PREVALENCE AND CONTROL MECHANISM OF GENDER CRIMINALITY AMONG UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS IN A NIGERIAN UNIVERSITY

IGBEKOYI, K. E.
Department of Peace and Security, Bamidele Olumilua University of Education, Science and Technology, Ikere-Ekiti, Ekiti State
igbekoyi.emmanuel@bouesti.edu.ng
+2347061338424 ORCID: 0000-0003-2908-0860

OLUWADARE, C. T.
Department of Sociology, Ekiti State University, Ado-Ekiti, Ekiti State

OLUWASANMI, L. A.
Department of Sociology, Ekiti State University, Ado-Ekiti, Ekiti State

SUNMOLA, K. A.
Department of Gender and Development Studies, Ekiti State University, Ado-Ekiti, Ekiti State, Nigeria

AGBOOLA, E. B.
Department of Peace and Security, Bamidele Olumilua University of Education, Science and Technology, Ikere-Ekiti, Ekiti State

DOI: https://doi.org/10.64633/wissj.v10i1.18

Keywords

Campus Crime, Gender Criminality, Gender Role, Gender-Specific Crimes, and Sexual Harassment

Abstract

Background to the Study*: Criminality within the university environment is no longer conceived as male phenomenon as female involvement in criminality cannot be overemphasize, and these anti-social behavior include; bullying, stealing, sexual harassment, and physical violence to mention a few.*

Objectives: *The study aim to investigate the prevalence and forms of gender criminality among undergraduate students in a Nigerian university.*

Methods*: The study adopted a descriptive research design in which quantitative methods was employed. The study made use of 120 questionnaires, and the selection was carried out using multistage sampling techniques. Data collected was analyzed and presented in simple frequency and percentage.*

Results: *Finding from the study revealed that 77.5% affirmed that harassment is prevalent, 67.5% claimed not to have experienced any violence due to the gender, both gender believed campus administration adequately address crime against female. Also, it revealed that 70%, 75%, 58%, and about 62% confirmed male are more involved in campus crime, violent act, stealing, and fraud respectively than female students. Revealing from the study is that 60.8% are aware of reporting mechanism, 70.8% claimed there is no adequate measure to support victims of gender-specific crimes, 57.5% are aware of the university policies on gender-based harassment, 67.5% attested staff are not well trained, and 57.5% affirmed to have participated in any campus event towards awareness of gender-specific crimes.*
Conclusion*: The study that despite policies and reporting mechanism being in place, its effectiveness remains limited due to inadequate resources, weak enforcement, and insufficient support system for victims.*
Recommendations*: The study recommends that there should be policy implantation and enforcement, improve support service for victims, and enhance staff training and awareness.*

Introduction

A study reported that approximately 8% of students in tertiary institutions claimed that they have been victimized at least in one of the crime since their enrollment on campus. Also, a low-to-moderate level by students affirmed to have fear and perceived risk of reporting crimes on campus among genders (Tomsich et al (2011). Owusu-Antwi et al (2024) stressed that students are fearful of reporting campus crimes, but students in Ghana (OR=2.58, 95%, CI=1.38-4.85) and Rwanda (OR=2.62, 95%, CI=1.20-5.71) were 2 times likely to report than students in Nigeria. It is based on this that the study tends to investigate the prevalence and control mechanism of gender criminality in a Nigerian university.

Globally, criminality within the university environment is no longer conceived as male phenomenon as female involvement in criminality cannot be overemphasize.However, the rate of female participation in campus crimes is relatively low compared to male students (Okoh, 2024). Criminality within the university environment has made both staff and students vulnerable to different forms of victimization. Study by Jacobsen (2021) shows that students who attend university which is relatively suburban in natureare concerned about the sexual assault and rape, especially by non-students off campuses, because there is thelikelihood of being robbed. According to Ilori et al (2024), cultism, financial extortion, physical and psychological intimidations, theft, sexual violence and harassment are the kind of campus criminality in Ekiti State urban Universities.

Statement of the Problem

Gender criminality defined the intersection of crime and gender roles, which has become an increasingly critical issue in Nigeria. The differential involvement of male and female in criminality, as well as their victimization, reflects deep-rooted societal constructs. However, the degree to which gender plays a role in shaping the nature and impact of these

crimes remains underexplored. For example, study by Oluwadare and Igbekoyi (2019) shows the prevalence of (87.2%) cybercrime perpetrated in tertiary institution, but 36.7% claimed female involved in cybercrime in the study ofIgbekoyi et al. (2025). This implies that both gender are involved in campus crime, but varies in degree at which is perpetrated.The statistics of campus crimes shows a decreasing figure 32% from 2001 to 2016 (Musu et al, 2019). Nonetheless, the figure can be said to be inaccurate, as several campus crimes remain unreported to the authorities. Also, studies around the globe have shown that a significant number of female have experience some form of sexual violence on campuses. For example in Malawi, 2.3% female students experience rape, 13.5% experience sexual assaults, and 7.8% female were targets of sexual comments (Bouchrika, 2025).

At the university level, studies have shown that gender differences in criminality are often related to socialization, economic needs, and gender-based violence. For instance, Ajayi and Ojo (2019) examine the prevalence of sexual harassment among university students in Southwest, Nigeria, revealing significant gender-based disparities in victimization, with female students being disproportionately affected by these crimes. Similarly, Amnesty International (2018) enumerates gender-based violence as a pervasive issues in Nigerian institutions, with female facing challenges in accessing justice and protection from crimes such as rape. Also, Okeshola and Adeta (2019) explore the effectiveness of crime control mechanism in Nigeria institutions, noting that gender-specific issues such as treatment of female offenders and victims, play a critical role in the success or failure of these mechanism.

Moreover, societal stereotypes and traditional gender roles often prevent the accurate reporting of crimes. Female victims particularly encounter barriers when seeking justice due to institutional inefficiencies or stigmatization. Okeshola and Adeta (2019) also discussed how crime control mechanisms often fail to address gender-specific challenges, particularly concerning female offenders and victims. The assessment of gender criminality among undergraduate students is essential to understand how gender influences crime participation, victimization and student's overall experience within the university environment. As a results, because there is little or no grounded empirical study on the prevalence and control mechanism of gender criminality among undergraduate students in Nigerian University, makes this study germane.

Research Objectives

The general objective of the study investigate gender criminality in a Nigerian university, while the specific objective were to;

i. Examine the prevalence of gender criminality in a Nigerian university

ii. Investigate the control mechanism of gender criminality in a Nigerian University

Method

Research Design

Descriptive design was adopted, and a quantitative method was employed to investigate the prevalence and forms of gender criminality among undergraduate students in a Nigerian University. This approach enables the identification of salient areas for data collection based on respondents' perception of the subject matter. The study area is a Nigerian university located in Southwestern region. The study employed both primary and secondary sources

of date. The study was conducted in a Nigeria university located in Ekiti State, Nigeria.

Sample Size, Techniques and Procedure

The sample size for this study is one hundred and twenty (120) students which were selected from the university using multistage sampling techniques. The multistage sampling include; stratified, purposive, and simple random sampling techniques. The first stage adopted purposive sampling technique in identifying the faculties in the University; the second stage employed simple random sampling in which 4 faculties were selected from 8 faculties and they include; Arts, Education, Management Sciences and Social Sciences. The third stage employed quota sampling techniques in allocating 30 questionnaires to each faculties to make it 120 respondents.

Method of Data Collection and Analysis

For primary source of data collection, questionnaire was used to gather data from purposively selected 120 respondents, and analysis was done with the aid of SPSS (Version 21) and it was presented in simple frequency and percentage. While the secondary data was a report on the level of criminality between male and female students from 2021 to 2024 collected from the university security units.

Literature Review

Gender Criminality

Gender criminality are crimes according to Kanwar (2025) committed against person(s), regardless whether they are male or female. Several studies have stressed that male are known for assaults and aggressive behavior which might be attributed to genetic determinants, while female perpetrate lesser offences due to their marginalization status in a patriarchy societies

The conceptualization of gender criminality is perceived as one of the important determinant, which plays a significant role with regards to different forms of crime. It is envisaged that men and women differs in their offence rates, and pattern of victimization (LawTeacher, 2018). Braithwaite (1987) assert that crime is committed disproportionately by men, which appears to have significant effects on the way both law and society reacts to the different forms of crime. However, female expectation and gender roles are different from men, as there are some forms of crimes that can be expected to be committed by women, but there are others that are not.

Prevalence of Gender Criminality on Campus

Several reports corroborated the body of existing literatures that female students are more fearful of campus crimes, and they believed they are more prone to be victimized, and more likely to engage in self-protective behaviors than male students (Woolnough, 2009). Gender differential have a long tradition in criminological studies on higher institution, which has exhibit a fact as the fear-gender paradox (Tomschi, et al. 2011). Empirical studies suggest that most victims are female, and both gender can be a victims of various crimes. Though male mainly engage in theft and physical assault, which females perpetrated higher rates of sexual assault, but with high value of fear (Azevedo, et al. 2022). Gender differences are socially constructed, but studies seems to be gender biased, stressing the female point of view. Report by Azevedo et al (2022) estimated that 13% students affirmed that they experienced sexual violence on campus, in which 9.7% female and 2.5% male suffer sexual violence. Also, 5.8% students experience

stalking, which further showed that female students from the age of 18-24 years are 3 times likely to suffer stalking compared to male.

Control Mechanism of Gender Criminality on Campus

Campus crime maybe decreasing but safety remain a priority for university students and their parents, as burglaries, rapes, and vehicle theft were recorded as the common criminal offences on campus (Bryant, 2023). With regard to support mechanism on campuses, report from Rainn (2025) shows that 4 out of 5 students do not report victimization to school authority, as only 1 in 5 female students received assistance. The reasons for not reporting as stated in the study include; believed that it is a personal matter (26%), fear of reprisal (20%), believed it is not important (12%), do not want trouble for the perpetrator (10%), and the assumption that the system will not do anything (9%). University environment ensures various support mechanisms for reporting and controlling crimes, and these include the traditional law enforcement approach along with confidentiality and anonymous tip to encourage reporting. Several mechanism options which include; direct contact with campus security, call boxes, the police, anonymous hotline, and others have been provided in some universities in Nigeria (Jimoh et al, 2023).

Theoretical Framework

Sex Role Theory (SRT)

Sex role theory is attributed Talcott Parson in early 1950s, and the theory is a framework which explain how gender role are socialized and maintained in society by suggesting that individuals learn behaviors and expectations associated with their gender from an early age. This theory enumerate the ways societal norms defined appropriate behaviors for male and female, and thereby, reinforcing traditional roles that often contribute to systems of patriarchy, sexism, and gender inequality. Sex role theory according to Thompson (2021), gender differentials in criminality with respect to differences in gender socialization, gender role, gender role and gender identities. The norms and values associated with traditional femininity are not conditioned to crime, while the norms and values associated with traditional masculinity are more likely to result into crime.

In Nigeria, it could be observed that toy guns and teddy bear were bought for male and female child at their early age. This is an expected socialization of norms in which metamorphosis into their masculinity and femininity in the society. According to Parson (1964), because female are involved in the “expressive role” of the family which is engaging in house chores and looking after the emotional needs of the male (husband), and that girls grew up to internalized such value as caring and empathy, both of which reduces the likelihood of committing crimes. The child caring role also mean that female are effectively more attached to their family and the larger society than the male counterpart. This is just as the bond in the attachment theory, which stated that women are more attached to the larger society and therefore, less likely to commit crime. However, this can be argued that due to gender bias investigation in policing, prosecuting and convicting criminality (Igbekoyi et al. 2025), and several scholars have stressed there exist unexpected investigation disparities (Bielen and Grajzl, 2020)

Results

Table 1: Socio-Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Variables	Frequency	Percentage
Sex	**N=120**	**%**
Male	66	55.0
Female	54	45.0
Age		
Below 20	26	21.7
21-25	50	41.7
26-30	26	21.6
31 and above	18	15.0
Religion		
Christianity	79	65.8
Islam	30	25.0
Traditional	11	9.2
Ethnicity		
Yoruba	59	49.2
Igbo	43	35.8
Hausa	18	15.0
Faculty		
Art	22	18.3
Education	11	9.2
Management Sciences	29	24.2
Social Sciences	34	28.3
Science	24	20.0

Source: Fieldwork (2025)

Table 1 presented data on respondents' socio-demographic characteristics. The gender disparity among respondents shows that 55% were male, while 45% were female. The implication of this finding is that more male students took active part in the study. Also, the age difference of respondents was presented and it stated that 21.7%, 41.7%, 21.6%, and 15.0% were for those between less than 20 years, 21-25 years, 26-30 years, and above 31 years respectively. What this implies is that nearly one-quarter (41.7%) of the total population that took part in the study falls between 21-25 years. The Table (1) further illustrates the religion affiliation of respondents. It explained that about 66% claimed to be Christian, 25% attested to be an Islamic worshipper, and 9% respondents affirmed to practice Traditional belief. In other words, it implies that a large distribution of respondents around 66% that confirmed that they practice Christianity.

The Ethnicity of respondents was also illustrated in the Table 1. It shows that 49.2% of the respondents claimed to be from the Yoruba ethnic group, 35.8% respondents attested to be from the Igbo ethnic group, and 15.0% respondents said they from the Hausa ethnic group. Therefore, this result implies that nearly half (49.2%) of the total population confirmed that they are from the Yoruba ethnic and this is attributed to the study area. Respondents' faculty was also presented in Table 1, and it shows that 18.3% were from Art, 9.2% respondents were from Education, 24.2% were from Management,

28.3% were from faculty of the Social Sciences, and 20.0% respondents were from Sciences. In nutshell, what this means is that majority of the respondents with 28.3% were from Social Sciences that took part in the study.

Table 2: Fieldwork Reported Criminal Cases from the University Security Unit

Cases	2021		2022		2023		2024	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Burglary	5 (6.6)	2 (2.6)	3 (3.4)	1 (1.1)	2 (3.0)	1 (1.5)	2 (2.8)	-
Examination Malpractices	11 (14.5)	8 (10.8)	10 (11.2)	9 (10.1)	3 (4.5)	3 (4.5)	8 (11.1)	4 (5.6)
Cultism	12 (15.8)	(0.00)	3 (3.4)	(0.00)	1 (1.5)	(0.00)	4 (5.6)	1 (1.4)
Assault	4 (5.3)	4 (5.3)	2 (2.2)	(0.00)	3 (4.5)	5 (7.6)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Cybercrime	2 (2.6)	2 (2.6)	4 (4.5)	4 (4.5)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Bullying	8 (10.5)	4 (5.3)	20 (22.5)	3 (3.1)	14 (21.2)	2 (3.0)	23	5 (6.9)
Indecent Dressing	10 (13.2)	4 (5.3)	10 (11.2)	20 (22.5)	6 (9.1)	20 (30.3)	11 (15.3)	14 (19.4)

Sources: University Security Unit (2025)

Table 2 is a case report collected from where the study was carried out. It shows figures on the kind of crimes committed by both male and female students in the university from 2021 to 2024. In 2021, cultism was high among male students with 15% cases recorded. This was followed with examination malpractice (14.5%), indecent dressing (13.2%), bullying (10.5), and burglary (6.6%). However, for the female students, examination malpractice with 10.8% was the highest crime in which they are involved within the university. In 2022, there was cases of bullying (22.5%), examination malpractice and indecent dressing (10.8%) for male. While for female students, examination malpractice and indecent dressing (11.2%) were the highest cases recorded. In the 2023, the male students maintained bullying (21.2%) as the highest cases, follow by cultism and examination malpractice. In the cases of female involvement, indecent dressing (30.3%) shows the highest cases. Lastly in 2024, the male involvement shows indecent dressing (30.3%), while for female students, indecent dressing was recorded as the highest anti-social behavior. From the report given in Table 2, it shows that male students are well involved in indecent dressing, examination malpractice, and bullying. While for female students, indecent dressing, examination malpractice were the most common practice of female students in the university.

Table 3: Percentage Distribution of respondents on the Prevalence of Gender Criminality among Undergraduate students in a Nigerian

Details	Male N= 71		Female N= 49		Total N=120	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Have you ever felt unsafe on campus due to criminal activities	31 (43.7)	40 (56.3)	21 (42.9)	28 (57.1)	52 (43.3)	68 (56.7)
Have you believe that harassment of students is a prevalent issue among students at your institution	57 (80.3)	14 (19.7)	36 (73.5)	13 (26.5)	93 (77.5)	27 (22.5)
Have you personally experienced any form of violence because of your gender or sex	20 (28.2)	51 (71.8)	19 (38.8)	30 (61.2)	39 (32.5)	81 (67.5)
Do you think that the campus administration takes adequate measures to address criminal activities against female students	56 (78.9)	15 (21.1)	40 (81.6)	9 (18.4)	96 (80.0)	24 (20.0)
Have you witnessed incidents of violence or harassment happening to other students on campus either due to their sexes	30 (42.3)	41 (57.7)	22 (44.9)	27 (55.1)	52 (43.3)	68 (56.7)

Source: Fieldwork (2025)

Table 3 investigates the prevalence of gender criminality among undergraduates students in a Nigeria University. Whether students have ever felt unsafe on campus due to criminal activities in the University was determined, and it stated across both gender that 43.3% respondents claimed they feel unsafe, while 56.7% respondents attested otherwise. Therefore, what this implies is that more than half of the respondents that they did not feel unsafe due to criminality in the University. The Table (3) further examined whether students believe that harassment among students a is prevalent issue among student. For male and female respondents, 80.3% and 73.5% believed it is a prevalent issue. This is to say that a very large proportion (77.5%) of respondents confirmed that harassment is a prevalent issues among undergraduates in the university. Also, Table 3 investigate whether students have experienced any form of violence because of their gender, and both male (71.8%) and female (61.2%) claimed that they have not personally experienced any form of violence as a result of their gender. As a result, the implication of this finding is that a high degree (67.5%) from the total population attested that they have not personally experienced any form of violence due to their gender.

Whether campus administration takes adequate measures to address criminal activities against female students was investigated and presented in Table 3. It shows that a very large degree (78.9%) of male respondents, and an overwhelming proportion (81.6%) of female respondents affirmed that campus administrative take adequate measures in addressing criminal activities against female students. In totality, an overwhelming distribution of respondents with 80.0% confirmed that campus administration address criminal activities against female students. Finally from Table 3 is the presentation of data on whether students have witnessed

incidents of violence or harassment happening to other students due to their gender. The Table shows that more than half of both male (57.7%) and female (55.1%) respondents claimed not to have witnessed any incidents of violence against any students due to their gender. Therefore, more than half (56.7%) of both male and female students attested not to have witnessed any incident against any students due to their gender.

Table 4: Percentage Distribution of Respondents on the Expectation that Contribute to both Involvement and Victimization of Gender Criminality among Undergraduate Students in a Nigerian University

Details	Male N=71		Female N=49		Total N=120	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Male students are more involved in criminal offenses than female students	53 (74.6)	18 (25.4)	31 (63.3)	18 (36.7)	84 (70.0)	36 (30.0)
Male students are more involved in violent acts than female students	59 (83.1)	12 (16.9)	31 (63.3)	18 (36.7)	90 (75.0)	30 (25.0)
Male students are more involved in truancy in school work than female student	53 (74.6)	18 (25.4)	27 (55.1)	22 (44.9)	80 (66.7)	40 (33.3)
Male students are more involved in stealing offenses than female students	41 (57.7)	30 (42.3)	29 (59.2)	20 (40.8)	70 (58.3)	50 (41.7)
Male students are more involved in fraud than female students	49 (69.0)	22 (31.0)	25 (51.0)	24 (49.0)	74 (61.7)	46 (38.3)

Source: Fieldwork (2025)

Table 4 investigates the expectation that contribute to both involvement and victimization of gender criminality among students in a Nigerian University. The Table determined whether male students are more involved in criminal offenses than female. It illustrated that both male (74.6%) and female (63.3%) believed that male students are more involved in criminal offenses than female compared to those male (25.4%) and female (36.7%) that believed otherwise. In nutshell, what this result implies is that 70.0% respondents agreed that male are more involved in criminality than the female. Also, whether male students are more involved in violent acts than female students was examined, and it shows that both male and female respondents with 83.1% and 63.3% respectively believed that male students are more involved in violent acts than female students. In total, both gender with 75.0% attested that male students are more involved in violent acts. Whether students are more involved in truancy in school that work than female students. It stated that 74.6% male and 55.1% female believed that male students are more involved in truancy in school work than female students. However, a large distribution (66.7%) of respondents confirmed that male students are more involved in truancy in school work than female.

Furthermore, whether male students are more involved in stealing offenses than female students. The result shows that more than half of

both male (57.7%) and female (59.2%) respondents affirmed that male students are more involved in stealing offenses than female students, as 42.3% male and 40.8% female claimed otherwise. Therefore, the implication of this results is that more than half (58.3%) of the total sampled population confirmed that male students are more involved in stealing than female student. Finally, the Table (4) presented data on whether male students are more involved in fraud than female students, and nearly 70% male students and more than half (51%) female respondents agreed that male students are more involved in fraud than female students. Nonetheless, 61.7% from the total respondents affirmed that male students are more involved in fraud than female

Table 5: Percentage Distribution of Respondents on the Supporting Mechanism for Addressing Gender-Specific Crimes among Undergraduate Students in a Nigerian University

Details	Male N=71		Female N=49		Total N=120	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Are you aware of any formal reporting mechanisms for gender-based crimes in this university	40 (56.3)	31 (43.7)	33 (67.3)	16 (32.7)	73 (60.8)	47 (39.2)
Do you believe that the university provides adequate resources and support for victims of gender-specific crimes	21 (29.6)	50 (70.4)	14 (28.6)	35 (71.4)	35 (29.2)	85 (70.8)
Are you aware of information about the university's policies on gender-based violence or harassment	38 (53.5)	33 (46.5)	31 (63.3)	18 (36.7)	69 (57.5)	51 (42.5)
Do you think that university staff are well-trained to handle cases of gender-specific crimes	22 (31.0)	49 (61.0)	17 (34.7)	32 (65.3)	39 (32.5)	81 (67.5)
Have you ever participated in any campus events on raising awareness about gender-specific crimes	28 (39.4)	43 (60.6)	23 (46.9)	26 (53.1)	51 (42.5)	69 (57.5)

Source: Fieldwork, (2025)

Table 5 presented data on the supporting mechanism in addressing gender-specific crimes among undergraduates in a Nigerian university. Whether students are aware of any formal reporting mechanism for gender-specific crimes in the university was examined, and it explained that more than half (56.3%) of male respondents and a large percentage (67.3%) female attested that they are aware of reporting mechanism. Based on this, the total population confirmed that a high degree of respondents with 60.8% believed that they are aware of formal reporting mechanism for gender-specific crimes in the university. The Table 4 also presents data on whether students believed that the university provides adequate resources and support for gender-specific crimes. It therefore shows 70.4% male and 71.4% female affirmed that there is no adequate resources and support for victims of gender crime. As a results, a very high distribution (70.8%) of respondents affirmed that there is no adequate measures and support for victims of gender-specific crimes in the university.Whether students are aware of information about the university's policies on gender-based violence or harassment. It

therefore stated that both male and female respondents with 53.5% and 63.3% respectively claimed to be aware of university policies on gender-based violence. Across both gender, more than half (57.5%) from the total respondents affirmed that they are aware of the university policies on gender-based violence and harassment.

In addition, the Table (5) investigates whether students think that university staff are well-trained to handled cases of gender-specific crime. It explained that both male (61.0%) and female (65.3%) respondents believed that u5niversity staff are not well-trained on gender-specific crimes in the university. Based on this, a large proportion of respondents with 67.5% attested that university staff are not well-trained to handled cases of gender-specific crimes on campus. Lastly, the Table (5) determined whether students have ever participated in any campus event on raising awareness about gender-specific crimes. It shows that both gender (60.6% male and 53.1% female) respondents claimed not to have ever participated in raising awareness. Therefore, more than half (57.5%) of the total respondents affirmed that they have never participated in any campus event in raising students awareness on gender-specific crimes.

Discussion

The study presented data on respondents' socio-demographic characteristics. The gender disparity among respondents revealed that more male (55%) students took active part in the study. Also revealing from the study is that nearly one-quarter (41.7%) of the total population that took part in the study falls between 21-25 years. The study further revealed that a large distribution of respondents around 66% that confirmed that they practice Christianity. Findings from the study also revealed that nearly half (49.2%) of the total population confirmed that they are from the Yoruba ethnic and this is attributed to the study area. Revealing form the study is that majority of the respondents with 28.3% were from Social Sciences that took part in the study.

From the study on the prevalence of gender criminality on campus, it revealed that more than half of the respondents that they did not feel unsafe due to criminality in the University. Report from tertiary institutions on campus crime throughout the years according to Bouchrika (2025)had left parents, students and lecturers questioning if their institutions are safe. Further revealing from the study is that a very large proportion (77.5%) of respondents confirmed that harassment is a prevalent issues among undergraduates in the university. This finding is in agreement with Bouchrika (2025), that there is a total of 1.4 million crimes committed in Schools across the United State, which equals to 28 crimes per 1,00 students, with crimes such as burglaries (42%), sexual harassment (31%), and theft (12%). Also, the study revealed that a high degree (67.5%) from the total population attested that they have not personally experienced any form of violence due to their gender. The finding from the study shows that an overwhelming distribution of respondents with 80.0% confirmed that campus administration address criminal activities against female students. This affirmation can be attributed to the enhancement of physical security through measures like access control, increasing the visibility of campus security, and campus safety through programs and policies (West Yorkshire Police, 2024). It further revealed that more than half (56.7%) of both male and female students attested not to have witnessed any incident against any students due to their gender. This result is in corroboration with the result of Amaral et (2024)that decrease

in sexual violence by teachers and staff for example, regardless of the targeted gender group, providing evidence of the role of improving the capacity of key school personnel to deter perpetrators. Despite the report by the United Nation that nearly 1 in 3 female has experienced both physical or sexual violence, and this is equivalent to 736 million female globally (Project Hope, 2023), the result from this study contradicted in its finding.

The study in Table 4which is on the expectation that contribute to both involvement and victimization of gender criminality revealed that 70.0% respondents agreed that male are more involved in criminality than the female.This can be attributed to the fact that male do not fear to engage in criminality. This is also supported by Azevedo et al (2022) which reported that female students claimed to have fear than male students when it comes to criminalities like robbery, sexual offenses, and physical aggression. Furthermore, the study also revealed that both gender with 75.0% attested that male students are more involved in violent acts. This report corroborate with a study which shows that between 40 developing nation which also include Nigeria, around 42% male and 37% female were subjected to bullying than involving in physical violence (Bouchrika, 2025). Globally, UNESCO (2019) stated that 1 in 3 students were bullied at least once a month. However, it stated that bullying is prevalent in Sub-Saharan Africa with 48.2% students who claimed to have been bullied Also revealing in the study stated that a large distribution (66.7%) of respondents confirmed that male students are more involved in truancy in school work than female.Furthermore, the study revealed that more than half (58.3%) of the total sampled population confirmed that male students are more involved in stealing than female student. Finding from the study revealed that 61.7% from the total respondents affirmed that male students are more involved in fraud than female. Based on these findings, it is not a gain saying that male students are more involved in stealing and fraud than female students. However, several studies have supported it showing higher rates of stealing and frauds committed by male students compare to female students (Ubbels, 2015).

Revealing from the study on the second objective which is on the support mechanism shows a high degree of respondents with 60.8% believed that they are aware of formal reporting mechanism for gender-specific crimes in the university. Despite the that this study claim that students are aware of reporting mechanism, several studies shows low awareness of certain policies such as academic integrity. This awareness can be attributed to channels like social media, website, and orientation programs on campuses (Domingo et al, 2025). However, it should be noted that support and report is a confidential mechanism, and informal reporting mechanism is not suitable and appropriate process of making complains. The study revealed that a very high distribution (70.8%) of respondents affirmed that there is no adequate measures and support for victims of gender-specific crimes in the university.The finding of this report is in support of Agbongiasede (2024) which identified warning, punishment and discouragement as the measures taken to support campus crimes. Finding also shows that more than half (57.5%) from the total respondents affirmed that they are aware of the university policies on gender-based violence and harassment. Reporting mechanism is an essential medium for members of a university community to report incidents such as harassment and discrimination to guarantee thorough investigations and appropriate adjudication. With such mechanism, a safe and more inclusive campus atmosphere, can ensure that students and

staff affected by campus crime receive the support they need (Anti-Defamation League, 2024).

In addition, the study revealed that a large proportion of respondents with 67.5% attested that university staff are not well-trained to handled cases of gender-specific crimes on campus. Inadequate training is a significant factors for campus staff not to handled campus crimes effectively. Barriers such as poor funding, lack of modern security equipment, and limited awareness of management skill like de-escalation skill is a contributing factor to effectively handle gender-specific campus crimes (Mkhize et al, 2022). It also revealed that more than half (57.5%) of the total respondents affirmed that they have never participated in any campus event in raising students awareness on gender-specific crimes.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Based on the findings from the study, the study concluded that the university in which this study was carried out underscore the importance of robust institutional mechanism for reporting and to address, and prevent gender differential crimes on campus. It further concluded that while there are policies and reporting mechanism in place, its effectiveness remains limited due to inadequate resources, weak enforcement, and insufficient support system for victims. As a result, the following recommendations were provided;

i. Strengthen policy implementation and enforcement especially on campuses with a view to discouraging and preventing students misconduct and criminality.

ii. Enhance staff training and awareness of existing forms of criminality for each gender.

iii. Promote students engagement through mainstreaming human rights, gender space respect and crime reporting into general study curriculum.

iv. Introducing Naming and Shaming of offenders as veritable means of checkmating gender based violence practices.

References

Agbongiased, C. K. (2024). Approaches to Crime Control in Public Universities: A Case Study of South-South Geo-Political Zone of Nigeria. *American Journal of Social and Humanitarian Research. Vol. 5(2)*

Ajayi, A and Ojo, B. (2019). Prevalence of Sexual Harassment among University Students in Southwest, Nigeria. *International Journal of Social Justice. Vol. 12(3):88-98*

Amaral, S., Garcia-Ramos, A., Gulesci, S., Ramos, A., Ore-Quispe, S., and Sviatschi, M. M. (2024). Gender-Based Violence in Schools and Girls' Education: Experimental Evidence from Mozambique. *National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper. Cambridge, USA*

Amnesty International (2018). Gender-Based Violence in Nigerian Institutions: A Call for Action. *Human Right Review. Vol.20(4):180-194*

Anti-Defamation League (2024). Improving Campus Incident Reporting Mechanisms. *Retrieved from www.notoleranceforantisemitism.adl.org on the 26th of October, 2025*

Azevedo, V., Nunes, L. M., and Sani, A. (2022). Is Campus a Place of (In)Security and

Crime? Perceptions and Predictors among Higher Education Students. *European Journal of Investigating Health Psychological Education. Vol. 12(2):193-208*

Bielen, S., and Grajzl, P. Z. (2020). Gender-Based Judicial In-Group Bias in Sex Crime Sentencing: Evidence from Belgium. *International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice. Vol. 62*

Braithwaite, J. (1989). *Crime, Shame and Reintegration*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Bouchrika, I. (2025). 40 Student Crime Statistics: 2025 Data, Analysis and Predictions. *Retrieved from 12th of October, 2025 from www.research.com*

Bryant, J. (2023). College Campus Crime and Safety Statistics. *Retrieved from www.bestcolleges.com on the 14th of January, 2026*

Domingo, A. M. U., Palao, J. L. B., Baluyos, G. R., and Daniel, M. B. (2025). Students' Awareness, Practices, and Engagement in the Institution's Philosophy, Vision, Mission, Goals, Objectives and Core Values. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science. Vol.9(1):2379-2399*

Igbekoyi, K. E., Ilori, S. O., Agboola, E. B., Boluwade, B. I, Gbadamosi, S. G, Likinyo, O. S., Omotayo, B. J., Olabamiji, A. A., Arum, I., Azeez, A. O., and Kayode, O. J. (2025). Gender Bias and Cybercrime Investigation: A Comparative Study of Female Involvement in Cybercrime among Undergraduate Students in Selected Universities in Ekiti State, Nigeria. *Bradleya. Vol. 43(4):45-60*

Ilori, S. O., Ilori, A. A. and Alaba, E. V. (2024). Campus Criminality and Vulnerability of Victimsation among Undergraduate Students in Ekiti State Urban University. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science. Vol. 12(1): 23-31*

Jacobsen, S. K. (2021). More of a Girl Thing? Examining the Role of Gender and Campus Context in Perceptions of Risk and the Shadow of Sexual Assault. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence. Vol. 37(15)*

Jimoh, A., Ibrahim, M., Adediran, R., Olawale, T., Yusuf, A., and Folorunso, M. (2023). Campus Crime Reporting Software Framework using Short Message Services (SMS). *International Journal of Innovative Research in Education Technology and Social Strategies. Vol.10(2):16-30*

LawTeacher (2018). Relationship between Gender and Crime. *Retrieved on the 13th of January, 2026 from www.lawtechers.net*

Mkhize, S., Cinini, S. F., Ngcece, S. (2022). University Campuses and Types of Crimes: A Case Study of the University of Kwazulu-Natal/Howard Campus in the City of Durban-South Africa. *Cogent Social Sciences. Vol.2(1)*

Musu, L., Zhang, A., Wang, K., Zhang, J., and Oudekerek, B. (2019). *Indicators of School Crime and Safety.* Washington DC:NCES

Oluwadare, C. T., and Igbekoyi, K. E. (2019). Prevalence and Consequences of Cybercrime Perpetrated by Students in Public Tertiary Institutions in Ekiti State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Arts, Languages and Business Studies (IJALBS). Vol. 2(1):211-224*

Owusu-Antwi, R., Fedina, L., Robba, M. B., Khatibi, K., Bosomtwe, D., Nsereko, E., Oluwatobiloba, S., Campton, S., Akinyemi, A., Randa, M. B., Afolabi, A., and Kramer, M. L. (2024). Prevalence of Gender-Base Violence and Factors Associated with Help-Seeking among University Students in Sub-Saharan African. *Women's Health. Vol. 21(20).*

Parson, T. (1964). *Social Structure and Personality*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe

Rainn, (2025). Statistics: Campus Sexual Violence. *Retrieved on the 14th of January, 2026 from* www.rainn.org

Thompson, K. (2021). Gender and Crime: Sex-Role Theory. *Retrieved from* www.revisesociology.com *on the 16th of November, 2025*

Tomsich, E. A., Gover, A. R., and Jennings, W. F. (2011). Examining the Role of Gender in the Prevalence of Campus Victimization, Perception of Fear and Risk of Crime, and the use of Constrained Behaviors among College Students Attending a Large Urban University. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*

Ubbels, W. (2015) . shoplifting: Why and How Men and Women Steal Differently. *Retrieved on the 26th of October, 2025 from* www.nedap-retail.com

UNESCO (2019). *Behind the Numbers: Ending School Violence and Bullying.* Paris: UNIESCO

West Yorkshire Police (2024). The 10 Principles of Crime Prevention. *Retrieved from* www.westyorkshire.police.uk *from 26th of October, 2025*

Woolnough, A. D. (2009). Fear of Crime on Campus: Gender Differences in use of Self-Protective Behaviors at an Urban University. *Security Journal. Vol. 22(1):40-55*