Rethinking Doctoral Careers in an AI-Reshaped Academy

Sandeep Puri
Professor, Asian Institute of Management, Philippines
E-mail: spuri@aim.edu
ORCID ID: 0000-0003-2920-9257

Rameshwar Dubey
MBS School of Business, Montpellier, France
Liverpool Business School, UK
E-mail: r.dubey@mbs-education.com
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-3913-030X

Abstract

Doctoral education is increasingly misaligned with contemporary academic and professional labour markets, a tension sharpened by the rapid integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into research and teaching. This opinion piece argues that AI is not merely improving academic productivity, but changing what counts as valuable scholarly work. As routine tasks such as literature synthesis, data analysis, and writing become easier to execute, doctoral value increasingly lies in judgment, problem framing, methodological reasoning, originality, and critical interpretation. Building on two decades of doctoral reform advocacy, the paper argues that AI changes the stakes of that agenda and that doctoral education should shift from a narrow pipeline into academic employment to a broader platform for developing transferable, AI-resilient capabilities. It outlines five implications for practice: embedding AI literacy, revising assessment beyond output volume, treating non-academic careers as core outcomes, building supervisors' own capacity for AI-mediated research, and making career outcome transparency central to program design. For each, it identifies who is accountable, what it costs, and how to judge progress.

Keywords: Doctoral education, Generative artificial intelligence, Academic careers, Doctoral supervision, AI literacy, Higher education innovation

Introduction: The Breakdown of the Doctoral Contract

There is a quiet assumption that underpins doctoral education. It is rarely stated outright, yet it shapes how programs are designed, how students are trained, and how success is defined. The assumption is simple: invest years in mastering the production of knowledge, and the system will, in some form, absorb you. The structure of the doctorate itself, largely inherited from Western research universities, is questioned even less often. For a long time, this assumption held just enough truth to sustain itself. That is no longer the case.

The imbalance between the number of PhD graduates and the availability of stable academic roles is well established (Cyranoski et al., 2011; Larson et al., 2014). Universities continue to expand doctoral programs, driven by incentives tied to research output, rankings, and relatively low-cost teaching labor. At the same time, permanent academic positions have not kept pace, replaced

instead by short-term contracts and fragmented career trajectories (Marginson, 2016). What was once framed as a competitive pathway has become structurally constrained.

What distinguishes the present moment is not only the scale of this imbalance, but its predictability. Doctoral candidates now enter programs with a clear awareness that the most visible outcome of their training, stable academic employment, is available to only a minority. Yet the structure of doctoral education still signals otherwise. This creates a gap between expectation and reality that is rarely addressed directly, leaving individuals to absorb the consequences of a system that continues to expand without corresponding capacity.
This creates a gap between expectation and reality that is rarely addressed directly, leaving individuals to absorb the consequences of a system that continues to expand without a corresponding capacity to absorb.

AI enters this already fragile arrangement not as a marginal tool, but as a structural force. Recent developments in generative AI have demonstrated the capacity to perform tasks central to academic work, including literature synthesis, coding, and writing (Brynjolfsson et al., 2025; Eloundou et al., 2024). The question is not whether AI can replace doctoral work entirely. It cannot. The more consequential question is what happens when it can perform enough of that work to change how value is assigned.

The case for broadening doctoral outcomes is not new. The Vitae Researcher Development Framework (Vitae, 2025), comparative work on doctoral education (Nerad, 2004), and repeated calls to rebuild the PhD (Gould, 2015) have argued for transferable skills and non-academic destinations for two decades. This opinion piece adds an account of why AI changes the stakes of that argument: by lowering the cost of execution, it weakens the task-based rationale on which the traditional doctorate partly rests, and it does so faster than earlier reform cycles have. It therefore argues for a shift from doctoral training as academic pipeline preparation to doctoral training as a platform for transferable, AI-resilient scholarly capabilities.

Reordering Academic Value in an AI-Driven System

Doctoral training has historically emphasized execution. The ability to conduct a thorough literature review, manually analyze data, and produce extended academic writing has long been treated as evidence of rigor. These competencies remain important. However, their relative importance is shifting. As AI compresses the time and effort required for execution, differentiation shifts elsewhere. For example, a doctoral student today can generate a literature review in hours, yet spend months refining the framing of a single research question. The value of doctoral work increasingly lies in the ability to define meaningful problems, design robust approaches, and interpret outputs critically. Expertise is no longer anchored in performing every step of the process, but in orchestrating it. This represents a fundamental reconfiguration rather than a marginal adjustment.

Over the past two years, research across higher education has consistently shown that generative AI is reshaping core academic practices, particularly by accelerating routine scholarly tasks while raising concerns around over-reliance and the erosion of critical thinking (Almisad & Aleidan, 2025; Rodrigues et al., 2025). In one quasi-experiment, AI-assisted student teams produced weaker

designs than unassisted teams while rating their own creativity no lower (Tsakalerou et al., 2026). This is accompanied by a broader transformation in the economics of academic output. The traditional academic system relies on scarcity. Limited journal space, competitive funding, and institutional prestige create filters through which quality is signaled. These filters are imperfect, but they have historically structured how scholarly contributions are evaluated.

AI complicates this arrangement by lowering the cost of producing structured academic content. As baseline competence in writing and synthesis becomes more accessible, output volume increases. Contributions that rely primarily on aggregation or reformulation become easier to replicate. In contrast, value shifts toward work that demonstrates conceptual originality, interdisciplinary integration, and contextual depth. The difficulty is that evaluation systems have not kept pace with this transition. Metrics such as publication counts and journal rankings continue to dominate, even as their ability to distinguish meaningful contributions weakens. This creates a persistent tension between what is measured and what matters.

The assumption that the PhD is primarily a pathway to academic employment has been eroding for years. Among US doctorate recipients with definite employment commitments, the share entering academe fell from 48% in 2001 to 36% in 2021 (National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics, 2022). In the UK, 59% of recent doctoral graduates work outside higher education (Vitae, 2026), and OECD data document substantial doctoral employment in business and government across member countries (Auriol et al., 2013). AI accelerates this shift by increasing demand for individuals who can combine domain expertise with the ability to work alongside, and when necessary, override, computational systems (Sposato, 2026).

Doctoral graduates are well positioned for such roles. They are trained to engage with complexity, manage ambiguity, and produce structured insights. Yet doctoral programs rarely treat these outcomes as central. Instead, non-academic careers are framed as alternatives rather than integral pathways. This model persists because of institutional inertia. Universities operate within incentive systems that reward research output and program expansion. While awareness of AI's implications is increasing, integration into doctoral training remains uneven (Sozon et al., 2025). Reform efforts tend to be incremental, leaving underlying structures largely intact.

Implications for Doctoral Education Practice

If AI is changing the basis of academic value, doctoral education cannot respond only through policy statements or restrictions on tool use. It needs to reconsider what doctoral candidates are trained to do, how their work is assessed, and how their future roles are imagined. Five practical shifts follow. Table 1 sets out, for each, the accountable actor, the principal costs and constraints, and indicators by which progress could be judged.

First, AI literacy should become a core part of doctoral training. This does not mean treating generative AI as a shortcut to be either embraced uncritically or prohibited entirely. Rather, doctoral candidates need structured guidance on how to use AI responsibly across literature synthesis, data analysis, writing, peer review, and research communication, including the norms of authorship and disclosure now being renegotiated across academic practice (Tsakalerou &

Lukhmanov, 2026). The emphasis should be on judgment: knowing when AI can support scholarly work, when it may distort it, and how to evaluate its outputs.

Second, assessment in doctoral education needs to move beyond output volume. Publication counts, lengthy literature reviews, and visible productivity remain important, but they are increasingly insufficient indicators of doctoral capability. Programs should place greater weight on problem framing, methodological judgment, conceptual originality, critical interpretation, and the ability to integrate knowledge across domains. Where doctoral programs include coursework, assignments should be redesigned so that disclosed and critically evaluated AI use is not penalised but becomes part of what is assessed.

Third, treat non-academic career preparation as a central doctoral outcome rather than an alternative path for those who do not remain in academia. Doctoral programs should therefore make transferable capabilities explicit, including analytical reasoning, evidence-based decision-making, stakeholder communication, and the ability to work with complex knowledge systems.

Fourth, supervisors need support, and this is the most demanding of the five. Most supervisors are being asked to guide a competence they did not acquire in their own training. Expecting technical mastery from them would be unrealistic. What can be expected is that they examine judgment: asking candidates to show how an AI-assisted step was checked, where it was overridden, and why the conclusions remain their own. Institutions can build this capacity by adding AI-mediated research to existing supervisor development and accreditation, by pairing supervisors with methodologists or AI-experienced early-career researchers, and by recognising the added supervisory time in workload models. Without that workload recognition, the recommendation will remain rhetorical.

Finally, institutions should make career outcome transparency part of doctoral program design. This is already happening in places: the Coalition for Next Generation Life Science publishes standardised doctoral outcome data, and UK institutions report outcomes through the Graduate Outcomes survey (Vitae, 2026). The task is to extend this practice beyond early-adopting fields and systems, and to present it to applicants before enrolment rather than to graduates at the point of transition. Taken together, these changes would not weaken doctoral education. They would make it more honest, more adaptive, and more relevant to the environment in which doctoral graduates now operate.

Insert Table 1 about here

Conclusion: From Pipeline to Platform

AI does not make doctoral education irrelevant. It makes some of its inherited assumptions harder to defend. The idea that academic labour markets will absorb most doctoral graduates, that scarcity

will continue to organize scholarly value, and that execution remains the clearest signal of expertise no longer fully reflects the environment in which doctoral education operates.

The challenge, therefore, is not simply to add AI tools to existing doctoral programs. It is to reconsider the purpose of doctoral education itself. If knowledge production is becoming faster, more abundant, and increasingly mediated by computational systems, then doctoral training must place greater emphasis on the capabilities that remain distinctly valuable: judgment, originality, synthesis, ethical reasoning, problem framing, and the capacity to work across disciplinary and professional boundaries.

This requires a shift from a pipeline model to a platform model. The pipeline model treats the PhD as a narrow route into academic employment, even as that route becomes available to only a minority. A platform model, by contrast, understands doctoral education as a space for developing advanced capabilities that can travel across academic, professional, policy, technological, and societal contexts.

Such a shift does not diminish the doctorate's intellectual seriousness. Rather, it strengthens it by aligning doctoral education with the realities of contemporary knowledge work. The future value of the PhD will depend on whether institutions can redesign doctoral education around the forms of expertise that remain meaningful in an AI-reshaped academy.

References

Almisad, B., & Aleidan, A. (2025). Faculty perspectives on generative artificial intelligence: Insights into awareness, benefits, concerns, and uses. *Frontiers in Education*, *10*, Article 1632742. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1632742

Auriol, L., Misu, M., & Freeman, R. A. (2013). *Careers of doctorate holders: Analysis of labour market and mobility indicators* (OECD Science, Technology and Industry Working Papers, No. 2013/04). OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/5k43nxgs289w-en

Brynjolfsson, E., Li, D., & Raymond, L. (2025). Generative AI at work. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, *140*(2), 889–942. https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjae044

Cyranoski, D., Gilbert, N., Ledford, H., Nayar, A., & Yahia, M. (2011). Education: The PhD factory. *Nature*, *472*(7343), 276–279. https://doi.org/10.1038/472276a

Eloundou, T., Manning, S., Mishkin, P., & Rock, D. (2024). GPTs are GPTs: Labor market impact potential of LLMs. *Science*, *384*(6702), 1306–1308. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.adj0998

Gould, J. (2015). How to build a better PhD. *Nature*, *528*(7580), 22–25. https://doi.org/10.1038/528022a

Larson, R. C., Ghaffarzadegan, N., & Xue, Y. (2014). Too many PhD graduates or too few academic job openings: The basic reproductive number R_0 in academia. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science*, *31*(6), 745–750. https://doi.org/10.1002/sres.2210

Marginson, S. (2016). The worldwide trend to high participation higher education: Dynamics of social stratification in inclusive systems. *Higher Education*, *72*(4), 413–434. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-016-0016-x

National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics. (2022). *Doctorate recipients from U.S. universities: 2021* (NSF 23-300). National Science Foundation. https://ncses.nsf.gov/pubs/nsf23300

Nerad, M. (2004). The PhD in the US: Criticisms, facts, and remedies. *Higher Education Policy*, *17*(2), 183–199. https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.hep.8300050

Rodrigues, A. L., Cavaco, C., & Pereira, C. (2025). Exploring generative AI tools in higher education: Insights for policies. *Journal of e-Learning and Knowledge Society*, *21*(2), 61–72. https://doi.org/10.20368/1971-8829/1135999

Sozon, M., Parnther, C., Wei Lun, W., & Chowdhury, M. A. (2025). Generative AI in higher education: navigating benefits and challenges in the technological era. *Journal of applied research in higher education*, 1-16. https://doi.org/10.1108/JARHE-02-2025-0103

Sposato, M. (2026). Rethinking career development for the AI era: A framework for training professionals in hybrid human–machine workplaces. *European Journal of Training and Development*, *50*(5–6), 465–481. https://doi.org/10.1108/EJTD-06-2025-0116

Tsakalerou, M., Akhmadi, S., Balgynbayeva, A., & Kumisbek, Y. (2026). AI-assisted design synthesis and human creativity in engineering education. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence*, *9*, Article 1714523. https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2026.1714523

Tsakalerou, M., & Lukhmanov, Y. (2026). The ethical frontier: ChatGPT's cultural impact on academic practices. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2026.2614477

Vitae. (2025). Vitae Researcher Development Framework. Careers Research and Advisory Centre. https://vitae.ac.uk/vitae-researcher-development-framework/

Vitae. (2026). *What do researchers do? Employment, earnings and activities of recent doctoral graduates 2026*. Careers Research and Advisory Centre. https://vitae.ac.uk/policy/researcher-career-tracking-in-the-uk/what-do-researchers-do-employment-earnings-and-activities-of-recent-doctoral-graduates-2026/

Table 1. Accountability, Costs, Constraints and Indicators for the Five Recommendations

Recommendation	Accountable actor	Principal costs and constraints	Indicators of progress
1. AI literacy as core training	Graduate school / doctoral college, with research-integrity office	Curriculum time in already crowded programs; rapid tool change dates content quickly; uneven staff expertise	Required module or equivalent in place; candidates' disclosure statements accompany theses; fewer AI-related integrity cases arising from misunderstanding
2. Assessment beyond output volume	Program committees and examination boards	Examiner retraining; revision of regulations and coursework rubrics; resistance from metric-driven incentive systems	Examination criteria explicitly weight framing and judgment; oral defenses probe AI-assisted steps; coursework rubrics credit disclosed, evaluated AI use
3. Non-academic careers as core outcomes	Program directors with careers services and employer partners	Placement and partnership costs; supervisor perception that it diverts research time; weaker employer links in some disciplines	Structured non-academic placements or projects available; graduates' reported use of doctoral skills outside higher education
4. Supervisor capacity	Institution (research office, academic development unit)	Supervisor time and workload allocation; development costs; supervisors' own skill gap; variable disciplinary norms	Share of supervisors completing AI-in-research development; workload models recognize it; candidate supervision-experience survey items
5. Career outcome transparency	Institution, with national agencies and sector bodies	Tracking costs; response bias in graduate surveys; small cohorts risk identifiability	Standardized destination data published by program and visible to applicants before enrolment; periodic updates