

## The Status of Internationalization of Higher Education in Kenya: The Case of University Diversity

**Mr. Jafred Muyaka**  
University of Eldoret  
Dept of Foundations of Education,  
School of Education  
P.O. BOX 1125-30100, Eldoret.

---

### Abstract

Higher education sector continues to undergo tremendous changes in order to provide skillful workforce for the dynamic labor market. There has been a shift in focus from access to the quality of knowledge generated within the sector. This has pushed institutions of higher learning particularly universities to find ways to equip students with the necessary knowledge and skills for the increasingly multicultural job market. Recruitment of international students and staff is identified as one key aspects of enhancing a cosmopolitan learning environment capable of producing graduates with 'global employable skills'. However, few studies consider how the created campus diversity are utilized to advance internationalization. In this study, the researcher employed multiple case study design to explore how campus diversity is used to advance internationalization in four selected universities in Kenya. Internationalization trends on campus diversity are important in decision making and setting priority areas to support universities to design, develop and implement highly effective internationalization practices that ensures production of globally employable graduates. The results indicate that universities in Kenya have not been attractive to international students as their numbers remain miniscule. In addition, universities had not put structures in place to utilize the few international staff and students to advance internationalization. There is need for universities in Kenya to devise appropriate recruitment strategies to attract international students and create more avenues that enhance interactions among international and domestic students and staff.

---

**Keywords:** internationalization, campus diversity, students mobility, academic staff, international students, international staff

---

### INTRODUCTION

Higher education exists mainly to deliver knowledge for socio-economic development. In the growing volumes of literature on internationalization, knowledge production in higher education is identified as a measure of competitiveness of nations and regions (Pausits, 2015). As a tool of competition, performance indicators such as graduation rates, presence of Nobel Prize winners, presence of international students, and the number of exchange programs are used to highlight the success (NAFSA, 2005). Additionally, knowledge from the sector is seen as an appropriate strategy of tackling emerging societal problems. This explains the recommendation by Bologna Process for nations to increase investment in the sector to build a knowledge society capable of providing solutions to the emerging problems. Coupled with evidence that increased investment in higher education is positively correlated to improved Gross Development Product (GDP) in Africa, there has been a heightened interest attached to the sector (World Bank, 2009).

Student mobility remains one common measure of internationalization. Globally, there has been a steady

increase in student mobility in all regions. Between 1999 and 2012, Arab Emirates saw an increase from 12% to 26%, Central and Eastern Europe increased from 25% to 37% while the sub-Saharan Africa moved from 18% to 28% (UNESCO, 2014). Equally, staff mobility has been on the rise with universities putting in place strategies to recruit and retain international academic staff among Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) to achieve or retain the international outlook of their institutions (Dolby, 2011; Samil, 2009). These caliber of staff is known to improve the quality of university education. They form one of the 13 carefully calibrated performance indicators used in global university rankings' methodology as pointers of quality higher education (Samil, 2009). Besides publishing in journals with wider readerships, international academic staff form the basis for the development of intercultural learning experiences in home campuses. Internationalization literature indicates unprecedented rush for international staff specifically in developed HEIs. In the year 2012, British Council reported that 25% of academic staffs working in United Kingdom were non-nationals while in America 38% of academic staff were non-nationals. In African higher

education, whereas studies do not indicate the exact figures of international staff, Jowi et al., (2013) observed that there had been a slight growth in their numbers. However, the contribution of international staff in advancing internationalization in African higher education has evaded scholarly attention.

Globally, there has been a shift in the discussions from the need for HEIs to support internationalization to effective ways to internationalize. One of the suggestions has been investing in campus diversity. According to Wiers-Jenssen (2008) student mobility plays a critical role in advancing the goals of internationalization especially in the acquisition of global skills for global workspace. Studies continue to show that mobile students are better placed to offer their services on jobs demanding international skills (Wiers-Jenssen, 2008). However, the concern has been the limited number of students involved in exchange programs. The challenge remains how the higher percentages of domestic students in local HEIs can benefit from internationalization. One of the approaches has been to take advantage of the presence of international students in home campuses to enrich the international skills of the domestic students (Beleen and Jones, 2015). Unfortunately, not many studies have examined how the international students in domestic universities are utilized to expose domestic students to international education.

There also are claims of disproportionate engagements in student mobility that disadvantages African higher education (Oanda, 2009). According to UNESCO's report on Global Flow of Tertiary-Level Students in 2012, sub-Saharan Africa remained the second most regions with the most mobile students. It had the highest outbound mobility ratio at 6% compared to the global outbound mobility ratio of 1.9% (UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2006). The Ministry of Education Science and Technology in 2005 reported that the country loses of up-to \$19M each year to foreign universities in terms of fees paid for higher education. However, little is known about the international student within Kenyan universities although estimates have been made of about 2% (Jowi et al., 2013).

### **Statement of the Problem**

Universities in Kenyan have had the desire to utilize campus diversity as a strategy to advance internationalization. This is partly because recruitment of international students and staff is identified as one key aspects of enhancing a cosmopolitan learning environment capable of producing the much sought for graduates with 'global employable skills'. However, few studies consider how the created campus diversity are utilized to advance internationalization. The current study explored how campus diversity was used to advance

internationalization in two public and two private universities in Kenya.

### **The Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of the study was to examine the extent to which universities in Kenya use campus diversity to enhance the quality of their education.

The study was guided by two objectives:

1. To establish internationalization trends in students' and staffs' profiles in the selected universities in Kenya.
2. To determine the extent to which public and private universities in Kenya utilized campus diversity to advance internationalization for quality higher education.

The study had one limitation. The views of important players like the Ministry of Education and the higher education regulator, the Commission for University Education (CUE) were not sought. However, the study utilized document analysis of CUE's documents to complement the data collected from the administrators, students and academic staff to get a holistic understanding of how campus diversity influenced activities in the selected public and private universities in Kenya

### **The Relevance of Campus Diversity to Higher Education Sector**

International student and staff mobility is not a new phenomenon but has existed in higher education from the earliest times. During the ancient period, and in the later part of the first millennium, students and scholars crossed national borders in search of knowledge and in the process help spread their own thoughts and culture (N'dri, 2006). In the 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> century, the movements of teachers and students are credited for the founding of the first modern universities at Bologna, Paris and Oxford (Zezeza 2017; N'dri, 2006). During colonization, the colonized found themselves in their 'colonial masters' countries to pursue dreams of higher education. This is what has raised concerns on the loss of some of the African culture as some scholars argue that it was the foundation of indoctrination of thoughts and culture of the natives (Oanda, 2009). However, globalization has tremendously changed the approach to student and staff mobility with the current trends going for symbiotic relationships where the benefits of partnerships overflows to both host and mother universities.

The benefits of campus diversity to higher education sector has received scholarly attention. The process is credited for fast tracking access to higher education, which ultimately contributes to economic growth and development (Zezeza, 2017). There are opportunities for domestic students in varying regions including marginalized and poor region, to access high quality

higher education in prestigious institutions in foreign countries. This comes with advantages namely; learning in a cosmopolitan environment that fosters multicultural education, acquisition of new language skills, access to high-status qualifications, and exposure to up-to-date knowledge necessary for creation of new innovations and knowledge (Zezeza, 2017; Knight, 2008). The other benefits emanate from partnership of local universities with other international partners. Partnerships in higher education encourage programme and institution mobility which improves the quality of local universities (World Education Services, 2012). In most cases, highly technical universities in economically endowed regions offer technical support to their counterparts in developing regions, which, help create highly trained practitioners who otherwise would not be prepared in the local universities.

Presence of international staff and students has also been linked to vibrancy and competitiveness of higher education sector. This is besides preparation of future workforce capable of tackling global challenges (Ramakrishna & Krishna, 2011). Campus diversity forms part of the key parameters in the "ranking" of 'world class universities'. Universities with high numbers of international staff and students rank higher than those with minimal numbers. The other catalyst for campus diversity has been the recent job market research that report employers' preference for graduates with internationalized education and skills (Zezeza, 2017). Therefore, universities are strategizing on how to attract a large number of international students and academic staff to create a cosmopolitan and global environment in local campus is necessary to produce 'globally employable graduates'.

World over, there has been declining financial support directed to universities (Altbach & Knight, 2006). Universities continue to receive reduced budgets from their governments in support of their planned activities. For sustainability, universities have been forced to find ways to cover the ever reducing financial support. Today, internationalization is seen as an export industry in which exporting nations gain from the school fees and goods and services that international students' pay (Larsen, Morris & Martin, 2002). Besides school fees, foreign students significantly contribute to a nation's economy through both direct and indirect spending. Higher education has prioritized these external sources as an alternative source to cover the high costs for their educational programmes, and research projects. For instance, in the academic year 2013-2014, United States attracted 888,052 international students who contributed an estimated \$26.8 billion to the USA economy and supported creation of about 340,000 jobs. In Australia,

education was the third largest export industry with an estimated \$17 billion in 2014 drawn from an international student population of about 450,000 (Zezeza, 2017). Universities with the support of their governments are setting up policies to recruit more international students.

Whilst the growth in the number of mobile students globally has been exponential, the ratio to global enrolment in higher education remains low. This is an indication of still untapped market. In 2013, the percentage of international students to domestic students was estimated to be as low as 2.04% and even much lower in Africa at 1.46% (Zezeza, 2017). Unfortunate for Africa, the destination of outbound international students favors the developed regions, mainly going to North America and Western Europe.

The other reasons that has made it imperative for universities to invest in campus diversity has been out of practical reasons. Most universities cannot afford to send most of their students outside their borders for international exposure (de Wit, 2011). Therefore, attracting international students into their local campuses remains the only option for their local immobile students to meet and interact with international students. Therefore, to avail an international environment to students, universities have to find ways of utilizing the present home campus diversity for international experience. Literature around diversity in African higher education has been centered on inability of universities to recruit international staff and students. Few studies provide the actual population but attribute lack of competitiveness of the African higher education to the perceived low quality of academic programs, poor marketing of academic programs, and weak institutional structures among many other factors (Jowi et al., 2013).

The contribution of these studies are timely but research has emerged indicating that the mere presence of international students and staff in domestic campuses does not guarantee the goals of multicultural education (de Wit, 2011; Leask and Carroll, 2007). There is a need for meaningful engagements of international students and staff on domestic campuses if the goals of cross-cultural communication and the enhancement of international and intercultural skills are to be accomplished. According to De wit (2011) international students and staff must be integrated with domestic students and staff respectively for meaningful collaborations. However, few studies investigate comparatively the manner in which international academic staff and students have been utilized as resource people at domestic universities to achieve the objectives of campus diversity. Yet Urban (2014) indicated that for the majority of domestic students to be exposed to an

international learning environment, then, it is crucial for higher education sector to systematically and actively facilitate international students' contribution to campus internationalization and find ways to engage their knowledge and experience as a teaching and learning strategy.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

**Research Design**

The study utilized the mixed methods design in examining how campus diversity was used to advance internationalization for quality academic programs in the selected universities in Kenya. The design was ideal for this study since both qualitative and quantitative data investigated the same concept of internationalization and obtained different but complementary data for a holistic understanding of the phenomenon as was practiced in public and private universities in Kenya.

The study was carried out in two national universities and two private universities. The study targeted university administrators, academic staff, and first year doctoral students. There were 2,008 academic staff in total, and 804 first year doctoral students.

**Sample and Sampling Techniques**

The study used critical case sampling to select two public and two private universities. These were University of Nairobi and Moi university for public and United States International University –Africa (USIU-Africa) and Mount Kenya University (MKU) for private universities. USIU-Africa was identified as among the most internationalized in the country (Munyae *et al.*, 2017) while MKU selected because despite being moderately internationalized, it was the only private university in Kenya operating a branch campus outside Kenyan borders (MKU, 2017).

University of Nairobi (UoN) was selected because it is the oldest university in Kenya with not only well-established traditions but has also been ranked consistently among the best performing university in the region (The Times Higher Education World University Rankings, 2006-2017). The second public university was Moi University (MU) and was selected because it houses the secretariat of the African Network for Internationalization of Education (ANIE); an institution that was responsible for enhancing internationalization of higher education in African universities.

For university administrators, the study employed maximum variation sampling with the aim of getting the views of all the diverse categories of university administrators on campus diversity and how it influences internationalization. The university administrators sampled to participate in the study were the Deputy Vice Chancellors, principals of colleges, deans of schools, heads of departments,

deans of students and directors of international office(s). Maximum variation sampling was used in selection of academic staff and students to participate in the study. The aim was to ensure that the various academic fields in the different universities give their views on how campus diversity was used to advance internationalization.

The sample size for academic staff was determined by use of the Sample Size Calculator. The population of the academic staff in the four selected public and private universities was 2,008 yielding a sample of 236 participants as captured in the survey system in Table 1.

Table 1: Sample Size by Survey System Software

Sample Size by Survey System Software	
Confidence Level:	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 95% <input type="radio"/> 99%
Confidence Interval:	<input type="text" value="6"/>
Population:	<input type="text" value="2,008"/>
Sample size needed:	<input type="text" value="236"/>

The other participants were as captured in in Table 2.

Table 2: Total Number of Participants as Per Data Collection Instrument

Tool/ Participant	Administrators	Academic Staff	Students	Total
FGDs	0	0	36	36
Interviews	20	32	32	84
Questionnaire	0	169	0	169
<b>Total</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>289</b>

**Data Analysis**

Quantitative data used the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) computer software for analysis. There was use of descriptive statistics; frequencies, percentages and mean to analyze the data. Where means were used to present and discuss the data, the responses were measured on a 5-point Likert-type scale with assigned values ranging from 1=Strongly Disagree to 4=Strongly Agree and with 0=Not Applicable. Then the findings were summarized with the mean, standard deviation, and actual range of the scale scores for each university either displayed in a table or given as a narrative. The analysis of qualitative data involved the 'classic approach' which entailed a holistic review of the transcripts, establishing codes and analyzed along established themes to respond to the objectives of the study. After the separate analysis of the two sets of data, their results were merged for interpretation. After merging the data, there was synthesis of the specific results. The focus was to look at data convergence and divergence.

**General and Demographic Information of the Participants**

**a) University Administrators Demographics**

The university administrators who took part in the study were predominantly male (78.9%) as compared to female (21.1%). These were six professors, eight senior lecturers, two lecturers and four senior non-teaching administrators working in internationalization offices. There was a Deputy Vice Chancellor (DVC), two registrars, two deputy registrars, five directors of respective international offices, two deans of schools, and three heads of departments also known in some universities as chairpersons of departments. The average years of experience of administrators in their respective universities was three years adequate enough to respond to questions on campus diversity policies in their respective universities.

**b) Demographics of the Academic Staff**

The study involved male and female academic staff members. There were more male academic staff (57%) than female (43%) that took part in the study. Over a half of the academic staff (51.2%) were those with a masters as compared to the 48.8% that had doctoral qualifications. The study also established the source of the highest level of qualification for the involved academic staff which was grouped as either ‘attained within universities in Kenya’ or ‘attained outside the country’ (overseas). The study found out that there was a mix of experiences in the selected public and private universities with 70.4% of the academic staff having obtained their highest level of qualification within the country and another 29.6% with overseas education backgrounds.

Data on the ranks/position of academic staff showed that majority of the participants (39.5%) were lecturers, followed by tutorial fellows (20.4%), assistant lecturers (14.2%), professors (13.6%), and senior lecturers (12.3%).

**c) Demographics of the Students**

The study had slightly more male doctorate students (52.9%) than female students (47.1%). The majority of the students (40%) were from College of Humanities and Social Sciences followed by College of Education (30.9%), College of Health Sciences (13.2%), and College of Biological and Physical Sciences (10.3%). College of Agriculture and Veterinary Science had the least representation (5.9%).

**STUDY FINDINGS**

**Practices on Campus Diversity and Internationalization**

The first task of this study sought to determine the number of international staff and students recruited to work and study in the selected universities in Kenya. The ratio of international students to the total student population varied from one university to the other as shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Student Diversity in the Selected Universities in Kenya

University	Students		
	Total Student Pop	Total Number of International Students	Campus Diversity
UoN	103,000	459	0.004%
MU	42,670	225	0.005%
MKU	25,919	256	0.01%
USIU-Africa	7,059	1006	14.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>159,594</b>	<b>2,322</b>	<b>0.015</b>

Source: UoN, MU, USIU-Africa, and MKU’s Student Registry

The overall campus diversity ratio of 0.015% for student was inadequate in enhancing multicultural education. Delivery of quality higher education demands a highly cosmopolitan environment signifying diverse culture and cross-cultural expertise, which, as established above was lacking. With exception of USIU-Africa with a ratio of 14.3%, all other universities had a negligible ratio of less than 0.01%.

The findings on nationalities of international students indicated that USIU-Africa had attracted and recruited students from over 65 different nationalities while UoN and Moi University had attracted international students from 30 and 32 nationalities respectively. Data from the two public universities in Kenya showed that the recruited students were predominantly from Africa (93.4%).

The study also examined the popular programs for international students and the findings indicate that regardless of the category of the university, majority of international students were enrolled in undergraduate programs. However, the two public universities had attracted a significant proportion of international students (40%) into their postgraduate programs. The enrolment was mainly in health sciences, social sciences and humanities. For instance, in USIU-Africa, programs in ‘The Chandaria School of Business’ and ‘The School of Humanities and Social Sciences’ had enrolled over three-quarters of international students (79.3%). At UoN, analysis of the attractive courses revealed that academic programs in three colleges had received over three-quarters (85.6%) of the international students. These were College of Humanities and Social Sciences (CHSS) attracting 58%, College of

Health Sciences (CHS) had 14.7% and College of Agriculture and Veterinary Science (CAVs) had 12.9%.

**Academic Staff Diversity in the Selected Universities in Kenya**

The other aspect of diversity that the study examined was the academic staff diversity ratios. The ratios for the selected public and private universities were as shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Academic Staff Diversity in the Selected Universities in Kenya

University	Total	Total Number of International Staff	Campus Diversity
MU	1,140	45	0.04%
USIU-Africa	120	12	0.1%
UoN	2,052	Not Accessed	Not accessed
MKU	Not Accessed	Not Accessed	Not Accessed

The population of academic staff was predominantly local yet there is adequate evidence that links predominant use of local professionals in universities to weak intellectual development (Salmi, 2009) insufficient to provide quality higher education. In addition, such composition of academic staff lacks the overflow of overseas concepts in curriculum development, teaching methodology and finds it difficult to foster partnerships with foreign universities.

The presence of diverse student and/or academic body does not in itself enrich the overall student learning experiences that will guarantee quality education. It is in the utilization of the diverse campus diversity that enriches the academic programs. The study investigated the general support that the few recruited international staff and students enjoy to integrate well into their new culture.

The first aspect that the current study investigated was the support that the international staff and students received to integrate into the new environment. When academic staff were asked on the support they provide international students to integrate into the new university culture, 50.6% indicated that they were not involved. There were more academic staff with overseas backgrounds (53.2%) than those with local qualifications (47.4%) involved in integrating international students.

The extent to which academic staff were engaged in integrating international students into their new culture varied from one university to the other as shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Avenues for Staff to Engage with International Student in the University

Name of the	Mean	Std.
-------------	------	------

University		Deviation
UoN	2.63	1.051
MKU	2.59	1.104
MU	2.43	.995
USIU-Africa	2.23	1.243

The Table shows that academic staff in UoN and MKU with means of 2.63 and 2.59 respectively were significantly engaged in integrating international students in their university culture. This was not the case for Moi University and USIU-Africa with means of 2.43 and 2.23 respectively.

The study looked at the avenues available for interactions. Majority of the academic staff (67.7%) reported that the university had created adequate avenues to interact with international academic staff. However, still a significant number of academic staff (33.2%) reported that their universities had done little to allow interactions with international staff.

In the selected universities, the level of interactions with international staff was not uniform as shown in Table 5.

Table 5: Academic Staff Interactions with International Staff

Name of the University	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
USIU-Africa	3.11	27	.801
University of Nairobi	2.89	38	.953
Moi University	2.70	63	.854
MKU	2.52	33	.972

There were significant interactions between the academic staff and international staff in all the sampled universities. This was a positive environment for enhancing quality academic programs.

The findings on avenues within universities to interact with international students were even higher as shown in Table 5.

Table 5: Academic Staff Interactions with International Students

Name of the University	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
USIU-Africa	3.37	27	.792
University of Nairobi	3.13	38	.875
Moi University	2.78	63	.832
Mount Kenya University	2.59	34	.857

The selected public and private universities in Kenya had created adequate avenues to interact with international students. However, the older and more established universities had higher level of interactions between international students and academic staff (UoN for public universities with a mean of 3.37 and USIU- Africa for private universities with a mean of 3.13). Their counterparts,

Moi University (2.78) and MKU with a mean of 2.59 had relatively less interactions.

The source of highest academic qualification affected the level of interactions with both international staff and students. In both public and private universities, academic staff who acquired their highest qualification from overseas reported more avenues (77.1%) to interact with international staff than those who had acquired within the country (63.7%). The trend was the same with avenues to interact with international students with those acquired highest qualification outside the country at 79.1% as compared to those who acquired locally (71.1%). These findings suggest the readiness and willingness of those academic staff with international exposure to create more avenues of interactions with international students and staff.

The other area that support campus diversity in enhancing internationalization is the aspects of the curriculum. There is the need to offer facilitative languages. However, the findings showed that none of the sampled universities offered language acquisition/facilitative courses to their international students as part of the course requirements. This was despite the increasing number of international students coming from non-English speaking nations. These findings on language of instruction corroborates well with findings from the academic staff who when asked if they teach some of their courses in foreign language, only 18.6% reported to have taught in a language other than English and Kiswahili. The question, 'I teach some of my courses in foreign language(s) other than English and Kiswahili', was rated lowly with a mean of 2.03. This was the case for both public and private universities.

#### **DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS**

The world is becoming more multicultural and interdependent in its composition. Hence modern universities are increasingly called upon to be more diverse in its culture and composition. In higher education, international students and international academic staff represent this cosmopolitan culture. They are an academic resource that provides the much needed cross-cultural expertise that have become part of global market skills. However, the current study established a less diversified student body with a campus diversity ratio of 0.015%. This is consistent with earlier studies that pointed to a less diversified student population in African higher education (Teferra & Knight, 2008; Oanda, 2009). In University of Ghana campus diversity ratio was estimated at a paltry 0.03% (Intsiful, 2017). In the academic year 2001, the ratio in the University of Zululand was estimated at 3% (Welch et. al., 2004) while in the academic year 2003-2004, Cheikh Anta Diop University had a campus diversity ratio of 2% (Teferra & Knight, 2008).

When compared to the campus diversity ratios in western and North American universities, the established ratios in public and private universities in Kenya were very low. For instance, Harvard University reported a highly diversified student body with a ratio of 19%, Stanford University had 21%, and Columbia University had 23% (Salmi, 2009). In South Africa, the ratio of international student to total student population was estimated at 7% (Mulumba et al., 2008).

The global diversity ratio that was 2.04% and African ratio that was 1.46% in 2013 (Zezeza, 2017), the campus diversity ratio in the selected public and private universities in Kenya was very low. Claims that universities in Kenya have invested in campus diversity to create the necessary environment for implementation of their academic programs remains rhetorical statements particularly in public universities where campus diversity remained miniscule. Higher percentage of international students reported in USIU-Africa compared to the other selected universities could be associated with the history of USIU-Africa, which was established as an international university; a trend that the university has maintained over time.

The noted lower numbers of international students in Kenyan universities compared to North America and European universities emanate from the differences in the financial investments directed towards higher education in favor of the later. In North America and Europe, universities have invested heavily in better equipment, high quality staff, better working conditions and relevant curricula, making them easier choices for international students globally. This is not the case in Kenyan universities where perceptions of poor quality academic programs, irrelevant curricula and inadequate qualified academic staff are common. The apparent differences were equally captured by Teferra & Knight (2008) when explaining the limited number of inbound student mobility in African higher education.

Regardless of the category of the university, majority of international students (69.4%) in the selected universities in Kenya were enrolled in undergraduate programs. The preferred courses were in health sciences, social sciences and humanities. This enrolment trend is contrary to what studies in North America have reported. In the USA, universities known to record high numbers of international students like University of Southern California, Purdue University and University of Illinois, had a range of 50-60% of the enrolments in postgraduate programs (Hegarty, 2014). This was also the case between the years 2005 to 2007 for Stanford University (64%), Massachusetts Institute of Technology (60%), Harvard University (59%),

London School of Economics and Political Science (51%) and Tokyo University 45% (Salmi, 2009, p. 81).

The findings on the preferred courses also presents contrary established trends in western and Asian universities. For instance, Indian students seeking admission outside India go for courses in science, technology, engineering and mathematics with over 75% enrolled in post-graduate programs (Association of Indian Universities, 2014). The preferred courses for international students in the American were in engineering, management, and life sciences (Hegarty, 2014).

The study also investigated whether academic staff rank and years of experience influenced participation in internationalization activities. The findings indicate that the source of highest qualification, the rank and years of experience were factors that determined engagement in internationalization activities. Whilst academic staff with overseas qualifications found it easy to participate in internationalization activities than those with local qualifications, academic staff with superior ranks and those with many years' of experience were easily engaged in internationalization. In most cases, academics with overseas qualifications tend to keep their established networks and utilize them in formation of partnerships long after they relocate back to their countries and universities. However, those with local qualifications have to depend on their university for exposure and in building these networks. With established minimal support for internationalization networks, it is rather harder for their participation.

## CONCLUSION

The study suggests that there were no significant differences in the use of campus diversity to advance internationalization in both public and private universities in Kenya. The recruitment of international students especially in public universities remains minuscule. Further, the few recruited are not utilized adequately to inform on academic programming. The study recommends the need for universities in Kenya invest in attracting international students and staff and move the ratio to over 10% of the total student and academic staff population.

## REFERENCES

- Altbach, P., & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalisation of Higher Education: Motivations and Realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11 (3), 290-305.
- Beleen, J., & Jones, E. (2015). *Defining Internationalisation at Home*. Accessed

online on 9th December 2015 from. Retrieved from World university news: <http://universityworldnews.com/article.php?story>

- British Council (2012). The shape of things to come: Higher education Global Trends and Emerging Opportunities to 2020.
- Dolby N. (2011). *Internationalizing Higher Education in South Africa and the United States: Policy and Practice in Global, National, and Local Perspective*. Accessed online from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED523150.pdf>
- Hegarty, N. (2014). Where We Are Now-The Presence and Importance of International Study to Universities in the United States. . *Journal of International Students*, 4(3): 223-235.
- Institute-of-International-Education. (2016, 11 28). *Open Doors*. Retrieved from Research and Insights: <https://www.iie.org/en/Research-and-Insights/Open-Doors#.WDtFZ9IrLIW>
- Intsiful, E. (2017). The Rationale and Strategies of University Internationalization: The Case of University of Ghana . *The International Journal of Humanities & Social Studies*, 159-166.
- Jowi, O., Knight, & Schoole. (2013). Internationalisation of African Higher Education: Status, Challenges and Issues. In Schoole, & K. Jane, *Internationalisation of African Higher Education Towards Achieving the MDGs*. Sense Publishers.
- Knight, J. (2008). *Higher Education in Turmoil: The Changing World of Internationalization*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Larsen, K., Morris, R., & Martin, J. (2002). Trade in education services: Trends and issues. *World Economy*, 25(6), 849–868.
- Leask, B. (2014). Internationalizing the Curriculum and All Student Learning. *International Higher Education*, 78, 5-6. Available at <https://ejournals.bc.edu/ojs/index.php/ihe/article/viewFile/5798/5168>, (Accessed 3 January 2019).
- MKU. (2017). <http://www.mku.ac.ke/>. Retrieved from Our History: <http://www.mku.ac.ke/> (Accessed 15 2018).
- Munyae, M; Arasa J& Wawire,V. (2017). *The Status of Student Involvement in University Governance in Kenya: The Case of Public and Private Universities*". Dakar: CODESRIA.
- Mulumba, M., Obaje, A., Kagiso, K. and Kishun, R. (2008) 'International Students Mobility in and out of Africa: Challenges and Opportunity', in D. Teferra and J. Knight (eds.) *Higher Education in Africa: The*

- International Dimension, Accra/Boston: AAU/CIHE, pp. 490–514.
- N'dri, A.-L. (2006). *Higher Education in Africa: Crises, Reforms and Transformation*. Dakar: Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa.
- NAFSA. (2005), May 14 [http://www.nafsa.org/\\_/File/\\_/itc2005pdf](http://www.nafsa.org/_/File/_/itc2005pdf). *Association of International Educators*. Retrieved from Internationalising the Campus 2005: Profiles of Success at Colleges and Universities.
- Oanda, I. O. (2009). Internationalisation vs Regionalization of Higher Education in East Africa and the Challenges of Quality Assurance and Knowledge Production. *Higher Education Policy*, 22(3) 331-347.
- Pausits, A. (2015). The Knowledge Society and Diversification of Higher Education: From the Social Contract to the Mission of Universities. In L. M. Adrian Curaj, *The European Higher Education Area - Between Critical Reflections and Future Policies* (pp. 267-284). Springer.
- Ramakrishna, Seeram: Krishna, Venni, Venkata. (2011). Paths to a World-Class University Lessons from Practices and Experiences. In C. L. Nian, W. Qi, & C. Ying, *Emergence of Asian Universities as Centres of New Knowledge Generation and a Base for National Competitiveness. A Case Study of the National University of Singapore* (pp. 205-236). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Salmi, J. (2009). *The Challenge of Establishing World-Class Universities*. Washington, DC
- Teferra, D. (2008). Charting Africa Higher Education: Perspective at a Glance. In D. Teferra, & J. Knight, *Higher Education in Africa: The International Dimension*. Massachusetts: Center for International Higher Education.
- Wiers-Jenssen, J. (2008). Does higher education attained abroad lead to international jobs? *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 12, 101-130. doi:10.1177/1028315307307656
- World Bank. (2009). *Accelerating Catch-up: Tertiary Education for Growth in sub-Saharan Africa*. Washington DC: The World Bank. Washington DC: World Bank.
- Zelega, P.T. (2017). Internationalization of Higher Education in the Era of Xenophobic Nationalisms. *NAFSA 2017 Annual Conference and Expo*, (pp. 1-10). Los Angeles, USA: NAFSA.