



Estereotipos de género en universitarios españoles sobre el riesgo psicosocial en la infancia

Gender stereotypes among Spanish university students about psychosocial risks in childhood

Yolanda Sánchez-Sandoval.
Universidad de Cádiz.
yolanda.sanchez@uca.es

Elena Vizcaya.
Universidad de Cádiz.
elena.vizcaya@mail.uca.es

Sandra Melero.
Universidad de Cádiz.
sandra.melero@uca.es

Laura Verdugo.
Universidad de Cádiz.
laura.verdugo@uca.es

RESUMEN.

Estudios recientes han mostrado que los estereotipos de género no son sensibles a los cambios sociales. Hay un vacío sobre cómo el género es tratado en la educación universitaria. Este estudio se enmarca en un proyecto de innovación para la mejora de la calidad docente en la universidad. Pretendemos analizar la presencia de estereotipos de género relacionados con menores en riesgo en una muestra de 113 universitarios. La mayoría de los estudiantes considera que algunas circunstancias, como el uso de sustancias, son más probables en chicos. Por el contrario, piensan que el tener que cuidar de los hermanos o la ansiedad son más comunes en chicas. Los resultados muestran la necesidad de incorporar la perspectiva de género en las universidades. Las necesidades de las chicas en riesgo requieren más investigación y formación especializada.


PALABRAS CLAVE.

Estereotipos de género, Riesgo psicosocial, Infancia, Adolescencia, Educación superior.

ABSTRACT.

Recent studies have shown that gender stereotypes are not sensitive to social changes. There is a gap in how gender is treated in college. This study is part of an innovation project to improve teaching quality in university. We aim to analyze the presence of gender stereotypes related to at-risk childhood in a sample of 113 university students. Most students considered that some circumstances, like substance consumption, are more likely in boys. On the contrary, they think that looking after siblings or anxiety are more common in girls. Results show the need to incorporate the gender perspective into universities. The special needs of the at-risk girls require further research and specialized training.



**KEY WORDS.**

Gender Stereotypes, Psychosocial Risks, Childhood, Adolescence, High Education

1. Introduction.

Over the last few decades, women's social participation and acceptance increased. According to the social role theory, it might be expected that real changes in social positions of women would also imply some changes in stereotypes. In spite of the higher female presence in society, recent studies have shown that gender stereotypes have not been sensitive to these changes. Haines, Deaux, & Lofaro (2016), comparing gender stereotypes of university students with the ones analyzed 30 years ago by Deaux & Lewis (1983), showed the durability of basic stereotypes according to which men and women are perceived differently. Findings of little change in gender stereotyping support theories that emphasize the bias confirmation and self-fulfilling prophecies.

Gender is a sociocultural construction learnt by interacting in different contexts (education, language, family, institutions, religion...). Identity, roles and stereotypes start their development and internalization during early childhood (Moreno & Márquez, 2016; Bian, Leslie, & Cimpian, 2017), continue in school years and extend to higher education (Zúñiga & Cerros, 2013). Gender is not a static concept but instead depends on the culture and is based on prior learning. Formal education is one of the main contexts that participates in the construction of gender stereotypes, roles and identities. The role of school in this respect has been analyzed mainly during primary and secondary education (Subirats, 1999; Acker, 2003; Araya, 2004; Salomone, 2007). However, there is a gap in the study about the treatment of gender at college levels.


The current study takes place, precisely, in college context. It is part of a project for updating a degree course from a Gender Perspective (GP). It is necessary for future psychologists and social workers to take into account the triple vulnerability to which at-risk girls are subjected: (1) being minors, (2) being at psychosocial risk and, (3) being females.

1.1. Gender perspective in higher education.

According to Rebollo (2013), the inclusion of GP in education is a core quality in the system. In this regard, gender mainstreaming refers to a strategy that emerged with the aim of transmitting knowledge according to the legal framework, integrating competences to reach a realistic and effective equality of opportunities in courses of every curriculum (Diez Ros et al., 2016).

This approach involves several actions, from the diagnosis of gender biases in the content and the promotion of participation for female students to the review of teaching staff's speech. Despite gender stereotypes are known to be transmitted from the professorship during the learning process, it is uncommon to find subjects which integrate GP transversely. This commitment between teachers and students must be mutual, including the university community. Faculty members are responsible for being trained, motivating students, creating awareness in their classes about the importance of GP, and making their students responsible for the achievement of an effective equality. In fact, in a research performed in Mexico and Spain, a high percentage of students agreed that the formation of the faculty staff was the key to promote equality (López, 2013). Another challenge that must





be faced is the limited formation that students receive in gender and equality issues. Contents about gender in college degrees are infrequent, and it is common to find some students' demands in lines of work related to gender-based violence in their final degree projects.

Nowadays, university has not reached a complete integration of GP (Vargas Jiménez, 2011; Donoso-Vázquez & Velasco-Martínez, 2013; Zippel, Ferree & Zimmermann, 2016), because of the lack of resources and formation on gender matters and because of students' mirage of equality (Anguita, 2011). Some studies reveal that curriculums still need to incorporate this perspective (Roig-Vila, Blasco, Lledó & Pellín, 2016). The most recent data showed that, in Spain, less than 5% of research groups are working on gender matters, and that only 7% of college degrees have specific subjects about gender, of which 68% are optional (Verge & Cabruja, 2017), hence, not all students receive that formation.

Nonetheless, there are some best practices that are hopeful and encourage to continue this pathway. Currently, an important amount of these practices has been initiated in some Spanish universities, and this might help to integrate GP in teaching. Best practices also allow us to review and update the course from this perspective. The best experiences have been: the creation of an educational resource bank, the assessment of teaching activity, the exchange of courses between colleges, the development of discussion groups, the implementation of projects of innovation, and the acknowledgement of professors and students who carry out degree or master's thesis incorporating GP.

In Spain, the Autonomous University of Barcelona is highlighted as a pioneer for the implementation of GP in college teaching, through the Observatory for the Equality and the Unit of Educational Innovation in High Education. This observatory incorporated GP across training courses for faculty staff (Observatori per a la Igualtat, 2006). Some years later, in 2011/12, the University of Valencia introduced gender studies. In 2014, the Juan Carlos University (Madrid) offered the only degree on Gender and Equality, but it was deleted due to the lack of economic profitability. However, more than thirty non-Spanish universities have these degrees.

On another hand, there are specific gender courses in some Spanish degrees like: "Gender and Health" in the Nursing Degree of the University of Seville; "Gender Equality in Education" in the Primary Education Degree of the University of Almeria; "Gender Equality in the Contemporary Society," a cross-sectional course provided by the University Institute of Women's Studies of the Autonomous University of Madrid (AUM) (García Sainz, Maquieira, Mó Romero, Sánchez & Sebastián, 2015); "Gender and Psychology" of the Psychology Degree of the AUM. University degrees in social work should include competencies in gender, and gender-based analysis of social inequalities; a solid gender training enables the development of more qualified professional interventions (Agrela & Morales, 2017).

In addition, different master and postgraduate studies specifically about gender have emerged, for example, the "Interuniversity Master's Degree of Gender Studies, Identity and Citizenship" of the University of Cádiz or the "Master's Degree in Interdisciplinary Gender Studies" of the AUM. The rise of PhD studies specialized in gender matters is also a recent reality. However, these studies are only present in social, legal and human sciences, while technological sciences seem to lack them.





1.2. Current study.

The present work participates in a teaching innovation project. The purpose is to update, from a GP, a subject (“Psychological Intervention in Children at Risk”) of the Psychology Degree of the author’s university. During the two years in which the subject has been taught, we detected some problems and realities that needed to be addressed, including: 1. Students associate the concept “children at risk” mostly with boys at psychosocial risk and much less with girls; 2. Girls seem to be barely visible in some contents of the subject; 3. It is necessary to analyze and discuss whether some risk situations have different prevalence and characteristics for boys and girls; and 4. Different socialization processes for boys and girls contribute to childhood development, and might be a risk factor for the manifestation of some pathologies.

Taking into account these identified needs, we proposed a teaching innovation project. The main purpose is to reduce students’ gender stereotypes related to situations, needs and interventions with children, adolescents and families at risk.

We developed this project within the framework of a Program of Innovation for the Improvement of Teaching during 2016/2017 year. It gains meaning under the Strategic Frame for European Cooperation in the area of Education and Formation (‘ET 2020’) (European Commission, 2011). In addition, it is in accordance with the Organic Law 1/2004 about Comprehensive Protection Measures against Gender-Based Violence; the Organic Law 6/2001 of Universities; and the Law 14/2011 about Science, Technology and Innovation, which promote formation for equality between males and females in higher education.

The purpose of this work is to analyze students’ prior ideas about the prevalence of certain risk situations in boys and girls, trying to identify stereotypes and misconceptions about the contents that students will work on the subject.

2. Materials and Methods.


2.1. Participants.

The sample was made up of students registered in the last term of the Educational Sciences College at University of Cádiz in year 2016/2017. A total of 113 students from the Psychology Degree took part in this study as a convenient sample, because one of their subjects was the main reference of the innovation project. Concerning gender, 89.40% of the samples were women, and the remaining 10.60% were men. Participants’ age ranged between 20-53 years, with a mean of 23.50 years ($SD = 3.88$).

2.2. Measures.

A questionnaire was designed *ad hoc* to assess students’ prior ideas about the incidence of certain psychosocial circumstances that might be present in children’s lives depending on their gender. This questionnaire shows students’ opinions about whether such circumstances are more likely for girls, boys or whether they have the same proportion. The questionnaire has 41 items with three possible responses (*more likely in girls, more likely in boys, same likelihood*). Items are organized in 6 categories: 1. Developmental disorders (Autism, ADHD and dyslexia) and learning or academic difficulties (Truancy and dropout); 2.





Behavioral disorders and dysfunctional behavior (Feeding and eating disorder, anxiety, antisocial behavior, violence against mothers, violence against fathers, violence between siblings and being a bully); 3. Childhood abuse (Physical abuse, physical punishment, physical abuse by mothers, physical abuse by fathers, being bullied, sexual abuse, abandonment, labor exploitation, begging, organ trafficking, sex trafficking, being mocked and housework siblings' care); 4. Substance consumption (Alcoholism, smoking, cannabis use, cocaine and other drugs use); 5. Offending behavior (Non-violent thefts, robbery with violence, murder and drug dealing); 6. Risk behavior (Foreign unaccompanied minors, Sexual promiscuity, sex with non-regular partners, suicide and excessive gambling with money).

2.3. Procedure.

During the first lessons of the course, after giving their informed consent, students completed the questionnaire. The questionnaire was anonymous, voluntary and individual. In order to avoid pressure, researchers explained that students' refusal to participate would have no consequences. Data collection took place in the classroom. Students received the questionnaire in printed format. Instructions were given orally and also appeared on the written questionnaire.

2.4. Data analysis.


Analyses were conducted using the SPSS version 21. In order to compare proportions, binomial tests were performed. This test assumes as null hypothesis the same proportion in both categories included in the comparison. For every one of the analyzed variables, the first binomial test reveals possible significant differences between the proportion of people who think that the prevalence is the same for both genders and those who think that there are differences. The second comparison analyses whether, in cases of different assigned likelihoods, participants think that the prevalence is more likely in boys or in girls. Previous studies used this kind of analysis to compare proportions (Cianfaglione, Hastings, Felce, Clarke, & Kerr, 2015; Scola, Holvoet, Arciszewski, & Picard, 2015).

3. Results.

3.1. Developmental disorders, learning disabilities and academic difficulties.

Results of the one-sample binomial test showed that a greater proportion of students thought that autism and Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) occur with a different probability as a function of gender (Table 1). In both cases, they considered that these disorders are more likely in boys. Concerning dyslexia, however, a higher proportion of the sample believed that boys and girls have the same likelihood of presenting this learning disability. Among participants who thought that the prevalence of dyslexia differs according to gender, a larger proportion thought that it is more frequent in boys. Regarding academic difficulties, the most widely held opinion was that it is the same for boys and girls. In the case of perceived differences, academic difficulties were considered more likely in boys. Regarding truancy and dropout, the opinion was equally divided between students





who thought that they have the same likelihood for boys and girls and those who did not. When differences were perceived, these behaviors were mostly attributed to boys.

Table 1: Developmental disorders, learning difficulties and academic difficulties.

	% Same likelihood	% Different likelihood	<i>p</i>	% More probable in girls	% More probable in boys	<i>p</i>
Autism	24.78	75.22	.00	4.42	70.80	.00
ADHD	20.35	79.65	.00	0.89	78.76	.00
Dyslexia	77.68	22.32	.00	6.25	16.07	.00
Truancy	59.29	40.7	.06	1.77	38.94	.00
Academic difficulties	71.43	28.57	.00	2.68	25.89	.00
Dropout	47.79	52.21	.71	2.65	49.56	.00


3.2. Behavioral disorders and dysfunctional behavior.

Regarding dysfunctional behavior and behavioral disorders, our findings showed that a statistically higher proportion of the sample thought that feeding and eating disorders, anxiety and violence among siblings differ according to gender. Students found greater differences in relation to feeding and eating disorders and anxiety, considering that they are more frequent in girls. In fact, almost 90% of students thought that boys do not suffer from feeding and eating disorders. However, the opposite was observed regarding antisocial behavior and violence; that is, students believed that boys present this kind of behavior more than girls. In the case of violence against parents or bullying, a half of the sample indicated that the proportion is similar for both genders (Table 2).

Table 2: Behavioural disorders and dysfunctional behaviour.

	% Same likelihood	% Different likelihood	<i>p</i> (One-sample Binomial test)	% More probable in girls	% More probable in boys	<i>p</i>
Feeding and Eating Disorder	10.62	89.38	.00	89.38	0.0	.00
Anxiety	39.82	60.18	.04	59.29	0.88	.00
Antisocial Behaviour	44.25	55.75	.26	4.42	51.33	.00
Violence against mothers	41.44	58.56	.09	5.41	53.15	.00
Violence against fathers	46.36	53.64	.51	6.36	47.27	.00
Violence between siblings	68.47	31.53	.00	1.80	29.73	.00
Being a bully	56.76	43.24	.18	2.70	40.54	.00





3.3. Childhood abuse.

In the case of childhood abuse, students mostly thought that minors might suffer certain events regardless of their gender: trafficking in organs, being mocked, physical abuse by parents, being bullied, begging and labor exploitation. On another hand, students' belief in gender differences in sex trafficking, sexual abuse, housework and care was significant. In this case, they believed that girls suffer these abuses in a higher proportion. It was observed that, among participants who believed in gender differences regarding begging, almost 30% thought that boys suffer it to a greater extent (Table 3).

Table 3: Childhood abuse.

	% Same likelihood	% Different likelihood	p (One-sample Binomial test)	% More probable in girls	% More probable in boys	p
Physical Abuse	50.44	49.56	1.00	41.60	7.96	.00
Physical punishment	52.25	47.75	.70	36.04	11.71	.00
Physical abuse by mothers	73.87	26.13	.00	13.51	12.62	1.00
Physical abuse by fathers	62.16	37.84	.01	18.02	19.82	.88
Being bullied	69.37	30.63	.00	21.62	9.01	.03
Sexual Abuse	15.04	84.96	.00	77.88	7.08	.00
Abandonment	86.73	13.27	.00	10.62	2.65	.04
Labour Exploitation	44.14	55.86	.26	47.75	8.11	.00
Begging	72.32	27.68	.00	5.36	22.32	.00
Organ Trafficking	84.08	15.92	.00	7.96	7.96	1.00
Sex trafficking	9.82	90.18	.00	83.04	7.14	.00
Being mocked	76.58	23.42	.00	17.12	6.30	.03
Housework	8.18	91.82	.00	90.91	0.91	.00
Siblings' care	16.22	83.78	.00	82.88	0.90	.00

3.4. Substance consumption.

More than half students thought that alcohol and cocaine use depends on gender, indicating a higher rate in boys. Although they did not think that tobacco consumption depends on gender, 31% of the students believed that boys smoke more than girls. In general, when differences were perceived, boys were always the group with a higher consumption. The lower likelihood of substance use that students granted to girls was notable.






Table 4: Substance consumption.

	% Same likelihood	% Different likelihood	p (One-sample Binomial test)	% More probable in girls	% More probable in boys	p
Alcoholism	36.28	63.72	.01	3.54	60.18	.00
Smoking	65.49	34.51	.00	3.54	30.97	.00
Cannabis use	41.59	58.41	.09	0.00	58.41	.00
Cocaine use	36.28	63.72	.01	1.77	61.95	.00
Other drugs	54.13	45.87	.44	0.92	44.95	.00

3.5. Offending behavior.

Regarding offending behavior (non-violent theft, robbery with violence, murder, drug dealing), it was clear to the majority of students that there are gender differences, and that such behavior is always more probable in boys. In cases where differences were observed, students conferred a very low percentage to girls.

Table 5: Offending behaviour.

	% Same likelihood	% Different likelihood	p (One-sample Binomial test)	% More probable in girls	% More probable in boys	p
Non-violent thefts	31.53	68.47	.00	9.01	59.46	.00
Robbery with violence	10.81	89.19	.00	0.90	88.29	.00
Murder	23.42	76.58	.00	1.80	74.77	.00
Drug dealing	22.52	77.48	.00	0.00	77.48	.00


3.6. Risk behavior.

In relation to psychosocial risk behavior (Foreign Unaccompanied Minor, sexual promiscuity, sex with non-regular partner and suicide), students thought that almost all the behaviors (with the exception of excessive gambling with money) take place regardless of children's gender. On another hand, students who believed that there are differences as a function of gender thought that, except for suicide, these behaviors are more likely in boys than in girls in all circumstances. These differences were statistically significant.

Table 6: Risk behaviour.

	% Same likelihood	% Different likelihood	p (One-sample Binomial test)	% More probable in girls	% More probable in boys	p
Foreign Unaccompanied Minors	63.06	36.94	.01	0.00	36.94	.01
Sexual promiscuity	58.18	41.82	.11	17.27	24.55	.30
Sex with non-regular partner	72.07	27.93	.00	8.11	19.82	.03
Suicide	66.67	33.33	.00	22.52	10.81	.05
Excessive gambling with money	37.27	62.73	.01	0.91	61.82	.00






4. Discussion.

The persistence of gender stereotypes and the difficulties involved in changing them must be recognized by all those who teach. The current study was designed with the aim of identifying gender stereotypes about children and adolescents at psychosocial risk. In this section, we will discuss our findings in light of the evidence about the prevalence of the analyzed circumstances. An initial difficulty is that there is insufficient research integrating GP effectively. Only 5% of the research groups include GP in their work (Verge & Cabruja, 2017), leading to the risk of finding a biased research. Maybe, as Agrela & Morales (2017) stated, the commercialization of the academic work gives priority to the profitability of the topic, demanding visible results at commercial level. Women social issues are a second-class research interest for Academia. However, during the last quarter of century, psychology of gender has considerably increased its scientific outputs (Eagly, Eaton, Rose, Riger & McHugh, 2012).

Findings of our work show that, in relation to school problems such as academic difficulties, dropout and truancy, most of our participants stated there were no differences as a function of gender. That is, half of participants (up to three quarters in the case of academic difficulties) expect to find such problems on the same degree in boys and girls. In the case of perceiving gender differences, they identify boys as more prone to academic difficulties. In fact, empirical evidence has revealed a generalized advantage in girls' school achievement (Voyer & Voyer, 2014). A Spanish report on failure and dropout has shown that boys have higher failure rates than girls in every educational stage (Fernández Enguita, Mena Martínez & Riviere Gómez, 2010). At the European level, academic difficulties and repetition are more likely in boys (EURYDICE, 2009). In addition, more boys than girls prematurely leave the educational system, and the number of girls who graduate from high school is higher. A study about academic achievement in Iceland pointed out that *'the relative superiority of girls is due to psychological factors, like their affinity with the learning culture, but boys' yield is more influenced by the discipline and behavior'* (Halldórsson & Ólafsson, 2009, p.50).

In relation to behavioral disorders and dysfunctional behavior, boys are known to have a higher likelihood of presenting antisocial disorders than girls, but it seems that these differences decrease with age (Ezpeleta, Keeler, Erkanli, Costello & Angold, 2001). Additionally, there are differences in the typology of violence as a function of gender. Girls are more likely to use emotional violence whereas boys use more physical violence (Howard, 2011). Concerning the fact of being bullied or bullying, we note that proportions are similar for both genders (53% for males vs. 47% for females) (ANAR Foundation, 2015). Regarding antisocial behavior, research has focused particularly on boys, who carry out more antisocial behaviors (Light et al., 2014). Gender differences are higher during adolescence (Garaigordobil & Maganto, 2016). On another hand, students think that anxiety disorders and feeding and eating disorders are more frequent in girls than in boys. There is evidence according to which the predominant disorders in girls are depression, feeding and eating disorders and anxiety disorders (Rutter, Caspi, & Moffitt, 2003; González-Quiñones, Martínez-Caro, Martínez-Muñoz & Pinzón-Ramírez, 2017). This information should be





nuanced according to the children's age, as some studies have shown that, during childhood, anxiety disorders are more likely for boys than for girls (Vasey & Ollendick, 2000). In relation to childhood abuse, a total of 13818 reports were recorded in Spain during 2015. There was a higher proportion of boys (55%) than girls (45%) among the cases (Ministry of Health, Social Services and Equality 2017). 50.9% involved neglect, 25.9% emotional maltreatment, 19.2% physical abuse, and 4% sexual abuse. Boys and girls were equally at risk of physical abuse, although boys were more likely to suffer emotional abuse (53%) and neglect (57%). Girls were more likely to be sexually abused (67.39%) than boys. Participants in our study mistakenly expected more physical abuse for girls.


Regarding sexual abuse and sex trafficking, students correctly thought that these circumstances are more frequent in girls than boys. Most studies of child sexual abuse agree that the majority of victims are female (Orjuela López & Rodríguez Bartolomé, 2012). As reported in a prevalence study, child sexual abuse occurs in about 20% of girls and 8% of boys (Cantón-Cortés, 2013). However, the scope and qualitative dimension of the situation of children and adolescents who are victims of sex trafficking are unknown in Spain. This is because child sexual exploitation is an obscure and illegal act. However, readers are reminded that girls are at greater risk of becoming victims of sexual abuse or sexual exploitation than boys, and that 80% of victims of sex trafficking are girls and women (Orjuela López & Rodríguez Bartolomé, 2012). The III Plan of Action against sexual exploitation in childhood and adolescence indicates that:

Although there is no information to offer a general view of the phenomena, there are signs that reflect that the gender component is very important, with girls being the majority of the victims and males the majority of sexual abusers or exploiters (Ministry of Health, Social Services and Equality, 2011, p.14).

With respect to labor exploitation, it affects approximately 215 million children worldwide (especially in Asia and Pacific Sea, South America, the Caribbean and Africa). The International Labor Organization (ILO, 2015) estimates that child labor affects more than 100 million girls, and, according to this organization, girls spend more time working than boys due to their double burden: work outside home and housework. The same report showed that girls were exploited during long working hours and even frequently did not receive a salary. The higher feminization of domestic exploitation has led technical research personnel to refer to victims as 'child workers'.

Regarding poverty and begging, in Europe, more than 25 million children live at risk of poverty or social exclusion (Save the Children, 2014). Concerning childhood begging, the concept 'street kids' is used to define children who live and/or work on the street. It is impossible to quantify the number of children who actually live on the streets. According to UNICEF (2006), the majority are boys, because girls seem to bear abusive situations or domestic exploitation for longer periods of time. However, once girls leave their homes and their family, they are less likely to return.






On another hand, students associated behaviors related to substance consumption, violence, delinquency and risk situations with being male. In relation to substance use or abuse and drug dealing, students are convinced that these behaviors are more frequent in boys than girls. However, according to the survey about drug use in high schools in Spain, consumption of legal substances like alcohol, tobacco and hypno-sedatives is more extended among girls (Ministry of Health, Social Services and Equality, 2016). In fact, the survey shows that the percentage of females who used hypno-sedatives in the past year duplicates the percentage of male users (13.8% vs. 7.7%). In contrast, the use of illicit drugs (cannabis, cocaine and new psychoactive substances) is more widespread among boys. Regarding excessive gambling with money, a survey performed in 2016 with 96.000 adolescents from 35 European countries showed that 12% of adolescent males bet money frequently (ESPAD, 2016). In addition, this survey confirms that online gambling is much more frequent in boys (39%) than girls (7%).

According to students' opinions, boys commit more thefts (with or without violence) and more murders than girls. It is known that most adult criminals are males (Cámara Arroyo, 2010) and the same applies to offending youth. Boys are more likely to commit offending behavior than girls. Moreover, data in the literature about female offenders are limited, projecting the image of women as victims, not as offenders. However, in recent years, there has been a slight increase in the number of female offenders. Even so, in our country more than 80% of the offenses registered in 2016 were committed by males and less than 20% by females (INE, 2018). The fact that boys are more likely to offend than girls is, undoubtedly, a matter of gender. Also, boys and girls do not commit the same types of offenses: boys commit more violent offenses (homicides, torture and offenses against moral integrity...), and girls commit more crimes against property and socio-economic order (Montero-Hernanz, 2014). On another hand, youths and adolescents generally participate marginally in drug offenses, usually as 'mules' or in micro-trafficking (Collective Studies on Drugs and Law, 2015).

Regarding risk situations and behaviors, specifically with regard to foreign unaccompanied minors, students believed that girls were less likely to migrate. Until mid-80s, migration was considered more likely in males. But currently, almost half of the world's migrant population is made up of females (IOM, 2018). We also know that the profile of the foreign unaccompanied minor in Spain used to be male, aged between 14-17 years coming from Morocco (Ramírez-Fernández & Jiménez-Álvarez, 2005). Nevertheless, there were also cases of "invisible" minors, as is the case of unaccompanied female minors. In addition, gender influences migration processes; boys and girls do not migrate for the same reasons, and it has a different impact on women and men. More recent reports suggest that the profile of Foreign Unaccompanied Minors begins to be more feminized (Fuentes Sánchez, 2014). Students should know more about how migration impacts differently on boys and girls in their process of displacement, the vulnerability of girls, and that the subsequent intervention should take these specific needs into account.

As far as suicide is concerned, most students think that girls commit more suicide than boys, but the global trend indicates that more men do it, although suicide attempts are more frequent in women (Rosenbaum et al., 2008). Furthermore, there seems to be a link





between suicide and country resources. In richer countries, men commit more suicide, but in low-income nations, women do it more frequently. For example, India is the country with the highest suicide rate, and the only one where young women commit more suicide than men (WHO, 2014). Some authors report that self-injurious behavior may occur at any age, but it is more frequent in adolescents and young adults, mainly in females (Fliege, Lee, Grimm & Klapp, 2009).


There are many practical applications of this work. As we have indicated, there are still gender stereotypes and misconceptions in higher education. In order to improve the subject, one of the main objectives we established was to evaluate and identify such erroneous judgments in our students. In addition, based on the previous stage, we reviewed the stereotypes in order to modify and adjust them to the realities of children at psychosocial risk. By doing so, we also made girls who are at risk visible. The mainstreaming of GP in this course (2016/2017) has been the beginning of a path towards teacher improvement in this regard. As a challenge for the future, we recommend studying in depth the role of gender in at-risk groups, which impacts on the different ways of preventing, detecting and intervening. There has been considerable progress in gender research, although less in relation to childhood. It is necessary to take into account, understand and make students aware of the triple vulnerability of at-risk female children. Ultimately, a framework of feminist pedagogy in educational contexts is needed, as Crawford & Jackson-Best (2017) advocated, to give voice to women who have been historically marginalized and to achieve social change.

This work presents some limitations. It would have been more appropriate to have a larger group of participants. Due to the characteristics of the project, only the stereotypes of students to which the intervention was addressed were considered. In the successive courses of this same subject, a similar set of data will be gathered so that the number of participants can be increased. Likewise, as the proportion of females in this subject is much higher than that of males, it is recommended to obtain the opinion of more male students, in order to have a more complete vision.

5. References


- Acker, S. (2003). *Género y educación. Reflexiones sociológicas sobre mujeres, enseñanza y feminismo*. Madrid, Spain: Narcea.
- Agrela, B., & Morales, A. (2017). Knowledge Hierarchy of Social Work and Gender Studies in Spain. *Affilia: Journal of Women and Social Work*, 32(3), 276-291. doi:10.1177/0886109917692373
- ANAR Foundation (2015). *Problemas detectados en la infancia y la adolescencia en España*. Madrid: ANAR Foundation. Recuperado de: <https://www.anar.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/DEF-Presentaci%C3%B3n-Medios-informe-2015.pdf>
- Anguita, R. (2011). El reto de la formación del profesorado para la igualdad. *Revista Electrónica Interuniversitaria de Formación del Profesorado*, 14(1), 43-51. Recuperado de: <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/26831246.pdf>





- Araya, S. (2004). Hacia una educación no sexista. *Revista Electrónica Actualidades Investigativas en Educación*, 4(2), 1-13. Recuperado de: <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/447/44740217.pdf>
- Bian, L., Leslie, S.J., & Cimpian, A. (2017). Gender stereotypes about intellectual ability emerge early and influence children's interests. *Science*, 355(6323): 389-391. doi:0.1126/science.aah6524.
- Cámara Arroyo, S. (2010). La finalidad educativa de los centros de internamiento de menores: el Hospicio como antecedente. *Anuario Facultad de Derecho de la Universidad de Alcalá* (3), 521-554. Recuperado de: <http://hdl.handle.net/10017/7990>
- Cantón-Cortés, D. (2013). Características y consecuencias del abuso sexual infantil. In J. Cantón, M.R. Cortés, M.D. Justicia and D. Cantón-Cortés (Eds.), *Violencia doméstica, divorcio y adaptación psicológica* (pp. 289-334). Madrid: Pirámide.
- Cianfaglione, R., Hastings, R. H., Felce, D., Clarke, A., & Kerr, M. P. (2015). Psychological Well-Being of Mothers and Siblings in Families of Girls and Women with Rett Syndrome. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 45(9), 2939-2946. doi: 10.1007/s10803-015-2457-y
- Collective of Studies on Drugs and Law (2015). *Jóvenes y adolescentes privados de libertad por drogas en América Latina*. Recuperado de: http://www.drogasyderecho.org/publicaciones/pub-priv/Rose_v07.pdf
- Crawford, C., & Jackson-Best, F. (2017). Feminist pedagogy and social change: The impact of the Caribbean institute in gender and development. *Gender and Education*, 29(6), 709-730. doi:10.1080/09540253.2016.1149554
- Deaux, K., & Lewis L.L. (1983). Assessment of gender stereotypes: Methodology and components. *Psychological Documents*, 13, 1–23.
- Diez Ros, R., Aguilar Hernández, B.M., Lozano Cabezas, I., Vera Muñoz, M.I., Iglesias Martínez, M.J., Gómez Trigueros, I.M., Pérez Castelló, T.D., Menargues Marcilla, A., Limiñana Morcillo, R., Luján Feliu-Pascual, I., & Soriano-López, C. (2016). Inclusión de la perspectiva de género en las asignaturas de Didáctica. In R. Roig-Vila, J.E. Blasco, A. Lledó, and N. Pellín (Eds.), *Investigación e innovación educativa en docencia universitaria. Retos, propuestas y acciones* (pp. 403–420). Alicante: Universidad de Alicante.
- Donoso-Vázquez, T., & Velasco-Martínez, A. (2013). ¿Por qué una propuesta de formación en perspectiva de género en el ámbito universitario? *Profesorado: Revista de Curriculum y Formación del Profesorado*, 17(1), 71-88. Recuperado de: <http://www.ugr.es/~recfpro/rev171ART5.pdf>
- Eagly, A.H., Eaton, A., Rose, S.M., Riger, S., & McHugh, M.C. (2012). Feminism and psychology: Analysis of a half-century of research on women and gender. *American Psychologist*, 67(3), 211-230. doi:10.1037/a0027260.
- ESPAD (2016). *Results from the European School Survey Project on Alcohol and Other Drugs*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- European Commission (2011). *Progresos hacia los objetivos europeos comunes en Educación y Formación*. Luxembourg: European Union.






- EURYDICE (2009). *La educación superior en Europa 2009: Progresos en el Proceso de Bolonia*. Brussels: EURYDICE.
- Ezpeleta, L., Keeler, G., Erkanli, A., Costello, E.J., & Angold, A. (2001). Epidemiology of psychiatric disability in childhood and adolescence. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 42(7), 901-914. doi:10.1111/1469-7610.00786.
- Fernández Enguita, M., Mena Martínez, L., & Riviere Gómez, J. (2010). Fracaso y abandono escolar en España. En *Colección Estudios Sociales* (Vol. 29). Barcelona: Fundación La Caixa.
- Fliege, H., Lee, J.R., Grimm, A., & Klapp, B. F. (2009). Risk factors and correlates of deliberate self-harm behavior: A systematic review. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 66(6), 477-493. doi:10.1016/j.jpsychores.2008.10.013
- Fuentes Sánchez, R. (2014). Foreign Unaccompanied Minors. *Revista Internacional de Trabajo Social y Bienestar*, 3, 105-111. Recuperado de: <https://www.sis.net/documentos/ficha/216899.pdf>
- Garaigordobil, M., & Maganto, C. (2016). Conducta antisocial en adolescentes y jóvenes: prevalencia en el País Vasco y diferencias en función de variables socio-demográficas. *Acción Psicológica*, 13(2), 57-68. doi:10.5944/ap.13.2.17826
- García Sainz, C., Maquieira, V., Mó Romero, E., Sánchez, C., & Sebastián, J. (2015). *Violencia de género: escenarios y desafíos*. Madrid: Instituto Universitario de Estudios de la Mujer, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid.
- González-Quiñones, J.C., Martínez-Caro, D.C., Marínez-Muñoz, S.G., & Pinzón-Ramírez, J.A. (2017). Relación entre trastorno de conducta alimentaria y género y familia en adolescentes escolarizados, Suba (Bogotá). *Carta Comunitaria*, 25(143), 29-35. doi:10.26752/ccomunitaria.v25.n143.81
- Haines, E.L., Deaux, K., & Lofaro, N. (2016). The times they are a-changing... or are they not? A comparison of gender stereotypes, 1983–2014. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 40(3), 353-363. doi:10.1177/0361684316634081
- Halldórsson, A.M., & Ólafsson, R.F. (2009). The case of Iceland in PISA: Girl's educational advantage. *European Educational Research Journal*, 8(1), 34-53. doi:10.2304/eeerj.2009.8.1.34
- Howard, J. (2011). *Adolescent violence in the home: The missing link in family violence prevention and response*. Sydney: Australian Domestic and Family Violence Clearinghouse.
- Instituto Nacional de Estadística (2018). *Anuario Estadístico de España 2018*. Madrid: INE. Retrieved from: https://www.ine.es/prodyser/pubweb/anuario18/anu18_completo.pdf
- International Labor Organization (2015). *Youth-oriented version of ILO Conventions on Child Labor*. Retrieved from: http://www.ilo.org/ipecc/Informationresources/WCMS_IPEC_PUB_26035/lang--en/index.htm
- International Organization for Migration (2018). *World Migration Report 2018*. Geneva: IOM.
- Law 14/2011, of 1st June, de la Ciencia, la Tecnología y la Innovación. *Boletín Oficial del Estado*. Madrid, 1st June 2011, number 14910.





- Light, J.M., Rusby, J.C., Nies, K.M., & Snijders, T.A.B. (2014). Antisocial behavior trajectories and social victimization within and between school years in early adolescence. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 24, 322–336. doi:10.1111/jora.12055
- López, I. (2013). *La Igualdad y la violencia de género: análisis comparado de las percepciones del alumnado de la Universidad de Valencia (España) y de la Universidad Autónoma del Estado de Morelos (México)*. (Doctoral dissertation). University of Valencia, Spain.
- Ministry of Health, Social Services and Equality (2011). *III Plan de Acción contra la explotación sexual de la infancia y la adolescencia (2010-2013)*. Madrid: Ministry of Health, Social Services and Equality. Retrieved from: <http://www.observatoriodelainfancia.msssi.gob.es/productos/pdf/IIIPlanContraExplotacion.pdf>
- Ministry of Health, Social Services and Equality (2016). *Encuesta estatal sobre uso de drogas en enseñanzas secundarias (Estudes) 2014/2015*. Madrid: Ministry of Health, Social Services and Equality. Retrieved from: http://www.pnsd.msc.es/Categoria2/observa/pdf/PresentESTUDES2012_2013.pdf
- Ministry of Health, Social Services and Equality (2017). *Boletín de datos estadísticos de medidas de protección a la infancia. Boletín número 18. Datos 2015*. Madrid: Ministry of Health, Social Services and Equality. Retrieved from: <http://www.msssi.gob.es/ssi/familiasInfancia/Infancia/pdf/Boletinproteccion18provisionalcorrecto.pdf>
- Montero-Hernanz, T. (2014). La criminalidad juvenil en España (2007-2012). *Revista de Criminalidad*, 56(2), 247-261. Recuperado de: <http://www.scielo.org.co/pdf/crim/v56n2/v56n2a05.pdf>
- Moreno, E., & Márquez, C. (2016). Determinantes Implicados en la construcción de la violencia de género. El caso de las escuelas primarias en una provincia de España. *Archivos Analíticos de Políticas Educativas*, 24(11), 1-28. doi:10.14507/epaa.24.2132.
- Observatori per a la Igualtat (2006). *Introducció de la perspectiva de gènere en la docència universitària: Diagnosi de la situació a la Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona*. Barcelona: Univerisitat Autònoma de Barcelona. Retrieved from: http://observatori-diagnostics.uab.es/Recursos/Documents_PDF/Informe_Perspectiva_Genere_Docencia_UAB.pdf
- Organic Law 1/2004, of 28th December, de Medidas de Protección Integral contra la Violencia de Género. *Boletín Oficial del Estado*. Madrid, 29th December 2004, Number 21760.
- Organic Law 6/2001, of 21st December, de Universidades. *Boletín Oficial del Estado*. Madrid, 24th December 2011, Number 24515.
- Orjuela López, L., & Rodríguez Bartolomé, V. (2012). *Violencia sexual contra los niños y las niñas. Abuso y explotación sexual infantil. Guía de material básico para la formación de profesionales*. Save the Children España.
- Ramírez-Fernández, A., & Jiménez-Álvarez, M. (2005). *Las otras migraciones. La emigración de menores marroquíes no acompañados a España*. Madrid: Akal Ediciones.
- Rebollo, M.A. (2013). La innovación educativa con perspectiva de género. Retos y desafíos para el profesorado. *Revista de Curriculum y Formación de Profesorado*, 17(3), 3-8. Recuperado de: <http://hdl.handle.net/11441/43551>





- Roig-Vila, R., Blasco, J.E., Lledó, A., & Pellín, N. (2016). *Investigación e Innovación Educativa en Docencia Universitaria. Retos, Propuestas y Acciones*. Alicante: Universidad de Alicante.
- Rosenbaum, J., Baraff, L.J., Berk, M., Grob, C., Devich-Navarro, M., Suddath R., Piacetini, J., & Tang L. (2008). Pediatric emergency department suicidal patients: Two-site evaluation of suicide ideators, single attempters, and repeat attempters. *Journal American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 47(8), 958-966. doi:10.1097/CHI.0b013e3181799ee8
- Rutter, M., Caspi, A., & Moffitt, T.E. (2003). Using sex differences in psychopathology to study causal mechanisms: Unifying issues and research strategies. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 44, 1092-1115. doi:10.1111/1469-7610.00194.
- Salomone, R. (2007). Igualdad y diferencia. La cuestión de la equidad de género en la educación. *Revista Española de Pedagogía*, 238, 433-446. Recuperado de: <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/descarga/articulo/2576686.pdf>
- Save the Children (2014). *Pobreza infantil y exclusión social en Europa. Una cuestión de derechos*. Brussels: Save the Children.
- Scola, C., Holvoet, C., Arciszewski, T., & Picard, D. (2015). Further Evidence for Infants' Preference for Prosocial Over Antisocial Behaviors. *Infancy*, 20(6), 684-692. doi: 10.1111/infa.12095
- Subirats, M. (1999). Género y escuela. In C. Lomas (Ed.), *¿Iguales o diferentes? Género, diferencia sexual, lenguaje y educación* (pp. 19-32). Spain: Paidós Ibérica.
- UNICEF (2006). *The state of the world's children. Excluded and invisible*. New York: UNICEF.
- Vargas Jiménez, I. (2011). Reflexiones en torno a la vinculación de la educación y el género. *Revista Electrónica Educare*, 15(1), 137-147. Recuperado de: <https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=194118804011>
- Vasey, M.W., & Ollendrick, T.H. (2000). Anxiety. In A.J. Sameroff, M. Lewis & S. Miller (Eds.), *Handbook of Developmental Psychopathology* (pp. 511-529). Boston: Springer Science & Business Media.
- Verge, T., & Cabruja, T. (2017). *La perspectiva de género en docencia i recerca a les universitats de la Xarxa Vives. Situació actual i reptes de future*. Castellón (Spain): Xarxa Vives d'Universitats.
- Voyer, D., & Voyer, S.D. (2014). Gender differences in scholastic achievement: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 140(4): 1174-1204. doi:10.1037/a0036620
- World Health Organization (2014). *Preventing Suicide. A global imperative*. Geneva: WHO.
- Zippel, K, Ferree, M.M., & Zimmermann, K. (2016). Gender equality in German universities: vernacularising the battle for the best brains. *Gender and Education*, 28(7), 867-885. doi:10.1080/09540253.2015.1123229
- Zúñiga, M., & Cerros, E. (2013). Entornos laborales agresivos y redes sociales. Un estudio con académicas de universidades estatales mexicanas. In A. Flores & A. Espejel (Eds.), *Género y desarrollo. Problemas de la población*, (pp. 133-154). México: Universidad Autónoma de Tlaxcala.

