

The Kenyan School Systems' Impact on Public Higher Education Access: Examination of Growth, Access, and Challenges

Tamara Yakaboski
University of Northern Colorado

Katelyn Nolan
Southern Illinois University Carbondale

The Kenyan educational system is an example of how increasing demand, external policies, and lack of resources have hindered access into Kenya's highest level of education. While it is possible to view higher education as the problem and the solution as a means to an educated workforce and economic development, the issues stem from growth, access, and challenges at the lower levels of education, primary and secondary. In order to improve Kenya's higher education access, educators and leaders should first examine the issues hindering primary and secondary education. The trends imply that if United States educators and leaders can better understand the challenges in Kenyan education, then we can better educate the Kenyan international students with the tools and knowledge to improve the Kenyan system when they return home after graduation.

Keywords: Kenya, access, higher education, primary, secondary

Since independence, many African education systems have faced pressures for expansion, and Kenya is no different, as it continues to see numerous challenges since its 1963 independence from British colonization. Prevalent issues across Africa result from the increased demand for educational access, decreased governmental funding combined with increased costs, and the mismanagement of university and governmental resources (Ngome, 2003; Teffera & Altbach, 2003). As a developing country, Kenya struggles with access issues to its education system beginning with universal primary schools, then a selective and hierarchical secondary system, and finally, with a young public higher education system. In just over 40 years, Kenya's higher education system has grown from one British originated university, the University of Nairobi, to seven public universities. Since it is such a young system, it can only accommodate approximately three percent of the university aged population (Otieno, Kiamba, & Some, 2008). For the 2011 academic year, more than 60,000 academically qualified students were unable to attend university due to space limitations and the government's inability to cover their costs ("Thousands to miss places in varsities," 2010).

The Kenyan educational system is a direct example of how increasing demand, the World Bank's financial and policy involvement, and Kenya's resource limitations have hindered access into Kenya's highest level of education. It is possible to focus only on higher education as the problem and the solution when the government and society

perceive that higher education is a means to an educated workforce and economic development, but the issues stem from growth, access, and challenges at the lower levels of education, primary and secondary. Overcoming these access issues is important to the general development of Kenya, and specifically to advancing girl's and women's education status nationwide and to diminishing ethnic and tribal regional tensions over resources (Hughes & Mwiria, 1989).

The purpose of this scholarly review essay is to critically examine Kenya's educational access issues based on previous research and the authors' professional experiences with Kenyan education. We begin by discussing the enrollment growth, increased demand for access, funding, and policy challenges in the primary and secondary systems. We posit that in order to address Kenya's higher education access issues, educators and leaders should first examine the access issues hindering primary and secondary education and finish with a focus on Kenyan higher education access issues. The opening discussion explores the history and trends in primary and secondary education then their impact on higher education access. We conclude by discussing the implications for United States and Kenyan leaders, educators, and students.

These discussions are important as Kenya increases their participation in the global economy and as Kenyan students continue to be in the top 25 places of origin for international students studying in the U.S. higher education system. These trends imply that if U.S. educators and leaders can

understand the challenges in Kenyan education, then we can better educate the Kenyan international students with the tools and knowledge they need to improve the Kenyan system when they return home after graduation. This examination of Kenyan education access is significant to furthering the development of comparative research as it provides a foundational review to begin research projects addressing what has been learned through the Kenyan system compared to other countries access development.

Overview to the Kenyan Education System

While the Kenyan government claims that primary education is a universal, free service, there are obstacles in the K-8 system that affect access into a non-government funded secondary system. If a student cannot afford to attend secondary school, then a student's progress through the education system stops, and the possibility of reaching the university level becomes unattainable. A student's inability to pay for basic education restricts the student from attending the schooling that will create foundational knowledge and prepare the student to pass the exam that determines their future at the university level. Even though primary education is free, students still struggle to afford non-tuition items such as books and uniforms thus making the first level of education a challenge for poor families. Without adjustments to the Kenyan education system, students may not reach the tertiary level that could strengthen the economy by producing an educated workforce. However, an overview of Kenyan education is not complete without discussing the impacts of colonization from both the British and the World Bank. While there have been other colonizing stakeholders such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and religious or missionary organizations, the main impacts have come from the British and the World Bank.

Colonization's Influence on Kenyan Education

As is the case for other African nations, Kenya was under British colonization, which influenced the country's academics, language, instruction, and governmental policy. The British created a system geared towards educating British administrators and their families with policies to keep Kenyans out of

education. For example, "At independence less than one-quarter of all professional civil service posts were held by Africans; most trade and industry throughout the continent was foreign-owned; and only three percent of high school-age students received a secondary education" (Teferra & Altbach, 2004, p. 24). Independence meant Kenya was without specific guidance on how to formulate its own system but with an infiltrated British influence (Teferra & Altbach, 2004). One example of the British influence was in Kenya's prior 7-4-2-3 educational system, which meant that students spent seven years in primary, four in secondary, two in advance secondary, and then they could be eligible for the three year higher education program. It was not until the 1980s that the Kenyan government restructured to the U.S. 8-4-4 model.

Policies established during the colonial years regarding primary education remain as issues for the present Kenyan government. The British government used both entrance exams and fees as a means to hinder Kenyan student's opportunity to move upward in the educational system. In order for the British government to portray the wastage of providing education to Kenyan students, they established the Beecher Committee through the 1940s and 1950s. As a means to limit the number of Kenyan students who progressed through the educational system, the Beecher Committee reported on the assumption that of the students who entered primary school, 50 percent would drop out in the first four years. Examinations would then eliminate four-fifths of the students who remained, and the rest would move up to the upper primary. Once at this level, 50 percent of those students would drop out due to fees or be eliminated by the exams (Nkinyangi, 1982). Colonial governments hoped to eliminate all African students who attempted to join the education system, which eventually contributed to access issues that have created impoverishment still present today. As something that began during colonization, education costs and fees remain political issues that continue today.

The World Bank and Kenya

Some of Kenya's current education struggles are the result of colonization and pre-independence policies and systems. Independence left Kenya with the task to create and grow a system that had been

dedicated to removing native people from education and to do so with limited financial and human resources. As an option, Kenya, along with most of Africa, shifted reliance to the World Bank. However, the World Bank's agendas have created the numerous problems in Kenya, especially within the education system. In the 1960s, when Africa pushed for nationalism, the World Bank responded by investing in "Human Capital Theory," which emphasized education as the catalyst for social, political, and economic change (Banya & Elu, 2001; Samoff & Carroll, 2004; Sifuna, 2007). This agenda emphasized higher education and ignored basic education.

By the 1970s, the popularity of higher education increased, as did the lack of resources and external education related debt (Banya & Elu, 2001). The result was that the World Bank shifted its focus away from higher education to basic education. The World Bank's policy was to send promising students overseas for higher education because focusing on a Kenyan grown higher education system at that time, in the World Bank's words, was a "luxury" (Brock-Utne, 1995). The World Bank's shift redirected money, donors, and policies away from higher education and led to the deterioration of Kenyan higher education system and facilities for decades.

By the 1990s, the World Bank realized that by removing the focus from preparing teachers at the university level, they negatively had affected the basic education system. Therefore, the Bank refocused on the university system and emphasized technology, new inventions, government intervention, and basic education supported by a strong university system (Banya & Elu, 2001; Samoff & Carrol, 2004; Teferra & Altbach, 2004). Due to earlier World Bank influenced policies, Kenya's expenditure on the education system averaged between "5 and 7 percent of GDP between 1991/92 and 2002/03 fiscal years" (Vos et al., 2004, p. 1). In reality, not even the World Bank was prepared to handle the obstacles within Kenya's education system. Arguably, policies that were the most efficient and cost effective for the World Bank, in general, only hindered an unestablished system.

Primary Education in Kenya Free Primary Education's Development

When independence came in 1963, the government promised to eliminate education fees yet they continued into the 1970s, which caused many parents to withhold their children from school for almost a decade (Nkinyangi, 1982; Sifuna, 2007; Somerset, 2007; Vos et al., 2004). However in 1971, the Kenyan government provided universal education by removing tuition fees in districts that the government considered "unfavorable." It was labeled Free Primary Education (FPE) 1971 (Oketch, 2010; Sifuna, 2007; Vos et al., 2004). In 1973, the government eliminated school fees (FPE 1973) for students in standards (grades) one through four in all districts, and placed a uniform fee of 60 shillings per year for standards five through seven. By 1978, the government had eliminated fees for the entirety of primary education, standards one through eight (Nkinyangi, 1982; Oketch, 2010; Sifuna, 2007; Vos et al., 2004). Elimination proved simply a government gesture as the fees had been removed but took on a new name. The government and schools now required students to provide money for building funds and equipment funds, including books and uniforms. The new and added costs continued to marginalize poor families. As more students attended schools, the need for resources increased in the form of equipment and buildings.

In the 1980s, the government canceled their fee elimination decision thus ending free primary education when the World Bank established the Structural Advancement Program (SAP) to support basic education (Banya & Elu, 2001; Mooko, Tabulawa, Maruatona & Koosimile, 2009; Samoff & Carrol, 2004). The government introduced cost-sharing thus effectively shifting the responsibility of paying for education from the government to parents and students (Sifuna, 2007). It was not until 2003 that the government introduced Universal Primary Education (UPE), which once again eliminated primary education fees. The growth of "enrolments increased from 5.9 in 2002 to 7.2 million in 2004" (Sifuna, 2007, p. 696). Although the claim is to have finally reached universal education, Kenya's primary education system still experiences numerous challenges, especially in resources as discussed next.

Obstacles with “Free” Primary Education

Throughout the entire process of eliminating fees, Kenya's education system saw an increase in enrollment, a decrease in resources, enormous access issues, and an increase of equity concerns. As a direct result to both FPE 1974 and FPE 1979, the primary schools saw a large increase in enrollment (Oketch, 2010). However, the dropout time was quick, and students struggled to stay enrolled because of the decreasing quality of education. Schools struggled to provide space, classrooms, books, notebooks, and even teachers to support the student's education. The Kenyan government made fee changes without planning how to bring in money from other venues.

Although primary education has been considered free since 2003, many district schools require parents to help with building funds or equipment funds. With access increases and a large numbers of students entering Grade 1, it is obvious that a country with limited resources would struggle. The enrollment increases have resulted in a reduction of quality education in Kenya. The government hopes to create an educated population by providing education universally, but by doing this they are essentially adding bodies to the classroom, but limiting the knowledge passed onto those students. According to Sifuna (2007):

With increased enrolments, many schools were unable to cope with the high influx of pupils. It was common to find classes being conducted in the open, under trees or in church buildings to supplement the available space. Many schools introduced double sessions/shifts in the morning and afternoon to cope with the upsurge, while others introduced several streams. (p. 692)

When examining the problems created by the elimination of fees, the question is whether the government is truly aiding primary education. In some areas, teachers have classrooms with 60 to 80 students, and spend so much time with the large classes that they end up limiting assignments and do not have enough supplies for all children (Lewin & Sabates, 2011; Oketch, 2010; Otienoh, 2010; Sifuna, 2007; Somerset, 2007). Also, in most districts, due to the large class sizes students are left behind and either end up repeating the class or dropping out all

together. Somerset (2007) examined the repetition rate between 1974 and 1977 and discovered that “total enrolments rose from 227,600 in Grade 5 to 243,400 in Grade 7, an increase of 15,800; but over the same period the number of repeaters jumped from 11,100 to 34,800, an increase of 23,700” (p. 5). This trend has not improved over the decades. For the 2010/11 school year, over 400,000 students did not complete grade 8 and from tracking students who began primary school in 2003, only 59 percent of them completed the system (“Dropouts, repeats take toll on free primary education,” 2011).

The education system lacks the infrastructure and the materials to properly support the influx of students that the elimination of fees encouraged. This does not suggest that removing the fees was a mistake; it simply suggests that in reality primary education is not universally free for these students or of equal quality. For example, families still have to pay for uniforms and have to decide to lose income if they take their child out of the labor market.

Student's families are responsible for purchasing required uniforms before they can attend, yet in many cases, this is not affordable. For example, while a uniform in a Kenyan village may cost the equivalent of five U.S. dollars, this is a significant amount for a family when the annual gross national income (GNI) per capita for Kenya is \$770 compared to the United States' GNI of \$47,240 (UNICEF, 2011).

For some families, it will be more cost effective to keep their children at home to help the family. Child labor continues in Kenya and it affects poorer, rural families more and creates greater education access obstacles for girls (Nungu, 2010; UNICEF, 2005). These trends cause the added fees and uniform costs to be hurdles that families often cannot realistically overcome unless the government embraces completely free universal public primary school. Public primary education may be free in the policy statements, but the enrollment increases and the quality decreases have not created universal access.

Secondary Education in Kenya

As stated before, primary education access increased, but current policies and expenses have not aided students' progression through the education system. The Kenyan secondary education system is

unlike primary education. It is not a universally free system as such students do not have the opportunity to attend secondary school even if they can pass the exams. Access issues at the primary level are compounded by more challenging access issues at the secondary level, which further decreases the number of students who might have access to higher education.

Secondary School Transition and Access

The secondary education system has followed indecisive trends, as the government shifts policies. Immediately after independence, the government and the World Bank emphasized secondary education as a means to promote human development and overall national growth. However, in comparison to the primary schools, the secondary enrollments have stayed relatively low. In reality, with the growing number of primary attendants, the system established for secondary admissions could not support that rapid growth.

Kenya's secondary school system is broken up into three groups: government funded, *Harambee*, and private. The government schools are divided into three categories arranged in a hierarchy with a quota system in place for admissions. At the top are the national schools that consist of a tiny minority of prestigious public funded schools, found mostly in Kenya's larger cities. Then there are provincial schools in the middle, and finally, the largest and lowest ranking group are the district schools. The national schools consist of some of the longest-established secondary schools in the country, including 18 national schools, five of which were established during colonial rule. Due to the fact that national schools are so prestigious, only about one in 100 primary school students will move into these national schools (Oketch & Somerset, 2010). The national schools tend to be boarding schools so there is the added cost of room and board. Under the national school quota system, there must equal numbers of students from each district in an attempt to address equal access for regional and tribal admissions.

Provincial schools will recruit and accept students within the province of the individual primary school. Under the current quota system, which has been in place since the 1980s, the provincial schools must admit 85 percent of their

students from their localities. Critics of the current quota system argue that it perpetuates tribal and ethnic segregation rather than promoting diversity (Opiyo, 2010) especially when urban areas have more financial and human resources. Then district schools, or what are known as day schools, do not consist of boarding like the national and provincial schools, thus are much cheaper to attend. The *harambee* schools (self-help schools) are day schools, which were established by President Jomo Kenyatta as an initiative that challenged local communities to build secondary schools in areas where government support was minimal (Somerset, 2007). These unaided schools tend to absorb the students who do not perform well enough on examinations to enter the public funded secondary schools (Oketch & Somerset, 2010). The secondary admissions quota system discourages parents from enrolling their children in private primary schools, which have a higher educational quality, but the top national secondary schools can only admit 25 percent from private schools (Siringi, 2011).

The biggest concerns with secondary school access revolve around prestige and costs. The admissions system and fees perpetuates the hierarchy making it difficult for many students to attend secondary school. The process of a student applying for secondary school begins when he or she registers for the Kenya Certificate of Primary Education (KCPE). At registration, each student makes seven choices of which secondary schools he or she would like to attend, which includes "two for national schools, two for provincial schools, and three for district schools. Once the results are available, three selection rounds follow in sequence: the national schools first, then the provincial schools, and finally the district schools" (Oketch & Somerset, 2010, p. 16). This only perpetuates the system of hierarchy, the national schools begin the selection, thus eliminating many opportunities from the lower schools to receive the higher test-performing students. In Oketch and Somerset's (2010) study they discovered:

At the apex of the pyramid a tiny minority of leavers – just four among the 447 in our Grade 8 sample - succeeded in winning a national-school place. The provincial schools were more accessible: they recruited 103 leavers, or 23% of our sample. Then, at the base of the public-

school pyramid, 190 leavers (43%) entered district schools. (p. 20)

The KCPE plays a large role in controlling access because if students fail the test, they will either drop-out or repeat the final year of primary school. The KCPE not only limits access, but also reinforces the hierarchy amongst the government-funded secondary schools. The Kenya Secondary Schools Heads Association has called for a revision to the current secondary school selection policy that would allow students to revise their top choices after the KCPE has been graded (Muindi, 2010).

Along with placement hierarchies, fees can negatively affect secondary school access. Although the government waived tuition fees in 2008 with the Free Secondary Education (FSE) program, this resulted in a drastic increase in boarding costs (Ohba, 2011; Oketch & Somerset, 2010). Essentially, secondary education is far from free:

In a group of more than 20 district day schools, total charges in 2007, before FSE, averaged Kshs 11,628 (\$US 185); whereas in 2008, the first FSE year, they amounted to only Kshs 4,938 (\$US 79) – a reduction of 58 percent. By contrast, the total costs of attending a national or provincial school remain substantial. (Oketch & Somerset, 2010, p. 16)

Even though district schools reduced charges, national schools increased by 10,000 Kshs and provincial schools increased by about 25,000 Kshs (Ohba 2011). In a country without an established educational loan system, these statistics assume that the poorer populations, even if they did well on their KCPE, may still have to go to district schools because they might not be able to afford the national or provincial schools. The district schools' curriculum is not college preparatory so "approximately four primary school leavers out of ten fail to progress to secondary school" (Ohba, 2011, p. 1). The fact that 40 percent of Kenyan students will fail to reach secondary education demonstrates the inaccessibility of the education system (Ohba, 2011).

The Higher Education or Tertiary System Transition to Tertiary

The education system does not provide true universal access to the primary and secondary levels to help students eventually reach higher education. If these students are unable to reach secondary school, then moving up the education ladder to university is even more inaccessible due to the limited availability of university spots and the high costs due to cost sharing. Only a small percentage of students are able to attend the most prestigious and college preparatory secondary schools so an even smaller group is eligible for university. Between 2004 and 2009, only 24 percent of the Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education (KCSE) exam takers had obtained a high enough grade, C+, to be considered for university admissions (Siringi & Ndurya, 2009). To further demonstrate the severity of competition and the difficulty of access, in 2001, administrators at Egerton University expelled 90 students after discovering these student's gained admissions with fraudulent secondary school exams and transcripts (Kigotho, 2001).

Access to Higher Education

Historically, it is important to note that after independence, Kenyan higher education was free as the government desired to train a truly Kenyan workforce to replace the departing British administrators and the government wanted to improve access (Wangenge-Ouma, 2008). The free higher education program lasted until 1974 when the government introduced a student loan "scheme" or program created to help cover non-tuition costs. This program was unsuccessful partially because the government had not developed a repayment process so the default rate was 81 percent by 1987 (Otieno, 2004).

Since independence, the government has established six additional public universities as shown in Table 1. All seven Kenyan public universities have experienced rapid growth and expansion with the governmental goals to improve equity, the economy, and the educated populace (Hughes & Mwiria, 1990; Jowi, 2009; Otieno, Kiamba, & Some, 2008). Each year the Joint Admissions Board (JAB) determines the number of student seats and the cut off grade point. In 2009, the

board increased seats from the previous 16,629 to a record 20,000 and lowered the entry grade (Buchere, 2009). Then in 2011, the JAB admitted 32,645 students and while this two year increase is drastic, tens of thousands of students who took the 2010 KCSE will not be attending university (Wanyama, 2011).

Table 1

Kenyan Public Universities and Establishment Year

University	Year Established
University of Nairobi	1970
Moi University	1984
Kenyatta University	1985
Egerton University	1987
Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture & Technology	1994
Maseno University	2000
Masinde Muliro University	2007

Source: Otieno, Kiamba, & Some (2008)

However, as stated earlier, the World Bank's marginalization of African higher education during the 1980s and 1990s (Caffentzis, 2000) gravely influenced the Kenyan government's economic resources and the infrastructure of higher education (Gray & Credle, 1996; Mamdani, 2008). Initially, after 1963, the Kenyan government financially sponsored students of top academic level. Since then, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund's restructuring of their policies on African education forced the government to recover the cost of public higher education and to encourage more private education development and implementation of student loans (Caffentzis, 2000; Johnstone, 2002; Otieno, 2004).

To address the growing demand, the government switched the Kenyan polytechnics or vocational colleges to "university colleges," which might eventually include teacher training programs. This program started in 2007 and now consists of 15 university colleges that function similar to branch campuses for the seven public universities (Commission for Higher Education, 2008). These mid level polytechnics generally admitted the students who did not have the grades or the financial

abilities for admission to the public universities or private colleges. They also provided not only vocational degrees but also professional degrees such as nursing and teaching. Given the gender breakdown of nursing and teaching fields, this shift could have a much larger negative impact on women's access to higher education programs, which would be an area to continue observing and for possible future research and assessment.

The government lauds this program as a positive response to the growing access demands for higher education (Muindi, 2009). However, the program has closed off many opportunities for more affordable vocational higher education and has threatened certificate and diploma granting programs and options. Renaming and re-chartering previous vocational and polytechnics without providing additional financial and human resources does not address quality issues or cost issues. The issue with universities taking control of teacher training programs is that the university system is a four year program compared to the three year program for teachers, thus creating concern about cost and admissions criteria that we have discussed. The added worry is that Kenya already faces a teacher shortage of approximately 61,000 (Mutambo, 2011).

Funding and Cost-sharing

To address the decreased funding of higher education and the increased demand for access, the Kenyan government implemented parallel degree programs thus creating two main student groups admitted to the public universities. The University of Nairobi was the first Kenyan institution to implement cost-sharing (Kiamba, 2004). The original admissions program remains government sponsored, which are those students admitted through the Joint Application Program (JAP) and of the highest academic grades. The new group is self-sponsored or full paying students and they are the result of the government's implementation of cost-sharing where parents and students pay tuition fees and university maintenance fees in addition to books and room and board (Kiamba, 2004; Mwiria, Ng'ethe, Ngome, Ouma-Odero, Wawire, & Wesonga, 2007). Self-sponsored students are admitted with lower grade levels and by paying full cost for their education they subsidize other higher education areas. Since the inception of cost-sharing

in the 1990s, more students are self-sponsored ("More students in Module II courses," 2010) than are in JAP. Even with these increases, academically qualified students still do not all get seats.

For the small percentage of students who persist through the primary and secondary school systems, they face challenges in the higher education admissions' process and financial barriers that create more access obstacles. The system then becomes one where it is not just the best and brightest who attend university, but often the richest or those with financial means. These patterns are detrimental for a country that wants to participate in the global market and to shift reliance from the World Bank to an internal economy.

Implications

Based on the current policies and the political environment pervasive throughout Kenyan primary and secondary education, students who have merit and high academic performance may not be successful in gaining access to higher education due to educational fees and increasing tuition costs combined with a high stakes exam culture and quota systems for admissions. The World Bank's push into cost-sharing for all levels of education has been detrimental to access. A continuation of the current trends and educational policies will create a further rift between the haves and have nots of Kenya and could damage inter-tribal cooperation and regional development.

One consideration would be to expand the number of national secondary schools and ensure they are equitably located throughout the various regions and all have the same levels of financial support from the government. Access to higher education cannot be addressed fully until there is greater quality access at the secondary level with college preparatory curriculum. While recognizing that this is perhaps an idealistic consideration, it could be possible with a commitment from the government and national strategic plan that involved creating and fostering partnerships beyond reliance upon the World Bank.

Given the government's expansion of the higher education system with the new university colleges, there will be a need for longitudinal monitoring and assessment of these new programs. It is not possible to know at this point how much the change will

affect access for women and other ethnic tribes through out the nation. This does offer research potential to examine if the positive effects outweigh what appear to be negative outcomes. The concern for educators and leaders to watch is if the elimination of mid level colleges means that large population segments lose access to higher education all together.

Limited and costly access issues have encouraged brain drain where qualified and intelligent students exit the local education system and migrate overseas, often permanently. Without significant adjustments and improvements to the education system, the country may continue to suffer from brain drain to the United States and other countries. Reports show that less than 30 percent of Kenyans return and there are over a million Kenyans living and working overseas (Siringi & Kimani, 2005). Currently, the United States is the top location for Kenyan internationals to migrate to for education and employment. Few Kenyans return after completing higher education degrees overseas for a variety of reasons that are beyond the scope of this article (see Oyelere, 2007). During the 2000s, between 5,000 to 7,000 Kenyan students were studying in the United States alone (Open Doors, 2010). The implication of this brain drain is that the Kenyan government has invested significant human resources into those students and so few of them will return to invest back into the Kenyan economy unless they are encouraged and rewarded. Without significant investment in skilled job development that comes with appropriate and increased level of salary, then there will be limited economic attraction for students to return.

United States universities, that are educating and employing Kenyan students on college campuses, need to be a part of addressing Kenya's great brain drain situation. This is a call for research and assessment on whether an U.S. undergraduate or graduate degree prepares a Kenyan student with the skills and abilities to transfer and apply the Western-based knowledge into an African context. U.S. higher education institutions need to reassess their partnerships and consider building more collaborative connections with Kenyan universities to help support their growth and economic development. Eventually, the Kenyan government will have to consider not only job growth for a highly educated, cosmopolitan population, but

recruitment mechanisms to encourage more of a brain circulation rather than a brain drain pattern.

A final implication for U.S. educators and leaders is to practice the rhetoric of internationalization of our K-12 and higher education systems. Given the educational access issues discussed throughout this article, U.S. educators need to consciously respond to the global education community. As mentioned earlier, more collaborative and financial partnerships are needed across national borders. As U.S. K-12 schools focus more on civic engagement and community service, the curriculum should include developing partnerships with other schools to create scholarships and materials donations in addition to sharing curriculum back and forth to truly develop and foster the internationalization of education that educators talk about so much. U.S. higher education also focuses on service learning and study abroad as ways to internationalize the curriculum, but outside of South Africa, no African country is in the top 25 of leading destinations for U.S. student study abroad.

Conclusion

Many students gained entrance when the government eliminated primary school fees, but the government did not provide a system in which those students would have anywhere to go in their education, especially the poorer students. The low rates of students who are able to attend national secondary schools depict how the system diminishes access to higher education with each level of education. Due to the hierarchical system that was established during colonization, Kenya continues to struggle to provide access and quality to its students, as it is apparent that as access increased, quality dramatically decreased. Kenya has yet to see a time where the Kenyan government holds the highest stake in the educational decision making process. The back and forth nature of policy in regards to the importance of which level of education the government would support has only been detrimental to student success. British and World Bank policy makers established a system of inequalities thus causing the elimination of negative policies only to be reinvented and perpetuated under different names and programs. Kenya has continuously hoped that education will spur growth

and development; however, if the students are going to be the catalyst for social, political, and economic change, Kenya will have to find a way to eliminate the hierarchical structure that keeps so many students from attending school or even progressing all the way through the tertiary level.

Author Biographies

In 2011, *Tamara Yakoboski* joined the University of Northern Colorado's Higher Education and Student Affairs Leadership (HESAL) program as an assistant professor. Her teaching and research specialties are in higher education organization and administration, qualitative research, international higher education, women in higher education, and student affairs. Much of Dr. Yakoboski's research and service interests are based on experiences living and teaching in South Korea and India and more recently working with service learning and study abroad trips to Kenya. Prior to joining UNC's HESAL program, Dr. Yakoboski served for four years as an assistant professor in Higher Education and Women's Studies at Southern Illinois University Carbondale. Dr. Yakoboski also worked for five years as a student affairs administrator at the University of Arizona. She earned her bachelor's degree in 1997 from Louisiana Tech University and is a two-degree graduate of the University of Arizona, earning a master's in 2002 and a Ph.D. in Higher Education with a minor in Sociology in 2007.

Katelyn Nolan is second year master's student in the Southern Illinois University Carbondale's Educational Administration and Higher Education's College Student Personnel (EAHE-CSP) program. Much of Katelyn's research interests revolve around residential life and the transition into the university level for first-year students. Katelyn recently began focusing more on international education through a service learning and study abroad trip to Kenya in June 2011. Prior to SIUC, Katelyn earned her bachelor's degree in 2010 from the University of Colorado at Boulder in History and Elementary Education.

Acknowledgements

Both authors would like to thank and acknowledge the students, teachers, and headmistress at Kambi Primary School. Tamara Yakaboski would like to acknowledge the higher education administrators at University of Nairobi, Moi University, Kenyatta University, Egerton University, Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture & Technology, Maseno University, and Masinde Muliro University for their time and insights into Kenyan universities.

References

- Assié-Lumumba, N. T. (2006). *Higher education in Africa: Crises, reforms, and transformation*. Dakar, Senegal: Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa (CODESRIA).
- Banya, K., & Elu, J. (2001). The World Bank and financing higher education in sub-Saharan Africa. *Higher Education*, 42, 1-34.
- Brock-Utne, B. (1995). The role of higher education in Africa. *Institute of Educational Research*, 37, 16-25.
- Buchere, D. (2009, December). Kenya: Entry points lowered to boost access. University World News. Africa Edition. Retrieved September 17, 2011 from <http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20090813170055514>
- Caffentzis, G. (2000). The World Bank and education in Africa. In S. Federici, G. Caffentzis, & O. Alidou (Eds.), *A thousand flowers: Social struggles against structural adjustment in African universities* (pp. 3-18). Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press.
- Commission for Higher Education. (2008). Status of universities in Kenya. Retrieved September 19, 2011 from <http://www.che.or.ke/status.html>
- Dropouts, repeats take toll on free primary education. (2011, May 18). *Daily Nation*. Retrieved September 18, 2011 from <http://www.nation.co.ke/News/Dropouts+and+repeats+take+a+toll+on+free+primary+education+/-/1056/1165462/-/11gi03g/-/index.html>
- Gould, W.T.S. (1974). Secondary school admissions policies in eastern Africa: some regional issues. *Comparative Education Review*, 18(3), 374-387.
- Hughes, R., & Mwiria, K. (1989). Kenyan women, higher education and the labor market. *Comparative Education*, 25(2), 179-195.
- Hughes, R., & Mwiria, K. (1990). An essay on the implications of university expansion in Kenya. *Higher Education*, 19(2), 215-237.
- Johnstone, D. B. (2002). The finance and politics of cost-sharing in higher education. In B. L. M. Mwamila, I. Omari, & E. Mbuya (Eds.), *Financing higher education in Eastern and Southern Africa: Diversifying revenue and expanding accessibility* (pp. 71-85). Dar es Salaam: University of Dar es Salaam.
- Kigotho, W. (2001, March 19). Admissions fraud at university in Kenya may have gone on for years, officials say. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved September 17, 2011 from <http://chronicle.com/article/Admissions-Fraud-at-University/107411/>
- Lewin, K.M., & Sabates, R. (2011). Changing patterns of access to education in Anglophone and francophone countries in sub-Saharan Africa: is education for all poorer?. *Consortium for Research on Educational Access, Transitions and Equity*, 52, 1-34.
- Mabokela, R.O. (2003). "Donkeys of the university": organizational culture and its impact on South African women administrators. *Higher Education*, 46, 129-145.
- Mooko, T., Tabulawa, R., Maruatona, T., & Koosimile, A. (2009). Revitalizing higher education in sub-Saharan Africa. *The United Nations University Project Report*, 5-33.
- More students in Module II courses. (2010, July 29). *Daily Nation*. Retrieved August 10, 2010, from <http://www.nation.co.ke/News/More%20students%20in%20Module%20II%20courses%20/-/1056/967138/-/f7ms4n/-/index.html>
- Muindi, B. (2009, April 23). Varsity growth gets backing. *Daily Nation*. Retrieved September 18, 2011 from <http://www.nation.co.ke/News/-/1056/590552/-/u6490f/-/index.html>
- Muindi, B. (2010, January 12). Rule on school choices criticized. *Daily Nation*. Retrieved September 18, 2011 from <http://www.nation.co.ke/News/-/1056/841042/-/vpac43/-/index.html>
- Mutambo, A. (2011, April 19). PS faults upgrade of colleges. *Daily Nation*. Retrieved September 18, 2011 from <http://www.nation.co.ke/News/PS+faults+upgrade+of+colleges+/-/1056/1147636/-/ibx2wn/-/index.html>

- Mwiria, K., Ng'ethe, N., Ngome, C., Ouma-Odero, D., Wawire, V., & Wesonga, D. (2007). *Public & Private Universities in Kenya: New Challenges, Issues, & Achievements*. Oxford, UK: James Currey.
- Ngome, C. (2003). Kenya. In D. Teferra & P. G. Altbach (Eds.), *African higher education: An international reference handbook*, (pp. 359-371). Bloomington, IN: Indiana UP.
- Nkinyangi, J.A. (1982). Access to primary education in Kenya: the contradictions of public policy. *Comparative Education Review*, 26(2), 199-217.
- Nungu, M. (2010). Universalizing access to primary education in Kenya: Myths and realities. *Canadian Journal for New Scholars in Education*, 3(2), 1-10.
- Ohba, A. (2011) The abolition of secondary school fees in Kenya: Responses by the poor. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 31(4), 402-408.
- Oketch, M., & Somerset, A. (2010). Free primary education and after in Kenya: enrolment impact, quality effects, and the transition to secondary school. *Consortium for Research on Education Access, Transitions, and Equity*, 37, 1-13.
- Open Doors. (2010). *Open Doors 2010: Report on International Educational Exchange*. New York: Institute of International Education.
- Opiyo, D. (2010, October 19). Raila wants quota system abolished. *Daily Nation*. Retrieved September 18, 2011 from <http://www.nation.co.ke/News/Raila+wants+quota+system+abolished/-/1056/1035748/-/11v5yud/-/index.html>
- Otienoh, R.O. (2010). The issue of large classes in Kenya: the need for professional support for primary school teachers in school context. *International Studies in Educational Administration*, 38(2), 57-72.
- Otieno, W. (2004). Student loans in Kenya: Past experiences, current hurdles, and opportunities for the future. *Journal of Higher Education in Africa*, 2(2), 75-99.
- Otieno, J. J., Kiamba, C., & Some, D. K. (2008). Kenya. In D. Teferra & J. Knight (Eds.), *Higher education in Africa: The international dimension*, (pp. 238-261). Boston, MA: Center for International Higher Education.
- Oyelere, R. U. (2007). Brain drain, waste or gain? What we know about the Kenyan case. *Journal of Global Initiatives*, 2(2), 113-129.
- Samoff, J., & Carrol, B. (2004). Conditions, coalitions, and influence: the world bank and higher education in africa. *Proceedings of the Annual conference of comparative and international education society*, 1-35.
- Sifuna, D.N. (2007). The challenge of increasing access and improving quality: an analysis of universal primary education interventions in Kenya and Tanzania since the 1970s. *International Review of Education*, 53, 687-699.
- Siringi, S. (2011, January 15). Pupils exodus feared from private to public schools. *Daily Nation*. Retrieved September 18, 2011 from <http://www.nation.co.ke/News/Pupils+exodus+feared+from+private+to+public+schools+/-/1056/1090300/-/121itwnz/-/index.html>
- Siringi, S. & Kimani, M. (2005, December 8). Kenya: Leading in brain drain. *The Nation*. Retrieved September 18, 2011 from <http://www.afrika.no/Detailed/11015.html>
- Siringi, S., & Ndurya, M. (2009, June 29). Kenya exam council on the spot. *Daily Nation*. Retrieved September 18, 2011 from <http://www.nation.co.ke/News/-/1056/617004/-/ukeer7/-/index.html>
- Somerset, A. (2007). A preliminary note on Kenya primary school enrolment trends over four decades. *Consortium for Research on Educational Access, Transitions and Equity*, 9, 1-15.
- Teferra, D. & Altbach, P. G. (2003). Trends and perspectives in African higher education. In D. Teferra & P. G. Altbach (Eds.), *African higher education: An international reference handbook*, (pp. 3-14). Bloomington: Indiana UP.
- Teferra, D., & Altbach, P. (2004). African higher education: challenges for the 21st century. *Higher Education*, 47, 21-50.
- Thousands to miss places in varsities. (2010, March 2). *Daily Nation*. Retrieved August 10, 2010, from <http://www.nation.co.ke/News/-/1056/872072/-/vr5n6u/-/index.html>
- UNICEF. (2011). Kenya: Statistics. Retrieved September 18, 2011 from http://www.unicef.org/infobycountry/kenya_st

statistics.html

UNICEF. (2005, November 17). Kenya: Regional disparities threaten progress towards education for all. Retrieved September 19, 2011 from http://www.unicef.org/infobycountry/kenya_newsline.html

Vos, R., Bedi, A., Kimalu, P.K., Manda, D.K., & Nafula, N.N. (2004). Achieving universal primary education: can Kenya afford it?. *Economics Working Papers*. Paper 200447. http://digitalcommons.uconn.edu/econ_wpapers/200447

Wanyama, H. (2011, August 30). Kenya: Board admits 32,600 to public universities. *The Star*. Retrieved September 17, 2011 from <http://www.the-star.co.ke/national/national/38179-jab-university-admission>