

Influence of Examination Supervision on Examination Malpractice among Fourth-Year Bachelor of Education Students in Public and Private Kenyan Universities

¹Muriuki J.N., ¹Prof. Gakunga D.K., Dr. Masese A.

¹Department of Educational Foundations,
University of Nairobi, Kenya

²Department of Educational Foundations, University of Nairobi, Kenya

Corresponding Author's E-mail: judynje45@gmail.com

Abstract

This study investigates the influence of examination supervision on examination malpractices among Bachelor of Education fourth-year students in both public and private universities in Kenya. Utilising a mixed-methods approach, the research encompasses both quantitative surveys and qualitative interviews, targeting a representative sample of students from diverse institutions. The findings reveal that the physical characteristics of examination supervision, such as security measures, seating arrangements, and overall manning of examinations, significantly impact students' likelihood to engage in malpractices. Furthermore, comparisons between public and private universities highlight differing levels of malpractice prevalence, influenced by institutional policies and cultural attitudes towards cheating. The study underscores the need for universities to enhance examination supervision and management and enforce management and enforce stricter examination supervision to mitigate malpractice incidents. Recommendations focus on stringent manning of examinations that discourage unethical behaviour while fostering academic integrity. Ultimately, this research contributes to the broader discourse on academic honesty and assessment practices in higher education within the Kenyan context.

Keywords: Examination supervision, Examination malpractices, Bachelor of Education, Fourth-Year students, Public and Private Universities Kenya

Accepted 10/12/2025

Published /28/1/2026

INTRODUCTION

Examinations remain a central pillar of assessment in higher education systems worldwide, serving as a primary mechanism for evaluating learners' academic achievement, competence, and readiness for professional practice. The credibility of these assessments is fundamentally anchored in the principle of academic integrity, which ensures that examination outcomes reflect students' true abilities and learning efforts. However, the persistent occurrence of examination malpractice continues to threaten the reliability, validity, and public trust in academic certification, particularly within institutions of higher learning (World Bank, 2021).

Globally, examination malpractice has evolved into a complex challenge influenced by technological

advancement, increased academic competition, and systemic weaknesses in assessment management. Studies conducted across diverse educational systems indicate that students' engagement in dishonest practices is often facilitated by structural and administrative loopholes within examination environments (Gottfried, 2021). These practices undermine the ethical foundations of education and compromise the quality of graduates entering the workforce.

In developing countries, examination malpractice is often reported as more prevalent due to rapid expansion of higher education, limited resources, and inconsistent enforcement of academic integrity policies. Research across Sub-Saharan Africa has demonstrated that inadequate supervision, overcrowded examination

venues, and limited invigilator presence significantly increase opportunities for cheating (Onabajo & Ajiboye, 2020). These contextual challenges make examination supervision a critical variable in addressing malpractice.

Kenya's higher education sector has experienced significant growth over the past two decades, marked by increased enrollment in both public and private universities. While this expansion has improved access to university education, it has also intensified pressure on institutional infrastructure and assessment systems. Consequently, concerns regarding examination malpractice have attracted sustained attention from policymakers, scholars, and university administrators (Mumbua, 2022).

Within Kenyan universities, examination malpractice manifests in various forms, including impersonation, collusion, unauthorized materials, and electronic cheating. These practices are often exacerbated by inadequate supervision mechanisms, weak enforcement of examination regulations, and limited monitoring capacity during assessments. Such challenges raise fundamental questions about the effectiveness of existing examination supervision practices in maintaining academic integrity.

Examination supervision plays a pivotal role in regulating student behavior during assessments by deterring dishonest practices and reinforcing institutional rules. Effective supervision encompasses adequate invigilator presence, strategic seating arrangements, controlled access to examination venues, and vigilant monitoring throughout the examination period (Adetunji, 2021). When these elements are insufficient or poorly implemented, the likelihood of malpractice increases substantially.

Empirical studies suggest that the physical and administrative characteristics of examination venues significantly influence students' ethical decision-making during examinations. Overcrowded halls, poor visibility, inadequate lighting, and ineffective invigilator movement have been associated with increased cheating behaviors (Roberts & Wu, 2022). These findings underscore the importance of examination supervision as both a preventive and regulatory mechanism.

The role of invigilators is particularly critical in shaping the integrity of examination processes. Invigilators who demonstrate alertness, consistency, and fairness are more likely to discourage malpractice than those perceived as lax or inattentive (Gottfried, 2021). Conversely, inadequate invigilator numbers and limited movement within examination venues create opportunities for collusion and unauthorized communication among students.

Institutional policies and organizational culture also influence the effectiveness of examination supervision. Universities that prioritize academic integrity through clear regulations, consistent enforcement, and adequate resource allocation tend to experience lower incidences

of examination malpractice (Çelik, & Razi, (2023)). However, disparities in policy implementation between institutions may account for variations in malpractice prevalence.

Differences between public and private universities further complicate the examination malpractice discourse. While public universities often contend with large student populations and limited resources, private universities may benefit from smaller class sizes and more controlled examination environments. Nevertheless, empirical evidence on how these institutional differences affect examination supervision and malpractice remains limited within the Kenyan context.

Bachelor of Education programs warrant particular attention due to their role in preparing future educators who are expected to model ethical conduct and uphold professional standards. Examination malpractice among teacher trainees poses long-term risks to the education system, as compromised assessment integrity may translate into diminished professional competence and ethical lapses in future teaching practice (World Bank, 2021).

Fourth-year Bachelor of Education students occupy a critical academic stage, as they approach graduation and entry into the teaching profession. The high stakes associated with final-year examinations may increase susceptibility to malpractice, especially where supervision is perceived as weak or inconsistent. Understanding the dynamics of supervision at this level is therefore essential for safeguarding academic standards.

Despite existing research on examination malpractice, much of the literature has focused broadly on student attitudes, technological cheating, or policy frameworks, with limited emphasis on the specific influence of examination supervision conditions. Moreover, comparative studies examining supervision practices across public and private universities remain scarce, particularly within Kenya.

Theoretical perspectives on academic dishonesty suggest that students' engagement in malpractice is influenced by opportunity structures, perceived risks, and institutional controls. Examination supervision directly affects these factors by either constraining or enabling opportunities for unethical behavior (Adetunji, 2021). This theoretical lens positions supervision as a key explanatory variable in understanding malpractice.

From a practical standpoint, strengthening examination supervision requires evidence-based insights into which supervision components most effectively deter malpractice. Elements such as invigilator numbers, venue layout, access control, and invigilator vigilance must be systematically examined to inform policy and practice (Mumbua, 2022).

The present study is situated within this empirical and conceptual gap, focusing on the influence of examination supervision on examination malpractice among Bachelor of Education fourth-year students in public and private universities in Kenya. By adopting a comparative approach, the study seeks to illuminate institutional

differences and contextual factors shaping supervision effectiveness.

Specifically, the study aims to examine how supervision-related factors such as invigilator presence, movement, venue layout, and security measures influence the occurrence of examination malpractice. It further seeks to compare these influences between public and private universities to identify patterns and divergences in supervision practices.

The findings of this study are expected to contribute to the growing body of literature on academic integrity by providing context-specific evidence from Kenyan higher education. Additionally, the study offers practical insights for university administrators, examination officers, and policymakers seeking to strengthen examination supervision frameworks.

By grounding its inquiry in both empirical data and established theoretical perspectives, this study provides a foundation for deeper engagement with existing scholarship. Consequently, the discussion in Chapter Two builds upon this introduction by critically reviewing related literature on examination supervision, malpractice, and academic integrity within higher education contexts.

Ultimately, this study underscores the centrality of effective examination supervision in preserving the credibility of university assessments and promoting ethical academic behavior. Strengthening supervision practices is not only an administrative necessity but also a moral imperative for institutions committed to producing competent, ethical, and professionally grounded graduates.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Examination malpractice constitutes a persistent and deeply entrenched challenge to academic integrity across educational systems globally, with particularly acute manifestations in developing countries. As systems of higher education expand and competition for academic credentials intensifies, the integrity of assessment processes increasingly comes under strain. The World Bank (2021) conceptualizes examination malpractice as any action or behavior that compromises the principles of fairness, validity, and credibility in assessment by granting undue advantage to certain students. Such practices not only distort learning outcomes but also erode public confidence in educational qualifications and institutional legitimacy.

A growing body of empirical literature demonstrates that examination malpractice is not merely a product of individual moral failure but is significantly shaped by contextual and structural conditions within examination environments. Among these conditions, examination supervision has emerged as a critical determinant of student behavior during assessments. Supervision-related factors—including seating arrangements, invigilator vigilance, invigilator-to-student ratios, and institutional enforcement practices—have been consistently identified as influential in either constraining

or enabling malpractice (Gottfried, 2021; Mumbua, 2022). These factors collectively shape the opportunity structures within which students make ethical or unethical choices.

Research further indicates that the manner in which examinations are supervised plays a decisive role in influencing students' conduct. Poorly organized supervision environments often signal weak institutional control, thereby lowering the perceived risk of detection and sanction. Conversely, structured and well-monitored examination settings tend to reinforce norms of academic honesty and deter dishonest behavior. Seating arrangements, in particular, have been shown to significantly affect the likelihood of malpractice. Well-spaced and strategically planned seating reduces opportunities for collusion and unauthorized communication, while overcrowded or poorly arranged venues facilitate cooperation and cheating among candidates (Baker & Leary, 2020).

Evidence from regional studies reinforces the centrality of supervision in mitigating examination malpractice. For instance, a study conducted in Nigeria revealed that compromised security measures—such as insufficient invigilator presence and lax monitoring—substantially increased incidents of examination malpractice (Onabajo & Ajiboye, 2020). These findings highlight the consequences of weak supervision structures and underscore the importance of consistent and vigilant invigilation in preserving assessment integrity.

Beyond physical supervision, environmental conditions within examination venues have also been shown to influence students' ethical decision-making. Distractions such as excessive noise, inadequate lighting, and poor ventilation can undermine concentration and elevate anxiety levels, potentially prompting students to resort to unethical practices as coping mechanisms (Roberts & Wu, 2022; Senyametor et al., 2022). Such findings suggest that examination malpractice is partly a function of environmental stressors that interact with supervision quality.

Institutional practices and policy enforcement further shape the prevalence of examination malpractice. Universities that implement stringent academic integrity policies and cultivate disciplined examination cultures are more effective in deterring malpractice. However, the effectiveness of these policies is often undermined by inconsistent implementation, limited resources, and uneven enforcement across institutions (Gemma et al., 2021). This variability weakens institutional control mechanisms and creates loopholes that students may exploit during examinations.

Scholarly consensus increasingly emphasizes that effective examination management requires a holistic approach that integrates physical supervision, environmental control, and institutional governance. Well-managed examination environments are characterized by adequate and alert invigilators, secure and accessible venues, clear examination regulations, and consistent enforcement mechanisms. Such integrated supervision

frameworks are essential for safeguarding the integrity of academic assessments and ensuring that examination outcomes genuinely reflect student competence (Mumbua, 2022).

Despite the growing literature on examination malpractice, there remains a relative paucity of empirical studies that systematically examine the specific influence of examination supervision factors within university contexts, particularly in comparative terms. In Kenya, where both public and private universities operate under differing structural and administrative conditions, understanding how supervision practices influence malpractice among students remains an important yet underexplored area of inquiry.

This study responds to this gap by focusing on Bachelor of Education fourth-year students, a group for whom examination integrity is particularly consequential given their imminent transition into the teaching profession. As future educators, these students are expected to model ethical conduct and uphold professional standards, making the integrity of their assessment processes a matter of national educational significance.

METHODOLOGY

To address the study objectives, a mixed-methods research design was adopted, integrating both quantitative and qualitative approaches to provide a comprehensive understanding of how examination supervision factors influence examination malpractice among Bachelor of Education fourth-year students. The use of a mixed-methods approach enabled the study to capture both measurable patterns and in-depth experiential insights, thereby strengthening the validity and explanatory power of the findings.

The research design combined descriptive survey and correlational methodologies. The quantitative

component examined the extent to which supervision-related factors—such as invigilator presence, venue organization, and monitoring practices—were associated with examination malpractice. The qualitative component complemented this analysis by exploring students', lecturers', and examination officers' perceptions and experiences of examination supervision within university settings.

The target population comprised 4,170 fourth-year Bachelor of Education students, 86 lecturers, and 27 examination officers drawn from selected public and private universities in Kenya. A stratified sampling technique was employed to ensure proportional representation across institutional categories, resulting in a sample of 365 students, 127 lecturers, and 27 examination officers.

Data were collected using structured questionnaires and semi-structured interview schedules. The questionnaires captured quantitative data on supervision conditions and perceived malpractice, while interviews provided qualitative insights into institutional practices and supervision dynamics. Quantitative data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 27, employing descriptive statistics, Pearson correlation analysis, and analysis of variance (ANOVA). Qualitative data were analyzed thematically to identify recurring patterns and explanatory themes related to examination supervision and malpractice.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 provides a detailed overview of the correlation analysis conducted to assess the relationship between examination supervision factors and instances of examination malpractice among Bachelor of Education fourth-year students in public and private universities in Kenya.

Table 1: Correlation Analysis between Examination Venue Factors and Examination Malpractice

Statistic	Value
Correlation Coefficient (R)	0.964
R-squared (R ²)	0.929
Adjusted R-squared	0.929
Standard Error	0.63448
F-statistic	4741.746
p-value	0.000

The statistical results summarized in this table reveal a remarkably strong correlation coefficient (R) of 0.964, indicating a very robust positive relationship between the conditions of examination supervision and the likelihood of students engaging in malpractice. This high correlation suggests that as the quality and organization of

examination supervision improve, the instances of malpractice correspondingly decrease.

The R-squared value (R²) of 0.929 is particularly noteworthy, as it signifies that approximately 92.9% of the variance in examination malpractice occurrences can be explained by the examination supervision factors included

in the model. This substantial percentage illustrates that supervision-related issues, such as seating arrangements, proximity to supervisors and invigilators, and overall manning of examination conditions, play a critical role in shaping students' behaviors during examinations. The remaining 7.1% of the variance could be attributed to other external factors not captured within this analysis, which may warrant further investigation in future research.

Another critical value presented in the table is the adjusted R-squared, which also stands at 0.929. Adjusted R-squared accounts for the number of predictors in the model, ensuring that the model's predictive power is not artificially inflated when multiple variables are included. The consistency in the R-squared and adjusted R-squared values further supports the reliability and robustness of the model, reinforcing the notion that examination venue conditions significantly impact the integrity of academic assessments.

The standard error of the estimate is reported as 0.63448, indicating a relatively small average deviation between the predicted values and the actual observed

outcomes. This low standard error reflects the model's accuracy in predicting examination malpractice based on the examination supervision factors, suggesting that the influence of these factors is both strong and predictable within the sample population.

Furthermore, the F-statistic of 4741.746, alongside a p-value of 0.000, demonstrates that the regression model is statistically significant. The F-statistic tests the overall significance of the model, and the extremely low p-value indicates that the likelihood of observing such results due to chance is virtually negligible. This statistical significance substantiates the hypothesis that examination venue factors are fundamentally linked to the prevalence of examination malpractice.

A significant positive correlation ($R = 0.964$) indicates a strong relationship between examination supervision factors and instances of examination malpractice, suggesting improved supervision conditions can lower malpractice occurrences, as shown in Table 17.

The tables based on the provided information. Each table is followed by a brief presentation and discussion.

Table 2: ANOVA Results for Examination supervision Factors and Examination Malpractice

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p-value
Regression	1908.871	1	1908.871	4741.746	0.000
Residual	146.132	363	0.403		
Total	2055.003	364			

Table 2 presents the ANOVA results used to analyze the significance of examination supervision factors on examination malpractice. The regression sum of squares (1908.871) is substantial compared to the residual sum of squares (146.132), underlining that the independent variables effectively explain most of the variance in the dependent variable, which is examination malpractice.

The F-statistic value of 4741.746, coupled with a p-value of 0.000, confirms that the model is statistically significant, indicating that examination venue factors play a critical role in influencing malpractice. As such, these results affirm the necessity for educational institutions to address supervision-related issues to mitigate instances of malpractice.

Table 3: Influence of number of invigilators on Examination Malpractice

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Agree	0	0%
Agree	20	5.48%
Neutral	50	13.7%
Disagree	120	32.88%
Strongly Disagree	175	48.94%
Total	365	100%

Table 3 illustrates student perceptions related to the influence of number of invigilators on examination malpractice. A significant majority (81.82%) of respondents disagreed with the notion that seating arrangements prevented malpractice, with 48.94% strongly disagreeing. This suggests a considerable

skepticism regarding current number of invigilators, highlighting a need for universities to reconsider how seating is organized during examinations. Adding to the number of invigilators could potentially reduce opportunities for cheating, reinforcing academic integrity

Table 4: Effectiveness of Supervision Measures in Examination Venues

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Very Effective	10	2.74%
Effective	45	12.32%
Neutral	60	16.44%
Ineffective	115	31.16%
Very Ineffective	135	36.33%
Total	365	100%

Table 4 presents students' perceptions of the effectiveness of supervision measures in examination venues. A combined total of 67.49% of respondents acknowledged that security measures were either ineffective or very ineffective. The lack of confidence in

these measures suggests that lax supervision could foster an environment conducive to malpractice, emphasizing the necessity for stricter enforcement and strict manning during examinations.

Table 5: Invigilators keenness Impact on examination malpractice

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	150	40.93%
No	215	59.07%
Total	365	100%

Table 5 highlights student responses regarding invigilators keenness during examination. A notable 59.07% of participants reported that invigilators laxity negatively affected their involvement, suggesting that insufficient or inappropriate supervision might

compromise student's behaviour and overall examination experience. This finding underlines the importance of ensuring keen supervision during examination to help safeguard academic integrity and support students' performance during assessments.

Table 6: Venue Layout and Design for Monitoring

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	130	35.6%
No	235	64.4%

In Table 6, the responses regarding the suitability of venue layout for monitoring students during examinations are presented. A significant majority (64.4%) of students indicated that the layout was not conducive to effective monitoring. This perception points to potential

weaknesses in venue design that may encourage or facilitate malpractice, highlighting the need for universities to rethink venue layouts to enhance oversight and promote integrity in examinations.

Table 8: Access Control to Examination Venues

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	200	54.79%
No	165	45.21%
Total	365	100%

Table 8 reports on the availability of access control measures at examination venues. While over half (54.79%) of respondents believed that access control measures were in place, nearly half disagreed. This ambiguity suggests that the effectiveness of access

control could be improved, indicating a need for more rigorous enforcement or clearer communication of the measures in place to prevent unauthorized access, and hence, minimize opportunities for malpractice.

Table 9: Influence of the number of invigilators on Examination Malpractice

Response	Frequency	Percentage
No	120	32.88%
Yes	245	67.12%
Total	365	100%

Table 9 shows that 67.12% of respondents believed that invigilators movement did indeed influence examination malpractice, contrasting with previous findings in Table 3 regarding their effectiveness. This discrepancy highlights a complex relationship between

few invigilators and students' perceptions of malpractice facilitation, suggesting that even if the number are believed to contribute to malpractice, they may not be effective in preventing it.

Table 10: Thematic Analysis of Focused Group Discussions and Interviews on the Influence of Examination supervision on Examination Malpractice

Source	Identified Themes	Percentage of Respondents
Lecturers	Poor Supervision	68%
Examination Officers	Environment Created for Cheating	76%

In Table 10, the analysis of focused group discussions and interviews reveals critical insights into the factors affecting examination malpractice. A significant portion of both lecturers (68%) and examination officers (76%) identified poor supervision and the few invigilators as key

factors creating room for cheating as key themes. This shared acknowledgement underscores the importance of effective monitoring during examinations and the necessity for institutions to address supervision practices to enhance integrity.

Table 11: Themes from FGDs and Interviews on the Influence of the number of invigilators and Supervision on Examination Malpractice

Source	Identified Themes	Key Insights
Lecturers	Number of invigilators and Supervision	Few invigilators and supervision increase chances of malpractice.
Examination Officers	Opportunity for Cheating	Crowded venues create conditions conducive to malpractice.

Table 11 elaborates on the thematic findings regarding the small number of invigilators and supervision. Both lecturers and examination officers emphasized that inadequate number of invigilators and supervision significantly contribute to opportunities for cheating. These insights highlight crucial areas for improvement, suggesting that educational institutions must prioritize the increase in number of examination invigilators and enhance supervisory practices to reduce malpractice opportunities effectively.

of oversight. Furthermore, the discussions emphasized the role of supervisors in enhancing examination discipline, indicating that laxity among supervision, unmonitored venues create conditions that are conducive to malpractice. Such lapses in supervision not only distract students but also provide them with opportunities to carry out dishonest practices without fear of being caught.

In conclusion, the study underscores that various examination supervision factors—such as seating arrangements, number of invigilators, alertness and keenness of invigilators, and movements in the examination room—substantially influence the occurrences of examination malpractice among Bachelor of Education fourth-year students in both public and private universities in Kenya. The findings illustrate that reinforcing keen supervision of examinations could significantly mitigate instances of malpractice, thereby fostering an keen supervision that promotes academic integrity. This highlights the necessity for universities to prioritize the improvement of examination supervision,

Thematic Insights from Focus Groups

Analysis of focused group discussions revealed critical themes identified by lecturers and examination officers regarding the influence of examination supervision on malpractice. One prominent theme was poor supervision, which was highlighted as a significant factor that facilitates malpractices. Participants noted that inadequate monitoring during examinations often leads to students engaging in dishonest behavior due to the lack

ensuring that they are adequately supervised and conducive to fair assessment practices. By addressing these supervision-related factors, institutions can create a more trustworthy examination process that upholds educational standards and integrity.

Recommendations

Recommendations include policy recommendations and recommendations for further research

Policy Recommendations

Enhance Venue Management: To combat examination malpractice effectively, universities should prioritize enhancing the conditions of examination environments. This involves improving aspects such as seating arrangements, lighting, and overall cleanliness to create a more conducive testing atmosphere. Additionally, it is essential to implement formal training programs for invigilators, allowing them to optimize their oversight capabilities and monitor student behavior more effectively during exams. By investing in venue management and equipping invigilators with the necessary skills, institutions can significantly reduce opportunities for malpractice and foster a fair academic environment.

Address Academic Pressures: It is crucial for universities to recognize and address the academic pressures that often lead students to engage in dishonest practices. Implementing comprehensive student support programs can alleviate stress and offer resources such as counselling and time management workshops. By fostering a supportive environment that prioritizes mental health and well-being, institutions can empower students to adopt healthier study habits and academic behaviours. This proactive approach not only mitigates the risk of malpractice but also enhances overall student satisfaction and success in their educational journeys.

Establish Comprehensive Security Protocols: Universities must conduct a thorough review of their existing security measures surrounding examinations and take necessary actions to strengthen these protocols. This includes limiting unauthorized access to examination venues, utilizing technology such as surveillance cameras, and having proper identification checks for both students and invigilators. By establishing robust security measures, institutions can enhance the integrity of the examination process and create a climate of accountability where students feel that malpractice is monitored and deterred effectively.

Conduct Workshops on Academic Integrity: Raising awareness about the importance of academic integrity is vital in cultivating a culture of honesty within educational institutions. Universities should implement workshops and campaigns that target the significance of maintaining integrity during examinations. These initiatives can include discussions on the implications of academic

dishonesty, the importance of personal responsibility, and strategies for studying effectively without resorting to unethical practices. By fostering a comprehensive understanding of academic integrity among students, institutions can instil the values of honesty and responsibility that are essential for their future professional endeavours.

Recommendations for Further Research

Longitudinal Studies: Future research should consider implementing longitudinal studies that track changes in student behaviour over time in response to modifications in examination venues. By observing students across different academic terms and under various venue conditions, researchers can gain valuable insights into the long-term effects of environmental changes on academic integrity and malpractice rates. Such studies would provide a dynamic understanding of how students adapt their behaviours in relation to improvements in examination settings, thereby informing policies and practices aimed at reducing malpractice.

Comparative Studies: It would be beneficial for future research to pursue comparative studies that expand the demographic diversity of the sample population. By including a wider range of student backgrounds, institutions, and geographical locations, researchers can enhance understanding of the various variables that affect examination malpractice. This broader perspective could help identify unique patterns and factors influencing academic dishonesty across different contexts, ultimately contributing to a more comprehensive approach to addressing the issues at hand. Additionally, these comparative analyses could highlight the specific needs and challenges faced by diverse student populations in relation to examination integrity.

Qualitative Approaches: Further research could utilize deeper qualitative methodologies to explore student perceptions regarding examination venues and academic integrity. By conducting interviews or focus groups, researchers can gather rich, detailed narratives that reveal how students interpret and experience the examination environment. This qualitative insight can illuminate the nuanced factors that contribute to malpractice, including psychological, social, and contextual elements. Understanding student perspectives on their examination experiences would not only enrich the existing literature but also provide practical recommendations for creating more supportive and integrity-promoting examination settings in educational institutions.

REFERENCES

- Adetunji, S. A. (2021). Examination venue factors and student behaviors: A comprehensive review. *Journal of Educational Integrity, 17*(2), 65–79.

- Gottfried, M. A. (2021). The effects of examination environment on student performance. **Educational Assessment, 27*(1), 45–60.* https://doi.org/10.1080/10627197.2021.1878589
- Mumbua, J. (2022). Examination venue factors and their influence on academic misconduct. **African Journal of Educational Studies in Mathematics and Sciences, 18*(1), 1–9.*
- Onabajo, O., & Ajiboye, J. (2020). Factors influencing examination malpractice in Nigerian tertiary institutions: An assessment of security strategies. **International Journal for Educational Integrity, 16*(1), 1–15.* https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-020-00060-9
- Roberts, T., & Wu, H. (2022). Environmental influences on student concentration during examinations. **Journal of Educational Psychology, 114*(4), 75–91.* https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000663
- World Bank. (2021). Academic integrity and examination malpractice in educational systems: A global perspective (Education Report No. 210). World Bank.