African Sociological Review, 7, (1), 2003, pp.117-161.

RESEARCH REPORTS

Sexual Harassment in Academia in Nigeria: How Real?

Olugbenga Jelil Ladebo
Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development
University of Agriculture, Abeokuta
P.O. Box 2316, Sapon, Abeokuta
Ogun State, Nigeria
Email: adebo@unaab.edu.ng
olugbenga@yahoo.com

Introduction

Sexual harassment in Nigeria's universities appears to be under-researched and even less reported (Adamolekun, 1989). However, the Commission on the Review of Higher Education in Nigeria (CRHEN) (1991) suggests that the phenomenon is gradually assuming critical dimensions in Nigeria's higher education institutions. A study of four Nigerian universities reveals that students identified sexual harassment as being among the stressors hindering academic work in the sample of universities (Ladebo, 2001). This contentious issue came to the fore in 2001, when the nation's president, General Olusegun Obasanjo in apparent disregard of protocol during an official engagement, ridiculed the Nigerian university teachers for being unproductive pleasure seekers who sees the female students as sex objects for self gratification. The vituperative utterances of the President regarding academics evoked serious debates from the public, as well as denials and counter accusations from individual academics and collectively as a union.

The motivation for this study stemmed in part from the public debate generated by President's remarks. The intention was to undertake a rapid assessment of the issue of sexual harassment by, first, examining the legal situation regarding sexual harassment either in the work-place in general or academe specifically. The study then undertook fieldwork at a number of tertiary institutions to try to determine whether sexual relationships between faculty staff and students was considered to be widespread, and whether it was coercive or voluntary.

Information for this study was obtained through interviews with key actors and focus group discussions using checklists with both male and female students, and faculty staff in three universities. The three institutions are situated in Ogun State located in the south-west part of Nigeria. To preserve the identity of these institutions, they are referred to as Case I, II, and III respectively in the

study. Key actors interviewed included a university legal officer, two student affairs deans, a deputy vice-chancellor for administration, a university registrar, three college officers, a planning officer, and four head of departments, disciplinary committee members, and union leaders. Also interviewed were three lawyers in private practice, a judicial member of the bench in Ogun State, and a senior legal officer (in charge of legal drafting) in the State Ministry of Justice. One hundred and twenty-three subjects were interviewed, but no probabilistic sampling procedure was followed in the identification of respondents. Key actors were interviewed on the need to know basis and/or through referrals from colleagues.

The overall research questions that formed the basis of this study were:

(a) Is there any legislation on sexual harassment in the country; and do focal universities have explicit or formal regulations on sexual harassment?
(b) Do professional associations (such as the Academic Staff Union of Nigerian Universities, (ASUU)) on the campus have codes of conduct for members that contain an explicit anti-sexual harassment provisions?
(c) Are there constituted grievance procedures regarding those who might consider themselves victims of sexual harassment?
(d) What is the perceived extent of sexual harassment and sexual relationships between female students and male faculty members on the campuses under study?

The paper first conceptualises sexual harassment and identifies its various forms from the literature; second, it discusses the consequences of sexual harassment and considers what might be the extent of harassment in academia; and third, it takes a snapshot view of the perceived situation at three Nigerian universities.

Sexual Harassment: Meaning and its Consequences

Various definitions of sexual harassment have been posited due in part to the wide range of behaviours that may be viewed as constituting harassment. A frequent component of these definitions is that of unequal or differential power relationships in hostile work environments. The U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) (1980) guidelines for example define sexual harassment as:

> Unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature constitute sexual harassment when (1) submission to such conduct is made either explicit or implicit a term or condition of an individual's employment, (2) submission to or rejection of such conduct by an individual is used as the basis for employment decisions affecting such individual, (3) such conduct has the purpose or effect of unreasonably interfering with an individual's work performance or creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working environment (74677).

The definition identifies the various behaviours that may constitute sexual harassment in a work environment. The first two provisions deal with unequal power relations between the employer/supervisor and employee/subordinate. An employer or a supervisor demands sexual gratification from the employee or subordinate in return for job benefits. In the academic environment, a parallel situation could be argued to arise when faculty staff proposition female students for sexual favours, in return for favourable examination results. The third provision refers to the existence of a hostile work environment, where the offending behaviour interferes with the satisfactory work performance of an employee. Arising from the EEOC (1980) guidelines, sexual harassment cases have been successfully pursued in the U.S. (Koen, 1989; Popovich, 1988). Fitzgerald, Gelfand and Drasgow (1995) extended this definition by adding three empirically derived situations. First, unwanted sexual attention such as touching, hugging, stroking and demanding a date. Second, sexual coercion, which relates to sexual advances with the promise of job-related benefits. Third, gender harassment which refers to those verbal and non-verbal behaviours (such as jokes, taunts, gestures, and exhibition of pornographic materials) directed at and/or intended to degrade women.

However, Husbands (1992) believes that the meaning of sexual harassment is socially constructed depending on the personal and situational characteristics of the individual making the judgement. For instance, behaviour is likely to be labelled harassment when: (a) there are physical advances accompanied by threats of punishment for non-compliance; (b) There is an unequal power relation between the harasser and the victim; (c) It elicits negative response from the person being harassed; (d) The behaviour is perceived as being inappropriate for the actor's social role; (e) The harasser is seen as being persistent in his/her action; and (f) Women professionals are more likely than secretarial or clerical personnel to label behaviour as sexual harassment.

In general, women are more likely to perceive or label behaviour as sexual harassment (Riger, 1991; Konrad & Gutek, 1986; Popovich et al., 1986). Dey, Korn and Sax (1996) in a review of literature present three theoretical models specifying the likely causes of sexual harassment. First, is the socio-cultural model that views harassment as the enforcement of gender role inequalities within the social system. The prevailing patriarchal system subordinates the position of the woman to that of the man. Thus, sexual harassment is seen as a tool of domination to keep the woman perpetually subordinated to men. Second, the natural/biological model argues that the intent is not to harm, or harass women, but that men are naturally aggressive in pursuing their sexual urges. A similar version of this view posits that sexual harassment is the product of attraction of the man to the woman. The tendency is for the man to exert pressure on the woman, but devoid of any intent to harm her. Finally, the organisational model argues that the existing hierarchical authority relations and

structures in organisations are responsible for the incidence of sexual harassment.

Victims of sexual harassment

In academia as in other work environments, victims of sexual harassment in most cases have been women; though to a lesser extent men have been the targets of harassment too (Dey et al., 1996). In their sample of faculty staff in the U.S., Dey et al., (1996) report that 15.1 percent of female faculty staff compared with 3.1 percent of male faculty experienced sexual harassment. However, much higher incidence rates have been reported for the women, such as 63 percent by Schneider, Swan and Fitzgerald (1997). Schneider (1987) observes that 60 percent of female faculty staff who were included in a study experienced a form of harassment every working day. But, Kelly and Parsons (2000) suggest that women in the academia must not be viewed as being a homogenous gender group. Rather there are subgroups such as female faculty members, staff, administrators, undergraduates and graduate students. Each of the five subgroups has differing incidence rates (female faculty members 22 percent, staff 30 percent, administrators 43 percent, undergraduate students 20 percent, and graduate students 19 percent). They also report that the perpetrators differ markedly in the case of undergraduates where fellow students are the main culprits, while for the graduate students male faculty members are often the offender.

Each of the subgroups of women in academia is vulnerable to certain forms of harassment. Kelly and Parsons (2000) found that employees (62 percent) are more likely to experience gender harassment than do students (43 percent), while more students (41 percent) are likely to be the target of unwanted sexual attention than are employees (30 percent). However, students experience sexual coercion more frequently than do employees. Finally, power differentials play a significant role regarding the identity of the victim. For instance, it has been established that female faculty of lower rank are more vulnerable to harassment from either senior faculty members or students (Dey et al., 1996; Kelly & Parsons, 2000). This is consistent with research that indicates that women employed in low status jobs (such as 'blue-collar jobs') and highly dependent on them experience more harassment than do other women (Riger, 1991). Similarly, young, unmarried, or divorced women are likely candidates of harassment (Popovich, 1988).

Though recognised as a work-place malady, and despite its negative physical and psychological effects on victims, sexual harassment incidents are seldom reported by victims. Most victims of harassment exhibit avoidance behaviour, for example staying away from the aggressor or from the environment that promotes such behaviours, or they simply put up with the behaviour. In some cases, victims blamed themselves for the situation, while others confide in friends or family members. Only a few actually filed a formal complaint

against the offender (Kelly & Parsons, 2000; Schneider et al., 1997; Riger, 1991; Schneider, 1987). Victims of harassment, most especially women, are often disinclined to report harassment cases because of fear of reprisals, ridicule, perceived indifferent attitudes by the organisation, and the nature of the grievance procedure, which may be male-dominated (Riger, 1991; Adamolekun, 1989; Schneider, 1987).

Studies have shown that the consequences of sexual harassment even at low levels for the victims could include impaired psychological well-being, such as lowered self esteem, nervousness, irritability, and anger (Popovich, 1988); and negative job attitudes, and work withdrawal behaviours that may eventually lead to the discharge from the organisation. Negative outcomes to the organisation include absenteeism, decreased productivity, high attrition rate, litigation expenses, and an impaired organisational climate. In academia, female students who experienced harassment may exhibit a form of 'job withdrawal' behaviour in terms of changing their major subject choices, altering career plans, or avoiding a threatening situation (Schneinder et al., 1997; Riger, 1991). Harassed female faculty members are more likely to suffer strained work relations, view colleagues as professionally incompetent, and become generally dissatisfied with their jobs (Dey et al., 1996). At other times, female faculty members have had to suffer detrimental consequences to their academic careers (Schneider, 1987).

The Nigerian experience

Although the subject of sexual harassment evokes spontaneous reactions from people whenever and wherever it is mentioned, there is no legislation in Nigeria that explicitly penalises sexual harassment at work, including academic environments. Sexual harassment is yet to be officially recognised as the violation of the rights of an individual in the work-place. Organisations and members view it as an employer-employee personal problem, which should be resolved between the parties concerned. Not a single case of sexual harassment has been known to come before the Nigerian courts. A female judicial member interviewed had this to say about it:

> I am not aware of any case of sexual harassment in our records. Since there is no law on it, it becomes pretty difficult for anybody to allege harassment. What we have are assaults and rape, that is all. Certainly, there is sexual harassment here and there; but the nature of our society...is male dominated and nobody will pay attention to you, when you come up with such allegation. Besides, no woman wants to lose her job... jobs are hard to come by, and so, many women have to put up with it as much as possible. It is like rape, nobody wants to be associated with it because of the stigma.

It is believed that sexual harassment permeates all facets of Nigeria's national life. The same respondent observes: 'Even, on the bench there is harassment, so, who is going to judge the case'.

Findings from Fieldwork: CASE I

This private university came into existence in 1958, and its initial focus was on theological education, awarding certificates and degrees in theology. In 1999 it was granted approval to award degrees in secular disciplines. Due to its religious background, most teaching and administrative staff belong to the religious order that established the institution. Student enrolment is 2150, while the faculty number 120.

The University does not have a formal regulation on sexual harassment, though the institution was in the process of preparing a code of conduct for its staff. Key informants reiterated the hope that the proposed code of conduct would include provisions on sexual harassment and normative behaviours expected from faculty members. A top administrator in the institution observed that sexual harassment may not be a problem in the institution considering the religious orientation of the school; and besides, the faculty members were adequately screened to ensure that only those with exemplary character were employed. Another reason cited was that student enrolments in future will not exceed 3000 to allow for effective management of the institution. The administrator comments:

> Parents bring their daughters here because of the kind of education we offer here. Should I say we have more girls than boys; and our teachers have a moral duty to be role models to these kids. Besides, the girls are not permitted to wear body revealing dresses.

However, the institution relies on informal awareness education programme where standard behavioural practices are prescribed for the students and faculty staff alike. On Mondays and Wednesdays every week, the university convenes what is referred to as chapel seminar where issues concerning staff-student relations, well-being and moral expectations are discussed. Students are encouraged to express their views on any subject that affects them in this forum. It is believed that if misdemeanours such as sexual harassment are being perpetrated by any of the faculty staff, the students would report it at this forum. Otherwise, students may formally notify the student affairs office, which will investigate the allegations. If the allegation of harassment is found to have merit, then the offending faculty member will be arraigned before the Staff Disciplinary Committee (SDC).

Students interviewed observed that sexual harassment in its various forms does not exist on the campus. In a particular instance, a male student directed the author to Case III because the institution's reputation for sexual harassment by faculty is phenomenal. Further enquiries asking why this (male) student made an unsolicited comparison between Case I, and Case III revealed that the subject changed institutions, from Case III to Case I. He was in a better position to know the difference between the two institutions. This respondent went on to recount how a cousin came home for the December 2001 Christmas holidays with complaints that a particular male faculty staff was propositioning her for

sex. The student did not think that this experience was an isolated one, rather he believed that sexual harassment of female students by the faculty staff is a common feature in Case III. This perception of Case III as a sexual harassment-prone institution was corroborated by another respondent in Case II who is an academic staff union executive.

However, it is believed by some of the students interviewed that female students are involved in sexual relationships with the faculty staff. In most of the cases, female students who are weak academically out of desperation proposition their course teachers in exchange for academic rewards. Interestingly, the students' views were confirmed by a male faculty member who reported that some of his colleagues said they had been propositioned by female students. A twist to this issue is that a few of the interviewed students (inclusive of male and female) opined that it is normal to have a female student dating the male faculty staff if there is mutual consent between the two parties or if the girl wants to have 'fun' and the faculty staff can provide it for her.

Findings from Fieldwork: CASE II

Case II is a federal government funded institution, which was established in 1988. The academic staff population is 258, while student enrolment is 3,778 (both undergraduates and postgraduates). There is no published university policy prohibiting sexual harassment or staff-student sexual relationship at this institution. Nevertheless, the absence of policy guidelines on sexual harassment cannot be construed that the university is permissive of the act, or the institutional environment is devoid of harassment. Institution members believe that individuals experiencing harassment can file formal complaint with the registrar of the institution, who will refer the matter to the SDC. Aggrieved students can channel their grievances through the student affairs office. For instance, two sexual harassment-cum-examination malpractice cases involving faculty members and female students between 1998 and 2000 were brought before the SDC. The faculty members were adjudged guilty, and consequently relieved of their duties. In the case of staff-staff harassment, no known complaints have been reported to the university.

However, members of the SDC interviewed reported that the aggrieved party must be able to prove the commission of the act against their person as well as present an incontrovertible evidence and witness(es). Due to the absence of guidelines, it was difficult convicting offenders, and most harassment cases are not even reported. In the two cases between 1998-2000 involving faculty-female students, proof of commission of sexual coercion against the offending faculty members was provided by examination malpractices, to which the offence was linked. The first male member of faculty extorted money and sexual favours from a female student in return for awarding good grades to the student, but the lecturer later reneged on the agreement. The student, feeling cheated, decided to brave the odds, and she reported the incident to the school

authority, which took the case up. The faculty member was found guilty of examination misconduct, rather than sexual harassment and his appointment was terminated.

The second case involved a male faculty member who harassed a female student about a sexual relationship over a period of two academic sessions, but the student refused to oblige. Consequently, the female student failed the particular course that first year. In the second year, and in a desperate bid to pass the course, the female student employed a 'live mercenary'[1] (Nwagwu, 1997), to write the examination for her, but the mercenary was apprehended by security officials in the examination hall. When the case was referred to the student disciplinary committee the female student narrated how in desperation she had had to employ fraudulent means to pass the course. This situation led to the arraignment of the affected faculty member before the SDC, which eventually found him culpable of examination malpractice, and was subsequently dismissed from the institution. The informant had this to say:

> The girl looked (him) in the face and told him, but you are man, why are you now denying that you don't know me and want to have fun with me. Be a man and own up to your actions. Eventually, he (faculty) broke down before the panel weeping, and he (faculty) confessed. We (panel members) were ashamed as academic staff because the girl really dragged our image in the mud. Anyway, the girl was given one year suspension, and she is back on campus.

Both faculty members and students believe that staff-student sexual relationships are a common feature on the campus. Respondents made comments which included the following:

> 'Guys are doing it (having sexual affairs with their students), oh'; and 'You better believe it some of our people (faculty staff) are sleeping with the girls, and in some cases the girls will come to you. You may not know because you are not in that circle. But those who do it know themselves'.

A female student observed that some of the female students involved in the relationship are sometimes thrilled about having an affair with their teachers; while a female faculty volunteered that the trend now is such that female students are becoming more aggressive and making the overtures to the male faculty.

Faculty members are not solely involved. Administrative personnel also engage in sexual coupling with students; though the parties involved in the relationship usually keep it discreet. Male staff members have been noted to initiate sexual relationships with students, while in some cases female students have been the perpetrators. To support the view that students sometimes make the first move, two disparate incidences were highlighted. A male faculty member recounted how a female student in his college propositioned him for friendship, which was politely turned down by him. The second incident was an extreme case, which is a reversal of the normal relationship between female stu-

dent/male teachers. In the second incident, a male final year student attempted to woo his female teacher who was of a junior rank.

The motives for the relationship are varied depending on the situation and the personality involved. Some of the female students enter into a sexual relationship with the faculty to acquire the status of a 'super girl' on the campus. A female student respondent submitted that some of the girls do derive great pleasure for being sexually involved with a faculty. Such female students flaunt the fact when in the company of friends. In some instances, sexual affairs may be due to monetary gains where the student is financially indigent. A number of the relationships between the faculty and female students hinge on the academic favours that faculty are willing to offer the student.

Staff-student sexual relationships are in most cases not evident to the members of the university community except to the close friends and/or colleagues of the parties involved. This may be due to the mutuality of consent between the actors involved in the act. Where any of the actors involved in the act decides to disengage from the relationship, such disengagement has not been known to generate any rancour, which could lead to accusations of sexual harassment.

Sexual coercion is less common when compared with consensual sex but it does exist on the campus. A number of faculty members are believed to be involved in sexual coercion of female students. Most sexual coercion incidents are not being reported in the institution due to the reluctance of female students to file formal complaints against faculty members. Consistent with previous research, respondents, most especially the female students, reported that victims of coercion are always apprehensive about the outcome if they report the harasser to the school authority. Victims of harassment are sometimes advised by friends not to report the matter because of the perceived tendency to have the case swept under the carpet by the school authority. Another view has it that a few of the university officers in charge of student affairs are not exemplary in character; since they too are involved in sexual relationships with female students. One of the female respondents narrated three cases to me. In the first incident the victim succumbed to the demand of the faculty staff for sex due to helplessness, while in the other two incidents, the female students ignored the faculty members, but were willing to damn the consequences. The female student respondent commented: 'People are really suffering in silence'.

Student respondents concurred that students prefer recourse to informal mechanisms such as reporting the offending faculty staff to a respected colleague/friend of the faculty member for intervention. It was further observed that, over time, the informal means paid off, since the message filtered through to the attention of the university management. Consequently, the university management had to call for a formal dialogue with the various trade union leaders on the campus on the issue of sexual harassment. Management sought for the cooperation of the various trade union leaderships to prevail on their union

members to desist from all acts that might be interpreted as sexual harassment of female students.

The direct fall-out of the dismissal of two faculty staff between 1998 and 2000 on the grounds of sexual harassment and examination malpractices induced the academic staff union to prepare a code of conduct for its members. The code of conduct covered areas such as work ethics, general conduct, faculty staff-employee relations, faculty staff-union relations, and faculty staff-student relations. Two items relating to sexual harassment formed part of the guidelines. The guidelines specify that: (a) faculty staff must not victimize students on the basis of his/her sex, ethnicity, and religion; and (b) faculty must avoid all acts capable of being interpreted as sexual harassment. It is clear that while there is an effort to check the commission of sexual harassment by its members, the academic staff union failed to define what constitutes sexual harassment for faculty staff. Also, the code did not provide for male faculty-female faculty sexual harassment situations.

Discussions with faculty members on the absence of a provision on male faculty-female faculty sexual harassment suggest that such a provision is unnecessary since no definite case has been reported to either the union or the school. Faculty members were of the opinion that there is nothing wrong about the male faculty making overtures to the female faculty, but the female faculty has the liberty to accept or reject the overtures. However, if the male has been turned down, but he is still persistent, the female staff must employ tact in driving her message home without bruising the ego of the male faculty. A female faculty member submitted that a sexual or friendship proposition might not degenerate into sexual harassment should she handle the situation with decisiveness and maturity.

Findings from Fieldwork: CASE III

Case III is a state government owned institution, and was established in 1983. Student enrolment is over 18,000, while the faculty staff population is 481. No formal policy on sexual harassment exists at the institution, but student victims of harassment can file their grievances through the student affairs office, while staff members are expected to make written representation to the office of the university registrar. In the last six years, two male faculty members have had their employment terminated for being guilty of sexual coercion against female students. Similarly, two staff (a female secretary and her boss) went before the SDC for fighting on the university premises. The secretary alleged that her superior was putting pressure on her to engage in sex with him.

Sexual intercourse between faculty and female students is believed to be widespread on the campus. Initiators of the sexual relationship might be either the faculty or the female students depending on the motives for the relationship. Both faculty and students agreed that it is common-place to have female students proposition faculty members in exchange for academic rewards. A male

faculty recounts a popular line of some of the female students to him, thus: (a) 'Oga, you have both the yam and knife in your hands', meaning 'Sir, you are at liberty to make your request'; and (b) 'Oga (Sir), you seems not to understand the message we are communicating to you with our eyes or mouth'.

Respondents agreed that sexual coercion of female students by male faculty takes place, but not all colleges in the institution experience the same level of harassment. In a particular college, both faculty and students concurred that sexual coercion is non-existent, due largely to the small size of student population, and to the faculty members who are perceived as men of outstanding character. However, certain colleges were reported to be notorious for harassment due chiefly to the large student population (of which women constitute a large proportion) in the colleges. Sexual coercion is not restricted to faculty-female students but is also prevalent among staff, most especially junior female staff and their bosses.

Some respondents observed that academically weak female students are more vulnerable than good students. In fact, some faculty prey upon those they perceive as being poor students to minimise the risk of complications that might arise later. Coping mechanisms include ignoring the faculty if the student is bold and good academically; bringing their parents to personally complain to the school authority; and soliciting the assistance of fellow mature students, who can approach the faculty. Most respondents are of the opinion that cases of sexual coercion go unreported in the institution.

A worrisome vice reported by subjects is sexual assault, mostly being perpetrated by people alleged to be 'cult members'[2] on the campus. There is consensus among the students and faculty members that sexual assault is rampant at the institution. Female victims are coerced into sex through threats to their life with the perpetrators brandishing knives or guns. An example was cited which involved a male student (a cultist) and a female student. The male student took the female student out on a date ostensibly to see the film showing on the campus on that night. Instead of driving to the venue of the film show, the male student headed to a secluded part of the university campus, and, drawing out a gun, sexually assaulted her and threatened to kill her if she dared report to the authorities. The victim reported the incident to the student affairs office the next morning, and the eventual outcome was that the aggressor had his studentship terminated by the institution.

Discussion and Conclusion

Sexual harassment has been recognised as a critical stressor that constitutes a threat to the task performance of the individual and even to overall organisational outcomes. Unlike in some nations such as the USA where there is legislation protecting individuals against every form of harassment (Husbands, 1992; Koen, 1989), Nigeria lacks any form of law against sexual harassment be it in its national life or in academia. The absence of legislation against sexual

harassment is likely to be at least partly responsible for the fact that some of the universities in the country do not have any policy guidelines against it (personal communication with the legal officers). The absence of policy guidelines defining what constitutes sexual harassment could in turn have encouraged the perpetration of the act in the institutions studied.

Institutions of higher education without explicit policies against sexual harassment are less likely to have a stress-free environment that will promote positive employee and student attitudes. For the students, it is believed that a person-environment match is crucial for the development of satisfaction, which is more pronounced for the female student than in the case of males (Bean & Bradley, 1986). Similarly, Winteler (1981) suggests that students who are congruent with their environment (particularly with their peers and faculty) appears more satisfied with aspects of their college experience than those who feel out of place. Therefore, unless the academic environment is sanitised and completely free of harassing experiences, negative social and performance outcomes will be experienced by the students, perhaps in the main by female students.

This study has shown that it is becoming imperative to have a congenial environment on the country's university campuses, and there has to be an attempt at defining sexual harassment by the various university managements. This will enable potential victims and perpetrators to understand what constitutes harassment, and offending behaviours appropriately interpreted. Secondly, there has to be a formal policy condemning harassment in the institutions. Thirdly, both staff and student of the institution must be sufficiently aware of the enacted policy. Fourthly, the institutions must endeavour to educate its members on the moral expectations from each one of them. Further, members must be educated on the inherent risks of sexual harassment. Fifthly, there must be a grievance procedure to investigate and punish those found guilty of the offence of harassment. Members of the investigating panel need be those that are of impeccable character and well respected by the community. Above all, it is believed that the absence of national legislation recognising sexual harassment is a major contributory factor to the perpetration of the act in the institutions. Therefore, the government of the country needs to awaken to the fact that sexual harassment is a work-place scourge that must be tackled decisively, if the productivity of its members is not to be jeopardised. An urgent intervention effort expected from the government is the passing of a law on sexual harassment, which will protect the rights of individuals in their respective work environments.

Notes

1. 'Live mercenary' refers to someone (either a student from within the university or outside) employed by a student to write his/her examinations.

2. Cultism is a common feature in the Nigerian tertiary institutional system. Members of various cult groups in the nation's universities at different times have been responsible for murdering students or rival cult group members, and of raping female students. For instance, on the 10th July, 1999, a group of suspected cultists attacked and killed seven students at Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife (south-west Nigeria) (Ladebo, 2001). Similarly, on the 13th February, 2002, a male student was murdered by suspected cultists at Lagos State University, Lagos.

References

Adamolekun, O. 1989. 'Sexual harassment on campus: A counsellor's reflection'. *Nigerian Journal of Counselling and Development.* 4, November, 53-57.

Bean, J. P. and Bradley, R. K. 1986. 'Untangling the satisfaction-performance relationship for college students'. *Journal of Higher Education.* 57(4), 393-412.

Dey, E. L., Korn, J. S. and Sax, L. J. 1996. 'Betrayed by the academy: The sexual harassment of women college faculty'. *Journal of Higher Education.* 67(2), 149-173.

Fitzgerald, L. F., Gelfand, M. J. and Drasgow, F. 1995. 'Measuring sexual harassment: Theoretical and psychometric advances'. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology.* 17, 425-445.

Husbands, R. 1992. 'Sexual harassment law in employment: An international perspective'. *International Labour Review.* 131(6), 535-559.

Kelley, M. L. and Parsons, B. 2000. 'Sexual harassment in the 1990s: A university-wide survey of female faculty, administrators, staff, and students'. *The Journal of Higher Education.* 71(5), 548-568.

Koen, C. M. 1989. 'Sexual harassment: Criteria for defining hostile environment'. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal* vol. 2(4), 289-301.

Konrad, A. M. and Gutek, B. A. 1986. 'Impact of work experiences on attitudes toward sexual harassment'. *Administrative Science Quarterly.* 31(3), 422-438.

Ladebo, O. J. 2001. *Appraisal of institutional performance of selected universities offering agriculture in Southern Nigeria.* Unpublished PhD Thesis in the Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria.

Nwagwu, C. C. 1997. 'The environment of crises in the Nigerian education system'. *Comparative Education.* 33(1), 87-95.

Popovich, P. M., Licata, B. J., Nokovich, D., Martelli, T. and Zoloty, S. 1986. 'Assessing the incidence and perceptions of sexual harassment behaviours among American undergraduates'. *The Journal of Psychology.* 120(4), 387-396.

Popovich, P. M. 1988. 'Sexual harassment in organizations'. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal.* 1(4), 273-282.

Riger, S. 1991. 'Gender dilemmas in sexual harassment policies and procedures'. *American Psychologist.* 46(5), 497-505.

Rowe, M. P. 1981. 'Dealing with sexual harassment'. *Harvard Business Review.* May-June, 42-46.

Schneider, B. E. 1987. 'Graduate women, sexual harassment, and university policy'. *Journal of Higher Education*. 58(1), 46-65.

Schneider, K. T., Swan, S. and Fitzgerald, L. F. 1997. 'Job-related and psychological effects of sexual harassment in the work-place: Empirical evidence from two organizations'. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 82(3), 401-415.

U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. 1980. *Final amendment to guidelines on discrimination because of sex under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended. 29 CFR Part 1604. Federal Register*. 45, 74675-74677.

Winteler, A.1981. 'The academic department as environment for teaching and learning'. *Higher Education*. 10(1), 25-35.