

موضوعات باللغة العربية

- الضغوط النفسية لدى أمهات الأطفال ذوي اضطراب التوحد وأساليب مواجهتها.
أ. موزة سيف الدرهمي - مركز الفجيرة لرعاية وتأهيل أصحاب الهمم - الإمارات العربية المتحدة
أ. مريم راشد اليماني - مركز الفجيرة لرعاية وتأهيل أصحاب الهمم - الإمارات العربية المتحدة
- التحليل المكاني لمواقع مراكز الإسعاف على الطرق السريعة بمنطقة القصيم.
أ. نوره فيحان تركي الفيداني الحربي - جامعة القصيم - المملكة العربية السعودية
أ.د. محمد بن إبراهيم الدغيري - جامعة القصيم - المملكة العربية السعودية
- القيادة التشاركية لدى قيادات مراكز التربية الخاصة في ضوء متطلبات قيادة التغيير.
د. مها عثمان الزامل - جامعة الأميرة نورة بنت عبد الرحمن - المملكة العربية السعودية
أ. روان مساعد العواد - جامعة الأميرة نورة بنت عبد الرحمن - المملكة العربية السعودية
- الصعوبات التي تواجه القائمين برعاية مريض الزهايمر في المجتمع السعودي - دراسة ميدانية في مدينة جدة.
د. مها محمد نهشل - جامعة الملك عبدالعزيز - المملكة العربية السعودية
- دور أعضاء هيئة التدريس بجامعة شقراء في تنمية الشخصية الوطنية السعودية لدى طلابهم وفقاً لرؤية المملكة العربية السعودية 2030.
د. أثير إبراهيم أبو عباة - جامعة شقراء - المملكة العربية السعودية
- المسؤولية الاجتماعية للشركات الخاصة في ظل جائحة كورونا بمصر دراسة حالة لشركتي «سيراميكا كليوباترا» - «النساجون الشرقيون».
د. حنان أمين إسماعيل - جامعة الأزهر - مصر
- التصورات الاجتماعية المستقبلية لدى طلبة جامعة السلطان قابوس نحو التعليم والعمل.
د. مليكة بنت المرادس البوسعيدية وآخرون - (جمعية الاجتماعيين العمانية)

موضوعات باللغة الإنجليزية

- التنشئة الاجتماعية الفلسطينية: بين عدم المساواة بين الجنسين والمظاهر التمييزية.
د. بسام يوسف بنات - جامعة القدس
- جواد دية - جامعة غرناطة
- فرانيسكو انترينا دوران - جامعة غرناطة



جمعية الاجتماعيين
Sociological Association

مجلة فصلية علمية محكمة تعنى بالعلوم الإنسانية والاجتماعية
تصدر عن جمعية الاجتماعيين
الشارقة، الإمارات العربية المتحدة ص.ب: ٣٧٤٥
هاتف: +٩٧١٦-٥٥٦٧٧٢٢ - E-mail: social@emirates.net.ae
www.sociological-uae.org.ae
ISSN 1025-059X

English Section

- Palestinian Socialization: Between Gender Inequality and Discriminatory Practices.
Dr. Bassam Youssef Banat - Al-Quds University
Dr. Jawad Dayyeh - The University of Granada
Dr. Francisco Entrena-Durán - The University of Granada

Arabic Section

- Psychological stress among mothers of Autism disorder children and methods to cope with.
Moza Saif Khamis Nasir Aldarmaki - Fujairah Center for Care and Rehabilitation of the Disabled - UAE
Maryam Rashed Salem Alyamahi - Fujairah Center for Care and Rehabilitation of the Disabled - UAE
- Spatial Analysis of the Locations of Ambulance Centers on the Highways in Al Qassim Region.
Norah Faihan Al-Harbi - Qassim University - KSA
Prof. Mohammad Ibrahim Aldagheir - Qassim University - KSA
- Participatory leadership for leaders of special education centers
In light of the requirements of leadership of change.
Dr. Maha Othman AL-zamil - Princess Nourah bint Abdul Rahman University - KSA
Rwan Musaed ALawad - Princess Nourah bint Abdul Rahman University - KSA
- Difficulties facing by caregivers of Alzheimer's patients in Saudi society:
A field study in Jeddah City.
Dr. Maha Mohammed Ahmed Nahshal - King Abdulaziz University - KSA
- The role of the Teaching Staff at Shaqra University
in Developing the Saudi national character among their students
according to the Vision of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia 2030.
Dr. Atheer Ibrahim Abuabat - Shaqra University - KSA
- Corporate Social Responsibility in the Context of the Corona Pandemic in Egypt
Case Study of Some Egyptian Private Companies (Ceramica Cleopatra - Oriental Weavers).
Dr. Hanan Amin Ismail - Al-Azhar University - Egypt
- Social Perceptions of Sultan Qaboos University Student
towards Future Of Education And Work.
PhD. Malika Almuradas ahmed Albusaidi, and others - Omani socials association - Sultanate of Oman



جمعية الاجتماعيين
Sociological Association

A Refereed Quarterly Journal Published
by the Sociological Association of the UAE
P.O.Box: 3745 Sharjah | Phone: +9716-5567722
E-mail: social@emirates.net.ae
www.sociological-uae.org.ae
ISSN 1025-059X

The Sociological Association of the UAE

The Sociological Association of the UAE was established in 1981 for the public benefit.

Member of The International Sociological Association /ISA

Member of The Gulf Sociological Association

Its Goals And Purposes Are:

- to provide a representative body for professionals in the social sciences;
- to better serve the needs of society by increasing and maintaining standards of excellence for professionals in the social sciences;
- to disseminate culture and promote social awareness among all classes of society, in conjunction with other public and benevolent institutions, in order to achieve the highest level of social harmony and cohesiveness;
- to promote scholarly research that will help identify factors and problems that inhibit the appropriate development of society, and that will help design and select the best policies for dealing with such factors and problems;
- to offer support to individuals and groups who are unable to fully take advantage of governmental services, or who have special needs, such as the handicapped, the aged, minors, orphans, and any children without parents to care for them;
- to promote the exchange of information with other Arab and international Associations that specialize in the social sciences by all conventional means, such as the organization of seminars and study groups, sponsorship of local conferences, sponsorship of attendance by members at conferences of other Associations, and the publication of books and scholarly journals;
- to improve the conditions of employment for professionals in the social sciences, and to offer financial, social, and cultural services to members of the Association.

جمعية الاجتماعيين

منبر اجتماعي ثقافي وطني، جمعية ذات نفع عام اشتهرت بالقرار الوزاري رقم 2/76 لسنة 1981 وبدأت نشاطها في 1981/11/19

عضو الجمعية الدولية لعلم الاجتماع

عضو الجمعية الخليجية للاجتماعيين

تهدف إلى :

- رعاية مصالح العاملين في الميدان الاجتماعي.
- العمل على رفع المستوى المهني للعاملين في المجال الاجتماعي بشتى الوسائل والأساليب والعمل على تطوير المهن الاجتماعية لخدمة الأهداف الاجتماعية للمجتمع.
- نشر التوعية والثقافة الاجتماعية بين جميع فئات المجتمع بشتى الوسائل المتاحة بغرض تحقيق أفضل قدر من التماسك والاستقرار والتكامل الاجتماعي بالتعاون مع الهيئات الرسمية والتطوعية الأخرى.
- العناية بإجراء البحوث والدراسات بهدف تحديد حجم المشكلات والظواهر الاجتماعية التي قد تعوق سبل التطور الاجتماعي لمجتمعنا وتبني السياسات التي تعنى في التغلب عليها واقتراح الوسائل والحلول المناسبة لها.
- الإسهام في تقديم وجوه الرعاية الاجتماعية للأفراد والجماعات الذين لا تسمح لهم ظروفهم بالاستفادة الكاملة من الخدمات الحكومية أو الذين يحتاجون إلى رعاية أعلى مستوى أو أكثر تخصصاً كالمعاقين والمسنين والأحداث والأيتام ومجهولي الأبوين.
- تقديم الخدمات المالية والاجتماعية والثقافية للأعضاء.
- تبادل المعلومات والخبرات المهنية مع الجمعيات المتشابهة الدولية والعربية والجمعيات المختصة في المجالات الاجتماعية بشتى الوسائل والسبل ومنها إقامة المؤتمرات المحلية وحضور المؤتمرات العربية والدولية وإصدار الكتب والمجلات وغير ذلك بإقامة الندوات والحلقات الدراسية.

Palestinian Socialization: Between Gender Inequality and Discriminatory Practices

Dr. Bassam Yousef Ibrahim Banat •

Dr. Jawad Dayyeh • •

Dr. Francisco Entrena-Durán • • •

DOI: 10.12816/0057777

11

Abstract

The current study addressed the socialization process in the Palestinian family which remains unclear. Family discriminatory practices as experienced by sons and daughters was evaluated using an index of a 27-item scale, developed by the researchers, and was administrated to three hundred eighty-four youth in the West Bank, Palestine stratifiedly selected. Findings demonstrated that Palestinian family imposes moderate discriminatory practices among their sons and daughters during the socialization process; and females experienced more gender discriminatory practices within their households than males in a patriarchal society. Current statistics revealed that parents' educational level, number of household members, and poverty contributed to their discriminatory practices among their sons and daughters.

-
- Associate Professor, PHD. Sociology (Statistical Methods and Research Techniques) Al-Quds University.
 - • Postdoctoral Researcher, Assistant Professor, PHD. Social Sciences (Migration and Refugees) The University of Granada.
 - • • Professor, PHD. Sociology (Theory and Social Change) The University of Granada.
-

Keywords: Socialization, gender inequality, discriminatory practices, patriarchal society.

1. Introduction

Socialization is a global construct in social sciences, refers to a continuing process whereby an individual acquires a personal identity and learns the norms, values, behavior, and social skills appropriate to his or her social position.

The socialization process begins at birth; families usually treat newborns differently according to their sex (Messner, 2000; Carter, 2014). Historically, the supposed fundamental differences between sexes have been used as an argument against equal rights, notably in the opposition to women's suffrage. In this regards, the United Nation's Human Development Report (1997) concluded that no society treats its women as well as its men.

Gender inequality and discrimination is one of the great challenges of modern history; it has always been experienced by all cultures and societies worldwide. The latest Human Development Report (2014) concluded that gender inequality remains a major barrier to human development; although girls and women have made major strides since 1990, but they have not yet gained gender equity.

2. Background and Literature Review

Sociologists and other social scientists generally attribute many of the behavioral differences between genders to socialization. Socialization is the process of transferring norms, values, laws, beliefs, and behaviors to group members (Beal, 1994; Crespi, 2003).

The individual and society are mutually dependent on socialization essential for the renewal of culture and the perpetuation of society (Hughes & Kroehler, 2002). The most intense period of socialization is during childhood; and it obviously occurs through the cooperation with various agents during an individual's personal lifetime. The family is the primary source of socialization, in addition to the peer group, the school and the mass media. The family provides the child with his/her first social contact with the social world through informal manners; which can affect the formation of ethical behaviors; later in life, peers and schools become important agents of socialization (Bell, 2008; Crespi, 2003).

Gender is included in this process; individuals are taught how to socially behave in accordance with their assigned gender, which is assigned at birth based on their biological sex (for instance, male babies are given the gender of boy, while female babies are given the gender of girl). According to Crespi (2003) the way we are, behave and think is the final product of socialization; and through socialization we also learn what is appropriate and improper for both genders.

Gender is a social construct which asserts that the expectations, capabilities and responsibilities of men and women are not always biologically determined. The gender roles assigned to men and women are significantly defined - structurally and culturally - in ways which create, reinforce, and perpetuate relationships of male dominance and female subordination. Through the process of socialization within the family, in educational institutions and other social spheres, boys and girls are conditioned to behave in certain ways and to play different roles in society. They are encouraged to conform to established cultural norms by being rewarded or punished for their behavior (Njogu & Orchardson-Mazrui, 2008).

Gender socialization is thus the process of educating and instructing males and females as to the norms, behaviors, values, and beliefs of group membership. Gender socialization is a more focused form of socialisation; it is how children of different sexes are socialized into their gender roles and taught what it means to be male or female as dictated by societal beliefs, values, attitudes and expectations (Condry & Condry, 1976; Giddens, 1993).

According to UNICEF (2007) early gender socialization is one of the most pertinent issues in early childhood, affecting both boys and girls. Yet, gender socialisation begins even before the birth of the child; from the simple question people usually ask is it a boy or a girl? This is the beginning of a social categorization process that continues throughout life (Gleitman et al., 2000).

Today, it is largely believed that most gender differences are attributed to differences in socialization, rather than genetic and biological factors. The Social Learning Theory study gender socialization and asserts that people learn through observation, imitation, and modeling (Bandura, 1979). Besides, sociologists explain through gender socialization why human males and females behave in different ways: they learn different

social roles. For example, girls learn to do different household chores than boys; girls learn to bake and clean, and boys learn to mow lawns and take out garbage (UNICEF, 2007).

Gender socialization is one of the factors responsible for the reinforcement of gender inequality since childhood. The society continues to transmit the traditional gender roles to the individual through the various agencies of socialization. The different institutions of socialization play an integral part in shaping the adulthood of an individual. Since childhood, women learn to be submissive and men authoritarian (Essays UK, 2013). In this regards, the United Nations Report (2003) indicated that gender stereotypes can be a result of gender socialization. Girls and boys are expected to act in certain ways, and these ways are socialized from birth by many parents and society.

Indicators of gender inequality seek to go beyond description worldwide, within the family, labor market, politico-judicial structures and in cultural-ideological productions. According to Johnsson-Latham (2004) inequality and discrimination may occur in legislation that denies women a right to own and inherit land; in law enforcement that does not guarantee women's constitutional rights and does not bring to justice and punish men who commit violence against women; in norms that exclude women from decision-making forms, that define men as the principal actors and breadwinners and deny women reproductive rights; in budget appropriations and other distribution of resources (personnel, training, research, and epistemology) that disregard/discriminate against activities and social sectors where women predominate; and in dialogues, partnerships and agenda setting in which men primarily take part and men's interests are equated with the interests of everyone.

Furthermore, listed as The International Declaration on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (1993: 7); The United Nations Fourth World Conference on Women, held in Beijing (1995); and The General Assembly (2003: 58/142) is well recognized as a critical tools for advancing gender equality. Nonetheless, the obstacles to achieving this goal are daunting, given that gender inequality has been prevalent in all societies and continue to exist even today.

Recent statistics show just how far societies are from achieving gender equality. According to Human Development Report (2014) gender inequality remains a major barrier to human development; the

disadvantages facing women and girls are a major source of inequality; since women and girls are discriminated against in health, education, political representation, labor market, which has negative repercussions for development of their capabilities and their freedom of choice.

In the Arab world, the outcomes of Arab Human Development Report (2009) indicated that many Arab women are still bound by patriarchal patterns of kinship, legalized discrimination, social subordination and ingrained male dominance; and they find themselves in a lowly position in relation to decision-making within the family, their situation continuously exposes them to forms of family and institutionalized violence. While in the Palestinian patriarchal society, male dominance has been cited as a major obstacle to gender equality (Banat, 2015).

A substantial body of research has examined the socialization of children in the family in various ways. Ram et al. (2014) results underscored the gendered nature of socialization experiences, showing that male and female youth inhabit different social worlds; female youth expressed more gender-egalitarian attitudes than male youth but reported greater restrictions to their independence than male youth. The study of Carter (2014) concluded that family operates as agents of socialization build gender identity that are cultivated and fostered in youth and provide meaning throughout the life course and maintain the social order.

15

Moreover, Parveen (2013) indicated that gender roles are social constructs that propagated by parents during childhood; and both sexes suffer from its consequences. While Hamieh & Usta (2011) argued that gender roles are social constructs that are propagated by parents during childhood; however, both sexes suffer from its consequences. Additionally, the study of Rina & McHale (2010) found that more expressive parents and less instrumental fathers had more positive relationships in the face of discrimination.

In spite of the extensive studies on gender socialization, the empirical test of such assumptions in the Palestinian family in general and gender inequality in particular is scarce.

3. Purpose and Scope

The study addressed the socialization process in the Palestinian family as perceived by their sons and daughters which remains unclear.

Patriarchal ideology is deeply rooted in the Palestinian society, where the notions of father and brother are prevalent that may increase gender inequality and raise the family discriminations between male and females in their daily needs.

The objectives of the study were to explore perceptions of sons and daughters about gender inequality and discriminatory practices in the Palestinian family; to examine the extent of family discriminatory practices among their sons and daughters; to identify the types of family discriminatory practices as perceived by their sons and daughters; and to explore how socio-demographic factors influence gender discriminatory practices.

The study considered the first of its kind, to the author knowledge, and one of the leading studies that demonstrated gender socialization and inequality, where empirical studies of such important topic is scarce. Besides, the study is expected to add a new scientific knowledge in terms of gender socialization inequality in the Palestinian occupied society.

4. Definition of Terms

16

Socialization: socialization is the process of transferring norms, values, beliefs, and behaviors to group members, through which the child becomes an individual respecting his or her environment laws, norms and customs (Crespi, 2003).

Gender can be defined as a set of characteristics, roles, and behavior patterns that distinguish women from men socially and culturally and relations of power between them (Women Information Centre, 2005).

Gender socialization: gender socialization is the process of educating and instructing males and females as to the norms, behaviors, values, and beliefs of group membership (Parveen, 2013).

Gender discrimination: Gender discrimination means that a person on grounds of sex does not enjoy the same rights as someone of the opposite sex (Johnsson-Latham, 2004).

5. Hypotheses

The study proposed the following hypotheses:

1. There are no statistical significant differences at $\alpha \leq 0.05$ in the

Palestinian family discriminatory practices among their sons and daughters according to gender, religion, place of residency, and parent's educational level.

2. There are no statistical significant correlation at $\alpha \leq 0.05$ between number of household members, family income and the Palestinian family discriminatory practices among their sons and daughters.

6. Methodology and Design

6.1 Approach

The current study used a quantitative approach using a questionnaire, appropriate to the exploratory nature of the research.

6.2 Population and Sampling

The target population consists of Palestinian sons and daughters in the West Bank during 2018, which includes 261139 youth (133501 males to 127638 females (Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics, 2018a), as indicated in table no. 1.

The sample composed of three hundred eighty-four sons and daughters stratifiedly selected, due to gender. The sample size was calculated using the sampling web. of <http://www.surveysystem.com/sscalc.htm>, sample size calculator, with a margin error of 0.05, as indicated in table no. 1.

6.3 Instrumentation

Family discriminatory practices among their sons and daughters was evaluated using an index of a 27-item scale, that developed by the researchers. A 5-point Likert scale (strongly agree to strongly disagree) was used to measure responses. Participants to the research were approached in the West Bank by a trained research's team, and were asked to complete the questionnaire. The interview was conducted with sons and daughters in the household between 15-19 years of age. The sampling survey instrument sought socio-economic background information about participants' mainly gender, religion, place of residency, number of household members, family income, and parent's educational level.

6.3.1 Instrument Validity

Validation of the instrument proceeded in two distinct phases. The

initial phase a small focus group session (N=20); while the second phase involved the implementation of a pilot study (N=60) to validate the survey using exploratory factor analysis. Factor loading for all items exceeded 0.65 (0.67 to 0.89), which means that those items are suitable in measuring every item of family discriminatory practices among their sons and daughters, as indicated in table no. 9.

6.3.2 Instrument Reliability

The reliability was tested using Cronbach's Alpha and Guttman Split-Half Coefficients to ascertain reliability and consistency of the survey. Cronbach's Alpha and Guttman Split-Half Coefficients for the survey instrument was 0.95 and 0.92, respectively, indicating excellent reliability and consistency, as indicated in table no. 10.

6.4 Sample Socio-demographic Characteristics

The demographic breakdown of the participants were gender, religion, place of residency, number of household members, family income, and parent's educational level. In total, three hundred eighty-four sons and daughters and three focus groups were conducted. Respondents were between 15 and 19 years of age; and the vast majority 82.3% were Muslims. Females represented 51.8% of the participants, while the remaining 48.2% were males. Half (50.8%) of the participants were from rural areas, 31.5% from urban, while the remaining 17.7% were from refugee camps; and having on average of 5.96 household members, with a range of 1 to 14 (SD 2.64). The participants' parents were well-educated, almost 52.1% of their fathers had a college or undergraduate degree compared to 40.9% of their mothers as well; and the average of the family monthly income was moderate (2387.75 NIS), with a range of 1000 to 9000 (SD 1564.49), as indicated in tables' no. 2-8.

6.5 Data Analysis

The questionnaire items were rated on a 1-5 Likert scale (1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree). The highest score indicated a highly level of family discriminatory practices among their sons and daughters. Descriptive statistics gauged level of decision-making autonomy among the sampled population. The following statistical techniques were measured Regression, T.test, One way analysis of variance, Tukey test, Cronbach's Alpha, Guttman Split-Half Coefficients and Factor Analysis using SPSS.

7. Findings

The mean score of Palestinian family discriminatory practices scale among their sons and daughters as reported by the sample of three hundred eighty-four participants was moderate (M 3.26, SD 0.87). The total score showed that (65.2%) of the sons and daughters experienced a moderate level of gender discriminatory practices in their household, as indicated in table no. 11.

Furthermore, findings identify the types of family gender discriminatory practices as experienced by their sons and daughters, ranked in a descending order as follows, selecting dressing styles (M 3.65, SD 1.21); selecting friends (M 3.49, SD 1.26); participating in familial decisions (M 3.47, SD 1.29); enrolling in university abroad (M 3.45, SD 1.37); and inviting friends at home (M 3.36, SD 1.40). Furthermore, participants experienced family gender discriminatory practices in life partner selecting (M 3.35, SD 1.35); free opinion (M 3.34, SD 1.36); having driving license (M 3.33, SD 1.31); future job selection (M 3.32, SD 1.34); and joining parents out (M 3.31, SD 1.26), as indicated in table no. 12.

The study explored demography breakdown over family gender discriminatory practices with the aim of identifying any differences. Findings show that religion and place of residency do not indicate any significant differences, as indicated in tables' no. 14-16. However, it was found that gender, parents' educational level, number of household members, and family income are significant variables, as indicated in tables' no. 17-23. In relation to gender, the differences were in favor of females (M 3.40, SD 0.86) compared to (M 3.11, SD 0.87) for males participants: T-test value was (-3.204, $P=0.001$), as indicated in table no. 13. As for parents' educational level, the differences were in favor of less-educated parents, (M 3.54, SD 0.78): F-value was (13.184, $P=0.000$); and (M 3.48, SD 0.87): F-value was (8.887, $P=0.000$) for the fathers and the mothers respectively, as indicated in tables' no. 17-22.

Finally, findings indicated that there are statistical significant positive correlation between number of household members and the average score of family gender discriminatory practices, Beta-value was (0.270, $P=0.004$). Meanwhile, a negative statistical significant correlation was found between family income and gender discriminatory practices, Beta-value was (-0.460, $P=0.000$), as indicated in table no. 23.

8. Discussion

Findings of the study showed that the Palestinian family imposes moderate discriminatory practices among their sons and daughters during the socialization process; and females experienced more gender discriminatory practices within their households than did the males. The process of socialization in the Palestinian society is based on religious education and teachings of Islam. The majority of the Palestinian people are Muslims; and the teachings of Islam influence the daily, social and cultural life (Banat, 2010).

Furthermore, as any Arab society, the Palestinian family socialization is characterized for being patriarchal in relation to the gender differentiation between males and females. Gender separation starts at a very early age in the individual's life. Males are raised in the men's world while females are raised in the women's, according to several educational, moral, aesthetic, intellectual, philosophical and even practical atmospheres. The Palestinian culture seeks to direct males towards affirmation of masculine qualities like manhood, chivalry, bravery, gallantry, dare and stamina. On the other hand it stresses on directing females towards feminism, decency, decorum, and virginity, love of children, home economics and stability (Muhawi & Kana'na, 2001; Banat, 2010). These ideas are supported by the Social Learning Theory introduced by (Bandura, 1979), who argued that most gender differences are attributed to differences in socialization, rather than genetic and biological factors.

Moreover, patriarchal ideology is deeply rooted in the Palestinian society, where the notions of father and brother are prevalent. According to these notions, male dominance supports the structure that keeps men in positions of power, authority and control. This allows for a larger space for males compared with females in relation to nature of social ranks, roles, freedom, participation in decision making, responsibility, large scale engagement in labor market and development of potentials and skills (Barakat, 1993; Banat & Rimawi, 2014; Banat, 2015, 2019). Regarding this issue, the sociologists explain through gender socialization why human males and females behave in different ways: they learn different social roles. For example, girls learn to do different household chores than boys; girls learn to bake and clean, and boys learn to mow lawns and take out garbage (UNICEF, 2007). According to Ruxton (2004) men enjoy benefits from patriarchal systems that reinforce their sense of masculinity.

Men are expected to dominate, to control, and to be the authority figures and decision-makers within their families and environment.

Recently statistics introduced by The Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics (2018b) in the anniversary of the International Women's Day, reflects the gender inequality gap in the Palestinian patriarchal society. Findings revealed the widespread of traditional social norms and gender inequalities in the Palestinian patriarchal society; the high fertility rates, the continued rise in literacy among women despite the rise in literacy rates among females over the last decade; and Palestinian society have yet to adopt laws prohibiting women marriage before the age of majority, namely, eighteen years of age and. In addition to the direct and indirect intimate partner violence; the gap in the participation rate and average daily wages between men and women; and the unemployment rates of women which exceed the rate among men by about 15 percent. It follows that females would likely experience more gender discriminatory practices within their households than males.

Furthermore, findings revealed that parents' educational level negatively correlated with gender discrimination; less-educated parents had more gender discriminatory practices among their sons and daughters during the socialization process. In fact, education plays an important role in communication skills, and social integration. Education also, fulfills social interaction that contributes to the development of parents' personality, reinforces their abilities, and holding responsibility, which affect negatively their discriminatory practices among their sons and daughters. In this context, Parveen (2013) indicated that gender roles are social constructs that propagated by parents during childhood; and both sexes suffer from its consequences. Additionally, Rina & McHale (2010) emphasized that more expressive parents and less instrumental fathers had more positive relationships in the face of discrimination.

The study results also revealed that religion and place of residency do not indicate any significant differences over family gender discriminatory practices among their sons and daughters during the socialization process. This indicates that family gender discriminatory practices are not very much influenced by these variables and is more likely to be affected by other factors other than religion and place of residency.

Finally, findings showed that number of household members positively correlated with gender discrimination; youth in large families experienced

more gender discriminatory practices during the socialization process. Besides findings indicated that income negatively correlated with gender discrimination; poor families impose more gender discriminatory practices among their sons and daughters during the socialization process.

Sociologically, Karl Marx (1844) had pointed out in his social theory the significance of the economic aspect in the social structure and its role in controlling all aspects of the society (Banat, 2012). In fact, the Palestinian experience under Israeli occupation was and still is the most tragic one in terms of the victims and violence it has left behind, as a result of acts of killing, injury, handicap, physical and psychological torture which is exercised in the form of house demolition, confiscation of lands and water, arrests, raids, pursuits and other forms of violence. Palestinians have faced one of the most brutal occupations that history has ever known who brought destruction and hatred to this region of the world more than a century ago (Banat, 2014; Najib et al., 2015).

On the economic level, most Palestinians experience harsh conditions as they cannot work or bring food to their children. Since 1996 Israel has imposed a series of closures, preventing Palestinians, who earn their living by working inside Israel, from going to their jobs. They were replaced by tens of thousands of workers imported from Romania and Thailand (Said, 2006). Most parts of the infrastructure were destroyed in the Palestinian territories like electricity, water and health services. The destruction was not limited to the offices of the Palestinian Authority which Israel considered as a gang of terrorists, but it also targeted and included those relating to the civil authority like Labor and Education ministries and health centers (MacAskill, 2002).

Additionally, the latest report introduced by the Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics (2017) reflects the highest percentage of poverty and the difficult socio-economic conditions in Palestine society under the ongoing Israeli occupation, where 47.5% of the refugee families under risk of poverty, a result of the high unemployment; high fertility rate; the large family size; and the high dependency rate. With the increased number of household members, the Palestinian extended family deal with different problems including economic issues under the difficult living conditions prevalent in the Palestinian society and new challenges; which would agitate the stability of the family and impose more gender discriminatory practices among their sons and daughters. The findings of the study are similar to some findings in the related studies and disagreed with others as well.

9. Conclusion and Recommendations

Gender inequality remains a major barrier to human development and well-being in all societies, and highly increased in the fast changing scenario of the world. Findings confirm that family discriminatory practices during the socialization process are a social problem in the Palestinian patriarchal society that could have important and long-lasting effects among their sons and daughters and the society as well. Consequently, there are still a lot of needs to be done in terms of the reality of gender discriminatory practices in the Palestinian family especially of females in order to reduce these discriminatory practices against them. The implications of the study will be helpful for sociologists, psychologist, social workers, feminist, and family counselors in many prospective, taken into consideration that gender discrimination starts and learned at home. Based on the findings and conclusion of this study, the following recommendations are made:

1. Empowering women in the Palestinian family is an essential indicator for gender equality.
2. There is a need to address the Palestinian curriculum with gender equalities perspectives as an important mechanism for healthy gender socialization.
3. Creating forums for discussion and debate on gender issues among Palestinian youth.
4. Conducting research on youth perceptions about gender equality.
5. Across-sectional for more understanding of gender discriminatory practices during the socialization process, in different cultures is recommended.

References

1. Arab Human Development Report (2009). Challenges to human security in the Arab countries. New York: United Nations Development Program. Retrieved from <http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/hdr2009-arabic.pdf>
2. Banat, B. (2010). Palestinian suicide martyrs (Istishhadiyin): facts and figures (Doctoral Dissertation). Granada, University of Granada. Retrieved from <https://hera.ugr.es/tesisugr/18599424.pdf>
3. Banat, B. (2012). Introduction to sociology. Jerusalem: Department of Applied Sociology, Faculty of Arts, Al-Quds University (Arabic version).
4. Banat, B. (2014). Palestinian refugees: Facts and figures. Conference: The National Statistical Week. Jerusalem: Al-Quds University, main campus, Abu Dies, April 27-28.

5. Banat, B. (2015). Violence against Palestinian women. *Journal of Peace and Conflict (Revista de Paz y Conflictos)* 8(1), 135-149. Retrieved from <http://revistaseug.ugr.es/index.php/revpaz/article/view/2506/3190>
6. Banat, B. (2019). Life aspirations of Palestinian women. *Intercultural Relations Society*, 31(1), 60-68.
7. Banat, B., & Rimawi, O. (2014). The impact of emotional intelligence on academic achievement of Al- Quds University students. *International Humanities Studies*, 1(2), 12-39. Retrieved from http://ihs-humanities.com/journals/vol1_no2_july2014/2.pdf
8. Bandura, A. (1979). Self-referent mechanisms in social learning theory. *American Psychologist*, 34(5), 439-441. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.34.5.439.b>
9. Barakat, H. (1993). *The Arab World: society, culture, and state*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
10. Beal, C. (1994). *Boys and girls: the development of gender roles*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
11. Bell, K. (2008). *Intimate partner violence on campus: a test of social learning theory*. (Doctoral Dissertation). Indiana, Indiana University of Pennsylvania. Retrieved from <https://knowledge.library.iup.edu/etd/1032>
12. Carter, M. (2014). Gender socialization and identity theory. *Social Sciences* 3(2), 242-263. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci3020242>
13. Condry, J., & Condry, S. (1976). Sex differences: a study of the eye of the beholder. *Child Development*, 47(3), 812-819. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1128199>
14. Crespi, I. (2003). *Socialization and gender roles within the family: a study on adolescents and their parents in Great Britain*. Milan: Catholic University of Milan.
15. Essays, UK. (2013). *How gender socialization process reinforces gender inequality: sociology essay*. Retrieved from <http://www.ukessays.com/essays/sociology/how-gender-socialization-process-reinforces-gender-inequality-sociology-essay.php?cref=1>
16. Giddens, A. (1993). *Sociology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
17. Gleitman, H., Fridlund, A., & Reisberg, D. (2000). *Basic psychology*. New York: Norton & Company, Inc.
18. Hamieh, C., & Usta, J. (2011). *The effects of socialization on gender discrimination and violence: a case study from Lebanon*. Oxford: Oxfam GB Research Report.
19. Hughes, M., & Kroehler, C. (2002). *Sociology*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
20. Human Development Report (1997). *Human development to eradicate poverty*. New York: United Nations Development Program. Retrieved from http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/reports/258/hdr_1997_en_complete_nostats.pdf
21. Human Development Report (2014). *Sustaining human progress: reducing vulnerabilities and building resilience*. New York: United Nations Development Program. Retrieved from <http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/hdr14-report-en-1.pdf>
22. Johnsson-Latham, G. (2004). *Power and privileges on gender discrimination and poverty*. Stockholm: The Ministry for Foreign Affairs. Retrieved from <https://www.government.se/49b74f/contentassets/f0f72a30b3f84ba7a9f7557f18cb5ae5/power-and-privileges---main-text>

23. MacAskill, E. (26/4/2002). Schools, banks, and a puppet theatre trashed. *The Guardian*, British Daily, 13.
24. Messner, M. (2000). Barbie girls versus sea monsters: children constructing gender. *Gender & Society* 14(6), 765-784. <https://doi.org/10.1177/089124300014006004>
- Muhawi, I., & Kana'na, S. (2001). *Speak bird, speak again: Palestinian Arab folktales*. Beirut: Institute for Palestine Studies (Arabic version).
25. Najib, M., Banat, B., Radida, F., Labom, D., & Rabee, R. (2015). Traumatic experiences among mothers of Palestinian prisoners. *International Humanities Studies*, 2(1), 1-19. Retrieved from http://ihs-humanities.com/journals/vol2_no1_january2015/1.pdf
26. Njogu, K., & Orchardson-Mazrui, E. (2008). *Gender inequality and women's rights in the great lakes: can culture contribute to women's empowerment?* Nairobi: Twaweza Communications. Retrieved from <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/7533/8a6cda1c4c06835c0731646b137d4241a74b.pdf>
27. Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics (2017). *Socio-economic conditions in Palestine*. Ramallah: Printing Press (Arabic version).
28. Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics (2018a). *Population, housing and establishment census*. Ramallah: Printing Press (Arabic version).
29. Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics (2018b). *International Women's Day: Palestinian women facts and figures*. Ramallah: Printing Press (Arabic version).
30. Parveen, F. (2013). *Socialization factor cause gender inequality*. Pakistan: Fatima Jinnah Women University. Retrieved from <https://www.slideshare.net/faizamumraiz26/soicalization-factor-cause-gender-inequality>
31. Ram, U., Strohschein, L., & Gaur, K. (2014). Gender socialization: differences between male and female youth in India and associations with mental health. *International Journal of Population Research* 1(1), 1-11. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2014/357145>
32. Rina, E., & McHale, S. (2010). Parents' experiences of discrimination and family relationship qualities: the role of gender. *Family Relations*, 59(3), 283-296. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3729.2010.00602.x>
33. Ruxton, S. (2004). *Gender equality and men: learning from practice*. Oxford: Oxfam GB Research Report.
34. Said, E. (2006). *Culture and Resistance*. Translated by Alaadin Abu-Zeneh. Beirut: Dar Al-Aadab (Arabic version).
35. The International Declaration on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (1993). General Assembly of the United Nations. Geneva. Retrieved from https://www.un.org/en/genocideprevention/documents/atrocities-crimes/Doc.21_declaration%20elimination%20vaw.pdf
36. The United Nations Fourth World Conference on Women (1995). *Action for equality, development and peace*. Beijing. Retrieved from https://www.un.org/en/events/pastevents/pdfs/Beijing_Declaration_and_Platform_for_Action.pdf
37. UNICEF (2007). *Early childhood: early gender socialization*. Retrieved from http://www.unicef.org/earlychildhood/index_40749.html
38. United Nations (2003). *Gender stereotypes and the socialization process*. Geneva: Division for

- the Advancement of Women (DAW). Retrieved from [https://elearning.un.org/CONT/GEN/CS/I_Know_Gender_\(English\)/story_content/external_files/M01_S09_Gender_Stereotypes.pdf](https://elearning.un.org/CONT/GEN/CS/I_Know_Gender_(English)/story_content/external_files/M01_S09_Gender_Stereotypes.pdf)
39. United Nations General Assembly Resolution (2003). Women and political participation. A/RES/58/142. New York. Retrieved from <http://www.worldlii.org/int/other/UNGA/2003/213.pdf>
40. Women Information Centre (2005). Training manual for gender planning. Tanzania: Ministry of Community Development Gender and Children.

Appendixes

Table no. (1). Distribution of the study population and sample by gender

Gender	Population	Sample
Males	133501	185
Females	127638	199
Total	261139	384

Table no. (2). Sample distribution by gender

Gender	N	Percent %
Male	185	48.2
Female	199	51.8
Total	384	100

Table no. (3). Sample distribution by religion

Religion	N	Percent %
Muslims	316	82.3
Christians	68	17.7
Total	384	100

Table no. (4). Sample distribution by place of residency

Place of residency	N	Percent %
City	121	31.5
Village	195	50.8
Camp	68	17.7
Total	384	100

Table no. (5). Sample distribution by father educational level

Father educational level	N	Percent %
Basic	73	19.0
Secondary	111	28.9
Diploma	73	19.0
Bachelor and above	127	33.1
Total	384	100

Table no. (6). Sample distribution by mother educational level

Father educational level	N	Percent %
Basic	94	24.5
Secondary	133	34.6
Diploma	69	18.0
Bachelor and above	88	22.9
Total	384	100

Table no. (7). Sample distribution by number of household members

Variable	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Deviation
Number of household members	384	1	14	5.96	2.64

Table no. (8). Sample distribution by income

Variable	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Deviation
Family income	361	1000	9000	2387.75	1564.49

Missing=23

Table no. (9). Factor analysis of Palestinian family discriminatory practices among their sons and daughters scale

No.	Items	Extraction
1.	Children names	0.68
2.	Life partner selecting	0.67
3.	Daily expenses amounts	0.67
4.	Going out for work	0.68
5.	Enrolling in education	0.73
6.	University selection	0.68
7.	Future job selection	0.67
8.	Children joining school trip	0.70
9.	Participating in social gatherings	0.72
10.	Go out for shopping	0.72
11.	Penalty construction when mistakes committed	0.71
12.	Psychological support	0.77
13.	Giving information on puberty physical changes	0.76
14.	Participation in home activities	0.75
15.	Enrolling in university abroad	0.70

No.	Items	Extraction
16.	Emotional support	0.86
17.	Strict dressing styles	0.85
18.	Participating in political occasions	0.68
19.	Free opinion	0.76
20.	Joining parents out	0.70
21.	Participating in familial decisions	0.75
22.	Inviting friends at home	0.84
23.	Having driving license	0.80
24.	Selecting friends	0.89
25.	Distributing sweets on holidays	0.76
26.	Political Participation	0.86
27.	Practicing Hobbies	0.85

Table no. (10). Reliability of Palestinian family discriminatory practices among their sons and daughters scale

Model	No. of items	Alpha
Cronbach's Alpha	27	0.95
Guttman Split-Half	27	0.92

Table no. (11). Number, mean, standard deviation, and percentage of Palestinian family discriminatory practices among their sons and daughters total score

Variable	N	Mean*	Std. Deviation	Percent %
Total score	384	3.26	0.87	65.2

*Mean out of 5 points.

Table no. (12). Mean scores, standard deviation, and percentage for the indicators of Palestinian family discriminatory practices among their sons and daughters ranked in a descending order

Indicators of Palestinian family discriminatory practices among their sons and daughters	Mean*	Std. Deviation	Percent %
Selecting dressing styles	3.65	1.21	73.0
Selecting friends	3.49	1.26	69.8
Participating in familial decisions	3.47	1.29	69.4
Enrolling in university abroad	3.45	1.37	69.0

Indicators of Palestinian family discriminatory practices among their sons and daughters	Mean*	Std. Deviation	Percent %
Inviting friends at home	3.36	1.40	67.2
Life partner selecting	3.35	1.35	67.0
Free opinion	3.34	1.36	66.8
Having driving license	3.33	1.31	66.6
Future job selection	3.32	1.34	66.4
Joining parents out	3.31	1.26	66.2
Practicing Hobbies	3.30	1.34	66.0
Emotional support	3.29	1.31	65.8
Participating in social gatherings	3.26	1.31	65.2
Going out for work	3.24	1.42	64.8
Children joining school trip	3.24	1.35	64.8
Psychological support	3.23	1.40	64.6
Go out for shopping	3.23	1.36	64.6
Penalty construction when mistakes committed	3.22	1.43	64.4
Participation in home activities	3.20	1.35	64.0
University selection	3.20	1.36	64.0
Enrolling in education	3.15	1.51	63.0
Daily expenses amounts	3.14	1.32	62.8
Participating in political occasions	3.11	1.36	62.2
Giving information on puberty physical changes	3.11	1.33	62.2
Political Participation	3.09	1.47	61.8
Children names	3.07	1.52	61.4
Distributing sweets on holidays	2.93	1.41	58.6
Total	3.26	0.87	65.2

*Mean out of 5 points.

Table no. (13). T-test for the differences in Palestinian family discriminatory practices among their sons and daughters scores according to gender

Gender	N	Mean*	Std. Deviation	Df	T-value	Sig.
Male	185	3.11	0.87	382	-3.204	0.001
Female	199	3.40	0.86			
Total	384	3.26	0.87			

*Mean out of 5 points.

Table no. (14). T-test for the differences in Palestinian family discriminatory practices among their sons and daughters scores according to religion

Religion	N	Mean*	Std. Deviation	Df	T-value	Sig.
Muslim	316	3.28	0.82	382	0.926	0.357
Christian	68	3.16	1.06			
Total	384	3.26	0.87			

*Mean out of 5 points.

Table no. (15). One way analysis of variance for the differences in Palestinian family discriminatory practices among their sons and daughters scores according to place of residency

Source	Df	Sum of squares	Mean square	F-value	Sig.
Between groups	2	3.470	1.735	2.276	0.104
Within groups	381	290.362	0.762		
Total	383	293.831	-----		

Table no. (16). Mean scores and standard deviation for the differences in Palestinian family discriminatory practices among their sons and daughters scores according to place of residency

Place of residency	N	Mean*	Std. Deviation
City	121	3.13	0.95
Village	195	3.34	0.79
Camp	68	3.28	0.94
Total	384	3.26	0.87

*Mean out of 5 points.

Table no. (17). One way analysis of variance for the differences in Palestinian family discriminatory practices among their sons and daughters scores according to father educational level

Source	Df	Sum of squares	Mean square	F-value	Sig.
Between groups	3	27.700	9.233	13.184	0.000
Within groups	380	266.132	0.700		
Total	383	293.831	-----		

Table no. (18). Tukey test for the source of differences in Palestinian family discriminatory practices among their sons and daughters scores according to father educational level

Father educational level	Basic	Secondary	Diploma	Bachelor and above
Basic		0.15863	0.07610	0.64925*
Secondary			-0.08253	0.49062*
Diploma				0.57315*
Bachelor and above				

Table no. (19). Mean scores and standard deviation for the differences in Palestinian family discriminatory practices among their sons and daughters scores according to father educational level

Father educational level	N	Mean*	Std. Deviation
Basic	73	3.54	0.78
Secondary	111	3.38	0.82
Diploma	73	3.46	0.74
Bachelor and above	127	2.89	0.92
Total	384	3.26	0.87

*Mean out of 5 points.

Table no. (20). One way analysis of variance for the differences in Palestinian family discriminatory practices among their sons and daughters scores according to mother educational level

Source	Df	Sum of squares	Mean square	F-value	Sig.
Between groups	3	19.264	6.421	8.887	0.000
Within groups	380	274.568	0.723		
Total	383	293.831	-----		

Table no. (21). Tukey test for the source of differences in Palestinian family discriminatory practices among their sons and daughters scores according to mother educational level

Mother educational level	Basic	Secondary	Diploma	Bachelor and above
Basic		0.08930	0.27855	0.59249*
Secondary			0.18925	0.50319*
Diploma				0.31394
Bachelor and above				

Table no. (22). Mean scores and standard deviation for the differences in Palestinian family discriminatory practices among their sons and daughters scores according to mother educational level

Mother educational level	N	Mean*	Std. Deviation
Basic	94	3.48	0.87
Secondary	133	3.39	0.82
Diploma	69	3.20	0.85
Bachelor and above	88	2.89	0.85
Total	384	3.26	0.87

*Mean out of 5 points.

Table no. (23). Regression coefficients between number of household members, family income and the Palestinian family discriminatory practices among their sons and daughters scores

Variables	N	Beta	Sig.
Number of household members	384	0.270	0.004
Income	361	-0.460	0.000

التنشئة الاجتماعية الفلسطينية: بين عدم المساواة بين الجنسين والمظاهر التمييزية

- د. بسام يوسف إبراهيم بنات
- د. جواد دية
- د. فرانسيسكو انترينا دوران

ملخص:

34

تناولت الدراسة التنشئة الاجتماعية الفلسطينية: بين عدم المساواة بين الجنسين والمظاهر التمييزية، وتحقيقاً لهذا الهدف استخدمت الاستبانة أداة لجمع البيانات في (27) فقرة من إعداد فريق البحث، من خلال عينة طبقية تكونت من (384) شاباً وشابة في الضفة الغربية للعام 2018. بينت النتائج أن الأسرة الفلسطينية تمارس مظاهر تمييزية بدرجة متوسطة بين أبنائهم من الجنسين، وأن الإناث يعانين أكثر من هذه المظاهر التمييزية في عملية التنشئة الاجتماعية. وأشارت النتائج إلى أن مظاهر التمييز في عملية التنشئة الاجتماعية ترتبط بالمؤهل العلمي للوالدين، وعدد الأبناء، والفقر.

كلمات مفتاحية: التنشئة الاجتماعية، عدم المساواة، مظاهر التمييز، المجتمع الأبوي.

-
- أستاذ مشارك، دكتوراه علم اجتماع (أساليب وتقنيات البحث العلمي) جامعة القدس.
 - باحث ما بعد الدكتوراه، أستاذ مساعد، دكتوراه علوم اجتماعية (اللاجئون والهجرة) جامعة غرناطة.
 - أستاذ، علم اجتماع (نظريات اجتماعية وتغير اجتماعي) جامعة غرناطة.