

## DOCTORAL TRAINING: STATUS OF THE PROBLEM DEVELOPMENT IN DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN SCIENCE

*The aim of the study is to determine the status of development of the problem of doctoral training reformation at the national and international level.*

*The paper analyzes the extent of prior investigation of the issue on reforming doctoral training and education on the national and global scale. The research focuses on the interrelated political, economic, social, cultural, organizational and academic contexts, where this phenomenon emerges. The structural and logical analysis of the scientific studies of both Ukrainian and foreign scholars exploring the issues of major diversity trends in PhD employment facing doctorate holders beyond academia, the impact of their acquisition of transversal competencies and skills on the social and economic development and nation building make it possible to conclude that much has been done in trying to go in depth into the subject matter in question. Though there has been much debate on the nature of transformation of doctoral education, it is clear that this process is widely studied from various perspectives, including but not limited to, transformation triggers, agents of change, content, structure, trans-disciplinary context. The impact of diversification, globalization and internationalization of doctoral training offers a promising field for further in-depth analysis.*

**Key words:** *doctoral training, doctoral education, doctorate practice, doctoral supervision, reformation, PhD holder, quality assurance, globalization, internationalization.*

**Introduction.** With the categorization of studies at the doctorate level as the third educational and scientific phase of higher education initiated by the intergovernmental Bologna Process, the training of PhD holders has been badly in need of systemic changes providing for such overriding priorities as the transformation of the goals and objectives of doctoral education, principles and structure of the organization of the doctoral training process, realigning the above organization more effectively with the exact needs of its target market of educational services, content, forms and methods of training; updating the methods and criteria for involving PhD seekers in doctoral programs, criteria for ensuring the quality of the doctoral training process and outcomes of PhD program implementation; modification of supervisor-supervisee relationship, development of relevant requirements for scientific supervisors and universities implementing educational and scientific programs, etc. The need to put in place these

and other relevant measures aimed at reforming doctoral training to create a common framework of doctoral education considering the specificities of each institution is based on a certain set of conceptual approaches formulated jointly by the supranational educational, political, academic and scientific communities.

**Analysis of relevant research.** Review of Ukrainian and foreign literature on reforming doctoral training makes it possible to ascertain a profound experience gained in solving the problem under consideration. It is worth noting the studies of Cardoso, S., Carvalho, T., Santos, S., Diogo, S., Soares, D. devoted to a systematic literature review of the transformation of doctoral education, which touch upon coexistence of different ideas or concepts of doctoral education, aspects related to foundations, objectives, methods, expertise, organization and process of modern doctorate. The Ukrainian scholars Boichenko, M., Sbruieva, A., Talanova, Zh. have carried out the analysis of the regulatory, organizational, procedural, methodological foundations of reforming doctoral education in EHEA and Ukraine. Much literature focuses on the revisiting of doctoral education and creation of a new doctorate environment, and the challenges faced by PhD actors in the process of transformation of doctoral training and supervision.

**Aim of the study.** The aim of the study is to determine the status of development of the problem of doctoral training reformation at the national and international level.

**Research methods.** To properly achieve the goal to be sought, the following groups of methods were used:

- general scientific (systematic observation, analysis, synthesis, comparison, generalization and systematization, which made it possible to clarify the theoretical approaches that form the basis for the issue under consideration);
- specific scientific (method of genetic analysis, method of structural and logical analysis; method of structural and functional analysis);

**Results.** The algorithm for analyzing the extent of study of the scientific problem of doctoral training focuses on the extent of its prior investigation that is its consideration as a systematic formation and finding out what foreign and Ukrainian scientists have done in this direction. Analyzing the national pedagogical discourse on

the state of development of the above problem, it is expedient to ascertain a contradiction between the social significance of quality preparation of researchers of a new generation, which is dynamic in nature, and the insufficiency and sporadicness of scientific justification of theoretical, methodological, organizational and pedagogical foundations of its development in the process of PhD training. The consideration of the issue on doctoral training reformation at the national and international level provides for the implementation of four tasks: 1) analysis of the state of research of the problem at the national and international level; 2) analysis of the theoretical foundations of solving a certain educational problem in EHEA and Ukraine; 3) analysis of the practice of solving this educational problem in EHEA and Ukraine; 4) justification of recommendations or directions for the development of the national education system, taking into account foreign experience. In determining the relevance of the study of trends in doctoral training reformation in the European Higher Education Area (EHEA), the analyzed literature makes it possible to highlight the interrelated political, economic, social, cultural, organizational and academic contexts, where this phenomenon emerges.

The political events such as the inclusion of doctoral studies as a third cycle in the three-cycle higher education system with a vision to build stronger synergy between the EHEA and the ERA in 2003, the formulation of the Salzburg Principles in 2005 at the EUA seminar “Doctoral Program for the European Knowledge Society” in Salzburg, the development and adoption of the recommendations entitled the “Salzburg Recommendations” in 2010 by the EUA Council to place great store on research as an indispensable constituent of the European higher education system, have accorded priority to issues subject to discussion. The global socio-political challenges in a spectrum of intensity across a variety of dimensions, which affect the nature and the form of research and doctoral education, are highlighted in papers of Balaban, C., Boichenko, M., Cardoso, S., Carvalho, T., Sbruieva, A., Sin, C., Tavares, O. [3; 35] The works of Bartelse, J., Huisman, J., Kehm, B., Nerad, M. focus on the political implications and initiatives aimed at reshaping the doctoral education process. Political, economic, social and professional travails that hang out for high levels of PhD training

and the development of both generic and specific competences are characterized by Biaudet, P., Chambaz, J., et al. [4; 17; 25; 29; 30].

Considering the economic dimension, some scholars focus on the need for doctoral education to train PhD holders not only to be professionals in research, but also to be competent experts in various fields for the development of a global knowledge economy. Higher educational institutions, primarily involved in conducting doctoral research, have turned into a cluster producing new knowledge. The nation-building role of doctoral education outcomes on the nationally empowered social and economic development, the role of universities in regional development and cluster formation are analyzed by Gibbons, M., Green, H., Limoges, C., McCarney, P., Nowotny, H., Schwartzman, S., Scott, P., Trow, M., Powell, S., Wolfe, D. A. [20]. The benefits from the production of doctorates and their impact on the improvement of economic performance, the value of PhD holders are subject to debates of Maheu, L., Scholz, B., Balán, J., Graybill, J.K., Strugnell, R., Casey, B, Coan, P., Connor, H., Gatto-Roissard, G, Kerrin, M., O'Leary, N., Sloane, P., and Paterson F., Pearson, M. [28; 33; 34]. The value of doctoral graduates to employers, their deep subject knowledge, high-quality research, transversal skills, capacity for critical thinking, problem-solving that enables to innovate, develop new or improve existing goods, services, processes and ways of working are considered and refreshed through examples of economic benefits by Ball, C., Canals V., Diebolt C., Diamond, A., Hughes, T., Howe, P., Moreton, R., Nathwani, T., Vorley, T. [13; 14; 18]. A deeper understanding of the potential of doctoral education has auspicated a slew of reforms and policy initiatives taken by the governments at the national and supra-national levels, aimed at its reshaping and better regulation. The effect of the above reforms and initiatives on effectuation and organizational structure of doctoral education is analyzed in studies of Bao, Ya., Bartelse & Huisman, Kehm, Nerad, et. al., complemented with the diverse perspectives of multidisciplinary approaches, transferability of skills acquired by doctorate holders across different jobs and sectors, international collaboration by Cardoso, S., Carvalho, T., Sin, C., Tavares, O., and others [4; 16; 29; 30].

As for the social aspect of considering the process of reforming doctoral training, it should be emphasized that globalization and advanced development at the global scale have reshaped the content and structure of doctoral training. The overall aim of such reshaping is the development of transversal competencies comprising of skills, knowledge and values needed by the new-age and early-career researchers to be competitive outside academia, succeed in the marketplace and have a good sense of their career prospects and further direction. This aspect is considered by Ameryckx, C., Bao, Y., Bebiroglu, N., Dethier, B., Kehm, B. M., et al [5; 6]. The economic and social returns of the doctorate, as well as its dimension and implication on PhD holders' employment, skills match are the subject matter of the scientific discourse of Barrioluengo, M., Boman, J., Beeson, H., Rusitoru, M., et al, who distinguish themselves by another way to look at the issue in question [9; 14]. A particular focus on employment trends, contributing to a more international picture of doctoral ultimate impact from the perspective of employment opportunities, a public policy framework from the standpoint of the development of knowledge economies, outcomes-based judgments on education and the professionalization of the doctorate in Australia and other OECD countries is put by Neumann, R., and Tan, K., et al [31]. The doctorate-to-work transition, PhD labor market prospects and challenges, reasons of unemployment are analyzed by Berkhout, P., Biggeri L., Bini M., Canals V., Diebolt C., Enders, J., Grilli L., Nguyen, A.N., Taylor, J., Van der Klaauw, B., Van Vuureny, A., Wadsworth J. [8; 14]. The role and significance of doctorate holders for the labor market and current labor market perspectives for PhD graduates are also considered by Boman, Ju., Degtyarova, I., Hnatkova, E., Kersschot, M. [22]. The phenomenon of social and academic performance stratification at the micro-level of the individual academic scientist is explored in depth by Cole, J. R., Cole, S., Enders, J., Fumasoli, T., Goastellec, G., Kehm, B. M., Kwiek, M., Musselin, C. [19; 25].

Debates about the academic specifics, content and structure of doctoral education have been the focus of a number of scholars, considering the transition from scientific doctoral programs to educational and scientific ones. Improvement in doctoral programs, quality of the doctoral training and new models for improving its outcomes

are the staple subjects of thought of Bueschel, A., Campbell, S., Cyr, T., Dwyer, C., Golde, C., Jones, L., Hutchings, P., Kuh, C., Millett, C., Muth, Ostriker, J., Payne, D., Voytuk, J., Walker, G. Moreover, specific features of collaborative doctoral programs implemented jointly by universities and industry/business partners, the approaches and characteristics of their introduction, as well as perspectives and expectations of universities, industry representatives, and doctorate holders are highlighted by Borrell-Damian, L., Brown, T., Dearing, A., Font, J., Hagen, S., Metcalfe, J., Smith, J. [10; 21].

Changes in the structure of doctoral education are considered in two categories: those coming from introduction of more structured doctoral programs and establishment of doctoral schools that have become a top priority at most universities in Europe. In this regard, PhD education structuring means taking by universities responsibility for training through research. By introducing new doctorate practices tailored to be conducive to doctoral education while increasing the transparency, efficiency and quality of its procedures and institutional profiles, doctoral schools contributes to innovative landscape of doctoral training and supervision. These changes involving the structuring, standardization and transparency of doctoral training that preserve its academic character are revealed in the works of Baschung, L., Eberle, Ju., Herzig, S., Lachmann, D., Landmann, M., Kotzebue, L., Martius, T., Neuhaus B. [26].

In addition, regarding the academic aspect of consideration of the problem, it should be noted that one of the specifics of the reforming of doctoral education is the transformation of PhD training. Since this aspect is deemed important for the analysis of literature in question, a review of diversification of doctoral education from the perspective of introduction of new categories, types, methods, models is included in the issues under consideration by Ambrasat, J., Borrell-Damian, L., Brown, T., Dearing, A., Font, J., Hagen, S., Metcalfe, J., McKenna, S., Smith, J., Scott, D., Tesch, J., and others [2; 10; 21; 14]. Furthermore, the presenting features of doctorate transformation, as well as various dimensions thereof, providing for a more structured and highly-organized configuration of doctoral training practice, the drivers of its expansion at individual, institutional and system level are analyzed by Kärner, A., Kariyana, I., Marongwe, N., Puura, V., Sonn, R. A., Zusman, A., et.al [23; 24].

The process of PhD reforming is indissolubly related to improvement in quality of doctoral education and its assurance that is reflected in studies of both Ukrainian and foreign scholars such as Bitusikova, A., Bohrer, J., Borošic, I., Byrne J., Costes, N., Edinsel, K., Jørgensen Th., Holländer, K., Loukkola T., Talanova, Zh., et al [12; 36]. The regulation and guidance of doctoral education are carried out in a professional and skillful manner through doctoral schools and other institutional structures that result in ensuring accountability and improving quality. Quality management (QM) in doctoral training is an ongoing commitment for all governing bodies involved on various university levels and considers different subject areas, knowledge domains and contexts. The quality assurance (QA) processes are based on the principles and objectives defined in the quality strategies of the universities. Since research is of fundamental importance in doctoral studies, the processes of quality management and assurance in doctoral training sets out the direction towards the processes in research. A plenty of reports on doctoral studies contain outcomes of surveys of doctoral holders and their performance through the quality analysis and quality outcomes review. The goal of modern doctorate is to provide the next generation of researchers with a set of transversal skills in order to train creative, critical and intellectual individuals who will achieve success beyond research and academia, being prepared for a variety of careers in different sectors. These objectives may be achieved through excellent training entrenched in a strong research culture and through quality management processes which reinforce this culture. A high-quality research culture encourages doctoral holders and their supervisors to solve challenging issues with creativity and strictness. Quality assurance and management processes touch upon structural and administrative aspects of doctoral education at the research training program, department, faculty and institutional levels and their efficiency is ensured and monitored through quality assessment procedures in place.

The high-quality process of doctoral training is not conceivable without the high-performance supervision that provides for transition from the traditional master-apprenticeship relationship between a supervisor and a supervisee to a more structured and regulated supervisory practice. Quality of supervision is a priority in the area of

doctoral education at universities. In this regard, some scholars, such as Hutchings, M., Kiley, M., Lee, A., McAlpine, Lynn et al., consider that the apprenticeship model is no longer capable of meeting new demands and challenges facing doctoral education [27; 32]. As the doctoral preparation is replenished with a great deal of additional liability, duties and opportunities for doctorate holders, supervisors' area of expertise and obligations have redoubled to facilitate the efficient completion of doctoral studies by PhD students. Studies of Åkerlind, Gerlese, and Lynn McAlpine, Carter, S., Laurs, D., Guerin, Cally, Kerr, H., Green, Ia., et al contain opinion that supervision should be a joint endeavor with clearly defined and explicit responsibilities of the principal supervisor, supervisory team, PhD student, doctoral school, research group and university that foresees the possibility of the personal growth of the doctorate holder [1; 15]. The issues on promoting supervisory convergence by professional development of supervisors through formal training sessions and courses, building a common supervisory culture at the institutional level are specified by Helmut Brentel, an advisor of doctoral supervisors at European universities. He has developed an integrated set of measures and tools which are aimed at achieving outstanding quality in research supervision through initial workshops, follow-up workshops, workshops for experienced supervisors, lunch time meetings, peer group supervision, training for trainers of supervisors. However, the issue on specifics of supervisory practice at a global scale and its improvement remains understudied and needs insight consideration by both Ukrainian and foreign scholars.

Other fundamental trends in the doctoral education reforming specified in studies of many scholars are the globalization and internationalization of modern doctorate, reflected in an increase in the number of international students and growing diversity of PhD holder profiles, as well as expectations and mobility. Internationalization is associated with the implementation of cross-cultural, institutional and global dimensions, which results in the enhancement of training and scientific research quality. The internationalization of doctoral education covers many structural facets, including the creation of international research environment, mechanisms for quality assurance of training and supervision, opportunities for international recognition, international focus

of doctoral programs; participation in international projects, etc. The impact of globalization and internationalization on various aspects of modern doctorate has become a key topic of many recent studies. Some scholars like Bound, J., Fyfe, J., & Flores-Scott, E., Graybill, J. K., Halai, N., Huisman, J., Marginson, S., Shandas, V., Trahar, S., Turner, S., Walsh, P., et al describe the process of integrating the international, intercultural and global dimensions and objectives of the doctoral training and research of universities [7; 11]. Many authors focus on response of doctoral training practices to more diverse PhD student population, effect of international experiences on the professional qualifications of doctorate holders since the Salzburg Recommendations specify internationalization as one of the most essential constituents of enhancing the quality of research and doctoral training at the institutional level.

**Conclusion and prospects for future research.** The systematic literature review has enabled to determine the status of development of the problem of doctoral training reformation and transformation at the national and international level. Moreover, the analysis of the national pedagogical discourse on the state of development of the above problem has made it possible to reveal a certain contradiction between the social significance of quality creation of researchers of a new generation, which is dynamic in nature, and the insufficiency and sporadicness of scientific justification of theoretical, methodological, organizational and pedagogical foundations of its development in the process of PhD training. The reformative nature of modern doctorate is the mirroring of global challenges it faces entering the era of a new knowledge society. From this perspective, since the inclusion of doctoral studies as the third cycle by the Berlin Communiqué (2003) in a three-cycle higher education system with the aim to create interdependence of the EHEA and the ERA, both Ukrainian and foreign scholars have explored to a greater or lesser extent different aspects of the interrelated political, economic, social, cultural, organizational and academic contexts, where the phenomenon of doctoral education emerges. The multidimensional analysis of the scholars covers the transformation of the goals and objectives of doctoral education, principles and structure of the organization of the doctoral training process, forms and methods of training; updating the methods and criteria for involving PhD seekers in

doctoral programs, criteria for ensuring the quality of the doctoral training process and outcomes of PhD program implementation; modification of supervisor-supervisee relationship, development of relevant requirements for scientific supervisors and universities implementing educational and scientific programs. The impact of diversification, globalization and internationalization of doctoral training offers a promising field for further in-depth analysis.

## REFERENCES

1. Åkerlind, Gerlese, and Lynn McAlpine (2017). Supervising Doctoral Students: Variation in Purpose and Pedagogy. *Studies in Higher Education* 42 (9): 1686–98.
2. Ambrasat, J., Tesch, J. (2017). Structured diversity – The changing landscape of doctoral training in Germany after the introduction of structured doctoral programs. *Research Evaluation*, 26(4), 292–301
3. Balaban, C. (2020). Diversifying the mission and expectations of doctoral education: Are we losing the distinctive ‘added value’ of the PhD? In S. Cardoso, O. Tavares, C. Sin, & T. Carvalho (Eds.), *Structural and institutional transformations in doctoral education: Social, political and student expectations*. London, UK: Springer Nature, 325–345
4. Bartelse, J., & Huisman, J. (2008). The Bologna process. In M. Nerad & M. Hegglund (Eds.), *Toward a global PhD? Forces and forms in doctoral education worldwide*. University of Washington Press, 101–113.
5. Bao, Y., Kehm, B., & Ma, Y (2018). From product to process. The reform of doctoral education in Europe and China. *Studies in Higher Education*, 43(3), 524–541
6. Bebiroglu, N., Dethier, B., & Ameryckx, C. (2022). Gaining insight into transferable skills training: Perspectives from doctorate holders and non-academic employers. Executive Summary. Observatory Thematic Report Series: Recruiting Talents #1. Retrieved from [http://www.observatoire.frs-fnrs.be/\\_media/report.employers.1.summary.pdf](http://www.observatoire.frs-fnrs.be/_media/report.employers.1.summary.pdf)
7. Bernstein, B. L., Evans, B., Fyffe, J., Halai, N., Hall, F. L., Marsh, H., & Jensen, H. S. (2014). The continuing evolution of the research doctorate. In M. Nerad & B. Evans (Eds.), *Globalization and its impacts on the quality of PhD education: Forces and forms in doctoral education worldwide* (pp. 5-30). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
8. Biggeri L., Bini M., Grilli L. (2001). The transition from university to work: a multilevel approach to the analysis of time to obtain the first job *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society (Series A)* 164: 293–305
9. Boman, J., Beeson, H., Sanchez Barrioluengo, M., & Rusitoru, M. (2021). What comes after a PhD? Findings from the DocEnhance survey of doctorate holders on their employment situation, skills match, and the value of the doctorate. Strasbourg: European Science Foundation (ESF). [https://docenhance.eu/wordpress/wpcontent/uploads/2021/12/DocEnhance-D1.2\\_Report-on-career-tracking-ofPhD-graduates.pdf](https://docenhance.eu/wordpress/wpcontent/uploads/2021/12/DocEnhance-D1.2_Report-on-career-tracking-ofPhD-graduates.pdf)

10. Borrell-Damian, L., Brown, T., Dearing, A., Font, J., Hagen, S., Metcalfe, J., Smith, J. (2010) Collaborative Doctoral Education: University-Industry Partnerships for Enhancing Knowledge Exchange. *Higher Education Policy*, Vol. 23, No.4, p. 493-514.
11. Bound, J., Turner, S., Walsh, P. (2009). Internationalization of U.S. doctorate education. Retrieved from [https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=1366192](https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1366192)
12. Byrne, J., Jørgensen, T., Loukkola, T. (2013). *Quality Assurance in Doctoral Education – results of the ARDE project*. Brussels: European University Association. Retrieved from [https://www.eua-cde.org/downloads/publications/2013\\_byrnej\\_quality-assurance-arde-project-results.pdf](https://www.eua-cde.org/downloads/publications/2013_byrnej_quality-assurance-arde-project-results.pdf).
13. Canals V., Diebolt C. (2002). France In Ehlert H., Cordier H., (eds), *The Transition from Higher Education to the Labour Market. International Perspectives and Challenges* Peter Lang Frankfurt am Main. Pp. 13–54.
14. Cardoso, S., Tavares, O., Sin, C., & Carvalho, T. (Eds.) (2020). *Structural and institutional transformations in doctoral education: Social, political and student expectations*. London, UK: Springer Nature.
15. Carter, S., Laurs, D. (2014). *Developing Generic Support for Doctoral Students: Practice and Pedagogy*. Abingdon: Routledge.
16. Carvalho, T., Cardoso, S. (2020). Conclusion: The transformation in doctoral education – A comprehensive and critical approach. In S. Cardoso, O. Tavares, C. Sin, & T. Carvalho (Eds.), *Structural and institutional transformations in doctoral education: Social, political and student expectations*. London, UK: Springer Nature. Pp. 375–389.
17. Chambaz, J., Biaudet, P., & Collonge, S. (2006). *Developing the Doctorate*. In *EUA Bologna Handbook*, Chapter C 4, 4-2.
18. Diamond, A., Ball, C., Vorley, T., Hughes, T., Moreton, R., Howe, P. and Nathwani, T. (2014). *The Impact of Doctoral Careers*, CFE Research, Leicester (UK).
19. Fumasoli, T., Goastellec, G., Kem B. *Academic Careers and Work in Europe: Trends, Challenges, Perspectives* (2014) in *Academic Work and Careers in Europe: Trends, Challenges, Perspectives* Retrieved from: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/267633798\\_Academic\\_Careers\\_and\\_Work\\_in\\_Europe\\_Trends\\_Challenges\\_Perspectives](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/267633798_Academic_Careers_and_Work_in_Europe_Trends_Challenges_Perspectives).
20. Gibbons, M., Limoges, C., Nowotny, H., Schwartzman, S., Scott, P., & Trow, M. (1994). *The new production of knowledge: The dynamics of science and research in contemporary societies*. London, UK: Sage.
21. Hodges, V Metcalfe, J and Pollard, E (2011) ‘What do Researchers do? Career paths of doctoral graduates’ Produced as part of a series by Vitae
22. Hnatkova, E., Degtyarova, I., Hnatkova, E., Kersschot, M. Boman, Ju. (2022). Labour market perspectives for PhD graduates in Europe. *European Journal of Education* 57(3).
23. Kärner, A., Puura, V. (2008). Doctoral education in transition to knowledge-based society. *Trames*, 12(1), 95–109
24. Kariyana, I., Sonn, R. A., Marongwe, N. (2017). Objectivity of the subjective quality: Convergence on competencies expected of doctoral graduates. *Cogent Education*, 4(1), 1, 390, 827.

25. Kehm, B. (2020). Reforms of doctoral education in Europe and diversification of types. In S. Cardoso, O. Tavares, C. Sin, & T. Carvalho (Eds.), *Structural and institutional transformations in doctoral education: Social, political and student expectations* (pp. 85–104). London, UK: Springer Nature.

26. Lachmann, D., Martius, T., Eberle, Ju., Landmann, M. University of Cologne (2020). Regulations and practices of structured doctoral education in the life sciences in Germany. Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/343344543\\_Regulations\\_and\\_practices\\_of\\_structured\\_doctoral\\_education\\_in\\_the\\_life\\_sciences\\_in\\_Germany](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/343344543_Regulations_and_practices_of_structured_doctoral_education_in_the_life_sciences_in_Germany)

27. Lee, A., Boud, D. (2009). Framing doctoral education as practice. In D. Boud & A. Lee (eds.). *Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge Changing practices of doctoral education*. 18–35.

28. Maheu, L., Scholz, B., Balán, J., Graybill, J.K., Strugnell, R. (2014). Doctoral Education as an Element of Cultural and Economic Prosperity. In: *Globalization and Its Impacts on the Quality of PhD Education. Global Perspectives on Higher Education*. SensePublishers, Rotterdam. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6209-569-4\\_8](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6209-569-4_8)

29. Nerad, M. (2011). What We Know about the Dramatic Increase in PhD Degrees and the Reform of Doctoral Education Worldwide: Implications for South Africa. *Perspectives in Education*. 29(3):1– 12.

30. Nerad, M. (2020). Governmental innovation policies, globalisation, and change in doctoral education worldwide: Are doctoral programmes converging? Trends and tensions. In S. Cardoso, O. Tavares, C. Sin, & T. Carvalho (Eds.), *Structural and institutional transformations in doctoral education: Social, political and student expectations* (pp. 43–84). London, UK: Springer Nature

31. Neumann, R., Tan, K. (2011). From PhD to initial employment: the doctorate in a knowledge economy. Retrieved from: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/03075079.2011.594596?journalCode=cshe20>

32. McAlpine, Lynn (2013). Doctoral Supervision: Not an Individual but a Collective Institutional Responsibility. *Journal for the Study of Education and Development* 36 (3): 259–80.

33. Patterson, F., Kerrin, M., Gatto-Roissard, G. and Coan, P. (2009). *Everyday Innovation: How to Enhance Innovative Working in Employees and Organizations*. NESTA, London.

34. Pearson, M., Brew, A. (2002). Research Training and Supervision Development. *Studies in Higher Education* 27 (2): 135–50.

35. Sbruieva, A., Boichenko, M. (2021) Doctoral training reforms in the European Higher Education Area: stages and further development trends. Retrieved from: [https://repository.sspu.edu.ua/bitstream/123456789/10837/3/Monograph\\_pedagogika\\_SSPU.2021.pdf](https://repository.sspu.edu.ua/bitstream/123456789/10837/3/Monograph_pedagogika_SSPU.2021.pdf)

36. Talanova, Zh. (2010) Doctoral training in the world and Ukraine. K.: Millennium. Retrieved from: <https://ihed.org.ua/about/staff/talanova-zhanna/>

## АНОТАЦІЯ

**Клочкова Тетяна.** Докторська підготовка: стан розроблення досліджуваної проблеми у вітчизняній і зарубіжній науці.

*Метою статті є визначення стану розроблення проблеми реформування докторської підготовки на національному та міжнародному рівнях. Для досягнення поставленої мети були використані наступні групи методів: загальнонауковий (систематичне спостереження, аналіз, синтез, порівняння, узагальнення і систематизація); конкретно-науковий (метод генетичного аналізу, метод структурно-логічного аналізу; метод структурно-функціонального аналізу).*

*У статті схарактеризовано стан дослідження проблеми реформування докторської підготовки. Здійснено аналіз наукової літератури, присвяченої розгляду політичних, соціально-економічних, організаційних та освітніх аспектів реформування докторської освіти на сучасному етапі. Структурно-логічний аналіз наукових робіт як українських, так і зарубіжних вчених, які досліджують питання основних тенденцій трансформації докторантури дозволяє зробити висновок, що процес реформування докторської підготовки широко вивчається з різних точок зору, включаючи, крім іншого, видозмінення цілей і завдань докторантури, принципів і структури організації процесу підготовки аспірантів з урахуванням потреб і запитів споживачів ринку освітніх послуг, зміст, форми і методи докторської підготовки; оновлення методів і критеріїв забезпечення якості процесу підготовки аспірантів і результатів реалізації освітньо-наукових програм підготовки здобувачів третього рівня вищої освіти; зміна моделі «науковий керівник-аспірант», розробка відповідних вимог до наукових керівників та університетів, що реалізують освітньо-наукові програми підготовки здобувачів третього рівня вищої освіти тощо.*

*До подальших досліджень автором віднесено вивчення наслідків процесів глобалізації та інтернаціоналізації у сфері докторської освіти.*

**Ключові слова:** докторська підготовка, докторська освіта, докторська практика, керівництво аспірантами, реформування, аспірант, забезпечення якості, глобалізація, інтернаціоналізація.