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CASE STUDY

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.

For urban low on perceived familial gender discrimination score group, 20 girls scoring '16' and below on gender discrimination Scale were selected, and for the urban high on perceived familial gender discrimination score group 20 girls Scoring '23' and above were selected.

For rural low perceived familial gender discrimination score group 20 girls scoring ‘16’ and below on gender discrimination scale was selected. For rural high perceived familial gender discrimination score group 20 girls scoring ‘24’ and above were selected, and rest all were deleted.

In the following tables urban group scoring high and low on perceived familial gender discrimination scale have been mentioned as urban high on PFGDS and urban low on PFGDS respectively. Similarly for rural girls scoring high and low on perceived familial gender discrimination scale have been mentioned as rural high on PFGDS and rural low on PFGDS respectively.
DIFFERENT AREAS OF DISCRIMINATION AS PERCEIVED BY RURAL URBAN GIRLS

Table 6.1 gives the following description

1. Career related discrimination was faced by 75 percent of rural and 25 percent of urban girls scoring low on perceived familial gender discrimination scale and 55 percent of rural and 20 percent of urban girls scoring high on the same scale. Girls who perceived career related discrimination remarked that their parents discriminated between them and their brothers in selecting certain careers and most of them were of the view that fields like, engineering aviation, airhostess etc were not suitable for girls. Most of these girls said that their parents were much concerned about the society's reaction and comments, if their daughters opted for such a career, moreover the body of girls are weaker than boys and its framework doesn't suit certain jobs.

2. Educational discrimination was perceived by 70 percent of rural and 25 percent of urban girls scoring low on perceived familial gender discrimination scale and 35 percent of rural and 20 percent of urban girls scoring high on the scale. They reported that they had aims related to high education, but their parents were not in favour of it. Most of the rural girls said that due to 3-4 girls in their family, their parents were insisting them to get married leaving their studies. Many of them said that a girl's ultimate duty is to look after the house, kitchen & children so higher studies are futile.

3. Social discrimination was perceived by 90 percent of rural and 40 percent of urban girls scoring low and 60 percent of rural and 15 percent of urban girls scoring high on perceived familial gender
discrimination scale. These girls remarked that they were not given the freedom which, their brothers enjoyed. For every minute thing they have to see the permission of their parents/elders. Going out for shopping, movies, picnics or outdoor games for few of them were out of question. Some had a set timings i.e. not to go out after sunset, going for movies only once in a month or two months.

4. Love, affection and acceptance related discrimination was perceived by 40 percent of rural 15 percent of urban girls scoring low and 10 percent of urban and 30 percent of rural girls scoring high on perceived familial gender discrimination scale. Girls perceiving-this discrimination stated that the love and affection and acceptance which they received as girls would have been more if they were boys.

5. Economic discrimination was perceived by 50 percent of rural 15 percent of urban girls scoring low and 45 percent of rural and 20 percent of urban girls scoring high on perceived familial gender discrimination scale. Some of these girls remarked that they did not get any pocket money and that they had to go and get the things from their mothers. Some of them said that the amount of their pocket money was less in comparison to what their brothers got.

6. Attitudinal discrimination was perceived by 70 percent of rural and 25 percent of urban girls scoring low on perceived familial gender discrimination and 45 percent of rural girls scoring high on perceived familial gender discrimination scale urban girls scoring high on this scale did not perceive any attitudinal discrimination.
Table 6.1
Different areas of perceived familial gender discrimination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group / Areas</th>
<th>Career Related</th>
<th>Educational</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Love acceptance</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Attitudinal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>URBAN LOW ON PFGDS</td>
<td>5 (25%)</td>
<td>5 (25%)</td>
<td>8 (40%)</td>
<td>3 (15%)</td>
<td>5 (15%)</td>
<td>5 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN HIGH ON PFGDS</td>
<td>4 (20%)</td>
<td>4 (20%)</td>
<td>3 (15%)</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
<td>4 (20%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL LOW ON PFGDS</td>
<td>15 (75%)</td>
<td>14 (70%)</td>
<td>18 (90%)</td>
<td>8 (40%)</td>
<td>10 (50%)</td>
<td>14 (70%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL HIGH ON PFGDS</td>
<td>11 (55%)</td>
<td>7 (35%)</td>
<td>12 (60%)</td>
<td>6 (30%)</td>
<td>9 (45%)</td>
<td>9 (45%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The case study further revealed attitude of urban and rural girls scoring high and low on perceived familial gender discrimination towards the restrictions they perceive. The details are as follows:

1. **Higher Studies:**

   20 Percent of rural girls, 20 percent of urban girls scoring low on perceived familial gender discrimination scale and 30 percent of rural girls and 5 percent of urban girls scoring high on perceived familial gender discrimination scale had a positive attitude towards this restriction whereas negative attitude was held by 70 percent of rural and 70% of urban girls scoring low and 25 percent of rural and 20 percent of urban, girls scoring high on perceived familial gender discrimination scale. Rest 10 Percent of rural and 10 percent of urban girls scoring low and 25 percent of rural and 25 percent urban girls scoring high on the scale remarked can’t say.

   Girls, who held a positive attitude towards this restriction said that, being girls no matter how much we study, are ultimately bound to work in the four walls of the home and society also discriminates us, so higher studies are of no use.

   Girls with negative attitude supported their views by saying that, if girls are allowed to study further and encouraged then the world would become a better place to live and will be able to produce educated citizens for tomorrow. They disliked this restriction.
2. **Going for Movies:**

15 percent of rural and 10 percent of urban girls scoring low and 20 percent of rural and 15 percent of urban girls scoring high on perceived familial gender discrimination scale had a positive attitude towards this restriction. Negative attitude was held by 80 percent of rural and 75 percent of urban girls scoring low and 30 percent of rural and 75 percent of urban girls scoring high on perceived familial gender discrimination scale.

5 percent of rural and 15 percent of urban girls scoring low and 20 percent of rural and 10 percent of urban girls scoring high on the scale reported cad, t say.

Girls who held a positive attitude towards this restriction stated that some of the movie halls have elements which are not in favour of girls and such environment is not good for girls, so we think such restrictions are for our safety. Negative attitude holding girls remarked that they did not like this restriction as wished freedom from this.

3. **Going Out for Shopping with Friends:**

25 percent of rural and 25 percent of urban girls scoring low and 10 percent of rural and 10 percent of urban girls scoring high on perceived familial gender discrimination scale reported a positive attitude towards this restriction.

Negative attitude was held by 50 percent of rural and 70 percent of urban girls scoring, low and 25 percent of rural and 25 percent of urban girls scoring high on perceived familial gender discrimination scale.
Can't say was reported by 25 percent of rural and 5 percent of urban girls scoring low and 10 percent of rural and 20 percent of urban girls scoring high on the scale.

Girls holding positive attitude remarked that it is not safe for girls to move with their friends in public and therefore, this restrictions is for their safety, but they also wished freedom from this restrictions. Negative attitude holding girls remarked they can face the situations and that they are not so weak and wished freedom from these restrictions.

4. Talking to Opposite Sex Friends / Relatives:

45 percent of rural and 30 percent of urban girls scoring low and 25 Percent of rural and 35 percent of urban girls scoring high on perceived Familial gender discrimination scale reported a positive attitude.

Negative attitude was held by 40 percent of rural and 40 percent of urban girls scoring low and 35 percent of rural and 35 percent of urban girls scoring high on the scale.

15 percent of rural and 30 percent of urban girls scoring low and 15 percent of rural and 30 percent of urban girls scoring high on perceived familial gender discrimination scale remarked, can't say.

Girls with a positive attitude remarked that before marriage girls should not talk with boys (but with cousins, there is no problem). The thing some of these girls do not like is over emphasis on such restrictions at home which is not there on the part of boys. Girls with
Negative attitude remarked that they do not like these restrictions at all and wanted freedom.

5. **Going out after Sunset:**

40 percent of rural girls and 25 percent of urban girls scoring low & 45 percent of rural girls and 40 percent of urban girls scoring high on perceived familial gender discrimination held a positive attitude towards this discrimination. Negative attitude was held by 40 percent of rural and 35 percent of urban girls scoring low and 15 percent of rural and 25 percent of urban girls scoring high on perceived familial gender discrimination. 10 percent of rural girls and 40 percent of urban girls scoring low and 25 percent of rural girls and 35 percent of urban girls scoring high on perceived familial gender discrimination remarked, can't say on this discrimination.

Girls with positive attitude remarked that this restriction is for their safety as the society is not favourable for them whereas girls with negative attitude disliked this restriction.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Restrictions</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Can't Say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural Low on PFGDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher studies</td>
<td>4 (20%)</td>
<td>14 (70%)</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural High on PFGDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to movies</td>
<td>3 (15%)</td>
<td>16 (80%)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping with friends</td>
<td>5 (25%)</td>
<td>10 (50%)</td>
<td>5 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking to friends of opposite sex</td>
<td>9 (45%)</td>
<td>8 (40%)</td>
<td>3 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going out after sunset</td>
<td>8 (40%)</td>
<td>8 (40%)</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 (45%)</td>
<td>3 (15%)</td>
<td>5 (25%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Attitude Towards Restrictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Restrictions</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Can't Say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban Low on PFGDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher studies</td>
<td>4 (20%)</td>
<td>14 (70%)</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban High on</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to movies</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>4 (20%)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
<td>15 (75%)</td>
<td>3 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (15%)</td>
<td>3 (15%)</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping with friends</td>
<td>5 (25%)</td>
<td>14 (70%)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
<td>5 (25%)</td>
<td>4 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking to friends of opposite sex</td>
<td>6 (30%)</td>
<td>8 (40%)</td>
<td>6 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 (35%)</td>
<td>7 (35%)</td>
<td>6 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going out after sunset</td>
<td>5 (25%)</td>
<td>7 (35%)</td>
<td>8 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 (40%)</td>
<td>5 (25%)</td>
<td>7 (35%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.3 gives the following description:

Among the rural high group, 100 percent of girls had a perceived goal for their life and 55.80 percent faced obstacle, whereas 40.10 percent had a driving force in pursuing their goal. Among these, 40 percent anticipated a positive outcome, 30 percent anticipated a negative outcome and 21 percent stated, can’t say in pursuing their goals.

Among the rural girls scoring low on perceived familial gender discrimination scale, 85 percent had a perceived goal for their future and 82.35 experienced obstacle, whereas 47.05 had a driving force in pursuing their career. 29.41 percent anticipated a positive outcome 35.29 percent anticipated a negative outcome, and 52.94 stated, can’t say in pursuing their goals.

Among the urban girls scoring high on perceived familial gender discrimination scale 100 percent had perceived goal for their and future 15 percent faced obstacle and 90 percent had a driving force. 70 percent anticipated a positive outcome, 10 percent a negative outcome and 20 percent stated can’t say.

Among urban girls scoring low on perceived familial gender discrimination scale, 95 percent had perceived goal, 47.36 percent faced obstacle, 57.89 percent had a driving force, 42.10 percent anticipated a positive outcome and 31.5 percent a negative outcome and 31.5 percent stated can't say.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>(No. of Cases) Perceived Goal</th>
<th>(No. of Cases) Obstacle</th>
<th>(No. of Cases) Driving Force</th>
<th>Anticipated Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(No. of Cases)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural High on PFGDS</td>
<td>20 (100%)</td>
<td>11 (55%)</td>
<td>8 (40%)</td>
<td>8 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Low on PFGDS</td>
<td>17 (85%)</td>
<td>14 (82.35%)</td>
<td>8 (47.05%)</td>
<td>5 (29.41%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban high on PFGDS</td>
<td>20 (100%)</td>
<td>3 (15%)</td>
<td>18 (90%)</td>
<td>14 (70%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban low on PFGDS</td>
<td>19 (95%)</td>
<td>9 (47.36%)</td>
<td>11 (57.89%)</td>
<td>8 (42.10%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.3

Perceived obstacle / driving force within family behind perceived goal and anticipated outcome
Table (6.4) gives the following description:

60 percent of rural and 65 percent of urban girls scoring low and 85 percent of rural and 90 percent of urban girls scoring high on perceived familial gender discrimination scale had a positive attitude towards girlhood.

40 percent of rural and 30 percent of urban girls scoring low and 10 percent of rural and 5 percent of urban girls scoring high on perceived familial gender discrimination scale had negative attitude towards girlhood.

5 percent among urban low, 5 percent among rural low & rural high remarked can’t say.

Some girls having a positive attitude towards girlhood remarked that inspite of these restrictions; they enjoy being a girl, because a woman is the mother of the whole earth. They are proud to be a girl.

Girls having negative attitude remarked that they dislike being a girl and prefer to be born a male in the next birth.

**Table 6.4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Can’t Say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low on PFGDS</td>
<td>High on PFGDS</td>
<td>Low on PFGDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>(12) 60%</td>
<td>(17) 85%</td>
<td>(8) 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>(13) 65%</td>
<td>(18) 90%</td>
<td>(6) 30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thus the case study reveals that girls belonging to rural and urban group perceive familial gender discrimination in different areas of life though, the percentage of discrimination varies in both the groups.

Thus case study has supported the results obtained in phase one of the study.
Fig 5.1: Graphical Presentation of Familial Gender Discrimination in Rural and Urban Adolescent Girls
Fig. 5.2: Graphical Presentation of Repression-Sensitization Tendency in Rural and Urban Adolescent Girls
Fig. 5.3: Graphical Presentation of Achievement Motivation in Rural and Urban Adolescent Girls
Fig 5.4: Graphical Presentation of Self Confidence in Rural and Urban Adolescent Girls
Fig. 5.5: Graphical Presentation of Assertiveness in Rural and Urban Adolescent Girls
Fig. 5.6  Graphical Presentation of Low and High Perceived Familial Gender Discrimination on Repression - Sensitization Tendency of Adolescent Girls
Fig. 5.7 Graphical Presentation of Low and High Perceived Familial Gender Discrimination on Achievement Motivation of Adolescent Girls
Fig. 5.8 Graphical Presentation of Low and High Perceived Familial Gender Discrimination on Self Confidence of Adolescent Girls
Fig. 5.9  Graphical Presentation of Low and High Perceived Familial Gender Discrimination on Assertiveness of Adolescent Girls
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DISCUSSION

This study was undertaken to see the effect of perceived familial gender discrimination in relation to repression – sensitization tendency, achievement motivation, self-confidence and assertiveness of adolescent girls.

Results and analysis of data of present investigation is given in chapter 5 detailed discussion of findings in terms of hypothesis framed to fulfil the purpose of the study is given below:

**Hypothesis 1 States That**

There will be significant relationship between familial gender discrimination and repression-sensitization tendency of adolescent girls.

The finding result (Tables 5.2.1, 5.2.5, 5.2.9) reveals negative correlation between familial gender discrimination and repression-sensitization tendency among adolescent girls in urban, rural, total areas. It indicates that the girls perceiving high familial gender discrimination have low sensitization tendency.

Thus the findings are supported of hypothesis 1. Social behavior theory recognize that the person is a product of hereditary influences and of learning experiences and personality is shaped by the family influences, way of learning in the family, parental attitude and way of child rearing. Sex typing or the development of responses and interests to one’s own sex, grows in family situations. Boys are rewarded by their parents for rough and aggressive play, for showing emotional restraint,
and for an interest in mechanical things. Girls are usually rewarded for being more submissive, sweet and emotionally expressive. Parents may or may not administer this training consciously, nevertheless, the pressure is there, and it produces some of the personality differences we often see between boys and girls.

At adolescent age there is an increased sensitivity to gender stereotypes and an adherence to them, which is referred to as gender intensification (Hill and Lynch, 1983). As a result, adolescence is characterized by an increase in prejudice and discriminatory behavior towards individuals exhibiting behavior deviant from their social group norms (Hurlock, 1973). An additional characteristic of adolescence that seems be relevant to discriminatory behavior is social conformity. The importance of peers and their approval and social acceptance increases during adolescence (Berndt, 1979; Berndt and Keefe, 1995; Constanzo and Shaw, 1966; Newcomb and Bagwell, 1995; Vitaro et al., 1997) and conformity pressures reach their peak (Berndt, 1979). Susan Sen (1999) indicates that girls perceiving more familial gender discriminating are more tensed and the girl perceiving less familial gender discrimination are more emotionally stable. Kisker, G.W. (1983) in his study found out that the period of adolescent has its own emotional problems, both in boys and girls.

Girls who are affected by negative feelings are tended to develop negative attitudes towards present life as girl. Case study revealed that 40% of rural, 30% of urban girls scoring low and 10% of rural, 5% of urban girls scoring high on perceived familial gender discrimination scale have negative attitude towards girlhood. They remark that they dislike
being a girl and prefer to be born a male in the next birth or if given a choice.

Charles Johannes (1976) indicate that females responding as repressors and males as sensitizers. Females responded to sexually suggestive stimuli with neutral or nonthreatening interpretations. Repression refers to avoiding or drawing attention away from threatening stimuli. Whereas, sensitization is the tendency to continuously monitor and attend the environmental cues for the presence of such stimuli. Thus repression/sensitization may have influence on the processing of negative affection information (Rusting, 1988). On the other hand there are studies to demonstrate that repression/sensitization correlates with trait anxiety and thus it represent trait anxiety only (Byrne, 1961, 1964). sensitization tendency for negative valance emotion whereas, desensitization tendency for positively valance emotions (Khan Mohammad and Srivastava Abhay Oct.2009).

PsycINFO Database Record (2008) reported females repressors are less distress than sensitizers overall. Type of information interacted with the measures of coping style, with sensitizers and approaches’ more reactive after irrelevant information and avoiders more reactive after relevant information, as predicted. Consistency interacted with both measures to improve the prediction of skin conductance and self-report. Verma V, (2007) in her study of adolescent girls of broken families has more sense of insecurity. In the absence of father or mother the child develops the sense of insecurity, which may be defined as emotional instability, feeling of rejection, inferiority, anxiety, isolation, jealousy, hostility, irritability, and inconsistency etc. The extrovert girls
tend to feel and act according to the demand and expectation of the situation and they are establishing friendship with others very easily.

Case study revealed that love, affection and acceptance related discrimination was received by 40% of rural and 15% of urban girls scoring low (perceiving more gender discrimination) and 10% of urban and 30% of rural girls scoring high (perceiving less gender discrimination) of perceived familial gender discrimination scale. These girls stated that the love and affection and acceptance which they received as girls would have been more if they were boys. This feeling may have contributed to the more emotional instability and tension among these girls.

**Hypothesis 2 States That**

There will be significant relationship between familial gender discrimination and achievement motivation of adolescent girls.

The finding result (Tables 5.2.2, 5.2.6, 5.2.10) reveals positive correlation between familial gender discrimination and achievement motivation among adolescent girls in urban, rural, total areas. It indicates that the girls perceiving high familial gender discrimination have high achievement motivation.

Thus the findings are supported of hypothesis 2. Achievement motivation provides the necessary direction to effort in adolescent age. It is related to person’s feelings, thoughts, basic instants and emotions. So many factors (like family, school, teachers, society etc.) play an important role in achieving the goals.
Several reports show that students select their academic streams based on some factors such as personality type, self-esteem, and expectation (Pike, 2006, Pullmann & Allik, 2008).

Case study reveals that career related discrimination was faced by 75% of rural and 25% of urban girls scoring low and 55% of rural and 20% of urban girls scoring high on perceived familial gender discrimination scale. Educational discrimination was perceived by 70% of rural and 20% of urban girls scoring low and 35% of rural and 20% of urban girls scoring high on perceived familial gender discrimination scale. Love affection and acceptance related discrimination perceived by 40% of rural and 15% of urban girls scoring low and 10% of urban and 30% of rural girls scoring high on perceived familial gender discrimination scale. Economic discrimination was perceived by 50% of rural and 15% of urban girls scoring low and 45% of rural and 20% of urban girls scoring high on perceived familial gender discrimination scale.

Discrimination regarding higher studies and pursuing of the perceived goal may affect the education and finally discrimination in love, affection and acceptance and attitudinal discrimination might affect emotional adjustment.

Stewart and Chester (1982) finding that expressions of need achievement for men were restricted to the traditional domains of work and leadership and that this is linked to a rigid masculine gender role. For women, on the other hand, need achievement could be aroused with cues from a wide variety of domains because achievement opportunities
in the traditional domain of work were less available to women at that time. Skaalvik (1990) indicated that the girls had a significantly higher level of achievement and higher success expectations.

Miller & Byrnes (2001) results indicated that younger adolescent boys and girls (regardless of gender) had higher achievement striving behaviors than the older adolescent boys. Giota (2002) found that girls were more likely than boys to score higher on academic achievement in language. Results indicated that parental neglect, discrimination, and rejection that parent’s incest which is experienced during childhood and adolescence is associated with vulnerable intra and interpersonal achievements during young adulthood.

**Hypothesis 3 States That**

There will be significant relationship between familial gender discrimination and self-confidence of adolescent girls.

The finding result (Tables 5.2.3, 5.2.7, 5.2.11) reveals negative correlation between familial gender discrimination and self-confidence among adolescent girls in urban, rural, total areas. It indicates that the girls perceiving high familial gender discrimination have less self-confidence.

Thus the findings are supported of hypothesis 3. Gender discrimination can significantly affect the confidence and courage of adolescents. It may stop someone from pursuing their career due to lack of self confidence; forcing the individual to not apply for certain jobs as a result of stereotype ideas. When one is discriminated against due to their gender, one doubts their abilities and potential affecting their
emotional health. This self doubt may lead into depression affecting their self confidence and isolation from the rest of the community, causing a lack of communication, affecting their social life.

Orivilline, G.B.Jr.(1958) revealed that an adolescent girls who perceives a balance in her parents attitudes both sexes and has a positive attitude towards parenting child rearing practices, develops a sense of confidence in herself. A youth who expresses confidence in self and values, goals and a positive attitude towards parental behaviour towards them is presumably more capable of operating effectively on his own and a second aspect is concerned with the degree of adolescent self reliance, is problem solving and accepting responsibility coping and decision making.

Gender can also affect the level of self-esteem and academic achievement. Girls experience low self-esteem as compared to boys (Carlson, Uppal & Prosser 2000; DuBois et al., 2002). O’Brien (1991) examined sex difference in self-esteem and reported that men scored significantly higher in global self-esteem than women. A majority of other researchers (Kelikangas-Jarvimen, 1990, Sekaran, 1983) have also observed that male students’ scored higher on the self-esteem than female students. Kling, Hyde, Showers and Bus well (1999) and Rabbins et al. (2002) have also reported that adolescents’ boys have higher self-esteem than adolescent’s girls.

Bauman and Geher (2002) find a relation between self-confidence and gender discrimination: Self-confident males tend to overvalue male performers. Probably, males project their positive attitude towards themselves on performers of their own gender, but not on females. In
Discussion

In general, previous literature indicates that highly self-confident individuals behave differently from individuals with low levels of self-confidence (e.g., Falk, Huffman, and Sunde 2006; Niederle and Vesterlund 2007).

Case study reveals that girls, who perceived familial gender discrimination, develop a negative attitude towards girlhood. This might be due to the fact that they are unable to cope up with the stress of perceived familial gender discrimination. This discrimination indicates that girls are not confident with themselves. Those low in self confidence tend to become preoccupied with distress emotions, and are more likely to disengage from their goals when under stress.

Our level of self confidence is affected by what happens to us and more importantly on how we interpret events around us. This has a direct bearing on our level of self esteem as we will found out (www.unlimited-confidence.com).

Hall, Evelyn (1990) made a study of the effect of performer gender, performer skill level, and opponent gender on self-confidence in a competitive situation. He found that self-confidence of females is not lower than that of males.

Hypothesis 4 States That

There will be significant relationship between familial gender discrimination and assertiveness of adolescent girls.

The finding result (Tables 5.2.4, 5.2.8, 5.2.12) reveals positive correlation between familial gender discrimination and assertiveness
among adolescent girls in urban, rural, total areas. It indicates that the girls perceiving high familial gender discrimination found high assertive behaviour.

Thus the findings are supported of hypothesis 4. When we introduce assertiveness, keep in mind that communicating assertively, especially for women, is not considered the norm in some cultures. Assertiveness is a very important part of life as each individual need it to build a relationship, become part of the career world, make decisions for their own, and to communicate with friends, family. Behaving assertively means asking for what you want or saying how you feel in an honest and respectful way that does not infringe on another person's rights or put the individual down.

Assertiveness is more congruent with the male gender role stereotypes than with the female gender role stereotypes. Empirical evidence shows that assertiveness is a highly socially desired male gender-role attribute (Cheng, Bond & Chan, 1995).

Case study reveals that social discrimination was perceived by 90% of rural and 40% of urban girls scoring low and 60% of rural and 15% of urban girls scoring high on perceived familial gender discrimination scale. Attitudinal discrimination was perceived by 70% of rural and 25% of urban girls scoring low and 45% of rural girls scoring high on perceived familial gender discrimination scale.

Wills, Thomas A.; Baker, Eli; Botvin, Gilbert J. (1989) describe that interaction and effects indicated that relations were stronger for girls for substance and social assertiveness.
Robert Bolton, translate to Persian Sohrabi & Haiat Roshanaei, (2009) people avoid stereotypical and repetitive behavior and in any case, the appropriate response occurred to current situation.

Boris Crassini, H. G. Law, E. Wilson (2011) The analysis revealed a discriminated function differentiating between males and females, with males scoring higher on the function than females.

Caballo (1993) explain that assertive individuals usually cope well in their interpersonal relation, are satisfied with their social life, and confident that can change when they need to.

**Hypothesis 5 States That**

There will be significant difference on familial gender discrimination in rural and urban adolescent girls.

The finding result (Tables 5.3.1) reveals that t value (-1.43) is not significant but mean difference of urban (18.51) vs rural (19.02) is 0.51. It indicates that urban area adolescent girls perceive less familial gender discrimination in comparison to rural area adolescent girls.

In rural areas high level of cultural stereotypes threaten the development of girl child. Negative stereotypes are used to judge their behaviour, thus impairing their performance as women in later years. They feel that they are the burden to the family and are discriminated.

Adolescent are an increased sensitivity to gender stereotypes and an adherence to them, which is referred to as gender intensification (Hill and Lynch, 1983). This gender intensification makes any deviation from
the expected traditional masculine or feminine norm more salient and it is more severely judged (Lobel, 1994).

Rural area show higher preference of sex selective abortions than urban areas (UNFPA 2001). In rural areas parents show more insecurity like ‘If I get better educated them there will be problem in getting married’. Rural girls said that their brother was served food before them. They desire for freedom and independent movement. Urban girls provided good food, education, healthy family environment and treat equal with their brothers, so they don’t feel as much discrimination as rural areas girls. Choudhary and Choudhary (2008) observed that almost one third (34.33%) girls attributed the reason for their discrimination to society, its values and the customs practised.

**Hypothesis 6 States That**

There will be significant difference on repression-sensitization tendency in rural and urban adolescent girls.

The finding result (Tables 5.3.2) reveals that t value (0.58) is not significant but mean difference of urban (16.14) vs rural (15.77) is 0.37. It indicates that urban area adolescent girls have more sensitization tendency in comparison to rural area adolescent girls.

Urban girls having more sensitization tendency might be discrimination in parental treatment, so that girls express their frustration and anger. Good parent child relationship brings a belief of security in adolescents. Such feelings bring positive attitude towards personality. Girls who have such relations with parents have less risk of internalized problems such as feeling of apathetic, excitable, confusion.
Krohne, 1993 reported that the combination of low avoidance and high vigilance characterizer are sensitizers.

Sensitization tendency positively correlated with the measures of negative affect including trait anxiety (Rusting, 1988), sensitization tendency for negative valance emotions (Khan Mohammad and Srivastava Abhay Oct.2009). Repressors reported less distress than sensitizers overall (PsycINFO Database Record 2008).

**Hypothesis 7 States That**

There will be significant difference on achievement motivation in rural and urban adolescent girls.

The finding result (Tables 5.3.3) reveals that t value (-3.48) is significant and mean difference of urban (144.52) vs rural (151.62) is 7.10. It indicates that the rural adolescent girls, who are the victim of familial gender discrimination, are generally self motivated achievers.

In rural culture parents have lack of attention and cooperation with their girl child, ignoring them and their activities, generating feeling of neglect in girls. Parents are over ambitions regarding their son. The girl child exhibits her existence before her parents. Therefore she has a strong desire to depict her capabilities to parents. So that she achieve the more parents expect of them. Salili (1996) investigated age, sex and cultural differences in achievement motivation. Female subjects had higher score then males.

Because of the complexities of urban life and girls being more socially aware about the implications of social demands, they develop
confused tendencies which lead to low level of achievement. They are not in a state to decide what to do and what to avoid, hence high expectations from the parents and tough competition trends in urban setting leads to the feeling of inferiority and in competence in them.

Social resources may be positively associated with physical and mental health (Heller & Swindle, 1983, Moss and Mitchell 1982) because they provide emotional support, tangible, assistance, and informational guidance.

Over a period of time feminist have provided weakness for women and even in the age of democracy the gender relationship designed on unethical principle of superiority of man over women (Anamika Publication 2005). Other research indicated that the girls had a significantly higher level of achievement and higher success expectations than males (Skaalvik, 1990).

Pandey (2005) studied parental disciplining behaviour and academic achievement of adolescents and found that there was a positive effect of father’s disciplining behaviour upon academic achievement of urban adolescents of high intellectual level; rural adolescents showed positive and significant impact of mother’s disciplining behaviour upon academic achievement of average intellectual level.
Hypothesis 8 States That

There will be significant difference on self-confidence in rural and urban adolescent girls.

The finding result (Tables 5.3.4) reveals that t value (1.08) is not significant but mean difference of urban (25.97) vs rural (25.09) is 0.88. It indicates that the urban adolescent girls have more self-confidence in comparison to rural adolescent girls.

Self-confidence is an attitude which allows individuals to have positive yet realistic views of themselves and their situations. In urban environment gender discrimination is observed in very few cases. That is why urban girls are well confident and well determine about their decisions. Their parents and social environment are supportive. This treatment has a profound impact on the behaviour. Self-confident girls trust their own abilities, have a general sense of control in their lives, and believe that within reason, they will be able to do what they wish, plan and expect. Social acceptance brings about self confidence and produces high self-esteem in them, whereas rejection from peers and loneliness brings about self-doubts, poor self image and produces low self-esteem (Leary & Baumeister, 2000).

Devi and Prashani (2004) reported that pupils staying in rural area generally suffer from social and cultural deprivation in comparison with urban pupils. There are indications from research that the environment plays a determining role student in self-esteem. DuBois, Burk, Braston, Swenson, Tevendale and Hardesty (2002) revealed that environment has shown to play important role in determining trajectories of adolescents’ self-esteem. Researchers have noted the particular vulnerabilities of rural
youth, who tended to be more isolated and have to fewer educational, recreational and other public health resources (Apostal & Bilden, 1991; Markstrom, Marshall & Tryon, 2000; Hurray & Keller, 1991).

In urban area, parents have come to realize the importance of behaviour related to autonomy, self reliance and freedom of decision making abilities. Hence, they impart independence training and self concept training so that their daughters are capable of deciding for self and develop their confidence.

**Hypothesis 9 States That**

There will be significant difference on assertiveness in rural and urban adolescent girls.

The finding result (Tables 5.3.5) reveals that t value (0.87) is not significant but mean difference of urban (8.54) vs rural (8.38) is 0.16. It indicates that the urban adolescent girls have more assertive behaviour in compare to rural adolescent girls.

An urban area girl gets a proper environment around themselves, due to the increasing effect societies have in which they live. Usually rural community does not give due and proper respect to the women folk. So that in rural environment girls does not express their opinions and disagreement. Assertiveness according to Lieberman Lazarus (1971) is self expression of emotional freedom. To stand up without destroying other right is assertiveness.

Assertiveness referred to some category of social skill in which the emphasis is on the “ability to express both positive and negative
feelings in the interpersonal contexts without suffering consequent loss of social reinforcement”. Qadir, A. Sajitha; Sugumar, V. Raji October (2013), found that the urban adolescents had better assertiveness scores than the rural adolescents both among boys and girls.

Urban society provides freedom to her in all circumstances. But in rural adolescents face many problems in physical as well as psychological aspect. It is not easy for them to cope up with the problems like healthy persons. Urban area’s parents trained their girls to improve the assertive behaviour. Assertiveness is a valuable skill to cope up with many problems.

The culture in which one lives also contributes to the framing of personality. In many cultures, there has been greater cultural reinforcement for girls to be emotionally dependent on parents and others whereas independence and self assertiveness in boys. Jerome Kagan and Howard Moss (1962) in their longitudinal study of development from early childhood to maturity found that dependency was a more stable trait in girls than in boys. In Indian culture emotional dependence remains fairly acceptable for girls and thus girls tend to be emotionally unstable and affected by feelings.

The urban girls have developed an understanding of the implication of education. Education has helped them in changing or modifying their behaviour patterns. They have built up their socialization by using proper way of knowledge of assertive behaviour. But in rural area, parents keep a watching eye on their daughters and do
not hesitate to condemn behaviours which are unsuitable for traditional Indian girls. The sex role stereotypes and gender discriminated value patterns are still prevailing in rural background.

**Hypothesis 10 States That**

There will be significant difference between low and high perceived familial gender discrimination on repression-sensitization tendency of adolescent girls.

The finding result (Tables 5.3.6) reveals that t value (5.70) is significant at .05 level of confidence. It indicates that high sensitization tendency is found in most of the adolescent girls who perceive less familial gender discrimination.

Where the parents using more discrimination with girls, they display a different emotional style as a result of selective attention to information. Sensitizers are verbally coping with their emotional arousal more accurately. In the family it is the parents who play a major role in the overall development of the child by using different parenting styles (Juyal and Gaur, 2007). Family provides most of the early environmental influence upon the personality which remains throughout the life. It is the greatest socializing agency in all contemporary cultures (Gaur and Gupta, 2004).

In our culture adolescence has traditionally been viewed as a more difficult period in the lives of children and their parents than either the middle childhood years or the years emerging adulthood.
Adolescence has traditionally been a challenging and sometime trying time for both the young and their parents.

The new social demands on the adolescence along with the restrictive environment at home where girls perceive gender discrimination in their family, may display alterations in mood; distressing, turbulent, impulsive and tensed.

Girls have less sensitization tendency which might be due to the difference in parental treatment of boys and girls (Mehta et al., 2005). Girls are expected to have more control on their feelings and are not expected to express their frustration and anger, So that they are apathetic, excitable and unassuming.

**Hypothesis 11 States That**

There will be significant difference between low and high perceived familial gender discrimination on achievement motivation of adolescent girls.

The finding result (Tables 5.3.7) reveals that t value (5.95) is significant. It indicates that girls perceiving high familial gender discrimination are found to have high achievement motivation in comparison to girls perceiving less familial gender discrimination. The findings prove the hypothesis.

In male oriented society avoids the achievements of girls, so they feel low though they have adequate abilities to achieve their goals. This orthodox thought of the society restricts girls to go ahead of boys. Some
of the girls want to achieve their goals to change this orthodox thinking of the society and they always remain self motivated to do something. Mandel & Marcus, (1988) Children between the ages of 9 and 12 years come to the realization that their future is important. This realization means that motivation at this point becomes focused on meeting achievement demands, but there is a connection with the internal importance of meeting demands. The young adolescent individual begins to establish a more appropriate self-concept and independence. Motivation is persuaded by the new challenges for which the individual feels competent or not competent enough to succeed in the future. Stewart and Chester (1982) reviewed finding that expressions for women, $n$ Achievement could be aroused with cues from a wide variety of domains because achievement opportunities in the traditional domain of work were less available to women at that time.

Tikoo (2008) revealed that as the home and school deprivation increases, achievement motivation deteriorates which means that deprivation regarding food, medicine, clothing facilities, parental love, affection and encouragement develops emotional instability, psychic imbalances among children and they experience anxiety, irritation, doubt, conflicts which ultimately lead to low achievement motivation.

**Hypothesis 12 States That**

There will be significant difference between low and high perceived familial gender discrimination on self-confidence of adolescent girls.
The finding result (Tables 5.3.8) reveals that t value (3.69) is significant. It indicates that girls perceiving high familial gender discrimination are found less self-confidence in comparison to girls perceiving less familial gender discrimination. The findings prove the hypothesis.

Self-confidence is an attitude which allows individuals to have positive yet realistic views of themselves and their situations. When girls discriminated in any area don’t trust their own abilities. Baumeister & Campbell (2003) reported that poor parenting builds a child with low self confidence and a child with low self confidence groups up almost inevitable-to be an adult with self confidence. Parental abuse in the family of origin may contribute to self confidence.

Parenting can also play an important role in self-esteem development of children. Students in elementary school who have high self-esteem have parents who are caring and supportive, who put high standards for their child and encourage them to voice their opinion in decision making (Lamborn et al., 1991).

An adolescent girl who perceives a balance in her parents attitudes towards both sexes and has a positive attitude towards parental child rearing practices, develops a sense of confidence in herself. A youth who expresses confidence in self and values, goals and a positive attitude towards parental behavior towards them is presumable more capable of operating effectively on his own and a second aspect concerns the degree of adolescent self reliance, is painful problem solving and accepting responsibility coping and decision making.
Debra Instone, Brenda Major, Barbara B. Bunker (1983), reveals that Females displayed lower levels of self-confidence than did males, and sex-linked differences in self-confidence explained much of the gender difference observed in the frequency with which influence attempts were made and the extent to which coercive strategies were used.

**Hypothesis 13 States That**

There will be significant difference between low and high perceived familial gender discrimination on assertiveness of adolescent girls.

The finding result (Tables 5.3.9) reveals that t value (3.60) is significant. It indicates that girls perceiving high familial gender discrimination are found to have low assertiveness in comparison to girls perceiving less familial gender discrimination. The findings prove the hypothesis.

Gender role stereotyping believes that girls are docile and compliant and boys are tough and aggressive, these messages become embedded in children. Not only are their childhoods constricted but they are ill-prepared for adult life in today’s society. Girls may feel they should not be assertive because it is not expected of them. Boys grow up afraid to express feelings which in turn unduly pressures men and affect their relationships with women. Gender child-rearing is bad. Parents specifically do not help their daughters become assertive to avoid gender role stereotyping in their household. Encourage daughters to be more concerned about who they are and what they know.
Discussion

Assertiveness also gives more control over their environment, reducing anxiety in difficult situations. Researchers have established that assertiveness can help a student improve communication skills, self-esteem, and decision-making ability.

When the family, society and culture places high value to the development and expression of assertive behavior, then only we can expect the future female generation having healthy personality development. Continuous appraisals from parents, teachers and friends are of crucial importance for the development of assertive behavior.