

Valley boundary, 1999-2000." PhD Dissertation, Cambridge University, UK.

Melvin, Neil J.

1995 *Russians beyond Russia: The Politics of National Identity*. London: Royal Institute of International Affairs.

2000 *Uzbekistan: Transition to Authoritarianism on the Silk Road*. Amsterdam: Harwood Academic.

Zevelev, Igor

2001 *Russia and Its New Diasporas*. Washington, D.C.: USIP Press.

Politics and Public Policy in Post-Soviet Central Asia: The Case of Higher Education Reform in Kyrgyzstan

Askat Dukenbaev, Assistant Professor, International and Comparative Politics Department, American University-Central Asia, Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan, askatd@mail.auk.kg

Research Methodology

The aim of my research is to understand the role of politics in the educational policy of Kyrgyzstan. In particular, the study focuses on reforms in higher education since 1992. I apply a theoretical framework designed to analyze issues of policy origin, adoption, implementation, and outcomes (Levin 2001). With this framework in mind, I focus on the following questions: 1) Origins: Where did particular reform proposals come from? How did they become part of the government agenda, when so many proposals do not? What role did various actors and interests play in the development of reform programs? 2) Adoption: How do policies as finally adopted or made into law differ from those originally proposed? What factors led to changes between proposals and approval? Who supported and proposed various policies, and to what effect? 3) Implementation: What model of implementation, if any, did the government use to put the reforms into practice? What "policy levers" were used to support the reforms? How did universities respond to the reforms? 4) Outcomes: What were the intended and unintended effects of the reforms? How did the reforms affect student outcomes and learning processes at the universities?

To answer these questions, my research has employed semi-structured interviews with key actors at major policy-making institutions of the Kyrgyzstan higher education system, such as the administrative staff of the relevant departments of the Ministry of Education, members and administrative staff of the Committee on Education of the Kyrgyzstan parliament, key staff members of the Department on Social Policy and the

Commission for Education and Science in the Presidential Administration, university rectors, members of university administrations in Bishkek, former higher education public servants, university students, and alumni. Obtaining data from administrative agencies and scheduling interviews with high-level policy-makers, especially in the Presidential Administration, constituted the major challenge in the data collection stage. In time, I gained access to all of the above-mentioned institutions and established good working relations with insiders in the administrative units. These ties became very helpful in obtaining documents, such as legislative regulations, statements of policy-makers, and survey results in the field of higher education. In total, I interviewed 25 people from the above-mentioned institutions.

The questionnaire used in the face-to-face interviews contained 15 open-ended questions aimed at 1) understanding the role of a unit in policy initiation, formulation, and implementation; 2) identifying the level, forms, and outcomes of interactions during the policy-making process with outside parties, such as political and administrative bodies, and informal groups; 3) analyzing the cases of politically motivated decisions.

Major Actors in Educational Policy-Making in Kyrgyzstan

Presidential Administration. According to the Constitution of the Kyrgyz Republic, all three branches of the government — executive, legislative, and judicial — are responsible for policy-making. In practice, policies are initiated and formulated mainly by the Presidential Administration's Social Policy Department and

Commission for Education and Science. For example, President Akaev's statements on education are binding for educational policy institutions and groups, including the Ministry of Education and the Committee on Education in the legislature. Another example is related to the law "On Education," which was signed by President Akaev in 2003 only after the parliament incorporated into law all of his recommendations.

Ministry of Education. Formally, the Ministry of Education — whose major functions include certification, licensing, financing, state education standardizing, and planning — has some autonomy in implementing educational policy. In reality, the President has significant influence on the decision-making process at the Ministry. The level of autonomy seemingly varies from one Minister of Education to another as long as new policies and decisions conform to the broad political aims of the Presidential Administration. For example, two major breakthroughs in educational reform in Kyrgyzstan took place in 1992-1993 and 2001-2002. In both periods, the Ministry of Education was headed by reformist ministers, who had the vision, leadership skills, charisma, and political popularity to introduce significant innovations into the educational system in Kyrgyzstan. Their personal abilities enabled them to secure considerable support (at least at the initial stages of the reforms) from high-level officials, including the President himself. Therefore, during these two periods the Ministry of Education clearly enjoyed higher autonomy from the Presidential Administration, exercised greater authority in policy-making, and cooperated with more societal groups than at any other time.

Committee on Education of the Parliament (Jogorku Kenesh). Preliminary findings of the research suggest that this Committee's role is limited to legislative functions (initiating, adopting, and amending laws), and the ability to make budgetary allocations for the educational sector while passing the country's state budget, which is very rarely implemented in full. For example, the two new major laws on education — "On the Status of the Teacher" (2001) and "On Education" (2003) — were initiated by members of the Committee. However, they were adopted with "corrections" made by one of the divisions of the Presidential Administration acting hand-in-hand with the government. Currently, the Committee is drafting laws "On Pre-School and School Education," "On Higher and Post-Graduate Education," and it is planning to work on the educational legal code.

Rectors of Higher Education Institutions. Partial delegation of some functions of the Ministry of Education to universities, mainly in managerial and financial matters, is one of the outcomes of educational reform in Kyrgyzstan. Universities also have received the right to determine their internal activities, as long as they correspond to the state standard and general curriculum framework approved by the Ministry. For example, today most universities elect their rectors and can make independent decisions on collection and allocation of funds received from fees for educational services (UNDP 1998: 46). In addition, many local rectors established formal and informal contacts with high-level government decision-makers (e.g., some rectors have been appointed as official advisers to the President), becoming part of the political establishment. As a result, the rectors have become a very powerful and resourceful network that can strongly oppose any innovations — such as creation of a board of trustees, which puts the rector and the university's financial resources under its supervision and control — that might threaten their personal interests and positions.

Politics and Higher Education in Kyrgyzstan: Initial Conclusions

The initial conclusions of my research suggest that the country's educational policy is highly politicized, and has become an important tool in political mobilization, socialization, and state-building. Since independence in 1991, promotion of the cultural values of the "titular" nationality — ethnic Kyrgyz — has become one of the major questions on the political agenda of Kyrgyzstan. The Ministry of Education plays a pivotal role in this process. One of the basic aims of the "State Educational Doctrine" adopted in August 2000 by Presidential decree is to "preserve national cultural traditions" (Government of the Kyrgyz Republic 2000). Ratified in 2003, the new law "On Education" also stipulates that educational policy in Kyrgyzstan should be based on the principle of "the priority of universal human values *combined with national cultural heritage*, upbringing in terms of citizenship, hard work, patriotism, and respect for human rights and liberties" [emphasis added]. The requirement to obtain the Ministry of Education's approval for the university's curriculum is one of the policy implementation tools. Finally, in February 2004 the Ministry of Education issued its decision to introduce a compulsory examination on the history of Kyrgyzstan for all graduating students as of 2004.

Also, university students and their faculty are regularly mobilized for participation in official events, such as presidential elections, referenda, national celebrations, officially organized public meetings, rallies, and conferences. For example, in January 2003 on the eve of the referendum on constitutional amendments, the Ministry of Education delayed the beginning of winter break at the related universities so as to keep students on campuses to be marshaled to the referendum. The Ministry also ordered the universities to set up "groups to clarify the referendum's goals and purposes, organize talks, discussions, roundtables, and other special events among students and faculty" (*Vechernii Bishkek* 2003).

Another characteristic of the policy process in higher education is its high degree of centralization restricted to interactions mainly among the four institutions: 1) Presidential Administration, 2) Ministry of Education, 3) Parliament, and 4) major universities. I maintain that a more open and pluralistic policy-making process (with institutionalized involvement of non-governmental groups) is necessary to make the policy decisions more rational and their implementation more effective. Such change, in its turn, requires further liberalization of the political and administrative system of Kyrgyzstan.

Research on this project has been carried out under the framework of the Open Society Institute Higher Education Support Program's Central Asian

Research Initiative project (October 2002 to August 2004). Logistical support has been provided by the East-West Center for Research and Intercultural Dialogue of the American University-Central Asia (AUCA) in Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan. One of the final goals of the project is to publish an article on educational policy-making in Kyrgyzstan, and design an undergraduate course entitled "Politics and Bureaucracy in Kyrgyzstan" to be offered at the AUCA.

References

- Government of the Kyrgyz Republic
2000 *Educational Doctrine of the Kyrgyz Republic*. Attachment to the Presidential Decree "On state educational doctrine of the Kyrgyz Republic." Bishkek, August 27.
- Levin, Benjamin
2001 "Conceptualizing the process of education reform from an international perspective," *Educational Policy Analysis*, 9 (14), Arizona State University.
<http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v9n14.html>
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
1998 *Kyrgyzstan: National Human Development Report*. Bishkek: UNDP.
- Vechernii Bishkek*
2003 Bishkek, January 24, p. 1.

The Soviet Policy of Economic Nationalization in Uzbekistan and its Consequences, 1917-1940

Nadejda Ozerova, Senior Researcher at the Institute of History, Uzbek Academy of Sciences, Senior Lecturer at the Tashkent Financial Institute, Tashkent, Uzbekistan, nadejda29@yandex.ru

This report presents preliminary findings of dissertation research started in 2000 at the Institute of History of the Uzbek Academy of Sciences. The research is funded in part by a Central Asia Research Initiative (CARI) grant designed to support the research and teaching interests of young faculty. This study aims to provide a comprehensive examination, through critical analysis and objective evaluation, of the Soviet policy towards private property and its owners in Uzbekistan in the period 1917-1940. The study also investigates the policy's consequences, especially its effect on the democratic

rights of citizens. I pay particular attention to the relationship between authorities and private property ownership, and to the status of property owners in Turkestan (and from 1925, in Uzbekistan) in the first decades of Soviet rule.

Since independence Uzbekistan has been driven to reform its society. As part of the reform, economic liberalization has been designed to develop a class of private property owners by reducing the government's regulatory functions, providing more freedom to businesses, strengthening the private sector, and promoting small- and