

Staff and Students' Gender Education in a Nigerian Public University

Israel Ayinla Fadipe, Ph.D.¹
Olayinka Abimbola Egbokhare, Ph.D.²

¹Faculty of Humanities, North-West University,
Mafikeng Campus, South Africa

²Department of Communication & Language Arts,
Faculty of Arts, University of Ibadan, Nigeria

¹Email: israelfadipe77@gmail.com

²Email: yinkaegbokhare@gmail.com

Abstract

The University of Ibadan has invested resources in mainstreaming gender through awareness campaigns. While studies have devoted attention to only female students' gendered experiences and perceptions on campus, they have not focused on factors affecting both staff and students' gender education in the institution. Adopting a mixed method technique, we gathered data by administering two sets of questionnaire to staff and student respondents, testing their knowledge and understanding of some gender messages. Also, we supplemented the quantitative data with the data collected through in-depth interviews of staff and focus group discussion sessions among student representatives from the selected halls of residence. We discovered that though most staff and students did not understand the basic difference between sex and gender as concepts, they still exhibited some significant knowledge about gender sensitivity, gender equality, gender discrimination, gender friendliness, sexual harassment and sexual violence. However, we found that issues of intractable institutional traditions, selective attention, access to basic amenities and subjectivity shaped staff and students' understanding of gender knowledge. Consequently, these are factors, which influence gender education at the University of Ibadan. We suggest

a need for the institution's gender mainstreaming office to focus gender messages on changing all staff and students' negative opinions by tackling the identified factors to have a favourable influence on gender education on campus.

Keywords: University of Ibadan, Gender issues, Knowledge and understanding, Gender, mainstreaming, Sexual harassment.

Introduction

The United States Agency for International Development (USAID, 2008, p.5) posits that "achieving gender equality in education means that boys and girls will have equal opportunities to realize their full human rights and contribute to and benefit from economic, social, cultural, and political development." According to Ijaiya and Balogun (2013), gender education helps humans to understand the dynamics of gender inequality already entrenched in various institutions and societies. Yet, people's gender knowledge and understanding in institutions of higher learning is a debatable argument among scholars of gender studies the world over. As a result, they have often attributed various reasons such as institutional cultures, strategies deficiency, funding and so on to the failures or successes of gender mainstreaming in these institutions (Aina et al., 2015; Banes, 2007; Bennett et al., 2013; Omoera & Akinwale, 2012; DEA, 2006; Graaff, 2017; Joseph, 2015; Morley, 2012; Odejide, 2007; Rasool, 2017; Schafer, 2010; Shackleton, 2007; Yang, 2016). For instance, Diaw (2007) assessed how the institutional culture at the University of Dakar influenced male and female staff and how they in turn shaped this culture. She discovered that the staff's identity, prejudices and power negotiation skills shaped the institutional and intellectual culture, which reinforced the masculinisation of the institution.

Bennett et al. (2013) did a study on the implementation of sexual harassment policies in three South African higher institutions, and realised that there had been some continued ignorance among the stakeholders in the institutions on the potentials of sexual harassment policies because of intellectual and philosophical fear. While Schafer (2010) criticises the top-down approach strategy of using focal persons for gender mainstreaming in North Rhine-Westphalia universities in Germany, Bennett et al. (2013) raised the issue of the commitment level of university

management. Graaff (2017) solicits less focus on survivor-based strategy but more attention to masculine-focused intervention for solving gender-based violence. However, examining the gender-mainstreaming concept focusing on higher education in Ghana and Tanzania, Morley (2010) explains that studies have concentrated on only the differences between men and women neglecting the ones between women in gender mainstreaming theorisation. Her explanation reveals problems with the conceptualisation and implementation of gender mainstreaming. She does not want to merely focus on access and representation but wants to address feminist concerns the way they enact gendered power and privilege in everyday social relations in higher education institutions. Affirming the constraints on fully implementing gender mainstreaming in many Nigerian higher institutions, Odebode (2017) notes the inadequacy of resources committed to these institutions, which Karlsson (2010) also supports as the main problem in the South African education situation.

It is easy to find how true these challenges are in other institutions as each institution has its own peculiarities that are different. Of course, the more probing question is: why do institutional cultural practices and gender mainstreaming strategies continue to affect people's gender knowledge and peculiarities, there is a need to consider these traits that can influence people's gender knowledge and understanding in these instances. Although Odejide (2007) examined the perceptions and the lived experiences of female students at the University of Ibadan to decide how gender and power relations affected their gender knowledge, new studies should focus on a broad assessment of people's gender knowledge and understanding as it relates to students' new experiences with gender awareness campaigns that have occurred after her study on campus. For instance, what are the peculiar instances that affect the gender education of staff and students at the University of Ibadan? How and why do these instances influence their gender education? The university is the pioneer in efforts at gender mainstreaming among Nigerian higher education institutions. This study may serve as a measure for evaluating the effects of similar efforts in other contexts. Therefore, this article assesses the effects of gender awareness on the university community.

Higher Education and Gender Mainstreaming Issues

Adequate gender education, especially in institutions of higher learning, has great effects on people who pass through these institutions and society at large. According to Ijaiya and Balogun (2013), gender education is the main solution to gender issues in most institutions. Latifee (2011) supports the belief that education is a basic human right, which makes an individual realise his or her potential and strive for a better life. Education empowers one by providing knowledge, values and skills that form the foundation for lifelong learning and professional success. However, in the editorial of *Rethinking Universities 1*, Mama and Banes (2007, pp.1-2) clearly emphasise this need for standard education: we want to revisit the public institutional sites of African knowledge production: as places, as spaces where cultural norms have developed which condition the kinds of questions that are asked and the kinds of answers that are then elicited. We are taking Africa's universities seriously, and rethinking them - going beyond the labels ("crumbling") and behind the static stereotypes ("supporting national development").

The authors believe that taking African universities seriously in terms of gender education matters because higher education in Africa favours masculinity. Of course, gender mainstreaming programmes which they have embarked upon through gender documents and campaigns show the authors' efforts at liberalising discourse on gender education in African institutions of higher learning. Their submission further explains that gender mainstreaming can improve people's gender education in these institutions. For example, people's gender knowledge and understanding of gender mainstreaming messages can result in the assertion of their rights and harnessing of opportunities. Arenas and Lentisco (2011) emphasise that gender mainstreaming is essential. They explain that in 1997, the Economic and Social Council of the General Assembly (ECOSOC) adopted gender mainstreaming as the method by which the entire United Nations system would work towards advancing women and gender equality goals. They say that gender mainstreaming not only questions social justice but is necessary for ensuring fair and sustainable human development, United Network of Young Peace builders (2014). The long-term outcome of gender mainstreaming

should translate to greater and more sustainable human development for all. Furthermore, Arenas and Lentisco explain that:

Mainstreaming as a gender perspective is the process of assessing the implications for women and men of any planned action, including legislation, policies or programmes, in all areas and at all levels. It is a strategy for making women's as well as men's concerns and experiences an integral dimension of the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of policies and programmes in all political, economic and societal spheres so that women and men benefit equally and inequality is not perpetuated. The ultimate goal of mainstreaming is to achieve gender equality. (p. 9)

However, Development of Education in Africa (2006, p. ii) in its preface gives this scorecard on gender mainstreaming in African higher education institutions thus: over the past decade African higher education institutions, universities in particular, have been keen to mainstream gender into their core functions of teaching and research, as well as administration. As a result, many have introduced gender courses in various faculties and departments. It is not uncommon to find a university with half a dozen gender-related courses, scattered through faculties as disparate as Agriculture, Law, Medicine, Education, Sociology, Theology, etc., reflecting the commitment of individual lecturers, deans, and Vice Chancellors. Seldom has there been a concerted, synchronized policy and plan for integrating gender into university functions as a whole. The fact that there has not been full integration of gender mainstreaming in most of the African higher education institutions calls for more concerted efforts.

What's more, the report recognises that 'gender-mainstreaming initiatives in higher education in Africa are far from adequate and there is very limited capacity within institutions, particularly with respect to mainstreaming gender in their human resource development policies and academic programs.' Even with the little they have achieved gender mainstreaming or sensitisation in some African higher education institutions, how has this affected people's knowledge and understanding of gender issues in their respective environments? Has there been any evaluation on this? In the case of the University of Ibadan, what is the level define

what sexual harassment is. However, she discovered that across the globe people and institutions do not uniformly use sexual harassment as a concept. This means that in the higher institutions across the globe what is sexual harassment differs from one place to another. She further contends that the only challenge for all tertiary institutions is to prevent sexual harassment and not manage it. Therefore, she suggests that tertiary institutions need to carefully clarify sexual harassment by providing explicit policies, and training for students, faculty and staff. Then tertiary institutions should create accessible mechanisms to report cases of sexual harassment, and effectively respond to cases of sexual harassment, and punish perpetrators who are guilty of sexual harassment.

Similarly, Abudu (2017) examined sexual harassment in the Nigerian contexts - workplaces, universities, churches and even communities to know why it is prevalent. She believed that holding conversations about the issue as Nigerians could lead to changing national attitudes and behaviour about this problem. However, convinced that curbing sexual harassment prevalence had moved beyond holding a mere conversation, she suggested that the government should give adequate attention to sexual harassment cases in the Nigerian laws. Uduma, Samuel and Agbaje (2015) investigated the prevalence and forms of sexual harassment of girls by male students of some secondary schools in Ohafia Local Government Area-LGA, Abia State. They discovered that male students sometimes perpetuated sexual hostility and occasional sexual coercion, unwanted sexual attention and sexist hostility on girls. Among other suggestions, the authors believed that the schools' authorities should educate only girls about sexuality and human rights. While Rasool (2017) argued that boys were more likely to report experiencing all types of gender-based violence in selected Johannesburg high schools, she found that a majority of perpetrators of rape and threats of rape were still male students. Tackling this menace, she suggested the inclusion of intervention and prevention strategies in high school curriculum with the introduction of social workers.

In light of the foregoing, findings have established that gender education can encourage gender equality, national development, women empowerment and prevention of pervasive sexual harassment. In turn, it can curb sexual violence in institutions of

higher learning and resolve conceptual problems of gender mainstreaming with much emphasis on gender messaging in campaigns. Therefore, we note that gender messaging of most gender campaigns in various institutions is not sensitive to all gender needs and lacks promotion of shared responsibilities for both males and females (Koech, Maithya & Muange, 2013; Cambronero-Saiz, 2013). However, what is uncertain is, upon so much so far given to mainstreaming gender in most institutions, why is there so little to show for this? Is there any visible impact on gender education? Again, how has this really influenced people's gender knowledge and understanding of gender messages? Other than the noticeable factors responsible for this in literature, are there any other ones peculiar to each institution? For instance, when the University of Ibadan exposed staff and students to gender messages, how did the exposure influence their gender knowledge and understanding of these gender messages? How did these gender messages affect their level of gender knowledge?

Methodology

First, we drew data from 10-item and 14-item questionnaires for staff and students. We used the instruments to primarily test respondents' gender knowledge about gender sensitivity, gender discrimination, gender equality, gender friendliness, sexual harassment, sexual violence, and male and female empowerment using the Likert Scale of Agree (A) and Disagree (D). The reason for use of two sets of questionnaire was due to the different gender campaign messages to staff and students. Prior to administering the questionnaires, to confirm the validity of the instruments, we gave them to some gender mainstreaming advocates and a data analyst for critical evaluation, while we conducted a reliability test through a pilot study with an alpha score of 0.967. We sought respondents' consent if they would be willing to fill questionnaires or to be interviewed in the various discussions. Having got it, we proceeded to conduct the research. Thereafter, we administered the first questionnaire to 248 (133 males and 103 females) drawn by quota and convenience sampling techniques from 1,596 academic and 4,251 non-academic staff across all the units and departments. We administered the second questionnaire to 724

(357 males and 362 females) by the same techniques from 10,372 students from 14 faculties in the University of Ibadan.

With six research assistants, we distributed copies of questionnaires to staff respondents in their offices and to student respondents in the departments, halls of residence and religious fellowship centres. In the end, we achieved 85.5% return rate of the administered questionnaires, though some academic staff were not receptive to filling the questionnaire while some misplaced copies given to them. Moreover, we exempted first-year students because they had not properly experienced gender orientation programmes on campus as at the time when we conducted the survey. After collating the properly filled copies of the questionnaires, we coded the data using IBM SPSS 20 first. Then, we used descriptive statistics to analyse the coded data. The items (10 and 14) contained in the two questionnaires served as measurements testing staff and student respondents' gender knowledge with the results presented in frequency counts and percentages in tables (see Table 1 and Table 2). Furthermore, we gathered the second stream of data from six sessions of Focus Group Discussion with hall executive members of three male and female hostels each, consisting of 46 discussants altogether. Hall executives are students elected to represent fellow students in the hostel and university management. They are the student leaders at the hostel accommodation level.

Also, we purposefully selected these discussants because they were the student leaders in their respective halls and the university's Gender Mainstreaming Unit often chose and trained them to disseminate gender messages to their colleagues in the hostels. We deployed 2 female post-graduate students as research assistants who conducted 3 FGD sessions in 3 female students' hostels; while we with 1 male research assistant did 3 FGD sessions in 3 male hostels. We conducted the sessions either in the students' TV or reading rooms. Also, we purposefully chose five female and four male interviewees from academic and non-academic staff that were either designated gender focal persons for the university or not. We selected three female and two male focal persons, and two female and two male non-focal persons among the staff respectively. Focal persons in the University of Ibadan are designated gender mainstreaming advocates who organise gender

programmes, sensitise the university community and adjudicate gender matters on campus. We used this criterion deliberately to balance the opinions of these two groups (gender advocates and non-gender advocates) would provide on the level of gender knowledge among staff and students on campus.

We conducted these interviews in person in the interviewees' offices. Incidentally, a three-month industrial strike by academic staff nearly disrupted the data collection exercise as some staffers were not available or receptive to the study. This could be due to the general atmosphere then. Consequently, the data gathering took more than three months. After listening to the taped conversations we eventually had with selected interviewees, we transcribed the data. Then, we did a thematic analysis of the qualitative data. The findings thereof afforded us to explain the reasons and processes behind the quantitative data as it relates to factors influencing gender knowledge of staff and student respondents at the University of Ibadan. To drive home the points, we took some excerpts from the qualitative data to substantiate the findings.

Intractable Institutional Traditions, Selective Attention and Subjectivity

Although Table 1 reveals that most staff respondents (male (42.2%) and female (28.0%)) did not understand the basic difference between gender and sex, it still shows they agreed favourably with gender messages based on issues of gender sensitivity, gender equality, gender discrimination, gender friendliness, sexual harassment and sexual violence. We believe that their understanding of the difference between the concepts possibly may make the respondents more conscious of the identified gender messages and how these affect both male and female staff of the university. For example, though male respondents (33.3%) mostly agreed that gender issues are more about women empowerment than men empowerment, they (28.9%) conceded that it was also about men empowerment. This deficit in knowledge further stresses the need for adequate gender education on gender issues that can improve gender knowledge of both male and female staff.

Table 1: Staff's Display of Gender Knowledge and Understanding of Gender Messages

	Male		Female	
	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree
Being gender sensitive does not mean being anti-men.	119(52.7%)	9(3.9%)	91 (40.3%)	7 (3.1%)
Female staffers do not make good leaders in campus politics because they are weak.	29 (12.4%)	105(44.3%)	8 (3.4%)	94 (40.2%)
Female staffers have the same mental ability as male staff.	80 (34.3%)	53 (22.7%)	84 (36.1%)	16(6.9%)
Making rude remarks or cat-calls when a female staffer is passing is a form of sexual harassment.	92 (39.5%)	39 (16.7%)	70 (30.0%)	32 (13.7%)
It is okay to beat one's wife or any woman who misbehaves.	8 (3.4%)	124 (52.8%)	7 (2.9%)	96 (40.9%)
Gender means the same thing as sex.	98 (42.2%)	33 (14.2%)	65 (28.0%)	36 (15.5%)
Gender issues are always about empowering women.	78 (33.3%)	55 (23.5%)	45 (19.2%)	56 (23.9%)
Gender is also about men and how they can be empowered.	67(28.9%)	63 (27.2%)	51 (21.9%)	51 (21.9%)
Male staffs are superior to female staffs and when they are speaking women should keep quiet.	25 (10.8%)	103 (44.4%)	12 (5.2%)	89 (38.4%)
Creating a gender-friendly space in UI will benefit both female and male staff.	123 (53.7%)	8 (3.5%)	92 (22.7%)	6 (2.9%)

Obviously, the above findings confirm that gender education can help in understanding the basic human rights of individuals in an institution and a workplace as explained by Ijaiya and Balogun (2013). Therefore, we infer that some staff understood this, though male respondents initially agreed that gender messages were about women empowerment (33.3%). It appears that male respondents' experiences at first did not allow them to agree that efforts at gender empowerment also involved them. This shows when quantitative data indicates previously that gender issues also focused on men empowerment (28.9%). Notwithstanding, the circumstances and the prevalent culture in which gender education takes place, appear to have influence on most gender issues in the institution. This clearly shows with the reaction to the issue of gender empowerment between male and female respondents in Table 1. To buttress this impact, however, a

female teaching staffer interviewed explained that traditional societal belief is an impediment to efforts at ensuring gender equality between male and female on campus. She asserts that 'people believe that males are better at doing some things than females and you will see it cutting across every sector of the African society, especially the reservations when it comes to women being in particular positions'. She further offers an example that 'A male professor seems normal; a female professor to some people looks abnormal'. This seems to show that the general atmosphere on campus does not allow for the practice of gender equality. Sadly, we argue that this reality may foreclose equal gender empowerment argument between male and female staff in the university.

On the other hand, a male teaching staff commented on the problems of subjectivity and lack of gender balancing as obstacles to the message of gender mainstreaming on campus. He equated the practice of gender equality to the subjectivity politics, especially in the efforts at putting female colleagues at the top leadership positions in the name of gender balancing. He explained thus, "It may not be very explicit, but based on deductions; effort is being made to make sure that both sexes are represented at high level of administration at the University of Ibadan (UI)." Implicitly, this interviewee decried this kind of skewed efforts at female empowerment. It appears that he wanted fair gender balancing without prejudicing anyone. He further stated his uneasiness more with the way of gender education on campus that "I like to separate gender from feminism, which is most of the time people that are involved in gender do. People that are involved in gender most of the time talk about feminism, right of the women, women this, women that. I don't believe in the equality of sex but I believe in equal opportunity for each gender. So, I believe that every human being, male or female should be given equal opportunity."

This shows that the male academic's inability to reconcile gender with feminism affects him from accepting gender message in the campaign. It may partly explain what Bennett et al. (2013) describe as the display of intellectual fear in the male-dominating institutions. Therefore, he will not be favourably disposed to acquiring gender knowledge through this kind of message. Conversely, a non-teaching female staff interviewee spoke of how many heads of departments preferred working with men. She said

these bosses “believe that men are more efficient and effective in performing their duties. Some will say they just don’t want women, that they want a male secretary.” Also, she noted that the reason for this preference arose from women performing the biological roles of childbirth and breastfeeding, which the bosses assumed to impede women’s work efficiency. As Barnes (2007) has noted, this kind of attitude indeed can limit women’s participation and contributions in the affairs of such an institution. In this situation, such discriminatory attitude compels female staff to underplay their gender importance (Britton, 2017), as this experience could affect their worldviews of gender equality, and the belief in gender friendliness on campus. As a matter of fact, we believe that this experience disproves the claim about the presence of gender sensitivity on campus. After all, nearly all the staff respondents (male, 52.7% and female, 40.3%) agreed, that being gender sensitive did not mean being anti-men (see Table 1).

Sexual harassment is a very sensitive issue at the University of Ibadan such that it has a distinct policy different from the main gender policy. If not properly handled as Joseph (2015) cautions, sexual harassment can permanently change people’s lives or create certain kinds of perception that can hinder gender education on campus. A female member of staff who is a gender advocate made this observation, for example: when a case of sexual harassment is reported to me, I ask if the person has any evidence and we look into it. Some could easily make that up in order to indict any head of department (HOD) that is giving them problems. They may be perpetual latecomers and will use the excuse of because he wants to sleep with me. We need to balance this. As one of the gender focal persons on campus, the interviewee acknowledged the sensitive nature of sexual harassment cases among staff. Of course, both male and female staff respondents have initially displayed their displeasure against any form of sexual harassment on campus to show the level of awareness of the enormity of sexual harassment in the quantitative data (see Table 1).

As a way of preventing the sexual harassment incidence in universities, Joseph supports the training of staff and faculty to forestall what Bennett et al. (2013) refer to the people’s exhibition of fear because of sexual harassment policy implementation in institutions of higher learning. Considering this development, we

believe that, perhaps, gender awareness campaigners need to allay this fear for people to attend favourably to gender messages on gender equality. Cataloguing the benefits of gender awareness campaigns on campus, another female gender focal person stated that Gender Mainstreaming Office (GMO) has resolved cases of sexual harassment, marital discords, has prevented stigmatisation of sexually harassed victims, and counselled victims. Supporting this claim, a female gender focal person stated that: their family life is also coming to the GMO where a wife would come and report the husband for lack of maintenance and so on and so forth. And, the Gender Mainstreaming Office calls in the person and says look...the gender policy is there and it's quite clear. Once you are a member of staff or student you have subscribed to the gender policy.

In a sense, all these might attest to the positive effects of gender messaging on female staff on campus, or might be based on people's perspectives of campus gender mainstreaming functions. Still, findings from the quantitative data show both male (53.7%) and female staffers (22.7%) (Table 1) mostly agree that creating a gender-friendly environment would benefit them; though they each do not agree that gender empowerment was about them. Similarly, Table 2 reveals students' ignorance (male, 36.1%; female, 35.3%) about the difference between the concepts of gender and sex. Generally, most student respondents displayed a significant level of gender knowledge and understanding on the issues of gender sensitivity, gender equality and gender equity. For instance, male students (77.9%) even largely consented to the fact that making rude remarks or cat-calls when their female counterparts were passing through their hostels was a form of sexual harassment, and condemned the beating of female girlfriends who misbehaved (85.4%). On the other hand, most female students (77.2%) accepted that when a woman dressed provocatively, this could sexually harass men on campus. Ordinarily, these quantitative data display an ideal situation where it seems that gender education campaigns have worked to improve the knowledge of male and female students despite not being able to understand the difference between the concepts of gender and sex. Moreover, making rude remarks, gender violence and provocative dressing have become persistent gender issues in the relationship between male and female students on campus.

Therefore, we conclude that these issues over time have exposed the gender, power and control dynamics that exist in human society between male and female.

Table 2: Students' Display of Gender Knowledge and Understanding of Gender Messages

Gender Messages	Male		Female	
	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree
QUESTIONS MEANT FOR BOTH MALE AND FEMALE STUDENTS				
Being gender sensitive does not mean being anti-men.	335 (47.6%)	23 (3.3%)	324(46.0%)	21 (3.0)
Female students do not make good leaders in politics because they are weak.	103 (14.5%)	256 (36.0%)	23 (3.2%)	329(46.2%)
Female students have the same mental ability as male students.	243 (34.4%)	112 (15.9%)	278(39.4%)	72 (10.2%)
Males are superior to females and when they are speaking women should keep quiet.	85 (12.0%)	273 (38.5%)	22 (3.1%)	329(46.3%)
Class reps are preferably male because women are too weak to perform the duties.	101 (14.2%)	248 (34.9%)	45 (6.3%)	306(43.0%)
Gender means the same thing as sex.	252 (36.1%)	98 (14.0%)	247(35.3%)	101(14.5%)
Gender issues are always about empowering women.	225 (31.9%)	133 (18.9%)	189(26.8%)	157(22.3%)
Gender is also about men and how they can be empowered.	223 (31.5%)	135 (19.1%)	233(33.0%)	115(16.3%)
QUESTIONS MEANT FOR MALE STUDENTS ONLY				
Making rude remarks or cat-calls when a lady is passing is a form of sexual harassment.	278 (77.9%)	75 (21.0%)	2 (0.6%)	2 (0.6%)
It is okay to beat one's girlfriend or any girl who misbehaves.	50 (14.0%)	304 (85.4%)	7 (2.0%)	3 (0.8%)
QUESTIONS MEANT FOR FEMALE STUDENTS ONLY				
Male students have greater mental ability than female.	1 (0.3%)	1 (0.3%)	32 (9.4%)	305(90.0%)
When a female student dresses provocatively it can sexually harass the men.	2 (0.6%)	0 (0.0%)	260(77.2%)	75 (22.3%)

However, the issues arisen from provocative dressing and making rude remarks or cat-calls constantly involving female and male students on campus still show that they attached different meanings to what constitute sexual harassment. Their understanding of being sexually harassed significantly differs,

which further affirms Joseph's observation about diverse views on the meaning of sexual harassment. During Focus Group Discussion sessions, both parties did not believe their actions were any forms of sexual harassment. For example, a female student related an experience thus: one happened recently between a girl in Idia Hall and a guy in Zik Hall, where the girl was passing through. Apparently, the girl happened to be somebody on the bigger side when it comes to her backside (buttocks). This caused an attention from the guys. One person accused the other of slapping the other, and the other accused the person of yabbing (jeering) her because of her buttocks. The girl was in Zik Hall when it happened, and the boy claimed that she had slapped him, of which she didn't. Then they formed an angry mob on her and the next thing, they told her to kneel and apologise to the boy.

We argue that the above excerpt displays that male and female students' gendered experiences can affect their reception of gender education on campus. This discussant cited this occurrence as an example of the common female students' experience passing through male hostels. But each party seemed to claim it was sexually assaulted. The incident paints a microscopic view about the students' perception of sexual harassment on campus. In a way, this supports Joseph's (2015) submission that people attached different meanings to sexual harassment in various institutions of learning. The male students involved obviously did not regard their action as any form of sexual harassment. They did not think that the 'yabbing' march between them and the female students in the narrative above could have turned violent, and the females might not believe that dressing provocatively and passing through a male hostel was any crime. In fact, one of the discussants in a male hostel corroborated this ignorance further that: what they call harassment for instance in Zik Hall we are known to do Aros (spoken and unspoken derisive, sometimes sexual comments directed at female students passing through male hostels) which I don't really see as sexual harassment. It is something that has been since for years. It is something like a tradition. There have not been physical contacts or physical harassments so far. So it has always been exchange of words and stuff like that.

Although it is clear from the above excerpt that some male students displayed lack of knowledge about what is sexual

harassment, they claimed that they usually suffered the consequences more than the female students when the school authorities took up such cases (Rasool, 2017). Specifically, one complained that “more attention is paid towards girls when it comes to issues like that. They don’t want to know how much they are guilty. They don’t ascribe any guilt to them at all in as much as they are females.” Ultimately, we reason how these male and female students interpreted their plights in this kind of circumstance can shape their worldviews about themselves and others, and about how gender is mainstreamed to them on campus. For example, Alkali (2014) while calling for the preservation of African cultural practices that promote equal gender rights, advises that people should condemn those attitudes that impede human development such as favouritism for male over female child. Yet, a male respondent decried this partiality, explaining that “based on the judgement of students by the Student Disciplinary Committee, I have observed that the judgements given to guys are different from the females. It is rare for me to hear cases about girls being expelled.” He may be wrong in his perception of the school authorities’ adjudication duties on campus; an experience like the above can negatively affect his attitudes to being educated gender-wise.

Furthermore, some female discussants’ experience in a gender-unfriendly situation on campus could also shape their reception of gender messages on gender equality and equity. For instance, a female discussant related an experience thus: my point of view from Hall experience, I think they tend to listen to the guys more. Like now we have a lot of issues with light, and I learned in time past Zik Hall or Indy Hall do have. But once there was a problem in their halls those guys will gather up and storm their offices protesting, but they know we won’t do that as females. Then weeks we would not have light, sometimes months they would be so passive about it. They feel that you are females, there is nothing you can do; we can cheat you; we can ride you anyhow we want. There is nothing you can do about it. We believe that that gender discrimination existed in the provision of basic social amenities such as security, water, light and accommodation for male and female students can hinder the influence of gender messages.

This shows prominently in the discussants’ responses to know about their level of awareness of gender campaigns on campus.

At a point during the session for instance, the discussants fiercely criticised the feelings that the campus was any friendly to them. One said 'If they are really working there, trust me, a month plus there was no light in Awo Hall and nobody had done anything about it. I kept calling the dean of students, calling the DVC, and they would just tell me that you guys are tough'. However, to achieve equity in allocation of resources whether it is light, water or money, a female gender focal person submitted that, 'it is important to build alliances. The Hall Wardens are critical to these issues'. Therefore, she blames the electricity problem raised by the discussant on lack of coordinated communication among the stakeholders on campus including Hall Wardens. Still, that singular experience may have distorted the students' perceptions of the scenario. On the contrary, though inadequate funding Joseph (2015) has been the major obstacle of higher institution management, Shackleton (2007) echoes the real effect on the female students' gendered experience. She discloses that 'Without individuals being overtly aware of it, institutional culture guides behaviour and beliefs and thus influences every aspect of the institution's functioning'.

In line with this as well, Morolong (2007) reveals that the essence of mainstreaming gender in any institution of higher learning is for it to have a character in such a way that the institution will be gender sensitive to everybody. Their submissions support gender friendliness atmosphere, which benefits equally both male and female students that pass through an institution. Likewise, a discussant from Queen Elizabeth II Hall also reacted to a female student's specific gender experience on campus thus: There was this particular case of a girl that was raped. She is a student. Rumour had it that she went to a guy's place. It was a gang rape actually according to the people that were there. The girl came to the hospital and they treated her. She had to see the surgeon. They had to flush her womb so she wouldn't get pregnant. Somehow, I wasn't kind of happy the way the case was going, because I could see that the girl was really sad; she was down. She wasn't having the right attention. Her mother would just bring her food; the girl wasn't talking to her. She was on the sickbed for quite a while.

This discussant narrated vicariously the possible physical and psychological effects of gang rape on the victim in particular and herself as a female colleague. What happened in the narrative falls within the ambit of gender issues on campus. We believe this experience can linger on in victims' minds more than any gender message disseminated to students on campus when school authorities do not properly attend to victims. She continued: when the security people (Abefe) came around to see things they were just questioning and questioning her. In my opinion, they should be able to take up things like that, because that kind of person will be traumatised. They are questions that will make her feel like she was stupid. She should have instead got a perfect encouragement from a counsellor at that time. I am sure that the issue now is dead. Those guys have not been arrested. Another thing about us is that we like to bury things so that people will not get to hear about them. It kills a lot of people inside, especially women.

We are convinced that some redress through adequate security provision and gender justice in resolving cases related to sexual violence could have gone a long way to assuaging this experience. Supporting this reasoning, Schafer (2010) confirmed that gender justice could help in the implementation of gender mainstreaming in institutions of higher learning. In her study of North Rhine Westphalia universities, she discovered that there existed superficial commitment to ensuring gender justice for social transformation in administration on these campuses, because the universities' leaders merely exhibited dedication to gender mainstreaming. Can it be concluded then that this is a trend among managements of higher learning institutions? Consequently, we can argue that the perceived denial of gender justice will affect the discussant's understanding of the unintended gender messages emanated in the above excerpt. The same way the failure of the right authorities on campus-health, security and Gender Mainstreaming Office-to properly help the traumatised rape victim to benefit from gender justice will influence other students' understanding.

Conclusion and Recommendations

We, therefore, conclude that male staff and students consider gender messaging by the University of Ibadan authority less favourable to them, compared to their female counterparts.

However, issues of intractable institutional traditions, selective attention, access to basic amenities and subjectivity in gender justice were factors that negatively shaped staff and students' gender experiences, and thus impede gender education on campus. Also, the student respondents tacitly show that inasmuch the management does not properly address issues of equity, equality, leadership question, gender justice in sexual harassment cases and adequate basic social amenities, the denial or inaccessibility would continue to impede the success of gender education among staff and students on campus. All these thus constitute a certain problem for efforts at gender education. Based on this, Gender Mainstreaming Office in the university needs to be inclusive in its gender messaging of gender issues campaigns and policies by integrating both male and female staff's and students' concerns without fear of or favour to anybody. This can radically change their prejudiced worldviews such that nobody would feel left out and the university will be truly gender-friendly. The University Management should review existing gender policies critically to ensure that these documents tackle the identified prejudices. Also, despite the recurrent funding inadequacy, it should strive especially to improve upon students' access to basic facilities such as accommodation, light, water and security so that they do not continue to interpret and understand gender awareness messages and policies in light of their accessibility to these basic needs.

References

- Abudu, O. (2017, November 22). Sexual harassment in Nigeria: It's everybody's problem, Retrieved 20 Jan 2021, from <https://guardian.ng/issue/sexual-harassment-in-nigeria-its-everybodys-problem/>
- Aina, O.I., Ogunlade, I., Ilesanmi, O.O. & Afolabi, C. (2015). Institutionalization of gender mainstreaming in Nigeria's tertiary, *European Scientific Journal*, Special Edition, Nov 2015, 314-339. <http://eujournal.org/index.php/esj/article/viewFile/6541/6266>.
- Alkali, Z. (2014). The relevance of gender studies in Nigeria's higher institutions of learning: Why gender studies? 8th Inaugural Lecture, Nasarawa State University, Keffi.
- Arenas, M. C. & Lentisco, A. (2011). *Mainstreaming gender into project cycle management in the fisheries sector*. Bangkok: Rap Publication.

- Banes, T. (2007). Politics of the mind and body: Gender and institutional culture in African universities; South Africa. In A., Mama & T., Barnes (Eds.), *Feminist Africa 8: Rethinking universities I* (pp. 1-8). Cape Town: African Gender Institute.
- Bennett, J., Gouws, A., Kritzing A., Hames, M. & Tidimane, C. (2013). 'Gender is over': Researching the implementation of sexual harassment policies in Southern African higher education. In A., Mama & T., Barnes (Eds.), *Feminist Africa 8: Rethinking universities I* (pp. 83-104). Cape Town: African Gender Institute.
- Britton, D.M. (2017). Beyond the chilly climate: The salience of gender in women's academic on the well-being of women in Nigeria. In V.B. Jugale (Ed.), *Poverty, globalization and human development* (pp.347-360). New Delhi: Serial Publications.
- Joseph, J. (2015). Sexual harassment in tertiary institutions: A comparative perspective. *Temida 1*, 125-144, DOI: 10.2298/TEM1502125H.
- Karlsson, J. (2010). Gender mainstreaming in a South African provincial education department: A transformative shift or technical fix for oppressive gender relations? *Compare*, 40(4), 497-514.
- Koech, J., Maithya, H. & Muange, V. (2013). The influence of socio-cultural factors on communication and women participation in HIV and AIDS campaigns in Kenya. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 3(1), 60-66.
- Latifee, H.I. (2011). Education, poverty and finance: Empowering the children of micro-entrepreneurs with primary and secondary education, college scholarships and loans, and financial services for their businesses: 2011 Global microcredit summit commissioned workshop paper Nov 14-17, 2011 - Valladolid, Spain.
- Mama, A & Barnes, T. (Eds.) (2007). Editorial: Rethinking universities I. *Feminist Africa 8: Rethinking Universities I*. Cape Town: African Gender Institute, 1-7.
- Morley, L. (2010). Gender mainstreaming: myths and measurement in higher education in Ghana and Tanzania. *Compare*, 40(4), 533-550.
- Morolong, B.L. (2007). Gender inequalities in higher education, information communication technologies and sustainable development: what are the connections? *Studies in Gender and Development in Africa*, 1, 43-58.
- Odebode, S. (2017). Mainstreaming gender in Nigeria's higher education: strategies and outcomes. In I.O., Albert, S.A. Omotoso

- & A. Akeredolu (Eds.), *Gender-based violence in contemporary Nigeria* (pp.465-481). Ibadan: Institute for Peace and Strategic Studies.
- Odejide, A. (2007). 'What can a woman do?' Being women in a Nigerian university. In A., Mama & T., Barnes (Eds.), *Feminist Africa 8: Rethinking Universities I* (pp.42-59). Cape Town: African Gender Institute.
- Omoera, O.S. & Akinwole, O.T. (2012). A review of literature: Rape and communication media strategies in Nigeria. *Benin Mediacom Journal*, 6, 164-184.
- Rasool, S. (2017). Adolescent reports of experiencing gender based violence: Findings from a cross-sectional survey from schools in a South African city. *Gender and Behaviour*, 15(2), 9109-9120.
- Schafer, B. (2010). What about gender justice in higher education? The case of universities in North Rhine-Westphalia, Germany. In L. Husu, J. Hearn, A. Lamsa & S. Vanhala. (Eds.), *Leadership through the gender lens: Women and men in organisations* (pp. 313-324). Helsinki: Hanken School of Economics.
- Shackleton, L. (2007). Lost in liberalism: A case study of the disappearance of the gender agenda at a South African university. In A., Mama & T. Banes: *Feminist Africa 9: Rethinking Universities II* (pp.23-42). Cape Town: African Gender Institute.
- Uduma, P.C., Samuel, E.S. & Agbaje, O.S. (2015). Prevalence and forms of sexual harassment of girls by male students of secondary schools in Ohafia LGA, Abia State, *Science Journal of Public Health*, 3(3), 433-444.
- USAID. (2008). *Education from a gender equality perspective*. New York: USAID's Office of Women in Development.
- United Network of Young Peacebuilders. (2014). *Gender toolkit: A manual for youth peace workers*.
- Yang, H. (2016). Transforming concepts into practices: Mainstreaming gender in higher education. *Asian Journal of Women's Studies*, 22(4), 392-413. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/12259276.2016.1242940>.