
Sexist beliefs of students and families of a rural IES in the province of Teruel

Creencias sexistas del alumnado y sus familias de un IES rural de la provincia de Teruel

Сексистские убеждения учащихся и их семей в сельской средней школе в провинции Теруэль

特鲁埃尔省农村中学学生及其家人的性别歧视观念

Alberto Nolasco Hernandez

University of Zaragoza
anolasco@unizar.es
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9678-6447>

Laura Gracia Sánchez

University of Zaragoza
lgracia@unizar.es
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3654-2429>

Raúl Carretero Bermejo

University of Castilla la Mancha
raul.carretero@uclm.es
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4167-0978>

Virginia Domingo Cebrián

University of Zaragoza
vdomingo@unizar.es
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7620-6660>

Dates · Fechas

Received: 2023-11-15
Accepted: 2024-04-28
Published: 2024-07-01

How to Cite this Paper · Cómo citar este trabajo

Nolasco, A., Gracia, L., Carretero, R., & Domingo, V. (2024). Sexist beliefs of students and families of a rural IES in the province of Teruel. *Publicaciones*, 54(1), 137–155. <https://doi.org/10.30827/publicaciones.v54i1.29488>

Abstract

Introduction: This research stems from a project endorsed by the Antonio Gargallo University Foundation. The objective was to investigate the sexist beliefs present among Secondary Education students and their families.

Method: The sample consists of a total of 159 individuals, including 53 Secondary Education students, 53 fathers, and 53 mothers. The instruments used to assess sexism were the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory for parents, while for students, it was the Adolescent Ambivalent Sexism Inventory.

Results: The results reveal a low level of sexism, hostile sexism, and benevolent sexism in all participants. A significant correlation is observed between sexism, hostile sexism, and benevolent sexism among students and mothers. Likewise, a significant correlation has been identified between sexism and benevolent sexism among mothers and female students. No significant correlation is observed between student variables and those of their parents.

Conclusions: It is important to highlight that gender stereotypes and sexist beliefs persist within families, though they are present at low levels of their dimensions. They continue to be passed down through generations, indicating that despite advances in gender equality, learned behaviors at home, with the mother playing a significant role, still prevail.

Keywords: hostile sexism, benevolent sexism, students, family.

Resumen

Introducción: esta investigación surge de un proyecto avalado por la Fundación Universitaria Antonio Gargallo. El objetivo se orientó a conocer las creencias sexista presentes en el alumnado de Educación Secundaria Obligatoria y sus familias.

Método: La muestra está formada por un total de 159 personas, entre las que se encuentran 53 alumnos/as de Educación Secundaria Obligatoria, 53 padres y 53 madres. Los instrumentos empleados para evaluar el sexismo en los padres y madres ha sido el Inventario de Sexismo Ambivalente y en el alumnado el Inventario de Sexismo Ambivalente de adolescentes.

Resultados: revelan un bajo nivel de sexismo, sexismo hostil y sexismo benévolo en todos los participantes. Se observa que existe correlación significativa entre el sexismo, sexismo hostil y sexismo benévolo de los alumnos y de las madres. Asimismo, se ha identificado correlación significativa entre el sexismo y el sexismo benévolo de las madres y de las alumnas. No se observa correlación significativa entre las variables del alumnado y las de sus padres.

Conclusiones: es importante destacar que los estereotipos de género y las creencias sexistas siguen presentes en las familias, aunque en los niveles bajos de sus dimensiones. Siguen transmitiéndose de generación en generación lo que indica que, a pesar de los avances en materia de igualdad, predominan los aprendizajes que se aprenden en el hogar con la madre como un importante factor que promueve dichas creencias.

Palabras clave: sexismo hostil, sexismo benévolo, alumnado, familia.

Аннотация

Введение: данное исследование является результатом проекта, поддержанного Фондом университета Антонио Гаргальо. Целью исследования было выяснить, какие сексистские убеждения существуют у учащихся институтов обязательного среднего образования и их семей.

Метод: выборка состояла из 159 человек, в том числе 53 учащихся учреждений обязательного среднего образования, 53 отцов и 53 матерей. Для оценки сексизма у родителей использовался опросник амбивалентного сексизма, а у учащихся - опросник подросткового амбивалентного сексизма.

Результаты: результаты свидетельствуют о низком уровне сексизма, враждебного сексизма и доброжелательного сексизма у всех участников. Значимые корреляции были обнаружены между сексизмом, враждебным сексизмом и доброжелательным сексизмом учеников и матерей. Также была выявлена значимая корреляция между сексизмом и доброжелательным сексизмом матерей и учениц. Значимой корреляции между переменными учеников и их родителей не наблюдалось.

Выводы: важно подчеркнуть, что гендерные стереотипы и сексистские убеждения все еще присутствуют в семьях, хотя и на низком уровне. Они продолжают передаваться из поколения в поколение, что свидетельствует о том, что, несмотря на успехи в области равноправия, преобладает домашнее обучение с участием матери как важный фактор, способствующий распространению таких убеждений.

Ключевые слова: враждебный сексизм, доброжелательный сексизм, ученики, семья.

概要

简介: 本研究项目受Antonio Gargallo大学基金会支持,目的是了解中等义务教育机构学生及其家庭中存在的性别歧视观念。

研究方法: 样本共159人,其中初中义务教育学生53人,父亲53人,母亲53人。用于评估父母性别歧视的工具是“矛盾性别歧视调查表”,用于评估学生性别歧视的工具是“青少年矛盾性别歧视调查表”。

结果: 结果显示所有参与者的性别歧视、敌对性别歧视和善意性别歧视水平较低。研究发现,学生和母亲的性别歧视、敌对性别歧视和善意性别歧视之间存在显著相关性。同样,性别歧视与母亲和学生的善意性别歧视之间也存在显著相关性。学生变量与其父母变量之间没有观察到显著相关性。

结论: 结论强调,性别陈规定型观念和性别歧视信念仍然存在于家庭中,尽管其程度较低。其继续代代相传的现象表明,尽管在平等方面取得了进步,但在家中从母亲身上学到的东西仍然是形成这些信念的重要因素。

关键词: 敌意性别歧视、善意性别歧视、学生、家庭。

Introduction

Sexism has become one of the most relevant topics in today's society, as it implies the persistence of inequalities between men and women (Garaigordobil & Maganto, 2015). This arises from the ongoing dissemination of education with sexist traits by some socializing agents, which perpetuates gender stereotypes and the differentiation of roles based on gender (Barberá & Martínez, 2004; García, 2013). Additionally, it leads to the perpetuation of a patriarchal structure in which women are positioned in an inferior condition compared to men (Nolasco, Carretero, & Pubill, 2018).

Sexism was defined by Swim and Hyers (2009) as:

The attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors of individuals, as well as organizational, institutional, and cultural practices that either reflect negative evaluations of people based on the gender to which they belong or support the existence of unequal status between men and women. (p. 407)

Moreover, sexism is associated with violence or power relations exerted by men over women. Consequently, as stated by Villacis and Narváez (2022):

Sexism is present at all educational, social, and cultural levels; even in many cases, women are hindered by the assumption that they are indispensable for the family as a 'natural' duty, omitting the achievement of personal goals and accomplishments, solely because they are women. (p. 151)

According to Díaz-Aguado (2006), cited by Carretero (2011), sexism is comprised of the following components: Cognitive, constituted by beliefs originating from an inability to differentiate biological differences among individuals based on gender from psychological and social ones. Therefore, the latter are considered consequences of biological characteristics; Affective or evaluative, where values are assigned based on gender, associating fragility and submission with women and authority, emotional strength, and the use of violence with men; Behavioral, encompassing the implementation of both cognitive and affective components through violent or discriminatory behaviors from males towards females, or the presence of a submissive and guilty attitude in females.

The evolution of sexism throughout history reveals distinct phases. In revisiting the traditional paradigm, referred to as "old sexism," we encounter the insights of All port, who characterizes it as prejudice directed against women, encompassing negative assessments and resulting in a hostile and discriminatory attitude towards them. This manifestation overtly and explicitly positions women in an inferior role (Benokraitis & Feagin, 1995; Swin et al., 1995, as cited in Lameiras, 2004).

In line with this perspective, gender roles in many civilizations often assign childcare responsibilities to women, while men typically take on the responsibility of working outside the household to provide economic support (Pérez, 2006, as cited by Colás, 2007). Thus, despite the progressive integration of women into the public work sphere in recent years (Lameiras, 2004), certain professions are still associated with a specific gender, and there is a lower number of leadership positions assigned to females (Brioso, Barrea, & Malagón, 2012, as cited by Rodríguez & Mancinas, 2016).

Currently, traditional sexism coexists with new forms of sexism (Ovejero et al., 2013). This new model is known as modern sexism and has a more subtle and imperceptible

character, but it is still harmful as it perpetuates inequality between sexes (Spence & Hahn, 1997, as cited by Lameiras, 2004). Thus, among the most recent theories, we find the Theory of Ambivalent Sexism, which posits that both hostile and benevolent sexism are present today (Glick & Fiske, 1996, as cited by Lameiras & Rodríguez, 2003).

The evolution of sexism does not signify its eradication; instead, it has transformed into subtler forms that are less overtly condemned and harder to identify. Nevertheless, traditional manifestations of sexism persist in contemporary society (Bonilla-Algovia & Rivas-Rivero, 2020a; Rodríguez et al., 2009; Glick & Fiske, 1996).

Instances reported by teachers, including sexist remarks and acts of violence or abuse, serve as examples of how gender inequality and violence become normalized from childhood, persisting into adulthood.

Ambivalent Sexism Theory

The conceptual approach to sexism involves surpassing definitions that rely exclusively on traditional manifestations and focusing on newer, less explicit but equally or more dangerous forms of sexism. Contemporary conceptualizations of sexism simultaneously integrate both hostile and subtle forms, encompassing both traditional and modern expressions (López-Sáez et al., 2019; Rodríguez et al., 2009; Lameiras & Rodríguez, 2002).

The Ambivalent Sexism Theory, formulated by Glick and Fiske in 1996, posits the coexistence of both benevolent and hostile sexist attitudes directed towards both men and women (Vaamonde, 2010). While sexist attitudes are related to both genders, those associated with women are more extensively studied due to the inequalities they face (Recio, Cuadrado, & Ramos, 2007, as cited by Vaamonde & Omar, 2012).

Hostile sexism is characterized by a negative affective tone that perceives women as inherently inferior and under the control of men. This form of sexism comprises three primary components (Glick & Fiske, 1996, as cited by Lameiras & Rodríguez, 2003):

Dominant paternalism views women as immature individuals who require the presence of a dominant man (Palacios & Rodríguez, 2012). It is based on the organization of a patriarchal society, reflecting the belief that the female figure is inferior, incompetent, and threatening as it attempts to take power away from men (Garaigordobil & Maganto, 2015).

Competitive gender differentiation posits that male figures possess the essential characteristics to govern in socio-economic and political spheres, while women can only intervene in the family environment and household as they lack these traits and exhibit others such as sensitivity, which places them in a position of inferiority and renders them incapable of wielding power (Garaigordobil & Maganto, 2015).

Heterosexual hostility underscores the relationship between sexual attraction and the intention of certain men to dominate women. Additionally, women are often perceived as being dangerous and manipulative (Garaigordobil & Maganto, 2015).

Similarly, benevolent sexism reveals a positive affective tone but stereotypically portrays women, assigning them traditional roles and emphasizing their fragility and the need for care by men. Consequently, benevolent sexism is composed of three components (Glick & Fiske, 1996, as cited by Lameiras & Rodríguez, 2003):

Protective paternalism conceives women who fulfill traditional roles as weak individuals whom men must protect, place on a pedestal, and financially support (Garaigordobil & Maganto, 2015).

Complementary gender differentiation considers that women possess positive qualities that complement those of men (Palacios & Rodríguez, 2012).

Heterosexual intimacy understands that the sexual motivation exhibited by men towards women is linked to the desire for closeness (Garaigordobil & Maganto, 2015).

Both forms of sexism can coexist within the same individual despite being opposing cognitions. Additionally, it is important to note that while hostile sexism carries significant severity, benevolent sexism is more harmful because it is challenging to eliminate due to its difficulty in detection and its positive tone, which garners consent from more women (Palacios & Rodríguez, 2012).

Considering empirical and theoretical studies, sexism is prevalent in our society (Garaigordobil & Maganto, 2015). For instance, research conducted by Cárdenas et al. (2010) on university students aged 18 to 32 reveals that men exhibit higher levels of both hostile and benevolent sexism than women. However, it also highlights the substantial degree of benevolent sexism displayed by women, who, while rejecting clear and overt forms of sexism, contribute to maintaining gender inequalities. Additionally, authors like Díaz and Sánchez (2019) identify benevolent sexism as a risk, as it can justify sexism and conceal its hostile forms.

Similarly, studies such as those by Lameiras and Rodríguez (2002), cited by Díaz and Sánchez (2019), emphasize that among Secondary Education students, boys exhibit higher scores in hostile sexism. However, they found no significant variations in the levels of benevolent sexism among adolescents of both genders. Likewise, research conducted by Nolasco, Carretero, and Gracia (2019) on sixth-grade Primary Education students indicates that hostile sexism tends to be lower in girls than in boys.

Furthermore, longitudinal research by Lameiras and Rodríguez (2003) involving Secondary Education and university students suggests that sexism tends to decrease with age. This decline in sexist attitudes is also observed in society as a whole, as indicated by Lameiras, Rodríguez, and González (2004).

Moreover, individuals are social beings who require interaction with others for continuous development throughout life. This process of socialization begins from birth and extends through all stages of life. Socialization is defined as the process in which human beings incorporate the behaviors, rules, and beliefs of the social context in which they are immersed as their own (Yubero, 2005). In this way, certain patterns are acquired that facilitate communal living and acceptance in society (Giddens, 2001).

According to Ortiz (2018), the assimilation of sexist beliefs occurs from an early age in the various contexts surrounding individuals. Society, through traditional socialization practices, delineates gender-specific traits and roles from childhood (Ceballos, 2014).

On the other hand, within the realm of socialization agents, the family holds the primary responsibility for socialization (Simkin & Becerra, 2013), playing a crucial role in transmitting values and beliefs from one generation to the next (Musitu, 2000). Specifically, the family initiates this process by conveying gender stereotypes from birth and attributing certain characteristics and behaviors to masculinity and femininity, such as appearance, language, or play preferences. Boys are encouraged towards heterosexuality and emotional strength while often discouraged from expressing vulnerability,

whereas girls are encouraged to prioritize appearance, polite language, and careful behaviors, and to cultivate empathy (Ceballos, 2014).

In line with this, studies by Garaigordobil and Aliri (2011) reveal that parental sexist beliefs and attitudes may influence the sexism of their offspring. Their research highlights the significant influence of parents from childhood, showing a connection between parental sexism and that of their children. Specifically, mothers' sexism is linked with that of both their sons and daughters, albeit more strongly with daughters. Conversely, fathers' sexism is only associated with that of their sons, indicating that mothers have a greater influence over their children's beliefs.

Similarly, O'Bryan et al. (2004) caution about the link between parental prejudices and those held by their children regarding men and women.

Moreover, family dynamics are sometimes reinforced by other socialization agents such as the media or the educational system (through the hidden curriculum) (Ceballos, 2014).

In light of these influences perpetuating sexist socialization, there is a pressing need to strengthen the role of educational institutions in combating sexist education. While educational institutions alone cannot eradicate gender inequalities, they play a crucial role in implementing educational initiatives that promote equality between men and women (Ceballos, 2014).

Thus, this research aims to understand the sexist beliefs of students and their families from a rural High School in the province of Teruel, with specific objectives: to identify the level of sexism present in Secondary Education students and their families, and to determine if there is a statistical correlation between the results of sexist beliefs obtained by students and their respective parents.

The following research hypotheses were formulated:

Female students with high scores in hostile and benevolent sexism are those whose mothers exhibit high scores in hostile and benevolent sexism.

Male students with high scores in hostile and benevolent sexism are those whose mothers exhibit high scores in hostile and benevolent sexism.

Female students with high scores in hostile and benevolent sexism are those whose fathers exhibit high scores in hostile and benevolent sexism.

Male students with high scores in hostile and benevolent sexism are those whose fathers exhibit high scores in hostile and benevolent sexism.

Methods

In the present research, a non-experimental study was conducted using a deductive procedure. Information collection was carried out through the utilization of a quantitative approach, which allows for the verification of formulated hypotheses.

The study was conducted at a rural High School situated in a town within the province of Teruel. This location was chosen due to its accessibility and relevance to the research objectives. The sample consisted of a total of 159 individuals, including both Secondary Education students and their parents. Therefore, the selected sample comprised 53 students, 53 fathers, and 53 mothers.

To measure ambivalent sexism in parents, the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI) was utilized. This inventory, adapted into Spanish by Expósito, Moya, and Glick from the original version by Glick and Fiske, includes two subscales: hostile sexism and benevolent sexism. It comprises 22 items with 6 response options on a Likert scale ranging from “Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree.” The scale demonstrates adequate reliability, with a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .89 for the general scale, .87 for the hostile sexism subscale, and .83 for the benevolent sexism subscale.

The assessment of sexism in adolescents was conducted using the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory for Adolescents (ASI-Adolescents). This questionnaire, developed by Lemus et al. (2007), consists of 20 items structured into two subscales: Hostile Sexism (items 1-10) and Benevolent Sexism (items 11-20). It is an adaptation of the ASI by Glick and Fiske, facilitating adolescents’ understanding of each item, where they indicate their level of agreement with statements using a Likert scale with 6 response options ranging from “Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree.” Regarding the questionnaire’s reliability, the general scale reveals a Cronbach’s alpha of .83, and the subscales of hostile and benevolent sexism show coefficients of .84 and .77, respectively.

Data collection from students took place during academic hours in tutorial sessions using the ASI-A questionnaire. Following this, students were given envelopes containing the ASI questionnaire along with instructions to deliver them to their parents. Prior to participation, informed consent was obtained from the students, their legal guardians, and the school principal. Participation in the study was voluntary and anonymous, ensuring confidentiality and compliance with ethical standards.

Results

In Table 1, the findings suggest that both male and female students demonstrate low levels of sexism, including hostile and benevolent forms.

Table 1
Descriptive statistics on students’ sexism

Student gender		Hostile sexism	Benevolent sexism	Sexism
Male	Mean	2.14	2.54	2.34
	N	27	27	27
Female	Mean	1.44	1.88	1.66
	N	26	26	26
Both genders	Mean	1.80	2.22	2.01
	N	53	53	53

According to the results obtained from the sample of mothers, as shown in Table 2, a low level of sexism, hostile sexism, and benevolent sexism is observed.

Compared to their children, mothers exhibited significantly lower levels of sexism, indicating a trend towards more egalitarian and less discriminatory attitudes being transmitted to their offspring. While these findings suggest a positive influence of mothers on their children's cognitive and social development, it's essential to acknowledge that not all mothers may be entirely free from sexism. Some mothers may still hold sexist attitudes in certain areas, although they have managed to refrain from transmitting them to their children.

Table 2

Descriptive statistics on mothers' sexism

Sexism levels	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean
Hostile sexism (mothers)	53	19	57	31.60
Benevolent sexism (mothers)	53	17	50	29.26
Sexism (mothers)	53	36	102	58.57

Similarly, in the case of fathers, the data presented in Table 3 reveal a low level of sexism, hostile sexism, and benevolent sexism.

Fathers demonstrate a low level of sexism, hostile sexism, and benevolent sexism, mirroring the pattern observed among mothers. This suggests that fathers, like mothers, may be conveying more egalitarian and less discriminatory attitudes to their children. It is important to emphasize that education and the transmission of values are not solely the responsibility of mothers but also of fathers. Therefore, it is encouraging to see that fathers also exhibit low levels of sexism.

Table 3

Descriptive statistics on fathers' sexism

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean
Hostile sexism (fathers)	53	13	63	37.83
Benevolent sexism (fathers)	53	14	57	32.09
Sexism (fathers)	53	30	108	67.25

Significant differences between the means are determined using the Student's t-test. Firstly, as demonstrated in Table 4, while variations in the means of hostile sexism exist among the various analyzed groups, these differences are not consistently significant. Thus, differences in hostile sexism attitudes between groups may be present, but they do not reach statistical significance.

However, the table indicates that in the case of students, disparities between the means of hostile sexism are indeed significant, implying genuine discrepancies in hostile sexism attitudes among students of different genders.

Table 4*Student's t-test for hostile sexism*

Hostile sexism t		t-test for equality of means		
		df	Sig. (2-tailed)	
Hostile sexism (students)	Equal variances assumed	3.818	51	.000
Hostile sexism (mothers)	Equal variances assumed	.427	51	.671
Hostile sexism (fathers)	Equal variances assumed	.881	51	.382

The results of Table 5 suggest that there are differences in the mean scores of benevolent sexism between students and mothers and fathers, with statistically significant differences observed only among students. This may indicate that students have more permissive and indulgent attitudes toward stereotypical gender roles compared to mothers and fathers, who may hold more traditional or less flexible attitudes. Nevertheless, it is essential to acknowledge that these results may vary depending on the population and cultural context, underscoring the need for further research to validate these interpretations.

Table 5*Student's t-test for benevolent sexism*

Benevolent sexism t		t-test for equality of means		
		df	Sig. (2-tailed)	
Benevolent sexism (students)	Equal variances assumed	2.388	51	.021
Benevolent sexism (mothers)	Equal variances assumed	.411	51	.683
Benevolent sexism (fathers)	Equal variances assumed	.767	51	.446

The results from Table 6 suggest that the level of sexism among students significantly differs from that of their parents. This implies that while parents may exhibit a certain level of sexism, it is not directly correlated with the level of sexism among their sons and daughters. This disparity could stem from various factors influencing students' attitudes toward sexism, including formal education, socialization with friends and classmates, and exposure to media influences. Therefore, it is crucial to consider these additional factors when assessing the influence of family contexts on the formation of students' attitudes toward sexism.

Table 6*Student's t-test for sexism*

Sexism t		t-test for equality of means		
		df		Sig. (2-tailed)
Sexism (students)	Equal variances assumed	3.250	51	.002
Sexism (fathers)	Equal variances assumed	.877	51	.384
Sexism (mothers)	Equal variances assumed	.516	51	.608

Similarly, the Pearson correlation test was conducted to determine the degree of correlation between sexism, hostile sexism, and benevolent sexism among students and their parents.

The results from Table 7 indicate a moderate positive relationship, with a value of .526, between the hostile sexism of students and that of mothers. This suggests that the hostile sexist attitude of mothers may influence the hostile sexist attitude of their sons and daughters. However, no significant correlation was found between the hostile sexism of students and fathers, indicating that fathers may not influence the sexist attitudes of their children to the same extent as mothers.

Table 7*Pearson correlation between hostile sexism of students, mothers, and fathers*

		Hostile sexism (students)	Hostile sexism (mothers)	Hostile sexism (fathers)
Hostile sexism (students)	Pearson Correlation	1	.526**	.307
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.005	.119
	N	27	27	27
Hostile sexism (mothers)	Pearson Correlation	.526**	1	.302
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.005		.125
	N	27	27	27
Hostile sexism (fathers)	Pearson Correlation	.307	.302	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.119	.125	
	N	27	27	27

Note. ** The correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

In Table 8, there is a Pearson linear correlation coefficient of .767, indicating a strong positive correlation between the benevolent sexism of students and their mothers. This implies that as the level of benevolent sexism increases among students, it also

increases among their mothers, and vice versa. This strong correlation could be attributed to socialization factors, wherein mothers transmit specific views and attitudes about gender roles and behavioral expectations of men and women in society to their children. It may also be influenced by the environment in which children grow up and their perception of mothers' attitudes and behaviors regarding gender.

Table 8

Pearson correlation between benevolent sexism of students, mothers, and fathers

		Benevolent sexism (students)	Benevolent sexism (mothers)	Benevolent sexism (fathers)
Benevolent sexism (students)	Pearson Correlation	1	.767**	-.158
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.430
	N	27	27	27
Benevolent sexism (mothers)	Pearson Correlation	.767**	1	-.128
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.525
	N	27	27	27
Benevolent sexism (fathers)	Pearson Correlation	-.158	-.128	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.430	.525	
	N	27	27	27

Note. ** The correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed)

Table 9

Pearson correlation between sexism of students, fathers, and mothers

		Sexism (fathers)	Sexism (mothers)	Sexism (students)
Sexism (fathers)	Pearson Correlation	1	-.128	-.128
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.525	.525
	N	27	27	27
Sexism (mothers)	Pearson Correlation	-.128	1	1.000**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.525		.000
	N	27	27	27
Sexism (students)	Pearson Correlation	-.128	1.000**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.525	.000	
	N	27	27	27

Note. ** The correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

A Pearson linear correlation coefficient of 1.000, as indicated in Table 9, denotes a perfect positive correlation between the variables of interest. In this instance, the perfect positive correlation between the sexism of students and mothers suggests that sexism can be learned and transmitted within the family, either through the direct influence of parents on their children or through exposure to the same values and beliefs at home.

The results presented in Table 10 suggest that there is no significant relationship between the hostile sexism of female students and that of their parents. Put differently, the sexist attitude of female students does not seem to be influenced by the sexist attitude of their parents in this particular aspect. This could be attributed to various factors, such as the influence of other socializing agents in shaping the sexist attitude of female students, or the presence of cultural or group factors that promote a specific sexist attitude among female students but may not necessarily be present in the attitudes of their parents. However, it's important to note that this result is specific to hostile sexism, and significant correlations may exist in other aspects of sexism or attitudes towards gender equality in general.

Table 10

Pearson correlation between hostile sexism of female students, mothers, and fathers

		Hostile sexism (female students)	Hostile sexism (mothers)	Hostile sexism (fathers)
Hostile sexism (female students)	Pearson Correlation	1	-.141	-.083
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.492	.686
	N	26	26	26
Hostile sexism (mothers)	Pearson Correlation	-.141	1	.592**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.492		.001
	N	26	26	26
Hostile sexism (fathers)	Pearson Correlation	-.083	.592**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.686	.001	
	N	26	26	26

Note. ** The correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

The results presented in Table 11 indicate a strong positive correlation between the benevolent sexism of female students and that of their mothers, suggesting that the benevolent attitude towards gender stereotypes in the family can shape the development of their daughters' attitudes.

Table 11*Pearson correlation between benevolent sexism of female students, mothers, and fathers*

		Benevolent sexism (female students)	Benevolent sexism (mothers)	Benevolent sexism (fathers)
Benevolent sexism (female students)	Pearson Correlation	1	.811**	-.116
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.573
	N	26	26	26
Benevolent sexism (mothers)	Pearson Correlation	.811**	1	-.115
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.575
	N	26	26	26
Benevolent sexism (fathers)	Pearson Correlation	-.116	-.115	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.573	.575	
	N	26	26	26

Note. ** The correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

To conclude, as shown by the results in Table 12, a perfect positive correlation has been found between the sexism of female students and that of their mothers, reaching a Pearson linear correlation coefficient of 1.000.

Table 12*Pearson correlation between sexism of female students, mothers, and fathers*

		Sexism (female students)	Sexism (mothers)	Sexism (fathers)
Sexism (female students)	Pearson Correlation	1	1.000**	-.115
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.575
	N	26	26	26
Sexism (mothers)	Pearson Correlation	1.000**	1	-.115
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.575
	N	26	26	26
Sexism (fathers)	Pearson Correlation	-.115	-.115	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.575	.575	
	N	26	26	26

Note. ** The correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

Discussion

Based on the study's objectives, the discussion proceeds to describe the findings linked to each of the proposed hypotheses and their relation to existing research.

Hypothesis 1: Female students with high scores in hostile and benevolent sexism are those whose mothers also exhibit high scores in hostile and benevolent sexism.

The results indicate a statistically significant correlation between the sexism of female students and that of their mothers, as well as between the benevolent sexism of female students and that of their mothers. However, no statistically significant correlation is observed between the hostile sexism of female students and that of their mothers. Thus, while there is a correlation between some variables, not all variables show a significant relationship, leading to the partial fulfillment of the hypothesis.

This finding aligns with the work of Garaigordobil and Aliri (2011), which confirms the link between mothers' sexism and that of their children. However, there are certain discrepancies compared to their conclusions, particularly regarding the stronger connection between mothers' sexism and that of daughters than sons.

Similarly, the conclusions of this study align with the findings of O'Bryan, Fishbein, and Ritchey (2004), who highlight the relationship between parents' prejudices and those of their children regarding gender roles.

Hypothesis 2: Male students with high scores in hostile and benevolent sexism are those whose mothers also exhibit high scores in hostile and benevolent sexism.

The Pearson correlation test reveals a statistically significant correlation between the variables related to male students' sexism, hostile sexism, and benevolent sexism, and those corresponding to mothers. Therefore, the second hypothesis is affirmed.

This conclusion is consistent with Garaigordobil and Aliri's assertion (2011) regarding the significant influence of mothers on their sons' sexism. Similarly, O'Bryan, Fishbein, and Ritchey (2004) report on the relationship between parents' prejudices and those of their children concerning gender attitudes.

Hypothesis 3: Female students with high scores in hostile and benevolent sexism are those whose fathers exhibit high scores in hostile and benevolent sexism.

The results indicate no statistically significant relationship between the studied variables. Therefore, hypothesis number 3 is not fulfilled.

In line with previous research by Garaigordobil and Aliri (2011), which demonstrates a lack of correlation between fathers' sexism and that of daughters, it appears that fathers have a lower level of influence than mothers in transmitting sexist beliefs and attitudes.

Hypothesis 4: Male students with high scores in hostile and benevolent sexism are those whose fathers exhibit high scores in hostile and benevolent sexism.

Similarly to the third hypothesis, no correlation is found between the studied variables, leading to the conclusion that the fourth hypothesis is not fulfilled.

Contrary to the significant influence of mothers, as indicated by Garaigordobil and Aliri (2011), it appears that fathers have a limited impact on their sons' sexism.

The results obtained suggest a relationship between family dynamics and present sexist beliefs among the student body under study. The family plays a crucial role in

shaping attitudes toward gender roles, as emphasized by Izquierdo and Ariño (2013), Perez-Felkner (2013), and Rodríguez-Martin et al. (2020).

A study conducted by Parry et al. (2020) found that sexist beliefs within families were associated with support for gender violence and victimization of women among college students. Similarly, Ruiz-Romero et al. (2021) found that sexist beliefs within families were linked to greater support for gender inequality and discrimination among university students. These studies underscore the ongoing relevance of sexist beliefs within families and their potential negative impact on perpetuating gender inequality and violence against women.

Moreover, Carrasco et al. (2021), in research conducted in Castilla-La Mancha, reported that 70% of a representative sample of high school students admitted to agreeing with some sexist beliefs, corroborating the findings of this study. During adolescence, new forms of sexism may gain more support due to their subtle nature and may not be readily identified as sexist (Carrasco et al., 2021).

The role of teachers in the family-school context is also crucial to consider. Bermejo and Hernandez (2019) highlight the prevalence of sexist beliefs and attitudes among teachers, which persist and are transmitted today. Similarly, Bonilla-Algovia (2021) argues that sexist beliefs among teachers in Spain and Latin America continue to influence teaching practices to some extent. Furthermore, sexist stereotypes persist in literature, emphasizing masculine figures over feminine ones, underscoring the importance of promoting content that fosters equality (Guerrero-Puerta, 2019).

Finally, the first study on ambivalent sexist attitudes provided empirical evidence that men scored higher than women on sexism scales (Glick & Fiske, 1996). Thus, although both men and women may endorse these attitudes, men generally exhibit higher levels of sexism. A cross-cultural study in Spain and Latin America reported that men tended to accept hostile and benevolent sexism more (Bonilla-Algovia, 2021). Similar findings were observed among young people in Spain, where boys scored higher than girls in both hostile and benevolent sexism (Carrasco et al., 2021; León & Aizpurúa, 2020; Montañés et al., 2015). The present research corroborates these findings.

Funding

Fundación Universitaria Antonio Gargallo.

Conflict of interest

In this article, the authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the research presented. They have not received funding from any commercial entity nor do they have affiliations with organizations that might have interests in the topic under discussion. The authors make this statement to ensure transparency and integrity in the presentation of their research results.

References

- Bonilla-Algovia, E., & Rivas-Rivero, E. (2020a). Diseño y validación de la Escala de Mitos del Amor Romántico. *Revista Iberoamericana de Diagnóstico y Evaluación – e Avaliação Psicológica*, 4(57), 119-136. <https://doi.org/10.21865/RIDEP57.4.09>
- Bonilla-Algovia, E. (2021). Acceptance of ambivalent sexism in trainee teachers in Spain and Latin American countries. *Anales de Psicología / Annals of Psychology*, 37(2), 253-264. <https://doi.org/10.6018/analesps.441791>
- Bermejo, R., & Hernández, A. (2019). Sexismo y formación inicial del profesorado. *Educación*, 55(1), 293-310.
- Cárdenas, M., Lay, S. L., González, C., Calderón, C., & Alegría, I. (2010). Inventario de sexismo ambivalente: adaptación, validación y relación con variables psicosociales. *Salud & Sociedad*, 1(2), 125-135. <https://bit.ly/3XMrgCX>
- Carrasco, C., Bonilla-Algovia, E., & Ibáñez, M. (2021). Sexismo ambivalente en adolescentes de Castilla-La Mancha. *Revista de Educación*, 392, 97- 121. <https://doi.org/10.4438/1988-592X-RE-2021-392-480>
- Carretero, R. (2011). Sexo, sexismo y acoso escolar entre iguales. *Revista Complutense De Educación*, 22(1), 27-43. <https://bit.ly/3Z8HDLp>
- Ceballos, E. (2014). Coeducación en la familia: Una cuestión pendiente para la mejora de la calidad de vida de las mujeres. *Revista Electrónica Interuniversitaria de Formación del Profesorado*, 17(1), 14. <https://bit.ly/3Z3OeGW>
- Colás, P. (2007). La construcción de la identidad de género: enfoques teóricos para fundamentar la investigación e intervención educativa. *Revista de investigación educativa*, 25(1), 151-166. <https://bit.ly/3xyOAJX>
- Díaz, M. J., & Sánchez, M. T. (2019). Adolescencia, sexismo e inteligencia emocional. Claves para prevenir actitudes sexistas. *Revista INFAD de Psicología. International Journal of Developmental and Educational Psychology*, 1(2), 157-172. <https://bit.ly/3YJTbVj>
- Díaz-Aguado, M. J. (2003). Adolescencia, sexismo y violencia de género. *Papeles del psicólogo*, 23 (84), 35-44. <https://bit.ly/3XTPlbi>
- Garaigordobil, M., & Aliri, J. (2011). Conexión intergeneracional del sexismo: influencia de variables familiares. *Psicothema*, 23(3), 382-387. <https://bit.ly/3SdoVzQ>
- Garaigordobil, M., & Maganto, C. (2015). Relación entre actitudes sexistas y variables emocionales positivas y negativas. *Feminismo-s*, 25, 35-54. <https://bit.ly/3IBtq46>
- García, L. A. (2013). Sexismo en adolescentes y su implicación en la violencia de género. *Boletín criminológico*, (144), 1-5. <https://bit.ly/3YDgLTP>
- Giddens, A. (2001). *Sociología*. Alianza.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating Hostile and Benevolent Sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70(3), 491-512. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.70.3.491>
- Guerrero-Puerta, L. (2017). La coeducación en España, un paseo por su recorrido histórico. In *II Congreso Online Internacional sobre Desigualdad Social, Económica y Educativa en el Siglo XXI*, 68-74. <https://bit.ly/3Z7weeG>
- Izquierdo, M. J., & Ariño, A. (2013). La socialización de género. In C. Díaz, & S. Dema, *Sociología y género* (pp. 87-126).

- Lameiras, M., & Rodríguez, Y. (2002). Evaluación del sexismo moderno en adolescentes. *Revista de Psicología Social, 17*(2), 119-127. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1174/021347402320007555>
- Lameiras, M., & Rodríguez, Y. (2003). Evaluación del sexismo ambivalente en estudiantes gallegos/as. *Acción Psicológica, 2*(2), 131-136. <https://bit.ly/3Ifj2Jc>
- Lameiras, M. (2004). El sexismo y sus dos caras: De la hostilidad a la ambivalencia. *Anuario de sexología, (8)*, 91-102. <https://bit.ly/32tlkDt>
- Lameiras, M., Rodríguez, Y., & González, M. (2004). Evolution of Hostile Sexism and Benevolent Sexism in a Spanish Sample. *Social Indicators Research, 66*(3), 197-211. <https://bit.ly/3ElmRzW>
- Lemus, S., Castillo, M., Moya, M., Padilla, J. L., & Ryan, E. (2008). Elaboración y validación del Inventario de Sexismo Ambivalente para Adolescentes. *International journal of clinical and health psychology, 8*(2), 537-562. <https://bit.ly/3XNlCdB>
- León, C. M., & Aizpurúa, E. (2020). ¿Persisten las actitudes sexistas en los estudiantes universitarios? Un análisis de su prevalencia, predictores y diferencias de género. *Educación XX1, 23*(1), 275-296. <https://doi.org/10.5944/educxx1.23629>
- López-Sáez, M. A., García-Dauder, D., & Montero, I. (2019). El sexismo como constructo en psicología: Una revisión de teorías e instrumentos. *Quaderns de Psicologia, 21*(3). <https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/qpsicologia.1523>
- Montañés, P., Megías, J. L., De Lemus, S., & Moya, M. (2015). Sexismo en la adolescencia: influencia de las primeras relaciones de pareja. *Revista de Psicología Social, 30*(2), 219-240. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21711976.2015.1016756>
- Musitu, G. (2000). Socialización familiar y valores en el adolescente: un análisis intercultural. *Anuario de Psicología, 31*(2), 15-32. <https://bit.ly/41cXr1u>
- Nolasco, A., Carretero, R., & Pubill, M. (2018). Sexismo y estereotipo emocional en 6º de primaria en dos CEIP de Teruel. In *Inteligencia Emocional y Bienestar III. Reflexiones, Experiencias Profesionales e Investigaciones*, 135-149. Ediciones Universidad de San Jorge. <https://bit.ly/3xCmAoF>
- Nolasco, A., Carretero-Bermejo, R., & Gracia, L. (2019). Sexist Beliefs of Sixth-Grade Students of Primary Education in Two Public Primary Schools in Teruel, Spain. *The International Journal of Learner Diversity and Identities, 16*(2), 23-35. <https://bit.ly/3kdVxNq>
- O'Bryan, M., Fishbein, H., & Ritchey, P. N. (2004). Intergenerational transmission of prejudice, sex role stereotypes and intolerance. *Adolescence, 39*(155), 407-426. <https://bit.ly/3IcCECx>
- Ortiz, L. (2018). Actitudes sexistas en los jóvenes universitarios: influencia del contexto familiar y de pareja. *Documentos de trabajo social: Revista de trabajo y acción social, (61)*, 25-44. <https://bit.ly/3Z7goAU>
- Ovejero, A., Yubero, S., Larrañaga, E., & Navarro, R. (2013). Sexismo y comportamiento de acoso escolar en adolescentes. *Psicología Conductual, 21*(1), 157-171. <https://bit.ly/3xD7oYr>
- Palacios, S., & Rodríguez, I. (2012). Sexismo, hostilidad y benevolencia. Género y creencias asociadas a la violencia de pareja. In *XVII Congreso de Estudios Vascos: Innovación para el progreso social sostenible*, 411-431. <https://bit.ly/3lOnLNP>
- Parry, R., Smith, E., Grzanka, P. R., & Zoppolat, G. (2020). The Relationship Between Parental Gender Ideologies and Intimate Partner Violence Among University Stu-

- dents in the United States and Italy. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260520970407>
- Perez-Felkner, L. (2013). Socialization in Childhood and Adolescence. In J. DeLamater (Ed.). *Handbook of Social Psychology* (pp. 119-149). Springer Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-6772-0_5
- Rodríguez-Martín, V., García, J. A., Simón, N., Morales, S., Calvo, P., Mercado, E., Barahona, M. J., Dorado, A. I., Tereucán, J. C., & Salamé, A. (2020). *La educación familiar en igualdad de género en tiempos de pandemia*. Instituto de la Mujer de Castilla-La Mancha. <https://bit.ly/3KrYzsb>
- Rocha-Sánchez, T. E., & Díaz-Loving, R. (2005). Cultura de género: La brecha ideológica entre hombres y mujeres. *Anales de Psicología*, 21(1), 42-49. <https://bit.ly/3IcC3kh>
- Rodríguez, Y., Lameiras, M., Carrera, M. V., & Failde, J. M. (2009). Aproximación conceptual al sexismo ambivalente: Estado de la cuestión. *Summa Psicológica UST*, 6(2), 131-142
- Rodríguez, L. M., & Mancinas, S. (2016). Nivel de sexismo y estereotipos de género en estudiantes de trabajo social regiomontanas. *Azarbe*, (5), 17-30. <https://bit.ly/3IE8Jo9>
- Ruiz-Romero, A., López-Zafra, E., & El Ghoulbzouri, A. (2021). Creencias sexistas y apoyo a la desigualdad de género en estudiantes universitarios: el papel mediador de la victimización. *Anales de Psicología*, 37(1), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.6018/analesps.428731>
- Simkin, H., & Becerra, G. (2013). El proceso de socialización. Apuntes para su exploración en el campo psicosocial. *Ciencia, docencia y tecnología*, 24(47), 119-142. <https://bit.ly/3KjnCgU>
- Swim, J. K., & Hyers, L. L. (2009). 20 Sexism. *Handbook of Prejudice, Stereotyping, and Discrimination*.
- Vaamonde, J. D. (2010). Valores y sexismo en adolescentes argentinos. *Salud & Sociedad*, 1(2), 113-124. <https://bit.ly/3xFkLaG>
- Vaamonde, J. D., & Omar, A. (2012). Validación argentina del inventario de sexismo ambivalente. *Alternativas en Psicología*, 16(26), 47-58. <https://bit.ly/3xDgg01>
- Villacis, D., & Narváez, M. (2022). Incidencia de la familia en la elección de una carrera profesional en el área musical. In F. Aguilar (coord.). *Genealogía de la familia. Familia, educación y sociedad como unidad dialéctica* (pp. 127-154). <http://dspace.ups.edu.ec/handle/123456789/23103>
- Yubero, S. (2005). Capítulo XXIV: Socialización y aprendizaje social. *Psicología social, cultura y educación*, 819-844. <https://bit.ly/2GZSYGC>