DOI 10.52260/2304-7216.2026.1(62).39
UDC 330.1
SRSTI 06.01.45

N. Kinetova, master's student[1]
R. Ismailova, d.e.s., professor[1]
B. Amralinova, PhD, associate professor[2]
A.Turegeldinova*, c.e.s., PhD, associate professor[2]
IT University, Astana, Kazakhstan[1]
Satbayev University, Almaty, Kazakhstan[2]
* – main author (author for correspondence)
e-mail: a.turegeldinova@satbayev.university

QUALITY ASSESSMENT OF PROJECT MANAGEMENT IN KAZAKHSTAN: MIXED-METHODS

This paper examines the quality of Project Management educational programs in Kazakhstan through a mixed-methods design combining curriculum content analysis and a survey of 193 project management professionals. The study identifies clear structural differences between Master's and doctoral programs: Master's curricula are primarily oriented toward professional specialization and applied managerial preparation, whereas doctoral programs place greater emphasis on research methodology, digital transformation, sustainability, and analytical depth. Although all reviewed programs demonstrate formal alignment with international standards, important differences remain in the extent to which practice-oriented components are embedded in the curriculum. Survey findings reveal a statistically significant gap between soft and hard competencies, with behavioral and interpersonal skills receiving higher evaluations than technical and methodological preparation. Respondents consistently identify practical orientation as the most important criterion of program quality. Overall, Project Management education in Kazakhstan, within the framework of the considered institutional and professional context, appears institutionally established and academically developed; however, stronger alignment between curriculum design and stakeholder needs is required to ensure balanced competency formation.

Keywords: *project management education, quality assessment, competency-based approach, curriculum analysis, higher education reform, hard and soft skills, respondent.*

Кілт сөздер: *білім берудегі жобаларды басқару, сапаны бағалау, құзыреттілікке негізделген тәсіл, оқу бағдарламаларын талдау, жоғары білім беруді реформалау, қатты және жұмсақ дағдылар, сауалнамаға қатысушы.*

Ключевые слова*: управление проектами в образовании, оценка качества, компетентностный подход, анализ учебных программ, реформа высшего образования, жесткие и гибкие навыки, респондент.*

Introduction Project management has developed into a strategic discipline that influences organizational performance, public governance, and global digital transformation. As project-based work becomes more common in the economy, the demand for skilled project managers is also growing [1]. This change shows how important it is to have structured and skills-based educational programs that can prepare specialists for complex and changing project environments.

International professional frameworks, such as the PMBOK Guide [1], the IPMA Individual Competence Baseline [2], and PRINCE2 [3], delineate standardized knowledge domains, procedural models, and competency dimensions for project management practice. These frameworks are extensively utilized as benchmarks in curriculum development and professional certification systems [4]. Research demonstrates that formal adherence to international standards does not guarantee effective competency development or practical preparedness [5].

Contemporary research highlights that the evaluation of quality in higher education must utilize multidimensional frameworks that encompass learning outcomes, student engagement, pedagogical innovation, and labor market relevance [6, 7]. In project management education, experiential learning, serious games, and practice-based methodologies have demonstrated efficacy in improving competency development and student engagement [8, 9]. Simultaneously, emerging technologies like artificial intelligence and digital simulation tools are revolutionizing instructional design and competency evaluation in project management programs [10].

Notwithstanding these global advancements, numerous national quality assurance systems predominantly depend on regulatory compliance and accreditation processes instead of discipline-specific competency assessments. This challenge is especially pertinent in developing higher education systems, where institutional frameworks remain in flux [11].

Project management has acquired heightened institutional importance in Kazakhstan's national modernization and digital transformation initiatives [12]. Universities have augmented Master's and doctoral programs in Project Management to address labor market demand and trends in internationalization. Even though regulatory and accreditation frameworks make sure that State Mandatory Educational Standards are followed, there is currently no organized way to check the professional quality of Project Management educational programs.

Current studies emphasize the necessity of synchronizing educational curricula with global standards and industry demands [13, 14]. Nevertheless, there is a paucity of empirical evidence concerning the degree to which Kazakhstani programs successfully incorporate technical, behavioral, and strategic competencies in alignment with professional practice standards. Moreover, scant research integrates curriculum analysis with stakeholder perceptions to assess program efficacy.

This establishes a methodological disparity between:

The increasing strategic significance of project management in national development; the numerical increase of educational initiatives; and the lack of a thorough, evidence-based framework for evaluating their substantive quality.

This study employs a mixed-methods approach, integrating content analysis of Master's and doctoral Project Management programs in Kazakhstan with an empirical survey of 193 project management professionals to address this gap. The research seeks to discern structural patterns, competency discrepancies, and stakeholder anticipations, while formulating a structured and analytically grounded framework for evaluating program quality.

Literature review. The notion of quality in higher education has transitioned from a compliance-focused interpretation to a multidimensional, outcome-driven comprehension. Conventional quality assurance systems have predominantly concentrated on accreditation criteria, regulatory compliance, and institutional resources. Contemporary scholarship underscores that educational quality should be evaluated based on learning outcomes, competency development, stakeholder satisfaction, and labor market relevance [7]. In professional domains such as project management, quality cannot be limited to curriculum design or credit allocation; rather, it must reflect the program's ability to prepare graduates for complex, unpredictable, and interdisciplinary project environments. Studies show that student engagement and intrinsic motivation have a big impact on how well students learn, especially in online and blended formats [6]. Consequently, modern evaluation frameworks increasingly incorporate behavioral and competency-based indicators alongside traditional academic metrics.

Global professional frameworks that define organized knowledge areas and skill requirements have a big effect on project management education. The PMBOK Guide [1] gives a process-based way to group project management knowledge areas. The IPMA Individual Competence Baseline [2] takes this a step further by adding technical, behavioral, and contextual skills. PRINCE2 [3] presents governance-focused principles extensively utilized in public administration and corporate settings. These frameworks function as normative standards for curriculum development and professional certification [4]. Nonetheless, studies demonstrate that the formal incorporation of international standards does not inherently guarantee thorough competency development. Marcelino and Domingues [5] illustrate that educational simulations aligned with PMBOK frequently prioritize planning and execution, while inadequately addressing stakeholder integration and contextual factors. This indicates that effective quality assessment should examine both the existence of standards in curricula and the extent of their pedagogical integration and alignment with professional practice.

In light of the growing complexity in project environments, pedagogical innovation has emerged as a pivotal element of project management education. Experiential learning, serious games, simulations, and Agile project work are progressively utilized to augment applied competencies and strategic thinking. Jääskä and Aaltonen [8] indicate that game-based learning techniques markedly enhance engagement and conceptual comprehension, whereas Barbosa and Rodrigues [13] illustrate that portfolio simulation exercises bolster strategic and resource allocation skills. Likewise, Marnewick [9] concludes that Agile project-based learning improves retention and practical preparedness. Nonetheless, the efficacy of innovative approaches is contingent upon the quality of instructional design and the competencies of educators [15], while superficial gamification may not facilitate significant competence development. Simultaneously, digital transformation is revolutionizing educational delivery, as artificial intelligence and data analytics progressively facilitate adaptive learning and performance-based assessment [10]. These

developments highlight the necessity to assess not only curriculum content but also instructional methods and technological integration when evaluating program quality.

Despite extensive research on project management education and competency frameworks, few empirical studies have combined curriculum analysis with stakeholder perceptions to assess program quality, especially in developing higher education systems. In contexts like Kazakhstan, where project management education has proliferated due to national modernization and digital transformation initiatives [12], quality assurance mechanisms predominantly remain regulatory and institution-focused. Although national standards guarantee formal adherence, they lack discipline-specific metrics that assess professional efficacy and alignment with the labor market. This establishes a methodological disparity among international competency frameworks, research on pedagogical innovation, and the practical evaluation systems implemented at the national level. Bridging this gap necessitates a comprehensive evaluation strategy that incorporates structural curriculum analysis, alignment of competencies with international standards, and empirical data from industry stakeholders — a goal of the current study.

Methodology. This research employs a data-driven mixed-method approach that integrates curriculum content analysis with an empirical survey of project management professionals. The empirical component relies on a structured survey administered in 2026 to 193 professionals engaged in project-oriented positions in Astana. The sample comprises Project Managers, Program Managers, Portfolio Managers, Product Managers, Scrum Masters, and Team Leads working in corporate business, IT/digital, public administration, and engineering sectors. Due to the concentration of project-based activities in Astana, the city serves as a pertinent professional context for analyzing labor market expectations. A sample of 193 respondents, with a 95% confidence level and a conservative assumption ($p = 0.5$), yields an approximate margin of error of ±7% for a managerial population segment, deemed acceptable for exploratory professional research.

From a methodological perspective, this study is conceptualized as an exploratory and diagnostic investigation aimed at identifying prevailing trends and potential structural imbalances in project management education, rather than at drawing statistically generalizable conclusions. Empirical surveys and curriculum content analysis are combined to identify converging patterns, perspectives, and institutional characteristics of various educational programs. In this context, the proposed quality assessment system should be understood as an analytical and structuring framework that defines key aspects of assessment, rather than as a fully implemented model of quantitative measurement. Accordingly, the study prioritizes analytical consistency and the coherence of interpretation over an exhaustive, indicator-based assessment. Accordingly, the proposed quality assessment system is used in this method as an interpretative and structuring basis rather than a fully implemented digital assessment tool.

The survey's dependent variables were defined as perceived competency development in two primary dimensions: hard (technical-methodological) skills and soft (behavioral-managerial) skills. Both variables were assessed utilizing a five-point Likert scale, with 1 representing minimal development and 5 denoting maximal development. Furthermore, participants were requested to assess the significance of practical orientation in educational curricula and to specify their preferred methods of competency evaluation. For specific analytical procedures, Likert responses were dichotomized, with responses 4 (“high”) and 5 (“very high”) assigned a value of 1 (indicating high competency perception), while responses 1–3 were assigned a value of 0 (indicating low-to-moderate competency perception). Responses categorized as “no answer” or incomplete submissions were omitted from analysis through pairwise deletion to maintain the maximum number of available observations for each statistical test.

The analytical strategy was executed in two phases. Initially, descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations, and frequency distributions) were computed to encapsulate the distribution of competency perceptions and evaluation preferences. Secondly, inferential analysis was performed to investigate disparities and correlations among principal variables. A paired-samples comparison was employed to determine if the mean difference between soft and hard skill ratings was statistically significant. The effect size was calculated using Cohen's d to assess the magnitude of the observed disparity. Chi-square (χ^2) tests were utilized to analyze associations between perceptions of competency and preferences for practice-oriented assessment formats, treating variables as categorical, while Cramer’s V was employed to assess the strength of these relationships. The study's primary objective is exploratory, concentrating on identifying structural patterns rather than developing predictive models; thus, multivariate regression models were not utilized. All statistical analyses were conducted utilizing SPSS Statistics (version 29).

The qualitative aspect of the study involved a systematic content analysis of 18 Master's and 5 doctoral (PhD) programs in Project Management conducted in Kazakhstan. Official curricula and course catalogs were obtained from university websites and the national Register of Educational Programs. Disciplines were classified based on established competency categories sourced from international frameworks, including PMBOK [1], IPMA ICB [2], and PRINCE2 [3]. The coding categories encompassed technical competencies, behavioral competencies, strategic and portfolio management, digitalization and AI integration, sustainability (ESG), research intensity, and practice-oriented elements (internships, capstone projects, simulations). Quantitative metrics, including credit allocation and the ratio of specialized fields, were computed, while qualitative analysis evaluated coherence and logical sequencing. The amalgamation of survey results and curriculum evaluation facilitated triangulation and bolstered the creation of a comprehensive quality assessment framework.

Results. The results are presented in two parts: (1) findings from the survey of project management professionals and (2) findings from the content analysis of educational programs.

Survey Results. The sample (n = 193) exhibited a systematic depiction of professionals involved in project-based endeavors in Astana. The predominant age group was 24–34 years (34.8%), succeeded by 35–44 years (29.5%), signifying that most respondents are early- to mid-career professionals. Regarding sectoral distribution, 30.4% were employed in corporate business, 26.1% in IT/digital industries, 17.4% in public administration, while the remaining respondents were engaged in engineering, consulting, and social sectors. In terms of professional roles, 21.7% identified as Project Managers, 30.4% as Team Leads, while the remaining individuals held positions including Program Manager, Portfolio Manager, Product Manager, and Scrum Master.

The survey reflects the general professional perception of competency development, shaped by the respondents' broader educational and professional experience. Since the study design does not require respondents to evaluate specific educational programs, the results reflect general trends and expectations rather than an assessment of the effectiveness of individual training programs.

Descriptive statistical analysis indicated a significant disparity between the development of perceived soft and hard competencies. The average score for soft skills was M = 4.3 (SD = 0.72), signifying a high level of perceived behavioral competence. Conversely, the average score for hard skills was M = 3.2 (SD = 0.81), indicating a moderate degree of perceived technical-methodological readiness. The mean difference between the two variables ($\Delta = 1.1$) signifies a substantial disparity on a five-point scale.

Table – 1

Descriptive Statistics of Perceived Competency Development

Competency Type	Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (SD)
Soft Skills	4.3	0.72
Hard Skills	3.2	0.81
Mean Difference (Δ)	1.1	—

**compiled by the authors*

A paired-samples analysis validated that this difference is statistically significant ($p < 0.001$). The computed effect size (Cohen's $d \approx 1.41$) signifies a substantial practical effect, indicating that the identified competency disparity is both statistically relevant and substantively important. This discrepancy reflects the perceived emphasis on competence among professionals and should not be interpreted as a direct measure of the effectiveness of instruction within specific educational programs. Additionally, 74% of participants reported that soft skills constitute over fifty percent of professional success in project management positions. When responses were categorized into high versus low-to-moderate competency perception, a significantly greater proportion of respondents indicated elevated levels of soft skills in comparison to hard skills.

In assessing the quality of educational programs, 65.2% of respondents recognized practical orientation as the foremost criterion of program efficacy. Furthermore, 39.1% underscored that competency evaluation ought to be predicated on actual project results rather than conventional academic testing methods. Chi-square (χ^2) analysis revealed a statistically significant correlation between elevated soft-skill perception and a preference for practice-oriented evaluation methods ($p < 0.05$), with Cramer's V suggesting a moderate strength of association.

Results of Content Analysis

An analysis of 18 Master's and 5 doctoral programs revealed three consistent structural models at the Master's level: practice-oriented (60 ECTS), hybrid (90 ECTS), and academic (120 ECTS).

Table – 2

Comparative Analysis of Master's and Doctoral Programs in Project Management in Kazakhstan

Comparison Criteria	Master's Programs	Doctoral Programs (PhD)
Level of Training	Professional and/or academic specialization	Research-oriented academic training
Duration	1 year (60 ECTS), 1.5 years (90 ECTS), 2 years (120 ECTS)	3 years (180 ECTS)
Primary Objective	Preparation of project management specialists for organizations and industry	Preparation of researchers and academic professionals in project management
Professional Core	Project Management, Risk Management, Portfolio Management, Financial Evaluation, International Standards	Advanced Models and Methods in Project and Portfolio Management, International Competency Frameworks
Research Component	Minimal (1-year), moderate (1.5-year), strong (2-year academic)	Central and mandatory component; advanced research design and methodology
Final Assessment	Applied project or master's thesis (depending on format)	Doctoral dissertation with publication requirements (Scopus/WoS in many cases)
Digital Technologies	Project management software (MS Project, GanttPro, Asana, Bitrix24); some data analysis tools	Artificial Intelligence, Machine Learning, Big Data, advanced data analytics
Sustainability / ESG	Present mainly in 1.5–2-year programs	Integrated as a strategic and research-oriented theme
Pedagogical Training	Included primarily in 2-year academic master's programs	Not always formalized as pedagogy courses, but oriented toward academic career development
Interdisciplinary Integration	Management, finance, entrepreneurship, digitalization	Management, economics, AI, sustainability, intellectual property, entrepreneurship, organizational behavior
Competency Profile	Practice-oriented / Hybrid / Academic (depending on duration)	Research-intensive, strategic, digital, sustainability-oriented
Orientation to International Standards	Based on PMI, ISO 21500, IPMA frameworks	Analytical and critical study of international standards and competency models
Language of Instruction	Russian, Kazakh, English (increasing internationalization)	Strong international orientation; significant use of English

**compiled by the authors*

Digitalization and AI modules were predominantly found in 1.5-year and 2-year programs, whereas ESG and sustainability themes were more commonly incorporated into longer academic formats. Internships and compulsory industry placements were not consistently integrated across institutions, reflecting variability in practice-oriented execution.

All doctoral programs exhibited a robust research focus, encompassing advanced methodology courses, publication mandates, and the incorporation of digital transformation topics. Although alignment with international standards existed across programs, the extent of integration differed, especially concerning the development of behavioral competencies and organized experiential learning.

To organize the results of the content analysis and support their structured interpretation, a set of quality assessment criteria is presented below. These criteria combine regulatory requirements, curriculum characteristics, faculty capabilities, and practice-oriented elements identified across various programs, and serve as an analytical framework rather than a basis for comprehensive quantitative assessment.

Table – 3

Quality Assessment Criteria and Metrics for Project Management Educational Programs

No.	Criteria Block	Criterion	Metric (What is Evaluated)	Source / Method of Assessment
1	Regulatory and Institutional	Presence of the program in the official register	Inclusion of the educational program in the Register (epvo.kz), level (Master's / PhD)	Official Register of Educational Programs (epvo.kz)
		Licensing	Compliance with licensing requirements of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education (MSHE RK)	MSHE RK official documents
		Program accreditation	Existence of external accreditation agency and validity period	IAAR / IQAA / ARQA, etc.
2	Structural and Content	Curriculum logic	Coherence of disciplines, presence of mandatory PM core	Curriculum, course catalog
		Share of specialized disciplines	Percentage of Project Management disciplines in total curriculum	Content analysis
		Alignment with PMBOK	Coverage of PMI domains (integration, risk, cost, etc.)	PMBOK 7, content analysis
		Agile and flexible methodologies	Availability of courses in Agile, Scrum, Kanban	Curriculum
		Digitalization and AI	Courses in digital PM, data analytics, AI	Curriculum
3	Faculty Capacity	Academic qualification	Percentage of faculty with PhD / doctoral degree	University website, program profiles
		Practical experience of faculty	Presence of practitioner-lecturers	Faculty biographies
		International certifications	PMP, IPMA, PRINCE2 certifications among faculty	Open data sources
4	Practice Orientation	Project-based learning	Availability of project-based learning and case studies	Syllabi
		Capstone project	Final applied project instead of / in addition to thesis	Curriculum
		Internships	Availability of mandatory internships	Curriculum
5	International and Industry Integration	English-medium instruction	Availability of courses taught in English	University website
		Academic mobility	Exchange programs, double degree programs	University website
		Industry collaboration	Industry partners, employer involvement	Program documentation, reports
6	Internal Quality Assurance System	Program update	Regular curriculum review	Program documents
		Feedback mechanisms	Student and employer surveys	IQAS (Internal Quality Assurance System)
		Use of evaluation results	Curriculum adjustments based on QA results	QA reports

**compiled by the authors*

Systematic framework of quality evaluation criteria established through comparative and regulatory analysis. The framework comprises six interrelated components: regulatory and institutional compliance, structural and content alignment, faculty capacity, practice orientation, international integration, and internal quality assurance mechanisms. In this study, the system is used for comparative and interpretive purposes and does not imply a weighted evaluation or ranking of educational programs. Its main contribution is to identify structural patterns and institutional gaps across different programs, rather than to produce summary quality ratings.

The regulatory and institutional framework guarantees program legitimacy by inclusion in the official educational register, adherence to licensing requirements, and accreditation status. The structural and content block assesses curriculum coherence, the ratio of specialized Project Management disciplines, alignment with PMBOK domains, integration of Agile methodologies, and inclusion of digitalization and AI elements.

The faculty capacity block assesses academic qualifications, practical experience of instructors, and the existence of international professional certifications. The practice-oriented block evaluates the presence of project-based learning, applied capstone elements, and compulsory internships. Criteria for international integration encompass English-medium instruction, academic mobility initiatives, and organized industry collaboration. The internal quality assurance unit assesses curriculum review cycles, feedback systems, and the application of evaluation outcomes for ongoing program enhancement.

Discussion.The findings of this study indicate that Project Management educational programs in Kazakhstan exhibit institutional stability and formal alignment with international standards, while also revealing structural differentiation in competency orientation across various academic levels. The comparative analysis (Table 2) demonstrates a distinct vertical progression.

The organized system of quality assessment criteria (Table 3) indicates that the national quality assurance framework is predominantly regulatory and compliance-oriented. Accordingly, the criteria are used to interpret systemic characteristics and institutional trends, rather than to evaluate the effectiveness of individual programs. The criteria prioritize licensing, accreditation, curriculum consistency, and formal alignment with global standards. Nonetheless, as demonstrated in the results section, practice-oriented elements such as internships, employer engagement, and capstone integration are not consistently institutionalized across programs. This observation aligns with international research indicating that formal acknowledgment of PMBOK domains does not inherently ensure thorough competency development [5]. Nijhuis [4] contends that the professionalization of project management education necessitates a more profound integration of standards into pedagogical practices, rather than mere symbolic incorporation into curricula.

The empirical survey results indicate a structural disparity between curriculum focus and stakeholder perception. Although Master's programs assign a consistent professional foundation to technical and methodological subjects, participants evaluated soft skills considerably higher (M = 4.3) than hard skills (M = 3.2), exhibiting a statistically significant and substantial effect size. Furthermore, 65.2% of participants recognized practical orientation as the foremost criterion for program quality, while 39.1% highlighted assessment formats based on project performance. This discovery corresponds with IPMA’s competency model, which amalgamates behavioral and contextual competencies with technical domains, and substantiates Cicmil and Gaggiotti’s [7] assertions that effective project management education must encompass reflective, leadership, and ethical dimensions. This aligns with research indicating that experiential and project-based learning enhances competence acquisition [8, 9].

Comparative analysis of international educational models reveals that Kazakhstani programs exhibit robust academic and research integration, especially at the doctoral level; however, they show comparatively weaker systematic industry integration than PMI GAC-accredited programs in the United States. Although digital transformation, artificial intelligence, and ESG elements are progressively incorporated into Master’s and PhD programs, the extent of structured employer involvement and compulsory practice-based assessment varies significantly. This indicates that the system emphasizes academic rigor and structural adherence rather than outcome-oriented professional evaluation. Mariani et al. [10] assert that digital transformation in project management education necessitates adaptive and practice-integrated evaluation mechanisms to guarantee effective competency development.

The findings collectively indicate a methodological disparity among regulatory compliance, curriculum design, and labor market expectations in Kazakhstan. The enduring focus on robust technical and research orientation within the curriculum, alongside stakeholder prioritization of behavioral and

applied competencies, indicates the necessity for a multifaceted assessment strategy. These discrepancies should be interpreted as analytically identified trends, rather than as causal evidence of program inefficiency.

Conclusion. This study has analyzed the quality of Project Management educational programs in Kazakhstan using a mixed-methods approach that integrates curriculum content analysis with an empirical survey of project management professionals. The findings reveal that although Kazakhstani programs, within the framework of the considered institutional and professional context, formally align with international professional standards and exhibit a coherent academic progression from Master's to doctoral levels, significant discrepancies persist between curriculum focus and stakeholder expectations.

Another observation pertains to structural differentiation among program models. Practice-oriented Master's programs focus on operational tools, whereas academic formats emphasize research methodology and analytical preparation. Doctoral programs increasingly focus on digital transformation, artificial intelligence, and the integration of sustainability. This vertical progression guarantees academic legitimacy but may not entirely align with industry expectations for structured experiential learning and outcome-based evaluation.

The results obtained indicate that within the framework of the considered institutional and professional context, the Kazakh project management education system has achieved institutional stability and international recognition, yet it is still transitioning in terms of competency balance and discipline-specific quality assessment. To better match academic preparation with what employers want, we could improve systematic learning in the workplace, make sure that soft skills are included, and use multidimensional evaluation frameworks that include feedback from stakeholders. From a policy point of view, making quality assessment tools that are specific to each field is important to make sure that both rules are followed and professionals are effective. Adding competency-based indicators, practical orientation, faculty capability, and international benchmarking to national evaluation frameworks could make Project Management programs more transparent, comparable, and competitive.

Future research should examine longitudinal graduate outcomes, employer performance evaluations, and comparative studies with other developing higher education systems.

This research is supported by the Committee of Science of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan through Grant No. BR27198643, "Development of digital competencies of human capital in industry and logistics through cluster collaboration of science, education and industry".

REFERENCES

1. Project Management Institute (PMI). A Guide to the Project Management Body of Knowledge (PMBOK® Guide) – Seventh Edition. Project Management Institute. – 2021.

2. International Project Management Association (IPMA). Individual Competence Baseline (ICB) Version 4.0. IPMA. – 2015.

3. Office of Government Commerce (OGC). Managing Successful Projects with PRINCE2® (6th Edition). TSO (The Stationery Office). – 2017.

4. Nijhuis S.A. Exploring Project Management education. European Journal of Social Sciences Education and Research. – 2017. – №9(1). – 44 p. – DOI: 10.26417/ejser.v9i1.p44-61

5. Marcelino E. & Domingues L. An analysis of how well serious games cover the PMBOK. Procedia Computer Science. – 2022. – №196. – P. 1013–1020. – DOI: 10.1016/j.procs.2021.12.104

6. Afzal F. & Crawford L. Student's perception of engagement in online project management education and its impact on performance: The mediating role of self-motivation. Project Leadership and Society. – 2022. – №3. – 100057 art. – DOI: 10.1016/j.plas.2022.100057

7. Cicmil S. & Gaggiotti H. Responsible forms of project management education: Theoretical plurality and reflective pedagogies. International Journal of Project Management. – 2017. – №36(1). – P. 208–218. – DOI: 10.1016/j.ijproman.2017.07.005

8. Jääskä E. & Aaltonen K. Teachers' experiences of using game-based learning methods in project management higher education. Project Leadership and Society. – 2022. – №3. – 100041 art. – DOI: 10.1016/j.plas.2022.100041

9. Marnewick C. Student experiences of project-based learning in agile project management education. Project Leadership and Society. – 2023. – №4. – 100096 art. – DOI: 10.1016/j.plas.2023.100096

10. Mariani C., Aaltonen K., Ingason H.Þ., Mancini M. & Huemann M. The future of learning: How artificial intelligence and other new technologies revolutionize project management education & training. Project Leadership and Society. – 2024. – №5. – 100147 art. – DOI: 10.1016/j.plas.2024.100147

11. Åsgård T. Learning Project Management. The case of further education in Norway. Procedia Computer Science. – 2022. – №196. – P. 848–855. – DOI: 10.1016/j.procs.2021.12.084

12. Tokayev K.-J. A fair state. One nation. A prosperous society (Address to the Nation). – 2022. – URL: https://www.gov.kz/memleket/entities/aqmolamadeniet/documents/details/340635?lang=en

13. Barbosa M.W. & De Ávila Rodrigues C. Project Portfolio Management teaching: Contributions of a gamified approach. The International Journal of Management Education. – 2020. – №18(2). – 100388 art. – DOI: 10.1016/j.ijme.2020.100388

14. Jaccard D., Bonnier K.E. & Hellström M. How might serious games trigger a transformation in project management education ? Lessons learned from 10 Years of experimentations. Project Leadership and Society. – 2022. – №3. – 100047 art. – DOI: 10.1016/j.plas.2022.100047

15. Nousiainen T., Kangas M., Rikala J., & Vesisenaho M. Teacher competencies in game-based pedagogy. Teaching and Teacher Education. – 2018. – №74. – P. 85–97. – DOI: 10.1016/j.tate.2018.04.012

REFERENCES

16. Project Management Institute (PMI). A Guide to the Project Management Body of Knowledge (PMBOK® Guide) – Seventh Edition. Project Management Institute. – 2021.

17. International Project Management Association (IPMA). Individual Competence Baseline (ICB) Version 4.0. IPMA. – 2015.

18. Office of Government Commerce (OGC). Managing Successful Projects with PRINCE2® (6th Edition). TSO (The Stationery Office). – 2017.

19. Nijhuis S.A. Exploring Project Management education. European Journal of Social Sciences Education and Research. – 2017. – №9(1). – 44 p. – DOI: 10.26417/ejser.v9i1.p44-61

20. Marcelino E. & Domingues L. An analysis of how well serious games cover the PMBOK. Procedia Computer Science. – 2022. – №196. – P. 1013–1020. – DOI: 10.1016/j.procs.2021.12.104

21. Afzal F. & Crawford L. Student's perception of engagement in online project management education and its impact on performance: The mediating role of self-motivation. Project Leadership and Society. – 2022. – №3. – 100057 art. – DOI: 10.1016/j.plas.2022.100057

22. Cicmil S. & Gaggiotti H. Responsible forms of project management education: Theoretical plurality and reflective pedagogies. International Journal of Project Management. – 2017. – №36(1). – P. 208–218. – DOI: 10.1016/j.ijproman.2017.07.005

23. Jääskä E. & Aaltonen K. Teachers' experiences of using game-based learning methods in project management higher education. Project Leadership and Society. – 2022. – №3. – 100041 art. – DOI: 10.1016/j.plas.2022.100041

24. Marnewick C. Student experiences of project-based learning in agile project management education. Project Leadership and Society. – 2023. – №4. – 100096 art. – DOI: 10.1016/j.plas.2023.100096

25. Mariani C., Aaltonen K., Ingason H.Þ., Mancini M. & Huemann M. The future of learning: How artificial intelligence and other new technologies revolutionize project management education & training. Project Leadership and Society. – 2024. – №5. – 100147 art. – DOI: 10.1016/j.plas.2024.100147

26. Åsgård T. Learning Project Management. The case of further education in Norway. Procedia Computer Science. – 2022. – №196. – P. 848–855. – DOI: 10.1016/j.procs.2021.12.084

27. Tokayev K.-J. A fair state. One nation. A prosperous society (Address to the Nation). – 2022. – URL: https://www.gov.kz/memleket/entities/aqmolamadeniet/documents/details/340635?lang=en

28. Barbosa M.W. & De Ávila Rodrigues C. Project Portfolio Management teaching: Contributions of a gamified approach. The International Journal of Management Education. – 2020. – №18(2). – 100388 art. – DOI: 10.1016/j.ijme.2020.100388

29. Jaccard D., Bonnier K.E. & Hellström M. How might serious games trigger a transformation in project management education ? Lessons learned from 10 Years of experimentations. Project Leadership and Society. – 2022. – №3. – 100047 art. – DOI: 10.1016/j.plas.2022.100047

30. Nousiainen T., Kangas M., Rikala J., & Vesisenaho M. Teacher competencies in game-based pedagogy. Teaching and Teacher Education. – 2018. – №74. – P. 85–97. – DOI: 10.1016/j.tate.2018.04.012

Кинетова Н., Исмаилова Р.А., Амралинова Б.Б., Турегельдинова А.Ж.

ҚАЗАҚСТАНДАҒЫ ЖОБАЛАРДЫ БАСҚАРУ САПАСЫН БАҒАЛАУ: АРАЛАС ӘДІСТЕР

Аңдатпа

Бұл мақалада көріп отырғандарыңыздай Қазақстандағы жобаларды басқару бойынша білім беру бағдарламаларының сапасы аралас зерттеу әдіснамасы негізінде қарастырылады, ол оқу жоспарларының мазмұнын талдауды және жобаларды басқару саласындағы 193 маманға жүргізілген сауалнама нәтижелерін біріктіреді. Зерттеу барысында магистратура мен докторантура бағдарламалары арасындағы айқын құрылымдық айырмашылықтар анықталды: магистрлік бағдарламалар негізінен кәсіби мамандану мен қолданбалы басқарушылық даярлыққа бағытталған, ал докторлық бағдарламалар ғылыми зерттеу әдіснамасына, цифрлық трансформацияға, тұрақты дамуға сонымен қатар аналитикалық тереңдікке көбірек мән береді. Қарастырылған бағдарламалардың барлығы халықаралық стандарттарға формалды түрде сәйкес келгенімен, оқу үдерісіне практикалық-бағытталған компоненттердің енгізілу деңгейінде елеулі айырмашылықтар сақталады. Сауалнама нәтижелері жұмсақ және қатты құзыреттер арасындағы статистикалық мәнді алшақтықты көрсетті: мінез-құлықтық және коммуникациялық дағдылар техникалық және әдіснамалық даярлыққа қарағанда жоғары бағаланады. Респонденттер практикалық бағыттылықты бағдарламалар сапасының негізгі критерийі ретінде тұрақты түрде атап өтті. Жалпы алғанда, Қазақстандағы жобаларды басқару саласындағы білім беру қарастырылған институционалдық және кәсіби контекст аясында институционалды түрде қалыптасқан және академиялық дамыған болып көрінеді; дегенмен құзыреттердің теңгерімді қалыптасуын қамтамасыз ету үшін білім беру мазмұнын мүдделі тараптардың талаптарымен үйлестіруді күшейту қажет.

Кинетова Н., Исмаилова Р.А., Амралинова Б.Б., Турегельдинова А.Ж.

ОЦЕНКА КАЧЕСТВА УПРАВЛЕНИЯ ПРОЕКТАМИ В КАЗАХСТАНЕ: СМЕШАННЫЕ МЕТОДЫ

Аннотация

В данной статье рассматривается качество образовательных программ по управлению проектами в Республике Казахстан на основе смешанного исследовательского дизайна, включающего контент-анализ учебных планов и результаты опроса 193 специалистов в области управления проектами. В ходе исследования выявлены четкие структурные различия между магистерскими и докторскими программами: магистерские программы в большей степени ориентированы на профессиональную специализацию и прикладную управленческую подготовку, тогда как докторские программы делают акцент на методологии научных исследований, цифровой трансформации, устойчивом развитии и аналитической глубине. Несмотря на то, что все рассмотренные программы формально соответствуют международным стандартам, сохраняются существенные различия в степени интеграции практико-ориентированных компонентов в образовательный процесс. Результаты опроса демонстрируют статистически значимый разрыв между мягкими и жесткими компетенциями: поведенческие и коммуникативные навыки оцениваются выше, чем уровень технической и методологической подготовки. Респонденты также последовательно выделяют практическую направленность как ключевой критерий качества образовательных программ. В целом, образование в области управления проектами в Казахстане, в рамках рассматриваемого институционального и профессионального контекста, представляется институционально устоявшимся и академически развитым; однако для обеспечения сбалансированного формирования компетенций необходима более тесная взаимосвязь между разработкой учебных программ и потребностями заинтересованных сторон.