

# Gender Differences in Family Sex Communication Quotient

Prof.N.Meenakumari\* , Dr. Clay Warren Chauncey M. Depew\*\*

\* B.Sc N .M.Sc N.PhD Scholar, Principal , JIET College of Nursing, India

\*\* Professor of Communication and Professor of Organizational Sciences Chair, Organizational Sciences & Communication, The George Washington University, Washington, USA.

**Abstract-** A Descriptive study was done among 120 adolescence to explore Gender differences in family sex communication Quotient at salawas Village, Rajasthan, India. Participants were selected from village at bus stops, shops, and roads by Convenience sampling technique. Level of sex orientation was assessed by Family Sex Communication Quotient (FSCQ) scale. The study findings revealed that adolescence girls perceived that they can openly share and discuss about sex in family also they can learn more about sex in family compared to adolescence boys, but in contradictory Adolescence boys perceived that family plays an important role in sexual learning compared to adolescence girls. The study findings suggested that (1) Encourage the parents to educate their own children on sex and sexuality (2) Formulate the common platform to discuss about sex in family.(3)Spill about the myths and fallacies about sex, and provide adequate information on sex.(4)Empower our children to abstain from sex(5)Provide a conducive environment for sharing and discussing about sex in family.(6)Provide positive value on sex among adolescence.(7)Parents are to be encouraged to allow conversation on sex with children in family.

**Index Terms-** Gender,FSCQ,Adolscence

## I. INTRODUCTION

Sexuality is part of every person's life, no matter what the age. As child grows and develops, they may giggle with friends about "private parts," share "dirty" jokes, and scan through dictionaries looking up taboo words. Their curiosity is natural, and children of all ages have questions. When they were ready to ask, as a parent they should be ready to answer. The best place for a child to learn about sexuality is at home from those who care most about him. Anyone can teach the basic facts about reproduction in an hour or two (or they can be read in any of several reference books), but parents are in the best position to put this information in the proper context and give it the right perspective over a period of years.

## II. OBJECTIVES

The study explored the gender differences in family sex communication Quotient among adolescence and also estimated an association of family sex communication Quotient with their selected demographic variables.

## III. MATERILAS AND METHOD

A descriptive study was done in Salawas Village Rajasthan to explore the gender differences in family sex communication Quotient among adolescence

## IV. SAMPLE

The 120 Adolescences were selected by convenience sampling technique.

### Inclusion Criteria

1. Adolescence aged 13-18 years living with parents.
2. Adolescence resided in Salawas village since last 5years.
3. Adolescence willing to participate.
4. Adolescence available during the time of Data collection.

### Exclusion Criteria

1. Migrated adolescence from other countries.
2. Mentally challenged adolescence.
3. Homeless adolescences.

## V. INSTRUMENT

The instrument used had 2sections.

Section 1 : Baseline Data.

Section 2 : Family Sex Communication Quotient. The instrument consists of 18 Likert-like items anchored from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree."

## VI. DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURE

The data was collected from 15 january 2016 to 20<sup>th</sup> january 2016 under the guidance of Dr. Clay Warren Chauncey M. Depew Professor of Communication and Professor of Organizational Sciences, The George Washington University,washigton,USA also a formal permission was obtained from sarpanch , to do a study at Salawas Village,Rajasthan.Brief introduction about self and study has given and Informed consent had obtained from the adolescence for assurance of participation & continuation in this study in their residential areas. Confidentiality of their response was maintained. Participants were selected from village at bus stops, shops, and junction of roads by Convenience sampling technique. Level of sex orientation was assessed by Family Sex

Communication Quotient (FSCQ) scale. The adolescents were informed about statements representing personal feelings about family discussions of sex, and instructed to circle one of the five response categories that best describes their opinion:

SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, N=Neutral(or Don't Know), D=Disagree, SD=Strongly Disagree also made assured to answer these questions regardless of whether they have ever talked about sex with their parents. Instrument took 10 Minutes to complete.

VII. RESULTS

SECTION-A: DESCRIPTION OF LEVEL OF FAMILY SEX COMMUNICATION

**Table 1: Level of family sex communication among adolescences.**  
N-120

S.no	Level of family sex communication Quotient	Girls n-60		Boys n-60	
		No	%	No	%
2	Low	1	1.6	0	0
3	Medium	58	96.6	60	100
4	High	1	1.6	0	0

In Adolescence girls most of them are in medium 58(96.6%) level of family sex communication, only one girl got high and low level of FSCQ. In Adolescence Boys most of them are in medium 60(100%) level of family sex communication, none of them got high and low level of FSCQ.

SECTION: B PERCEPTION OF COMFORT IN FAMILY SEX COMMUNICATION

**Table: 2 perception of comfort in family sex communication Quotient (FSCQ)**  
N-120

S.no	Level of comfort	Girls n-60	Boys n-60
1	Mean	19.8	17.55
2	Median	20	19
3	Mode	19&22	19&15
4	Standard Deviation	4.24	3.21
5	Co variance	17.99	10.28

Table 2 shows that in Adolescence girls were got mean score of 19.8 with Standard Deviation of 4.24 where as boys got mean score of 17.555 with Standard Deviation of 3.21 in comfort to discuss on sex with Family.

SECTION-C: PERCEIVED OF INFORMATION RECEIVED IN FAMILY SEX COMMUNICATION

**Table: 3 perception of information received in family sex communication**  
N=120

S.no	Level of information	Girls n-60	Boys n-60
1	Mean	18.33	16.93

2	Median	16	17.5
3	Mode	22	17
4	Standard Deviation	4.24	3.09
5	Co variance	17.98	9.55

Table 3 shows that in Adolescence girls were got mean score of 18.33 with Standard Deviation of 4.24 where as boys got mean score of 16.93 with Standard Deviation of 3.09 in perception of information received on sex with Family.

**SECTION-D : PERCEPTION OF VALUE OF FAMILY IN FAMILY SEX COMMUNICATION**

**Table: 4 perception of value of family in family sex communication  
N=120**

S.no	value of family in family sex communication Quotient	Girls n-60	Boys n-60
1	Mean	18.7	19.28
2	Median	18.5	21
3	Mode	18	17
4	Standard Deviation	2.66	2.99
5	Co variance	7.06	8.95

Table 5 shows that in Adolescence girls were got mean score of 18.7 with Standard Deviation of 2.66 where as boys got mean score of 19.28 with Standard Deviation of 2.99 in perception of value of family to discuss on sex.

**SECTION: E ASSOCIATION OF FAMILY SEX COMMUNICATION**

**TABLE: 5-1 Association of family sex communication with their Selected Demographic Variables among Girls.  
n-60**

SNo	Demographic data	Family sex communication			Chi square value
		Low	Medium	High	
1	<b>Age in years</b>				NS At .05 level
	14-17yrs	1	58	1	
	18-21 yrs	0	0	0	
	22-25 yrs	0	0	0	
2	<b>Educational qualification</b>				NS At .05 level
	Illiterate	0	0	0	
	Primary & upper primary class	0	0	0	
	High school	0	0	0	
	Secondary school	1	58	1	
3	<b>Mothers Educational qualification</b>	0	0	0	1.034 P(0.99802) NS
	Illiterate	1	38	1	
	Primary & upper primary class	0	15	0	

	High school	0	2	0	At .05 level
	Secondary school	0	1	0	
	Graduate	0	2	0	
4	<b>Fathers Educational qualification</b>				7.92 P(0.440832) NS At .05 level
	Illiterate	0	5	0	
	Primary & upper primary class	1	18	0	
	High class	0	21	0	
	Secondary school	0	6	0	
	Graduates	0	8	1	
5	<b>Type of family</b>				NS At .05 level
	Nuclear family	1	57	1	
	Joint family	0	1	0	

The computed  $\chi^2$  value indicated that there was no statistical significant association of sex communication with any of their demographic variables at  $P < 0.5$  in Girls.

**TABLE:5 -2 Association of family sex communication with their Selected Demographic Variables among Boys**

SNo	Demographic data	Family sex communication			
		Low	Medium	High	
1	Age in years				NS At .05 level
	14-17yrs	0	60	0	
	18-21 yrs	0	0	0	
	22-25 yrs	0	0	0	
2	<b>Educational qualification</b>	0	0	0	NS At .05 level
	Illiterate	0	0	0	
	Primary & upper primary class	0	0	0	
	High school	0	0	0	
	Secondary school	0	60	0	
	Graduates	0	0	0	
3	<b>Mothers Educational qualification</b>				NS At .05 level
	Illiterate	0	43	0	
	Primary & upper primary class	0	11	0	
	High school	0	3	0	
	Secondary school	0	3	0	
	Graduates	0	0	0	
4	<b>Fathers Educational qualification</b>				NS At .05 level
	Illiterate	0	11	0	
	Primary & upper primary class	0	27	0	
	High class	0	11	0	
	Secondary school	0	10	0	
	Graduates	0	1	0	
5	<b>Type of family</b>				NS At .05 level
	Nuclear family	0	54	0	
	Joint family	0	6	0	

The computed  $\chi^2$  value indicated that there was no statistical significant association of sex communication with any of their demographic variables at  $P < 0.5$  in Boys.

### VIII. DISCUSSION

This chapter discusses the findings of the study derived from the statistical analysis and its pertinence to the objectives set for the study and related literature of the study. The study was conducted to In order to estimate gender differences in family

sex communication among Adolescences. Convenient sampling technique was used to select the 60 girls & 60 boys. Data was collected through structured self reported family sex communication Quotient questionnaire. The findings of the study have been discussed with the reference to the objectives. The findings of the study based on the objectives were

### **1. Gender differences in level of orientation on sex among Adolescence.**

The mean score of **FSCQ** in adolescence girls are 56.83 with the standard deviation of 7.60 also a median score of 55.5, most of girls got medium level of orientation on sex 58(96.66%) only one girl got low level 1 (1.66%). The mean score of **FSCQ** in adolescence boys are 53.77 with the standard deviation of 5.58 also a median score of 56, all boys got medium level of orientation on sex 60(100%) none of them are low and high level of orientation. The result shows that adolescence girls got high level of score compared to adolescence boys.

### **2. Gender differences in perception of openness to share with family on sex among adolescence with family**

The mean score perception of openness to share with family on sex in adolescence girls are 19.8 with the standard deviation of 4.24 also a median score of 20.

The mean score in adolescence boys are 17.55 with the standard deviation of 3.21 also a median score of 19, the result shows that adolescence girls perceived that they can openly share about sex in family compared to adolescence boys.

### **3. Gender differences in perception of amount of information learned and shared among adolescence with family**

The mean score of perception of amount of information learned and shared in adolescence girls are 18.33 with the standard deviation of 4.24 also a median score of 16.

The mean score in adolescence boys are 16.93 with the standard deviation of 3.09 also a median score of 17.5, The result shows that adolescence girls perceived that they can learn more about sex in family compared to adolescence boys.

### **4. Gender differences in perception of importance of the family role in sexual learning among adolescence**

The mean score of perception of importance of the family role in sexual learning in adolescence girls are 18.7 with the standard deviation of 2.66 also a median score of 18.5.

The mean score in adolescence boys are 19.28 with the standard deviation of 2.99 also a median score of 21, the result shows that boys perceived that family plays an important role in sexual learning compared to adolescence girls.

### **5. Is education level of mothers has influence FSCQ among Adolescence**

The computed  $x^2$  value indicated that there was no statistical significant association of education level of mothers (1.034) and FSCQ at  $P < 0.5$  in adolescence Girls.

The computed  $x^2$  value indicated that there was no statistical significant association of education level of mothers (0) and FSCQ at  $P < 0.5$  in adolescence Boys.

### **6. Is education level of fathers has influence FSCQ among Adolescence**

The computed  $x^2$  value indicated that there was no statistical significant association of education level of fathers (7.92) and FSCQ at  $P < 0.5$  in adolescence Girls. The computed  $x^2$  value indicated that there was no statistical significant association of education level of fathers (0) and FSCQ at  $P < 0.5$  in adolescence Boys.

## IX. CONCLUSION

1. The study findings revealed that adolescence girls perceived that they can openly share and discuss about sex in family compared to adolescence boys.
2. The adolescence girls perceived that they can learn more about sex in family compared to adolescence boys.
3. The Adolescence boys perceived that family plays an important role in sexual learning compared to adolescence girls.
4. Education level of their parents does not play any role in family sex communication in both Gender.

## X. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Encourage the parents to educate their own children on sex and sexuality
2. Formulate the common platform to discuss about sex in family.
3. Spill about the myths and fallacies about sex, and provide adequate information on sex.
4. Empower our children to abstain from sex
5. Provide a conducive environment to children for sharing and discussing about sex Provide positive value on sex among adolescence.
6. Parents are to be encouraged to allow conversation on sex with children in family.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The investigator extends her sincere thanks to Dr. Clay Warren Chauncey M. Depew Professor of Communication and Professor of Organizational Sciences Chair, Organizational Sciences & Communication, The George Washington University for the valuable suggestion and guidance to the study.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Van Nuil JI(1), "Let's talk about sex": a qualitative study of Rwandan adolescents' views on sex and. PLoS One. 2014 Aug 5;9(8):e102933. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0102933. eCollection 2014.
- [2] Guilamo-Ramos V(1), Lee JJ, Kantor LM, Levine DS, Baum S, Johnson J. Potential for using online and mobile education with parents and adolescents to impact sexual and reproductive health. Prev Sci. 2015 Jan;16(1):53-60. doi: 10.1007/s11121-014-0469-z
- [3] Janković S(1), Malatestinić G, Striehl HB. Parents' attitudes on sexual education--what and when? Coll Antropol. 2013 Mar;37(1):17-22.
- [4] Meechamnan C(1), Fongkaew W, Chotibang J, McGrath BB. Do Thai parents discuss sex and AIDS with young adolescents? A qualitative study Nurs Health Sci. 2014 Mar;16(1):97-102. doi: 10.1111/nhs.12072. Epub 2013 May 21.
- [5] Hu Y(1), Wong ML, Prema V, Wong ML, Fong NP, Tsai FF, Vijaya K. Do parents talk to their adolescent children about sex?--findings from a community survey in Singapore. Ann Acad Med Singapore. 2012 Jun;41(6):239-46.
- [6] Reina MF, Ciaravino H, Llovera N, Castelo-Branco C. Contraception knowledge and sexual behaviour in secondary school students. Gynecol Endocrinol. 2010 Jul;26(7):479-83. doi: 10.3109/09513591003649856.

AUTHORS

**First Author** – Prof.N.Meenakumari B.Sc N .M.Sc N.PhD  
Scholar, Principal , JIET College of Nursing,India

**Second Author** – Dr. Clay Warren Chauncey M. Depew  
Professor of Communication and Professor of Organizational  
Sciences Chair, Organizational Sciences & Communication,The  
George Washington University,Washington,USA.