SOCIAL INCLUSION AND EQUALITY BETWEEN MEN AND WOMEN
A study of ambivalent sexism in the roma population

Inclusión social e igualdad entre hombres y mujeres: Un estudio sobre el sexismo ambivalente en la población romaní

ROBERTO MORENO LOPEZ[1], ROSA MARI YTARTE[1], MARTA VENCESLAO PUEYO[2], SONIA MORALES CALVO[1]
[1]Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, España
[2]Universitat de Barcelona, España

ABSTRACT

The objective of the research is focused on the study of the evolution of sexism as a cultural parameter in the Roma population whose people maintain recognition as an ethnic minority in Europe. The design selected for this study is descriptive. This study involves testing the reliability of the reduced version of the ambivalent sexism inventory (ASI; Glick and Fiske, 1996) scale among a representative group of the Roma population belonging to the city of Toledo. A representative sample of 44 people aged between 16 and 40 years was selected, with an average of 27.3. The results confirm the reliability of the scale and provide little differentiation and sex-disaggregated results. The responses on the items show a high degree of sexism among the participants. The obtained results give a better understanding of the scope of gender roles and, therefore, can help us to reorient interventions in the prevention of gender inequalities or early school dropouts among Roma girls.

RESUMEN

El objetivo de la investigación se centra en el estudio de la evolución del sexismo como parámetro cultural en la población gitana cuyo pueblo mantiene el reconocimiento como minoría étnica en Europa. El diseño seleccionado para este estudio es descriptivo. Se trata de comprobar la fiabilidad de la versión reducida de la escala de sexismo ambivalente (ASI; Glick y Fiske, 1996) en un grupo representativo de la población gitana perteneciente a la ciudad de Toledo. Se seleccionó una muestra representativa de 44 personas de entre 16 y 40 años, con una media de 27,3 años. Los resultados confirman la fiabilidad de la escala y ofrecen resultados poco diferenciados y desagregados por sexo. Las respuestas a los ítems muestran un alto grado de sexismo entre los participantes. Los resultados obtenidos permiten comprender mejor el alcance de los roles de género y, por tanto, pueden ayudarnos a reorientar las intervenciones en la prevención de las desigualdades de género o del abandono escolar prematuro entre las niñas gitanas.

1. Introduction

Sexism includes all those manifestations and actions that establish a differentiated status among people based on their biological sexual assignment. The term was widely used with regard to discrimination against women during the second half of the 20th century, as an expression linked to the idea of negative prejudice (Allport, 1971) based on sexual difference. This paper is based on the theory of ambivalent sexism (Glick and Fiske, 1996, 2001), and focuses on analyzing the levels of sexism in people belonging to a sociocultural environment different from the rest of the population, that is, where the pressure of social group is very strong.

Sexism is correlated with the construction of gender images based on sexual stereotypes from a biological, affective, and/or behavioral perspective. Gender, in this sense, denotes the social and individual attributes assigned to people from this previous sexual categorization. Although, as a social construction, gender classifications present a certain variability over time in its cultural configuration. Sexism persists as a justification for discriminatory differentiation processes. Like racism, sexism forms a social discourse that legitimizes hegemonic power and domination structures based on the assignment of differentiated roles from societies' sexual classifications. We start with the notion that sexism is persistent and transversal to all societies and times (Valcárcel, 2004), configuring a sex-gender system which, as a form of classification, through processes of socialization and enculturation, constructs forms of social relationship based on the criteria of power and hierarchy. These configurations can be observed in beliefs, behaviors, and distribution of social spaces, among other things, in which sexual difference is used to confirm and reinforce the assigned identity within the cultural reference system (in its social, cultural, or social dimension). With a triple effect (Ladmiral and Lipiansky, 1989) that is constructed from social/group dynamics and the processes of confrontation-identification, sexism function is precisely to highlight the differences thus constructed. In this sense, sexism is seen as a hostile attitude towards women and a manifestation of the belief in their inferiority, which legitimizes situations of discrimination, submission, and/or dependence. At the same time, sexism shows the persistence of an imaginary legitimization of the superiority of men over women.

Nonetheless, as social constructions, the ways in which sexism is manifested have evolved and undergone a transformation in contemporary societies. It is also rooted in variables such as cultural identity and belonging to ethnic groups or minorities (Arnoso, et al., 2017; Archer, 2006), where the socialization of masculinity in the cultural macrosystem, and the variables linked to social values and majority beliefs in a given context, favor sexism and a higher level of aggression within a society, family, and couple (Puente et ál., 2016). In addition, the changes produced in the evolution of sexism that reduce its visibility, as manifested in a discourse and in policies of equality, generate two contradictory circumstances: first, the sensation of substantial progress and an apparent elimination of differences; and, second, the palpable inequality with respect to the labor market, the differentiation of responsibilities in the private and public spheres, and a system of violence grounded in this gender inequality (Herranz et al., 2007).

As pointed out by Glick and Fiske (1996) despite advances in policies of equality and women's position of autonomy, those attitudes, from ambivalent perspectives, legitimate and reproduce situations of discrimination and inequality, albeit in subtle ways. This benevolent sexism portrays women as weak creatures who must be protected and are placed on a pedestal where they are to adore their natural roles as mother and wife and must not surpass these roles. The persistence of gender inequality and situations of discrimination, in both the public and private spheres, as well as violence against women occur as forms of sexism and belief systems that seem to reflect a negative attitude towards women. In reality, they function as mechanisms of discrimination which, from a discourse based on supposed "natural" differences, mask men's dependence on them (Rodríguez, Lameiras and Carrera, 2009), and reduce them to roles based solely on their relationship with them. Research indicates that in today's society, sexism persists as a belief and attitude regarding the roles assigned to women, and functions as a mechanism for reproducing inequalities from positions of protection, intimacy and/or recognition of their worth. Although this is not so easily recognizable, benevolent sexism also implies covert behaviors which, from an affective and protective attitude, reinforce control, stereotypes, and the allocation and biased use of public and private spaces, as has been studied using the scale of micromachism (Bonino, 2005).

These forms of sexism normalize discriminatory practices cloaked as intrinsic differences between men and women, generating a greater vulnerability to violence, insofar as it is not perceived as violence. Sexism, in its non-aggressive forms, assumes a dissonance between the expressed beliefs and the reality of gender relations in society, in which the practices of an entrenched patriarchal system are based on a monopoly of power and violence (Arnoso et al., 2017; Bringas-Molleda et al., 2017) that makes young people especially vulnerable, since they are learned and reproduced in the socialization processes from a very early age. This highlights the fact that far from being static natural processes, such attitudes are learned and adopted or rejected through educational and cultural processes. Thus, we see "the need to analyze the different strategies that people adopt to accommodate to, and at the same time resist, the patterns of gender established by the social order" (Blazque-Rodríguez, 2005). Patriarchy thus configures a hegemonic system that subordinates women and makes them invisible, just because they are women (Lagarde, 2012).

Paying close attention to the importance of socialization in the family and in the cultural surroundings, the model proposed by Glick and Fiske (1996) proves to be of great relevance. Socialization processes favor, both in the family, educational and community spheres, the transmission of sexist gender roles from the very first childhood: "The limits established in the course of socialization include not only explicit demands and warnings, but also the more subtle, but no less influential, force of the expectations of others as experienced through social interactions" (Musitu, 2000). With regard to the intersection of the categories of gender and cultural group, it was found that gender stereotypes, in their benevolent form (McConhay, 1986), are greater in "racialized" populations or ethnic groups, such as the Roma population examined in this study (Garcés, 2016; Sierra, 2016). At the IV World Conference on Women, held in Beijing in 1995 at the behest of the UN, it was emphasized that violence against women is structural and has an ideological basis that keeps women in a subordinate social position, this being of a nature intersectional, in which other variables such as social class or belonging to ethnic minorities interfere. In Spain specifically, the measures adopted for the development of the commitments assumed in said Conference are included, it is highlighted in the National Strategy for the Social Inclusion of the Roma Population in Spain 2012-2020 that Roma women suffer greater social and educational discrimination with respect to non-gypsy women and also with respect to gypsy men. Among the measures adopted, the need to promote the social participation of Roma women to promote their emancipation stands out (MSSSI, 2014), as well as the development of studies on how gender violence affects Roma women, and implementation of preventive measures. The European Commission, in the Proposition of Recommandation du Conseil sur L'égalité, L'inclusion et la Participation des Roms highlights the need to address the situations of multiple discrimination suffered by Roma women (European Commission, 2020), understanding that this type of discrimination as: The expression multiple discriminations is a global notion used to designate the set of cases of discrimination for various reasons and possible manifestations of minorities.

Furthermore, recent research (Shearer, 2008; Aguaded, 2017; Arnoso, 2017; García et. ál, 2018), has shown how distorted beliefs about the social role of women persist in the patterns of family transmission that go above and beyond the training and awareness of equality (Shearer, 2008). The differentiation of work roles between those tied to the labor market and those related to positions within the family were the most explicit in those studies. Women's inequality and dependency are treated as normal, and these messages are transmitted to the children of both sexes and used to justify control (Bringas et. al, 2017; Mosteiro and Porto, 2017). In parallel, the research centered on the messages that are transmitted and received by boys and girls, the conclusion being that the most common messages concerned certain jobs conditioned by gender and by family roles.

The latest reports on the situation of the Roma in Spain suggest insufficient schooling and a high illiteracy rate in parents over 30 years of age (VVAA, 2007; Amnesty International, 2015). In this sense, as indicated by Tenenbaum and Leaper (2002), it is necessary to pay attention to how social stereotypes of gender influence the learning of sexist values and behaviors at an early age, both in the family and in education, in what has been called Hidden curriculum Sánchez Bello (2006) also points out that in school cultural meanings with a gender perspective are caught on through daily practices, language and educational spaces. Although the influence of the schooling levels of parents on their children's sexism was not analyzed, one investigation did show that the study level of the participants (12 to 25 years) of both sexes correlated negatively with sexist attitudes (Lameiras and Rodríguez, 2003). On the other hand, there is evidence that establishes the significant relationship between the levels of prejudice of parents and children (O 'Bryan, Fishbein and Ritchey, 2004). Finally, despite the importance of identifying the influence of factors in the family context in sexism, it is important to highlight that there is very little research focusing on the analysis of the relationship between the sexism of parents and children, that is, in the connection and/or intergenerational transmission of sexism.

2. Methodology used: The validity of the ASI / AMI Scale in minority groups

The design selected for the realization of the present study is descriptive, that is, it is limited to making a single observation of a single group in a single moment of time, in order to correlate the set of ASI items with the differentiated cultural factor of the Roma population in the city of Toledo.

In the study, a group of young people and adults belonging to an ethnic minority from "Roma town" in the city of Toledo—specifically two segregated areas in the periphery of the city—participated. The total population that resides in these two areas (Cerro de los Palos and El Cavero) is 312 people, including minors. The details of the selection process were verbally communicated to the whole population, and people were invited to participate voluntarily. Subsequently, the sample consisted of a total of 44 people, which made it possible to obtain a margin of error of ± 2.7% for a 95% significance level.

In line with the objective of the research study, the sample consisted of 50% women and 50% men. This was randomly selected from an age range between 16 and 40 years. Ethical review and approval were not required for the study on human participants in accordance with the local legislation and institutional requirements. Written, informed consent was inferred through the completion of the questionnaire.

The socioeconomic status of the population constituting the sample was categorized as lower class and lower middle class and included those at risk of social exclusion. One of the most important characteristics is that most of the participants had no regular job, but rather were involved in underground activities or the informal sector. Furthermore, of the total working-age population, none of the women who participated in the study had a job or earned any remuneration. The sample group of women were mainly involved in child rearing and daily domestic tasks.

As for their academic and educational levels, none of the participants had earned a primary school certificate or a high school diploma. After examining the school data by the participants' gender, we observed that, as a general rule and particularly in the case of those under 25 years of age, men had attained a higher level of schooling, reaching up till the second year of secondary school. In contrast, most of the women had not passed the last year of compulsory basic education (the sixth year of the primary stage). The remaining participants had not completed the primary stage.

In order to facilitate the participants' responses in the questionnaire, it should be noted that efforts were made in the areas of adjusting the instruments, in the procedures for data collection, as well as in the tools and strategies adopted. A majority of the sample respondents were illiterate and faced major difficulties in understanding the different items. For this reason, a comprehensive interview format was employed, as was introduced by Kaufmann (1996), as well as easy reading techniques, with the purpose to create a space of trust that would favor reflective capacity and concrete responses.

In a population with reading, writing and comprehension difficulties, the personalized survey allows individualized attention in a climate of trust that favors the explanation of questions and the clarification of doubts. In especially vulnerable groups, as in this case, the personal survey also ensures the protection of people's privacy, promoting the visibility of their problems and needs. We also consider that social research has to develop tools (easy to read in this survey) that help these people to participate in knowledge processes from which without these methodologies they would be excluded, and therefore doubly silenced. Social research with a vulnerable population must thus guarantee both the protection of the person interviewed and their right to expression and communication, as is the case with Roma women. The survey carried out in this way allowed the realization of concrete and simple questions favored by the model in its reduced version and also avoided group distortion (which could occur in discussion groups, for example) in strongly community contexts.

In relation to the spatial distribution of the sample, and with the objective of maintaining a balanced representation of the participants' neighborhoods, the different residential areas of the representative group in the city of Toledo were selected at random. The sample was based on this criterion of spatial disposition. It consisted of people living in standardized rented housing, in rented housing in a social system, in occupied dwellings and, finally, in shanty towns. The two shanty towns of the city were sufficiently represented. It is also important to point out that these settlements are located outside the city's residential areas and are physically and socially isolated from the community as a whole. They are 10 km away from the city center, with a single daily journey made possible by public transport. Only school transport serves minors from both areas during school days. The obtained data using the statistical program SPSS (version 19.0 for Windows), UCLM license.

2.1. Instruments used: ASI / AMI questionnaires

To collect the data on variables of sex and age, various reports provided by the socio-educational organization Llere, which has a long history of developing socio-educational care programs for the Roma community in the city of Toledo, have been consulted. This organization specializes in intercultural and gender education, and projects to prevent social exclusion.[1]

The ASI Scale was used for evaluating the prevalence of sexism as well as the level of ambivalence, as an expression of sexist beliefs. The ASI Scale consists of 22 items that evaluate the ambivalent sexist attitudes described by Expósito et al. (1998) in the three sub factors established by Glike and Fiske (1996) regarding benevolent sexism: paternalism, gender complementarity, and heterosexual intimacy. The two versions of the scale were used because of the variable, gender of participant: ASI for men and AMI for women (see Tables 1 and 2).

The first questionnaire (*Ambivalent Sexism Inventory)* (Glick and Fiske, 1996) measures ambivalent (hostile and benevolent) attitudes towards women. The original scale consists of 22 items, with a Likert type response range from 0 (totally disagree) to 5 (totally agree), where higher scores represent a higher level of sexism. The reduced version of the scale consists of 12 items; six of these items evaluate hostile sexism (items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6), which would be equivalent to the following items of the extended version: 11, 14, 15, 16, 18, and 21 (see Table 1). The other six measure benevolent sexism (items 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12), which would be equivalent to those of the extended version: 8, 9, 12, 13, 19, and 20 (see Table 1). The reliability of the Scale of Hostile Sexism (SH) obtained in this study was .82. In the Benevolent Sexism (SB) subscale, the Alpha coefficient was .67 for the Ambivalence towards Men Inventory (AMI; Glick and Fiske, 1999).

---

1   https://llere.org/cause/programa-de-intervencion-social-y-acompanamiento-para-la-inclusion-social/

Table 1: Sexism Categories ASI / AMI

Hostile Sexism	Benevolent Sexism
The man	**The man**
Superior	Protector
Dominant	Breadwinner
Paternalistic	Powerful
Competitive	Rational
Active	Sexual attraction to women: paternalistic
Oriented to management and government	Desire for domination
Heterosexual	
The woman	**The woman**
Inferior	Complements a man
Immature	Passive
Dependent	Sensitive
Oriented to family and home	Emotional
Seductive	Search for psychological intimacy
Manipulative	Desire for subordination

Our own elaboration (adaptation of Lameiras, 2004; Rodríguez and Lameiras, 2009)

When administering the questionnaire, each respondent was asked to determine if it was appropriate for a man to have *the attitudes* described in each item towards a woman with whom he is in a relationship. The response scale constituted five points: 1 indicated "Never appropriate" (i.e., rejection of the behavior in question) and the responses from 2 to 5 indicated a varying degree of acceptance of that behavior (2: "Rarely appropriate," 3: "Sometimes appropriate," 4: "Almost always suitable," and 5: "Always appropriate"). The greatest number of points was always attributed to the highest level of acceptance of the behavior in question.

The second questionnaire (*Ambivalence towards Men Inventory*) (Rodríguez et al., 2009) measures ambivalent (both hostile and benevolent) attitudes towards men. This scale consists of 20 items, with a Likert type response range from 0 (totally disagree) to 5 (totally agree), with the highest scores representing the highest level of ambivalent sexism towards men. As in the previous case, this reduced version is made up of 12 items, of which six evaluate hostile attitudes towards men (items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6), which would be equivalent to the items of the extended version: 4, 8, 9, 11, 17, and 19 (see Table 2). The other six measure benevolence towards men (items 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12), which would be equivalent to the items of the extended version: 1, 5, 7, 10, 13, and 18 (see Table 2). The reliability of the sexism scale was quite good, considering that the Alpha coefficient obtained was .81.

Table 2: Sexism Categories ASI / AMI

ASI	AMI
1. Women try to gain power by controlling men.	1. When men help women, they often try to prove that they are better than them.
2. Women exaggerate the problems they have at work.	2. Men behave like children when they are sick.
3. Once a woman gets a man to commit to her, she usually tries to control him closely.	3. Men will always strive to have greater power in society than women.
4. When women are beaten by men in fair competition, they usually complain that they have been discriminated against.	4. Even if both people in a relationship work, the woman should pay more attention and take care of her man at home.
5. There are many women who, to mock men, are at first sexually instigative and then reject their advances.	5. The men in the background are like children.
6. Feminist women are making completely irrational demands on men.	6. Most men sexually harass women, even if only in a subtle way, as soon as they have a position of power over them.
7. Many women are characterized by a purity that few men possess.	7. Even men who claim to be sensitive to women's rights, really want a traditional relationship at home where women take care of domestic chores and their children.
8. Women must be loved and protected by men.	8. Every woman should have a man to worship.
9. Every man must have a woman to love.	9. A woman will never be fully realized in her life if she does not have a stable relationship with a man.
10. The man is incomplete without the woman.	10. Men are especially useful in providing economic security for women.
11. Women, in comparison with men, tend to have a higher moral sensitivity.	11. Men are more willing to put themselves in danger to protect other people.
12. Men should be willing to sacrifice their own well-being in order to provide economic security for women.	12. Men are more willing to take risks than women.

(Rodríguez, Lameiras and Carrera, 2009)

2.2 Executing procedures: Tools for the adaptation of the questionnaire on the sociocultural characteristics of the participants

A suitable sample size was selected for an acceptable margin of error using stratified sampling by gender and age (generational variable). As we have indicated earlier, the data on the different residential areas were randomly selected to represent the different areas. The interviewees were informed about the objective of the investigation, the process of collecting and using the extracted data, and lastly about the conclusions. In all cases, they were treated in accordance with the ethical standards of the APA Code, version 2010.

Given the socio-educational characteristics of the population, preliminary preparations were made with the person in charge of carrying out the interviews, based on the comprehensive interview model (Kaufmann, 1996). The questionnaires were answered orally in *face to face* meetings. We would like to reiterate the difficulties faced during the interviews due to the poor reading comprehension and the limited oral expression abilities of the participants. These sociocultural conditioning factors may imply that the responses did not precisely correspond with the questionnaire, nor can it be guaranteed that they were not influenced by the procedural model utilized, considering there was no prior consensus building regarding the topic with the interviewer. To carry out the interviews, an interviewer was selected who, for several years, had been conducting social and educational programs with the population that forms a part of the sample. In this way, a space of trust and security was created, so that the interviewees could respond more comfortably to the questions.

Approximately 30 minutes were dedicated to each questionnaire. The interviews were conducted individually to facilitate the understanding of the items and response procedures and explain the key concepts or ideas that were required.

3. Coding and analyzing

The data processing was valid in 100% of the cases. First, the reliability of the reduced ASI / AMI scale in the sample of Roma youth was reviewed. The results, obtained using a Cronbach's Alpha of .829, indicated a high degree of reliability for all the cases. Table 3 shows the data for each of the categories of the two reduced scales.

Table 3: ASI / AMI values

Gender		N	Mean	Mean standard error
ASI1	Men	44	4,8182	0,12197
	Women	44	4,4545	0,15746
ASI2	Men	44	4,0909	0,09091
	Women	44	2,0000	0,19069
ASI3	Men	44	4,4545	0,15746
	Women	44	4,2727	0,14084
ASI4	Men	44	4,8182	0,12197
	Women	44	4,7273	0,14084
ASI5	Men	44	4,7273	0,14084
	Women	44	4,4545	0,15746
ASI6	Men	44	4,5455	0,15746
	Women	44	4,4545	0,15746
ASI7	Men	44	2,0000	0,13484
	Women	44	4,6364	0,15212
ASI8	Men	44	2,4545	0,15746
	Women	44	4,3636	0,20328
ASI9	Men	44	3,9091	0,16262
	Women	44	4,6364	0,15212
ASI10	Men	44	2,0909	0,44445
	Women	44	4,7273	0,14084
ASI44	Men	44	2,0000	0,13484
	Women	44	4,5455	0,15746
ASI12	Men	44	4,1818	0,12197
	Women	44	4,5455	0,15746
AMI1	Men	44	2,2727	0,14084
	Women	44	4,5455	0,15746
AMI2	Men	44	1,8182	0,18182
	Women	44	4,6364	0,15212
AMI3	Men	44	4,4545	0,15746
	Women	44	4,3636	0,15212
AMI4	Men	44	4,4545	0,15746
	Women	44	4,5455	0,15746
AMI5	Men	44	1,4545	0,15746
	Women	44	4,3636	0,15212
AMI6	Men	44	1,8182	0,12197
	Women	44	3,8182	0,18182
AMI7	Men	44	3,1818	0,18182
	Women	44	4,4545	0,15746
AMI8	Men	44	4,8182	0,12197
	Women	44	4,4545	0,15746
AMI9	Men	44	4,2727	0,19498
	Women	44	4,3636	0,15212
AMI10	Men	44	4,1818	0,22636
	Women	44	4,8182	0,12197

AMI22	Men	44	4,9091	0,09091
	Women	44	4,3636	0,15212
AMI12	Men	44	4,1818	0,18182
	Women	44	4,4545	0,15746
ASI	Men	44	3,6742	0,04272
	Women	44	4,3182	0,05819
SH	Men	44	4,5758	0,05669
	Women	44	4,0606	0,07545
SB	Men	44	2,7727	0,04066
	Women	44	4,5758	0,06098

Source: Own elaboration

The significant difference between men and women, with the men scoring lower on the ASI, can be seen in items 7 and 8; 7 – *Many women are characterized by a purity that few men possess,* and 8 – *Women should be loved and protected by men.* In both the items, men scored 2 and women, over 4 (Table 3).

In the case of items 10 and 11, men scored over 2 and women scored close to 5; 10 – *The man is incomplete without the woman,* and 11 – *Women, compared to men, tend to have a more refined sense of culture and good taste.*

Both groups have categories linked to an imaginary and solid belief system, which place women in positions related to care, attention, affectivity, and affective and emotional relationships.

In contrast, men scored higher than women in item 2: *Women exaggerate the problems they have at work* (with men scoring over 4 and women, 2). Here, it is worth noting that women perceive sexism in those statements that lower their worth in a hostile way. On the other hand, the obtained scores indicate that for men, negative perceptions about women occur indistinctly from both positions: a) that which reinforces the idea of protective and positive masculinity, and b) that which reflects hostile feelings towards the attitudes of women who participate in the world of work.

For the remaining items, the differences between both groups are not very significant. The items without appreciable differences are: 1 – *Women try to gain power by controlling men;* 3 – *Once a woman manages to get a man to commit to her, she usually tries to control him closely;* 4 – *When women are beaten by men in fair competition, they usually complain that they have been discriminated against;* 5 – *There are many women who, to mock men, are at first sexually instigative and then reject their advances;* 6 – *Feminist women are making completely irrational demands on men;* 9 – *Every man must have a woman to love;* 12 – *Men should be willing to sacrifice their own well-being in order to provide economic security for women.*

The scores obtained are variable and not very relevant if we look at them comparatively. Most items, in both groups, have scores above 4. Items 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 are clearly sexist with regard to women's attitudes towards men. These confirm the sexist stereotypes, indicating the manipulation and control behaviors assigned to women (negative prejudices can also be found with regard to racialized minorities as veiled strategies to achieve their own objectives). For items 9 and 12 in both groups, there is a repetition of benevolent sexism towards women, which seems to subtly justify the preponderant position of men. The obtained scores seem to indicate that benevolent sexism is not perceived as such by both the surveyed men and women.

Regarding the AMI scale, we found significant differences in the relationship between both the sexes in the items: 1 – *When men help women, they often try to prove that they are better than them*; 2 – *Men behave like children when they are sick*; 5 – *Men in the background are like children.* The results for items 2 and 5 indicate that men scored below 2 and women, above 4; 6 – *Most men sexually harass women, even if only in a subtle way, as soon as they have a position of power over them.*

This shows men's rejection of the images that question their ideal of masculinity and those that link them with hostile attitudes towards women. The denial of beliefs and attitudes in this group can be recognized as sexist and the legitimacy of this behavior is considered normal for men. Women, on the contrary, confirm that these behaviors belong to men in items that define their position of power negatively.

Similarly, there were hardly any differences in the items: 3 – *Men will always strive to have greater power in society than women;* 4 – *Even if both people in a relationship work, the woman should pay more attention and take care of her partner at home;* 7 – *Even men who claim to be sensitive to the rights of women, really want a traditional relationship at home where women take care of domestic chores and their children;* 8 – *Every woman should have a man to worship;* 9 – *A woman will never be fully realized in her life if she does not have a stable relationship with a man;* 10 – *Men are especially useful in providing economic security for women;* 11 – *Men are more willing to put themselves in danger to protect other people;* 12 – *Men are more willing to take risks than women.*

In all of the above items, the scores for both groups are between 3 and 4, highlighting the clear differentiation between male and female roles. The former are linked to positions of power, action, risk, and centrality, and the

latter to positions of passivity, fragility, inaction, and a search for security. For women, the relationships between the sexes are built around strongly stereotyped categories of gender. What should be observed, for example, is the normality with which they assume that the well-being of men is dependent on women's care and attention.

From the data set, we calculated the SH variable, which is the sum of the first 6 items of the reduced scale, and the SB variable, which is the sum of items 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12. The results of hostile sexism show that there are hardly any differences in the perceptions and beliefs of the two sexes. In contrast, they increase significantly in reference to benevolent sexism. Men scored below 3 and women scored above 4.5 (Table 4).

Table 4. Group Statistics

	Gender	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean Standard Error
SH	**Men**	44	4,5758	,18803	,05669
	Women	44	4,0606	,25025	,07545
SB	**Men**	44	2,7727	,13484	,04066
	Women	44	4,5758	,20226	,06098

Source: Own elaboration

To analyze the differences expressed by men and women, and compare the means of the two samples, we performed the *Student's t-test*. We found a contrast of 6.11 in Levene's test. With a confidence interval of 95%, it can be seen that the sample variances are equal with regard to gender, and that hostile sexism does not depend on sex (Tables 5 and 6).

Table 5. Independent samples t-test

		Levene's test of equality of variances		Test T for equality of means					95% Confidence interval for the difference	
F		Sig.	t	df	Sig. (two tailed)	Difference of means	Standard error of the difference	Lower	Upper	
SH	Equal variances have been assumed	,267	,611	5,458	20	,000	,51515	,09438	,31828	,71202
	Equal variances have not been assumed			5,458	18,562	,000	,51515	,09438	,31730	,71300
SB	Equal variances have been assumed	,592	,451	-24,600	20	,000	-1,80303	,07329	-1,95592	-1,65014
	Equal variances have not been assumed			-24,600	17,423	,000	-1,80303	,07329	-1,95738	-1,64868

Source: Own elaboration

Table 6 presents the Pearson correlation coefficients obtained by relating sexism (ASI) with the variables SH and SB. With respect to SB, the sexism scale detects most of the answers and explains 94.5% of the cases. It has a high significance level ($p<0.001$) and allows us to detect *attitudes* of benevolent sexism. With regard to SH, the sexism scale has only detected half of the cases and explains 43.7% of them. The level of significance is high, but the correlation is negative, that is, there is an inverse relationship ($p <0.05$).

Table 6. Correlations

			ASI
ASI		Pearson correlation	1
		Sig. (two tailed)	
		Sum of squares and cross products	2,854
		Covariance	,136
		N	44
SH		Pearson correlation	-,437*
		Sig. (two tailed)	,042
		Sum of squares and cross products	-1,154
		Covariance	-,055
		N	44
SB		Pearson correlation	,945**
		Sig. (two tailed)	,000
		Sum of squares and cross products	6,862
		Covariance	,327
		N	44

*. The correlation is significant at the level of 0.05 (two tailed)

**. ** The correlation is significant at the level of 0.01 (two tailed)

Source: Own elaboration

4. Conclusions: Benevolent sexism and its relation to gender violence

We believe that the acceptable values of the reliability coefficient should be between 0.50 and 0.60. The analysis of the differences between the men and women interviewed indicates that there are no significant differences, either in the SH (with .611) or in the SB (with a .451 significance on Levene's test). The correlation between sexism and the variables indicates, with respect to SB, that it is significant for most of the cases (it explains 94.5% of the cases). The responses on the items show a high degree of sexism among the participants.

There were two limitations of the study with regard to the sample, that is, its size and its limited spatial location. The results obtained should be treated with some caution when extrapolating to other contexts. These obstacles were expressly assumed and integrated into the typology of the study when considering the sociocultural and academic characteristics of the participating population. In this sense, seemingly contradictory results appear in the correlation of sexism. On one hand, the results obtained explain 43.7% of the cases (a mediocre percentage), and on the other hand, a considerable degree of correlation is inferred, but it is negative, that is, the inverse of sexism. This points to an unusual situation: the inverse relationship between sexism and hostile sexism does not necessarily confirm the intended objectives with the use of the ASI scale (although, it does do so with regard to benevolent sexism). Perhaps the interviewees' limited schooling and knowledge of standard social codes may have led to these contradictory results.

It is significant to note that the participants did not perceive the belief, attitude, or sexist behavior that the ASI scale understands as benevolent sexism. There are also no significant differences by sex in this sense. The masculine and feminine roles within the group are highly differentiated, not as a distorting element but, on the contrary, as a factor of cohesion and group identity. From the data obtained, one could question if the items on the scale a cultural bias in the perception of gender inequalities have, based on broad social criteria that prevented the firm establishment of a clear correlation between the identities or roles of highly differentiated gender and positions of power in intra-group relations between men and women. This means that the research conclusions in major groups where ethnic or cultural belonging is not contemplated, indicate that benevolent sexism can also be a predictor of violence against women and clearly express relationships based on a position of power exercised

by women. However, other studies (Rottenbacher, 2010) have also pointed out the need to introduce the scale items that permit measurement of cultural and age variables in the social context of the groups studied.

The results confirm a certain ambivalence. Benevolent sexism (Glike and Fische, 1996) highlights, in both cases, the protector and provider roles of men, and the consolidation of traditional roles in heterosexual relationships. These legitimate and reinforce the mutual positions within the group. Although the differences would be insignificant, the same does not occur with respect to hostile sexism. For men, it is seen as a normal phenomenon. On the contrary, women identify it as something negative. It could be said that men maintain clear-cut positions regarding their dominating role, that go beyond positive masculine roles, without establishing a clear difference between them (Cárdenas et ál., 2010). Women hold traditional positions only when they correspond to a positive image of themselves with respect to their place in the group, while men do so in all cases.

The ASI scale, in its reduced version, is an adequate tool to measure ambivalent sexism when applied to minority or racialized groups with a strong social stigma as well. However, it is advisable to introduce measures to segregate and analyze the data based on cultural variables, educational levels, and economic levels. The adjustments made in the questionnaire are positively valued with regard to the training gaps, but insufficient with respect to the others. However, we emphasize the relevance of this type of study to improve social and educational programs in groups and profiles with such characteristics. The obtained results give a better understanding of the scope of gender roles and, therefore, can help us to reorient interventions in the prevention of gender inequalities or early school dropouts among Roma girls.

It is also important to point out that the persistence of attitudes that differentiate the roles assigned to men and women, operate as elements of group cohesion or resistance to negative discourses against the Roma community. It is in this sense that socio-educational programs can generate rejection if they are perceived as a form of contempt or threat to distinctive cultural traits (Machado and Zibechi, 2016; Garcés, 2016). As these authors point out, social exclusion constitutes a negative factor for any process of change in which the group or the excluded person cannot be recognized as an equal before his interlocutor. The recognition as subjects and the positive visibility of the group constitute a precondition for their possible comparison with the rest of society, including gender equality. The Sara Program, (Institute for Women of Spain, 2018) in agreement with the Fundación Secretariado Gitano (2012), points out that Roma women live in situations of greater vulnerability to gender violence in their communities and are less likely to report due to less autonomy and access to Social Services. In studies of the Fundación Secretariado Gitano, it is indicated in this sense that the cultural characteristics of the gypsy community in Spain place women in a situation of double dependence, since the values of family cohesion, group loyalty and fidelity significantly greater control over Roma women compared to the general population.

Finally, the fact that sexism is not perceived as such among the Roma population can have a negative impact on the effectiveness of programs aimed at facilitating the reduction of gender inequalities and providing women with a greater social projection in the whole society, through maximum educational, social, and economic equality. The majority view on sexism and its correlation with gender inequality in these groups can be an impediment, rather than a working criterion, for the medium and long-term effectiveness of social integration projects. In conducting research based on perceptions of sexism and the behaviors that explain it, it is necessary to contextualize, from a critical perspective, the situation of social exclusion of the Roma population, and the discourses of the majority population that attempt to legitimize it. In this way, it will be possible to develop programs for the prevention of gender violence that go beyond models disconnected from their own reality or from views biased by a certain cultural exoticism. In other words, it will allow us to design more coherent and effective social integration programs.

References

Aguaded, E.M. (2017). Análisis de la presencia de sexismo en alumnado universitario. *ENSAYOS, Revista de la Facultad de Educación de Albacete, 32*(1). Enlace web:

http://www.revista.uclm.es/index.php/ensayos - Consultada en fecha (12-01-2019)

Allport, G. W. (1971). *La naturaleza del prejuicio.* Buenos Aires: EDUDEBA.

Amnistía Internacional (2015). *Informe 2014/15 Amnistía Internacional. La situación e los Derechos Humanos en el mundo.* Madrid: AILRC-ES https://www.amnesty.org/download/Documents/POL1000012015SPANISH.PDF

Archer, J. (2006). Cross-cultural differences in physical aggression between partners: Asocial-role analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 10, 113–133. doi: 10.1207/s15327957pspr1002_3

Arnoso, A.; Ibabe, I. Elgorriaga, E. (2017). El sexismo como predictor de la violencia de pareja en un contexto multicultural. *Anuario de Psicología Jurídica,* n. 27, 9–20.

Bonino, L. (2005). Las microviolencias y sus efectos: claves para su detección. En C. Ruiz-Jarabo y P. Blanco (Coords.), *La violencia contra las mujeres: prevención y detección* (pp. 83-102). Madrid: Díaz de Santos.

Blázquez-Rodríguez, M. (2005). Los componentes de género y su relación con la enfermería. Index de Enfermería, 14(51), 50-54.

Bringas-Molleda, C.; Estrada-Pineda, C.; Suárez-Álvarez, J.; Torres, A.; Rodríguez-Díaz, F.; García- Cueto, E. y Rodríguez-Franco, L. (2017). Actitud sexista y trascendente durante el noviazgo entre universitarios latinoamericanos. *Revista Iberoamericana de Psicología y Salud*, Vol. 8. Nº 1. pp.44-55.

Cárdenas, M.; Lay, S-L.; González, C.; Calderón, C. y Alegría, I. (2010). *Revista Salud & Sociedad*, Vol.1, No.2. pp. 125–135

European Commission (2020). Lutter contre les discriminations multiples. Pratiques, politiques et lois. Rapport de la Commission européenne (2020). *Multiple Discrimination in EU Law: Opportunities for Legal Responses to Intersectional*

https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/info/files/commission_proposal_for_a_draft_council_recommendation_for_roma_equality_inclusion_and_participation_fr.pdf

Expósito, F., Moya, M., y Glick, P. (1998). Sexismo ambivalente: medición y correlatos. *Revista de Psicología Social*, 13, 159-169.

Fundación Secretariado Gitano (2012). Guía de intervención social con población gitana desde la perspectiva de género. Disponible en: https://www.gitanos.org/upload/80/53/Guia_Interv_Genero.pdf

Garcés, H.F. (2016). El racismo antirom/antigitano y la opción decolonial. *Tabula Rasa. Bogotá - Colombia, No.25: 225-251.* Grupo Kale Amengue, España

García-Díaz, V.; Lana-Pérez, A.; Fernández-Feitoa, A.; Bringas-Molledab, C.; Rodríguez-Franco, L.; y Rodríguez-Díaz, J. (2018). Actitudes sexistas y reconocimiento del maltrato en parejas jóvenes. *Atención Primaria; 50(7):398-405.* http://digibuo.uniovi.es/dspace/bitstream/10651/45284/1/Actitudes.pdf

Gobierno de España (2019). *Informe Nacional de España. Informe sobre la aplicación de la Declaración y Plataforma de Acción de Beijing (1995) y los resultados del vigésimo tercer período extraordinario de sesiones de la Asamblea General (2000) en el contexto de 25º aniversario de la Cuarta Conferencia Mundial sobre la Mujer y la aprobación de la Declaración y Plataforma de Acción de Beijing.* http://www.exteriores.gob.es/Portal/es/PoliticaExteriorCooperacion/DerechosHumanos/Documents/Informe%20Beijing%20Espa%C3%B1a%20(+25).pdf

Glick, P., y Fiske, S. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 70, 491-512.

Glick, P., y Fiske, S. (2001). An ambivalent alliance: Hostile and benevolent sexism as complementary justifications of gender inequality. *American Psychologist,* 56, 109-118.

Kaufmann, J. C. (1996). *L'entretien compréhensif.* Paris: Nathan.

Herranz, I; J Flores, J.A y Arias, E. (2007). La Mujer en el siglo XXI: desigualdades, retos y oportunidades.Mujeres en desigualdad: Una perspectiva socio-antropológica. pp. 6-31. (España): Instituto de la Mujer de Castilla-La Mancha. Consejería de Bienestar Social, 2007. ISBN 978-84-690-7

Institute for Women of Spain, (2018) *Programa Sara - Mujeres pertenecientes a minorías étnicas.* Disponible en: https://www.inmujer.gob.es/areasTematicas/AreaProgInsercionSociolaboral/SaraMujMinoriasEtnicas.htm

Ladmiral, J.R., Lipiansky, E.M (1989). *La comunication interculturelle.* París Armand Colin.

Lagarde, M. (2012). *El feminismo en mi vida. Hitos, claves y topías.* México DF: Instituto de las Mujeres del Distrito Federal.

Lameiras, M. (2004). El sexismo y sus caras: de la hostilidad a la ambivalencia. *Anuario de Sexología,* 8, 91-102

Lameiras, M., y Rodríguez, Y. (2003). Evaluación del sexismo ambivalente en estudiantes gallegos/as. *Acción Psicológica*, 2, 131-136.

Machado, D. y Zibechi, R. (2016). *Cambiar el mundo desde arriba. Los límites del progresismo.* CEDLA: La Paz.

McConahay, J. B. (1986). Modern racism, ambivalence, and the modern racism scale. En J. F. Dovidio & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism* (pp. 91-125). New York: Academic.

Ministerio de Sanidad, Servicios Sociales e Igualdad (2014). *Estrategia Nacional para la Inclusión Social de la Población Gitana en España 2012-2020.* Madrid: Gobieerno de España.

Mosteiro García, M.J. y Porto Castro, A.M. (2017). Análisis de los estereotipos de género en alumnado de formación profesional: diferencias según sexo, edad y grado. *Revista de Investigación Educativa,* 35(1), 151-165 DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.6018/rie.35.1.257191

Musitu, G. (2000). Socialización familiar y valores en el adolescente: un análisis intercultural. *Anuario de Psicología*, 31, 15-32.

O'Bryan, M., Fishbein, H., y Ritchey, P. N. (2004). Intergenerational transmission of prejudice, sex role stereotypes and intolerance. *Adolescence*, 39, 407-426.

Puente-Martínez, A.; Ubillos-Landa, S., Echeburúa, E y Páez-Rovira, D. (2016). Factores de riesgo asociados a la violencia sufrida por la mujer en la pareja: una revisión de meta-análisis y estudios recientes. *Anales de psicología*, vol. 32, nº 1, 295-306

Rodríguez, Y., Lameiras, M., y Carrera, M.V. (2009). Validación de la versión reducida de las escalas ASI y AMI en una muestra de estudiantes españoles. *Psicogente*, 12 (22), 546-563.

Rodríguez, Y., Lameiras, M., Carrera, M.V y Faílde, J.M. (2009). Aproximación conceptual al sexismo ambivalente: estado de la cuestión. *SUMMA Psicológica UST*, 2, 131-142.

Rottenbacher de Rojas, J.M (2010). Sexismo ambivalente, paternalismo masculino e ideología política en adultos jóvenes de la ciudad de lima. *Pensamiento Psicológico,* vol. 7, No. 14, 2010, pp. 9-18

Sánchez Bello, A. (2006). La identidad de genero en el marco de la escuela intercultural. Cobo, R. (Ed.). *Interculturalidad, femenismo y educación.* Madrid: Catarata.

Shearer, C. (2008). Gender socialization in the family. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering*, 68(10-B), 7004.

Sierra, M. (2016). *Identidad nacional y barbarie sexual: los gitanos en el discurso romántico sobre España.* Disponible en: http://paradojas.hypotheses.org/1368.

Tenenbaum, H. R., & Leaper, C. (2002). Are parents' gender schemas related to their children's gender-related cognitions? A meta-analysis. Developmental psychology, 38(4), 615.

Valcárcel, A. (2004). *La política de las mujeres.* Madrid: Cátedra.

V.V. A. A (2007). *Diagnóstico social de la comunidad gitana en España. Un análisis contrastado de la Encuesta del CIS a Hogares de Población Gitana.* Madrid: Fundación Secretariado Gitano. Disponible en: https://www.mscbs.gob.es/ssi/familiasInfancia/PoblacionGitana/docs/diagnosticosocial_autores.pdf