

Construction and Validation of the “#YoCuento” Survey (Gender-Based Discrimination and Violence) for the University of Antioquia

Construcción y validación de la Encuesta “#YoCuento” (Discriminaciones y Violencias Basadas en Género) para la Universidad de Antioquia



Laura Correa Sierra¹

Universidad de Antioquia, Medellín, Colombia

coralparadoja@gmail.com |  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1873-4366>

Received: December 2, 2025 | **Reviewed:** February 16, 2026 | **Approved:** March 13, 2026 | **Published:** April 24, 2000

DOI: [10.25100/lamanzanadeladiscordia.v19i1.15474](https://doi.org/10.25100/lamanzanadeladiscordia.v19i1.15474)

Research article

How to quote this article? | ¿Cómo citar este artículo?

Correa Sierra, Laura. (2026). Construction and Validation of the “#YoCuento” Survey (Gender-Based Discrimination and Violence) for the University of Antioquia. *La Manzana de la Discordia*, 19(1), e20615474, <https://doi.org/10.25100/lamanzanadeladiscordia.v19i1.15474>

¹ Psychologist from the Universidad de Antioquia, Medellín, Colombia. Master’s in Women’s and Gender Studies from the Universidad de Oviedo, Spain. Master’s in Modern, Postcolonial and Comparative Literature from the Università di Bologna, Italy. Research Coordinator of the Institutional Gender Equity Action Plan (PAIEG) 2021–2024 of the University Welfare Directorate of the Universidad de Antioquia, from which the presented publication is derived (Completed). Co-education professional, Hospital Mental de Antioquia and Secretaría de las Mujeres de Antioquia (Ongoing).



Abstract

Objective: to describe the construction and validation process of the “#YoCuento” survey, designed to assess discrimination and gender-based violence (GBV) at the Universidad de Antioquia.

Method: a quantitative instrumental study was conducted; the survey was constructed through the intersectional operationalization of different forms of gender-based discrimination using a two-dimensional methodological approach. Content validity was examined through expert panel review and a pilot sample, and quantified using Lawshe’s Content Validity Ratio –CVR– (n = 31). Internal consistency was estimated using Cronbach’s alpha coefficients, and construct validity was assessed through confirmatory factor analysis.

Results: the final version of the instrument comprised six domains and 42 items. The overall CVR reached 0.65, exceeding the minimum acceptable threshold of 0.37. Cronbach’s alpha coefficients ranged from 0.95 to 0.99, indicating high internal consistency. Confirmatory factor analysis supported the proposed structure, explaining 76% of the total variance.

Conclusions: adequate indicators of content validity, construct validity and internal consistency were found, supporting the use of the instrument for the intersectional assessment of discrimination and GBV in higher education.

Key words: survey; Gender-Based Violence; discrimination; intersectionality; university; psychometrics.

Resumen

Objetivo: describir el proceso de construcción y validación de la encuesta “#YoCuento”, diseñada para evaluar discriminaciones y violencias basadas en género (VBG) en la Universidad de Antioquia.

Método: se realizó un estudio instrumental cuantitativo; la encuesta se construyó mediante la operacionalización interseccional de diferentes formas de discriminación basadas en el género con metodología de doble dimensión. La validez de contenido se examinó a través de juicio de expertas y muestra piloto, y se cuantificó mediante el Coeficiente de Razón de Validez de Lawshe -CRV-(n = 31). La consistencia interna se estimó mediante el coeficiente alfa de Cronbach y la validez de constructo se evaluó a través de un análisis factorial confirmatorio.

Resultados: la versión final del instrumento quedó conformada por 6 dominios y 42 ítems. El CRV global alcanzó un valor de 0.65, superando el umbral mínimo aceptable de 0.37. Los coeficientes alfa oscilaron entre 0.95 y 0.99, indicando alta consistencia interna. El análisis factorial confirmatorio respaldó la estructura propuesta, explicando el 76% de la varianza total.

Conclusiones: se encontraron adecuados indicadores de validez de contenido, constructo y consistencia interna, lo que respalda el uso del instrumento para la caracterización interseccional de discriminaciones y VBG en educación superior.

Palabras-clave: encuesta; Violencias Basadas en Género; discriminación; interseccionalidad; universidad; psicometría.

Financing Data:

This study was funded by the University Welfare Directorate of the Universidad de Antioquia.

Article provenance:

Research developed within the framework of the project: Institutional Gender Equity Action Plan (PAI EG) of the University Welfare Directorate of the Universidad de Antioquia during 2021–2024.

Conflicts of Interest:

The author declares that she has no conflict of interest in the writing or publication of this article.

Ethical Implications:

This research was conducted following the ethical principles established for social science research. Confidentiality, anonymity and the responsible use of information were guaranteed. Furthermore, when involving persons, informed consent was obtained and their rights were respected at all times.

Statement Using Artificial Intelligence:

In the preparation of this article, artificial intelligence (ChatGPT) was used during manuscript planning to organize ideas; however, the content, analysis and interpretation are the exclusive responsibility of the author.

Authors' Contributions:

¹Laura Correa Sierra: writing (original draft), writing (review and editing).

Introduction

This article presents the process of creation and validation of the “#YoCuento” survey, which fulfilled the objective of characterizing the most frequent forms of discrimination and Gender-Based Violence (GBV) at the Universidad de Antioquia (UdeA), as part of the Institutional Gender Equity Action Plan (PAI EG) of the University Welfare Directorate. The survey and the plan were created and implemented between 2021 and 2024 by the National University Network for Gender Equity in Higher Education –Antioquia Chapter– (RENUEGES, 2024)² ³. In this article the results of the instrument’s application are not presented, nor are the results of the other two objectives of the project, as other texts have already been published formally and informally for these purposes⁴.

In general terms, this project was situated within the exercises of academic feminist activism developed in Colombian universities since the beginning of the 21st century, which arise from the recognition by faculty and students of the problem of GBV in all spheres of university life. In this context there are some important milestones such as: the commitments of rectorates around the world in 1998, 2008 and 2018 to address the issue; the pioneering projects of the first decade of the 2000s with the Universities of Valle, Javeriana, Nacional and Antioquia; and those of the second decade such as Misesal and FEGES (Strengthening Gender Equity in Higher Education), which included the Universidad Central, Autónoma, Nacional and Industrial de Santander (Fernández et al., 2013; Fuentes, 2019; Rodríguez, 2019; Navarro and Uribe, 2020; Universidad del Valle, 2025).

This path led to the need to construct an instrument that could contain the different typologies of GBV and other forms of discrimination. After the RENUEGES meeting, during the second “Colloquium of Feminist and Gender Studies”, held in 2019 at the Universidad del Valle —a space in which it was recognized that prior diagnostic exercises, both nationally and internationally, had addressed these issues in a fragmented manner: they have generally focused on a single university constituency —almost always

² The two additional objectives of the PAI EG were: to design a public health surveillance system for GBV, as well as to develop training and capacity-building spaces with the university community. To learn more about this process, as well as the partner organizations, visit the following link: <https://acortar.link/67OX9o>

³ The members of RENUEGES –Antioquia Chapter– were: Sara Yaneth Fernández, Angela Maria Botero Pulgarín, Nancy Eliana Gallo, Carlos Mario Piedrahita Londoño, Mónica Carrillo Arias, Melisa Forero Velilla, Laura Murillo Sánchez, Karen Andrea Arroyave Barco, Luis Alfredo Bonza Ramírez, Natalia Isaza Chavarría, Edenive Margarita Monsalve, Elisa Castrillon, Laura Victoria Jaramillo and Laura Correa Sierra.

⁴ To review this content in depth, go to the results and reports button for the survey at the link <https://acortar.link/67OX9o> or review the results article at this other link: <https://revistas.uis.edu.co/index.php/revistacyp/article/view/16642>

the student body— or have limited their attention to sexual harassment, leaving aside the need to understand the structural nature of these forms of violence, their intersectionality with other forms of discrimination and GBV, their presence in all campus constituencies and, above all, the growing phenomenon of institutional re-victimization that had been occurring in universities (Correa, 2020; RENUEGES, 2024)⁵.

In sum, the research problem of this phase of the project focused on the need to design and validate a diagnostic instrument that would allow the characterization of GBV from an intersectional perspective, overcoming the limitations identified in institutional precedents and in prior instruments, particularly with regard to the integration of multiple forms of discrimination, ease of completion, inclusion of institutional re-victimization and applicability across various university constituencies beyond the student body. This is expected to bridge a methodological gap in this field, making it possible to demonstrate that robust and validated instruments in this area, which are also easy to complete, are indeed possible, and that they can be used to build institutional policies based on concrete data about the problem.

Conceptual and Intersectional Foundations of Discrimination and Gender-Based Violence in the #YoCuento Survey for UdeA

For the development of the instrument, the concept of GBV was taken as the central axis, along with other types of discrimination such as racist, classist, xenophobic, ableist/capacitist, epistemic and re-victimizing discriminations, as well as concepts of workplace mistreatment and/or harassment (mobbing); the theory of intersectionality was applied during the operationalization of each variable and in the final structuring of the instrument for this university context.

GBV is usually exercised against women and persons with Diverse/Dissident Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity (SOGI) within the heteropatriarchal system; this population includes homosexual, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons. These forms of violence manifest as a forced reorientation towards gender roles traditionally associated with the male-female binary. They can be exercised through both action and omission, with the deliberate intention of causing harm, and encompass various forms: physical, psychological, sexual, economic and property-related violence, as well as re-victimizing and

⁵ At the end of the article, references are included for all the precedent instruments reviewed for the preparation of the #YoCuento survey for UdeA. <https://acortar.link/67OX9o>

institutional violence (RENUEGES, 2024).

Furthermore, there are racist discriminations, defined by the United Nations (UN) as:

any distinction, exclusion, restriction or preference based on race, colour, descent or national or ethnic origin that has the purpose or effect of nullifying or impairing the recognition, enjoyment or exercise, on an equal footing, of human rights and fundamental freedoms. (UN, 1965)

As Segato (2007) demonstrated, racism can adopt different expressions, such as conviction-based, political, emotional or customary racism, giving rise to structural and institutional racism. For its part, “classical racism” is based on explicit hatred towards populations considered ethnically different from the white population; this materializes in insults, exclusion and other forms of direct violence. Structural racism, in contrast, operates through social practices and values that associate race and class, limiting non-white persons’ access to prestigious positions and better opportunities. Finally, institutional racism reproduces inequalities through legal but unjust mechanisms, such as complex bureaucratic procedures, exclusionary language or language barriers, which impede equitable access to services and rights. As we shall see below, this could constitute an umbrella definition for other terms taken up here.

6

Related to the above, Roger Bastide (1970) defined classist discrimination as the set of prejudices that result in the isolation and rejection by dominant social classes of those that are subordinated. This is evidenced, in particular, in white populations with unrestricted access to all types of resources, who exercise this discrimination against those who form part of the ‘third world’ labour force or, in broader terms, against those who form part of the wealth-generating production system, as Karl Marx conceived it (Cerdeña, 2004).

Now, with regard to xenophobic discriminations, closely related to the previous two, they are identified as those manifestations that arise from a phobia originating in migration, due to economic gaps between countries. Here the emphasis is placed on the nationality and/or ethnic origin of the person, who is also rejected through the various forms that have been presented, whether through insults, threats, physical aggression or deterioration of the subsistence conditions of those considered unwanted foreigners, above all and especially if they are poor (Cortina, 2017).

On the other hand, there are ableist and/or capacitist discriminations, understood as those practices

of exclusion and marginalization of persons with psychomotor, mental and/or emotional functional diversity—in general, the experience of persons who do not conform to a standard of body and behaviour read as normal, but are instead understood as lacking ability, deficient and as having deficiencies, in other words, without the supposed competencies to perform tasks of everyday life (Arnau, 2019).

Now, regarding forms of workplace mistreatment and harassment/mobbing, these are understood as those forms of violence that occur in work and/or professional settings; they may include isolated and/or recurrent incidents, depending on the type of relationship established between the alleged perpetrator and the victim who is in the course of their duties. When referring to workplace harassment or mobbing, this refers to intimidating behaviours, also commonly known as psychological harassment, which seek to generate demotivation and/or resignation. The difference between the two is that in the former, the aggressor may be internal or external to the work context, while in the latter they must form part of the work setting (Soto, 2013; López and Timana, 2021).

Epistemic violence, for its part, is understood as a series of practices that render invisible the contributions of different social groups to the construction and dissemination of knowledge in academic and scientific spheres, through actions such as trivializing or ignoring persons from specific excluded groups—such as women, Afro-descendants, indigenous peoples, among others—in the context of an exercise of reinforcing power through knowledge restricted to only a few (Harding, 1993/2016; Lagarde, 2000; Güreca, 2017).

Furthermore, re-victimizing violence can be enacted through action or omission to cause additional harm to a person who has undergone a primary suffering, caused by one or more of the typologies described here. The aggravating factor is that re-victimization may come from the perpetrator themselves, the community or the institutions that should be acting to protect and/or restore the rights affected. Re-victimizing acts occur when: the violence is delegitimized, the victim is blamed, the violence is justified or confrontation scenarios between the parties are created, causing further harm. It also occurs through omission when no record is made, no action is taken, spaces and/or procedures are not adapted and professionals lack the necessary qualities for timely care (Correa, 2020; RENUEGES, 2024).

The incorporation of this dimension—institutional re-victimization—is particularly significant, in that it enables the educational institution to evaluate the quality of the care it provides to its community and to adopt concrete and effective measures for the improvement of its processes. This is especially

relevant in view of the need to remedy the systematic exclusion of the feminine and the feminized in the university dialectic; an exclusion that persists despite the ostensibly humanistic and civic orientation that characterizes the discourse of higher education institutions. In this sense, it will be empirical data that allow the institution to confront itself and recognize the expressions of violence reproduced through its own structure. This has been demonstrated, for example, by the Constitutional Court in ruling T-235 of 2025, which documented the so-called ‘institutional pilgrimage’ to which persons reporting GBV at UdeA are subjected (Fuentes, 2019; Martínez, 2019; Programa Integral Contra Violencias de Género, 2010; Butler, 2006, 2009; Haraway, 2007; Izquierdo, 2007; Monticelli, 2012; Braidotti, 2013; Fernández et al., 2013; Buquet et al., 2013; Segato, 2016; Domínguez, 2016; Correa, 2020).

The intersectional perspective, for its part, allows for the interconnection of the different dimensions associated with discrimination, since, in general, the conceptual categories already addressed have been used by dominant social groups to legitimize difference as an excuse to sustain and fuel inequality at all social levels, favouring a narrative of superiority for the first group; it is therefore fundamental to understand how and in what ways this inequality strikes the lives of people, above all those who have been identified as belonging to oppressed groups, also in the contexts of teaching, learning and work, represented in universities (Crenshaw, 1993; Collins, 1998; Bourdieu, 2000; Menéndez, 2005; Foucault, 1990).

Regarding the precedents reviewed, it should be noted that 22 instruments at the national level and 45 at the international level from 17 countries were consulted: Colombia, Puerto Rico, Dominican Republic, Mexico, Peru, Cuba, Ecuador, Argentina, Costa Rica, United States, Spain, Ghana, India, Nigeria, South Africa and China. None of the reviewed precedents contained an integrating instrument for the different typologies of GBV and other forms of discrimination in an intersectional manner that also took into account the forms of institutional re-victimization at universities and a characterization for each case; although pioneering national examples were found that sought to understand the intersectionality of different forms of discrimination, including those based on gender, within universities (Fernández et al., 2013; Fuentes, 2019; RENUAGES, 2024).

In the transnational sphere, there is the precedent of a study that addressed polyvictimization — understood as exposure to multiple forms of violence in different contexts, including family, partner, community and educational settings— with a sample of 2,393 adolescents aged between 15 and 19 from

the United States, India, Nigeria, South Africa and China. The study focused its analysis on the intersection between this polyvictimization and mental health (Kamndaya et al., 2017).

In the international sphere there are various instruments to measure individually issues such as transphobia, psychological violence, attitudes towards GBV, discrimination associated with HIV/AIDS, or dating violence in university populations; there are also others that analyse sexual education and myths associated with romantic love, as well as those that evaluate victimization, re-victimization and sexual violence in social and educational contexts in countries such as Puerto Rico, Dominican Republic, Cuba, Mexico, Peru, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Argentina, United States and Spain (Caleb et al., 2020; Soto et al., 2018; Velázquez and Figueroa, 2017; Zamudio et al., 2017; Lozano, 2018; Gallegos et al., 2020; Ramos-Rodríguez and Aranda-Beltrán, 2020; Aldrete et al., 2006; Barragán-Pérez and Fouilloux-Morales, 2021; Velásquez et al., 2020; Juarez and Bardales, 2021; Benavides et al., 2017; Castillo and Choque, 2018; Quintana et al., 2020; Begazo and Naldy, 2016; Huerta et al., 2021; Velásquez et al., 2014; Torres, 2017; Llerena et al., 2019; Palacios-Verdugo and Valverde, 2020; Aizenberg et al., 2019; Morón, 2018; Preinfalk-Fernández, 2015; González-Galbán et al., 2013; Hill et al., 2011; Valenstein et al., 2015; Suriá et al., 2014; Díaz et al., 2017; Martínez et al., 2018; Delgado and Mergenthaler, 2011; Rodríguez-Borrego et al., 2012; Mohamed et al., 2014; Acosta, 2017; Navarro-Guzmán et al., 2016; Martín and Villa, 2019; García-Cueto et al., 2015; Marchal et al., 2018; Cepeda-González, 2018; Rominski et al., 2017).

At the national level, there are exercises such as the National Demographic and Health Survey, which incorporates GBV typologies; also, the Gender Equity Index of the CIDEEM Foundation and the survey entitled “How sexist are you?” from the National School for Unlearning Machismo (ENDEMA). There are also documents that specifically address either workplace harassment, sexist beliefs, homophobia, dating violence or institutional re-victimization (Dávila and Dávila, 2018; Saldarriaga et al., 2021; Zambrano and Escalante, 2013; Rincón, 2020; Aranzales et al., 2014; Martínez et al., 2016; Ramos-Aldana et al., 2018; Mantilla-Ojeda, 2014; Orduz, 2015; Mantilla-Ojeda and Avendaño-Prieto, 2020).

In the Colombian university context, universities such as Antioquia have been implementing instruments to diagnose different forms of gender discrimination; from the Universidad Central, the FEGES project (Strengthening Capacities Related to Gender Equity in Higher Education in Colombia) was coordinated, bringing together different universities. In this framework, the Universidad Nacional addressed sexual violence; the Universidad de San Buenaventura addressed sexual harassment; the

Universidad del Valle focused its diagnosis on gender relations, adapting questions from the UNAM (National Autonomous University of Mexico) questionnaire. Also, at the Universidad Pedagógica Nacional, a questionnaire on experiences of misogyny, sexism, racism, ableism/capacitism and prejudice within the institution was developed, but no associated results are known (Fernández et al., 2013; Fuentes, 2019; Carvajal et al., 2018)⁶.

Consequently, after the conceptual and background review, the need for a new instrument was reaffirmed, one that could:

- Address intersectionally different types of discrimination, including those based on sex and gender, class, racialization, national and ethnic origin and disability/capacitist status. Above all, broadening the scope to other forms of sexual violence, beyond sexual harassment, which had until that point been the focus of inquiry.
- Expand the populations of application, moving from the student body towards faculty and administrative staff.
- Integrate the component of institutional re-victimization in order to understand the university's response in addressing these cases.
- Integrate a component of effects experienced as a consequence of the discrimination suffered.
- Provide better characterization with regard to the sex and type of affiliation of persons who perpetrated the discriminations, the locations of occurrence, how many times and when the stated discriminations had been experienced.

Method

The entire PAI EG project was conducted with a mixed approach, based on the feminist and reflexive participatory action research methodology –FPRAR–. In particular, this segment of its first objective was quantitative and instrumental in nature, with a descriptive, cross-sectional and two-dimensional scope (Supo, 2013; Hernández et al., 2014; Fuentes, 2019).

Thus, to answer the question of what evidence of validity and reliability can support the

⁶ To review each of the instruments in detail, see the final research report at the link: <https://acortar.link/67OX9o>

construction of an intersectional instrument for measuring discrimination and GBV for UdeA, the following process was followed: first, for design and construction, Supo's (2013) 10 steps were used, along with a process of operationalization of the variables selected as typologies of discrimination and GBV (Hernández et al., 2014). The two-dimensional intention of the instrument was also taken into account, so that the university population could better identify the forms of manifestation of each type of discrimination and accurately indicate the details of their experience in each item given as a response option (Fuentes, 2019).

Regarding sampling, a convenience sample was chosen among the active constituencies of the institution (student, faculty and administrative), both for validation and for the final application. On the other hand, graduates and retired persons were excluded from the sample as non-active constituencies of the institutional mission.

As regards the instrument's application procedure, a self-completion scenario was established, through a survey hosted on the university welfare microsite by the university's IT team, for which access using institutional credentials was required; there was a time limit of 30 minutes, with no option to save progress or complete the survey at a later time.

As dissemination measures, before, during and after the application, and despite the self-completion procedure of the instrument, 5 stages were carried out in which an expectation campaign was launched on social media in the context of 8 March; material was then disseminated through various institutional channels, both digital and physical. The survey was shared with university decision-makers such as secretariats, vice-rectorates, faculty directorates and administrative offices, as well as trade union organizations and the communications offices of each academic unit. Collective applications were also conducted in coordination with faculty during some in-person classes and, finally, results were disseminated in person at feminist “juntanzas” (gatherings) of coordination with different constituencies within the framework of the third objective of the PAI EG and on the project's microsite.

As an ethical measure, a protocol was developed for use during the different phases of creation, dissemination and application of the instrument, aimed at: strengthening the Critical Care Route for GBV at UdeA; constructing a digital course to train its professionals in avoiding institutional re-victimization. Furthermore, it was clarified that this was a diagnostic instrument and not a complaint mechanism, so potential victims or perpetrators were not directly identified. A direct communication channel with the

project was also opened for potential complaints, grievances, suggestions and compliments (PQRSF), and the response was coordinated with the university welfare coordinators of each faculty, in the event of potential crisis situations.

The instrument’s validation was carried out through content validity procedures, for which the assessment of national and international academic peers and expert judges was obtained; they evaluated the relevance, coherence and appropriateness of the domains and items that comprise it. The peers were 6 members of the project components, while at the national and international level, 9 expert thematic judges from the following universities participated: UNIMINUTO, Politécnico Jaime Isaza Cadavid, Universidad Nacional, Universidad de los Andes, Colegio de la Frontera Norte de México, San Francisco de Ecuador and Universidad de Coímbra in Portugal.

As regards construct, the internal consistency and reliability of the instrument were analysed through the application of Lawshe’s Content Validity Ratio –CVR– (1975). With responses received in a test version from 31 members of the student, faculty and administrative constituencies of UdeA, who rated each item as essential, useful or unnecessary. Cronbach’s alpha was also used for each component and, finally, a confirmatory factor analysis was conducted in the SPSS software.

Results

The first result was the structuring of the “#YoCuento” survey on discriminations with an emphasis on GBV for UdeA. In its final version it comprised 6 domains or components based on 42 items directly related to the themes, which could be completed in an average time of 10 to 15 minutes and, in exceptional cases, 20 minutes.

Initially, informed consent was presented to the community and, if accepted, the survey could proceed; if not, it could not. Then, from the second domain onward, a general yes-or-no closed-response question was presented to determine whether the type of violence described had been experienced and, if the response was affirmative, a second phase was presented in which the manifestations of that type of violence could be indicated, from a variety of multiple-choice response options, which was very useful in facilitating quick completion. If none of the listed options applied, a blank field was provided for a narrative written entry. The following shows how the instrument’s components were structured (Table 1):

Table 1. Structure of the “#YoCuento” survey on discriminations with an emphasis on GBV for UdeA.

Domain and/or component	Manifestations / response options
Identification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ethnic background: Indigenous, Gypsy/Rom, Raizal, Palenquero, Afro-descendant, None. • Disability: None, Visual disability, Hearing disability, Physical disability, Multiple disability, Short stature – dwarfism, Deaf-blindness disability, Intellectual disability, Psychosocial – mental disability. • Sex on identity document: Female, Male, Intersex, Transgender. • Gender identity: Man, Woman, Transgender, Non-binary, None. • Sexual orientation: Heterosexual, Lesbian, Homosexual, Bisexual.
Psychological violence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have you experienced any form of psychological violence?, such as verbal expressions, threats, control actions, manipulation strategies, cyberbullying and epistemic violence. Yes/No. • Indicate the verbal expressions you have experienced: Insults and/or offensive shouting. Public criticism and/or humiliation. Mockery and/or offensive nicknames. Constant interruptions when you speak. You have been addressed with a pronoun different from your gender identity, maliciously. None. • Indicate the threats you have experienced: Distribution of intimate audiovisual material. Exercising physical and/or sexual violence. Harming and/or separating you from your loved ones. Ending the romantic relationship or replacing you with someone else. Threatening self-harm and/or suicide if the relationship ends. Disclosure of

confidential information about your health, such as serological status or other. None.

- Indicate the control actions you have experienced: the expression of your personality such as your manner of speaking, manner of dress, make-up, hairstyle, personal tastes, etc. Physical appearance such as body weight, hair length, etc. Time spent with family and friends. Surveillance through electronic devices and/or social media. Accusation of infidelity. Restriction from seeking medical, psychological and/or legal care. None.

- Indicate the manipulation strategies you have experienced: lies, deception or concealment of relevant information. You have been ignored or the other person has absented themselves for a prolonged and intentional period to make you suffer. They have behaved ambiguously to make you feel confused or guilty. Your words and/or actions have been distorted. None.

- Indicate the forms of cyberbullying you have experienced: calls or messages containing insults or threats. Electronic sabotage through account theft, sending of viruses, email flooding and/or projection of offensive images. Unauthorized use of photos, photomontages and/or videos posted on social media, websites or similar platforms that rate your appearance. Receipt of sexual photographs without consent. Spreading false rumours via the internet. None.

- Indicate the forms of epistemic violence you have experienced or witnessed: your experience as a member of a specific population group (indigenous, Afro-descendant, persons with disabilities, migrants) has been trivialized or ignored in the construction of training, research and institutional care processes. 'Pedagogical' examples that reproduce gender, racial, ableist, xenophobic and/or classist stereotypes have been

	<p>used in academic or work environments. Greater value has been placed on knowledge created by economic elites than on that created by marginalized communities. Testimonies of victims of different forms of discrimination have been silenced or denied. You have been ignored, denied the floor, mocked in your discourse, discredited or your participation in university spaces has been ironized in a covert manner because you are a woman or part of the LGBTIQ+ population. Intellectual, cultural and/or artistic property has been misappropriated to take economic advantage of it. None.</p>
<p>Workplace violence and economic violence (Workplace only for faculty and administrative staff)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have you experienced any form of workplace violence?, such as forms of workplace harassment and economic violence. Yes/No. • Indicate the forms of workplace harassment you have experienced: comments, criticism and/or remarks that devalue your work. Threats of dismissal. Blaming you for crimes and unethical conduct without reason. Provocations to generate emotional outbursts. Abrupt changes in working conditions such as: workload, duties, hours and/or place of work. You have been ignored or isolated from the work environment. Deliberate workplace errors provoked. Denial of labour rights such as: permission for medical appointments, maternity/paternity leave or vacations. Biased evaluation of work to affect performance. Calls or messages at inconvenient hours. Receipt of a lower salary despite performing the same work and having the same qualifications as other persons. Opportunities for professional advancement are limited. None. • Indicate the forms of economic violence you have experienced: control of your income. You bear sole responsibility for economic, domestic and/or childcare duties for children or other family members. Retention of personal documents. Your belongings have been damaged. Extortion in exchange for 'protection' or to avoid harm to your property and/or

	loved ones. None.
Sexual violence and physical violence	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Have you experienced any form of sexual and physical violence?, such as gestures and expressions with sexual content, violations of personal space with sexual intent, sexual extortion, sexual abuse, violations of sexual and reproductive autonomy and sexual exploitation. Yes/No.• Indicate the gestures with sexual content you have experienced: shouts, whistles and/or catcalling (drawing attention through 'hissing'). Expressions such as: blowing kisses, lip-biting, tongue movements, winks, lascivious looks or 'undressing looks', 'visual scanning' or 'looking up and down'. Exhibition of genitals. Sexual hand gestures. Display of offensive sexual material such as posters, calendars, screensavers, etc. None.• Indicate the unwanted expressions with sexual content you have experienced: comments, jokes, offers, questions and/or compliments with sexual content. Spreading rumours about your sex life. Unwanted sexual propositions that 'exoticize' your identity. Group intimidation to generate sexual discomfort. Negative or degrading comments about your sexual orientation. None.• Indicate the violations of personal space with sexual intent you have experienced: cornering, trapping and/or blocking passage to generate sexualized physical contact. Sexualized hugging. Touching such as brushing against face, arms, hands, legs; uninvited arrangement of hair and/or unsolicited massages, etc. Stimulation of erogenous zones through unwanted and unsolicited kissing, biting, sucking, etc. Lifting of clothing. You have been spied on while in the bathroom. None.• Indicate the forms of sexual extortion you have experienced: deceptive invitations under the pretence of carrying out academic and/or work

tasks as a way to seek intimate situations. Pressure to perform sexual acts to avoid sanctions/dismissal. Proposal of sexual acts in exchange for benefits such as: promotions, scholarships, contracts, course approval and/or permits. Threat to reveal your sexual orientation as a pressure mechanism to perform sexual acts. None.

- Indicate the forms of sexual assault and/or abuse you have experienced: stimulation or touching of genitals without authorization. Non-consensual penetrations. Non-consensual penetrations with objects. Pressure to view pornographic material. Attempted rape. None.

- Indicate the forms of violation of sexual and reproductive autonomy you have experienced: refusal to use a condom or removal without notice. You have been forced to become pregnant or to continue a pregnancy. You have been forced to have an abortion. You have been denied the use of contraceptive methods such as: pills, implants and/or voluntary sterilization procedures. You have been pressured to change your sexual orientation and/or gender identity. None.

- Indicate the forms of sexual exploitation you have experienced: pressure to perform sexual acts for the production of pornographic material. Deceptive job, educational or romantic offers involving national or international travel to force you to perform sexual activities. Undue pressure taking advantage of a state of vulnerability to propose the commercialization of your sexuality through various means. None.

- Indicate the forms of physical violence you have experienced: pushing, shaking and/or hitting. Impediments to free movement. Strangulation. Injuries produced by blunt objects, edged and/or piercing weapons and/or firearms. Injuries caused by acid or other corrosive substances. None.

Re-victimization	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Have you experienced any form of re-victimization?, such as the repetition of violent acts and inadequate forms of care that generate new situations of violence after informing the institution of the acts of violence. Yes/No.• Have you filed a complaint and/or report about what happened? Yes/No.• Indicate the instances informed about the acts of violence: professors. Ruta Violeta. Violet guidance helpline. Security line for persons and property. Professors' Association. University Welfare personnel such as: psycho-counsellors or welfare coordinators. Human Resources Division. Trade unions. Disciplinary Affairs Units. Administrative units of the University such as: Deanships, department heads and/or directorates. External bodies such as: Police, Prosecutor's Office, Magistrates' Courts, etc.• Indicate the means used to file the complaint and/or report: social media. Email. Phone lines. Verbal report. Written report. Public denunciation activities (such as 'escraches').• Indicate the forms of re-victimization experienced: repetition of the violent acts. Discrediting of the veracity of the facts by the community. Absence of institutional regulations to address these cases. Inadequate infrastructure in the care space. Unfriendly treatment. Discouragement from filing a complaint and/or report. Denial of care citing lack of competence. Redirections to other bodies without positive results. Lack of case follow-up. Request not to tell others what happened. Request to resolve the matter directly with the aggressor. Personal information shared publicly without consent. Failure to respect your autonomy to make decisions. The waiting time for care was very long. Information about the process was: non-existent, incomplete, unclear and/or sent
------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>through informal channels. You were asked to recount what happened on repeated occasions. You were judged, blamed for the events, criticized, what happened was minimized and/or your experience was ridiculed. A counter-complaint was filed in your name. A disciplinary proceeding has been opened in your name for filing and/or supporting a complaint and/or report of discrimination or GBV. Your contractual conditions have been changed for defending victims of discrimination and/or GBV. Negative evaluations were carried out to affect your continuity at the University. Access to student academic guarantees was made difficult for supporting victims or activist processes related to discrimination and/or GBV. You were denied the possibility of continuing in the position you held. You have received discriminatory treatment due to your disability status, ethnic origin, religious creed, place of origin, political activism, sex, gender identity or sexual orientation. You have not been included in a reparation process.</p>
Effects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After the violent events, did you require health care (physical and/or mental)? Yes/No. • Did you receive medical disability leave? Yes/No. • How many days of disability leave did you receive?: from 1 to 20 days. From 20 to 40 days. From 40 to 60 days. From 60 to 80 days. From 80 to 100 days. From 100 to 120 days. From 120 to 140 days. More than 140 days. • Indicate the physical effects experienced: personal injuries such as: bruises, fractures, sprains, burns, cuts, stab wounds, contusions, loss of organs and/or function, etc. Pregnancy. Abortion. Attempted murder. None. • Indicate the emotional effects experienced: decreased self-esteem

because your concept of yourself changed, your insecurity increased and/or you lost trust in yourself. Loss of trust in other people. Feelings of guilt and/or shame. Feelings of anger. Feelings of helplessness and/or fear. Feelings of sadness. Aggressiveness. Stress. Sweating, sensation of suffocation or palpitations when passing through the location of the events or when recalling them. Constant state of alertness. Mixed feelings towards the person(s) who perpetrated the violence. Loss of enjoyment of things you used to like. Difficulty expressing emotions or recognizing feelings. None.

- Indicate the cognitive effects experienced: sleep problems. Concentration and/or memory problems. Difficulties making decisions and/or thinking about the future. Thoughts of ending your life. None.

- Indicate the behavioural effects experienced: isolation from support networks such as family and/or friends. Beginning or increased use of psychoactive substances. You stopped frequenting certain spaces or political or cultural initiatives. Difficulties in distancing yourself from the aggressor. Changes in eating habits: you increased or reduced your food intake. Abandonment of the Ruta Violeta care process. Change of place of residence. Attempts to end your life. None.

- Indicate the economic effects experienced: dismissal from work or denial of contract renewal. Resignation or absence from work. Payment of additional tuition fees. Unexpected expenses as a consequence of the violence such as: legal representation, medical, psychological and/or medication costs. None.

- Indicate the academic effects experienced: cancellation of a course and/or semester or class absenteeism. Failure of a course. Prolonged academic stays. Consideration of changing career or university. A disciplinary proceeding has been opened against you. Transfer of

	<p>internship location. None.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicate the political effects experienced: persecution and/or stigmatization. Counter-suits. Transfer of place of work. Dismissals. Death threats. Attempted murder. None.
<p>Characterization (repeated in each domain)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicate the university constituencies to which you belonged when you experienced the (...): student. Faculty. Administrative. • Indicate the sex of the persons who perpetrated the (...): male, female. • Indicate who the perpetrators of the (...) were: faculty members. Students. Senior management. Administrative staff. Security personnel. Cleaning staff. Medical care personnel. Psychological care personnel. Legal care personnel. Persons external to the university. Political activists. Hooded and/or clandestine groups. Guerrilla groups. Paramilitary groups. Unknown/I don't know. • Indicate the number of perpetrators of the (...): 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. More than 10. • Indicate the number of times the forms of (...) have occurred: 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. More than 10. • Indicate when the forms of psychological violence occurred: this week. This month. In the past year. Between 2 and 5 years ago. Between 5 and 15 years ago. • Indicate where the forms of psychological violence occurred: classroom. Laboratories. Offices. Bathrooms. Sports and recreational spaces. Green areas. Hallways. University surroundings. Theatres. Field trips. University parties. Friends' homes. Home of the person(s) perpetrating the violence. My home. Internship location. Virtual

	<p>settings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Indicate the reasons you have identified as motivating the psychological violence experienced: sex. Gender identity. Sexual orientation. Manner of dressing. Body weight. Age. Height. Physiognomy (such as the shape of the face, eyes, nose, etc.). Skin colour. Hair type. Accent or the way you express yourself. Language. Traditions. Manner of eating. Place of origin. Religious faith you profess. Place of residence. Socioeconomic stratum. Work performed. Level of academic training. Political activity. Tattoos and/or body modifications you have. Migration status. Stereotypes about your nationality. Disability status. None.
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Note. Source: own elaboration.

The second result was content validity through the application of Lawshe’s Content Validity Ratio –CVR– (1975), in which 31 persons from the student, faculty and administrative constituencies of UdeA participated as a pilot sample; according to this sample a minimum approval threshold of 0.37 was required and an approval rate of 0.65 was found —almost double for the sample used.

Second, Cronbach’s alpha was estimated in SPSS software for each domain in order to test the reliability and internal consistency of the instrument; in this case a value >0.7 is acceptable, >0.8 is good and >0.9 is excellent. The results were as follows: identification component: 0.973. Psychological violence component: 0.989. Workplace violence component: 0.984. Economic and property violence component: 0.957. Sexual and physical violence component: 0.987–0.968; Re-victimization component: 0.995 and Effects component: 0.996.

Third, a confirmatory factor analysis was conducted, which yielded a value of 0.762. This result indicates that the variables included in the measurement instrument explain 76.2% of the variance of the studied phenomenon. The remaining percentage (23.8%) could be attributed to factors not captured by the predefined categories, which could be identified through the open-ended responses that participants provide in the field corresponding to the “Other” option.

Discussion-Analysis

In relation to the two results previously presented, it should be noted that, with regard to the final structuring of an instrument to characterize the most frequent forms of discrimination and GBV in the “#YoCuento” survey of UdeA, a comprehensive measurement tool has been developed that articulates the different dimensions of discrimination into a single structure. This instrument also incorporates aspects related to re-victimization, the effects derived from these forms of violence and their characterization from an intersectional perspective. In this sense, the deployed tool constitutes a benchmark with potential for national and international projection, capable of being replicated, adapted and refined in other university measurement exercises and, equally, of being adapted for broader institutional or social contexts.

Another success in the final structuring of the survey was the use of the two-dimensional methodology recommended by Fuentes (2019), which helped its participants to identify their experience with greater precision, given the normalization and naturalization that extends over discriminations in general and, in particular, over GBV. Likewise, the instrument proved to be of particular use in remedying a recurring limitation in the consulted precedents, with regard to the treatment of open-ended questions. Indeed, a large part of the reviewed instruments do not provide guiding resources for this type of dual-purpose exercise—the collection of data and pedagogical formation—but rather presuppose a level of prior knowledge that has not necessarily been internalized by those who participate in them.

23

On the other hand, in structural terms of the survey, it follows that for future exercises the arrangement of domains and the individualized characterization conducted for each of them can be improved. This is aimed at streamlining the completion time of the survey, since—although adequate response times were achieved, even given the high volume of information presented—favoured by the possibility of selecting multiple options through a reduced number of interactions—the university community reported the need for the characterization to be conducted in a single domain, rather than being replicated for each of the existing ones, given the tedious nature that such a structure could represent. Although this simplification entails the risk of losing specificity in the data associated with each form of discrimination, the results analysis showed that the variation was not statistically significant, either between constituencies or between the different components of the instrument.

Likewise, the initial closed-response yes-or-no question in each domain could be dispensed with

in order to optimize time; a substantial improvement would consist in formulating direct questions for each form of manifestation of the discriminations addressed in the instrument. Similarly, it would be advisable to reduce the number of response options available in each domain through a new exercise of operationalization of the existing categories, with the aim of achieving greater quantitative homogeneity in their distribution.

In the opposite direction, in future applications of the survey it would be possible to include more constituencies of the university, such as the retired and graduate populations; this, of course, could pose a technical challenge for its effective implementation, particularly with populations that do not have institutional credentials to be able to access these instruments. Another option could be to find new means of access to the survey that facilitate completion for these types of university populations, as well as improving the time available for completion and enabling progress to be saved on whatever platform is provided for this purpose.

In this same vein, the samples used could be improved so that they can have a statistically representative impact in relation to the population universe of the constituencies to which the survey was directed at UdeA. On this occasion, budgetary constraints made this impossible, but in future exercises this could be improved if financial support is available that enables a university gender policy in this regard and, furthermore, facilitates dissemination and other strategies for completion, beyond self-application.

With regard to the second finding of the present study, referring to the validation of the instrument, it should be noted that the tripartite process carried out—which integrated the judgment of national and international academic peers and expert judges, the application of Lawshe’s Content Validity Index (1975), the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient and the confirmatory factor analysis—provided the statistical and conceptual foundations necessary to recognize that the instrument is adequately structured, and that each domain is relevant and coherent with the themes it set out to address, given the inherent complexity of the forms of discrimination examined.

Statistical validation methods could also be improved with sufficient financial resources to reach a greater number of samples, both to increase the number of participants and the types and number of applications that may be necessary. On this occasion, it was possible to validate this instrument thanks to the budget available for the project; this constitutes a distinguishing aspect with respect to the majority of

the reviewed precedents, in which none of these validation procedures were used or only one of them was employed, frequently due to budgetary constraints. In the exceptional cases in which previously validated instruments were used, the already noted limitation of being centred on a single one of the variables considered persisted, which did not correspond to the approach or objectives of the present study.

Finally, it is worth noting that, although the coefficient values indicate excellence in their results, it would be necessary to review the structure of the survey in its entirety in order to reduce the possible redundancies among items, evidenced by coefficients above 0.95.

Conclusions

First, it is worth highlighting that it was possible to develop the “#YoCuento” survey on discriminations with an emphasis on GBV as an instrument capable of intersectionally articulating the diversity of categories that were intended to be characterized in the university population. This was made possible through the understanding that the typologies describing the harms associated with GBV — psychological, economic and property-related, physical, sexual and re-victimizing— can equally manifest in the other forms of discrimination addressed —racist, classist, xenophobic and ableist/capacitist—, varying only in the context and content that confer upon each experience its discriminatory character, which may adopt one or multiple forms simultaneously in the particular lived experience of each person. Consequently, the instrument inquired generally about these typologies in each domain, so that in the characterization phase the reasons identified as motivating the manifestations indicated in each response option could be confirmed —which also requires a systematic analysis subsequent to its application.

25

Second, the “#YoCuento” survey was satisfactorily validated through a three-point procedure: the judgment of national and international academic peers and expert judges; the application of Lawshe’s Content Validity Ratio –CVR– (1975); and the application of Cronbach’s alpha. Furthermore, the confirmatory factor analysis with the data derived from the pilot application conducted with 31 members of the community, which also supported the fulfilment of the first objective of the PAI EG: that of creating and validating an instrument to characterize the most frequent forms of these discriminations in the university population during 2023.

Third, it is necessary to highlight that the developed survey can substantially broaden the approach to GBV by integrating an intersectional perspective that encompasses discriminations based not only on

sex and gender, but also on social class, racialization, national or ethnic origin and disability. Likewise, an attempt was made to overcome a restrictive focus centred exclusively on sexual harassment, incorporating other forms of sexual violence and expanding the application population to include faculty and administrative constituencies.

Furthermore, as innovations, the sections on institutional re-victimization, the effects experienced and the detailed characterization of perpetrators, locations of occurrence, frequency and timing of the discriminations were included —with the expectation of strengthening the comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon in the university context. This is relevant as a novel result at the practical level, as it is currently the only survey in the world that integrates all the aforementioned elements into a single one.

Finally, the request for the creation of this type of tool by RENUEGES, gathered at the second “Gender Studies Colloquium” at the Universidad del Valle, held in the city of Cali in 2019, was fulfilled. It is hoped that with this publication the purpose of its free and open use may be fulfilled for those institutions that wish to review it and replicate similar exercises, as was explicitly stated in the PAI EG project.

This is done with the aim of continuing to contribute to the advancement of the study and action around discriminations embedded in higher education institutions, especially for the broadening of its application to different constituencies such as the student, faculty and administrative bodies, thereby contributing to the strengthening of the detection axis in the implementation of protocols and institutional policies that address this problem in Colombia and the world.

References

- Acosta, Jeronimo. (2017). *La violencia en las relaciones de pareja entre adolescentes de la Bahía de Cádiz. Validación de un modelo explicativo desde la perspectiva ecológica*. [Tesis de doctorado]. Universidad de Cádiz.
- Aizenberg, Lila. Saletti-Cuesta, Lorena. y Torres, Eduardo. (2019). Desarrollo de una Escala para Evaluar Opiniones sobre la Violencia de Género en las Escuelas. *Revista Argentina de Ciencias del Comportamiento*, 11(3). <https://doi.org/10.32348/1852.4206.v11.n3.24278>
- Aldrete, María. Pando, Manuel. Aranda, Carolina. y Torres, Teresa. (2006). Acoso psicológico en el

trabajo: ¿un problema de género? *Enseñanza e Investigación en Psicología*, 11(1), 53-63.

Aranzales, Yuvitza. Castaño, José. Figueroa, Reinaldo. Jaramillo, Sebastián. Landazuri, Johan. Muriel, Vanessa. Rodríguez, Alejandra. y Valencia, Katerine. (2014). Frecuencia de acoso y ciber-acoso, y sus formas de presentación en estudiantes de secundaria de colegios públicos de la ciudad de Manizales. *Archivos de Medicina*, 14(1), 65-82. <https://doi.org/10.30554/archmed.14.1.237.2014>

Arnau, María. (2019). *Estudios críticos de y desde la diversidad funcional* [Tesis doctoral, Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia]. <https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14468/18019>

Barragán-Pérez, Virginia. y Fouilloux-Morales, Claudia. (2021). Generaciones centennial y milenial: actitudes hacia la sexualidad. *Revista Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales, Niñez y Juventud*, 19(3). <https://doi.org/10.11600/rlcsnj.19.3.4609>

Begazo, Jacobo. y Naldy, Antonieta. (2016). Investigación sobre la Violencia Durante el Noviazgo en las Alumnas de la Escuela Profesional de Psicología. Repositorio Universidad Nacional San Agustín. <http://repositorio.unsa.edu.pe/handle/UNSA/2481>

Benavides, Consuelo. Bartolos, Laura. y Medina, Diana. (2017). Escala para la evaluación de las Actitudes Machistas. *Apuntes Científicos Estudiantiles de Psicología*, 1(1).

Bourdieu, Pierre. (2000). *La dominación masculina*. Editorial Anagrama.

Braidotti, Rosi. (2013). *The Posthuman*. Polity Press.

Buquet, Ana. Cooper, Jennifer. Mingo, Araceli. y Moreno, Hortencia. (2013) *Intrusas en la universidad*. Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.

Butler, Judith. (2007). *El Género en disputa: el feminismo y la subversión de la identidad*. Paidós.

Butler, Judith. (2009). Performatividad, precariedad y políticas sexuales. *Revista de Antropología Iberoamericana*, 4(3), 321 - 336. <https://doi.org/10.11156/aibr.040303>

Caleb, Esteban. González-Rivera, Juan. Francia, Margarita. y Lespier, Zahira. (2020). Desarrollo y validación de la Escala de Distancia Social hacia Personas Trans. *Revista Evaluar*, 20(1). <https://doi.org/10.35670/1667-4545.v20.n1.28477>

- Carvajal, Zaira. Ulate, Carmen. y Delvó, Patricia. (2018). *Prevalencia, manifestaciones y efectos del hostigamiento sexual. Análisis comparado de países: Perú, Costa Rica y Colombia*. Universidad Nacional de Costa Rica.
- Castillo, Roxana. y Choque, Sandra. (2018). Percepción de violencia y sexismo en estudiantes universitarios. *Entorno*, (66), 51-61. <https://doi.org/10.5377/entorno.v0i66.6726>
- Cepeda-González, María. (2018). Assessing the impact of gender education on sexism: evidence from college students in Madrid. *Revista Internacional de Pensamiento Político*, 13(1), 221-233. <https://doi.org/10.46661/revintpensampolit.4094>
- Cerda, Urzula. (2004). *Razas, racismo, clases sociales y clasismo: Revisión teórica y desarrollo en Chile*. [Tesis de maestría, Universidad de Chile]. Repositorio académico de la Universidad de Chile. <https://repositorio.uchile.cl/handle/2250/112665>
- Collins, Patricia. (1998). La política del pensamiento feminista negro. En Marysa Navarro & Catharine Stimpson (Comps.), *¿Qué son los estudios de mujeres?* (pp. 253–312). Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Correa, Laura. (2020). *Revictimización y violencia de género en la Universidad de Antioquia* [Tesis de maestría no publicada]. Universidad de Bologna y Universidad de Oviedo].
- Cortina, Adela. (2017). *Aporofobia, el rechazo al pobre. Un desafío para la democracia*. Paidós.
- Crenshaw, Kimberlé. (1993). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory, and antiracist politics. En D. Kelley Weisberg (Ed.), *Feminist legal theory: Foundations* (pp. 17–29). Temple University Press.
- Dávila, Carlos. y Dávila, Jorge. (2018). Percepción del acoso laboral entre estudiantes universitarios: medición en tres universidades de la ciudad de Pereira - Colombia. *Revista Libre Empresa*, 15(2), 163-178.
- Delgado, Carmen. y Mergenthaler, Esperanza. (2011). Evaluación psicométrica de la percepción de la violencia de género en la adolescencia. *International Journal of Developmental and Educational Psychology*, 2(1).

- Díaz, Natalia. Fernández, Lidia. Fernández, Rosa. Rubio, Juan. y Santos, María. (2017). Conocimientos, opiniones y creencias de los profesionales de Atención Primaria en relación a la violencia de género. *RqR Enfermería Comunitaria*, 5(2) 35-39.
- Domínguez, María. (2016). Violencia de género y victimización secundaria. *Revista Digital de Medicina Psicosomática y Psicoterapia*, 6(1), 3-22.
- Fernández, Sara. Hernández, Gloria. y Paniagua, Ramón. (2013). *Violencia de género en la Universidad de Antioquia*. Colección Asoprudea. <https://repositorio.unal.edu.co/handle/unal/53231>
- Foucault, Michel. (1990). *Tecnologías del yo y otros textos afines*. Paidós.
- Fuentes, Lya. (2019). Cuentos que no son cuentos: Acoso sexual, violencia naturalizada en las aulas universitarias. *Nómadas*, 51, 135–153. <https://dx.doi.org/10.30578/nomadas.n51a8>
- Gallegos, Antonio. Sandoval, Amada. Espín, María. y García, Dulce. (2020). Autoestima y violencia psicológica contra mujeres universitarias en sus relaciones de pareja. *Enseñanza e Investigación en Psicología*, 2(1), 139-148. <https://doi.org/10.62364/sspdpe24>
- García-Cueto, Eduardo. Rodríguez-Díaz, Francisco. Bringas-Molleda, Carolina. López-Cepero, Javier. Paíno-Quesada, Susana. y Rodríguez-Franco, Luis. (2015). Development of the Gender Role Attitudes Scale (GRAS) amongst young Spanish people. *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology*, 15(2), 61-68. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijchp.2014.10.004>
- González-Galbán, Humberto. Iglesias-Linares, Mildred. Mena-Martínez, Mercedes. y Bojórquez-Chapela, Ietza. (2013). Diseño y aplicación en Cuba de un constructo para identificar dimensiones sociales de la discriminación por VIH/sida. *Salud Pública de México*, 55(4), 399-407. <https://doi.org/10.21149/spm.v55i4.7224>
- Güereca, Raquel. (2017). Violencia epistémica e individualización: tensiones y nudos para la igualdad de género en las IES. *Reencuentro. Análisis de Problemas Universitarios*, 29(74), 11-32.
- Haraway, Donna. (2007). *When Species Meet*. University of Minnesota press.
- Harding, Sandra. (2016). *Ciencia y feminismo* (Pablo Manzano, Trad.). Morata. (Trabajo original publicado en 1993).

- Hernández, Roberto. Fernández, Carlos. y Baptista, María. (2014). *Metodología de la investigación* (6a ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
- Hill, Justin. Vernig, Peter. Lee, Jonathan. Brown, Cynthia. y Orsillo, Susan. (2011). The development of a brief acceptance and mindfulness-based program aimed at reducing sexual revictimization among college women with a history of childhood sexual abuse. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 67(9), 969–980. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jclp.20813>
- Huerta, Rosa. Santibáñez, Renato. Ramírez, Natalia. Vega, José. Quispe, Juan. Terrel, Samira. Gamboa, Sandra. Escudero, Juan. Chumbes, Giovanni. Gonzales, Ana. Merino, Sofía. Potenciano, Judith. y Ortiz, Adriana. (2021). Actitudes hacia el machismo y regulación emocional en estudiantes universitarios de Lima Metropolitana. *Revista de Investigación en Psicología*, 24(1), 39-54. <https://dx.doi.org/10.15381/rinvp.v24i1.20099>
- Izquierdo, María. (5 de noviembre de 2007). *Lo que cuesta ser hombre: costes y beneficios de la masculinidad*. [Ponencia]. Congreso SARE “Masculinidad y vida cotidiana”, Vitoria-Gasteiz, España.
- Juarez, Juan. y Bardales, Efraín. (2021). El desarrollo moral y la violencia de género en estudiantes de una universidad pública. *Ciencia Latina Revista Científica Multidisciplinar*, 5(4), 4860-4878. https://doi.org/10.37811/cl_rcm.v5i4.663
- Kamndaya, Mphatso. Pisa, Pedro. Chersich, Mathew. Decker, Michele. Olumide, Adesola. Acharya, Rajib. Cheng, Yan. Brahmabhatt, Heena. y Delany-Moretlwe, Sinead. (2017). Intersections between polyvictimisation and mental health among adolescents in five urban disadvantaged settings: the role of gender. *BMC Public Health* 17(Suppl 3), 41-50. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-017-4348-y>
- Lagarde, Marcela. (2000). Universidad y democracia genérica: Claves de género para una gran alternativa. En Daniel Cazéz, Eduardo Ibarra y Luis Porter (Coords.), *Encuentro de especialistas en educación superior: re-conociendo a la universidad, sus transformaciones y su por-venir* (Tomo I, pp. 145-160). Centro de Investigaciones Interdisciplinarias en Ciencias y Humanidades. Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.

- Lawshe, Charles. (1975). A quantitative approach to content validity. *Personnel Psychology*, 28(4), 563–575. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1975.tb01393.x>
- Llerena, Luis. Rodríguez, Luis. Freire, Diego. y Salas, Paulina. (2019). La percepción de los estudiantes de la UNIANDES sobre la violencia de género. *Dilemas contemporáneos: Educación, Política y Valores*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.46377/dilemas.v28i1.1700>
- López, Kristhel. y Timana, Gabriela. (2021). *Mobbing laboral en trabajadores de latinoamérica: una revisión sistemática*. [Tesis de pregrado, Universidad Cesar Vallejo]. <https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12692/70352>
- Lozano, María. (2018). El género de la violencia en las aulas universitarias, una realidad invisibilizada. *El Cotidiano*, 34(212), 87-96.
- Mantilla-Ojeda, Saida. y Avendaño-Prieto, Bertha. (2020). Diseño y análisis psicométrico de un instrumento para evaluar victimización judicial en víctimas durante la etapa de denuncia. *Revista Jurídicas*, 17(2), 106 - 125. <https://doi.org/10.17151/jurid.2020.17.2.6>
- Mantilla-Ojeda, Saida. (2014). *Construcción de la escala Samanto para medir actitudes revictimizantes de los operadores judiciales hacia la víctima*. [Tesis de maestría]. Universidad Santo Tomás.
- Marchal, Ana. Brando, Cecilia. Montes, Javier. y Tomás, Joaquín. (2018). Diseño y validación de un instrumento para medir actitudes machistas, violencia y estereotipos en adolescentes. *Metas de Enfermería*, 21(3), 11-8. <https://doi.org/10.35667/MetasEnf.2019.21.1003081206>
- Martín, Beatriz. y Villa, María. (2019). Relación entre dependencia emocional y maltrato psicológico en forma de victimización y agresión en jóvenes. *Revista iberoamericana de psicología y salud*, 10(2), 75-89. <https://doi.org/10.23923/j.rips.2019.02.027>
- Martínez, Ana. García, Silvia. y Velasco, Lilian. (2018). Análisis de situaciones y perfiles de riesgo respecto al sexismo y la violencia de género en los adolescentes españoles. *Electronic Journal of Research in Education Psychology*, 16(3), 703-715. <https://doi.org/10.25115/ejrep.v16i46.2242>
- Martínez, Jorge. Vargas, Rochy. y Novoa, Mónica. (2016). Relación entre la violencia en el noviazgo y observación de modelos parentales de maltrato. *Psychologia: Avances de la Disciplina*, 10(1),

101-112.

- Martínez, Consuelo. (2019). Las instituciones de educación superior y el mandato de masculinidad. *Nómadas* 51, 117-133 <https://doi.org/10.30578/nomadas.n51a7>
- Menéndez, Eduardo. (2005). El Modelo Médico y la Salud de los Trabajadores. *Salud Colectiva*, 1(1), 9 - 32. <https://doi.org/10.18294/sc.2005.1>
- Mohamed, Laila. Herrera, Lucía. y Carracedo, Sandra. (2014). Violencia de pareja en jóvenes estudiantes universitarios de diferente origen cultural. *DEDiCA. Revista de Educação e Humanidades*, (5), 223-236. <https://doi.org/10.30827/dreh.v0i5.7011>
- Monticelli, Rita. (2012). *The Politics of the Body in Women's Literature*. Odoya.
- Morón, Nazareth. (2018). Discriminación de Género en el Sistema Universitario Argentino. *Revista Estudos Feministas*, 26(2). <https://doi.org/10.1590/1806-9584-2018v26n251339>
- Navarro-Guzmán, Capilla. Ferrer-Pérez, Victoria. y Bosch-Fiol, Esperanza. (2016). El acoso sexual en el ámbito universitario: análisis de una escala de medida. *Universitas Psychologica*, 15(2), 371–382. <https://doi.org/10.11144/Javeriana.upsy.15-2.asau>
- Navarro, Laura. y Uribe, Juan. (2020). *Juntanza y digna rabia: sistematización de experiencias de las colectivas feministas en la PUJ* [Trabajo de grado de pregrado, Pontificia Universidad Javeriana]. Repositorio Institucional Pontificia Universidad Javeriana. <http://hdl.handle.net/10554/52726>
- Orduz, Frank. (2015). Victimización y violencia sexual en el conflicto armado en Colombia. *Subjetividad y Procesos Cognitivos*, 19(2), 173-186.
- Organización de las Naciones Unidas. (1965). *Convención Internacional sobre la Eliminación de todas las Formas de Discriminación Racial*. <https://www.ohchr.org/es/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/international-convention-elimination-all-forms-racial>
- Palacios-Verdugo, Mónica. y Valverde, Paula. (2020). Mitos del amor romántico y violencia de género en jóvenes estudiantes de la Universidad del Azuay. *Killkana Social*, 4(3), 27-34. <https://doi.org/10.26871/killkanasocial.v4i3.665>
- Programa Integral Contra Violencias de Género. (2010). *Estudio sobre tolerancia social e institucional a*

la Violencia Basada en Género en Colombia. Fondo de las Naciones Unidas y España para el cumplimiento de los objetivos de desarrollo del milenio.

- Quintana, Alberto. Grajeda, Alex. Malaver, Carmela. Medina, Nicolás. Montgomery, William. Ruiz, Gabriela. y Ojeda, Giancarlo. (2020). Estereotipos de género y violencia encubierta de pareja en hombres y mujeres de 18 a 24 años. *Revista de Investigación en Psicología*, 22(2), 181-196. <https://doi.org/10.15381/rinvp.v22i2.17420>
- Ramos-Aldana, Lina. Jiménez-Torres, Libia. y Thola-Ospitia, Yudy. (2018). Impacto jurídico de las violencias contra mujeres víctimas de violencia de pareja o expareja. *Colombia Forense*, 5(1), 19-33. <https://doi.org/10.16925/cf.v5i1.2302>
- Ramos-Rodríguez, Irma. y Aranda-Beltrán, Carolina. (2020). Violencia y acoso escolar: diferencias por sexo y edad en estudiantes universitarios mexicanos. *Ciencia Unemi*, 13(34), 84-93. <https://doi.org/10.29076/issn.2528-7737vol13iss34.2020pp84-93p>
- Red Nacional Universitaria por la Equidad de Género en la Educación Superior en Colombia. (2024). *Documento de análisis de resultados de la aplicación del instrumento de caracterización de las formas más frecuentes de discriminación y VBG terminado*. Universidad de Antioquia.
- Rincón, Maryi. (2020). Actitudes de homofobia en estudiantes de Psicología en Bogotá. *Horizontes Pedagógicos*, 22(1), 12-24. <https://doi.org/10.33881/0123-8264.hop.22102>
- Rodríguez, María. (2019). Fraternalidad y luchas feministas contra el acoso sexual en la Universidad Nacional de Colombia. *Nómadas*, 51, 49-65. <https://dx.doi.org/10.30578/nomadas.n51a3>
- Bastide, Roger. (1970). *El prójimo y el extraño. El encuentro de las civilizaciones*. Amorrortu Editores.
- Rominski, Sarah. Darteh, Eugene. y Munro-Kramer, Michelle. (2017). An intervention to reduce sexual violence on university campus in Ghana: a pilot test of Relationship Tidbits at the University of Cape Coast. *The Lancet Global Health*, 5. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X\(17\)30132-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(17)30132-8)
- Saldarriaga, Guillermina. Cárdenas, Patricia. González, Nadia. Velásquez, Fabio. Díaz, Olga. y Ruidiaz, Keydis. (2021). Creencias sexistas y actitudes de violencia de género. Situación de estudiantes universitarios del área de la salud. Cartagena - Colombia. *Enfermería Global*, 20(2), 35-64. <https://doi.org/10.6018/eglobal.427171>

- Segato, Rita. (2007). Racismo, discriminación y acciones afirmativas: herramientas conceptuales. En Juan Ansión, Fidel Tubino, Santiago Alfaro, María González, Luis Mujica, Rita Segato, Manuel Villasante, *Educación en ciudadanía intercultural*, (pp. 63-90). Fondo Editorial de la Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú. <https://doi.org/10.18800/9789972427893.003>
- Segato, Rita. (2016). *La guerra contra las mujeres*. Traficantes de Sueños.
- Soto, Carmen. (2013). DIVERSOS TIPOS DE MOBBING Y CONCEPTOS RELACIONADOS. *Boletín Del Ministerio De La Presidencia, Justicia Y Relaciones Con Las Cortes*, 67(2159). Recuperado a partir de <https://revistas.mjusticia.gob.es/index.php/BMJ/article/view/6337>
- Soto, Patricia. Noboa, Joan. y Moreno, Libia. (2018). Me transformo: efectos de los talleres psicoeducativos y clínicos en mujeres víctimas de abuso psicológico en República Dominicana. *Ciencia y Sociedad*, 43(1), 51-72. <https://doi.org/10.22206/cys.2018.v43i1.pp51-72>
- Supo, José. (2013). *Cómo validar un instrumento*. Biblioteca Nacional del Perú.
- Suriá, Raquel. Rosser, Ana. y Villegas, Esther. (2014). *Validación de un cuestionario sobre las nuevas tecnologías para transmitir la violencia de género*. XII Jornadas de Redes de Investigación en Docencia Universitaria.
- Torres, Cindy. (2017). *Violencia de género en estudiantes del Área de la Salud Humana de la Universidad Nacional de Loja, en el período académico Marzo – Julio de 2016* [Tesis de pregrado, Universidad Nacional de Loja]. <http://dspace.unl.edu.ec/handle/123456789/19531>
- Universidad del Valle. (17 de noviembre de 2025). *Centro de Investigaciones y Estudios de Género, Mujer y Sociedad*. <https://genero.univalle.edu.co/el-centro>
- Valenstein, Helen. Larimer, Mary. Zoellner, Lori. y Kaysen, Debra. (2015). Blackout Drinking Predicts Sexual Revictimization in a College Sample of Binge-Drinking Women. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, 28(5), 484–488. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jts.22042>
- Rodríguez-Borrego, María-Aurora. Vaquero-Abellán, Manuel. y Bertagnolli, Liana. (2012). Estudio transversal sobre factores de riesgo de sufrir violencia por compañero íntimo en la mujer enfermera. *Rev. Latino-Am. Enfermagem*, 20(1), 11-18.

- Velásquez, Carlos. Montgomery, William. Dioses, Alejandro. Pomalaya, Ricardo. y Chávez, José. (2014). Agresión entre pares y bienestar psicológico en estudiantes de una universidad pública de Lima Metropolitana. *Revista de Investigación en Psicología*, 17(2), 93–115. <https://doi.org/10.15381/rinvp.v17i2.11260>
- Velásquez, Carlos. Grajeda, Alex. Montgomery, William. Montero, Víctor. Pomalaya, Ricardo. Pampa, Kelly. Flores, Susy. Vallejos, José. Cabrera, Susana. Zamudio, David. (2020). Violencia de género y riesgo de feminicidio en alumnas de universidades públicas y privadas de Lima Metropolitana. *Revista de Investigación en Psicología*, 23(2), 5–26. <https://doi.org/10.15381/rinvp.v23i2.19228>
- Velázquez, David. y Figueroa, Milagros. (2017). *Homofobia en el aula: una mirada cuantitativa de las actitudes de jóvenes universitarios hacia la homosexualidad*. Congreso nacional de Investigación Educativa. Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.
- Zambrano, Gloria. y Escalante, Harrison. (2013). Grado de homofobia en estudiantes de enfermería de una universidad pública en Colombia. *Revista Ciencia y Cuidado*, 10(2), 115 - 126.
- Zamudio, Francisco. Andrade, Marco. Arana, Roxana. y Alvarado, Arturo (2017). Violencia de género sobre estudiantes universitarios(as). *Convergencia Revista De Ciencias Sociales*, (75), 133-157. <https://doi.org/10.29101/crcs.v0i75.3726>