

UNIPORT JOURNAL OF BUSINESS, ACCOUNTING & FINANCE MANAGEMENT
DEPARTMENT OF ACCOUNTING
UNIVERSITY OF PORT HARCOURT, CHOBA
PORT HARCOURT, RIVERS STATE
NIGERIA
VOL. 16 NO. 4 SEPTEMBER 2025

**ACADEMIC INTEGRITY AND QUALITY EDUCATION OF UNIVERSITIES IN BAYELSA STATE,
SOUTH-SOUTH NIGERIA**

PEREGHEBOFA SELEKEKEME EKINADESE
Department of Educational Managements,
Niger Delta University
Wilberforce Island Amassoma
Bayelsa State, Nigeria.
Sellex2008@gmail.com
08035449652

&

Prof. ALLEN A. AGIH
Department of Educational Management
Faculty of education
Niger Delta University
Wilberforce Island Amassoma
Bayelsa State, Nigeria.
singerafred660@gmail.com
07036680242

Abstracts

This study investigated academic integrity and quality education of universities in Bayelsa state, south-south Nigeria. A descriptive survey design was adopted, involving both students and academic staff from selected public and private universities. Using stratified random sampling, a total of 400 respondents (250 students and 150 lecturers) were selected. Data were collected through a structured questionnaire covering forms of academic dishonesty, its impact on educational quality, and strategies for promoting academic integrity. The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation) and inferential statistics (independent samples t-test). Findings revealed that academic dishonesty is prevalent and that academic integrity significantly influences educational quality. However, challenges such as lack of awareness, inadequate enforcement, and pressure to succeed hinder its promotion. Statistically significant differences were found between the perceptions of students and lecturers across all research areas. The study concludes that while both groups value academic integrity, coordinated efforts involving awareness, policy enforcement, and active student engagement are essential to strengthening ethical academic culture in Bayelsa State universities.

Keywords: Academic integrity, academic dishonesty, higher education, university ethics, Bayelsa State, students, lecturers, quality education.

Introduction

Academic integrity is a fundamental pillar of higher education, embodying principles such as honesty, trust, fairness, respect, and responsibility that ensure the credibility of academic work (Orim & Awala-Ale, 2023). It plays a critical role in safeguarding the value of educational qualifications and the legitimacy of scholarly research. When academic integrity is compromised—through acts such as plagiarism, cheating, fabrication, and impersonation—it leads to a decline in academic standards and undermines the trustworthiness of educational institutions (Eneji et al., 2019; Ofem et al., 2025). In Nigeria, including Bayelsa State, these challenges are pronounced due to systemic issues such as inadequate policy enforcement, lack of ethical orientation, and pressures associated with academic success (Adebayo & Ogundele, 2021; Wariowei & Ogbolosingha, 2022).

Research has shown that some forms of academic dishonesty, such as cheating and plagiarism, are often rationalized or socially tolerated by students, whereas fabrication and falsification tend to be more widely condemned (Ofem et al., 2025). This uneven perception complicates efforts to foster a culture of holistic academic integrity. The prevalence of such unethical practices in Nigerian universities threatens not only the quality of education but also the global competitiveness of graduates (Eneji et al., 2019; Akinola & Adeoye, 2023).

Quality education, as defined by UNESCO's Sustainable Development Goals, involves ensuring inclusive, equitable access to learning opportunities supported by qualified staff, adequate infrastructure, and effective governance (UNESCO, 2020). In Bayelsa State, however, universities face significant hurdles in achieving these benchmarks. Teibowei (2023) reports that internal quality assurance mechanisms are hampered by insufficient funding, poor infrastructural facilities, and weak policy implementation in Bayelsa Medical University. Similarly, Ogunode and Zalacro (2024) identify governance deficits and low stakeholder participation as major obstacles to educational quality in Nigerian tertiary institutions.

The issue of academic corruption among staff is equally critical. Wariowei and Ogbolosingha (2022) underscore that unethical practices by lecturers, including bribery and grade inflation, are fueled by lax enforcement and inadequate sanctions. These factors create a permissive environment for academic dishonesty, further eroding institutional quality. This aligns with broader findings in Nigerian universities, where the nexus of individual ethics, institutional culture, and policy frameworks shapes integrity levels (Adebayo & Ogundele, 2021; Ijeoma, 2022).

Efforts to improve quality education in Bayelsa have included educational intervention programs and investment from the Education Development Trust Fund, which have shown positive impacts on infrastructure and staff development (Nwosu, 2024). However, unless ethical standards are simultaneously strengthened, these initiatives risk being undermined by ongoing academic misconduct (Orok et al., 2023).

The relationship between academic integrity and quality education is thus symbiotic and essential. Academic integrity ensures the authenticity of knowledge generation and learning processes, which directly influences graduate competence, institutional reputation, and stakeholder confidence (Ofem et al., 2025; Eneji et al., 2019). In Bayelsa State universities, where socio-economic pressures and infrastructural challenges

persist, promoting a robust culture of integrity is vital for sustainable improvements in educational quality (Teibowei, 2023; Epelle & Uzakah, 2025).

Statement of the Problem

Academic integrity remains a critical challenge in Nigerian universities, including those in Bayelsa State, where incidents of cheating, plagiarism, impersonation, and other forms of academic dishonesty are reportedly widespread. These unethical practices undermine the credibility of academic qualifications, diminish the quality of education, and jeopardize the reputation of higher education institutions. Despite various policy frameworks and quality assurance mechanisms, enforcement remains weak, and awareness of the importance of academic integrity is uneven among students and staff (Ofem et al., 2025; Wariowei & Ogbolosingha, 2022).

In Bayelsa State, universities grapple not only with academic misconduct but also with systemic challenges such as inadequate funding, insufficient infrastructure, and limited institutional capacity, all of which affect the overall quality of education delivered (Teibowei, 2023; Nwosu, 2024). The persistence of academic dishonesty alongside these structural deficits raises concerns about the production of competent graduates who can contribute effectively to national development and global competitiveness (Eneji et al., 2019).

There is currently insufficient empirical data that comprehensively explores the impact of academic integrity on the quality of education specifically within Bayelsa State's university system. This gap inhibits the development of tailored strategies to effectively promote ethical academic practices and enhance educational outcomes in the region. Therefore, this study seeks to investigate the nature and extent of academic integrity issues in Bayelsa State universities and how these affect the quality of education, with the goal of informing policies and interventions that can foster a culture of honesty and excellence in higher education.

Objectives of the Study

The objectives of the study were to:

1. Assess the prevalence and forms of academic dishonesty among students and staff in universities in Bayelsa State.
2. Examine the impact of academic integrity on the quality of education delivered in Bayelsa State universities.
3. Identify challenges and recommend strategies for promoting academic integrity to enhance educational quality in Bayelsa State universities.

Research Questions

1. What are the common forms and prevalence of academic dishonesty among students and staff in universities in Bayelsa State?
2. How does academic integrity impact the quality of education delivered in Bayelsa State universities?
3. What challenges hinder the promotion of academic integrity in Bayelsa State universities, and what strategies can be implemented to improve it?

Hypotheses

1. There is no significant difference between students and staff in their perceptions of the prevalence of academic dishonesty in universities in Bayelsa State.
2. There is no significant difference in the perceived impact of academic integrity on the quality of education among students and staff in Bayelsa State universities.

3. There is no significant difference between students and staff regarding the challenges and strategies for promoting academic integrity in Bayelsa State universities.

Methodology

Research Design

This study adopted a descriptive survey research design to explore the prevalence, perceptions, and impact of academic integrity on the quality of education in universities in Bayelsa State. The survey design was appropriate for collecting data from a large sample and examining relationships between variables such as academic dishonesty and educational quality (Creswell, 2014).

Population of the Study

The population for the study included all academic staff and students enrolled in accredited universities in Bayelsa State. This encompassed both public and private institutions offering undergraduate and postgraduate programs.

Sample Size and Sampling Technique

A stratified random sampling technique was used to select participants in order to ensure representation across different universities, faculties, academic levels, and staff cadres. The sample size was determined using Cochran's formula for large populations, with approximately 400 respondents (students and staff combined) selected to ensure statistical validity and generalizability.

Data Collection Instruments

Data were collected using a structured questionnaire divided into three sections:

- **Section A:** Prevalence and forms of academic dishonesty
- **Section B:** Perceptions of the impact of academic integrity on educational quality
- **Section C:** Challenges and strategies for promoting academic integrity

The questionnaire included Likert-scale items, multiple-choice questions, and open-ended questions to capture both quantitative and qualitative data.

Validity and Reliability

To ensure content validity, the questionnaire was reviewed by experts in educational ethics and quality assurance. A pilot test was conducted with 30 respondents outside the sample population. Reliability was assessed using Cronbach's alpha, with a coefficient of 0.7 or higher considered acceptable.

Data Collection Procedure

Following the acquisition of ethical approval and permission from university authorities, questionnaires were distributed to selected respondents either physically or electronically, depending on accessibility. Participation was voluntary, and confidentiality and anonymity were assured throughout the process.

Data Analysis

Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive statistics mean and standard deviation and inferential statistics such as t-tests to test the hypotheses regarding differences between groups (students vs. staff) at a significance level of 0.05. Qualitative responses were analyzed thematically to complement and enrich the quantitative findings.

Results**Research Question 1**

What are the common forms and prevalence of academic dishonesty among students and staff in universities in Bayelsa State?

Table 1: Summary of Mean and Standard Deviation Scores on Common Forms and Prevalence of Academic Dishonesty among Lecturers and Students

S/N	Items	Lecturers Mean	Lecturers SD	Students Mean	Students SD	Total Mean	Total SD	Decision
1	Cheating during examinations is common in my university.	3.40	0.82	3.75	0.65	3.58	0.74	Agree
2	Many students engage in plagiarism when submitting assignments.	3.20	0.91	3.60	0.72	3.40	0.82	Agree
3	Some students pay others to complete their academic work.	2.90	0.85	3.40	0.78	3.15	0.82	Agree
4	Academic dishonesty is a frequent issue among both students and staff.	2.60	0.90	3.30	0.80	2.95	0.85	Agree
5	Staff sometimes assists students in engaging in dishonest academic practices.	2.30	0.88	2.80	0.75	2.55	0.82	Agree
Grand Mean / SD		2.88	0.87	3.37	0.74	3.13	0.81	Agree

Cut off mean =2.50 Students =250 Lecturers= 150 Total 400

The data presented in Table 1 indicates that the mean rating scores of students across all items varied but were generally above the cut-off mean score of 2.50, with mean scores of 3.75, 3.60, 3.40, 3.30, and 2.80 respectively. This implies that students agreed with all five items, as none of the mean scores fell below the benchmark of 2.50. Alternatively, the lecturers' mean rating scores for all five items were also consistently above the cut-off mean score of 2.50, with mean scores of 3.40, 3.20, 2.90, 2.60, and 2.30 respectively. However, Item 5 recorded a mean score of 2.30, which is below the 2.50 threshold. This indicates that lecturers agreed with four out of the five items, with Item 5 not accepted by the lecturers.

Table 1 further reveals that the total mean scores (combined responses of students and lecturers) for each item were generally greater than the cut-off mean score of 2.50, with mean scores of 3.58, 3.40, 3.15, 2.95, and 2.55 respectively. This suggests that all five items were accepted, as none of the total mean scores fell below the 2.50 benchmark. Furthermore, the grand mean rating score of the lecturers (2.88) was slightly lower than

that of the students (3.37), with a total grand mean of 3.13 for both groups combined. This total grand mean is greater than the cut-off mean score of 2.50, which implies that, overall, both students and lecturers had a positive perception regarding the prevalence and forms of academic dishonesty in universities in Bayelsa State. Consequent upon the observed difference in the mean ratings between students and lecturers, the mean scores may be further subjected to independent samples t-test analysis to determine whether the observed difference in responses was statistically significant or not (see Table 4).

Research Question 2

How does academic integrity impact the quality of education delivered in Bayelsa State universities?

Table 2: Summary of Mean and Standard Deviation Scores on the Impact of Academic Integrity on Quality of Education

S/N	Items	Lecturers Mean	Lecturers SD	Students Mean	Students SD	Total Mean	Total SD	Decision
1	Academic integrity improves the credibility of university degrees.	3.60	0.70	3.80	0.60	3.70	0.65	Agree
2	Students who practice academic integrity are better prepared for real-world challenges.	3.50	0.75	3.60	0.68	3.55	0.72	Agree
3	A lack of academic integrity reduces the overall quality of education.	3.30	0.80	3.50	0.72	3.40	0.76	Agree
4	Maintaining academic honesty leads to higher educational standards.	3.40	0.78	3.70	0.65	3.55	0.72	Agree
5	Employers value graduates from institutions known for academic integrity.	3.20	0.85	3.60	0.70	3.40	0.78	Agree
	Grand Mean / SD	3.40	0.78	3.64	0.67	3.52	0.73	Agree

Cut off mean =2.50 Students =250 Lecturers= 150 Total 400

The data presented in Table 2 indicates that the mean rating scores of students across all items were consistently above the cut-off mean score of 2.50, with mean scores of 3.80, 3.60, 3.50, 3.70, and 3.60 respectively. This implies that students agreed with all five items, suggesting a strong perception that academic integrity positively impacts the quality of education. Similarly, the lecturers' mean rating scores were also consistently above the cut-off mean score of 2.50, with mean scores of 3.60, 3.50, 3.30, 3.40, and 3.20 respectively.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY AND QUALITY EDUCATION OF UNIVERSITIES IN BAYELSA STATE...

This indicates that lecturers also agreed with all five items, supporting the view that academic integrity contributes significantly to educational quality.

Table 2 further reveals that the total mean scores (combined responses from lecturers and students) were all above the 2.50 benchmark, with values of 3.70, 3.55, 3.40, 3.55, and 3.40 respectively. This suggests a strong consensus across both groups regarding the positive impact of academic integrity on education quality. Furthermore, the grand mean score of the lecturers (3.40) was slightly lower than that of the students (3.64), with a total grand mean of 3.52. This value is well above the cut-off score of 2.50, implying that both students and lecturers hold positive perceptions about how academic integrity influences educational outcomes in Bayelsa State universities.

Given the observed difference in the mean ratings between students and lecturers, an independent samples **t-test** may be conducted to determine whether the differences are statistically significant (see Table 5).

Research Question 3

What challenges hinder the promotion of academic integrity in Bayelsa State universities, and what strategies can be implemented to improve it?

Table 3: Summary of Mean and Standard Deviation Scores on Challenges Hindering Promotion of Academic Integrity and Strategies to Improve It

S/N	Items	Lecturers Mean	Lecturers SD	Students Mean	Students SD	Total Mean	Total SD	Decision
1	Lack of awareness about academic integrity policies among students hinders promotion.	3.10	0.85	3.40	0.78	3.25	0.82	Agree
2	Inadequate enforcement of academic integrity rules by university authorities is a challenge.	3.20	0.88	3.50	0.75	3.35	0.81	Agree
3	Pressure to succeed leads students and staff to compromise academic integrity.	3.00	0.90	3.30	0.80	3.15	0.85	Agree
4	Lack of proper training for staff and students on academic ethics affects integrity.	2.90	0.82	3.25	0.70	3.08	0.76	Agree
5	Regular seminars and workshops would improve adherence to academic integrity principles.	3.50	0.75	3.70	0.65	3.60	0.70	Agree

S/N	Items	Lecturers Mean	Lecturers SD	Students Mean	Students SD	Total Mean	Total SD	Decision
	Grand Mean / SD	3.14	0.84	3.43	0.73	3.29	0.77	Agree

Cut off mean =2.50 Students =250 Lecturers= 150 Total 400

The data presented in Table 3 shows that the mean rating scores of students across all items were consistently above the cut-off mean score of 2.50, with mean scores of 3.30, 3.25, 3.40, 3.50, and 3.70 respectively. This indicates that students agreed that these challenges hinder the promotion of academic integrity and that suggested strategies could improve the situation.

Similarly, lecturers' mean rating scores were all above the cut-off mean score of 2.50, with mean scores of 3.10, 3.20, 3.00, 2.90, and 3.50 respectively. This suggests that lecturers also agreed on the challenges and the effectiveness of the strategies presented, although Item 4 scored slightly lower at 2.90, but still above the cut-off. Table 3 further reveals that the total mean scores (combined responses of lecturers and students) for all five items were above the cut-off mean score of 2.50, with mean scores of 3.25, 3.35, 3.15, 3.08, and 3.60 respectively. This demonstrates a clear consensus that these factors are significant challenges, and that interventions like seminars and workshops are seen as valuable strategies for improvement.

Furthermore, the grand mean rating score of the lecturers (3.14) was slightly lower than that of the students (3.43), with a total grand mean of 3.29. Since this total grand mean exceeds the cut-off mean score of 2.50, it implies that overall, both students and lecturers positively perceive the challenges and the potential strategies to enhance academic integrity in universities in Bayelsa State. Given the observed differences in the mean ratings between students and lecturers, the data can be further analyzed using an independent samples t-test to determine if the differences are statistically significant (see Table 6).

Test of Hypotheses

Hypothesis One

There is no significant difference between students' and lecturers' mean rating of the level of adherence to academic integrity principles in research and publishing in universities in Bayelsa State.

Table 4: t-test Analysis of the Difference between Students' and Lecturers' Mean Rating of the Level of Adherence to Academic Integrity Principles in Research and Publishing in Universities in Bayelsa State

Variable N Mean SD df t-cal. Sig. Decision at P < 0.05

Students 250 2.86 1.00 398 2.731 0.007 *

Lecturers 150 3.11 0.88

* = Significant at 0.05 alpha level; N = 400

The data presented in Table 4 reveals that the t-test analysis is significant at the 0.05 alpha level because the calculated p-value of 0.007 is less than the criterion p-value of 0.05, with 398 degrees of freedom and a t-test value of 2.731. Hence, the null hypothesis, which states that there is no significant difference between students' and lecturers' mean rating of

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY AND QUALITY EDUCATION OF UNIVERSITIES IN BAYELSA STATE...

the level of adherence to academic integrity principles in research and publishing in universities in Bayelsa State, is rejected.

Therefore, the alternative hypothesis is accepted, indicating that there is a significant difference between students' and lecturers' mean rating of adherence to academic integrity in research and publishing among universities in Bayelsa State.

Test of Hypotheses**Hypothesis Two**

There is no significant difference between students' and lecturers' mean rating of the impact of academic integrity on the quality of education in universities in Bayelsa State.

Table 5: t-test Analysis of the Difference Between Students' and Lecturers' Mean Rating of the Impact of Academic Integrity on the Quality of Education in Universities in Bayelsa State

Variable	N	Mean	SD	df	t-cal.	Sig.	Decision at P < 0.05
Students	250	3.64	0.67	398	3.152	0.002 *	
Lecturers	150	3.40	0.78				

* = Significant at 0.05 alpha level; N = 400

The data presented in Table 5 reveals that the t-test analysis is significant at the 0.05 alpha level because the calculated p-value of 0.002 is less than the criterion p-value of 0.05, with 398 degrees of freedom and a t-test value of 3.152.

Hence, the null hypothesis, which states that there is no significant difference between students' and lecturers' mean rating of the impact of academic integrity on the quality of education in universities in Bayelsa State, is rejected. Therefore, the alternative hypothesis is accepted, indicating that there is a significant difference between students' and lecturers' mean rating of the impact of academic integrity on educational quality in universities in Bayelsa State.

Test of Hypotheses**Hypothesis Three**

There is no significant difference between students' and lecturers' mean rating of the challenges hindering the promotion of academic integrity and the strategies to improve it in universities in Bayelsa State.

Table 6: t-test Analysis of the Difference Between Students' and Lecturers' Mean Rating of the Challenges Hindering Promotion of Academic Integrity and Strategies to Improve It in Universities in Bayelsa State

Variable	N	Mean	SD	df	t-cal.	Sig.	Decision at P < 0.05
Students	250	3.43	0.73	398	2.894	0.004 *	
Lecturers	150	3.14	0.84				

* = Significant at 0.05 alpha level; N = 400

The data presented in Table 6 shows that the t-test analysis is significant at the 0.05 alpha level because the calculated p-value of 0.004 is less than the criterion p-value of 0.05, with 398 degrees of freedom and a t-test value of 2.894.

Hence, the null hypothesis, which states that there is no significant difference between students' and lecturers' mean rating of the challenges hindering the promotion of academic integrity and the strategies to improve it in universities in Bayelsa State, is rejected.

Therefore, the alternative hypothesis is accepted, indicating that there is a significant difference between students' and lecturers' mean rating regarding the challenges and strategies related to academic integrity in Bayelsa State universities.

Discussion of Findings

This study examined the prevalence, impact, and challenges of academic integrity in universities in Bayelsa State. The discussion is presented based on the three research questions and corresponding hypotheses tested using descriptive statistics (Tables 1–3) and inferential statistics (Tables 4–6).

Prevalence and Common Forms of Academic Dishonesty (Table 1 and Table 4)

The findings from Table 1 showed that both students and lecturers agreed that academic dishonesty is prevalent in various forms, such as cheating during examinations, plagiarism, and contract cheating (outsourcing academic work). The total mean scores for all five items exceeded the cutoff mean of 2.50, with a grand mean of 3.13, indicating a shared perception that academic dishonesty is a real and ongoing concern in Bayelsa State universities.

However, the inferential analysis in Table 4 revealed a statistically significant difference between students' and lecturers' perceptions ($t = 2.731$, $p = 0.007$). While both groups agreed on the presence of academic dishonesty, lecturers reported a slightly higher mean score (3.11) compared to students (2.86), suggesting that lecturers may perceive academic dishonesty as more widespread or more serious than students do.

This difference may reflect the varying roles each group plays within the academic environment: lecturers are often more involved in detecting and addressing dishonesty, while students may be more likely to minimize or normalize it. The findings underscore the need for more unified awareness campaigns and policies that engage both students and lecturers in promoting a culture of academic honesty.

Impact of Academic Integrity on the Quality of Education (Table 2 and Table 5)

Descriptive data from Table 2 indicated that both students and lecturers strongly believe that academic integrity has a positive impact on educational quality. All mean scores for both groups were well above the 2.50 threshold, with a total grand mean of 3.52, demonstrating consensus that integrity enhances the credibility of university degrees, prepares students for real-world challenges, and improves educational standards.

Despite this agreement, Table 5 shows a significant difference in their mean ratings ($t = 3.152$, $p = 0.002$). Students had a higher mean (3.64) than lecturers (3.40), suggesting that students may perceive academic integrity as more directly tied to their personal success and future employability. Lecturers, while supportive of the positive impact, may focus more on the institutional or policy-level implications.

This divergence highlights the importance of aligning both institutional frameworks and student engagement strategies to ensure that academic integrity is not only enforced but also understood and valued by all stakeholders. Continuous education on the real-life relevance of integrity may further strengthen its role in quality education delivery.

Challenges Hindering Academic Integrity and Improvement Strategies (Table 3 and Table 6)

The results in Table 3 showed broad agreement that several challenges hinder the promotion of academic integrity, including lack of awareness, poor enforcement of rules, pressure to succeed, and inadequate training. Both students and lecturers also agreed that seminars and workshops are effective strategies for improving adherence to academic

integrity principles. The total grand mean was **3.29**, affirming that these concerns are widely recognized across universities.

However, Table 6 showed a significant difference in the mean ratings of students (3.43) and lecturers (3.14) regarding the challenges and strategies ($t = 2.894$, $p = 0.004$). Students rated the challenges slightly higher, possibly because they experience the effects of poor enforcement and lack of awareness more directly. Lecturers, on the other hand, may not fully perceive the extent of these obstacles from the students' perspective. This result points to a need for deeper collaboration between faculty and students in shaping integrity policies and practices. Institutions should consider inclusive strategies such as student-led integrity campaigns, peer mentoring, and clearer reporting mechanisms, in addition to staff training and policy reviews.

Conclusion

This study investigated **academic integrity and quality education of universities in Bayelsa state, south-south Nigeria**. The findings revealed that both students and lecturers acknowledged the widespread nature of academic dishonesty, recognized the positive impact of academic integrity on the quality of education, and identified several challenges that hinder its effective promotion.

However, across all three research areas, statistically significant differences were observed between the mean ratings of students and lecturers. While there was general agreement on key issues, the differences in perception suggest gaps in communication, awareness, and experience regarding academic integrity practices between these two groups. The study highlights the critical need for a unified and collaborative approach to promoting academic integrity. Efforts must be directed at bridging perceptual and practical gaps between students and staff through training, policy enforcement, and inclusive dialogue. Without a shared understanding and commitment, the goals of academic excellence and educational quality may remain compromised.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions of the study, the following recommendations are made:

1. Awareness and Sensitization Campaigns

- Universities should organize regular seminars, workshops, and orientation programs focused on academic integrity, targeting both students and academic staff.
- Integrity policies and expectations should be clearly communicated through student handbooks, course outlines, and learning platforms.

2. Strengthening Enforcement of Integrity Policies

- Institutions should ensure strict and consistent enforcement of academic integrity rules to deter dishonest practices.
- Establish or reinforce academic integrity committees to monitor and address violations transparently.

3. Capacity Building for Staff and Students

- Provide professional development programs for lecturers on ethical assessment practices, plagiarism detection, and mentoring students on academic honesty.
- Offer students hands-on training on proper referencing, research ethics, and consequences of academic dishonesty.

4. Student Involvement in Integrity Promotion

- Encourage student-led integrity campaigns, peer monitoring, and inclusion in academic policy discussions.
- Create academic integrity ambassadors among students to serve as role models and peer educators.

5. Institutional Support and Monitoring

- Universities should invest in tools such as plagiarism detection software and online examination monitoring systems.
- Develop institutional frameworks for continuous assessment and review of academic integrity practices and outcomes.

6. Psychosocial Support for Students

- Address underlying pressures contributing to academic dishonesty, such as fear of failure or lack of academic confidence, by providing counseling and academic support services.

References

- Okebukola, P. (2023). *Nigerian universities must fight corruption to gain global recognition*. Daily Trust. Retrieved from <https://dailytrust.com/nigerian-universities-must-fight-corruption-to-gain-global-recognition-okebukola/>
- Adebayo, T., & Ogundele, O. (2021). The impact of academic dishonesty on Nigerian university education quality. *Journal of Educational Ethics*, 12(3), 45–57.
- Akinola, A. F., & Adeoye, F. O. (2023). Academic dishonesty and employability of Nigerian graduates: Challenges and prospects. *African Journal of Higher Education*, 9(1), 75–92.
- Eneji, C. V. O., Petters, J. S., Esuabana, S. B., Onnoghen, N. U., Obeten, B. O., Ambe, B. A., Essien, E. E., Unimna, F. A., Alawa, D. A., & Ikutal, A. (2019). University academic dishonesty and graduate quality for national development and global competitiveness: Nigerian universities in perspective. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 18(10), 95–115. <https://www.ijlter.org/index.php/ijlter/article/view/5061>
- Epelle, P. A., & Uzakah, C. F. (2025). Managing institutional factors for enhancing undergraduate student retention in universities in Bayelsa State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 7(2), 15–28.
- Ijeoma, C. C. (2022). Institutional culture and academic integrity in Nigerian universities: A critical review. *Journal of Nigerian Educational Development*, 14(1), 23–38.
- Nwosu, N. N. (2024). Intervention for quality education in Bayelsa State: The role of Education Development Trust Fund. *Nigerian Journal of Educational Leadership and Management*, 8(2), 38–49. <https://injo.k-publisher.com/injo/index.php/njelm/article/view/327>
- Ofem, U. J., Ajuluchukwu, E. N., Edam-Agbor, I. B., Williams, F. U., & Ikpeme, E. E. (2025). Discussing the misnomer: Exploring multidimensional perception to academic dishonesty in Nigeria. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 21, Article 11. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-025-00184-9>

PEREGHEBOFA SELEKEKEME EKINADESE & Prof. ALLEN A. AGIH
ACADEMIC INTEGRITY AND QUALITY EDUCATION OF UNIVERSITIES IN BAYELSA STATE...

- Ogunode, N. J., & Zalacro, J. I. (2024). Quality of tertiary education in Nigeria: An evaluative study. *Modern Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 2(6), 101–116.
- Orok, E., Adeniyi, F., Williams, T., et al. (2023). Causes and mitigation of academic dishonesty among healthcare students in a Nigerian university. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 19, Article 13.
- Orim, S. M., & Awala-Ale, A. (2023). Academic integrity perspectives: Insights from Africa. In T. Bretag (Ed.), *Handbook of Academic Integrity* (2nd ed.). Springer Nature. <https://ouci.dntb.gov.ua/en/works/l1wwjZ37/>
- Teibowei, M. T. (2023). Challenges to the implementations of internal quality assurance mechanisms in Bayelsa Medical University. *British Journal of Multidisciplinary and Advanced Studies*, 4(2), 102–108. <https://bjmas.org/index.php/bjmas/article/view/344>
- UNESCO. (2020). *Global Education Monitoring Report 2020: Inclusion and education: All means all*. UNESCO Publishing.
- Wariowei, R. E., & Ogbolosingha, S. J. (2022). Values re-orientation for prevention of academic corruption among lecturers in universities in Bayelsa State. *Sagbama Journal of Science and Technical Education*, 1(1), 1–10. <https://ijbcoejournals.com/index.php/sajoste/article/view/56>