УДК 378.126+005.95/96

POSTGRADUATE COMPARATIVE EDUCATION THEORY UNDER GLOBALIZATION

Georgiy Stompel

У статті висвітлено результати наукового дослідження змінної природи порівняльних досліджень теорії і практики післядипломної освіти для суспільства знань в умовах глобалізаційних процесів. Розмаїття міжнародних обмінів і їхня вагомість вимагають якісної наукової підготовки на рівнях магістратури, аспірантури та докторантури. Це вимагає гнучкості в управлінні і стандартах у розвитку професіоналізму студентів магістратури, аспірантури та докторантури

Ключові слова: теорія і практика післядипломної освіти, суспільство знань, міжнародні академічні обміни.

The innovative model of society's development requires functioning of the knowledge triangle (education – research – innovation). The number of companies implementing innovations in Ukraine is now officially 12–14 % of all enterprises. It is 3–4 times less than in the developed economies. The experience gained in the implementation of the Russian Federation Act of Law № ФЗ–217 dated 02.08.2009 suggests that positive assessment of higher educational institutions should take into account the number of faculty simultaneously working in the innovative companies as a criterion. The innovation side of the triangle sinks deeply as a result of many driving factors: lack of entrepreneurial orientation in postgraduate education, its poor national quality assurance and research as for dynamic pace of regional and global integration, challenges and controversies of postmodern reality, theoretical and conceptual inconsistencies of the comparative postgraduate practice in consequence of *methodological nationalism* and *highereducationism* (Riyad A. Shahjahan), and so forth.

A set of factors relevant to success of the knowledge triangle functioning may be changing and depends on the specific situation analysis. Kerim Edinsel, Prof. Dr. phil. Dipl.-Ing., is sure that 'a significant amount of postgraduate students have serious professional and personal shortcomings resulting from previous studies. But the same shortcomings can also be observed amongst the supervisors because they have gone through the same study programmes about which we complain' [5, p. 68]. Nathalie Costes, *Quality Assurance in Postgraduate Education* Project Manager, finalises: 'The organisation and provision of postgraduate research education differ around the world. Compared with Bachelor's and Master's programmes, PhD programmes greatly vary in terms of demand, structure, form of organisation and funding. This explains why specific evaluation procedures and standards need to be established for doctoral education' [5, p. 69]. In *Michael Crossley* and *Keith Watson*, worldwide illustrious comparativists' opinion, 'the tensions that are emerging between the ideas and development that underpin globalization, on the one hand,

and the theoretical perspectives that prioritise difference on the other, generate what may be the most fundamental of all intellectual challenges of the present day' [7, p. X].

In view of the prevailing *methodological nationalism* and *highereducationism* the comparative postgraduate theory is one of such fundamental challenges for the innovative model of society's development under globalization. The experience of the European Innovation and Technology Institute, *Skolkovo* Innovation Centre of the Russian Federation, Institute of Electric Welding named after Eu.Paton of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences and the National Technical University of Ukraine 'Kyiv Polytechnic Institute' provides hints, ideas and some technologies for the consolidation of the postgraduate comparative theory that overlaps higher education and research contingent approaches. The purpose of this paper is to suggest the ways to reorient postgraduate comparative theory beyond post-soviet national and scholastic constraints to the pragmatic concerns of the knowledge society formation under globalization in the context of the economic downturn and the need for educational reforms.

The comparative education theorists in Ukraine and Russia (V. Byednaya, A. Vasylyuk, O. Lokshyna, A. Sbruyeva, V. Tytov etc.) argumentatively enough distinguish in what is researched a wider spectrum of reality (object) and a narrower one (subject). For instance, the former for comparative pedagogy is the process of social and cultural reproduction of the human being in the modern world as well as a social institution at a global, regional and national scale. The latter is trends, principles and condition of the development of foreign and national educational experience and culture. Other theorists similarly attribute differing substance to what is researched in a wider and narrower sense. It contradicts the traditional approach of comparativists as well as other scholars that the latter is the way a researcher sees the researched. The problem may be also interpreted in the terms of the philosophical approach towards the relationship between the matter and the spirit.

The roots of poor conceptual arrangement within the comparative postgraduate theory are accounted for historically recent (the end of the 19th century) appearance of the educational theory and prevalence of the application of Philosophy of Education methods based on the eclectic mixture of idealism, neothomism, naturalism, marxism, pragmatism, behaviourism and existentialism within the influential principles of perennialism, progressivism, essentialism, critical pedagogy and democratic education. There are also some barriers in the understanding of the fundamentals of the comparative theory of education.

The radical alternative at the beginning of the 21st century is put forward by A. Androushchenko and V. Loutaj to consider Philosophy as theory and methodology for educational development (arch philosophical approach). Nevertheless 'the prevailing image of educational theory remains that of something that informs practice without itself being a form of practice, as something that releases educational practice from its dependence on contingent norms and constraints without itself being dependent on contingent norms and constraints, as something that can infuse educational practice with the rationality it so patently lacks' [6, p. 11].

Unfortunately seldom attempts to conceptualize research results in higher and postgraduate education remain incomplete [1, pp. 7, 47, 57, 183; 5, pp. 21, 34, 42, 46, 54, 62]. Gregory P. Fairbrother draws attention 'not only to challenges brought about

by globalization and socio-economic change' but also attends to comparative education scholars' call for more dialogue on the contribution of theory towards meeting the challenges [8, p. 5]. The postgraduate training and education seems not to be properly biased towards strategic priorities of research and innovation for knowledge society as well as the comparative postgraduate theory. It looks true for European comparative and international education [10].

Thus the land-marking experience of the European Institute of Innovation and Technology as for the knowledge and innovation communities (businesses, universities and research institutions) elaborating new pragmatic actions towards climate change, ICT, and sustainable energy remain poorly accepted in some countries and in the theory of comparative postgraduate education. The innovations in Ukrainian enterprises are not thriving and the in-service training of the faculty lacks entrepreneurial orientation.

In addition the postgraduate education in Ukraine and other former Soviet and socialist republics is theoretically perceived and named differently due to 'methodological nationalism' (postgraduate education, podyplomowe studia, professional and additional education, postgraduate and doctoral studyes etc). It cannot be justified by controversial understanding of the essence of postgraduate education. In the latest British report on it the *postgraduate* is clarified in such a way: 'There is no single definition of the term 'postgraduate' although it is often used to describe further study undertaken by those who already have a first degree. It is frequently used to refer to master or doctoral studies, but it also includes certificates and diplomas which are taught to a more academically demanding standard than undergraduate certificates and diplomas' [9, p. 3].

The postgraduate education theory in the Commonwealth of Independent States is primarily oriented at the development of professionalism of all those who work. Since Soviet times the dividing line between professions and occupations has not been drawn. In the long run, that equates professionality and professionalism with occupational training significantly lowering the standards. In contrast to the post-Soviet interpretation of postgraduate education as commencing with the initiation of employment life, within the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) and many other countries the postgraduate education starts after the bachelor's degree is awarded and continues lifelong and lifewide along the trajectories suggested by recently adopted or still being elaborated National Qualifications Frameworks.

Therefore the globalised understanding of postgraduate education envisages magisterial, doctoral and postdoctoral education including postgraduate non-degree training. The postgraduate education theory suffers greatly from its intersection with principles of higher education [5 et al.]. They are directly and bluntly applied ignoring pragmatic orientation of postgraduate education towards burning issues of the survival of humankind in the 21st century. This approach is named by R. Shahjhan *highereducationism*.

The scientists and scholars in research institutions, universities and companies are a major driving force for the functioning of the knowledge triangle. However the underestimation of the faculty role, especially those who participate in the operation of business centres, industrial parks, technology towns, venture foundations etc., makes a negative impact on the innovative development of the country.

The professional activities of masters, PhDs and agents of higher doctorates

differ depending on the posts occupied and sector of economic or any other industry it is applied to. The success of knowledge triangle functioning for the knowledge-based economy and society, in particular, at its information-communicative technology stage, relies both on scientists and scholars because they mainly produce new original ideas and technologies. The faculty embraces a wider spectrum of responsibilities than scientists and scholars. The underestimation of that breadth makes civil society and governments overlook the potential of more gifted and better prepared faculty members in making of the knowledge triangle functioning successful. The entrepreneurial orientation of the faculty postgraduate education might have led to more efficient and effective innovative activities, if the interaction of the knowledge triangle components interaction had been explored within the theory of comparative postgraduate education.

The theoretical recognition of the duplicate role of the faculty (*entrepreneurial-innovational and ennectent-generative*) is held back due to the underdevelopment of higher and comparative postgraduate theory even within the Bologna process [3; 4 et al.]. A faculty member generates some research with possible innovative ideas and technologies under the accelerating speed of regional and global integration. The faculty's generative role may be supplemented with the orientation of students' learning. That may be defined as ennectent assignment for the knowledge triangle functioning. If the entrepreneurial aspect of the discovered ideas or technology implementation comes to light, then the faculty's role in the knowledge triangle functioning is enhanced. Thus faculty's performance is understood through the lenses of entrepreneurial-innovational and ennectent-generative functions.

In spite of all its shades and nuances the professional activities of faculty members is originally educational and research [1; 5 et al.]. It is reflected in Ukrainian legislation. The faculty qualifications correspond to the 7–8th levels of the International Standard Classification of Education (ISCE-2011), revised at the 36th UNESCO General Assembly session in 2011 (Paris), as well as to the second and third cycles of the EHEA. According to the International Labour Organization Classification of Occupations of 2008 the faculty memberss are qualified for professionals and managers. Any professional may advance in its career to the position of a manager.

As a professional the faculty member increases the available knowledge, applies concepts and theories, systematically teaches or combines any of these activities. The faculty member as a manager develops organization's policy, establishes standards, distributes resources and bears responsibility for professional development of the personnel in an organization and so on. The invariant content of the faculty's professional activities is mirrored in ISCE-2011, Framework Qualifications for the EHEA, European Qualifications Framework for Lifelong Learning and respective national documents for the qualifications system. All of these give ground for the elaboration of the faculty standards.

The Tentative Framework Standards for the Faculty alongside with the Experimental Standards of Faculty Members' Professional Development are being tested in Ukraine. The former foresees 5 provisions for masters, 8 for PhDs and 9 for higher doctorates. The latter comprises 7 indicators and 3 levels of their attainment by masters, doctors and postdoctors. Both types of standards are interrelated and need approval by professional associations after testing and some improvement.

The exploitation of Standards incurs some risks and poses some challenges.

The excessive exploitation and subjective interpretation of the provisions in the Standards may provoke some bureaucratization resulting in elimination of faculty's entrepreneurial-innovational and ennectent-generative assignment for the knowledge triangle functioning. Another risk is in the application of the Performance Professional Development Standards. The holistic outcomes of the faculty's research and educational activities may be reduced to some of its products and services.

The application of Standards requires respond to the challenge of violation of professional autonomy and identity. The introduction of Standards is needful of collective defence from the imbalance of centralization and decentralization of governance in the system of higher and postgraduate education as well as that of management within an educational organization. Pityingly enough, authoritarian leadership is widespread on the post-Soviet terrains and professional associations are customarily non-extant. The striving for adhocracy with its changeability as 'the most characteristic feature' (Bob Travica) may assist in implementation of democratic rule in the progression towards knowledge society.

The management accompaniment within an educational organization facilitates faculty's entrepreneurial-innovational and ennectent-generative assignment for the functioning of knowledge triangle. These functions of the faculty complement the leading role of scientists and scholars in the interaction of research, education and innovation. The invariant content of professionality acquisition and development of professionalism constituting the Faculty Standards may play its global integration part in the second decade of the 21st century if the theory of comparative postgraduate education takes up globalization challenges.

References:

1. *Наукові записки Ніжинського державного університету імені Миколи Гоголя. Психолого-педагогічні науки: науковий журнал. – № 1. / гол. ред. Є. І. Коваленко. [Міністерство освіти і науки, молоді та спорту України, Ніжинський державний університет імені Миколи Гоголя]. – Ніжин : НДУ ім. М. Гоголя, 2011. – 192 с.*
2. *Титов В. А. Сравнительная педагогика (конспект лекций). – М. : А-Приор, 2008. – 156 с.*
3. *Штомпель Г. О. Сучасні світові тенденції розвитку вищої школи / Г. О. Штомпель // Основи організації праці керівних кадрів вищої школи : [навч. посібник для слухачів очно-дистанц. курсів підвищ. кваліфікації кер. кадрів вищої шк.] / В. А. Семиченко, О. С. Снісаренко, Л. П. Сніцар, Г. О. Штомпель. – К. : Педагог. думка, 2010. – С. 31–82.*
4. *Штомпель Г. О. Удосконалення фахівця як проблема теорії й управлінського супроводу в системі післядипломної освіти / Г. О. Штомпель // Вісник післядипломної освіти. – 2011. – № 3(16). – С. 173–180.*
5. *Bitusikova A. Quality Assurance in Postgraduate Education / Alexandra Bitusikova, Janet Bohrer, Ivana Borošić et al. – Helsinki : European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education. 2010. – 74 p.*
6. *Carr W. Education without Theory / Wilfred Carr. – 2006. – 14 p. – Режим доступу : http://www.philosophy-of-education.org/pdfs/Saturday/Carr.pdf.*
7. *Crossley M. Comparative and International Research in Education. Globalization, context and diffetrence. / Michael Crossley, Keith Watson. – London and New York : RoutledgePalmer, 2003. – 192 p.*
8. *Fairbrother G. P. Comparison to what end? Maximizing the potential of comparative education research / Gregory P. Fairbrother // Comparative Education. – 2005. – Vol. 41. # 1 (February). – P. 5–24.*
9. *Postgraduate Education in the United Kingdom [Higher Education Policy Institute, The British Library]. – London : Ginevra House, 2010. – 70 p.*
10. *Silova I. The Changing Frontiers of Comparative Education: A Forty-Year Retrospective on 'European Education' / Iveta Silova. – European Education. – 2009. – Vol. 41. – # 1 (Spring). – P. 17–31.*