Differences Between Men and Women in the Acceptance of Gender Roles and Stereotypes in Intimate Partner Violence
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ABSTRACT

Background/Objective: Intimate partner violence against women is a widespread form of gender-based violence present in societies of all types. Among the possible factors implicated in its existence are gender stereotypes and cognitive distortions of a sexist or violence-justifying nature. Thus, a general population survey was designed with the aim of studying gender differences in the acceptance of gender roles and stereotypes, and violence against women in intimate relationships. Method: A total of 391 participants from the general population (61.9% women) aged from 18 to 67, responded to measures of the internalization of gender norms or mandates based on differential socialization, distorted thoughts about women and the use of violence, beliefs about intimate partner violence, and social desirability. Results: Men scored higher on different types of sexism and stereotypes, on stereotypes related to motherhood, and romantic love generally attributed to women. Converse, no gender differences in the justification of violence were observed. Likewise, no significant differences were found for the educational level factor. Conclusions: The implications of the results for the contents of prevention and intervention programmes are discussed.

Diferencias Entre Hombres y Mujeres en la Aceptación de los Roles y Estereotipos de Género en la Violencia de Pareja

RESUMEN

Antecedentes/Objetivos: La violencia de pareja contra las mujeres es una forma generalizada de violencia de género presente en sociedades de todo tipo. Entre los posibles factores implicados en su existencia se encuentran los estereotipos de género y las distorsiones cognitivas de carácter sexista o justificadoras de la violencia. Por ello, se diseñó una encuesta a población general con el objetivo de estudiar las diferencias de género en la aceptación de roles y estereotipos de género, y la violencia contra las mujeres en las relaciones íntimas. Método: Un total de 391 participantes de la población general (61.9% mujeres) con edades comprendidas entre los 18 y los 67 años, respondieron a medidas de interiorización de normas o mandatos de género basadas en socialización diferencial, pensamientos distorsionados sobre la mujer y el uso de la violencia, creencias sobre la violencia en la pareja y deseabilidad social. Resultados: Los hombres puntuaron más alto en diferentes tipos de sexismo y estereotipos, en estereotipos relacionados con la maternidad y el amor romántico generalmente atribuido a las mujeres. Por el contrario, no se observaron diferencias de género en la justificación de la violencia. Tampoco se encontraron diferencias significativas en el factor nivel educativo. Conclusions: Se discuten las implicaciones de los resultados para los contenidos de los programas de prevención e intervención.
Introduction

Being a woman is the main risk factor in several criminal typologies, such as human trafficking (Hickle & Roe-Sepowitz, 2014; Salami et al., 2021), sexual violence (Fahlberg & Pepper, 2016; Turchik et al., 2015), and intimate partner violence (IPV) (Ferrer-Pérez & Bosch-Fiol, 2014; Ullman, 2023), including teen dating violence (Muñoz-Rivas et al., 2021). At the IV World Conference on Women held in Beijing in 1995, the need to intervene in eradicating the different forms of violence suffered by women in all countries became visible. This historic milestone highlighted the importance of investigating the possible relationship between structural inequality between men and women and the violence suffered by women in all areas, especially in intimate partner relationships. It is known that acceptance of gender roles influences the acceptance of IPV violence increasing the risk of violence and the perpetration (Reyes et al., 2016; You & Shin, 2022).

This form of victimization represents a very serious social problem, present worldwide, with different prevalence depending on the country, with heterogeneity being its most important characteristic, since it affects all types of women regardless of sociodemographic, individual, family, or social aspects. One extreme on IPV against women, sometimes the most visible, are homicides (López-Ossorio et al., 2018; Spencer & Stith, 2020), with a risk itself affecting the health and well-being of women and their children (Hernández, 2021; Juarras-Basterretxea et al., 2022).

In recent decades, research has focused on identifying those factors that increase the risk of IPV against women, especially in relation to explicit physical aggression, such as homicides and attempted homicides (Expósito-Álvarez et al., 2021; Matías et al., 2020; Spencer & Stith, 2020). Different IPV explanatory models has been developed considering both victim and offenders characteristics in relation to sociocultural aspects. Some of these theoretical models focus on the importance of differential socialization and the distribution of roles based on male and female stereotypes (Ferrer-Pérez & Bosch-Fiol, 2014). The presence of cognitive distortions related to women and the use of violence against them has been widely studied (Echeburúa et al., 2016; Loinaz, 2014), attitudes and thoughts that may sometimes be related to a low level of education (Guerrero-Molina et al., 2021).

Education and social acceptance, therefore, are objectives to be faced in the prevention of IPV. Gender inequality is correlated with the prevalence of any form of IPV (Willie & Kershaw, 2019), and in those countries where gender stereotypes are less questioned, the prevalence of IPV against women is higher (Bonilla-Algovia & Rivas-Rivero, 2021, 2022). Individual beliefs regarding gender roles and masculinity influence the perceptions of IPV (Stanziani et al., 2020). This internalization of gender roles and stereotypes would also be at the basis of other forms of violence against women, such as sexual harassment and assaults (Kaiser et al., 2022; Lizzio-Wilson et al., 2022).

The relationship between attitudes and IPV is complex and differ for females and males (Nabors & Jasinski, 2009). Males endorsing higher levels of hegemonic masculinity may perceive IPV as less serious, while females who endorsed the same beliefs perceived the perpetrators as less likely to benefit from treatment (Stanziani et al., 2020). Boys also justify more attitudes of violence and agree more with sexist beliefs (Ferragut et al., 2014). Gender roles, as submissive attitude, are associated with IPV in female students (Llano-Suárez et al., 2021). Research also shows less acceptance of these beliefs among women and people with prior IPV academic-training (Ferrer-Pérez et al., 2019).

Recent research analyzing the social perception of the seriousness of IPV against women show that, on average, men presented lower levels of perceived severity than women, and participants with higher levels of perceived severity also present lower levels of acceptability, victim-blaming attitudes, and hostile sexism, and higher levels of willingness to intervene in the event of witnessing an assault (Martín-Fernández et al., 2022). It has also been shown how in countries where traditional gender roles and mandates are more accepted, fewer prevention and intervention programs on intimate partner violence against women are carried out (Lowe et al., 2022). However, most of the research analyzing the possible relationship between acceptance of gender roles and stereotypes and IPV against women has focused specifically on the distortions presented by perpetrators, and the assessment of the general population has remained in the background.

The prevailing cultural variables in society play a role of great importance in the acceptance of IPV, and the existence of rigid gender stereotypes can act as a risk factor in the normalization and execution of the phenomenon (Bucheli & Rossi, 2019). Therefore, it is essential to understand the values and beliefs prevailing in society, not only for a better general understanding of the phenomenon, but also with the aim of developing more effective prevention and intervention programs. The present research aims to fill this gap in the literature analyzing individual differences between men and women in the acceptance of gender roles and stereotypes and violence towards women in intimate relationships.

We hypothesize that: (a) men will present a greater internalization of gender mandates related to work projection, biological factors and neo-sexism; (b) women will present a greater internalization of gender stereotypes related to motherhood, romantic love and care; (c) men will present greater distorted beliefs towards IPV than women.

Method

Participants

The sample consisted of 391 participants, of whom 242 were women (61.9%). The mean age was 43.17 (SD = 10.33), ranging from 18 to 67. Most were of Spanish nationality (n = 370, 94%) and had no children (52.7%). Most of the participants indicated that they did not consider themselves to be victims of any form of IPV (n = 335, 86.1%). Of the remaining 13.9%, 72.2% (n = 39) were women. Other demographic characteristics of the participants are shown in Table 1. Inclusion criteria were: (a) signing the informed consent form; (b) being of legal age (≥ 18 years); (c) completion of all instruments; and (d) scores between 6 and 13 on the M-C SDS (recommended criteria by Gutiérrez et al., 2016).

Procedure

A snowball sampling survey design was used. The selected tests were adapted to Google Surveys, together with a brief questionnaire that collected sociodemographic variables, and an initial page where informed consent was presented, and the objectives of the study...
were indicated. This initial page explicitly stated the anonymous and voluntary nature of the study. The survey was distributed through social networks as a study developed by the university of AMVG, during the months of April to September, with reminders every 20 days. For the design of the survey and distribution system, the indications of Moreh (2019) were followed.

This study was approved by the Comité de Bioética of the Universidad Internacional de La Rioja [PI:89/2022] and followed the ethical considerations proposed by the American Psychological Association (2017).

Measurement Instruments

Inventory of Covert Social Violence against Women (IVISEM; Vinagre-González et al., 2020). The IVISEM is a self-report questionnaire designed to measure the internalization of gender norms or mandates based on differential socialization. It consists of 35 items, scored on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), which are grouped into seven subscales, each one composed of 5 items, to assess gender mandates related to Motherhood, Romantic Love and Couple, Caregiving, Work Projection, Attitudes and Submission, Biology and Neo-sexism. The following cutoff scores were proposed for the total score: 35-70 = Low internalization of gender mandates; 71-105 = Medium internalization of gender mandates; 106-140 = High internalization of gender mandates; 141-175 = Very high internalization of gender mandates. In the subscales, the higher the score, the greater the internalization of gender mandates. The internal consistency (reliability), Cronbach’s α, for the present study sample was: α (total) = .91; α (motherhood) = .62; α (romantic love and couple) = .79; α (caregiving) = .71; α (labor projection) = .65; α (attitudes and submission) = .63; α (biology) = .72; α (neo-sexism) = .92.

Inventory of Distorted Thoughts about Women and the Use of Violence - Revised (IPDMUV-R; Echeburúa et al., 2016). This is a self-reported inventory that allow the identification of irrational beliefs that are related to gender roles and the supposed inferiority of women with respect to men, as well as the use of violence as an acceptable way to resolve conflicts. It consists of 21 items in true and false format and the score ranges from 0 to 21 points. The higher the scores, the greater the number of cognitive distortions about women and the use of violence, although a cutoff score of >8 has been proposed. Internal consistency (reliability) for this sample was α = .60.

Inventory of Beliefs about Intimate Partner Violence (IBIPV; García-Ael et al., 2017). The IBIPV is a self-reported questionnaire that measures general and specific attitudes toward violence against women within intimate partner relationships. It is composed of 22 items with Likert-type responses from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). It is divided into three factors: Justification of gender-based violence (6 items), Responsibility of the victim (9 items) and Responsibility of the abuser (7 items). Higher scores indicate higher justification, higher responsibility of the victim and lower responsibility of the abuser. Internal consistency for this sample was α = .72.

Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale brief version (M-C SDS; Gutiérrez et al., 2016). M-C SDS is a self-report questionnaire with 18 true or false statements. It is a test used in conjunction with other instruments to measure social desirability bias. The authors recommend using the 10th and 90th quartiles (scores 5 and 14) to determine the risk of social undesirability and desirability, respectively. The reliability (internal consistency) for the present study sample was α = .73.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were used to study the sociodemographic and relevant variables in the overall sample. Subsequently, differences in the scales included in the study according to educational level, perception of having been a victim and sex were analyzed using one factor ANOVA (Bonferroni correction) and Student’s t test for independent samples. Effect size was analyzed using Cohen’s d statistic, and the results were interpreted following as following: small, d = 0.20, an effect size larger than 55.6%; moderate, d = 0.50, an effect size larger than 63.7%; large d = 0.80, an effect size larger than 71.6%, or more than large, d > 1.20, an effect size larger than 80.2% (Cohen, 2013; Arce et al., 2015). Complementary, the magnitude of the effect size was quantified in percentages of increase (+) or decrease (-) with r (Arias et al., 2020; Rosenthal & Rubin, 1982). Finally, binary logistic regression was performed with sex (0 = female and 1 = male) as the dependent variable, and the scores on the IVISEM and IBIPV subscales, and the IPDMUV-R total score as predictive factors. Odds ratios from binary logistic regression analysis were examined to determine the association between each of the variables and the probability of belonging to the male or female category, controlling for the other variables in the model. Before performing the logistic regression analysis, correlational analyses were conducted to ensure that multicollinearity in the regression was avoided. A correlation coefficient > 0.8 was used as a criterion for the existence of multicollinearity (Midi et al., 2010). No missing or outliers were identified in the sample.

Results

Together with the sociodemographic characteristics, in Table 1 the overall description of the variables studied are presented. The mean score for internalization of gender mandates (IVISEM-Total) was in the medium category (M = 71.01, SD = 20.11), with approximately half of the participants in that category (n = 166, 42.70%). On the other hand, low scores were obtained on the IPDMUV-R (M = 1.3; SD = 1.5), and only 2 participants (0.5%) scored above the cut-off point (> 8). The mean scores obtained on the subscales of the IBIPV were also low (ranging from 1.1 to 2.1).

Comparing scores according to education level, no significant differences were found. However, the scores in all the three tools were lower among those with university level, followed by medium level studies (e.g., IVISEM Total Score for primary, medium and university studies: M = 82.73, SD = 15.15; M = 71.96, SD = 17.75; M = 70.24, SD = 20.93, respectively). The higher the education the lower the stereotypes or distortion level in most of the scales. There were also no significant differences in the scores according to age. However, we found significant differences in the scores among people who perceived themselves as victims of gender-based violence. People who perceived themselves as victims scored significantly higher on the IVISEM subscales of caregiving (M = 9.81, SD = 4.49; t(387) = 2.44, p = .015), labor projection (M = 9.35,
specifically, in those related to romantic love and couple ($M = 13.44$ and $M = 9.17$, respectively) with a more than large effect, to biology ($M = 13.00$ and $M = 10.95$, respectively) with a moderate effect, and to neo-sexism ($M = 10.90$ and $M = 7.80$, respectively) with a moderate effect. Quantitatively, men report, in general, a $29.6\% (r = .296)$ more internalization of gender mandates; and a $51.8\% (r = .518)$ more internalization of gender mandates of romantic love and couple, a $24.7\% (r = .247)$ more internalization of gender mandates of biology, and a $30.0\% (r = .300)$ more internalization of gender mandates of neo-sexism.

Table 3 shows the results of the logistic regression model proposed, with sex as the dependent variable. The complete model with the eleven independent variables was statistically significant, $\chi^2(11) = 134.63, p < .001$, Cox-Snell’s $R^2 = .30$, Nagelkerke’s $R^2 = .40$. It correctly classified 77% of the cases. Three of the variables introduced (IVISEM romantic love, caregiving and neo-sexism) made a statistically significant contribution to the model. These findings suggest that high scores on romantic love-related stereotypes and neo-sexism are, respectively, 41% and 10% higher in men ($OR = 1.41, 95\% CI 1.29-1.55$) and ($OR = 1.10, 95\% CI 0.98-1.16$), whereas high scores on care-related stereotypes are 19% higher in women ($OR = 0.81, 95\% CI 0.72-0.91$).

Finally, Table 4 shows the bivariate correlations between the study variables. No evidence of multicollinearity was observed. However, we identified significant positive correlations between the IVISEM subscales and the IPDMUV total score ($r$ between .288 and .364), between the IVISEM caring and work promotion subscales and the IBIPV victim responsibility subscale ($r = .130$ and $r = .101$, respectively), between the IVISEM neo-sexism subscale and the IBIPV justification subscale ($r = .127$) and between the IPDMUV total score and the IBIPV justification subscale ($r = .133$). Significant negative correlations were also identified between the IVISEM motherhood and caregiving subscales and the IBIPV Batterer Responsibility subscale ($r = -.156$ and $r = -.131$, respectively).

### Discussion

Gender stereotypes are widespread in all societies and related to different forms of violence and women discrimination. Although literature has showed differences between countries with variants of patriarchy (Grzyb, 2023), and even some changes among generations, for instance in the Spanish society (Moya & Moya-Garofano, 2021), gender stereotypes still exist and influence our daily life leading to unequal access and distribution of resources such as education, employment, and healthcare (Willie & Kershaw, 2019). Gender differences and stereotypes, indeed, influence also the implication of women in different types of violent behaviour (Loinaz, 2016; Loinaz et al., 2020). Research suggest that promotion of legal reforms can improve social awareness and gender equality attitudes, which in turn changes public attitudes toward IPV against women (Yang et al., 2021). Therefore, we need to measure the state of gender roles and stereotypes among men and women to allocate and adjust the necessary measures that allow greater awareness of violence against women and its prevention.

The current paper aimed to analyze individual differences between men and women in the acceptance of gender roles and stereotypes and violence towards women in intimate relationships.
As expected according to the literature, men had the highest scores on different types of sexism and stereotypes (Ferragut et al., 2014; García-Díaz et al., 2018), also on stereotypes related to motherhood and romantic love usually attributed to women. Despite this, there were no differences in the justification of violence, with the same level for both. Men and women had a more similar cognitive pattern than expected. This may reflect a social change, were learned stereotypes still exist buy social awareness about the severity of violence against women has increased. There may be also an influence of social desirability, seeing stereotypes or gender roles as more subtle and more socially acceptable, but violence as more reprehensible due to the influence of public, political and media campaigns against gender violence.

Although differences were not statistically significant, the higher the education the lower the stereotypes or distortion level in most of the scales, confirming previous research (Guerrero-Molina et al., 2021). Specifically, Ferrer-Pérez et al. (2019) found less acceptance of stereotypes and distortions among women and people with prior IPV academic-training, so the more the education level and the...
access to trainings and information on gender equality and IPV may help in the reduction of violence against women.

There are some limitations that should be taken into account. The study did not have an IPV indicator, such as the CTS-2 (Loinaz et al., 2012), used in other studies. For this reason, it was not possible to confirm whether the level of stereotypes or acceptance or justification of violence were related to IPV perpetration or victimization in a quantitative way. This research line is of special interest in the youth population where the greatest preventive educational efforts should be invested. Gender roles and acceptance of violence has been shown to be related to dating violence perpetration, mainly among boys (Reyes et al., 2016; You & Shin, 2022). In addition, a collection of tools with the same style was used. It could be of interest to incorporate more indirect measures of distortions, stereotypes, or acceptance of violence that allow to measure distortions or cognitions in a more subtle way, like using vignettes (Wilson & Smirles, 2020), specific and different violence behaviors (Dardis et al., 2016; Wagers et al., 2017) or of qualitative type (Zidenberg et al., 2022), or developing new tools (Toplu-Demirtas et al., 2020).

One of the problems when investigating stereotypes and cognitive distortions is the measurement of the construct. Not only can there be differences in the way of manifesting or expressing themselves within the same culture (Grzyb, 2023; Ruiz-Hernández et al., 2020), but it is also known that the measure is not consistent or convergent with other objective indicators such as behaviors, as research on cognitive distortions has shown comparing partner violent men and the general population (Loinaz, 2014). On the other hand, issues such as the education or age of the participants in these studies do not have a clear direct reflection in the results, since these variables also depend on social, historical and generational changes that are difficult for studies to categorize (for example, knowing if the participant has been educated in a more egalitarian educational model or more macho classic values; to know if the family environment was also educated and has transmitted egalitarian values or perpetuated stereotypes, and so on). Stereotypes evolve and change between generations, as evidenced by opinion polls over decades (Eagly et al., 2020; Scarborough et al., 2019), but it is very difficult to address these differences in cross-sectional studies. We know that gender ideologies are multidimensional (Begall et al., 2023). Moreover, the concept of “gender” has evolved substantially in the last decades (for instance, as a nonbinary spectrum), something with implication for psychological research (Cameron & Stinson, 2019), so it can be expected that the measure of the “gender” stereotypes no longer conform to classic patterns. Also, stereotypes of masculinity and femininity in young people can allude to differentiated personal or social spheres, which affect the expression of abusive behavior in a different way, for example at school (Morales et al., 2016), or the acceptance of these abuse (Rosen & Noziger, 2019) maintaining inequalities. The challenge, therefore, is to design measures of stereotypes and gender roles, as well as cognitive distortions about the acceptance of violence, that are sensitive to this multidimensionality, social change, and population differences.
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