

Let's talk about sex: college students' attitudes towards Sexuality Education in a Spanish University

Clara Lahoz-García¹*, José María Jimenez², María José Castro², José-Luis Parejo³.

¹Department of Urology, HM Torrelodones, Madrid, Spain.

² Research Group "Multidisciplinary Assessment and Intervention in Health Care and Sustainable Lifestyles VIMAS+", Faculty of Nursing, University of Valladolid. Valladolid, Spain

³ Department of Pedagogy, Segovia Faculty of Education, University of Valladolid, Spain. Research Group "Curriculum Research and Teacher Training ICUFOP", Faculty of Education, University of Granada, Spain

E-mail: clara.lahoz@gmail.com (CLG)

ABSTRACT

The concept of Sexual Education has greatly evolved over the years. Its definition and scope have been adapted to changing social and political circumstances.

University students face broad access to information, but not always adequate. A lack of good tools for discrimination can lead to the persistence of stereotypes, rejection of diversity, low perception of risk or the appearance of sexual dysfunctions.

Methods: between December 2020 and April 2021, 1,028 students from the University of Valladolid filled out a questionnaire exploring their attitudes towards Sexuality. A latent class analysis was carried out to characterise different student profiles, and the Chi-squared distribution test was applied to assess the influence of sociodemographic factors on each of the profiles.

Results: the sample mostly represented undergraduate students (93%), women (67%) and heterosexuals (80%), with an average age of 21. 51% identified as Christians and 53% had not left home. Gender, sexual orientation and religious feelings influenced the characterization of every classes ($p < 0.05$). Regarding the proposed Opinions on Sexuality, three student profiles were identified: unfavourable (17%), with a greater proportion of women, heterosexuals, and Christians; intermediate (68%) and favourable (15%) made up of more men, non-heterosexuals and non-religious. Concerning Myths, four profiles were observed: indifferent (31%), with more women and non-religious students, those who accept them (2%), composed of more men, heterosexuals and the religious, intermediates (48%) and those who reject the myths (20%), with a higher percentage of non-heterosexual undergraduates.

Conclusions: different student profiles have been identified by the opinions and attitudes expressed towards Sexuality. The results show that gender, sexual orientation and religious feelings were the most influential factors for their characterisation despite the indifference shown by a large number of students. These observations detect needs to be covered by future proposals to improve Sexual Education.

INTRODUCTION

Sexual Education (SE) begins from birth and is lifelong [1]. It has been present throughout history, more formally within the educational system, and more informally in other areas such as the home, meetings with friends, personal experiences or through

books, media, and more recently the Internet. On the more formal side, SE can be present in various aspects such as education for affectivity, emotions and feelings, education for health and well-being, for equality, autonomy and freedom, respect, and the more biologicistic side, such as knowledge of one's own body and the functioning of its different parts throughout life, for example, the reproductive system. Such knowledge and attitudes are often transmitted explicitly, with classes on the female menstrual cycle or HIV prevention, while on other occasions it occurs more transversally, via activities or exercises that promote respect for diversity. However, this transmission of knowledge is not free of biases, myths, or gaps.

The concept of SE has evolved over time. Numerous agreements between international organizations such as the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), or the World Health Organization (WHO), have adapted the definitions of SE and the areas it covers to the social and political situation around the world.

In 1975, Sexual Health began to be spoken of as “the integration of the somatic, emotional, intellectual and social elements of the sexual being through means that are positively enriching and that strengthen personality, communication and love” [2]. The concept evolved over the years until it reached Comprehensive Sexual Education, a vision opposite to that focused on abstinence, which provides a positive perspective on sexuality, respect for diversity, rigorous knowledge adapted to an individual's stage of life and the social and cultural context, in addition to being linked to health services [3,4]. This way of approaching SE strives to be fair, accessible to all and includes values related to gender, equality, responsibility, respect, and sexuality, from the universal values of Human Rights [5,6]. Its objectives are to promote sexual health, improve quality of life, achieve well-being from values such as gender equality and respect for diversity, and to foster safe, healthy, and positive practices, behaviours, and relationships [7,8].

There is practically unanimity amongst the various international organisations concerning the idea that SE is essential [3,9] and can be improved [10]. There are numerous proposals to work on SE [10], placing more emphasis on certain aspects and always adapted to the context and characteristics of the public, their social situation, their age, etc. to address it in the most appropriate manner [4,8,11].

Most research on SE focuses on the study of the changes that occur during adolescence, there being far fewer studies of the university population, made up mostly of young adults. Members of this group are still in a formative period and either have not yet fully entered the labour market or their experience in the field is limited. The changes typical

of puberty are still recent at these ages and experience in romantic relationships is usually incipient.

Furthermore, all university students, and young people in general, face broad access to information that is not always correct, including pornography, with few discriminatory tools, which encourages the perpetuation of marked gender roles, the persistence of myths of romantic love, and low perception regarding the risks of disease transmission or the appearance of sexual dysfunctions [8,10,12]. The situation of students in degrees related to Education and Health is especially delicate since they will be in charge of disseminating SE in the future and of promoting healthy attitudes among different sectors of the population as part of their professional life [9]. There does not seem to be a wide variety of university subjects that include this knowledge, it being taken for granted that it has been mastered, when on many occasions, the professionals themselves recognise their lack of training in this area or feel uncomfortable when addressing these issues during their worktime [13].

Latent class analysis

Latent Class Analysis (LCA) is an extremely useful statistical tool for differentiating between various groups of people who follow the same behavioural pattern in a given situation. Paul Lazarsfeld first described this type of statistical analysis in 1950. At the beginning, it was used only for dichotomous variables, but in light of its possibilities from 1974 on its use became increasingly popular [14]. LCA has numerous applications in social science research due to its usefulness when classifying groups of individuals by attitudes, perceptions, or opinions, since it allows new groups of individuals to be established based on less obvious characteristics [15]. Interest in this statistical tool is increasing thanks to the availability of software such as Mplus [16].

As a model of multivariate analysis, LCA studies different variables at the same time. It allows the definition of a series of latent classes or profiles, represented by their response patterns to different variables. Thus, new underlying (latent) variables can be discovered and studied, though not directly observable they may influence the relationships between the variables being studied. By means of this analysis, new groups of individuals (latent classes or profiles) are defined and the probability that each observation, or variable, belongs to one or the other can be calculated [17]. Thus, LCA focuses on grouping different individuals, in this case university students, unlike other statistical techniques such as factor analysis, which focuses on associating different variables [15].

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study design

This is a cross-curricular, descriptive study, with an observational design. It was carried out on University of Valladolid (UVa) students during the 2020-21 academic year.

The UVa has sites in 4 Spanish cities: Valladolid, Palencia, Segovia, and Soria. During this year a total of 18,556 students were enrolled. To achieve a 99% confidence interval, a sample of 641 students was required [18].

In order to attract the largest possible number of participants, a user-friendly questionnaire was drawn up that was adapted to the diversity at UVa and the language of its students. It was reviewed by a group of 10 experts in sexual education and 11 university students, who provided suggestions for preparing the final version. It was distributed primarily through social media and was available online from December 2020 to April 2021.

Participants and ethical considerations

Participation was voluntary and anonymous. The people included in the study were students enrolled in one of the 133 degree courses offered by UVa for the 2020-21 academic year, adults, who expressly accepted written informed consent and who filled out the questionnaire in its entirety.

This research was approved by the Ethics Commission of Eastern Health Area of Valladolid (CEIm Valladolid), code PI 20-1833.

Data analysis

The questionnaire consisted of 2 parts, a first section that explores sociodemographic data such as age, type of studies, years at university, gender, sexual orientation, religious affiliation, and type of family and housing; and a second part that gathers opinions and attitudes towards Sexuality composed of two Likert scales: 8 opinions and 7 myths (Table 1), healthier attitudes would correspond to showing greater agreement with the opinions and greater disagreement with the myths. Two scales revealed acceptable internal consistency: result of Chronbach test were 0.752 and 0.788 respectively).

Table 1 Attitudes towards sexuality

OPINIONS		MYTHS	
1	Talk about sex	1	Sexuality: adolescence - old age
2	Masturbation	2	Virginity and transition to adulthood
3	Oral sex, anal sex	3	Sex for boys vs. girls
4	Consumption of pornography	4	Jealousy and true love
5	Polyamory	5	Good ideas from porn
6	Sexual fantasies	6	Condoms and pleasure
7	Consumption of drugs	7	Circumcision
8	Sex between the elderly		

Statistical analyses were performed using MPLUS software [16]. Several latent class analyses were carried out to characterise different student profiles in accordance with their opinions and attitudes towards sexuality, and the Chi-squared technique was used to calculate the influence of sociodemographic factors on the composition of the profiles. Statistical significance was set at $p < 0.05$. In this analysis, 8 no-woman no-man people was excluded in order to adjust Chi-squared test norms.

RESULTS

Sociodemographic characteristics

The final sample was made up of 1,028 UVa students.

The sample participants were mostly undergraduate students (93%), with an average age of 21 (a range between 18 and 49 years-of-age). 22.9% of the sample were in their first year of university, 67% were women and there were 8 participants who did not define themselves as either man or woman. In terms of sexual orientation, the majority defined themselves as heterosexual (80%), 12% were bisexual and 3.4% were homosexual. A predominance of Christian university students (51%) and those who have not yet become independent (53%) was observed.

Attitudes towards sexuality

In the first part, Opinions, no participant disagreed with “talking about sex”. 90% of the university students showed a favourable opinion to talking about the topic, masturbation,

and other forms of sexual relations. 43.7% agreed with the consumption of pornography, and 13.3% with polyamory (62.2% were indifferent in this section). Furthermore, 56.8% were in favour of sexual fantasies, 13.2% of the consumption of drugs to improve sexual experience and 27.3% were in favour of sexual relations between the elderly (Fig 1).

On the second scale, myths, the percentage of students who chose to answer 'don't know' or 'indifferent' increased in all sections, being the options preferred by between 46.4% and 70% of the students. 23% agreed that good ideas can be taken from porn, 30% that condoms reduce sensitivity in sexual relations and only 7% that jealousy expresses true love. The percentages of disagreement with or disbelieving the proposed myths were from 20% to 37% (Fig 2).

Latent class analysis

After making the appropriate adjustments, 3 student profiles were obtained from Opinions (Table 2) and 5, finally reduced to 4, from the analysis of myths about sexuality (Table 3). The variables that most influenced the composition of the different profiles were gender, sexual orientation and type, and religious orientation.

Table 2 Latent Class Analysis: Opinions.

OPINIONS SCALE	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3
Students: n (%)	170 (16.54)	706 (68.68)	152 (14.79)
1: Talk about sex			
Agree	0.746	0.949	0.941
Indifferent or DK/NR	0.254	0.051	0.059
Disagree	0	0	0
2: Masturbation			
Agree	0.344	1	0.968
Indifferent or DK/NR	0.620	0	0.032
Disagree	0.037	0	0
3: Oral sex, anal sex			
Agree	0.309	0.897	0.934
Indifferent or DK/NR	0.616	0.1	0.066
Disagree	0.075	0.002	0
4: The existence of porn			
Agree	0.051	0.469	0.749
Indifferent or DK/NR	0.736	0.424	0.207

Disagree	0.212	0.108	0.044
5: The existence of polyamory			
Agree	0	0.041	0.649
Indifferent or DK/NR	0.831	0.913	0.351
Disagree	0.169	0.046	0
6: Sexual fantasies			
Agree	0.251	0.677	0.894
Indifferent or DK/NR	0.683	0.275	0.106
Disagree	0.066	0.048	0
7: Use of drugs			
Agree	0.015	0.079	0.377
Indifferent or DK/NR	0.746	0.696	0.594
Disagree	0.240	0.225	0.029
8: Sexual relations between the elderly			
Agree	0.123	0.271	0.554
Indifferent or DK/NR	0.683	0.560	0.398
Disagree	0.194	0.169	0.048

Table 3: Latent Class Analysis: Myths.

MYTHS SCALE	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4	Class 5
Students: n (%)	317 (30.84)	13 (1.27)	255 (24.81)	242 (23.54)	201 (19.55)
1: Sexuality is present from adolescence to middle age.					
Agree	0.039	1,000	0.077	0.195	0.035
Indifferent or DK/NR	0.888	0.000	0.799	0.776	0.226
Disagree	0.073	0.000	0.124	0.028	0.738
2: Losing your virginity is an essential step in going from childhood to adulthood.					
Agree	0.033	0.925	0.068	0.276	0.041
Indifferent or DK/NR	0.916	0.075	0.725	0.694	0.052
Disagree	0.051	0.000	0.207	0.030	0.907
3: Sex is more important for boys than for girls.					
Agree	0.029	0.927	0.077	0.185	0.046
Indifferent or DK/NR	0.961	0.073	0.374	0.775	0.075
Disagree	0.011	0.000	0.650	0.041	0.880
4: If there is no jealousy, there is no true love.					

Agree	0.000	0.932	0.018	0.168	0.042
Indifferent or DK/NR	0.967	0.068	0.307	0.747	0.086
Disagree	0.033	0.000	0.675	0.085	0.873
5: You can get good ideas from porn.					
Agree	0.012	1,000	0.143	0.555	0.180
Indifferent or DK/NR	0.883	0.000	0.334	0.389	0.264
Disagree	0.105	0.000	0.523	0.056	0.556
6: Condoms reduce the pleasure derived from sexual relations.					
Agree	0.095	0.775	0.245	0.621	0.192
Indifferent or DK/NR	0.792	0.225	0.549	0.294	0.268
Disagree	0.113	0.000	0.206	0.085	0.539
7: All men should be circumcised.					
Agree	0.041	1,000	0.043	0.076	0.023
Indifferent or DK/NR	0.956	0.000	0.633	0.788	0.306
Disagree	0.003	0.000	0.325	0.136	0.671

In the case of Opinions on Sexuality, three student profiles were identified: unfavourable/indifferent (17%), intermediate (68%) and favourable (15%). The sociodemographic factors that were significant in the composition of the profiles were gender ($p = 0.026$), sexual orientation ($p < 0.001$) and religious situation and orientation ($p < 0.001$ in both cases) (Table 4). A higher probability of women, heterosexuals, and people with religious feelings of a Christian orientation was observed in the unfavourable profile, with a greater proportion of men and non-heterosexual and agnostic/atheist students among the components of the favourable profile.

Table 4: Influence of sociodemographic factors in the characterisation of opinions on sexuality.

OPINIONS SCALE	CLASS 1	CLASS 2	CLASS 3
Students	170 (16.54)	706 (68.68)	152 (14.79)
Gender (n 1020)			
Woman	128 (75.7)	467 (66.5)	92 (61.7)
Man	41 (24.3)	235 (33.5)	57 (38.3)
Sexual Orientation			
Heterosexual	154 (90.5)	565 (80)	99 (65.1)
Bisexual	9 (5.2)	82 (11.6)	33 (21.7)
Homosexual	3 (1.7)	28 (3.9)	4 (2.6)
Non-defined	4 (2,3)	31 (4.3)	16 (10.5)

Religious feeling			
Agnostic/atheist	75 (44.1)	430 (60.9)	109 (71.7)
Believer	72 (42.3)	240 (33.9)	40 (26.3)
Practicing	23 (13.5)	36 (5)	3 (1.9)
Religion orientation			
NA/ DK	47 (27.6)	330 (46.7)	79 (51.9)
Christian	115 (67.6)	349 (49.4)	61 (40.1)
Other religions	8 (4.7)	27 (3.8)	12 (7.8)

In the proposed Myths about Sexuality, five latent classes were observed: one composed of indifferent students (31%), and another of those who accept the myths (2%), two intermediate classes in terms of disbelieving myths (48%) and finally, those who reject them (20%). The most relevant sociodemographic factors in determining the composition of the classes were gender (p 0.002), sexual orientation (p 0.003) and religious situation and orientation (p 0.002 and <0.001 respectively) (Table 5). A greater probability of finding women and people without religious feelings was observed among those who were indifferent; men, heterosexuals and practicing Christians were more common among those who accept the myths; and students of non-heterosexual orientation, who furthermore have at some moment felt uncomfortable with this aspect, are among those who make up the class that has already seen through the proposed myths about sexuality.

Table 5: Influence of sociodemographic factors on the characterisation of myths.

MYTHS SCALE	CLASS 1	CLASS 2	CLASS 3	CLASS 4	CLASS 5
Students	307 (30.84)	13 (1.27)	255 (24.81)	242 (23.54)	201 (19.55)
Gender (n 1020)					
Woman	239 (76.1)	6 (50)	170 (67.4)	132 (54.7)	140 (69.6)
Man	75 (23.8)	6 (50)	82 (32.5)	109 (45.2)	61 (30.3)
Orientation					
Heterosexual	238 (75)	11 (84.6)	203 (79.6)	228 (94.2)	138 (68.6)
Bisexual	44 (13.8)	0 (0)	30 (11.7)	8 (3,3)	42 (20.8)
Homosexual	13 (4.1)	1 (7.6)	11 (4.3)	1 (0.4)	9 (4.4)
Non-defined	22 (6.9)	1 (7.6)	11 (4.3)	5 (2)	12 (5.9)
Religious feelings					
Agnostic/atheist	193 (60.8)	5 (38.4)	174 (68.2)	122 (50.4)	120 (59.7)
Believer	100 (31.5)	7 (53.8)	68 (26.6)	108 (44.6)	69 (34.3)
Practicing	24 (7.5)	1 (7.6)	13 (5)	12 (4.9)	12 (5.9)
Religion orientation					

NA/ DK	153 (48.2)	3 (23)	127 (49.8)	74 (30.5)	99 (49.2)
Christian	153 (48.2)	10 (76.9)	123 (48.2)	148 (61.1)	91 (45.2)
Other religions	11 (3.4)	0 (0)	5 (1.9)	20 (8.2)	11 (5.4)

DISCUSSION

Most of the university students who made up the sample were undergraduate students, two-thirds being women and 80% heterosexuals. The average age was 21.4 years.

In our questionnaire question about gender, possible response options offered were, apart from male or female, non-binary, or non-defined. These last two options were chosen by only 1.6% of our sample. Costa in Brazil [19] and Kaufman in the United States [20] obtained similar proportions in their research. It is striking that in numerous studies no alternatives other than men or women are offered, such as those carried out by the Centre for Sociological Research in Spain in its latest study on social and emotional relationships [21], or that, in others, such as that of Burrell in 2019, despite the fact that they exist, no student feels identified [22]. On other occasions, sexual identity is confused with sexual orientation [23].

Regarding sexual orientation, the options offered were heterosexual, homosexual, bisexual or non-defined. Fehr conducted a study in 2018 in which he proposed a scale with 7 degrees between heterosexual and homosexual to a group of university students, obtaining similar proportions to our sample [24]. The percentages observed regarding heterosexual university students in different studies range from 65% to 90.5% [20,25,26] reaching 94.2% found by Ballester-Arnal in a study of Spanish students [27].

Religious feelings were explored as was, when present, their orientation, or the type of religion professed. Over half of the students in our sample identified as agnostic or atheist, with a third being believers and only 6% practicing. A study carried out in Seville a few years ago revealed that 39% of university students were atheist/agnostic, and that up to 59% declared themselves Catholic [23], while, in another American study, more than half of university students declared themselves non-religious [20]. Among the general Spanish population in this period, 57.8% defined themselves as Catholic Christians (with only 17.7% practicing), compared to 39.8% who identified as agnostic/atheist or indifferent to religion [21]. As for religious orientation, or type of religion professed, it is striking that 22.9% of the students who responded that they felt Christian, also answered the question about whether they had religious feelings with "agnostic/atheist". This may be due to baptised university students who have lost their

faith (or never had it), or students who comply with Christian precepts for social reasons but who have stopped seeing themselves as forming part of that religious group.

Attitudes towards sexuality

Initially, showing healthier attitudes would mean agreeing with the opinions and rejecting the myths about sexuality. The results analysed show a large percentage of students agreeing with the opinions, in many cases exceeding 50%, while the number of students against myths about sexuality drops to only 20-30% of our sample. These results are in line with those observed by Beaumont in a study on SE in the European Union, where it is confirmed that a large part of young Spaniards' attitudes towards SE are conditioned by stereotypes, myths, and erroneous beliefs [28].

What is striking is the large percentage of students in our sample who chose not to answer or appear indifferent in this section on attitudes; up to a third in the part concerning opinions and almost half on some of the proposed myths. If we add together the students who choose these two options, between Don't Know and Indifferent, we find that around half of the students are not engaged with or do not have a clear opinion on the different aspects of sexuality raised in the study. The reasons for this lack of attitude were not analysed, although it could be attributed to passivity, ignorance, or to the influence of the confinement and general despondency caused by the Covid-19 pandemic.

The general predisposition to talk about sex is worthy of mention. This finding shows how widespread the presence of sex, sexuality or sexual relations is, whether formally or informally, in our sample. This fact was studied a few years ago in the United Kingdom, when it was observed that female students talked about sex about 13 times a day [29].

One of the first tools developed to understand behaviours, attitudes, and knowledge regarding sexuality among university students was the SKAT [30]. This questionnaire was implemented during the 1970s and revealed that up to three-quarters of students believed masturbation to be healthy, but that 16% of a sample of future doctors believed that masturbation could cause mental illness. A few years after this research, 90% of UVA students in our sample were in favour of masturbation.

Only 12% of our sample was against the consumption of pornography and 20% against taking drugs during sexual relations. Some studies have already indicated the large percentage of students who have had regular contact with porn and substance use [31,32].

In the last section, Myths, from 7% to 30% of the students accepted the proposals. The most commonly debunked myths were “jealousy represents true love” and “sex is more important for men than for women”, while the most enduring ones turned out to be “condoms reduce the sensitivity of sexual relations” and “good ideas come from porn.”

One of the myths debunked was that condoms reduce sensitivity in sexual relations, with which a third of our sample agreed. This could be wielded as an excuse not to use this method of contraception and protection against STIs in a sexual relationship. However, it was not among the reasons registered in research carried out with a sample of university students, when they were asked about reasons for not using a condom [33]. The responses were that the students were using other forms of contraception, participants had got carried away by the moment, the condom had been forgotten due to the influence of drugs or alcohol, a condom was not available at the time, and other reasons, the least frequent being that they are looking to procreate or that the relationship was between people of the same sex and there was no risk of pregnancy.

20% of the UVa students agreed with the controversial phrase that “all men should be circumcised”, incidentally, since 2007 the WHO has recommended voluntary circumcision in certain African countries as a part of an HIV prevention strategy [34], these being countries with high prevalence of HIV and difficult access to health programs. Additionally, there is the justification that some religions claim that the procedure is necessary, even if there are no medical reasons for performing it. The arguments in favour of the need for this surgery would not affect our sample, since they are neither African students nor do they practice any of the religions that are in favour of circumcision.

Latent class analysis

The subject studied by our sample did not influence the characterisation of the profiles calculated by means of the attitudes shown towards sexuality. However the opposite was observed in a study on prejudices and myths in sexuality, here students of Engineering and degrees related to Earth Sciences corresponded proportionally more to a profile that accepted stereotypes of diversity; the intermediate class was made up of more students taking health subjects and Social and Biological Sciences; while those who specialized in Humanities and Philology had a greater probability of being included in the profile with more positive and healthier attitudes [19].

Gender greatly influenced the characterisation of the profiles observed in Attitudes towards Sexuality, as in the study by Yu, whose LCA confirmed a greater presence of

men in the class that has a higher probability of showing more unfavourable opinions or not getting beyond stereotypes [35]. A Hungarian study analysed the influence of gender, sexual orientation and religious situation on the attitudes shown, describing two student profiles, conservative and adventurous, with a higher percentage of women among the former and a greater probability that those seeking new experiences were men [36].

As described above, the LCA of Affirmations about sexuality revealed 3 student profiles regarding their opinion on the proposed affirmations: unfavourable/no engagement, intermediate and favourable.

What is striking about this analysis is the number of students that make up Class 2, more than half of the sample, which may imply a reduction in the power of the analyses or the existence of a non-response bias [37], but taking the results as a whole, what the appearance of this profile suggests is that a large percentage of students have not formed an opinion or are indifferent towards SE [35]. The causes and consequences of this lack of engagement should be addressed in greater depth in the future since there is currently hardly any research on the matter.

In Class 1, with more unfavourable opinions towards sexuality, a greater probability was observed of finding women, heterosexual students, and Christians. The healthier Class 3 was made up of a higher percentage of men, of people of non-heterosexual orientation and those without religious feelings (agnostics or atheists), which concurs with what some studies have observed [20,39,36,40] and is contrary to what has been found in research with Spanish university students, where gender did not influence the attitudes shown towards sexuality [41] or if it did, women were the ones who showed healthier opinions [23].

Regarding myths in sexuality, it has been observed that, on many occasions, students are not aware of the prejudices they show towards topics in the field of SE [19]. After the analyses of the rejection or acceptance of the proposed myths, five student profiles were observed, which were finally deduced to four. Class 1 was indifferent, Class 2 agreed with sexuality myths, Classes 3 and 4 were intermediate, and Class 5 showed a greater likelihood of disbelieving the proposed myths.

In our sample, it was observed that Class 1, characterised by a tendency towards indifference, was made up of a higher percentage of women and students without religious sentiment. In some research such as that of Evcili [37], it is women who are more likely to show greater prejudices towards Sexuality.

As for the members of Class 2, tolerant of the myths and in agreement with them, they are a minority. The characteristics of this profile, completely in favour of consuming pornography, are in line with the positive relationship observed between the acceptance of porn, myths, and stereotypes concerning sexuality [42]. This class was made up of a greater proportion of men, homosexuals, and those of a Christian orientation. These findings are in line with studies confirming that religious university students are the most likely to accept myths about sexuality [42].

Students in Class 5, healthier since they show greater discordance with the proposed stereotypes, make up a fifth of our sample. These results are quite promising, contrary to what some reports on SE in Europe state [28], where it is argued that the attitudes of Spanish students are conditioned by myths and erroneous beliefs. The university students who made up this group were, with higher probability, students of bisexual orientation and a large percentage of women compared to men [23].

Finally, the intermediate classes, 3 and 4, intermediate in terms of accepting some myths and rejecting others, were made up of a higher percentage of students of heterosexual orientation. The difference between both classes lies in religion; in Class 3 there is a greater probability of non-religious students and in Class 4, there is a greater proportion of students who follow some religion.

The objective of SE programs would be to get the members of class 1 engaged with something that, ultimately, is a part of their life, and for the members of intermediate classes 3 and 4, as well as class 2, to become part of Class 5, thus showing favourable attitudes towards sexuality.

Strengths and weaknesses

An online survey such as the one carried out in our research may imply a bias in sample selection, but in the case of the university population, this situation is greatly attenuated since it is a group characterised by good Internet connection and considerable use of social media in general [43]. Furthermore, the anonymity it provides allows participants to talk about sensitive topics such as sexuality or mental health, thereby reducing the risk of stigmatisation or that the answers are not real [38].

This study is based on a cross-disciplinary study, making it difficult to establish causes or triggers and effects or consequences of the findings. More research is needed to verify the effect, for example, of the confinement that took place in the months after the start of the field work, and its implications.

Although all questions in the questionnaire were mandatory, it was observed that, in some cases, more than half of the students chose Don't Know or Indifference. This lack of response or engagement may lead to bias, but far from being a limitation, some studies have already shown that not responding also implies a response [37]. The reasons for this lack of attitude were not analysed, although it could be attributed to ignorance, lack of information, or insecurity [38]. More research is particularly needed to confirm and clarify such *indifference*.

Finally, our research analyses students at a Spanish public university, but our findings should not be generalised to other universities or to the general Spanish population of that age range. Future studies are called for, since there is little in the literature which would allow the contrasting of results and conclusions.

CONCLUSIONS

The concept of Sexual Education is evolving. There is a positive relationship between greater Sexual Education and healthier attitudes towards sexuality. This research establish different classes of students depending on their opinions and belief in myths, and the influence of factors like gender, sexual orientation and religious feelings. Future programs of Sexual Education could be designed considering our findings to correct deficiencies and promote healthier attitudes towards sexuality.

A large part of the participants did not show any attitude towards Sexual Education factors, be it due to indifference, ignorance, or lack of response. The reasons for this lack of engagement and its implications are worthy of study.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

UVa students for their generous participation in this research.

REFERENCES


1. UNESCO. International technical guidance on sexuality education: an evidence-informed approach for schools, teachers and health educators. Paris: UNESCO,


- UNAIDS, UNFPA, UNICEF, WHO; 2010. Available from: https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000183281_spa.locale=es
2. WHO. Brief sexuality-related communication: Recommendations for a public health approach. Washington DC: Organización Panamericana de la Salud, World Health Organization; 2015. ISBN: 978-92-4-154900-4
 3. UNFPA. Operational Guidance for Comprehensive Sexuality Education: a Focus on Human Rights and Gender. New York: UNFPA; 2014
 4. UNFPA. Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights: An Essential Element of Universal Health Coverage. New York: UNFPA; 2019
 5. Kim E, Park B, Kim S, Park M, Lee J, Jo A, et al. A Meta-Analysis of the Effects of Comprehensive Sexuality Education Programs on Children and Adolescents. *Healthcare*, 2023; 11(18): 2511-2528. doi: 10.3390/healthcare11182511
 6. UNESCO. Comprehensive sexuality education: a global review. Paris: UNESCO, UNFPA, ONUSIDA; 2015. Available from: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000235707>
 7. Mark D, Corona-Vargas E, Cruz M. Integrating Sexual Pleasure for Quality & Inclusive Comprehensive Sexuality Education. *Int J Sex Health*. 2021; 33:4, 555-564. doi: 10.1080/19317611.2021.1921894
 8. UNESCO. The journey towards comprehensive sexuality education: global status report. UNESCO, UNAIDS, UNFPA, UNICEF, UN Women, WHO, 2022. ISBN 978-92-3-300186-2
 9. UNESCO. The journey towards comprehensive sexuality education. Global status report. Paris: UNSECO; 2021. Available from: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000379607>
 10. Lameiras-Fernández M, Martínez-Román R, Carrera-Fernández MV, Rodríguez-Castro Y. Sex Education in the Spotlight: What Is Working? Systematic Review. *Int J Environ Res Pub Health*. 2021; 18, 2555. doi: 10.3390/ijerph18052555
 11. WHO. Standards for sexuality education in Europe: a framework for policy makers, educational and health authorities and specialists. Cologne: World Health Organization Regional Office for Europe and Federal Centre for Health Education (PZgA); 2010. Available from: https://www.bzga-whocc.de/fileadmin/user_upload/WHO_BZgA_Standards_English.pdf
 12. Areskoug-Josefsson, K; Schindele, AC; Deogan, C; Lindroth, M. Education for Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights (SRHR): A Mapping of SRHR-Related Content in Higher Education in Health Care, Police, Law and Social Work

- in Sweden. *Sex Ed-Sex Loc Lea*. 2019; 19(6): 720-7029. doi: 10.1080/14681811.2019.1572501
13. WHO. WHO recommendations on adolescent sexual and reproductive health and rights. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2018. ISBN 978-92-4-151460-6
 14. Magidson J, Vermunt JK, Madura JP. Latent Class Analysis, In P. Atkinson, S. Delamont, A. Cernat, J.W. Sakshaug, & R.A. Williams (Eds.), SAGE Research Methods Foundations; 2020. doi: [10.4135/9781526421036883636](https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526421036883636)
 15. Collins LM, Lanza ST. Latent Class and Latent Transition Analysis: With Applications in the Social Behavioral, and Health Sciences; Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics; Wiley: Hoboken, NJ, USA, 2010; ISBN 978-0-470-22839-5
 16. Muthén LK, Muthén BO. Mplus statistical modeling software: Release 7.0. Los Angeles, CA: Muthén & Muthén; 2012
 17. Goodman LA. Exploratory Latent Structure Analysis Using both Identifiable and Unidentifiable Models. *Biometrika* 1974, 61, 215–231
 18. Qualtrics (n.d.), Sample size calculator. Available from: <https://www.qualtrics.com/blog/calculating-sample-size/>
 19. Costa AB, Peroni RO, Seger de Camargo E, Pasley A, Nardi HC. Prejudice Toward Gender and Sexual Diversity in a Brazilian Public University: Prevalence, Awareness, and the Effects of Education. *Sex Res Soc Policy*. 2015; 12(4): 261-272. doi: 10.1007/s13178-015-0191-z
 20. Kaufman G, Aiello A, Ellis C, Compton DL. Attitudes Toward Same-Sex Marriage, Polyamorous Marriage, and Conventional Marriage Ideals Among College Students in the Southeastern United States. *Sex Cult*. 2023; 26 (5): 1599-1620. doi: 10.1007/s12119-022-09960-y
 21. CIS. Encuesta sobre relaciones sociales y afectivas en tiempos de pandemia de la Covid-19. Estudio nº 3325, mayo-junio 2021
 22. Burrell CN, Sharon MJ, Bassler J, Davidov DM, Gender Differences in Sexual Health Knowledge Among Emerging Adults in Acute-Care Settings. *J Am Osteopath Assoc*. 2019; 119 (5): 289-298. doi: 10.7556/jaoa.2019.050
 23. Leon-Larios F, Macías-Seda J, Factors related to healthy sexual and contraceptive behaviors in undergraduate students at university of Seville: a cross-sectional study. *Reprod Health*. 2017; 14 (1). doi: 10.1186/s12978-017-0444-9
 24. Fehr SK, Vidourek RA, King KA, Nabors LA. Relationship Factors' Impact on Condom Use Among College Students. *Sex Cult*. 2018; 22(3): 724-739. doi: 10.1007/s12119-018-9503-9

25. Döring N, Danebach K, Shaughnessy K, Grov C, Byers ES. Online Sexual Activity Experiences Among College Students: A Four-Country Comparison. *Arch Sex Behav.* 2017; 46(6): 1641-1652. doi: 10.1007/s10508-015-0656-4
26. Gerassi LB, Lowe S, Walsh K. University Students Who Report Exchanging Sex for Money or Other Compensation: Findings from a Public University Sample. *Arch Sex Behav.* 2023; 52 (1): 459-468. doi: 10.1007/s10508-021-02215-1
27. Ballester-Arnal R, Castro-Calvo J, Gil-Llario D, Gil-Julia B. Cybersex Addiction: A Study on Spanish College Students. *J Sex Marital Ther.* 2016; 43(6): 567-585. doi: 10.1080/0092623X.2016.1208700
28. Beaumont K, Maguire M. Policies for Sexuality Education in the European Union. Policy Department for Citizen's Rights and Constitutional Affairs. European Parliament, January 2013. ISBN 978-92-823-4253-4. doi: 10.2861/11317
29. Pariera KL, Abraham B. "We talked about our hookups": A diary study of sexual communication among U.S. college women. *J Soc Pers Relat.* 2020; 1-14. doi: 10.1177/0265407520933002
30. Miller WR, Lief HI. Masturbatory Attitudes, Knowledge, and Experience: Data from the Sex Knowledge and Attitude Test (SKAT). *Arch Sex Behav.* 1976; 5 (5): 447-467
31. Folasayo AT, Oluwasegun AJ, Samsudin S, Saudi SN, Osman M, Hamat RA. Assessing the Knowledge Level, Attitudes, Risky Behaviors and Preventive Practices on Sexually Transmitted Diseases among University Students as Future Healthcare Providers in the Central Zone of Malaysia: A Cross-Sectional Study. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2017; 14(2): 159. doi: 10.3390/ijerph14020159. PMID: 28208724. PMCID: PMC5334713
32. Meggett-Sowell D. Examining Relationships Between Sexual Education and Behaviors Among Virginia College Students. M. Sc. Thesis, Walden University. Virginia. 2019
33. Lally K, Mathan VY, Dunne S, McGrath D, Cullen W, Meagher D, et al. Awareness of sexually transmitted infection and protection methods among university students in Ireland. *Irish J Med Sci.* 2015; 184(1): 135-142. doi: 10.1007/s11845-014-1073-8
34. Bansi-Matharu L, Mudimu E, Martin-Hughes R, Hamilton M, Johnson L, ten Brink D, et al. Cost-effectiveness of voluntary medical male circumcision for HIV prevention across sub-Saharan Africa: results from five independent models. *Lancet Glob Health.* 2023; 11(2): e244-e255. doi: 10.1016/S2214-109X(22)00515-0

35. Yu c, Lou C, Lian Q, Tu X, Zhang J, Zuo X. The pattern of romantic and sexual related experiences among Chinese young adolescents: an exploration with multi-group latent class analysis. *Reprod Health*, 2021. 18(1): 184-195. doi: 10.1186/s12978-021-01235-3
36. Keresztes N, Plko B, Howard-Payne L, Gupta H. An exploratory study of Hungarian university students' sexual attitudes and behaviours. *Int J Emot Ed*. 2020; 12(1): 83-87. ISSN: 2073 7629
37. Casola A, Matson P, Jones, R. Association between relationship characteristics, sexual health attitudes, and dual contraceptive use among young adult college students aged 18-24. *J Am Coll Health*, 2020. 70(1): 314-324. doi: 10.1080/07448481.2020.1751172
38. Montagni I, Cariou T, Tzourio C, González-Caballero JL. "I don't know, "I'm not sure", "I don't want to answer": a latent class analysis explaining the informative value of nonresponse options in an online survey on youth health. *Int J Soc Res Method*. 2019; 22(6): 651-667. doi: 10.1080/13645579.2019.1632026
39. Evcili F, Golbasi Z. Sexual Myths and Sexual Health Knowledge Levels of Turkish University Students. *SexCult*. 2017;21(4):976-990. doi: 10.1007/s12119-017-9436-8
40. Jun EY, Oh H. Gender Differences in Contraceptive Self-Efficacy: A Cross-Sectional Study of South Korean College Students. *Int J Env Res and Pub He*. 2020; 17 (9): 3142. doi: 10.3390/ijerph17093142
41. García-Vega E, Rico R, Fernández P. Sex, gender roles and sexual attitudes in university students. *Psicothema*. 2017; 29(2): 178-183. doi: 10.7334/psicothema2015.338
42. Martyniuk U, Dekker A, Sehner S, Richter-Appelt H, Briken P. Religiosity, sexual myths, sex taboos, and pornography use: A cross-national comparison of Polish and German university students. *Cyberpsch*. 2015; 9(2). doi: 10.5817/CP2015-2-4
43. Porter SR, Umbach PD. Student survey response rates across institutions: Why do they vary? *Res High Ed*. 2006; 47 (2). doi: 10.1007/s11162-005-8887-1





medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.07.24303955>; this version posted March 9, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).