

Globalization and Education: Some Analyses of Challenges and Opportunities for National Educational Systems

გლობალიზაცია და განათლება: ეროვნული განათლების სისტემების
გამოწვევებისა და შესაძლებლობების ანალიზი

 <https://doi.org/10.52340/healthecosoc.2026.10.03.05>

Susanna Khachatryan^{1a}, Mariam Yeghyan^{1b}

სუსანა ხაჩატრიანი¹, მარიამ იელიანი¹

¹ Department of Armenian History, Armenian State Pedagogical University (ASPU), Yerevan, Armenia

¹ სომხეთის ისტორიის დეპარტამენტი, სომხეთის სახელმწიფო პედაგოგიური უნივერსიტეტი (ASPU), ერევანი, სომხეთი.

* suskhach@mail.ru, eghyanm@mail.ru

Abstract

Introduction: Globalization has substantially transformed national education systems by expanding international academic mobility, access to knowledge, digital technologies, and cross-border cooperation. At the same time, these processes may generate challenges related to educational inequality, commercialization, brain drain, excessive dependence on global university rankings, and the preservation of national and cultural identity. This study examines the major opportunities and challenges associated with globalization in national education systems, with particular attention to developing and transition countries. **Methods:** A comparative narrative literature review was conducted using academic publications addressing globalization, internationalization, digitalization, educational mobility, inequality, commercialization, brain drain, university rankings, and cultural identity in education. Literature from different national and regional contexts, including Europe, Asia, and developing and transition countries, was examined. The selected studies were analyzed thematically across seven areas: internationalization and academic mobility; access to knowledge and digital technologies; institutional competitiveness and university rankings; educational inequality; commercialization; brain drain; and national and cultural identity. **Results:** The review demonstrated that globalization has a dual and context-dependent impact on education. Positive effects include greater academic mobility, wider access to scientific knowledge, international research collaboration, technological modernization, curriculum development, and increased opportunities for students and researchers. However, the benefits are distributed unevenly. Globalization may reinforce inequalities in access to international and digital opportunities, intensify competition among universities, encourage commercialization and ranking-oriented institutional priorities, contribute to the outward migration of highly skilled graduates, and create tensions between international standardization and national educational traditions. The extent of these effects depends largely on institutional capacity, available financial and technological resources, and national policy responses. **Conclusion:** Globalization should not be regarded as either inherently beneficial or harmful to national education systems. Its outcomes depend on how international integration is managed and adapted to local circumstances. Developing and transition countries need balanced strategies that promote international cooperation, academic mobility, digital transformation, and access to global knowledge while protecting educational equity, national priorities, cultural diversity, and the broader social and humanistic functions of education.

Caucasus University; PRINT ISSN 2960-9992; ONLINE ISSN 2960-9984



© 2026 by the authors. Licensee Health Policy, Economics and Sociology. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

^b The research has been carried with the financial aid of the Higher Education and Science Committee of the Ministry of Education, Culture and Sports of RA (Project No. 10-5/TB-24)

Keywords: globalization, education, higher education, internationalization, educational inequality, brain drain, cultural identity.

აბსტრაქტი

შესავალი: გლობალიზაციამ მნიშვნელოვნად გარდაქმნა ეროვნული განათლების სისტემები საერთაშორისო აკადემიური მობილობის, ცოდნაზე ხელმისაწვდომობის, ციფრული ტექნოლოგიებისა და საზღვარგარეთი თანამშრომლობის გაფართოების გზით. ამავე დროს, აღნიშნული პროცესები შესაძლოა დაკავშირებული იყოს ისეთ გამოწვევებთან, როგორიცაა საგანმანათლებლო უთანასწორობა, განათლების კომერციალიზაცია, „ტვინების გადინება“, გლობალურ საუნივერსიტეტო რეიტინგებზე გადაჭარბებული დამოკიდებულება და ეროვნული და კულტურული იდენტობის შენარჩუნება. კვლევის მიზანია გლობალიზაციასთან დაკავშირებული ძირითადი შესაძლებლობებისა და გამოწვევების გაანალიზება ეროვნულ განათლების სისტემებში, განსაკუთრებული ყურადღებით განვითარებად და გარდამავალ ქვეყნებზე. **მეთოდები:** ჩატარდა შედარებითი ნარატიული ლიტერატურის მიმოხილვა, რომელიც მოიცავდა აკადემიურ პუბლიკაციებს განათლებაში გლობალიზაციის, ინტერნაციონალიზაციის, ციფრულიზაციის, საგანმანათლებლო მობილობის, უთანასწორობის, კომერციალიზაციის, „ტვინების გადინების“, საუნივერსიტეტო რეიტინგებისა და კულტურული იდენტობის საკითხებზე. განხილული იქნა სხვადასხვა ეროვნული და რეგიონული კონტექსტის, მათ შორის ევროპის, აზიისა და განვითარებადი და გარდამავალი ქვეყნების გამოცდილება. შერჩეული კვლევები თემატურად გაანალიზდა შვიდი მიმართულებით: ინტერნაციონალიზაცია და აკადემიური მობილობა; ცოდნასა და ციფრულ ტექნოლოგიებზე ხელმისაწვდომობა; ინსტიტუციური კონკურენტუნარიანობა და საუნივერსიტეტო რეიტინგები; საგანმანათლებლო უთანასწორობა; კომერციალიზაცია; „ტვინების გადინება“; ეროვნული და კულტურული იდენტობა. **შედეგები:** მიმოხილვამ აჩვენა, რომ გლობალიზაციას განათლებაზე ორმხრივი და კონტექსტზე დამოკიდებული გავლენა აქვს. დადებით ეფექტებს შორის გამოიკვეთა აკადემიური მობილობის ზრდა, სამეცნიერო ცოდნაზე ფართო ხელმისაწვდომობა, საერთაშორისო კვლევითი თანამშრომლობა, ტექნოლოგიური მოდერნიზაცია, სასწავლო პროგრამების განვითარება და სტუდენტებისა და მკვლევარებისთვის შესაძლებლობების გაფართოება. თუმცა, ეს სარგებელი თანაბრად არ ნაწილდება. გლობალიზაციამ შესაძლოა გააძლიეროს უთანასწორობა საერთაშორისო და ციფრულ შესაძლებლობებზე ხელმისაწვდომობის მხრივ, გაზარდოს უნივერსიტეტებს შორის კონკურენცია, წახალისოს კომერციალიზაცია და რეიტინგებზე ორიენტირებული ინსტიტუციური პრიორიტეტები, ხელი შეუწყოს მაღალკვალიფიციური კადრების ქვეყნიდან გადინებას და შექმნას დამაბულობა საერთაშორისო სტანდარტიზაციასა და ეროვნულ საგანმანათლებლო ტრადიციებს შორის. ამ ეფექტების მასშტაბი მნიშვნელოვნად არის დამოკიდებული ინსტიტუციურ შესაძლებლობებზე, ფინანსურ და ტექნოლოგიურ რესურსებსა და ეროვნული პოლიტიკის პასუხებზე. **დასკვნა:** გლობალიზაცია არ უნდა განიხილებოდეს როგორც ეროვნული განათლების სისტემებისთვის მხოლოდ დადებითი ან მხოლოდ უარყოფითი მოვლენა. მისი შედეგები დამოკიდებულია იმაზე, თუ როგორ იმართება საერთაშორისო ინტეგრაცია და როგორ ხდება მისი ადაპტირება ადგილობრივ პირობებთან. განვითარებად და გარდამავალ ქვეყნებს სჭირდებათ დაბალანსებული სტრატეგიები, რომლებიც ხელს შეუწყობს საერთაშორისო თანამშრომლობას, აკადემიურ მობილობას, ციფრულ ტრანსფორმაციასა და გლობალურ ცოდნაზე ხელმისაწვდომობას, ამავე დროს კი დაიცავს საგანმანათლებლო თანასწორობას, ეროვნულ პრიორიტეტებს, კულტურულ მრავალფეროვნებას და განათლების ფართო სოციალურ და ჰუმანისტურ ფუნქციებს.

საკვანძო სიტყვები: გლობალიზაცია; განათლება; უმაღლესი განათლება; ინტერნაციონალიზაცია; საგანმანათლებლო უთანასწორობა; ტვინების გადინება; კულტურული იდენტობა.

Introduction

Globalization is a complex and multidimensional process characterized by the intensification of economic, social, cultural, political, technological, and educational interactions across national borders. Advances in communication technologies, digital infrastructure, and transportation have accelerated the cross-border circulation of people, knowledge, capital, services, and ideas, thereby reducing geographical barriers and strengthening global interconnectedness. Education, and higher education in particular, has become one of the sectors most profoundly affected by these processes, as universities increasingly operate within interconnected international networks of teaching, research, student mobility, and knowledge exchange (Marginson & van der Wende, 2007; Altbach & Knight, 2007).

In the educational sphere, globalization is closely associated with internationalization, although the two concepts are not identical. Globalization refers to the broader economic, technological, cultural, and academic forces that shape contemporary societies, whereas internationalization encompasses the policies and practices through which educational institutions respond to these forces, including student and staff mobility, international partnerships, joint and double-degree programmes, cross-border research collaboration, and the internationalization of curricula (Knight, 2004; Altbach & Knight, 2007). Over recent decades, internationalization has moved from a relatively marginal activity to a central strategic component of higher education policy and institutional development worldwide (Knight & de Wit, 2018).

These developments have created substantial opportunities for national educational systems. Greater international connectivity can facilitate access to scientific knowledge and technological innovation, expand opportunities for students and academics to participate in international networks, support intercultural learning, and enhance professional and academic mobility. At the institutional level, globalization has also intensified collaboration and competition among universities and encouraged educational institutions to adapt their curricula, teaching practices, and research agendas to rapidly changing global conditions. At the same time, however, increased internationalization and competition may generate significant challenges, including commercialization, inequalities in access to international opportunities, brain drain, excessive dependence on global university rankings, and tensions between global educational models and national educational priorities (Knight, 2008; Knight, 2012; Marginson, 2004).

A particularly important issue concerns the relationship between globalization and cultural and national identity. Educational institutions have traditionally performed not only economic and professional functions but also important social and civic roles related to citizenship formation, cultural transmission, language, and national identity. Consequently, the diffusion of internationally dominant educational standards and institutional models raises questions about how national education systems can benefit from global integration without weakening locally embedded educational traditions and priorities. Comparative research also suggests that internationalization is interpreted differently across national contexts and that its effects depend substantially on institutional, cultural, and socio-economic conditions (Buckner, 2019).

These tensions are particularly relevant for developing and transition countries, where the opportunities generated by globalization often coexist with more limited institutional resources, unequal access to technology, outward migration of highly skilled graduates and academics, and greater vulnerability to the dominance of educational models developed in wealthier countries. Accordingly, globalization should not be understood simply as either a beneficial or a harmful force. Rather, its influence on education reflects a complex interaction between global opportunities and national capacities, priorities, and institutional responses.

Against this background, the aim of this study is to examine the principal opportunities and challenges associated with globalization in national educational systems, with particular attention to developing countries. Specifically, the study seeks to analyse how globalization influences international academic mobility, access to knowledge and technology, institutional competitiveness, educational inequality, commercialization, brain drain, and the preservation of national and cultural identity. Through a comparative review of the relevant literature, the study also aims to identify approaches that may help national educational systems balance the benefits of international integration with the protection of local educational priorities and cultural diversity.

Materials and methods

This study employed a comparative narrative literature review to examine the major opportunities and challenges associated with globalization in national educational systems. The analysis was based on published academic literature addressing the effects of globalization, internationalization, digitalization, educational mobility, inequality, commercialization, brain drain, university rankings, and cultural identity in education.

Sources representing different national and regional contexts were reviewed, including studies from Europe, Asia, and other developing and transition regions. Particular attention was given to literature discussing educational experiences in countries such as China, India, Russia, Germany, and selected countries of South Asia and Africa. The inclusion of geographically and institutionally diverse contexts enabled comparison of both common trends and context-specific effects of globalization on education.

The reviewed literature was analyzed thematically. The main analytical categories included: (1) internationalization and academic mobility; (2) access to knowledge and digital technologies; (3) institutional competitiveness and university rankings; (4) educational inequality; (5) commercialization of education; (6) brain drain; and (7) the preservation of national and cultural identity. Findings from different country contexts were compared in order to identify recurring patterns, contrasting experiences, and major policy challenges.

The study does not constitute a systematic review or meta-analysis. Rather, it provides a qualitative comparative synthesis of selected literature in order to develop a broader understanding of how globalization influences national educational systems and how these systems may balance international integration with local educational priorities and cultural traditions.

Results and Thematic Findings

The comparative review of the literature identified several recurring themes concerning the influence of globalization on national educational systems. Although globalization creates substantial opportunities for international cooperation, academic mobility, access to knowledge, and technological modernization, its effects are not uniformly positive. The reviewed literature also highlights persistent concerns related to inequality, commercialization, brain drain, institutional competition, and the potential weakening of national and cultural dimensions of education. These findings are presented below according to seven major thematic areas.

1. Internationalization and Academic Mobility

One of the most visible effects of globalization on education is the increasing internationalization of higher education. Universities and other educational institutions have expanded cross-border cooperation through student and academic mobility, international research partnerships, joint and double-degree programmes, and the internationalization of curricula. Internationalization has therefore become an important institutional response to the broader forces of globalization (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Knight, 2004).

The reviewed literature suggests that academic mobility provides students with opportunities to acquire intercultural competencies, foreign-language skills, professional networks, and educational experiences that may improve their future academic and employment prospects. For academic staff and researchers, international collaboration facilitates participation in transnational research networks, dissemination of scientific findings, and access to new methods and knowledge.

At the institutional level, internationalization may also contribute to curriculum modernization and the development of partnerships between universities in different countries. However, access to these opportunities is uneven. Students from lower-income households and institutions with limited financial resources may face greater barriers to participation in international mobility programmes. Consequently, academic mobility can simultaneously broaden educational opportunities and reproduce existing social inequalities (Knight, 2012; Mountford-Zimdars & Sabbagh, 2013).

2. Access to Knowledge and Digital Technologies

A second major theme concerns the role of technological globalization in facilitating access to knowledge. The rapid development of the internet, digital learning platforms, online courses, virtual classrooms, and electronic scientific resources has significantly reduced geographical barriers to education. Digital technologies allow students and academics to access educational materials and research produced in other countries and facilitate communication across institutional and national boundaries.

The expansion of digital education became particularly important as higher education institutions increasingly incorporated online and blended forms of teaching. Digitalization also creates opportunities for more flexible and individualized learning and can facilitate international cooperation without requiring physical mobility.

At the same time, the literature emphasizes that technological globalization does not automatically produce equal educational opportunities. Access to reliable internet connections, digital devices, learning platforms, and technologically competent teaching staff remains uneven both between and within countries. The resulting digital divide is particularly important for developing countries and disadvantaged communities, where limited technological infrastructure can restrict participation in increasingly digitalized educational environments.

Thus, digital globalization has a dual effect: it expands the potential availability of educational resources while simultaneously making technological capacity an increasingly important determinant of educational inequality.

3. Institutional Competitiveness and University Rankings

Globalization has also intensified competition among universities. Higher education institutions increasingly compete for international students, highly qualified academic staff, research funding, institutional partnerships, and international visibility. University rankings have become one of the most influential mechanisms through which this competition is organized and communicated internationally.

Rankings may provide certain positive incentives. They can encourage institutions to improve research performance, strengthen international partnerships, enhance institutional visibility, and develop more systematic approaches to quality assurance. International competition may also encourage universities to compare their performance with institutions operating in other national contexts.

However, the literature also identifies significant limitations. Ranking systems are based on particular indicators and definitions of academic excellence that may privilege research-intensive and internationally oriented universities. As a result, institutions may redirect resources toward activities that improve ranking positions rather than toward locally important educational or social objectives (Stack, 2021).

This creates a potential tension between global competitiveness and national educational missions. For universities in developing or transition countries, the pressure to reproduce organizational models developed by leading Western universities may be particularly challenging where financial resources, institutional capacities, and national priorities differ substantially.

4. Educational Inequality

The review further indicates that globalization can both reduce and reinforce educational inequality. The international circulation of knowledge, digital resources, scholarships, and educational programmes potentially increases access to high-quality education. Nevertheless, the capacity to benefit from these opportunities remains strongly influenced by socio-economic background, geographical location, institutional resources, language competence, and digital access.

International scholarships and mobility programmes can provide transformative opportunities for students from disadvantaged backgrounds, yet unequal selection processes and differences in educational preparation may continue to shape who benefits from such programmes. Comparative research on higher education access demonstrates that questions of social class, ethnicity, gender, and institutional background remain important dimensions of educational opportunity (Mountford-Zimdars & Sabbagh, 2013).

Globalization therefore does not necessarily eliminate educational inequality. Instead, it may create new dimensions of inequality based on access to international mobility, digital technologies, English-language education, and globally recognized institutions.

5. Commercialization of Education

Another recurring finding concerns the increasing commercialization and market orientation of education. As higher education institutions compete internationally for students and financial resources, education may increasingly be treated as an internationally tradable service rather than exclusively as a public and social good.

Nayyar (2007) argues that globalization has contributed to the growing importance of market mechanisms in higher education. International student recruitment, tuition fees, private provision, commercially oriented educational programmes, and competition for external revenue have become increasingly important components of university strategies.

While greater competition may generate additional resources and stimulate institutional innovation, excessive commercialization can create tensions between financial incentives and the broader educational mission of universities. Institutions may prioritize programmes with strong market demand while reducing attention to fields that are less commercially profitable but remain socially or culturally important.

This tendency is particularly relevant to disciplines such as history, philosophy, literature, and languages, whose value may not always be adequately represented through market-based indicators. The findings therefore suggest that national education policies need to balance financial sustainability and responsiveness to labour-market needs with the civic, cultural, and intellectual purposes of education.

6. Brain Drain and the International Mobility of Human Capital

Globalization has substantially increased the international mobility of highly educated individuals. Students from developing countries often pursue education abroad because of better academic opportunities, more advanced research infrastructure, higher salaries, or stronger employment prospects. When graduates remain permanently in destination countries, this mobility may contribute to brain drain in their countries of origin.

The economic literature has long identified the potential relationship between educational investment, international mobility, and the loss of highly skilled human capital from developing countries (Miyagiwa, 1991). Countries that finance the education of students but are unable to provide competitive professional opportunities may experience shortages of skilled workers and researchers.

However, international mobility should not be interpreted only negatively. Contemporary mobility may also generate international professional networks, knowledge transfer, remittances, research cooperation, and the eventual return of highly qualified specialists. The effects therefore depend substantially on whether migration results in permanent human-capital loss or develops into forms of brain circulation and transnational cooperation.

For national educational systems, the policy challenge is not necessarily to restrict academic mobility, but rather to create institutional and professional conditions that enable internationally trained graduates to maintain meaningful links with their countries of origin.

7. National and Cultural Identity

The relationship between globalization and national identity emerged as one of the most contested themes in the reviewed literature. Education has historically played an important role in transmitting language, historical memory, cultural traditions, civic values, and collective identity. The increasing circulation of international curricula, accreditation models, educational standards, and dominant academic languages can therefore produce tensions between global integration and national educational traditions.

Internationalization may contribute positively to intercultural understanding and expose students to different values, cultures, and intellectual traditions. Multilingual and multicultural education can promote tolerance and strengthen the capacity of students to function in increasingly diverse societies.

At the same time, excessive standardization may weaken locally embedded educational content and reduce institutional space for national history, languages, cultural traditions, and locally developed teaching approaches. Concerns of this kind are particularly relevant where international models are adopted without sufficient adaptation to the social and cultural context of the receiving country.

The Armenian example discussed in the literature reviewed for this study illustrates this broader tension between international educational adaptation and concern for the preservation of national educational content. However, such examples should be interpreted cautiously: changes in national curricula cannot automatically be attributed to globalization without specific evidence demonstrating a causal relationship.

Consequently, the findings suggest that successful internationalization does not require the abandonment of national educational identity. Rather, sustainable educational globalization depends on the capacity of national institutions to integrate internationally relevant knowledge and standards while preserving culturally and socially significant educational priorities.

Synthesis of the Thematic Findings

Taken together, the reviewed literature demonstrates that globalization has a dual and context-dependent influence on national educational systems. Its benefits include greater academic mobility, wider access to knowledge, international research collaboration, technological innovation, and exposure to diverse educational experiences. At the same time, globalization can intensify competition, reinforce inequalities, accelerate the commercialization of higher education, contribute to the outward migration of skilled human capital, and generate tensions between international standardization and national educational identity.

Importantly, these outcomes are not determined by globalization alone. Their magnitude and direction depend on the institutional capacity of national education systems, the availability of financial and technological resources, public policy choices, and the ability of governments and educational institutions to adapt global developments to local circumstances. The findings therefore indicate that the central policy challenge is not whether national educational systems should participate in globalization, but how international integration can be managed in a manner that maximizes educational opportunities while limiting social, institutional, and cultural risks.

Discussion

The findings of this review demonstrate that the relationship between globalization and education is neither uniformly positive nor uniformly negative. Rather, globalization creates a set of interconnected opportunities and risks whose effects vary according to national context, institutional capacity, socio-economic conditions, and the policy choices made by governments and educational institutions. The central implication is that globalization should not be viewed simply as an external force to which national education systems must adapt. Its consequences are mediated by the ways in which countries and institutions manage internationalization, technological change, academic mobility, market pressures, and the preservation of national educational priorities.

One of the clearest benefits of globalization is the expansion of internationalization and academic mobility. International partnerships, student exchanges, joint academic programmes, and cross-border research collaboration can enhance access to knowledge and facilitate the development of intercultural and professional competencies. As Knight (2004) argues, internationalization represents an institutional and policy response to the broader forces of globalization, rather than globalization itself. This distinction is important because it emphasizes the capacity of educational institutions to shape their engagement with global processes rather than merely respond passively to them. Similarly, Altbach and Knight (2007) note that internationalization can generate substantial academic and institutional benefits, while also being driven by different political, cultural, economic, and commercial motivations.

At the same time, the benefits of internationalization are distributed unevenly. Opportunities for international study, participation in exchange programmes, access to research networks, and use of advanced technologies depend strongly on financial resources, institutional support, language competence, and social background. Consequently, globalization can broaden educational opportunities while simultaneously reproducing or even deepening existing inequalities. This finding is consistent with comparative research showing that access to higher education and international opportunities continues to be shaped by socio-economic status, ethnicity, gender, and institutional background (Mountford-Zimdars & Sabbagh, 2013). The expansion of international opportunities therefore cannot automatically be interpreted as equalization of educational opportunity.

A similar duality is evident in the digital transformation of education. Digital technologies have reduced many traditional geographical barriers and have expanded access to educational materials, international communication, and flexible forms of learning. However, access to these benefits depends on digital infrastructure, devices, institutional capacity, and the technological competencies of both students and teachers. The digitalization of education can therefore contribute to inclusion where these resources are widely available, but it may reinforce inequality where technological access is uneven. For developing and transition countries in particular, the digital divide represents not only a technological problem but also an educational and social equity challenge.

Globalization has also transformed the competitive environment in which higher education institutions operate. Universities increasingly compete for international students, researchers, external funding, partnerships, and global visibility. International rankings have become particularly influential in shaping

perceptions of institutional quality. Such competition may create incentives for universities to strengthen research capacity, improve institutional management, and expand international collaboration. However, rankings also promote particular models of academic excellence that may not correspond to the priorities or resources of all national systems. As Stack (2021) demonstrates, global university rankings are not neutral measurement instruments; they reflect particular assumptions about what counts as academic quality and institutional success.

This tension is especially important for educational institutions in developing countries. Efforts to improve international visibility may encourage universities to redirect resources toward ranking-sensitive indicators, such as publication output, citation performance, or international recruitment, while giving less attention to locally relevant teaching, community engagement, national-language scholarship, or disciplines with limited commercial value. The policy challenge is therefore not to reject international benchmarking, but to avoid allowing global ranking systems to define the entire institutional mission of universities.

The findings concerning commercialization raise a related concern. Globalization has contributed to the increasing integration of higher education into national and international markets. Educational institutions increasingly compete for tuition-paying students, private investment, research contracts, and other sources of external income. Nayyar (2007) argues that the growing role of market mechanisms in higher education has important implications for both access and institutional priorities. Although greater market responsiveness may stimulate innovation and improve financial sustainability, an excessive emphasis on revenue generation can undermine the broader public, civic, and intellectual purposes of education.

This issue is particularly relevant to the balance between applied and non-market-oriented academic fields. Where funding and institutional priorities are increasingly determined by labour-market demand or commercial return, disciplines such as history, philosophy, literature, languages, and some areas of the social sciences may become relatively disadvantaged. Rather than concluding that globalization necessarily “dehumanizes” education, as suggested in the original version of the manuscript, a more cautious interpretation is that market-oriented reforms may shift institutional priorities away from broader humanistic and civic educational objectives if they are not balanced by appropriate public policy and institutional safeguards. The original text raised this concern in strongly normative terms. Pasted markdown

Brain drain represents another important dimension of the relationship between globalization and national educational development. Greater international mobility enables talented students and professionals to gain access to high-quality institutions and better career opportunities. However, when highly skilled graduates remain permanently abroad, countries of origin may lose human capital in which they have invested substantial educational resources. Miyagiwa (1991) identified the potential relationship between economies of scale in education and the migration of highly skilled individuals. For developing countries, this challenge remains particularly important because differences in salaries, research infrastructure, and career opportunities can make permanent emigration more attractive.

Nevertheless, international mobility should not be interpreted solely through the concept of brain drain. Academic migration may also produce transnational research networks, knowledge transfer, professional collaboration, remittances, and eventual return migration. The more relevant policy question is therefore how countries can transform one-directional brain drain into forms of brain circulation. This requires not restricting mobility, but strengthening domestic research environments, professional opportunities, institutional autonomy, and mechanisms through which diaspora academics can remain engaged with their countries of origin.

One of the most sensitive findings concerns the relationship between globalization and national or cultural identity. Educational institutions perform functions that extend beyond the transmission of professional knowledge; they also contribute to language preservation, civic socialization, historical memory, and cultural continuity. For this reason, the international diffusion of educational standards and models can generate legitimate concerns regarding the marginalization of locally important subjects and traditions. However, the relationship between internationalization and cultural homogenization should not be treated as automatic. Internationalization may also increase exposure to cultural diversity and strengthen intercultural understanding.

The Armenian example discussed in the original manuscript illustrates these tensions but should be interpreted cautiously. The reduction of teaching hours devoted to national history, if empirically documented, may be relevant to debates about curriculum priorities. However, such a change cannot be attributed directly to globalization without evidence demonstrating the causal mechanism. The original manuscript linked changes in the teaching of Armenian history to the possible weakening of national identity, but did not provide

sufficient empirical evidence for this causal claim. A more defensible interpretation is that globalization and international standardization may create pressures to reconsider curriculum priorities, while the final balance between international and national content remains primarily a matter of domestic educational policy.

Taken together, these findings suggest that the key challenge for national education systems is not to choose between globalization and national autonomy. Such a binary choice would overlook the fact that virtually all contemporary educational systems operate within interconnected international environments. Rather, the central challenge is to develop forms of managed internationalization that allow educational systems to benefit from knowledge exchange, technological innovation, mobility, and international cooperation without allowing market pressures, institutional competition, or standardized models to erode educational equity and nationally significant academic and cultural priorities.

This balance is particularly important for developing and transition countries, which may have fewer institutional and financial resources with which to respond to global competition. Their ability to benefit from globalization depends not only on access to international opportunities but also on the strength of domestic institutions. Policies aimed at expanding digital access, supporting disadvantaged students, improving research environments, strengthening quality assurance, and protecting socially and culturally important academic fields can therefore play an important role in determining whether globalization contributes to educational development or reinforces existing inequalities.

Accordingly, the findings of this review support a policy approach based on selective adaptation rather than uncritical standardization. International standards, technologies, mobility programmes, and institutional models can provide important resources for educational modernization, but they should be adapted to national circumstances rather than adopted mechanically. The long-term objective should be to create educational systems that are internationally connected and competitive while remaining socially inclusive, culturally responsive, and capable of serving national as well as global educational goals.

Conclusion

Globalization has become a major force shaping contemporary education, creating both significant opportunities and substantial challenges for national educational systems. On the positive side, it promotes the internationalization of education, expands access to knowledge and scientific collaboration, supports academic and professional mobility, encourages multilingual and multicultural learning, and accelerates the integration of digital technologies into teaching and learning. These developments can strengthen institutional capacity, broaden educational opportunities, and improve the ability of students and academics to participate in an increasingly interconnected world.

At the same time, the effects of globalization are uneven and may generate important risks. These include persistent inequalities in access to international and digital opportunities, brain drain, the commercialization of education, excessive dependence on global rankings, and pressures toward cultural and curricular homogenization. Such challenges are especially relevant for developing and transition countries, where limited financial and institutional resources can constrain the ability to benefit equally from global educational integration.

The findings of this review suggest that the central policy challenge is not whether national education systems should engage with globalization, but how this engagement should be managed. Effective strategies should combine international openness with the protection of educational equity, cultural diversity, national educational priorities, and the broader social and humanistic functions of education. Rather than adopting global models uncritically, educational institutions should adapt international practices to local contexts and institutional capacities.

In this regard, a balanced model of internationalization is required, one that supports innovation, mobility, digital transformation, and global cooperation while preserving the distinctive cultural and social role of national education systems. Developing such a balance will require strong institutions, inclusive digital policies, support for disadvantaged groups, investment in domestic academic and research environments, and continued attention to the cultural dimensions of education. Ultimately, the long-term value of globalization in education will depend on the capacity of national systems to transform global opportunities into socially inclusive, academically meaningful, and culturally sustainable outcomes.

References

- Altbach, P. G., & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(3–4), 290–305. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315307303542>
- Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: Definition, approaches, and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 8(1), 5–31. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315303260832>
- Knight, J., & de Wit, H. (2018). Internationalization of higher education: Past and future. *International Higher Education*, 95, 2–4. <https://ejournals.bc.edu/index.php/ihe/article/view/10715>
- Knight, J. (2012). Student mobility and internationalization: Trends and tribulations. *Research in Comparative and International Education*, 7(1), 20–33. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.2304/rcie.2012.7.1.20>
- Marginson, S., & van der Wende, M. (2007). Globalisation and higher education. OECD Education Working Papers, No. 8. https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/globalisation-and-higher-education_173831738240.html
- Miyagiwa, K. (1991). Scale economies in education and the brain drain problem. *International Economic Review*, 32(3), 743–759.
- Mountford-Zimdars, A., & Sabbagh, D. (2013). Fair access to higher education: A comparative perspective. *Comparative Education Review*, 57(3), 359–368.
- Nayyar, D. (2007). Globalisation: What does it mean for higher education? *Economic and Political Weekly*, 42(50), 30–35.
- Stack, M. (Ed.). (2021). *Global university rankings and the politics of knowledge*. University of Toronto Press.