Journal of Education Psychometrics and Bibliometric Studies
(JEPSY); ISSN (E): 3139-308X

Vol.01, No.02 (2026)
pp.127-134

Article Type: Review Article

Article Information:
Received: 14/05/2026
Accepted: 5/07/2026
Published: 17/07/2026

Vyom Hans Publications

Transforming Higher Education in a Global Knowledge Economy

Snigdha Singh

Amity Business School, Amity University, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh, India (Bharat).
Email: *ssingh7@lko.amity.edu; snigdha.singh001@gmail.com*(corresponding author)

Abstract

The globalization and liberalization of higher education have significantly transformed the education sector across the world. Advancements in technology, increased private participation, and the implementation of the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) have accelerated the internationalization and marketization of higher education (Knight, 2003; Robertson, Bonal, & Dale, 2002). While these developments have expanded access and created new opportunities, they have also raised concerns related to commercialization, quality, affordability, unequal access, brain drain, and declining research orientation. This paper examines the major challenges emerging in higher education due to globalization and privatization, particularly in the Indian context. It also suggests measures for improving quality, ensuring equitable access, strengthening regulation, and promoting research and innovation. The paper concludes that higher education must balance global competitiveness with its broader social and developmental responsibilities.

Keywords: Knowledge management, Privatization, Higher Education, General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS)

INTRODUCTION

Over the past few decades, one of the most significant developments in higher education has been its increasing internationalization. Advancements in technology and communication have made education more accessible, flexible, and student-centric. Students today move across national boundaries in search of educational opportunities that match their interests, career aspirations, aptitude, and financial capacity. As a result, education is increasingly viewed not only as a public good but also as a competitive and commercially driven service. This transformation emerged largely from the neo-liberal economic reforms introduced in many Western countries during the late 1970s and later reflected in India's liberalization, privatization, and globalization reforms of the 1990s. These reforms had a major impact

© 2026 Author(s). This article is published under the CC-BY license at https://edu.vyomhansjournals.com/

on higher education, particularly on professional and technical education.

In the Indian context, economic liberalization created new possibilities for higher education at a time when the traditional university system was facing serious challenges. Rapid population growth, increasing numbers of secondary school graduates, expansion of knowledge, and growing awareness regarding lifelong learning led to a sharp rise in the demand for higher education (Rizvi, 2016). Existing public institutions struggled to accommodate this growing demand. Indian universities during this period faced several structural and financial constraints. Many institutions suffered from inadequate funding, excessive affiliation burdens, bureaucratic rigidity, and lack of academic flexibility. Research activities in many affiliated and constituent colleges remained limited in both quality and impact. Consequently, the need was felt for alternative models and greater institutional expansion to improve standards and meet the educational needs of a growing population.

Against this backdrop, the economic reforms of the early 1990s marked a significant turning point for the education sector in India. Regulatory restrictions on educational services were gradually relaxed, allowing greater private participation and increased global engagement in higher education. These reforms also coincided with broader international developments, particularly the establishment of the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) under the World Trade Organization in 1995 (Sharma, 2011).

GATS aimed to promote international trade in services through transparency and progressive liberalization while encouraging economic growth and development among participating nations. Under this framework, education came to be viewed as a tradable service sector (Raju, 2004). Among the twelve major service sectors identified under GATS, education was included as an important category. Educational services were further divided into five sub-sectors: primary education, secondary education, higher education, adult education, and other educational services, including private tutoring and specialized training (Raju, 2004).

The inclusion of higher education within the framework of global trade accelerated the marketization and internationalization of the sector. It created opportunities for private investment, institutional expansion, foreign collaborations, and cross-border mobility of students and academic programs (Rizvi, 2016). At the same time, these developments also raised important concerns related to equity, affordability, accessibility, quality assurance, and commercialization of education. GATS not only brought education within the framework of tradable services, but also identified different modes through which educational services could be delivered internationally (Robertson, et al., 2002). Four major modes of trade in services were recognized.

Cross-border Supply

In this mode, the service itself crosses national boundaries while the learner remains in the home country. Examples include online education, e-learning platforms, virtual classrooms, and distance education programs.

Consumption Abroad

Under this mode, students travel to another country to obtain educational services. International student mobility and overseas education are the most common examples.

Commercial Presence

This occurs when an educational institution or service provider establishes its presence in another country. Examples include foreign university campuses, franchised institutions, collaborative programs,

and offshore educational centres.

Presence of Natural Persons

This mode refers to the temporary movement of individuals such as teachers, researchers, trainers, and academic professionals to another country for the purpose of providing educational services.

These modes significantly facilitated the cross-border mobility of higher education. Liberalization opened the doors for educational services to be offered not only by governments but also by private and foreign institutions. As a result, higher education increasingly became globalized, privatized, and competitive in nature.

To some extent, privatization and globalization contributed positively to the expansion of higher education. Increased competition encouraged institutional growth, diversification of courses, technological integration, and greater emphasis on skill development and employability (Robertson, 2006). The entry of private players also helped meet the growing demand for professional and technical education, particularly in developing countries like India (Alam & Halder, 2016).

However, the outcomes have not always been uniformly positive. Market-driven approaches in education often prioritize profitability over academic quality and social responsibility. In the absence of effective regulation and quality assurance mechanisms, commercialization can lead to declining academic standards, unequal access, excessive fee structures, and the growth of degree-oriented institutions with limited focus on research and knowledge creation.

Today, the higher education sector has witnessed massive expansion in terms of institutions, student enrollment, and program diversity. Despite this growth, several serious challenges continue to persist. Issues related to quality assurance, employability, faculty shortages, research output, affordability, digital divide, and equitable access remain major concerns for policymakers and educational institutions alike.

The modern university now performs a strange balancing act. It is expected to function simultaneously as a center of knowledge, a skill-development hub, a research institution, a social equalizer, and a globally competitive enterprise (Reddy, 2015). Humans, naturally, decided one institution should solve every economic and social problem at once.

CONTEMPORARY CHALLENGES IN HIGHER EDUCATION

One of the major challenges arising from the commercialization of higher education is the increasing emphasis on profit maximization (Dash et al., 2023). In many cases, private and foreign educational providers may prioritize expansion, revenue generation, and market capture over academic quality and institutional standards (Dash et al., 2023). This concern is also acknowledged in the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020, which recognizes education as a public service and explicitly calls for measures to curb the commercialization of higher education by requiring institutions to function on a not-for-profit basis with transparent governance (Ministry of Education, 2020). Higher education cannot be viewed solely as a private commodity that benefits individual learners. It also functions as a public and social good, contributing to social development, nation-building, innovation, and democratic progress. Excessive commercialization may therefore weaken these broader societal objectives of education (Rajeev, 2023).

Unregulated market forces may conflict with the national goals of equal access, social justice, and inclusive growth. Rising tuition fees and market-driven educational costs can exclude economically weaker and marginalized sections of society from accessing quality higher education (Gautam et al.,

2015). This concern is particularly relevant in the Indian context, where the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 emphasizes equitable access, affordability, and inclusion as fundamental objectives of higher education. The policy advocates targeted financial assistance, expanded scholarships, and the establishment of Special Education Zones to improve participation among socio-economically disadvantaged groups (Ministry of Education, 2020). In such a system, talented and deserving students from disadvantaged backgrounds may struggle to secure admission due to financial constraints, while economically privileged students may gain greater access irrespective of merit.

Another concern is that, in the absence of effective regulatory oversight, foreign institutions of varying quality may enter the higher education market. If academic standards and accreditation are not rigorously monitored, students may face uncertainty regarding the recognition and credibility of their qualifications. Although NEP 2020 encourages the entry of high-performing foreign universities to enhance quality and global collaboration, it also emphasizes the need for a robust regulatory framework and quality assurance mechanisms to safeguard students' interests and maintain academic standards (Ministry of Education, 2020). Global universities and offshore campuses often focus on programs with high commercial and employment value. As a result, indigenous knowledge systems, regional languages, arts, humanities, and local cultural traditions may receive less attention and support. Recognizing this risk, NEP 2020 advocates a holistic and multidisciplinary education system that promotes Indian knowledge systems, regional languages, arts, culture, and value-based education alongside global competencies (Ministry of Education, 2020).

Universities have traditionally served as centers for knowledge creation, critical inquiry, and advanced research. However, many offshore campuses and virtual institutions primarily focus on skill delivery and information dissemination rather than original research and innovation. This may adversely affect the long-term development of scientific research and intellectual advancement. A large proportion of programs offered by foreign universities are delivered in English. In countries like India, where many students come from regional language backgrounds, language barriers may limit access and participation in higher education. Acknowledging the importance of linguistic inclusion, the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 promotes the use and development of regional and national languages to preserve India's linguistic diversity and reduce language-related barriers to higher education (Narkhede et al., 2026).

The increasing dependence on digital technologies, online platforms, and internet-based learning may further widen the digital divide (Singh, 2016). Students from rural and economically weaker regions may lack adequate access to devices, connectivity, and technological infrastructure, thereby remaining excluded from emerging educational opportunities. Recognizing this challenge, the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 emphasizes the need to bridge the digital divide by strengthening digital infrastructure, expanding access to technology-enabled learning, and ensuring equitable participation in digital education (Ministry of Education, 2020). Nevertheless, persistent socio-economic disparities continue to limit the realization of these objectives (Tewathia et al., 2020).

International mobility programs, twinning arrangements, and overseas education opportunities may also create a sense of cultural dislocation among students (Hegde, 2016). Many students studying abroad may experience social alienation, identity conflicts, and uncertainty regarding long-term settlement and employment. While NEP 2020 promotes internationalization and student mobility to enhance global exposure, institutions must also provide adequate academic, cultural, and psychological support to help students adapt to cross-cultural learning environments.

Globalization may also intensify inequalities between developed and developing nations. Wealthier countries often attract highly qualified talent by providing superior research infrastructure and better career opportunities. This movement of skilled individuals, commonly referred to as brain drain, can deprive developing countries of valuable human capital. Universities may struggle to retain experienced faculty, which in turn weakens research capacity and limits innovation. Such losses reduce the ability of institutions to compete internationally and contribute to national development. Over time, the concentration of expertise in developed economies may widen existing disparities in knowledge production and scientific advancement. Although international mobility creates opportunities for collaboration and learning, these benefits are not distributed equally. Unless developing countries strengthen their research ecosystems and create attractive academic careers, they may continue to lose talent to wealthier nations (Bhardwaj & Sharma, 2023; Petreska et al., 2023).

Rapid commercialization may also increase the risk of unethical practices within higher education (Hegde, 2016). Issues such as fake degrees, misleading advertisements, poor-quality institutions, and compromised evaluation systems can damage the credibility of the education sector. Continuous upward revision of tuition fees on economic and market considerations may gradually place higher education beyond the reach of ordinary citizens. This can further deepen educational inequality and social stratification.

While the expansion and globalization of higher education have created new opportunities, they have also given rise to several structural, economic, and social challenges. Concerns related to quality, equity, commercialization, accessibility, and research cannot be ignored, particularly in developing countries where higher education continues to play an important role in social mobility and national development (Gautam et al., 2015). However, these challenges are not beyond resolution. With effective regulation, transparent governance, strong quality assurance mechanisms, and inclusive policy interventions, it is possible to balance global competitiveness with social responsibility. Therefore, there is a need to adopt comprehensive measures that can strengthen the higher education system while ensuring that the benefits of globalization are distributed more equitably across society.

MEASURES FOR IMPROVEMENT

Strong and independent accreditation mechanisms should be established at both national and international levels to ensure quality and accountability in higher education. However, merely creating accreditation agencies is not sufficient. These bodies must function autonomously, transparently, and free from political or commercial influence. Their scope should include public institutions, private universities, foreign educational providers, and all forms of cross-border educational operations.

Permission to establish and operate private or foreign educational institutions should be granted only after ensuring that minimum academic, infrastructural, financial, and faculty-related standards are fulfilled (Gautam et al., 2015). Regulatory authorities must conduct periodic evaluations to ensure continued compliance with these standards.

Foreign universities seeking to operate in host countries may initially be granted permission for a limited trial or probationary period. Their continuation and long-term approval should depend upon their academic performance, research contribution, student outcomes, and compliance with regulatory norms during this period. Such evaluation mechanisms should apply to all forms of collaboration, including franchising agreements, twinning programs, offshore campuses, study centers, and academic partnerships.

Host countries must verify whether foreign educational institutions are duly recognized and accredited in their home countries before granting permission to operate (Alam & Halder, 2016). Institutions should also be required to submit recent audit and quality assurance reports issued by internationally recognized accreditation agencies.

Appropriate financial regulations should be introduced to ensure that educational institutions prioritize academic development over excessive profit generation. As proposed in the Foreign Educational Institutions Bill, a substantial portion of the income generated within the host country should be reinvested into institutional development, infrastructure, research facilities, faculty development, and student welfare initiatives.

Rising tuition fees have become a major concern in higher education. Therefore, there should be reasonable regulatory oversight regarding fee structures, particularly in professional and private institutions. Educational providers should not be allowed to increase fees arbitrarily without approval from competent regulatory authorities (Kezar, 2005). At the same time, financial assistance, scholarships, and student support mechanisms should be strengthened to ensure equitable access.

Foreign universities and cross-border educational providers should obtain prior approval from the relevant national regulatory bodies before establishing campuses or offering academic programs in the host country. Such approvals should be based on transparent criteria related to quality, infrastructure, financial stability, and academic credibility.

In some cases, foreign institutions discontinue operations after a few years, leaving students academically and financially vulnerable (Kezar, 2005). To prevent such situations, regulatory authorities should require institutions to maintain substantial security deposits or financial guarantees. Strict penalties and compensation mechanisms should also be introduced to safeguard student interests in case of sudden institutional closure.

For achieving inclusive growth and equal educational opportunities, governments must strengthen higher education infrastructure in rural, remote, and underserved regions. Adequate investment in digital infrastructure, libraries, laboratories, internet connectivity, and faculty availability is essential so that students are not compelled to migrate merely due to lack of local educational opportunities.

The quality of existing higher education institutions must be enhanced to meet international standards. This requires continuous curriculum revision, faculty training, technological integration, academic autonomy, industry collaboration, and improved governance practices (Singh, 2016). Emphasis should also be placed on outcome-based education and skill development without compromising academic depth and critical thinking.

At present, many higher education institutions focus primarily on teaching and industry-oriented skill development, while research and innovation often receive inadequate attention. Universities should therefore be evaluated not only on enrollment and placements, but also on the basis of research output, patents, publications, innovation, and societal contribution. Institutions must actively promote a strong research culture by providing funding support, research incentives, international collaborations, and opportunities for interdisciplinary work.

Along with academic expansion, ethical and social responsibilities of higher education institutions must also be strengthened. Universities should contribute toward developing socially responsible citizens, promoting democratic values, preserving cultural diversity, and encouraging critical thinking. Higher education should not become solely employment-oriented at the cost of intellectual and social

development.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the liberalization and globalization of higher education have significantly transformed the educational landscape across the world. These changes have expanded access, encouraged institutional growth, promoted technological integration, and facilitated international mobility of students, faculty, and knowledge. The entry of private and foreign institutions has also helped address the growing demand for higher education, particularly in developing countries like India. At the same time, the increasing marketization of education has created several serious challenges. Issues related to commercialization, rising tuition fees, unequal access, declining academic standards, brain drain, and neglect of research and indigenous knowledge systems continue to raise important concerns. If left entirely to market forces, higher education may gradually move away from its broader social responsibilities and become accessible only to economically privileged sections of society.

Therefore, a balanced and well-regulated approach is essential. Governments, regulatory authorities, universities, and accreditation agencies must work together to ensure that higher education remains accessible, affordable, inclusive, and academically relevant (Dash et al., 2023). Greater emphasis should be placed on quality assurance, research culture, ethical governance, and equitable opportunities for students from all sections of society. Higher education cannot be treated merely as a commercial enterprise. It plays a crucial role in national development, social transformation, scientific advancement, and human progress (Hegde, 2016). The real challenge before policymakers is not whether globalization in higher education should be accepted or rejected, but how its benefits can be maximized while minimizing its negative social and economic consequences. Universities today stand at a complicated intersection of public responsibility and global competition. They are expected to produce employable graduates, generate research, preserve culture, encourage innovation, and promote social equity simultaneously. A modest workload, apparently.

Disclosure statement

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Funding

The research received no external funding.

REFERENCES

Alam, K., & Halder, U. K. (2016). The emergence and impact of privatization of higher education: Indian overview. Journal of education and development, 6(12), 146-152.

Bhardwaj, B., & Sharma, D. (2023). Migration of skilled professionals across the border: Brain drain or brain gain?. European Management Journal, 41(6), 1021-1033.

Dash, A. K., Mishra, P., & Markose, L. H. (2023). The privatisation of Indian education: Challenges & solutions, with special reference to the primary education system. Deshbandhu Journal of Social Sciences, 1(1), 93-119.

Gautam, R., Parihar, A. S., & Khare, S. (2015). Analysis of globalization/privatization of higher education in India. In International Conference on Science, Technology and Management.

Hegde, G. A. (2016). Privatization in higher education in India: A reflection of issues. In A global perspective on private higher education (pp. 157-168). Chandos Publishing.

Kezar, A. J. (2005). Challenges for higher education in serving the public good. Higher education for the public good: Emerging voices from a national movement, 23-42.

Knight, J. (2003). GATS, trade and higher education perspective 2003-where are we?. The Observatory on Borderless Higher Education, London. Ministry of Education. (2020). National Education Policy 2020. Government of India. Ministry of Education.

Narkhede, G., Pasi, B., Dhamak, P., Mahalle, P., & Ambhore, N. (2026). In the pursuit of educational excellence: investigating CSFs for implementing NEP 2020 to redefine the higher education ecosystem. Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education, 18(2), 372-393.

Petreska, N., Prodanova, J., & Kocarev, L. (2023). Should I Leave My Country? Higher Education Value Shaping Students' Satisfaction and Brain Drain Intentions in Western Balkans. Sage Open, 13(4), 21582440231208770.

Rajeev, S. (2023). An analysis of NEP 2020: certain key issues. Indian Journal of Information Sources and Services, 13(1), 10-16. Raju, P. (2004). Barriers To Trade In Education Services Under The Gats: An Indian Experience. Amity Law Review, 5(1).

Reddy, S. (2015). Impact of privatisation of education in Indian Society. Journal of Culture, Society and Development. Rizvi, F. (2016). Privatization in Education: Trends and Consequences. Paris: UNESCO.18 1–12)

Robertson, S. L. (2006). Globalisation, GATS and trading in education services. Supranational regimes and national education policies–encountering challenge. Finnish Education Research Association: Helsinki.

Robertson, S. L., Bonal, X., & Dale, R. (2002). GATS and the education service industry: The politics of scale and global reterritorialization. Comparative education review, 46(4), 472-496.

Sharma, V. (2011). GATS and Higher Education in India: Implications. Globalization and Higher Education in India, 99. Singh, S. (2016). Challenges to English Language Teaching in the Twenty-First Century: An Indian Perspective. IUP Journal of English Studies, 11(4).

Tewathia, N., Kamath, A., & Ilavarasan, P. V. (2020). Social inequalities, fundamental inequities, and recurring of the digital divide: Insights from India. Technology in society, 61, 01251.

COPYRIGHT AND LICENSE

[© 2026 **Snigdha Singh**] This is an Open Access article published in **Journal of Education Psychometrics and Bibliometric Studies** *(JEPSY)*, an Open Access Journal by Vyom Hans Publications. It is published with a Creative Commons Attribution - CC-BY4.0 International License. This license permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

HOW TO CITE?

Snigdha Singh (2026). Transforming Higher Education in a Global Knowledge Economy. *Journal of Education Psychometrics and Bibliometric Studies*, 01(02), 127-134.