Differences in the levels of sexism in physical education students according to sociodemographic variables

Diferencias en los niveles de sexismo en estudiantes de Educación Física según variables sociodemográficas

Diferenças nos níveis de sexismo em estudantes de Educação Física segundo variáveis sociodemográficas

Cristian Cuevas González [1], Joaquín Matamala Muñoz [2], Francisca Sepúlveda Ormeño [3], Marcelo Barrera Bolados [4] & Fernando Maureira Cid [5]

ABSTRACT

Sexism is the set of beliefs and characteristics that are socially considered appropriate for men and women, in the case of men, activities associated with strength, and virility, among other features, while the ladies are related to activities such as beauty and body expression, among others. The objective of the present research was to analyze the differences in sexism among the students in pedagogy training in physical education at the University of Santiago de Chile according to various sociodemographic variables. The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI) was applied to 201 participants. The results showed low levels of sexism, the levels of hostile and benevolent sexism decrease as the career progresses, and that men score higher than women in the two types of sexism. It is concluded that sex, career year, sexual orientation, and religious beliefs influence the sexism levels of physical education students.

Key words: Sexism, Gender role, Pedagogy, University, Physical education.

[1] Estudiante Magíster en Educación Física, Salud y Deportes. Universidad Metropolitana de Ciencias de la Educación, Santiago, Chile. https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9100-575X | ccuevasg@miucsh.cl

[2] Estudiante de Pedagogía en Educación Física, Escuela de Ciencias y Tecnología Educativa. Universidad Católica Silva Henríquez, Santiago, Chile. https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1440-0139 | jmatamalam@miucsh.cl

[3] Estudiante de Pedagogía en Educación Física, Escuela de Ciencias y Tecnología Educativa. Universidad Católica Silva Henríquez, Santiago, Chile. https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8984-2172 | fasepulveda@miucsh.cl

[4] Estudiante de Pedagogía en Educación Física, Escuela de Ciencias y Tecnología Educativa. Universidad Católica Silva Henríquez, Santiago, Chile. https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2287-066X | mbarrerab@miucsh.cl

[5] Doctor en Educación. Departamento de Educación Física, Deportes y Recreación. Universidad Metropolitana de Ciencias de la Educación, Santiago, Chile. https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7607-7416 | maureirafernando@yahoo.es

RESUMEN

El sexismo es el conjunto de creencias y características que son socialmente consideradas apropiadas para hombres y mujeres, en el caso de los varones, actividades asociadas a la fuerza, virilidad, entre otras características, mientras que a las damas se ligan actividades como la belleza, expresión corporal, entre otras. El objetivo de la presente investigación fue analizar las diferencias en el sexismo en los estudiantes en formación de pedagogía en educación física de una Universidad de Santiago de Chile según diversas variables sociodemográficas. Para ello se aplicó el Inventario de Sexismo Ambivalente (ISA) a 201 participantes. Los resultados evidenciaron bajos niveles de sexismo, los niveles de sexismo hostil y benevolente disminuyen conforme avanza la carrera y que los hombres puntúan más alto que las mujeres los dos tipos de sexismo. Se concluye que el sexo, año de carrera, orientación sexual y las creencias religiosas influyen en los niveles de sexismo de los estudiantes de Educación Física.

Palabras clave: Sexismo, Roles de género, Pedagogía, Universidad, Educación física.

RESUMO

Sexismo é o conjunto de crenças e características que são socialmente consideradas apropriadas para homens e mulheres, no caso dos homens, atividades associadas à força, virilidade, entre outras características, enquanto as mulheres estão ligadas a atividades como beleza, expressão corporal, entre outras. O objetivo da presente pesquisa foi analisar as diferenças no sexismo nos estudantes em formação de pedagogia em educação física de uma Universidade de Santiago do Chile segundo diversas variáveis sociodemográficas. Para este fim, o Inventário do Sexismo Ambivalente (ISA) foi aplicado a 201 participantes. Os resultados mostraram baixos níveis de sexismo, com níveis de sexismo hostil e benevolente diminuindo à medida que o curso avançava, e que os homens pontuaram mais alto que as mulheres em ambos os tipos de sexismo. Conclui-se que gênero, ano de estudo, orientação sexual e crenças religiosas influenciam os níveis de sexismo dos estudantes de Educação Física.

Palavras chave: Sexismo, Papel de gênero, Pedagogia, Universidade, Educação física.

INTRODUCTION

Sexism is a problem present in all dimensions of social relations, since it is a set of beliefs in which different roles, characteristics and behaviors are assigned according to biological sex to gender (Carretero & Nolasco, 2019; González, 1990; Moya, 2004). Education, since its beginnings, is not alien to this phenomenon, because these sexist actions and behaviors continue to be replicated (Baeza & Lamadrid, 2018; Mujica, 2019), which causes its transcendence over time, considerably impacting students, teachers and all their educational actors.

Carretero & Nolasco (2019) agree that gender roles are closely related to the biological sex of people, however, it is linked to gender and the existing connection between these concepts in society. On the other hand, González (1990) describes sexism as the restrictions that are assigned to masculine and feminine characteristics. Therefore, women could not perform construction work or practice masculinized sports, such as rugby, soccer, among others, since these activities are considered socially masculine, linking sexism to a series of affective, cognitive and ideological

behaviors that assume and depend on the gender of each person (Vargas, 2018).

As indicated by Heilman et al. (2021), traditionally sexism focuses on the social roles that men and women should fulfill. On the one hand, leadership would characterize men and the maintenance of the home and parenting is awarded to women. This serves to justify the treatment of women and maintain conventional gender roles. On the other hand, modern sexism focuses on gender discrimination or its current state. In short, modern sexism is defined by discrimination and denial towards women. According to Glick & Fiske (1996), sexism is a discriminatory attitude, focused on people through the sex assigned at birth, to which different behaviors and characteristics are attributed. These characteristics are divided into two areas: hostile and benevolent. Within the benevolent sexist beliefs are positive affective actions in which women should be protected and adored by men. On the other hand, hostile sexism is associated with all actions and attitudes of prejudice towards women based on the belief that they are inferior to men.

Just like traditional sexism, hostile sexism has a negative emotional charge, assuming negative stereotypical views of women as a consequence of male supremacy (Garaigordobil & Aliri, 2011), as happens particularly in physical and/or sports activities, where women are left aside because they have fewer characteristics and/or physical qualities than men. Its counterpart, benevolent sexism, refers to sexism that, although it should not occur, is even more accepted by society, since it idealizes women with the roles assigned socially, such as wives, mothers or for more romantic reasons. In this way, as previously announced, women are sought to be worshipped through certain positive actions. A study conducted by Carretero & Nolasco (2019) at the University of Castilla-La Mancha and the University of Zaragoza in Spain evaluated 1,308 participants, of which 354 were men (27%) and 954 women (73%). The results showed that male students have a higher score in hostile and benevolent sexism than women. As for women, they have high levels of benevolent sexism, but not hostile sexism. The study by Fernández et al. (2017) with 177 men and 357 women from the San Pablo Catholic University and the National University of San Agustín in Peru, revealed that men are more sexist than women in the subdimensions of hostile sexism and paternalistic benevolent sexism. In addition, male and female students from the Public University present higher sexism results in correspondence with the private entity. A study carried out by Pérez (2017) in Spain, had as its main objective to detect the beliefs and conceptions of teachers about sexism in Early Childhood Education and whether initial training and years of experience have any influence on these practices. The participants were 9 in total, 4 of them were teaching at the time of the research while 5 were not teaching, with an age between 19 and 59 years. The study concludes that there are differences between teachers depending on the academic training they have, those with more training present fewer sexist practices, which indicates that they understand the problem and the long-term impact that exists compared to their peers with less training. Along these same lines, it is considered that there is a deficiency in terms of knowledge and training regarding sexism and its influence on society.

Mujica (2019) analyzed the internal regulations of different educational establishments in Chile, with the purpose of recognizing the presence of sexist regulations that stereotype corporality. The author concludes that in Chile there are different educational establishments that are reproducing sexist and hegemonic gender stereotypes, through their

internal regulations, where students are required to obey through punishments or sanctions for violating the regulations, therefore, students are forced to comply and abide by sexism within the establishment. A study conducted by Trujillo & Contreras (2021) surveyed a sample of 1,120 students from three public and regional universities in Chile. Their results show the permanence of gender roles and stereotypes in student communities, in addition to being able to visualize the degree of social acceptance of sexist and macho statements. The authors conclude that it is urgent to generate spaces for dialogue and critical reflection on issues of equity, violence and gender constructions.

Cáceres et al. (2020) studied the existence of sexism in the educational process in the subject of Physical Education and Health, from the perspective of the main representatives, surveying 23 students between 7th grade and 4th year of high school, and 8 Physical Education teachers. The authors concluded that within educational centers, sexist behaviors are strongly manifested with attitudes related to hostile sexism and neosexism, likewise, it is the students themselves who continue to perpetuate these discriminatory behaviors and attitudes within the Physical Education class. A research carried out by García et al. (2022) analyzed the relationship between attitudes towards gender in the educational field and sexist attitudes at a university in Spain. The sample consisted of 668 students from the Faculty of Education, Psychology and Sports Sciences. The results revealed that boys scored higher in sexism, concluding that a positive attitude towards sexuality allows one to be less prejudiced and discriminatory, therefore, the levels of sexism would be lower.

Pastor-Vicedo et al. (2019) with a sample of 54 sixth grade students (27 boys and 27 girls) from two public schools located in the city of Toledo (Spain), aimed to identify the perception of primary school students about gender stereotypes linked to physical activity and sport. The main results show the presence of stereotypes related to performance, self-concept and treatment by teachers. Finally, it is concluded that boys continue to be linked to activities that require strength, aggressiveness, endurance and risk, while girls continue to be linked to activities of rhythm, flexibility, expression and coordination. Limiting and conditioning exclusively by gender, the practice of physical activities exclusively by gender. Suárez (2021) analyzed sexist stereotypes in free play carried out by boys and girls in early education. The study was carried out in an Early Childhood Education center in Quito. The results show that students have embedded sexist stereotypes, specifically in the categorization of objects and activities for boys and girls. The author concludes that there is a reproduction of sexist attitudes by students, evidenced through the activities carried out in the educational establishment, such as by excluding gender in activities socially seen as masculine, as well as by assigning gender to objects depending on their colors or functionalities.

Based on the background presented, the objective of this research arises: To analyze the differences in the levels of sexism in students in physical education pedagogy training at a University in Santiago de Chile, according to various sociodemographic variables.

METHODS

Sample: non-probabilistic intentional type (Maureira & Flores, 2018). It consisted of 201

students of Physical Education Pedagogy from a private university in the city of Santiago de Chile. The minimum age was 18 and the maximum was 35 years, with an average of 21.9 ± 3.8. Of the total, 116 were men (57.7%) and 85 were women (42.3%). 24 students were in their first year of the degree (11.9%), 28 in their second year (13.9%), 55 in their third year (27.4%), 39 in their fourth year (19.4%) and 55 in their fifth year (27.4%). 173 students identified themselves as heterosexual (86.1%), 5 as homosexual (2.5%), 21 as bisexual (10.4%) and 2 as asexual (1.0%). Of the total, 57 identified themselves as Catholic (28.4%), 16 as Evangelical (8.0%), 76 as atheist (37.8%) and 52 with other religious beliefs (25.9%). The inclusion criteria were to be regular students of the Physical Education degree, regardless of sex, sexual orientation or religious belief. The exclusion criteria were: students who during the last six months were in psychological treatment or had consumed medication for any mood or psychological disorder; b) students who had taken a university degree prior to Physical Education.

Instruments: a sociodemographic survey was applied which collected information on age, year of degree, sex, socioeconomic level, religious belief and whether they received sexual education in schools and/or university. In addition, the ambivalent sexism inventory (ASI) of Glick & Fiske (1996) was applied. This instrument was validated in Physical Education students in Chile by Maureira et al. (2023) with a reduction to 20 items that explain 56.5% of the total variance explained, maintaining the two original dimensions: a) hostile sexism that presented two sub-factors: female manipulation with eight items and female distrust with three items; b) ambivalent sexism that presented two sub-factors: protective paternalism with five items and gender differentiation with four items. Cronbach's alpha gave a value of 0.908 for the 20

items of the instrument. For each item, the respondent must answer on a 5-point Likert scale, from 1 = totally disagree to 5 = totally agree.

Procedure: the instruments were applied during class hours with a duration of approximately 20 minutes. All participants signed an informed consent to participate in the research.

Data analysis: the statistical program SPSS 25.0 for Windows was used. Descriptive statistics were applied as means and standard deviations. KS normality tests were also used to determine the distribution of the data, which had a normal distribution ($p>0.05$). For this reason, parametric statistics were used, with t tests for independent samples to compare hostile and benevolent sexism between women and men, and between those who received sexual education and those who did not. ANOVA tests were also used to compare hostile and benevolent sexism according to course of study, religious beliefs and socioeconomic level. Values $p<0.05$ were considered significant.

RESULTS

Table 1 shows the scores obtained for each item of the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory. It is possible to notice that the items with the lowest scores were item 1. A man is not truly complete without the love of a woman (1.4±0.8), item 13. A woman seeks to commit to a man in order to control him (1.4±0.7) and item 18. Men should be willing to sacrifice their own well-being in order to provide economic well-being for women (1.4±0.8). On the contrary, the items with the highest sexism scores are item 4. Many women interpret innocent comments and actions as sexist (2.8±1.2), item 8. Women should be loved and protected by men (2.6±1.4) and item 17. Women have higher moral values than men (2.6±1.1). In general, the scores for each item reveal low or medium-low levels of sexism.

When comparing the ASI scores according to the sex assigned at birth of the sample, it can be seen that men obtain the highest score in item 4. Many women interpret innocent comments and actions as sexist (3.0±1.1), while women do so in item 17. Women have higher moral values than men (2.7±1.2). On the other hand, the lowest scores in men are evident in item 13. Women seek to commit to a man in order to control him (1.4±0.7) and women in item 18. Men should be willing to sacrifice their own well-being in order to provide economic well-being to women (1.3±0.7). In general, men score higher in all items.

Table 1

Scores on each item of the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory in the sample.

Items		Total (n=201)	Female (n=85)	Male (n=116)	p
1.	A man is not truly complete without the love of a woman.	1,4±0,8	1,2±0,5	1,6±0,9	0,000**
2.	In the name of equality, many women try to gain certain privileges.	2,5±1,2	2,3±1,3	2,6±1,1	0,052
3.	In disasters, women should be rescued before men.	2,2±1,1	1,7±1,0	2,6±1,1	0,000**
4.	Many women interpret innocent comments and actions as sexist.	2,8±1,2	2,5±1,3	3,0±1,1	0,014*
5.	Women are easily offended.	2,3±1,2	2,0±1,2	2,6±1,2	0,001**
6.	People cannot be truly happy without having a partner.	1,5±1,0	1,4±0,8	1,6±1,1	0,079
7.	Feminists try to give women more power than men.	2,0±1,3	1,8±1,2	2,2±1,3	0,028*
8.	Women should be loved and protected by men.	2,6±1,4	2,4±1,5	2,8±1,4	0,056
9.	Women do not value everything that men do for them.	2,0±1,1	1,6±0,9	2,3±1,2	0,000**
10.	Women seek to gain power by manipulating men.	1,8±1,0	1,5±0,9	2,0±1,1	0,000**
11.	Every man should have a woman to love.	1,8±1,1	1,5±0,8	2,1±1,3	0,000**
12.	Women exaggerate the problems they have at work.	1,6±0,9	1,4±0,8	1,7±0,9	0,026*

Items	Total (n=201)	Female (n=85)	Male (n=116)	p
13. The woman seeks to commit to a man in order to control him.	1,4±0,7	1,3±0,6	1,4±0,7	0,109
14. Generally, when a woman is defeated cleanly she complains of having suffered discrimination.	1,9±1,0	1,5±0,9	2,1±1,1	0,000**
15. A good woman should be put on a pedestal by her man.	2,0±1,2	1,6±1,0	2,3±1,3	0,000**
16. Many women, to make fun of men, use their appearance to attract them and then reject them.	2,3±1,2	2,1±1,2	2,4±1,2	0,033*
17. Women have higher moral values than men.	2,6±1,1	2,7±1,2	2,6±1,1	0,485
18. Men should be willing to sacrifice their own well-being in order to provide economic well-being for women.	1,4±0,8	1,3±0,7	1,4±0,9	0,256
19. Women's requests to men are completely irrational.	1,6±0,9	1,4±0,7	1,7±0,9	0,008**
20. Women tend to be more elegant and have better taste than men.	2,1±1,2	2,2±1,2	2,1±1,1	0,365

*significant difference at the 0.05 level.
**significant difference at the 0.01 level.

Table 2 shows the scores for the dimensions of hostile sexism and benevolent sexism. The female distrust sub dimension has the highest sexism scores (2.5±1.0) and the female manipulation sub dimension has the lowest scores (1.8±0.8). Hostile sexism obtained a score similar to benevolent sexism. Table 2 shows the scores for the dimensions of hostile sexism and benevolent sexism according to the sex of the sample. The female distrust sub dimension has the highest sexism scores (2.7±0.9) in men and the lowest scores are in women in the female manipulation sub dimension (1.6±0.6) and in the protective paternalism sub dimension (1.6±0.6). Hostile sexism obtained a score similar to benevolent sexism.

Table 2

Scores on each dimension of hostile and benevolent sexism in the sample.

Sexism	Subdimensions	Total (n=201)	Female (n=85)	Male (n=116)	p
Hostile	Female manipulation	1,8±0,8	1,6±0,6	2,0±0,8	0,000**
	Female distrust	2,5±1,0	2,3±1,0	2,7±0,9	0,002**
	TOTAL	2,0±0,8	1,8±0,7	2,2±0,7	0,000**
Benevolent	Protective paternalism	1,9±0,8	1,6±0,6	2,1±0,8	0,000**
	Gender differentiation	2,1±0,7	2,0±0,7	2,2±0,7	0,077
	TOTAL	2,0±0,6	1,8±0,5	2,1±0,7	0,000**

**significant difference at the 0.01 level.

Table 3 shows the ANOVA tests comparing the scores of each dimension of hostile and ambivalent sexism according to the year of the sample's degree. In the dimensions of female manipulation, female distrust, and protective paternalism, first-year students present higher sexism scores compared to the other four years.

In the dimension of gender differentiation, first-year students present higher sexism scores compared to fourth and fifth years. Finally, in hostile sexism and benevolent sexism, first-year students present higher sexism scores compared to the other four years.

Table 3

Comparison of the scores of each dimension of hostile and benevolent sexism according to the year of the sample's degree.

Sexism	Subdimensions	1st year (n=24)	2nd year (n=28)	3rd year (n=55)	4th year (n=39)	5th year (n=55)	p
Hostile	Female manipulation	2,5±0,9	1,9±0,8	1,7±0,7	1,7±0,6	1,7±0,7	0,000**
	Female distrust	3,2±0,9	2,6±0,9	2,5±1,0	2,2±0,9	2,5±1,0	0,002**
	TOTAL	2,7±0,8	2,1±0,8	1,9±0,7	1,8±0,6	1,9±0,7	0,000**
Benevolent	Protective paternalism	2,6±0,8	1,9±0,8	1,9±0,8	1,7±0,6	1,7±0,7	0,000**
	Gender differentiation	2,5±0,7	2,1±0,7	2,3±0,8	1,9±0,6	1,9±0,6	0,005**
	TOTAL	2,5±0,6	2,0±0,6	2,0±0,7	1,8±0,5	1,8±0,6	0,000**

*significant difference at the 0.05 level.
**significant difference at the 0.01 level.

Table 4 shows the ANOVA tests comparing the scores of each dimension of hostile and ambivalent sexism according to the sexual orientation of the sample. The dimension of female distrust presents significant differences where students who declare themselves heterosexual present higher sexism scores than those who declare themselves homosexual and bisexual. In hostile sexism, students who declare themselves heterosexual present higher sexism scores than those who declare themselves bisexual.

Tabla 4

Comparison of scores for each dimension of hostile and benevolent sexism according to the sexual orientation of the sample.

Sexism	Subdimensions	He (n=173)	Ho (n=5)	Bi (n=21)	As (n=2)	p
Hostile	Female manipulation	1,9±0,8	1,2±0,2	1,5±0,6	1,2±0,3	0,055
	Female distrust	2,6±1,0	1,4±0,5	1,9±0,9	1,2±0,2	0,000**
	TOTAL	2,1±0,7	1,3±0,2	1,6±0,7	1,2±0,3	0,003**
Benevolent	Protective paternalism	1,9±0,8	1,3±0,3	1,6±0,5	1,4±0,6	0,054
	Gender differentiation	2,1±0,7	2,2±1,2	1,9±0,6	1,0±0,0	0,059
	TOTAL	2,0±0,7	1,7±0,5	1,7±0,3	1,2±0,3	0,064

He=heterosexual; Ho=homosexual; Bi=bisexual; As=asexual.
*significant difference at the 0.05 level; **significant difference at the 0.01 level.

Table 5 shows the ANOVA tests comparing the scores of each dimension of hostile and ambivalent sexism according to the religious beliefs of the sample. The female distrust dimension presents significant differences where students who declare themselves evangelical present higher sexism scores than those who declare themselves agnostic or atheist. In the protective paternalism dimension, students who declare themselves evangelical present higher sexism scores than those who declare themselves agnostic or atheist and those who declare another religious belief. In the gender differentiation dimension, students who declare themselves Catholic present higher sexism scores than those who declare themselves agnostic or atheist and those who declare another religious belief. Finally, in benevolent sexism, students who declare themselves evangelical have higher sexism scores than those who declare themselves agnostic or atheist and those who declare another religious belief.

Table 5

Comparison of scores for each dimension of hostile and benevolent sexism according to the religious beliefs of the sample.

Sexism	Subdimensions	Catholic (n=57)	Evangelical (n=16)	Atheist (n=76)	Other (n=52)	p
Hostile	Female manipulation	1,8±0,7	2,1±0,9	1,7±0,7	1,9±0,7	0,207
	Female distrust	2,6±1,0	2,9±0,9	2,3±0,9	2,7±1,1	0,027*
	TOTAL	2,0±0,7	2,3±0,8	1,9±0,7	2,1±0,7	0,092
Benevolent	Protective paternalism	2,0±0,8	2,4±0,7	1,6±0,7	1,9±0,8	0,001**
	Gender differentiation	2,5±0,8	2,2±0,7	1,9±0,6	2,0±0,6	0,000**
	TOTAL	2,2±0,7	2,3±0,5	1,8±0,5	1,9±0,6	0,000**

*significant difference at the 0.05 level.
**significant difference at the 0.01 level.

When comparing the scores of each dimension of hostile and benevolent sexism by those who declare having received sexual education at school or university, significant differences are only evident in the Gender Differentiation dimension where those who received sexual education have a higher score (Yes = 2.2 ± 0.7; No = 2.0 ± 0.7; p = 0.024). When making the same comparisons according to socioeconomic level, no significant differences are observed.

DISCUSSION

Regarding the results of sexism levels according to the year of the degree, it is observed that as one advances in it, the lower the values obtained, therefore, they are less sexist, when historically in the career of pedagogy in physical education the male presence has predominated, also reflected in recent years with the low levels of female enrollment at the national level (Matus-Castillo et al., 2022) quite contrary to the female presence in the rest of the university careers (Matus-Castillo et al., 2021), concluding that said career would be masculinized due to various factors. Maureira et al. (2022) presented in their research on masculinities and femininities in which students of pedagogy in physical education present socially accepted feminine characteristics, such as empathy, understanding, among others. All under the auspices that these characteristics are important as an element of social development and fundamental tools for the teaching task, which justifies the values obtained in this research. In relation to the results of sexism levels according to biological sex, it is evident that men are the ones who obtain a higher score than women in both dimensions of sexism. This is similar to the results obtained in the research by Carretero & Nolasco (2019), where sexist attitudes are predominantly found in men. These results indicate the need to take measures in relation to

the urgency of designing study plans with a gender, equality and sexism perspective, this being the main attitude of discrimination towards the female universe. On the other hand, a similar situation occurs in the research carried out by Fernández et al. (2017) where men are more sexist than women in the subdimensions of hostile sexism and benevolent paternalistic sexism, implying that while there are men who take a more violent role towards women, there will be others who assume a more protective role. Therefore, it would seem that, through the results obtained by various investigations, sexism and its various behaviors would not be a problem per se in physical education, nor at a national level. Regarding the result of the sexual orientation variable, heterosexuals score higher overall compared to homosexuals, bisexuals and asexuals. This is supported by what was proposed by Moya (2004) since, according to beliefs and heteronorms, different roles, characteristics and behaviors are assigned to the biological sex of the gender; it is from this that we can infer that the sum of both factors (the roles assigned to gender and the roles assigned to sexual orientations) also play a determining role in the self-perception of sexism demonstrated in the responses given by the sample and how they declare that the phenomenon of sexism is manifested.

There is a significant difference in the Gender Differentiation sub-dimension between those who claim to have received sexual education and those who have not. Because the lack of education or ignorance on the subject causes the transcendence of sexism over time, as mentioned by Mujica (2019) and Baeza & Lamadrid (2018), considerably impacting the school community that must then insert itself into society and cohere with it in a macro way, responding to it with the level of information received in the training that is carried out in educational centers that are a typical society at the micro level.

The self-perception of sexism according to the socio demographic variable of religious beliefs is higher in Catholic and Evangelical students in the benevolent sexism sub-dimension. This can be explained since religious institutions are those that preach and practice the most certain values and traditions (Mikolajczak & Pietrzak, 2014, cited in Mori, 2021), pigeonholing men in the dominant and protective role and women under their submission (Cassese & Holman, 2016).

CONCLUSION

The present research was able to verify that the levels of sexism in general terms are low, that is, scores less than 3 points in the ASI. Regarding the variable of biological sex, it is verified that men score higher than women in dimensions of hostile sexism (2.2±0.7) and benevolent sexism (2.1±0.7). Regarding the year of the degree, there are also differences; in the first year, hostile and benevolent sexism scores are higher than the rest of the years, gradually decreasing as the degree progresses. Regarding the sexual orientation of the sample, there are differences in both dimensions, in which those who identify as heterosexual score higher than the other orientations. In the variable of religious beliefs, there are differences in both dimensions, those who are believers of some religion score higher than those who are atheists. Regarding the sexual education received, it seems that there are no differences in the dimensions of sexism between those who did and those who did not receive it. Finally, there are no major differences in monthly family income.

It is recommended that this study be replicated in other Physical Education Pedagogy courses, to contrast the results obtained here. Sexism could also be studied in other pedagogy courses.

REFERENCES

Baeza, A., & Lamadrid, S. (2018). Trayectorias educativas según género. Lo invisible para la política educativa chilena. *Revista de Investigación Educativa*, 36(2), 471–490. https://doi.org/10.6018/rie.36.2.298061

Cáceres, E., Hinojosa, C., & Hinojosa, I. (2020). *Conductas sexistas en la clase de Educación Física y Salud.* [Tesis de grado, Facultad de Educación, Universidad de Concepción]. http://repositorio.udec.cl/jspui/handle/11594/5891

Carretero, R., & Nolasco, A. (2019). Sexismo y formación inicial del profesorado. *Educar, 55,* 293-310. https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/educar.903

Cassese, E., & Holman, M. (2016). Religious beliefs, gender consciousness, and women's political participation. *Sex Roles, 75,* 514-527. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-016-0635-9

Fernández, S., Arias, W., & Alvarado, M. (2017). La escala de sexismo ambivalente en estudiantes de dos universidades de Arequipa. *Avances en Psicología*, 25(1), 85-96. https://doi.org/10.33539/avpsicol.2017.v25n1.138

Garaigordobil, M., & Aliri, J. (2011). Sexismo hostil y benevolente: relaciones con el autoconcepto, el racismo y la sensibilidad intercultural. *Revista de Psicodidáctica, 16(2),* 331-350. https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=3674148

García, A., del Río, F., & Santín, C. (2022). La formación del alumnado universitario en género y sexualidad como estrategia

preventiva del sexismo en las aulas. *Revista Electrónica Interuniversitaria de Formación del Profesorado, 25*(3), 177-189. https://doi.org/10.6018/reifop.533411

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. (1996). The ambivalent sexisminventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*(3), 491–512. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.70.3.491

González, M. (1990). *El sexismo en la educación: la discriminación cotidiana.* Universidad de Costa Rica.

Heilman, M., Shrout, P., Manzi, F., & Zehnter, M. (2021). Belief in sexism shift: Defining a new form of contemporary sexism and introducing the belief in sexism shift scale (BSS scale). *PLoS ONE, 16*(3), e0248374. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0248374

Matus-Castillo, C., Cornejo-Améstica, M., & Castillo-Retamal, F. (2021). La perspectiva de género en la formación inicial docente en la Educación Física chilena. *Retos, 40*, 326-335. https://doi.org/10.47197/retos.v1i40.83082

Matus-Castillo, C., Serra, O., Duclos-Bastías, D., & Castillo-Retamal, F. (2022). Masculinización de la matrícula universitaria en la carrera de Educación Física. Un análisis desde la perspectiva de género. *Revista Educación, 46*(1), 299–316. https://doi.org/10.15517/revedu.v46i1.47576

Maureira, F., & Flores, E. (2018). *Manual de investigación cuantitativa para estudiantes de educación física.* Bubok Publishing.

Maureira, F., Flores, E., Ibarra, J., González, P., Barrera, M., Cuevas, C., Matamala, J., & Sepúlveda, F. (2023). Sexismo en estudiantes de educación física de Chile. *Retos, 49*, 157-162. https://doi.org/10.47197/retos.v49.96308

Maureira, F., Flores, E., Castillo-Retamal, F., & González, P. (2022). Masculinidades y femineidades en estudiantes de educación física de Chile. *Retos, 45*, 456-461. https://doi.org/10.47197/retos.v45i0.92774

Mori, V. (2021). *Ideología política, religiosidad y sexismo ambivalente en una muestra en Lima Metropolitana* [Tesis de grado, Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú]. http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12404/19825

Moya, M. (2004). *Actitudes sexistas y nuevas formas de sexismo.* Pearson Educación.

Mujica, F. (2019). Reglamento sexista en los centros de educación escolar en Chile. *CPU-e, Revista de Investigación Educativa, 29*, 87-107. https://doi.org/10.25009/cpue.v0i29.2634

Pérez, L. (2017). *Concepciones y creencias de los maestros y maestras sobre el sexismo en educación inicial.* [Tesis de maestría, Universidad de Almería]. http://repositorio.ual.es/handle/10835/5835

Pastor-Vicedo, J., Sánchez-Oliva, A., Sánchez-Blanchart, J., & Martínez-Martínez, J. (2019). Estereotipos de género en las clases de educación física. *SPORT TK: Revista Euroamericana de Ciencias del Deporte, 8*(2), 23–31. https://doi.org/10.6018/sportk.401071

Suárez, F. (2021). *Sexismo en el juego libre en la educación inicial* [Tesis de grado, Universidad Politécnica Salesiana].

https://dspace.ups.edu.ec/handle/123456789/20529

Trujillo, M., & Contreras, P. (2021). Cuestionando imaginarios sexistas a través de prácticas pedagógicas transformadoras. *Izquierdas*, *50*, 2405-2426. https://dx.doi.org/10.4067/s0718-50492021000100215

Vargas, E. (2018). *Sexismo y violencia en relaciones de noviazgo en adolescentes del distrito La Esperanza* [Tesis de grado, Universidad César Vallejo]. https://repositorio.ucv.edu.pe/bitstream/handle/20.500.12692/30325/monge_ak.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

Address for correspondence

Fernando Maureira Cid
Doctor en Educación
Departamento de Educación Física, Deportes y Recreación.
Universidad Metropolitana de Ciencias de la Educación.
Santiago de Chile.

ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7607-7416

Contact: maureirafernando@yahoo.es