

INTERNATIONALIZATION POLICIES FOR IMPROVEMENT ON GLOBAL RANKING OF UNIVERSITY EDUCATION IN DELTA STATE

Samuel Akpoyovwaire MUKORO

Department of Educational Administration and Foundations, School of General Education, College of Education,
Warri, Delta State, Nigeria
mukorosam2020@gmail.com

Oghenero Ricardo OGUMA

Department of Educational Management, Faculty of Education, Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Nigeria
dr.ricjp@gmail.com

ABSTRACT: This study investigated internationalization policies for improvement on global ranking of university education in Delta State. Six research questions and six hypotheses guided the study. Descriptive survey design was employed for the study. Population of the study was 160 management staff of the universities, while the sample size for the study was 143 management staff. The instrument for data collection was questionnaire. Data analysis was done using mean and standard deviation to answer research questions, while z-test was used to test the hypotheses at .05 level of significance. Findings of the study shows that governance policies for improvement of global ranking of university education entails expressed commitment by senior leaders, active involvement of faculty and staff, articulated rationale and goals for internationalization and recognition of an international dimension in mission statement and other policy documents. The result equally indicated that there is a significant difference between the mean scores of federal and state universities management staff on the governance policies for improvement on global ranking of university education in Delta state. It further shows a significant difference between the mean scores of federal and state universities management staff on the operations policies for improvement on global ranking of university education in Delta state. The study recommended that universities should put in place modalities to ensure there are governance policies that can foster considerable exchange of knowledge, ideas, staff and students at the international level that can improve global ranking.

Keywords: Internationalization, Policies, Improvement, Global Ranking, University Education.

Reference to this paper should be made as follows:

Mukoro, S. A., & Oguma, O. R. (2025). Internationalization policies for improvement on global ranking of university education in Delta State. *International Journal of Strategic Leadership, Education and Social Sciences*, 1(3), 601-616. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18176495>.

Copyright © 2025 IJSLESS

INTRODUCTION

Internationalizing university education implies a strategic process embarked upon by a country to bring about integrating an international, interracial and global initiative in reforming of the structure and operations in the service delivery of the post-secondary education in order to achieve excellent output for improvement of ranking (Mukoro & Enaohwo, 2022). Therefore, internationalization is a process of integrating and international and cultural dimension into the teaching, research and service function of the university. Internationalization is changing the

world of university education. University education policies are no longer restricted issues within a university or a particular country. This suggests that international concerns must be given consideration in its mandate of teaching, research and community service. According to International Association of Universities (IAU) (2017), internationalization is an intellectual revolution that stands out clearly as a strategic vision which aims at promoting functionality, dynamism, pro-activeness and sustainability of the world's 21st century institutions and minimum standard of university education.

The idea of internationalization has to do with pragmatic articulation of talents globally in support of collaborative research output, qualitative teaching, qualitative faculty, qualitative publications, Alumni employment, influence/relevance and citations and so on. Internationalization is the effort of national governments to standardize the curriculum with international minimum content so as to package their university education in a way it will be marketable globally thereby attracting cross-border students and scholars (Cross-border student and scholar mobility) (Uche & Awunanya, 2018). In other words, this has to do with exportation of university education as a commercial product to the world.

Jibeen et al. (2019) stated in clearer terms that industrialized countries have long been benefiting from the strategy of internationalization in the following ways; revenue generation and brain gain, improved academic quality, having the services of internationally oriented students and scholars, franchising of instructional programmes and modules to foreign providers and guarantors. For instance, Vavrus and Pekol in Mukoro (2022) opined that integrating international dimension into university education is intended to help students to be more competitive in the global economy, faculty to develop a broader perspective on their disciplines, and the universities themselves to have an international presence, and financially self-sufficient. For example, in Canada, enrolment of international students contributed \$6.5billion to her economy and that internationalization helps to seek financial incentives because of the reduction in the source of funding university education from the government (Yesufu, 2018).

Internationalization makes it possible for universities to improve in the quality of their academic and research programmes and internationalizes their curriculum, thereby increasing their patronage and improving their world class university status in the academic and industrial environment, nationally and internationally (Ho, 2017). Consequently, this scenario has created a platform where foreign students and researchers move across their national borders to acquire higher education and they pay their charges in hard currencies thereby empowering the developed countries gain the main financial benefits. It is without doubt that the process of internationalization possesses inbuilt capacity to transform universities and other institutions of higher learning to move beyond the minimum standard of quality, both at the institutional and national levels, thereby improving their ranking within the global higher education index (Momoh, 2018).

The Nigerian government has been in support of internationalization of university education as its various ministries, departments and agencies (MDAs) have sent personnel abroad for trainings, conferences and workshops. An agency such as petroleum technology fund has been in the fore front of internationalization of university education with their various programmes. The development plan of Nigeria, aimed at developing Nigeria and bringing her to the league of the world's 20 leading economies has the main goal of improving the well-being of Nigerians by reducing hunger, poverty, poor health care, low quality human capital, gender imbalance, low productivity and poor basic facilities. The Federal Ministry of education, Nigeria

seeks to increase access to higher education with internationalization among its policies as follows:

- Creation of innovative enterprise institutions and vocational institutions in partnership with the private sector to reflect industry, practice and technological innovation, enrolling a huge number of students yearly.
- Increasing and aggressively marketing distance learning programmes in universities to provide access to over ten million students who demand higher education.
- Expanding the Open University by introducing courses relevant to the market needs to create access to over one million students.
- Inviting foreign universities with a proven track record of excellence, high quality education and good employability track record to establish campuses in Nigerian universities to provide access for about 1.5 million students annually.

Besides, the last goal of university education as stipulated in the national policy on education emphasis promotion of national and international understanding and interaction. This is an indication that university education is not only saddled with the responsibility of training people to satisfy local needs but also for cross boarder demand.

Therefore, internationalization may enhance universities reputation and status as it is an essential parameters in world ranking of higher institution of learning with components as academic reputation, faculties citation, employee reputation and international student ratio. The total weight given to internationalization dimension in the world higher institution of learning ranking methodology is 10%, that is, proportion of international faculty is 5% and proportion of international student is also 5% weight (Khalid, et al., 2017). Unfortunately, in the 2019 world higher institution of learning ranking, none of the Nigerian universities is among the first three hundred highly-rated universities. Yet there are 190 universities (43 federal universities, 48 state universities and 99 private universities) in the country as at 2022. One may think the upsurge in number of Universities in the country would be to the advantage but it seems the reverse is the case (Jaiyeobe et al, 2019). This appears to mean a disconnection between Nigerian Universities and rest of the world (Atanda, 2019).

The level of functional internationalization policy is a major criterion used by university education ranking groups in global ranking of university. This situation calls for urgent attention for universities to put in place internationalization policies that may enhance the curricular operation in the Nigeria universities to be relevance to the need of the global market, policies that encourage cross fertilization of ideas, partnership programmes, cross-cultural and inter-cultural training for staff and students among others that may improve global ranking of university education.

Admittedly, internationalization policies of universities may be the mechanism that makes internationalization more frequently achievable in university education for improvement of global ranking. Policies on internationalization of university education consist general strategic plans on internationalization, policy statement and documents presented to the board or senate and the institutions self-presentation on their websites. Internationalization policies of university education include governance, operations and support services. Governance policies may be express commitment by senior management staffs for the recognition of an international dimension in its mission statement of contributing to the improvement of the global community. Operation policies may include strategies the university has put in place, an appropriate

organizational structure, the centre for research and international programme to oversees the university international programmes. Support services may be the university staffs/students counselling centre, and e-learning centre, students' accommodation, sporting facilities among others.

The researcher's experience, observation and interaction with management and staff in universities in Delta State have shown that there are some collaboration effort and partnership. Consequently, it is important to ascertain if such collaborations and partnerships have the requisite internationalization policies. As shown by Tagoe in Mukoro and Onyeike (2022) internationalization policies at the institutional level that are part of the universities strategic plan are germane to the effective implementation of internationalization and universities participation in international joint ventures and partnerships. Implementation of internationalization of universities via policies may impact universities national outlook, improve and maintain a competitive edge for universities through the development of a highly skilled and knowledgeable workforce that can function in an international work environment, promote national culture and improve quality of university education as well as improvement in global ranking. It is, therefore, necessary to conduct a study as this in order to obtain empirical evidence to ascertain the internationalization policies for improvement on global ranking of university education in Delta state.

Aim and Objectives of the Study

The aim of this study was to ascertain the internationalization policies for improvement on global ranking of university education in delta state. Specifically, the study intended to:

- Examine the governance policies for Improvement on global ranking of university education in Delta State.
- Determine the operations policies for improvement on global ranking of university education in Delta State.
- Ascertain the support services policies for improvement on global ranking of university education in Delta State.

Research Questions

The following research questions were stated to guide the study:

- What are the governance policies for improvement on global ranking of university education in Delta State?
- What are the operations policies for improvement on global ranking of university education in Delta State?
- What are the support services policies for improvement on global ranking of university education in Delta State?

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were formulated to guide the study at 0.05 significance level:

- There is no significant difference between the mean scores of Federal and state university management staffs on the governance policies for improvement on global ranking of university education in Delta State.
- There is no significant difference between the mean scores of Federal and state university management staffs on the operations policies for improvement on global ranking of university education in Delta State.
- There is no significant difference between the mean scores of Federal and state university management staffs on the support services policies for improvement on global ranking of university education in Delta State.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Concept of Internationalization of University Education

Internationalization deals with the issues like learning and teaching, education, evaluation, professional development, the measurement and the quality of graduates. It is also concerned with the values and intercultural understanding and can be considered within the usual educational programmes in the higher education, or in the training courses for the researchers or academic members of the universities (Ardakani et al., 2017). It could be argued that university internationalization is no longer the exclusive province of elite universities it can become the concern of all academics dedicated to building intercultural bonds and understanding. Academics can construct collaborative relationships to share knowledge across nations and cultures (Chetro-Szivos, 2019).

The International Association of Universities in Jimoh (2019) identified the top three motivations for internationalization of university education to include (1) mobility and exchanges for student and faculty development (2) improvement of academic standards and quality assurance and (3) international research collaboration. Okada and Okada (2017) declared that internationalization implies the move to form a functional system in which as many students as possible are free to cross their countries borders and study abroad, while at the same time the traditional structure of a “nation-state” is being preserved. Internationalization holds particularly the meaning of an attempt to achieve a consensus at an international level and to regulate the university entrance system, the development of multilingual curricula and educational programmes, the quality assurance of education and research, as well as the evaluation of academic degree and their recognition (Knight in Okada & Okada, 2017). Internationalization of university education, therefore, is the process of providing international experiences to staff and students in order to help them perform well within a global contest with increased opportunities for partnership and collaborative learning, attracting foreign researchers and students, develop ways to improve local capacity and develop research co-operation programmes between universities for improve curriculum content and development. de Wit et al., (2019) highlighted and explained some of the main institutional and national trends in internationalization in tertiary education (university education inclusive) in the past decades. They are:

- A greater focus on internationalization abroad than on internationalization at home, with internationalization at home defined by Beelen and Jones in de Wit et al., (2019) as the purposeful integration of international and intercultural dimensions into the formal and informal curriculum for all students within domestic learning environments.

- Approaches that are more ad hoc, fragmented and marginal than strategic, comprehensive and central in policies, with comprehensive internationalization described by Hudzik in de Wit et al., (2019) a commitment, confirmed through action, to infuse international, global and comparative perspectives throughout the teaching, research and service missions of higher education. It shapes institutional ethos and values and touches the entire higher education enterprise.
- A greater interest in a small, elite subset of students and faculty than focused on global and intercultural outcomes for all.
- Being directed by a constantly shifting range of political, economic, social/cultural and educational rationales, with increasing focus on economic motivations.
- An increasing tendency to be driven by national, regional, and global rankings
- Little alignment between the international dimensions of the three core functions of tertiary education: education, research and service to society.
- Being primarily a strategic choice and focus of institutions of tertiary education and less a priority of national governments.
- Being less important in emerging and development economics and more of a particular strategic concern among developed economics.

Concept of University Ranking

Academic ranking of World Universities is human effort to measure quality, organizational effectiveness and performance of tertiary institutions in quantitative terms. It is also aimed at ensuring quality assurance measurements, standards, competitiveness and comparing certain categories of tertiary institutions and ranking them according to a common set of metrics in descending order (Usher & Salvino, 2018). It began in the early years of the twenty first century. The first of the global rankings was compiled in 2003 by ARWU -Academic Ranking of World Universities, also referred to as the Shanghai ranking. Since then, many more ranking bodies; national, regional and international, had emerged. Some of these are the QS World University Rankings, the Times Higher Education (THE) World University Rankings, the Web metrics, and the G-Factor. Others included the Global University Ranking, the US News World's Best Universities Ranking, the High Impact Universities Research Performance Index (RPI), Leiden Rankings, Professional Ranking of World Universities, the SC imago Institutions Ranking (SIR), and The Wuhan University Ranking. Of the aforementioned, three considered fairly sound are:

- The Academic Ranking of World Universities (ARWU),
- The QS World University Ranking, and
- The Times Higher Education (THE) World University Rankings.

The indicators and weighting for each criteria used by each of the ranking systems are summarized in Table 1.

Essential Elements in World University Rankings

The Times Higher Education (THE) World University Ranking, also referred to as top Universities ranking, is often the most preferred because of the number of indices evaluated to determine its scores. It judges universities across the core missions of research, teaching,

knowledge transfer and international outlook (THE 2019 methodology). It employs thirteen (13) performance indicators grouped into five categories as follows:

Teaching and Learning Environment (30% of the overall ranking score); there were five performance indicators under this category:

- Reputation in teaching = 15%
- Ratio of students per academic = 4.5%
- Ratio of doctorate-to-bachelor's degree = 2.25%
- The number of doctoral awards per academic = 6%
- Income per academic = 2.25%

Research: Volume, Income and Reputation (worth 30%). This category consisted of three indicators

- University's research reputation among its peers = 18%
- University research grants/income = 6%
- University Research outputs in academic journals indexed by Thomson Reuters per academic = 6%

Table 1: Indicators and weighting for each criteria used by each of the ranking systems

S/N.	ARWU criteria/indicators weighting	THE criteria/indicators weighting	QS Criteria/indicators weighting
1	Nobel prizes/Field Medal 30%	Research-Industry Income 2.5%	Academic Reputation score 40%
2	Cited Researchers 20%	Citations 30%	Employers Reputation score 10%
3	Papers in Science & Nature 20%	Research Income/Output 30%	Faculty-Student Ratio 20%
4	Citation 20%	Teaching/Learning Environment 30%	Citations per Faculty score 20%
5	Academic Performance/Staff 10%	International Aspects 7.5%	International Faculty score 5% International Student score, 5%

Citations: Research Influence (worth 30%) This is the single most influential of the 13 indicators used by the and it is weighted 30% of the overall score

Industry Income: Innovation (worth 2.5%) This is a one indicator category and it referred to the ability of a University to help industry with consultancy, innovations and inventions, per academic staff.

International Outlook: Staff, Students and Research (worth 7.5%)

This category comprised three indicators:

- Student diversity on campus - the ratio of international to domestic students (2.5% of the overall score)
- Faculty Diversity – the ratio of international to domestic staff = 2.5%

- The proportion of a University's total research journal publications that have at least one international-co-author = 2.5%

The above scoring system used in World University Ranking is different from the one used for World Reputation Rankings by the same ranking body – THE. According to the Times Higher Education (2020), World Reputation Ranking was created using the world's largest invitation which involved a survey of academic opinion of 16,639 responses from 144 countries. The respondents that were pooled, on the average, had been working in the academic institutions for at least seventeen (17) years. The questionnaire was administered only on experienced published scholars, who offered their views on excellence in research and teaching within their disciplines and at institutions with which they were familiar. Although the scoring systems used in the World University Rankings (WUR) is different from that used in World Reputation Rankings (WRR), the results were very similar. While only 100 top Universities were listed by reputation and World University Rankings listed and ranked the top 400 Universities, the world Reputation actually ranks only “the top 50 because, according to THE, the differential between institutions after that point becomes very narrow” (THE 2019). Because rankings by reputation is based on three principal factors for 90 percent, the three major categories of the indicators used in the World University rankings were analyzed based on the 100 World Reputation Rankings of Universities by THE.

Internationalization Policies of University Education for Improvement of Global Ranking

Essentially, the policies on internationalization of university education are grouped into five generic categories such as:

Governance Policies: According to Jimol (2019) through institutional governance policies universities focus on recognition for an international dimension in their mission statement of contributing to the improvement of the global community. He noted that institutional governance policies are geared towards putting in place an appropriate organizational structure to oversee the international programmes in universities. Atanda (2019) remarked that institutional governance policies on internationalization of university education entails strategic plan for internationalization with vision and mission statements that are clear indications that the university is not passive in the global trend in higher education. The essence of institutional governance policies on internationalization of university education is to continually expand the university contributions to the global knowledge pool, as well as act as a roadmap for the institution's efforts to progressively integrate diverse international dimensions and perspectives into its core functions of teaching, learning, research, governance and community services (Atanda, 2019). The institutional governance policies on internationalization of university education are related to the indicators for internationalization by the Centre for International Higher Education (CHE) as cited in

Operations Policies: According to Jimol (2019) operations policies covered policies integrated into institution-wide and department planning, budgeting and quality review systems, appropriate organizational structures, communication systems (formal and informal) for liaison and coordination. Jimol (2019) stressed those operational policies on internationalization of university education entails balance between centralized promotion and management of internationalisation, as well as, adequate financial support and resource allocation systems.

Support Services Policies: These policies covered support from institution-wide units, that is, student housing, counselling, fund-raising among others. It equally embraced involvement of academic support units, that is, language training, curriculum development library, student support services for international students studying on campus and domestic students going abroad, that is orientation programmes, counselling, cross-cultural training, student advisors, among others (Jimol, 2019).

METHODOLOGY

The study adopted a descriptive survey research design. This was suitable for the study because the researcher described the data that will be collected and analyzed them based on the existence of internationalization policies for improvement on global ranking of university education in Delta State.

The population of this study comprised all management staff in universities in Delta state. However, only federal and state universities and their management staff are used in this study. Therefore, the population of this study comprised all the management staff of both Federal and State universities in Delta State. The population of management staff of universities in Delta State is one hundred and Sixty (160).

The sample size for this study is 143 management staff from public universities in Delta State. To ensure adequate representation, multi-stage sampling procedure was adopted in selecting the sample for the study. In the first stage, purposive sampling technique was employed to select two (2) federal universities and three (3) state universities from the public universities in Delta State. This brought the sampled universities to five (5) out of the six (6) public universities in Delta State. In the second stage, the purposive random sampling approach was used to select the management staff in the five (5) sampled universities at the time of this study. This distribution is shown in Table 3.1. In the third stage, the researcher used 100% of management staff in each of the federal and state universities in Delta State. The use of 100% of management staff is above Roscoe (1977) recommendation of using a sample size of 10% and is above the minimum sample size of 384 for a population of over 1,000,000 suggested by Ovie (2013). The total sample size therefore was 143 respondents to whom the research instrument was administered.

The instrument for data collection was a researcher developed questionnaire. The questionnaire was titled Internationalization Policies for Improvement on Global Ranking of University Education Questionnaire (IPIGRUEQ). It had two parts, one and two. Part one was on the bio-data of the respondents, bothering on their status – whether state or federal universities management staff, gender, name of university. Part two was designed to obtained information internationalization policies for improvement on global ranking of university education in Delta State. The response categories of the instrument was based on a Likert four (4) point summated rating scale of agreement weighted as Strongly Agree (SA) (4 points), Agree (A) (3 points), Disagree (D) (2 points) and Strongly Disagree (SD) (1 point). The questionnaire contained items built in five (5) clusters on which respondents were requested to indicate their opinion.

Face and content validity of the instrument was obtained through the judgment of two experts in Educational Management and two experts in Measurement and Evaluation from Delta State University, Abraka. Based on the inputs, corrections, suggestions, criticism and remarks, the contents of the instrument were improve and the final copy produced.

The reliability of the instrument was determined through a test-retest administration of the instrument to thirty (30) management staff selected randomly from two (2) public

universities in Edo State and 2 public universities in Bayelsa state. The management staff used in the pilot study will not participate in the real study. In the pilot study, the instrument was administered and collected by the researcher and after two weeks, they were re-administered to the same groups of management staff. The result from the testing of the instrument was analyzed using Cronbach's Alpha to establish its internal consistency. The researcher's choice of Cronbach's Alpha is because the expected responses were not dichotomous (that is scored right or wrong, or 0-1) but fell along a continuum like Likert-type scale (Siegle, 2013). Over all, the instrument yielded reliability co-efficient of 0.89. This is above 0.80 which according to Bryman and Teevan (2005) is acceptable for internal consistency.

The questionnaires were administered to management staff in the five (5) sampled universities. The researchers make sure that the questionnaires are properly administered, filled and returned.

In analyzing the data collected, the researchers used mean and standard deviation to answer the research questions. The mean of each item was calculated by multiplying the frequency of the responses under which response category and the sum of the product obtained was divided by the number of respondents who responded to the items concerned. The mean for the scale was 2.50. The decision was that any item that scored a mean of 2.50 and above was regarded as agreed while any item that scored below 2.50 was regarded as disagreed. The z-test was used to test the null hypotheses within two groups, that is, federal and state university management staff. The hypotheses were tested at 0.05 level of significance. Decision point was that, if z-calculated is less than or equal to the z-critical, do not reject the null hypotheses, but if vice-versa, then reject the null hypotheses.

RESULTS

Research Question One: What are the governance policies for improvement on global ranking of university education in Delta State?

Table 2: Mean and Standard Deviation on the Governance policies for improvement on global ranking of university education

S/N	Items	Federal Universities Management Staff N= 28			State Universities Management Staff N=115		
		\bar{X}	SD	Decision	\bar{X}	SD	Decision
1.	Expressed commitment by senior leaders.	3.20	0.55	Agree	3.37	0.48	Agree
2.	Active involvement of faculty and staff.	3.72	0.44	Agree	3.81	0.38	Agree
3.	Articulated rationale and goals for internationalization.	3.57	0.57	Agree	3.65	0.50	Agree
4.	Recognition of an international dimension in mission statement and Other policy documents	3.72	0.59	Agree	3.73	0.64	Agree
Grand mean		3.55	0.53		3.64	0.59	Agree

Source: Field work (2025)

The data in Table 2 showed the mean scores and standard deviation of federal and state universities management staff on the governance policies for improvement on global ranking of university education in Delta state. Given a 2.50 mid-point in the 4-point rating scale, data analysis indicated that all the items (item 1-4) had mean ratings above the mid-point, indicating

that they are for governance policies for improvement on global ranking of university education. In summary, all the respondents agreed that expressed commitment by senior leaders, active involvement of faculty and staff, articulated rationale and goals for internalization and recognition of an international dimension in mission statement and other policy documents.

Research Question Two: What are the operations policies for improvement on global ranking of university education in Delta State?

Table 3: Mean and Standard Deviation on the operations policies for improvement on global ranking of university education

S/N	Items	Federal Universities Management Staff N= 28			State Universities Management Staff N=115		
		Mean	SD	Decision	Mean	SD	Decision
1.	Integrated into institution-wide and department planning, budgeting and quality review systems.	3.26	0.51	Agree	3.34	0.47	Agree
2.	Appropriate organizational structures.	3.45	0.55	Agree	3.37	0.52	Agree
3.	Communication systems (formal and informal) for liason and coordinator.	1.52	0.50	Disagree	1.44	0.49	Disagree
4.	Balance between centralized and decentralized promotion and management of internationalization.	3.08	0.28	Agree	3.13	0.34	Agree
5.	Adequate financial support and resource allocation systems.	1.83	0.37	Disagree	1.86	0.34	Disagree
Grand Mean		2.62	0.44		2.63	0.43	Agree

Source: Field work (2025)

The data in Table 3 showed the mean scores and standard deviation of federal and state universities management staff on the operation policies for improvement on global ranking of university education in Delta state. Given a 2.50 mid-point in the 4-point rating scale, data analysis indicated that items 1, 2, and 4 had mean ratings above the mid-point, indicating that they are for operations policies for improvement on global ranking of university education in Delta state. However, the respondents disagreed that items 3 and 5 were not operation policies for improvement on global ranking of university education in Delta state.

Research Question Three: What are the support services policies for improvement on global ranking of university education in Delta State?

Table 4: Mean and Standard Deviation on the Support Services policies for improvement on global ranking of university education

S/N	Items	Federal Universities Management Staff N= 28			State Universities Management Staff N=115		
		Mean	SD	Decision	Mean	SD	Decision
1.	Support from institution-wide units, i.e. student housing, counselling, fund-raising, etc.	3.36	0.96	Agree	3.19	1.26	Agree
2.	Involvement of academic support unit i.e.	1.33	0.47	Disagree	1.43	0.53	Disagree

	language training, curriculum development library.							
3.	Students support services for international students studying on campus and domestic students going abroad.	1.31	0.46	Disagree	1.34	0.47	Disagree	
4.	Orientation programmes for students and counselling	3.08	0.27	Agree	2.90	0.59	Agree	
5.	Cross-cultural training programme for students.	1.38	0.48	Disagree	1.46	0.50	Disagree	
6.	Students advisors	1.33	0.47	Disagree	1.43	0.53	Disagree	
Grand Mean		2.05	0.52		2.04	0.65	Disagree	

Source: Field work (2025)

Table 4 showed that items 1 and 4 had mean ratings above the mid-point mean of 2.50. This indicates that the respondents agreed that those items are support services policies for improvement on global ranking of university education in Delta state. However, the respondents disagreed that items 2, 3, 5, and 6 were not support services policies for improvement on global ranking of university education.

Hypothesis One: There is no significant difference between the mean scores of Federal and state university management staffs on the governance policies for improvement on global ranking of university education in Delta State.

Table 5: z-test analysis of difference between mean scores of federal and state universities management staff on the governance policies for improvement on global ranking of university education

Variables	No.	\bar{x}	SD	DF	z-cal.	z-crit.	Level of Sig.	Decision
Federal Universities Management Staff	28	14.22	2.15	141	-15.122	1.96	0.05	Rejected
State Universities Management Staff	115	14.56	2					

Source: Field work (2025)

Data in Table 5 showed the analysis of z-test difference between the mean scores of federal and state universities management staff on the governance policies for improvement on global ranking of university education in Delta state. The results of the z-test revealed that the calculated z-value of -15.122 is greater than the critical value of 1.96 of a degree of freedom 141 of .05 significant level. The null hypothesis is therefore rejected. Thus, there is a significant difference between the mean scores of federal and state universities management staff on the governance policies for improvement on global ranking of university education in Delta state.

Hypothesis Two: There is no significant difference between the mean scores of Federal and state university management staffs on the operations policies for improvement on global ranking of university education in Delta State.

Table 6: z-test analysis of difference between mean scores of federal and state universities management staff on the operations policies for improvement on global ranking of university education

Variables	No.	\bar{x}	SD	DF	z-cal.	z-crit.	Level of Sig.	Decision
Federal Universities Management Staff	28	13.14	2.21	141	-30.787	1.96	0.05	Rejected
State Universities Management Staff	115	13.14	2.16					

Source: Field work (2025)

Data in Table 6 showed the analysis of z-test difference between the mean scores of federal and state universities management staff on the operations policies for improvement on global ranking of university education. The results of the z-test revealed that the calculated z-value of -30.787 is greater than the critical value of 1.96 of a degree of freedom of 141 of 0.05 significant level. The null hypothesis is therefore rejected. Thus, there is a significant difference between the mean scores of federal and state universities management staff on the operations policies for improvement on global ranking of university education in Delta state.

Hypothesis Three: There is no significant difference between the mean scores of Federal and state university management staffs on the support services policies for improvement on global ranking of university education in Delta State.

Table 7: z-test analysis of difference between mean scores of federal and state universities management staff on the support services policies for improvement on global ranking of university education

Variables	No.	\bar{x}	SD	DF	z-cal.	z-crit.	Level of Sig.	Decision
Federal Universities Management Staff	28	11.79	3.11	141	5.706	1.96	0.05	Rejected
State Universities Management Staff	115	11.75	3.88					

Source: Field work (2025)

Data in Table 7 showed the analysis of z-test difference between the mean scores of federal and state universities management staff on the support services policies for improvement on global ranking of university education. The results of the z-test revealed that the calculated z-value of 5.706 is greater than the critical value of 1.96 of a degree of freedom 141 of 0.05 significant level. The null hypothesis is therefore rejected. Thus, there is a significant difference between the mean scores of federal and state universities management staff on support services policies for improvement on global ranking of university education in Delta state.

DISCUSSION

The finding of the study based on research question one showed that the respondents agreed that expressed commitment by senior leaders, active involvement of faculty and staff, articulated rationale and goals for internalization and recognition of an international dimension in mission statement and other policy documents. This finding is in line with that of Cinches et al., (2017)

that higher education varied in their range of internationalization policies, but intentions to internationalization were commonly academic and economic. The test of hypothesis one revealed that there is a significant difference between the mean scores of federal and state universities management staff on the governance policies for improvement on global ranking of university education in Delta state.

The findings of the study based on research question two showed that items 1, 2, and 4 had mean ratings above the mid-point, indicating that they are for operations policies for improvement on global ranking of university education in Delta state. However, the respondents disagreed that items 3 and 5 were not operation policies for improvement on global ranking of university education in Delta state. This finding agreed with that of Jimol (2019) who noted that operation policies covered budgeting and quality review and appropriate organizational structures. The test of hypothesis two revealed that there is a significant difference between the mean scores of federal and state universities management staff on the operation policies for improvement on global ranking of university education in Delta state.

The finding of the study based on research question three showed that items 1 and 4 had mean ratings above the mid-point mean of 2.50. This indicates that the respondents agreed that those items are support services policies for improvement on global ranking of university education in Delta state. This finding is supported by Zolfaghari et al (2019) that support service policies for internationalization range from students support services for international students, studying on campus and domestic students going abroad in form of orientation programmes, counselling and cross cultural training. The test of hypothesis three revealed that there is a significant difference between the mean scores of federal and state universities management staff on the support services policies for improvement on global ranking of university education in Delta state.

CONCLUSION

The following conclusions were drawn on the basis of data analyzed for the study. The study concluded that there is a significant difference between the mean scores of federal and state universities management staff on the governance policies for improvement on global ranking of university education in Delta state. Also, the analysis of data showed that there is a significant difference between the mean scores of federal and state universities management staff on the support services policies for improvement on global ranking of university education in Delta state.

Recommendations

The following recommendations were made in view of the foregoing findings and conclusion:

- Universities should put in place modalities to ensure there are governance policies that can foster considerable exchange of knowledge, ideas, staff and students at the international level that can improve global ranking.
- Universities management should develop strategic plans that will permit strong alliances, partnership and collaborations between Nigeria universities and those in foreign countries through appropriate operations policies.

- Universities should formulate support service and human resource development policies that adequately capture international student studying abroad, support for international assignment and sabbaticals among others

REFERENCES

- Ardakani, F. B., Yarmohammadian, M. H., Abari, A. A. F., & Fathi, K. (2017). Internationalization of higher education systems. *Procedure social and Behavioural Sciences, 15*, 1690-1695.
- Atanda, A. I. (2019). Institutional policies and practices on internationalization of higher education: A case study of university of Ibadan, Ibadan. In C. Uche & S. Ahunanya (Eds.), *Internationalization of higher education in Nigeria*. (pp. 180 – 201). Totan Publishers.
- Chetro-Szivos, J. (2019). Cross-border tertiary education: The challenges and opportunities for intercultural understanding. *Journal of Intercultural Management*.
- Cinches, F. C., Russell, R.L.V, Borbon, M.L.F.C., & Chavez, J.C. (2017). Internationalization of higher education institutions: The case of Four HEIs in the Philippines. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/317369846>.
- De-Wit, H., Rumbley, L.E., Craciun, D., Mihut, G., & Woldegiyorgis, A. (2019). *International mapping of national tertiary education internationalization strategies and plans (NTEISPs)*. Centre for International Higher Education.
- Ho, H.W.L. (2017). International student's perceptions of services and supports provided: A case study of a mid-sized university in the U S A. *International Journal of Technology and Educational Marketing, 7*(1), 1-4
- International Association of Universities (IAU). (2017). Affirming academic values in internationalization of higher education: A call for action. <http://globalhighered.wordpress.com/2012/04/19/affirming-academic-values-in-internationalization>.
- Jimol, B. O. (2019). Prospects of internationalization of higher education in Nigeria: Focus on policies and practices in Delta State University, Abraka, Nigeria. In C. Uche & S. Ahunanya (Eds.), *Internationalization of higher education in Nigeria*. (pp. 202-232). Totan Publishers.
- Khalid, J., Ali, A.J., Islam, M.S., Khaleel, M., & Shu, Q. (2017). Internationalization as investment for higher education institutions: Introducing a framework to enhance investment in internationalization practices. *Review on 2nd Science, 2*(2), 1-11. <http://socialsciencejournal.org>
- Knight, J. (2019). Internalization plans for higher education institutions. *Journal of Studies on International Education*.
- Momoh, O. A. (2018). Internationalization of higher education and youth employment for global workplace in Lagos state. An unpublished thesis submitted to the faculty of education, university of Lagos.
- Mukoro, S. A. (2022). Global Reading and Internalization of university education: Qualitative Analysis. Seminar paper, University of Port-Harcourt, River state.
- Mukoro, S. A., & Enaohwo, J. O. (2022). Institutional practices for the internationalization practices for the internalization of university education in South-South Geo-political

- zone, Nigeria. *International Journal of Institutional Leadership, Policy and Management*, 4(3), 430-445.
- Mukoro, S. A., & Onyeike, V. C. (2022). Collaboration programmes for internationalization of university education in South-South Geo-political zone, Nigeria. *International Journal of Economics, Environmental Development and Society*, 3(4), 491-506
- Okada, N., & Okada, A. (2017). The new development of internationalization in Japanese higher education. *Asia Pacific Journal of Educational Development*.
- Uche C. M., & Ahunanya, S. (Eds.) (2018). *Internationalization of higher education in Nigeria*. Totan publishers.
- Usher, A., & Savino, M. (2018). A global survey of university ranking and league tables. *Higher Education in Europe*, 32(1), 5-15.
- Yesufu, L. O. (2018). Motives and measures of higher education internationalization: A case study of a Canadian university. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 7(2), 155-168. <http://ijhe.sciedupress.com>
- ZolFaghari, A., Sabran, M. S., & ZolFaghari, A. (2019). Internationalization of higher education: Challenges, strategies, policies and programmes. *US-China Education Review*, 6(4), 1-9.