

PROMISING CHANGES? THE OFFICIAL DISCOURSE ON SOCIAL
MODERNIZATION IN INDEPENDENT KAZAKHSTAN

A Thesis
Presented to the MA Programme
of the OSCE Academy in Bishkek
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts in Politics and Security Programme (Central Asia)

by
Anna Savchenko

September 2015

The OSCE Academy in Bishkek

STATEMENT OF THESIS APPROVAL

The MA Thesis of

Anna Savchenko

has been approved by the following:

Kristin Fjaestad, Thesis Supervisor

8 September 2015

Date Approved

Meded Tiulegenov, Defense Committee Chair

8 September 2015

Date Approved

Aigoul Abdoubaetova, Academic Coordinator

8 September 2015

Date Approved

Maxim Ryabkov, OSCE Academy Director

8 September 2015

Date Approved



ABSTRACT

Twenty four years of Kazakhstan's independence, from 1991 to 2015, have brought reforms and changes into different spheres. Some are studied extensively: economic development and reforms, the nation building process, and formulation and objectives of foreign policy. However, the process of formulation and development of social policy remains understudied. Utilizing discourse analysis, this thesis scrutinizes official statements, speeches, and documents (such as official speeches and annual addresses of President Nazarbayev) covering issues of social policy and social modernization since 1991. It attempts to answer how the discourse has been formed since independence from the USSR, what are its main priorities and approaches, and how the President uses the concepts of "Western" and "Eastern" models of modernization in relation to social policy. Moreover, several in-depth interviews with experts help in the process of discourse analysis and context establishment. The results show that the official discourse on social policy is predominantly positive, development-oriented, and interconnects social modernization with economic development. Moreover, there are some tendencies, like social responsibility shift from state to individuals or businesses, or proposition for wider autonomy of an individual to be self-reliant. State officials present the state's role in social policy as of a creator of conditions for the citizen to realize her or himself, especially through the opening of a business, in a contradiction to a donor-state. In these regards, the idea of the Society of Universal labour and labour-oriented people is discussed extensively in the official documents. The last finding shows that there is an attempt to create a model of modernized society, through the emphasis on desirable characteristics for Kazakhstani people, like self-sufficiency, self-reliance, competitiveness, and patriotism.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my advisor Kristin Fjaestad, for the continuous support during the planning and development of the thesis, for her patience, attention, enthusiastic encouragement, and immense knowledge. Her valuable comments, useful critiques of the thesis, and suggested literature inspired me to improve the arguments and to develop the research design. Her experience in conducting discourse analysis encouraged me to study and implement this methodology in my thesis. I could not have imagined having a better advisor for my MA Thesis.

I would also like to thank Minda Holm (researcher, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs, NUPI) and Roman Vakulchuk (senior researcher, NUPI), for their advice and support during the last phase of the work. Their constructive suggestions during development of the thesis, willingness to give their time so generously have been very much appreciated.

I would also like to extend my thanks to Selbi Hanova (PhD candidate, the University of St. Andrews), who helped me in understanding research methodology, in searching for the right literature and inspiration.

My grateful thanks are also extended to professors, lecturers and staff of the OSCE Academy in Bishkek, who shared their knowledge and experience throughout the academic year. I wish to thank the OSCE Academy for an afforded opportunity to express myself through the conducted research.

My sincere thanks also goes to the Russia, Eurasia and the Arctic group's members of the Norwegian Institute of International Affairs, who provided me an opportunity to join their team as intern, and who gave access to the library and research facilities. Without their precious support it would not be possible to conduct this research.

Special thanks should be given to all experts, who agreed to give me interviews during this research. Their opinions have been valuable for my work.

Last but not least, I wish to thank my parents and friends for supporting me throughout writing this thesis and my life in general.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
Research design	2
Structure of the thesis	6
CHAPTER 2: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....	7
Language, discourse and social world	7
Discourse analysis: from theory to practice.....	10
CHAPTER 3: LITERATURE REVIEW	16
Modernization: Eastern and Western approaches.....	19
Soviet approach to modernization	24
Kazakhstani approach to modernization.....	27
Conclusion	29
CHAPTER 4: DISCOURSE ON SOCIAL POLICY: THE MELTING POT.....	31
Discourse on urbanization.....	33
Discourse on education	36
Discourse on health care, social protection and demography.....	38
Conclusion	40
CHAPTER 5: DISCOURSE ON ECONOMY AND SOCIETY	41
Mapping the “economy” and “market” discourse construction.....	41
Social policy of employment: Creating motivation and responsibility	46
The discourse of hope: business and entrepreneurship.....	49
Conclusion	51
CHAPTER 6: DISCOURSE ON THE MODERNIZATION OF SOCIETY	52
Establishing state-society relations	52
Modernizing values and features of society.....	54
Conclusion	57
SUMMARY FINDINGS AND CONCLUDING REMARKS.....	59
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	62
APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW GUIDELINE.....	68
APPENDIX B: DISCOURSE DOCUMENTS: PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESSES.....	70
APPENDIX C: LIST OF EXPERT INTERVIEWS.....	73

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

If someone asks an ordinary citizen of Bishkek, the capital of Kyrgyzstan, what she or he knows about Kazakhstan, most probably, she is going to hear the following: “Oh... Kazakhstan is our rich neighboring country,” or: “It is big, and it has a lot of oil,” or “Kazakhstanis live well.” However, twenty years ago Kazakhstan was not rich or successful. People did not have high salaries or the feeling of stability or confidence in the future. When I asked my relatives about their life in the middle of 1990s, I heard a lot of negative memories: “We did not get salaries for months,” “my pension was not enough to survive,” or even “I had to leave university in order to work at bazaar to feed my family,” and comparisons like “today we live much better.” All these answers describe issues of social policy and social security, which are crucial for the development of Kazakhstan. Today it is noticeable that Kazakhstan has changed and life has become different for many Kazakhstanis since independence. This process of change can be referred to as development, reformation, transformation or modernization. The last term is used extensively during the years of independence in the official state documents. However, there is no research on the role of the modernization concept in the process of policy formation, and in the social sphere.

Images of progress and modernity dominate the Kazakhstani official discourse.¹ But what does it mean for politics and society? Does the progress and modernity discourse affect the way officials look at and speak about social policy? Notions of social and economic modernization do appear in the official discourse in 2005 with the President Nursultan Nazarbayev’s address “Kazakhstan on the road to accelerated economic, social and political modernization.” Social modernization is referred to as the main approach to development in Kazakhstan’s 2012 official documents (Document 24 and 25).² The President introduces the importance of social modernization as an instrument to enter a new stage of development. Nazarbayev explains:

¹ Natalie Koch, “Technologising the opinion: Focus groups, performance and free speech,” *Area* 45, no. 4 (2013): 412.

² All the documents under examination in this thesis are listed in Appendix B. In order to refer to any of them, the term “Document” and its number is used.

“Today the aim and the notion of social modernization is to prepare society for life in the conditions of new industrial innovative economy, to find an optimal balance between accelerated economic development of Kazakhstan and wide range of social welfare, ensuring to strengthen social relations based on the principles of law and justice.” (Document 25)

What can be concluded from this passage? One may argue that Kazakhstan is a country with a developing economy and wide range of social insurance; however, society cannot (yet) face it. The necessity to modernize society serves the aim to maintain the balance between economic and social development. Another deduction from this quotation is that the leader of the country is talking about the arduous task to modernize Kazakhstan, and social modernization will happen through social policy.

In these regards, this thesis addresses the following **research question**: *How has the Kazakhstani discourse on social policy been formulated and developed since 1991?* The thesis focuses on the process of social policy discourse formulation, features, priorities and understandings, as well as how the discourse is formulated in relation to the wider context. Moreover, it examines different approaches to social modernization, which helps to analyze the development of the Kazakhstani discourse. It is done to cover an understudied approach, that of social modernization, while economic modernization is studied extensively, as the literature review shows. The expected results of this thesis is an observation of the way officials discuss the social sphere, policy and modernization in Kazakhstan.

Before we start answering the research question, another question must be addressed: “Why do we need to study the official discourse on social policy?” The answer is simple: discourse, or the way we speak about something, influences reality. The pronounced idea might become material through the process of implementation and realization.³ Furthermore, there are no known studies on the formulation and development of the official discourse on social policy in Kazakhstan.

In regards to the “social policy” term, this thesis does not employ a fixed definition. The reason is the following: When conducting discourse analysis, social policy, as represented by the Kazakhstani state officials, can be constructed on the basis of the official discourse. As such, this thesis examines social policy as Kazakhstani officials represent it, based on their vision, and not based on an externally established definition.

³ Cynthia Hardy, Bill Harley, and Nelson Phillips. “Discourse analysis and Content Analysis: Two Solutions?” *Qualitative Methods*, (2004), 20.

Research design

To answer its research question, this thesis uses qualitative analysis. It aims to answer the research question through a discourse analysis of relevant texts, and to establish the context of study by analysis, interpretation and critical assessment of published literature on modernization, and political and social developments in Kazakhstan during the 24 years of its post-Soviet independence. Additionally, expert interviews will help to analyze the formulation and development of social policy discourse and implementation of the associated modernization concept.

The thesis is based on a single case-study. As Bruce Berg⁴ underlines, the case study approach requires gathering explicit information about a unit of analysis and analyzing events or phenomena inside of it. I have chosen this approach since exploring an individual country's experience, the formulation of discourse on social policy can be examined more deeply than with multiple cases.

The analysis is based on a selection of key texts, as part of the process of discourse analysis. These are the programmes and speeches of President Nazarbayev. Some argue that it is not enough to study an individual person's statements.⁵ Moreover, some claim that Nazarbayev is not the single actor, initiator of reforms, and only source of official discourse on social and political issues in Kazakhstan. However, the participation of a limited group of advisers, or counseling elite in the process of decision-making is out of this study's examination (the decision-making process and different stakeholders participating in it are for example studied by Ayazbekov⁶). The reason for this is the nature of the discursive environment in Kazakhstan, wherein the role of the first and only President in policy-making, policy implementation, and official discourse is rather significant for three reasons.

First of all, Kazakhstan's Constitution⁷ stipulates that the President is the person who presents annual addresses and long-term strategies. Secondly, political elites and representatives of the ruling party, *Nur Otan*,—headed by Nazarbayev since 2007—cultivate the role of the President in the success of nation-building process and

⁴ Bruce L. Berg, *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences*. (Boston: Pearson International Edition, 2007).

⁵ Kevin C. Dunn and Iver B. Neumann, *Undertaking Discourse Analysis for Social Research*. (Upcoming publication, 2015), 71.

⁶ Anuar Ayazbekov, "Independent Kazakhstan and the "black box" of decision-making: Understanding Kazakhstan's foreign policy in the early independence period (1991-4)" (PhD dissertation, The University of Saint Andrews, St Andrews, 2014).

⁷ Government of Kazakhstan. "The Constitution of the Republic of Kazakhstan," 2011.

other national programmes on the level of discourse.⁸ Thirdly, Sally Cummings calls the Kazakh President the “epicentre of all state- and institution-building efforts,” who has total control over “all branches of government.”⁹ Halil Burak Sakal,¹⁰ in turn, specifies that Nazarbayev has crucial influence on economic processes, as well as on the distribution of benefits through the established elite and clan networking in the country.

In general, the discursive environment in Kazakhstan can be characterized as a “closed context.”¹¹ This term describes places with prevailing closure acts.¹² Here, it is used to display a lack of liberal subjectivity, when official rhetoric can be repeatedly and unconsciously reproduced by the population.¹³ It happens even in cases where the population does not affiliate itself with the ruling regime.¹⁴ I thus argue that the factors of presidential dominance over the official discourse, promotion of the President as a leading political figure; the concentration of economic, political and institutional power in his hands; and the nature of the discursive environment, all make the analysis of the presidential discourse on social policy adequate and sufficient for the purpose of this thesis.

Discourse analysis of primary sources is a tool to understand the process of social policy formulation. The main focus will be President Nazarbayev’s annual addresses, available on-line on the official governmental site: www.akorda.kz. According to Kazakhstani Law, the presidential addresses contain the principal indicator of the state’s internal and external political directions.¹⁵ Through an analysis of these addresses, as well as of other presidential speeches, therefore, the main aspects of the social policy discourse and of the modernization discourse can be examined.

The second method used in this thesis is interviews. Interviews are aimed at giving expert insight on social modernization, and check reliability and viability of

⁸ Rico Isaacs, “‘Papa’ – Nursultan Nazarbayev and the discourse of charismatic leadership and nation-building in post-Soviet Kazakhstan,” *Studies in Ethnicity and Nationalism* 10, no. 3 (2010): 436.

⁹ Sally Cummings, “Kazakhstan: An uneasy relationship – power and authority in the Nazarbayev regime.” in *Power and Change in Central Asia*, ed. Sally N. Cummings, 63 (New York: Routledge, 2002).

¹⁰ Halil Burak Sakal, “Natural resource policies and standard of living in Kazakhstan,” *Central Asian Survey* 34 (2): 237–254 (2014).

¹¹ Natalie Koch, “Introduction – Field methods in “closed contexts”: undertaking research in authoritarian states and places,” *Area* 45, no. 4 (2013): 393.

¹² *Ibid.* 390.

¹³ *Ibid.* 394; *Supra* n 1, 413.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵ *Supra* n 7, “The Constitution ...,” Article 44.

discourse analysis' findings. Interviews allow re-assessing the information gathered during the text-analysis, and complement the analysis on social policy and modernization discourse. Moreover, discourse analysis is an interpretive method,¹⁶ which gives results on the basis of certain type of analyzed materials. It is argued here that in order to present a broader approach to social policy and modernization discourse, interviews are needed for this study.

In the end, I conducted seven in-depth expert interviews. Two interviews were face to face in late July and August 2015, and five were via Skype and email during May-July 2015. The interviews were conducted in Russian and were later transcribed and translated. The interview guide, i.e. the questions posed to interlocutors, is attached as Appendix A to the thesis. In order to integrate the results of the interviews in the analysis of the official discourse, the “#” sign is used, with each interview coded with its own number.

The interviews were semi-structured. According to Berg,¹⁷ a semi-structured interview is flexible in wording and vocabulary, allows adding or skipping questions, and gives respondents an opportunity to make clarifications. One of the challenges in this case is that some of the interviews were conducted by e-mail, which means that there were no unexpected questions. Moreover, the interviewer has to frame the conversation and approach the core questions. The next challenge of the interviews is that the experts are representatives of a “closed context” country.¹⁸ This makes reproduction of the official discourse more expected, than in a more open society. In this case, it is indicated in the analysis as “apprehension” of the presidential discourse by the experts.

All research designs face limitations. The methodology and theoretical framework of the thesis limit the area of analysis. The first limitation here, as one can argue, is the choice of official texts presented by only the President. However, a number of scholars¹⁹ argue, as also does this thesis, that this kind of discourse can be analyzed on the assumption that it is of importance for a collective or a country. The second limitation is that this thesis does not cover the process of implementation of the social modernization concept into practical actions. Moreover, it does not show

¹⁶ Martin W. Bauer and George Gaskell, *Qualitative Researching with Text, Image and Sound: A Practical Handbook* (London: Sage Publications, 2000).

¹⁷ *Supra* n 4.

¹⁸ *Supra* n 1, 413; ---, “Introduction – Field methods,” 393.

¹⁹ *Supra* n 5, 21.

the quality of change in the policy with the emphasis on the modernization concept. This means that the thesis does not show factual progress or regress in the society. It reflects, instead, on the process of social policy formulation only. The third limitation of the study is the difficulty to arrange interviews during the summer time. Many of the experts approached simply refused to talk, perhaps because they were on vacation, outside the country or their work places.

Despite these limitations, this thesis contributes to the existing debates on modernization theory and practice, and official discourse. The thesis is devoted to examine how social policy, with focus on the social modernization concept, is formulated in the Republic of Kazakhstan. Moreover, the thesis shows the development of discourse on social policy as a reflection of different tendencies and events, which form the context of the annual speeches.

Structure of the thesis

The overall structure of this study is the following: a presentation of the research puzzle, followed by a description (research design, theoretical framework, and literature review) of how to find an acceptable answer to the research question, in addition to analytical chapters, and findings and conclusions. The thesis starts with an introductory chapter, where the problem, research question, objectives and significance are presented. This chapter also includes a description of the research design and the thesis structure.

The second chapter covers the theoretical framework, which helps to understand the approach with which the work is conducted. Moreover, this chapter explains the ideas behind the specific methods used in this thesis. The literature review or the third chapter helps to understand the main concepts of modernity, modernization and its components used in the thesis from different perspectives ('Eastern' and 'Western' approaches). Moreover, the chapter presents the Soviet vision of modernization. The reason for this is to trace any possible influence of the Soviet discourse and experience over present Kazakhstani discourse on modernization.

Chapters four, five and six are analytical. They present and discuss the formulation, development and changes in the social policy discourse in detail during the years of independence. Moreover, there is a context establishment which helps to tie together results of this thesis and facts of changes and development. These

chapters are divided in different parts, in which the evolution of the official ideas and discourse is displayed.

One of the features of all these chapters is the use of interview findings together with discourse analysis. It provides the study with an opportunity to see the interrelation between expert opinions and official discourse. The thesis ends with a general conclusion, where the main arguments are re-established in summary format and seen in relation to the original research question.

CHAPTER 2

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The author of this thesis is a social constructivist, a theoretical framework according to which individuals and collectivities (including states) act toward others in the framework of meanings that these other individuals, states or entities have for them. These meanings, as far as concerning identities and interests, are constructed in the process of social interaction.²⁰ Meaning construction and further actions on the basis of this knowledge becomes an integral part of an individual's or even a state's activity and everyday life.

In pursuit of the goal to answer the research question, the discourse analysis approach is chosen. Discourse analysis is developed by several schools; however, this thesis is written in accordance with the post-structuralist approach, to be explained more in detail below. In addition, examination of the social modernization concept can be incomplete without a detailed study of modernization theory. Further, a short overview of discourse analysis is presented, whereas modernization theory is discussed in the literature review chapter.

Language, discourse and the social world

What do we mean while speaking about language? Is it a set of signs and associated with them sounds to name objects, subjects and processes, or a way to communicate basic or complicated thoughts and ideas with each other? For constructivists, language has special meaning: it is, primarily, social. Language helps in the process of interaction to form and to delegate the meanings for objects and ideas.²¹ Language is a constituent part of the process, where the social world, in which individuals and greater national and international societies live, is produced.

Moreover, it is wrong to equate language and discourse with mere text or a combination of coded words, sentences, only.²² Discourse is more than a series of words or sentences. The same word might be used for different occasions and in

²⁰ Alexander Wendt, "Anarchy is what States Make of it: The Social Construction of Power Politics," *International Organizations* 46, no. 2 (1992): 402.

²¹ Ronen Palan, "A World of Their Making: An Evaluation of the Constructivist Critique in International Relations," *Review of International Studies* 26, no. 4 (2000); supra n 5.

different contexts, which gives it meaning. Context is crucial for understanding the meaning of words. Discourse, the word's meaning can be understood through the examination of the context. Furthermore, discourse analysts count gestures, actions and images as "text," which can be analyzed to see how meaning is constructed and used.²³

Language helps to produce some kind of "truth" about the world. Meanings, constructed in the process of interaction, are always subjective.²⁴ Thus, language "does not reveal essential truth," but naturalizes meanings and gives a sense of them as of "truth."²⁵ Language reflects truth, formed by individual(s) in specific conditions and, probably, for a certain purpose. Reality, in turn, consists of the interacting subjective meanings people have about it.

In the process of creating and sharing meanings and truth about objects and the world, individuals participate in knowledge production: "[H]umans see the world through perspectives, developed socially."²⁶ Discourse analysts, such as Kevin Dunn and Iver Neumann,²⁷ add that the process of reproduction of special meanings makes them and this knowledge natural and stable; however, the emphasis should not be given to the word as such, but to the process of production and meaning fixation.

Knowledge is formed under the usage of "socially reproduced facts, packages of phenomena" cognized as wholes (meanings) and called representations.²⁸ Representations reflect things as they are introduced to us. For instance, bread can appear as a result of labour of many people, becoming a "head of everything," i.e. the main meal (in Russian: *хлеб – всему голова*), or as a baked dough made of flour, salt and water, used as an addition to meal.

There is a link between produced knowledge and power. Through the use of certain representations, discourse becomes a part of the strategy to accomplish things, to create an effect.²⁹ Through the use and control over certain discourse, knowledge can be monopolized. The source of discourse, then, becomes a constituent of it.

²² Dunn and Neumann, *Undertaking Discourse Analysis ...*, Supra n 5.

²³ Ibid., 140.

²⁴ Ronen Palan, "A World of Their Making"

²⁵ Dunn and Neumann, *Undertaking Discourse Analysis ...*, Supra n 5, 7.

²⁶ Palan, supra n 24, 580.

²⁷ Supra n 25.

²⁸ Ibid., 49.

²⁹ Alan Bryman, *Social Research Methods*. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012).

Through the use of language, individuals can change the surrounding world. Specifically, in discourse analysis, language is depicted as a tool to produce and to shape social world.³⁰ After construction has been formed on the level of language, and has been used as representation, it brings an impetus for individuals to act in a special way.³¹ It means that language has a power and ability to influence “socio-cultural change.”³² Through the use of representations, the way to frame actions is constructed: what is “normal” behavior and what is not in particular settings and in relation to specific cases.

At this point, it is crucial to give a definition of the term “discourse.” On the one hand, discourse is understood as “talk and linguistic texts of all kinds, including naturally occurring conversation, newspaper articles and interview data,”³³ or as a set of images constructing objects and tools used in this process.³⁴ On the other hand, it is a way to use language in order to introduce a version of reality, to form meaning and knowledge.³⁵ Discourse focuses on specific interests and constitutes the social world around it.³⁶ Moreover, it influences our life through the connections with social and institutional actions and practices.³⁷ All these features of discourse are presented in a description given by Dunn and Neumann:

“[W]e understand a discourse as a system producing a set of statements and practices that, by entering into institutions and appearing like normal, constructs the reality of its subjects, and maintains a certain degree of regularity in a set of social relations. Or, more succinctly, *discourses are systems of meaning-production that fix meaning, however temporarily, and enable actors to make sense of the world and to act within it*” (emphasis in the original).³⁸

The analysis in this thesis is, thus, constructed on the basis of this definition, because it pays attention to the process of meaning, production, fixation and development, and it looks at actors and their functionality in regards to discourse. Moreover, discourse analysis is understood as an analysis of text (statements, documents, speeches, and et cetera) in order to discover the process of knowledge

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ Vivien Burr, *An Introduction to Social Constructionism*, (London: Routledge, 1995), 5.

³² Bryman, supra n 28, 536.

³³ Bauer and Gaskel, supra n 16, 355.

³⁴ Vivien Burr, *An Introduction to Social Constructionism*, (London: Routledge, 1995).

³⁵ Supra n 28.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Burr, supra n 33.

³⁸ Dunn and Neumann, supra n 5, 10.

formation and tools used in it.

Using the “constructive feature” of language through discourse, emphasizing the role of social modernization, the vision of society and the ongoing processes can be formed.³⁹ The discourse on the concept of social modernization can be understood as a way of constructing new ideas and ideals in society. There is an argument that discourse can produce material reality, i.e. ideas, pronounced in the discourse, can be realized.⁴⁰ The official discourse of the President of Kazakhstan creates some kind of knowledge about the social sphere inside of the country. Through the analysis of content and organization of the texts (in Bauer and Gaskel’s understanding of discourse), the fixation of ideas and values can be explored. As Alexander Wendt⁴¹ argues, shared ideas underlie the construction of identity and interests, which is very important for any modern nation, including Kazakhstan.⁴² Discourse is significant to analyze as it indicates and defines society’s benchmarks.

Discourse analysis: from theory to practice

Discourse analysis is used as a theoretical approach and as a method. In general, the analysis is conducted in several steps: preparation of the research question, selection of the texts, repeated critical readings, coding, analysis of the findings, checking reliability, and validity of results.⁴³ On the whole, 19 annual addresses to the Parliament of Kazakhstan by President Nazarbayev (from 1997 to 2015) are examined. The period prior to 1997 is analyzed on the basis of different presidential speeches, which are available on-line. Moreover, other official documents have been included in the text selection. For example, Nazarbayev’s article “Social Modernization of Kazakhstan: Twenty Steps to the Society of Universal Labour” (2012), and presidential speech “The Plan of Nation – One Hundred Concrete Steps. Modern State for Everybody” (2015).

Discourse analysis is a method that requires multiple re-reading of texts. Before starting reading, on the basis of the literature review, a list of possible discursive objects is formed. These are the objects, which are used for representations

³⁹ Bauer and Gaskel, supra n 32.

⁴⁰ Supra n 3, 20.

⁴¹ Supra n 20.

⁴² Sally N. Cummings, “Eurasian bridge or murky waters between east and west? Ideas, identity and output in Kazakhstan's foreign policy,” *Journal of Communist Studies and Transition Politics* 19, no. 3 (2003); ---, “Legitimation and Identification,” *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics* 12, no. 2 (2006).

⁴³ Bauer and Gaskel, supra n 16.

and positioning to be traced in order to see how discourse is constructed. For instance, there is a need to search for any mentioning of education, health, social security, urbanization, and reformation of society, among others. In the case of this thesis, a hypothesis is not used, because it may limit understanding of the process of discourse formulation and development.

During the first reading of speeches, relevance of the text for thesis is analyzed. The next point is clarified at this stage: Does the text cover questions about social sphere and society, its activity, and development in present or in the future? And does it contain the discursive objects indicated above or not? For instance, the period prior to 1997 is analyzed on the basis of the following transcripts of presidential speeches delivered to various government bodies, in which the discourse on social policy is revealed.⁴⁴ (All the documents under examination in this thesis are listed in Appendix B).

During the second reading, specific parts of speeches on social policy and modernization are highlighted and analyzed. The analysis of these parts is conducted on the basis of the combination of several textual mechanisms. The first is “presupposition.” It reveals how background knowledge or “natural facts” have been used and presented in the text and how they have not been examined from the position of questioning them.⁴⁵ In order to understand how knowledge about some objects is constructed, the related method – “predication” – is worthy to implement. This method examines the use of linguistics to establish the meaning of objects. The last mechanism is “subject positioning” within a discourse. It allows looking at how the links between objects are established in a way they are presumed as “normal” and “natural.”⁴⁶ Revealing subject positioning and studying relationships, it becomes easier to see priorities in the discourse.

To make this analysis understandable and clear, representations are coded in accordance with their preliminary list. These representations can be scrutinized in three groups: The first group combines discourse on the economy and social policy.

⁴⁴ Speech at the meeting of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Kazakhstan of the twelfth convocation (December 10, 1991), The strategy of formation and development of Kazakhstan as a sovereign state (May 16, 1992), Opening speech for the first anniversary of the Republic of Kazakhstan’s independence (December 15, 1992), Speech at the national meeting: “Ideational consolidation of society as a condition for Kazakhstan’s progress” (May 11, 1993), Opening speech for the celebration of the Republic of Kazakhstan’s Independence Day (December 16, 1995), and Address to the population of Kazakhstan (October 7, 1996).

⁴⁵ Dunn and Neumann, *supra* 5, 156.

This group is formed with the help of an argument that discourse is always relational and that discourse on one issue is always tightened together with another issue's discourse.⁴⁷ For example, economic development and social development (with special emphasis on the market and its "ideology," as Nazarbayev puts it), employment/unemployment and related issues (for instance, crime rates), development of business and entrepreneurship, and labour motivation.

The second analytical group is gathering concepts of social sphere and politics, in particular rural/urban areas and its development, housing, health and insurance, education, social protection and pension system, and the institute of family (including questions of women and children). The third analytical group combines concepts related with morality and elements of future construction. These are: relations between society and state, the most noticeable issues here being: paternalism and dependence (*izhdivenchestvo*), "quality" of society (with its common characteristics such as values and value systems, and mentality), including image/model of a ideal future society.

After reading separate texts and coding representations, materials are gathered in an Excel table. This allows tracing the prevalent tendencies in the discourse, the way representations are formed and maintained. It is worthy to mention, that in late speeches, starting from 2007-2010, President Nazarbayev implements such concept as "human capital," for which a new category is not created, and it is coded under the category of "quality." It preserves consistency in coding and analysis when discourse uses different notions, albeit referring to the same content and direction.

During the next reading, it is necessary to pay attention to details in order to see how background knowledge, i.e. existence of some ideas or knowledge which are not questioned and accepted as they are (also referred to as "presupposition") is constructed and what prediction mechanisms exists for them.⁴⁸ Analysis of the use of lexis (totality of vocabulary items used in the text) plays a major role at this level. It is necessary to search for the words describing some issues, and what the categories of these words are (economic terms, jargons, etc.). Moreover, at this level relationships and links between objects are traced during the readings.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ Ibid, 8.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

After all the representations and categories of discursive objects are established, they must be connected with the historical, political, economic and social contexts. If there is a noticeable change in discourse, or if there is a new priority, context plays a crucial role for analysis. Context is established on the basis of secondary resources. Moreover, the expert interviews are used to establish the context. Here the results of in-depth interviews are implemented in the analysis and tightened together with results of discourse analysis. Further, analysis is expected to reveal the significance of created knowledge, or how presupposition is used. At this level, analysis focuses at how created knowledge is used in the discourse, implemented into the discursive sphere, and connected with other objects. After this is done and all the outcomes are discussed, conclusions are formed and presented.

Assessing challenges and limitations of discourse analysis, several aspects should be underlined: Discourse analysis is not a method for empirical generalization, as it can be non-representative, and the produced analysis can present unreliable data.⁴⁹ Discourse analysis is good for case-study and for examination of how an individual draws on wider discourses of social modernization to build knowledge in society and to establish meaning through constant use of the discourse on modernization. In fact, there is no need for generalization. Interpretation of one individual's discourse provides the thesis with data on the powerful Kazakh President's approach to modernization and social policy.

To understand why discourse analysis is a convenient tool to analyze annual presidential addresses and speeches, the comparison with content analysis of the same documents can be made. There are two content-analysis studies conducted on the base of annual addresses in Kazakhstan: one by Smagulov,⁵⁰ and another by Oleinik and Djamangulov.⁵¹ Smagulov codes the most frequent words in each address and draws some parallels of the word usage with political or economic events that have formed the conditions in which the address is presented. Oleinik and Djamangulov analyze how the priorities in the addresses vary from year to year and influence external and internal policy directions. Smagulov shows that the most popular words are “state”

⁴⁹ Bauer and Gaskel, *supra* n. 16.

⁵⁰ K.Y. Smagulov, “The content-analysis of the annual addresses of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan,” *Sociologicheskiye issledovaniya* 6 (2012).

⁵¹ Anton Oleinik and Kairat Djamangulov, “Azbuks vlasti: yazyk ezhegodnyh poslanii Prezidenta Respubliki Kazakhstan [Alphabet of power: The language of the annual addresses of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan],” (2012) <<http://www.zakon.kz/4531454-azbuka-vlasti-jazyk->

and “we” (words used during the time of crisis or instability and serving as uniting factor), “development” and “economics,” “social” and “society,” “reform” and “modernization,” and “I/me” – primarily used in the years when the presidential elections are to be held. The study shows that there is a link between internal and external factors in the country and official rhetoric, involved in the annual presidential addresses.⁵² Moreover, the political discourse relates to events that have taken place, and needs or even requests of the society for about one year before the address.⁵³ However, it is impossible to analyze the character of changes made – modernization – and the way the social policy progresses on the basis of these studies and content analysis as a method. This would require discourse analysis of the official documents, which allows analyzing approaches to social policy and the main priorities of it.

Discourse analysis as a theoretical framework and method for analyzing primary data allows for revealing peculiarities of the official discourse on social policy and social modernization in Kazakhstan. It provides the researcher with tools and analytical perspectives on the research. Moreover, discourse analysis allows concentrating on a specific type of discourse of interest and ignoring the rest.

[ezhegodnykh.html](#)> (accessed 14 March 2015).

⁵² Ibid.

⁵³ Smagulov, *supra* n 50; Oleinik and Djamangulov, *supra* n 51.

CHAPTER 3

LITERATURE REVIEW

The research question of this thesis focuses on the process of formation and development of social policy discourse in Kazakhstan during the years of independence. Within the social policy discourse, social modernization is one of the trends since 2005. In sum, the term “modernization” is mentioned 104 times in the President’s Annual addresses from 1997 (the first address presented) to 2014. Some of the speeches have the term in the title: “Kazakhstan is on the way to forced economic, social and political modernization” (2005), or “Socio-economic modernization: the main vector of Kazakhstan’s development” (2012). One of the first challenges this research encountered was to understand what is meant by “modernization.” Several questions appeared: What does social modernization mean? What are its components and features? Does modernization start the moment it appears in the title of the document? And, how does one analyze Kazakhstan’s social policy discourse in regards to modernization?

To put in simply, modernization means that a society transforms from traditional into modern.⁵⁴ But how does this description help to analyze the case of Kazakhstan and its social policy discourse? On the one hand, it is possible to form an understanding of “modernization” through discourse analysis of President Nazarbayev’s speeches. On the other hand, there is a need to have a basic knowledge of this term in order to trace its development in the discourse. Moreover, as the literature shows, modernization as theory and process is highly relevant for developing countries, including the so-called postcommunist “countries in transition” of the post-Soviet space, such as Kazakhstan.⁵⁵ On the whole, there are different

⁵⁴ Anatolii Vishnevskii, “Conservative modernization in the Soviet Union,” *Problems of Economic Transition* 44, no. 2 (2001); I.V. Poberezhnikov, “Modernization theory: the main stages of evolution,” in *The Problems of Russian History*, I.V. Poberezhnikov. (Yekaterinbourg: Volot, 2001); John Frenreis and Raymond Tatalovich, “Secularization, modernization, or population change: Explaining the decline of prohibition in the United States,” *Social Science Quarterly* 2, no. 94 (2012); Yuan Peng, “Modernization Theory: From historical misunderstanding to realistic development: A review of a new thesis on modernization,” *Chinese Studies in History* 1, no. 43 (2009); Luo Rongqu, “New Perspectives on Historical Development and the Course of Modernization in East Asia,” *Chinese Studies in History* 1, no. 43 (2009).

⁵⁵ Patrick H. O’Neil, “States and markets in transition,” in *Introduction to International Political Economy*, eds. David Balaam and Michael Veseth. (Upper Saddle River: Pearson Prentice Hall, 2008).

studies discussing transformation and modernization processes in the post-Soviet countries.⁵⁶ So, it is logical to use modernization literature in the analysis of the Kazakhstani case to understand the development of social policy and associated discourse on it.

Looking at the literature on Kazakhstan, the gap on social modernization is noticeable. Bulat Sultanov⁵⁷ argues that an effective social policy, which supports the economic development of the country, is the main direction of Kazakhstan's politics. Yet, whereas several works cover the economic modernization of Kazakhstan;⁵⁸ the social aspect of modernization, or the process of social policy formulation in the country, has not gotten similar attention from scholars. Economic transition and modernization, democratization, and nation-building seem to be more significant topics for an emerging state, while social modernization is less important from the first sight. However, social sphere, social policy, as well as its modernization, have its features and importance for society, and thus also requires attention from both politicians and scholars. Through the use of modernization theory in the analysis of social policy discourse, this thesis attempts to make a modest contribution to literature on Kazakhstan in the post-Soviet period, and its social policy discourse.

Furthermore, the literature shows that the process of modernization has its peculiarities depending on the place of implementation and the vision of its core principles.⁵⁹ It makes analysis of the social modernization discourse in case of Kazakhstan more challenging. Academic literature shows the following: One of the features of the official Kazakhstani discourse is the idea that the country is a bridge between West and East, Europe and Asia.⁶⁰ Nazarbayev creates an image and identity of a "Eurasian" country on the basis of ties between Europe, Asia, and the Islamic

⁵⁶ For example, Valerie Bunce, Michael McFaul, Kathryn Stoner-Weiss, eds. *Democracy and Authoritarianism in the Postcommunist World*. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010); O'Neil, supra n 56; Sally N. Cummings *Understanding Central Asia: Politics and contested transformations*. (New York: Routledge, 2012).

⁵⁷ Bulat Sultanov, *Kazakhstan v sovremennom mire: realii i perspektivy* [*Kazakhstan in A Modern World: Realities and Perspectives*], (Almaty: KISI pri Presidente RK, 2008).

⁵⁸ K. Arystanbekov, "Quality of Kazakhstan's economic policy and balance of payments," *Problems of Economic Transition* 51, no. 10 (2009); Alexandr Akimov and Brian Dollery, "Financial system reform in Kazakhstan from 1993 to 2006 and its socioeconomic effects," *Emerging Markets Finance and Trade* 44, no. 3 (2008).

⁵⁹ Frenndreis and Tatalovich, "Secularization, modernization, or population change"; Rongqu, "New Perspectives on Historical Development"; Wang Jiafeng. "Some Reflections on Modernization Theory and Globalization Theory," *Chinese Studies in History* 1, no. 43 (2009).

⁶⁰ Natalie Koch, "The "heart" of Eurasia? Kazakhstan's centrally located capital city," *Central Asia Survey* 32, no. 2 (2013).

world.⁶¹ Kazakhstani image is an assembly of the Eastern and Western features.⁶² At this point, the literature review is constructed in the same discursive way: The modernization literature is presented as if it is separated between Eastern and Western dimensions. These dimensions are constructed; they cannot be presented as steady concepts or “truths.” However, in the framework of this research, analysis is constructed on the base of this division, i.e. Western and Eastern approaches to modernization. It is done to examine the difference in “modernization” knowledge construction in “Eastern” and “Western” approaches, as it is presented in the Kazakhstani official discourse. This is despite the fact that there are scholars who have already divided the study on modernization into these two dimensions.⁶³ However, the division is not established and each interprets peculiarities of the approaches on the base of her/his understanding. This forces me to use methods of discourse analysis of the literature on modernization to form Eastern and Western understandings of the modernization process. Furthermore, it is used to analyze how Eastern and Western knowledge on modernization is used in the construction and development of Kazakhstani discourse on social policy and social modernization.

The literature review consists of three parts. The first presents the main concepts of the literature on modernization. Further, it displays the features of understanding the process and theories of modernization in Eastern and Western social science, and reflects on the significance of these theories for this thesis. The next part looks at how modernization was understood in the USSR especially with regards to the formation of social policy. The last part examines how scholars have analyzed the modernization process in Kazakhstan after independence.

Modernization: Eastern and Western approaches

The way this thesis looks at modernization follows the aim to analyze how Nazarbayev’s official discourse on the “Eurasian” position of Kazakhstan is reflected

⁶¹ Thomas Ambrosio and William A. Lange, “Mapping Kazakhstan’s geopolitical code: an analysis of Nazabayev’s presidential addresses, 1997-2014,” *Eurasian Geography and Economics* 55, no. 5 (2015): 16.

⁶² Sally N Cummings, “Eurasian bridge or murky waters between east and west? Ideas, identity and output in Kazakhstan's foreign policy,” *Journal of Communist Studies and Transition Politics* 19, no. 3 (2003).

⁶³ Jiafeng. “Some Reflections on Modernization Theory”; Yuan Peng, “Modernization Theory: From Historical Misunderstanding”; Li Yuanxing, “Revival of Tradition or Modernization? The Perspective of Subjectivity in the Study of Modernization Theory and a Critique of the Functionalist Approach,” *Chinese Studies in History* 1, no. 43 (2009); Rongqu, “New Perspectives.”

or not in the discourse on social policy. The “Eurasian” place of Kazakhstan and the special role of East and West in Kazakhstani politics have been noted by scholars.⁶⁴ However, this has not been used for the analysis of social policy discourse.

If modernization is a process of turning society into modernity, there is a need to clarify what modernity is. The representative features of modernity can, in one understanding, be defined as the following, per Chinese scholars Junqing Yi and Lingmei Fan: “[S]ubjectivity and individual self-consciousness, a spirit of rationalized and contracting public culture, modernity in socio-historical narratives as an ideology, rationalization of economic operations, bureaucracy in administrative management, autonomy of the public sphere, and the democratization and contraction of public power.” Yi and Fan argue that modernity, in fact, is “a set of new and “man-made” rationalized mechanisms and rules for human societies.”⁶⁵ Arif Dirlik⁶⁶ adds that current claims on modernity are conceptualized as cultural, especially in Eastern and Islamic countries. So, modernity is tied together with culture, knowledge, and ideology in society. Moreover, modernity is characterized by rationalization of the economic sphere. Its growth creates prerequisites for the development of administrative management and public relations.⁶⁷ On the whole, modernity in the more Eastern understanding can be summarized to be about rationalization, social empowerment and population’s consciousness.

The more Western approach emphasizes that modernity answers the demands of cultural development through the reconstruction of institutions and ideology.⁶⁸ One of the elements of modernity is democracy, facilitating structural reforms and integration into the global market.⁶⁹ In Shmuel Eisenstadt’s vision, development is forced by an activist. This individual states an agenda in social, political or economic spheres to achieve development and move towards modernity. This activism is

⁶⁴ Cummings, “Eurasian bridge”; Ambrosio and Lange, “Mapping Kazakhstan’s geopolitical code”; Golam, Mostafa. “The concept of “Eurasia”: Kazakhstan’s Eurasian policy and its implications.” *Journal of Eurasian Studies* 4 (2013).

⁶⁵ Junqing Yi and Lingmei Fan, “Dimensions of Modernity and Their Contemporary Fate,” *Frontiers of Philosophy in China* 1, no. 1 (2006), 6.

⁶⁶ Arif Dirlik, “Modernity as History: Post-Revolutionary China, Globalization and the Question of Modernity,” *Social History* 27, no. 1 (2002).

⁶⁷ Yi and Fan, supra n 68.

⁶⁸ Shmuel N. Eisenstadt, “Multiple Modernities,” *Daedalus* 129, no. 1 (2000).

⁶⁹ Sebastian Schiek, “Kazakhstan: Will conservative modernization succeed?” In: *OSCE Yearbook 2013*, edited by Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg/ IFSH, 105-117. (Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlag, 2014).

representing the “autonomous human agency.”⁷⁰ Hereby, the individual is the pivotal agent of the modernizing society, is a leader of progress, whose objectives are freedom and engagement. Social activism and public participation brings an idea of political transformation through the openness of the policy-making system.⁷¹ On the whole, Western and Eastern scholars can be said to share the understanding on modernity as cultural and ideological development; however, the Westerns underline that the modernizing force is in the hands of individuals; whereas the driving force for development and industrialization in Asia is the state itself.⁷²

This explanation shows that modernity has a very complicated nature. The process of becoming modern should also be studied in detail for Western and Eastern approaches. Understanding the features of the modernization process helps to search for them and trace them in the official discourse on social policy and social modernization in Kazakhstan. From the point of view of the archetypical Western approach, modernization is a study of social change, happening on the national (first) and individual levels⁷³ and can be characterized as structural change, or ability to respond to emerging problems.⁷⁴ Moreover, modernization can happen independently in different spheres.⁷⁵ Modernization can be also explained through Talcott Parsons’s functional imperative.⁷⁶ This imperative demands to pass four different stages: adaptation to the environment and economy establishment; goal attainment with government being responsible for the systemic change; integration and institutional formation conducted by the juridical and cultural and religious institutions; and “latency” or preservation of the established order.⁷⁷ After passing these stages, society becomes modernized.

Analyzing the components of modernization, the traditional Western approach highlights several social processes: industrialization, economic growth, rationalization, structural differentiation, political development and bureaucratization, urbaniza-

⁷⁰ Eisenstadt, *supra* n 68, 3.

⁷¹ *Supra* n 68.

⁷² Schiek, *supra* n 69.

⁷³ Dean C. Tipps, “Modernization Theory and the Comparative Study of Societies: A Critical Perspective,” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 2, no. 15 (1973).

⁷⁴ Shmuel N. Eisenstadt, “Studies of modernization and sociological theory,” *History and Theory* 3, no. 13 (1974).

⁷⁵ Tipps, “Modernization Theory and the Comparative Study”; Eisenstadt, “Studies of Modernization and Sociological Theory.”

⁷⁶ Poberezhnikov, “Modernization theory: the main stages.”

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*

tion, and social and political mobilization.⁷⁸ Samuel Huntington adds to this list: growing public participation, political engagement, changing norms and values, political stability, and institutionalization.⁷⁹ Society in these processes becomes more active, with individuals and citizens being involved into different political, social and economic campaigns. Zehra Arat, in turn, argues that modernization and democratization share a lot of the same features: development of media, public participation, and educational changes.⁸⁰

According to Stefan Hradil, Western visions of the modernization goals include growing freedom, rationalization of life, secularization and a linear character of progress.⁸¹ Gary N. Marks, in turn, sees the primary goal of modernization as satisfaction of the labour market needs. For him, modernization is forced by economic needs, and thus, requires changes in labour relations, trainings, development in technologies and resources.⁸² On the basis of modernization processes and goals, Kazakhstani official discourse on modernization can be compared with the Western approach to the concept.

Some critique of the Western approach to modernization theory should be taken into account. The first point is that it is difficult to define the modernization process and its levels of analysis; it is thus easy to misuse the term or to explain when modernization starts and finishes.⁸³ For instance, Dean Tipps describes modernization theory as an attempt to summarize the transformations of societies.⁸⁴ Hereby, scholars and politicians may refer to some transitions as modernization, even when they are not. The next point of critique is in the Tipp's⁸⁵ definition of modernization as a study of social change. In this regard, Nazarbayev's construct of "social modernization" can be understood as redundant.

⁷⁸ Arnold S. Feldman, and Christopher Hurn, "The Experience of Modernization," *Sociometry* 4, no. 29 (1966); Tipps, "Modernization Theory and the Comparative Study."

⁷⁹ Samuel Huntington, *Political Order in Changing Societies*. (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1973).

⁸⁰ Zehra F. Arat, "Democracy and Economic Development: Modernization Theory Revisited," *Comparative Politics* 1, no. 21 (1988).

⁸¹ Stefan Hradil, "The "objective" and the "subjective" Modernization," *Society and Economy in Central and Eastern Europe* 1, no. 17 (1995).

⁸² Gary N. Marks, "Modernization Theory and Changes Over Time in the Reproduction of Socioeconomic Inequalities in Australia," *Social Forces* 2, no. 88 (2009).

⁸³ Raymond Grew, "More on Modernization," *Journal of Social History* 2, no. 14 (1980); Tipps, "Modernization Theory and the Comparative Study."

⁸⁴ Tipps, "Modernization Theory and the Comparative Study."

⁸⁵ Ibid.

After scrutinizing the Western approach to modernization, it is only appropriate to investigate the literature on the topic from the non-Western (“Global South”⁸⁶) scholars,⁸⁷ what this thesis refers to as the “Eastern approach.” As part of the Eastern approach to modernization, there is also the East-Asian approach, covering China, Japan, South Korea, Vietnam and Southeast Asia.⁸⁸ It is a critical approach, which tends to show that there is a non-Western way of experiencing and understanding modernization. The “division” on modernization between “developed vs. underdeveloped/ developing,” “Global North vs. Global South,” “Western vs. non-Western/Eastern” is important in order to see how differences or similarities of these approaches are used in the Kazakhstani discourse on social modernization.

Based on historiographical analysis, Huaiyin Li argues that modernization leads to marketization, privatization, and globalization, with special focus shifted from rural development to urban.⁸⁹ Rongqu, in turn, underlines that modernization is not the process of copying foreign experience, as it has national features, as well; however, economic regulations must be universal in order to be competitive.⁹⁰ To achieve high levels of economic performance and development, some regimes in Asian countries may also use the discourse on “Asian values,” encompassing concepts such as order, obedience and loyalty to the state and its ruler.⁹¹

Li Yuanxing argues that the main goal of the Western approach to modernization is to understand Western society through the contradiction of “we” and the “other society,” whereas non-Western science assesses modernization process as historical transformation, and logical and idealistic model of progress.⁹² Yuanxing criticizes the Western analysis of modernization’s focus on the end result and how to get it,⁹³ while for non-Western science the main emphasis is on the process of transition, the struggle between norms and values, traditions and universality, with

⁸⁶ M.D. Litonjua, “Third World/Global South: From Modernization to dependency/liberation, to postdevelopment,” *Journal of Third World Studies* 29 (1): 25-56.

⁸⁷ Jiafeng, “Some Reflections on Modernization Theory”; Peng, “Modernization Theory: From Historical Misunderstanding”; Yuanxing, “Revival of Tradition or Modernization?”; Rongqu, “New Perspectives.”

⁸⁸ Rongqu, “New Perspectives.”

⁸⁹ Huaiyin Li, “From revolution to modernization: the paradigmatic transition in Chinese historiography in the reform era,” *History and Theory* 49, no. 3 (2010).

⁹⁰ Rongqu, “New Perspectives.”

⁹¹ Kanishka Jayasuriya, “Asian Values as Reactionary Modernization,” *News from the Nordic Asia Institute*, (1997).

⁹² Yuanxing, “Revival of Tradition or Modernization?”

⁹³ Ibid.

proponents of the Eastern approach holding that the Western paradigms may not necessarily work in developing countries or the Global South. For Litonjua, for example, the “first challenge to modernization models came from within the Third World/Global South in the form of dependency theory.”⁹⁴ This and other contradictions between traditional and universal models of values coexistence is not reflected in Western literature, but is described in other sources.

Modernization theory explores the historical process of the changes in societies. Critiques of the Western model claim that Western science uses the term “modernization” and studies this process in the simplest way – as the way of using several tools to achieve the level of Western (often American) pattern, but that such an approach ignores the inevitable process of evolution of the humankind.⁹⁵ Peng stresses that Western scholars fail to understand modernization tendencies in non-Western countries.⁹⁶

In the 1960s some non-Western countries perceived modernization as “Westernization,” because most of the ideas came from the West, and were based on Western, and mainly European, social and economic development.⁹⁷ As a critique, Yuanxing argues that modernization should reflect the country’s features, be they Western or Eastern, without copying the Western model.⁹⁸ Rongqu names Japan the first country where modernization was designed and implemented in the end of 19th and beginning of 20th centuries, before it became popular in Western science.⁹⁹ Several scholars¹⁰⁰ use examples of China, Japan, Singapore, Hong-Kong and the Republic of Korea in order to show that there is a possibility to modernize a country without using the Western model. Rongqu, for example, argues that modernization can be based on cultural norms and the spiritual component of the Chinese civilization.¹⁰¹ Peng adds that the Chinese modernization model presents a viable model, guaranteeing a stable structure.¹⁰² The feature of China is that it has passed industrial and cultural revolutions and achieved economic progress. Moreover, for Peng, Chinese society

⁹⁴ M.D. Litonjua, “Third World/Global South ...,” supra n. 91, 25.

⁹⁵ Jiafeng, “Some Reflections on Modernization Theory,” 73.

⁹⁶ Peng, “Modernization Theory: From Historical Misunderstanding.”

⁹⁷ Ibid.

⁹⁸ Yuanxing, “Revival of Tradition or Modernization?.”

⁹⁹ Rongqu, “New Perspectives.”

¹⁰⁰ Peng, “Modernization Theory: From Historical Misunderstanding”; Rongqu, “New Perspectives”; Jiafeng, “Some Reflections on Modernization Theory.”

¹⁰¹ Rongqu, supra n 100.

remains traditional, but culture is not an obstacle for development.¹⁰³

There is some critique of Eastern scholars by Li,¹⁰⁴ which is important for understanding “Eastern” and “Western” approaches to modernization. Li argues that Eastern, mostly Chinese, scholars tend to borrow “Western” ideas on modernization in their analysis of development in Eastern countries. Li also points that there is a lack of rethinking and critical assessment of theories in use. Moreover, prominent scholars like Rongqu are just inspired by Western ideas and do not present a new approach.¹⁰⁵

To sum up, Western and Eastern dimensions towards modernization have similar views on the process (as visible change within the society; shared views on certain components: urbanization, economic growth and stability, cultural and ideological significance for the society), but they differ in the understanding of the actors. For the Western dimension, the main actor, who forces the process of change, is the individual, whereas within the Eastern dimension this kind of emphases has no meaning. For some of the Eastern scholars modernization is more general historical process, in which the state and the government are the central forces. These findings can be used in the analysis of the official discourse on social policy and social modernization in Kazakhstan. On this basis, the mapping of modernization models (be it Western, Eastern, combination of both, or another option) is possible. Moreover, it allows tracing modernization processes in the discourse before it has been announced in the 2005 annual address.

Soviet approach to modernization

The twentieth century for the Soviet Union was marked as a period of pivotal changes, which were referred to as modernization.¹⁰⁶ After the collapse of the USSR in 1991, the post-Soviet states got the opportunity to choose their own path of development. Some scholars argue that in many regards, the newly independent states are “replica[s] of the Soviet state,” and that they have continued on a near-teleological process started earlier.¹⁰⁷ This means that an analysis of the way modernization is represented in Kazakhstani politics risks being incomplete without taking into account

¹⁰² Peng, *supra* n 96.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁴ Li, “From revolution to modernization: the paradigmatic transition in Chinese historiography in the reform era.”

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁶ Vishnevskii, “Conservative modernization in the Soviet Union.”

¹⁰⁷ Schiek, “Kazakhstan: Will conservative Modernization Succeed?”, 110.

Soviet ideas and models of modernization.

The “Soviet” understanding of modernization is based on the assumption that society should be transformed from traditional, rural, and holistic into a “contemporary, industrial or “post-industrial,” urban, and individualistic.” This idea with small corrections was attempted realized through different processes in the Soviet period: collectivization, industrialization, and various strategic plans and reforms. In general, the Soviet modernization can be analyzed as a set of “five modernizations”: economic, urban, demographic, cultural, and political.¹⁰⁸ These modernizations changed the way territory (cities and villages) looks, how and how long people live, get education and occupation, produce goods, and understand processes and events.

The focus, or as Vishnevskii puts it – “the subject as well as the object” of Soviet modernization is the village.¹⁰⁹ The village is the grassroots of an old-type agrarian way of life and the main force of possible changes. The issues of villages and rural populations are education, urbanization, technology, and medical and social care. These issues are also those of the urban population. However, the point is made by scholars,¹¹⁰ that there are various distinctions and imbalances in the social sphere in cities and villages.

There are several works about modernization in social sphere in the Soviet Union. They form the basis for analytical concepts to be used in tracing similarities and differences in the Kazakhstani and Soviet official discourse on modernization and social policy. For instance, there are articles that pay attention to the interconnections of modernization of social and economic spheres.¹¹¹ Zinam, for example, finds that in the process of modernization, the economy and planning become more sophisticated; however, the way they can be managed stay the same.¹¹² Development of the society leads to the “revolution of rising expectations,” when people tend to struggle for higher living standards of living, political and economic participation, and

¹⁰⁸ Vishnevskii, *supra* n 106, 33.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid*, 35.

¹¹⁰ Vishnevskii, “Conservative modernization in the Soviet Union”; Anthony T. Jones, “Modernization and Education in the U.S.S.R.,” *Social Forces* 57, no. 2 (1978).

¹¹¹ Oleg Zinam, “Impact of Modernization on the USSR: Convergence or divergence?” *Russian review* 32, no. 3 (1973); Georg Vobruba, “Transitional Social Policy in the Process of Transformation,” *International Journal of Sociology* 25, no. 1 (1995); Vishnevskii “Conservative Modernization in the Soviet Union.”

¹¹² Zinam, “Impact of Modernization on the USSR.”

freedoms.¹¹³ Society and economy have required more than the process of development could give them in the framework of Soviet model of modernization.

Klaus Von Beyme¹¹⁴ argues that social policy had been understood in the USSR as a Western, capitalist notion; and thus Soviet officials did not pay attention to it. He goes on to argue that social security is rather a technical and administrative concept, which can be realized through insurance, social maintenance and public assistance. The main goal of social policy can be presented as an idea to preserve working power and protect the abilities of workers.¹¹⁵ On the one hand, social policy and the amount of funds allocated for it depends on economic performance of the state, while on the other, social policy enables economic and ecological modernization.¹¹⁶ That is an argument that modernization in different spheres depends on how social policy is organized and conducted.

Despite von Beyme's critique on the way the Soviet regime perceived social policy, there are some other points to consider. As statistics show, in many cases economic, social, educational, demographic, and similar indicators improved significantly during seventy years of Soviet rule.¹¹⁷ However, as Anatolii Vishnevskii argues, in many spheres the process of modernization was incomplete.¹¹⁸ For him, Soviet ideology was an obstacle for society to become modern, post-industrial and individualistic. And by the end of the Soviet period, many spheres needed continuation of reforms and further improvement. This argument has to be considered in order to start tracing the development of the social sphere from the first days of Kazakhstan's independence in 1991.

For this thesis, it is crucial to see the components of the Soviet model of modernization as analytical concepts, which can be used in the context of the Kazakhstani discourse on modernization. For instance, the way the Soviet modernization model has seen reforms in the sphere of education can be compared with Kazakhstani discourse on education in the 1990s or even today. It is necessary to consider semantics, meaning, intertextuality, rather than just words, indicating the

¹¹³ Ibid, 258.

¹¹⁴ Klaus Von Beyme, "Soviet social policy in comparative perspective," *International political science review* 2, no. 1 (1981).

¹¹⁵ Ibid.

¹¹⁶ Vobruba, "Transitional Social Policy in the Process of Transformation."

¹¹⁷ Vishnevskii, "Conservative modernization in the Soviet Union"; Jones, "Modernization and Education in the U.S.S.R."; Beyme, "Soviet social policy in comparative perspective."

¹¹⁸ Vishnevskii, "Conservative modernization in the Soviet Union."

model of modernization (for example, when President argues that he implements Eastern or Western approach to modernization).

Kazakhstani approach to modernization

The last part of the literature review covers research on different aspects of modernization in Kazakhstan, written by Kazakhstani and international scholars. Most of the literature on modernization in Kazakhstan after independence focuses on the economic dimension.¹¹⁹ Pomfret and Anderson, for example, underline that economic modernization in Kazakhstan depends on the Soviet history, including its developed infrastructure and political legacy.¹²⁰ Pamela Blackmon adds that the success of economic transformation is the result of the country's geography, natural resources and Nazarbayev's personality and vision of modernization,¹²¹ as well as the introduced investment framework, which favors external investment.¹²² Linn and Kohli¹²³ analyze the economic side of the "Kazakhstan 2050" programme, and highlight the reforms which should be done in order to achieve the programme's goals. These reforms are focused on economic diversification, development of non-oil industries, stable economic growth, and institutional reforms. In Schiek's¹²⁴ opinion, the tendency to organize the state's processes in accordance with different long-term projects can be described as developmental state model, in which the economy mostly has been monopolized by the state through the Samryk-Kazyna fund. On the whole, Schiek calls development in Kazakhstan "conservative modernization," underlying its tendency towards industrialization and formation of a capitalist economic model. This includes political reforms, but without democratization or changes implying a move away from the authoritarian regime.¹²⁵

¹¹⁹ Akimov and Dollery, "Financial System Reform in Kazakhstan"; supra n 71; Pamela Blackmon, "Back to the USSR: why the past does matter in explaining differences in the economic reform process of Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan," *Central Asian Survey* 24, no. 4 (2005); ---, "Divergent path, divergent outcomes: linking differences in economic reform to levels of US foreign direct investment in Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan," *Central Asian Survey* 26, no. 3 (2007); Richard Pomfret, and Kathryn Anderson, "Economic development strategies in Central Asia since 1991," *Asian Studies Review* 25, no. 2 (2001); Johannes F. Linn and Harpaul Alberto Kohli, "Will Kazakhstan succeed in joining the thirty developed countries' list by 2050?" (2014).

¹²⁰ Pomfret and Anderson, "Economic development strategies."

¹²¹ Blackmon, "Back to the USSR"; ---, "Divergent path, divergent outcomes."

¹²² Akimov and Dollery, "Financial System Reform in Kazakhstan."

¹²³ Linn and Kohli, "Will Kazakhstan succeed?"

¹²⁴ Schiek, "Kazakhstan: Will Conservative Modernization Succeed?"

¹²⁵ Ibid.

There had been a dearth of literature on the connection between economy and social policy in Kazakhstan, but in recent years some analyses have appeared.¹²⁶ Nellis positively evaluates economic development of Kazakhstan after independence, along with Linn and Kohli.¹²⁷ However, Nellis¹²⁸ argues that today political and economic institutions cooperate poorly, and that the lack of cooperation has a negative impact on social management. Moreover, there is an argument that Kazakhstani authorities failed to improve living standards despite the growing oil prices.¹²⁹

Zaure Chulanova¹³⁰ highlights the significance of education and employment in the process of social modernization, emphasizing the disbalance of the labour market and educational system in Kazakhstan. Chulanova says that there is a need to raise governmental and individual responsibility towards society, and to strengthen the connection between implemented innovations and the requirements of economy.

“Social modernization” is discussed in several articles by Aktoty Aitzhanova, Shigeo Katsu, Johannes F. Linn and Vladislav Yezhov, as part of a greater report on the social modernization in Kazakhstan, wherein they argue that Kazakhstan needs to form a strong base of human resources. Moreover, they indicate the need to strengthen education and health-care spheres, and create a solid institutional basis.¹³¹ Michelle Riboud,¹³² in turn, writes that the situation in these spheres is contradictory, in that there are funds allocated for reforms, and the reforms are supposedly implemented, but the results are poor. She adds that the government should pay more attention to the social sphere and labour market. Riboud also mentions that one of the components of social development must be political support of the chosen strategy.

Leonid Gurevich¹³³ argues that any change within the educational sphere leads to societal transformation and this is why educational reform is important for

¹²⁶ Sakal, “Natural resource policies”; Zaure Chulanova, “Social modernization: New approaches to the question of Employment and Professional education”; John Nellis, “Is the improvement of economic and political institutions key to the implementation of the Strategy ‘Kazakhstan-2050’?” (2014).

¹²⁷ Nellis, “Improvement of economic institutions”; Linn and Kohli, “Will Kazakhstan succeed.”

¹²⁸ Nellis, “Improvement of economic institutions.”

¹²⁹ Sakal, “Natural resource policies.”

¹³⁰ Chulanova, “Social modernization: New approaches.”

¹³¹ Aktoty Aitzhanova et al. “Kazakhstan-2050: on the way to the modern inclusive society” (2014).

¹³² Michelle Riboud, “How should Kazakhstan develop its human resources to get into thirty most developed countries by 2050?” (2014).

¹³³ Leonid Gurevich, “On the Reform of Higher Education and Science in Kazakhstan,” *Russian Education & Society* 53, no. 9, (2011).

development and modernization. Gurevich also asserts that reforms in Kazakhstan are usually accepted by its population, “but not understood.” The reason, he claims, is the lack of understanding of how to implement foreign innovations in Kazakhstani realities, as well as to understand these reforms by those who teach and study.¹³⁴ This has a remarkable meaning for the process of social modernization. It shows the connection between discourse (presentation of reforms), reforms and their implementation, changes in the society, and relations between state and society.

Analyzing the context in which the concept of social modernization has become more debated, most studies point to the 2011 events in Zhanaozen¹³⁵ and the Government of Kazakhstan’s repressive response to them, as a great influence on the government’s rethinking of social policy.¹³⁶ Stein and Beissenova et al.¹³⁷ indicate that social conflicts, miner strikes, violent clashes, and attacks against police, and fears of terrorist attacks serve as significant incentives for the authorities to deal with social demands, and to create mechanisms for social partnership. Moreover, these events also emphasize the necessity to deal with the social sphere, including its stagnation and associated controversies.

Conclusion

To sum up this literature review chapter, the studies of modernization in Kazakhstan are focused in general on the economic component of the concept. Some works¹³⁸ cover the problem of discrepancy between the economic requirements and qualification of individuals who try to enter the labour market after graduation from professional schools and universities. However, these articles do not analyze the meaning and understanding of the (social) modernization concept, nor do they explain changes in social policy or the causes of existing problems in the social sphere. Even if there are some attempts in the literature to examine social policy and its

¹³⁴ Ibid, 64.

¹³⁵ The year 2011 saw mass social strikes of state gas and oil company’s workers in Mangistau region. The most well known strike happened in Zhanaozen on December 16, 2011. The official result of it is 15 dead, and dozens of injured, disappeared and arrested individuals.

¹³⁶ Sakal, “Natural resource policies”; A. Beissenova, Zh. Nurbekova, Z. Zhanazarova, Y. Dzyurenich, A. Turebayeva. “Labour conflicts in Kazakhstan: A Specific Character of Their Solution,” *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences* 82 (2013); Matthew Stein, “Unraveling the violence in Kazakhstan,” *Small Wars & Insurgencies* 24, no. 3 (2013); Peter Salmon, “Police Massacre has Opened a Dark Chapter for Kazakh Workers’ Movement,” *Debatte: Journal of Contemporary Central and Eastern Europe* 20, no. 1 (2012); ---, “Repression Intensifies Against Kazakh Oil Workers’ Uprising,” *Debatte: Journal of Contemporary Central and Eastern Europe* 19, 1-2 (2011).

¹³⁷ Stein, “Unraveling the violence in Kazakhstan”; Beissenova et al. “Labour conflicts in Kazakhstan.”

consistency, there is little if any analysis of the priorities, or features in the discourse on modernization. This is what the subsequent chapter seeks to do.

¹³⁸ Chulanova, “Social modernization: New approaches”; Aitzhanova et al., “Kazakhstan-2050.”

CHAPTER 4

DISCOURSE ON SOCIAL POLICY: THE MELTING POT

The term “social policy” can be explained in many ways; however, the point here is to analyze the official Kazakhstani representation of it. There are special sections on social sphere and social policy in the official speeches and addresses of the President. This allows tracing the understanding of social sphere and its components, social policy and its development by the officials, via the examining of documents from 1991 to 2015.

Annual addresses by President Nazarbayev provide perspectives on the state’s development in internal and external directions. Social policy can be understood as internal policy. The understanding of the concept of social sphere should also be clarified on the basis of the official documents. Starting from 1992, the President focuses on some issues, named as “social.” In the 16 May 1992 speech on the “Strategy of development and formation of Kazakhstan as an independent state” (Document 2), for example, Nazarbayev connects social welfare, abilities for business development; preservation of ethnic and cultural peculiarities of Kazakhstan; and increases of salaries, pensions and social benefits. These spheres are linked under the title “social policy.” This can be understood as the process of linkage establishment and creation of new vision of social policy, where economic development, ethnic relations and social benefits are taken as a basis of the social policy. The President tries to present some issues as the issues of social policy, underlying significance for population, or social direction of actions. Another example of titling something as “social” can be found in the same document: The freedom of geopolitical choice (independence from any political blocks) is named as a positive side of the Kazakhstani social sphere. These components make social sphere and social policy overly broad, even vague, concepts.

Tracing the discourse on social policy, the change is noticeable in the 10 October 1997 presidential address, where the main emphasis of the social sphere is put on health, education and welfare of the population (Document 10). These issues compose the basis of social sphere indicators in the later documents (and can be found in most of the addresses after 1997). A new component of the social sphere is added

in 2003, when the President underlines the role of Astana as a new capital and the sign of social development of the state (Document 15). The capital is displayed as the leading force of development and enrichment, giving happiness and glory to all Kazakhstanis. This type of presentation is also highlighted by Koch,¹³⁹ who explains that the image of Astana has been created as an example of success, development and realization of the President's dream, and the spectacle of welfare, which goes in line with the discourse of any developmental regime. In the addresses, the image of Astana is used to underline the dynamic of social policy as a result of successive strategy in the social sphere.

During the years of independence, the concept of the social sphere has continuously grown. In the documents after 1997, the section on social sphere has been enriched with the President's comments on the issues of rural development, water accessibility and clean environment, housing, health-care system, family and woman's role in the society, social benefits for disabled people, pensions, health insurance, education system and the ability of society to face the challenges of market economy and upcoming crises. Moreover, the President comments on the image of a future Kazakhstani society, and exhorts youth in the sections on social policy. In general, the most pressing or urgent issues are presented and discussed in the sections on social policy.

The experts' (#3, #4) opinion in regards to the state's position towards social policy in the 1990s is that this field has been filled by many ideas; however, the state¹⁴⁰ has tried to create its distance and to stay away from spending. The first years of 2000 is marked as a period when the state earned "oil-money" (Expert #2, #3, #7) and invested in different "socially-oriented" programmes. The years after the 2008-2009 financial crisis are explained as a period with tendency to decrease state's participation in social policy (Expert #3). Expert #7 adds that after 2007, officials paid less and less attention to any "social" programmes or investments. Experts connect the state's participation in the social sphere with economic capabilities and income from natural resource's rent.

¹³⁹ Natalie Koch, "The City and the Steppe: Territory, Technologies of Government, and Kazakhstan's New Capital" (PhD dissertation, University of Colorado, Boulder, 2012), 161-162.

¹⁴⁰ The term "state" is used in this thesis as a simplification to refer to the ruling regime. It is done in accordance with the presidential official discourse.

Based on the official documents and various speeches of the President, several categories compose the fundamental aspects of social policy: rural/urban development, housing, the issues of health and insurance, social protection and pension system, and education. These issues are discussed further in this chapter. They are grouped as follows: urbanization and housing; health care, demography and social protection; and education.

Discourse on urbanization

Urbanization is one of the components of the modernization process.¹⁴¹ In the Kazak Government's official discourse, as exemplified by President Nazarbayev's speeches, urbanization is presented as a two-faced problem: development of rural, *auyl* (village) areas and housing. The problems of cities are not discussed as a separate matter, but are covered sporadically in the discussion of other issues, like the quantity of schools in cities. From the first documents, issues of rural areas are named as fundamental. Development of these areas were prioritized by the President in 1992 (Document 2). In general, rural modernization or rural development in Kazakhstan is characterized as the process when "primitive, subsistence economies [transform] to technology-intensive, industrialized economies..."¹⁴² This description follows the logic of one of the tendencies in the official discourse on villages: from weak post-Soviet village to modern, economically effective agro-industrial complexes. In this regard, Kazakhstani discourse follows the Eastern approach, which is attempting to describe modernization as a process aimed at the transformation of rural areas.¹⁴³

Development of the discourse on rural areas has two stages: contraposition of Soviet policy to independent Kazakhstani policy; and the village as a part of market economy, or modern economic module. The first stage can be traced in the documents from 1991 to 2002. During this period, the President demonizes Soviet policy towards rural areas. It is done via the following rhetoric: "propaganda hype" ("*propagandistskaya shumikha*"), "cynical robbery of rural workers," "during the years of Soviet regime, vodka deeply penetrated into everyday life, customs and traditions; it [thus] became an integral part of the rural life," "many negative features ... are the legacy of the Soviet times" (Document 3, Document 14).

¹⁴¹ Tipps, "Modernization Theory and the Comparative Study."

¹⁴² Ibid, 204.

¹⁴³ Yuanxing, "Revival of Tradition or Modernization?"; Jiafeng. "Some Reflections on Modernization Theory."

On the other hand, as opposed to the supposed negative Soviet effects of social policy on rural areas, there is the Kazakhstani discourse on social policy on rural development, which claims to allow for “dreaming about future harvest,” “hopefully speaking about it,” “maintaining harvesting of the record yield on one’s own,” and “getting yield – the most valuable wealth of Kazakhstan, through the selfless labour providing for our stability, independence and sovereignty” (Document 2, Document 3). In general, such discourse creates an image of the limited Soviet urbanization project (instrumental, rather than functional),¹⁴⁴ while contrapositioning it to the image of the independent Kazakhstani policy as conditions-maintaining, and allowing for increased welfare of the population.

During the second stage of discourse, 2002-2014, the President focuses on the penetration of villages into new economic conditions, into the market and global economic processes and draws a way for the village to become an agro-industrial complex. After the dissolution of the USSR and ceasing financial support of villages, the gap between rural and urban Kazakhs widened.¹⁴⁵ By 2002, Nazarbayev starts a new policy discourse towards rural areas by proposing to change the way business is organized in outlying regions. The main instrument for this is not the state’s support, but micro-credits and other types of investment (for instance, from the Asian Development Bank or the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development) (Document 14). As Expert #1 notices, Kazakhstan opened many spheres of national economy for international investment in 1990s, what made it easier to find funds to allocate in and to conduct economic transformation.

Analyzing the economic and social policy in villages and *auyls*, it is worth to look at the image of rural population. First of all, the President highlights the role of traditions, customs and everyday life peculiarities for cultural development of Kazakhstanis:

“Rural folk are a genetic embodiment of any nation. Indeed, the rural population seeks stability and wise evolutionary development. The rural population, more than others, comprehend all ideals of independence and strong statehood, because its gene-informational level preserves and recalls hopes and dreams of our ancestors.” (Document 14)

¹⁴⁴ Vishnevskii, “Conservative modernization in the Soviet Union.”

¹⁴⁵ Cengiz Surucu, “Modernity, nationalism, resistance: identity politics in post-Soviet Kazakhstan,” *Central Asian Survey* 21, no. 4 (2002).

As it is seen from this statement, President Nazarbayev underlines that the way of life and some problems which people face in rural areas are natural and have their benefits. These conditions allow for the preservation of traditions and hopes. Moreover, as the President notices, 43% of population lives in rural areas, where one of the main issues is cheap labour force and unemployment (Document 14). These are the reasons for rural population to migrate, create migration disbalance, and cause marginalization processes in cities.¹⁴⁶ Expert #7, describing the main priorities of the social policy, concurs that these are the issues of unemployment (especially among youth) and housing, which are discussed extensively in the majority of the official documents. Also the expert adds that the average Kazakhstanis are marginal and apolitical, what makes them mostly interested in basic employment.

Describing the mechanisms of problem resolution in rural areas, the President follows the main discursive trend: The state creates conditions for citizens' self-realization (*samozanyatost'*) and organizes the process of people's relocation. The main idea is to support prospective territories (where market and business can flourish), and to remove citizens from depressive territories; moreover, to construct boarding-schools in villages to serve rural children, the same with medical centers. As Expert #4 commented on this policy: Western type of modern system leads to interference of the state into some areas of private life, for instance, into the process of child rearing. In the expert's opinion, this interference will be continued by the state, and will face some opposition from the population. The last trend in the official programme is to reorganize rural areas and to achieve the level of agro-industrial complexes. Rural business is presented as the main force of the state's economic development. The same role were given to housing construction in the 2003 Address.

Official discourse on housing began in 1992, when on the contraposition with Soviet policy of free apartments for citizens, Nazarbayev based an idea that as from this moment, housing is becoming the responsibility of citizens—and not the state. Discourse on housing presents quite a stable line during the years of independence: If a citizen wants to own property, he or she can buy it with cash or credit, or mortgage. Housing construction is very positive process in the discourse: Firstly, it is creation of houses for young families and for those, who can earn money, workers; secondly, it leads to an economic boom through raising the employment level and by its role as an

¹⁴⁶ Ibid.

“economic locomotive” (Documents 4, 8, 14-16). However, discussing the state’s programme on mortgage, Expert #4 underlines that there is no possibility for “simple workers” to own a new home, as “only expensive cars are parked at the doors of mortgage blocks.”

In general, official discourse on housing construction and on the solution to rural problems follows the main idea that the state creates conditions for economic self-realization, and individuals enjoy this freedom to earn money and to solve their daily problems. This can be described as a form of Western democratic capitalistic pattern of endowing individuals with the freedom or autonomy to move towards further development.

Discourse on education

Education occupies a big portion of the Kazakhstani official discourse on social policy. Education with its spread has a crucial role in the process of modernization, and especially in the transformation of society, as the Western approach to modernization argues.¹⁴⁷ The main roles of education in the process of development are: diffusion of knowledge, widening of worldview, and occupational shift. During the twenty 24-year period since independence, the image of the Kazakhstan’s education system, its role and influence over society have passed several changes. This transition can be characterized as follows: Education is the first basic feature of Kazakhstani society and the only positive legacy from the Soviet system; education favors state’s efforts to raise employment, and education is the way to competitiveness and welfare.

After independence, Kazakhstan inherited some positive and negative elements of the Soviet educational system. As President Nazarbayev underlines, the only positive legacy is the educational basis and qualified specialists, and the spread of “scientific ideas and innovations” (Document 2). Discursively, high levels of education can be understood as presupposition – and Nazarbayev does not challenge the level or quality of Soviet education, but asks to protect and use it. The President uses this idea to stop people from leaving universities or schools, where there are little funds to pay for salaries and scholarships; he also invites private businesses to invest in education (Document 3).

¹⁴⁷ Frensdreis and Tatalovich, “Secularization, Modernization, or Population Change”; Huntington, *Political Order in Changing Societies*; Eisenstadt, “Studies of Modernization.”

In the middle of the 1990s, the President promoted the idea that the high level of education, which is inherited from the past, should be used for development and a better future (Document 7). The activities of the scientific and educational institutions, he argued, should be oriented towards state economy; however, all that without reliance on the state's material support. The economic crisis of the 1990s did not allow the state to allocate sufficient resources for education.¹⁴⁸ Moreover, the President argues that the State Academy of Science did not participate in the discussions of the reformation model. He states that academicians are nostalgic, they “lack thematical flexibility,” are narrow-minded, or old-minded, idealize the past, and do not comprehend market ideology and values. Creation of this negative image of science allows the President to argue that the state should distance itself from the education sphere and science should be self-sufficient, private and commercialized.

In the beginning of 2000s (Documents 12-14), the President argues that education serves the need of the economy through the promotion of skills and ideas needed for industrialization. This discourse follows the Western approach: Industrialization, as a part of modernization, demands higher levels of literacy in order to contribute to economic development of the state.¹⁴⁹ The President then widens the discourse on education: He connects the economy's and the worker's competitiveness with the standards of Kazakhstani education. For him, “total literacy” is not enough for citizens; they should be ready to study throughout their lives in order to be competitive. Moreover, professional establishment is dependent on schooling and further professional education. The features of this discourse are the following: Officials discuss standards of education and international acknowledgment of diplomas, but fall short of talking about the quality of education. This finding supports Gurevich's¹⁵⁰ argument on the authorities' aspiration for international recognition of Kazakhstani diplomas, despite the fact that the educational system lacks the quality and assimilation of the implemented Western experience. Discussing education in regards to modernization, authors have recommended that countries of the post-Soviet space need to move from “formal expansion of the accessibility of higher education to differentiation of the levels of education and improvement of ...

¹⁴⁸ Asad Alam and Arup Banerji, “Uzbekistan and Kazakhstan: A Tale of Two Transition Paths?” *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 2472* (2000).

¹⁴⁹ Frenreis and Tatalovich, “Secularization, Modernization, or Population Change.”

¹⁵⁰ Gurevich, “On the Reform of Higher Education.”

quality.”¹⁵¹

Modernization changes the way of life of average people, it influences shifts in education, culture and world vision. However, today modernization is more difficult than reading ability for women, as it is often the computerization of schools, or access to internet in rural areas. This approach is presented by the President through his programme on “wise economy [and] the way of the successful states” (Document 19). “Wise economy” is another connection between education and the economy. This concept presupposes that the state develops another concept, that of “human capital.” In Kazakhstan, as it is presented in the presidential discourse, human capital is formed through technology-based education, extensive lessons of English language, math, computer science, and other technical subjects.¹⁵²

Discourse on health care, social protection and demography

The official discourse on health care, social protection, pension system and insurance can be characterized as a discourse of responsibility transfer: from the state to the individual. There is a basic assumption that the Soviet Union developed a social insurance system, free education, free medicine, and available culture and leisure (Document 2), but that in the conditions of economic reformation and integration into the world market, the state should provide only a minimum package of free social services (Document 3). For instance, the official discourse on pensions is concentrated around two dimensions: The state pays pensions and tries to increase them due to economic possibilities, and new generations should think about their pensions and enter into state-individual partnerships in order to take responsibility of self-financing for future.

In the discourse on health-care and health insurance, several trends can be highlighted. The first is an attempt to promote the image of healthy life-style in the 1990s. (“Snow-tiger must be wiry and springy, without obesity and lazyness” or “we have to diversify the way of life: from pernicious habits to sports” (Document 10), or the puzzling use of economic term “diversify” in regards to person’s life). Moreover, Nazarbayev proposes some controversial ideas in healthcare: “[T]o tax those who do

¹⁵¹ Tat’iana Maleva and Liliia Ovcharova, “Recommendations for Long-Term and Short-Term Social Policy Measures,” *Russian Social Science Review* 54, no. 4 (2013), 35.

¹⁵² Michelle Riboud (Riboud, “How should Kazakhstan develop its human resources”) points that human capital can be developed through the maintenance and guarantees of four elements: education, health care, employment and social protection.

not want to have children [and] to delegate this money to families with many children” or “to develop public discussion on the prohibition of abortion, where I [the President] will support the majority”(Document 10). As Expert #3 argues, in the 1990s, the state did not have money to support the social system and tried to leave this sphere. One of the attempts to realize this, was to transform Soviet, state-centered medical system to private insurance system. However, in 2003, during what Expert #3 calls “oily years of easy money” from 2000-2010, the President criticizes “Western type” of private medical system as “too commercialized,” and proposes state-individual partnership (Document 15). This model follows the discursive tendency to establish relations between state and people. During the years of crisis (2008-2009), the President adds that business must participate in the health-care system partnership.

Expert #4, answering the question of the most actual issues in social policy, underlines that there is no family politics in Kazakhstan. In her opinion, officials substitute demography for family politics discursively, and the President refers to the problems of women’s role in the society. There are several approaches to discuss this: the family institute and woman; woman and upbringing of the younger generation; and women’s role in the economy. Basically, the Western approach to modernization emphasizes that modernization process should lead to a decrease in gender inequalities and a more gender-balanced society.¹⁵³ In the Kazakhstani discourse, the promotion of gender equality and stability is one of the most widespread.

Speaking about family issues and demography, the President tends to highlight the problem as if it is the problem of women: the “ways to help families, women during the pregnancy and up-bringing time,” “we have to discuss the ways to preserve the family institute and to solve the problem of single-mothers,” “we have to strengthen responsibility of spouses,” “we provide pregnant women with free medication,” “state takes care of single-mothers” (Documents 15 and 17). As a result, the woman is represented as the center of the state’s family politics.

Women give birth and participate in the upbringing of children. Nazarbayev uses the same discursive logic in this area, as in most social policy: Parents take care of children, and then, children take responsibility of their parents (‘responsibility approach’). Also the President notes that if a woman is respected in the family, where she rears children, the state will prosper in the future (Document 15). This statement

¹⁵³ Marks, “Modernization Theory and changes.”

shows that the older generation should ask for help from their children, and not from the state. When President says that the woman is the center of the family, and thus of the state, he contributes to the image of woman as a reproductive organism. This image is supported by several phrases: “The image of our country in the future depends on you,” “We have to pay attention to upbringing of our daughters. Indeed, they are the future wives, mothers, and keepers of family” (Document 26). At the same time, there is another image of women, as a part of state and economy: “The Kazakhstani woman should have a career,” “We have to involve women into state management,” “We need to support women in business,” “We will create conditions for women in business,” “We need to increase the quantity of women in the state structure,” “The state should support creation of a bank, which will provide women with credit” (Document 11)—as if other banks give credits exclusively to men. This kind of gendered discourse divides the Kazakhstani population into men (who are not really visible) and women, who are weak and in need of state’s support.

Conclusion

The concept of social policy in Kazakhstani official discourse has passed a long way of transformation. The result is a composition of issues like education, health care, family and demography policy, social protection, and pension system as the core of social policy. The discourses on these spheres have some features and linkages to position them in the social policy and social modernization discourse. Several tendencies should be underlined here. For instance, the main approach to the discourse on urbanization is the problem of rural development and housing building. And education and educational system are presented in the discourse through the presupposition that there is a high level of education as a legacy of the Soviet Union. The main tendency throughout the years of independence is to connect education and employment and to promote the idea of competitiveness based on educational level. The discourse on social protection and pension system is a discourse of responsibility shift. Officials try to promote here state-society partnership with increasing responsibilities of citizens and employers. The last feature of the official discourse is the tendency to highlight the problems of family as the problems of women and their role in society. In general, the approach to the discourse on social modernization in the spheres discussed above is a combination of Western and Eastern ideas, and contraposition of Soviet-Kazakhstani policy in the social sphere.

CHAPTER 5

DISCOURSE ON ECONOMY AND SOCIETY

The Soviet Union had a command economy, and after the breakup, the topic of economic restructuring and modernization became one of the most significant parts of the official discourse in the post-Soviet space, including in Kazakhstan. “The economy is the main sphere of public life,” said President Nazarbayev in a his Independence Day speech in December 1992 (Document 3). As the analysis shows, in the early 1990s, the President discusses social issues and economic changes in close relation to each other. Economic development has been displayed as a way to improve the lives of all citizens. In 1992, he identified three components determining a “flourishing society”: the market, an open economy, and development of entrepreneurship. For the purposes of this thesis, the relationship between the discourse on society and these three elements can thus be analyzed.

This chapter reflects how “truth” or knowledge about the economy, the market, employment and entrepreneurship is constructed and interconnected with social policy and the social modernization discourse. In order to do so, the appropriate representations are coded in the text and analyzed in the following combination: a) “market” and “economy and society;” b) “employment/unemployment” and “labour motivation;” and c) “entrepreneurship/business.” In these regards, modernization theory is used in its emphasis on economic growth and development as the main factors of growing social welfare. Comparing the literature on modernization from Western and Eastern approaches, there is a tendency of Eastern scholars to rely on economic development as an indicator of modernization.¹⁵⁴ For them, change in the use of productive forces, standardization, growing competitiveness and the rapid development of the economy are crucial for the modernization process.

Mapping the “economy” and “market” discourse construction

Analyzing the speeches and statements of the first two decades of independence, it is puzzling to look at the representations of the economy and economic development, as

¹⁵⁴ Rongqu, “New Perspectives”; Wang Jiafeng. “Some Reflections on Modernization Theory”; Peng, “Modernization Theory: From Historical Misunderstanding”; Yuanxing, “Revival of Tradition or Modernization?”

well as the role of the market for social development. One of the first claims made by the President is that the economy should be “social,” and it should maintain conditions for the economic self-realization of citizens (Document 2). This is the starting point of constructing something known as the “economy”: It works for the benefits of society and provides individuals with their basic needs and instruments.

Zygmunt Bauman argues that modern societies all over the world are driven by market forces, wherein the individual is turned into a consumer.¹⁵⁵ President Nazarbayev also indicates that the development of Kazakhstan depends on economic reforms and acceptance of the market by the population (Documents 2-3). The image of the “market” from 1991–1995 is two-faced: It is both economic and social. Economically, the market is a way of organizing the economy, conducting reforms and following the rules. It is also propagated as a way out of crisis. Socially, the market is a way of understanding the world; it has its own ideology and values. However, there is no description of these values or ideology in the texts. According to the official discourse, the market has its value per se. For instance, in the 1992 speeches, the President characterizes it as “acceptable and fair,” with a “constructive role” for society and individuals, as “a practical approach to life.” This, probably, can be characterized as a “positive” representation of “market” in society, which does not have any alternative options. Citizens should accept the market without question. The President uses contrapositions very often when he proposes new ideas or creates new images. For instance, in regards to market positioning, he states that those, who oppose the process of market reforms, are “clinging to the old,” and show their economic incompetence; whereas supporters have strategic vision and tend to bring benefits to the country and society (Document 1). Another example is the contradiction between those, who benefit from reforms (wise, active, enthusiastic people), and those, who have lost during the crisis (lacking knowledge, understanding of reality, nostalgic towards the Soviet past) (Documents 3 and 9).

There is a significant change in the discourse from 1996. Before this time, the “market” is represented as a panacea, later, as the only instrument to construct effective economy and complete independence, but no longer as the universal cure. After the 1996 address, the word “market” as such disappears from the discourse. It merges instead with “economy” in the concept of “market economy,” and since then,

¹⁵⁵ Zygmunt Bauman, “The burning of popular fear.” *New Internationalist* 310 (1999).

the economy of Kazakhstan cannot be understood separately from the market. In 2002 this notion has been strengthened by the statement that there is a new generation of citizens for whom the market and freedoms (economic and political) are the fundamental values. This assumption goes in line with a “Western” understanding of modernization, where development brings freedoms to society.¹⁵⁶ In general, the “market” has gotten its place in the discourse during the first five to six years into independence, when it was positioned as a part of everyday life, the economy and its modernization.

Reading further speeches of President Nazarbayev, it is crucial to highlight how the economy is presented in 1998. The President draws a puzzling parallel: The economy is equated to the health of the population. In order to protect the economy, society should react as if there is an “external enemy,” against whom they should mobilize their power and delegate power to “strong and brave leaders.” This statement can be better understood in the context of the 1997 Asian financial crisis. In the 1997 Address, despite what was to become massive losses of capital due to their economies due to the financial crisis,¹⁵⁷ Nazarbayev presents the states known as the “Asian tigers” (Hong Kong, Singapore, South Korea, and Taiwan) as a good example of economic success. He makes a very explicit connection between the Asian tigers when he refers to Kazakhstan as a “snow leopard” which is strong and brave in its attempt to protect property.

Further discourse on the economy and society tends to present the economy as a sphere in which the conditions for the further development of citizens are created. The aim of society in these conditions is to realize some ideas and to establish business. With regards to business, Nazarbayev tends to use the term “business” and less “entrepreneurship” after 1997. As experts #1 and #6 explain, the priorities of economic modernization after 1997 has been a tendency of Kazakhstani officials to attract foreign investment and foreign partners and to study and implement foreign

¹⁵⁶ Huntington, *Political Order in Changing Societies*.

¹⁵⁷ Describing the four “Asian tigers,” i.e. Hong Kong, Singapore, South Korea, and Taiwan, The Economist wrote in 1998: “Never before had any economy sustained such rapid growth for so long. The four original ‘tiger’ economies ... had worked themselves up to developed-country status ... There was much talk about an ‘Asian century’ ahead, when the region's economies would leap ahead of America's and Europe's. But plunging currencies and stockmarkets ... put the economic miracle in the deep freeze, and minds are now concentrated simply on survival.” Currency values plummeted against the dollar, leading to “swollen” “foreign debt burdens.” As much as US\$600 billion, “the equivalent of two-fifths of the region's GDP” were “wiped off the [Asian] stockmarkets' value.” *The Economist*, “East Asian economies: Tigers adrift,” 5 March 1998.

experience. Probably, that is the change in discourse showing the tendency towards partnership with the international (in particular, English speaking) community.

An increase in revenues from natural resources in the beginning of 2000s influenced state spending, and also changed the way the connection between society and economy is constructed discursively.¹⁵⁸ As Expert #3 argues, there has been a flow of money, the budget has been full and the government could invest funds into social programmes and strengthen the legitimacy of the regime. In speeches made between 2003–2007, Nazarbayev presents the economy as the main guarantee of social welfare and stability: A growing economy must benefit social policy through multiplied pensions, salaries and social benefits. In this regard, social reforms and development are represented as the final goals of the state’s economic policy during the previous years. This kind of discourse can be compared with an Eastern discourse on the state’s role in the process of development. An example of this is found in Jayasuriya’s argument on Asian conservative modernization, where the state plays the major role in the process of economic transformation, industrialization and societal change. This kind of logic is supported by the discourse on the change of leaders to technocrats and active implementation of technologies.¹⁵⁹ In this regard, the characterization of Nazarbayev as a technocrat supports this argument.¹⁶⁰ Moreover, in the discourse, the possibility of the state to invest into social policy is presented as Nazarbayev’s personal achievement through constructions like: “As I repeatedly promised you in the past, now we succeed” or “I keep my word.” As Isaacs highlights, economic performance during these years has made Nazarbayev a central figure to economic success and discourse on prosperity, welfare and unity of the population.¹⁶¹

After the economic crisis of 2007-2009, which negatively affected Kazakhstani medium and small business and the economy in general,¹⁶² there is a change in the discourse on the connection between the economy and social policy. For instance, in the 2009 Address, the President notes that due to the challenging economic situation, the state takes responsibility to pay pensions and social benefits in

¹⁵⁸ Sakal, “Natural resource policies”; Blackmon, “Divergent path, divergent outcomes”; Isaacs, “‘Papa’ – Nursultan Nazarbayev.”

¹⁵⁹ Jayasuriya, “Asian Values as Reactionary Modernization.”

¹⁶⁰ Cummings, “Kazakhstan: An uneasy relationship,” 63.

¹⁶¹ Isaacs, “‘Papa’ – Nursultan Nazarbayev.”

¹⁶² Smagulov, “The content-analysis of the annual addresses.”

full form; however, there are no more discussions on further social programmes. The following year, the President highlights that economic conditions are created for the business which takes all the risks and responsibilities to induce societal development: The obligations of the state are transferred to businesses and the middle class. In this regard, the tendency to underline the principle of duty (for business and society) as a guarantee of “common ‘good’ of economic development” goes in line with the Eastern approach to modernization and state organization.¹⁶³ As Expert #3 argues, after the 2007–2009 crisis the state tends to show that all the economic goals of “Kazakhstan 2030” are fulfilled by 2012, but investment in the social sphere is limited due to the budget shortages and the use of money to support banks and corporations.

A new image of the economy’s influence over society and social policy appears in 2012. “Optimal balance between economic success and social welfare” (Document 24 and 25) is proclaimed as the key concept at the modern stage. This composition of an “optimal balance” is constructed through the explanation that there is a modernization process that changes society due to the shift of economy towards industrial-innovative form (which can be compared with the Eastern discourse on technocrats and the use of technologies mentioned above). Due to this balance composition, the social sphere should be supported in a way it can exist and function in these new economic conditions. Expert #3, describing the current trends of the socio-economic development, argues that the state tries to leave the social sphere, with financial investment in it having been reduced as a consequence of the 2007–2009 financial crisis.

In general, the economy dominates the official discursive space. This priority is explained by the President in a formula that states that economic success leads to social progress and welfare. However, this welfare is not provided directly by the state as such. Discursively, business and citizens themselves should be involved in economic processes in order to prosper. The regime favors development of the economic sphere, but does not act as a mechanism to supply all citizens with benefits. This finding contributes to Koch’s argument that the role of the Kazakhstani government is seen by the regime as a provider of growth and competitiveness, “rather than welfare and equality.”¹⁶⁴ The questions of competitiveness and welfare are discussed further below.

¹⁶³ Jayasuriya, *supra* n 159, 19.

Social policy of employment: creating motivation and responsibility

Employment is presented as an essential indicator of the state's capacity to develop and to adapt to modern economic conditions.¹⁶⁵ Moreover, the nature of employment processes and professional atmosphere are used to discuss the effectiveness of the educational system and the relationship between educational institutions, the labour market and the state.¹⁶⁶ In the discourse on employment, Nursultan Nazarbayev uses several approaches. These are connection of labour motivation with employment, employment and entrepreneurship, and employment and responsibility.

The first approach connects labor motivation and employment. In the beginning of the 1990s, the President emphasizes labour motivation. Nazarbayev links together several processes: abundance of goods, labour motivation, the quality of life, and social stability. The logic is as follows: If a person comes to a market and sees abundant goods on the shelves, she can become motivated to be employed and to earn more and to buy more in order to satisfy her/his consumption needs. The high level of consumption, for the President, leads to social satisfaction and, then, to social stability. The first part of this chain can be analyzed through the argument of Zinam on consumption in the USSR. Zinam¹⁶⁷ argues that in the process of social modernization, Soviet society realized the necessity to have more freedom and participation in economic and political life of the state. Realization of this necessity would lead to marketization, economic liberalization and widening consumption. So, Nazarbayev proposes a similar instrument: to give goods (to fight "*tovarnyy golod*": hunger for goods); and similar final result: higher standard of living, but the middle part of the chain is different. For Zinam, it is increasing political and economic participation, and for Nazarbayev it is labour motivation. The challenge of the abundance of goods concept appears in the 1996 speeches, when the President states that the economy provides shops with goods; however, it does not lead to satisfaction with consumption, increased labour motivation or higher living standards. Following this logic, some can conclude that the labour motivation cannot replace the processes of political and economic participation of the public.

¹⁶⁴ Koch, "The City and the Steppe," 153.

¹⁶⁵ Chulanova, "Social modernization: New approaches."

¹⁶⁶ Ibid.

¹⁶⁷ Zinam, "Impact of Modernization on the USSR".

Beginning in the early 2000s, the discourse on labour motivation becomes an integral part of the discourse on entrepreneurship. Motivation has been presented as something similar to power for economic progress of a person, resulting in material reward. During the first decade of 2000s, the President repeatedly states that every year the minimal and average salary is growing, and that living standards are improving. Describing this period and the image of business and a businessman, Expert #6 highlights that the market ideology has brought up a generation of people motivated by salaries and benefits, who ignores the quality of goods or services. According to the expert's opinion, the discourses on labour motivation/enrichment and on market ideology coincide. In this regard it is puzzling to look at the speech of the President 2012, where he states that people have "perverted labour motivation" from "the wild 1990s": to work less and to earn more (Document 25). This statement is worthy to look at from the prism of Huntington's vision of modernization (a Western approach). Huntington argues that prompt economic growth leads to "money-making ambitions" and destabilization because of equally growing aspirations.¹⁶⁸ From this point of view, the "perverted" aspiration for a better life can be understood as a stage of modernization.

To fight this "perverted motivation," Nazarbayev argues that there is a need "to introduce" (top-down approach) an alternative new labour motivation to fight social dependency expectations and to improve the socio-economic atmosphere. The components of this motivation are high responsibility of workers and employers, and the proper relationship of partnership between state, society and business. These elements are not directly connected to existing aspirations and labour motivation. As Eshpanov et al.¹⁶⁹ argue, younger Kazakhstanis have a pragmatic approach to life, which influences labour motivations: to have a diploma so as to get a high profiled and lucrative job, to build a career, to obtain respect and material stability.

At the same time, there are several studies focusing on responsibility, and state-society-business partnership in Kazakhstan prior to 2012.¹⁷⁰ These studies concentrate on different events, but all find a more general dissatisfaction with living

¹⁶⁸ Huntington, *Political Order in Changing Societies*, 49.

¹⁶⁹ Eshpanov, D.D., Aitbai, K.O., and Aidarbekov, Z.S. "Problems of the social development of the Young people of Kazakhstan." *Russian Education and Society* 51, no. 5 (2009): 63–80.

¹⁷⁰ Sakal, "Natural resource policies"; Beissenova et al. "Labour conflicts in Kazakhstan"; Stein, "Unraveling the violence in Kazakhstan"; Peter Salmon, "Police Massacre"; ---, "Repression Intensifies."

standards, salaries and working conditions. Moreover, studies propose that in addition to low salaries and a massively widening income-gap, the absence of communication between workers, employers and officials and dysfunctional trade unions can be understood as the reasons of conflict in the deadly Zhanaozen event in 2011. So, the change in discourse from the concept of enrichment to responsibility and partnership can be analyzed through the prism of several events, which happened before 2012.

The official discourse on employment has another approach, which can be characterized by how it focuses on hard work and responsibilities (productive labour). The focus on hard work appears in the discourse in various years. During 1992–1995, labour is characterized in terms of “selfless,” “utter,” “self-sacrificing” and “paramount necessity” in order to live “well” (Documents 2-3, and 4). In the conditions of economic crisis, widening income disparities, and deteriorating living conditions, such appeal to this kind of labour may be understandable but insubstantial. Changes in the discourse on labour can be noticed after 2007, when the main focus is work productivity or labour efficiency through the promotion of blue collar jobs. It can be understood in the context of plans to reconstruct the economy to the level of industrial-innovative form. From 2012, labour productivity is transformed into the concept of the society of universal labour, which is linked to the developed economy and a strong state. This concept includes several ideas: Productive labour is a guarantee of welfare, the state creates conditions for labour and does not help in any other ways, and business should employ disabled people in order to provide them with salaries (state social benefits are paid to a limited group of people with disabilities only) (Documents 24-26). As Peng notes, the process of modernization process must be accompanied with the change of social values.¹⁷¹ In general, the discourse on labour is devoted to promote a new ideology of hard work leading to a better future through the realization of long-term plans like Kazakhstan 2030 or Kazakhstan 2050. This can be understood as an attempt to bring in new social values.

The features of the discourse on responsibility are the following: In the 1990s, the President tends to put responsibility for employment on individuals and businesses. Nazarbayev speaks about business as a creator of new employment opportunities. He also mentions that society should rely on itself in the realization of economic opportunities. The state’s aim in this process is to create better conditions

¹⁷¹ Peng, “Modernization Theory: From Historical Misunderstanding.”

for the economic self-realization of citizens. After 2012, however, the President speaks about the state's involvement in the process of employment: "We have to provide employment through the various state and regional programmes" (Document 26). This moment in the discourse is tightened together with promotion of economic modernization, industrial and innovative economy and its demand for workers, and the employment programmes like "*Dorozhnaya karta*" ("The road map"). At this point two things are worth noting: On the one hand, the transfer of the employment initiative to the individual can be understood as representing a Western approach towards the economic process. On the other hand, the active participation of the state in the economic processes including in the creation of specific economic dynamics, can be seen as a more Eastern approach towards the modernization process.

The discourse of hope: business and entrepreneurship

Since the first days of independence, President Nazarbayev has positioned entrepreneurship or business as one of the main components of the socio-economic development of Kazakhstan. In the representations of business, the following feature is noticeable: It is positive and hopeful. In order to trace this, the description of business and its impact on society can be examined. For instance, the following representations are prevailing: Business leads to stability, it creates opportunities, and allows individuals economic self-realization. Business is represented as fighting unemployment and poverty. There is a link with the discourse on health: Business is only for healthy people (Document 10). In regards to the relations between state and business, the last should be protected by the first, regulations should be eased, the state should provide favorable conditions for business development. From the discourse on employment, it becomes easier to understand that the President puts emphasis on business as the alternative way to provide some basic conditions for the development of society.

Official discourse on entrepreneurship has a confusing moment. This is the statement of the President in the 1996 address that "the Kazakhstani Government and the Parliament should reanimate entrepreneurship" (Document 8). Here the question appears as to whether business has been alive before this moment or not. In fact, a comparative study on economic performance in Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan in the beginning of 1990s shows that there have been few opportunities to open and manage

businesses in Kazakhstan in this period.¹⁷² The discourse creates an image of the country as if it has been welcoming to new businesses; however, as data shows, new business has not been there, or it has been limited and needed support to be maintained, but not “reanimated.”

The concept of “business” has been constructed on the base of opposition to “*uravnilovka*” (“leveling”). *Uravnilovka* changes the way people see their position in the economy: They tend to wait for paternalistic actions from the state, as Nazarbayev claims (Document 10). Moreover, for him leveling decreases the motivation to participate in the economy. On the opposite, business requires active involvement and self-realization of participants. The President brought together these concepts in the beginning of the 1990s (Documents 1-2, and 6). In the documents after 1996, there is no challenging of the contraposition of business and leveling.

An notable feature of the discourse on business is its link with formation of the middle class through reasonable payments and employment. In general, the discourse on business in the 1990s underlines its role in the stimulation and stabilization of the economy, and the creation of new jobs. The discourse on the formational role of business and its possibility to enlarge employment can be found in the concept of “developmental citizenship” spread in South Korea before the economic crisis of 1997.¹⁷³ The main features are universal stable employment, sustained economic growth and reasonable living conditions. The parallel of Kazakhstani official discourse with the South Korean concept is in the connection between state and business: South Korean developmental governments have been portrayed as the creators of the conditions and regulations for business, whereas business guarantees jobs for the population.

The connection and interdependence of state and business is also one of the discursive features. In 2001, Nazarbayev underlines that business should consolidate itself in order to protect the state’s interests. Business becomes more than a way to realize person’s entrepreneurial aspirations and satisfy economic expectations. Business becomes more than a part of economic processes. The discourse follows the logic of an Eastern approach to modernization: State, business and society are

¹⁷² Alam and Banerji, “Uzbekistan and Kazakhstan: A Tale.”

¹⁷³ Chang Kyung-Sup, “The End of Developmental Citizenship? Restructuring and Social Displacement in Post-Crisis South Korea,” *Economic and Political Weekly* 42, no. 50 (2007).

perceived as one natural organism, fighting for maximal enjoyment of benefits.¹⁷⁴ After this, the concept of state-business partnership is fulfilled with the idea on increasing competitiveness of business. This competitiveness has two sides: an opportunity to compete in the international market and some shared responsibilities with the state domestically. The competitiveness has been constructed gradually, starting from 2004, when Nazarbayev describes business as “mature” and asks it to enter the international arena (Document 16). In 2006, he notes that business stands on its own two feet (Document 18). This stability of the business is seen as an indicator of the readiness to be involved into the social policy. Nazarbayev tries to impose the notion of responsibility, shifting some social functions, like re-qualification, from the government to business. This is presented like a compromise: Business takes some social responsibilities, whilst the state, in turn, supports business initiatives and improves legal conditions.

Conclusion

The notion of “entrepreneurship” or as it is called predominantly since the second part of the 1990s, (“business”), has been constructed as something opposite to leveling (which is “unfair” in President’s words), and as something leading to universal employment, higher living standards and welfare. Also, business becomes an organic part of the state (an Eastern way of understanding state existence and management) and takes on social responsibilities.

In sum, the discourses on economic development and social modernization are interlinked. Every process in the social sphere is tightened together with processes in economic sphere. Discursively, economic development of the state has been presented through the implementation of “market” component and its ideology. The main approaches to the market economy discourse and overall economic development are: Market is a way to prosperity, the main actor of it is business, which is supported by the state, but must be driven by individuals. The last peculiarity of this discourse is a tendency to present entrepreneurship or business as a solution of the employment issue. The overall picture of the discourse development on the economy and society presents a construction of new type of economy and parallel reconstruction of society and social policy towards a less investing state.

¹⁷⁴ Jayasuriya, “Asian Values as Reactionary Modernization.”

CHAPTER 6

DISCOURSE ON THE MODERNIZATION OF SOCIETY

In one of his speeches in 1992, President Nazarbayev argues that social transformation should be conducted in accordance with the traditional and psychological features of Kazakhstani society (Document 2). In regards to the role of traditions in modernization, scholars of Western and Eastern approaches have different views. Those representing the more Eastern approach propose that modernization should not restrict or abandon traditions; it must, instead, support the construction or maintenance of a spiritual base of society.¹⁷⁵ Moreover, states should “[revive] tradition for [purpose of] serving modernization.”¹⁷⁶ Western scholars, in turn, underline how societies tend to become more secular, and to get rid of some traditions and customs during social transformations.¹⁷⁷ This happens due to the tendency to rationalize everyday life. Moreover, in the process of transition, diversified ideological and institutional changes come into existence.¹⁷⁸ The tension between the possibility to preserve customs and a more traditional way of understanding the world, and to move forward is noticeable in the Kazakhstani official discourse on modernization. In this regards, this chapter is aimed at the analysis of how modernization affects the Kazakhstani society since independence, and the relations between state and society as deciphered via discourse analysis.

Establishing state-society relations

The relationship between the state and the population is one of the crucial aspects in modernization. As primarily Western scholars argue, the cultural part of modernization demands citizens to transform the concept of human agency, and not be bound to culture and traditions.¹⁷⁹ Moreover, there is a need to shape a new understanding of political participation and mobilization, as well as to fight bureaucratic connections in the institutions.¹⁸⁰ Kazakhstani official discourse on

¹⁷⁵ Jiafeng, “Some Reflections on Modernization Theory.”

¹⁷⁶ Yuanxing, “Revival of Tradition or Modernization?,” 67.

¹⁷⁷ Fren dreis and Tatalovich, “Secularization, Modernization, or Population Change.”

¹⁷⁸ Tipps, “Modernization Theory and the Comparative Study.”

¹⁷⁹ Ibid.

¹⁸⁰ Huntington, *Political Order in Changing Societies*.

modernization is that of individual autonomy and responsibility for one's own life and welfare, as well as for the stability of the entire state. On the one hand, this is a composition of Western and Eastern approaches to the role of an individual in the state: Western scholars highlight individuals as the main actors and initiators of development,¹⁸¹ whereas Eastern scholars tend to emphasize the role of organic cooperation of individuals under the state's leadership and its consolidating power.¹⁸² On the other hand, this can be an unstable structure, because individualism is a principle, which contradicts the traditional organization of Kazakh society.¹⁸³ In these regards, it is puzzling to see how state-society relations are represented in Kazakhstani discourse.

During the first years of independence, Nazarbayev focuses on the role of the state vis-à-vis public relations (Documents 2 and 4). The President displays an image of the state as an entity, which creates conditions for development and establishes the rule of law; which guarantees and describes directions for further development, but does not support the population with unnecessary financial help. The state should thus avoid raising paternalistic expectations among the population, but pay attention to social issues in order to realize the constitutional principle of social state.

The problem of social dependency and paternalism has been discussed as one of the main issues in the President's 1991–1996 speeches. In 1997, presenting the new political course, the President highlights that society has been transformed, leaving dependency in the past. However, with increasing oil revenues from early 2000s, Nazarbayev starts to discuss these issues again (Document 16). The most critical reproach of dependency is presented in the discussion on the failure of liberal values in 2012 (Document 25).

Describing the Kazakhstani population, the President uses neutral constructions, but underlines the tendency of society to depend on the government and state funding. Moreover, a society in transition can be distrustful and demanding. In this regards, the President notes that the state is not going to return to the old ways of interaction with society (Document 8). Instead, society can enter into a new form of relations with that state: partnership (Document 6). This partnership should be

¹⁸¹ Huntington, *Political Order in Changing Societies*; Tipps, "Modernization Theory."

¹⁸² Jayasuriya, "Asian Values as Reactionary Modernization"; Schiek, "Kazakhstan: Will Conservative Modernization Succeed?"

¹⁸³ Surucu, "Modernity, nationalism, resistance."

organized around several ideas: trust, patriotism, and selfless labour. This is presented as a kind of social contract, in which society participates in a dialogue with the state. The state is still presented as a “patron,” but it does not necessarily subsidize, but provided direction and advice.

The President denies any possibilities to continue the practice of paternalism. However, the rhetoric contributes to the image of the “guardian” state: “to invest money in the programmes ... which bring direct benefits to citizens,” “sacred duty of the government to support population,” “we will do all that is necessary,” “to resolve critical issues,” “to guarantee justice” (Document 11). In contrast to this image of the state, there are some bureaucrats who cross up the state’s efforts: “the problems are caused as a favour of bureaucratic muddle-heads” (“*po milosti buyrocraticheskoi bestolochi*”), “bad management in private hands,” or “unresolved question of whose duty [it] is,” and “delay robs people” (Document 11). So, these representations create an idea that the state is a reliable partner of citizens, and if there are any problems, individual bureaucrats are to blame, not the state as a whole and its leadership.

The next trend in the discourse is the reconstruction of the state’s role in social policy, noticed in the addresses from 2007 to 2014. The role of the state is constructed through the use of several verbs: to observe, to standardize and to support citizens on their way to self-sufficiency. These actions characterize the state’s involvement into social policy from a distance. This can be traced through the description of new principles of social policy, which are formed on the base of: coordination, synchronization, standardization, establishment of minimal standards, counting and rating of individual’s needs, encouragement of business to take responsibilities for re-qualification of workers and employment of disabled people, and heightening the quality of local management (Document 27).

The last feature of the discourse on agency is involvement of the *Nur Otan* Party as a responsible manager of the reforms (Documents 20-22, 25, 27). The role of the party is described as of a social lift (helps people to move from one social strata to another), protector of the socially vulnerable population, adviser on requalification and credit system for ordinary people, a mobilizing power of reforms in the society, and promoter of rising pensions and social benefits. In this term, the President follows the logic of an Eastern approach: A strong state must be formed through the coherent

work of institutions and the population.¹⁸⁴

Modernizing values and features of society

Modernization causes changes of basic “values, attitudes and expectations.”¹⁸⁵ In the official discourse of post-Soviet Kazakhstan, three main stages of the development of values are identified. The first stage is 1991–1997, a period dominated by two main discourses: The first is the construction of a free, democratic and open society. This is one of the main ideas of Western approach to modernization, that social transformation should lead individuals to freedoms, values and principles of democracy.¹⁸⁶ Partly, this can be seen as the continuation of the Soviet thaw and its discourse on openness (Gorbachev era). The second discourse is on the revival of the Kazakh nation, its traditions and culture, which is presented as the developmental “nucleus.” This discourse is surrounded by the emphasis on equal capabilities and conditions, tolerance and stability. It can be called “developmental,” as the solution to social problems is found in the cultivation of some qualities in society.

In 1995, the developmental discourse is enriched by ideas of self-reliance (as a solution of dependency), responsibility and self-realization in the sphere of business with the help of market economy. Following the Western idea of modernization, officials propose that the state create conditions for development, so that individuals will also become more autonomous, and participate in economic processes (Document 8).

The second stage starts in 1997, when the President proposes a new strategy for development: “Kazakhstan 2030.” This project has a two-faced nature: nation-building (through the propaganda of multi-ethnic and multi-faith balance) and development (to lead the Kazakhstani economy out of financial collapse).¹⁸⁷ In order to show the readiness of population for changes, the President proclaims that the Kazakhstani society has almost passed the process of mental transformation and inner changes oriented towards freedom and an individualistic vision of life (Document 10). At the same time, Nazarbayev underlines that the new Kazakhstan should be constructed on the basis of balance between individual and collective interests, which fits the consensus-hierarchical traditions of Kazakh society. Giving freedom to the

¹⁸⁴ Jayasuriya, “Asian Values as Reactionary Modernization.”

¹⁸⁵ Huntington, *Political Order in Changing Societies*, 32.

¹⁸⁶ Schiek, “Kazakhstan: Will Conservative Modernization Succeed?”

population, the President underlines that these freedoms are framed by the interests of society as a whole (an Eastern vision of state organization).

The leading idea of the 2030 strategy, which appears in the following documents, is future orientation. Long-term planning and goal-orientation are some of the features of an Eastern approach to development.¹⁸⁸ Modernity, in this case, is seen as a logical evolution, and the way to it is planning and future orientation.¹⁸⁹ This approach is discussed by Nazarbayev as “oriental wisdom and endurance,” whereas the Western approach gives Kazakhstan “elegance” and “high level of development” (Document 10). Nazarbayev highlights that Kazakhstan has good human resources (as a legacy of the Soviet system), and they must be used in order to develop the country in a “civilized way” (Document 10). He proposes to look at the experience of East Asia, which as opposed to Kazakhstan, is flourishing without rich natural resources.

The third stage of discourse on society and its mentality appears after 2004. It underlines the need to shift public attention from oil-income and income-share to increased competitiveness and ability to live under conditions of global economic competition. Income-share or government subsidies is described in negative terms, like “*izhdivencheskiye nastroyeniya*” (“dependency”), “*besplatnost*” (“free”), and “*darmovsh’ina*” at (“others’ expense”), thus something unwise, a perversion of the labour motivation, and a move backward (Document 16). Opposite to subsidies is a discussion of self-reliance, survival. The President describes a successful action-plan for citizens: physical, spiritual, and intellectual strength; hard work and respect to any labour; and independence from the state help.

The last pattern of the ideological representation of Kazakhstani society is a discourse on the nation’s consciousness. This becomes strong in 2012. To problematize the creation of Kazakhstani national values and ideas, the President uses contraposition with what is presented as an international crisis of value systems. He states that the world is in crisis, that civilizations tend to fight each other, and that multicultural ideas are dead (Document 26). As Expert #7 notices, Kazakhstan lacks a national ideology, which makes the population vulnerable to destructive ideas from abroad. The President uses similar arguments, but presents it as the formulation of

¹⁸⁷ Isaacs, “Papa” – Nursultan Nazarbayev.”

¹⁸⁸ Koh Tai Ann, “The Singapore experience: cultural development in global village,” *Southeast Asian Affairs*, (1980); Yuanxing, “Revival of Tradition or Modernization?”

¹⁸⁹ Yuanxing, “Revival of Tradition or Modernization?”

historical consciousness of the nation (Documents 26-27). In fact, Nazarbayev repeats old ideas on multi-ethnicity and multi-faith tolerance, and Kazakh ethnos and Kazakh language as developmental “nucleus.” In addition to this, Kazakhstanis must be responsible and faithful to their country, and must trust each other. In general, these qualities fulfill cultural and intellectual demands of modernity proposed by Eastern scholars.¹⁹⁰ From the Western point of view, modernity demands growing autonomy of individuals, democracy, openness and self-consciousness.¹⁹¹ However, as Schiek¹⁹² argues, the Kazakhstani way of modernization is not democratization, but an orientation towards a conservative modernization with emphasis on “prevailing patrimonialism and rentier economy” and not abandoning the spirit of authoritarianism. In this regard, the experience of Singapore’s long-term development through cultural strengthening presents itself as a more viable model to be implemented.¹⁹³ A more recent example is the 2014 Annual address, where the President proposes an idea of the “*Mangilik El*” (“Eternal Nation”) as the ideological basis for national consolidation. This programme incorporates several concepts: independence and Astana, tolerance, economic growth, hard work (Society of Universal labour), consolidation around common language and history, national security, and participation in international conflict resolution (Document 27). In general, this programme includes most of the discursive trends, with the exception of the discourse on self-reliance and responsibility of citizens, as was seen in the social policy during the years of independence.

Conclusion

The discourse on social modernization during the years of independence proposes several ideas on how state-society relations should look like and what must be the main characteristics for society to live under a new, modern Kazakhstan. Firstly, there is a tendency to reconstruct the state’s role from a “giving and deciding” patron to a partner; at the same time, the state’s role in the system is presented as strong and the “establisher” of conditions. Secondly, in the process of modernization, the President moves from Western, liberal values towards more Eastern understanding of state-society relations. In this regard, close ties between the state and its institutions, and

¹⁹⁰ Yi and Fan, “Dimensions of Modernity and Their Contemporary Fate.”

¹⁹¹ Schiek, *supra* n 71; Eisenstadt, *supra* n 70.

¹⁹² *Supra* n 71, 117.

business and society are presented as vital for stability and prosperity. The last point is the proposition of the societal model. This model consolidates the discourses on other issues, like education, employment, health, and economic development.

¹⁹³ Tai Ann, “The Singapore experience: cultural development in global village.”

SUMMARY FINDINGS AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

The official discourse on social policy and social modernization in Kazakhstan has developed over time, and at each stage different issues and features have been of importance. The role of the official discourse in the way policy is formed is crucial. However, while economic modernization has been analyzed by some scholars, the process of development in the social sphere has received little attention from scholars inside and outside of Kazakhstan. Moreover, there is no analysis of the main priorities of the social policy, which means there is no understanding of *what* is presented as crucial and valuable and *how* it is presented in the official documents. This thesis was an attempt to analyze and understand the process of social modernization in Kazakhstan, with the help of discourse analysis and the aim of answering the research question: “How has the Kazakhstani discourse on social policy been formulated and developed since 1991?”

The discourse on social policy can be looked at through the prism of modernization, or “social modernization,” as President Nazarbayev calls it. The findings of this thesis indicate that there are several approaches to social modernization in Kazakhstan. First of all, it can be seen as a combination of Eastern and Western ideas on how the process of social change should be organized, a hybrid of Eastern and Western approaches, if you will, or even as a “Eurasian” model of modernization. Discursively, Kazakhstan presents a strong state discourse (a more Eastern approach) of creating conditions for citizens to be autonomous in the social sphere (a largely Western approach). This finding contributes to the argument of several scholars (Cummings, Koch, Ambrosio and Lange, and Golam¹⁹⁴) on President Nazarbayev’s “Eurasian” approach to foreign policy and identity.

Secondly, the influence of the Soviet Union and its discourse on social policy is noticeable in the Kazakhstani official discourse. In general, the discourse of the first decade of independence is constructed on the contraposition of the former Soviet system and the new Kazakhstani system, where a market economy forms the new basis for development. Here the following detail can be revealed: The documents

¹⁹⁴ Koch, “The “heart” of Eurasia?”; Ambrosio and Lange, “Mapping Kazakhstan’s geopolitical code”; Cummings, “Eurasian bridge”; Golam, “The concept of “Eurasia.”

corresponding to 1991-1997 years have a more general, declarative character, while those after 1997 are more specific and overloaded with economic terminology.

Another finding is that the discourse on social modernization is connected with economic modernization (rather than with political modernization), where Eastern references to modernization dominate. For instance, the “Kazakhstan 2030” programme, starting in 1997, refers specifically to the examples of some Asian countries in the process of modernization. This finding supports Sebastian Schiek’s¹⁹⁵ argument that a conservative modernization model (with the main foci of industrialization and economic development) seems to have migrated to Kazakhstan from Asian countries, potentially from states like South Korea or Singapore.

The analysis shows that in addition to the interconnection between social and economic policy discourses, there is a tendency to position the market in relation to the state. Official discourse in the early independence period created an image of the salutary “market,” with its values and ideology and how it can bring welfare to the nation. Another tendency has been to show that the state creates general conditions for development and establishes the rules, whereas the market and market economy (whose role is shared with business) creates jobs and opportunities for economic self-realization of citizens. The official discourse represents education, health-care, social protection and pension system in a likely response to the needs of the market economy and business community.

One of the most noticeable features of the discourse on social modernization is a tendency to propose how individuals should act and what they should or should not expect from the state. Citizens should become more active and self-reliant in order to be employed, accommodated, educated, and socially protected. Moreover, the Kazakhstani society should become highly competitive and self-sufficient to serve the needs and requirements of a rapidly growing economy. The discourse on state-society relations shows the tendency to present dependency (*izhdivenchestvo*) and paternalism as negative Soviet legacies, which must be changed in a way so that society relies less and less on state’s support. The President proposes to construct state-business-society partnership, because individualism contradicts traditional Kazakh societal culture.

One of the findings of this thesis contributes to Isaacs’ argument¹⁹⁶ on the President’s role in the discourse on Kazakhstan’s development. The President is a

¹⁹⁵ Schiek, “Kazakhstan: Will Conservative Modernization Succeed?”

central figure not only in the discourse on identity and nation-building, but also on social modernization and development. The President is able to form the understanding of social policy and its main issues and priorities. For instance, he positions Astana as a visible result of development and an embodiment of social stability and welfare. This argument contributes to Natalie Koch's¹⁹⁷ work on the role of Astana in Kazakhstani geopolitical discourse.

On the basis of in-depth interviews with experts (political scientists, social scientists and economists), the following findings can be presented: The Kazakhstani state has tried to leave the social sphere in the 1990s and in particular after the economic crisis in 2008. In the beginning of the 2000s, the state had a stable income from natural resources (largely gas and oil) and started several social campaigns, many of which served the aim of growing competitiveness. In the interviews, some of the experts repeated the official discourse on social policy issues (especially in regards to economic modernization), which advances Natalie Koch's¹⁹⁸ argument on the closed context of Kazakhstan.

Overall, this research is hoped to be a contribution to the existing literature on Kazakhstan, especially in the field of social policy. It hints at the main trends of the development process with its problems and opportunities. Moreover, it reveals the interconnections in the social sphere, which have been constructed during the last 24 years. This thesis has also had its limitations and does not pretend to uncover irrefutable arguments. It was an attempt to underline the role of discourse in the process of policy formation in a developing state. The author encourages further research in the field of social policy and social modernization on Kazakhstan. One of the suggestions for further research is to study different groups of society in relation to discourse perception and the state's practical measures, such as discourses and policies on youth or self-employed people in the country. Another suggestion is to conduct a comparative study of social policy and modernization in Kazakhstan and Russia (or other post-Soviet states with natural resource revenues, such as Azerbaijan). These countries share the Soviet experience and legacy, and are also in the process of transformation. It would be thought-provoking to see the ways states with similar pasts manage their different social transformations and modernization processes.

¹⁹⁶ Isaacs, "Papa" – Nursultan Nazarbayev."

¹⁹⁷ Koch, "The "heart" of Eurasia?"; Natalie Koch, "The City and the Steppe."

¹⁹⁸ Koch, "Technologising the opinion"; ---, "Introduction – Field methods in "closed contexts."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aitzhanova A. et al. "Kazakhstan-2050: on the way to the modern inclusive society" (2014).
- Akimov, Alexandr and Brian Dollery. "Financial System Reform in Kazakhstan from 1993 to 2006 and Its Socioeconomic Effects." *Emerging Markets Finance and Trade*, 44, no. 3 (2008): 81–97.
- Alam, Asad and Arup Banerji. "Uzbekistan and Kazakhstan: A Tale of Two Transition Paths?" *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper*, 2472 (2000).
- Ambrosio, Thomas and William A. Lange. "Mapping Kazakhstan's geopolitical code: an analysis of Nazabayev's presidential addresses, 1997-2014." *Eurasian Geography and Economics* 55, no. 5 (2015): 1-23.
- Arat, Zehra F. "Democracy and Economic Development: Modernization Theory Revisited." *Comparative Politics* 1, no. 21 (1988): 21–36.
- Arystanbekov, K. "Quality of Kazakhstan's Economic Policy and Balance of Payments." *Problems of Economic Transition* 51, no. 10 (2009): 63–77.
- Ayazbekov, Anuar "Independent Kazakhstan and the "black box" of decision-making: understanding Kazakhstan's foreign policy in the early independence period (1991-4)." PhD dissertation, University of St. Andrews, St. Andrews, 2014.
- Bauer, Martin W. and George Gaskell. *Qualitative Researching with Text, Image and Sound: A Practical Handbook*. London: Sage Publications, 2000.
- Berg, Bruce L. *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences*. 6th ed. Boston: Pearson International Edition, 2007.
- Bauman, Zygmunt. "The burning of popular fear." *New Internationalist* 310 (1999): 6–11.
- Beissenova Alina et al. "Labour conflicts in Kazakhstan: A specific character of their Solution." *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences* 82 (2013): 877–881.
- Blackmon, Pamela. "Back to the USSR: why the past does matter in explaining differences in the economic reform process of Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan." *Central Asian Survey* 24, no. 4 (2005): 391–404.
- Blackmon, Pamela. "Divergent path, divergent outcomes: linking differences in economic reform to levels of US foreign direct investment in Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan." *Central Asian Survey* 26, no. 3 (2007): 355–372.
- Bryman, Alan. *Social Research Methods*. 4th ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.

- Bunce, Valerie, Michael McFaul, Kathryn Stoner-Weiss, eds. *Democracy and Authoritarianism in the Postcommunist World*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Burr, Vivien. *An Introduction to Social Constructionism*. London: Routledge, 1995.
- Chulanova, Zaire. "Social modernization: New approaches to the question of Employment and Professional education"
<<http://minplan.gov.kz/economyabout/9044/46224/>> (accessed 3 October 2014).
- Cummings, Sally N. "Kazakhstan: An uneasy relationship – power and authority in the Nazarbayev regime." in *Power and Change in Central Asia*, ed. Sally N. Cummings. New York: Routledge, 2002: 57–73.
- Cummings, Sally N. "Eurasian bridge or murky waters between east and west? Ideas, identity and output in Kazakhstan's foreign policy." *Journal of Communist Studies and Transition Politics* 19, no. 3 (2003): 139–155.
- Cummings, Sally N. "Legitimation and Identification." *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics* 12, no. 2 (2006): 177–204.
- Cummings, Sally N. *Understanding Central Asia: Politics and Contested Transformations*. New York: Routledge, 2012.
- Dirlik, Arif. "Modernity as History: Post-Revolutionary China, Globalization and the Question of Modernity." *Social History* 27, no. 1 (2002): 16–39.
- Dunn, Kevin C, and Iver B. Neumann. *Undertaking Discourse Analysis for Social Research*. Upcoming publication, 2015.
- Eisenstadt, Shmuel N. "Studies of Modernization and Sociological Theory." *History and Theory* 3, no. 13 (1974): 225–252.
- Eisenstadt, Shmuel N. "Multiple Modernities." *Daedalus*, 129, no. 1 (2000): 1–29.
- Eshpanov, D.D., Aitbai, K.O., and Aidarbekov, Z.S. "Problems of the social development of the Young people of Kazakhstan." *Russian Education and Society* 51, no. 5 (2009): 63–80.
- Feldman, Arnold S. and Christopher Hurn. "The Experience of Modernization." *Sociometry* 4, no. 29 (1966): 378–395.
- Frendreis, John and Raymond Tatalovich. "Secularization, Modernization, or Population Change: Explaining the Decline of prohibition in the United States." *Social Science Quarterly* 2, no. 94 (2012): 379–94.
- Golam, Mostafa. "The concept of "Eurasia": Kazakhstan's Eurasian policy and its implications." *Journal of Eurasian Studies*, 4 (2013): 160–170.
- Government of Kazakhstan. "The Constitution of the Republic of Kazakhstan." 2011.

- Grew, Raymond. "More on Modernization." *Journal of Social History* 2, no. 14 (1980): 179–187.
- Gurevich, Leonid Ia. "On the Reform of Higher Education and Science in Kazakhstan." *Russian Education & Society* 53, no. 9, (2011): 63–70.
- Hardy, Cynthia, Bill Harley, and Nelson Phillips. "Discourse analysis and Content Analysis: Two Solutions?" *Qualitative Methods*, (2004): 19–22.
- Hradil, Stefan. "The "objective" and the "subjective" Modernization." *Society and Economy in Central and Eastern Europe* 1, no. 17 (1995): 135–137.
- Huntington, Samuel. *Political Order in Changing Societies*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1973.
- Isaacs, Rico. " 'Papa – Nursultan Nazarbayev and the discourse of charismatic leadership and nation-building in post-Soviet Kazakhstan.'" *Studies in Ethnicity and Nationalism* 10, no. 3 (2010): 435–452.
- Jayasuriya, Kanishka. "Asian values as reactionary modernization." *News from the Nordic Asia Institute*, (1997): 19–26.
- Jiafeng, Wang. "Some reflections on Modernization Theory and Globalization Theory." *Chinese Studies in History* 1, no. 43 (2009): 72–98.
- Jones, Anthony T. "Modernization and education in the U.S.S.R." *Social Forces* 57, no. 2 (1978): 522–546.
- Kennedy, Ryan. "The contradiction of modernization: A conditional model of endogenous democratization." *The Journal of Politics* 3, no. 72 (2010): 785–798.
- Koch, Natalie "The city and the steppe: Territory, technologies of government, and Kazakhstan's new capital." PhD dissertation, University of Colorado, Boulder, 2012.
- Koch, Natalie. "Introduction – Field methods in "closed contexts": undertaking research in authoritarian states and places." *Area* 45, no. 4 (2013): 390–395.
- Koch, Natalie. "Technologising the opinion: focus groups, performance and free speech." *Area* 45, no. 4 (2013): 411–418.
- Koch, Natalie. "The "heart" of Eurasia? Kazakhstan's centrally located capital city." *Central Asia Survey* 32, no. 2 (2013): 134–147.
- Kyung-Sup, Chang. "The End of Developmental Citizenship? Restructuring and Social Displacement in Post-Crisis South Korea." *Economic and Political Weekly* 42, no. 50 (2007): 67–72.
- Latova, N.V., and Iu.V. Latova. "Characteristics of the Westernization of College Students' Mentality in Modernizing Countries." *Russian Social Science Review* 2, no. 50 (2009): 50–66.

- Li, Huaiyin. "From revolution to modernization: the paradigmatic transition in Chinese historiography in the reform era." *History and Theory* 49, no. 3 (2010): 336–360.
- Linn, Johannes F., Harpaul Alberto Kohli. "Will Kazakhstan succeed in joining the thirty developed countries' list by 2050?" 2014. <<http://www.nac.gov.kz/news/analytics/747/>> (accessed 3 October 2014).
- Litonjua, M.D. "Third World/Global South: From Modernization to Dependency/liberation, to postdevelopment." *Third World Studies* 29 (1): 25–56.
- Maleva, Tat'iana and Liliia Ovcharova. "Recommendations for long-term and short-term social policy measures." *Russian Social Science Review* 54, no. 4 (2013): 33–49.
- Marks, Gary N. "Modernization Theory and changes over time in the reproduction of socioeconomic inequalities in Australia." *Social Forces* 2, no. 88 (2009): 917–44.
- Nazarbayev, Nursultan. "The Social modernization of Kazakhstan: Twenty steps to the society of universal labour" 2012 <<http://inform.kz/rus/article/2478336>> (accessed 2 October 2014).
- Nellis, John. "Is the improvement of economic and political institutions key to the implementation of the Strategy 'Kazakhstan-2050'?" 2014 <<http://nac.gov.kz/news/analytics/755/>> (accessed 3 October 2014).
- Oleinik, Anton and Kairat Djamangulov. "Azbuĥa vlasti: yazyk ezhegodnyh poslanii Prezidenta Respubliki Kazakhstan." ("Alphabet of power: The language of the annual addresses of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan"), 2012 <<http://www.zakon.kz/4531454-azbuka-vlasti-jazyk-ezhegodnykh.html>> (accessed 14 March 2015).
- O'Neil, Patrick H. "States and Markets in Transition." In *Introduction to International Political Economy*, eds. David N. Balaam and Michael Veseth. Upper Saddle River: Pearson Prentice Hall, 2008, 262–82.
- Palan, Ronen. "A world of their making: An evolution of the Constructivist critique in International Relations." *Review of International Studies* 26, no. 4(2000): 575–598.
- Peng, Yuan. "Modernization Theory: From historical misunderstanding to realistic development: A Review of a New Thesis on Modernization." *Chinese Studies in History* 1, no. 43 (2009): 37–45.
- Poberezhnikov, I.V. "Modernization theory: the main stages of evolution [Teoriya modernizatsii: osnovnyye etapy evolyutsii]." In *The Problems of Russian History*, I.V. Poberezhnikov. Yekaterinbourg: Volot, 2001, 217–246.
- Pomfret, Richard and Kathryn Anderson. "Economic development strategies in Central Asia since 1991." *Asian Studies Review* 25, no. 2 (2001): 185–200.

- Riboud, Michelle. "How should Kazakhstan develop its human resources to get into thirty most developed countries by 2050?" (2014).
< <http://www.nac.gov.kz/news/analytics/752/>> (accesses 4 October 2014).
- Rongqu, Luo. "New perspectives on historical development and the course of modernization in East Asia." *Chinese Studies in History* 1, no. 43 (2009): 17–27.
- Sakal, Halil Burak. "Natural resource policies and standard of living in Kazakhstan." *Central Asian Survey*, 34, no. 2 (2015): 237–254.
- Salmon, Peter. "Repression intensifies against Kazakh oil workers' uprising." *Debate: Journal of Contemporary Central and Eastern Europe* 19, 1-2 (2011): 507–510.
- Salmon, Peter. "Police massacre has opened a dark chapter for Kazakh workers' movement." *Debate: Journal of Contemporary Central and Eastern Europe* 20, no. 1 (2012): 73–77.
- Schiek, Sebastian. "Kazakhstan: Will Conservative Modernization Succeed?" In: OSCE Yearbook 2013, edited by Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg/ IFSH, 105-117. Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlag, 2014.
- Smagulov, K.Y. "The content-analysis of the annual addresses of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan." *Sociologicheskiye issledovaniya* 6 (2012): 51–64.
- Stein, Matthew. "Unraveling the violence in Kazakhstan." *Small Wars & Insurgencies* 24, no. 3 (2013): 394–412.
- Sultanov, B.K. *Kazakhstan v sovremennom mire: realii i perspektivy* [Kazakhstan in A Modern World: Realities and Perspectives]. Almaty: KISI pri Presidente RK, 2008.
- Surucu, Cengiz. "Modernity, nationalism, resistance: identity politics in post-Soviet Kazakhstan." *Central Asian Survey* 21, no. 4 (2002): 385–402.
- Tai Ann, Koh. "The Singapore experience: cultural development in global village." *Southeast Asian Affairs*, (1980): 292–307.
- The Economist*. "East Asian economies: Tigers adrift," 5 March 1998.
- Tipps, Dean C. "Modernization Theory and the comparative study of societies: A critical perspective." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 2, no. 15 (1973): 199–226.
- Vishnevskii, Anatolii. "Conservative modernization in the Soviet Union." *Problems of Economic Transition* 44, no. 2 (2001): 33–93.
- Vobruba, Georg. "Transitional social policy in the process of transformation." *International Journal of Sociology* 25, no. 1 (1995): 23–39.
- von Beyme, Klaus. "Soviet social policy in comparative perspective." *International*

political science review 2, no. 1 (1981): 73–94.

Wendt, Alexander. “Anarchy is what States Make of it: The social construction of power politics.” *International Organization* 46, no. 2 (1992): 391–425

Yi, Junqing, Lingmei Fan. “Dimensions of modernity and their contemporary fate.” *Frontiers o Philosophy in China* 1, no. 1 (2006): 6–21.

Yuanxing, Li. “Revival of tradition or modernization? The perspective of subjectivity in the study of Modernization Theory and a critique of the Functionalist Approach.” *Chinese Studies in History* 1, no. 43 (2009): 67–71.

Zinam, Oleg. “Impact of Modernization on the USSR: Convergence or divergence?” *Russian Review* 32, no. 3 (1973): 254–263.

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW GUIDELINE

Name	
Position	
Data of interview	
Type of interview	
Overall impression	

Brief description of the project	This interview is conducted as one of the methods to study formulation and development of the official discourse on social policy and social modernization in the Republic of Kazakhstan. The main focus of the research is the process of discourse development, approaches to it, and priorities.		
Do you allow citation of your answers in the Thesis?	Yes,		No
	With my name and affiliation	Only affiliation	
Do you allow me to tape-record the interview?	Yes		No

Core questions¹⁹⁹

1. In your opinion, what are the prioritized spheres in Kazakhstani politics?
Какие сферы, на Ваш взгляд, являются приоритетными для руководства страны?
2. In your opinion, what is the main initiator of changes/development in Kazakhstani politics? What the sources of new ideas are?
Кто является главными инициаторами изменений/развития в казахстанской политике? Как Вы думаете, каковы источники новых идей, примеры для подражания?
3. What are the trends of economic development in Kazakhstan during the independence period? Какие, по Вашему мнению, существовали тренды в экономическом развитии Республики Казахстан за годы независимости?
4. How would you characterize the role of social policy for the ruling elite? Are there any differences in social policy's status within the 24-year period? Какое значение, по Вашему мнению, имеет сфера социальной политики для руководства страны? Менялся ли этот статус за годы независимости?

¹⁹⁹ Although 17 experts in total were initially planned to be interviewed, only seven agreed to do so.

5. What is the role and contribution of the President Nursultan Nazarbayev in the process of formulation of society and social policy? What is the source of his inspiration, what the examples are?
Какова роль и вклад Президента Нурсултана Назарбаева в формирование общества и социальной политики? Как Вы думаете, каковы источники этих идей, примеры для подражания?
6. What are the main features/qualities of the Kazakhstani society in 1990s, in the beginning of 2000s and today?
Как Вы считаете, какими характеристиками обладало казахстанское общество в 90-е, в начале 2000-х и сегодня?

Extra questions

7. How would you characterize economic modernization in Kazakhstan?
В чем, по-Вашему, заключается экономическая модернизация в Казахстане?
8. How would you characterize connection between society development and economy development?
Как бы Вы охарактеризовали связь между развитием экономики и общества?
9. Who is the main initiator of reforms in the social policy sphere, in your opinion?
Кто, по Вашему мнению, является главным инициатором реформ в сфере социальной политики?
10. What are the main trends of the social policy development in the Republic of Kazakhstan? What should be changed, in your opinion?
Какие основные тренды Вы видите в развитии социальной политики в Республике Казахстан? Что, по Вашему мнению, следовало бы изменить в социальной политике?
11. How do you think, what the peculiarities of social modernization in Kazakhstan are?
Как Вы считаете, в чем особенность «социальной модернизации» в Казахстане?
12. What are the documents, strategic plans influencing social policy mostly?
Какие документы, стратегические планы, на Ваш взгляд, имели/имеют наибольшее значение в развитии социальной политики?
13. Is there any change of relations between society and state during the years of independence?
Менялось ли взаимоотношение между государством и общества на протяжении лет независимости?
14. How do you see paternalism and social dependency in Kazakhstani realities?
Как бы Вы охарактеризовали патернализм и социальную зависимость в казахстанских реалиях?
15. How would you characterize the image of Kazakhstani business man?
Как бы Вы охарактеризовали образ Казахстанского предпринимателя?
16. How do you think, have we succeeded in the comprehension of «market ideology»?
Как Вы думаете, преуспели ли мы в восприятии идеологии рынка?

APPENDIX B

DISCOURSE DOCUMENTS: PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESSES

Document 1: Speech at the ceremonial meeting of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Kazakhstan of the twelfth convocation on the occasion of accession to an office of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan, December 10, 1991.

Document 2: “Strategy of formation and development of Kazakhstan as a sovereign state,” May 16, 1992.

Document 3: Opening speech for the first anniversary of the Republic of Kazakhstan’s independence, December 15, 1992.

Document 4: Speech on the governmental programme of urgent anti-crisis measures and deepening socio-economic reforms at the X session of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Kazakhstan of the twelfth convocation, January 18, 1993.

Document 5: Speech at the national meeting “Ideational consolidation of society as a condition for Kazakhstan’s progress,” May 11, 1993.

Document 6: Opening speech for the celebration of the Republic of Kazakhstan’s Independence Day, December 16, 1995.

Document 7: Speech at the meeting dedicated to the 50th anniversary of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan, June 7, 1996.

Document 8: Address to the population of Kazakhstan, October 7, 1996.

Document 9: Speech at the solemn meeting on the occasion of the 5th anniversary of Kazakhstan's independence “Independence of Kazakhstan: the lessons of history and modernity,” December 16, 1996.

Document 10: Address of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Nursultan Nazarbayev, to the People of Kazakhstan “Prosperity, Security and Ever Growing Welfare of all the Kazakhstanis,” October 10, 1997.

Document 11: Address of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Nursultan Nazarbayev, to the People of Kazakhstan “On the Situation in the Country and major Directions of Domestic and Foreign Policy: Democratization, Economic and Political Reform for the New Century,” September 30, 1998.

Document 12: Address of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Nursultan Nazarbayev, to the People of Kazakhstan “Stability and Security of the State in a new Millennium,” December 15, 1999.

Document 13: Address of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Nursultan Nazarbayev, to the People of Kazakhstan “Towards Free, Effective and Secure Society,” October 24, 2000.

Document 14: Address of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Nursultan Nazarbayev, to the People of Kazakhstan “On the Situation in the Country and Main Directions of Domestic and Foreign Policy for 2002,” September 3, 2001.

Document 15: Address of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Nursultan Nazarbayev, to the People of Kazakhstan “On the main approaches to internal and foreign policy in 2003,” April 29, 2002.

Document 16: Address of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Nursultan Nazarbayev, to the People of Kazakhstan “On the main approaches to internal and foreign policy in 2004,” April 4, 2003.

Document 17: Address of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Nursultan Nazarbayev, to the People of Kazakhstan “To competitive Kazakhstan, competitive economy, and competitive nation,” March 19, 2004.

Document 18: Address of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Nursultan Nazarbayev, to the People of Kazakhstan, “Kazakhstan on the Road to Accelerated Economic, Social and Political Modernization,” February 18, 2005.

Document 19: Address of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Nursultan Nazarbayev, to the People of Kazakhstan “Kazakhstan’s strategy of joining the world’s 50 most competitive countries,” March 1, 2006.

Document 20: Address of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Nursultan Nazarbayev, to the People of Kazakhstan “New Kazakhstan in the new world,” February 28, 2007.

Document 21: Address of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan Nursultan Nazarbayev to the People of Kazakhstan “Growth of Welfare of Kazakhstan’s Citizens is the Primary Goal of State Policy,” February 6, 2008.

Document 22: Address of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Nursultan Nazarbayev, to the People of Kazakhstan “Through the crisis to renovation and development,” March 6, 2009.

Document 23: Address of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Nursultan Nazarbayev, to the People of Kazakhstan “New decade – new economic growth – new abilities for Kazakhstan,” January 29, 2010.

Document 24: Address of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Nursultan Nazarbayev, to the People of Kazakhstan “Building the Future Together,” January 28, 2011.

Document 25: Address by the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan Nursultan Nazarbayev to the People of Kazakhstan “Socio-Economic Modernization as Main Vector of Development of Kazakhstan,” January 27, 2012.

Document 26: Nursultan Nazarbayev “Social Modernization of Kazakhstan: Twenty Steps to the Society of Universal Labour,” July 10, 2012.

Document 27: Address by the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Leader of the Nation, Nursultan Nazarbayev to the People of Kazakhstan “Strategy Kazakhstan-2050”: new political course of the established state”, December 14, 2012.

Document 28: Address of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan Nursultan Nazarbayev to the nation “Kazakhstan’s way – 2050: common aim, common interests, common future,” January 17, 2014.

Document 29: Address of President of the Republic of Kazakhstan Nursultan Nazarbayev to the people of Kazakhstan “Nyrlı Zhol – The Path to the Future,” November 11, 2014.

Document 30: The National Plan “100 concrete steps. The modern state for everybody,” May 6, 2015.

APPENDIX C

LIST OF EXPERT INTERVIEWS

1. Expert #1, Political scientist, Economist at the non-governmental organization, face to face interview, 26 May 2015.
2. Expert #2, Political scientist, Analyst at the governmental research institute, Skype interview, 14 June 2015.
3. Expert #3, Economist at the governmental research institute, Skype interview, 21 June 2015.
4. Expert #4, Political scientist, Skype interview, 26 June 2015.
5. Expert #5, Sociologist at the state university, Skype interview, 27 June 2015.
6. Expert #6, Sociologist at the state university, face to face interview, 29 June 2015.
7. Expert #7, Political scientist at the non-governmental research institute, Email interview, 13 August 2015.