

## PDF - PREVALENCE AND CORRELATES OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT OF FEMALE STUDENTS BY LECTURERS IN THE TERTIARY INSTITUTIONS - researchcub.info

Before the emergence of the concept, people had no way to express their encounter since there was no term by which to name it. Since this time, sexual harassment has drawn a great deal of interest from academic and legal scholars. Both parties focused primarily on the traditions, methodologies, and assumptions, but drew different conclusions. Feminist scholars, for instance, contended that the legal system, being male-dominated, has no understanding or regard for the perspectives of women who have been sexually harassed. Initially, sexual harassment was perceived by the public as a normal biological attraction of males to females or

an instigation of males' sexual pursuit of women in the workplace or institution. Catherine MacKinnon, as cited in Wyatt (2007) a professor at the University of Michigan Law School and Susan Brownmiller, an activist, initiated the study of sexual harassment and redefined the concept as an issue of power instead of sex (Nancy Wyatt, 2007). These noble women acknowledged that sexual behaviors in the workplace or in the academic institutions were not normal, but were a problem of discrimination against women. It is a cliché that any construct studied by the methods of empirical science like the current one must be reliably and validly measured; sexual harassment is no exception. However, despite growing interest in this topic, a number of basic questions remain (Fitzgerald, Gelfand, & Drasgow, 1995). Of these, perhaps the most perplexing has to do with the level of specificity at which such experiences should be measured. Early studies (Fitzgerald et al., 1988; Martindale, 1990; U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1981) were primarily designed to collect frequency data and typically examined harassment at item level; that is, they calculated the number of individuals who experienced one or more of a number of specific acts. The general procedure was to present individuals with lists of behaviours and count as harassed all respondents who reported experiencing any of these during the time frame of the study.

Although, empirical investigations into the phenomenon of sexual harassment have increased exponentially over the past decades, many basic questions about the measurement of this construct remain unanswered. Most research has utilized an aggregate-level approach, which assesses the frequency of all offensive sex-related behaviours experienced by an individual within a given time. However, this approach has several limitations, including obscuring the etiology and impact of separate harassment incidents on a particular individual (Suzanne, Mindy, NiCole, Fritz, & Louise, 2001). Consequently, Suzanne, Mindy, NiCole, Fritz, & Louise, (2001) adopted a situation-specific approach to the measurement of sexual harassment experiences, the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire-Specific Experience version (SEQ-SE) was employed and evaluated. Results of confirmatory factor analysis suggested that the measure has adequate construct validity. In addition, the substantive information yielded by this measure indicated that it is an important tool in the investigation of the prevalence and correlates of sexual harassment experiences.

Studies (Fitzgerald 1995) have begun to conceptualize harassment as a higher order construct that is more appropriately assessed by a scale score than by individual items. Such an approach has the advantage of being amenable to traditional reliability and validity investigations as well as to examination by item response theory-IRT methodologies (Donovan & Drasgow, 1999). Research at the aggregate level assesses the frequency of all offensive sex-related behaviours experienced by an individual within a given period. This methodology, thus, has revealed substantial data on sexual harassment measurement.

Despite these insights, aggregate methodology suffers from its own limitations.

Specifically, aggregate measurement ignores the fact that behaviours can combine to produce both more and less than the sum of their parts. This is because the meaning of complex experiences is not well captured by simply summing their components; less because such aggregations obscure the experience of multiple incidents, possibly perpetrated by different people across time, departments, and so forth. When separate experiences are aggregated, their etiology cannot be determined. Thus, it is impossible to explore potential associations between antecedents (e.g., organizational climate) and specific types of experiences. Moreover, the impact of a given experience is difficult to evaluate when data are “collapsed” over multiple incidents and perpetrators. Another problem of aggregation is that it equates incidents of varying types and can thus underestimate the importance of situations that, though rare, are particularly severe. For instance, a woman who reports hearing offensive jokes at work “many times” over the past 2 years receives 5 points (on a 5-point scale) toward her score on the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire-SEQ (Fitzgerald et al., 1988, 1995), a widely used aggregate measure of harassment. In contrast, a woman whose supervisor tried to rape her in a single violent incident theoretically receives only 2 points. Because items on the SEQ are unit-weighted, the measure’s major source of variance is the frequency ratings assigned by the participants; thus, repeated exposure to “minor” events carries much more weight than a single violent incident.

In practice, this problem arises infrequently, as virtually all respondents who report sexual coercion or sexual assault describe it as embedded in a network of other offensive behaviours; still, the situation is conceptually unsatisfying as well as occasionally empirically problematic. A final limitation of aggregate-level measurement is that it complicates examination of targets’ coping strategies, including whether they report their experiences. Also, research has demonstrated that fewer than 15 per cent of harassment targets formally complain about their experiences (Dansky & Kilpatrick, 1997) and the question of why this is so, and under what circumstances, is not completely understood. These predictors are obscured, however, when an aggregate measure is employed and multiple incidents are collapsed. Suzanne et al. (2001) explored an alternative approach to the measurement of sexual harassment experiences using the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire—Specific Experience (SEQ-SE), which assesses such situations at the level of a unitary experience (i.e., it inquires about the behaviours that comprise a single harassment incident). This approach, which was labelled situation-specific measurement, is not new to sexual harassment research; situation-specific data have been collected for as long as researchers have been exploring this topic.

The Sexual Experiences Questionnaire-Department of Defense version (SEQ-DoD) (Fitzgerald et al., 1999) is a behaviourally based measure of offensive sex-related experiences derived from Fitzgerald et al.’s (1988) measure; it was revised and expanded for use in military settings. All questions share a common stem: “In the past 12 months, have you been in situations involving military personnel and/or civilian employers and contractors employed in your workplace where one or more of these individuals.” The body of each item describes behaviours that the respondent may have experienced, such as “Repeatedly told sexual stories or jokes that were offensive to you?” and “Continued to ask you out after you had repeatedly said you weren’t interested?” Responses are made on a Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (very often). Factor analyses of the original SEQ (Fitzgerald et al., 1988, 1995) have consistently yielded a three-factor solution (gender harassment, unwanted sexual attention, and sexual coercion); the first two factors are

conceptually similar to the legal concept of hostile work environment, whereas the last more closely corresponds to the concept of quid pro quo harassment. New items were incorporated in the SEQ-DoD that formed an additional fourth dimension, sexist hostility (Fitzgerald et al., 1999); these items assess behaviour that, although not explicitly sexual in content (e.g., comments that women are not suited to be leaders or do not belong in the military), convey sex-based antipathy and discriminatory attitudes. As with previous forms of the measure, the words "sexual harassment" do not appear until the final item, at which point respondents are asked if they have been sexually harassed during the time frame of the study; this item is not included in SEQ scores.

Fitzgerald et al. (1999) report internal consistency reliabilities of .83, .91, .85, and .95 for the sexist hostility, sexual hostility, unwanted sexual attention, and sexual coercion scales, respectively. Sexual Experiences Questionnaire-Significant Experience (SEQ-SE) was based directly on the SEQ-DoD; this measure asks respondents who marked any items on the SEQ-DoD to provide information about the one such experience that had the greatest impact on them. Respondents are then directed to review the items they have marked (on the SEQ-DoD) and indicate all behaviours involved in this single, significant incident. Operationally, the SEQ-SE is a re-administration of SEQ-DoD with a different instructional set. In contrast to the parent measure, responses to the SEQ-SE are dichotomous (i.e., "yes/no"). As a check on reliability, data from the SEQ-DoD and the SEQ-SE were first examined for response consistency. Because the SEQ-SE assesses the one situation that had the greatest effect on the respondent in the past 12 months (whereas the SEQ-DoD asks about all experiences during the same time frame) the items checked on the former should logically be a subset of the latter. Therefore, women who marked an item on the SEQ-SE not marked in their overall SEQ-DoD were excluded from subsequent analysis; less than 2 per cent of respondents (1.6%) failed to satisfy this consistency requirement.

Wadsworth et al. (1993), maintain that the two popular tools for data collection in sexual behaviour studies have remained the self-administered questionnaire and interview. They further explain that the greatest advantage of the self-administered questionnaire is its efficacy in eliciting information on socially-censored behaviours. The efficacy, means that, it is a product of the anonymity, which the questionnaire guarantees the respondent to such issues. According to Helitzer-Allen, Makhambera and Wangel (1994), there are two types of interview suitable for obtaining sensitive information like information on sexual harassment, namely in-depth interview and focus group discussion (FGD). They further stressed that in-depth interview is a one-on-one type of interview conducted on a few subjects typical of the study population. Such interviews, according to them, are good for deriving information on all the interviewees who know or have experience about the sexual behavior in question. This type of interview helps the interviewer to find out which social norms might limit the content of the FGD; hence, it will better precede the FGD.

The FGD, according to World Health Organisation WHO (1995), is an organised discussion among 6 to 12 individuals on a single topic for a limited amount of time. WHO further asserted that one person, called the facilitator, guides the conversation by asking a series of very general, open-ended questions about the chosen topic. The aim is to encourage ordinary dialogue among members of the group, including differences of opinion. The discussion, according to WHO (1995), is recorded in detail by a documenter and is analyzed afterwards for information about the topic. In the current study, the phenomenon of sexual harassment against female students by their male lecturers shall be measured by adapting and

integrating Fitzgerald et al.'s (1995) Sexual Experiences Questionnaire-SEQ. SEQ adopts an approach where item responses are made on a Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (very often).

### **2.3 Sexual Assault in Tertiary Institutions and the Experience of Female Students in Nigeria.**

The impact and scope of sexual harassment in colleges and universities surfaced in the early 1980s leading to the creation of policies, procedures, extensive training programs and materials designed to identify and prevent sexual harassment. In spite of the efforts to minimize or eradicate sexual harassment on college campuses the frequency of complaints are increasing (Riggs et al., 1993). Sexual harassment is a real life experience for women across countries, culture, and ethnicity. According to the AAUW (2006) report about two-third of college students (62%) have been sexually harassed and about one-third of first-year students (41%) have been sexually harassed by peers. Katz (2005) indicated that a survey conducted by the American Psychological Association (APA) on female graduate students revealed that over 12.7% have experienced sexual harassment, 21% have avoided classes for fear of being sexually harassed, 11% tried to report an incident of sexual harassment and 3% have dropped a course because of sexual harassment. A 1997 survey of nearly 200 female college and university students in Mumbai, India found that 39% of the respondent complained of sexual harassment (Puja, 2003).

At Jimma University in Ethiopia sexual violence, harassment, and lack of security were indicated as the most common problems facing female students (Panos, 2003). AAUW (2006) identified sexual harassment as number one pervasive problem to equity in education at all levels. AAUW argued that sexual harassment posed a damaging effect on the educational experience of many college students and disrupts students' ability to learn and succeed. According to AAUW sexual harassment interferes with the students' ability to perform in an educational setting. Students have become aware of the existence of policies on harassment (AAUW, 1999); however, increased awareness does not mean less incidents of sexual harassment or increased report of incidents. The AAUW's research report, "Drawing the Line: Sexual Harassment on Campus" indicated that more than one-third of college students tell no one after being harassed; almost half (49%) confide in a friend; and only seven percent (7%) of students report the incident to a college employee.

In addition, sexual assault is any sexual act performed by one person on another without the person's consent and it includes genital, oral or anal penetration by a part of the accused body or by an object. It may result from force, the threat of force either on the victim or another person, or the victim's inability to give appropriate consent. Sexual assault have been described or categorised based on personal relationship as marital, acquaintance, incest and date rape, or legally in terms of age as statutory rape and child sexual abuse. It is a serious violent crime that has no place in any ideal society and no one can justify its prevalence in any community that thrive on mutual trust particularly our tertiary universities and other tertiary institutions are by conception knowledge dissemination centres where knowledge is both brought in and taken out by students as well as teachers and it further inculcate moral values that will influence positive behaviour change to the students in the course of the training. These are the attributes that qualifies student for award of certificates which at graduation ceremonies summarised as found worthy both in "character and learning". Equally, not only positive knowledge but negative knowledge and experiences are consciously or subconsciously distributed in both directions which manifest with immoral behaviours as sexual assault. Sexual assault is becoming a common occurrence among students; the vulnerable group were the weak

female students which both the lecturers and fellow male students take undue advantage to abuse. This was facilitated by the degree of freedom of social interaction among young men and women encouraged by the learning environment and lack of parental supervision because they are away from home. Female students in Nigeria colleges and universities have unique experiences of this menace from male faculty, staff, and peers. Though sexual harassment is a global concept that affects virtually women of all races, ages, and colors Nigerian women experience more elusive types of harassment. In other countries or cultures, sexual harassment is a behavior that is generally unacceptable in any public setting. Nigerian society does not accept the concept of harassment and so does not perceive harassment as evil or a violation of women's right. In fact, in some states in Nigeria for instance, this ugly practice was indirectly legitimized by teaching and non-teaching staff. According to Nwaogwugwu (2007) "a practice in Anambra State colleges and universities popularly called "sorting" where students (males and females) pay their way through examinations either with cash, gifts, or sexual gratifications. In this practice, male students were asked to pay money but sexual gratification was the top expectation for women students. These faculty and staff proudly call this practice "inconvenience allowance". As a result, students fondly divide faculty into "sortable" (those who make demands for gratification) and "unsortable" (those who do not). Consequently, women students in Nigeria colleges and universities are raising concerns over the alarming incidents of sexual harassment on campus by male faculty, staff, and students". Hourel (2006) found that 80% of women in Nigerian higher education institutions reported sexual harassment as their greatest challenge in the successful completion of their academic goals. Adedokun (2004) and Ejiogu and Onyene (2006) found that about 86% of male faculty and staff in the sampled universities in Nigeria have sexually harassed female students at one point in their teaching career.

## **PREVALENCE AND CORRELATES OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT OF FEMALE STUDENTS BY LECTURERS IN THE TERTIARY INSTITUTIONS**

**The complete project material is available and ready for download. All what you need to do is to order for the complete material. The price for the material is NGN 3,000.00.**

**Make payment via bank transfer to Bank: Guaranteed Trust Bank, Account name: Emi-Aware technology, Account Number: 0424875728**

**Bank: Zenith Bank, Account name: Emi-Aware technology, Account Number: 1222004869**

**or visit the website and pay online. For more info: Visit <https://researchcub.info/payment-instruct.html>**

**After payment send your depositor's name, amount paid, project topic, email address or your phone number (in which instructions will be sent to you to download the material) to +234 70 6329 8784 via text message/ whatsapp or Email address: [info@allprojectmaterials.com](mailto:info@allprojectmaterials.com).**

**Once payment is confirmed, the material will be sent to you immediately.**

**It takes 5min to 30min to confirm and send the material to you.**

**For more project topics and materials visit: <https://researchcub.info/> or For enquiries:  
info@allprojectmaterials.com or call/whatsapp: +234 70 6329 8784**

**Regards!!!**