

Original Article

Institutional Integrity and Quality Assurance in Teaching and Learning Practices at Public Universities in Nigeria

Olugbenga T. Ajadi^{1*} 

Abstract: Academic integrity is essential for effective teaching, learning, and assessment in higher education. This study examined academic misconduct, its perceived contributing factors, and its association with institutional integrity in three public universities in Southwest Nigeria. A total of 450 academic staff, non-academic staff, and students participated in the study. Data were collected using a structured questionnaire and analyzed using descriptive statistics and Pearson's correlation. The findings showed that examination malpractice, plagiarism, and academic dishonesty were the most prevalent forms of misconduct, while accountability challenges (84.7%; $M = 4.24$) and governance transparency concerns (80.0%; $M = 4.12$) were the most prominent perceived factors. Academic misconduct was moderately and negatively associated with institutional integrity ($r = -0.482$, $p < 0.01$), accounting for 23.2% of the observed variance. The findings emphasize the need to strengthen academic integrity through teaching, learning, and assessment practices that promote ethical academic engagement, transparent evaluation, and responsible learning. Such practices can contribute to a more supportive learning environment and improved educational quality. The findings should be interpreted with caution because the data were self-reported.

Keywords :

Academic misconduct; Higher education; Governance transparency; Institutional integrity; Quality assurance.



Author Affiliation:

¹Faculty of Education, University of the Free State, South Africa

***Corresponding author(s):**

Olugbenga T. Ajadi, Department of Curriculum Studies and Higher Education, University of the Free State, Bloemfontein 9300, Free State, South Africa

 ajagbesope@yahoo.co.uk

Article History:

Received 5 April 2026; Revised 2 May 2026; Accepted 10 June 2026

Available online 30 June 2026

INTRODUCTION

Universities worldwide are acknowledged as hubs for the generation of knowledge, the acquisition of skills, and the cultivation of values essential for the transformation of nations. Public universities in Nigeria, especially those in the Southwest, are essential for producing graduates who support political, social, and economic advancement. However, like many countries worldwide, Nigeria faces growing concerns about institutional integrity and the prevalence of academic misconduct that may affect the effectiveness of

university teaching, learning, and governance processes in providing accessible, equitable, and high-quality higher education that advances knowledge through teaching, research, and community service, develops skilled manpower, fosters innovation and ethical values, and contributes to national and socio economic development. Institutional integrity refers to the extent to which universities uphold ethical principles, transparency, accountability, and fairness in their governance and academic processes. Challenges in maintaining these values may affect perceptions of the credibility of academic outcomes and institutional reputation. Academic integrity has become a fundamental pillar for ensuring the credibility, quality, and sustainability of higher education institutions, particularly in maintaining ethical standards in teaching, learning, and research activities (Bretag *et al.*, 2018; Khan *et al.*, 2022; Ogunode *et al.* 2020). The authors address various dimensions of institutional integrity, particularly ethical conduct, transparency in governance, accountability mechanisms, fairness in administrative and academic practices, and their implications for Nigerian universities. However, limited empirical research has examined the relationship between institutional integrity and specific academic misconducts in Southwest Nigerian public universities.

In addition, public universities in Southwest Nigeria face a variety of academic misconduct, including concerns related to graduate quality, malpractice in examinations, research culture challenges, curriculum implementation issues, and suspension of lectures, examinations, research activities, and academic calendars, resulting in delayed graduation and extended study periods for students occasioned by industrial strikes (Orok *et al.*, 2023; Mulyaningsih, *et al.*, 2022). The sustainability of the university system and its ability to deliver quality education are adversely affected by these issues, especially when combined with institutional integrity challenges. According to Orok *et al.* (2023), Ofem *et al.* (2025), and Bandekaji (2024) academic misconduct in Nigerian universities has been associated with factors such as challenges in assessment integrity, enforcement of ethical standards, and emerging digital cheating practices challenges in assessment integrity, enforcement issues related to ethical standards, and emerging digital cheating practices, while institutional integrity is framed around quality assurance, ethical governance, and academic accountability. In a similar vein, Sulphey *et al.* (2018), stress that academic misconduct may become more difficult to address when institutional integrity mechanisms are insufficient when institutional integrity mechanisms are insufficient. Therefore, it is important to critically examine how academic misconduct and institutional integrity interact, especially in Southwest Nigeria. Institutional integrity and effective quality assurance systems are closely associated with improved university governance, accountability, and educational effectiveness, thereby strengthening institutional performance in higher education (Asiyai, 2020; Mireku & Bervell, 2023).

Although university governance and reform have received attention in Nigeria, most existing literature treats academic misconduct and institutional integrity as separate concerns. Studies by Sadiq (2024), Yunusa and Usman (2023), and Chan (2023) generally treat academic misconduct as a behavioural or technological issue and institutional integrity as a governance or compliance concern, rather than examining both as mutually reinforcing phenomena. While Sadiq (2024) emphasizes cultivating academic integrity

cultures, [Yunusa and Usman \(2023\)](#) focus on punitive and corrective mechanisms, and [Chan \(2023\)](#) explores emerging forms of misconduct driven by technology. Collectively, these perspectives reveal a conceptual fragmentation in which institutional structures and student misconduct are analysed independently. This creates a critical gap in understanding how institutional integrity systems may shape, enable, or constrain academic misconduct, particularly within Nigerian universities. Addressing this gap is essential for developing integrated frameworks that link governance practices with behavioural outcomes in higher education. Academic misconduct remains a global concern because it undermines fairness in assessment, weakens learning outcomes, and threatens institutional credibility in higher education ([Bretag et al., 2018](#); [Orok et al., 2023](#)).

Research by [Mireku and Bervell \(2023\)](#) found that accreditation, monitoring, and continuous evaluation are vital for improving teaching, research, institutional integrity, and higher education goal attainment in Sub-Saharan Africa. Identified quality assurance as a key mechanism for promoting quality inputs, processes, outputs, accountability, equity, and integrity in tertiary institutions. Both studies concluded that effective quality assurance enhances institutional integrity and goal achievement, although its effectiveness is often constrained by capacity-related challenges, funding limitations, and implementation difficulties. Despite the presence of internal quality assurance mechanisms in the 23 public universities in Southwest Nigeria (11 federal and 12 state universities) (National Universities Commission, 2025), their contribution to the development of graduate employability competencies remains inadequately understood. This is particularly important as the effectiveness of quality assurance systems is often constrained by disjointed processes, limited feedback mechanisms, and capacity challenges, which impede continuous improvement, accountability, and the achievement of institutional goals. The rapid adoption of artificial intelligence has transformed academic practices while simultaneously creating new ethical challenges related to plagiarism, authorship, and assessment integrity ([Chan, 2023](#)).

As a result, academic misconducts represent important institutional and academic challenges that limit universities' ability to fulfill their missions of developing skilled graduates, expanding knowledge, promoting national growth, and retaining the integrity of the university. Addressing these concerns demands a strong foundation of institutional integrity. Universities that strengthen openness, accountability, and fairness may be better positioned to address academic misconduct and support graduate quality. Quality assurance mechanisms are essential for improving educational standards, institutional accountability, and sustainable development in Nigerian universities ([Ofem et al., 2024](#); [Ogunode et al., 2021](#)). Students who actively participate in academic and institutional activities tend to demonstrate stronger academic achievement, persistence, and commitment to ethical learning practices ([Torres Castro, 2024](#)). Developing a culture of academic integrity requires institutional commitment, transparent governance, ethical leadership, and continuous awareness among students and faculty members ([Fishman, 2014](#); [Sadiq, 2024](#)). Fair and transparent assessment practices are critical components of institutional quality assurance because they reinforce students' trust in educational systems

and promote academic honesty (Harrad *et al.*, 2024; Ofem *et al.*, 2024). Consequently, this study examined the types and perceived contributing factors to academic misconduct and determined the relationship between institutional integrity and academic misconduct among the sampled public universities in Southwest Nigeria. Transparent governance contributes significantly to institutional effectiveness by strengthening accountability, ethical decision-making, and stakeholder confidence in higher education institutions (Mireku & Bervell, 2023; Ntshoe & Faller, 2025).

THEORETICAL SUPPORT

Academic Misconducts in the University

Academic misconducts within the university system are multifaceted challenges that encompass structural, cultural, and ethical dimensions, influencing research, teaching, learning, and assessment practices while affecting both individual students and institutional effectiveness. Examination malpractice, plagiarism, challenges related to academic standards, ineffective teaching practices, lectures boycotts by students, and violations of research integrity are some common ways that these problems manifest. Academic integrity has become a fundamental pillar for ensuring the credibility, quality, and sustainability of higher education institutions, particularly in maintaining ethical standards in teaching, learning, and research activities (Bretag *et al.*, 2018; Khan *et al.*, 2022). According to Ibijola (2014), academic misconducts are essentially not limited to the classroom; they also reflect structural issues such as resource constraints for academic purposes or policy implementation challenges related to examination conduct in institutional frameworks, governance, and resource distribution. Recent empirical evidence from Southwest Nigeria has highlighted the persistence of academic misconduct in higher education institutions. For instance, Erhun *et al.* (2023) investigated cheating among undergraduate pharmacy students in Southwest Nigeria and found that various forms of academic dishonesty remained prevalent among students, with several individual and institutional factors predicting engagement in academic integrity concerns. Similarly, Oyewole and Adetimirin (2025) examined attitudes toward plagiarism among Library and Information Science undergraduates in Southwestern Nigeria and reported that a substantial proportion of students exhibited positive attitudes toward plagiarism, indicating continued challenges to academic integrity within the region's universities. These structural issues often intersect with institutional integrity concerns, including matters related to accountability and transparency.

Academic misconduct refers to behaviours that are inconsistent with the ethical principles and standards governing teaching, learning, assessment, and research within educational institutions. According to Harrad *et al.* (2024), academic misconduct encompasses actions through which students seek illegitimate academic advantage, including plagiarism, examination malpractice, falsification of information, and other forms of academic behaviour that raises integrity concerns that undermine fairness and credibility in higher education. This perspective emphasizes that academic misconduct represents a departure from the fundamental values that sustain academic integrity. Similarly, Mejía and Garcés-Flórez (2025) defined academic misconduct as actions that

are inconsistent with academic integrity principles that support honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility, and accountability in scholarly activities. The authors argued that academic integrity extends beyond compliance with institutional regulations and involves the protection of ethical standards in knowledge creation, teaching, learning, and research. From this viewpoint, academic misconduct weakens the moral foundation upon which higher education institutions operate. These conceptualizations suggest that academic misconduct and institutional integrity are closely interconnected. While academic misconduct reflects violations of ethical and academic standards by individuals, institutional integrity refers to the extent to which universities uphold accountability, transparency, ethical leadership, and policy enforcement. Consequently, institutions characterized by strong institutional integrity are more likely to discourage academic misconduct, whereas governance and ethical oversight challenges may create conditions that contribute to academic misconduct.

As a result, academic misconduct can be categorized into two dimensions: student-related challenges, and institutional/systemic issues. Issues pertaining to students include dishonesty, academic preparation challenges, and performance challenges. Dishonesty is measured through behaviours such as plagiarism, examination malpractice, falsification of records, and other forms of cheating. Academic preparation challenges are reflected in study skills that require development, content mastery challenges, and insufficient readiness for academic tasks. Performance challenges are indicated by low grades, completion rates that require improvement, reduced research quality, and frequent examination failures. While dishonesty directly reflects academic misconduct, academic preparation and performance challenges often signify institutional integrity challenges, including support systems that require strengthening and quality assurance mechanisms that require improvement. Conversely, governance structures that require strengthening, practices that raise integrity concerns, quality assurance mechanisms that require improvement, and policy implementation challenges are examples of institutional problems. The ability of institutions to provide reliable, quality, and trustworthy education is inversely related to academic misconduct and directly related to positive academic outcomes, highlighting the central role of institutional integrity in shaping educational effectiveness.

Institutional Integrity

While institutional integrity may be conceptualized differently across cultural and national contexts, it is commonly characterized by key dimensions such as honesty, transparency, accountability, and fairness in university governance and academic operations. [Ntshoe and Faller \(2025\)](#), and [Shokunbi *et al.* \(2026\)](#) collectively conceptualized institutional integrity as the adherence to accountability, responsible governance, regulatory compliance, honesty, openness, fairness, academic freedom, and ethical institutional practices that sustain public trust and enhance university effectiveness. While broadly applicable across higher education systems, these dimensions are particularly relevant to the governance realities of African and Nigerian universities.

Strong institutional integrity, reflected in transparent admissions procedures, equitable evaluation, and responsible research practices, may be associated with lower reported levels of academic misconduct. On the other hand, lower levels of institutional integrity are associated with higher reported levels of academic misconduct, such as: examination malpractice, plagiarism, decline in quality assurance, weak research supervision and bias in grading students. Academic integrity violations may adversely affect perceptions of institutional integrity by influencing trust, educational quality, and ethical behaviour among university stakeholders, compromising educational quality, and encouraging unethical behaviour among university stakeholders (Yunusa & Usman, 2023).

Institutional integrity in higher education refers to the extent to which a university consistently upholds ethical principles, accountability, honesty, fairness, transparency, and compliance with established rules in its academic and administrative operations. Drawing on the perspectives of [Tinto \(1993\)](#), institutional integrity is embedded within a supportive institutional culture that promotes student involvement, academic and social integration, ethical conduct, and adherence to institutional values. These theories suggest that students' behaviours and educational outcomes are shaped not only by individual characteristics but also by the quality and integrity of the institutional environment in which they learn. Recent reviews by [Samoila and Vrabie \(2023\)](#) and [Torres Castro \(2024\)](#) reaffirm the continued relevance of these perspectives, emphasizing that supportive institutional environments and active student engagement are essential for student development, retention, and institutional effectiveness.

Lower levels of institutional integrity may be associated with conditions in which academic misconduct can emerge and persist. Violations of integrity in key university functions such as admissions, assessment, employment, promotion, procurement, and research management weaken ethical standards and undermine institutional credibility. Previous studies in Nigeria have reported concerns regarding admission and examination practices that may affect perceptions of public confidence in universities, while weak quality assurance systems adversely affect the quality of graduates produced by these institutions ([Ibijola, 2014](#)); Academic integrity has become a fundamental pillar for ensuring the credibility, quality, and sustainability of higher education institutions, particularly in maintaining ethical standards in teaching, learning, and research activities ([Bretag et al., 2018](#); [Khan et al., 2022](#)). Consequently, institutional integrity extends beyond a set of values to encompass a practical capacity demonstrated through credible governance, ethical leadership, accountability mechanisms, regulatory compliance, and the consistent implementation of fair and transparent academic and administrative processes. As such, it serves as a foundation for confidence among students, staff, employers, regulators, and the wider public ([Khan et al., 2022](#)). Admission policies should balance equity and merit to improve access while maintaining academic standards and institutional effectiveness ([Mulyaningsih et al., 2022](#); [Mohamad et al., 2019](#)). Effective research governance promotes responsible research practices, strengthens institutional integrity, and enhances the societal impact of university research outputs ([Ogunode et al., 2020](#)).

Respondents from the sampled public universities in Southwest Nigeria reported notable concerns related to governance and institutional integrity. These concerns may

affect the effectiveness of quality assurance processes and academic practices. According to [Ogunode et al. \(2021\)](#), insufficient funding, poor policy implementation, infrastructure deficiencies, and governance and implementation challenges may affect the effectiveness of quality assurance processes, which are intended to protect institutional quality. Frequent disruptions to academic schedules, deteriorating staff morale, deteriorating facilities, and decreased research outputs are all indicators of institutional integrity challenges, which lowers student learning and academic achievement ([Ukozor et al., 2023](#)). Students in public institutions of higher learning, including universities throughout Southwest Nigeria, continue to face significant academic misconducts, with performance levels falling below expected standards, despite the implementation of policy frameworks aimed at improving academic performance, according to empirical evidence.

Studies on Academic Issues and Institutional Integrity

Extending the concerns raised by [Olaniyan \(2025\)](#), it has been observed that quota-based admission policies in Nigeria continue to generate debates about the balance between equity and merit. While such policies are intended to promote inclusive access and regional representation, concerns persist that they may create challenges for merit-based selection and influence perceptions of academic standards within the university system. Some scholars have further emphasized that admission practices that seek to balance equity, regional representation, and academic merit may present challenges for maintaining consistent perceptions of academic standards may be associated with differences in students' academic preparedness and may reinforce existing inequalities in access to quality higher education. Thus, inclusion policies, when implemented without sufficient attention to transparency and academic standards, may inadvertently create challenges for maintaining educational quality. Numerous studies conducted in Nigeria have indicated that academic misconduct in public universities may be influenced by factors such as financial constraints, institutional governance challenges, and practices that may raise academic integrity concerns. These institutional conditions may also affect the effectiveness of quality assurance procedures and create difficulties in ensuring that graduates develop the competencies required to contribute to national development. Quality assurance in Sub-Saharan African higher education and found that although access to higher education has expanded significantly, persistent quality challenges remain due to weaknesses in the implementation of quality assurance mechanisms, capacity constraints, and institutional inefficiencies. Collectively, these studies suggest that challenges related to accountability, transparency, merit-based practices, and quality assurance may have implications for institutional integrity, underscoring the need to examine its relationship with academic misconduct in public universities in Southwest Nigeria.

Studies in several countries also support the connection between academic misconducts and institutional integrity. While [Mohamad et al. \(2019\)](#) discovered that merit-based admission improved student results in Indonesian public institutions, [Sulphrey et al. \(2018\)](#) demonstrated a substantial correlation between admission scores and graduation quality in Saudi universities. Similarly, within Nigeria context, [Ogunode et al.](#)

(2020) found that merit-based admission significantly improved educational quality in Cross River State ($\beta = 0.025$, $t = 2.437$, $p = .032$), with admission variables jointly accounting for 68% of the variance in educational quality ($R^2 = .68$), supporting the idea that open and accountable admissions practices improve institutional integrity. Together, these results support the claim that institutional integrity and academic concerns appear to be closely related. Reducing malpractices, enhancing academic achievement, and promoting graduate employability are associated with strong, open, and accountable governance frameworks. However, no study has specifically examined this relationship across multiple stakeholder groups (students, academic staff, and non-academic staff) in Southwest Nigerian public universities.

Problem

In Nigeria, especially in the Southwest universities, the effectiveness and perceived credibility of these universities may be influenced by the strength of their institutional integrity. Scholars, policymakers, and accreditation bodies have raised concerns regarding institutional integrity, uneven enforcement of academic standards, and challenges in administrative and governance procedures. These challenges may affect stakeholder perceptions of institutional effectiveness and credibility. by shortcomings in governance and the management of academic processes. Challenges in institutional integrity may make it more difficult for universities to consistently fulfill their missions of producing qualified graduates and advancing knowledge.

Public universities in Southwest Nigeria continue to face persistent academic misconducts, such as examination malpractice, plagiarism and academic dishonesty, decline in quality assurance, bias in grading, uneven enforcement of policies, a weak research integrity culture, and governance-related challenges (Orok *et al.*, 2023; Ofem *et al.*, 2024). Conflicts between staff and students, recurrent industrial actions, and inadequate curriculum implementation often reflect weaknesses in institutional integrity, particularly in governance, accountability, communication, and resource management, thereby disrupting academic schedules and compromising educational standards (Mireku & Bervell, 2023; Ofem *et al.*, 2024). These converging challenges highlight the importance of strengthening academic quality and institutional integrity in the region by the convergence of academic misconducts and institutional integrity challenges. If these concerns are not adequately addressed, these challenges may create difficulties for public universities in maintaining academic standards, responding to evolving international expectations, and supporting graduate development, and produce graduates equipped to contribute effectively to national development. Therefore, this study empirically examines the relationship between institutional integrity and this academic misconduct to identify pathways for intervention

METHOD

The research design used in this study was a descriptive survey, which is appropriate for examining attitudes, experiences, and difficulties regarding academic problems and

institutional integrity at higher education institutions. In order to identify trends, connections, and the relationships between governance practices and academic outcomes, the design made it possible to systematically gather quantitative data from a sizable population (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). All academic staff, non-academic staff, and students from the 23 public universities in Southwest Nigeria made up the study's population. This demographic was selected because issues of institutional integrity, such as accountability, openness, adherence to academic standards, and ethical practices in university governance, directly affect and include these groups.

The total sample for this study comprised 450 participants selected through multistage procedure. The sample size was arrived at using Research Advisor. In order to guarantee equitable participation across federal and state universities, two federal universities (Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife and the University of Lagos) and one state university (Ladoke Akintola University of Technology, Ogbomoso) were firstly purposefully selected from the six states in Southwest Nigeria. The selected institutions were purposively chosen to provide representation of federal and state public universities within the Southwest region. Secondly, stratified sampling was utilized to classify respondents by role (students, administrators, and academic staff). Thirdly, the disproportional stratified sampling was utilized to select 50 academic staff, 50 administrators and 50 students each from the selected institutions, which is considered adequate for survey-based educational research (Krejcie & Morgan, 1970).

The research tool was a structured questionnaire with two sections in addition to the section on respondents' demographic data: one on perceived contributing factors to academic misconduct and types of academic misconduct with 10 items while the other on academic misconduct (plagiarism, academic performance, examination malpractice, and the quality of research output) and institutional integrity (transparency, accountability, adherence to regulations, and ethical practices) also has 10 items. The items were created using adapted instrument from research on the integrity of higher education (Ogunode *et al.*, 2021). To ensure ease of analysis and comparability across respondents, responses were measured using a five-point Likert scale that ranged from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (5). Three experts in higher education management and educational administration evaluated the tool to determine its clarity, relevance, and content validity.

The Institutional Integrity and Academic Misconduct Questionnaire (IIAMQ) was validated through face and content validation by three experts, comprising two Professors of Educational Management with specializations in Higher Education Administration and Quality Assurance and one Senior Lecturer in Measurement and Evaluation. They evaluated the instrument for clarity, relevance, language, content coverage, and alignment with the study objectives, leading to the revision and refinement of some items. The final version was adjudged suitable for the study. To establish reliability, a pilot study was conducted with 50 respondents drawn from a public university outside the study sample, and the data obtained were analysed using Cronbach's alpha. The instrument yielded reliability coefficients of 0.84 for perception, 0.81 for types of academic misconduct, and

0.88 for institutional integrity, indicating satisfactory internal consistency as all values exceeded the recommended threshold of 0.70 (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994).

The researcher sought permission from the administration of each university to administer questionnaires. The researcher distributed and collected the questionnaires in four weeks with the help of qualified research assistants. Of the 450 questionnaires distributed, 450 were duly filled, returned and found useful. Confidentiality and anonymity were guaranteed to respondents in order to promote truthful answers. Mean and percentage of the descriptive statistic was used to answer the two research questions. While, the Pearson Moment Correlation Co-efficient of the inferential statistics was used to test the hypothesis formulated

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The results relating to the research questions were analysed using descriptive statistics and are presented in the tables below. Table 1 presents the respondents' perceptions of the factors contributing to academic misconduct among the sampled public universities in Southwest Nigeria, while Table 2 shows the various types of academic misconduct prevalent in public universities in the region. The presentation and interpretation of the results provide insight into the underlying causes and manifestations of academic misconduct within the universities studied.

Table 1. Respondents' Perceptions of Academic Misconduct and Related Institutional Challenges in the Sampled Public Universities in Southwest Nigeria (N = 450)

Reported Academic Integrity Concerns and Related Institutional Challenges	% Agree	Mean ($\bar{x}$)	SD	Interpretation
Examination malpractice	86.0%	4.31	0.74	Very significant
Plagiarism and academic dishonesty	78.7%	4.05	0.82	Significant Issue
Decline in quality assurance mechanism	74.0%	3.89	0.88	Significant Issue
Weak research supervision	69.3%	3.71	0.93	Moderate to Significant
Unfair grading practices	64.7%	3.58	0.97	Moderate issue
Uneven enforcement of policies	61.3%	3.46	1.01	Moderate Issue
Deficient research integrity culture	59.3%	3.42	1.04	Moderate Issue
Governance-related challenges	56.0%	3.36	1.08	Moderate Issue

The findings in Table 1 indicate that examination malpractice (86.0%, $\bar{x}$ = 4.31, SD = 0.74) and plagiarism and academic dishonesty (78.7%, $\bar{x}$ = 4.05, SD = 0.82) were the most frequently reported forms of academic misconduct. Declining quality assurance mechanisms (74.0%, $\bar{x}$ = 3.89, SD = 0.88) was reported as an important related institutional challenge. These findings align with global concerns regarding academic integrity and the challenges posed by technological and institutional developments (Avello & Aranguren Zurita, 2025; Bretag, 2016; Coates, Croucher, & Calderon, 2025; Eaton, 2021). The results corroborate earlier Nigerian studies that identified weak monitoring systems and inconsistent policy implementation as key contributors to declining academic quality (Odukoya *et al.*, 2018). Additionally, weak research supervision (69.3%, $\bar{x}$ = 3.71, SD =

0.93) was identified as a notable issue, reflecting challenges associated with high student-to-supervisor ratios and inadequate faculty mentoring resources.

In contrast, moderately rated issues such as unfair grading practices (64.7%, $\bar{x}$ = 3.58, SD = 0.97), uneven policy enforcement (61.3%, $\bar{x}$ = 3.46, SD = 1.01), deficient research integrity culture (59.3%, $\bar{x}$ = 3.42, SD = 1.04), and governance-related challenges (56.0%, $\bar{x}$ = 3.36, SD = 1.04) suggest that governance-related weaknesses, while less immediately apparent to students and staff than examination cheating, remain relevant institutional concerns associated with academic integrity. These findings align with broader literature emphasizing the critical role of institutional governance, accountability, transparency, and ethical leadership in reducing academic misconduct and sustaining educational quality (Avello & Aranguren Zurita, 2025; Bretag, 2016; Coates, Croucher, & Calderon, 2025; Eaton, 2021; Ibijola, 2017; Macfarlane, Zhang, & Pun, 2014; UNESCO, 2021). The significant negative correlation between institutional integrity and academic misconduct (r = -0.482, p < 0.01) further reinforces the argument that the observed negative correlation is consistent with the possibility that stronger institutional governance and integrity systems are associated with lower reported levels of academic misconduct.

The prevalence of examination malpractice and plagiarism reported in this study is consistent with global patterns. According to McCabe, *et al* (2012), plagiarism and examination malpractice are worldwide problems that impact both developed and developing countries. However, Bretag *et al.* (2018) discovered that academic dishonesty frequently takes the form of contract cheating in developed systems like Australia, while in Nigeria, it is more evident in examinations and plagiarism as suggested by the weak enforcement reported by respondents. In conclusion, the conversation indicates that although student-related misconduct is the most obvious and pressing academic misconduct, governance and enforcement challenges were identified as important perceived contributing factors. Therefore, tackling the issue calls for a two-pronged strategy: enhancing institutional monitoring and integrity frameworks and fostering an ethical culture among employees and students.

Table 2. Perceived contributing factors to academic misconduct among the sampled public universities in Southwest Nigeria (N = 450)

Factors associated with academic misconduct	% Agree	Mean ($\bar{x}$)	SD
Accountability deficits	84.7%	4.24	0.76
Transparency deficits in governance	80.0%	4.12	0.81
Inadequate policy execution	75.3%	3.98	0.87
Inadequate funding	72.0%	3.91	0.90
Leadership integrity concerns	69.3%	3.76	0.95
Integrity concerns and favouritism within institutional practices	65.3%	3.64	0.99
Non-reporting of examination malpractice	61.3%	3.52	1.03
High student enrollment relative to staff capacity	58.0%	3.41	1.08

The results presented in Table 2 answer Research Question 2. The Table shows that 84.7% of respondents agreed that accountability deficits ($\bar{x}$ = 4.24; SD = 0.76), 80.0% of respondents agreed that transparency deficits in governance ($\bar{x}$ = 4.12; SD = 0.81), and 75%

of the respondents agreed that inadequate policy implementation ($\bar{x}=3.98$; $SD=0.87$), and 69.3% of respondents agreed that leadership integrity concerns ($\bar{x} = 3.76$; $SD=0.95$) are the major factors contributing to academic misconduct among the sampled public universities in Southwest Nigeria. The high levels of agreement and mean ratings across these four variables indicate that weaknesses in institutional governance and integrity mechanisms constitute key drivers of academic misconduct within the universities studied.

This section presents multi-level factors (institutional, structural, and cultural) contributing to academic misconduct. Systemic issues that foster academic misconduct and institutional performance standards are reflected in institutional and structural factors, 72% of respondents agreed that insufficient financing and resources ($\bar{x}=3.91$; $SD=0.90$) and 58% of respondents agreed that high student enrollment relative to staff capacity ($\bar{x} = 3.41$; $SD=1.08$) contribute to academic misconduct. Furthermore, 65.3% of respondents agreed that academic misconduct is reinforced by cultural characteristics including institutional corruption and favoritism ($\bar{x} = 3.64$; $SD=0.99$), and 61.3% of respondents agreed that non-reporting of examination malpractice ($\bar{x}=3.52$; $SD=1.03$), underscores the significance of larger socio-cultural norms. These findings suggest interventions must address not only be institutional policies but also cultural attitudes.

The results show that governance-related issues were identified as the most prevalent contributing factors to academic misconduct in universities in Southwest Nigeria, with accountability deficits and transparency deficits in governance identified as the most frequently reported governance-related factors contributing to academic misconduct.

These findings show both contextual differences and similarities with evidence from other countries. In North American universities, dishonesty is more prevalent in institutions with governance weaknesses and uneven application of academic integrity regulations, according to McCabe et al (2012). In a similar vein, Bretag *et al.* (2018) found that insufficient oversight facilitates contract cheating in Australian universities. The present findings also support this pattern, as accountability deficits, lack of transparency, poor policy implementation, and leadership integrity concerns emerged as important contributors to academic misconduct. However, a key contextual difference is the role of sociocultural factors. In this study, non-reporting of examination malpractice was identified as a contributing factor to academic misconduct ($\bar{x} = 3.52$; $SD=1.03$), suggesting that unethical practices may be reinforced by broader social norms and attitudes. This finding should be interpreted within the specific institutional and contextual conditions represented in the present sample than in studies from North America and Australia, where governance and policy enforcement issues are emphasized more strongly than contextual attitudes toward reporting and addressing academic malpractice. The effects of systemic underfunding and contextual attitudes toward reporting and addressing academic malpractice are more pronounced in institutions characterized by governance structural weaknesses. That integrity challenges within the leadership and management of higher education institutions reflects broader societal challenges that often permeate academic institutions. Thus, while governance flaws are a common factor across countries, the combined effects of underfunding and socio-contextual attitudes toward academic malpractice and its reporting may represent contextual features that warrant further

investigation in Nigerian higher education and may intensify the prevalence of academic misconduct. These contextual differences suggest that interventions must address not only institutional governance but also broader societal norms and resource constraints.

Institutional issues like high student enrollments and staffing shortages have also been observed in other African countries. In Ethiopia, [Tadesse and Getachew \(2010\)](#) noted that universities with inadequate funding and congestion are more likely to experience academic misconduct. This implies that although problems with academic integrity are common throughout the world, sociocultural factors and resource limitations may also exacerbate them in Nigeria. Beyond the Nigerian context, similar patterns emerge regionally. These regional patterns reinforce the present study's conclusion that addressing academic problems requires both resource allocation and cultural change.

In conclusion, multiple factors contribute to academic misconduct among the sampled public universities in Southwest Nigeria, prominent among the contributing factors is poor governance, followed by institutional shortcomings and sociocultural norms, followed by weak quality assurance mechanisms, and sociocontextual attitudes toward academic malpractice and its reporting as reinforcing factors. The findings suggest that addressing the identified contributors to academic misconduct requires targeted institutional reforms. Specifically, stronger accountability and transparency mechanisms would help mitigate accountability deficits and transparency deficits in governance; consistent policy enforcement would address weak policy implementation and leadership integrity concerns; improved funding and staffing would reduce the pressures associated with inadequate funding and high enrolment to staff ratios; while the development of an integrity based culture would help counter contextual attitudes toward reporting and addressing academic malpractice, integrity violations, and favouritism. Collectively, these measures could strengthen institutional integrity and reduce the prevalence of academic misconduct among the sampled public universities in Southwest Nigeria. The principal statistical finding is that governance deficiencies constitute the most significant Perceived contributing factors to academic misconduct among the sampled public universities in Southwest Nigeria, with accountability deficits ($\bar{x} = 4.24$, $SD = 0.76$), transparency deficits in governance ($\bar{x} = 4.12$, $SD = 0.81$), and inadequate policy execution ($\bar{x} = 3.98$, $SD = 0.87$) recording the highest mean scores and levels of agreement among respondents. One limitation of this study is its reliance on self-reported data, which may be affected by social desirability bias. Due to the sensitive nature of academic misconduct and institutional integrity issues, some respondents may have under-reported unethical behaviours or provided socially acceptable responses, thereby influencing the accuracy of the findings.

Particular attention should also be given to strengthening the quality of teaching and learning through effective curriculum implementation, transparent assessment practices, and improved academic supervision. Universities should support lecturers through continuous professional development, adequate teaching resources, and opportunities to enhance pedagogical competencies. Regular monitoring of students' learning experiences and outcomes should be integrated into institutional quality assurance processes to identify areas requiring improvement. These efforts can foster an ethical academic environment

that promotes quality education, strengthens academic integrity, and supports positive learning outcomes.

Hypothesis Testing

To test the research hypothesis, Pearson's product-moment correlation analysis was performed to assess the relationship between institutional integrity and academic misconduct among respondents. The analysis examined whether higher levels of institutional integrity were associated with lower levels of academic misconduct. Table 3 summarizes the descriptive statistics and the correlation results used to evaluate the proposed hypothesis.

Table 3. Pearson Correlation Test between Institutional Integrity and Academic Misconduct (N = 450)

Variables	Mean	SD	R	p-value	Decision
Institutional Integrity (X)	3.92	0.64			
Academic Misconduct (Y)	3.78	0.71	-0.482	0.000***	Reject Ho

Note: *p < 0.01 (2-tailed)

Table 3 presents the results of the hypothesis tested. It shows that, based on a sample of 450 respondents (df = 448), the correlation coefficient between institutional integrity and academic misconduct is $r = -0.482$. The 95% confidence interval for the correlation coefficient ranges from -0.550 to -0.408, providing further evidence of a stable negative relationship between the variables. The correlation yields an r^2 value of 0.232, indicating that Institutional integrity was statistically associated with 23.2% of the observed variance in academic misconduct, while about 76.8% remains explained by other factors. The negative correlation suggests that the prevalence of academic misconduct, such as plagiarism and academic dishonesty, examination malpractice, and declining quality assurance, decreases as institutional integrity, reflected in accountability, transparency, ethical leadership, and effective policy enforcement, increases. The magnitude of $r = -0.482$ indicates a moderate inverse relationship between the two variables. Furthermore, the relationship is statistically significant ($p = 0.001 < 0.05$); therefore, the null hypothesis (H_0), which states that there is no relationship between institutional integrity and academic issues is rejected and the alternative hypothesis (H_1) is accepted. This finding indicates a statistically significant relationship between institutional integrity and academic misconduct among the sampled respondents to academic misconduct among the sampled public universities in Southwest Nigeria.

Globally, the finding that institutional integrity is negatively associated with academic misconduct is consistent with those of McCabe *et al.* (2012), who reported that academic dishonesty is less prevalent in universities with strong integrity systems and more common in institutions characterized by weak governance mechanisms. Similarly, Bretag *et al.* (2018) found that quality assurance procedures and integrity frameworks serve as effective deterrents to contract cheating in Australian universities. The findings of the present study confirm and partially align with these global patterns, as a significant negative relationship was found between institutional integrity and academic misconduct

among the sampled public universities in Southwest Nigeria ($r = -0.482$, $p < 0.01$), indicating that stronger institutional integrity is associated with lower levels of academic misconduct. However, the moderate coefficient of determination ($r^2 = 0.232$) suggests that institutional integrity explains only part of the variation in academic misconduct, implying that additional contextual factors such as resource constraints, inconsistent policy enforcement, governance deficiencies, and limited quality assurance capacity may also influence academic behaviour in Nigerian universities. Thus, while the deterrent role of institutional integrity observed in Australia and other contexts is supported, its effectiveness in Southwest Nigerian public universities appears to be moderated by local institutional realities.

The moderate and statistically significant negative association observed in Nigeria ($r = -0.482$) suggests that higher institutional integrity is associated with lower levels of academic misconduct among the sampled population. This finding highlights institutional integrity as an important correlate, while recognizing that academic misconduct may also be shaped by broader institutional and contextual factors, including resource constraints, accountability mechanisms, transparency, enrolment pressures, and attitudes toward reporting malpractice. Although these factors were not examined as separate variables, they provide relevant contextual considerations for interpreting the findings. Accordingly, addressing academic misconduct may benefit from a coordinated approach that strengthens governance and accountability, supports adequate institutional resources, and promotes a sustained culture of ethical academic practice. Further research is needed to examine these contextual factors and their potential interactions with institutional integrity and academic misconduct. The study revealed a moderate but statistically significant negative relationship between institutional integrity and academic misconduct ($r = -0.482$), indicating that higher levels of institutional integrity are associated with lower levels of academic misconduct among the sampled public universities in Southwest Nigeria. This finding underscores the importance of institutional integrity as an important institutional factor associated with academic behaviour within the university system. However, institutional integrity does not operate in isolation. Its influence is shaped by other contextual factors such as resource constraints, weak accountability mechanisms, limited transparency, and contextual attitudes toward academic malpractice and its reporting. Similarly, governance practices may interact with broader systemic challenges, including inadequate funding, increasing student enrolment, and societal acceptance of unethical practices, to influence the prevalence of academic misconduct.

The findings suggest that efforts to reduce academic misconduct should extend beyond policy declarations to include strengthening accountability systems, promoting transparency in admissions, teaching, examinations, and assessment processes, and investing in digital monitoring and quality assurance tools capable of identifying and deterring unethical practices. Particular attention should be given to strengthening the quality of teaching and learning by ensuring consistent curriculum implementation, fair and transparent assessment, effective academic supervision, lecturer accountability, and meaningful student engagement. In addition, resource investment, cultural reorientation, and governance reforms are important for sustaining institutional integrity and fostering

ethical academic environments in which lecturers and students are encouraged to uphold academic standards. Given the significant negative association observed, strengthening institutional integrity may represent an important institutional approach to addressing academic misconduct while simultaneously supporting improvements in educational quality and teaching practices. Future research should employ longitudinal and, where feasible, mixed-methods designs to examine whether changes in institutional integrity are followed by measurable changes in academic misconduct over time and to provide deeper insight into the contextual and institutional processes underlying this relationship.

The Universities ought to specify transparent and publicly documented procedures for admissions, research supervision, and grading. To ensure adherence to administrative and academic rules, independent integrity units could be set up to complement the quality assurance unit. Leadership development programmes should be institutionalized." for academic administrators to ensure that university governance is rooted in ethics, fairness, and accountability. Based on the findings of this study, a multi-level approach involving regulatory agencies, governments, and university authorities is required to strengthen institutional integrity and reduce academic misconduct among the sampled public universities in Southwest Nigeria. First, university governing councils and management should strengthen governance and accountability mechanisms by ensuring the consistent and procedurally fair application of sanctions for plagiarism, examination malpractice, and other forms of academic misconduct in accordance with established institutional regulations. Given the regulatory and institutional autonomy arrangements within the Nigerian higher education system, Given the regulatory and institutional autonomy arrangements within the Nigerian higher education system, the role of the NUC may appropriately focus on policy guidance, monitoring compliance, and promoting good practices across universities.

Furthermore, university management should empower internal quality assurance units by providing clearly defined mandates, adequate staffing, and sufficient operational resources to regularly monitor and improve the quality of education and teaching. Their responsibilities should include reviewing curriculum implementation, teaching quality, instructional strategies, student engagement, academic supervision, learning resources, examination administration, assessment practices, and the achievement of intended learning outcomes. Regular quality assurance activities should also incorporate feedback from students and lecturers to identify areas for improvement and ensure that teaching practices remain responsive to students' learning needs. Strengthening these units can enhance institutional oversight, promote continuous improvement in teaching and learning, support lecturers in maintaining professional and ethical standards, and ensure that educational practices are implemented consistently with established academic standards and institutional integrity principles.

The study also recommends greater transparency in admissions, examinations, grading processes, and staff promotion procedures through the adoption of digital record-management and monitoring systems. Ethical leadership and transparent institutional governance play a crucial role in strengthening university integrity by fostering accountability, promoting ethical decision-making, and minimizing opportunities for

academic misconduct. Universities that establish effective governance structures are generally more successful in maintaining quality assurance standards and cultivating trust among stakeholders (Asiyai, 2020; Ntshoe & Faller, 2025). Such measures will strengthen accountability and reduce opportunities for unethical practices. In addition, federal and state governments, university proprietors, TETFund, private-sector partners, development agencies, and alumni associations should increase investments in higher education infrastructure, human resources, and information and communication technology facilities. Addressing challenges such as inadequate personnel, overcrowded classrooms, and limited ICT resources is critical because overcrowding reduces the effectiveness of examination supervision, while inadequate technological infrastructure limits the capacity to detect and prevent plagiarism and other forms of academic misconduct.

The findings further suggest the need for sustained academic integrity awareness programmes targeting students, academic staff, and non-academic staff. Academic integrity should be viewed as a collective responsibility shared among university administrators, academic staff, students, and policymakers. Developing a sustainable culture of integrity requires continuous education, institutional policies, and preventive strategies that encourage ethical behaviour while discouraging plagiarism, contract cheating, and other forms of academic dishonesty (Bertram Gallant, 2017; Fishman, 2014; Packalen & Rowbotham, 2024). These programmes should be conducted on a semester basis and should include workshops, orientation activities, ethics training, awareness campaigns, and the promotion of institutional honour codes aimed at reducing contextual attitudes toward reporting and addressing academic malpractice and strengthening ethical conduct within the university community. In terms of implementation priority, governance and accountability reforms should be addressed in the short term because they provide the institutional foundation for the effective deployment of resources and enforcement of academic standards. Medium-term efforts should focus on improving infrastructure, staffing, and technological capacity, while long-term interventions should emphasize continuous cultural reorientation and periodic institutional integrity audits to sustain ethical practices and strengthen institutional integrity over time.

CONCLUSION

This study examined academic misconduct and institutional integrity among the sampled public universities in Southwest Nigeria. The findings showed that examination malpractice (86.0%), plagiarism and academic dishonesty (78.7%), and declining quality assurance standards (74.0%) were the most frequently reported academic challenges. These findings suggest that academic misconduct remains a significant concern and is accompanied by institutional issues related to accountability, transparency, and governance. Furthermore, the correlation analysis revealed a moderate and statistically significant negative relationship between institutional integrity and academic misconduct ($r = -0.482$, $p < .01$), indicating that universities with higher perceived levels of institutional integrity tended to report lower levels of academic misconduct. Nevertheless, the squared correlation coefficient indicated that institutional integrity was statistically associated with 23.2% of the observed variance in academic misconduct, suggesting that

other contextual and institutional factors may also contribute to its occurrence. Therefore, the findings should be interpreted as demonstrating an association rather than a causal relationship. Overall, the study highlights the importance of strengthening institutional integrity through improved governance, accountability, transparency, and quality assurance as part of broader efforts to foster ethical academic environments. Future research should employ longitudinal or mixed-methods approaches to examine the causal mechanisms underlying this relationship and to investigate additional factors associated with academic misconduct in higher education.

The study was limited by its cross-sectional design, which restricts the ability to establish causal relationships among the variables examined. Data were collected through self-report measures, making the findings susceptible to social desirability bias, particularly in relation to sensitive issues such as academic misconduct and integrity violations. In addition, the use of a single data collection method may have introduced common method bias. The data were collected during the 2022–2023 academic session; therefore, the findings reflect the conditions prevailing within that period. Furthermore, the results may not be generalizable beyond public universities in Southwest Nigeria. Although the study focused on three purposively selected first-generation public universities and involved 450 participants, the sample may not adequately represent all 23 public universities in the region. The purposive selection of universities also presents a potential risk of selection bias. Future studies may employ longitudinal designs, multiple data sources, and broader institutional coverage, including other public and private universities, to enhance the generalizability and robustness of findings.

REFERENCES

- Asiyai, R. I. (2020). Best practices for quality assurance in higher education: Implications for educational administration. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 25(5), 843–854. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2019.1710569>
- Avello, D., & Aranguren Zurita, S. (2025). Exploring the nexus of academic integrity and artificial intelligence in higher education: A bibliometric analysis. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 21, Article 24. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-025-00199-2>
- Bandekaji, C. A., Amorha, I., & Salihu, A. J. (2024). Promoting academic integrity in the digital age: Strategies for fostering ethical online learning environments in Nigeria. *Integrity Journal of Education and Training*, 8(1), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.31248/IJET2023.199>
- Bertram Gallant, T. (2017). Academic integrity as a teaching and learning issue: From theory to practice. *Theory Into Practice*, 56(2), 88–94. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2017.1308173>
- Bretag, T., Harper, R., Burton, M., Ellis, C., Newton, P., Rozenberg, P., Saddiqui, S., & van Haeringen, K. (2018). Contract cheating: A survey of Australian university students. *Studies in Higher Education*, 44(11), 1837–1856. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2018.1462788>
- Bretag, T. (Ed.). (2016). *Handbook of academic integrity*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-098-8>
- Chan, C. K. Y. (2023). A comprehensive AI policy education framework for university teaching and learning. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 20, Article 38. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00408-3>
- Coates, H., Croucher, G., & Calderon, A. (2025). Governing academic integrity: Ensuring the authenticity of higher thinking in the era of generative artificial intelligence. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 23(4), 2015–2028. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-025-09639-7>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Eaton, S. E. (2021). Plagiarism in higher education: Tackling tough topics in academic integrity. *Bloomsbury Academic*. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350195783>

- Erhun, W. O., Jegede, A. O., & Emmanuel, D. O. (2023). Cheating in pharmacy schools in Southwest Nigeria. *West African Journal of Pharmacy*, 32(2), 113–123. <https://doi.org/10.60787/wapcp-32-2-248>
- Fishman, T. (2014). The fundamental values of academic integrity (2nd ed.). *International Center for Academic Integrity*. <https://academicintegrity.org/resources/fundamental-values>
- Harrad, R., Keasley, R., & Jefferies, L. (2024). Academic integrity or academic misconduct? Conceptual difficulties in higher education and the potential contribution of student demographic factors. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 43(7), 1556–1570. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2024.2339833>
- Ibijola, E. Y. (2017). Provision of student support services and its impact on quality university education. *Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science*, 19(2), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.9734/BJESBS/2017/30955>
- Iguodala, W. A., & Enowoghomonwenma, D.-E. (2023). Accreditation and quality assurance nexus in higher education production function in Nigeria. *African Journal of Educational Management*, 23(1), 171–186. <https://journals.ui.edu.ng/index.php/ajem/article/view/876>
- International Center for Academic Integrity. (2021). *The fundamental values of academic integrity* (3rd ed.). <https://academicintegrity.org/resources/fundamental-values>
- Khan, Z. R., Priya, J., & Tuffnell, C. (2022). Culture of integrity institutional response to integrity during COVID-19. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 18, Article 27. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-022-00118-9>
- Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30(3), 607–610. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001316447003000308>
- Navarro, R. L., Flores, L. Y., Legerski, J.-P., Brionez, J., May, S. F., Suh, H. N., Slivensky, D. R., Tapio, F., Lee, H.-S., Garriott, P. O., Hunt, H. K., Desjarlais, C. D., Lee, B.-H., Diaz, D., Zhu, J., & Jung, A.-K. (2019). Social cognitive predictors of engineering students' academic persistence intentions, satisfaction, and engagement. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 66(2), 170–183. <https://doi.org/10.1037/cou0000319>
- Macfarlane, B., Zhang, J., & Pun, A. (2014). Academic integrity: A review of the literature. *Studies in Higher Education*, 39(2), 339–358. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2012.709495>
- McCabe, D. L., Butterfield, K. D., & Treviño, L. K. (2012). *Cheating in college: Why students do it and what educators can do about it*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Mejía, A., & Garcés-Flórez, M. F. (2025). What do we mean by academic integrity? *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 21, Article 1. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-024-00176-1>
- Mireku, D. O., & Bervell, B. (2023). A decade of quality assurance in higher education (QAIHE) within Sub-Saharan Africa: A literature review based on a systematic search approach. *Higher Education*, 87(5), 1271–1316. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-023-01064-2>
- Mohamad, I., Massie, N. W. G., & Kuncoro, A. (2019). *A comparison between merit-based and test-based higher education admission in Indonesia*. LPEM FEBUI Working Papers, 201932. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3352221>
- Mulyaningsih, T., Dong, S., Miranti, R., Daly, A., & Purwaningsih, Y. (2022). Targeted scholarship for higher education and academic performance: Evidence from Indonesia. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 88, Article 102510. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2021.102510>
- National Universities Commission. (2025). *Annual statistics bulletin of Nigerian universities*. <https://www.nuc.edu.ng/>
- Ntshoe, I., & Faller, F. (2025). Reframing conversations on institutional autonomy, academic freedom, and accountability in the context of emerging managerialism and corporatism in South African higher education. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 39(4), 217–235. <https://doi.org/10.20853/39-4-7507>
- Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Odukoya, J. A., Adekeye, O., Igbinoba, A. O., & Afolabi, A. (2018). Item analysis of university-wide multiple choice objective examinations: The experience of a Nigerian private university. *Quality & Quantity*, 52(3), 983–997. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-017-0499-2>
- Odukoya, A. A. (2025). Policy fluctuations and their impact on quality assurance in higher education in Nigeria. *Jurnal Saintifik (Multi Science Journal)*, 23(2), 81–94. <https://doi.org/10.58222/js.v23i2.404>
- Ofem, U. J., Nwinyinya, E., Sama, R., Ojong, B., Eyo, E., & Effiom, G. (2024). Quality assurance indicators and sustainable assessment integrity in universities in Nigeria. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 15(4), 72–84. <https://doi.org/10.36941/mjss-2024-0031>

- Ogunode, N. J., Akinlade, O. M., & Abubakar, M. (2021). Quality assurance in Nigerian public higher institutions: Challenges and way forward. *Web of Scientist: International Scientific Research Journal*, 2(7), 36–55. <https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/K9QP5>
- Ogunode, N. J., Jegede, D., Adah, S., Audu, E. I., & Ajape, T. S. (2020). Administration of research programmes in Nigerian public universities: Problems and the way forward. *Riwayat: Educational Journal of History and Humanities*, 3(2), 21–32. <https://doi.org/10.47832/2717-8293.2-3.3>
- Olaniyan, Y. D. (2025). A policy analysis of Nigeria's university admission quota system: Rurality and the reproduction of structural inequalities. *Higher Education Policy*. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41307-025-00421-3>
- Olujuwon, O., & Ojo, O. J. (2025). Nexus of plagiarism practice and academic integrity in Nigerian tertiary institutions. *FNAS Journal of Mathematics and Science Education*, 7(2), 72–80. <https://doi.org/10.63561/fnas-jmse.v7i2.1092>
- Orim, S.-M. (2016). Perspectives of academic integrity from Nigeria. In T. Bretag (Ed.), *Handbook of academic integrity* (pp. 147–160). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-098-8_9
- Orok, E., Adeniyi, F., Williams, T., Dosunmu, O., Ikpe, F., Orakwe, C., & Kukoyi, O. (2023). Causes and mitigation of academic dishonesty among healthcare students in a Nigerian university. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 19, Article 13. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-023-00135-2>
- Oyewole, O., & Adetimirin, A. (2025). Digital literacy skills and attitude towards plagiarism by library and information science undergraduates in Southwestern, Nigeria. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09557490251378738>
- Packalen, K. A., & Rowbotham, K. (2024). Clues to fostering a program culture of academic integrity: Findings from a multidimensional regression model. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 20, Article 14. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-024-00163-6>
- Sadiq, I. Z. (2024). Strengthening and preserving a culture of academic integrity in global higher educational settings. *Journal of College and Character*, 25(3), 276–282. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2194587X.2024.2348999>
- Samoila, M. E., & Vrabie, T. (2023). First-year seminars through the lens of Vincent Tinto's theories of student departure: A systematic review. *Frontiers in Education*, 8, 1205667. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2023.1205667>
- Shokunbi, O., Agbaje, M., & Ogu, E. C. (2026). Measuring nigeria data protection act (NDPA) 2023 compliance in Nigerian universities: A general compliance index and evidence of institutional decoupling. *FUDMA Journal of Sciences*, 10(6), 291–296. <https://doi.org/10.33003/fjs-2026-1006-5085>
- Sulphey, M. M., Al-Kahtani, N. S., & Syed, A. M. A. M. (2018). Relationship between admission grades and academic achievement. *Journal of Entrepreneurship and Sustainability Issues*, 5(3), 648–658. [https://doi.org/10.9770/jesi.2018.5.3\(17\)](https://doi.org/10.9770/jesi.2018.5.3(17))
- Ukozor, C., Ogunode, N. J., & Ayoko, V. O. (2023). Quality assurance units in Nigerian public tertiary institutions: Problems and ways forward. *Journal of Governance and Policy Dynamics*, 1(1), Article 21. <https://doi.org/10.61796/JGRPD.V1i1.21>
- UNESCO. (2021). *Reimagining our futures together: A new social contract for education*. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000379707>
- Tadesse, T., & Getachew, K. (2010). An exploration of undergraduate students' self-reported academic dishonesty at Addis Ababa and Jimma Universities. *Ethiopian Journal of Education and Sciences*, 5(2), 79–99. <https://doi.org/10.4314/ejesc.v5i2.65375>
- Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition* (2nd ed.). University of Chicago Press.
- Torres Castro, U. E. (2024). Toward a unified framework: The intellectual lineage of student engagement in higher education (1999–2024). *Cogent Education*, 11(1), Article 2369002. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2024.2369002>
- World Bank. (2018). *Nigeria development update: Investing in human capital for Nigeria's future*. <https://documents.worldbank.org>
- Yunusa, E., & Usman, J. (2023). Reformed methods of sanctions, investigation and punishment to prevent academic corruption in Nigerian tertiary institutions. *International Journal of Applied Research in Social Sciences*, 5(3), 80–88. <https://doi.org/10.51594/ijarss.v5i3.491>