

**CORRELATIONAL STUDY OF ATHLETES' MARITAL STATUS, LEVEL OF EDUCATION AND PERCEPTION OF GENDER HARASSMENT, UNWANTED SEXUAL ATTENTION AND SEXUAL COERCION IN SOUTHERN NIGERIAN UNIVERSITIES**

**Dr. Elendu Ifeanyichukwu Christian**

Department of Human Kinetics and Health Education, Faculty of Education, University of Port Harcourt, Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria

---

**ABSTRACT:** *The study was a correlational study of athletes' marital status, level of education and perception of gender harassment, unwanted sexual attention and sexual coercion in southern Nigerian universities using survey design on 946 athletes as sample. A questionnaire with .93 as overall reliability co-efficient, and inter-scale reliability indices of  $\alpha = .76$  (gender harassment);  $\alpha = .85$  (unwanted sexual attention), and  $\alpha = .91$  (sexual coercion). Mean and simple regression statistic were used for data analysis. Results revealed that single (i.e. unmarried), married, undergraduate and postgraduate athletes perceived gender harassment as not a problem. Single (i.e. unmarried) and undergraduate athletes perceived unwanted sexual attention as not a problem while married and postgraduate athletes perceived it as a problem. Again, single (i.e. unmarried), married, undergraduate and postgraduate athletes perceived sexual coercion as a problem. Athletes' marital status and level of education had significant relationship with perception of gender harassment, unwanted sexual attention and sexual coercion. It was recommended that sexual harassment intervention programmes should be designed and mounted by governmental and non-governmental agencies, sports researchers/stakeholders and should focus more on married and postgraduate athletes. Sports participants should be made to understand what constitutes sexual harassment to athletes especially to married and postgraduate athletes through mass media, seminars, workshops and conferences by sports stakeholders.*

**KEYWORDS:** Athletes, Marital Status, Level Of Education, Gender Harassment, Unwanted Sexual Attention, Sexual Coercion.

---

## **INTRODUCTION**

Just like in every social organization and profession, the good rapport and social interactions between and among sportspersons are negatively affected by gender harassment, unwanted sexual attention and sexual coercion. Some individuals in almost every sector in the society including sports may have experienced some unwelcomed and offensive sex-related advances, comments and gestures. Gelfand, Fitzgerald and Drasgow's (1995) categorization of sexual harassment into gender harassment, unwanted sexual attention and sexual coercion, was adopted in this study, since they reported that the categorization was generalizable across settings, job types, and cultures. According to them, gender harassment covers range of verbal and non-verbal behaviours aimed not at getting sexual co-operation, but at denigrating, insulting, or conveying hostility towards men and women. In some recent studies, gender harassment has been found to break into two distinct factors: sexist hostility (behaviours that show discriminatory hostility based upon one's sex), and sexual hostility (behaviour that exhibit hostility in a more explicitly sexual way (Gettman, 2003; Cortina, 2001; Fitzgerald,

Magley, Drasgow, & Waldo, 1999). Sexual hostility according to Gettman (2003) include offensive stories or jokes; discussion of sexual matters and offensive remarks about appearance, body or sexual activities. He also explained that sexist hostility include being treated differently because of one's sex. Unwanted sexual attention, according to Gelfand, Fitzgerald and Drasgow (1995) covers range of verbal and non-verbal behaviour of a sexual nature that is unwanted, unreciprocated and offensive, but with no implication of job related losses or benefits. Gettman (2003) stated that unwanted sexual attention include attempts to establish a romantic relationship, and attempts to stroke, fondle or kiss. Sexual coercion involves coercion of sexual activity by threat of punishment (Till, 1980), negative consequences for refusing to be sexually co-operative; and reprisals detrimental to athlete's athletic aspirations for refusing sexual advances (Hayden, 2003). Sexual coercion attempts to get sexual co-operation by bribes or threats, and being bribed to engage in sexual co-operation; treated with retaliation if not sexually co-operative; treated badly for refusing to have sex; and implied better treatment if sexually co-operative (Gelfand, et al., 1995; Gettman (2003;

The various forms of sexual harassment could be perceived differently among athletes. Questions have been asked as to which behaviour constitutes sexual harassment and who decides whether a particular behaviour constitutes sexual harassment or not (Elendu, 2009). Sports persons like athlete(s) who have experienced sex-related behavior(s) directly or indirectly have idea, opinions, views and feelings about those behaviours, with regards to whether they are sexually harassing or not, and such decide(s) whether they constitute problem or not based on his or her perception. Perception refers to the idea, opinion, belief, or image an athlete has about sex-related behaviours (Elendu, 2009). Athletes' perception of sexual harassment forms (gender harassment, unwanted sexual attention and sexual coercion) may relate to their socio-demographic characteristics such as marital status and level of education. This is the thrust of the study to establish the relationship between marital status, level of education and university athletes' perception of gender harassment, unwanted sexual attention and sexual coercion.

### **Aim of the Study**

The aim of the study was to investigate the correlation between athletes' marital status, level of education and perception of gender harassment, unwanted sexual attention and sexual coercion in southern Nigerian universities. Specifically the study seeks to determine:

1. perception of gender harassment by single (i.e. unmarried) and married athletes in southern Nigerian universities.
2. perception of unwanted sexual attention by single (i.e. unmarried) and married athletes in southern Nigerian universities.
3. perception of sexual coercion by single (i.e. unmarried) and married athletes in southern Nigerian universities.
4. perception of gender harassment by undergraduate and postgraduate athletes in southern Nigerian universities.
5. perception of unwanted sexual attention by undergraduate and postgraduate athletes in southern Nigerian universities.
6. perception of sexual coercion by undergraduate and postgraduate athletes in southern

Nigerian universities.

### **Research Questions**

1. What is the perception of gender harassment by single (i.e. unmarried) and married athletes in southern Nigerian universities?
2. What is the perception of unwanted sexual attention by single (i.e. unmarried) and married athletes in southern Nigerian universities?
3. What is the perception of sexual coercion by single (i.e. unmarried) and married athletes in southern Nigerian universities?
4. What is the perception of gender harassment by undergraduate and postgraduate athletes in southern Nigerian universities?
5. What is the perception of unwanted sexual attention by undergraduate and postgraduate athletes in southern Nigerian universities?
6. What is the perception of sexual coercion by undergraduate and postgraduate athletes in southern Nigerian universities?

### **Hypotheses**

To further give direction to the study, the following null hypotheses were tested at .05 level of significance.

- H<sub>01</sub>: There is no significant relationship between the athletes' marital status and perception of gender harassment in southern Nigerian universities.
- H<sub>02</sub>: There is no significant relationship between the athletes' marital status and perception of unwanted sexual attention in southern Nigerian universities.
- H<sub>03</sub>: There is no significant relationship between the athletes' marital status and perception of sexual coercion in southern Nigerian universities.
- H<sub>04</sub>: There is no significant relationship between the athletes' level of education and perception of gender harassment in southern Nigerian universities.
- H<sub>05</sub>: There is no significant relationship between the athletes' level of education and perception of unwanted sexual attention in southern Nigerian universities.
- H<sub>06</sub>: There is no significant relationship between the athletes' level of education and perception of sexual coercion in southern Nigerian universities.

### **METHODS AND MATERIALS**

The study adopted a survey design, as it records and describes behaviours and phenomena as they occur in a natural setting at a particular time. The population was 3,408 athletes in southern Nigerian universities. A sample size of 1,214 athletes was used for the study. A structured and validated questionnaire was used for data collection. Using split-half method, the instrument had overall reliability co-efficient of .93 established using Pearson product moment correlation

in conjunction with Spearman-Brown prophecy statistic. Cronbach alpha ( $\alpha$ ) was used to establish the inter-scale reliability indices with  $\alpha = .76$  for gender harassment;  $\alpha = .85$  for unwanted sexual attention, and  $\alpha = .91$  for sexual coercion. Again, 1,214 copies of questionnaire were administered to the athletes. Only 975 copies of the questionnaire were returned giving a return rate of 80.31 per cent. However, 946 copies of the questionnaire were properly filled and finally used for analysis. Mean and simple regression statistic were used for data analysis. Ejifugh's (1998) criteria for interpreting the correlation co-efficient index was adopted in interpreting the nature of the relationship between athletes' marital status, level of education and perception of gender harassment, unwanted sexual attention, and sexual coercion. According to her, .00 - .19 was considered "no relationship/very low"; .20 - .39 "low"; .40 - .69 "average or moderate"; .70 - .89 "high", and .90 - 1.00 "very high" relationship.

## RESULTS

**Research Question1:** What is the perception of gender harassment by single (i.e. unmarried) and married athletes in southern Nigerian universities?

**Table 1:** Southern Nigerian universities athletes' perception of gender harassment based on marital status

S/no	Items	Single (n = 777)		Married (n = 169)	
		$\bar{X}$	Decision	$\bar{X}$	Decision
1	Directing sexist jokes to athletes	2.10	NSH/NP	2.48	NSH/NP
2	Displaying and distribution of sexual materials to athletes	2.47	NSH/NP	2.79	SH/P
3	Sexually suggestive comments about athlete's body	2.34	NSH/NP	2.72	SH/P
4	Being treated differently because of athlete's gender	1.18	NSH/NP	1.32	NSH/NP
	Grandmean	2.02	NSH/NP	2.33	NSH/NP

NSH – Not Sexual harassment; NP – Not Problem; SH - Sexual Harassment; P – Problem

Table 1 reveals that athletes who are single ( $\bar{x} = 2.10$ ) and married ( $\bar{x} = 2.48$ ) perceived directing sexist jokes to athletes as not sexual harassment and not a problem. Athletes who are single ( $\bar{x} = 1.18$ ), and married ( $\bar{x} = 1.32$ ) perceived being treated differently because of athlete's gender as not sexual harassment and not a problem. Again, athletes who are single perceived display and distribution of sexual materials to athletes ( $\bar{x} = 2.47$ ), and sexually suggestive comments about athlete's body ( $\bar{x} = 2.34$ ) as not sexual harassment and not a problem while their married counterparts perceived display and distribution of sexual materials to athletes ( $\bar{x} = 2.79$ ), and sexually suggestive comments about athlete's body ( $\bar{x} = 2.72$ ) as sexual harassment and a problem. Both single (i.e. unmarried) and married athletes perceived gender harassment as not sexual harassment and not a problem.

**Research Question 2:** What is the perception of unwanted sexual attention by single (unmarried) and married athletes in southern Nigerian universities?

**Table 2:** Southern Nigerian universities athletes' perception of unwanted sexual attention based on marital status

S/no	Items	Single (n = 777)		Married (n = 169)	
		$\bar{X}$	Decision	$\bar{X}$	Decision
1	Directing sexualized name-calls to athletes	2.54	SH/P	2.94	SH/P
2	Spreading sexual rumours about athletes	2.62	SH/P	3.01	SH/P
3	Talking about sex all the time in athletes' presence	2.57	SH/P	3.47	SH/P
4	Pressuring athlete for sex	2.60	SH/P	3.74	SH/P
5	Pressuring athlete for a date or relationship refusing to take "No" for answer	2.41	NSH/NP	3.86	SH/P
6	Pulling athlete's clothings in a sexual way	2.24	NSH/NP	3.03	SH/P
7	Directing sexual gestures to athletes	2.51	SH/P	2.94	SH/P
8	Attempt to establish romantic relationship with athlete	2.42	NSH/NP	2.87	SH/P
9	Sending sexually offensive messages or calls to athlete	2.38	NSH/NP	2.74	SH/P
	Grandmean	2.48	NSH/NP	3.18	SH/P

NSH – Not Sexual harassment; NP – Not Problem; SH - Sexual Harassment; P - Problem

Data in table 2 show that athletes who are single ( $\bar{x} = 2.54$ ), and married ( $\bar{x} = 2.94$ ) perceived directing sexualized name-calls to athletes as sexual harassment and a problem. Athletes who are single ( $\bar{x} = 2.62$ ), and married ( $\bar{x} = 3.01$ ) perceived spreading sexual rumours about athletes as a problem. Athletes who are single ( $\bar{x} = 2.57$ ), and married ( $\bar{x} = 3.47$ ) perceived talking about sex all the time in athletes' presence as sexual harassment and a problem. Athletes who are single ( $\bar{x} = 2.60$ ), and married ( $\bar{x} = 3.74$ ) perceived pressuring athlete for sex as a problem. Athletes who are single ( $\bar{x} = 2.41$ ), and married ( $\bar{x} = 3.86$ ) perceived pressuring athlete for a date or relationship refusing to take "No" for answer ( $\bar{x} = 2.41$ ); pulling athletes' clothing in a sexual way ( $\bar{x} = 2.24$ ); attempt to establish romantic relationship with athlete ( $\bar{x} = 2.42$ ), and sending sexually offensive messages or calls to athlete ( $\bar{x} = 2.38$ ) as not sexual harassment and not a problem. It could be seen that married athletes perceived pressuring athlete for a date or relationship refusing to take "No" for answer ( $\bar{x} = 3.86$ ); pulling athletes' clothing in a sexual way ( $\bar{x} = 3.03$ ); attempt to establish romantic relationship with athlete ( $\bar{x} = 2.87$ ), and sending sexually offensive messages or calls to athlete ( $\bar{x} = 2.74$ ) as sexual harassment and a problem. Single (i.e. unmarried) athletes perceived unwanted sexual attention as not a problem while married athletes perceived it as sexual harassment and a problem.

**Research Question 3:** What is the perception of sexual coercion by single (unmarried) and married athletes in southern Nigerian universities?

**Table 3:** Southern Nigerian universities athletes' perception of sexual coercion based on marital status

S/no	Items	Single (n = 777)		Married (n = 169)	
		$\bar{X}$	Decision	$\bar{X}$	Decision
1	Offering benefits as incentives to engage in sexual relationship with athlete	1.06	NSH/NP	2.27	NSH/NP
2	Threatened athlete with negative consequences for refusing to engage in sexual relationship	2.59	SH/P	3.68	SH/P
3	Forceful attempts to touch or fondle athlete's body	2.66	SH/P	3.25	SH/P
4	Attempted rape or forceful sexual intercourse on athlete	3.42	SH/P	3.75	SH/P
5	Rape or forceful sexual intercourse on athlete	3.57	SH/P	3.89	SH/P
	Grandmean	2.66	SH/P	3.37	SH/P

NSH – Not Sexual harassment; NP – Not Problem; SH - Sexual Harassment; P - Problem

It is evident in table 3 that athletes who are single ( $\bar{x} = 1.06$ ), and those married ( $\bar{x} = 2.27$ ) perceived offering benefits as incentives to engage in sexual relationship with athlete as not sexual harassment and not a problem. Athletes who are single ( $\bar{x} = 2.59$ ), and those married ( $\bar{x} = 3.68$ ) perceived threatening athletes with negative consequences for refusing to engage in sexual relationship as sexual harassment and a problem. Athletes who are single ( $\bar{x} = 2.66$ ), and those married ( $\bar{x} = 3.25$ ) perceived forceful attempts to touch or fondle athlete's body as sexual harassment and a problem. Athletes who are single ( $\bar{x} = 3.42$ ), and those married ( $\bar{x} = 3.75$ ) perceived attempted rape or forceful sexual intercourse on athlete as sexual harassment and a problem. Athletes who are single ( $\bar{x} = 3.57$ ), and those married ( $\bar{x} = 3.89$ ) perceived rape or forceful sexual intercourse on athlete as sexual harassment and a problem. Both single (i.e. unmarried) and married athletes perceived sexual coercion as sexual harassment and a problem.

**Research Question 4:** What is the perception of gender harassment by undergraduate and postgraduate athletes in southern Nigerian universities?

**Table 4:** Southern Nigerian universities athletes' perception of gender harassment based on level of education

S/no	Items	Undergraduate (n = 777)		Postgraduate (n = 169)	
		$\bar{X}$	Decision	$\bar{X}$	Decision
	Gender Harassment – GH				
1	Directing sexist jokes to athletes	2.37	NSH/NP	2.54	SH/P

2	Displaying and distribution of sexual materials to athletes	2.53	SH/P	2.99	SH/P
3	Sexually suggestive comments about athlete's body	2.31	NSH/NP	2.74	SH/P
4	Being treated differently because of athlete's gender	1.16	NSH/NP	1.37	NSH/NP
	Grandmean	2.09	NSH/NP	2.41	NSH/NP

NSH – Not Sexual harassment; NP – Not Problem; SH - Sexual Harassment; P - Problem

Table 4 shows that undergraduate athletes ( $\bar{x} = 2.37$ ) perceived directing sexist jokes to athletes as not sexual harassment and not a problem while their postgraduate counterparts ( $\bar{x} = 2.54$ ) perceived it as sexual harassment and a problem. Again, undergraduate athletes ( $\bar{x} = 2.53$ ) and postgraduate athletes ( $\bar{x} = 2.99$ ) perceived displaying and distribution of sexual materials to athletes as sexual harassment and a problem. Undergraduate athletes ( $\bar{x} = 2.31$ ) perceived sexually suggestive comments about athlete's body as not sexual harassment and not a problem whereas postgraduate athletes ( $\bar{x} = 2.74$ ) perceived it as sexual harassment and a problem. Both undergraduate athletes ( $\bar{x} = 1.16$ ) and postgraduate athletes ( $\bar{x} = 1.37$ ) perceived being treated differently because of athlete's gender as not a problem. Both undergraduate and postgraduate athletes perceived gender harassment as not sexual harassment and not a problem.

**Research Question 5:** What is the perception of unwanted sexual attention by undergraduate and postgraduate athletes in southern Nigerian universities?

**Table 5:** Southern Nigerian universities athletes' perception of unwanted sexual attention based on level of education

S/no	Items	Undergraduate (n = 777)		Postgraduate (n = 169)	
		$\bar{X}$	Decision	$\bar{X}$	Decision
1	Directing sexualized name-callings to athletes	2.51	SH/P	2.82	SH/P
2	Spreading sexual rumours about athletes	2.62	SH/P	2.96	SH/P
3	Talking about sex all the time in athletes' presence	2.53	SH/P	3.14	SH/P
4	Pressuring athlete for sex	2.57	SH/P	3.22	SH/P
5	Pressuring athlete for a date or relationship refusing to take "No" for answer	2.14	NSH/NP	3.14	SH/P
6	Pulling athlete's clothings in a sexual way	2.32	NSH/NP	2.95	SH/P
7	Directing sexual gestures to athletes	2.25	NSH/NP	2.86	SH/P
8	Attempt to establish romantic relationship with athlete	2.12	NSH/NP	2.79	SH/P
9	Sending sexually offensive messages or calls to athlete	1.76	NSH/NP	2.88	SH/P
	Grandmean	2.31	NSH/NP	2.97	SH/P

NSH – Not Sexual harassment; NP – Not Problem; SH - Sexual Harassment; P - Problem

It could be seen in table 5 that directing sexualized name-callings to athletes (undergraduate athletes  $\bar{x} = 2.51$ ; postgraduate athletes  $\bar{x} = 2.82$ ); spreading sexual rumours about athletes (undergraduate athletes  $\bar{x} = 2.62$ ; postgraduate athletes  $\bar{x} = 2.96$ ); talking about sex all the time in athlete's presence (undergraduate athletes  $\bar{x} = 2.53$ ; postgraduate athletes  $\bar{x} = 3.14$ ), and pressuring athlete for sex (undergraduate athletes  $\bar{x} = 2.57$ ; postgraduate athletes  $\bar{x} = 3.22$ ) were perceived as sexual harassment and problem. The table reveals that undergraduate athletes perceived pressuring athlete for a date or relationship refusing to take "No" for answer ( $\bar{x} = 2.14$ ); pulling athlete's clothings in a sexual way ( $\bar{x} = 2.32$ ); directing sexual gestures to athletes ( $\bar{x} = 2.25$ ); attempt to establish romantic relationship with athlete ( $\bar{x} = 2.12$ ), and sending sexually offensive messages or calls to athlete ( $\bar{x} = 1.76$ ) as not sexual harassment and not a problem. Postgraduate athletes perceived pressuring athlete for a date or relationship refusing to take "No" for answer ( $\bar{x} = 3.14$ ); pulling athlete's clothings in a sexual way ( $\bar{x} = 2.95$ ); directing sexual gestures to athletes ( $\bar{x} = 2.86$ ); attempt to establish romantic relationship with athlete ( $\bar{x} = 2.79$ ), and sending sexually offensive messages or calls to athlete ( $\bar{x} = 2.88$ ) as sexual harassment and a problem. Undergraduate athletes perceived unwanted sexual attention as not sexual harassment and not a problem while postgraduate athletes perceived it as sexual harassment and a problem.

**Research Question 6:** What is the perception of sexual coercion by undergraduate and postgraduate athletes in southern Nigerian universities?

**Table 6:** Southern Nigerian universities athletes' perception of sexual coercion based on level of education

S/no	Items	Undergraduate (n = 777)		Postgraduate (n = 169)	
		$\bar{X}$	Decision	$\bar{X}$	Decision
1	Offering benefits as incentives to engage in sexual relationship with athlete	1.15	NSH/NP	2.44	NSH/NP
2	Threatened athlete with negative consequences for refusing to engage in sexual relationship	2.54	SH/P	3.45	SH/P
3	Forceful attempts to touch or fondle athlete's body	2.41	NSH/NP	3.01	SH/P
4	Attempted rape or forceful sexual intercourse on athlete	2.57	SH/P	3.44	SH/P
5	Rape or forceful sexual intercourse on athlete	2.88	SH/P	3.98	SH/P
	Grandmean	2.31	NSH/NP	3.26	SH/P

NSH – Not Sexual harassment; NP – Not Problem; SH - Sexual Harassment; P - Problem

It is evident in table 6 that undergraduate athletes ( $\bar{x} = 1.15$ ) and postgraduate athletes ( $\bar{x} = 2.44$ ) perceived offering benefits as incentives to engage in sexual relationship with athlete as not sexual harassment and not a problem. Undergraduate athletes ( $\bar{x} = 2.41$ ) perceived forceful



attempts to touch or fondle athlete's body as not a problem while postgraduate athletes ( $\bar{x} = 3.01$ ) perceived it as sexual harassment and a problem. The undergraduate athletes ( $\bar{x} = 2.54$ ) and postgraduate athletes ( $\bar{x} = 3.45$ ) perceived threatening athlete with negative consequences for refusing to engage in sexual relationship as sexual harassment and a problem. Also, attempted rape or forceful sexual intercourse on athlete (undergraduate athletes  $\bar{x} = 2.57$ ; postgraduate athletes  $\bar{x} = 3.44$ ), and rape or forceful sexual intercourse on athlete (undergraduate athletes  $\bar{x} = 2.88$ ; postgraduate athletes  $\bar{x} = 3.98$ ) are perceived as sexual harassment and a problem. Undergraduate athletes perceived sexual coercion as not sexual harassment and not a problem while postgraduate athletes perceived it as sexual harassment and a problem.

**Hypothesis 1:** There is no significant relationship between the athletes' marital status and perception of gender harassment in southern Nigerian universities.

**Table 7:** Simple regression of no significant relationship between athletes' marital status and perception of gender harassment.

Variables	R	R <sup>2</sup>	df	F-cal	F-tab	$\beta$	t-cal	t-tab	Decision
Marital status and gender harassment	.656	.30	1 & 944	198.826	3.84*	.637	69.182	1.960	Rejected

\* Significant at  $\alpha=.05$

It is evident in table 7 that the R-value for gender harassment (GH) is .656 which going by Ejifugha's (1998) criteria, showed positive moderate relationship. Again the F-cal. (198.826) is greater than the F-tab. (3.84) with df (1 & 944), and at .05 alpha level. Furthermore, the value of regression weight  $\beta = .637$  (moderate predictive value), and regression co-efficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) is .430 showing that 43.0 per cent of the variation in the perception of GH was accounted for by the variation in athletes' marital status. Also, the table revealed that for GH, the t-cal. (69.182) > t-tab. (1.960), at  $\alpha=.05$  with df (944). Hence, there was significant relationship between athletes' marital status and perception of gender harassment.

**Hypothesis 2:** There is no significant relationship between the athletes' marital status and perception of unwanted sexual attention in southern Nigerian universities.

**Table 8:** Simple regression of no significant relationship between athletes' marital status and perception of unwanted sexual attention.

Variables	R	R <sup>2</sup>	Df	F-cal	F-tab	$\beta$	t-cal	t-tab	Decision
Marital status and unwanted sexual attention	.682	.465	1 & 944	201.097	3.84*	.668	61.028	1.960	Rejected

Data in the table 8 showed that the R-value for unwanted sexual attention (USA) is .682 indicating positive moderate relationship. It was evident that  $F\text{-cal.} (201.097) > F\text{-tab.} (3.84)$ ,  $\alpha=.05$ ,  $df(1 \& 944)$ . The value of R weight  $\beta = .668$  (moderate predictive value), and regression co-efficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) is .465 showing that 46.5% of the variance in the perception of unwanted sexual attention was as a result of variation in the athletes' marital status. The table further showed that the  $t\text{-cal.} (61.028) > t\text{-tab.} (1.960)$ , at .05 alpha level, with  $df(944)$ . There was significant relationship between athletes' marital status and perception of unwanted sexual attention.

**Hypothesis 3:** There is no significant relationship between the athletes' marital status and perception of sexual coercion in southern Nigerian universities.

**Table 9:** Simple regression of no significant relationship between athletes' marital status and perception of sexual coercion.

Variables	R	R <sup>2</sup>	Df	F-cal	F-tab	$\beta$	t-cal	t-tab	Decision
Marital status and sexual coercion	.718	.516	1 & 944	226.026	3.84*	.704	70.192	1.960	Rejected

Data in table 9 revealed that the R-value for sexual coercion (SC) is .718 (positive high relationship). The  $F\text{-cal.} (226.026) > F\text{-tab.} (3.84)$ ,  $df(1 \& 944)$ ,  $\alpha=.05$ . The value of R weight  $\beta = .704$  (high and strong predictive value), and regression co-efficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) is .516 showing that 51.6 per cent of the variation in the perception of sexual coercion was accounted for by the variation in the athletes' marital status. Also the  $t\text{-cal.} (70.192) > t\text{-tab.} (1.960)$ ,  $\alpha=.05$ ,  $df(944)$ ; there was significant relationship between athletes' marital status and perception of sexual coercion.

**Hypothesis 4:** There is no significant relationship between the athletes' level of education and perception of gender harassment in southern Nigerian universities.

**Table 10:** Simple regression table of no significant relationship between athletes' level of education and perception of gender harassment

\* Significant at  $\alpha=.05$

Variables	R	R <sup>2</sup>	Df	F-cal	F-tab	B	t-cal	t-tab	Decision
Level of education and gender harassment	.644	.415	1 & 944	209.931	3.84*	.521	76.007	1.960	Rejected

Data in table 10 showed that the R-value for GH is .644 which going by Ejifugha's (1998) criteria, showed positive moderate relationship. The  $F\text{-cal.} (209.931) > F\text{-tab.} (3.84)$ ,  $df(1 \& 944)$ ,  $\alpha=.05$ . The value of regression weight  $\beta = .521$  (moderate predictive value), and regression co-efficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) is .415 showing that 41.5 per cent of the variation in the perception of GH was accounted for by the variation in athletes' level of education. Also, the  $t\text{-cal.} (76.007) > t\text{-tab.} (1.960)$ ,  $\alpha=.05$ ,  $df(944)$ . Hence, there was

significant relationship between athletes' level of education and perception of gender harassment.

**Hypothesis 5:** There is no significant relationship between the athletes' level of education and perception of unwanted sexual attention in southern Nigerian universities.

**Table 11:** Simple linear regression table of no significant relationship between athletes' level of education and perception of unwanted sexual attention

Variables	R	R <sup>2</sup>	Df	F-cal	F-tab	B	t-cal	t-tab	Decision
Level of education and unwanted sexual attention	.687	.472	1 & 944	211.937	3.84*	.563	79.934	1.960	Rejected

Results in the table also showed that the R-value for USA is .687 indicating positive moderate relationship. The F-cal. (211.937) > F-tab. (3.84),  $\alpha=.05$ , df (1 & 944). The value of R weight  $\beta = .563$  (moderate predictive value), and regression co-efficient of determination (R<sup>2</sup>) is .472 showing that 47.2 per cent variation in the perception of unwanted sexual attention was as a result of variation in the athletes' level of education. The t-cal. (79.934) > t-tab. (1.960), at  $\alpha=.05$ , with df (944). There was significant relationship between athletes' level of education and perception of unwanted sexual attention.

**Hypothesis 6:** There is no significant relationship between the athletes' level of education and perception of sexual coercion in southern Nigerian universities.

**Table 12:** Simple linear regression table of no significant relationship between athletes' level of education and perception of sexual coercion

Variables	R	R <sup>2</sup>	Df	F-cal	F-tab	$\beta$	t-cal	t-tab	Decision
Level of education and sexual coercion	.724	.524	1 & 944	229.147	3.84*	.635	68.986	1.960	Rejected

It was evident in the table that the R-value for SC is .724 (positive high relationship). The F-cal. (229.147) > F-tab. (3.84), df (1 & 944),  $\alpha=.05$ . The value of R weight  $\beta = .635$  (moderate predictive value), and regression co-efficient of determination (R<sup>2</sup>) is .524 showing that 52.4% of the variance in the perception of sexual coercion was due to the variation in the athletes' level of education. Also, the t-cal. (66.021) > t-tab (1.960),  $\alpha=.05$ , df (944); there was significant relationship between athletes' level of education and perception of sexual coercion.

### Discussion of Findings

The study revealed that marital status correlates with athletes' perception of sexually harassing behaviours. Married athletes mostly perceived sexually harassing behaviours as problem compared to the athletes who are single. The finding is not surprising as the married athletes

might have been speaking against such behaviours to their younger ones or children. Also the moral standard of the married athletes are expected to be higher than that of athletes who are single. In the same vein, the finding is in concordance with Duncan (1987), and Kan (1995) who reported that marital status significantly influences workers' perception of unwanted sexual behaviours. Students of different marital statuses were not significantly different in their perception of sexual harassment (Idowu & Yahaha, 1993). There is no significant difference between perception of sexual harassment among female employees with different marital statuses (Hutagalung & Tarbe, 2016). It was found that level of education correlates with athletes' perception of sexually harassing behaviours. Postgraduate athletes mostly perceived sexually harassing behaviours as a problem. Since most of the postgraduate athletes might be married, the finding is not surprising. The undergraduates especially those who are young and single may not see sexual harassment as problem. The finding is in agreement with Kan's (1995) report that workers' perception of sex-related behaviours is significantly dependent on their level of education.

## CONCLUSION

It was concluded that unwanted sex-related behaviours are perceived differently as a problem and not a problem. The perception of sexually harassing behaviours is influence by marital status and level of education.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

It was recommended that:

1. Sexual harassment intervention programmes should be designed and mounted by governmental and non-governmental agencies, sports researchers/stakeholders and should focus more on married and postgraduate athletes.
2. Sports participants should be made to understand what constitutes sexual harassment to athletes especially to married and postgraduate athletes through mass media, seminars, workshops and conferences by sports stakeholders.
3. Sports persons should be careful about the type of sex-related behaviours directed to athletes considering the diverse nature of athletes in terms of marital status and level of education.
4. Ministry of Education should integrate sexual harassment into their curriculum for knowledge and awareness purposes to prevent sexual harassment perpetration on athletes.

## REFERENCES

Cortina, L. M. (2001). Assessing sexual harassment among Latinas: Development of an instrument. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 7, (2), 164-181.

- Duncan, T. F. (1987). Public workers' experiences of unwanted sexual behaviours. Accessed from <http://www.art.org/sex87/expusb.pdf>
- Ejifugha, A. U. (1998). *Fundamentals of research in health education*. Benin: Barloz Publishers Inc.
- Elendu, I. C. (2009). Incidence, perception, correlates of, and intervention programme for sexual harassment among athletes in southern Nigerian universities. Ph.D Thesis, University of Nigeria Nsukka.
- Fitzgerald, L. F., Magley, V. J., Drasgow, F., & Waldo, C. R. (1999). Measuring sexual harassment in the military: The sexual experiences questionnaire (SEQ-DoD). *Military Psychology, 11*, (3), 243-263.
- Gelfand, M. J., Fitzgerald, L. P., & Drasgow, F. (1995). The structure of sexual harassment: A confirmatory analysis across cultures and settings. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 47*, 164-177.
- Gettman, H. J. (2003). Bringing sexual harassment research in line with the service economy: A measure and model of sexual harassment of professional women by their clients. An Unpublished MA Thesis Report, University of Maryland, College Park. Accessed from <http://www.google.com.ng/search?hl=en&q=Bringing+Sexual+harassment+research+in+line+with+the+service+economy&meta=>
- Hayden, D. L. (2003). *Female and male athletic coaches' and female high school athletes' perception of sexual harassment and the incidence among female high school athletes*. An Unpublished Ph.D Thesis Report, The George Washington University. Accessed from <http://etd-gw.wrlc.org/theses/submitted/etd-07082003-124401/unrestricted/01thesis01.pdf>
- Hutagalung, F & Tarbe, I. H. A. (2016). *Perception of sexual harassment among women employees: Implications for counseling services in organizations*. London: Taylor and Francis Group
- Idowu, A. I. & Yahaha, L. A. (1993). Perception of sexual harassment in universities: A case study of lecturers and students of the University of Ilorin. *Nigerian Journal of Counseling and Consulting Psychology, 2*(1), 1 – 15.
- Kan, S. V. (1995). Perception of unwanted sex-related behaviours among aluminium manufacturing workers. Retrieved from <http://www.sex-relatedbehaviours/kan95.pdf>
- Till, F. (1980). *Sexual harassment: A report of sexual harassment of Students*. Washington: National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Program.