
Known Works in the Field

In a book of this nature, it is important to look at the global scenario of women in leadership in universities, in Africa and in Nigeria. This scenario serves as a background to interpretations of and conclusions from the data. Literature reviews are also a vital tool for a discussion of the findings because the findings are weighed against the existing literature and places its contribution to scholarship into context. As such, the literature review is a vital aspect of the research process. In this literature review, women and leadership in higher education were reviewed at the global, African and Nigerian levels. The global level provided the perception of women and leadership in higher education around the world. The African level revealed the situation of women and leadership in African universities, and the Nigerian review showed the situation in Nigeria. With this data, the reader can evaluate the entire situation and see how far Africa and Nigeria has gone in this regard, and what still needs to be done. Also, best practices can also be copied from the literature to make things better in women and higher education leadership in Nigeria. The literature also reviewed the causes and consequences of crises in Nigerian universities. The literature therefore informed the study and gave it the needed direction.

Women and University Leadership Globally

The absence of women in leadership positions in public spaces has a long history and as noted by Kwesiga (2002), there are factors that edge out women at every step of their educational career. As noted by Adebayo and Akanle, cited in Olaogun *et al.* (2015), in the past, there were concerted and determined efforts to deprive women of employment opportunities. Olaogun *et al.* (2015) also posited that from 1841 until the outbreak of first world war in 1914, a combination of pressure from male workers and philanthropic reformers restricted female employment in industry. Infact, in 1841, a committee of male factory workers called for the gradual withdrawal of all female labour in the factory (2015). Men tended to use the wife/mother role of women to justify their exclusion from the work place. Thus, with

ideology, blackmail and lobbying by male workers, women were excluded from factory work (Olaogun *et al.* 2015). In our African and Nigerian context in which everyman was basically a farmer, women were not allowed to own tangible property as they work in their husbands' farms. In fact, women were inheritable properties in many cultures in Nigeria. This was made worse with the advent of Europeans in Nigeria. It was then that the situation of women became a double burden of being black and being a woman. These scenerios were made possible because in most parts of the world, societies were organized along patriarchal lines. This could explain the absence of women in leadership positions in most of these societies.

This trend was carried into the university system. Due to women's inferior social position, access to higher education did not come easily to women. As university employees, women are mainly at the lower cadre of university positions. As observed by Morley (2013), 80.9 per cent of professorial roles in the United Kingdom were held by men. In the same vein, Blandford *et al.* (2011), found that men comprised 72 per cent of academic staff in senior academic management positions. In Arab countries, Hammoud (1993), found that women are under-represented in higher education leadership and that women constituted 15.5 per cent of academic staff and 16.7 per cent of women in administrative positions. At top level management positions such as president, vice president and members of the board of trustees, there were no females.

Infact, in 70 per cent of the 54 commonwealth countries, all universities were led by men in 2007 (Morley *et al.* 2005). Morley (2013) also observed that women's absence in leadership positions in universities is a recurrent theme in the global North and South; an indication that the problem is everywhere. For instance, in Arab countries, Hammoud (1993) maintained that women's absence in higher education leadership cannot be examined in isolation from women's inferior social status in the larger society. The right to vote or be voted for, for example, was prohibited to women in Arab countries even though there are equal rights in the constitution. This gives one an idea of the situation of women in such a region. Gender inequality is found in the legal, political and social domains and has various impacts on the lives of women of different classes or educational backgrounds. Furthermore, this inequality limits women's access to education and employment as well as to effective integration in decision-making processes (Hammoud 1993). Many inequalities in higher education management are found in regions where the constitution stipulates equal rights for both sexes. One can only imagine what the situations are like in Arab countries where the inequality is legal. In such a region, women are still likely to be battling with women's access to higher education. As such, it would be difficult for a legally inferior human being (female) to be a superior officer and for a legally superior human being (male) to be subordinate. For women to be in management positions in this context, it is likely to be in an all-girl's schools. Not surprisingly, there is no concrete data

on women and higher education management in Hammoud's study as very few women were found in intermediate management positions and none were found in presidential and vice presidential positions.

In India, 5.7 per cent of Vice Chancellors and 3.6 per cent of other university managers have been women (Chitnis 1993). Chitnis (1993) also noted that not only was the representation of women in the management of higher education in India very small, it was highly skewed in terms of their discipline and geographical location. For instance, 55.5 per cent of these universities headed by women were exclusively for women (Chitnis 1993). This stemmed from the inferior status of women in the country which made it easier for women to head women only institutions than to head institutions that included male students. This was a case of separate space for women, a kind of parallel leadership which is an indication that women were not yet fully in the mainstream of leadership in higher education in India.

In America and Canada, Featherman (1993), showed that women enter higher education at the same rate as men. They also tend to complete their first degree programmes more than men but they do not fare well at the advanced degree level. They often do not pursue or complete their doctorate and post doctorate degrees. Females constitutes only 29 per cent of academics. Many of the associate and full professors are men. Women in academia are generally paid less than their male counterparts (Fapohunda 2013). In a country like America with liberal principles, this signifies the seriousness and ubiquitous nature of women's inferior social status.

In Nigeria, Williams (1993), found that all the 59 full professors in the University of Benin were males while only 4 out of 35 of the associate professors were females. The vice chancellor, however, was also a female at this period. In OAU, Afonja (2002), found that females constituted 13 per cent of academic staff while Eboiyehi *et al.* (2016), found that 18 per cent of the academic staff were female. They also found that the vice chancellor and the two deputy vice chancellors were males and that females made up 33 per cent of all deans, 38 per cent of all the directors and 14 per cent of all the HODs. In the same vein, Soetan *et al.* (2009) found that of the 19 statutory committees, male representation was approximately 90 per cent in six committees, and 80 per cent in five committees. The gender gap is widest in senate where males constitute 94.5 per cent. Furthermore, in recent data, Odeyinka *et al.* (2015), found that in the same institution, there were no significant improvements in the proportion of female academic staff which was 18 per cent. The data also revealed a reduction in the proportion of females in the professorial cadre from 10 per cent in 2001/2002 to 8 per cent in 2013. In the Nigerian context, particularly at OAU, professorial cadre appears to have moved backwards, indicating that all the gender equity projects and programmes are not yielding fruits. The gender situation in university leadership in OAU provides a window through which one can look at women in leadership positions in other universities in Nigeria.

The experience of women in academic leadership is also problematic and tends to reinforce the absence of women in higher education leadership. According to Hammoud (1993), some female university administrators mentioned that their relationships with their male colleagues were cold. They revealed that their male counterparts lacked confidence and harboured negative attitudes towards women and their abilities. In general, the men were reserved and felt uncomfortable discussing certain issues with women. Some women university managers said that men were sensitive to having them as superiors and did not trust her aptitudes even if she was more qualified than them. They would reject her leadership. This may not be solely a problem of trust but a problem with the male ego. Many men found it humiliating to work under a woman as is perpetuated the perception that he was not masculine enough to be called a man. This humiliation was not limited to the work place, even at home, there was a chance that his wife would taunt him for having a female boss. All this boils down to the inferior status of women which has become a dominant social status covering all others. Women university leaders, however, battle with both male and female subordinates. The relationships with female subordinates are rather negative due to competition, jealousy, lack of objectivity and interference of personal factors in the workplace (Hammoud 1993). It was often more difficult to deal with women subordinates because women are also products of patriarchal gender relations and tend to believe in it more than men. For instance, it is the *umuada* – (daughters born in the family) that prosecute widows who question harmful widowhood practices. As such, many women may not accept the leadership of fellow women and will show their rejection through disobedience and by trying to make things difficult for women in leadership. It was further noted that the positions of president and vice president are reserved for men. Women are given positions only when it is necessary.

In India, Chitnis (1993) found that women who enter the academic profession are well qualified but very few are able to acquire the relevant academic distinctions required to be elevated to management positions. Moreover, even those who acquired additional qualifications were not always willing to move from a purely teaching and research position to one involving administrative responsibilities because that involves more time on the job. The major exclusion that the women university managers faced was not being able to move around (going to Delhi for administrative matters, for example). They therefore socialize less and are less informed on relevant matters than their male counterparts. This problem is generally experienced by women expected to look after children and maintain the home. Consequently, they often do not have time to be involved in extracurricular activities that would provide opportunities of meeting and networking with new people. Also, women education leaders find it difficult to exercise authority over male and female subordinates who always stigmatize these female leaders (Lunyolo *et al.* 2017). This difficulty in dealing with male and

female subordinates has become a recurrent theme in most parts of the world, showing that it is a serious problem for women in leadership positions (Lunyolo *et al.* 2017). Women also find it difficult to withstand and fight corruption and political pressures, since those who exercise them do not hesitate to indulge in character defamation (Chitnis 1993). It is important to note that it is very easy to blackmail and defame a woman's character due to the sensitive nature of women's social status. In fact, what some corrupt people do to have their way is tell the woman leader's husband to tell his wife to back down .or face the consequences.

Even when a woman manages to get to the top in Nigeria, she experiences many challenges. As a women university manager, you must work harder, face problems of insubordination from men and imitate male behaviour. The special qualities that distinguishes a competent woman manager in a higher education institution from the rest is being persuasive, assertive and flexible and which facilitates problem solving and taking care of diversity (Akudo and Okenwa 2015). Although male colleagues acknowledge that highly qualified women exist, they were not ready to offer support (Williams 1993). It is believed that men do not offer support they want the woman to fail to justify their exclusion of women from leadership positions in the universities. Trusting and delegating power to the right team can be an uphill task for women university leaders (Williams 1993). This is because with all the issues of conspiracy, lack of trust and jealousy raised above, the woman leader may be apprehensive about who to trust in order to avoid making mistake and ruining her tenure. In the same vein, Feather man (1993), found that there is still considerable bias against women as many male professors still believe that women are less qualified than men for academic careers. As such, women are better represented in lower rank positions, such as assistant professor than at the higher ranks of associate and full professors.

This lack of women in leadership positions in universities means that women are globally under represented across all decision-making organs including committees, boards, recruitment panels and the executive. This means that a significant part of the higher education workforce is being under-utilized (Morley 2013). In the same vein, Anyaoku (1993), noted that the under representation of women in higher education management serves to demonstrate that the pool of managerial talent within each country is not optimally utilized.

This assertion holds true in many public spaces in Nigeria and globally. Importantly, the society fails to appreciate this loss of skill and resource that has been sacrificed on the altar of patriarchal gender relations, values and practices. Infact, many people, even in higher educational institutions, do not know or have an idea that women can bring alternative leadership model to bear on leadership of universities. This is partly due to women's inferior social status which portrays women as second class and inferior, incapable of leadership generally, let alone leading in a sensitive space like the university system.

In this section, attempt had been made to look at women and higher education management around the globe. The situation in different parts of the globe (Europe, America, Arab, Asia and Africa) has been examined. This global review of what we know about women and higher education management has illuminated and revealed that everywhere one goes, the story is basically the same. Women are under-represented in higher education management which means that the world is losing some of its human resource potential in higher education management. It is also important to note that this problem has been recognized by many scholars and stakeholders which has resulted in affirmative action and gender equity projects and programmes in many universities around the world. Interestingly, this has not yielded much fruit in these universities..

Women and Leadership in African Universities

I wish to start this section by reemphasizing the fact that women are marginalized in academia globally. It is important to note that Nigerian women experience worse marginalization (Olaogun *et al.* 2015). This was reiterated by Egunjobi (2009) cited in Olaogun *et al.* (2015), that in commonwealth nations most of the low percentages of women in academia are found in African universities. This is to say that even as gender gap in academia is in most countries of the world, the cases in Africa are among the most serious. Women's low representation in academia also tends to be reinforced by the numerous discriminations and hostilities that women face as university faculty members. Infact, Sutherland (2008 cited in Olaogun 2015) observed that women face serious challenges in gaining access to their daily resources and bargaining power. Mabokela (2003) (in Njobvu (2014), asserted that women in academia experience hostilities such as subtle discrimination, psychological and other harassments and other inequalities based on gender. Apart from these experiences in the university, women are also members of a larger society which tends to reinforce and exacerbate women's poor quantity and quality representation in academia. As noted by Okeke (2004) (in Njobvu (2014), traditionally, Zambian women, as is the case in most Sub-Saharan African countries, are socialized to value marriage and motherhood so much so that non-conformity is derided by stigmatization. Njobvu (2014) talked about this societal pressure and posited that there is also pressure from socio-cultural gender expectations which impedes women's ambition. Prah (2002)) called this a socio-cultural conspiracy, which is detrimental to women achieving higher levels of education and senior leadership positions in Zambian universities. This could explain why Prah 2002 insisted that to write about gender and academic lide, they also need to see both the forest and the trees – the patriarchal structure and everyday forms of maintenance and control. In OAU, it is equally difficult for a woman secure a Vice Chancellor position because of these socio-cultural norms which are even stronger than laws. Infact, it is her fellow women counterparts here that will ask 'what is she looking for? They will assume that she is too greedy.

In the first place, academia is constructed as a carefree zone which assumes that academics have no commitment other than their professions (Lynch 2010). This description fits men better than women because women have as major commitment (as far as the society is concerned) to child bearing, rearing and the care economy and domestic work (Kiamba 2008). As such, the university space and leadership positions generally belong to men. This societal arrangement has generated a mindset that views men as university leaders. As captured by Kiamba (2008) the university workplace also has a way of promoting a certain perception among men and women, expecting and believing that universities are not the sort of places where women could excel as leaders. Kiamba (2008) further noted that women's contribution to development does not translate to equal representation and that culture and cultural expectations and women's own fear of success constitute barriers. In Nigeria, Odejide (2007) reported that male leaders were preferred as they were thought to be more suited to deal with student unrest. This implies that unrests have become a reason for choosing male leaders giving one the idea that Nigerian universities have become a home of incessant crises. Importantly, no one ever thought of the approach of leadership as being being the cause of student unrest. Women's absence in senior leadership positions is a recurrent theme in global South such as Nigeria (Odejide 2007) and Ghana (Ohene 2010; Morley 2013). Morley (2013) has noted that this phenomenon means that the expertise and skills of a significant part of higher education workforce are being under-utilized. Women vice-chancellors in African universities is quite low and can be counted in one's fingers. For instance, in Nigeria, there are approximately one hundred and twenty-four universities but female Vice Chancellors are not more than four signifying a significant absence of women in this position.

In the same vein, SARUA (2011) cited in Njobvu (2014) reported that women made up only 13 per cent of academic staff at the three public universities in South Africa and faced a very low probability of rising to senior academic positions. This same 13 per cent of female academic staff was also reported by Afonja (2002) in OAU. However, Eboiyehi *et al.* (2016) reported that females made up 18 per cent of academic staff in OAU; an indication that there has been a shift from 2002 to the present period. Furthermore, Guramatunhu Madiwa (2010) also reported that only 12 out of 117 universities in the South African development community were led by women. Importantly, these statistics are not stable, they sometimes fluctuate. For instance, Morley (2013) reported that the per centage of female professors in Nigerian universities in 2004 was 24 per cent, while in 2005, it was 15 per cent and 16 per cent and there was none in the Vice Chancellor position. Early on, one notices that the situation is the same throughout Africa with some universities being a little bit better than others. Importantly, most educated women in these universities accept the exclusion of women at the higher leadership level as given. Women who challenge this exclusion risk being labelled a bad influences and are stigmatized by fellow women. I remember when I joined a female feminist

Professor at the Centre for Gender studies in OAU in the late 1990s, husbands were warning their wives not to join the Professor because she will scatter their families. An erudite scholar was accused of destroying families because she questioned the status quo. This discourages other women from joining in the struggle. Indeed, Maluma (2013) captured this by saying that educated Zambian women may often not contest the status quo and tend to accept barriers like discrimination due to the same traditional socio-cultural belief system which has resulted in the exclusion of women from influential institutional positions. Maluma (2013) contended that patriarchal discrimination and intolerance continues to threaten women's enjoyment of their rights and fundamental freedoms. Hence, women suffer inequalities massively and are under-represented in senior leadership ranks (Njobvu 2014). It was also noted by Njobvu (2014) that the system rewards women's conformity to the values of the majority but punishes and even vilifies any portrayal of different independent behaviours and values that may not necessarily be harmful. What this scenario implies is that any woman who wants to be a leader in an African university must fight and be ready to endure humiliation. As noted by Njobvu (2014), if any woman is to rise and settle in these higher echelons, they must fight to create and utilize spaces within these workplaces. It is worth noting that the fight being referred to here is not an easy one because it is like moving against the tide. This could explain the reason for little advancement in gender equality after several years of advocacy and struggles by women and other stakeholders.

The on-going debate on the African continent reflects a consensus of higher education institutions continuing to be key sites to produce intellectual capacity that is both socially responsible and relevant to regional development agendas. Gender equity should be included in this understanding of the requisite capacities (Mama, 2003). Due to the strategic position of these institutions, there is need for effective leadership which requires the participation of both males and females. However, the reality is that women are virtually absent in the leadership of these institutions which could be the reason for the incessant crises ravaging the universities.

The dearth of women who are respected as accomplished thinkers, researchers and writers is one of the most intractable aspect of gender inequality in higher education systems (Mama 2003). As I have mentioned elsewhere, this dearth of accomplished women academia makes it difficult for women to have a critical mass from which to draw mentors and leaders from. As noted by Mama (2003), without a change in gender relations and sexual cultures that would allow men to participate in domestic responsibilities, women will continue to find it difficult to meet the complex and competitive demands of academic careers. As noted by Morley (2013), the under representation of women is reflected not only in the continued inequalities between men and women but missed opportunities for women to contribute towards the development of universities. One cannot be a full citizen of a country and at the same time be denied of attaining one's full potentials.

Importantly, higher education reform processes focus mainly on reducing the social and administrative cost and not on transforming human/gender relations or the human resources of the universities (Mama 2003). Regarding this issue of transformation, OAU was the first university in Nigeria to approve a gender policy which if implemented can address most issues of gender equity in the University. However, the implementation of this policy remains minimal or non-existent. This has buttressed the conclusion of Mama (2003), that while international, national and institutional statements reflect greater imperatives towards gender equality, the picture suggests that the demand of academic careers in today's African universities might well undermine the realization of policy commitments towards gender equitable transformation. Indeed, in the gendered institutions, Acker (1992) noted that gender is present in the processes, practices, images, ideologies and distributions of power in the various sectors of social life. In the same vein, the Nigerian universities are gendered in the sense that the patriarchal ideologies still dictate the image of university leader as male. As noted by Acker (1992), institutions are historically developed by men, currently dominated by men and symbolically interpreted from the standpoint of men in leading positions both in the present and historically and these institutions have been defined by the absence of women. Acker's assertion holds true for African/Nigerian universities where men reign supreme and women who attempts to raise their heads are regarded as untamed, wild and not good for marriage.

Women and Higher Education Management in Nigeria

To present a clear view of women and education in Nigeria, it would be pertinent to take into consideration the struggles that had to be made before Nigerian women had access to (higher) education. Christian missionaries and colonial administrators introduced formal education in Nigeria in the second half of the 19th century. At that time in many communities, free borns were not allowed by their parents to attend school due to skepticism about the motives of the white man (Muoghalu 2004). According to Fabiyi (2002), some level of attitudinal changes led to more males having access to formal education because the colonial administrators needed clerks, interpreters and teachers. Importantly, certain cultural beliefs and factors result to sex imbalance in educational sector and even limit opportunities thereby hindering development. As such, education was an investment capable of yielding dividends. Such dividends benefited the parents of the child in case of boys and husband's family in case of girls. This is in the sense that after graduation, the boy will stay in the family and bear the family name while the girl will get married and begin to bear the husband's name. As such, in patriarchal Nigerian traditional society, investing in a girl was seen as a waste of fund. The choice as to who should go to school considering the scarce family resources of those days had to be made in favour of the boys (Bankole and Eboiyehi 2003). This important decision as to who

should go to school was informed by the fact that girls were valued less than boys in most Nigerian cultures. In corroboration of this, Nwajiuba (2011) noted that families were reluctant to train girls because they will be married into another family. Also, women were first and foremost seen as mothers and wives who did not have much to do with public places. As such, the gender attribute of females was a master status that coloured every other status, life chances, and every other experience that a woman has as a human being including her experience of higher education.

In higher educational institutions in Nigeria, girls' enrolment is less than that of boys (Benneth 2001). The issue here is that girls are not suddenly missing in higher education. There are socio-cultural issues that militate against women participation in education in such a way that as they move from primary to secondary, their population becomes thinner. The school enrolment for girls at the primary school level is higher than girls' enrolment at the secondary school level and which is higher than their enrolment at the tertiary institution level. This means that as girls go up the educational ladder, their dropout rates increase. Indeed, the pyramid is the symbol for women (Risler 2014).

According to Pereira (2002), the female enrolment in Nigerian tertiary institutions constituted 33.1 per cent. The 33 per cent enrolment found by Pereira was the enrolment rate. When one begins to consider the number of girls who can complete their programmes, it becomes obvious that the number of girls that complete their programmes are far less than the number enrolled in these programmes. The numbers that are eventually absorbed as university staff are less than the number that completed their programmes. This scenario is typical to how cultural and social constraint eliminate women from educational institutions. The earlier disadvantages that Nigerian women suffered in education are still being suffered even in 2017 though to a lesser extent. It took quite some time before Nigerian women began to participate in higher education...

In Nigerian tertiary institutions, the drop-out rate is higher for girls than boys. According to Periera (2002), in many universities in Nigeria, the dropout rate for girls is as high as 60 per cent in some of the programmes. The implication of this is that many girls that enrolled into these university programmes do not complete their programmes. Importantly, there are institutional/cultural factors that constitute push factors to this problem. This problem of high dropout rate also constitutes one of the reasons for having few women in the university decision-making positions.

According to UNICEF (2001), the number of pupils decline from one class to the next. The gender disparity in education in Nigeria exists at all levels but it is especially glaring at the tertiary level. At the primary school level, 31 per cent of females and 23 per cent of males were not enrolled and 60 per cent of school children in Nigeria were girls (UNICEF 2015). Also, UNICEF (2015), noted that there was a difference in the completion of primary school which is 70 per cent for

boys and 65 per cent for girls. At the teaching level, the proportion of male teachers was consistently higher than that of female teachers for all levels of education but the gap increased more widely from primary school to universities. In primary school teaching, the male/female gap was about 5 per cent and over 80 per cent for colleges of education, polytechnics and universities. Among professors and associate professors, males constituted 94 per cent while females constituted 6 per cent. There were 88.1 per cent males and 11.9 per cent females among senior lecturers and research fellows in 2001. The trend is that the higher the level of educational institution and cadre within the professions, the lower the proportion of females (UNICEF 2001). According to UNICEF (2001), the problems that militate against girl child education in Nigeria include early marriage, son preference and poverty. In the same vein, UNICEF (2015) reported that 20 per cent of women (aged 20-40 years) were married before the age of 15 and that 40 per cent of women (aged 15-59 years) were married before the age of 18, with regional variations. For instance, in Northern Nigeria, 52 per cent of women (aged 15-19 years) were married (UNICEF 2015). The UNICEF findings corroborated the report of the commission on the review of higher education in Nigeria (National University Commission, 1992) which identified poverty, early marriage and unplanned pregnancy as factors that contributed to the low representation of women in higher education. In enrolment in higher education at the undergraduate level, females constituted 24.6 per cent with wider gaps in science and technology courses. At the post-graduate levels, females constituted 25.6 per cent and 10 per cent of these females graduated (Obafemi Awolowo university gender policy 2009).

This low representation of women translates to the low number of women in leadership positions in Nigerian universities. The number of female professors, senior lecturers and associate professors are usually low. For instance, Soetan *et al.* (2009) found that in the professorial cadre, males outnumbered females in the ratio of 19:1, out of 206 professors at OAU, 9 (4.3 per cent) were females. Also, there was no female dean of faculty, only one vice dean was a female and of 68 heads of academic departments only 12 were females (most of these females were acting heads of departments). In OAU, in 2014, women constituted 27 out of 279 professors which represented 9.6 per cent (OAU Planning and Budgeting Units 2014). Although this is an improvement from the 4.3 per cent recorded by Soetan (2009), women's representation at the professorial cadre is still minimal in the university. In other universities in Nigeria, Nwajiuba (2011) cited in Olaogun (2015) found low representations of women in academia with 27 per cent female at the University of Nigeria, Nsukka, 17 per cent female at Federal University of Technology, Owerri, 34 per cent at Enugu State University, 13 per cent in Imo State University, 18 per cent at University of Ibadan, 18 per cent at University of Calabar and 12 per cent at the University of Port Harcourt. The low level of female representation in higher education enrolment and employment also has implications for female representation in the management of universities. This

showed that women's absence in higher education leadership is not accidental. From the hidden curriculum to the hidden transcript, it is a systematic, organized process that continues to exclude women and edge them out of leadership positions in higher education in Nigeria. These issues could explain why even when a woman gets to such top position, she is confronted with many issues that have to do with women inferior social status; and the fact that the society (including the university community) regards men as leaders and women as subordinates. To buttress this point, Eboiyehi *et al.* (2016) quoted a female Director in a university unit :

Even though OAU is one of the very few universities where women are holding key senior management positions, the total per centage of women in senior management positions is far less than 35 per cent. When you compare this with their male counterparts, you will find that they are under-represented in senior management positions. This may be attributed to the patriarchal nature of our society where men dominate in all decision-making processes. Until recently, women were to be seen and not heard. Most men saw working under a woman as degrading and tend to flout orders given by their female bosses (Eboiyehi *et al.* 2016:12).

The interviewee above was trying to say that OAU is better than other universities in Nigeria in terms of gender and leadership. However, even in the OAU, there are persistent unequal gender relations and micro politics that subtly discriminate against women and exclude them from leadership positions in the university. This also frightens many women and makes them shy away from university leadership positions. As such, the issue of women and higher education leadership is a very intricate and dicey issue which sometimes makes some women leaders confused and frustrated. Again, being confused and frustrated is regarded as a sign of weakness. These issues are so subtle that most people do not realize that they are gender issues which colour women's experience of leadership and influences women's leadership outcomes.

Can Women Make a Difference?

This question, *can women make a difference?* was investigated by the fact that I took interest in crises in Nigerian universities and found out that there are incessant crises anywhere one turns and that in all these universities, women were absent. This necessitated the question as having only men leaders implies that leadership of universities is left for one half of the population and which could be from the cause of the crises. In fact, Zinger and Folkman (2012) noted that female leaders excelled at nurturing competencies such as building relationships, exhibiting integrity and self-development. The study also found that women were better overall leaders than their male counterpart and the higher the level, the wider the gap (2012).

Below is the overall leadership effectiveness table by gender and position, adapted from Zengar and Folkman (2012) in a gender study of performance of top management officials. Leadership effectiveness in their study means building

relationships, exhibiting integrity, development of the self in terms of acquiring better skills/education, carrying other people along and achieving organizational objectives and result in terms of profits and other goals. This was measured using per centile scores (scaling).

In the table below, the items in the particulars section represent the managerial positions studied. The first item-top management, executives, senior team members means males and females who are in these positions. The figures represent their performance when measured for building relationships, exhibiting integrity, self-development and achieving results. These variables were subjected to scaling and the achievements of real practicing managers were measured. The numerical values represent the average score that males and females scored respectively along the per centile continuum.

Table 2.1: Overall leadership effectiveness by gender and by position(per centile scores)

Particulars	Male	Female
Top management, executive, senior team members	57.7	67.7
Reports to top management, supervisors, middle managers	48.9	56.2
Middle managers	49.8	52.7
Supervisor, frontline manager, foreman	52.5	52.6
Individual contributor	52.7	53.9
Others	50.7	52.0
Total	51.3	55.1

Source: Zenger and Folkman inc., 2011

From Table 2.1 above, Zenger and Folkman (2011) have demonstrated that women can be good leaders and even better leaders than men. Women exhibit special leadership skills that are very effective and different from men. Incredible though this may sound in patriarchal Nigeria, it is the reality and even Nigerian studies are beginning to confirm this finding. For instance, Akudo and Okenwa (2015) found that female leaders bring distinct personality and motivational strength to leadership. They have an open consensus building and collegial approach to leading. They suggest that the leadership skills that come naturally to women are now absolutely necessary for the education system (2015).

Similarly, Shervin (2014) found that women leaders are more effective in overall measurement. The women posited that to get the same recognition and reward, they need to do twice as much, never make a mistake and constantly demonstrate competence. According to a participant in this study “we must perform twice as well to be thought half as good” (2014). Women have demonstrated, among other things, that they are good leaders. In the same vein, Njobvu (2014) found that women in academia site family support, mentors, determination and agency facilitating their success. This is an indication that women can also perform very

well if given the same support as men by academic institutions, family and society. Also, including women in leadership brings in diversity which may better serve the goals of the organization. As noted by Groyberg (2013), having women on boards will give corporations the competitive advantage to create products and services that will better meet their customers' needs. This was corroborated by O'Connors (2008 cited in Nelson, 2012), in Iceland, women were called in to replace high profile male bank leaders and institute a new culture.

The implication of this is that women leadership can change the social landscape of the organization. This is because women have a different way of handling issues which plays out in the leadership outcome and the quality of life of some stakeholders. According to Bunwaree (2010), the symbolism attached to women legislators is very important because it conveys the message that women can contribute towards women's empowerment and agency as well as transform the human condition. Bunwaree went on to say that women are supposed to bring a different perspective and understanding which is informed by the different gender lenses and their gendered understanding of women's realities. In the same vein, it is my view that women's leadership of Nigerian universities would transform the universities and would bring about a reduction in the incidence of crises. This is because women have been known to bring their empathic understanding to bear on their leadership styles. Women are known to have a deeper and better understanding of aggrieved people because of their own experiences as subordinated people in society (Akudo and Okenwa, 2015). This quality suggests that women do possess a veritable tool that would quench the fire of crises in Nigerian universities. However, Morley (2004) does not subscribe to the assertion that women leadership style is different. Bringing women into the leadership of Nigerian universities is likely to usher in a new dawn. As noted by Chamberlain (1977), women tend to have a different point of view and sometimes a more practical point of view than men. It is this different and practical point of view that is missing in the leadership of Nigerian universities. These are qualities that are meant to complement and eliminate the overbearing and autocratic nature of men which could result in the reduction of crises in these universities. As men are doing it alone in Nigerian universities, the gap continues to show and due to the patriarchal nature of Nigerian societies, no one sees this gap as part of the problem.

The presence of women in leadership positions is expected to make citizenship more equal (Bunwaree 2010). Making citizenship more equal in Nigerian universities entails equal participation of men and women including students and other stakeholders. This would mean that the university leadership would no longer be a leadership that imposes its opinion on other stakeholders, that disregard the opinion of staff and students, that bask in corruption and greed, that do not observe the constitution of the university in doing things and that would generally become democratically disposed. When all these are absent in the university, it is most likely that there would be a drastic reduction in crises.

There is a great need to make university leadership more democratic because democracy means that every stakeholder in the university is included in decisions and policies. Can it now be said that Nigerian universities are democratic in the face of a tokenistic presence of women, particularly at the leadership level. Bunwaree (2010) wondered, if modern democracy has come to mean representative democracy, can a system where more than half of the population is severely under-represented said to be representative democracy? The answer to this important question is *no*. This implies that in the first instance, leadership in Nigerian universities is not democratic. This constitutes a big problem because women's needs, experiences and knowledge are different from those of the men. There is no way men can represent women's needs adequately (Bunwaree 2010).

This raises a very important question about the so called democratic orientation of many Nigerian universities. In these universities, the democratic structure that has been put in place is not functioning well. In some cases, the university authorities undermine or subvert the power of the committee and make the system ineffective. Furthermore, even if the committee system is working effectively, it is not clear how they address the issues concerning women. When the needs of some members of the university community are not met, it tends to create crises. All these suggest that having women in leadership positions would make a significant difference. For instance, Valance and Davies (1986) has demonstrated that women's increased representation has made a difference in the European parliament since 1979. Whether this difference can be achieved in Nigerian universities with women in leadership positions in Nigerian university is something that needs exploration. There is a great need for alternative leadership visions and styles which only women in leadership can inject into the university system. Nigeria needs this difference in her universities to reduce the high incidence of crises in these universities.

Also, women's practical orientation, emotional intelligence, empathy, quieter leadership (Etter 2011) and the fact that they are more down to earth and closer to the grassroots/marginalized groups makes them a veritable tool for dousing tension and resolving conflicts in organizations and the general society which is key to reducing crises in these universities. As such, women's leadership in Nigerian universities would bring about a transformation that would make the university system a place for equal participation of all stake holders. According to Etter (2011), women are a very important aspect of diversity and diversity is essential in preventing corruption and cultural reform. This was also the position of Akudo and Okenwa (2015). This makes women very important in university leadership because the major gap/problem in Nigerian universities is gender and cultural constraints experienced by women in these universities.

Women leaders are more concerned with the maintenance of interpersonal relations, task accomplishments and tend to adopt democratic and participatory leadership styles while men tend to adopt autocratic and directive leadership

styles (Moran 1992). It is also believed that there is a recent emphasis on the importance of moving away from hierarchical autocratic leadership to the more democratic and participative leadership styles which are more prevalent among women than men (Moran 1992; Akudo and Okenwa 2015). In the same vein, Grove and Montgomery posited that good school administration is more attuned to feminine than to masculine modes of administration, and that female attributes of nurturing, being sensitive, empathetic, intuitive, caring and accommodative are increasingly associated with effective administration. This is a strong indication that women would indeed make a difference in reducing crises in Nigerian universities. However, this would not occur without a fight. For instance, in Njobvu's (2014) study (the study explored through indepth interviews, how 8 female professors struggled to reach the peak of their careers inspite of the Zambian society's patriarchal tendencies), the successful women had to attain the highest level of education, challenge and change existing gender stereotypes, exploit spaces through resistances, be creative and work hard. I guess that Nigerian women need to do the same things to fill the gender gap in leadership of higher education.

Women Leadership Qualities and Crises in Nigerian Universities

These crises are connected to leadership styles and the patriarchal culture of the university system in Nigeria where only men are found in university top management. Among professors and associate professors, males constituted 94 per cent while females constituted 6 per cent. There were 88.1 per cent males and 11.9 per cent females among senior lecturers and research fellows as at 2001. The gender disparity in employment at OAU (Table 2.2 below) reflects that in other universities in the country. Female academic staff made up only 13.6 per cent of the academic staff in the University (Afonja *et al.* 2002).

Table 2.2: Obafemi Awolowo University Staff Strength 2001/2002 Academic Session.

	Male	%	Female	%	Total
Academic staff	951	86.4	150	13.6	1101
Administrative staff	587	62.3	355	37.7	942
Senior technical staff	425	90.0	47	10.0	472
Junior staff	1812	85.0	320	15.0	2132
Total	3775	81.2	872	18.8	4647

Source: Afonja *et al.* 2002.

The above table portrays female representation in academia. It is important to note that OAU is better than many According to Hunt (2007 quoting Fukuyama, 1998) women in leadership would bring about a more corporative and less conflict-prone world. Also, Wells and Tanner indicated that women's unique ability to work within and between organizations hastens the coming together of diverse interest

groups, which is needed to bring new vigour to university administration. Indeed, Akudo and Okenwa (2015), provided evidence that women leaders are assertive, persuasive, empathic, flexible, and practical and that women combine these qualities to create a leadership profile that is much more conducive to a modern diverse workplace. This finding makes women leadership of universities more necessary than ever before as it represents a new vigour and new approach.

This new vigour is what is needed in Nigerian universities. In corroboration of this, Eagly *et al.* (2012), submitted that women leaders tend to adopt democratic or participatory style and a less autocratic or directive style than did men. In furtherance of this, Alimo-Meltcaffe (1995), also indicated the transformational nature of women leadership and which is what is central to having effective and efficient leadership in Nigerian universities. It is believed that these qualities would enable female leaders to make a difference. From the literature reviewed so far, it is important to note that most of the literature on university crises in Nigeria were mainly on causes of the crises. Not much of the studies was on the gender dimension of the university crises either in terms of women's involvement or women's leadership. This study would therefore contribute to knowledge and fill the gap on the roles that female leadership styles and qualities can play in minimizing these crises.

Student Crises and Causes in Nigerian Universities at a Glance.

Table 2.3: Conflict situations involving university students and other groups between 1995 and 2001

Date	Students' university	Grp to which the conflict is directed	Causes/effects
Dec. 1995	Most Nig. universities	Federal government	Judicial murder of Ken SaroWiwa and 8 others
May 1997	LASU, UNILAG, ABU, OAU, etc.	Federal government	Increase in school fees/ violent demonstration
June 1998	University of Ilorin	University administration	N1000 restitution fee on destroyed university property over power outage/ closure.
June 1999	Unilorin	Federal government	Kudirat Abiola's rally
July 1999	OAU	Univ. admin.	Cultic activities
Aug 1999	Uni- Ilorin, OAU, UI	Univ. admin.	Increase in school fees

Jan. 2000	UNAD	Police	Accidental killing of part one law student
March 2000	UDU	Federal govt.	Sharia riot leading to closure
April 2000	Unilorin	Kuntu villagers, Ilorin	Shortage of water/ destruction of taxi cabs on campus
April 2000	IMOSU	State government	Govt. interference in student union election

Source: Table 2.3 was adapted from Alabi (2001)

Table 2.4: Conflict situations involving university staff and other groups between 1995 and 2001

Date	Staffs' university	Groups involved	Causes/effects
June 1995	UINLORIN	ASUU V Univ admin	Non-payment of excess workload
Dec. 1995	OAU	ASUU V Univ. admin	Mass failure in pharmacy
April 1996	All universities	ASUU V Fed. Govt.	Stalled negotiation on welfare package/ban of ASUU
August 1999	All universities	ASUU V Fed. Govt	Demand for improved cond of service
March 2000	All universities	NASU V Fed. Govt.	Non-payment of allowances enjoyed by academic staff.
April 2000	Edo state university	ASUU V Edo st. govt.	Demand for increased subvention
April 2000	LASU	ASUU V Lagos st. govt.	Opposition to reappointment of VC/ termination of 22 lecturers
Oct 2000	All universities	NASU V Fed. Govt.	Non-payment of exam admin allowance
Jan 2001	UNILORIN	ASUU V Univ. admin	Demand for reinstatement of retrenched lecturers

Feb. 2001	All universities	ASUU V Fed. Govt.	Need for increased funding of universities
Feb. 2001	All universities	SANU V Fed. Govt.	Non-payment of exam. allowance
March 2001	UNILORIN	ASUU V Univ. admin	Demand for reinstatement of retrenched lecturers
May 2001	UI	Lecturers v ASUU exec.	Non-joining of strike

Source: Table 2.4 was also adapted from Alabi 2001

Table 2.5: Crises in Nigerian universities in more recent times

Date	Staffs'/stud. university	Groups involved	Causes/effects
Oct 2007	OAU	Student V univ. admin	Arrest of 3 student leaders/ ban of stud. Union
May 2008	UI	Student v univ admin	Power outage and dead student unionism
July 2009	OAU	Student V univ. admin	Water shortage and poor student welfare
July 2009	OAU	Staff V Fed govt	Imposition of pro chancellor
Jan 2011	UINJOS	Student V villagers	Attacks on students
Aug 2011	UNICAL	Student V univ. admin	Insecurity and insensitivity on campus
Jan. 2012	All universities	Staff, stu V. Fed. Govt.	Increase in petrol prize
April 2012	UI	Students V Univ. admin	Power outage and water scarcity
April 2012	UNIPORT	Student V Univ. admin	Agitating for termination of HOD of sociology
July 2012	OAU	NASU V Univ. admin	Non-payment of arrears
Aug. 2012	River state Univ. of Technology	ASUU V Fed. Govt.	Imposition of unwanted Vice Chancellor
Aug. 2012	UNILAG	Student V Fed. Govt.	Change of Univ. name to Moshood Abiola

Oct 2012	UNIPOINT	Students V villagers	Killing of 4 of their students by villagers
Feb 2013	UNI JOS	Student V villagers	Attacks on students
June 2013	UNIUYO	Students V Univ. admin	High fare of taxes and mgt. insensitivity
June 2013	UNIABUJA	Student V Univ. admin	Non-accreditation of some courses
July 2013	All universities	ASUU V Fed. Govt.	Funding of Univ. & payment of earned allowances

Incidence, Causes and Role of Government in these Crises

Education is widely accepted as a major instrument for promoting socio-economic, political and cultural development in Nigeria. Universities educate future leaders and develop high technical capacities that underpin economic growth and development (Odenkunle 2001). The relevance and purpose of university education in Nigeria, according to Ibukun (1997), is the provision of much needed manpower to accelerate the socio-economic development of the nation. The efforts towards the achievement of this much needed qualified manpower for Nigeria's development is being undermined by the incessant crises in Nigerian universities.

Unrests and demonstrations have become the order of the day in Nigerian universities. If it is not between students and administration, it is between lecturers and university administration or between lecturers and federal government or between lecturers and other non-academic staff of the university. This has made the incidence of crises in Nigerian universities high. This high incidence of crises has been highlighted by Alabi (2001), who stated that although conflict is inevitable in any organization, Nigerian universities have had many conflict situations in the recent past cutting across the major groups within the system and against the governments. In the same vein, Ekundayo and Ajayi (2009), maintained that in spite of the immense benefits of higher education to nation building, the potentials of these universities to fulfil its responsibility is frequently thwarted by long standing problems bedevilling the system.

The crises in Nigerian universities can be described as unprecedented ranging from mild conflicts to full blown violent demonstrations. Alabi (2001) provided an inventory of crises in Nigerian universities from 1995 to 2001. Within this period, there had been violent protests and demonstrations in all the universities in Nigeria. For instance, within this period, OAU had five serious crises (2001). The rate at which Nigerian universities experience crises is alarming and this makes it difficult for the university campuses to engage in sound academic enterprises. Fatile

and Adejuwon (2011) maintained that the incidence and severity of conflicts in the universities has and continues to destroy the basic environmental conditions required to provide a good environment for developing human resources in Nigeria. With this kind of situation, the university would be unable to make much progress towards realizing its set objectives. Apart from this, these crises cost Nigerian governments and people so much in terms of loss of lives and properties.

There are many factors that brought about these crises in Nigerian universities. They include conflict of interest between stake holders in the universities. Alabi (2001) indicated that conflicts were usually between students and university administration and between university administration and staff of many categories. Also, it could be between students and police over the killing of innocent citizens (2001). Furthermore, government intervention and policies perceived by students and staff of universities as bad can also cause crisis. Also, steps perceived by university community as bad governance such as the killing of Ogoni activists (Ken SaroWiwa and nine others by the then military government) in which all the universities in Nigeria (both staff and students) indulged in very violent demonstration over some weeks are issues that cause crises in Nigerian Universities (Alabi 2001). (Alabi 2001) summed the causes of these crises as welfare services (wages, water, light, increase in school fees), campus and national politics and defence of human rights.

Apart from these, there are other issues that create tension and cause conflicts in Nigerian universities. The activities of state or federal government of Nigeria sometimes generate conflicts in the universities. For instance, in 2003, university students all over Nigeria rioted over the removal of subsidy from petroleum and allied products (Fatile and Adejuwon 2011). As a result, most universities in Nigeria were closed. According to Agbonna, Yusuf and Onifade (2009), there has been unresolved conflict between the federal government and academic staff union of universities which lingers till this day and which is capable of generating crises at any time. For instance, the unsettled industrial agreement between the federal government and the academic staff union of universities which started as a nine-month national strike in April 2001 and later degenerated into a more complex conflict of the 49fired UniIorin lecturers (ibid 2009). This issue is a clear sign of high handedness and the university authority taking laws into their own hands.

This issue of high handedness brings out the worst from students and staff of Nigerian universities. Importantly, the universities represent the conscience of the people and are always ready to fight any unjust decisions that impinge on human rights. In corroboration of this, Oloyede (1999), insisted that the most violent conflicts in Nigerian universities have been traced to contested basis of citizenship rights, greed, predatory rule, autocracy and unresolved grievances. It is important to note here that during these crises, the university authorities usually bring in the army and police who end up creating more problems by shooting students and destroying properties. Infact, scholars have attributed the crises in Nigerian universities to many diverse causes.

The crises in Nigerian universities are so pervasive and wide spread that it obviously hinders both educational and national development. Verspoor (1974), submitted that there are doubts to whether Nigerian universities under the present conditions will be able to continue to lay claims on being central to national capacity building, connect with the new international knowledge systems, adopt, adapt and further develop the new technologies needed in the wider society. Following this, Ibukun (1997), observed that university governance today is nothing but crises management. Apart from these, the issue of under-funding of higher education has been a source of crises between the federal government and other stake holders. According to Ajayi and Ekundayo (2006), over the years, Nigerian government has not been meeting the UNESCO recommendation of 26 per cent of the total budget allocation to education sector. This has been corroborated by other scholars (Oyeneye 2006; Ajayi and Ayodele 2002). Also, the report of the world bank (1994) indicated that the equipment for research, teaching and learning were in deplorable conditions. This was corroborated by the National universities commission (2004). These problems create tensions and conflicts. At the time of my research these issues were not seriously being addressed by the federal government and university authorities which made it difficult to predict better conditions in the future.

Importantly, the role of the federal government of Nigeria in creating these crises cannot be over emphasized. The issues of bad governance that bring about untold hardship on students and workers and the high handedness with which the federal government handles issues are all indicated in the crises in Nigerian universities. In April, 2012, the senate of the UI suspended the academic Calendar and closed the University due to student protests. The students were protesting over power outages and lack of water supplies which had made it impossible for them to cook, take their bath and do assignments on campus (Guardian April 29, 2012). One may blame the students but looking at the issues critically is very necessary because these students were always under pressure to perform less than desirable conditions. If the federal government had value for education, providing electricity and other facilities for universities would not constitute a problem. In the same vein, the Non-Academic Staff Union (NASU) of OAU disrupted the activities in the University for more than one week protesting over the non-payment of their arrears by the University management (Guardian, 1st July, 2012). Interestingly, this protest took place during the Harmattan semester examinations, a time when this group of worker are needed most. This brought untold hardship on students and lecturers who had to make do with whatever was available. Some had to trek for long distances before writing their examinations because the NASU members blocked the gates and prevented vehicles from entering or leaving the university. Also, in November 2012, serious water scarcity hit OAU. This was caused by a breakdown in the electrical transformer that pumps water and threw students and staff into panic and hardship (Guardian, November, 25, 2012). These are things that can be easily provided by the federal government but in most cases, they hardly pay attention to these issues which generate many crises in Nigerian universities.

Furthermore, in August 2012, the academic staff and students of River State University, Port Harcourt went on rampage over the imposition of an unwanted Vice Chancellor on their university by the federal government. The federal government did not consult them and ignored their disapproval and went ahead to appoint the vice chancellor. The academic staff swore that they would not accept the new vice chancellor. This generated so much tension in the university and other academic staff throughout the federation threatened to join the strike if the federal government failed to resolve the matter. That same month, the students of the University of Lagos protested vehemently over the changing of the name of their school to Moshood Abiola University, Lagos by the federal government of Nigeria. The students alleged that they were not consulted and did not want to bear the new name imposed on them. This generated a prolonged demonstration causing destruction of properties and hardship for students, staff and the entire residents of Lagos.

Indeed, the federal government of Nigeria has played significant roles in generating crises in Nigerian universities. According to Onyenoru (2006), the crises in Nigerian universities is historical and constitutes parts of a wider governance crises in Nigeria- mismanagement of public utilities and funds, poor policy execution, authoritarian rule and underfunding of social services. Even in so-called democratic regimes in Nigeria, infringement on peoples' fundamental human rights; the killing, maiming, kidnapping of oppositions creates crises and uneasiness among the polity. This crisis in the wider society has affected the universities in inadequate university funding, lack of respect for university autonomy and poor conditions of service (2006). These have generated a series of strikes and demonstrations in Nigerian universities. This implies that the university is not insulated from what happens in the wider Nigerian society where high handedness is the order of the day and which has impacted on the universities in such a way that they are no longer able to achieve their original objectives. In fact, Onyenoru (2006), maintained that these crises have tended to jeopardize the basic objectives of excellence in teaching, research and community development.

Academic Staff Union of Nigerian Universities and the Government of Nigeria

In the light of the above scenario, some interest groups and trade unions have emerged to fight, protect, and proffer solutions to the crisis in Nigerian university system and as such, the future of Nigerian youth, which is being jeopardized. Among these groups is the Academic Staff Union of Universities (ASUU) and National Association Of Nigeria Student (NANS). The ASUU grew out of the Nigeria Association of University Teacher (NAUT). NAUT was formed in 1965, covering academic staff in UI, University of Nigeria Nsukka, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, University of Ife, Ile-Ife and University of Lagos, Lagos. The

NAUT's orientation, according to Fasina (2010), was mainly for improvement in the conditions of service of its members, and for the socio-economic and political wellbeing of the country.

The ASUU was formed in 1978, at the period of the beginning of the decline in the oil boom when it was evident that Nigerian leaders had failed to use the oil wealth to generate production and a social welfare system. Nigeria, as a country, was in the grip of military dictators. Academic freedom and university autonomy became casualties of the military dictatorship. The funding of education, especially at the university level, became much poorer. This, situation led to a changed orientation of the union of academics from 1980.

Fasina (2010) traced the history of ASUU struggle in Nigeria. He noted that assault on academic freedom was the subject of resistance by the group throughout the 1980s. In 1980, Shehu Shagari, the then president of Nigeria directed the council of the university of Lagos (UNILAG) to remove six senior members of the academic staff from their jobs following Justice Balonwu's visitation report. The ASUU protested this action and pressed for their reinstatement until in 1976 the Supreme Court gave judgment in favour of the UNILAG academics. In 1980-1981, the ASUU had a dispute with the Shagari Government. Its concerns were funding, salaries, autonomy and academic freedom, the brain drain and the survival of the university system. The ASUU also worked with separate industrial unions and Nigerian Labour Congress state chapters. It took on debates on the direction and content of national economic, educational and other policies.

Throughout the military period, ASUU waged its struggle for the survival of the university system with three components as the conditions of services. These include funding (salary and non-salary), university autonomy/academic freedom and the defence of the right to education. Their struggle also extended to broad national issues such as the struggle against military rule, privatization, Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP), and the World Bank's attempt to take over the universities and the struggle against the re-colonization of Nigeria and debt peonage.

Academic Staff Union Universities organized the state of the Nation conference in 1984 and 2002. Their struggle during the Buhari-Idiagbon regime was based on the union's principled opposition to military dictatorship and ASUU's position on the nation's path of development. ASUU diagnosed the ills of the Nigerian economy and proffered solutions to them. They saw then that a process had begun in 1984, the process of disengagement of government from the economy, and predicted that this would generate crises in all sectors of national life.

Academic Staff Union of Universities was central to the resistance to Buhari-Idiagbon regime's termination of the cafeteria system and the withdrawal of subsidies on accommodation in the universities (Aluede, Jimoh, Agwinede and Omoregie 2005). It also struggled against the regime's authoritarian Decree 16 of

1985, which transferred the power of senate to determine, regulate and monitor academic programmes to the National Universities Commission (NUC). The Decree took the accreditation of academic programme from professionals and transferred it to the NUC. Babangida's regime imposed on Nigerians the SAP and the harsh conditional of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) loan. The result was an introduction of measure which caused crisis in the economy, education, health and all aspects of life. ASUU's opposition to SAP made it a target of destruction by the Babangida regime. The union took a principled position against the regime's economic and socio-political policies. In 1986, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria ABU students were murdered by the mobile police. Academic Staff Union of Universities joined the NLC and NANS in protest. Babangida's regime accused the NLC, NANS and ASUU of attempting to topple it. The effects of SAP conditioned the struggle of ASUU. The academic staff became impoverished. The Elongated University Salary Scale (EUSS) was not implemented. But even if it were, it would not have addressed the problem of brain drain. In 1988, ASUU went on strike on the following set of demands:

- i) Implementation of the EUSS;
- ii) Setting up of a joint negotiation committee between the federal government and the university staff union and;
- ii) University Autonomy.

The strike led to the proscription of ASUU on August 7, 1988 with Professor Jibril Aminu as minister of education. The federal government banned ASUU, seized all its property, and made announcements directing all universities to immediately pay the EUSS backdated to January, 1988. Academic Staff Union of Universities responded by forming a new body, the University Lecturers' Association (ULA). The proscription broke the back of the strike members who returned to work. The president, Dr. Attahiru Jega, and the immediate past President, Dr. Festus Iyayi, were detained and tortured. The passports of these officials were seized. The period following the 1988 proscription was one of deep demoralization among academic staff, yet, the leadership continued to organize the ULA on campuses. In 1990, the ULA organized an anti-world Bank conference as part of the resistance to Babangida regime's plan to take a 120million dollar loan from the World Bank. The conference took place at OAU with the participation of civil liberties organization such as the Committee for the Defense of Human Rights (CDHR), Civil Liberties Organization (CLO) and the NLC. In 1990, ASUU was de-proscribed. In 1991, following the delegates' conference in Badagry ASUU asked the Babangida regime for negotiation. There were two rounds of negotiations. The first under the chairmanship Mr. Senas Ukpama, broke down when, following a disagreement on government offer on salary, the chairman suspended negotiation (May 30, 1991).

The failure by the federal government to effectively negotiate the conditions in the universities led to the 1992 strike declared by NEC on May 14, 1992. It

was suspended after one week because of IAP's (Industrial Abiteration panel) order for immediate suspension of the strike. Although the IAP ordered both sides to the negotiating table, government did not resume negotiation. ASUU resumed its strike on July 20, 1992. It was banned for a second time on August 23, 1992. ASUU had the support of the public, the professional organization and NANS. When the tactics to end the strike failed, the government had to devise a way of negotiating with a banned union. This took place between the federal government's team led by Owelle Chikelu, the minister of establishment and management service and representatives of ASUU. The September 3, 1992 agreement was a product of this negotiation. This agreement was significant for the following reasons:

- a) The agreement showed that a determined, principled and organized citizenry can defeat a military dictatorship. ASUU's success also showed that a civilian resistance organization could defeat the military.
- b) It showed that there could be a rational approach to the development of universities. By providing a periodic review of the funding needs of the universities, the agreement allowed universities to plan based on expected funds.
- c) It re-affirmed the right of workers to collective bargaining.
- d) It enabled a more scientific approach to funding.
- e) It kept the aspiration of the people for democratic rights alive.
- f) It formed the basis for further struggle by the union for the defence of the university system and for education.

However, the 1992 agreement also led to some future problems. Firstly, the agreement led to what came to be known as the problem of party. ASUU had argued for and convinced the government negotiation team that creating a special scale for academic purposes would be necessary for resolving the brain drain problem. After the 1992 agreement, the government encouraged other unions to demand a return to a single salary structure for the university system. ASUU's position then was that each union should be able to articulate and defend its demands, while co-operating as and when necessary. Secondly, the party problem drove a wedge between ASUU and other unions in the university, carrying with it a cost in solidarity among union and workers.

The period of Abacha dictatorship presented a great challenge to ASUU. ASUU and the National Executive Council decided to join the democratic anti-military movement to end military rule/At that time, they set their struggle for the university system through the defence of industrial democracy, the right of education and for national development. ASUU knew that if it compromised on its anti-military position the Abacha's regime would grant the union considerable concessions. However, ASUU demonstrated its unwillingness to trade principles for concessions when it took an open, very strong and unambiguous condemnation of the murder of Ken Saro-Wiwa. A letter was sent from the minister of education,

Dr. M.T. Liman, to Dr. H.A. Asobie, the then president of the ASUU, saying that “ASUU was jeopardizing its relationship with the government”. ASUU did not change its position. Instead it began to strengthen its relationship with civil society organizations.

1994, ASUU went on strike demanding for Abacha’s government

- 1) Re-negotiation of the agreement
- 2) The re-instatement of over eighty lecturers whose appointments were terminated at the university of Abuja (UNIABUJA) by professor Isa Mohammed and
- 3) The de-annulment of the June 12, 1993 elections.

The strike was unsuccessful for Three reasons. Firstly, the political demand caused a disagreement within ASUU. While some saw the incident on June 12th as a broad democratic issue, some saw it as a broad democratic issue hijacked by ethnic interests. Given these readings, ASUU had to drop the political demand to pressure its unity. The struggle for the reinstatement of the UNIABUJA colleagues and the renegotiation of the agreement continued throughout Abacha’s regime. In 1996, ASUU declared another strike to press its demand for the renegotiation of the agreement and the re-instatement of the UNIABUJA colleagues. The struggle, a protracted one that lasted for six months, saw the unleashing by the government of various tactics, including tactics aimed at dividing ASUU on ethno-regional lines to end the strike. Salaries were stopped. ASUU had to suspend the strike in response to wide appeals from the public and students. The Abacha government had, of course, begun a negotiation. It set up a negotiation team with first time chairman Professor Umaru Shehu. The government negotiating team was constituted in accordance with the Cookey Commission recommendations.

The federal ministry of education unilaterally terminated negotiation a day after ASUU refused to accept the introduction of fees in the universities and to call off the strike. The government announced the dissolution of ASUU’s national executive committee and left the branch union to operate. ASUU did not accept this just as it did not accept Babangida government’s ban.

Government made another manoeuvre, the governing council invited ASUU branch executive to negotiate for their branch members. ASUU decided to deal with the problem in the following ways: No branch should negotiate separately from its governing councils. If any branch met with its governing council. it should present the same negotiating document that had been adopted by ASUU national and presented to government. Government’s effort to decentralize negotiation collapsed. In response to ASUU challenges, the Abacha government through the NUC secretary, Dr. MunzaliJibril, wrote vice chancellors to remove ASUU leaders from their jobs. At the University of Nigeria, Nsukka, Dr. Assisi Asobie was fired. All members of the Dr George Amadi led branch were fired. At other campuses, ASUU officials were removed from their jobs without trial.

This was the position until General Abdulsalami Abubakar took over in 1998. The minister of education, Chief Olaiya Oni, made overtures to ASUU, as part of the efforts to win legitimacy for the new military government. He facilitated the re-instatement of the members of the union who were fired by Abacha regime for their role in ASUU 1996 strike and those who were dismissed by Decree 17 of 1984. A legal victory (in 1998) for ASUU was the judgment of an Enugu High Court that ASUU was not banned by the 1996 Decree. Abdulsalami's regime on May 25, 1999 signed an agreement with ASUU that was intended to be an interim palliative measure to enhance the income of academics, without prejudice to a comprehensive negotiation at a future date. The agreement did not cover basic salaries, funding and autonomy, it only adjusted allowances that existed.

When Obasanjo's civilian government took over in 1999, its response to the issue of the agreement was a committee led by Chief P.C. Asiodu. An agreement was signed between ASUU, represented by Dr. Assisi Asobie, President of the ASUU, and the federal government, represented by Chief P.C Asiodu on October 26, 1999. The agreement covered academic allowances, car refurbishment, housing loans and rent subsidy. It was agreed that negotiation on basic salaries, university funding and autonomy shall begin "within four weeks". It was not until July 31, 2000 that the federal government agreed to setup its negotiations which began on August 28, 2000.

The agreement reached on funding, basic salary, university autonomy and academic freedom was comprehensive. If implemented, it was capable of significantly addressing the brain drain. It also included a clause providing for the subvention of state universities by the federal government. It included federal assistance to the state to help establish universities. It provided for the restructuring of the Joint Admission and Matriculation Board (JAMB) and additional requirements were to be stipulated by the senate of each university for undergraduate admission. It also included an agreement on the restructuring of NUC. It was to be signed in December 2001 but the federal government did not sign the agreement. Dr. Babalola Borishade, then minister of education, disallowed the federal government team from signing the agreement and proceeded with propaganda to destroy it. He setup a committee on university autonomy and asked ASUU to discuss the implementation of an unsigned agreement. ASUU refused and in 2001 resumed its suspended strike. This led to the resumption of negotiation and the signing of the June 30, 2001 agreement. The 2001 agreement was also weaker in respect of salaried conditions of service. It offered a 22 per cent increase in basic salary. The provision on funding and university autonomy remained as it was in the first negotiated document.

The federal government, however, did not implement the agreement as required. It breached the provisions on salaries, funding and autonomy and the non-victimization clause of the agreement. This resulted in another strike in 2003.

Obasanjo's government had a different plan. It had a plan with the World Bank to cancel central bargaining in the universities. The goal was the repudiation of the June 30, 2001 agreement; the cancellation of collective bargaining, the introduction of fees, the 68 million dollars' loan, retrenchment, etc. were aimed at by the Nigeria University System Innovation Project (NUSIP)

Babangida's government had waged its war against ASUU by terminating the appointment of the president of ASUU, Dr. Festus Iyayi, illegally. Abacha's government had fired Dr. Assisi Asobie, also former president of ASUU and many branch officials (especially at University of Nigeria, Nsukka UNN). Among many unresolved conflicts in Nigerian higher education is the crisis of unsettled industrial agreement between the Federal Government and the ASUU. The prolonged nine-month national strike in 2001 was a typical example. The strike degenerated to a complexity conflicts that led to the termination of 49 Unilorin lecturers. All 49 lecturers refused to break ASUU's strike and return to work

The FG-ASUU agreement implementation committee (September 6, 2001), a reconciliation committee (December 2001), the international labour organization freedom of Association Committee and the Federal government committee on politically-motivated rustication in the tertiary institutions all found that the 49 were victimized and recommended their reinstatement. But the president had, at the Unillorin convocation, pronounced that the sacked UNILORIN ASUU members would never be reinstated.

On 29 December 2002, NEC declared the resumption of the strike. The issues were: the chronic under-funding of universities, the need to reinstate the unjustly fired 49 lecturers at University of Ilorin and the federal assistance to state universities in June 2003 on the order of IAP. All the issues are still alive. The federal government did not invite ASUU for renegotiation. In August 2005, the Ilorin High Court ruled in favour of the 49 lecturers and ordered their reinstatement. The injustice at University of Ilorin persisted despite the court's judgment reinstating the 49 victims. Universities are still grossly under-funded.

ASUU struggles have lived up to the union constitutional requirement that the union should defend the interest of its members, establish and maintain just and proper conditions of service for its members and protect and advance the socio-economic interests of the nation.

Overall, ASUU's only duties are to its members and of Nigerians. It can never be the goal of ASUU to please any government in power. The obligations are important for meeting the challenges of the twenty first century. The mission is to play the role of creating new values, producing knowledge for freeing our people from the systematic domination to which they have been subjected since through colonization to the present.

To enhance ASUU's struggle, the union needed to overcome several obstacles within, namely:

- i) The growing “economism” in the wrong appreciation of the goals of ASUU’s struggle
- ii) The problems of leadership include “tribalism” and opportunism.
- iii) The decline of discipline is important for understanding a possible degree of deterioration in the overall level of intensity of determination and credibility of union struggle.
- iv) Lack of education, trade union and political. Most of the members lack the historical knowledge required.
- v) ASUU’s link with the civil society organization are still not strong enough. This accounts for why in times of their struggles for the university system, they have sometimes been isolated.
- vi) ASUU’s link with student organizations have weakened and NANS is now run from the presidency.

ASUU’s struggles arose out of the necessity to build a country in which every citizen should be free, educated, well fed, and healthy.

Furthermore, the federal government sometimes does things in the university that are contrary to the statutes of the university. According to Awopetu (1998) and Asobie (1996), the arbitrary interference in university governance by military government and their authoritarian handling of university matters – often without regards to constituted statutory structures of the system creates crises in the universities. The issue here is that the civilian/democratic governments in Nigeria are not any different from the military regimes making one wonder what went wrong with the Nigerian democracy. This high handedness caused the ASUU to go on strike in 1973, 1988, 1992, 1994, 1996, 1998, 2001, 2003 and several times after (Onyenoru and Adeyinka, 2001). It is important to note that some of these strikes lasted approximately seven months. This gives a picture of the situation in Nigerian universities. These strikes and crises listed above were just ASUU strikes. By the time one takes account of the demonstrations and protests held by students, non-academic staff and senior staff associations of Nigerian universities, a full picture of crises in Nigerian universities can emerge. This means that these incessant crises debar universities from attaining the excellence for which they were established for. Interestingly, the same federal government is bemoaning the decline of standard of education in the country.

The impunity with which the federal government ignored the agreement it had with the ASUU, in addition to their threats and high handedness is noteworthy. For instance, the ASUU/Federal government agreement of 1992 brought much relief and stalled the brain drain ravaging Nigerian universities. According to ASUU (1996):

The agreement halted brain drain from the universities, at least temporarily. It raised the quality of teaching and research in the universities, at least for a

while. It kept the mobile police and soldiers out of campuses because student demonstrations and protests against poor conditions of hostels reduced drastically in number and frequency between 1992 and 1995 (1996).

However, this agreement was violated by the federal government. According to ASUU (1996), the federal government launched attacks on the academic staffs' salaries and merged them with the elongated university salary scale. The federal government also reneged on their agreement to fund universities adequately. Furthermore, they attacked university autonomy and academic freedom. This caused a series of protests and university closures. The federal government reacted to these by declaring that the agreement was a mere gentleman's agreement- a contract of imperfect obligations which would be implemented only so long as overriding public interest or other compelling circumstances did not make it impracticable or inexpedient to do so. The federal government previously agreed with ASUU but the agreement, resulting in a series of university crises. This reality was hard to comprehend. It has also created mistrust between federal government and ASUU and other university unions. As such, no union takes the federal government seriously and this can affect the achievements of universities. Onyenoru (2006) captured this and argued that the deep-seated problem that underlies ASUU/Government conflicts have remained fundamentally unresolved irrespective of approximately three decades of struggles by ASUU while the government has preferred cosmetic solutions and authoritarian approaches in dealing with the problem.

The funding of universities is particularly important due to its centrality in the universities' ability to carry out their activities. According to a two-time former Vice chancellor (University of Ilorin and Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria) Professor Akinkughe (2001), central to decay and desecration is funding and it does not need a gift of prophetic wisdom to surmise that unless this is addressed positively and aggressively, there can be no turnaround in the status of Nigerian universities. Interestingly, in the beginning, the universities were adequately funded (Ukeje 2002). Infact, in the case of Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Ukeje (2002) observed that:

From the beginning in 1962 to 1975, there was no substantive difference between the amount requested by the University and the amount received from the regional government. It was even reported that there were years in which the amount received was slightly more than the amount requested (Ukeje 2002).

At this period the universities were functioning normally and there were no strikes and demonstrations the way we know them then, at the time of my research. After this period, the federal government established more universities and, with the addition of private universities, there are one hundred and thirty universities in Nigeria. These universities were established without giving serious thought to the funding and sustenance of these universities (Oyenoru 2006). Rather, there was a decline in the funding of the universities (Ukeje 2002). According to ASUU (1987),

by 1986, the funding of Nigerian universities had declined by between 30 and 35 per cent at a time when inflation had risen between 400 – 500 per cent. University funding dropped from 416 million in 1985/86 to 316 million in 1986/87. This caused arrears of salary payments. In a comparative analysis of funding of education (as a percentage of Gross National Product) in Nigeria and some African countries, Onyenoru (2006) stated that educational spending in Botswana rose from 6.0 per cent in 1980 to 10.4 per cent in 1996, Ivory Coast from 7.2 per cent in 1980 to 7.7 per cent in 1990, Ghana from 3.1 per cent in 1980 to 3.3 per cent in 1995, Kenya from 6.0 per cent in 1980 to 7.1 per cent in 1995, South Africa 6.0 per cent to 7.9 per cent in 1995 and Nigeria from 6.0 per cent in 1980 to 1.2 per cent in 1985 to 0.9 per cent in 1995.

This gives a full picture of funding of educational system in Nigeria by the federal government. Given these data, one would be inclined to agree with Akinkugbe (2001), who stated that the major problem with Nigerian universities is funding. This picture also gives a clear view of how the federal government regards education and how they aspire to attain sustainable development. Importantly, this decline in funding is accompanied by huge increments in student populations throughout Nigeria. Subsequently, facilities originally meant for few students are being used by many students. For instance, in many of these universities, a room which was generally occupied by two students is now being occupied by sixteen to twenty students. The same thing applies to bathrooms, laboratories, classrooms and other facilities.

The implication of this is that the universities' staff and students are affected negatively. A teacher that earns his salary in arrears may not give his students his best efforts. He is likely to be distracted while teaching his students, wondering how he can pay his children's school fees, how to feed his family, buy petrol for his car and for his generating set because every lecturer needs a power generating set in order to function through incessant power outages. According to Adegboyega (1996), these and other problems such as mismanagement of funds, corruption and wasteful spending by university authorities, destroy the Nigerian university system.

The role of external forces in all these cannot be over emphasized. In a bid to satisfy the conditions given by the international funding agencies to attract assistance, the federal government sometimes heeds to the advice of these agencies to the detriment of Nigerians. For instance, the World Bank and the IMF submitted that public sector in Nigeria was over bloated and they insisted on gross reductions in federal government expenditures as part of the requirements for financial assistance. They also asserted that African countries did not need universities since their brilliant students could always embark on their university training abroad, in Europe and America (Awopetu 1998). Indeed, the structural adjustment programmes brought so much hardship on Nigerians and the universities were not spared. There were protests by students, staff of universities and civil society against these stringent conditions.

Students' Unrest

At the time of my research, students' militancy in Nigerian universities had been recognized as one of the most visible perennial problems of significance. Ahmed *et al* (2005) noted that in the history of Nigeria, no group has established itself more in terms of frequency and intensity of such violent incidents as the student population. In Nigeria, as noted by Onwuejeogwu (1991), from the inception NUNS embarked upon deliberate campaigns of fostering national consciousness and inspiring a strong sense of militancy in the Nigerian peoples' liberation struggle. As such the students' union was emanated more because of colonial protest.

Hence student unionism was more of protest union rather than student union and was aimed at evoking changes in the society (Babatope 1974; Onwuejeogwu 1991). One of the students' unrest in 1960 was essentially due to students' dissatisfaction with governments insensitivity to national issues and its inability to address these issues appropriately. Being aware of the British government's intention to perpetuate a neo-colonial state by establishing a military base in Nigeria, Nigerian students protested the proposed Anglo-Nigerian Defense Pact in Lagos on November 14, 1960.

This was followed by another protest against the introduction of new policies in the Nigerian educational system in the 70s. Ehiamentor (1979) stated that withdrawal of certain services like laundry offered to students and the introduction of other fees in the universities which hitherto were not there triggered the 1978 students' protest tagged "Ali Must Go". Subsequently, students have used several opportunities to express their grievances both at individual university level and at national level.

Since the 80s, revolts, protests, unrests and violence as well as incessant closure of schools for months in the wake of unrest or protests became a regular feature of Nigerian universities (Aluede *et al.* 2005). The authors reported many incidents of students' unrest in Nigeria. In 1981 there was student unrest in Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria caused by religion and against the vice-chancellor over an alleged rice deal. It resulted in the death of many students and the removal of the vice-chancellor. In 1984 government proposed the introduction of school tuition fees and the scrapping of catering services. Many tertiary institutions in Nigeria protested violently and many universities were closed for months. In 1986 many university students protested the high handedness of the vice-chancellor of Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria. The government reacted by closing some of the universities and expelling some of the students. Additionally, some students of the institution were murdered by policemen (Fasina 2010).

Removal of subsidy from petroleum and allied products was another bone of contention between the federal government and the Nigerian people, particularly the student body. As expected students reacted by massive demonstration against

the government. There was wanton destruction of government properties. The government closed several universities for a period of six months when the Babangida Military Administration introduced SAP in 1989. Nigerian students in many parts of Nigeria protested. Many students lost their lives during the protest as open shots were taken by the military. The protest did, however, result in improved service conditions for Nigerian workers.

In 1992, there was another student protest against the deregulation of Nigerian currency and increasing hardship for the people of Nigeria. Several students died in the crisis, schools were closed for months. However, it also resulted in the improvement of workers condition of service.. Also, the annulment of the June, 12, 1993 presidential elections in Nigeria elicited, at various times, violent demonstration from students in several tertiary institutions and even gained support from other tertiary institutions around the world (Ojo 1995). In 1998 there was student unrests in Ambrose Ali University, Ekpoma, Nigeria, which was caused by cult activities. There was violence leading to the death of many students. The school was also closed for some time.

The increase in the prices of petroleum products led to more student unrests in many universities in Nigeria in 2003. There was peaceful demonstration in some campuses while in others the demonstration was violent. 2007 witnessed another ASUU strike for three months. There was follow up twice in May, 2008. In 2009, there was another strike for three months. In January, 2012, the removal of oil subsidy by the civilian government of Goodluck Jonathan was the source of another crisis in Nigeria. The Nigerian people, including the students, protested by staging a no work and sit out demonstration in every part of the country for approximately two weeks. Nwakunor (2013) reported that currently the ASUU was on strike again over certain conditions in the educational sectors that were gradually killing it. The author stated that since 1992, Nigerians have gotten used to ASUU strikes and the ominous ways that the hopes and fates of young ones are spun in the roulette wheel.

Aluede (2001) and Ojo (1995) opined that a cursory look at Nigerian universities revealed that several issues precipitated students' unrest in those times. These issues included students' non-participation in decision-making processes in the universities. Accordingly, they noted that the degree of students' involvement in decision-making processes has been recognized to be inversely related to the frequency of students' unrest. Aluede (2001) and Ojo (1995) concluded that granted involvement of students in decision-making processes will most likely reduce the frequency of university unrests as students are not likely to be seen working against policies that they participated in formulating.