



## OPEN ACCESS

## EDITED BY

Ana María Pinto-Llorente,  
University of Salamanca, Spain

## REVIEWED BY

Patricia Sánchez-Holgado,  
University of Salamanca, Spain  
Luis Guillermo Restrepo-Jaramillo,  
Catholic University of Manizales,  
Colombia  
Miguel Farias,  
University of Santiago, Chile

## \*CORRESPONDENCE

Jesús Marolla-Gajardo  
✉ [jesus.marolla@ubo.cl](mailto:jesus.marolla@ubo.cl)

RECEIVED 02 January 2026

REVISED 04 March 2026

ACCEPTED 18 March 2026

PUBLISHED 06 May 2026

## CITATION

Marolla-Gajardo J, Peinado-Rodríguez M and Lozano-Mas MY (2026) Otherness and gender as an educational horizon: hate speech and initial teacher education in Chile. *Front. Educ.* 11:1779731. doi: 10.3389/feduc.2026.1779731

## COPYRIGHT

© 2026 Marolla-Gajardo, Peinado-Rodríguez and Lozano-Mas. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License \(CC BY\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.

# Otherness and gender as an educational horizon: hate speech and initial teacher education in Chile

Jesús Marolla-Gajardo<sup>1\*</sup>, Matilde Peinado-Rodríguez<sup>2</sup> and María Yazmina Lozano-Mas<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Centro de Estudios Históricos y Humanidades, Facultad de Ciencias Humanas, Universidad Bernardo O'Higgins, Santiago de Chile, Chile, <sup>2</sup>Didáctica de las Ciencias Sociales, Universidad de Jaén, Jaén, Spain, <sup>3</sup>Departamento de Didácticas Específicas, Facultad de Ciencias de la Educación, Universidad de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, Las Palmas, Spain

This study analyzes the beliefs of university teacher educators in history and geography initial teacher education programmes in Chile regarding gender-based hate speech. Using a structured questionnaire administered to 200 lecturers working in teacher education, the research explores their perceptions, attitudes, and reported practices concerning hate speech and discrimination within training contexts. The findings revealed that although most teacher educators acknowledge the negative impact of hate speech discourse and a lack of specific training persist. A significant proportion of respondents reported not addressing these issues in their classes or not perceiving expressions of hate within their professional environments. Additionally, 72% indicated that hate speech affects their professional practice, while 83% identified emotional harm to victims. The study also highlights tensions between freedom of expression and the need to regulate hate speech. From a pedagogical standpoint, it proposes an educational approach centered on otherness, critical thinking, and social justice to prevent the reproduction of hate and promote inclusion. Finally, the study concludes that specific competencies to address these issues should be incorporated into teacher education programs.

## KEYWORDS

freedom of expression, gender, hate speech, mansosphere, mirage of equality, social justice, teacher education

## 1 Introduction

The Council of Europe defines hate speech as any advocacy, promotion, or incitement of hatred, humiliation, or contempt against individuals or groups based on characteristics such as race, ethnicity, religion, gender, or sexual orientation (United Nations, 2019a; United Nations, 2019b). This definition highlights how hate speech operates in a stereotyped manner through intersecting categories, disproportionately affecting historically excluded groups. Currently, its visibility and dissemination have increased significantly through the internet. In the Chilean context, the issue of hate speech has gained increasing institutional visibility, particularly in relation to gender equality and human rights education. The Ministerio de Educación (MINEDUC) has incorporated principles of inclusion, coexistence, and non-discrimination into national

curricular guidelines, while the Ministerio de la Mujer y la Equidad de Género has promoted policies aimed at preventing gender-based violence and discrimination in public institutions. Despite these regulatory frameworks, tensions persist between formal policy commitments and everyday educational practices. Examining teacher educators' beliefs within this national landscape allows for a more situated understanding of how hate speech is interpreted, minimized, or addressed within Chilean initial teacher education programmes.

Bustos Martínez et al. (2019) stress that, in international political contexts, certain areas actively promote expressions of hatred, including campaigns centered on narratives of foreign cultural "invasion" and the defense of Christian European culture against perceived Islamization. For example, Baldauf et al. (2019) identified three main pathways through which these messages are disseminated:

- a) The construction of in-group self-victimization narratives, based on the belief that the group is under attack by an external out-group, such as immigrants, terrorists, or social movements.
- b) The articulation of redemption scenarios that idealize the in-group as uniquely capable of resisting or combating external threats.
- c) Appeals to the desire for self-realization, fulfillment, and individual responsibility among group members, using heroic terminology that encourages participation through strategies grounded in hate.

Chilean teacher education has undergone significant reforms in recent decades, including accreditation processes, competency-based curricular redesign, and the strengthening of standards for pedagogical practice. However, the incorporation of gender perspectives and critical engagement with controversial social issues remains uneven across programmes. Analyzing teacher educators' beliefs within this policy environment contributes to understanding how national reform agendas intersect with everyday professional positioning.

## 2 Theoretical framework

With the effect of the internet, a perception has emerged in which the "real" and the "virtual" are experienced as interconnected. Castells (2006) refers to this dynamic as the "space of flows", understood as a sphere characterized by ambivalence between physical individuals and global networks that shape our experience of "reality". Garmendia Larrañaga et al. (2019) argue that the internet has enabled the production of a greater volume of content and has also facilitated access for other users. The groups, profiles, and individuals who disseminate hate speech are characterized by their heterogeneity and are not necessarily linked to radical or ideologically defined areas (Bazzaco et al., 2018).

The anonymity involved in the dissemination, production, and reproduction of hate speech on social networks facilitates its spread beyond physical boundaries, allowing individuals to avoid direct contact with others while establishing an immediate connection with social reality. Bustos Martínez et al. (2019) note

that anonymity is accompanied by a sense of distance and a sense of belonging to a group. The sense of distance refers to the perception that messages circulated on social media exist outside of "reality", while the sense of belonging relates to the apparent "protection" provided by membership in a collective that shares similar discourses. As a result, the reach of online hate speech far exceeds that of face-to-face behaviors, persisting across multiple digital spaces unless an explicit judicial order requires its removal (Garmendia Larrañaga et al., 2019).

Within the educational sphere, hate speech becomes evident in teacher educators' comments and pedagogical practices, which, through mechanisms of power and silencing characteristic of the so-called "law of ice" (Arroyo et al., 2018), ignore, exclude, and reproduce inequalities related to gender, class, and ethnicity/race in an intersectional manner (Viveros Vigoya, 2022). Studies on teachers' attitudes and the influence of their beliefs on teaching practice consistently indicate that in-service teachers often perceive the inclusion of a gender perspective in their teaching as unnecessary or irrelevant<sup>1</sup>, and that knowledge about gender is treated as a secondary or peripheral issue, diluted within a more generic consideration of equality. This places us within the conceptual orbit of gender blindness, a term applied when there is a failure to recognise that men/boys and women/girls are assigned roles and responsibilities within specific social, cultural, economic, and political contexts and histories. Gender-blind projects, programmes, policies, and attitudes do not take into account these differing roles or needs. As a result, they maintain the status quo and do not contribute to transforming the unequal structure of gender relations (United Nations, 2017, p. 18).

In this way, expressions of gender-based hate enable recognition of the simultaneous intersection of discrimination and oppression in the classroom, which must be actively challenged (Baur et al., 2024; García Mingo and Díaz Fernández, 2023). Therefore, initial and ongoing teacher education on gender issues is essential to prevent the development of an androcentric, patriarchal, and sexist hidden curriculum that transmits gender prejudices and beliefs to students (Lacalle, 2023). Teachers must develop gender awareness to understand that their behaviors, beliefs, and prejudices have a decisive influence on their students (Peinado Rodríguez et al., 2026).

Education, as outlined above, must commit to constructing counter-narratives and alternative narratives as a long-term project. It is necessary to promote education for citizenship and awareness-raising initiatives focused on social values such as equality, human rights, critical thinking, and the rejection of exclusion and discrimination, among others (Marolla-Gajardo et al., 2023). This should be done while continuing to engage with the ongoing debate about the limits and scope of freedom of expression as a fundamental right. Hate speech is thus reframed as an issue of media education, to be addressed from the perspective of digital citizenship (Pasta, 2025), where

<sup>1</sup>This has been termed the "mirage of equality", a concept coined by Amelia Valcárcel to refer to the widely held belief that equality between women and men has already been achieved. By accepting this presumed equality, the conclusion is reached that there is no longer any need to promote further measures aimed at improving women's situation.

individual capacity is central to breaking the chains of hidden and normalized hate, taking on the task of dismantling inequalities in the face of the “silent majority” (Gómez Suárez, 2024), and generating awareness and support for those marginalized by expressions of hatred (Aguado Odina, 2017).

From this perspective, research in teacher education has shown that counter-narratives against hate speech cannot be reduced to isolated pedagogical interventions but must be articulated as part of an ethical-political project embedded in initial teacher training. Studies conducted in Chile demonstrate that hate speech circulates across digital environments and educational spaces, shaping classroom climate, professional beliefs, and relational dynamics within teacher education programmes (Marolla-Gajardo and Lozano-Mas, 2025a, b). In this sense, digital hate operates not only as a communicative phenomenon but also as a formative one, reinforcing asymmetries of power (Foucault, 1979), gender hierarchies, and processes of exclusion that demand explicit pedagogical responses. Recent findings also highlight the importance of grounding teacher education in ethical and political foundations that link diversity, alterity, and citizenship as core dimensions of democratic education, rather than as optional or transversal additions (Marolla-Gajardo and Riquelme Plaza, 2025).

In this context, although previous studies conducted in Chile have explored the circulation of hate speech in digital environments and its impact on classroom climate and professional beliefs (Marolla-Gajardo and Lozano-Mas, 2025a, b), most of this research has been qualitative in nature, focusing on narrative analysis, discourse interpretation, and case-based approaches. Consequently, there remains a need for quantitative evidence capable of systematically identifying patterns, tendencies, and shared beliefs among teacher educators regarding gender-based hate speech within initial teacher education programmes. The present study addresses this gap by providing descriptive empirical data derived from a structured survey administered to university lecturers in history and geography teacher education programmes in Chile. By doing so, it complements previous qualitative findings and contributes to a more comprehensive understanding of how hate speech is perceived, addressed, or normalized within training contexts. In line with critical pedagogy (Giroux, 2018) and intercultural education (Aguado Odina, 2017), these contributions stress that confronting hate speech requires fostering reflective judgment, ethical responsibility toward the other (Levinas, 1993), and active forms of digital citizenship capable of challenging normalised violence and symbolic exclusion within and beyond educational institutions.

Lingiardi et al. (2020) examined the phenomenon of hate in digital contexts in Italy, highlighting features that reflect the complexity of the issue: the use and misuse of social networks for harmful purposes; the false perception of anonymity and impunity; the increase in digital lynching and identity impersonation; the normalization of intimidation and threats; the emergence of criminal practices; the growing naturalization of hate speech and hate crimes; the confusion between freedom of expression and hate speech; and the digital traces that record and preserve these behaviors.

Similarly, in the field of gender-based hate speech within digital contexts, it is crucial to understand the influence on both

students and teachers of the *manosphere* or *machosphere*<sup>2</sup>. Moreover, this visible dimension represents only part of the phenomenon. What remains unseen continues to be reproduced within private groups (González Nadal and Hernández, 2023), generally on platforms such as WhatsApp and Telegram, primarily through “memes”. As Huete (2022) observes, because of their simplicity, humorous tone, anonymization, and decontextualization, memes have a strong capacity for distortion and manipulation. This, in turn, prevents the misogyny they convey from being readily recognized and hinders users’ ability to resist it. This refers to a set of virtual spaces in which communities or groups of men gather and recognise one another through shared antifeminist and misogynistic discourses, often also marked by racism and homophobia. Within these spaces, there is a strong sense of identity recognition and a defense of what is perceived as a wounded masculinity, attributed to what is interpreted as a feminist “invasion”, commonly referred to as *gynocracy* (A system allegedly designed by women (especially feminists) to keep men in a position of subordination; this idea reconfigures power relations within a patriarchal society by shifting masculinity from a position of privilege to one of victimhood—an understanding perceived daily within the spaces that constitute it).

Many hate discourses and expressions are situated at the margins of what is permitted and what is legal. Some messages fall within the category of what is legally “punishable” and subject to regulation, while most expressions are protected under freedom of expression. This creates particular complexity, as such freedom is a fundamental right of individuals as citizens within the framework of building a democratic society (Bazzaco et al., 2018). For example, the European Convention on Human Rights defines the right to freedom of expression, but also states that this freedom may be restricted to prevent criminal behavior and to protect the reputation and rights of others. Therefore, freedom of expression must be “necessary” and “proportionate”. Online platform managers play an essential role in limiting this phenomenon, as fake accounts, trolls, and hate attacks persist without effective measures to curb them (Piñero Otero et al., 2024), thereby creating tension between the right to freedom of expression and the unchecked proliferation of hate speech.

Bazzaco et al. (2018) propose seven guiding questions for identifying hate speech:

1. Who is speaking? And about whom are they speaking?
2. What is the content of the message?
3. What impact or consequences might the message have?
4. What is the objective of the speaker?
5. What is the reach of the message?

<sup>2</sup>Movements within the *manosphere* include antifeminism, incels (involuntary celibates), MGTOW (Men Going Their Own Way), PUA (Pick-Up Artists), the men’s rights movement (MRA), bloggers, and commentators, among others. However, opposition to the advancement of feminism is not always anonymous; it is also found among politicians, journalists, writers, athletes, and business leaders. Among younger populations, these misogynistic voices are also identified among TikTok creators, gamers, and YouTubers who legitimize the broader *manosphere* narrative. The reach of this movement is not limited to youth, as there is also a substantial following among individuals aged 35–50 years.

6. What is the social context in which the message was produced?
7. Does it constitute a pattern of discourse?

Beyond its legal or normative definitions, hate speech can also be conceptualized as a discursive genre characterized by the construction of antagonistic identities, the essentialization of social differences, and the attribution of collective blame (Vargas Saldarriaga et al., 2025). From a discourse-analytic perspective, hate speech operates through recurring rhetorical strategies such as dehumanization, moral polarization, and the framing of certain groups as threats to national or cultural integrity (Van Dijk, 2003). Understanding hate speech as a patterned form of discourse rather than merely as isolated offensive statements allows for a more precise evaluation of its destabilizing effects on inclusive educational goals.

Within this framework, the present study adopts a critical perspective that views education— and particularly initial teacher education— as a strategic space for problematizing hate speech and its effects on the reproduction of gender inequalities. From this standpoint, the first objective of the study is to analyze the beliefs of university teacher educators working in history and geography initial teacher education programmes regarding hate speech from a gender perspective, considering their relationship with processes of exclusion, symbolic violence, and the normalization of harm in educational contexts. Additionally, the second objective is to characterize these beliefs in relation to training contexts, pedagogical practices, and the tensions between freedom of expression, regulation, and ethical responsibility, to identify the limits and possibilities of education oriented toward otherness, social justice, and the construction of counter-narratives against hate. These objectives aim to contribute to a situated understanding of the phenomenon and to reflection on the ethical and political role of teachers in preventing the reproduction of hate within educational settings.

### 3 Methodological framework

This study adopts a quantitative, descriptive-exploratory design aimed at systematically identifying patterns in university teacher educators' beliefs regarding gender-based hate speech within initial teacher education programmes in Chile. Rather than testing predefined causal hypotheses, the study seeks to map tendencies, perceptions, and reported practices within a defined professional group. The descriptive-exploratory approach is appropriate for research areas where empirical evidence remains limited and where the primary objective is to provide structured, systematic data capable of informing subsequent analytical or comparative studies (Creswell and Creswell, 2018). In this sense, the study prioritizes empirical characterization over causal explanation, contributing baseline quantitative evidence to an emerging field of research in teacher education and digital hate (Flick, 2015).

From this perspective, as López-Roldán and Fachelli (2015) argue, quantitative analysis seeks to detect recurring patterns that facilitate the development of inferences and explanations about complex social phenomena (Hernández-García and Fernández-Cano, 2021). Despite criticisms regarding the potential

oversimplification of reality and excessive objectification of knowledge (Guba and Lincoln, 1994), the rigorous application of this approach provides robust tools for producing valid and replicable knowledge. Marolla et al. (2023) note that a coherent and systematic application of the quantitative approach can generate evidence useful for educational analysis (Bisquerra and Alzina, 2004). The methodological orientation emphasizes systematic data collection, internal consistency of measurement, and transparency in analytical procedures. The aim is not to establish universal generalizations but to provide a reliable empirical portrait of a specific training context, acknowledging that social and educational phenomena are situated and historically embedded (Cardona Moltó, 2002; Fernández Esquinas, 2003; López-Roldán and Fachelli, 2015; Muñoz and Tezanos, 2017).

In this study, “beliefs” are understood as relatively stable cognitive-evaluative orientations that shape how professionals interpret social phenomena and guide their pedagogical decisions. Beliefs do not necessarily correspond to formal knowledge or institutional policy, but rather reflect interpretative frameworks constructed through professional experience, socialization, and contextual influences. Examining teacher educators' beliefs is therefore central to understanding how institutional norms are translated -or not translated- into everyday pedagogical practice.

#### 3.1 Information analysis strategies

In line with the quantitative approach adopted, this research was conducted as a survey-based study, using a structured questionnaire as the data collection instrument (Cohen et al., 2013; Rubio Martín and Varas Reviejo, 2004). This technique was selected for its capacity to gather information efficiently and systematically, allowing valid inferences to be drawn about a broader population from a defined sample (Bryman, 2016; Ortega-Sánchez, 2023).

The survey was conducted in a self-administered format, meaning participants received the questionnaire with a cover letter and general guidelines, without direct involvement from the research team. This approach offers greater flexibility and autonomy for respondents but requires particular attention to instrument design due to the lack of immediate feedback (De Leeuw, 2004; Dillman et al., 2014). The complete questionnaire is provided in [Supplementary Appendix 1](#). As Cohen et al. (2013) note, the validity of a quantitative instrument depends on its accuracy in measuring the phenomena under study. In this case, the questionnaire assessed actions, attitudes, and beliefs. The instrument achieved a Cronbach's alpha of 0.84, indicating satisfactory internal consistency for exploratory research in the social sciences (Tavakol and Dennick, 2011).

The instrument was structured around four analytical dimensions derived from the theoretical framework and previous empirical research in teacher education: (1) beliefs regarding the presence and impact of gender-based hate speech within teacher education contexts; (2) ethical positioning and professional responsibility in relation to hate expressions; (3) training background and pedagogical practices addressing hate speech; and (4) perceptions concerning regulation, freedom of expression, and institutional responsibility.

The first section included 31 Likert-scale items designed to measure attitudinal positioning, perceived prevalence, and evaluative judgments regarding hate speech from a gender perspective. The second section consisted of 25 multiple-response items aimed at characterizing professional practices, training experiences, and institutional contexts. This dimensional structure allowed for systematic categorization of responses and strengthened internal coherence between theoretical constructs and empirical measurement.

The questionnaire was developed based on an extensive review of international literature on hate speech, digital misogyny, teacher education, and ethical-political responsibility in educational contexts (Bazzaco et al., 2018; Lingiardi et al., 2020; Marolla-Gajardo et al., 2023). Item construction followed a deductive procedure in which theoretical categories were translated into observable indicators. Particular attention was given to clarity of wording, avoidance of leading formulations, and conceptual alignment with the research objectives.

Prior to its administration, the instrument underwent content validation through expert review. Five academics specializing in gender studies, social sciences education, and quantitative methodology examined the questionnaire to assess conceptual adequacy, relevance of items, and internal coherence. Minor adjustments were made following their recommendations, primarily related to wording precision and the elimination of potential ambiguities.

Table 1 summarizes the main analytical dimensions, corresponding constructs, and examples of items included in the instrument.

### 3.2 Sample

Within the context of the quantitative approach used, ensuring the validity of the results requires a representative and statistically significant sample of the study population (Creswell and Creswell, 2018; Ortega-Sánchez, 2023). In this case, a sample of 200 teacher

educators was randomly selected to reflect the heterogeneity of the phenomenon under analysis and minimize sampling error, a fundamental criterion for validating the findings (Muñoz and Tezanos, 2017).

Three inclusion criteria were established for sample selection: (a) employment as a contracted lecturer in a history and geography teacher education program; (b) at least two years of professional experience in that program; and (c) professional affiliation with a Chilean university. These criteria were defined in accordance with the methodological guidelines proposed by Mertens (2010) to ensure the relevance of the data obtained for the study's objectives.

The sample size was set at  $n=200$ , which is considered appropriate for exploratory studies in the social sciences. This size ensured substantial coverage of the target teaching population and provided a solid basis for obtaining statistically reliable results. Nevertheless, it is acknowledged that, due to the inherent complexity of social and educational phenomena, cultural, individual, and contextual particularities cannot always be fully captured through quantitative aggregation techniques (Flick, 2015; Ortega-Sánchez, 2023).

Regarding sample characteristics, 65% of participants were between 30 and 44 years old. The sex-gender variable was distributed relatively evenly, with 55% of participants identifying as women and 45% as men; no responses were recorded in the "other" category. In addition, 83% of the surveyed teacher educators completed their degree programmes after 2000. Although the sample size allows for robust descriptive analysis, the findings should be interpreted within the contextual boundaries of Chilean history and geography teacher education programmes. The study does not seek statistical representativeness at a national level but rather analytical relevance within a defined professional field.

### 3.3 Data analysis

Data analysis was primarily descriptive, focusing on frequencies, percentages, and measures of central tendency to characterize patterns in teacher educators' responses. Given the exploratory nature of the study, the emphasis was placed on identifying tendencies and distributions rather than testing causal relationships. Where relevant, cross-tabulations were examined to observe potential associations; however, the study does not aim to establish statistically predictive models.

Data processing and analysis were conducted using the statistical software RStudio, a platform widely validated in social research for its flexibility, robustness, and capacity to handle large volumes of information (Field, 2018; Lynch, 2013; Navarro, 2019). This tool enabled the systematization of the data obtained, facilitated their interpretation, and generated graphical representations that enriched the analysis.

As Lynch (2013) noted, it is practically unfeasible to access an entire population in social research due to logistical and economic constraints. Therefore, statistical analysis relies on a representative sample from which patterns and behaviors generalizable to the target population can be inferred. The collected data allow the calculation of inferential statistics, estimation of parameters, and testing of hypotheses based on defined criteria, thereby

TABLE 1 Analytical dimensions.

Dimension	Construct	Example Item
Presence and impact of hate speech	Perceived existence of gender-based hate expressions	"It is possible to identify expressions of hate toward specific groups based on gender within the programme."
Ethical positioning	Rejection or normalization of hate expressions	"Teachers reject gender-based hate expressions."
Training and pedagogical practice	Formal and informal preparation	"During my initial training, I received specific preparation to address hate speech."
Regulation and institutional responsibility	Views on state intervention and freedom of expression	"The State should strengthen legislation to curb the dissemination of hate speech."

contributing to a more rigorous understanding of the phenomenon under investigation (Creswell and Creswell, 2018).

### 3.4 Ethical considerations

The instrument, in its final version, was submitted to a Scientific Ethics Committee for approval and was approved under Letter/Report No. 23-2024. The Santo Tomás Scientific Ethics Committee was accredited by Resolution of the Ministry of Health No. 23136643/2023.

## 4 Results

The results are presented in two main sections. First, teacher educators' beliefs regarding hate speech from a gender perspective are identified (Item 1 of the questionnaire; see [Supplementary Appendix 1](#)). Second, these beliefs are characterised based on contextual and training-related aspects. (Item 2; [Supplementary Appendix 1](#)).

Concerning the statement "In classes, conflictive topics related to messages, discourses, or expressions that convey hate are addressed", 52% of teacher educators responded affirmatively, while 18% expressed disagreement. Regarding student interest, 60% of teacher educators perceived a positive disposition among their students to address issues related to hate speech from a gender perspective. However, 22% believed such interest is absent, and 23% report being undecided. This situation suggests fragmented perceptions of student motivation and raises questions about teacher educators' beliefs regarding students' engagement and participation in socially relevant issues.

These findings reveal tensions in teacher educators' beliefs regarding their positioning towards gender-based hate speech. In response to the statement "Teacher educators who teach in the programme express concern about the presence of hate speech that promotes gender inequalities", 57% indicated agreement, suggesting a relative majority with awareness of the issue. However, 24 percent expressed disagreement, a significant proportion that reveals the persistence of segments among the teaching staff who do not identify such discourses as a relevant concern, which may contribute to their omission from pedagogical practices.

Regarding ethical positioning, 52% indicated that teacher educators reject gender-based hate expressions, while 20% reported the opposite. Notably, 29% remained undecided, highlighting a lack of clear positioning and potentially a form of neutrality that may contribute to perpetuating the problem. This ambivalence is further confirmed by responses to the statement "There are teacher educators who support hate speech from a gender perspective, to which 10% responded affirmatively, while 61% denied it, and a further 29% avoided taking a position."

On the other hand, the statement "It is positive that there are student groups and movements against gender inequalities and the dissemination of hate speech" was evaluated positively by a substantial 85% of teacher educators. Nevertheless, 13% expressed disagreement, raising questions about the beliefs of a segment of the teaching staff who view such forms of participation as negative within the university setting. This finding highlights the need to further explore the rationales underlying these positions.

Although 57% of teacher educators report concern about hate speech that promotes gender inequalities, 24% express an opposing view. This distribution indicates a fragmented perception of the phenomenon, with no unified position on its seriousness or relevance within the training context. Such ambivalence is reinforced by responses to the statement, "It is possible to identify expressions of hate toward specific groups or collectives based on gender within the program", where 65% denied their existence.

However, when analysing the statement "Within the programme, there have been various problems among students due to the presence and expressions of hate from gender perspectives", 24% of teacher educators acknowledged its existence, compared to 52% who denied it and 25% who avoided adopting a clear position. By contrast, there is broad consensus in response to the statement "The Ministry should assume responsibility for providing tools and creating spaces for the construction of counter-narratives against hate from gender perspectives", with 87% of affirmative responses. This indicates that, despite internal ambivalence, teacher educators recognize an active role for the state in designing policies and training strategies that address these issues structurally.

Finally, it is important to note that 90% of teacher educators agree with the statement, "Hate speech against diversities in general is accompanied by actions of physical, material, and/or psychological violence", indicating a shared recognition of the seriousness of the issue and the need to address it within teacher education programmes. Similarly, in response to the statement, "Hate speech commonly materializes in violent actions against marginalized groups", 83% positioned themselves in categories that validate the assertion, while 8% disagreed. These distributions indicate a strong concentration of responses in categories recognizing the consequences of hate speech within teacher education programmes (see [Table 2](#)).

### 4.1 Teachers' training and practices in relation to hate speech

One relevant aspect emerging from the data is the limited specialized training that teacher educators report having

TABLE 2 Summary of beliefs regarding presence and impact of hate speech.

Item	Agree (%)	Disagree (%)	Undecided (%)
Conflictive topics addressed in class	52	18	30
Teachers express concern about hate speech	57	24	19
Hate speech affects professional practice	72	-	-
Hate speech causes emotional harm	83	8	9

regarding hate speech. Although 75% indicated they possess basic knowledge of the topic, only 25% stated that they actively address it in the classroom. Only 8% of participants reported having received specific training in hate speech from an educational perspective. This situation is further highlighted by the fact that 63% indicated that during their initial training, they did not have access to courses or activities related to this issue, while only 20% did. Notably, 12% acknowledged that, despite the absence of formal opportunities, they sought training on their own initiative, demonstrating a degree of individual commitment in the face of institutional absence.

Regarding perceptions of the positions adopted by their colleagues, the results show a marked dispersion of opinions, with no dominant trend. Thirty-five percent believe that teacher educators take an active stance against hate speech, both inside and outside the classroom. In contrast, 24% perceived that their colleagues do not hold a clear position, although they align with the prevailing institutional discourse. Twenty percent think their peers do assume a defined stance and orient their practices toward prevention. To a lesser extent, 17% indicate that these issues are addressed only at the initiative of students, while 13% suggest that some teacher educators avoid involvement due to a lack of pedagogical competence. This diversity of perceptions points to a relatively non-homogeneous institutional context, in which personal convictions and training capacities play a decisive role in the inclusion or exclusion of these topics within teaching practice.

The results show that teacher educators identify two main targets of hate speech: 44% believe it is primarily directed at migrant populations, while 37% associate it with issues related to gender and diversity. Although these categories were analyzed separately, the data reveal that they share common characteristics of social vulnerability, with both at the center of discrimination and exclusion practices. This perception is reinforced by the finding that 72% of teacher educators report that hate speech affects their professional practice, while 75% directly link it to processes of social exclusion. Given this convergence, there is a need to address migration and gender/diversity dimensions in an integrated manner in future research, considering their recurring presence in the educational contexts analyzed and their potential impact on training and pedagogical practices.

The findings also reveal a concerning scenario regarding organized expressions of discrimination in educational settings: 28% of teacher educators acknowledge the existence of movements or groups that promote inequalities through hate speech, while 23% deny their existence and 17% report being unaware of them. This disparity highlights not only the actual presence of the problem but also a troubling level of misinformation or lack of awareness among teacher educators about dynamics that may be becoming normalised within their professional environments.

Regarding the impact of these discourses, 72% of teacher educators believe they negatively affect their professional practice, 56% mention consequences for their interpersonal relationships, and 46% report effects on their personal lives. In addition, 93% affirm that hate speech promotes violence and discrimination, while 83% identify emotional harm among those targeted by such expressions. Similarly, 75% indicate that these discourses contribute to social exclusion, and 72% associate

TABLE 3 Perceptions of regulation and institutional responsibility.

Item	Agree (%)
State should implement public policies	87
Legislation should be strengthened	72
Legal restrictions supported	40
Social sanctions preferred	44

them with mental health problems affecting both teacher educators and students.

Despite widespread recognition of the harmful impact of hate speech, significant tension remains between freedom of expression and its regulation. Fifty-eight percent of teacher educators believe such discourse restricts the full exercise of this right, revealing a paradox regarding its ethical and legal limits. Forty percent support legal restrictions, while 44 percent favor social sanctions based on collective rejection. This duality highlights not only concern about the instrumental use of freedom of expression as a mechanism for reproducing symbolic violence, but also the diversity of views on which regulatory mechanisms are considered most legitimate.

In this vein, 87% of teacher educators state that the State should implement public policies to protect individuals from hate speech, and 72% consider it necessary to strengthen existing legislation to curb its dissemination. This consensus indicates a clear demand for more active state intervention, even if it means partially restricting certain individual freedoms to safeguard the fundamental rights of affected communities (see Table 3).

Additionally, teacher educators widely acknowledge that initial teacher education can play a key role in preventing hate speech. Seventy-seven percent consider that such training would help prevent the reproduction of these comments in schools, 76% maintain that it would help prevent gender-based discrimination and violence in society, and the same percentage suggests that it would foster the development of critical awareness among students. Furthermore, 76% believe that it can promote collaborative institutional work in response to these issues.

Finally, regarding students' perceptions, 71% of teacher educators agree that expressions of hate from gender perspectives occur in the classroom. Of this group, 19% report that such incidents happen frequently, while 52% consider them sporadic. These data suggest that, although such expressions are not always explicit or daily occurrences, teacher educators recognize the existence of the problem in the educational environment, reinforcing the need to address it systematically through training and institutional policy.

Overall, the results reveal heterogeneous distributions of beliefs, with concentrations in categories acknowledging the impact of hate speech, alongside persistent ambivalence regarding its presence within institutional contexts. These descriptive patterns provide the empirical basis for the interpretative discussion that follows.

## 5 Discussion

The descriptive findings indicate the coexistence of recognition and ambivalence within teacher education contexts.

While a relative majority of teacher educators acknowledge the impact of gender-based hate speech, a significant minority express indifference or skepticism regarding its presence or relevance. This fragmentation suggests that professional positioning toward hate speech is neither uniform nor fully consolidated within initial teacher education programmes. Rather than interpreting this solely as ideological resistance, the data point to heterogeneous institutional cultures in which ethical positioning depends on individual training trajectories, professional experiences, and contextual factors.

These minority yet significant positions warrant further investigation in future research to understand the reasons that sustain them and their pedagogical implications. Despite the advances promoted by the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and their integration into education, the data indicate that attitudes persist that contradict principles of equity and social justice. This paradox suggests that the formal inclusion of the SDGs in education does not always lead to substantive changes in teaching practices. Several studies (de la Cruz et al., 2019; Díez Bedmar and Ortega-Sánchez, 2021; Díez-Bedmar, 2022; Marolla Gajardo et al., 2021; Ortega-Sánchez et al., 2020) have noted that, despite the adoption of inclusive approaches in teacher education, curricular structures and pedagogical practices rooted in conservative, patriarchal logics that reproduce the status quo continue to prevail. This reveals a dissonance between normative guidelines and actual practices within the training context.

The study shows that although 52% of teacher educators state they address socially relevant issues in their classes, 18% explicitly acknowledge they do not, highlighting the need to critically review the structural and cultural conditions that hinder genuine educational transformation. This situation raises key questions: Why have they not received specific training on these issues? Why, despite having some theoretical knowledge about the problem, do they not know how to integrate it into their teaching practice? What factors lead them to prioritize “curriculum compliance” over engagement with socially relevant issues? Addressing these questions is essential to advance educational transformation that goes beyond the formal incorporation of content and fosters effective change in pedagogical practices and institutional dynamics.

Various studies (Díez-Bedmar, 2022; Marolla, 2019; Marolla Gajardo et al., 2021; Ortega-Sánchez et al., 2020) agree that pedagogical practices in initial teacher education generally continue to reproduce content aimed at preserving the social status quo. This traditional approach is shaped by an androcentric and patriarchal perspective, in which historical narratives focus on male figures with political, economic, or military power, relegating women, sexual dissidents, Indigenous peoples, impoverished groups, and other actors historically marginalized from historical and educational narratives to a secondary position or rendering them invisible. In Chile, the historical experience of the military dictatorship (1973–1990) continues to shape public discourse, collective memory, and educational debates. The production of exclusionary narratives and the legitimization of state violence during that period left discursive traces that remain present in contemporary political and social polarization. As research on pedagogical discourse and historical memory has shown, how recent human rights

violations are narrated and taught influences the ethical frameworks through which students interpret conflict, difference, and democracy (Marolla Gajardo et al., 2021). Situating current debates on hate speech within this historical trajectory allows for a deeper understanding of how certain antagonistic narratives persist within educational contexts.

In this context, it is important to note that a significant proportion of the teacher educators participating in this study express concern about the presence of hate speech in educational settings. Approximately 70% report taking measures or creating new narratives to counteract such expressions, indicating openness to more inclusive practices. Additionally, more than 80% consider it essential to have specific training and competencies to address these issues comprehensively, not only from a gender perspective but also with an approach that recognizes the structural and symbolic complexity of hate within the educational sphere (Parodi et al., 2022; Rogero, 2019; Wachs et al., 2022).

This apparent willingness among teacher educators may be explained, in part, by their direct or proximate experience with issues related to gender and discrimination, whether in educational environments, the media, or everyday life (Bazzaco et al., 2018; González Nadal and Hernández, 2023). Nevertheless, it is necessary to adopt a more critical perspective that questions the coherence between declarative discourses and actual practices. This ambivalence is reflected in the study’s findings: although 52% of teacher educators reject gender-based hate speech, 20% take an opposing stance, and 29% remain in a zone of ambiguity. This fragmentation indicates that commitment to gender equity and the eradication of hate is neither uniform nor fully consolidated, representing an urgent challenge for teacher education and the creation of inclusive educational communities.

The results indicate that 60% of teacher educators perceive student interest in incorporating issues related to hate speech into pedagogical practices, while 22% do not perceive such interest. This disparity suggests the need to further examine how training dynamics, teaching methodologies, and institutional conditions may limit student engagement. Key questions arise: What types of pedagogical practices are teacher educators promoting? How are students’ actual interests expressed? What space do social issues occupy in training planning?

Crocco (2018, 2019) and Molet Chicot and Bernard Cavero (2015) agree that the development of critical thinking and agency is possible only when students recognize themselves as active participants in educational processes. Similarly, Giroux (2018) emphasizes the transformative potential of dialogic and critical education, in which teacher educators and students co-construct knowledge aimed at social justice. Therefore, beyond the percentages, it is essential to reflect on the pedagogical frameworks that enable or constrain the emergence of these interests, considering the shared responsibility in constructing an education with social and political significance.

When hate speech and gender inequalities are not integrated into sustained reflective practice, they risk being normalized in everyday teaching (Marolla Gajardo et al., 2021; Marolla-Gajardo and Lozano-Mas, 2025). From an ethical perspective, hate speech reflects broader dynamics of dehumanization that erode recognition of the Other and legitimize symbolic exclusion (Arendt, 2006; Van Dijk, 2003; Žižek, 2014; Žižek,

2002). Although participants largely acknowledge its harmful impact, ambivalence and neutrality persist, suggesting that pedagogical silence may inadvertently sustain existing inequalities (Bourdieu and Passeron, 2018). These findings reinforce the need to place alterity, critical judgment, and democratic citizenship at the core of teacher education (Giroux, 2018; Levinas, 1993; Mèlich, 2010; Mèlich, 2001; Nietzsche, 2007).

The findings suggest that addressing gender-based hate speech within teacher education requires moving beyond general declarations of inclusion toward the development of structured institutional strategies. The descriptive data reveal a clear gap between recognition of harm and the existence of systematic training. Consequently, teacher training policies should incorporate explicit competencies related to gender analysis, digital citizenship, and the ethical management of conflict within educational contexts (Giroux, 2018; Ortega-Sánchez, 2023). This could include the integration of mandatory modules on hate speech prevention, critical media literacy, and intersectional perspectives, as well as the establishment of institutional protocols that guide teacher educators in responding to discriminatory discourse. As research in teacher education has shown, when socially relevant conflicts are not structurally embedded within training programmes, they tend to remain peripheral and dependent on individual initiative (Díez-Bedmar and Ortega-Sánchez, 2021; Marolla Gajardo et al., 2021).

The results also indicate the need to embed the analysis of socially relevant problems—such as hate speech, gender discrimination, and digital polarization—within the core structure of initial teacher education programmes. Rather than treating these issues as transversal or optional topics, curriculum design should create opportunities for sustained reflection, case-based discussion, and the development of pedagogical strategies for addressing controversial issues in the classroom (Canal et al., 2012; Santisteban, 2009, 2018). Such integration would allow future teachers to translate ethical awareness into concrete practice, strengthening their capacity to navigate tensions between freedom of expression and the protection of vulnerable groups. In this sense, curriculum reform must not only expand content but also foster professional judgment and dialogical competence, aligning educational practice with commitments to democratic citizenship and social justice (Giroux, 2018; Parodi et al., 2022).

Addressing hate speech through education requires recognizing that teaching entails an ethical and political responsibility toward the Other (Levinas, 1993). Education for democratic citizenship must therefore move beyond the transmission of abstract values and foster pedagogical practices that confront exclusionary narratives, cultivate critical judgment, and reinforce commitment to human dignity (Giroux, 2018; Mèlich, 2010; The Adorno, 2004). Only through such ethically grounded training can teacher education contribute to building more plural and inclusive educational communities (Han, 2022).

## 6 Conclusions

Historically, processes of dehumanization have demonstrated how discursive normalization can precede broader forms of exclusion and violence. However, within the scope of this study, the concern is not the repetition of extreme historical events,

but the everyday normalization of symbolic exclusion within educational contexts. The findings suggest that ambivalence, neutrality, and pedagogical omission may function as mechanisms through which discriminatory narratives persist, even in institutions formally committed to equality.

The data analyzed in this study suggest that, despite advances in inclusion policies and human rights, hate and discrimination persist, often concealed or minimized. This creates a troubling paradox: in the name of efficiency, employability, or adaptation to the system, technical content and instrumental competencies have been prioritized, while ethical reflection, historical memory, and education for human dignity have been relegated. As critical pedagogy warns, educating for the world of work is not sufficient if education does not also cultivate responsibility and respect for others.

Therefore, education and, particularly, teacher education must reclaim its deeply ethical, political, and transformative dimension (Giroux, 2018). This is not merely about teaching content, but about creating conditions in which no form of hate can again become institutionalized or gain legitimacy through pedagogical silence. The Shoah cannot remain a static remembrance or a marginal topic; it must serve as a living warning. As history shows, pedagogical forgetting is also a form of complicity.

The findings underscore the need to strengthen the ethical foundations of teacher education, particularly regarding how future teachers are prepared to engage with difference, conflict, and inequality. Rather than invoking extreme historical analogies, the results of this study point to more immediate concerns: the persistence of ambivalence, neutrality, and uneven professional positioning toward gender-based hate speech within training contexts. In this sense, the ethical challenge is not primarily the formulation of new normative frameworks, but the consolidation of professional dispositions grounded in responsibility toward others and in critical awareness of how everyday pedagogical practices may either reproduce or challenge symbolic exclusion. An ethics of alterity, understood as sustained attentiveness to the dignity and vulnerability of others, becomes especially relevant within teacher education programmes that aim to foster democratic coexistence.

The second line of reflection concerns the transformation of teacher education curricula and institutional practices. The descriptive data reveal broad recognition of the harmful consequences of hate speech, alongside limited formal training to address it. This gap suggests that issues of gender, digital citizenship, and critical engagement with discriminatory narratives should not remain peripheral or transversal topics, but rather be integrated structurally into teacher education programmes. In line with research on socially relevant problem-based teaching (Canal et al., 2012; Díez Bedmar and Ortega-Sánchez, 2021; Parodi et al., 2022; Santisteban, 2009), addressing hate speech within initial training can strengthen critical thinking, ethical judgment, and democratic commitment. At the same time, the results reveal persistent tension between freedom of expression and regulatory intervention. A majority of participants support stronger state involvement to curb hate speech, even if it entails certain restrictions. This tension highlights the need for teacher education to provide spaces for informed, critical deliberation about the boundaries between legitimate expression and harm, equipping future educators to navigate these dilemmas within plural and polarized societies.

Returning to the proposed ethical approach, the response cannot be reduced to a legislative technique alone. Education, although it cannot resolve social problems by itself, can provide a space for critical reflection on the ethical foundations of communal life. Discussing the limits of freedom of expression, the legitimacy of dissent, and the forms of symbolic violence is part of the educational task, provided this is done with a commitment to the humanity of the Other. The resurgence of polarization and digitally mediated hostility underscores the urgency of strengthening reflective and ethical dimensions within teacher education. Yet the signs of our times, marked by the resurgence of nationalism, structural racism, normalized hate speech, and extreme polarization, show that the conditions that made it possible have not entirely disappeared. Education is not a guarantee against horror, but it can serve as an ethical and political barrier, a space from which to challenge the meaning of the present and to prevent the camps from returning, disguised as indifference, apathy, or the normalization of violence.

This study provides descriptive evidence regarding university teacher educators' beliefs about gender-based hate speech within history and geography initial teacher education programmes in Chile. The findings reveal three central patterns. First, there is broad recognition of the harmful consequences of hate speech, particularly its emotional and professional impact. Second, significant ambivalence persists regarding its presence within institutional contexts, suggesting fragmented professional positioning. Third, formal training on hate speech remains limited, despite widespread acknowledgment of its relevance.

Based on the empirical findings and the discussion presented, the following competencies emerge as particularly relevant for initial teacher education programmes:

1. Critical discursive analysis competence: the ability to identify, deconstruct, and contextualize hate speech as a patterned form of discourse, recognizing its rhetorical strategies, power dynamics, and social implications.
2. Ethical-professional positioning competence: the capacity to adopt and justify explicit pedagogical stances in situations involving discrimination or exclusion, avoiding neutrality that may legitimize harmful narratives.
3. Pedagogical intervention competence: the development of strategies for addressing controversial issues in the classroom, including dialogical facilitation, conflict mediation, and inclusive curriculum design.
4. Digital citizenship competence: the ability to critically engage with online environments, identify digital hate practices, and foster responsible participation in digital public spheres.
5. Institutional collaboration competence: the capacity to work collectively within educational institutions to design protocols, prevention strategies, and coordinated responses to discriminatory discourse.

These competencies do not imply the addition of isolated content modules, but rather the integration of ethical reflection, critical analysis, and professional judgment across the curriculum of teacher education programmes.

Overall, several limitations must be acknowledged. The study relies on self-reported data, which may be influenced by social desirability bias. Additionally, although the sample provides

robust descriptive coverage within the defined professional field, the findings are contextually situated and do not claim national statistical representativeness. Future research could incorporate mixed-methods approaches, comparative institutional analyses, and longitudinal designs to deepen understanding of how teacher education programmes respond to evolving forms of digital hate.

These findings highlight the need to integrate structured competencies related to gender, digital citizenship, and ethical responsibility into teacher education curricula. Addressing hate speech cannot rely solely on individual initiative; it requires institutional frameworks, coordinated training strategies, and explicit pedagogical positioning. Overall, the study contributes baseline quantitative evidence to an emerging field of inquiry and reinforces the importance of positioning teacher education as a critical space for confronting gender-based hate speech within democratic societies.

## Data availability statement

The original contributions presented in the study are included in the article/Supplementary Material, further inquiries can be directed to the corresponding author.

## Ethics statement

The studies involving humans were approved by Letter/Report No. 23-2024. The Santo Tomás Scientific Ethics Committee is accredited by Resolution of the Ministry of Health No. 23136643/2023. The studies were conducted in accordance with the local legislation and institutional requirements. The participants provided their written informed consent to participate in this study.

## Author contributions

JM-G: Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal analysis, Funding acquisition, Project administration, Supervision, Visualization, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. MP-R: Conceptualization, Formal analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Resources, Validation, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. ML-M: Conceptualization, Formal analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Resources, Software, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing.

## Funding

The author(s) declared that financial support was received for this work and/or its publication. This research was funded by Agencia Nacional de Investigación y Desarrollo de Chile (ANID), FONDECYT 11231022.

## Conflict of interest

The author(s) declared that this work was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

The author JM-G declared that they were an editorial board member of Frontiers at the time of submission. This had no impact on the peer review process and the final decision.

## Generative AI statement

The author(s) declared that generative AI was not used in the creation of this manuscript.

Any alternative text (alt text) provided alongside figures in this article has been generated by Frontiers with the support of artificial intelligence and reasonable efforts have been made to ensure accuracy, including review by the authors wherever possible. If you identify any issues, please contact us.

## References

- Aguado Odina, T. (2017). "El enfoque intercultural en educación," in *Educación Intercultural*, eds. T. Aguado Odina, and P. Mata Benito (Madrid: UNED), 17–46.
- Arendt, H. (2006). *Los Orígenes del Totalitarismo*. Madrid: Alianza.
- Arroyo, A., Ballbé, M., Canals, R., García, C. R., Llusà, J., López, M., et al. (2018). "El discurso del odio: una investigación en la formación inicial," in *Buscando Formas de Enseñar: Investigar Para Innovar en Didáctica de las Ciencias Sociales*, eds. E. López-Torres, C. R. García-Ruiz, and M. Sánchez-Agustí (Asociación Universitaria de Profesorado de Didáctica de las Ciencias Sociales (Barcelona-Málaga: AUPDCS)), 413–424.
- Baldauf, J., Ebner, J., and Guhl, J. (2019). *Hate Speech and Radicalisation Online: The OCCI Research Report*. London, Washington, DC and Beirut Toronto: OCCI. <https://www.isdglobal.org/isd-publications/hate-speech-and-radicalisation-online-the-occi-research-report/>
- Baur, V., Filippi Villar, J., and Pino, M. (2024). *Los Discursos de Odio Contra las Mujeres, Disidencias y las Políticas de Género en la Manosfera*. Segundo Boletín del Centro de Investigaciones sobre Sujeto, Institución y Cultura. Mar del Plata: Universidad Nacional de Mar del Plata.
- Bazzaco, E., García Juanatey, A., Lejardi, J., Palacios, A., and Tarragona, L. (2018). *¿Es Odio? Manual Práctico Para Reconocer y Actuar Frente a Discursos y Delitos de Odio*. Barcelona: Institut de Drets Humans de Catalunya & SOS Racisme Catalunya. Available online at: <https://www.idhc.org/es/publicaciones/es-odio-manual-practico-para-reconocer-y-actuar-frente-a-discursos-y-delitos-de-odio.php>
- Bisquerra, R., and Alzina, R. B. (2004). *Metodología de la Investigación Educativa*. Madrid: Editorial La Muralla.
- Bourdieu, P., and Passeron, J.-C. (2018). *La Reproduction: Éléments Pour une Théorie du Système D'enseignement*. Paris: Éditions de Minuit.
- Bryman, A. (2016). *Social Research Methods*, 5th edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bustos Martínez, L., De Santiago Ortega, P. P., Martínez Miró, MÁ, and Rengifo Hidalgo, M. S. (2019). Discursos de odio: una epidemia que se propaga en la red. *Med. Soc.* 18, 25–42. doi: 10.5209/meso.64527
- Canal, M., Costa, D., and Santisteban, A. (2012). "El alumnado ante problemas sociales relevantes: ¿cómo los interpreta? ¿cómo piensa la participación?," in *Educación Para la Participación Ciudadana en la Enseñanza de las Ciencias Sociales*, eds. N. de Alba, F. García Pérez, and A. Santisteban (Sevilla: Asociación Universitaria de Profesores de Didáctica de las Ciencias Sociales), 527–536. Available online at: <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=3978530>
- Cardona Moltó, M. C. (2002). *Introducción a los Métodos de Investigación en Educación*. Madrid: Editorial EOS.
- Castells, M. (2006). *The Network Society: From Knowledge to Policy*. Washington, DC: Johns Hopkins Center for Transatlantic Relations.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., and Morrison, K. (2013). *Research Methods in Education*, 7th Edn. London: Routledge.
- Creswell, J. W., and Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*, 5th Edn. Los Angeles, CA, London, New Delhi and Singapore: SAGE Publications.
- Crocco, M. (2018). "Gender and sexuality in history education," in *The Wiley International Handbook of History Teaching and Learning*, eds. S. A. Metzger, and L. M. Harris (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell), 335–363. doi: 10.1002/9781119100812.ch13
- Crocco, M. (2019). Teaching gender and social studies in the #MeToo era. *Soc. Stud. J.* 38 (1), 6–16.
- de la Cruz, A., Díez-Bedmar, M. C., and García Luque, A. (2019). "Formación de profesorado y reflexión sobre identidades de género diversas a través de los libros de texto de ciencias sociales," in *Enseñar y Aprender Didáctica de las Ciencias Sociales: La Formación del Profesorado Desde una Perspectiva Sociocrítica*, eds. M. João Hortas, A. Dias D'Almeida, and N. de Alba Fernández (Lisbon: AUPDCS–Politécnico de Lisboa), 273–287.
- De Leeuw, E. (2004). *New Technologies in Data Collection, Questionnaire Design and Quality*. Donostia-San Sebastián: Instituto Vasco de Estadística.
- Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., and Christian, L. M. (2014). *Internet, Phone, Mail, and Mixed-mode surveys: The Tailored Design Method*, 4th Edn. Madrid: John Wiley & Sons.
- Díez-Bedmar, M. C. (2022). Feminism, intersectionality, and gender category: essential contributions for historical thinking development. *Front. Educ.* 7, 1–8. doi: 10.3389/feduc.2022.842580
- Díez-Bedmar, M. C., and Ortega-Sánchez, D. (2021). "Estado de la cuestión sobre la perspectiva de género y enseñanza de la historia y las ciencias sociales en España," in *La Enseñanza de la Historia en Brasil y España: Un Homenaje a Joan Pagès Blanch*, eds. A. Santisteban, and C. A. Lima Ferreira (Porto Alegre: Editora Fi), 234–254.
- Fernández Esquinas, M. (2003). Criterios de calidad en la investigación social: la producción de datos sociales. *Empiria Rev. Metodol. Cienc. Soc.* 6, 47–78.
- Field, A. (2018). *Discovering Statistics Using R*, 2nd Edn. London: SAGE Publications.
- Flick, U. (2015). *Introducing Research Methodology: A Beginner's Guide to Doing a Research Project*, 2nd Edn. SAGE Publications.
- Foucault, M. (1979). *Microfísica del Poder*. La Piqueta.
- García Mingo, E., and Díaz Fernández, S. (2023). Wounded men and feminism: exploring regimes of male victimhood in the Spanish manosphere. *Eur. J. Cult. Stud.* 26 (2), 897–915. doi: 10.1177/13675494221140586
- Garmendia, M., Jiménez, E., Karrera, I., Larrañaga, N., Casado, M. A., Martínez, G., et al. (2019). *Actividades, Mediación, Oportunidades y Riesgos Online de los Menores en la era de la Convergencia Mediática*. León: Editado por el Instituto Nacional de Ciberseguridad (INCIBE).
- Giroux, H. A. (2018). *Pedagogy and the Politics of Hope: Theory, Culture, and Schooling: A Critical Reader*. Routledge.
- González Nadal, D., and Hernández, J. (2023). *Discurso de Odio y Orgullo LGTBIQ+ en la Conversación Digital (Ideas Llorente y Cuenca 1; LLYC IDEAS, p. 26)*. LLYC IDEAS. Available online at: <https://resources.lyc.global/es/discursos-de-odio-y-orgullo-lgtbq-en-la-conversacion-digital> (Accessed May 22, 2025).
- Gómez Suárez, A. (2024). La era del patriarcado de vigilancia: ciberviolencia, manosphere y democracia. *Asparkia* (45), 1–22. doi: 10.6035/asparkia.7857
- Guba, E. G., and Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). "Competing paradigms in qualitative research," in *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, eds. N. K. Denzin, and Y. S. Lincoln (Sonora, CA: SAGE Publications), 105–117.
- Han, B.-C. (2022). *La Sociedad del Cansancio*. Barcelona: Herder.
- Hernández-García, F., and Fernández-Cano, A. (2021). Investigación cuantitativa en educación: fundamentos, técnicas y estrategias. *Rev. Electron. Interuniv. Form. Prof.* 24 (1), 123–136. doi: 10.6018/reifop.487331

## Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

## Supplementary material

The Supplementary Material for this article can be found online at: <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/feduc.2026.1779731/full#supplementary-material>

- Huete, X. (2022). "Opresión epistémica en la manófera: un análisis estructural de los problemas de la ignorancia activa," in *Verdad, Desinformación y Verificación: Retos Epistémicos y Morales*, eds. A. Wagner, and S. Degli-Esposti (Madrid: ILEMATA, Revista Internacional de Éticas Aplicadas), 163–175. <https://www.dilemata.net/revista/index.php/dilemata/article/view/412000490>
- Lacalle, M. (2023). The otherless other: las pasiones misóginas de la manófera española. *Signa* (32), 41–53. doi: 10.5944/signa.vol32.2023.36111
- Levinas, E. (1993). *Humanismo del Otro Hombre*. Mexico City: Siglo XXI.
- Lingiardi, V., Carone, N., Semeraro, G., Musto, C., D'Amico, M., and Brena, S. (2020). Mapping twitter hate speech towards social and sexual minorities: a lexicon-based approach to semantic content analysis. *Behav. Inf. Technol.* 39 (7), 711–721. doi: 10.1080/0144929X.2019.1607903
- López-Roldán, P., and Fachelli, S. (2015). *Metodología de la Investigación Social Cuantitativa*. Barcelona: Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona.
- Lynch, S. M. (2013). *Using Statistics in Social Research: With a Complete SPSS Guide*. New York, NY: Springer. Available online at: <https://link.springer.com/book/10.1007/978-1-4614-8573-5>
- Marolla Gajardo, J., Castellví Mata, J., and Mendonça dos Santos, R. (2021). Chilean Teacher educators' conceptions on the absence of women and their history in teacher training programmes: a collective case study. *Soc. Sci.* 10 (3), 106–125. doi: 10.3390/socsci10030106
- Marolla, J. (2019). La ausencia y la discriminación de las mujeres en la formación del profesorado de historia y ciencias sociales. *Rev. Electrón. Educare* 23 (1), 137–157. doi: 10.15359/ree.23-1.8
- Marolla, J., Escribano, C., and Castellví, J. (2023). "El informe de investigación y la redacción científica," in *¿Cómo Investigar en Didáctica de las Ciencias Sociales? Fundamentos Metodológicos, Técnicas e Instrumentos de Investigación*, ed. D. Ortega-Sánchez (Barcelona: Octaedro), 225–232.
- Marolla-Gajardo, J., and Lozano-Mas, M. Y. (2025a). Anti-bullying in the digital age: how cyberhate travels from social media to classroom climate in pre-service teacher programmes. *Societies* 15 (10), 284. doi: 10.3390/soc15100284
- Marolla-Gajardo, J., and Lozano-Mas, M. Y. (2025b). Teaching against hate in a globalised world: lessons from initial teacher education in Chile for social work education. *Soc. Sci.* 14 (10), 595. doi: 10.3390/socsci14100595
- Marolla-Gajardo, J., and Riquelme Plaza, I. (2025). Teacher education, diversity, and the prevention of hate speech: ethical and political foundations for inclusive citizenship. *Societies* 15 (5), 139. doi: 10.3390/soc15050139
- Marolla-Gajardo, J., Zurita-Garrido, F., Pinochet-Pinochet, S., and Castro-Palacios, G. (2023). Hate speech and the gender perspective: a problem from the teaching of social sciences in school. *Eur. J. Educ. Res.* 12 (1), 133–144. doi: 10.12973/eu-jer.12.1.133
- Mertens, D. M. (2010). *Research and Evaluation in Education and Psychology: Integrating Diversity with Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Methods*, 3rd Edn. SAGE Publications.
- Mèlich, J.-C. (2001). *La Lección de Auschwitz*. Herder.
- Mèlich, J.-C. (2010). *Ética de la Compasión*. Herder.
- Molet Chicot, C., and Bernard Cavero, O. (2015). Políticas de género y formación del profesorado: diez propuestas para un debate. *Temas de Educación* 21 (1), 119–129. doi: 10.15443/tde659
- Muñoz, J., and Tezanos, J. F. (2017). *Metodología de la Investigación en Ciencias Sociales: Fundamentos, Técnicas y Estrategias*, 2nd Edn. Madrid: Editorial Biblioteca Nueva.
- Navarro, D. J. (2019). Learning statistics with R: A tutorial for psychology students and other beginners (Version 0.6). Available online at: <https://learningstatisticswithr.com> (Accessed 22 may 2025).
- Nietzsche, F. (2007). *Sobre Verdad y Mentira en Sentido Extramoral*. Madrid: Alianza Editorial.
- Ortega-Sánchez, D. (2023). *¿Cómo Investigar en Didáctica de las Ciencias Sociales? Fundamentos Metodológicos, Técnicas e Instrumentos de Investigación*. Barcelona: Octaedro.
- Ortega-Sánchez, D., Marolla, J., and Heras, D. (2020). "Invisibilidades sociales, identidades de género y competencia narrativa en los discursos históricos del alumnado de educación primaria," in *Educación Para el Bien Común: Hacia una Práctica Crítica, Inclusiva y Comprometida Socialmente*, eds. J. Diez Gutiérrez, and J. R. Rodríguez Fernández (Barcelona: Octaedro), 89–103.
- Parodi, R., Cuesta, M., and Wegelin, L. (2022). Problematicar los discursos de odio: democracia, redes sociales y esfera pública. *Tramp. Comun. Cult.* 87, 1–16. doi: 10.24215/2314274xe061
- Pasta, S. (2025). "Cómo contrarrestar el discurso de odio en la era posdigital: un desafío para la "ciudadanía digital"," in *Actas del II congreso Internacional de Educación y Diversidad*, eds. A. Quintas Hijos, and A. Quilez Robres (Zaragoza, UK: Academic Conferences and International Limited-Read Publications), 28–42.
- Peinado Rodríguez, M., García Luque, A., and de la Cruz Redondo, A. (2026). *Claves de Investigación/acción Para la Formación Inicial del Profesorado de Educación Infantil en Ciudadanía*. Síntesis (Barcelona: En prensa).
- Piñero Otero, T., Martínez Rolán, X., and Castro Souto, L. M. (2024). ¿Sueñan los troles con mujeres en el poder? Una aproximación al troleo de género como violencia política. *Anuario Electrónico de Estudios en Comunicación Social "Disertaciones"* 17 (2), 1–16. doi: 10.12804/revistas.uosario.edu.co/disertaciones/a.13988
- Rogero, J. (2019). Los discursos de odio y la educación. *Revista Digital de la Asociación Convives* 25, 5–15. <http://convivesenlaescuela.blogspot.com.es/>
- Rubio Martín, M. J., and Varas Reviejo, J. (2004). *El Análisis de la Realidad en la Intervención Social: Métodos y Técnicas de Investigación*. Madrid: X: Editorial CCS.
- Santisteban, A. (2009). Cómo trabajar en clase la competencia social y ciudadana. *Aula de Innovación Educativa* 187, 12–15.
- Santisteban, A. (2018). "El discurso del odio: una investigación en la formación inicial," in *Buscando Formas de Enseñar: Investigar Para Innovar en Didáctica de las Ciencias Sociales*, eds. E. López-Torres, C. R. García-Ruiz, and M. Sánchez-Agustí (Asociación Universitaria de Profesorado de Didáctica de las Ciencias Sociales (Valladolid: AUPDCS)), 413–424.
- Tavakol, M., and Dennick, R. (2011). Making sense of cronbach's alpha. *Int. J. Med. Educ.* 2, 53–55. doi: 10.5116/ijme.4dfb.8dfd
- The Adorno, T. W. (2004). *Pensar Contra la Barbarie*. Madrid: Trotta.
- United Nations. (2017). *Gender Equality Glossary*. New York, NY: UN Women Training Centre. <https://trainingcentre.unwomen.org/mod/glossary/view.php?id=36>
- United Nations. (2019a). *United Nations Strategy and Plan of Action on Hate Speech*. New York, NY: United Nations. [https://www.un.org/en/genocideprevention/documents/advising-and-mobilizing/Action\\_plan\\_on\\_hate\\_speech\\_EN.pdf](https://www.un.org/en/genocideprevention/documents/advising-and-mobilizing/Action_plan_on_hate_speech_EN.pdf)
- United Nations. (2019b). *La Estrategia y el Plan de Acción de las Naciones Unidas Para la Lucha Contra el Discurso del Odio*. New York, NY: Naciones Unidas. Available online at: <https://www.un.org/es/hate-speech/un-strategy-and-plan-of-action-on-hate-speech>
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2003). *Ideología y Discurso: Una Introducción Multidisciplinaria*. Ariel, Barcelona: Grupo Planeta (GBS).
- Vargas Saldarriaga, D. L., Diez-Bedmar, M. C., and Marolla Gajardo, J. (2025). "Diversidades en las representaciones profesionales del profesorado de historia y ciencias sociales desde un análisis interseccional de género en la prevención de discursos de odio. Conclusiones preliminares," in *Didáctica de las Ciencias Sociales y Perspectiva de Género: Un Camino Hacia el Progreso*, eds. A. Rubio Navarro, E. Bermejo Malumbres, and I. Piazuelo Rodríguez (Madrid: Dykinson), 19–31.
- Viveros Vigoya, M. (2022). *El Oxitomón de las Clases Medias Negras: Movilidad Social e Interseccionalidad en Colombia*. Bielefeld University Press. p. 224
- Wachs, S., Weinstein, A., Bilz, L., and Gámez-Guadix, M. (2022). Motivos del discurso de odio en la adolescencia y su relación con las normas sociales. *Comunicar* 30 (71), 9–20. doi: 10.3916/C71-2022-01
- Žižek, S. (2002). *Bienvenidos al Desierto de lo Real*. Madrid: Akal.
- Žižek, S. (2014). *Problemas en el Paraíso*. Barcelona: Anagrama.