



www.eprawisdom.com

Research Paper

AN ANALYSIS OF YOUTH PERCEPTION TOWARDS GENDER DISCRIMINATION IN HARYANA

Dr. (Mrs.) Sonu Madan¹

¹Assistant Professor, Department of Economics, Indira Gandhi
University, Meerpur, Rewari, Haryana, India

ABSTRACT

T*his paper intends to analyse the attitude and perception of currently married educated youth in the age group of 18-29 years in the light that young and educated generation is most adaptable to new, innovative and progressive ideas. In this concern, egalitarian attitude and perception of youth towards gender roles is quite important to determine the level of gender equality for future generations. Gender roles and relations are primarily re-produced and negotiated within families and local communities and hereby it's a matter of concern to explore attitude of young generation towards gender discrimination. The paper has explored four forms of gender discrimination using exploratory factor analyses and brought out the fact that educated youth possess a neutral perception towards gender roles prescribed for males and females within the society. Gender based analysis in this concern highlighted the egalitarian perception of males' towards the equal status for their female peers, whereas females still believe in the century old patriarchal system of the society. Acceptance of patriarchal gender roles by females indicates deep rooted prejudices within families and is a matter of concern for the policy makers to achieve gender equality.*

KEY WORDS: Youth Perception, Gender Discrimination, Gender Roles, Egalitarian Attitude, Patriarchal Society

1.1 Introduction:-

Indian society is a patriarchal society wherein gender inequality prevails in every sphere of life, despite the assurance of equality, justice, liberty and fraternity in the Indian constitution. At the very outset, it is essential to distinguish between sex and gender. The term 'sex' refers to the biological characteristics by which human beings are classified as women and men. 'Gender', represent not only the biological sex of an individual, but also the differential roles, rights and obligations that are associated with individuals' born with women and men sex characteristics. It refers to the social, cultural and psychological characteristics by which human behavior is categorized as Masculine or Feminine. Gender is a cultural construct, which is seen as a full range of personality traits, attitudes, feelings,

values, behaviour that society ascribes to males and females on a differential basis (Scott, 1986; Butler, 1990; Lakshmana, 1999). Gender not only characterize males and females by their qualities, but also the models of behaviour, thinking and action established by any society and culture for them time to time. Sex differentiated roles, rights and obligations exist in every sphere of human functioning; may it be domestic, communal, societal or religious and vary by class and lifecycle stage (Kishor and Gupta, 2004). These roles in their social, economic and political dimensions are internalized very early in life. The society over the years has tended to uphold these differences and segregate females on all kind of grounds (Lakshmana, 1999). In almost every sphere of human functioning, the roles defined for females are subordinated to those defined



for males. Gender related prejudices have put females in a disadvantageous position in almost all walks of life, such as in the allocation of social, economic and reproductive roles. Thus, gender discrimination can be considered as “departure from parity in the representation of females and males in key dimensions of social life” (Ramana and Rao, 1999). There is growing evidence that the gender discrimination and son preference in India has led to sex-selective abortions and skewed sex ratios at birth, leading to serious social and demographic problems (Guilmoto, 2012; Jiang; Li and Feldman, 2011; Madan, 2012). Because of current disparities, equal treatment of females and males is insufficient as a strategy for gender equality¹.

Gender, in this way, can be considered a kind of central organizing principle of social life in every culture and, hereby, gender relations determine how equally males and females, have access to, and control over resources. Female are deprived of opportunities in the allocation of social, economic and their reproductive roles and have limited access to education, training, skill development and decision making both at personal and social levels. It has been argued that equal rights and opportunities for and between females and males are crucial to economic and human growth (Wharton, 2004; World Bank, 2002; Madan, 2012). Females constitute almost half of the population, which need to be groomed and skilled in such a way to enable them to provide meaningful contribution to household, society and nation. This is possible only when they are not discriminated in any ways. Though the progress has been made towards narrowing the gap between females and males in several policy areas but gender inequalities continue to exist in our society, as indicated by India’s position in Global Gender Gap Index 2015, wherein India positioned at 108th place among 145 countries (World Economic Forum, 2015).

In the current scenario, there is gradual realization that females and males play an overlapping variety of roles which complement one another. A change for one, inevitably, brings a change for the other. A balanced gender aware approach would be the best way to implement development programmes. As human beings our creator made us all equal and has buried immense potential and success achieving capabilities within us. We are given the choice to either draw strength from the difference among us or let them become barriers to the pursuit of our destiny. Over the years, unfortunately, it is the latter that has been more commonly placed in Indian society. Notwithstanding the ability and intelligence, a girl is trained in housekeeping activities presumably keeping in view her future role as a house wife (Srivastava, 1999).

Inequality of access to resources and to decision-making power between females and males results in lower contribution to development by females, who are half of the labour force. No society can exploit its full potential for development using capabilities of only half of its population. The United Nations (UN) identified this as a major reason for slow economic development of developing countries and emphasized on the member countries to identify the status of females in their respective countries to identify gender inequality along with economic and social inequalities and evolve strategies to remove them. Both males and females have a stake in building a more just society, where all people are equally valued for their contributions.

The efforts of civil society and the involvement of the international community have led to a number of initiatives in India to address the issue of gender equality which were later transformed into legislative framework. Key among them is the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), adopted in 1979 by the UN General Assembly. The convention defines discrimination as “any distinction, exclusion or restriction made on the basis of sex...in the political, economic, social, cultural, civil or any other field”. Lack of discrimination in this sense could be seen as equal status between genders (Mikkola, 2005). Indian constitution has empowered the states to adopt measures in favour of women to neutralize the disadvantages faced by them in socio-economic, education and political sphere of life. Articles 14ⁱⁱ, 15(i)ⁱⁱⁱ, 15(3)^{iv}, 16^v, 39(a)^{vi}, 39(d)^{vii}, 39(A)^{viii} and 42^{ix} of the Constitution are of specific importance to achieve the objective of gender equality in the society. The ‘Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act 2005’, an Act of the Parliament of India, is also enacted to protect women from domestic violence. The national policy for empowerment of women, 2001; commits itself to gender equality and to confront all manifestations of gender disparity, violence against females and all forms of discrimination against women. Despite legislative changes, constitutional provisions, efforts and more equitable policies, gender equality still continues to be a far reaching goal for India. In most parts of India, females virtually have no property rights and their opportunities are primarily male-dependent. Thus, they have limited opportunities to capitalize on their human capital and returns from investment in this capital are constrained by the social situation, whereas males do not have such social constraints (Tisdell and Regmi, 2005).

Concept of gender equality is not a new one, what is relatively new is the strenuous effort to revisit the perception and attitude of youth towards gender roles. Youth has the power to re-strengthen the society and the perception of youth towards gender roles, relationships and discrimination have a great role to play in building gender-neutral societies, if they themselves possess gender neutral perceptions. These perceptions further determine their marital relationship and attitude of future generation towards gender as parents influence their children's gender role attitudes (Thornton, Alwin & Camburn, 1983; Blee & Tickamyer, 1995; Cunningham, 2001; Davis & Pearce, 2007; Cunningham, 2008). The pigeon-holed consensus of youth allows any society to continue with patriarchy of son preference leading to gender discrimination whereas the dynamism in this concern leads towards engendered society. There have been studies on analysing various forms of gender discrimination being practiced in Haryana, but analysing youth perception towards these dimensions is quite new in this concern.

1.2 Research Questions and Objectives of the Study:-

Perception and attitude towards gender role is a complex and multifaceted concept. Gender roles are determined by the society and are learned and reproduced in any society. These roles are transmitted among generations within families and local communities. The belief that females and males should be treated equally or the rejection of gender as a differential marker for role assignment is considered egalitarian. Gender discrimination such as inequality in distribution of resources, division of household responsibilities, power of household decision making, perceived status of girl children and domestic violence etc is a common phenomenon in India, more specifically in Haryana. Under this framework, it is researchable to know the dimensions of gender discrimination. Hereby, it is quite important to explore do males and females have different perception about various forms? Over the past sixty years, India has undergone several changes and has witnessed development in several broad areas. Its' interesting to analyse whether perceptions towards gender roles has changes or is still patriarchal. In the light of stated research question the study proceeds with the undermentioned objectives:

- To underline various forms of gender discrimination persisting in Southern Haryana.

- To examines the attitude and perception of educated youth towards various forms of gender discrimination.
- To analyse gender differences with regard to various forms of gender discrimination.

These themes form gender beliefs, which in turn are significant components of the gender system of any society.

SECTION-2 Review of Literature:-

Until recently, it was assumed that development was gender-neutral, which implies that males and females could benefit equally from development, and the benefits of development interventions spread evenly across the society. This has now shown to be a myth. (Madan, 2012). Moreover, India's rank i.e. 108th among 145 countries in terms of Gender Gap Index, has confirmed that gender equality still continues to be a far reaching goal for India. Equal rights & opportunities towards access to resources, sharing of responsibilities and power of decision making by females and males are critical to the well-being of individuals and nation as a whole (United Nations, 1995a). Gender issues in general and gender discrimination in particular are matter of great concern for the country. The important aspect of social lives now-a-days is mostly confined to the gender issues in various social, economic, health, demographic and cultural aspects of life. The same can be observed from the declining ratio of females to males in the Indian population (Tisdell, 2002; Madan, 2012; Konar, 2001).

Despite many efforts of civil society, legislative changes and constitutional provisions to bring equality of opportunities and rights between females and males, rigid patriarchal gender norms remain pervasive across the world. The century old gender norms are so deep-rooted that people often accept and adopt them as practice and fail to recognise the need of re-shaping expectations and behaviour (Carroll, 2010). Rigid gender norms do not just limit people's identities and potential, they also set females and males apart, based on societal expectations of their working, behaviour and actions. This division gives rise to unequal hierarchies of power because of persistence of gender dominance. Gender norms are created by our culture, not by nature and can change over time (Pana and Lesta, 2012). Though gender issues occupy an important place in any nation, still government efforts in this line are not enough. Women constitute 48 percentage of the total population in India,

but the union budget shows only 4.9 percentage of public sector outlay flow to women (Kidwai, 2008).

Educated youth being regarded as most active, progressive, innovative nation builders can be considered important stakeholders in this concern. Being in early phase of life there gender perception and attitude is of great relevance. In this line, Tinklin, et al., 2005, in their article investigated the views of students' in the age group of 14 to 16 year on work, family roles and gender roles in Scotland in the year 2000. The article explored that the students, in general, considered good qualifications at school equally important for girl and boy students for career building, and child care is also considered as a joint responsibility of mother and father. Though they have shown their consensus towards gender equality, but in practice their viewpoints and attitude towards gender inequalities is influenced by their own families and surroundings. In spite of egalitarian attitude, they have shown their inclination towards gender-typical subjects at school and are ambitious for different types of occupation. The study brought out the idea that realism of equal opportunities is still far away even though changed attitudes towards gender equality in principles. Young people, in principle, agreed with equal opportunities regardless of gender, but still views of equality, very often, strengthened by the viewpoints, perceptions and attitude of their family members, neighbourhood and colloquies in the workplace.

Educated youth, despite the overall low performance of gender equality in broader terms, are expected to hold more liberal attitudes and beliefs towards gender equality and are supposed to have progressive view points on at least some aspects of gender issues. Young generation hold more gender equitable attitudes than others (Niner et al., 2013). There are numerous studies expounding the attitude and perceptions of youngsters' towards gender roles across the world (La Font, 2010). Gender equality demands for a change in the persistent cultural and social norms and youth in this concern are crucial stakeholders, being usually a progressive force for social change and transformation in society. In the era of globalization and internalization, youth, especially educated youth, is more exposed to democratic, technological and other modern concepts and therefore, are not supposed to be influenced much by age old prejudices leading to gender discrimination. The attitude and perception of youth towards son preference in distribution of resources, male dominance in household decisions making, subordinate

status of girl children, and domestic violence is of great relevance as gender roles and relations are primarily reproduced and negotiated within families and local communities. Educated youth is a most adaptable to new, innovative and progressive ideas and hereby, liberal attitude and perception of youth towards gender roles determine the level of gender equality for future generations in the broad domains of private and public life in communities (Niner, 2012). While gender equality has been broadly accepted, understandings are often superficial and families find difficult to implement these new concepts at the household level and in intimate family relations (Wigglesworth et. Al, 2015).

SECTION-3

3.1 Data Collection:-

The present study is based on a field survey of 135 educated youth of Southern Haryana in the age group of 18-29 years, including 66 males and 69 female graduates. For the purpose, a schedule consisting 28 statements focused on gender roles and relationship was designed. These statements reflected discriminated attitudes towards females and covered various aspects of gender discrimination e.g. son preference, subordinate status of girl children, preferences in provision of education, decision making at household level, attitude towards job opportunities and domestic violence. In order to analyse various dimensions of gender discrimination and the perception of educated youth towards gender roles leading to various forms of gender discrimination, five point Likert scale was used (1= strongly disagree and 5= strongly agree). These gender role attitude measuring statements/variables were all ordinal level. However, since they were combined into Likert scales, they were treated as interval level variables. The responses strongly disagree and disagree are considered egalitarian, whereas strongly agree and agree are considered traditional/patriarchal responses.

3.2 Tools and Techniques:-

To explore various dimensions of gender discrimination, exploratory factor model has been used and factors are extracted using principal components method (PCM). The method retain factors with large Eigen vales to represent a meaningful factor. The Eigen value associated with a variable indicate the substantial importance of that factor and represents the amount of variation by a factor. Eigen value, by Kaiser Criteria, consider only the components having Eigen value greater than one as it represents substantial amount of variation. In order to calculate the degree to which

variables/statements load on extracted factors, varimax method of orthogonal rotation has been used as it attempts to maximise the dispersion of loadings within factors. This method tries to load a smaller number of variables highly on each factor and rests in more

interpretable cluster of factors. In case of principal component method of factor extraction with no rotation, the eigenvectors may not align close to the data clusters and thus may not focus the actual positions as well. Relevant rotated component scores have been acquired by Anderson-Rubin method.

Exploratory Factor Model:

$$\begin{bmatrix} X_1 \\ X_2 \\ \vdots \\ X_j \\ \vdots \\ X_p \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mu_1 \\ \mu_2 \\ \vdots \\ \mu_j \\ \vdots \\ \mu_p \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_{11} & \lambda_{12} & \dots & \lambda_{1m} \\ \lambda_{21} & \lambda_{22} & \dots & \lambda_{2m} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \lambda_{j1} & \lambda_{j2} & \dots & \lambda_{jm} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \lambda_{p1} & \lambda_{p2} & \dots & \lambda_{pm} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} F_1 \\ F_2 \\ \vdots \\ F_k \\ \vdots \\ F_M \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \delta_1 \\ \delta_2 \\ \vdots \\ \delta_F \\ \vdots \\ \delta_P \end{bmatrix}$$

Here; $X = \mu + \lambda F + \delta$

$X - \mu = \lambda F + \delta$ -----Exploratory Factor Model (1)

Herein; $X - \mu$ = Mean subtracted original model; λ = Factor Loading Matrix; F = Function of the factor; δ = Error

This model is handled with several undermentioned assumptions as $X - \mu$ is taken.

- E (X) = μ
- E (F) = 0
- E (δ) = 0
- Cov (F δ) = 0
- Cov (F) = E (FF^T) = I

Sampling adequacy is an important cause of concern in factor exploratory factor analysis. In this concern, Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure and Bartlett’s Test is applied to measure the sampling adequacy and the level of significance of factor analysis to be used. The KMO is calculated for individual and multiple variables and represents the ratio of the squared correlation between variables to the squared partial correlation between variables (Kaiser, 1970). Bertlette’s test identifies whether correlation matrix of variables/statements is significantly different from an identity matrix. The significance of this test means that the correlation between variables are significantly different from zero. Reliability of scale is measured using Cronbach’s Alpha (), a measure of convergence validity among various factors within a group. Mean factor score has also been calculated to underline the perception of youth towards various discriminatory practices being followed in Southern Haryana. Hereby, the mean score less than 2.8 is considered to denote egalitarian attitude whereas the mean score greater than 3.2 is considered to denote patriarchal attitude. The mean score in

between 2.8 to 3.2 is considered to denote neutral attitude.

In an attempt to analyse gender differences towards various dimensions of gender discrimination, it is important to examine if females and males differ in their attitude and perceptions towards various dimensions/forms of gender discrimination. For the purpose, independent t-test was conducted to compare the mean scores of all factors, extracted using principal component method. A level of 0.05 is established a priori for determining statistical significance. The data has been analyzed via SPSS 18.0 for Windows.

**SECTION-4
Results and Discussion:-**

A 28-item scale was designed to extract factors indicating various forms of gender discrimination. Inspection of the correlation matrix revealed the presence of many coefficients of 0.3 and above. Principal component method is conducted on 28 variables with varimax rotation. The Kaiser-Meyer- Olkin (KMO) measure, shown in table-1, verified the sampling



adequacy for the analysis, KMO = .924, is marvellous, exceeding the recommend value of 0.6. Bertlett's test is also significant ($p < .001$) indicating correlation matrix of variable is significantly different from identity matrix and

hereby is supporting the factorability of the correlation matrix. The KMO values for individual variables, as observed from anti-image correlation matrix are greater than .65, which is well above the acceptable limit of 0.5 (Fields, 2013).

Table-1: KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.924
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	3.052E3
	df	378
	Sig.	.000

An initial analysis was run to obtain eigenvalues for each factor in the data (Table-2). It is clear from table-2 that before extraction, 28 factors have been identified within the data set. The eigenvalues associated with each factor represent the variance explained by that particular factor and displays the

eigenvalues in terms of the percentage of variance explained. The first few factors explains relatively large amounts of variance, whereas subsequent factors explains only small amounts of variance. Four factors have eigenvalues over Kaiser's criterion of one and in combination explained 68 percent of the variance.

Table-2: Total Variance Explained by Factors Extracted by Factors

Factor	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	13.668	48.815	48.815	13.668	48.815	48.815	8.215	29.339	29.339
2	3.016	10.770	59.585	3.016	10.770	59.585	3.996	14.271	43.610
3	1.269	4.532	64.116	1.269	4.532	64.116	3.780	13.501	57.110
4	1.090	3.893	68.009	1.090	3.893	68.009	3.052	10.899	68.009
5	.857	3.061	71.070						
6	.766	2.735	73.805						
7	.711	2.539	76.344						
8	.651	2.323	78.667						
9	.642	2.292	80.960						
10	.551	1.967	82.927						
11	.518	1.849	84.777						
12	.502	1.792	86.569						
13	.459	1.640	88.209						
14	.385	1.373	89.582						
15	.365	1.303	90.885						
16	.340	1.215	92.100						
17	.319	1.139	93.239						
18	.263	.938	94.177						
19	.253	.905	95.082						
20	.239	.853	95.935						
21	.219	.782	96.718						
22	.182	.649	97.367						
23	.163	.582	97.948						
24	.152	.542	98.490						
25	.137	.488	98.978						
26	.119	.424	99.402						
27	.088	.314	99.716						
28	.080	.284	100.000						

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

The eigenvalues associated with these factors are again displayed in the column labelled Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings. In the final part of the table, eigenvalues of the factors after rotation are again displayed in the column labelled Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings. It is clear from the table that the rotation has the effect of optimising the factor structure and the display of relative importance of factors has also been equalised a bit. Before rotation, factor 1 accounted for considerably more variance than the remaining three i.e. the first factor accounted for 48.81 % variance whereas 10.77 %, 4.53 % and 3.89 % of variance is explained by factor 2, factor 3 and factor 4. After rotation, factor 1 accounted for 29.33 % of total variance, factor 2 accounted for 14.27 %, factor 3 accounted for 13.50 % and factor 4 accounted for 10.40 % of total variance.

Table-3 shows factors extracted using varimax rotation method, with Kaiser Normalization. An observation of factor loading after rotation makes it clear that the variables that cluster on the same category make one factor. Herein, factor 1 represents son preference in distribution of resources and opportunities, factor 2 represents male dominance in household decision making, factor 3 represents subordinate status of girl children and factor 4 represents domestic violence. The value of Cronbach's Alpha is greater than 0.80 for all the factors, indicating the convergence validity of factors. Thus, four categories named son preference in distribution of resources (Cronbach's Alpha= .954), maledominance in household decision making

(Cronbach's Alpha= .914), subordinate status of girl children (Cronbach's Alpha= .911), and domestic violence (Cronbach's Alpha= .809) are categorised appropriately in understanding the attitude and perception of youth towards various forms of gender discrimination. It denotes the high reliability of obtained factors and also indicates appropriate grouping of variables in each category of factors.

So far as the question of attitude and perception of youth towards various dimensions/forms is concerned, it can be concluded that youth see their roles and obligations through the patriarchal lens. In case of first dimension of gender discrimination i.e. son preference in the distribution of resources is concerned, the study highlights that the youth is in favour of their attitude towards providing equal educational opportunities but when the question of job/earning comes they think that getting good job is more important for boys than girls. This shows that females' prime role is considered to take care of household chores and children, whereas males are supposed to be the prime breadwinner for the family. Son is also considered essential for a family even when it is denied that only sons can take care of their parents in their old age. This shows that son preference is only due to century old customs and traditions wherein son is considered essential to carry forward the family name. The overall mean score of variables of this dimension is 2.92 indicating that youth have still conservative perception as they have not shown their clear consensus towards equality in allocation of resources.

Table-3: Various Dimensions of Gender Discrimination and Perception of Youth

Rotated Component Matrix ^a									
	Component				Cronbach's Alpha (α)	Mean of variable	Overall Mean of Scale/Factor	Mean of Scale/Factor (Male)	Mean of Scale/Factor (Female)
	1	2	3	4					
1. Son Preference in Distribution of Resources and Opportunities									
When a family has limited resources, girls may not be sent to join courses wherein educational expenses are high	.761					2.54			
When a family has limited resources, education need to be given to male children only	.740					2.46			
Woman's main duty is to take care of her family	.700					2.82			
University education in more important for a boy	.693					2.60			
Getting good job are more important for males than for females	.692					3.38			
Men are better political leaders/ political leaders	.689					3.10			
For males job is a necessity, while for women it's a matter of choice	.686					3.16			
Men should be the prime decision maker in a family	.678				.954	2.79	2.92	2.62	3.21
Men are better business executives than women	.674					3.08			
Dowry is a financial cost to parents of having daughters	.667					3.02			
Only sons can take care of their parents in their old age	.653					2.46			
After marriage girls are not in the position to provide any financial support to their parents, even if they are earning	.651					2.98			
Son is essential to carry forward the family name	.644					3.31			
Son preference is due to small family norm	.611					3.12			
A girl should not have any claims on parental land and property	.605					3.02			
2. Male Dominance in Household Decision Making									
Men should be the prime breadwinner (earner) in a family		.782				3.01			
Women should not take financial decisions of the household		.767				3.11			
If a wife has more income than a husband, in most cases there are problems in a relationship		.757			.914	2.91	3.02	2.67	3.35
Women do not act better as head of the household		.746				3.05			
3. Subordinate Status of Girl Children									
Daughters are less preferred child as they have to leave after marriage			.811			2.97			
Daughters are less preferred child keeping in concern their safety and security issues			.785		.911	2.86	2.98	2.74	3.19
When the first child is girl, one should go for testing the gender of child and sex-selective abortion to ensure that the second child is a boy child			.768			3.03			
Son preference is due to social customs and traditions			.510			3.05			
4. Domestic Violence									
Wife beating is justified if she does not take care of household responsibilities carefully			.878			1.94			
Wife beating is justified if she argues with him			.838			1.99			
Wife beating is justified if she goes out without telling her husband			.805		.809	2.01	1.98	2.02	1.95
Wife beating is justified if she has extra marital relation with someone else			.725			2.08			
Wife beating is justified in any case			.592			1.91			

The mean score of second and third dimension/ factor i.e. male dominance in household decision making and subordinate status of girl children is found to be 3.02 and 2.98 respectively, indicating that they are neither disagree nor agree from the statements. Overall, the

findings obtained from the study show that mostly young people support the traditional view points on son preference, distribution of resources and division of household responsibilities, wherein males are prime decision-makers and breadwinners and females are

supposed to take care of household chores as their prime work.

This undermines females' status and confine them within the limited private domain. In case of fourth dimension i.e. domestic violence, there is a strong evidence indicating its non-tolerance, which is a good symptom of social health of any society. Mean factor score of domestic violence i.e. 1.98 reveals disagreement towards domestic violence in any case.

It's a matter of concern to analyse do males' and females' differ in their perception towards various forms/dimensions of gender discrimination. It's useful to analyse the differences in youth perception towards various forms/factors of gender discrimination by gender. Levene's test statistic (F) shown in table-4, confirms the Equality of group Variances at 0.05 significance level for all four dimensions/factors. For Factor 1, $F=.287, p=.593$; for factor 2, $F=.053, p=.819$; in case of factor 3, $F=1.012, p=.316$; for factor 4, $F=.029, p=.866$ make us to conclude that there is insufficient evidence to claim that the variances are not equal. Having established the assumption of homogeneity of variance is met, we can look at t-test itself. Last two columns of

Table-3, from left, shows the mean score (M) of all four factors by gender. T-statistic¹ is shown in table-4 along with its significance level. In case of factor 1, factor 2 and factor 3, females have more conservative and patriarchal attitude and males have egalitarian perception, towards various gender dimensions, as indicated by their mean scores. For factor 1 (M= 2.62 for males and M= 3.21 for females), the difference in mean score $-.589, CI (-.904, -.274)$ is significant, $p=.001$. For factor 2 (M= 2.67 for males and M= 3.35 for females), the difference in mean score $-.677, CI (-1.014, -.339)$ is again significant, $p=.001$. For factor 3 (M= 2.74 for males and M= 3.19 for females), the difference in mean score $-.453, CI (-.845, -.060)$ is also significant, $p=.001$ at 1 % levels of significance. The difference in the mean score of factor 4 is not found to be significant (M= 2.02 for males and M= 1.95 for females), the difference in mean score $-.067, CI (-.136, -.271)$ is not significant $p=.514$, at 5 % levels of significance. This indicates that males and females possess similar attitude and perception towards factor 4 i.e. gender violence. Moreover, the low values on the scale indicates non tolerance of domestic violence among youth in any case.

Table-4: Mean Difference in Perception of Male and Female Youth towards various Dimensions of Gender Discrimination

Extracted Factors	Assumption regarding Equality of Variances	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Factor 1 (son preference in distribution of resources)	Equal variances assumed	.287	.593	-3.702	133	.000	-.589	.159	-.904	-.274
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.702	132.6	.000	-.589	.159	-.904	-.274
Mean Score of Factor 2 (male dominance in household decision making)	Equal variances assumed	.053	.819	-3.966	133	.000	-.677	.170	-1.014	-.339
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.966	132.7	.000	-.677	.170	-1.014	-.339
Mean Score of Factor 3 (subordinate status of girl children)	Equal variances assumed	1.012	.316	-2.284	133	.024	-.453	.198	-.845	-.060
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.286	132.9	.024	-.453	.198	-.845	-.061
Mean Score of Factor 4 (Domestic Violence)	Equal variances assumed	.029	.866	.654	133	.514	.067	.103	-.136	.272
	Equal variances not assumed			.655	132.9	.514	.067	.103	-.136	.271

The important point here to highlight is that, though the overall perception of youth have not shown any clear consensus towards three out of four dimensions of gender discrimination as shown by their mean score which happens to be in between 2.80 to 3.20 (table-3). The result of t-test shown in table-4, have shown a clear egalitarian perception of males as the mean score of male youth is observed to be less than 2.80 for all three dimensions showing their egalitarian perception, whereas for females it is more than 3.20 indicating their patriarchal perception.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS:-

So far as present study is concerned, it can be underlined that, the patriarchal society is not ready to consider females on the same platform, where the males are. In general, evidence from this research shows that male youth possess more egalitarian attitude towards equal status for their female peers than females themselves. However, patriarchal and hierarchical social structures has a great role to play in determining gendered roles and relationships in various walks of life. While young males do accept the rights of females to equal educational and work opportunities, but at the same time females are expected to perform domestic responsibilities and provide care within the household. Females are also expected to defer decision making to the male head/member of the family. However, acceptance of patriarchal gender roles by females has been observed in the study, that is prominent than their male counterparts. Hereby, there is an urgent requirement to create awareness among youth about various forms of gender discrimination being practised within the household and communities without realising the same. Young people, in this concern, are not expected to scarify their lives to fight against gender discrimination of any kind, but they should be aware of the issues relating to gender discrimination in their families/communities and should be capable to act as mini-educators and mini-activists in the defence of human rights. They should learn how to assist in the defence of gender equality – even when the issues do not appear to touch them personally. Hereby, there is a need to improve knowledge and understanding of people about the nature of gender-based discrimination of any kind, violence and its root causes in the enforcement of gender norms and gender inequality. People, especially females, should recognise their rights. They should also be taught to protect and value their rights.

REFERENCES

1. Blee, K. & Tickamyer, A. (1995). *Racial Differences in Men's Attitudes About Women's Gender Roles*, *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 57: 21-30.
2. Butler, J. (1990). *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, New York, Routledge.
3. Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) (1995): *Setting the Stage for the Next Century: The Federal Plan for Gender Equality, Status of Women in Canada*.
4. Carroll, J. L. (2010). *Sexuality Now: Embracing Diversity. Third Edition*, Pacific Grove, Wadsworth – Cengage Learning Publishers, CA.
5. Cunningham, M. (2001). *The Influence of Parental Attitudes and Behaviors on Children's Attitudes Toward Gender and Household Labour in Early Adulthood*, *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 63, 111-122.
6. Cunningham, M. (2008). *Changing Attitudes toward the Male Bread winner, Female Homemaker Family Model: Influences of Women's Employment and Education over the Life Course*, *Social Forces*, 87, 299-317.
7. Davis, S. and Pearce, L. (2007). *Adolescents' Work-Family Gender Ideologies and Educational Expectations*, *Sociological Perspectives*, 50, 249-271.
8. Field, A. (2014). *Discovering Statistics Using IBM SPSS Statistics, Fourth Edition*, Washington DC, Sage Publications, New Delhi.
9. Guilmoto, C. (2012). *Skewed Sex Ratios at Birth and Future Marriage Squeeze in China and India, 2005–2100*, *Demography*, 49 (1): 77–100.
10. Jiang Q., Shuzhuo Li and Marcus W. Feldman (2011). *Demographic Consequences of Gender Discrimination in China: Simulation Analysis of Policy Options*, *Population Research and Policy Review*, 30 (4): 619–38.
11. Kaiser, H.F. (1970). *A Second Generation Little Jiffy*; *Psychometrika*, 35, 401-415
12. Kidwai A.R. (2008). *Governor of Haryana. Draft Speech Delivered on the Occasion of a Meeting of the Committee of Governors in the Intellectual Room, Rashtrapati Bhawan, New Delhi on 30-10-2008*.
13. Kishor, S. and Gupta, K. (2004). *Women Empowerment in India in Demographic Change, Health Inequality and Human Development in India*, *Centre for Economic and Social Studies*; Edited by S. Irudaya Rajan, K.S. James, Beggumper, Hyderabad, India, pp. 288-339.
14. Konar, D.N. (2001): *Census 2001 and Sex Ratios in India with Special Reference to West Bengal*, *Artha Beekshan, Journal of the Bengal Economics Association*, 10 (2):23-41.
15. LaFont, S. (2010). *Beliefs and Attitudes toward Gender, Sexuality, and Traditions amongst Namibian Youth*, Available at <http://www.lac.org.na/projects/grap/Pdf/mono5beliefs.pdf> Accessed on 15.09.15
16. Lakshmana, M. (1999): *Population Policy in India: Gender Implications*; in *Gender and Society in India, Theme Papers and Urban Studies*, Edited by R. Indira, Deepak Kumar Behera; Manak Publications Pvt. Ltd.
17. Madan, S. (2012). *Economic Development and Status of Women in India: The Case of Haryana*, New Delhi, Serial Publication.

18. Madan, S. (2012). *The Socio-economic Determinants of Sex Ratio in India – an Empirical Perspective*, *Demografie*, 54 (4): 434-446.
19. Mikkola, A. (2005). *Role of Gender Equality in Development – A Literature Review; Discussion Paper, No. 84*, Helsinki Center of Economic Research, 32.
20. Niner, S., Wigglesworth, A., Santos, A.B. and Tilman, M. (2013). *Baseline Study on Attitudes and Perceptions of Gender and Masculinities of Youth in Timor Leste*, Paz y Desarrollo (PyD), Fatuhada, Dom Aleixo, Dili, East Timor. Available at <http://profiles.arts.monash.edu.au/sara-niner/files/2012/03/2013-Paz-y-Desarrollo-Draft-Report-.pdf>. Accessed on 10-07-2016.
21. Niner, S. (2012). *Barlake: An Exploration of Marriage Practices and Issues of Women's Status in Timor-Leste, Local-Global: Identity, Security, Community, Globalism Research Centre, RMIT, Melbourne*, pp. 138-153.
22. Pana, A. and Lesta, S. (2012). *Youth 4 Youth-A Manual for Empowering Young People in Preventing Gender Based Violence Through Peer Education*, Mediterranean Institute of Gender Studies, Daphne III Programme, European Commission.
23. Ramana P.V.L. and Rao K. Ranga (1999): *Changing Forms of Gender Discrimination and Oppression: A Study of Women in a Slum in Gender and Society in India*, Theme Papers and Urban Studies edited by R. Indira, Deepak Kumar Behera; Manak Publications Pvt. Ltd., Vol. 1.
24. Scott, J. (1986). *Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis*, *The American Review*, 91 (5): 1053- 1075.
25. Srivastava, O.P. (1999). *Women, Law and Society in Social Justice and Women in India*, Swaraj Prakashan, New Delhi, pp. 83-84.
26. Thornton, A., Alwin, D. and Camburn, D. (1983). *Causes and Consequences of Gender-Role Attitudes and Attitude Change*, *American Sociological Review*, 48, 211-227.
27. Tinklin, T., Croxford, L., Ducklin, A. and Frame, B. (2005). *Gender and Attitudes to Work and Family Roles: The Views of Young People at the Millennium*, *Gender and Education*, 17 (2), 129-142.
28. Tisdell, C.A., (2002). *Poverty and Economically-Deprived Women and Children Theories- Emerging Policy Issues and Development*, *International Journal of Social Economics*, 29 (½), 73-86.
29. Tisdell, C.A., Regmi, G. (2005). *Prejudice against Female Children; Economic and Cultural Explanations and Indian Evidence*, *International Journal of Social Economics*, 32 (6), 545.
30. UNDP (1995). *Human Development Report*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
31. United Nations (1995a). *Report of the Fourth World Conference on Women, Beijing, 4-15 September 1995 (A/CONF.177/20)*, Sales No. E.96.IV.13, Paragraph 15, New York: United Nations.
32. Wharton, A.S. (2004). *Gender Inequality*. In: G.Ritzer, ed. *Handbook of Social problems*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 156-17
33. Wigglesworth, A., Niner, S., Arunachalam, D., Dos, S., Abel B. and Tilman, M. (2015). *Attitudes and Perceptions of Young Men towards Gender Equality and Violence in Timor-Leste*, *Journal of International Women's Studies*, 16(2), pp. 312-329. Available at: <http://vc.bridgew.edu/jiws/vol16/iss2/20> accessed on 23-06-2016.
34. World Bank (2002). *Main report*. Washington DC; World Bank. Available at <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/2002/01/2017572/world-bank-annual-report-2002-vol-1-2-main-report> accessed on 15-06-2008.
35. World Economic Forum (2015). *Global Gender Gap Report*, Geneva, Switzerland: World Economic Forum, Switzerland.

End Notes

ⁱ Gender equality refers to equal opportunities in terms of access to sources of live hood, health, education as well as to social, economic and political participation without any discrimination, especially on the basis of gender (UNDP, 1997). It requires females and males to have equal conditions for realizing their full human rights and potential to contribute to national, political, economic, social and cultural development and also share benefits equally from the results (CIDA, 1995).

ⁱⁱ Equality before law for women (Article 14)

ⁱⁱⁱ The State not to discriminate against any citizen on grounds only of religion, race, caste, sex, place of birth or any of them (Article 15 (i))

^{iv} The State to make any special provision in favour of women and children (Article 15 (3))

^v Equality of opportunity for all citizens in matters relating to employment or appointment to any office under the State (Article 16)

^{vi} The State to direct its policy towards securing for men and women equally the right to an adequate means of livelihood (Article 39(a))

^{vii} Equal pay for equal work for both men and women (Article 39(d))

^{viii} To promote justice, on a basis of equal opportunity and to provide free legal aid by suitable legislation or scheme or in any other way to ensure that opportunities for securing justice are not denied to any citizen by reason of economic or other disabilities (Article 39 A)

^{ix} The State to make provision for securing just and humane conditions of work and for maternity relief (Article 42)

¹ t-statistic is calculated by dividing the mean difference by the standard error of the sampling distribution of differences.