



ISSN Print: 2394-7500
ISSN Online: 2394-5869
Impact Factor: 5.2
IJAR 2019; 5(9): 156-164
www.allresearchjournal.com
Received: 11-07-2019
Accepted: 15-08-2019

Dr. Susan Sam

Assistant Professor and Head,
Department of Home Science,
S.S. Jain Subodh Girls College,
Sanganer, Jaipur, Rajasthan,
India

Perceived familial gender discrimination in relation to personality pattern of adolescent girls

Dr. Susan Sam

Abstract

Adolescent girls in Rajasthan are subjected to various types of discriminatory practices even though various steps are taken to change the status of women and girls. Effects of these discriminatory practices along with the storm and stress of the age group depends upon how they perceive these practices which they face in the family and also in the community.

Continuous necessity for adjusting to situations in which she is inexperienced coupled with the demand that adult pattern of behavior must be learnt before she is often faced with contradictory values due to culturally created dependence and parental expectations of independently taken decisions regarding career and education.

However, we decided to uncover what role personality type may play through this study. After all, coping with the Gender Discrimination which she perceives in the Family has definitely different implication on her Personality Pattern as compared to girls who are treated equally in the family. Therefore this study aims to study the relationship between perceived familial gender discrimination in relation to Personality Pattern of the Adolescents in the urban and rural settings.

Keywords: discriminatory practices, perceived familial gender discrimination, personality pattern

Introduction

India is a country of demographic diversity. There exist differences in the lifestyles of people of different regions, communities, cultural backgrounds, urban-rural habitats, etc. Similarly, the psychological development of a child differs in various contexts. The male: female ratio as per census 2011 is 933:1000, which is alarming. Given the biological norm of 100 newborn girls to every 103 newborn boys, millions more women should be living among us. If they are not, if they are "missing," it means either they have been killed or have died through neglect and mistreatment. In India, the birth of a boy is a time for celebration, while the birth of a girl - especially a second or subsequent daughter - is often perceived as a crisis. Once the girl enters the school age, she becomes more aware of herself as an individual. The age between 5 and 12 years has been explained by Erickson as the stage of "industry versus inferiority." Morgan CT, King RA. (2008)^[16].

It is the stage in which she works hard to attain competence. Erickson viewed these years as critical for the development of self-confidence. Discrimination at this stage by parents, teachers, or society is likely to develop feelings of inferiority and develop personality problems in the girl child

Today as we look around there are calls to have a greater proportion of women in boardrooms and at the same time there are concerns about "positive discrimination" towards women and the discrimination perceived by girls in the family. The one thing is that both sides seem to agree on is that the playing field is not level yet.

The crux of the argument generally focuses on opportunity, which undoubtedly plays a very significant part here.

Bumiller, E. (1991)^[4]. Three-quarters of the population of India still resides in rural areas where the problems related to girl child are predominant. Contrary to this, female foeticide seems to be more in urban areas owing to the technical advances. Despite the hue and cry about women liberation, the 2011 census gives the shocking sex ratio of 900:1000 (Census of India. 2011)^[5].

Correspondence

Dr. Susan Sam

Assistant Professor and Head,
Department of Home Science,
S.S. Jain Subodh Girls College,
Sanganer, Jaipur, Rajasthan,
India

Purpose

Personality is one of the psychological dimensions that is possessed by every individual and hence help him/her to be under a common group and yet make him/her unique with a specific disposition of traits or qualities.

Literature from all around the globe has given evidence to the fact that inequalities between the genders exist in all spheres of life despite effective promotion programs. In this context an attempt is made in this study to focus on psychological dimension and to find out the extent of differences existing between the two groups.

Hypothesis

The perceived familial gender discrimination will be found significantly related to the personality pattern of adolescent girls, (Correlation between perceived familial gender discrimination score and all other variables under study were found separately for urban, rural and total group).

Sample

200 Urban adolescent girls and 200 rural adolescent girls of Tenth Standard constituted the sample for the present study. Girls were selected from Rajasthan Government Senior Higher Secondary Schools, belonging to Jaipur District. Only those girls were selected as subjects who had one or more brothers. Girls who had no brothers were not included.

N=400	
Rural	Urban
200	200

Group administration of tools in random order

Measurement devices

- **Gender discrimination scale** - To ascertain perceived familial gender discrimination of dolescent girls of Std. X, a scale was prepared by the researcher.
- **High school personality questionnaire (HSPO)** by S. D. Kapoor, S. S. Srivastava and G.N.P. Srivastava (1967).

Personality questionnaire for school students was subjected to the following analysis

- Pearson's 'r' between Perceived familial gender discrimination and Personality Pattern
- Mean difference between high and low perceived familial gender discrimination score groups on Personality Pattern
- Factor analysis of the variable.

The second phase of the study included case study of selected subjects. For this a semi structured interview schedule was prepared. Sample consisted of 20 girls each from urban and rural group scoring high on perceived familial gender discrimination scale (Perceiving less gender discrimination) and 20 girls each from urban and rural group scoring low on perceived familial gender discrimination scale (Perceiving more gender discrimination). Thus a total 80 sample were selected for the case study.

Gender discrimination

The woman Convention defines discrimination against women broadly and the elements of the definition are: Any distinction, exclusion or restriction made on the basis of sex is discrimination.

The Convention covers both the effect and the purpose of such distinction, exclusion or restriction based on sex that hampers the enjoyment by women of their human rights.

It covers discrimination in political, economic, social, cultural, civil or any other field.

It covers discrimination in public and private ("or any other") actions.

It prohibits intentional or unintentional discrimination.

Some Gender discrimination are empirically grounded while others appear to be socially constructed. Gender inequality is experienced differently across different cultures it can include education, life expectancy, personality, interests, family life, careers, and political affiliations.

From birth, males and females are raised differently and experience different environments throughout their lives. In the eyes of society, gender has a huge role to play in many major milestones or characteristics in life; like personality.

Cordier, B (2012) ^[11]. "males and females are led on different paths due to the influence of gender role expectations and gender role stereotypes before they are able to choose their own. The colour blue is most commonly associated with boys and they get toys like monster trucks or more sport related things to play with from the time that they are babies. Girls are more commonly introduced to the colour pink, dolls, dresses, and playing house where they are taking care of the dolls as if they were children. The norm of blue is for boys and pink is for girls is cultural and has not always historically been around. These paths set by parents or other adult figures in the child's life set them on certain paths. Cordier, B (2012) ^[11].

This leads to a difference in personality, career paths, or relationships. Throughout life, males and females are seen as two very different species who have very different personalities and should stay on separate paths. Brescoll, V (2013) ^[3].

Perceived gender discrimination

The meaning and measurement of perceived discrimination— defined as a behavioral manifestation of a negative attitude, judgment, or unfair treatment toward members of a group.

It is a preference or prejudice toward one gender over the other. Bias can be conscious or unconscious, and may manifest in many ways, both subtle and obvious

What are the psychological consequences of perceiving prejudice and discrimination against one's gender group? Because perceptions of discrimination can differ in meaning, there is no one answer to this question. One of the most important influences on the subjective meaning of perceptions of discrimination is the position of the targeted group within the social structure. In other words, the meaning and consequences of perceiving prejudice and discrimination against an in group will depend on whether the in group is privileged or disadvantaged within the existing social structure. We define privilege and disadvantage in relative terms. Compared to disadvantaged groups, privileged groups tend to receive more positive outcomes as a function of their group membership and hold more positions of power within the social structure.

Gender ideologies

Because people are socialised into their community's gender ideologies and rules about how boys and girls are expected to think and behave from early childhood – often with

limited exposure to other ideas or influences – they may not be able to imagine different ways of doing things. Gender ideologies and their associated norms can thus set the boundaries of what girls and boys and adult women and men think as well as what they do; they can make inequalities of power and resources seem natural or God-given, and thus unchangeable. Values and norms about who can speak out or make decisions also directly affect how power is distributed in society – typically to the disadvantage of children and adolescents in general, and girls in particular (Sen *et al.*, 2007;)^[22].

Personality Pattern

Personality is the apex and crux of psychology and education. In every day psychology we use the term ‘Personality’ to describe those traits which make people attractive or unattractive to other people. Personality refers to a behavior which, though not necessarily right or wrong, is pleasing or offensive to other people, favourable or unfavourable to the individual’s standing with his fellows. He may have characteristics of personality as energetic, persistent, cheerful, even tempered, self-reliant, unselfish and cooperative. They all tell us how a person behaves.

Following conclusions have been drawn after analysis and interpretation of data of the study conducted by Najmah, P. (2004)^[17].

1. The urban adolescents have been found out going, emotionally stable, assertive, enthusiastic, adventurous, zestful, apprehensive, and resourceful, whereas rural adolescents have been found reserved, emotionally less stable, obedient, sober, shy internally restrained, self-assured and sociable.
2. The male adolescents have been found outgoing, emotionally stable, excitable assertive, enthusiastic, adventurous, reflective, apprehensive and prefers own decisions whereas female adolescents have been found reserved, affected by feelings, obedient, sober, shy, self-assured and socially group dependent.

Beyond biological variables, youth personality traits are linked to a variety of social and environmental factors. For example, youth personality is associated with both positive and negative aspects of interpersonal relationships, including friendship, parenting quality, and social aggression (Smack, Kushner, & Tackett, in press; Tackett, Kushner, Herzhoff, Smack, & Reardon, 2014).

Review of literature

Common forms of sexism in modern society include gender role expectations, such as expecting women to be the caretakers of the household. Sexism also includes people’s expectations for how members of a gender group should behave. For example, women are expected to be friendly, passive, and nurturing, and when women behave in an unfriendly, assertive, or neglectful manner they often are disliked for violating their gender role (Rudman, 1998). Research by Laurie Rudman (1998) finds that when female job applicants self-promote, they are likely to be viewed as competent, but they may be disliked and are less likely to be hired because they violated gender expectations for modesty. Sexism can exist on a societal level such as in hiring, employment opportunities, and education. Women are less likely to be hired or promoted in male-dominated professions such as engineering, aviation, and construction (Blau, Ferber, & Winkler, 2010; Ceci & Williams, 2011).

Maccoby and Jacklin (1975) have reviewed research findings in the area of psychology of sex differences. While they found over 1400 published studies concerning sex differences in young boys and girls, they cited only 16 studies dealing with adolescent female development.

According to Singh (1975) studies on women and children have tended to receive secondary status in India because male researchers who do not have access to female spheres of activity in a highly segregated society such as India, tend to ignore topics related to young children and women. Once a girl sees herself and others as gendered, she gets self-motivated to engage in feminine behaviour, and to model herself on other people she identifies as women in her environment. Bem SL. G (1983)^[2].

Studies show that males score significantly higher on achievement striving, assertiveness, energy, industriousness and curiosity. By comparison, women score higher on traditionally more empathetic traits: both cognitive and emotional empathy, as well as control, openness to experience and orderliness, volatility and withdrawal.

Based on the rejection-identification model (Branscombe, Schmitt, & Harvey, 1999) we argue that perceptions of prejudice and discrimination will be more harmful for disadvantaged groups than for privileged groups. The model also predicts that disadvantaged groups counter some of the psychological costs of perceiving discrimination by increasing their identification with their disadvantaged group. We test these hypotheses about the effects of perceived discrimination among women and men—two groups that differ in their structural position.

Replicating past research, some study showed that higher levels of gender equality were associated with larger differences in personality between the sexes. Countries with very high levels of gender equality, such as Sweden and Norway, showed differences in personality between the sexes that were around twice as large as countries with substantially lower levels of gender equality, such as China and Malaysia.

Furthermore, women generally rated themselves as more worried (neuroticism), social (extraversion), inquisitive (openness), caring (agreeableness) and responsible (conscientiousness) than men, and these relative differences were larger in gender equal countries. Pager, D. & Shepherd, H. (2008)^[18].

According to Quillian L. (2006)^[19], factors such as stereotypes, prejudice and/or racism motivate a person to discriminate. Gender discrimination as the name suggests is the unfair treatment of women and denial of opportunities and violation of their rights. In the Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) gender discrimination was defined as “any distinction, exclusion or restriction made on the basis of sex which has the effect or purpose of impairing or nullifying the recognition, enjoyment or exercise by women, irrespective of their marital status, on a basis of equality of men and women, of human rights and fundamental freedoms in the political, economic, social, cultural, civil or any other field”. Despite the numerous gender discrimination laws and court rulings, women are subjected to unequal treatment in all spheres of life all over the world (Kelsey, C.L). Even in advanced countries that claim to be champions of women’s rights gender discrimination is present in one form or the other especially in the field of economics. Women are not compensated fairly for their

efforts and contributions at workplace and are often overlooked when it comes to promotions. The glass ceiling effect is more prevalent in developed countries as Baxter and Wright (2004)] observed that obstacles for women's promotion became intense at higher levels of authority. In the social sphere discrimination against women is rampant in almost every field.

The psychological consequences of perceiving familial gender discrimination

Pervasive Discrimination cannot be ignored. Although there is little disagreement among social psychologists that prejudice and discrimination are harmful to disadvantaged groups, there is less consensus about the psychological well-being consequences of perceiving oneself or one's group as a victim of discrimination. One perspective suggests that perceiving prejudice can be beneficial because it helps members of disadvantaged groups to discount the causal role of the self in bringing about negative outcomes (Crocker & Major, 1989).

Social role theories of gender development contend any and all ostensible differences between men and women are primarily the result of perceived gender roles (Eagly, 1987), gender socialization processes (Bussey & Bandura, 1999), and socio structural power differentials (Eagly, Wood, & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2004) ^[9]. That act on the androgynously-gendered blank slated minds of boys and girls (Butler, 1990). For instance, Eagly and Wood (1999) ^[8]. have argued, "men and women have inherited the same evolved psychological dispositions" (p. 224), Wood and Eagly (2002) ^[27]. Have proclaimed "it is likely that extensive socialization is required to orient boys and girls to function differently" (p. 705), and as second wave feminists have asserted since the 1970s, "social institutions produce observed social differences between men and women" (Fausto-Sterling, 2005, p. 1493) ^[12]. Given these foundational assertions, social role theorists expect gender differences should be conspicuously smaller in cultures with more egalitarian gender roles, gender socialization and sociopolitical gender equity. As Eagly and her colleagues hypothesized in 2004, the "demise of many gender differences with increasing gender equality is a prediction of social role theory" (p. 289). Several cross-cultural research findings are relevant for evaluating this prediction of social role theory, including patterns revealed in studies of gender differences in personality.

Gendered socialization practices, sociopolitical institutions and gender role stereotypes—some of which appear universal across cultures (Low, 1989; Williams & Best, 1990) ^[15, 26]. Undoubtedly influence men's and women's personalities to some degree (Kring & Gordon, 1998; Twenge, 1997) ^[14, 25].

Studies have shown that males and females differ in the way the psychological dimensions are expressed in their behavior (Abra & Valentine- French, 1991; Amr, Hady El Gilany, & El-Hawary, 2008).

Another perspective suggests that perceiving discrimination is harmful to the psychological well-being of members of disadvantaged groups because it represents the realization that one's ingroup is rejected by the majority, and that the ingroup's life opportunities are limited in a way that others' are not (Schmitt & Branscombe, in press-a).

Crocker and Major (1989) argued that attributions to prejudice for negative outcomes can protect self-esteem and

positive affect because they discount the role of one's own behavior or performance as a cause of that outcome. By explaining the event in terms of another person's prejudice, one can avoid blaming the self for the negative outcome. In support of this view, Crocker, Voelkl, Testa, and Major (1991) found that women reported less depressed affect when they could attribute negative feedback to the evaluator's sexism, compared to when an attribution to sexism was implausible. As stated by Crocker and Quinn (1998), "For people who are targets of prejudice and discrimination, knowing that one possible cause of negative outcomes is the prejudice of other people, rather than one's own faults or shortcomings, may protect self-esteem" (p. 172). According to this perspective, perceptions of discrimination against one's group are self-protective because they encourage individuals to explain their negative outcomes as being due to the prejudice of others. Although there is little disagreement among social psychologists that prejudice and discrimination are harmful to disadvantaged groups, there is less consensus about the psychological well-being consequences of perceiving oneself or one's group as a victim of discrimination. One perspective suggests that perceiving prejudice can be beneficial because it helps members of disadvantaged groups to discount the causal role of the self in bringing about negative outcomes (Crocker & Major, 1989). Another perspective suggests that perceiving discrimination is harmful to the psychological well-being of members of disadvantaged groups because it represents the realization that one's in group is rejected by the majority, and that the in group's life opportunities are limited in a way that others' are not (Schmitt & Branscombe, in press-a).

Individuals who perceive discrimination, for example, have a stronger cardiovascular response (Smart Richman, Pek, Pascoe, & Bauer, 2010) and tend to have more chronic systemic inflammation (Sutin, Stephan, Luchetti, & Terracciano, 2014). Stress and inflammation may inhibit the regulation of both mood and behavior (Harrison *et al.*, 2009), and, over time, may contribute to changes in the more stable aspects of psychological functioning.

To shift away from the dominant gender difference paradigm in psychological science—the view that perceived gender roles, gendered socialization and patriarchal socio cultural institutions are the primary causes of psychological gender differentiation (also called the Standard Social Science Model; Tooby & Cosmides, 1992) ^[24]. Will no doubt take some time.

Results

Scores obtained by all the three groups i.e. urban, rural and total on High School Personality Questionnaire, Adjustment Inventory for school students, ways of coping scale and P.G.I. Health questionnaire were subjected to statistical analysis, which is presented in four sections.

1. Statistics of variable under study.
2. Pearson's 'r' between Perceived familial gender discrimination and variables under study.
3. Mean difference between high and low perceived familial gender discrimination score groups on variables under study (t-ratio).
4. Factor analysis of variables under study.

Result-I

Statistics of variables under study.

Table 5.1(a): Statistics of perceived familial gender discrimination, personality pattern scores of urban adolescent girls

S. No	Variables	Mean	Std. Dev.	SEM
1	Gender Discrimination GD	20.265	2.875	.203
2	Reserved Vs outgoing A	10.505	3.159	.223
3	Less intelligent VS High Intelligent B	11.270	2.989	.211
4	Affected by feelings Vs Emotionally stable C	14.005	3.381	.239
5	Undemonstrative Vs Excitable D	10.080	3.590	.254
6	Obedient Vs Assertive E	8.830	2.584	.183
7	Sober Vs Happy go lucky F	12.605	4.015	.284
8	Expedient Vs Conscientious G	12.695	3.116	.220
9	Shy Vs Venturesome H	16.815	3.602	.253
10	Tough Vs Tender Minded I	6.790	2.442	.173
11	Zestful Vs Obstructive J	8.660	2.777	.196
12	Confident Vs Apprehensive Q1	6.805	2.688	.190
13	Social, Group Dependent Vs Self Sufficient Q2	22.160	5.880	.416
14	Undisciplined Vs Controlled Q3	4.480	2.923	.207
15	Relaxed Vs Tensed Q4	6.805	3.915	.277

Table 5.1(a) shows the means of the variables related to personality pattern, of the urban group. Along with the means, & Standard deviation (S.D.) and standard error Mean (SEM) are given.

Table 5.1(b): Statistics of perceived familial gender discrimination, personality pattern, scores of rural adolescent girls.

S. No	Variables	Mean	Std. Dev.	SEM
1	Gender Discrimination GD	20.045	3.193	.226
2	Reserved Vs outgoing A	10.690	3.159	.243
3	Less intelligent VS High Intelligent B	10.825	3.339	.239
4	Affected by feelings Vs Emotionally stable C	14.005	3.692	.261
5	Undemonstrative Vs Excitable D	10.695	3.370	.239
6	Obedient Vs Assertive E	9.160	2.519	.178
7	Sober Vs Happy go lucky F	13.885	3.853	.272
8	Expedient Vs Conscientious G	12.595	3.103	.219
9	Shy Vs Venturesome H	16.080	4.316	.305
10	Tough Vs Tender Minded I	5.350	3.156	.223
11	Zestful Vs Obstructive J	6.645	2.860	.202
12	Confident Vs Apprehensive Q1	5.380	2.772	.196
13	Social, Group Dependent Vs Self Sufficient Q2	17.380	7.200	.509
14	Undisciplined Vs Controlled Q3	4.405	2.862	.202
15	Relaxed Vs Tensed Q4	7.275	4.011	.284

Table 5.1(b) shows the means of all the t variables related to the personality pattern of the rural group. The standard deviation (S.D.) and the standard error of the Mean (SEM) are also shown in the table.

Table 5.1(C): Statistics of perceived familial gender discrimination, personality pattern scores of the total group.

S. No	Variables	Mean	Std. Dev.	SEM
1	Gender Discrimination GD	20.155	3.036	.152
2	Reserved Vs outgoing A	9.542	3.060	.153
3	Less intelligent VS High Intelligent B	6.628	2.031	.102
4	Affected by feelings Vs Emotionally stable C	9.230	3.107	.155
5	Undemonstrative Vs Excitable D	9.855	2.790	.139
6	Obedient Vs Assertive E	7.598	2.729	.139
7	Sober Vs Happy go lucky F	9.668	3.004	.150
8	Expedient Vs Conscientious G	11.270	4.068	.203
9	Shy Vs Venturesome H	9.445	2.911	.146
10	Tough Vs Tender Minded I	11.475	4.169	.208
11	Zestful Vs Obstructive J	8.697	2.798	.140
12	Confident Vs Apprehensive Q1	9.097	3.116	.156
13	Social, Group Dependent Vs Self Sufficient Q2	10.692	2.898	.145
14	Undisciplined Vs Controlled Q3	10.010	3.452	.173
15	Relaxed Vs Tensed Q4	9.370	2.750	.137

Table 5.1(C) shows the means of all the thirty variables related to the personality pattern of the total groups. The Standard deviation and the Standard error of means are also shown in the table.

Result – II

Pearson’s ‘R’ between perceived familial gender discrimination and personality pattern

Inter correlation

The Inter correlation perceived gender discrimination scores and scores on variable under study were found using Pearson’s ‘R’ method for all the three group separately (Urban, rural and Total). Some correlations were found to be highly significant whereas the others were found to be insignificant. The obtained results are presented in Table 5.2(a) to 5.2(c) the descriptions of results are as under:-

Table 5.2(a): Pearson’s ‘R’ Between Perceived Familial Gender Discrimination and Personality Factors of Urban Girls. N= 200

Personality factors	Pearson’s ‘r’
Reserved Vs outgoing A	.0117
Less Intelligent Vs High Intelligent B	.0142
Affected by feelings Vs Emotionally stable C	.1371
Undemonstrative Vs Excitable D	-.1086
Obedient Vs Assertive E	-.0101
Sober Vs Happy go lucky F	.0105
Expedient Vs Conscientious G	.1087
Shy Vs Venturesome H	.0914
Tough Vs Tender Minded I	-.0075
Zestful Vs Obstructive J	.0648
Confident Vs Apprehensive Q1	-.0241
Social, Group Dependent Vs Self Sufficient Q2	.0185
Undisciplined Vs Controlled Q3	.1004
Relaxed Vs Tensed Q4	-.1151

All obtained Pearson’s ‘r’ were not significant.

Inter Correlation between gender discrimination responses and fourteen factor of personality among urban girls is

shown in Table 5.2(a). It reveals that for all the fourteen factors of personality no significant relation was found.

Table 5.2(b): Pearson’s ‘R’ Between Perceived Familial Gender Discrimination and Personality Factors of Rural Girls. N= 200

Personality factors	Pearson’s ‘r’
Reserved Vs outgoing (A)	.1032
Less Intelligent Vs High Intelligent (B)	.0756
Affected by feelings Vs Emotionally stable (C)	.1288
Undemonstrative Vs Excitable (D)	-.0111
Obedient Vs Assertive (E)	-.0185
Sober Vs Happy go lucky (F)	.0450
Expedient Vs Conscientious (G)	.0942
Shy Vs Venturesome (H)	.0174
Tough Vs Tender Minded (I)	.0353
Zestful Vs Obstructive (J)	.0425
Confident Vs Apprehensive (Q1)	-.0343
Social, Group Dependent Vs Self Sufficient (Q2)	.1401
Undisciplined Vs Controlled (Q3)	.0203
Relaxed Vs Tensed (Q4)	.0978

(One tailed significance) all obtained correlations are not significant.

All obtained ‘r’ were not significant.

Table 5.2(b) shows that there is no significant relation between personality factors and perceived familial gender discrimination scores among rural girls.

It reveals that more the perceived familial gender discrimination, less will be the social group dependent factor

Table further shows that there is no significant relation between personality factors and perceived familial gender discrimination scores among rural girls.

Table 5.2(c): Pearson’s ‘R’ Between Perceived Familial Gender Discrimination and Personality Factors of Total Girls. N= 400

Personality factors	Pearson’s ‘r’
Reserved Vs outgoing (A)	.0592
Less Intelligent Vs High Intelligent (B)	.0508
Affected by feelings Vs Emotionally stable (C)	.1357(b)
Undemonstrative Vs Excitable (D)	.0527
Obedient Vs Assertive (E)	-.0121
Sober Vs Happy go lucky (F)	.0353
Expedient Vs Conscientious.0 (G)	.1033
Shy Vs Venturesome (H)	.0582
Tough Vs Tender Minded (I)	.0167
Zestful Vs Obstructive (J)	.0548
Confident Vs Apprehensive (Q1)	-.0223
Social, Group Dependent Vs Self Sufficient (Q2)	.0886
Undisciplined Vs Controlled (Q3)	.0582
Relaxed Vs Tensed (Q4)	.0063

b = significant at <.01 level
(1-tailed significance)

(One tailed significance) all obtained correlations are not significant.

Table 5.2(c) shows that the correlation between perceived familial Gender discrimination and factor ‘C’ of Personality i.e. affected by feelings Vs emotionally stable are positively correlated (r=.1357, P=<.01) among the total group. This shows that girls facing less perceived familial gender discrimination are more emotionally stable.

Result –III

Mean Difference between High and Low Perceived Familial Gender Discrimination Score Groups on Variable under Study (T-Ratio)

In order to have a detail study to see the effect of perceived familial gender discrimination on the personality pattern on adolescent girls, t-ratio were also calculated between two groups.

1. Scoring high on perceived familial gender discrimination and 2. Scoring low on perceived familial Gender discrimination. For the formation of these group Quartiles were calculated separately for urban, rural and total group. Subject falling below Q1 were considered high on perceived

familial gender discrimination (Group one) and subject falling above Q3 were considered low on perceived familial gender discrimination (Group two) which are shown in detail in the following tables:

Table 5.3(a): t-Ratio between mean personality factor scores in urban high and low perceived familial gender discrimination score groups.

Personality variables	Group	Mean	t-ratio	2-tail Prob.
Reserved Vs outgoing (A)	1	9.9375	.52	.607
	2	.6000		
Less intelligent Vs High intelligent (B)	1	6.6875	.39	.701
	2	6.5333		
Affected by feeling Vs Emotionally stable (C)	1	6.6875	.39	.701
	2	6.5333		
Undemonstrative Vs Excitable (D)	1	10.2708	1.66	.100
	2	9.4000		
Obedient Vs Assertive (E)	1	7.3125	1.84	.406
	2	7.7778		
Sober Vs Happy go Lucky (F)	1	10.3125	.19	.849
	2	10.4222		
Expedient Vs Conscientious (G)	1	11.7292	.53	.595
	2	12.2000		
Shy Vs Venturesome (H)	1	9.4167	1.01	.313
	2	10.0222		
Tough Vs Tender Minded (I)	1	11.9375	.80	.423
	2	11.2444		
Zestful Vs Obstructive (J)	1	8.4375	.22	.829
	2	8.3111		
Confident Vs Apprehensive (Q1)	1	9.7292	.13	.894
	2	8.31111		
Social, Group Dependent Vs Self Sufficient (Q2)	1	11.3333	.22	.829
	2	11.2000		
Undisciplined Vs Controlled (Q3)	1	9.5833	1.19	.236
	2	10.4444		
Relaxed Vs Tensed (Q4)	1	10.3125	2.40	.018
	2	9.0000		

N = group 1=48, group 2 = 45

Table 5.3(a) shows that ‘C’ factor of personality i.e. affected by feeling Vs emotionally stable show significant difference. The mean score of group two (10.6667) is higher than group one (9.5208), the calculated t-value is 1.78 and 2-tail Prob. is.078. It indicates that the girls perceiving less familial gender discrimination are emotionally stable amongst the urban group in comparison to girls perceiving more gender discrimination.

The table further reveals that ‘Q4 factor of personality i.e. (Relaxed Vs Tensed) show significant difference. The mean score of group one (10.3125) is higher than group two (9.0000). The calculated t-value is 2.40 and 2-tail Prob. is.018. This indicates that girls perceiving familial gender discrimination are more tensed in comparison to girls perceiving less familial gender discrimination. In the rest of the factors, no significant difference was obtained.

Table 5.3 (b): t-Ratio between mean of personality factor scores in rural high & low perceived familial gender discrimination score groups.

Personality Variables	Group	Mean	t-value	2'tall Prob.
Reserved Vs outgoing (A)	1	8.9310	1.10	0.272
	2	9.5417		
Less intelligent Vs High Intelligent (B)	1	6.1207	0.52	0.602
	2	6.3542		
Affected by feeling Vs Emotionally Stable (C)	1	8.4655	1.05	0.296
	2	9.0625		
Undemonstrative Vs Excitable (D)	1	9.7586	0.20	0.841
	2	9.8750		
Obedient Vs Assertive (E)	1	7.5772	0.14	0.893
	2	7.5833		
Sober Vs Happy go Lucky (F)	1	8.8448	0.21	0.833
	2	8.9792		
Expedient Vs Conscientious (G)	1	10.8966	0.69	0.492
	2	11.4583		
Shy Vs Venturesome (H)	1	9.1207	0.35	0.730
	2	9.3333		
Tough Vs Tender Minded (I)	1	11.6034	0.30	0.768

	2	11.8542		
Zestful Vs obstructive (J)	1	8.3621	0.06	0.952
	2	8.3958		
Confident Vs Apprehensive (Q1)	1	8.4828	0.35	0.724
	2	8.6875		
Social Group Dependent Vs Self Sufficient (Q2)	1	9.6207	1.76	0.082
	2	10.5833		
Undisciplined Vs Controlled (Q3)	1	9.9138	0.18	0.854
	2	9.7917		
Relaxed Vs Tensed (Q4)	1	9.0000	1.11	0.269
	2	9.6250		

N=group 1=58, group 2 = 48

Table 5.3 (b) shows that amount the rural group no significant difference was found between any of the 14 personality factors and perceived familial gender discrimination.

Table 5.3 (c): t-Ratio between mean on personality factor scores in total high and low perceived familial gender discrimination score groups.

Personality Variables	Group	Mean	t-value	2 tail Prob.
Reserved Vs outgoing (A)	1	9.4000	.40	.691
	2	9.5699		
Less Intelligent Vs High Intelligent (B)	1	6.3905	.17	.868
	2	6.4409		
Affected by feeling Vs Emotionally stable (C)	1	8.9330	2.07	.039
	2	9.8387		
Undemonstrative Vs Excitable (D)	1	9.9810	.85	.395
	2	9.6452		
Obedient Vs Assertive (E)	1	7.4190	.70	.486
	2	7.6774		
Sober Vs Happy Go Lucky (F)	1	9.5333	.32	.746
	2	9.6774		
Expedient Vs Conscientious (G)	1	11.2286	.98	.328
	2	11.8172		
Shy Vs Venturesome (H)	1	9.1810	1.14	.254
	2	9.6667		
Tough Vs Tender Minded (I)	1	11.7619	.34	.738
	2	11.5591		
Zestful Vs Obstructive (J)	1	8.3714	.04	.967
	2	8.3548		
Confident Vs Apprehensive (Q1)	1	9.0667	.19	.848
	2	9.1505		
Social, Group Dependent Vs Self-sufficient (Q2)	1	10.44761	.07	.288
	2	10.8817		
Undisciplined Vs Controlled (Q3)	1	-9.7333	.77	.443
	2	10.1075		
Relaxed Vs Tensed (Q4)	1	9.6095	.72	.475
	2	9.3226		

N= group 1=105, group 2=93

Table 5.3 (c) reveals that 'C' factor of personality trait i.e. (Affected by feeling vs. emotionally stable) is significant among the total group. The mean score of group two (9.8387) is higher than group one (8.9333), the calculated t-value is 2.07, and the 2 tail prob is.039. This indicates that the girls perceiving less familial gender discrimination are more emotionally stable as compared to girls perceiving more familial gender discrimination amongst the total group.

Conclusion

The study has been undertaken to gain new insights into personality pattern of adolescents with regard to girls

perceiving familial gender discrimination. It is found that girls differ in personality dimensions in levels of adjustment and in decision making when they perceive gender discrimination in the family.

Personality is one of the most important psychological dimensions that contribute to what makes an individual unique as well as classify him/her under a common class.

It has been observed that perceived gender roles, gendered socialization and patriarchal socio cultural institutions are the primary causes of psychological gender differentiation.

It is therefore seen that gender differences in traits like aggression and nurturance has little to do with societal pressures or socialization practices and is related to perceived familial gender discrimination.

Perceived discrimination also produces significantly heightened stress responses and is related to participation in unhealthy and nonparticipation in healthy behavior.

The study indicates that the present familial environment is not conducive enough to promote an integrated and holistic personality in adolescents. Various commissions on family and education reforms strongly recommended an integrated approach and curriculum that would promote all-round development in adolescents. Even though many steps have been taken towards that end, from the study it is seen that much vacuum is left and so, more proactive measures are needed to develop a holistic personality in adolescents through education. This study once again emphasizes the need for better evaluation of curriculum, educational practices, and school systems, formal and non-formal educational practices, student and parent counseling practices, pre-service and in-service teacher training programmes to achieve the desired goals through education.

Family and society together can lead girls toward the positive psychology of increasing optimism, strong social connections, and healthy self-confidence provided they do not perceive discrimination on the basis of gender in their family.

Implications

- Effect of perceived familial gender discrimination on personality could be important for establishing alliances, for the conduct of psychotherapy and for ensuring compliance.
- Gender effects of personality are of theoretical interest, but also have implications for practice.
- The knowledge of the dimensions of the adolescents' personality would help the teachers, parents and school administrators to support them to overcome their limitations in their personality.
- This study once again emphasizes the need to look into child rearing practices pertaining to girls particularly.

Limitations

Perceived Familial Gender Discrimination sometimes it is perceived and reported by subjects without verification of actual events. In the absence of methods of verification, it is important to note that much of the current work in this area involves perceptions of discriminatory treatment based on self-report of life events and not objectively observed discrimination.

Suggestions

1. There is a need to study the impact of course material particularly material related to culture, religious practices, ancient texts, etc. in promoting the desired personality traits in young adolescents.
2. Research may look into studies related to school practices that are conducive for personality development.
3. Further studies on adolescent's personality may focus on dimension wise analysis and influences of the dimensions on the personality of adolescents.
4. Future studies may focus on the role of electronic media, particularly the entertainment sector on the personality, decision making and adjustment of adolescents girls perceiving familial gender discrimination.
5. A group of parents could also have interviewed which could have yielded some more valuable results.

References

1. Baxter W. The glass ceiling hypothesis: a comparative study of the United States, Sweden and Australia. *Gender and Society*. 2000; 14:275-294.
2. Bem SL. Gender schema theory and its implications for child development: Raising gender-aschematic children in a gender-schematic society. *Signs*. 1983; 8:598-616. [Google Scholar]
3. Brescoll V. The effects of system-justifying motives on endorsement of essentialist explanations for gender differences. *Journal of personality and social psychology*. 2013; 105(6):891-908. DOI: 10.1037/a0034701. PMID 24295379.
4. Bumiller E. New Delhi: Penguin Books. *May You Be the Mother of a Hundred Sons: A Journey among the Women of India*, 1991. [Google Scholar]
5. Census of India. [Last accessed on 2013 Aug 8]: <http://www.imaginmor.com/censusof-india-2011>. Html.
6. Costa PT, Widiger TA (Eds.). *Personality disorders and the five factor model of personality (2nd ed.)*. Washington, DC: American psychological association, 2001.
7. Costa PT, Terracciano A, McCrae RR. Gender differences in personality traits across cultures: Robust and surprising findings. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 2001; 81:322-331.
8. Eagly AH, Wood W. The origins of sex differences in human behavior: Evolved dispositions versus social roles. *American Psychologist* Cross ref Web of Science Google Scholar. 1999; 54:408-423.
9. Eagly AH, Wood W, Johannesen-Schmidt MC. Social role theory of sex differences and similarities: Implications for the partner preferences of women and men. In A. H. Eagly, A. E. Beall, & R. Sternberg (Eds.), *The psychology of gender (2nd ed. pp.269-295)*. New York, NY: Guilford Press. Google Scholar, 2004.
10. Eliot, Lise. *Pink Brain, Blue Brain*.
11. Cordier B. Gender, betwixt biology and society. *European Journal of Sexology and Sexual Health*, 2012.
12. Fausto-Sterling A. The bare bones of sex: Part 1-sex and gender. *Signs* Cross ref Web of Science Google Scholar. 2005; 30:1491-1527.
13. Kesley CL. Gender inequality: Empowering women. *Journal of Legal Issues and Cases in Business*.
14. Kring AM, Gordon AH. Sex differences in emotion: Expression, experience, and physiology. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1998; 74:686-703.
15. Low BS. Cross-cultural patterns in the training of children: An evolutionary perspective. *Journal of Comparative Psychology* Cross ref Web of Science Google Scholar. 1989; 103:313-319.
16. Morgan CT, King RA. 7th ed. New York: Tata McGraw-Hill; 2008. *Personality in Introduction to Psychology*; pp. 257-94. [Google Scholar]
17. Najmah P. A Comparative Study on Personality Characteristics of Rural and Urban Adolescents of District Anantnag and Srinagar (J&K), India. *Journal of Education Research and Behavioral Sciences*. 2004; 3(4):081-086. April, 2014 Available online at <http://www.apexjournal.org> ISSN 2315-8735© 2014 Apex Journal International.
18. Pager D, Shepherd H. The sociology of discrimination: racial discrimination in employment, housing, credit, and consumer markets. *Annual Review of Sociology*. 2008; 34:181-209.
19. Quillian L. New approaches to understanding racial prejudice and discrimination. *Annual Review of Sociology*. 2006; 32:299-328.
20. Schmitt MT, Branscombe NR. (In press-a). The meaning and consequences of perceived discrimination in disadvantaged and privileged social groups. In W. Stroebe & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *European Review of Social Psychology*, Vol. 12. Chichester, England: Wiley.
21. Schmitt MT, Branscombe NR. Perceiving Discrimination Against One's Gender Group has Different Implications for Well-Being in Women and Men. (In press-b). *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*.
22. Sen G, Ostlin P, George A. *Unequal, Unfair, Ineffective and Inefficient. Gender Inequality in Health: Why it exists and How We Can Change It. Final Report to the WHO Commission on Social Determinants of Health*. Solna: Karolinska Institute, 2007.
23. Smack AJ, Kushner SC, Tackett JL. (In press). Childhood personality moderates associations between parenting and relational aggression. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*.
24. Tooby J, Cosmides L. Psychological foundations of culture. In J. Barkow, L. Cosmides, & J. Tooby (Eds.), *the adapted mind*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press. Google Scholar, 1992, pp.19-136.
25. Twenge JM. Changes in masculine and feminine traits over time: A meta-analysis. *Sex Roles* Cross ref Web of Science Google Scholar. 1997; 36:305- 325.
26. Williams JE, Best DL. *Measuring sex stereotypes: A multination study*. New York, NY: Sage. Google Scholar, 1990.
27. Wood W, Eagly AH. A cross-cultural analysis of the behavior of women and men: Implications for the origins of sex differences. *Psychological Bulletin* Cross ref PubMed Web of Science Google Scholar. 2002; 128:699-727.