

Thailand's Grand Strategy for Higher Education: Reimagining Universities as the Nation's Brain in the ASEAN Context

Krissana Bulan¹ and Naruemol Pechrasuwan^{2*}

Received: January 30, 2026 / Revised: March 13, 2026 / Accepted: March 27, 2026

Abstract

Thailand's higher education reform has primarily focused on enhancing university efficiency, establishing quality assurance mechanisms, and aligning with labor market demands. While these initiatives have generated measurable improvements, they remain fragmented and predominantly operational, offering limited contribution to long-term national strategic capacity. This article argues that such limitations stem not from implementation failure but from a constrained conceptualization of universities' role in national governance.

Drawing on the perspective of Grand Strategy, this study reframes universities as strategic institutions that generate national intelligence rather than merely deliver educational services. Building upon Nayef Al-Rodhan's triadic intelligence framework (2016), the article introduces the Nation Brain System Model, integrating knowledge intelligence, moral intelligence, and digital intelligence within higher education governance. Within this framework, *Thainess* is conceptualized as national consciousness, research and artificial intelligence function as enabling cognitive mechanisms, and wisdom emerges as the sustaining condition for long-term societal development.

The article further situates Thailand's higher education system within the ASEAN strategic environment, proposing that universities operate not only as national cognitive cores but also as interconnected nodes within a regional intelligence network. By linking higher education governance with ethical foundations, digital transformation, and regional connectivity, this study contributes an integrative framework to educational administration and public policy literature, offering strategic direction beyond incremental reform.

Keywords: Higher Education Policy, Educational Administration, Grand Strategy, Nation Brain System, ASEAN

^{1,2}Faculty of Education, Rajapruk University, Thailand

*E-mail: napech@rpu.ac.th

Introduction

Higher education systems are no longer confined to their traditional mandates of teaching and research. Across many national contexts, universities have gradually assumed strategic roles in shaping innovation capacity, policy deliberation, and social cohesion. This shift reflects broader transformations driven by technological disruption, economic restructuring, and demographic change. As a result, higher education has become increasingly embedded within national development strategies rather than positioned at their periphery.

In Thailand, higher education reform has unfolded through multiple waves of policy intervention, including the establishment of quality assurance regimes, curriculum standardization, and competency-based education initiatives (Mulder et al., 2010). These reforms have strengthened institutional accountability and operational efficiency. However, their cumulative impact has been uneven (World Bank, 2019). Universities continue to operate largely as autonomous organizations that respond to short-term policy directives, rather than as strategic partners that contribute systematically to national governance and long-term development.

From an educational administration perspective, this condition points to a deeper structural issue. The primary limitation of Thai higher education reform lies not in technical design or institutional capacity, but in strategic orientation. Reform initiatives are frequently implemented as discrete administrative projects, disconnected from an overarching framework that links higher education to long-term national goals. Consequently, institutional missions become fragmented, and system-level coherence remains underdeveloped.

This challenge is further intensified by Thailand's positioning within the ASEAN regional environment. Cross-border mobility, digital transformation, and regional policy alignment are increasingly shaping the expectations of higher education systems. Universities are now required to operate simultaneously within national regulatory frameworks and regional knowledge networks. Yet existing reform approaches rarely address this dual positioning coherently.

This article proposes that a Grand Strategy perspective offers a viable conceptual framework for addressing these limitations. By conceptualizing universities as the “nation's brain”, higher education institutions can be understood as the cognitive core of national development—integrating knowledge production, ethical orientation, and technological capability. At the same time, situating Thai universities within the ASEAN strategic context highlights their potential role as regional knowledge nodes contributing to collective intelligence beyond national boundaries.

The purpose of this article is therefore to develop a conceptual and policy-oriented framework that reimagines Thai universities as strategic institutions embedded within both national governance and the ASEAN regional system. Through the proposed National Brain System Model, the study seeks to bridge higher education governance, ethical foundations, and regional connectivity in a manner consistent with long-term national and regional development.

Higher Education Reform and Policy Fragmentation in Thailand

Thai higher education has historically been shaped by centralized governance structures designed to ensure quality, equity, and standardization. While these arrangements have provided stability and accountability, they have also produced bureaucratic rigidity and limited institutional adaptability. Policy reforms have tended to prioritize measurable outputs such as accreditation results, graduate employability indicators, and international rankings.

Although these metrics are important, their dominance has encouraged compliance-oriented behavior rather than strategic innovation. Universities often focus on meeting regulatory benchmarks instead of developing long-term institutional capacities aligned with national priorities. As a result, higher education reform becomes fragmented, with individual initiatives operating in isolation rather than contributing to a coherent system.

Educational administration research suggests that such conditions constrain universities' ability to function as strategic institutions. When higher education organizations are positioned primarily as service providers within a regulatory framework, their contribution to national intelligence production, policy experimentation, and ethical leadership remains underdeveloped. This fragmentation becomes more pronounced as Thailand seeks to align its higher education system with regional ASEAN initiatives that require flexibility, collaboration, and strategic autonomy.

This fragmentation reflects not only administrative inefficiency but also a deeper structural weakness in the governance logic of Thai higher education. When reform agendas are driven primarily by externally imposed indicators, universities are encouraged to respond tactically rather than strategically. Compliance becomes rational institutional behavior, while long-term institutional learning and strategic differentiation are deprioritized. Over time, this dynamic erodes universities' capacity to articulate distinctive missions and to invest in capabilities that extend beyond short-term regulatory cycles (Kaplan & Norton, 1996).

From an educational administration perspective, such governance conditions limit universities' ability to operate as strategic organizations. Rather than functioning as adaptive knowledge institutions capable of sense-making, experimentation, and foresight, universities are positioned as delivery mechanisms within a tightly controlled policy framework. This positioning constrains their role in generating national intelligence, shaping public policy discourse, and cultivating ethical leadership for complex societal challenges (Brew, 2010; Kezar & Maxey, 2014; Al-Rodhan, 2016). The result is a higher education system that performs administrative functions efficiently but struggles to contribute strategically to national transformation.

The problem becomes more acute in the context of regional integration. ASEAN higher education initiatives emphasize collaboration, mobility, mutual recognition, and institutional autonomy as foundations for regional competitiveness (ASEAN University Network, 2019). These objectives require universities to possess sufficient strategic discretion to form partnerships, develop niche expertise, and engage in cross-border knowledge production. Fragmented and compliance-driven governance, however, limits Thai universities' ability to participate meaningfully in such initiatives, reducing regional alignment to formal participation rather than substantive integration.

Moreover, the dominance of output-based metrics reinforces internal fragmentation within institutions themselves. Teaching, research, and community engagement are often treated as separate compliance domains rather than integrated components of a unified institutional strategy. This separation weakens interdisciplinary collaboration and discourages universities from addressing complex national and regional problems that require holistic approaches (Brew, 2010; Kezar & Maxey, 2014). As a consequence, higher education reform initiatives accumulate without generating systemic coherence or cumulative strategic impact.

In this context, higher education reform in Thailand risks becoming an incremental and reactive process rather than a transformative one. Without an overarching strategic frame-

work that aligns institutional autonomy, accountability, and national priorities, reforms remain fragmented across agencies, programs, and funding mechanisms. Universities adapt to policy signals individually, but the system as a whole lacks the capacity to evolve as an integrated national knowledge infrastructure capable of responding to technological disruption and competence transformation (Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2014; Mulder et al., 2010).

Addressing policy fragmentation, therefore, requires a fundamental rethinking of universities' role in Thailand's development strategy. Higher education institutions must be conceptualized not merely as regulated service providers, but as strategic actors entrusted with long-term knowledge creation, ethical leadership development, and policy experimentation. Such a shift is consistent with the logic of a grand strategy, in which institutional capacities must align with long-term national objectives rather than short-term tactical control (Luttwak, 2009). Only through such a shift can higher education reform move beyond fragmented compliance and toward a coherent system that supports Thailand's aspirations in the ASEAN region and the global knowledge economy (Farrell & Newman, 2019).

Grand Strategy and Higher Education Governance

Grand Strategy refers to the alignment of long-term national objectives with political, economic, cultural, and technological resources (Luttwak, 2009). Unlike sector-specific policy approaches, it emphasizes systemic coherence, strategic foresight, and institutional coordination across multiple domains.

Applied to higher education governance, a Grand Strategy perspective implies a fundamental shift in how universities are conceptualized within the policy system. Rather than functioning solely as implementers of ministerial directives, universities are understood as strategic institutions capable of generating national intelligence, informing public policy, and enhancing societal resilience.

From this perspective, higher education reform is not merely an administrative exercise but a strategic undertaking that shapes national capacity to respond to complexity and uncertainty. Without such a framework, reform initiatives risk remaining incremental and reactive, particularly in an increasingly competitive and interconnected ASEAN environment.

Building on this perspective, Grand Strategy offers an analytical lens that reveals the structural limitations of fragmented higher-education governance. As Luttwak (2009) emphasizes, grand strategy is not concerned with optimizing individual sectors in isolation, but with orchestrating institutions so that their collective capacities reinforce long-term national objectives. In the absence of such orchestration, even well-designed reforms risk producing localized efficiency gains without contributing to systemic resilience or strategic coherence.

When applied to higher education governance, this insight underscores the inadequacy of indicator-driven reform models. Performance metrics such as rankings, employability rates, and accreditation scores may improve surface-level outcomes, but they do not necessarily enhance a nation's strategic intelligence or adaptive capacity (Kaplan & Norton, 1996). Without an overarching strategic framework, these indicators function as fragmented control mechanisms rather than as instruments for institutional learning and strategic alignment.

A Grand Strategy approach, therefore, requires universities to be repositioned as core components of the national intelligence infrastructure. This role extends beyond knowledge transmission and workforce preparation to include policy analysis, foresight generation, ethical deliberation, and the cultivation of strategic leadership (Al-Rodhan, 2016). Universities, in this

sense, operate as cognitive and normative institutions that support state capacity in navigating uncertainty, technological disruption, and geopolitical interdependence.

Educational administration scholarship reinforces this argument by highlighting the importance of institutional autonomy and integrative governance. Brew (2010) and Kezar and Maxey (2014) demonstrate that universities are most effective when teaching, research, and societal engagement are aligned within a coherent strategic mission. Fragmented governance regimes, by contrast, encourage siloed compliance and inhibit universities' ability to address complex problems that cut across disciplinary and organizational boundaries.

The relevance of Grand Strategy becomes particularly evident in the ASEAN context. Regional higher education initiatives emphasize collaboration, mobility, and mutual recognition, all of which presuppose a degree of strategic autonomy and institutional discretion (ASEAN University Network, 2019). Without a grand strategic orientation at the national level, Thai universities face structural constraints that limit their ability to engage meaningfully in regional knowledge networks. Participation risks becoming procedural rather than transformative, weakening Thailand's position within the ASEAN higher education ecosystem.

Furthermore, rapid technological change amplifies the strategic importance of higher education governance. Brynjolfsson and McAfee (2014) argue that advanced economies increasingly depend on institutions capable of fostering creativity, systems thinking, and ethical judgment—capacities that cannot be engineered through fragmented administrative controls alone. Similarly, Mulder et al. (2010) emphasize that competence development requires integrative institutional environments rather than narrowly optimized performance silos.

From a Grand Strategy perspective, higher education reform must therefore move beyond incremental policy adjustments toward a reconfiguration of governance logic. Universities should be governed through frameworks that balance accountability with strategic autonomy, enabling them to contribute to long-term national objectives while remaining responsive to societal needs. Such a shift aligns higher education governance with broader strategic imperatives, including economic resilience, regional integration, and ethical leadership in an interconnected world (Farrell & Newman, 2019).

In sum, incorporating Grand Strategy into higher education governance reframes reform as a nation-building endeavor rather than a technocratic exercise. It positions universities as strategic actors within a coordinated national system, capable of generating intelligence, shaping policy, and sustaining societal resilience. Without this reframing, higher education reform risks remaining fragmented, reactive, and misaligned with Thailand's long-term aspirations in the ASEAN region and the global knowledge economy.

Higher Education and the ASEAN Strategic Environment

National higher education systems do not operate in isolation. For ASEAN member states, higher education increasingly functions within a regional strategic environment characterized by economic integration, labor mobility, digital transformation, and shared governance challenges. Thailand's higher education reform must therefore be understood in relation to both domestic policy objectives and regional dynamics.

ASEAN initiatives such as the ASEAN University Network, regional qualification frameworks, and cross-border research collaboration reflect an emerging architecture of regional knowledge governance. Within this environment, universities serve as conduits for policy learning, talent circulation, and normative alignment across member states.

From a Grand Strategy perspective, ASEAN should be viewed not merely as a competitive arena but as an extended cognitive space. Thai universities are positioned not only to produce national human capital but also to enhance Thailand's role as a regional knowledge hub contributing to ASEAN's collective resilience, innovation capacity, and ethical governance.

Building on this understanding, the ASEAN strategic environment reshapes the role of higher education from a nationally bounded system into a regionally embedded governance mechanism. As economic integration deepens and labor mobility increases, universities increasingly mediate flows of talent, knowledge, and norms across national boundaries. In this context, higher education systems become critical infrastructures for regional coordination rather than merely domestic policy instruments (ASEAN University Network, 2019).

ASEAN initiatives such as the ASEAN University Network, regional qualification frameworks, and collaborative research platforms signal a gradual shift toward shared governance in knowledge production. These mechanisms facilitate policy learning among member states, promote mutual recognition of competencies, and encourage convergence around quality standards and academic norms. However, participation in this emerging architecture requires universities to possess strategic autonomy and adaptive capacity—conditions that are difficult to achieve within fragmented, compliance-driven national governance regimes (Brew, 2010; Kezar & Maxey, 2014).

From a Grand Strategy perspective, ASEAN should not be conceptualized solely as a competitive arena in which universities seek ranking advantages or student market share. Rather, ASEAN constitutes an extended cognitive space in which knowledge institutions collectively contribute to regional intelligence, resilience, and normative coherence (Luttwak, 2009; Al-Rodhan, 2016). Within such space, universities function as strategic nodes that translate national priorities into regional contributions and, conversely, internalize regional norms into domestic institutional practice.

For Thailand, this reframing has significant strategic implications. Thai universities are positioned not only to produce national human capital but also to act as regional knowledge hubs that support ASEAN's collective capacity for innovation, ethical governance, and policy experimentation. This role requires universities to engage in cross-border research addressing shared challenges such as digital transformation, demographic change, sustainability, and governance reform—areas that demand integrative and interdisciplinary approaches (Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2014; Mulder et al., 2010).

However, fragmented higher education governance constrains Thailand's ability to fully realize this potential. When universities are tightly bound by indicator-based controls and short-term accountability cycles, their capacity to initiate long-term regional partnerships and invest in strategic niche expertise is diminished. As a result, regional engagement risks becoming symbolic rather than transformative, reinforcing procedural compliance without generating substantive regional impact (Kaplan & Norton, 1996).

The strategic environment is further complicated by global interdependence and geopolitical competition. Farrell and Newman (2019) demonstrate that power increasingly operates through institutional networks that shape standards, information flows, and regulatory norms. In this landscape, higher education systems function as instruments of soft power and strategic influence. ASEAN's ability to act as a coherent knowledge region depends, in part, on the strategic alignment of its member states' higher education governance frameworks.

Consequently, Thailand's higher education reform must be situated within a dual strategic horizon: Strengthening domestic institutional capacity while simultaneously enhancing regional integration. A Grand Strategy approach provides the conceptual foundation for aligning these objectives by coordinating higher education governance with broader national and regional priorities. Without such alignment, Thailand risks underutilizing its universities as strategic assets within the ASEAN knowledge ecosystem.

In sum, higher education in the ASEAN strategic environment cannot be effectively governed by fragmented national policies alone. It requires a coordinated strategic framework that recognizes universities as regional actors embedded within a shared cognitive and normative space. By embracing this perspective, Thailand can reposition its higher education system as a driver of regional resilience, innovation, and ethical governance within ASEAN and the broader global knowledge economy.

Universities as the Nation's Brain

The metaphor of the "nation's brain" provides a conceptual lens for understanding the integrative role of universities in modern societies. Analogous to the human brain, which coordinates perception, reasoning, and decision-making, universities integrate knowledge creation, ethical reflection, and technological capability.

In Thailand, universities possess substantial intellectual and human capital. However, institutional fragmentation and governance constraints have limited their capacity to function as a coordinated system. Reimagining universities as the nation's brain requires a shift from compliance-based governance toward strategic autonomy combined with public accountability.

Importantly, this reframing does not imply abandoning regulatory oversight. Rather, it emphasizes governance arrangements that enable universities to contribute proactively to national and regional strategy while remaining aligned with public values, cultural identity, and ethical standards.

Building on this metaphor, conceptualizing universities as the nation's brain highlights their function as integrative cognitive institutions rather than isolated organizational units. In complex societies, strategic capacity depends not merely on the accumulation of information but on the ability to synthesize knowledge, interpret uncertainty, and guide collective decision-making. Al-Rodhan (2016) emphasizes that effective national intelligence emerges from the interaction between cognition, ethics, and strategic foresight—an interaction that universities are uniquely positioned to facilitate.

Within this framework, universities perform multiple interdependent functions analogous to neurological processes. Research activities generate new knowledge and exploratory insight; teaching and learning systems develop cognitive capacity and ethical judgment; and institutional engagement with society enables feedback, adaptation, and policy learning. When these functions operate in silos, the system loses its integrative capacity, much like a brain impaired by disrupted neural connectivity (Brew, 2010; Kezar & Maxey, 2014).

In the Thai context, the challenge lies not in the absence of intellectual capital but in the fragmentation of governance mechanisms, which inhibits systemic coordination. Indicator-driven oversight and short-term accountability cycles prioritize localized performance while weakening collective sense-making across the higher education system. From a strategic management perspective, this reflects a misalignment between governance instruments and long-term strategic objectives (Kaplan & Norton, 1996). As a result, universities are unable to operate as a coherent cognitive infrastructure capable of supporting national strategy.

Reimagining universities as the nation's brain, therefore, necessitates a recalibration of governance arrangements. Strategic autonomy must be expanded to allow institutions to experiment, collaborate, and invest in long-term capability development, while public accountability mechanisms should focus on strategic contribution rather than narrow compliance. Such a balance aligns with the logic of grand strategy, in which institutions are coordinated toward enduring national objectives rather than managed through fragmented tactical controls (Luttwak, 2009).

This reconceptualization is particularly salient in the context of technological transformation and regional interdependence. Brynjolfsson and McAfee (2014) argue that societies entering the second machine age require institutions capable of ethical judgment, adaptive learning, and systems thinking—capacities that extend beyond technical skill formation. Similarly, Mulder et al. (2010) emphasize that competence development depends on integrative environments that align cognitive, social, and ethical dimensions of learning.

At the regional level, universities functioning as the nation's brain also enhance Thailand's position within ASEAN's shared cognitive space. By contributing policy-relevant research, regional leadership development, and ethical frameworks for cooperation, Thai universities can support collective resilience and normative coherence across ASEAN (ASEAN University Network, 2019; Farrell & Newman, 2019). This role transforms higher education from a domestically bounded sector into a strategic platform for regional intelligence and soft power.

Ultimately, conceptualizing universities as the nation's brain reframes higher education governance as a matter of strategic state capacity rather than administrative control. It underscores the need for governance systems that enable coordination, learning, and foresight across institutions while preserving alignment with public values and cultural identity. Without such a shift, universities risk remaining underutilized assets—rich in potential but constrained by fragmented governance—rather than functioning as the cognitive core of national and regional strategy.

Conceptual Framework: The Nation Brain System Model

1. Theoretical Foundation

The Nation Brain System Model draws on Nayef Al-Rodhan's triadic intelligence framework (Al-Rodhan, 2016), which highlights the interplay among knowledge intelligence, moral intelligence, and digital intelligence in sustainable governance. This article adapts the framework to higher education policy by positioning universities as the institutional locus where these forms of intelligence converge.

2. Nation Brain System Model



3. Explanation of the Model

Within the model, universities function as the nation's cognitive core. Knowledge intelligence supports research capacity, policy analysis, and strategic foresight. Moral intelligence, grounded in Thainess, provides ethical orientation, social cohesion, and cultural continuity. Digital intelligence enables adaptation to artificial intelligence, big data, and emerging technologies.

These dimensions interact dynamically rather than hierarchically. Their integration within higher education institutions generates national wisdom, defined as the capacity for sustainable and ethically grounded development. In the ASEAN context, universities also function as interconnected nodes within a regional intelligence network, facilitating cross-border knowledge exchange and policy learning.

Strategic Alignment across System Levels

National Policy Level

At the national level, higher education policy should evolve from regulatory control toward strategic partnership. Universities can support evidence-based policymaking, digital governance, and long-term human capital strategy, particularly in areas of regional relevance such as labor mobility and technological standards within ASEAN (ASEAN University Network, 2019; Farrell & Newman, 2019).

Institutional Governance Level

At the institutional level, university leadership must balance academic autonomy with strategic accountability. Strategic management tools may be adapted to support coherence between institutional missions, national priorities, and regional engagement, provided they respect the distinctive nature of academic work.

Faculty and Academic Practice Level

At the faculty level, academics function as cognitive agents within the National Brain System. Their roles increasingly involve interdisciplinary research, policy engagement, and adaptive pedagogy. Professional development should therefore emphasize strategic, analytical, and regional competencies alongside disciplinary expertise.

Policy Implications for Educational Administration

The Nation Brain System Model offers several implications for educational administration and public policy. First, universities should be evaluated not only on operational performance but also on their contribution to national and regional intelligence. Second, higher education governance must integrate ethical and digital considerations into strategic decision-making. Third, coordination across national and ASEAN policy levels is essential to achieve systemic coherence (Schwab, 2017; Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2014; Kaplan & Norton, 1996).

For Thailand, this perspective highlights the strategic value of universities in enhancing regional influence through knowledge diplomacy, ethical leadership, and digital governance rather than competition based solely on international rankings (Sooksomchitra & Sooksomchitra, 2014).

From an educational administration perspective, the Nation Brain System Model offers an alternative to fragmented reform approaches by emphasizing integration and strategic alignment. Rather than prescribing specific policy instruments, the model provides a conceptual lens for understanding higher education as a living system embedded within national and regional governance (Brew, 2010; Kezar & Maxey, 2014).

By situating universities simultaneously as national cognitive cores and ASEAN knowledge nodes, the framework extends the existing higher education policy literature and addresses the challenges of regional interdependence.

Conclusion

Thailand's higher education system stands at a strategic crossroads. Incremental reforms have improved efficiency and accountability but remain insufficient to address systemic challenges. This article argues that conceptualizing universities within a Grand Strategy framework—while situating them in the ASEAN strategic environment—can enhance their role as strategic institutions.

Through the integration of knowledge intelligence, moral intelligence rooted in Thinness, and digital intelligence, the Nation Brain System Model provides a pathway toward sustainable, ethically grounded, and regionally connected national development.

References

- Al-Rodhan, N. R. F. (2016). *The moral brain: Ethics, freedom and neuroscience*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- ASEAN University Network. (2019). *AUN strategic plan 2019-2023*. ASEAN University Network Secretariat.
- Brew, A. (2010). *Research and teaching: Beyond the divide*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2014). *The second machine age: Work, progress, and prosperity in a time of brilliant technologies*. W. W. Norton & Company.
- Farrell, H., & Newman, A. L. (2019). Weaponized interdependence: How global economic networks shape state coercion. *International Security*, 44(1), 42-79. https://doi.org/10.1162/isec_a_00351
- Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (1996). *The balanced scorecard: Translating strategy into action*. Harvard Business School Press.
- Kezar, A., & Maxey, D. (2014). Envisioning a new higher education research landscape. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 85(1), 9-27.
- Luttwak, E. N. (2009). *The grand strategy of the Roman Empire: From the first century A.D. to the third*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Mulder, M., Weigel, T., & Collins, K. (2010). *The concept of competence in vocational education*. *Journal of Vocational Education & Training*, 62(1), 75-95.
- Schwab, K. (2017). *The fourth industrial revolution*. Crown Business.
- Sooksomchitra, T., & Sooksomchitra, P. (2014). Educational reform in Thailand. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 5(33), 102-107.
- World Bank. (2019). *Thailand systematic country diagnostic*. World Bank Group.