



# **GENDER ROLES, SEXISM AND MYTHS OF ROMANTIC LOVE IN MEXICAN ADOLESCENTS**

**María Andrea Nava-Reyes<sup>1</sup>**

*Universidad Popular Autónoma del Estado de Puebla, México*

**José Luis Rojas-Solís**

**Louise Mary Greathouse Amador**

**Luz Anyela Morales Quintero**

*Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, México*

---

## **RESUMEN**

Los vínculos generados entre hombres y mujeres se distinguen por tareas y funciones específicas descritas, prescritas y manifestadas por cuestiones de género. Por ello el presente estudio cuantitativo, no experimental y transversal analiza la prevalencia y relación de factores de género a partir de la Escala Roles de género, la Escala de Ambivalencia hacia Hombres, Escala de Sexismo Ambivalente y Escala de mitos sobre el amor romántico. La muestra estuvo compuesta por 1020 adolescentes mexicanos con edades entre 14 y 19 años. Se halló una mayor aceptación de roles de género y sexismo ambivalente por parte de los hombres, las mujeres puntuaron más alto en sexismo hostil hacia las propias mujeres. En ambos sexos se hallaron numerosas relaciones estadísticamente significativas entre las variables estudiadas.

## **Palabras clave**

adolescencia, género, sexismo, amor romántico

## **ABSTRACT**

The links between men and women are distinguished by specific tasks which are described, expressed by prescribed gender roles. Therefore the present not experimental and cross-sectional quantitative study analyzes the prevalence and gender related factors from gender roles Scale, Scale Ambivalence toward Men, Ambivalent Sexism Scale and Scale myths about romantic love. The sample consisted of 1020 Mexican adolescents aged between 14 and 19 years. Greater acceptance of gender roles and ambivalent sexism by men was found, women scored higher on hostile sexism towards women themselves. Besides it was found numerous statistically significant relationships between the variables studied in both sexes.

## **Keywords**

adolescence, gender, sexism, romantic love

---

<sup>1</sup> Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to José Luis Rojas-Solís. Email Address: jlrojassolis@gmail.com.

## ROLES DE GÉNERO, SEXISMO Y MITOS DEL AMOR ROMÁNTICO EN ADOLESCENTES MEXICANOS

The specificity of the cultural context to which men and women belong influences the way they are socialized in the dynamics of their interpersonal relationships. In this respect, adolescence constitutes a very important period of development, involving the exploration of one's own identity on the basis of cultural, social, familial and intrapsychic references, which combine to guide children towards the construction of their adolescent selves (Lora, 2014). This is accompanied by a noticeable decentralization of the family and the recognition of emotional ties outside the home, whether they are friends or partners (Ardila, 1980). In this order of ideas, it is worth noting that gender regulates specific behaviors, characteristics, and even affections and cognitions for each sex. Thus, every individual is shaped by the parameters of the culture to which they belong, so that being male or female means having different and in some cases opposite behavioral attitudes and patterns (Rocha-Sánchez & Díaz-Loving, 2005).

Conversely, gender ideology comprises two categories which explain the relationship between the sexes and the dynamics that occur between them. In this respect, 1) traditional ideology is characterized by the differentiation of men and women with respect to certain tasks and qualities, in which the woman is assigned a passive position characterized by the roles of wife, housewife and mother, in which submission and the need for protection are the defining characteristics. Conversely, the male gender plays an active role in the public sphere, being responsible for decision-making and providing protection for women. On the other hand, 2) egalitarian ideology maintains that the functions and roles of men and women are the same and that they have been differentiated due to social and cultural factors (Moya, Expósito & Padilla, 2006).

#### **Ambivalent sexism towards men and women**

Relational dynamics regarding female and male roles justify the “nature” of relationships between young people due to the social construction which leads, among other things, to positive and negative attitudes towards the sexes. It is in this context that prejudices and attitudes acquire importance. Allport (1954) defines prejudice as “an attitude of antipathy based on inflexible, erroneous generalization producing discrimination. It is an attitude that can be felt, expressed and aimed at a group as a whole or a member of that group” (p. 10). Thus, judgments formed on the basis of these information biases can create inequality between men and women by drawing from arbitrary generalizations.

The study of prejudices and attitudes is therefore extremely important because of their potentially undesirable consequences for the personal interactions of men and women. An example of this is sexism, in other words, the assessment of the cognitions, affections or behaviors of any person as a result of their sex. It is therefore not surprising that the effects of these attitudes can directly or indirectly harm the recipient because evaluation is constructed on the basis of social prejudices about what is feminine and what is masculine (Expósito, Moya & Glick, 1998).

For this reason, the Ambivalent Sexism Theory is one of the main references for the psychosocial analysis of gender, a concept that has been linked to the maintenance of discriminatory behaviors and attitudes towards women (De Lemus, Castillo, Moya, Padilla & Ryan, 2008). In this respect, the division of perceptions between men and women perpetuates the differences between sexes (Expósito et al., 1998), resulting in three characteristic dimensions of sexism (Glick & Fiske, 1996, 1999, 2001): *paternalism*, which cites the need for affection and care for women, thereby justifying the patriarchal structure (female inferiority), *gender differentiation*, which reinforces the idea of male domination and the exercise of power as well as the subjection of men and women to traditional gender roles; and *heterosexuality*, a belief that regards heterosexual couple relationships as the main source of happiness for men and women and a form of manipulation and seduction between the sexes.

In the field of research, the approach to ambivalent sexism has shown a significant inclination towards women, although men can also be the recipients of both positive and negative sexist attitudes. It is therefore necessary to underline the fact that sexism is a phenomenon that affects both men and women, appearing in several everyday experiences framed by benevolent attitudes which, since they are not considered sexist, may go unnoticed and even be accepted (Arjona & García, 2014).

In the international context, it has been found that male adolescents have expressed a higher level of hostile sexism towards women (Glick & Fiske, 1996, Lameiras & Rodríguez, 2003) yet more benevolent attitudes than female adolescents towards themselves (Lameiras, Rodríguez & González, 2004; Paredes, 2012); On the other hand, girls have also shown hostile attitudes towards boys (Lameiras & Rodríguez, 2003). The ambivalent sexism theory represents a significant advance in the quest for equality between men and women, since as a result of the production of the Ambivalence towards Men Scale and the Ambivalent Sexism Scale, benevolent and hostile sexist attitudes towards both sexes have been identified, making it possible to visibilize and combat sexism in order to make equality a reality (Rodríguez, Lameiras, Carrera & Faílde, 2009).



### **Myths about romantic love**

It would be useful to include the role of cultural mediation in the formation and permanence of romantic relationships between men and women, producing complexity in relations between young people and the formation of couple bonds (Giordano, Longmore & Manning, 2006). These relationships or romantic experiences are characterized by cognitive, behavioral and affective elements that include the intensity and transience of emotions, which can lead to frequent or early sexual encounters (Collins, Welsh & Furman, 2009).

In this context, romantic relations and ties in adolescence are characterized by strong emotions and trivial experiences, leading to other forms of expression of affectivity. It is here that the concept of romantic love, a “set of socially shared beliefs about the allegedly true nature of love” (Yela, 2003, p.264) that lead to the socialization of irrational beliefs justifying any type of behavior, thoughts or attitudes for the sake of the love bond, becomes extremely important. The main myths involve: soulmates, exclusivity, faithfulness, jealousy, omnipotence, free will, marriage and eternal passion. Each and every one of them, “tend to be fictitious, absurd, deceptive, irrational and impossible to achieve” (Ferrer, Bosch & Navarro, 2010, p.7) and are collectivized differently due to the cultural beliefs regarding men and women.

In short, the reconstruction of the concept of love should be based on equity, whereby members of a couple are on equal terms and assume values such as respect, trust, emotional commitment and reciprocity in order to promote models of coexistence that demystify love in order to perceive it in a real, objective way (Bosch, Ferrer & Alzamora, 2006 cited by Rodríguez, Lameiras, Carrera & Vallejo, 2013).

Given that relationships between young people are influenced by gender issues, which leads to the construction of stereotyped roles around them as well as sexist attitudes towards men and women in their dynamics, the purpose of this paper is to analyze the presence and degree of gender factors in young Mexicans. The following hypotheses were posited: 1) boys will adhere more to traditional gender roles; 2) girls will adhere less to traditional gender roles; 3) boys will have a higher level of hostile sexism towards women; 4) boys will have more benevolent sexist attitudes towards members of their own sex; 5) female adolescents will show a higher level of hostile attitudes toward men; 6) there will be a relationship between religious practice and a high level of benevolent sexism in participants; 7) the younger the person, the greater adherence to benevolent sexist attitudes in both men and women and 8) boys will adhere less to romantic myths.

### **Method**

#### **Participants**

The sample comprised 1020 students from the states of Puebla (94.45%) and Tlaxcala (5.6%), 380 of which were boys (37.3%), with an average age of 16.57 years ( $SD=.951$ ), and 640 of which were girls (62.7%), with an average age of 16.56 years ( $SD=.972$ ). The main characteristics of the participants are given in Table 1.

#### **Instruments and variables**

**Sociodemographic data.** Age, school year, city of origin, area of origin and highest level of studies of the participants' parents.

**Religiosity** An item was included to determine how religious participants were, using a Likert scale with nine response options ranging from 0=*not at all* to 9=*very much*. High scores reflect the self-perceived religiosity of adolescents.

Table 1  
*Characteristics of sample of participants by sex (n=1020)*

	Female (%)	Male (%)
<b>Sex</b>	62,7	37,3
<b>School year</b>		
Second	68,9	72,1
Fourth	28,4	24,2
Fifth	2,7	3,7
<b>Area of origin</b>		
Urban	79,1	74,7
Rural	20,9	25,3
<b>Educational attainment of father</b>		
No schooling	1,4	1,1
Preschool education	,2	1,1
Elementary School	12,2	10,8
Middle School	24,1	25,8
High School/Baccalaureate/Technical degree	28,6	22,9
Bachelor's Degree	23,8	24,2
Master's Degree	7,2	11,1
Doctorate	2,3	2,6
Postdoctorate	,3	,5
<b>Educational attainment of mother</b>		
No schooling	,3	,5
Preschool education	,5	,8
Elementary Education	14,2	13,2
Middle School	22,2	26,1
High School/Baccalaureate/Technical degree	30,5	23,7
Bachelor's Degree:	25,2	26,8
Master's Degree	5,5	7,9
Doctorate	1,6	1,1
Postdoctorate	,2	-

*Note.* Girls n= 640; boys=380

**Gender roles.** The scale designed by Saldívar et al. (2015), used to evaluate sociocultural and traditional constructions regarding women and men, consists of eighteen items organized into three factors. The first one evaluates stereotyped male roles (for example: “A man is more aggressive than a woman”). The second one evaluates stereotyped female roles (for example: “A mother is more affectionate than a father”). Lastly, the third factor refers to traditional roles for women and men (for example: “A good woman must attend to her partner’s needs”, “a man must protect his family). A Likert response scale is used, in which 1=*totally disagree*, 2=*disagree*, 3=*neither agree nor disagree*, 4=*agree* and 5=*totally agree*.

**Ambivalent Sexism (ASI, Glick & Fiske, 1996).** This study used the abridged Spanish version of the Rodríguez, Lameiras and Carrera questionnaire (2009), consisting of twelve items that assess sexism towards women. Six of the items evaluate hostile sexism (example: “Women try to gain power by controlling men”) and another six measure benevolent sexism (example: “Every man should have a woman to love”). The scale includes a Likert response format with six anchors where 0=*totally disagree*, 1=*moderately disagree*, 2=*disagree*, 3=*agree*, 4=*moderately agree*, and 5=*strongly agree*. Some words were adapted to the type of Spanish spoken in Mexico. Higher scores on the scale indicate higher levels of prejudice towards women.



**Ambivalence towards Men (AMI, Glick & Fiske, 1996).** As in the previous case, the abridged version of the questionnaire was used (Rodríguez et al., 2009), consisting of twelve items, six of which measure hostile sexism towards men (example: “Men behave like children when they are sick”) while the remaining six evaluate benevolent attitudes towards men (example: Men are more willing to take risks than women”). The answers are organized on a Likert scale: 0=totally disagree, 1=moderately disagree, 2=disagree, 3=agree, 4=moderately agree, and 5=strongly agree. The higher the score, the higher the levels of sexist attitudes towards men.

**Scale of Myths about Love (Bosch et al., 2007)** in its abridged Spanish version (Rodríguez et al., 2013), which evaluates fictitious, absurd, deceitful, irrational and impossible beliefs about love (Ferrer et al., 2010). The instrument comprises seven items divided into two factors: the first factor is called “myth about the idealization of love” (example: “Somewhere there is someone predestined for each person”) and the second factor corresponding to the “myth of the love-abuse bond” (example: “You can love someone you mistreat”). A five-point Likert response scale is used, in which 1=totally disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neither agree nor disagree, 4=agree and 5=totally agree).

### Procedure

We visited the high schools to explain the nature and purpose of the study to the respective authorities and obtain permission for the application of the virtual questionnaire. The first sheet informed students of the nature and purpose of the study as well as the anonymous, voluntary and confidential nature of their participation. The questionnaire was applied in the computer rooms of the high schools and took approximately 23 minutes to answer. As regards ethical aspects, the measures suggested by the Mexican Society of Psychology (2007) were adopted, as well as those required for research undertaken through virtual media (Hoerger & Currell, 2012).

### Data analysis

To test the hypotheses presented in this study, descriptive and inferential statistical analyses were conducted, including the difference of means for independent samples (*Student's t*) and correlations (*Pearson*). The analyses were undertaken using the SPSS program, v.21.

## Results

### Differences by sex in gender variables

The comparison of means for independent samples between boys and girls revealed, through the *Student's t* test, statistically significant differences in all the variables studied. The results showing the differences between the scores obtained by both sexes are presented in Table 2.

Table 2  
*Difference of means between the sexes regarding gender factors*

Factors	Girls (n= 640)				Boys (n= 380)				t	p	η <sup>2</sup>
	α	M	Md	TD:	α	M	Md	TD:			
<b>Gender roles</b>											
Stereotyped male roles	,71	9,86	9,00	3,79	,76	<b>12,55</b>	12,00	4,74	-9,42	<b>,000</b>	.08
Stereotyped female roles	,85	19,19	20,00	6,39	,82	<b>20,66</b>	21,00	5,79	-3,76	<b>,000</b>	.01
Traditional roles	,74	12,76	13,00	4,43	,72	<b>14,91</b>	15,00	4,08	-7,85	<b>,000</b>	.05
<b>Sexism</b>											
Hostile towards women	,76	<b>14,03</b>	11,00	5,76	,84	11,71	16,00	5,30	-11,01	<b>,000</b>	.10
Benevolent towards women	,81	9,32	13,00	5,49	,78	<b>12,84</b>	16,00	6,59	-5,88	<b>,000</b>	0.03
Hostile towards men	,71	10,88	14,00	5,86	,64	<b>15,25</b>	12,00	6,54	6,42	<b>,000</b>	0.03
Benevolent towards men	,71	13,28	9,00	6,94	,80	<b>25,81</b>	13,00	6,46	-8,74	<b>,000</b>	0.06
<b>Myths of romantic love</b>											
Idealization of love	,57	15,76	16,00	3,72	,63	<b>16,76</b>	17,00	3,97	-2,22	<b>,026</b>	.004
Love-abuse bond	,69	2,57	2,00	1,36	,70	<b>3,03</b>	2,00	1,61	-4,66	<b>,000</b>	.02

**Relationship between the different variables studied**

In the sample of boys, it is necessary to point out the correlation between traditional roles and three gender factors: adoption of benevolent sexist attitudes towards men ( $r=.608, n=380, p<.01$ ), stereotyped male roles ( $r=.578, n=380, p<.01$ ) and stereotyped female roles ( $r=.6898, n=380, p<.01$ ). Likewise, a statistically significant relationship was found between benevolent sexism towards men and women ( $r=.642, n=380, p<.01$ ).

In the case of the girls, the results indicate significant correlations of a considerable magnitude between traditional roles and three variables: benevolent sexism towards women ( $r=.647, n=640, p<.01$ ), stereotyped male roles ( $r=.515, n=640, p<.01$ ) and stereotyped female roles ( $r=.663, n=640, p<.01$ ). Significant correlations were also found between benevolent sexism towards women and stereotyped female roles ( $r=.580, n=640, p<.01$ ) as well as between both types of benevolent sexism ( $r=.617, n=640, p<.01$ ).

At the same time, a significant association was observed between religious practice and benevolent sexism towards women in the case of both girls ( $r=.202, n=640, p<.01$ ) and boys ( $r=.223, n=380, p<.01$ ).

Regarding age, in the sample of girls, a low negative correlation with benevolent sexism towards women was obtained ( $r=-.184, n=640, p<.01$ ) and no significant associations were found in the boys, except for the relationship between age and benevolent sexism towards men ( $r=-.122, n=380, p<.05$ ). The results as a whole are shown in Table 3.

Table 3  
Correlations between gender variables according to sex

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1	-	.100*	.142**	-.069	-.050	-.110**	-.036	-.184**	-.045	.015	-.172**	-.218**	-.198**
2	.221**	-	.587**	-.037	-.080*	-.179**	-.006	-.233**	.005	.017	-.181**	-.264**	-.335**
3	.143**	.588**	-	-.004	-.062	-.123**	.049	-.208**	.040	.053	-.176**	-.275**	-.277**
4	-.106*	-.050	-.070	-	.137**	.149**	.090*	.202**	.019	.110**	.089*	.193**	.163**
5	-.031	-.029	-.054	.101*	-	.426**	.400**	.393**	.166**	.259**	.245**	.324**	.346**
6	-.122*	-.138**	-.150**	.166**	.483**	-	.479**	.617**	.215**	.291**	.356**	.379**	.526**
7	-.022	.046	.060	.093	.485**	.551**	-	.323**	0.065	.228**	.141**	.117**	.253**
8	-.090	-.107*	-.109*	.223**	.347**	.642**	.418**	-	.130**	.425**	.379**	.580**	.647**
9	.007	.018	-.061	-.013	.193**	.206**	.207**	0.048	-	0.047	.334**	.121**	.142**
10	-.118*	.015	.013	.242**	.276**	.373**	.339**	.490**	0.091	-	.164**	.295**	.343**
11	-.174**	-.163**	-.232**	.064	.358**	.506**	.375**	.348**	.456**	.244**	-	.493**	.515**
12	-.290**	-.313**	-.301**	.122*	.366**	.455**	.307**	.535**	.132*	.386**	.488**	-	.663**
13	-.195**	-.260**	-.299**	.180**	.380**	.608**	.400**	.583**	.215**	.413**	.578**	.689**	-

\*\*\*p<.001, \*\*p<.01, \*p<.05

Note. The values corresponding to girls are above the diagonal and those corresponding to boys are below it.  
1 =Age; 2= Father’s Education; 3= Mother’s Education; 4=Religiosity; 5=Hostile Sexism towards Men; 6=Benevolent Sexism towards Men; 7=Hostile Sexism towards Women; 8=Benevolent Sexism towards Women; 9=Love Abuse Myth; 10= Idealization myth; 11=Stereotyped Male Role; 12=Stereotyped Female Role; 13= Traditional Roles

**Discussion**

In light of the results obtained, it was possible to verify the first hypothesis (“males will adhere more to traditional gender roles”), since males show greater adherence to traditional roles, according to previous research (Baber & Jenkins, 2006; López-Cepero, Rodríguez-Franco, Rodríguez-Díaz & Bringas, 2013), which is important because of its possible contribution to the traditional, socially constructed image in the family context, which can place women in a position of self-denial and submission, while giving males a higher position in that system (Rocha-Sánchez & Díaz-Loving, 2005). The second hypothesis was also proved (“girls will show less adherence to traditional gender roles”) since the participants proved to be detached from traditional beliefs about their own sex, which differs from other studies that found adherence to “feminine” work and tasks related to private spaces (Aguilar, Valdez & González, 2012, Chahín-Pinzón & Libia, 2015, Sierra et al., 2014).

Conversely, the third hypothesis, “boys will have a higher level of hostile sexism towards women” was not confirmed. This finding contrasts with the results of other studies that coincide regarding the presence of a higher level of hostile sexism by men towards women (Lameiras, Rodríguez & Sotelo, 2001). Female participants expressed the highest level of antagonism towards their own sex, which may reflect, among other things, the reinforcement of



traditional gender stereotypes and the fact that they blame themselves for the violence and other behaviors to which they have been subjected. (Peixoto, 2010). On the other hand, and in keeping with other research (Garaigordobil, 2013, Lameiras et al., 2001, Lameiras & Rodríguez, 2003), the fourth hypothesis was proved (“boys will have more benevolent sexist attitudes towards members of the same sex”), since boys showed greater adherence to both benevolent and hostile sexist attitudes towards their own sex. Special attention should be paid to adherence to benevolent sexism due, perhaps, to the fact that these attitudes are regarded more favorably than hostile ones, since they are associated with more positive connotations in everyday interaction (Rollero & Fedi, 2012). However, the fifth hypothesis could not be proven “female adolescents will show a higher level of hostile attitudes towards men”, since they failed to express a high degree of adherence to hostile sexist attitudes towards men, which contrasts with other research carried out, for example, by Lameiras, Rodríguez and González (2004) and Zawisza, Luyt and Zawadzka (2012).

In another order of ideas, the sixth hypothesis was proved: “a relationship between religious practice and a high level of benevolent sexism will be observed in participants”, and not only in boys but also in girls, which could be explained by the possible link between sexist attitudes and high levels of religiosity which, in turn, reinforce traditional female roles and stereotypes (Aliri, Garaigordobil & Martínez-Valderrey, 2013). In this same tenor, the seventh hypothesis was proved (“the younger a person’s age, the greater the adherence to benevolent sexist attitudes in both men and women”) in the group of women, where a negative association between age and adherence to benevolent sexist attitudes was found, although it was a very weak correlation index, which contrasts with the results of other studies (Lameiras & Rodríguez, 2003, Paredes, 2012, Ovejero, Yubero, Larrañaga & Navarro, 2013). Apart from the hypotheses posited, it is worth mentioning the negative association linking higher educational attainment of the father or mother with less acceptance of traditional or stereotyped roles, in both boys and girls. One possible explanation for these findings is the negative relationship between sexism and educational attainment since the promotion of an education free of sexist attitudes in schools would make it possible to combat both positive and negative expressions of prejudice towards both men and women (Cruz, Zempoaltécatl & Correa, 2005).

As for the myths surrounding romantic love, the eighth hypothesis stated, “Boys will show less adherence to the myths of love” yet the male participants showed a greater acceptance of the myths surrounding the idealization of love and love-abuse bonding than women, a trend that has been observed in other research (Rodríguez et al., 2013), which, in turn, contrasts with other results suggesting lower adherence to love myths in men probably due to the different process of socialization of the sexes (Barrón, Martínez -Íñigo, De Paúl & Yela, 1999). A propos of this, Leal (2007) describes the way boys and girls perceive the concept of romantic love. Girls experience it from the point of view of dedication and commitment and as a significant part of their identity, whereas for boys, love gives them advantages and the power to “conquer” girls. In other words, most of these myths assign men a leading role in the couple relationship, with the duty to protect or perhaps control women (Marroquí & Cervera, 2014). At the same time, they place women in a subservient position, portraying them as needing affection due to the importance given to love as a key feature of female identity. However, more studies are required since until recently, romantic love was regarded as the reason and main ingredient of long-term, viable relationships (García and Díaz-Loving, 2011), which contrasts with the new types of romantic, affective and sexual relationships between young people (Quiñones, Martínez-Taboas, Rodríguez-Gómez, & Pando, 2017)

Regardless of the hypotheses posited, in the boys’ sample, significant associations were found between traditional roles and stereotyped female and male roles. Conversely, in the group of women, there was a significant relationship between stereotyped male and female roles and traditional roles, which is in line with other research suggesting that women continue to play a stereotyped female role characterized by expressiveness and the demonstration of affection (Aguilar, Valdez, González-Arratia & González, 2013).

This adoption of benevolent attitudes towards the same sex could be explained through the sublimation of the consequences of sexism by adhering to attitudes regarded as having a more “favorable” affective tone (Recio, Cuadrado & Ramos, 2007). These ideas are supported by other studies, which have found a correlation between traditional gender ideology and hostile and benevolent sexism, reflecting differentiated socialization by gender (De Lemus et al., 2008) and supporting the image of protection and provision characteristic of benevolent attitudes towards males (Glick et al., 2004).

By way of a conclusion, this study corroborates the differences between boys and girls regarding gender factors and highlights the connections between the variables studied. Particularly striking are the higher scores in boys in almost all the variables studied, particularly the greater acceptance of benevolent sexism and stereotyped female roles, which may give rise to their acceptance by both sexes due to their less hostile and more affective, permissive, protective and helpful tone. Thus, in light of the results obtained, it is important to work on both benevolent and hostile

sexist attitudes in adolescents in order to prevent violent behaviors and distortions in relation to couple relationships between men and women. It is therefore necessary to consider the implementation of programs that will help students recognize benevolent sexist behaviors and distinguish them from attentive or considerate treatment towards others. At the same time, it is essential to identify the traditional gender roles assigned to men and women, which limit human relationships, in order to prevent these patterns from being repeated with their future partners (Montañés, Megías, De Lemus & Moya, 2015). Without underestimating the foregoing, it is essential to recognize certain limitations of the present study such as the difference between the number of male and female participants as well as the non-probabilistic selection of the sample and its specific characteristics, which prevent the results from being generalized to other populations.





## References

- Aguilar, Y. P., Valdez, J. L., & González, N. I. (2012). Satisfacción con los roles de género. *Revista Electrónica de Psicología Iztacala*, 15(4), 1140-1453.
- Aguilar, Y. P., Valdez, J. L., González-Arratia, N. I., & González, S. (2013). Los roles de género de los hombres y las mujeres en el México Contemporáneo. *Enseñanza e Investigación en Psicología*, 18(2), 207-224.
- Aliri, J., Garaigordobil, M., & Martínez-Valderrey, V. (2013). Sexismo y características del centro escolar: diferencias en función del tipo de centro. *Revista de Investigación Educativa*, 31(2), 349-360. doi:10.6018/rie.31.2.159191.
- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley.
- Ardila, N. (1980). La adolescencia: factores críticos. *Revista Latinoamericana de Psicología*, 12(3), 441-454.
- Arjona, N., & García, J. M. (2014). Los efectos del sexismo no se olvidan ni inmediatamente ni permanentemente. *ReiDoCrea: Revista electrónica de investigación y docencia creativa*, 3(32), 267-272.
- Baber, K. M., & Jenkins, C. (2006). The Social Roles Questionnaire: A new approach to measuring attitudes toward gender. *Sex Roles*, 54, 459-467. doi:10.1007/s11199-006-9018-y
- Barrón, A., Martínez-Íñigo, D., De Paúl, P., & Yela, C. (1999). Romantic beliefs and myths in Spain. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 2(1), 64-73.
- Bosch, E., Ferrer, M. V., García, M. E., Ramis, M. C., Mas, M. C., Navarro, C., & Torrens, G. (2007). *Del mito del amor romántico a la violencia contra las mujeres en la pareja*. Madrid: Instituto de la Mujer.
- Chahín-Pinzón, N., & Libia, B. (2015). Propiedades psicométricas de la Escala de Ideología de género en adolescentes colombianos. *Universitas Psychologica*, 14(1), 15-23. doi:10.11144/Javeriana.upsy14-1.ppei
- Collins, W. A., Welsh, D. P., & Furman, W. (2009). Adolescent romantic relationships. *The Annual Review of Psychology*, 60, 631-652. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163459
- Cruz, C. E., Zempoaltécatl, V., & Correa, F. E. (2005). Perfiles de sexismo en la ciudad de México: validación del cuestionario de medición del sexismo ambivalente. *Enseñanza e Investigación en Psicología*, 10(2), 381-395.
- De 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
- Expósito, F., Moya, M. C., & Glick, P. (1998). Sexismo ambivalente: medición y correlatos. *Revista de Psicología Social*, 13(2), 159-169.
- Ferrer, V. A., Bosch, E., & Navarro, C. (2010). Los mitos románticos en España. *Boletín de Psicología*, 99, 7-31.
- Garaigordobil, M. (2013). Sexism and alexithymia: Correlations and differences as a function of gender, age, and educational level. *Anales de psicología*, 29(2), 368-377. doi:10.6018/analesps.29.2.132261
- García, G., & y Díaz-Loving, R. (2011). Predictores psicosociales del comportamiento sexual. *Revista Interamericana de Psicología*, 45(3), 405-418.
- Giordano, P. C., Longmore, M. A., & Manning, W. D. (2006). Gender and the Meanings of Adolescent Romantic Relationships: A Focus on Boys. *American Sociological Review*, 71, 260-287. doi:10.1177/000312240607100205
- 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. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.70.3.491
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1999). The Ambivalence toward Men Inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent beliefs about men. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 23, 519-536. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.1999.tb00379.x
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (2001). An ambivalent alliance: Hostile and benevolent sexism as complementary justifications for gender inequality. *American Psychologist*, 56(2), 109-118. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.56.2.109
- Glick, P., Lameiras, M., Fiske, S. T., Eckes, T., Masser, B., Volpato, C., ... Wells, R. (2004). Bad but bold: Ambivalent attitudes toward men predict gender inequality in 16 nations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 86, 713-728. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.86.5.713
- Hoerger, M., & Currell, C. (2012). Ethical issues in internet research. In S. Knapp, M. Gottlieb, M. Handelsman, y L. VandeCreek (Eds.), *APA handbook of ethics in psychology, Vol. 2: Practice, teaching, and research* (pp. 385-400). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association. doi:10.1037/13272-018
- Lameiras, M., Rodríguez, Y., & Sotelo, M. J. (2001). Sexism and Racism in a Spanish sample of Secondary School Students. *Social Indicators Research*, 54(3), 309-328. doi:10.1023/A:1010871706454
- Lameiras, M., & Rodríguez, Y. (2003). Evaluación del sexismo ambivalente en estudiantes gallegos/as. *Acción psicológica*, 2(2), 131-136.

- Lameiras, M., Rodríguez, Y., & González, M. (2004). Evolution of Hostil Sexism and Benevolent Sexism in a Spanish Sample. *Social Indicators Research*, 66(3), 197-211. doi:10.1023/B:SOCI.0000003553.30419.f1
- Leal, A. (2007). Nuevos tiempos, viejas preguntas sobre el amor: un estudio con adolescentes. *Revista de Posgrado y Sociedad*, 7(2), 50-70.
- López-Cepero, J., Rodríguez-Franco, L. Rodríguez-Díaz, F., & Bringas, C. (2013). Validación de la versión corta del Social Roles Questionnaire (SRQ-R) con una muestra adolescente y juvenil española. *Revista Electrónica de Metodología Aplicada*, 18(1), 1-16.
- Lora, M. E. (2014). Las adolescencias. *Ajayu*, 12(2), 308-315.
- Marroquí, M., & Cervera, P. (2014). Interiorización de los falsos mitos del amor romántico en jóvenes. *ReiDoCrea: Revista electrónica de investigación y docencia creativa*, 3(20), 142-146.
- Montañés, P., Megías, J. L., De Lemus, S., & Moya, M. (2015). Influence of early romantic relationships on adolescents' sexism. *Revista de Psicología Social*, 30(2), 219-240. doi:10.1080/21711976.2015.1016756
- Moya, M., Expósito, F., & Padilla, J. L. (2006). Revisión de las propiedades psicométricas de las versiones larga y reducida de la Escala sobre Ideología de Género. *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology*, 6, 709-727.
- Ovejero, A., Yubero, S., Larrañaga, E., & Navarro L. (2013). Sexismo y comportamiento de acoso escolar en adolescentes. *Psicología Conductual*, 21(1), 157-171.
- Paredes, M. L. (2012). Sexismo ambivalente en estudiantes universitarios de Antropología, Medicina e Ingeniería Química. *Educación y Ciencia, Cuarta Época*, 2(5), 19-32.
- Peixoto, J. M. (2010). Sexismo ambivalente: actitudes y creencias hacia la violencia de género. *Revista Ártemis*, 11, 133-139.
- Quiñones, R., Martínez-Taboas, A., Rodríguez-Gómez, J. R., & Pando, J. R. (2017). Friends with benefits in Puerto Rican college students. *Revista Interamericana de Psicología*, 51(1), 19-28.
- Recio, P., Cuadrado, I., & Ramos, E. (2007). Propiedades psicométricas de la Escala de Detección de Sexismo en Adolescentes (DSA). *Psicothema*, 19(3), 522-528.
- 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.
- Rodríguez, Y., Lameiras, M., & Carrera, M. V. (2009). Validación de la versión reducida de las escalas ASI y AMI en una muestra de estudiantes españoles. *Psicogente*, 12(22), 284-295.
- Rodríguez, Y., Lameiras, M., Carrera, M. V., & Faílde, J. M. (2009). Aproximación conceptual al sexismo ambivalente: Estado de la cuestión. *Summa Psicológica UST*, 6(2), 131-142.
- Rodríguez, Y., Lameiras, M., Carrera, M. V., & Vallejo, P. (2013). La fiabilidad y validez de la escala de mitos hacia el amor: las creencias de los y las adolescentes. *Revista de Psicología Social: International Journal of Social Psychology*, 28(2), 157-168.
- Rollero, C., & Fedí, A. (2012). Ambivalent attitudes toward women and men. *Psicología Política*, 44, 69-86.
- Saldívar, A., Díaz-Loving, R., Reyes, N. E., Armenta, C., López, F., Moreno, ... & Domínguez, M. (2015). Roles de género y diversidad: Validación de una escala en varios contextos culturales. *Acta de Investigación Psicológica*, 5(3), 2124-2147.
- Sierra, D. C., Martínez, H., Martínez, B., Bernat, I., Diaz, M. A., Berti, S., & Gibbons, J. L. (2014). Creencias marianistas en diferentes generaciones de mujeres guatemaltecas. *Revista Interamericana de Psicología*, 48(2), 203-211.
- Sociedad Mexicana de Psicología (2007). *Código ético del psicólogo* (4ª edición). México, D.F.: Trillas.
- Yela, C. (2003). La otra cara del amor: mitos, paradojas y problemas. *Encuentros de Psicología Social*, 1, 263-267.
- Zawisza, M., Luyt, R., & Zawadzka, A. M. (2012). Ambivalence toward men: Comparing sexism among Polish, South African, and British university students. *Sex Roles*, 66, 453-647. doi:10.1007/s11199-011-0112-4.

Received: 10/17/2016  
Accepted: 05/11/2018