

# Reading Education in The Midst of Globalisation

KOLOKIU

Jurnal Pendidikan Luar Sekolah

<http://kolokium.pjj.unp.ac.id/>

Jurusan Pendidikan Luar Sekolah

Fakultas Ilmu Pendidikan

Universitas Negeri Padang

Sumatera Barat, Indonesia

Volume 14, Nomor 1, 2026

DOI: 10.24036/kolokium.v14i1.1271

Received 25 February 2026

Approved 24 April 2026

Published 24 April 2026

*Bernadetha Nadeak*<sup>1,3</sup>, *Halim Wiryadinata*<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universitas Kristen Indonesia, Graduate Program

<sup>2</sup> Universitas Kristen Indonesia, Graduate Program

<sup>3</sup> [\\*halim.wiryadinata@uki.ac.id](mailto:halim.wiryadinata@uki.ac.id)

## ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to observe that the value of education in the era of globalisation has shifted from education to economic education. Education, which has a noble ideal of liberating humans from a life of shackles, has become economic education with a single goal: profitability in the era of globalisation. The narrative of globalisation promotes the connectedness and interdependence between individuals and ideas, but places education within a perspective of industrial education. This study employs a sociological approach to critically and logically explain this shift, drawing on access to books, journals, academic writings, and historical manuscripts. The results of this study suggest that globalization, driven by technological advancements, has transformed education into a commodity in the industrialization process. Ultimately, the conclusion of this study is the shift in educational values brought about by technological developments, which have elevated economic education as a key educational value in the era of globalisation.

**Keywords:** Education's Value, Globalisation, Technological Development, Economic Education

## INTRODUCTION

Education prioritizes the transmission of knowledge from one individual to another, aiming to develop ideas, concepts, attitudes, and behaviors. For Bourdieu (Bourdieu 1971, 15–17), education is a circle of social reproduction that binds educational values. This circle of social reproduction is a critique of Bourdieu that education is a tool that creates human resources according to the state of social capital. This circle of reproduction makes itself a dialectic with the economy as a parameter of educational success for the human resources it produces (Nash, 1990). This thinking positions education as a means of aligning with market needs to employ human resources to sustain life and practice knowledge (Reddy et al., 2023). Therefore, the value of education, as the transmission of knowledge, has positioned itself as a commodity to meet the needs of the human resource market from a global economic perspective (Klees, 2019). This shift is influenced by two major narratives: technology and globalization. The role of technology supports the shift in educational values to meet market needs through competition for technological human resource excellence (Smythe et al., 2021). This role of technology invites the narrative of globalization as a concept of interdependence

among individuals, technology, ideas, and concepts, thus creating a single world (Das et al., 2023).

Technology has become a dominant factor shaping the direction of educational values, moving them towards industrial education (Yang & You, 2018). Technology is undergoing rapid changes in algorithmic networks, resulting in limitless speed in engineering processes. Martono (Martono 2016, 275–76) explains that technology offers the promise of accuracy, speed, popularity, and efficiency. These promises are the values of the current educational curriculum, which aims to equip human resources to secure a place in the workforce (Arafat et al., 2022). This thinking makes technology part of the educational curriculum and directs educational resources as commodities in the industrial market (Jessop, 2018). Therefore, the labor market demands that human resources possess technological skills as complementary skills, leading educational institutions to create technologically enhanced curricula. This understanding shifts the value of education from a noble ideal of educating people with knowledge, ideas, concepts, attitudes, and behaviors to an economic education that meets market needs (Schofer et al., 2021). Economic education builds human capital as a profitable asset. This shift transforms the capital value of education into economic value for human resources.

Technological growth is inseparable from the grand narrative of the era's shift from modernization to globalization. The narrative of globalization, according to Martono (Martono 2016, 280–81), is the effect of modernization that promotes and creates a single world (one world) that is interdependent. This single world places the world without borders (borderless), so that every individual has unlimited opportunities to collaborate through expansion (Ritzer et al., 2018). The power of this expansion places educational institutions in unlimited competition, each promoting its own advantages. The expansion of educational institutions creates a capitalist education system, thereby generating social conflict in the era of globalization (Hay, 2020). According to Bourdieu (Bourdieu 1971, 56–57), this social conflict is the social reproduction of human resources. Bourdieu defines social reproduction as follows: if a child lacks capital, they are limited in their ability to attend school and advance to the next level of education. The limitations of lower-class individuals produce lower-class children (Bourdieu, 1987, pp. 98–99). Therefore, globalization transforms the cultural, economic, and social aspects of education, elevating its value to a competitive advantage in the labor market. This understanding builds a capitalist education system that prioritizes internationalization as a driving force behind rising education costs in the era of globalization (Jones et al., 2019). These costs, of course, make education a form of social reproduction for lower-class communities.

Two components (technology and globalization) are triggers for reading education in the current era of globalization. Stimson et al. (Hutagalung et al. 2022) note that education, including religious education, has shifted towards economic education. This shift is driven by technology, leading educational values to shift rapidly from noble values to economic education (Wiryadinata, 2023). Research by Jessop (Jessop 2017) indicates that the current educational curriculum is based on economic knowledge to develop the human resources the labour market needs. Ardlin (Ardlin 2017) supports Jessop's concept by adding that technology makes education a tool for achieving economic value. The above studies have not fully answered how to interpret the direction of education in the era of globalization from an economic-sociological perspective informed by technological growth values. This paper argues that education in the era of globalization emphasizes economic value, specifically the production of human resources to meet labour market needs through technological skill development. This thinking positions the era of globalization and its penetration into the

societal sphere as a basis for creating policies and curriculum designs that align with current economic values.

## **METHOD**

To address the above arguments, this study uses an economic sociology approach to examine books, journal articles, academic writings, and historical writings, employing critical thinking. The economic sociology approach is used to determine critical values of economic growth and its impact on intrinsic educational values through technological growth (Turner, 2015, pp. 156–157). This economic sociology approach divides this paper into three parts to answer the above arguments. First, this study explains that globalization – one world – affects education, with technology transforming intrinsic education into industrial education. Second, economic globalization turns education into a commodity, thereby increasing tuition fees as a variable taken into account in the construction of economic education in global education. Third, reading education through the lens of globalization shows that, in the globalization era, education and economics are two sides of the same coin, as they build and enhance the dignity of human resources in the labor market. This study concludes by addressing the above arguments and the implications of education in the era of globalization.

## **DISCUSSION**

### **Globalisasi and Its Effect on Education**

According to Ray and Stompka (Ray and Sztompka 1995, 27–28), globalization is a continuation of the modernization era, symbolized by technology. The continuous process from modernization to globalization transforms society into a unified world. In this unified world, technology plays a dominant role in making societies interdependent (Schofer et al., 2021). The development and growth of technology drive modernization toward globalization, making the world borderless. The absence of borders between countries provides opportunities for human resources and capital to permeate various aspects of society, such as education, the economy, and culture (Abbas & Razak, 2011). At the educational level, globalization enables foreign educational institutions to enter the country without borders. The confluence of high-ranking foreign educational institutions poses a threat to domestic institutions. Therefore, the intrinsic value of education is no longer a noble value and ideal, but rather a commodity (Antonopoulou et al., 2021). This thinking positions education as a selling point for every educational institution, fulfilling organizational needs. Globalization and technology support this shift and build the infrastructure for economic education (Yang & You, 2018).

Martono (Martono 2016, 265–66) asserts that education is part of the social change that determines and legitimizes the flow of globalization. This thinking positions education, on the one hand, as a tool to legitimize existing social structures and, on the other, as a means to transform them towards a world of justice. The position of education in the era of globalization presents a dilemma: maintaining its role as a tool for transforming human resources to create justice (Emawati, 2018), 2018). The era of globalization enables education to strike a balance between meeting workforce needs and the intrinsic value of education. Therefore, globalization requires education to perpetuate existing social structures to achieve a one world. This globalization also places the power of technology to accelerate social change, making education and educational institutions objects in the process (Onuoha & Odeke, 2020). Therefore, education places technology-related subjects or courses as a primary requirement

in the curriculum to meet the needs of the world of work. This understanding positions education as a task and role in building a modern society, as an agent of social change (Kharisma, 2018).

Globalization provides unlimited access to all elements and positions the education sector within the free market (Rehbein, 2020). The flow of globalization creates a regulatory role for the state, thus reducing its role in the public sphere. The free market created by globalization becomes dominant in the public sphere (Hrynkow, 2015). Therefore, the privatization of education forces educational institutions to seek ways to survive in the free market. This privatization forces education to be subsumed within the free-market mechanism to survive and compete (Batten, 2012). With the entry of the international education system into the country, international educational qualifications have become a benchmark for domestic educational institutions to internationalize. Spring (Spring 2004, 55–56) emphasizes that curriculum, organization, and pedagogy have shifted from intrinsic to digital as a result of globalization. English has become the global language of education, a sign of the internationalization of education to enable competition in the free market. The shift in education towards the free market is a symbol of social change in the era of globalization (Spring, 2009, pp. 70–72).

The shifting currents of globalization have integrated the education system into the economy, making it a manifestation of globalization. Kerckhoff (Kerckhoff 2008) explains that the expansion of technology into the education system formulates indicators of the success of education and educational institutions in the economic aspect. Indicators of educational success in the economic sphere include graduates' employment outcomes and the education system's adaptation to labour market needs (Zabaev & Prutskova, 2019). Therefore, education is oriented towards market interests, so the education and training system for human resources is market oriented. The success of this integration is key to future economic growth and prosperity, where education legitimizes the currents of globalization. Martono (Martono 2016, 290–91) explains that globalization is a process of advancing civilization, and national education follows this globalization to promote progress. The progress of globalization provides students with the opportunity to compete internationally in both knowledge and technology, serving as an indicator of the realization of educational globalization (Rowe, 2019).

### **Global Economy and Its Implication on Education**

A country's development is characterized by economic growth out of poverty and the emergence of a new economic system. Harrison (Harrison, 2005, pp. 82–83) explains that poverty is a problem indicator for Third World countries and is a target for social change in the era of globalization. This thinking gave rise to a theory of modernization that emphasizes that poverty levels are an internal problem of the country, necessitating a gradual modernization process (Datzberger, 2022), 2022). This modernization process leads to homogenization, creating societies with similar characteristics and structures. This similarity in character and structure causes Third World societies to adopt the concept of Westernization, so that the capitalist economy becomes the economic system (Vishnevsky & Narkhov, 2019). Therefore, this concept of modernization is used as a systemic social change process, thereby inviting education into it. The continuous modernization process creates a transformative economy within society's social system, enabling the accumulation of capital to meet needs. According to Spring (Spring 2009, 110–11), modernization requires economic change, including the development of modern human resources to become productive individuals. These productive humans need knowledge, so that education becomes a tool to perpetuate the idea that economic growth is the goal of human economic development.

Spring (Spring 2004, 77–78) proposed dependency theory as an alternative to modernization theory, emphasizing Marx's theory. This dependency theory holds that poverty in the Third World is caused by modernization theory, which emphasizes capitalism as the economic system. According to Marx (Marx 1961, 58–59), society has been divided into two classes: the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. The proletariat class is highly dependent on the bourgeoisie because the bourgeoisie owns capital and plays a role in the economy. This dichotomy creates a divide between developed and Third World countries, leading to regional polarization in the global economy (Paolucci, 2020). Therefore, dependency theory argues that economic development is an increase in the standard of living for every human being. This economic development involves education as an institution that produces human resources aligned with market needs (Hendrawan, 2017). The creation of human resources aligned with the market enhances the ability to build the economy and improve living standards. This understanding, for Ray and Sztompka (Ray and Sztompka 1995, 121–22), is a framework for economic activity and free trade as a tool for fulfilling needs through education in the era of globalization.

Globalization places the economy as a factor in the success of every individual in society. Economic fulfillment is a priority for society to meet needs (Rudnyckyj, 2009, pp. 77–79). One of the strengths of the global economy is investment, so each country creates economic policies to ensure the entry and exit of products meet society's needs. The concept of the global economy is to foster a consumer society in line with the expansion of broader markets in the era of globalization (Carstensen & Emmenegger, 2023). Therefore, every product manufactured has industrial value, thereby creating a global society that requires it. The expansion of foreign products into the domestic market places education as an industry with high sales value (Cristiani & Peiró, 2018). This thinking treats education as an industry, so it has great economic value in increasing Gross Domestic Product (GDP). Ritzer (G Ritzer 2003, 68–69) correctly explains that the global economy fosters a capitalist-based economy by creating products and a consumer society.

Weber's (Weber 2005, 15–16) theory of rationalized structures increases the element of consumption in society. With the massive expansion of globalization, this rational structure replicates itself worldwide as a form of modern capitalism. Capitalism seeks to expand economic markets through increased consumption (Morelock, 2021). This consumption area extends beyond products to other sectors such as education. This global economic system seeks expansion potential and creates human resources to maintain an abundant supply of goods and services. This abundance creates a large expansion area to meet the needs of large-scale public consumption (Lumby, 2019). Therefore, the global economy draws on information technology as a force shaping how people think today. This thinking aligns with Karl Marx's theory (Furseth & Repstad, 2013, pp. 78–79), as an adherent of the philosophy of historical materialism, which holds that technology is a tool humans use to shape the fragmentation of resources in the global economy. This thinking provides significant scope for education to create specialization in the division of labor based on professionalism in the workplace (King et al., 2018). Thus, the global economy supports education as the backbone for developing technologically savvy human resources.

### **Reading Education in Globalisation Era**

Globalization, through social change, creates an educational ideology that perpetuates a social order in accordance with current workforce needs (Koch et al., 2016). Education has an ideology in its practice in society, aiming to transform the world through educated human resources. Education as a science is inseparable from the influence of the ideas of figures in

shaping the nature, goals, and meaning of education, thereby forming an ideology (Babalola et al., 2018). The choice of ideological position creates a complex system, because education does not have a single definition. Topatimasang and Fakhri (Topatimasang and Fakhri 2001, 12–13) explain that education in the era of globalization adapts to political and economic conditions to address social problems. Therefore, reading education in the era of globalization has been characterized by a liberal educational ideology, reflected in educational adjustments such as standardization (Thongprasit & Wannapiroon, 2022). This standardization positions education as a good and service that can be absorbed into the world of work and aligns the curriculum with it.

In the context of globalization, education is the foundation and driving force of economic, social, and human development (Stickney, 2020). To realize a one-world vision, globalization requires education to drive change across the economic, social, and knowledge sectors. These changes have indicators aligned with international standards. Therefore, the quality of education becomes the quality of a country's human resources, as measured against international standards. This practice ranks countries' education systems based on human and educational outcomes (Carstensen & Emmenegger, 2023). This practice creates educational inequality in terms of quality compared to international standards. This means that each country has distinct qualities, leading to differences in the quality of the human resources produced (Schneider & Makszin, 2014). This understanding creates social stratification, enabling capital-rich human resources to compete globally. Spring explains that the inequality between the West and the East in education indicates that educational practices tend to align with the West as a reference for internationalization (Chen et al., 2018). In practice, education has shifted local cultural assets and integrated itself with economic aspects. A developed economy is a sign of educational success.

Bourdieu (Bourdieu, 1990, pp. 42–43) assessed that education has a social reproductive function due to social inequality in the field. This inequality shows that the level of economic differences in each family becomes a problem in education. The gap between the rich and the poor creates an elite group and determines the level of ability to access education (Chen et al., 2018). This economic inequality requires education to transform itself into educational capitalism. This means that education becomes an industry for its consumers. Education with superior, sophisticated facilities is expensive, but the opposite is true. Therefore, educational capitalism creates an imbalance in school fees, facilities, teachers, lecturers, and the educational system (Aurachman & Putri, 2020). Educational capitalism seeks to hide in policy, so that this inequality, as symbolic violence, becomes a policy accepted by society (Everett, 2002, pp. 22–23). This thought becomes, for Bourdieu, a critique of education as a cycle of human resource reproduction according to the strength of capital.

Globalization erodes the value of education in practice and creates a one-world culture. Globalization, which brings technology and economics, has transformed education into a highly profitable commodity (Nordlöf et al., 2022). Education has been transformed into a commodity that people must possess to become good, capable workers in the job market. Talcott Parsons (Parson 1964, 111–12) correctly assessed that education has become an arena for social selection, so that human resources who cannot compete will face difficulties in the workforce. Therefore, Parsons' research has been borne out by the echo of globalization in today's educational world. The social selection process has become a crucial factor in determining whether human resources obtain a diploma as a 'ticket' to register as a worker. We agree with Martono (Martono 2016, 272–73) when he eloquently explains that educational status and institutions are social selection mechanisms that shape intelligence, skills, values, mastery, and international standards for individuals and society. Based on the above thinking,

globalization erodes the value of education and eliminates local cultures, creating a one-world culture.

## CONCLUSION

Globalization positions education as a commodity, emphasizing its market value in the workforce. Educational institutions increasingly focus on improving technological skills to enhance human resources for the labour market. Thus, education is seen as a product and service with tangible market value, enabling individuals and society to secure employment. Because of this focus, education is closely tied to economic factors and is perceived as a tool for both personal and societal advancement. However, in the era of globalization, education is often shaped by economic pressures, resulting in what can be described as educational capitalism.

## REFERENCES

- Abbas, M., & Razak, A. (2011). *Globalization and its Impact on Education and Culture*. 1(1), 59–69.
- Antonopoulou, H., Halkiopoulou, C., Barlou, O., & Beligiannis, G. N. (2021). Associations between traditional and digital leadership in academic environment: During the COVID-19 pandemic. *Emerging Science Journal*, 5(4), 405–428. <https://doi.org/10.28991/ESJ-2021-01286>
- Arafat, M. Y., Khan, A. M., Ansari, M. S., & Saleem, I. (2022). What drives internationalization of new ventures? Evidence from India. *Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/S13731-022-00225-4>
- Ardlin, F. (2017). Forma Mobilitas Sosial Dalam Kapitalisme Pendidikan. *Jurnal Diskursus Islam*, 1(3), 437–448.
- Aurachman, R., & Putri, E. M. (2020). University Management System Engineering based on BAN PT Accreditation Criteria Two using SysML and Semantic Approach. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 1477(5), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1477/5/052023>
- Babalola, O., Patience, E., Afolabi, O., 'Sola, L., & 'Femi, O. (2018). Adoption of Human Resources Management Policies for Practices: Harvard Model versus Religious Model. *Business and Management Research*, 7(1), 51–60. <https://doi.org/10.5430/bmr.v7n1p51>
- Batten, A. J. (2012). Metaphors We Teach By: The Language of “Learning Outcomes.” *Teaching Theology and Religion*, 15(1), 16–28. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9647.2011.00756.x>
- Bourdieu, P. (1971). System of Education and System of Thought. In M. F. D. Young (Ed.), *Knowledge and Control: New Directions in Sociology of Education*. Callier-Macmillan.
- Bourdieu, P. (1987). What makes social class? On the Theoretical and Practical Existence of Groups. *Berkeley Journal of Sociology*, 32, 1–18.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. (1990). *The Logic of Practice*. Polity.
- Carstensen, M. B., & Emmenegger, P. (2023). Education as social policy: New tensions in maturing knowledge economies. *Social Policy and Administration*, 57(2), 109–121. <https://doi.org/10.1111/SPOL.12888>
- Chen, J., Xu, L., Mo, F., & Bian, Z. (2018). Regulation of education market access based on mixed oligopoly model. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Egitim Bilimleri*, 18(5), 1389–1399. <https://doi.org/10.12738/estp.2018.5.036>

- Cristiani, A., & Peiró, J. M. (2018). Human resource function, unions and varieties of capitalism: Exploring their impact on human resource management practices based on CRANET data. *Employee Relations*, 40(6), 1072–1098. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-10-2016-0198>
- Das, A., Hathi, V., & Kaushik, P. (2023). Philosophy of Contemporary Educational Management. *Journal of Contemporary Philosophical and Anthropological Studies*, 1(1), 58–63. <https://doi.org/10.59652/jcpas.v1i1.60>
- Datzberger, S. (2022). Lost in transition? Modernization, formal education and violence in Karamoja. *World Development*, 158, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2022.106013>
- Emawati, E. (2018). Dampak Kapitalisme Global terhadap Pendidikan Islam. *JURNAL PENELITIAN KEISLAMAN*, 14(2), 136–152. <https://doi.org/10.20414/jpk.v14i2.699>
- Everett, J. (2002). Organizational Research and the Praxeology of Pierre Bourdieu. *Organizational Research Methods*, 5(1), 56–80. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428102051005>
- Furseth, I., & Repstad, P. (2013). An introduction to the sociology of religion: Classical and contemporary perspectives. In *Ashgate Publishing Limited* (1st ed.). Ashgate Publishing Limited.
- Harrison, D. (2005). *The Sociology of Modernization and Development*. Routledge.
- Hendrawan, D. (2017). Alienasi Pekerja Pada Masyarakat Kapitalis Menurut Karl Marx. *Arete*, 6(1), 13–33.
- Hrynkow, C. (2015). Papal Economics: The Catholic Church on Democratic Capitalism from Rerum Novarum to Caritas in Veritate. *Journal of Church and State*, 57(2), 380–382. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jcs/csv012>
- Hutagalung, S., Wiryadinata, H., Suwanto, ;, Alvyn, A. ;, & Hendriks, C. (2022). Revisiting Religious Education: The Shifting Curve of Short-Run Aggregate Supply of Human Resource in Educational Capitalism. *DUNAMIS: Jurnal Teologi Dan Pendidikan Kristiani*, 7(1), 429–440. <https://doi.org/10.30648/DUN.V7I1.734>
- Jessop, B. (2017). Varieties of academic capitalism and entrepreneurial universities: On past research and three thought experiments. *Higher Education*, 73(6), 853–870. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-017-0120-6>
- Jessop, B. (2018). On academic capitalism. *Critical Policy Studies*, 12(1), 104–109. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19460171.2017.1403342>
- Jones, A. T., Hadsell, L., & Burrus, R. T. (2019). Capitalist Views and Religion. *Eastern Economic Journal*, 45(3), 384–414. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41302-019-00138-3>
- Kerckhoff, A. C. (2008). Education and Social Stratification Processes in Comparative Perspective. In J. H. Ballantine & J. Z. Spade (Eds.), *School and Society: A Sociological Approach to Education* (pp. 3–18). Sage Publication Inc.
- Kharisma, B. (2018). The Determinant of Participation in The Social Activities: Case in Indonesia. *Signifikan: Jurnal Ilmu Ekonomi*, 7(2), 185–200. <https://doi.org/10.15408/sjie.v7i2.7365>

- King, V., Roed, J., & Wilson, L. (2018). It's very different here: practice-based academic staff induction and retention. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 40(5), 470–484. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2018.1496516>
- Klees, S. J. (2019). Capitalism and global education reform. In *An International Handbook of Educational Reform* (pp. 11–26). <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119082316.ch1>
- Koch, T. F., Leal, V. J., & Ayala, R. A. (2016). Let's talk about society: A Critical Discourse Analysis of sociology courses in pre-registration nursing. *Nurse Education Today*, 36, 139–144. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2015.09.003>
- Lumby, J. (2019). Distributed Leadership and bureaucracy. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 47(1), 5–19. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143217711190>
- Martono, N. (2016). Sosiologi Perubahan Sosial. In *Perubahan Sosial Budaya* (4th ed.). PT Rajagrafindo Persada.
- Marx, K. (1961). *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*. Dover Publications.
- Morelock, J. (2021). Age Norms and the Spirit of Capitalism. *Innovation in Aging*, 5(Supplement\_1), 601–601. <https://doi.org/10.1093/GERONI/IGAB046.2306>
- Nash, L. (1990). *Good Intentions aside: A Manager's guide to resolving ethical problem*. Business School Press.
- Nordlöf, C., Norström, P., Höst, G., & Hallström, J. (2022). Towards a three-part heuristic framework for technology education. *International Journal of Technology and Design Education*, 32(3), 1583–1604. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S10798-021-09664-8>
- Onuoha, I. O., & Odeke, F. C. (2020). Globalization and Religion: Analysing the Impact. *East African Journal of Traditions, Culture and Religion*, 2(1), 48–59. <https://doi.org/10.37284/EAJTCR.2.1.213>
- Paolucci, P. (2020). Marx's Method of Successive Abstractions and a Historical-materialist Sociology of Religion. *Critical Sociology*, 46(1), 19–35. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0896920518809843>
- Parson, T. (1964). *The Social System* (2nd ed.). Free Press.
- Ray, L., & Sztompka, P. (1995). The Sociology of Social Change. *The British Journal of Sociology*. <https://doi.org/10.2307/591803>
- Reddy, P., Chaudhary, K., & Hussein, S. (2023). A digital literacy model to narrow the digital literacy skills gap. *Heliyon*, 9(4), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e14878>
- Rehbein, B. (2020). Capitalism and inequality. *Sociedade e Estado*, 35(3), 695–722. <https://doi.org/10.1590/s0102-6992-202035030002>
- Ritzer, G. (2003). *Postmodern Social Theory*. McGraw-Hill.
- Ritzer, G., Jandrić, P., & Hayes, S. (2018). The velvet cage of educational con(pro)sumption. *Open Review of Educational Research*, 5(1), 113–129. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23265507.2018.1546124>
- Rowe, E. (2019). Capitalism without capital: the intangible economy of education reform. *Discourse*, 40(2), 271–279. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2019.1569883>
- Rudnycky, D. (2009). Spiritual economies: Islam and neoliberalism in contemporary Indonesia. *Cultural Anthropology*, 24(1), 104–141. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1548-1360.2009.00028.x>

- Schneider, C. Q., & Makszin, K. (2014). Forms of welfare capitalism and education-based participatory inequality. *Socio-Economic Review*, 12(2), 437–462. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ser/mwu010>
- Schofer, E., Ramirez, F. O., & Meyer, J. W. (2021). The Societal Consequences of Higher Education. *Sociology of Education*, 94(1), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038040720942912>
- Smythe, S., Wilbur, A., & Hunter, E. (2021). Inventive pedagogies and social solidarity: The work of community-based adult educators during COVID-19 in British Columbia, Canada. *International Review of Education*, 67(1–2), 9–29. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S11159-021-09882-1>
- Spring, J. (2004). *How Educational Ideologies are Shaping Global Society*. Routledge.
- Spring, J. (2009). *Globalization of Education: An Introduction*. Routledge.
- Stickney, J. (2020). Wittgenstein's relevance to philosophy of education: Personal reflections on meaningful uses of post-foundationalism. *Educacao and Realidade*, 45(3). <https://doi.org/10.1590/2175-6236106759>
- Thongprasit, J., & Wannapiroon, P. (2022). Framework of Artificial Intelligence Learning Platform for Education. *International Education Studies*, 15(1), undefined-undefined. <https://doi.org/10.5539/IES.V15N1P76>
- Topatimasang, R., & Fakih, M. (2001). *Pendidikan Populer: Menuju Pendidikan Kritis*. Insist Press.
- Turner, J. H. (2015). Sociological Theory. In *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences: Second Edition*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.32159-6>
- Vishnevsky, Y. R., & Narkhov, D. Y. (2019). Paradoxes of the higher education modernization: Results of the 20year monitoring in the Sverdlovsk Region. *RUDN Journal of Sociology*, 19(2), 289–301. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2272-2019-19-2-289-301>
- Weber, M. (2005). The protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism. In *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203995808>
- Wiradinata, H. (2023). A Shifting Capital of Religious Education in the Digitalization Era. *Jurnal Ilmiah Religiosity Entity Humanity (JIREH)*, 5(2), 140–154. <https://doi.org/10.37364/jireh.v5i2.161>
- Yang, X., & You, Y. (2018). How the World-Class University Project Affects Scientific Productivity? Evidence from a Survey of Faculty Members in China. *Higher Education Policy*, 31(4), 583–605. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41307-017-0073-5>
- Zabaev, I., & Prutskova, E. (2019). The calling and humility scale: Extending the Weberian approach to the research of the elective affinity between religion and the economy. *Russian Sociological Review*, 18(2), 62–88. <https://doi.org/10.17323/1728-192x-2019-2-62-88>