian education system as an entity effectively collapsed as well. It collapsed in terms of infrastructure, teachers' salaries, as a governing entity, etc. By 1998, funding for the Georgian educational system accounted for only five percent of the funding of its budget under the Soviet Union (the World Bank, 2001, p. 5). More than anything else, it ceased to exist as a unified institution that was driven by certain objectives. Teachers were forced to revert to materials, pedagogical methods, etc. of the former Soviet Union as a result of no replacement being offered from the central state. This was occurring while both economic and social realities of Georgia were changing that held no resemblance to the former system. Thus, a key ailment that was identified with the Georgian educational system was the absence of a national curriculum policy that would prepare students for a new economic reality. As a World Bank report stated, "learning materials have to be updated and revised to reflect the emerging market economy and curriculum of Georgia" (2001, p. 30).

In collaboration with both USAID (2011) and the World Bank (2006), the Saakashvili regime undertook the process of implementing a national curriculum. In terms of concrete policy changes, the Georgian government organized a centralized institution called the *National Curriculum and Assessment Center* that was charged with organizing, developing, piloting, and implementing eighty percent of all curricula in schools across Georgia (the World Bank, 2006, 8). Likewise, the *National Curriculum and Assessment Center* also introduced new textbooks in all subjects that corresponded

with the objectives of the new curriculum (UNESCO, 2006, p. 5). However, the broader

question is what the larger objectives are of the curriculum and how it intends to shape

knowledge

The World Bank stated the intent of their intervention was to change what was

learned and how it was learned. As the report stated,

> "The objective of this sub component is to improve the teaching content methodologies in line with the national curriculum framework; to establish a system of student assessment so as to identify difficulties in student learning and develop targeted programs accordingly." (2006, vii)

Thus, we should understand the introduction of a national curriculum as not just the

introduction of new information but an entirely new way of learning. It represents an

epistemological break leading to a new regime of truth. The rationalities of the

curriculum shifted from a Soviet ideological education to a new rationality.

Throughout policy documents regarding educational policy produced by USAID

and the World Bank, emphasis is placed upon organizing a curriculum that shapes

students for a free market. These international organizations problematize the issue of

education as an imbalance of skills and the demands of the post-Rose Revolution

economy that is marked by mass deregulation. As one USAID report stated,

> "…the Government's primary concern about education is whether graduates meet the skill demands of employers, especially those positioned to stimulate investment-driven and innovation-driven growth…This acknowledgement translates into substantial pressures on the education sector to improve outcomes." (2011, p.4)

As such, a restructuring of the curriculum was organized that constructs subjects through the production of new forms of knowledge that reorient the market as the natural domain of action. As first post-Rose Revolution assessment stated,

> 'The Government needs to address both the challenges in relation to school building infrastructure, and the need for structural reforms to meet the demands o f a market economy and a democratic society. For this latter, the Georgian education system needs modernization o f curricula and assessment methods, teacher education in line with new pedagogical approaches, optimization o f schools and increase o f the teacher student ratio and an overall financing strategy for the education sector..' (2006, p. 2)

We must then understand that the introduction of a new curriculum that is constantly described throughout policy documents as introducing 'critical thinking' as a new rationality of neoliberalism. Critical thinking could be used interchangeably with "neoliberal thinking" as it does not speak in terms of breaking from powers of oppression but simply breaking from Soviet epistemologies in favor of capitalism.

With the introduction of a new curriculum that was finalized in 2009 which encompassed eighty percent of classroom activities, one area of interest that combines both political rationalities and technologies of government is the introduction of the English language to the national curriculum as a mandatory subject. Under the Saakashvili regime, the English language was mandated to become the second language of the country. All students were expected to have at least two periods of English lessons a week. The centerpiece of this curricular policy is a governmental program called *Teach and Learn* in Georgia that organizes thousands of English speaking natives to come teach throughout Georgia and which is partially funded by USAID (TLG, 2011, p. 11). The English language as a *lingua franca* of capital was introduced so that Georgia would be able to partake in the global economy. This reorients the Georgian labor market skill sets

towards the demands of the European Union and North American market. In this fashion, the introduction of the English language reshapes students' skill sets for the free market.

This program also functions as a political technology in that it renders the neoliberal rationality operable through the introduction of native English speakers into the classroom. English teachers brought over function as a technology of surveillance of ensuring new pedagogical methodologies that are in line with Western norms. As the 2011 TLG report stated,

> "…the only way that the actual improvement of in the English teaching methodology could have been done. Outdated teaching methods, lack of listening and speaking comprehensions, unmotivated teaching environment made it very difficult for the Georgian society to master the language. It is obvious that the importance of having a native speaker in schools should not be underestimated." (p. 16).

English teachers become integral to not simply the transmission of knowledge but also the sustainment of a particular rationality. Through their position in the classroom, they ensure that specific pedagogical practices are upheld and enhanced. Thus, foreign English teachers both are part of the neoliberal rationality of an English-speaking Georgian labor force while likewise exercising a technological purpose of making this rationality operable.

Post-Soviet Governmentality in Georgia

With the Rose Revolution, the role of international organizations has been integral in shaping the political rationalities and the technology of government through their

programs of government regarding education. As we have seen above, a complex array of mundane and heterogeneous technologies has emerged that looks to shape conduct and the field of possibilities through a mixture of accountancy, standardized testing, and the introduction of a national curriculum. Each different program supported by USAID and the World Bank holds a distinct mode of government and assembly of technologies, however we can speak of a strategic alliance among these different policies that produce a governmentality that is based in a post-Soviet neoliberal governmentality.

All these policies hold an underlying neoliberal rationality that looks to reorient students for the market economy. However, much of the interest in previous literature regarding neoliberal rationalities (Lemeke, 2001; Peters, 2004; Rose and Miller, 1992) emphasizes that the 'entrepreneurial-self' is constructed through educational facilities "that responsibilizes' the self to make welfare choices based on an actuarial rationality" (Peters, 2009, xxxii). I do not see this conception of neoliberal governmentality as relevant to the circumstances of Georgia. The role of international organizations and the state has been to reshape Georgian educational policy towards the so-called "knowledge economy" that is making knowledge the centerpiece of a post-industrialized globalized world. Furthermore, conceptions of illiberal governmentality as raised by some authors (Fimyar, 2008; Tikley, 2003) remain vague and under-theorized because they simply refer to the circumstance where the state does not conceptualize a space of non-intervention (Tikly, 2003, p. 163). Instead, we see the governmentality being practiced in Georgia as a post-Soviet neoliberal governmentality that is characterized by repositioning itself within the global assembly line.

I propose that a post-Soviet neoliberal governmentality is practiced that is a distinctively different governmentality than has been articulated by other authors. The rationalities that exist in the Georgian education system differ from the other neoliberal rationalities that have been articulated by other authors (Lemeke, 2001; Peters, 2004; Rose and Miller, 1992) that revolve around the 'responsiblization' of a population. Concepts of neoliberal governmentality are historicized within a post-Keynesian economic reality where individuals are rendered 'responsible' subjects that assume the risk of illness, unemployment, etc. that transforms these problems into an issue of self-care (Lemeke, 2001, p. 12). This history does not exist within Georgia where the existence of social welfare was deemed to be 'inefficient' and damaging to growth, like in advanced democracies. The division between civil space and political space that marks liberal governmentalities is viewed by international organizations as not to be established, but rather under construction through development programs (World Bank, 2011). Therefore, the issue of economics is not individualized, but rather spoken about as a hegemonic national problem. The space of intervention is that of the entirety of population that is not subdivided between classes, ages, and geographical regions (minus a minimal acknowledgement of ethnic minorities) but a totalizing subject. Individuals either partake within the project, or face exclusion and absolute poverty. In this fashion, it undertakes an aspect of illiberal governmentality but does not problematizing the issue within the dichotomy of civil and political space.

This does not diminish the neoliberal nature of the governmentality though. The circumstances of Georgia in terms of education differ in that although the rationalities underline the technologies of government (standardized examinations and tests, audits,

foreign teachers), the nature of economic circumstances differ. Georgia does not represent a post-industrialized economy that is based in scientific and technological innovation. Rather, Georgia represents a service-industry economy that supplements knowledge-based economies, which is based in call centers, tourism, and providing unskilled labor (mostly illegally) to Western nations. This does not imply that the educational policy of the international organizations is any less neoliberal because traditional neoliberal practices like entrepreneurialism and management are not the key themes throughout the policies. The emphasis is placed more on issues of skills such as English language skills that discussed above. What we see is a re-positioning, through international organizations, of Georgia in the global neoliberal assembly line to play a small but specific role. Thus, what has emerged in international organizations' educational policy documents is a post-Soviet neoliberal governmentality rationality that looks to render Georgian students subjects for a very specific position within the economic reality.

Chapter 5

Conclusion

Conclusion

I have argued that within the research regarding Georgian educational policy the question of power within the analysis is omitted. As a result, educational policy in Georgia has been wrapped into a political terminology that does not question power dynamics. Furthermore, the fundamental role of international organizations in shaping educational policy in Georgia is lacking research. Thus, I was investigating how the educational policy of international organizations renders individuals as subjects?

I argued that when studying how educational policy renders individuals as subjects, we must conceptualize and understand power. I conceptualize a notion of power that is not simply oppressive but rather looks to shape the field of possibilities of action for a subject. To understand how power is exercised, I addressed Foucault's concept of governmentality. I argue that governmentality helps unravel the 'take-it-for-granted' quality of policy. Thus, we must look to address the underlying political rationalities that are made operable through technologies of government to understand the functions of policy.

I analyzed both USAID and World Bank's policy documents regarding educational policy using a mixed methodological approach. I addressed three key areas of policy introduced after the Rose Revolution:

- Educational decentralization
- Unified National Exams
- National curriculum policy

I stated that each individual policy holds its own unique government, however they interlink in a shared political rationality of a post-Soviet neoliberal <u>governmentality</u>. By this, I mean a very specific role within the global assembly line that differs from traditional neoliberal rationalities that conceptualize a space for civil society. Because of the absence of an active civil society within Georgia, international organizations conceptualize Georgia as a single unitary entity that is tailored for a highly specific role within the global assembly line.

As a result of this research, certain questions for future research should be proposed. Through my research, I have raised the question of neoliberal governmentalities that render their subjects governable that do not conceptualize a space for civil society. Although this begins the conversation regarding the post-Soviet neoliberal governmentality, but further work is needed on the concept. Equally so, further research is needed on the governmental practices in the educational field to see how it shapes individuals. Nonetheless, this research has established that the reforms set in the post-Rose Revolution era hold a specific political character and are not only political instruments.

Within the conversation regarding educational policy, a greater role must be afforded to post-structural inspired work, like governmentality studies that seek to question the basic assumptions found in policy. Although post-structural approaches do not hold a specific functional quality that will make education more 'functional' or 'productive', they help contribute to help reveal complex forms of oppression that are ignored within traditional modes of analysis. Common criticism direct towards post-structural approaches is that they tend to be overly complex and 'theoretical' but power

functions in a multifaceted fashion that is not self-evident and demands a more

comprehensive approach to analyzing power. Governmentality studies and other post-

structural approaches provide a healthy contribution to education policy research in that

they help unravel the assumptions made by dominate modes of analyses. In this fashion,

they provide a complimentary function in furthering an understanding of the role that

policy plays.

Specifically in terms of governmentality research, greater attention needs to be

given to the location of the case study or the examples being used. This is particularly

relevant in terms of the fashion in which the governmentality is categorized, like

neoliberal and illiberal governmentalities. Within each of these broader terms exists

differing varieties of governmentalities that reflect the individual circumstances, and thus

it is important to avoid broad sweeping labeling that holds very little relevance to the

actual circumstances.

Resources:

Asmus, R. (2010). *A little war that shook the world: Georgia, Russia, and the future of the west*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan

Cheterian, V. (2008). *War and peace in the caucasus*. New York: Colombia University Press

Democratic & Freedom Watch. (2013, January 18). Saakashvili wants to decriminalize economic crime. Democratic & Freedom Watch. Retrieved. dfwatch.net/saakasvili-wants-to-decriminalize-economic-crime-33867

Fairbanks Jr. C. (2004). Georgia's rose revolution. *Journal of Democracy*, 15, 110-124

Foucault, M. (1994). Governmentality, in P. Rabinow and N. Rose (Eds.) *The Essential Foucault: selections from essential works of Foucault 1954-1984*. (pp. 229-245). London: The New Press.

Foucault, M. (1994). The subject and power. In P. Rabinow and N. Rose (Eds.) *The Essential Foucault: selections from essential works of Foucault 1954-1984*. (pp. 126-144). London: The New Press.

Foucault, M. (1994). Truth and power. In P. Rabinow and N. Rose (Eds.) *The Essential Foucault: selections from essential works of Foucault 1954-1984*. (pp. 300-318). London: The New Press.

Foucault, M. (2007). *Security, territory, population at the College de France*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan

Fougère, Martin. (2010). Governmentality. In Encyclopedia of Case Study Research. (pp. 413). New York: Sage Publications

Fimya, O. (2008). Using governmentality as a conceptual tool in education policy Research. *The Journal of Doctoral Research in Education*, 3-18

Fimyar, O. (2008a). 'Educational policy-making in post-communist Ukraine as an example of emerging governmentality: Discourse analysis of selected curriculum choice and assessment policy documents (1999-2004)', *Journal of Education Policy*, 23 (6), 571–593

Hajer, M. (2005). Doing Discourse Analysis: Coalitions Practices Meaning. In Margo van den Brink and Tamara Metze (Eds.), *Words Matter in Policy and Planning* (65-76). Utrecht: Netherland Geographical Studies.

Hewitt, G. (1995). *Georgian: A structural referemce grammar*. London: University of London

Jones, S. (2008). Georgia: Nationalism from under the rubble. In Lowell W. Barrington (Eds), *After Independence* (pp. 248-296). Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press

Kim, S.K. (2009). Democrazy? Democracy through education reform in the Republic of Georgia. *Comparative & International Higher Education* (1), 15-17

Lazarus, J. (2013). Democracy or good governance? Globalization, transnational Capital, and Georgia's neo-liberal revolution. *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding*, p. 11-28

Lemke, T. (2000, September 21-24). "*Foucault, govermentality, critique*". Paper presented at the Rethinking Marxism Conference, University of Amherst

Matiashvili, A. (2008). On being first: The meaning of education decentralization reform in Georgia. In Iveta Silova and Gita Steiner-Khamsi (Eds). *How NGOs React.* (119-137). , Kumarian Press

Miller, P and O'Leary T. (1987). Accounting and the construction of the governable person. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 1987. 12, I 3, p 235-265

Peters, M. (2001). Foucault and governmentality: Understanding the neo-liberal paradigm of education policy. *School Field*, 12, 61-72

Orkodashvili, M. (2010). Leadership challenges in the fight against corruption in higher education in Georgia. *The John Ben Sheppard Journal of Practical Leadership*. 5, p. 26-44

Slezkine, Yuri. (1994). "The USSR as Communal Apartment, or How a Socialist State Promoted Ethic Particularism". *Slavic Review*, 53, 414-152

Rostiashvili, K. (2012). Higher education in transition: From corruption to freedom of information in post-Soviet Georgia. *European Education*, 43, (4), 26–44.

van der Leeuw, C. (1998). *Storm over the Caucasus: In The Wake of Independence*. London: Routledge

Wheatley, J. (2005). *Georgia from national awakening to the rose Revolution: Delayed Transition in the Former Soviet Union*. Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing LTD

The World Bank. (2006). Doing business 2007: Georgia is top reformer in the commonwealth of independent states and jumps up the global rankings. [Press release]. Retrieved from http://www.doingbusiness.org/press/~/media/FPDKM/Doing%20Business/Documents/Press-Releases06-09/2007/DB07-PR-CIS.pdf

Tikly, L (2003). Governmentality and the study of education policy in South Africa. *Journal of Education policy* 39, no 2, 161-174

Documents

FRIDE (2010). *Assessing democracy assistance*: *Georgia*. Tbilisi: Jos Boonstra

Ministry of Education. *General Education Reform Strategy for 2010-2015*. Tbilisi: Government of Georgia

Ministry of Education. (2011). *Teach and learn with Georgia: Annual Report 2010-2011*. (Government of Georgia Publication) Tbilisi: Government of Georgia

UNICEF (2005). *School to work transition on Georgia: a preliminary analysis based on household management budget survey data*. Rome: L. Guarcello, S. Lyon, F.C. Rosati, and C. Valdiva

UNESCO (2007). *Consolidation education strategy and action plan.* (2007-2011). Tbilisi: UNESCO

UNDP (2011). *Economic and social vulnerabilities in Georgia*. Tbilisi: Franzika Gassmann, George Berulva, and Michael Tokmazishvili

USAID (2009). National security and the Social Sector in Georgia. Tbilisi: The Hudson Institute

USAID (2010). *Gender assessment*. Tbilisi: Elisabeth Duban

USAID (2011). *Assessment of Education Sector of the Republic of Georgia*. Tbilisi: Sue Berryman, Mzia Mikelandzem and Natia Anduladze

World Bank (2001). *Education System Realignment and Strengthening Program*. Tbilisi: Human Development Sector Unit

World Bank (2006). *Education System Realignment and Strengthening Program*. Tbilisi: Human Development Sector Unit

World Bank (2012). *Education System Realignment and Strengthening Program*. Tbilisi: Human Development Sector Unit

World Bank (2012a). First competitiveness growth development policy operation. Tbilisi: Rashmi Shakar