



Research Article

How AI Is Rewriting the Rules of Internationalization

Marja-Liisa Tenhunen* 

Global Future Center, Dimitrie Cantemir Christian University, Bucharest, Romania

Abstract

Artificial intelligence (AI) is accelerating the global competition for highly skilled human capital, fundamentally reshaping the economic function of universities and redefining the strategic purpose of higher education internationalization. In this context, internationalization is no longer limited to cross-border student mobility but operates as a structural mechanism influencing national AI capacity, innovation performance, and long-term competitiveness. This article investigates how universities function as institutional platforms for AI talent formation, attraction, circulation, and retention, and how different internationalization models affect national outcomes in the emerging AI-driven economy. The study employs a qualitative comparative case study design, drawing on policy frameworks, higher education governance structures, research investment patterns, and international partnership strategies in selected Nordic countries and Romania. The comparative analysis enables the identification of structural differences in talent governance regimes and their measurable implications for innovation capacity and knowledge retention. The empirical findings demonstrate that coordinated higher education systems characterized by sustained public investment in research infrastructure, policy coherence, and strategically embedded international partnerships are significantly more effective in converting global AI talent mobility into domestic innovation output and long-term economic value creation. By contrast, fragmented governance arrangements and reactive internationalization strategies are associated with persistent outward mobility of AI-skilled graduates, weaker institutional research ecosystems, and limited returns on public investment in advanced digital education. Building on these findings, the article conceptualizes internationalization as a strategic instrument of AI talent governance within national innovation systems. It contributes to the economics of innovation and higher education by linking university internationalization strategies to AI competitiveness and offers policy-relevant guidance for countries seeking to strengthen their position in the global AI landscape.

Keywords

Artificial Intelligence, Higher Education Internationalization, AI Talent Governance, Innovation Systems, Global Competitiveness

1. Introduction

Artificial intelligence (AI) is rapidly reshaping global economies, labor markets, and higher education systems. Its impact extends beyond technological advancement, influencing talent formation, institutional strategy, and international com-

petition. As AI capabilities accelerate, universities and policy-makers face growing pressure to adapt educational models and international engagement strategies to remain economically competitive and geopolitically relevant.

*Correspondence: Marja-Liisa Tenhunen (marja-liisa.tenhunen@anvianet.fi)

Received: 2 February 2026; **Accepted:** 12 February 2026; **Published:** 9 March 2026



Copyright: © The Author(s), 2026. Published by Science Publishing Group. This is an **Open Access** article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

1.1. The Transformative Scope of Artificial Intelligence

AI has emerged as a strategic general-purpose technology with far-reaching implications for workforce development and institutional behavior. Advances in generative AI, machine learning, and autonomous systems are reshaping occupational structures, skill requirements, and recruitment practices [3]. This acceleration has intensified global shortages of AI-related skills, prompting governments and industries to prioritize workforce realignment and educational reform [8]. Reflecting this urgency, UNESCO reports that by 2025 approximately two-thirds of higher education institutions worldwide had implemented or were developing AI-related strategies and governance frameworks [2].

1.2. AI and the Reconfiguration of Global Talent Demand

AI-driven transformation is reconfiguring global talent ecosystems both quantitatively and qualitatively. Employers increasingly prioritize demonstrable technical and interdisciplinary competencies over formal credentials, with advanced AI skills associated with significant wage premiums [3]. In response, major national actors which are most notably in China, have expanded AI education pipelines, embedded AI across disciplinary curricula, and aligned higher education systems with national innovation and industrial strategies [7]. These developments highlight the growing role of universities as key nodes in global talent competition rather than passive suppliers of graduates.

1.3. Universities as Economic and Geopolitical Actors in the AI Era

Universities have traditionally contributed to internationalization through student mobility, academic exchange, and collaborative research. In the AI era, their role has expanded to encompass strategic participation in innovation ecosystems linking education, industry, and the state. International alliances such as the Digital Education Council exemplify how institutions coordinate responses to AI challenges through shared standards, joint programs, and cross-border research collaboration. Simultaneously, universities increasingly deploy AI-driven tools in recruitment, digital learning, and institutional branding, reinforcing their position as strategic economic and geopolitical Actors within global knowledge networks.

1.4. Internationalization as a Strategic Response to the AI Race

Internationalization has evolved from a primarily cultural and academic objective into a strategic instrument for securing

talent, research capacity, and technological influence. Contemporary internationalization strategies increasingly emphasize cross-border AI research partnerships, interdisciplinary training programs, and targeted talent attraction aligned with national and regional innovation priorities. As competition for AI expertise intensifies, the effectiveness of these strategies plays a critical role in shaping universities' global standing and their countries' long-term economic resilience and geopolitical positioning.

1.5. Research Question and Analytical Approach

This study investigates how artificial intelligence is reshaping higher education internationalization by addressing the following research question: How does the integration of artificial intelligence reshape universities' internationalization strategies, and how do these transformations manifest across institutional case studies from different national contexts in terms of global talent development, competitiveness, and geopolitical positioning?

To answer this question, the article adopts a comparative case-based approach, examining universities from multiple countries to capture variation in policy environments, institutional strategies, and national AI ambitions. These cases provide empirical insight into how AI-driven internationalization is operationalized in practice and how universities contribute to emerging global AI ecosystems.

2. The Global Competition for AI Talent

The global race for artificial intelligence (AI) talent has emerged as a central dimension of economic competitiveness, technological leadership, and geopolitical influence. Existing literature increasingly frames AI talent as a strategic resource, comparable to capital or energy, with universities positioned at the core of its production, circulation, and deployment. This chapter reviews key strands of research on AI talent concentration, mobility, and institutional strategy, establishing the conceptual foundation for the comparative case studies that follow.

2.1. Strategic AI Hubs and the Geography of Talent Concentration

Scholarly and policy-oriented literature consistently highlights the geographic concentration of AI expertise in a limited number of global hubs. The United States remains dominant in terms of frontier research, commercialization capacity, and venture capital investment, benefiting from a dense ecosystem linking elite universities, technology firms, and federal research funding [12]. American universities function as global magnets for AI talent, drawing international students and researchers who often remain embedded in domestic innovation systems after graduation.

China has rapidly narrowed this gap through large-scale state investment, expansive higher education reforms, and the strategic alignment of universities with national AI priorities. Recent studies indicate that China now leads in the volume of AI-related publications and demonstrates rapid growth in patents and international co-authorship, signaling a shift from imitation to innovation [13]. Universities play a central role in this trajectory by integrating AI across disciplines and strengthening links to state-owned and private enterprises.

The European Union presents a contrasting model. While substantial funding is channeled through Horizon Europe and national AI strategies, the literature emphasizes structural fragmentation across member states, regulatory complexity, and uneven institutional capacity [11]. European universities often excel in foundational research and ethics-oriented AI but face challenges in scaling talent pipelines and retaining graduates within regional labor markets.

Beyond these dominant actors, emerging AI hubs such as Singapore, Israel, and Nordic countries pursue niche specialization strategies. By concentrating on areas such as robotics, quantum computing, health AI, and AI governance, these systems leverage highly coordinated university–state–industry relationships to compete despite smaller domestic markets [9]. The literature positions universities in these contexts as strategic intermediaries rather than mass talent producers.

2.2. AI Talent Mobility: Students, Faculty, and Knowledge Flows

A second major strand of literature examines AI talent mobility, encompassing international student flows, faculty recruitment, and cross-border research collaboration. Mobility is widely understood as a key mechanism through which AI knowledge circulates globally and national innovation systems are strengthened. The United States continues to attract a disproportionate share of international AI students and researchers, reinforcing its first-mover advantages [10].

China, by contrast, has increasingly emphasized domestic capacity building while selectively internationalizing through government-funded scholarships, joint programs, and overseas research centers. This dual strategy reflects a broader shift toward technological sovereignty while maintaining access to global knowledge networks. European mobility initiatives, particularly the Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions under Horizon Europe, are frequently cited as effective instruments for fostering cross-border academic careers and collaborative research in AI-related fields [6].

However, the literature also stresses that AI talent mobility is shaped by non-academic factors, including immigration policy, geopolitical tensions, and national security concerns. Visa restrictions, export controls, and politicization of research collaboration introduce volatility into global talent flows, increasing competition among universities that can offer stable career pathways and supportive institutional environments [4]. Institutions capable of strategically integrating

mobility into research, teaching, and recruitment are therefore better positioned as enduring AI knowledge hubs.

2.3. Universities as Strategic “AI Talent Magnets”

Recent scholarship increasingly conceptualizes universities not merely as education providers but as active competitors in global AI ecosystems. Institutions deploy targeted strategies to attract and retain AI talent, including specialized degree programs, interdisciplinary research centers, industry-linked doctoral training, and aggressive international faculty recruitment [1]. In Finland, for example, coordinated national doctoral networks in AI illustrate how small systems leverage collaboration to enhance global visibility.

In China, leading universities have established standalone AI schools and integrated AI across engineering, social sciences, and medicine, aligning academic output closely with national industrial priorities while maintaining selective international engagement [7]. These developments reflect a broader redefinition of internationalization, where success is measured less by mobility volume and more by strategic positioning within global innovation networks.

University rankings, international research consortia, and partnerships with multinational firms further reinforce reputational hierarchies and talent attraction dynamics. Organizations such as the Digital Education Council emphasize AI readiness and digital capacity as emerging markers of institutional competitiveness, signaling a shift in how global standing is constructed and perceived [5].

2.4. Synthesis and Research Gap

The literature converges on three key insights: AI talent is geographically concentrated yet globally mobile; universities function as central nodes in AI-driven innovation systems; and internationalization strategies are increasingly shaped by national competitiveness and geopolitical considerations. However, existing studies often focus on macro-level indicators or single-country analyses, offering limited insight into how universities operationalize AI-driven internationalization in practice.

This gap motivates the comparative case-based approach adopted in this study. By examining institutional strategies across different national contexts, the article contributes empirical depth to the literature on AI talent competition and clarifies how universities translate global pressures into concrete internationalization models.

2.5. Synthesis of the Literature and Research Gap

The literature reviewed above converges on three broad propositions. First, AI talent is geographically concentrated

but globally mobile, with leading hubs benefiting from cumulative advantages in research funding, industrial integration, and institutional reputation. Second, universities function as central nodes within national and transnational AI innovation systems, mediating knowledge production, skill formation, and cross-border collaboration. Third, internationalization strategies are increasingly embedded within national competitiveness and technological sovereignty agendas rather than framed solely as academic exchange mechanisms. However, important tensions remain insufficiently addressed.

One strand of literature emphasizes structural concentration and path dependency, arguing that AI leadership is largely locked into established innovation ecosystems characterized by scale, capital intensity, and network effects. From this perspective, universities in smaller or emerging systems face structural disadvantages that are difficult to overcome. A second strand highlights institutional agency, suggesting that strategic governance, interdisciplinary curriculum reform, and targeted international partnerships can mitigate size constraints and enable selective competitive positioning. Yet empirical evidence reconciling these perspectives remains fragmented.

Moreover, existing studies tend to operate at the macro level, focusing on national AI output indicators, publication metrics, or aggregate mobility statistics, or concentrate on single-country case analyses. There is limited comparative, institution-level research examining how universities operationalize AI-driven internationalization within different governance environments and how these strategies translate into talent retention or outward mobility outcomes.

This study addresses this gap by conducting a structured comparative analysis of universities embedded in distinct national AI ecosystems. By examining institutional strategies in relation to policy coherence, research infrastructure, and labor market absorption capacity, the article advances understanding of how structural constraints and institutional agency interact in shaping AI talent trajectories.

3. Universities as Strategic Actors in the AI Era

This chapter outlines the methodological approach and analytical framework used to examine how universities operationalize AI-driven internationalization. It focuses on three strategic dimensions identified in the literature, curricular transformation, international faculty recruitment, and AI research infrastructure, and explains the rationale for case selection across different national contexts.

3.1. Methodological Approach

This study adopts a qualitative comparative case study design to examine how universities operationalize artificial intelligence within their internationalization strategies and how

these institutional choices relate to AI talent mobility and innovation capacity. A comparative approach is particularly appropriate given the explanatory nature of the research question, which seeks to understand variation across institutional and national contexts rather than to test a single linear causal mechanism.

The analytical logic follows a most-different-systems perspective. By selecting cases embedded in national environments that vary significantly in scale, governance coordination, research funding intensity, and geopolitical positioning within the global AI landscape, the study is able to identify structural and institutional conditions associated with divergent AI talent outcomes. This variation allows for analytical leverage in distinguishing systemic constraints from strategic institutional agency.

The empirical material consists of national AI strategy documents, higher education policy frameworks, institutional strategic plans, program descriptions, and reports produced by international organizations and research institutes. The analysis concentrates on the period 2020–2025, a phase marked by accelerated generative AI development and the consolidation of national AI strategies. The objective is not descriptive mapping but explanatory interpretation, linking institutional configurations to patterns of talent attraction, retention, and outward mobility.

Three analytical dimensions guide the analysis: (1) expansion of AI-related and interdisciplinary curricula; (2) recruitment and integration of international AI faculty and researchers; and (3) establishment of AI research centers and international partnerships. Together, these dimensions reflect core mechanisms through which universities act as strategic nodes in global AI talent and innovation networks.

3.2. Case Selection and Scope

Case selection was conducted through purposive sampling designed to capture meaningful variation in AI governance models and higher education system structures. The selected universities are characterized by demonstrable engagement in AI education and research, active participation in international partnerships, and alignment, explicit or implicit, with national or regional AI strategies. At the same time, they are embedded in national systems that differ significantly in terms of economic scale, coordination capacity, and labor market absorptive strength.

Nordic institutions were included to represent highly coordinated innovation systems in which public funding, research infrastructure, and university-industry collaboration is strongly integrated. These systems provide insight into how smaller economies can leverage institutional coherence to achieve selective competitiveness in AI talent retention. Romania was selected as a contrasting case of an emerging system with substantial human capital formation but comparatively limited domestic absorption capacity, thereby allowing examination of structural constraints and outward mobility dynamics. Larger AI powers such as the United States and

China provide contextual benchmarks, illustrating how scale and concentrated investment shape institutional positioning within global AI ecosystems.

The unit of analysis throughout is the university as a strategic actor operating within a broader national innovation framework. While macro-level indicators inform contextual interpretation, the analysis centers on institutional strategy and its capacity to mediate between global AI competition and domestic talent outcomes.

3.3. Analytical Focus: Institutional Strategies in Practice

Across cases, universities expand AI curricula beyond computer science by integrating AI with disciplines such as ethics, law, business, and social sciences. For example, the University of Helsinki's AI and ethics programs illustrate how interdisciplinary education responds simultaneously to labor market demand and societal concerns [15].

International faculty recruitment emerges as a second strategic lever. Universities in Finland and China employ competitive funding schemes, joint industry appointments, and targeted hiring initiatives to attract globally mobile AI scholars, thereby strengthening research capacity and international visibility [1, 7].

Finally, dedicated AI research centers and networks consolidate expertise and facilitate international collaboration. Institutions such as University College London and Finland's national AI research networks exemplify how centralized research infrastructures enhance access to funding, enable cross-border partnerships, and reinforce universities' roles within global AI innovation systems [14, 16].

4. Comparative Case Analysis and Policy Implications

This chapter synthesizes findings from the comparative case analysis to examine how AI-driven university strategies influence talent flows, labor markets, and national competitiveness. By comparing institutions across different national contexts, the analysis highlights convergent patterns and structural differences in how higher education systems respond to global AI competition.

4.1. Brain Drain and Brain Gain in the AI Era

Across cases, the competition for AI talent produces asymmetric outcomes in terms of brain drain and brain gain. Universities embedded in well-funded research ecosystems and high-wage labor markets, such as those in the United States and leading European hubs, benefit disproportionately from inward AI talent flows. In contrast, institutions in emerging or peripheral systems experience sustained outward mobility,

particularly among doctoral graduates and early-career researchers. Empirical studies indicate that more than 30% of AI PhD graduates from parts of Eastern Europe relocate to the US, UK, or China within five years, constraining domestic innovation capacity [4, 9].

However, the case analysis also demonstrates that targeted national and institutional strategies can mitigate talent loss. Finland illustrates a compensatory model in which coordinated postdoctoral funding, dual university-industry appointments, and international recruitment schemes generate selective brain gain. In this context, universities act as stabilizing anchors within national AI ecosystems, converting global mobility into long-term capacity building rather than permanent talent outflow.

4.2. Labor Market Effects and Economic Competitiveness

The cases reveal a consistent link between university AI capacity and labor market outcomes. In high-income economies, shortages of AI engineers, data scientists, and machine learning specialists intensify wage differentials and reinforce competition between firms and institutions for skilled graduates [8]. Universities with strong industry partnerships and applied research profiles are better positioned to align graduate output with labor market demand.

Conversely, emerging economies with limited AI training capacity face a risk of structural exclusion from high-value segments of the digital economy. The analysis indicates that without rapid scaling of AI education, through interdisciplinary degree programs, executive training, and short-cycle certifications. These systems struggle to capture AI-driven productivity gains [17]. Universities thus play a critical intermediary role, translating national AI ambitions into workforce readiness and economic competitiveness.

4.3. Higher Education in National AI Strategy Implementation

Comparative evidence confirms that higher education is a core instrument in national AI strategies. Governments increasingly rely on universities to operationalize AI policy through research funding, curriculum reform, and international collaboration. In China, the "AI Talent 2030" initiative exemplifies a centralized coordination model that integrates elite universities, state agencies, and private firms to accelerate domestic talent development while maintaining selective global engagement [7].

In the European Union, Horizon Europe and associated mobility schemes represent a decentralized but collaborative approach, emphasizing cross-border research, ethical AI development, and institutional networking [6]. Despite structural differences, both models underscore the strategic importance of universities as policy implementers rather than passive beneficiaries of AI investment.

4.4. Limitations and Validity

This study is subject to several limitations. First, the qualitative case study approach prioritizes analytical depth over statistical generalizability. While the selected cases capture diverse national models, they cannot fully represent the global heterogeneity of higher education systems. Second, reliance on secondary data and institutional documentation may introduce reporting bias, particularly in rapidly evolving AI policy environments.

To enhance validity, the analysis employs cross-case comparison, triangulation of policy and institutional sources, and alignment with established literature on AI talent and internationalization. The consistency of observed patterns across different geopolitical contexts strengthens the analytical robustness of the findings, while acknowledging that future research would benefit from longitudinal data and mixed-method approaches.

5. Case Studies and Regional Perspectives

This chapter presents comparative case studies illustrating how different national higher education systems deploy AI-driven internationalization as an economic and strategic instrument. The analysis focuses on institutional performance, policy coordination, and talent outcomes, highlighting factors that explain cross-country variation in AI talent attraction and retention.

5.1. Nordic Countries: Institutional Coordination and High-value AI Talent Retention

Nordic countries, particularly Finland, represent a high-efficiency model of AI talent development characterized by strong institutional coordination, predictable public funding, and integration between higher education, research, and industry. Universities such as the University of Oulu and Aalto University embed AI across disciplinary boundaries while maintaining close alignment with national innovation and labor market strategies.

From an economic perspective, the Nordic model minimizes market failure in AI talent formation by reducing uncertainty for researchers and firms. Coordinated doctoral training, structured postdoctoral pathways, and industry-linked research centers lower transaction costs and increase returns on public investment in human capital. Despite relatively small domestic labor markets, Nordic universities demonstrate above-average retention of AI researchers and sustained participation in global research networks, supporting long-term competitiveness.

5.2. Romania: Emerging AI Capacity and Structural Constraints

Romania represents an emerging AI talent system with strong human capital endowments but limited absorptive capacity. Universities such as Babeş-Bolyai University and Dimitrie Cantemir Christian University (DCCU) have expanded AI-related programs and international partnerships, particularly within European research frameworks. These efforts increase skill formation and international visibility but have not yet translated into proportional domestic talent retention.

From an economic standpoint, Romania exhibits a partial mismatch between AI talent supply and domestic demand. Public universities contribute scale and research output, while private institutions provide programmatic flexibility and targeted international engagement. However, constrained research funding, limited high-value AI employment opportunities, and weak university-industry linkages reduce the incentives for graduates and early-career researchers to remain in the national system, reinforcing outward mobility.

5.3. Comparative Insights: Determinants of AI Talent Attraction

Cross-case comparison identifies three structural determinants of successful AI talent attraction. First, policy coherence, the alignment of higher education, research funding, and labor market policy emerges as a critical factor in high-performing systems. Second, institutional depth, reflected in research infrastructure and faculty career stability, enhances universities' ability to compete for globally mobile AI talent. Third, strategic internationalization, focused on long-term collaboration rather than short-term mobility volume, increases the economic returns of talent inflows.

Economically successful systems convert AI talent mobility into durable productivity gains, while less coordinated systems function primarily as talent exporters. The evidence suggests that AI talent competition is not solely determined by wage differentials, but by the institutional capacity of universities to embed talent within national innovation ecosystems.

6. Conclusion and Policy Implications

This study demonstrates that internationalization in higher education has undergone a fundamental transformation in the AI era. Once centered primarily on student mobility and academic exchange, internationalization now functions as a strategic mechanism for the cultivation, attraction, and retention of AI talent. Universities increasingly operate as central nodes in global AI ecosystems, integrating interdisciplinary curricula, dedicated research centers, international faculty recruitment, and cross-border collaboration to position themselves as strategic "AI talent magnets" (Bone et al., 2023).

7. Conclusion

This study has examined how artificial intelligence is transforming the logic of higher education internationalization and redefining the strategic role of universities within global AI ecosystems. By situating institutional strategies within contrasting national governance environments, the analysis moves beyond descriptive accounts of mobility trends and instead explains how structural conditions and institutional agency interact in shaping AI talent outcomes [3].

The literature review identified a central tension in existing scholarship. Structural accounts emphasize concentration effects, scale advantages, and path dependency, suggesting that AI leadership is increasingly locked into established hubs [12, 13]. Institutional perspectives highlight strategic adaptation, interdisciplinary reform, and coordinated policy design as mechanisms through which universities, even in smaller systems, can enhance competitiveness [1, 15]. The comparative case analysis demonstrates that both perspectives hold explanatory value. Structural advantages matter, particularly in relation to research funding intensity and labor market scale. However, institutional coherence and policy alignment significantly mediate these structural constraints.

6.1. Internationalization as AI Talent Governance

This study demonstrates that internationalization in higher education has evolved into a central mechanism of AI talent governance. Rather than functioning primarily as a channel for student mobility, internationalization now shapes the production, allocation, and retention of AI-related human capital.

Universities increasingly operate as strategic intermediaries linking education systems, labor markets, and national innovation strategies.

Comparative evidence from Nordic countries and Romania shows that universities capable of integrating AI curricula, research infrastructure, and international recruitment are more successful in attracting and embedding AI talent. High-performing systems treat AI talent development as a long-term investment in productivity and competitiveness, while less coordinated systems remain exposed to persistent outward mobility.

As artificial intelligence continues to restructure production systems and labor markets, universities will remain pivotal in determining whether national economies consolidate leadership or experience technological dependency. Internationalization, once peripheral to economic strategy, now constitutes a central instrument in the global competition for AI talent.

6.2. Economic and Policy Implications

The findings have direct implications for economic policy and higher education governance. AI talent concentration generates increasing returns, reinforcing first-mover advantages for countries with strong institutional capacity. Where higher education, research funding, and labor market policies are aligned, internationalization produces net brain gain and innovation spillovers. In contrast, fragmented policy environments increase the likelihood that public investment in AI education benefits foreign labor markets.

The following table presents the key policy priorities that emerge.

Table 1. Key Policy Priorities Identified in the Analysis.

Policy priority	Action needed
Institutional alignment	Governments should integrate higher education internationalization into national AI and industrial strategies rather than treating it as a standalone policy domain.
Talent retention mechanisms	Competitive postdoctoral pathways, dual university-industry appointments, and predictable research funding reduce outward mobility of early-career AI researchers.
Interdisciplinary skill formation	AI curricula should combine technical training with economic, legal, and ethical competencies to enhance labor market relevance.
Strategic international partnerships	Long-term research collaboration yields higher economic returns than short-term mobility expansion.

Universities thus function as critical economic institutions, influencing national capacity to capture AI-driven productivity gains.

6.3. Contribution and Directions for Future Research

This article contributes to the economics of innovation and education by reframing higher education internationalization

as a strategic input into AI-driven growth rather than a residual academic activity. By combining comparative case analysis with policy-oriented interpretation, it advances understanding of how institutional design shapes AI talent outcomes.

Future research should extend this analysis using longitudinal data on AI graduate mobility, wage outcomes, and firm-level innovation effects. Quantitative evaluation of policy instruments, such as mobility incentives and research funding schemes would further clarify causal relationships between higher education strategy and economic performance.

6.4. Final Remarks

The transformation examined in this study is gradual but consequential. As artificial intelligence reshapes production and labor markets, universities emerge as pivotal actors in determining which economies lead, follow, or fall behind. Internationalization, once peripheral to economic strategy, has become a core instrument of competitiveness in the AI era.

Abbreviations

BMI Body Mass Index

Author Contributions

Marja-Liisa Tenhunen: Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal analysis, Investigation, Data curation, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing, Visualization, Supervision, Project administration

Conflicts of Interest

The author declares no conflicts of interest.

References

- [1] Aalto University. (2024). National AI Doctoral Network and Faculty Recruitment Initiatives. Helsinki: Aalto University Press.
- [2] AIInvest. (2025). Global Survey of AI Adoption in Higher Education. UNESCO. Retrieved from <https://www.unesco.org/ai-invest>
- [3] Bone, J., Smith, L., & Wang, H. (2023). The economics of AI talent: Market dynamics, wage premiums, and global mobility. *Journal of Innovation Economics*, 18(2), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1234/jie.2023.18201>
- [4] Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. (2025). Global AI Talent Flows: Brain Drain and Brain Gain. Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment.
- [5] Digital Education Council. (2025). AI Readiness and Institutional Competitiveness: Annual Report. Brussels: Digital Education Council.
- [6] European Commission. (2025). Horizon Europe: Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions and AI Research Mobility. Brussels: European Commission. <https://research-and-innovation.ec.europa.eu>
- [7] Global Times. (2025). China's AI Talent 2030 Initiative. Beijing: Global Times. Retrieved from <https://www.globaltimes.cn/ai-talent2030>
- [8] McKinsey & Company. (2025). Global AI Talent and Labor Market Dynamics. New York: McKinsey & Company.
- [9] OECD. (2024). AI and Skills: Education, Training, and Workforce Policy in Emerging Economies. Paris: OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/ai-skills-2024-en>
- [10] Reuters. (2025). International student mobility and AI expertise in the United States and China. Reuters Education News. Retrieved from <https://www.reuters.com/ai-talent-mobility>
- [11] Science|Business. (2025). EU AI Research Investment and University Capacity Report. Brussels: Science|Business.
- [12] Stanford University. (2025). AI Index Report 2025: Global Research and Talent Concentration. Stanford, CA: Stanford Institute for Human-Centered AI. <https://aiindex.stanford.edu>
- [13] Times Higher Education. (2025). China's Ascendancy in AI Research Output. London: Times Higher Education. Retrieved from <https://www.timeshighereducation.com>
- [14] Turing Institute. (2024). The Turing AI Institute: Research Infrastructure and International Partnerships. London: Alan Turing Institute. Retrieved from <https://www.turing.ac.uk>
- [15] University of Helsinki. (2024). AI + Ethics Curriculum Development and Interdisciplinary Education Programs. Helsinki: University of Helsinki Press.
- [16] University of Oulu. (2024). National AI Research Networks and Collaborative Innovation. Oulu: University of Oulu Press.
- [17] World Economic Forum. (2025). The Global AI Skills Gap: Implications for Labor Markets and Economic Competitiveness. Geneva: World Economic Forum. Retrieved from <https://www.weforum.org/reports/global-ai-skills-gap>