

Parental Socialization Styles, Parents' Educational Level, and Sexist Attitudes in Adolescence

Maite Garaigordobil and Jone Aliri

Universidad del País Vasco (Spain)

The aims of this study were to analyze the differences in the mothers' and fathers' socialization styles depending on their children's sex; whether there are differences in hostile, benevolent, and ambivalent sexism, and neosexism as a function of both parents' socialization styles; and whether the parents' educational level affects their level of sexism and their children's sexism. The sample included 1,455 adolescents and their parents (764 mothers and 648 fathers). The results showed no differences in the socialization style of the father with his children's sexism, but the mother used a more authoritarian style with her daughters. The parents' socialization style had little influence on their children's sexism, although it had a higher impact on the sons' sexism. The father's style had less influence than the mother's on their sons' sexism, and it had no influence on their daughters' sexism. The indulgent style of both parents had the highest relation with a low level of sexism. Moreover, a negative correlation was found between the parents' educational level and their level of sexism, as well as between the mother's educational level and her daughters' sexism. To conclude, the indulgent style and the mother's high educational level promote fewer sexist attitudes.

Keywords: sexism, parental socialization, adolescence.

Los objetivos del estudio fueron analizar las diferencias en los estilos de socialización parental en función del sexo de sus hijos; analizar las diferencias en el sexismo hostil, benevolente, ambivalente y neosexismo en función del estilo de socialización parental; y estudiar las relaciones entre nivel educativo parental y sexismo. La muestra incluyó 1.455 adolescentes y sus padres (764 madres, 648 padres). Los resultados no mostraron diferencias en el estilo de socialización del padre con sus hijos e hijas, sin embargo, la madre utilizaba más un estilo autoritario con las hijas. El estilo de socialización parental no influyó mucho en el sexismo de sus hijos e hijas, aunque afectó más al de los hijos. El estilo del padre tuvo menor influencia que el de la madre en el sexismo de sus hijos, y no tuvo ninguna influencia en el sexismo de sus hijas. El estilo indulgente fue el que más se relacionó con un bajo nivel de sexismo. Además, se halló una correlación negativa entre nivel educativo parental y su nivel de sexismo, así como entre el nivel educativo maternal y el sexismo en sus hijas. En conclusión, el estilo indulgente y un alto nivel educativo maternal fomentan actitudes menos sexistas.

Palabras clave: sexismo, socialización parental, adolescencia.

Study financed by the Spanish Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación (FEM2009-09456), by the Departamento de Educación, Universidades e Investigación del Gobierno Vasco (Consolidated Research Group GIC10/66-IT-318-10), UFI 11/04 (UVP/EHU) and by the Spanish Ministerio de Educación AP2008-01811.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Maite Garaigordobil. Facultad de Psicología. Universidad del País Vasco, Avenida de Tolosa 70, 20018 Donostia-San Sebastián (Spain). E-mail: maite.garaigordobil@ehu.es

The study is based on the theory of ambivalent sexism (Glick & Fiske, 1996, 2001) and focuses basically on the analysis of the connections between parents' socialization style, their educational level, and their adolescent children's sexism, and this issue is the main object of investigation. As the primary educational setting, the family is very important when transmitting values and beliefs, so it is highly relevant to explore the way in which the family intervenes with gender socialization and adolescents' sexist beliefs. Socialization inevitably implies setting limits, and cultures differ in the degree of restrictions they impose. The limits set by the cultures in the course of socialization not only include explicit demands and warnings, but also the more subtle, but no less effective, strength of expectations about others, as experienced through social interactions (Musitu, 2000).

The Theory of Ambivalent Sexism

From a psychosocial analysis of gender, sexism is considered one of the main beliefs that maintain the inequality of the sexes (Moya, 2004). Sexism, understood as a prejudiced attitude towards women, has evolved over the years, somehow becoming more subtle. The most significant and clarifying contribution to understanding the new form of sexism was made by Glick and Fiske (1996, 1999, 2001), who identified this new sexism—which they call ambivalent sexism (AS)—as the result of the combination of two elements with antagonistic affective charges, a consequence of the complex approach/avoidance relations that characterize the sexes: 1) Hostile sexism (HS) shares its negative affective charge (women are inferior to men) with the more traditional sexism, and it assumes a stereotyped and negative view of women as a consequence of men's higher social power; and 2) Benevolent sexism (BS), of a positive affective tone, transmits the view of women as weak creatures who must be protected and, at the same time, placed on pedestal where their "natural" roles of mother and wife are adored, and from which they should not wander.

Glick and Fiske (1996, 1999, 2001) suggest that both HS and BS have their roots in biological and social conditions that are common to all human groups. And, consequently, they revolve around social power, gender identity, and sexuality, established around three common components: *paternalism*, *gender differentiation*, and *heterosexuality*. Each component reflects a series of beliefs in which ambivalence towards women is inherent because it presents a hostile and a benevolent component.

Glick and Fiske (1996) defined the first component, *paternalism*, as the way in which a father behaves towards his sons/daughters; on the one hand, he gives them affection and protection and, on the other, he rules over them. This conception is closely related to the ambivalent view of sexism because it includes two dimensions. *Dominating paternalism*, which leads to HS, rests on the structure of the patriarch, which legitimates the superiority of the male

figure, and considers women as incapable, incompetent beings who are also dangerous because they try to wrest power away from men. *Protective paternalism*, which leads to BS, and is applied by men to women who perform traditional roles, because men consider women to be weak and fragile creatures that must be placed on a pedestal and protected. Protective paternalism can co-exist with its dominating complement, because men depend on women's dyadic power as wives, mothers, and romantic objects. Thus, women must be loved, caressed, and protected because their weakness obliges men to fulfill their role of protector and economic sustenance.

The second component underlying sexism (Glick & Fiske, 1996) is *gender differentiation*. All cultures use biological differences (physical) between the sexes as a basis to make social distinctions, which leads to the assignation of values, qualities, and rules as a function of one's sex. As with paternalism, the two faces of sexism also exist in gender differentiation. *Competitive gender differentiation* is presented as a justification of male structural power, because it considers that only men possess the necessary traits to wield power and govern the socio-economic and political institutions. Women, being different from men, do not have either the necessary characteristics or the capacity to govern and, therefore, their sphere of action is limited to the family and the home. *Complementary gender differentiation* assumes that women's "characteristics" are "complementary" to men's characteristics. Men are aware of women's dyadic power, which makes them depend on women. This power makes men acknowledge that women have positive characteristics that complement their own characteristics. For the benevolent sexist, women's characteristics complement men's characteristics, whereas for the hostile sexist, certain female characteristics, such as sensitivity, place them at a lower level and make them incompetent to exercise power.

Lastly, Glick and Fiske (1996) point to heterosexuality as one of the most powerful origins of men's ambivalent attitudes towards women. As with the above-mentioned components, it has two faces: *heterosexual intimacy* and *heterosexual hostility*. Men's sexual motivation towards women may be linked to a desire of proximity (heterosexual intimacy), which promotes BS. Through sex, women have the power to satisfy men's desire. But the romantic relations between men and women are sometimes a threat for women, because male aggression (in cultures that promote gender inequality) and the threat of sexual violence have popularly been characterized as means by which men control women to maintain the inequalities. Men's dyadic dependence on women (for example, for reproduction) creates an unusual situation in which members of the dominant group depend on the members of the subordinate group, promoting more HS.

In recent years, at least in western countries, two different types of gender ideologies or sexism are routinely distinguished: classical and the one established by the new forms (Moya, 2003; Moya, Expósito, & Padilla, 2006).

Classical sexism (also called old, hostile, or old-fashioned sexism) is considered an attitude of prejudice or discriminatory behavior based on the supposed inferiority or difference of women as a group (Cameron, 1977). The new forms of gender ideology look more sophisticated than the traditional ideology, although there is still an underlying negative view of women.

Both BS and HS are rooted in the biological and social conditions that are common to all groups of humans, in which, on the one hand, men control the economic, legal, and political institutions, but, on the other hand, reproduction provides the women with dyadic power (that is, the power that proceeds from dependence in the relationship between two people), inasmuch as men depend on women to raise their children and, in general, to satisfy their affective-sexual needs. Women's dyadic power is reflected in almost all societies in certain forms of ideology: protective attitudes towards women, reverence for their role as wives and mothers, and idealization of women as loving objects. Domination by men favors HS, as the dominant groups inevitably promote stereotypes about their own superiority. But men's dependence on women favors BS; this dependence leads them to acknowledge that women are a valuable resource that must be protected and that affection must be offered to the women who satisfy their needs (Moya, Páez, Glick, Fernández, & Poeschl, 2002).

In view of these more subtle and covert sexist attitudes that conform modern sexism and that conceptualization of ambivalent sexism (in which hostile and benevolent attitudes are combined), we must become aware of the pernicious effect of this new sexism on the consummation of the equality of the sexes. Benevolent sexism, which conceals its true sexist essence under an air of positive affect, no doubt causes more harm to the goals of equality of the sexes, precisely because its sexist core is blurred by this tone of positive feeling. Remember that BS is still sexist, because it relegates women to "a different" place, and restricts them to certain roles that are included in the femininity stereotypes (*nurturing*) that are linked to their reproductive and maternal capacity. But the transformation of this reality requires changing what it means to be a man or a woman, which would allow modification of stereotyped opinions, attitudes, and behavior. In this way, we could overcome both the descriptive and the prescriptive stereotypes—what a person is expected to do as a function of his or her sex—and also the "cultural conservatism" that is still present in society.

Parental educational styles and gender socialization

Few studies have explored the differences in the socialization or educational styles employed by fathers and mothers, and the few that do exist yield contradictory results. In a study with Dutch participants, it was confirmed that most fathers used the neglectful style whereas most

mothers used the authoritative style (Huver, Otten, de Vries, & Engels, 2009), and in another study with USA citizens, it was found that there were more authoritative and authoritarian mothers than fathers (McKinney & Renk, 2008). When analyzing the relation between educational styles of both parents and the children's sex, the results are discrepant. In the study of Pychyl, Coplan, & Reid (2002), the daughters perceived both their parents as more authoritative than the sons did. In the study of Bulnes et al. (2008), with regard to the maternal figure, the level of affect perceived by the sons was higher than that perceived by the daughters, and, with regard to levels of indifference, the daughters perceived more indifference in their mothers than the sons did. Regarding the paternal figure, the level of indifference perceived by the daughters was also higher than that perceived by the sons. In another study (Martínez Festerazzi, Castañeiras, & Posada, 2010), it was observed that the daughters perceived more involvement than the sons in both the parents and, regarding imposition, there were no differences in the maternal figure but there were differences in the paternal figure: the sons perceived more imposition than the daughters.

Although the parents' level of impact on their children's socialization in general and on the socialization of their children's gender in particular has been the subject of much debate (Leaper, 2002; Sabbatini & Leaper, 2004), a meta-analytical study of 43 articles that investigated the relation between parents' gender schema and cognitions about their children's gender found that parents do have an impact, especially on the formation of their children's self-concept and on their attitudes toward gender (Tenenbaum & Leaper, 2002).

Therefore, it is important to explore the characteristics of the relation that may exist between fathers' and mothers' education or socialization typologies (authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, and neglectful) and the sexist beliefs of their sons and daughters. Thus, in a study carried out with 165 girls from 15 to 22 years of age and their mothers, it was shown that a mother's authoritative socialization style is related to less traditional gender attitudes in her daughters (Ex & Janssens, 1998). There are also data that support the idea that families with rules that are too respectful and that tend toward hierarchical inter-group relations increase the support of sexist ideologies (Lee, Pratto, & Li, 2007). It has been shown that egalitarian education among siblings negatively affects the development of sexist attitudes in girls and boys (Ferrer, Bosch, Ramis, & Navarro, 2006), and that the higher the mother's educational level, the greater will be the daughter's feminist consciousness (Buysse, 2000). Although the influence of parents' educational level on their children's sexism was not analyzed, in another study, it was found that the educational level of the participants (12 to 25 years old) of both sexes correlated negatively with sexist attitudes (Lameiras & Rodríguez, 2003).

In a recent investigation carried out by Shearer (2008), first the parents were instructed about gender prejudices, and subsequently they tested the effect of this preparation on their children. Although the preparation about gender prejudices provided to the parents did not mediate the association between parents' and the children's attitudes, high levels of maternal preparation about gender prejudices were associated with less traditional attitudes towards women both in their sons and daughters. In this same investigation, another study focused on the messages transmitted and how subjects receive such messages, concluding that the most habitual messages were about certain jobs conditioned by gender, and about family roles; the messages were habitually received by observation.

In another study carried out with Latin families in the United States, which attempted to explore how Latin American fathers and mothers socialized their sons and daughters, it was found that: (a) Latin boys and girls reported having received different gender socialization. Thus, the girls reported having suffered more limitations than the boys (with regard to what time they had to come home, relationships with opposite-sex friends, and even about starting to work or participating in out-of-school activities); and (b) it was shown that the mothers practiced more gender socialization with their daughters, and the fathers with their sons. Thus, in the case of the women, for example, the mothers scored higher than the fathers in items that assessed the extent to which parents encourage their daughters to dress gender appropriately, to behave femininely, and to play with girls' toys, whereas in the case of the men, the fathers scored higher in items that assessed the extent to which parents encourage their sons to engage in masculine activities (Raffaelli & Ontai, 2004).

Goals and hypotheses of the study

In this study, there were three goals: (1) to analyze the differences in parental socialization styles or educational styles (authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, neglectful) employed by the mother and the father as a function of children's sex; (2) to analyze the differences in hostile, benevolent, and ambivalent sexism and neosexism as a function of the socialization style of both parents; and (3) to verify the influence of the parents' educational level in their level of sexism and in the sexism of their sons and daughters.

Four hypotheses were formulated in this investigation: (1) Taking into account the cultural context of the sample of this study, the first hypothesis proposes that no differences will be found in the parental socialization styles used by the mother and the father as a function of their children's sex; (2) The authoritarian parental socialization style (low involvement and high imposition) will be associated with a higher level of sexism in the sons and daughters, whereas the indulgent style (high involvement and low imposition) will be more closely related to more egalitarian and less sexist

attitudes; (3) The mother's socialization style will have more influence on the sexist attitudes of the sons and daughters than the father's educational style; and (4) The higher the parents' educational level, the lower will be their level of sexism and the sexism of their adolescent sons and daughters.

Method

Participants

The study comprised 2,867 participants: 1,455 were adolescents between 11 and 17 years of age, 47.2% were boys ($n = 687$) and 52.8% were girls ($n = 768$) who were studying Compulsory Secondary Education (CSE) (25.2% first-graders; 28.3% second-graders; 21.4% third-graders, and 25% fourth-graders). Of the youths, 94.2% were Spaniards, and 5.8% were of various other nationalities (European, Asian, and American). With regard to the characteristics of the schools, 36.8% were public schools and 63.2% were private centers. Of the youngsters, 81.7% live with both parents, 11.1% live with the mother, 0.6% with the father, 0.4% alternatively with the mother and the father, and 6.2% live with the grandparents or other relatives. Regarding the sample of fathers and mothers, ($n = 1,412$), 764 mothers and 648 fathers, aged between 30 and 68 years, participated. Thus, 52.5% of the mothers and 44.53% of the fathers of the adolescent participants completed the questionnaire. Regarding the mothers, their age ranged between 30 and 60 years, although more than 90% were between 40 and 50 years old. Concerning educational level, 4.6% had basic-primary studies, 18.3% secondary studies, 29.6% second degree education (professional training or high school), 22.3% third degree education (diplomas), and 25.2% had third degree education (university degree). Regarding the fathers, their age ranged between 32 and 68 years, although 90% were between 42 and 53 years old. Concerning educational level, 4.5% had basic-primary studies, 17.3% secondary studies, 35.6% second degree education (professional training or high school), 22.1% third degree education (diplomas), and 20.8% had third degree education (university degree).

The sample of the study is representative of the students of CSE of the province of Gipuzkoa (Spain). According to the latest survey of schools presented by the eustat (eustat.es) on November 11, 2009, the population of students of CSE of Gipuzkoa was 23,758 (10,986 in public centers and 12,772 in private centers). With a .95% confidence level, a sampling error of .025, for a population variance of .50, the representative sample comprises 1,444. The sample was selected by means of a simple random sampling technique from the list of schools of the province of Gipuzkoa in the Basque Country. The public-private status as well as the population of the locations (town, small city, large city) of the schools was also taken into account.

To determine the sample size, we also carried out a prior power analysis, presuming a low-medium effect size ($f = .14$; estimated with Lamborn et al.'s [1991] ANOVAs), with a power of .95 ($\alpha = .05$; $1 - \beta = .95$) for the univariate F tests among the four parental styles, finding that the sample must have a minimum size of 948 participants (Erdfelder, Faul, & Buchner, 1996; Faul, Erdfelder, Buchner, & Lang, 2009; Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007; García, Pascual, Frías, Van Krunckelsven, & Murgui, 2008).

Instruments

To measure the variables object of the study, we used four assessment instruments with adequate psychometric guarantees of reliability and validity.

ESPA29. Parental Socialization Scale for Adolescence [in Spanish, Escala de Socialización Parental en la Adolescencia] (Musitu & García, 2001). This scale assesses the parents' socialization styles, that is, the educational styles of the father and mother with their children. The adolescent rates the father's and mother's action independently in 29 relevant situations. Of the 29 situations proposed, 16 are negative ("If I am dirty and poorly dressed," "If one of my teachers tells him/her that I behave badly in class," "If I am disobedient") and 13 are positive ("If I take care of my things and am clean and properly dressed," "If I do not skip classes and arrive punctually every day," "If I pick up and take care of things at home"). The questionnaire allows identifying 4 educational styles of the father and mother along the involvement/acceptance-coercion/imposition continuum: authoritative, indulgent, authoritarian, and neglectful. *Authoritative parents* (high involvement/acceptance and high coercion/imposition): They make an effort to guide the activities of their son/daughter rationally, sharing the rationale underlying their policy, they affirm their children's qualities, but they also set limits and the course of future behavior, resorting both to reasoning and to power to achieve their goals. *Indulgent parents* (high involvement/acceptance and low coercion/imposition): They attempt to behave affectionately, they accept their children's impulses, desires, and actions, and allow them to regulate their own activities as much as possible, they offer explanations and rationale, but they avoid the use of dominant or coercive control. *Authoritarian parents* (low involvement/acceptance and high coercion/imposition): They frequently do not offer any rationale when they give orders and are very reluctant to modify their positions in the face of their children's arguments. They are generally indifferent to their children's demands for support and attention and they are less likely to use positive reinforcement, acting indifferently towards their children's appropriate behaviors. *Neglectful parents* (low involvement/acceptance and low coercion/imposition): They have severe difficulties to relate to and interact with their children, and to set limits on their relations with them, and they express little affection. Psychometric studies of the

scale reveal high internal consistency (Musitu & García, 2001). The results of factor analysis confirmed the theoretical structure of the bidimensional model satisfactorily, and the cross-cultural validity of the scale was also confirmed in the cross-cultural study of Marchetti (1997). In the present study, the internal consistency coefficients were high (ESPA mother $\alpha = .91$ and ESPA father $\alpha = .93$). In this study, the typologies were defined from the cut-off points included in the norms of the instrument for each age range and sex.

ISA-Adolescents. Inventory of Ambivalent Sexism for Adolescents [in Spanish, Inventario de Sexismo Ambivalente para Adolescentes] (de Lemus, Castillo, Moya, Padilla, & Ryan, 2008). The ISA-Adolescents is an adaptation of the ASI (Ambivalent Sexism Inventory of Glick & Fiske, 1996), for adolescent population, which provides measures of hostile sexism (HS) and benevolent sexism (BS). The test measures ambivalent sexism (AS), which is made up of two dimensions: Hostile Sexism (HS, which basically coincides with the old sexism) and Benevolent Sexism (BS, understood as a series of sexist attitudes towards women inasmuch as they are considered in a stereotyped fashion and limited to certain roles). The 20 statements that make up the inventory measure two subscales, that of HS, with 10 items such as "Girls are easily offended," "Boys should control their girlfriend's friendships," or "Girls usually interpret innocent comments as being sexist," and that of BS, with 10 items. In this case, there are three factors: paternalism ("Girls should be loved and protected by boys"), complementariness ("Girls are more sensitive towards others' feelings than boys"), and intimacy ("Couple relations are essential to achieve true happiness in life"). The adolescents rate their degree of agreement with the content of the statements on a 6-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 6 (*strongly agree*). In the study of de Lemus et al. (2008), Cronbach's alpha index was high. The internal consistency with the sample of the present study was also high (SH $\alpha = .85$, SB $\alpha = .80$, SA $\alpha = .86$). Moreover, studies of the convergent validity have shown a correlation of the ISA-Adolescents with the Scale of Gender Ideology (Moya, Navas, & Gómez, 1991), both in boys and in girls.

NS. Neosexism Scale (Tougas, Brown, Beaton, & Joly, 1995; Spanish version by Moya & Expósito, 2001). This scale assesses neosexism (NS) and it has 11 items ("Discrimination against women in the occupational area is not a big problem in Spain," "Women's demands for equality of the sexes are simply exaggerated," "Due to social pressure, many companies hire women who are not qualified"), with a 7-point response format (1 = *strongly disagree*; 7 = *strongly agree*). The term neosexism is defined as the manifestation of a conflict between egalitarian values and residual negative feelings towards women. In the studies carried out, neosexism scores were positively related to age, and negatively to educational level. The Spanish version of the scale has shown good internal consistency ($\alpha = .71$.) and also convergent validity, as it correlated (r

= .52, $p < .001$) with the Scale of Sexual Role Ideology (Moya et al., 1991). In the present study, the internal consistency coefficient was somewhat low ($\alpha = .63$).

ASI. Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (Glick & Fiske, 1996, adapted by Expósito, Moya, & Glick, 1998). This instrument has 22 sentences, which are rated on a Likert scale ranging from 0 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). The test measures ambivalent sexism (AS, made of two dimensions: Hostile Sexism (HS), and Benevolent Sexism (BS). The scale was used to assess sexism in the adolescents' parents. The psychometric studies of reliability of the instrument have shown high internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) for ambivalent sexism and its subscales (Glick & Fiske, 1996). In the present study, the internal consistency coefficients were high (AS mother $\alpha = .91$ and SA father $\alpha = .92$). The studies of the validity of the ASI have revealed significant correlations of AS with the Scale of Gender Ideology (Moya et al., 2006), as well as with the scale of Neosexism (Tougas et al., 1995), and of a higher magnitude, with the HS subscale.

Procedure

Firstly, a letter was sent to the selected schools, explaining the research project. Subsequently, we contacted the directors of the schools by phone, and scheduled an interview with those who agreed to participate, in which we explained the project in more detail, and we handed in the informed consent forms for the parents and adolescents. Thirdly, a member of the research team went to the centers, administered the three assessment instruments to the adolescents, two to measure the adolescents' sexism (ISA-Adolescents, NS) and the third one to assess parental socialization style (ESPA). In addition, an envelope for the parents was given to the adolescents, which contained the ASI for the parents to complete anonymously in order to assess their own sexism. The study met the ethical values required in research with human beings, respecting the fundamental principles included in the Declaration of Helsinki in its updates and current regulations (informed consent and right to information, protection of personal data and guarantees of confidentiality, nondiscrimination, gratuity, and freedom to leave the study at any stage). The investigation was favorably assessed by the Ethical Commission of Investigation and Teaching (CUEID) of the Universidad del País Vasco (UPV/EHU).

Results

Differences in Socialization Styles of both Parents as a Function of the Children's Sex

Firstly, we analyzed whether there were differences in the four educational styles of the mother and father assessed with the ESPA-29 as a function of their children's sex. The results

of Pearson's chi square (χ^2) revealed no differences in any of the four educational styles used by the father with his sons and daughters (authoritative, $\chi^2(3) = 2.97$, $p > .05$; authoritarian, $\chi^2(3) = .90$, $p > .05$; indulgent, $\chi^2(3) = 3.54$, $p > .05$; and neglectful, $\chi^2(3) = .34$, $p > .05$). With regard to the mother, no differences were found between both sexes in three of the educational styles (authoritative, $\chi^2(3) = 3.29$, $p > .05$; indulgent, $\chi^2(3) = .83$, $p > .05$; neglectful, $\chi^2(3) = .80$, $p > .05$); however, there were differences in the authoritarian style $\chi^2(3) = 5.68$, $p < .05$, observing that the daughters perceived that their mothers used an authoritarian style with them to a greater extent (17.2%) than the sons (12.7%).

Complementarily, we analyzed the differences in the educational style of the father and the mother as a function of the living arrangement of the sons and daughters (with both parents, with the mother, with the father, alternatively with both, with the grandparents or other relatives). The MANOVA revealed the absence of differences in the mother's socialization style with her sons and daughters as a function of the diverse living arrangements, $\Lambda = .985$, $F(7, 1398) = 1.03$, $p > .05$. The ANOVAs also showed no differences in any of the educational styles, indulgent, $F(7, 1398) = 1.38$, $p > .05$; neglectful, $F(7, 1398) = .96$, $p > .05$; authoritative, $F(7, 1398) = 1.26$, $p > .05$; and authoritarian, $F(7, 1398) = .66$, $p > .05$. However, with regard to the father's socialization style, the MANOVA showed significant differences, $\Lambda = .930$, $F(7, 1067) = 3.70$, $p < .05$. The ANOVAs confirmed differences in the neglectful style, $F(7, 1067) = 4.23$, $p < .001$, the authoritative style, $F(7, 1067) = 8.25$, $p < .001$, and the authoritarian style, $F(7, 1067) = 2.75$, $p < .01$. Pearson's chi square test revealed that the fathers used a neglectful educational style significantly more when the sons or daughters lived alternatively with both parents, $\chi^2(7) = 29.07$, $p < .001$, a more authoritative style when they only lived with their mother, $\chi^2(7) = 55.24$, $p < .001$, and a more authoritarian style when the sons and daughters lived with both parents, $\chi^2(7) = 19.28$, $p < .01$.

Hostile, Benevolent, and Ambivalent Sexism, and Neosexism: Differences as a Function of both Parents' Socialization Style with Sons and Daughters

Before analyzing whether there were differences in the level of sexism of the adolescents as a function of the parental socialization style, we preliminarily explored the existence of gender differences in sexism, both among the adolescents and among their parents, respectively, because this information is relevant for the subsequent analyses. Thus, firstly, we carried out an ANOVA with the adolescents' scores on the ISA-Ad and the NS, the results of which are presented in Table 1. The results of the MANOVA for the series of variables, $\Lambda = .774$, $F(3, 1399) = 136.01$, $p < .001$, showed significant gender differences, of a medium effect size ($\eta^2 = .226$, $r = .47$). The results of the ANOVAs in each variable (see Table 1) confirm the significant differences in

HS, AS, and NS, with higher scores for the boys. The effect size of HS ($\eta^2 = .181, r = .42$) was medium, whereas for AS ($\eta^2 = .078, r = .27$) and NS ($\eta^2 = .114, r = .33$), it was lower. No significant differences were found between female and male adolescents in BS.

Complementarily, we analyzed the existence of gender differences between mothers and fathers in the level of sexism, performing a Student's t-test of comparison of means with related samples. The analysis was carried out with 633 pairs of parents, as we only selected the data of the participants when both parents had completed the ASI. The results (see Table 2) confirmed significant differences in HS, BS, and AS of the father and mother, with higher scores for the fathers. In order to analyze the differences and the effect size for the series of variables, we carried out a MANOVA, the results of which, $\Lambda = .949, F(2, 1409) = 38.00, p < .001$, showed significant differences between the father and the mother, with a low effect size ($\eta^2 = .051, r = .22$). The analysis of each variable studied independently also revealed that the effect size in HS ($\eta^2 = .051, r = .22$), BS, ($\eta^2 = .017, r = .13$), and AS ($\eta^2 = .041, r = .20$) was low.

Lastly, after confirming the basic assumptions (normality, homogeneity...) and taking into account the sex differences in the previous analyses, we analyzed the existence of differences in the levels of HS, BS, AS, and NS of the male and female adolescents as a function of the socialization style (authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, neglectful) of the father and mother differentially. For this purpose, we performed ANOVAs and multiple Bonferroni comparisons

on the adolescents' scores in the ISA-Ad, the NS, and the ESPA-29. The MANOVA of the Sex \times Mother's Typologies interaction, $\Lambda = .994, F(6, 2740) = 1.30, p > .05$, as well as the Sex \times Father's Typologies interaction, $\Lambda = .990, F(6, 2088) = 1.78, p > .05$, revealed no global differences in adolescents' HS, BS, AS, and NS as a function of parental socialization typologies and the children's sex. Nevertheless, the ANOVAs (see Table 3) confirmed some significant differences in HS, BS, AS, and NS between boys and girls as a function of the mother's socialization style, and the results with regard to the father pointed in the same direction, although no differences were observed in BS.

With regard to the maternal figure, the multiple Bonferroni comparisons ($p < .05$) specifically showed that the differences in HS in the boys were found between the mothers' neglectful ($M = 3.52$) and indulgent ($M = 3.17$) typologies, with the boys who had an indulgent mother obtaining lower scores in HS. The HS differences in the girls were nonsignificant. In BS, the differences in boys were between the authoritative ($M = 4.06$) and authoritarian ($M = 3.74$) typologies, and the boys who had an authoritarian mother had lower scores in BS. The BS differences in girls were nonsignificant. Regarding AS, in the boys, there were no significant differences as a function of the mothers' socialization typologies, whereas in the girls, significant differences between the authoritative ($M = 3.28$) and indulgent ($M = 3.06$) typologies were observed, with the girls who had an indulgent mother obtaining lower scores in AS. Lastly, regarding NS, in the boys, there were significant differences

Table 1
Gender Differences in Hostile, Benevolent, and Ambivalent Sexism, and Neosexism among Male and Female Adolescents

	Boys		Girls		<i>F</i> (1, 1420)
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
HS. Hostile Sexism	3.35	1.03	2.45	0.88	309.75***
BS. Benevolent Sexism	3.95	0.94	3.91	0.94	0.47
AS. Ambivalent Sexism	3.65	0.93	3.18	0.77	119.77***
NS. Neosexism	2.97	0.82	2.43	0.71	180.04***

HS, BS and AS: Likert scale, ranging from 1 to 6

NS: Likert scale, ranging from 1 to 7

*** $p < .001$.

Table 2
Gender Differences Hostile, Benevolent, and Ambivalent Sexism between the Father and the Mother

	Mother		Father		<i>t</i> (1, 632)
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
HS. Hostile Sexism	1.36	1.08	1.94	1.28	-11.97***
BS. Benevolent Sexism	1.40	1.02	1.69	0.95	-6.93***
AS. Ambivalent Sexism	1.38	0.95	1.81	1.07	-11.34***

HS, BS and AS: Likert scale, ranging from 0 to 5

*** $p < .001$

between the authoritarian ($M = 3.14$) and authoritative ($M = 2.87$) typologies, with the boys who had an authoritative mother obtaining significantly lower scores.

With regard to the paternal figure, the multiple Bonferroni comparisons ($p < .05$) showed that the differences in HS in the boys were specifically found between the

authoritative ($M = 3.52$), the neglectful ($M = 3.50$), and the indulgent ($M = 3.08$) typologies, with the boys who had an indulgent father obtaining the lowest scores in HS. The father's socialization typology did not affect either his daughters' HS, or the BS of his sons and daughters. Regarding AS, the differences in the boys were found

Table 3

Hostile, Benevolent, and Ambivalent Sexism and Neosexism in Boys and Girls as a Function of the Parental Socialization Style of the Mother and the Father

		Mother								
		Indulgent		Neglectful		Authoritative		Authoritarian		
		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i> (3, 1451)
HS	Boys	3.17	1.06	3.52	0.91	3.38	1.06	3.28	1.00	2.80*
	Girls	2.32	0.74	2.43	0.96	2.54	0.90	2.45	0.92	2.35
	Total	2.70	0.99	2.97	1.08	2.96	1.07	2.77	1.03	5.53***
BS	Boys	3.90	0.94	3.87	0.83	4.06	0.94	3.74	1.03	3.25*
	Girls	3.80	0.85	3.93	0.96	4.01	0.98	3.86	0.96	2.13
	Total	3.84	0.89	3.90	0.89	4.04	0.96	3.81	0.99	4.68***
AS	Boys	3.53	0.88	3.69	0.72	3.72	0.83	3.51	0.87	2.57
	Girls	3.06	0.65	3.18	0.79	3.28	0.78	3.15	0.82	3.12*
	Total	3.27	0.80	3.44	0.80	3.50	0.83	3.29	0.85	6.69***
NS	Boys	2.98	0.85	3.08	0.79	2.87	0.78	3.14	0.79	3.58*
	Girls	2.38	0.68	2.48	0.77	2.41	0.66	2.48	0.77	0.83
	Total	2.65	0.82	2.78	0.83	2.64	0.76	2.74	0.84	2.35
		Father								
		Indulgent		Neglectful		Authoritative		Authoritarian		
		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i> (3, 1451)
HS	Boys	3.08	1.00	3.50	1.00	3.52	1.09	3.17	0.98	4.99**
	Girls	2.40	0.81	2.46	0.90	2.52	0.89	2.44	0.87	0.52
	Total	3.68	0.95	2.97	1.08	3.01	1.11	2.76	0.99	5.81***
BS	Boys	3.89	0.95	3.89	0.86	4.03	0.93	3.76	1.02	1.92
	Girls	3.95	0.94	4.04	0.88	3.93	0.92	3.81	0.91	1.19
	Total	3.93	0.94	3.97	0.87	3.98	0.92	3.79	0.96	2.12
AS	Boys	3.49	0.83	3.69	0.81	3.78	0.83	3.46	0.83	4.16**
	Girls	3.17	0.72	3.25	0.69	3.22	0.76	3.12	0.74	0.71
	Total	3.30	0.78	3.47	0.78	3.50	0.84	3.27	0.80	4.93***
NS	Boys	2.77	0.79	3.18	0.79	3.00	0.86	2.90	0.76	3.73*
	Girls	2.48	0.75	2.41	0.72	2.47	0.71	2.36	0.69	0.72
	Total	2.60	0.78	2.78	0.85	2.73	0.83	2.60	0.77	2.74*

Note: Total = boys and girls

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

between the authoritative ($M = 3.78$) and authoritarian ($M = 3.46$) typologies, and the boys who had an authoritarian father obtained lower AS scores. The father's socialization typology did not affect the daughters' AS. Lastly, in NS, significant differences were observed in the boys who had a neglectful father ($M = 3.18$) and the boys with an indulgent father ($M = 2.77$), with the latter obtaining lower scores. The father's socialization typology did not affect the daughters' NS.

Summing up, with regard to the mother, the results show that: (a) Boys and girls who have an indulgent mother obtained lower HS scores; (b) Boys with an authoritarian mother obtained lower BS scores, but the mother's typology did not affect her daughters' BS; (c) Girls with an indulgent mother obtained lower scores in AS, and the mother's typology did not affect her sons' AS; (d) Boys with an authoritative mother obtained lower scores in NS, but the mother's typology did not affect her daughters' NS. With regard to the father, the results showed that: (a) Boys with an indulgent father had lower scores in HS and NS; (b) Boys with an authoritarian father had lower scores in AS; (c) The father's typology did not affect his daughters' scores in HS, BS, AS, or NS or his sons' scores in BS.

Relation between Parents' Educational Level and Parents' and Children's Sexism

To analyze whether there are relations between the parents' educational level and their level of sexism, we calculated the Pearson coefficients between educational level and sexism assessed with the ASI. With regard to the mother, significant negative correlations were confirmed ($p < .001$) between the educational level and HS ($r = -.29$), BS ($r = -.28$), and AS ($r = -.31$); and with regard to the father, the results point in the same direction, as significant negative correlations ($p < .001$) were observed between educational level and HS ($r = -.23$), BS ($r = -.23$), and AS ($r = -.26$). Subsequently, in order to analyze the relations

between the parents' educational level and their sons' and daughters' sexism, we calculated the Pearson correlation coefficients between the adolescents' scores in the ISA-Ad and the educational levels of both parents (0: no studies; 1: primary studies; 2: secondary studies; 3: high school-professional training; 4: diploma; 5: university degree) the results of which are presented in Table 4. As seen in Table 4, we only found significant negative correlations between the mother's educational level and the daughters' HS ($r = -.10$, $p < .05$), AS ($r = -.09$, $p < .05$), and NS ($r = -.15$, $p < .01$). No relation was found between the mother's educational level and the sons' sexism, or between the fathers' educational level and the sexism of their sons and daughters.

Discussion

The results obtained herein allow us to reach relevant conclusions and propose various aspects for discussion, focusing on the role of the parents' educational style and the sexism of their adolescent sons and daughters. Firstly, the results show that the fathers' and mothers' styles are very similar although the girls perceive their mothers as more authoritarian than the boys do. Therefore, Hypothesis 1 is almost completely confirmed, as, in general, the parents do not use different socialization styles with their children as a function of their sex, which represents a fairly egalitarian educational situation. These results are coherent with those obtained in studies that have found the perception of a higher level of affection of mothers towards their sons than towards their daughters (Bulnes et al., 2008). In the study carried out in the Basque Country, although the parents' educational style with their sons and daughters is similar, the girls experience a more authoritarian attitude in their mothers towards them. This may be a cultural pattern of mothers' more acquiescent and less demanding attitudes towards their sons than towards their daughters,

Table 4

Pearson Correlations between Adolescents' Hostile, Benevolent, and Ambivalent Sexism and Neosexism and their Parents' Educational Level

	Hostile Sexism	Benevolent Sexism	Ambivalent Sexism	Neosexism
Mother				
Total Sample	-.03	-.06	-.06	-.09**
Boys	.06	-.06	.00	-.00
Girls	-.10*	-.06	-.09*	-.15**
Father				
Total Sample	-.04	-.06	-.06	-.05
Boys	-.05	-.08	-.08	-.08
Girls	-.05	-.05	-.06	-.04

Note: Total Sample = boys and girls

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

which may be related to the importance of the mother in the context of the Basque family.

Secondly, the results confirmed higher scores in HS, AS, and NS in the adolescent boys, which was also found in previous studies (Garaigordobil & Durá, 2006). In the same vein, we also found higher scores of the fathers compared to the mothers in HS, BS, and AS, which ratifies a higher level of sexism in males compared to females. With regard to the relations between sexism and fathers' socialization typology, the results show that: (a) the parents' typology is not as relevant to the level of their sons' and daughters' sexism as we expected; (b) the parents' typology affects their sons' sexism more than their daughters' sexism; (c) the father's typology has less influence than that of the mothers on their sons' sexism, and no influence on their daughters' sexism; and (d) the indulgent typology in both parents (high involvement-low imposition) is the most highly related to a low level of sexism. Specifically, the study has shown that indulgent mothers stimulate a lower level of HS and AS in the daughters and a lower level of HS in the sons; authoritarian mothers stimulate a lower level of BS in their sons; authoritative mothers promote a lower level of NS in their sons; indulgent fathers promote a lower level of HS and NS in their sons; indulgent and authoritarian fathers promote a lower level of AS in their sons, whereas the father's socialization style does not affect their daughters' HS, BS, AS, and NS, or their sons' BS. Taking these results into account, Hypothesis 2 is partially ratified, because it was not shown that the authoritarian style promotes a higher level of sexism, although it was confirmed that the indulgent style has the most positive influence on sexism. Nevertheless, the data show that the mother's educational style has more influence than the father's educational style on the sexist attitudes of their sons and daughters, which confirms Hypothesis 3.

The results suggest that the indulgent style is one of the most positive socialization styles, as indicated in other studies carried out in Spain (García & Gracia, 2009, 2010; Martínez & García, 2007); however, they do not ratify those obtained in investigations (Tenenbaum & Leaper, 2002) that have emphasized the great impact of parents on their sons' and daughters' gender attitudes, because, in this work, the parents' socialization or educational style was not shown to have much influence on their sons' sexism, and even less on their daughters'. The data do not confirm the results of works that have found that authoritarian families support sexist ideologies (Lee et al., 2007), nor do they confirm the studies that have indicated that authoritative mothers have daughters with less traditional gender attitudes (Ex & Janssens, 1998). The results of the study can be related to other works that have associated parental socialization styles with adolescents' personality. Along these lines, Huver et al. (2009) found that emotional stability was associated with low levels of coercion/control, and that extraversion, agreeableness, and lower emotional stability were associated with an authoritative parental style.

Other studies have also confirmed that adolescents with indulgent parents had higher self-esteem (Martínez & García, 2007; Martínez, García, & Yubero, 2007) and higher levels of self-fulfillment (Martínez & García, 2008).

Lastly, the results allow us to conclude that the higher the educational level of both parents, the less sexist they will be. Therefore, it is suggested that promoting people's educational level will decrease the level of sexism in our society. In addition, the results confirm that adolescent girls who have mothers with a high educational level had low scores in HS, AS, and NS. Thus, Hypothesis 5 is partially confirmed, as the father's educational level did not affect the sexism of his sons and daughters, nor was the mother's educational level related to her sons' sexism. Only a high educational level in the mother was related to a low level of sexism in her daughters, which is coherent with the findings of other studies that have shown that the higher the mother's educational level, the greater the daughter's feminist consciousness (Buisse, 2000), and the works that have confirmed that the educational level correlates negatively with sexist attitudes in both sexes (Lameiras & Rodríguez, 2003). These results ratify the quality of the data obtained because they find precisely the differences that always appear in the previous studies.

One contribution of this work has been to show that the relations between adolescents' sexism and parental socialization styles depend both on the adolescent's sex and on the sex of the specific parental figure, and that the weight of the parental educational style on the children's sexism is not as relevant as expected. Nevertheless, the findings of this study allow us to conclude that an indulgent educational style by both parents and a mother's high educational level promotes fewer sexist attitudes. It is also relevant that both parents' socialization style affects the sons' sexism more than the daughters', and that the maternal socialization style affects the development of sexist attitudes more than the paternal style. However, it is still a challenge for gender developmental psychology to identify other influential means and contexts in which gender inequality occurs at a macro-systemic level and is transmitted to the microsystems during children's development (for example, the influence of the behavior models observed in the mass media, characteristics of peer groups in which adolescents participate...). Indirectly, the results suggest the importance of developing formative campaigns aimed at the family and society to eradicate sexism and promote egalitarian relations, as well as developing psychoeducational intervention programs that promote respect for human rights, equality, empathy... and prevention of violence (Garaigordobil, Maganto, Pérez, & Sansinenea, 2009; Garaigordobil & Fagoaga, 2006).

However, the interest of this study also implies a path for intervention in aspects related in the long term to family education about prejudices, which could be very enriching when resolving subsequent problems, even problems such as

police intervention (see Lila, Gracia, & García, 2010). As a limitation of this work, we note that the data are correlational, so they contribute little to the causal link between these variables. The methodology employed is not experimental (Ato & Vallejo, 2007), so we cannot categorically rule out the effect of third variables (Cook & Campbell, 1979; Pérez, 2008). More research with quasi-experimental designs, at least (Cook & Campbell, 1979; Pérez, Navarro, & Llobell, 1999), would help to better calibrate the relations between sexism and parental socialization styles.

References

- Ato, M., & Vallejo, G. (2007). *Diseños experimentales en psicología* [Experimental designs in psychology]. Madrid, Spain: Pirámide.
- Bulnes, M., Ponce, C., Huerta, R., Álvarez, C., Santiváñez, W., Atalaya, M. ... Morocho, J. (2008). Resiliencia y estilos de socialización parental en escolares de 4º y 5º año de secundaria de Lima Metropolitana [Resilience and depression in high school students metropolitan Lima with or without participating in violent acts]. *Revista de Investigación en Psicología*, *11*, 67–91.
- Buysse, T. M. (2000). The mother-daughter relationship and the development of daughters' feminist consciousness. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering*, *60* (12-B), 6419.
- Cameron, C. (1977). Sex-role attitudes. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Attitudes and opinions* (pp. 339-359). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (1979). *Quasi-experimentation: Design and analysis issues for field settings*. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- de Lemus, S., Castillo, M., Moya, M., Padilla, J. L., & Ryan, E. (2008). Elaboración y validación del Inventario de Sexismo Ambivalente para Adolescentes [Development and validation of the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory for Adolescents]. *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology*, *8*, 537–562.
- Ex, C. T., & Janssens, J. M. (1998). Maternal influences on daughters' gender role attitudes. *Sex Roles*, *38*, 171–186. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1018776931419>
- Erdfelder, E., Faul, F., & Buchner, A. (1996). G*POWER: A general power analysis program. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments and Computers*, *28*(1), 1–11. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3758/BF03203630>
- Expósito, F., Moya, M., & Glick, P. (1998). Sexismo ambivalente: medición y correlatos [Ambivalent sexism: Measurement and correlates]. *Revista de Psicología Social*, *1*, 159–169. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1174/021347498760350641>
- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Buchner, A., & Lang, A.G. (2009). Statistical power analyses using G*Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses. *Behavior Research Methods*, *4*, 1149–1160. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3758/BRM.41.4.1149>
- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A. G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G*Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research Methods*, *39*, 175–191. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3758/BF03193146>
- Ferrer, V. A., Bosch, E., Ramis, M. C., & Navarro, C. (2006). Las creencias y actitudes sobre la violencia contra las mujeres en la pareja: determinantes sociodemográficos, familiares y formativos [Beliefs and attitudes about violence against the female partner: socio-demographics, familiar and formative determinants]. *Anales de Psicología*, *22*, 251–259.
- Garaigordobil, M., & Durá, A. (2006). Neosexismo en adolescentes de 14 a 17 años: relaciones con autoconcepto-autoestima, personalidad, psicopatología, problemas de conducta y habilidades sociales [Neosexism in adolescents aged 14 to 17: relationships with self-concept/self-esteem, personality, psychopathology, behavioral problems and social skills]. *Clinica y Salud*, *17*, 127–149.
- Garaigordobil, M., & Fagoaga J. M (2006). *Juego cooperativo para prevenir la violencia en los centros educativos* [Cooperative games to prevent violence at school]. Madrid, Spain: Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia.
- Garaigordobil, M., Maganto, C., Pérez, J. I., & Sansinenea, E. (2009). Gender differences in socio-emotional developmental factors during adolescence and effects of a violence prevention program. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *44*, 468–477. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016%2Fj.jadohealth.2008.09.014>
- García, J. F., & Gracia, E. (2009). Is always authoritative the optimum parenting style? Evidence from Spanish families. *Adolescence*, *44*, 101–131.
- García, J. F., & Gracia, E. (2010). ¿Qué estilo de socialización parental es el idóneo en España? Un estudio con niños y adolescentes de 10 a 14 años [What is the optimum parental socialisation style in Spain? A study with children and adolescents aged 10-14 years]. *Infancia y Aprendizaje*, *33*, 365–384. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1174/021037010792215118>
- García, J. F., Pascual, J., Frías, M. D., Van Krunckelsven, D., & Murgui, S. (2008). Diseño y análisis de la potencia: n y los intervalos de confianza de las medias [Design and power analysis: n and confidence intervals of means]. *Psicothema*, *20*, 933–938.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *70*, 491–512. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.70.3.491>
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1999). The Ambivalence toward Men Inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent beliefs about men. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *23*, 519–536. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1999.tb00379.x>
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. (2001). An ambivalent alliance: Hostile and benevolent sexism as complementary justifications of gender inequality. *American Psychologist*, *56*, 109–118. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.56.2.109>
- Huver, R. M. E., Otten, R., de Vries, H., & Engels, C. M. E. (2009). Personality and parenting style in parents of

- adolescents. *Journal of Adolescence*, 33, 395–402. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2009.07.012>
- Lameiras, M., & Rodríguez, Y. (2003). Evaluación del sexismo ambivalente en estudiantes gallegos/as [Evaluation of ambivalent sexism in Galician students]. *Acción Psicológica*, 2, 131–136.
- Leaper, C. (2002). Parenting girls and boys. In M. H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Lee, I., Pratto, F., & Li, M. (2007). Social relationships and sexism in The United States and Taiwan. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 38, 595–612. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0022022107305241>
- Lila, M., Gracia, E., & García, J. F. (2010) Actitudes de la policía ante la intervención en casos de violencia contra la mujer en las relaciones de pareja: Influencia del sexismo y la empatía [Police attitudes toward intervention in cases of partner violence against women: The influence of sexism and empathy]. *Revista de Psicología Social*, 25, 313–323.
- Marchetti, B. (1997). *Concetto di se' relazioni familiari e valori* [Concept of the family relationships and values]. (Thesis in Social Psychology) Università degli Studi di Bologna. Italy.
- Martínez, I., & García, J. F. (2007). Impact of parenting styles on adolescents' self-esteem and internalization of values in Spain. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 10, 338–348.
- Martínez, I., & García, J. F. (2008). Internalization of values and self-esteem among Brazilian teenagers from authoritative, indulgent, authoritarian, and neglectful homes. *Adolescence*, 43, 13–29.
- Martínez, I., García, J. F., & Yubero, S. (2007). Parenting styles and adolescents' self-esteem in Brazil. *Psychological Reports*, 100, 731–745. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2466/PRO.100.3.731-745>
- Martínez Festorazzi, V., Castañeiras, C., & Posada M. C. (2010, February). *Socialización y adolescencia: efecto diferencial de los estilos parentales en adolescentes escolarizados* [Socialization and adolescence: Differential effect of parental styles in adolescent students]. Communication presented at the 11th Virtual Congress of Psychiatry, Interpsiquis, 2010. Retrieved from http://www.psiquiatria.com/articulos/psiq_general_y_otras_areas/investigacion/45618/
- McKinney, C., & Renk, K. (2008). Differential parenting between mothers and fathers: Implications for late adolescents. *Journal of Family Issues*, 29, 806–827. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0192513X07311222>
- Moya, M. (2003). El análisis psicosocial del género [The psychosocial analysis of gender]. In J.F. Morales & C. Huici (Eds.), *Estudios de Psicología Social* [Social Psychology Studies] (pp. 175-221). Madrid, Spain: UNED.
- Moya, M. (2004). Actitudes sexistas y nuevas formas de sexismo [Sexist attitudes and new forms of sexism]. In E. Barberá & I. Martínez-Benlloch (Eds.), *Psicología y Género* [Psychology and Gender] (pp. 271-294). Madrid, Spain: Pearson.
- Moya, M., & Expósito, F. (2001). Nuevas formas, viejos intereses: Neosexismo en varones españoles [New forms, old interests: Neosexism among Spanish men]. *Psicothema*, 13, 643–649.
- Moya, M., Expósito, F., & Padilla, J. L. (2006). Revisión de las propiedades psicométricas de las versiones larga y reducida de la Escala sobre Ideología de Género [Review of the psychometric properties of long and short versions of the Gender Ideology Scale]. *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology*, 6, 709–727.
- Moya, M., Navas, L., & Gómez, B. C. (1991, September). *Escala sobre la ideología del rol sexual* [Scale of sex role ideology]. Records of the Congress of Social Psychology (pp. 554-566). Santiago de Compostela, Spain.
- Moya, M., Páez, D., Glick, P., Fernández, I., & Poeschl, G. (2002). Sexismo, masculinidad-feminidad y factores culturales [Sexism, masculinity-femininity and cultural factors]. *Revista Electrónica de Motivación y Emoción*, 3, 127–142.
- Musitu, G. (2000). Socialización familiar y valores en el adolescente: Un análisis intercultural [Family socialization and values in adolescents: an intercultural analysis]. *Anuario de Psicología*, 31, 15–32.
- Musitu, G., & García, F. (2001). *ESPA29. Escala de Estilos de Socialización Parental en la Adolescencia* [Scale of Parental Socialization Styles in Adolescence]. Madrid, Spain: TEA.
- Pérez, J. F. G. (2008). *Métodos de investigación, diseño y técnicas en las ciencias del comportamiento* [Research methods, design and techniques in behavioral sciences]. Valencia, Spain: Palmero Ediciones.
- Pérez, J. F. G., Navarro, D. F., & Llobell, J. P. (1999). Potencia estadística del diseño de Solomón [Statistical power of the Solomon design]. *Psicothema*, 1, 431–436.
- Pychyl, T. A., Coplan, R. J., & Reid, P. A. M. (2002). Parenting and procrastination: Gender differences in the relations between procrastination, parenting style and self-worth in early adolescence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 33, 271–285. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869%2801%2900151-9>
- Raffaelli, M., & Ontai, L. (2004). Gender socialization in Latino/a families: Results from two retrospective studies. *Sex Roles*, 50, 287–299. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/B:SERS.0000018886.58945.06>
- Sabattini, L., & Leaper, C. (2004). The relation between mothers' and fathers' parenting styles and their division of labor in the home: Young adults' retrospective reports. *Sex Roles*, 50, 217–225. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/B:SERS.0000015553.82390.f7>
- Shearer, C. (2008). Gender socialization in the family. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering*, 68(10-B), 7004.
- Tenenbaum, H., & Leaper, C. (2002). Are parents' gender schemas related to their children's gender-related cognitions? A meta-analysis. *Developmental Psychology*, 38, 615–630. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.38.4.615>
- Tougas, F., Brown, R., Beaton, A. M., & Joly, S. (1995). Neosexism: Plus ça change, plus c'est pareil [Neosexism: The more things change, more they stay the same]. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21, 842–849. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167295218007>

Received October 11, 2010

Revision received May 17, 2011

Accepted May 21, 2011