

# **EDUCATION AND COMPARATIVE STUDIES**

## **Education Crossroads: Alignments and Divergences in Latvian and Georgian Education Systems**

*TABATADZE REVAZ, PhD*

*THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA*

*TBILISI, GEORGIA*

*ORCID: [0000-0003-3898-3092](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3898-3092)*

### **ABSTRACT**

The article describes, analyzes, and compares the education systems of two post-Soviet countries - Georgia and Latvia. The main focus is on studying the alignments and divergences in the aims and objectives of general, vocational, and higher education, mandatory qualifications of teachers and professors, curricula, and students' academic performances. Within the frames of the research, two types of desk research techniques are applied: internal desk research and external desk research, including online desk research, government published data, and customer desk research. Georgia and Latvia, both post-Soviet socialist countries, shared a unified education system before the Soviet Union's collapse. After gaining independence in 1991, both countries developed their own systems, but Latvia started rebuilding its education system earlier. This early development led to differences in curricula, teacher qualifications, and academic performance. As a result, Latvian students show better academic achievements compared to Georgian students, as evidenced by international assessments like PISA and NCIEA.

*Keywords:* Education systems; Latvia and Georgia; general, higher, and vocational education; curricula; teachers' qualification

This article is distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/), which permits non-commercial use and distribution in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited and no modifications or adaptations are made.  
© 2025 The Author(s). *Caucasus Journal of Social Sciences*.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.62343/cjss.2025.277>

Received: April 15, 2025; Received in revised form: September 22, 2025; Accepted: September 28, 2025

## INTRODUCTION

Latvia is a country of northeastern Europe and one of the three Baltic States, while Georgia is located on the east coast of the Black Sea at the crossroads of Western Asia and Eastern Europe, and borders Armenia, Azerbaijan, Russia, and Turkey. Both countries were occupied and annexed by the U.S.S.R., and they declared their independence in 1991.

Latvia was admitted to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the European Union (EU) in 2004. Georgia is on its way to joining these organizations with the consent of the majority of its population.

Since both countries were member states of the Soviet Union, they shared common educational principles, standards, goals, and missions. Schools and universities of both countries followed a common curricula created by the scientific committees of the Soviet Union with the involvement of “successful” teachers and professors.

In the Soviet Union, significant changes were made in the context of general and higher education in the 1960s and 1970s. The basis for these changes was the XXIII Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

The resolution of the XXIII Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) held in 1966 stated: “In these five years, we should basically complete the transition to universal secondary education for youth. The quality and content of general, labor, and polytechnic education should correspond to modern needs. Schools are called upon to teach the principles of communist morality to children and to improve the aesthetic and physical education of the adolescent generation ([CPSU Central Committee & USSR Council of Ministers, 1984, p. 236](#)).

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Council of Ministers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics adopted a resolution on November 10, 1966 - “Measures for Further Improvement of the Work of the General Education Secondary School”.

This resolution was a concrete plan for implementing the decisions of the XXIII Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

It is mentioned here that under the leadership of the Communist Party, “a cultural revolution unprecedented in its depth and scope was carried out in our country. The prominent role in solving this great task belongs to the Soviet school. For the first time in the history of mankind, ***a truly democratic system of education was created.***” This system provided workers with a real opportunity for secondary and higher education.

The resolution provides measures to further improve the performance of the general education school. It states that the Soviet school should continue to develop as a general educational labor polytechnic school and that its main task is to equip students with basic scientific knowledge, to develop a high communist consciousness among students, and to prepare them for life and a future profession.

According to the resolution, the school, which connects all educational work with life, should equip students with the knowledge of the law of social development, raise them with the revolutionary and labor traditions of the Soviet people, develop a high sense of Soviet patriotism,

show them the importance of the fraternal unity of all peoples of the Soviet Union, their friendship with the workers of socialist countries; **Students should be inculcated in solidarity with all the people fighting against colonialism and capitalism**, they should bravely fight against the intrusion of bourgeois ideology into the consciousness of students, the manifestation of hostile morality (CPSU Central Committee & USSR Council of Ministers, 1984, p. 238).

Georgia and Latvia, as member states of the Soviet Union, had to follow a new educational model that opposed the free thinking of students and teachers, providing a unified curriculum that did not take into account students' abilities, cultural values, etc.

The typical curriculum for Soviet and secondary schools, for example, gave great importance to expanding the teaching hours of Russian Language and Literature at the expense of limiting the teaching hours of ethnic languages (Counts, 1957, p. 77), emphasizing the dominance of Russian Ideology and values.

Subject	Number of Class Hours per										Week / Total Hours	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Week	Year
Russian Language and Literature	13	13	13	9	9	8	6	5	4	4	84	2,772
Mathematics	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	60	1,980
History				2	2	2	2	4	4	4	20	660
Constitution of USSR									1	1		33
Geography				2	3	2	2	2	3		14	462
Biology				2	2	2	3	2	1		12	396
Physics						2	3	3	4	4	16	528
Astronomy										1	1	33
Chemistry							2	2	3	4	11	363
Psychology									1	1		33
Foreign Language					4	4	3	3	3	3	20	660
Physical Culture	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	20	660
Drawing	1	1	1	1	1	1					6	198
Drafting							1	1	1	1	4	132
Singing	1	1	1	1	1						6	198
Labor	1	1	1	1	2	2	2				10	330
Practical Work (Agricultural Economy, Machine Operation, and Electro-Techniques)									3	2	2	231
Excursions												293
Total	24	24	24	26	32	32	32	33	33	33	293	9.962

**Table 1.** The typical Curriculum for soviet elementary and secondary schools

Source: From *The challenge of Soviet education* (p. 77), by G. S. Counts, 1957, New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

After the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, millions of students, thousands of schools, and universities started their own independent journey in terms of getting and providing education. Of course, the former Soviet states shared the Soviet Union's approach to general and higher education (late twentieth century): they had a centralized education system controlled by several sectorial units, a national curriculum, narrow specialization training, tuition-free study places, and compulsory employment.

The transformation of post-soviet countries' education systems began shortly after they attained their independence. The changes that have taken place in the education systems of the post-Soviet countries have varied in scope, structure, power, and impact ([Huisman, Smolentseva, & Froumin, 2018, p. 178](#)).

Some of the countries (Latvia, Estonia, etc.) of the post-Soviet Union are successfully dealing with the challenges in the field of general and higher education, while some (Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, etc.) are still trying to create such an education system that provides schools and universities with the necessary personnel having proper qualifications, programs and curricula, trainings, etc. ([OECD, 2019; Tabatadze & Dvořák, 2024](#)).

The success of post-soviet countries in terms of general and higher education is evaluated not only based on the results of local public and private student organizations, but also by the participation and reports of organizations such as: PISA - the OECD's Programme for International Student Assessment; NCIEA – the Center for Assessment: Advancing Student Learning; CSAI - the Center on Standards & Assessment Implementation, etc.

Hence, ***this article aims*** to describe, analyze, and compare the education systems of two post-Soviet countries - Georgia and Latvia. The article will be focused on general trends in terms of general and higher education in the mentioned countries, which includes the aims and objectives of general and higher education, mandatory qualifications of teachers, curricula, and students' academic performances.

***The significance of the research*** is determined by the following factor: Georgia and Latvia are both post-Soviet socialist countries. Before the collapse of the Soviet Union, both countries followed one unified curriculum within the Soviet Union. In 1991, after the collapse of the Soviet Union, countries including Georgia and Latvia were allowed to develop their own curricula. For 30 years, both countries have gone through a difficult path in this regard. It is interesting that the academic performance of students is totally different in these countries; in particular, students in Latvia have a much better academic record than in Georgia. With the scope of the research, we will be able to reveal the positive practices in the Latvian Education System that can be shared within the framework of the education system of Georgia.

### *Research Questions*

The following questions have been addressed throughout the presented research:

- How do the Georgian and Latvian education systems differ in their goals and objectives for general, vocational, and higher education?

- How do the current teacher qualification systems and curriculum frameworks in Latvia and Georgia compare, and what insights do these differences provide for understanding their respective educational developments?
- What factors influence the differences in academic performance of Latvian and Georgian students, as shown by PISA and NCIEA assessments?

## **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

Within the frames of the research, two types of ***desk research techniques*** will be applied:

1. Internal Desk Research;
2. External Desk Research, including online desk research, government published data, and customer desk research.

The desk research used in this study provides a broad perspective on the comparative analysis of education systems in two countries – Latvia and Georgia – but has certain limitations. First, desk research relies on existing data and information obtained from secondary sources. In addition, such research is not characterized by the collection of data from personal interviews with specific individuals or focus groups, which sometimes leads to more in-depth and dynamic insights.

### *Literature Review*

Educational systems are normally considered to be those structures created by the state to educate the population of that state. It is universally the case that each country has its own educational system, and this is usually a function of government (McGettrick, 2009).

Each education system is different in terms of organization, management, and arrangements, being conditioned by the society that is served by the educational provision.

Some of the aspects of “educational systems” related to the stated education are not necessarily part of state provision. In this particular case, we are referring to universities, centers for early education, schools, and other institutions of educational activity that are not funded, controlled, or influenced by the state.

The Latvian education system consists of pre-school education, basic education, secondary education, and higher education. General education in Latvia in total lasts 12 years, consisting of a compulsory 9-year basic education and 3-year secondary education. Additionally, pre-school education at the age of 5-6 is compulsory in Latvia.

Basic education stage comprises general basic education (grades 1-9) and vocational basic education. The secondary education stage comprises general secondary education, vocational secondary education, and vocational education. Higher education comprises both academic and professional study programmes ([Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Latvia, n.d.](#)).

The laws and regulations used to design, monitor, and guarantee quality education in the Republic of Latvia are:

1. Law on Education (1998);
2. Law on General Education (1999);
3. Law on Vocational Education (1999);
4. Law on Higher Education Establishments (1995);
5. Law on Scientific Activity (2005);

The Georgian education system includes general, higher, and professional education. Full general education in Georgia has three levels: primary (6 years), basic (3 years), and secondary (3 years).

Higher education in Georgia consists of three levels: bachelor's, master's, and doctoral. The law "On Higher Education" regulates the rules and procedures of providing higher education.

Vocational education in Georgia is regulated by: the Law of Georgia "On Vocational Education"; "On the Development of the Quality of Education", and other by-laws.

The types of vocational educational institutions are: vocational educational institution/college, which is authorized to implement vocational educational programs, short-cycle educational programs, vocational training programs in the state language ([National Center for Educational Quality Enhancement, n.d.](#)).

The laws and regulations used to design, monitor, and guarantee quality education in the Republic of Georgia are:

1. Law on General Education of Georgia (2005);
2. Law on Higher Education of Georgia (2006);
3. Law on the concept of vocational education of Georgia (2005);
4. Law on vocational education of Georgia (2012);
5. Law of Georgia on Early and Preschool Education (2015);
6. Law on the Development of the Quality of Education of Georgia (2018);

The right to receive education and to choose its form in Latvia and Georgia is guaranteed by the Constitution.

Based on the analysis of the obtained and processed material, it can be said that today the education systems of Georgia and Latvia are similar from a structural point of view.

However, it should be noted that Georgia, as a post-Soviet country, compared to Latvia, started to develop the regulatory laws and acts late, which allows for fundamental changes to the education system, creating a new curriculum, establishing new standards for teachers, etc.

For example, the Law on "General Education", which regulates all three levels of general education in Latvia, was developed in 1999, while the Government of Georgia adopted this law in 2005, which means that until 2005, there was no "systematic" principle in education in the country; the processes were chaotic and uncontrolled.

## RESULTS

Aims and objectives of education are represented in a dynamic form, considering and responding to the progressive status of society. These terms are inextricably connected: they occur in hierarchical order.

Ritz (2014) considers aim as “a general statement that suggests direction”. It provides a guide for the educational and training processes by which a terminal point of live outcome is focused. Nodding (2007) believes that aims are “brushed aside in favor of objectives because the last can be cast in language conducive to measurement”. Objectives of education bring to the fore the kind of knowledge and skills needed in society (Nicholls, 1973).

Hence, the aims and objectives of education play a major role in the process of formulating a proper education system.

On the example of the studied countries, it was found that Latvia has diversified aims and objectives of general education, while the Georgian education system does not diversify the aims and objectives of education at the primary, basic, and secondary education levels.

In terms of general education, Latvia distinguishes between aims and objectives for Pre-Primary Education and General Secondary Education.

Pre-primary Education, which is regulated by the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Latvia by the following legal acts and laws - Law on General Education / Education Law / Law on General Education / Model Program for Pre-school Education, aims to:

1. advance the development of mental, physical, and social abilities and to establish the understanding of general processes of nature and society, to build up moral and ethical values;
2. ensure the development of initiative and inquisitive, independent, and creative activities;
3. develop communication and cooperation skills;
4. favour the development of a harmonious personality of the child;
5. form the understanding of one's belonging to the State of Latvia and ensure possibility to learn about Latvia and values of democracy.

While general secondary education curricula are regulated by the National Standard for General Upper Secondary Education and Standards for Upper Secondary Education Subjects, and aim to:

1. provide pupils with knowledge and skills enabling them to prepare for further education;
2. encourage the development of their personality and of their physical and mental capacities, and to develop their understanding of health as a condition for the quality of life;

3. encourage the development of positive, critical, and socially active attitudes, and to develop an understanding of the rights and obligations of Latvian citizens;
4. develop the ability to study independently and improve knowledge as well as create motivation for lifelong learning and a purposeful career.

The Georgian education system does not distinguish between aims and objectives for Pre-Primary Education and General Secondary Education. The aims and objectives of general education are regulated by the law on “General Education”. It formulates general aims and objectives for all the levels of general education. After completing general education, a student should be able to:

1. Understand one's own responsibility towards the country's interests, traditions, and values;
2. preserve and protect natural environmental conditions;
3. effectively use technological or other intellectual achievements; acquire, process, and analyze information;
4. live independently and make their own decisions;
5. create values themselves and not to live only at the expense of the existing;
6. continuously develop their abilities and interests throughout life and realize them maximally within the country and outside its borders;
7. communicate with individuals and groups;
8. be a law-abiding, tolerant citizen.

#### *The aims and objectives of Vocational Education in Latvia and Georgia*

One of the significant aspects of the education systems of Latvia and Georgia is vocational education and training (VET).

In general, defining VET as a sector within the education system poses a number of difficulties. For the most part, general and academic education is seen as that which builds analytical skills, knowledge, and critical thinking, while VET develops craftsmanship, practical experience, and problem-solving. However, this simple distinction does not hold up to scrutiny.

These simple distinctions can also lead to confusion and academic drift in vocational institutions ([Neave, 1978](#)) or to the vocationalisation of higher education ([Williams, 1985](#)).

Latvia adopted the law on vocational education much earlier than Georgia. In particular, Latvia adopted the law on Law on “Vocational Education” in 1999, when Georgia submitted only the conceptual side of vocational education in 2005. Consequently, Latvia, as a post-Soviet country, had a much longer time to apply and monitor the principles of vocational education in practice.

The main aims and objectives of vocational and vocational secondary education, as regulated by the National Standard for General Upper Secondary Education and Standards for Upper Secondary Education Subjects, are to:

1. prepare the pupil for working in a certain profession, promoting his development as an open, responsible, and creative personality;
2. advantage the acquirement of skills and knowledge for gaining the second or third level of professional qualification;
3. promote a positive attitude towards other people and the state, favor self-confidence and the ability to undertake responsibilities of the Latvian citizen;
4. motivate the pupil for professional development and further education, and provide the possibility to prepare for continuation of education in the level of higher professional education.

While the law on “Approving the Concept of Vocational Education of Georgia” adopted in 2005 defines the aims and objectives of vocational education as to:

1. Meet the professional-educational requirements of the population, promote personal professional development, establish a professional career, and social protection;
2. Ensure the economy with competitive, qualified personnel in the domestic and international labor market;
3. Maintain the competitiveness of the employed workforce through professional training and qualification improvement;
4. Facilitate adaptation of the population to new socio-economic conditions through starting their own business and self-employment.

It should be noted that the professional education model of both countries is similar. They have similar aims and objectives. However, unlike Georgia, vocational education is much more popular in Latvia, which is confirmed by the number of vocational schools and the percentage of students.

Therefore, it is clear that the government of Georgia needs to create more vocational educational institutions, promote them among the youth, study the market requirements, and create programs that respond to the modern challenges.

### *The aims and objectives of Higher Education in Latvia and Georgia*

Higher education is education, training, and research guidance that takes place at the post-secondary level.

Higher education comprises all post-secondary education, training, and research guidance at educational institutions such as universities that are authorized as institutions of higher education by state authorities.

Higher education in Latvia is divided into two levels: first-level professional higher education and second-level professional higher education; hence, the aims and objectives are different.

The strategic objectives of first-level professional higher education regulated by the National Standard of First-Level Professional Higher Education Programmes are to:

1. prepare a person for work in a certain profession, promoting one's development as an open, responsible, and creative personality;
2. advance the acquirement of skills and knowledge for gaining the fourth-level professional qualification;
3. motivate one for further education and provide the possibility to prepare for continuation of education in the second-level of professional higher education.

While the strategic objectives of second-level professional higher education regulated by the National Standard of Second-Level Professional Higher Education Programmes are to:

1. educate specialists of fifth-level professional qualification in the fields necessary to the national economy and state security, favor competitiveness in the changing social-economic conditions and in international labor market;
2. implement acquirement of knowledge characteristic to each field enabling to develop new or improve existing systems, products and technologies and prepare for research, pedagogical and creative work.

The aims and objectives of higher education in Georgia, as regulated by the law on "Higher Education of Georgia" adopted in 2006, are to:

1. promote the formation of Georgian and world cultural values with orientation to the ideals of democracy and humanism, which are necessary for the existence and development of civil society;
2. meet the needs of receiving higher education, raise qualifications and retrain, meet the interests and abilities of the person;
3. realize personal potential, develop creative skills, train persons with competences to meet modern requirements, ensure the competitiveness of persons with higher education in the domestic and foreign labor market, offer high-quality higher education corresponding to the demands of students and the general public to interested persons;
4. ensure the development of the state and the viability of the higher education system itself, train and retrain new scientific personnel, create and develop conditions for scientific research;
5. Encourage the mobility of students and academic staff of higher educational institutions.

The aims and objectives of higher education in Georgia are of a wider range compared to the Latvian model of higher education. The Georgian model covers comparatively general concepts, and achieving them is quite hard for every stakeholder involved in these pro-

cesses. Universities are expected to design programmes considering these peculiarities that result in overloaded programmes and curricula, and hence, most of the students are not able to study and meet the requirements – *they are studying general, theoretical subjects without being focused on practical aspects of the subjects, and in general, the profession they are willing to specialize in*.

Unlike the Georgian model of higher education, the Latvian model is focused on *providing practical skills, considering the demands of the labor market*. The two-level professional higher education is comparatively flexible; the first-level professional higher education creates a bulwark for students to acquire the knowledge and skills that will be prerequisites for the second-level professional higher education, where students are expected to master the acquired knowledge and skills and specialize in one of the desired fields ([Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Latvia, n.d.](#)).

Besides general, vocational, and higher education, the Latvian education system also includes continuing Education and Training for Young School Leavers and Adults (Latvian Adult Education Association / State Employment Agency / Education Law), and its main goals are to:

1. provide individuals with the opportunity to complement education based on their needs and interests, irrespective of previous education and age;
2. supplement inadequate previous education and knowledge due to social and economic changes;
3. resolve questions of social adaptation and integration.

Training for the unemployed is the most essential active employment initiative for the improvement of employability and quicker reinsertion into the labor market. Unfortunately, the Georgian education system does not consider and offer such programmes to people that may equip them with proper knowledge and skills to respond to the modern challenges on the labor market.

Based on the data used, it is clear that the Latvian and Georgian education systems differ significantly from each other both in terms of goals and objectives and in the forms of their implementation. Latvia implements separate differentiation of educational goals and objectives, for example, for primary and secondary education, as well as in the vocational education system, which allows for the implementation of specific needs and demands of society. At the same time, the Georgian education system tries to implement the goals and objectives of all levels in a single way, which is often properly integrated with practical training and professional skills. This difference is also reflected in the popularity of the vocational education system, where Latvia is characterized by a significantly higher share of students than Georgia. It should be especially noted that in the Latvian system, employment programs and the development of a system of retraining for minors and adolescents, which Georgia does not offer, allow citizens to develop professional skills and adapt to the demands of the labor market.

### *Curricula and Academic Performances of Latvian and Georgian Students*

Defining the essence of the term curriculum is not an easy matter. In fact, different scholars interpret the term in different ways. According to Portelli (1987), more than 120 definitions of the term appear in the professional literature devoted to curriculum, presumably because authors are concerned about either delimiting what the term means or establishing new meanings that have become associated with it. Hlebowitsh (1993) criticizes commentators in the curriculum field who focus “only on certain facets of early curriculum thought while ignoring others” (p. 2). We need to be watchful about definitions that capture only a few of the various characteristics of curriculum (Toombs & Tierney, 1993).

Marsh (2009) considers that the incompleteness of any definition notwithstanding, certain definitions of the term can provide insights about common emphases and characteristics within the general idea of curriculum (p. 4).

In general, in the context of education, the term curriculum is commonly understood as a course or “plan for learning”. Various scholars consider the curriculum to be a set of subjects that help us master the skills that are important for the development of modern society. At some point, the term curriculum is “learning experiences” being attained at various learning sites (Marsh, 2009).

According to the State Education Development Agency of the Republic of Latvia, children attend schools from the year when they turn seven till the age of 18. In Georgia, children are obliged to attend schools from the year they turn six till the age of 18.

In the reports prepared by the mentioned agency, recently, the number of students attending schools has been approximately 226,000, while the number of teachers accounted for 26,760 teachers.

According to the National Statistics Office of Georgia, there are 633 302 pupils and 62 296 teachers in public and private schools in Georgia (National Statistics Service of Georgia, n.d.).

In Latvian schools, a basic school day includes 5 lessons in grades 1-3 and 8 lessons in grade 9. The school year is 34 weeks long in first grade and 37 weeks in grade 9 per year. General upper secondary education normally lasts for three years (grade 10-12). The school year comprises 35 weeks in 10-11 grade and 38 weeks in grade 12 with not more than 36 lessons per week and 8 lessons per day.

Like Latvian schools, a basic day includes 5 lessons in grades 1-3 and 8 lessons in grade 9 in Georgian schools. The number of study weeks in the first grade is 33; the minimum number of study weeks in second-ninth grades is 34 while in the Tenth-twelfth grades the number of study weeks is – 34 (Law on General Education of Latvia, 1999).

Compulsory curriculum in Latvia includes 4 subject areas: Introduction to technologies and science; Languages; Art; Man, and society. The curriculum for comprehensive education is defined by 20 subject standards. The average number of students per full-time teacher in basic education was 10 in 2006 (State Education Development Agency of the Republic of Latvia. n.d.).

Compulsory curriculum in Georgia includes: national language; mathematics; foreign languages; social sciences; natural sciences; technologies; aesthetic education; sports. The maximum number of students in a class in a general educational institution is defined as 30 students. Exceptions will be allowed by written agreement with the Ministry of Education and Science of Georgia. In such a case, the maximum number of students should not exceed 35.

In Latvia, the compulsory curriculum of 3-year general upper secondary schools is determined by the National Standard in the four standardized educational profiles:

1. comprehensive education, without intensive teaching of any particular subject;
2. the humanities and social sciences programme;
3. the mathematics, natural science and technical science programme;
4. the vocational programme, where the general education curriculum places emphasis on subjects in these particular fields.

Educational standards and Regulations regarding assessment of learning achievement for the compulsory school and general upper secondary school are drafted by the Centre for Curriculum Development and Examination which is a national administrative body reporting directly to the Minister of Education and Science, and are approved by the Cabinet of Ministers.

In Georgia, Educational standards and Regulations regarding school curricula is drafted by the ministry of education and science of Georgia as well as National Curriculum Portal. Students having desire to pursue their studies at universities are obliged to pass a national examination monitored by National Center for Evaluation and Examinations ([Dvořák, Cinkraut, Donovalová & Tabatadze, 2025](#)).

In both countries, learning achievements of school children are assessed through exams organized both at school level and centrally at National level.

### *International Assessment Results of Latvian and Georgian Students*

In Latvia and Georgia international assessments at schools are frequently conducted. The primary purposes of large-scale assessments are to highlight achievement gaps, track national progress over time, and compare student achievements within a country and to other countries.

One of the programmes for international assessment is PISA. PISA measures 15-year-olds' ability to use their reading, mathematics and science knowledge and skills to meet real-life challenges.

In this respect, we can use the results of Latvian and Georgian students in order to compare the education systems, in particular, the effectiveness of curricula of the mentioned countries and find some weaknesses.

According to the results from PISA 2018, in Latvia, 78% of students attained at least Level 2 proficiency in reading (OECD average: 77%). At a minimum, these students can identify

the main idea in a text of moderate length, find information based on explicit, though sometimes complex criteria, and can reflect on the purpose and form of texts when explicitly directed to do so.

While, In Georgia, only 36% of students attained at least Level 2 proficiency in reading (OECD average: 77%). At a minimum, these students can identify the main idea in a text of moderate length, find information based on explicit, though sometimes complex criteria, and can reflect on the purpose and form of texts when explicitly directed to do so.

In Latvia, 83% of students in Latvia attained Level 2 or higher in mathematics (OECD average: 76%). At a minimum, these students can interpret and recognize, without direct instructions, how a (simple) situation can be represented mathematically (e.g. comparing the total distance across two alternative routes, or converting prices into a different currency). While in Georgia, only 39% of students in Georgia attained Level 2 or higher in mathematics (OECD average: 76%). At a minimum, these students can interpret and recognize, without direct instructions, how a (simple) situation can be represented mathematically (e.g. comparing the total distance across two alternative routes, or converting prices into a different currency).

In Latvia, 82% of students in Latvia attained Level 2 or higher in science (OECD average: 78%). At a minimum, these students can recognize the correct explanation for familiar scientific phenomena and can use such knowledge to identify, in simple cases, whether a conclusion is valid based on the data provided. While in Georgia, 36% of students in Georgia attained Level 2 or higher in science (OECD average: 78%). At a minimum, these students can recognize the correct explanation for familiar scientific phenomena and can use such knowledge to identify, in simple cases, whether a conclusion is valid based on the data provided.

As it is clear from the results of the existing research, Latvian students have much better academic results in mathematics than Georgian students.

The question arising on the basis of the suggested information sounds as: ***How did Latvia, as a post-Soviet country, manage its students to have better academic performances comparing to other post-soviet countries including Georgia according to international studies?***

The very first factor having a tremendous influence on the academic achievement of students is the expenditure of a country on education. According to the OECD Reviews of Evaluation and Assessment in Education of Latvia and Georgia, in 2019, Latvia spent 4.3% of its GDP or a total of USD 8 461 per full-time equivalent student on primary to tertiary educational institutions, while the Georgian education sector totaled GEL 2.0bn or 4.1% of GDP in 2019, up from GEL 0.7bn in 2009 ([Galt and Taggart Research. Education Industry Overview, 2020](#)).

The second detrimental factor is a number of students in each class. In Latvian schools, maximum 20 students can be in each class, while in Georgia the number of students can account for 30 in each class. It is obvious that teachers cannot work with that the number of students in an effective way ([European Commission. Education and Training Monitor, 2020](#)).

The third factor having a great influence on the academic performances of students is a curriculum. In Latvia, national curriculum is competence-based, which provides students with practical skills necessary for their future success, while in Georgia national curriculum is overloaded meaning that students are expected to study plenty of subjects being focused only on theoretical part and not mastering practical skills.

The fourth factor is digital education and skills which are a key element of Latvia's overall education policy. In Latvian schools, a great importance is given to teaching digital skills to students that respond to the modern challenges on labor market. The same cannot be said about Georgian schools. Unfortunately, even today, Georgian schools are not equipped basic means of technologies to teach students basic skills in this respect. Moreover, we do not have teaching having proper qualifications especially in the reasons of Georgia to teach that subject.

The fifth factor is the qualifications of teachers. Teachers in Latvia are trained at five higher education institutions. Two training routes can be taken. The most common is a professional bachelor's degree programme lasting 4 years which provides a teaching qualification for a specific level of education (pre-school, primary, secondary) and, for secondary school teachers, a specific subject area. Pre-school and primary school teachers are qualified to teach all subjects. The second route requires two stages – a bachelor's degree (3 years) in Education Sciences, plus an additional two years of study in a second-level professional programme of studies to qualify as a teacher in a specific level of education and/or subject area. Vocational school teachers generally have a professional diploma in a vocational area with an additional qualification in vocational teaching. A person who has at least a bachelor's degree and has completed a 1-year teacher training program can work as a teacher in Georgia. Unfortunately, very few universities in Georgia offer 5-year teacher training programs to students, which is directly related to teacher qualifications ([Latvia: Certificate of General Secondary Education. n.d.](#)).

The sixth factor is national examinations. According to the Universities and Colleges Admissions Service (UCAS), in all education programmes there are eight compulsory subjects: Latvian language, literature, first foreign language, second foreign language, mathematics, Latvian and world history, sports, informatics ([Latvia: Certificate of General Secondary Education. n.d.](#)).

Depending on the education programme, the number of elective subjects varies from four to seven. The compulsory examinations are in Latvian Language, mathematics and a foreign language (English, German, French and Russian) of the student's choice ([State Education Development Agency of the Republic of Latvia. n.d.](#)).

Centralized examinations (compulsory):

1. Latvian (written);
2. Mathematics (written);
3. Foreign language – English, German, French, Russian (written and oral).

Centralized examinations (elective):

1. Latvian & world history (written);
2. Chemistry (written);
3. Biology (written);
4. Physics (written).

Centrally set examinations (administered and marked by school):

1. Informatics (combined);
2. Geography (written);
3. Economics (written);
4. Russian language/ literature (written).

In Georgia, in 2005, by the decision of the Georgian government, the old Soviet system of entrance exams was replaced by a new one. The introduction of the new model of entrance exams is considered one of the most successful reforms in the country.

The model developed and implemented by the National Center for Assessment and Examinations is a fair, transparent, unified, meritocratic assessment system that ensures the selection of the best applicants for higher education institutions.

Since 2020, entrants take the unified national exams with a new model. In order to enroll in the higher education program, students are obliged to take three mandatory subjects: Georgian language and literature; foreign language; Mathematics/History. The third exam depends on the programs. Entrants for technical and natural science courses take mathematics, for humanitarian courses – history.

According to educational programs, higher education institutions have defined additional examination subjects from the following list: biology, chemistry, physics, general skills, geography, literature, fine and applied arts, civil education.

There are four mandatory exams for healthcare educational programs: 1. Georgian language and literature; 2. foreign language; 3. Biology; 4. Mathematics/Chemistry/Physics (applicant chooses at least one) ([Unified National Exams. Naec.ge. n.d.](#)).

## ***DISCUSSION***

The significance of the study is due to the fact that there are similarities between Georgia and Latvia, both among the post-Soviet countries, and in the development of the educational system. Before the collapse of the Soviet Union, both countries used a unified curriculum, however, in 1991, after the collapse of the Soviet Union, both countries were allowed to develop their own educational systems. Over the past 30 years, both countries have gone through a difficult path in this process, although it is clear that the academic achievements of Latvian students are much higher than those of Georgian students.

When comparing the Latvian and Georgian educational systems, it is clear that Georgia

began to develop regulations relatively late, and accordingly, their education system had to make frequent changes. For example, in Latvia, the “Law on General Education” was developed in 1999, while in Georgia it was adopted only in 2005.

Thus, those aspects of the Latvian system that were often more modern and practice-oriented were compared to the Georgian system, where more theoretical and general training was envisaged. In terms of higher education, the Latvian model is more vocationally oriented, which gives the Georgian system a conceptual basis for creating a comprehensive and pragmatic system.

There is also a significant difference in the field of vocational education. Latvia, which started developing its vocational education system earlier, today has a more extensive and diverse system in this area. Georgia, for its part, needs to embrace and develop vocational education programs to meet the requirements of modernity.

Overall, although the Latvian and Georgian educational systems have sometimes developed similarly, they differ significantly in terms of academic outcomes. To this end, Georgia needs to pay more attention to the regulations of the education system, curricula, and teacher training process in order to meet modern needs and contribute to improving the quality of learning and research.

Beyond structural and curricular differences, cultural and socioeconomic factors significantly affect student performance in Latvia and Georgia. Latvia benefits from stronger economic indicators, lower poverty rates, and higher public trust in institutions – factors that correlate with educational attainment. The value placed on vocational and lifelong learning in Latvian society enhances student motivation and labor-market alignment. In contrast, Georgia faces ongoing economic instability and a high rate of rural depopulation, limiting equitable access to quality education. Societal attitudes toward vocational training and teacher status also differ, influencing both enrollment trends and teaching effectiveness across the two countries.

Future studies could focus on longitudinal tracking of student outcomes in both countries to better understand the long-term effects of educational reforms. Comparative qualitative research involving teacher and student interviews may reveal how curriculum content and pedagogical approaches are experienced in daily practice. Additionally, future inquiry could examine the role of educational technologies, inclusion policies, and regional disparities in shaping student success. Cross-country teacher training models and their impact on student achievement also represent a promising area for further exploration.

## ***CONCLUSION***

Since Latvia and Georgia were member states of the Soviet Union, they shared common educational principles, standards, goals, and missions. Schools and universities of both countries followed common curricula created by the scientific committees of the Soviet Union with the involvement of “successful” teachers and professors. Both countries were occupied and annexed by the U.S.S.R., and they declared their independence in 1991.

The Soviet legacy had a great impact on both countries. Latvia, unlike Georgia, started reforming the education system relatively early, creating a number of laws and regulations. These processes became more active in Georgia especially after the Rose Revolution, when the pro-Russian government resigned, and a pro-Western force came to power.

Latvian students have better academic records compared to Georgian students. Based on the existing research, certain factors can be identified that determine it:

1. The aims and objectives of education;
2. The expenditure of a country on education;
3. The number of students in each class;
4. The national curriculum;
5. The digital education and skills;
6. The qualifications of teachers;
7. The national examinations.

The Ministries of Education and Science of both countries strive to equip students with the relevant knowledge and competencies needed in the modern labor market. Existing countries are more or less coping with the existing challenge.

### **Ethics Approval and Conflict of Interest**

This study was conducted in accordance with relevant ethical standards. The authors declare that there are no financial, personal, professional, or institutional conflicts of interest that could have influenced the design, conduct, interpretation, or publication of this work.

### **Financing**

The research was carried out without financial aid.

### **Declaration of competing interest**

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

## REFERENCES

- 23rd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (1966). Novosti Press Agency Publishing House.
- Bochorishvili, E., Peranidze, N. (2020). Education Industry Overview - Georgia's Education Sector.
- Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, & Council of Ministers of the USSR. (1984). Measures for further improvement of the work of the general-education secondary school. Moscow: Politizdat.
- Counts, G. S. (1957). The challenge of Soviet education. New York, McGraw-Hill.
- Dvořák, D., Cinkraut, K., Donovalová, A., & Tabatadze, R. (2025). European Educational Research Association Season School on Curriculum and Annual Conferences in 2024. *Orbis Scholae*, 18(3), 61-68.
- Education system in Latvia. Izglītības un zinātnes ministrija. (n.d.). Retrieved December 6, 2022, from <https://www.izm.gov.lv/en/education-system-latvia>
- Education System. eqe.ge. (n.d.). Retrieved December 6, 2022, from <https://eqe.ge/en/page/parent/7/ganatlebis-sistema>
- Europe 2020 - European Commission. (n.d.-a).
- Galt and Taggart Research. Education Industry Overview, 2020.
- General education - National Statistics Service of Georgia. geostat.ge. (n.d.). Retrieved December 6, 2022, from <https://www.geostat.ge/ka/modules/categories/59/zoga-di-ganatleba>
- Hlebowitsh, P. S. (1993). Radical Curriculum Theory Reconsidered. New York, Teachers College Press.
- Huisman, J., Smolentseva, A., & Froumin, I. (2018). 25 Years of Transformations of Higher Education Systems in Post-Soviet Countries.
- Latvia: Certificate of General Secondary Education. (n.d.). Retrieved December 6, 2022, from <https://qips.ucas.com/qip/latvia-atestats-par-visparejo-videjo-izglitibu-certificate-of-general-secondary-education>
- Law on General Education of Latvia, 1999.
- Leslie, W. R. (1960). Some Aspects of Soviet Education. Volume 11, Issue 4.
- Marsh, C. J. (2009). Key Concepts for Understanding Curriculum. ISBN 9780415465786. Published by Routledge.
- Matyash, O. (2006). Social Values and Aims in Soviet Education.
- McGettrick, B. J. (2009). Quality Of Human Resources: Education – Vol. I - Foundations of Educational Systems.
- Ministry of Education And Science of Georgia (<https://mes.gov.ge/?lang=eng>)
- Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Latvia ([https://www.izm.gov.lv/en?utm\\_source=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.google.com%2F](https://www.izm.gov.lv/en?utm_source=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.google.com%2F))
- National Center for Educational Quality Enhancement. (n.d.). Education system of Georgia.
- Neave, G. (1978). Polytechnics: A Policy Drift? In Studies in Higher Education, 3/1, p. 105.

- Nicholls, A. et al. (1973). *Developing a curriculum: A practical Guide*, London George Allenand Union.
- Noddings, N. (2007). Curriculum for the 21st Century. *Educational Studies in Japan. International Yearbook No.2*, pp.75-81.
- OECD. (2019). *Reviews of Evaluation and Assessment in Education in Georgia*.
- OECD. (2019). *Reviews of National Policies for Education. Education in Latvia*.
- Portelli, J. P. (1987). On defining curriculum. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 2, 4, pp. 354–367.
- Ritz, J. (2014). Note taking Guide: Aims, Goals and objectives. Old Dominion University.
- SPLASH-db.eu (2015). Policy: “Educational Policies: Latvia” (Information provided by Zane Cunska & Indra Dedze).
- State Education Development Agency of the Republic of Latvia. Sākumlapa en | Valsts izglītības attīstības aģentūra. (n.d.). Retrieved December 6, 2022.
- Tabatadze, R., & Dvořák, D. (2024). Georgia: transformation of the national curriculum. In *Research Handbook on Curriculum and Education* (pp. 453-465). Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Toombs, W. E., Tierney, W.G. (1993). Curriculum definitions and reference points, *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 8, 3, pp. 175–195.
- Unified National Exams. Naec.ge. (n.d.). Retrieved December 6, 2022.
- Williams, G. (1985). Graduate Employment and Vocationalism in Higher Education. In *European Journal on Education* 20/2/3, pp.181-192.