CO-OCCURRENCE OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF INTERPERSONAL VIOLENCE IN MEXICAN ADOLESCENTS
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ABSTRACT: Adolescence is not exempt from the presence of various phenomena and problems, one of them is interpersonal violence, which manifests itself in different ways and in different areas, and whose consequences have a significant impact on the population of young people and adolescents for this reason, the goal of this research was describing and analyzing the prevalence, frequency and relationship between different types of violence suffered and committed by adolescents. For this, 450 Mexican students participated, of which 259 were women and 191 men, aged between 13 and 19 years. In regard to the method, a quantitative approach was used with a non-experimental, cross-sectional and ex post facto design, with exploratory, descriptive and correlational purposes. Among the main results, a high prevalence of psychological violence committed towards parents and of control violence exercised and suffered during dating was identified. Besides significant differences were also found in the frequency of severe direct violence and of the isolation control suffered in the courtship, as well as physical violence towards the father, with men showing the highest score. Finally, the co-occurrence of different forms of violence was found, based on these results it is necessary to contemplate interpersonal violence in an integrated and not fragmented way, where the possibility that people may suffer or perpetrate more than a type of interpersonal violence in different contexts and stages of his life.
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1. Introduction

Interpersonal violence has affected the quality of life of adolescents and youths; it is a serious phenomenon of great concern, which appears in one of the most important periods of the human life cycle, as it is the stage in which behaviors are noted and learned and can continue into adulthood. For this reason, over the last decades, an increase has been observed in the study of different forms of violence, which youths and adolescents inflict and suffer, and which have even been catalogued as important social and public health problems. One example is dating violence, which is defined as the practice of all acts of violence, mainly psychological, physical and sexual, which one partner in a couple perpetrates toward the other with the aim to cause harm, and where the two partners neither live together nor have a legally binding relationship (Vizcarra, Poo & Donoso, 2013).

In relation to the above, psychological violence has been acknowledged to be normally the most prevalent and frequent type, perhaps because the aggression is more subtle and may easily go unnoticed. It is exerted with the intention of one partner in a couple to denigrate and/or manipulate the other partner through demands, criticism and insults (Wincentak, Connolly & Card, 2017). Similarly, it must be specified that some controlling behaviors have been identified as belonging to psychological violence; these limit the social development of the partner through acts such as supervision of friendships or constant phone calls (Carranza & Galicia, 2020); and, perhaps because of the implications that this form of violence can lead to, certain authors have developed instruments to evaluate these controlling behaviors as a form of violence apart from the psychological or verbal (Aizpitarte & Rojas-Solís, 2019), as recent studies have shown that this type of violence is not only exerted face-to-face, but may also imply the use of electronic media and social networks (Javier-Juárez, Hidalgo-Rasmussen, Díaz-Reséndiz & Vizcarra-Larrañaga, 2021).

That said, there is also physical violence, which can be influenced by psychological and control violence (Esquivel-Santoveña, Rodríguez, Castillo, & Vizcarra-Larrañaga, 2021).
harming the physical integrity of the other partner of the couple through the use of minor physical force, such as pushing, shoving, slapping and kicking, or chronic force, where there are brutal blows that require medical attention and that may even threaten the other person’s life (Valenzuela-Varela & Vega-López, 2015); and finally there is sexual violence, where, according to some studies, both in Mexico (González, Romero-Méndez, Rojas-Solís & López, 2020) and in an international context (Estevez-Casellas, Gómez-Medina & Sitges, 2021) perpetration is usually greater in males toward females, perhaps due to the traditional gender roles, where males use this type of violence as a way to affirm their masculine sexuality. This type of violence may be manifested as sexual coercion or sexual abuse, meaning that psychological tactics may be used to maintain a position of power by degrading, manipulating or controlling the other person, thus suggesting that sexual violence does not only include the use of physical strength to force the other person to have sexual relations, and that it may also go unnoticed by the victims (Fernet, Hébert, Brodeur & Théoret, 2019).

Now, it is important to mention that since the first investigation pioneered by Kanin (1957), most research has dealt with the study of women as victims, as it is assumed that men are the only perpetrators. However, recent findings have suggested that both men and women have the same possibility of being victims and perpetrators of violence (Alegria & Rodríguez, 2015) though this does not mean that the consequences are the same for men and women. This bidirectional perspective has contributed to conceptualizing and understanding the dynamics of violence in young couples, especially for the creation of intervention programs, where the phenomenon is addressed from wider-ranging gender positions (Ocampo-Álvarez, Estrada-Pineda & Chan-Gamboa, 2018).

Without detriment to the above, several studies have contributed to the prevention of the phenomenon once associated factors have been identified (Puente-Martínez, Ubillos-Landa, Echeburúa & Páez-Rovira 2016); most of these are related to the quality of the family context, perhaps because basic aspects of socialization, which contribute to the formation of other relationships, are acquired in such environment. This is why different studies have been geared to the study of violence appearing from early ages, such as childhood, and how it affects subsequent relationships that are established in adolescence, suggesting that sons and daughters who witnessed violence between their parents can develop a culture of violence, which is highly possible of being carried over to other social circles. In this way, some studies have identified the relationship that exists between inter-parental violence and violence that is perpetrated and suffered in dating relationships, perhaps because of the repetition of a learning model (Guevara-Martínez, Rojas-Solís, Flores-Guevara & Romero-Apango, 2017); recently too there have been analyses on the relationship between violence exerted toward one’s partner and violence perpetrated toward parents, known as Filio-Parental or Child-to-Parent Violence (hereinafter, CPV); the latter is characterized by repeated perpetration of psychological, physical or economic violence exerted by sons or daughters toward their parents or those persons who occupy their place, with the intention of obtaining power and control (Pereira et al., 2017); with regard to this phenomenon, it has been suggested that if an adolescent inflicts violence toward his/her parents, s/he could also exert violence toward his/her partner (Laporte, Jiang, Pepler & Chamberland, 2011).

Having said that, it is important to acknowledge that child-to-parent violence is a problem that has not yet been studied extensively in Latin America, particularly in Mexico, and thus its exploratory character is still evident (Vázquez-Sánchez, Romo-Tobón, Rojas-Solís, González & Yedra 2019); especially if compared to advancements in other countries, such as the United States and Europe, where it has been more developed. Nevertheless, up to now, some characteristics of the phenomenon have been recognized, such as: mothers more easily become victims because they are the main caretakers and educators of their children (Abadías, 2020; Santos-Villalba, Matas, Alcalá & Leiva, 2021); and even though it can happen in families at any socioeconomic level, some studies have shown that it is usually more prevalent in families in the middle of the socioeconomic scale (Álvarez, Sepúlveda & Espinoza, 2016), as well as single-parent families, especially those having only the mother figure (Pereira, 2017). Conversely, there have been intentions to pinpoint which sex more frequently perpetrates violence toward parents, but that usually depends on the instruments and type of sample employed (community, clinical or judicial samples); for example, in community samples it has been found that females inflict more psychological violence (Beckmann, Bergmann, Fischer & Mößle, 2017; Ibabe, 2019) and males more physical violence (Ibabe & Jaureguizar, 2011). In this sense, studies such as the one of Boxer, Lakin & Mahoney (2009) using a clinical sample found no significant differences between men and women in terms of physical violence toward the mother figure, but they did find differences in the physical violence exerted
toward the father figure, with males having higher rates. Meanwhile, in judicial samples, it has been found that rates of serious violence exerted toward parents are similar between males and females, this according to the revision of Simmons, McEwan, Purcell & Ogloff (2018). In spite of all of the above, it must be emphasized that there is a need to conduct dyadic studies between parents and children, due to the fact that the information offered by male and female adolescents usually differs from that gathered by the parents (Calvete, Orue & González-Cabrera, 2017).

In another vein, certain variables have also been described that could be found to be associated to CPV, where quality in the family context is highlighted, as a negative environment favors the presence of interfamily violence (Ibabe, 2015); therefore, some studies have acknowledged that the exposure to inter-parental violence may also be associated to CPV (Calvete, Orue & Sampedro 2011; Gámez-Guadix & Calvete, 2012), as it may be the result of a learning model of violence observed between the parents (Boxer et al., 2009; Ibabe & Jaureguizar, 2013; Junco-Guerrero, Ruiz-Fernández & Cantón-Cortés, 2021).

2. Justification and objectives

The above-stated allows an understanding of the complexity of interpersonal violence, as this phenomenon had commonly been studied in fragments, without considering the possibility that people can exert or receive more than one type of interpersonal violence throughout their lives (Hamby & Grych, 2013). For this reason, the objective of this study is to analyze the prevalence, frequency and relationship between the exposure to violence by peers and inter-parentally, with child-to-parent violence and dating violence, in a sample of Mexican adolescents. In this sense, in order to reach the objective, the following hypotheses were implemented: (1) Psychological violence is exerted with greater frequency toward both parents in comparison to physical violence (Calvete & Orue, 2016). (2) Toward their parents, females perpetrate psychological violence more frequently while males perpetrate more physical violence (Lozano, Estévez & Carballe, 2013). (3) In dating relationships, violence through abuse of control and isolation, perpetrated and suffered, will have greater frequency in both sexes in comparison to psychological, physical and sexual violence (Zamora-Damián, Alvidrez, Aizpitarte & Rojas-Solis 2018). (4) Violence in dating relationships will be bidirectional (Alegria & Rodríguez, 2015). (5) Exposure to inter-parental violence will be related to child-to-parent violence and dating violence (Izaguirre & Calvete, 2016). (6) Adolescents of both sexes who perpetrate violence toward their parents also inflict it toward their partner (Laporte et al., 2011).

3. Methodology

This research was carried out from a positivistic paradigm, for which a quantitative approach and non-experimental design were used, with exploratory, descriptive and correlational scopes.

Sample

The sample was selected in a non-representative, non-probabilistic way for convenience. It was made up of 450 adolescent students from one middle school and two public high schools, located in urban zones of the State of Puebla (Mexico); 259 of the subjects (57.6 %) were female and 191 (42.4 %) were male, with ages ranging from 13 to 19 (M=16.09; DT=1.412); in spite of the location of the educational institutions, it should be mentioned that 39 (8.7 %) of the male and female adolescents came from a rural zone of the same State. The criteria for inclusion as participants in the research were the following: (1) heterosexual adolescents who indicated they were having or had had a dating relationship of at least one month of duration, (2) adolescents of nuclear families, thereby excluding those who said they belonged to single-parent families and (3) being students actively registered in the educational institution where their participation was sought.

Instruments

An online questionnaire was administered to both male and female adolescents, which was divided into the following four sections: Questionnaire on socio-demographic information, which gathered information about: sex, age, whether they’d had or were having a dating relationship, age when they began the first dating relationship, months of duration of their relationship, with whom they lived (both parents, only with the mother, only with the father or other relative). Experiences of victimization, which was a modified version of the sub-scales: Peer & Community Victimization and Exposure to Domestic Violence from the instrument Juvenile Victimization Questionnaire-Key Domains Short Form (Finkelhor, Hamby, Ormrod & Turner, 2005). The questionnaire was based on two options to be chosen from (yes or no); however, for purposes of this study the range of answers was modified to a Likert scale format from 0 to 3 where: 0=never, 1=rarely, 2=sometimes and 3=very often. In this way, the sub-scale
of exposure to violence by peer and community is composed of 8 items which evaluated violent acts received by peers. For the case of the subscale of exposure to inter-parental violence, there were 5 items which evaluated the violence between the parents which had been witnessed.

**Child-to-parent violence** applied to the adaptation of the Child-to-parent violence questionnaire on Mexican adolescents (Calvete & Veytia, 2018). It was composed of 20 items, where 10 evaluated violence of sons or daughters to the mother figure and 10 to the father figure; 7 of the 10 items correspond to psychological violence and the other 3 to physical violence. The answer format is on the Likert scale which goes from 0 to 3, where: 0=never (it has not happened in my relationship with my father or mother), 1=rarely (it has only happened on one or two occasions), 2=sometimes (it has occurred between 3 and 5 times) and 3=very often (it has happened on 6 or more occasions).

In **dating violence**, the Violence in Adolescents’ Dating Relationships Inventory (VADRI; Aizpitarte et al., 2017) was used, which has been validated for the Mexican population by Aizpitarte & Rojas-Solis (2019) and evaluates the frequency of dating violence both suffered and perpetrated. This instrument is made up of 38 questions distributed within three dimensions: 1) verbal indirect violence (psychological and verbal); 2) controlled isolation, referring to the intent to deprive and isolate the partner from their social circles, in person or through the use of technological means and social networks and 3) severe direct violence (physical and sexual); the frequency of these behaviors are evaluated through a Likert scale that goes from 1 to 10, where: 1=never, 2=very rarely, 3=rarely, 4=occasionally, 5=sometimes, 6=often, 7=frequently, 8=very frequently, 9=almost always and 10=always.

**Procedure**

At the start, permission was requested to do the research through a meeting with the authorities of the educational institutions, where the nature and purpose of the study was explained; once having obtained consent, the instrument was shared online through the platform of Google forms. The time estimated for completion was from 15 to 25 minutes.

**Ethical aspects**

The study was conducted adhering to the guidelines established by the Mexican Society of Psychology (Sociedad Mexicana de Psicología, 2010); for this reason, the students were made aware of confidentiality and anonymity guarantees, and emphasis on participation being voluntary was also expressed both verbally and through an inevitable item included in the form, where the informed consent was expressed, giving the option either to continue with the questionnaire or withdraw.

**Data analysis**

For data analysis, the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) program was used, version 21 for Windows. At the beginning, the internal consistency of the sub-scales was calculated through the Alpha de Cronbach index and the normality test was carried out through the Kolmogorov Smirnov test, which conveyed that distribution of the data was different from the usual, for which reason a non-parametric focus was chosen to obtain the inferential statistics. In this sense, after obtaining the main measures of central tendency and the prevalence for each of the variables, the differences by sex were determined through the statistical analysis Mann-Whitney U test, where the level of signification admitted was .05. Finally, for correlation purposes, the rho Spearman statistical analysis was used.

**4. Results**

Table 1 shows the main measures of central tendency, as well as the reliability of the sub-scales in the whole sample and segmented by sex; the internal consistency of most of the dimensions is acceptable and good.
Table 1. Main descriptive statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Total N=450</th>
<th>Females n=259</th>
<th>Males n=191</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>α  M  Md  SD</td>
<td>α  M  Md  SD</td>
<td>α  M  Md  SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EV</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>.79 .76 .60 .694</td>
<td>.81 .76 .60 .712</td>
<td>.77 .76 .60 .669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-parental</td>
<td>.86 .39 .00 .757</td>
<td>.86 .40 .00 .764</td>
<td>.85 .37 .00 .749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CPV</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological mother</td>
<td>.76 .60 .57 .499</td>
<td>.75 .61 .57 .493</td>
<td>.77 .59 .57 .509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical mother</td>
<td>.89 .05 .00 .247</td>
<td>.81 .05 .00 .198</td>
<td>.79 .08 .00 .301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological father</td>
<td>.81 .47 .28 .546</td>
<td>.81 .45 .28 .534</td>
<td>.81 .51 .42 .561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical father</td>
<td>.87 .10 .00 .417</td>
<td>.87 .08 .00 .367</td>
<td>.88 .14 .00 .475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DV</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirectly suffered</td>
<td>.83 .16 .12 .116</td>
<td>.87 .15 .12 .119</td>
<td>.78 .16 .12 .113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control suffered</td>
<td>.93 .19 .12 .164</td>
<td>.94 .18 .11 .171</td>
<td>.92 .19 .13 .155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control perpetrated</td>
<td>.90 .16 .11 .220</td>
<td>.89 .16 .11 .115</td>
<td>.90 .16 .11 .126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directly suffered</td>
<td>.82 .12 .10 .775</td>
<td>.91 .11 .10 .747</td>
<td>.71 .13 .10 .798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directly perpetrated</td>
<td>.82 .12 .10 .685</td>
<td>.90 .11 .10 .677</td>
<td>.73 .12 .10 .696</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: EV=Exposure to violence, CPV=Child-to-parent violence, DV=Dating violence, α=Alpha de Cronbach, M=Mean, Md=Median, SD=Standard deviation.

Table 2 shows the prevalence of the different forms of violence, which generally found that psychological-type acts of violence toward both parents have greater presence, where 86.9 % of the adolescents of both sexes reported having exerted such toward the mother and 73.8 % toward the father. Meanwhile, the physical CPV showed lesser prevalence as the rates oscillated between 9.3 % and 11.3 % for the mother figure and father figure respectively. In dating violence, control violence was found to be of greater prevalence, where within the total sample, the data oscillated at 68.7 % for suffered and 64.4 % for perpetrated.
To determine the differences by sex in relation to the frequency with which the different types of violence was suffered or perpetrated, the Mann-Whitney U test was used; according to the results obtained (see Table 3), there were statistically significant differences observed in the variable of physical violence toward the father figure, and in that of dating violence, direct and severe as well as controlled isolation suffered, with males showing higher rates in comparison to females.
Table 3. Sex differences in exposure to violence, child-to-parent violence and dating violence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Females (n = 259)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Rango</th>
<th>Males (n = 191)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Rango</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Psest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EV Peers</td>
<td></td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>224.6</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>226.7</td>
<td>24502.5</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>230.4</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>218.7</td>
<td>23452.0</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPV</td>
<td>Psychological mother</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>228.9</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>220.8</td>
<td>23851.5</td>
<td>-.65</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical mother</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>222.6</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>229.3</td>
<td>24005.0</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychological father</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>220.0</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>232.9</td>
<td>23319.5</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical father</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>218.3</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>235.2</td>
<td>22869.5</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV</td>
<td>Indirectly suffered</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>218.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>234.4</td>
<td>23018.0</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirectly perpetrated</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>230.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>218.6</td>
<td>23427.0</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control suffered</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>215.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>239.0</td>
<td>22154.0</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control perpetrated</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>225.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>226.0</td>
<td>24633.0</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Directly suffered</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>197.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>263.3</td>
<td>17501.0</td>
<td>-.63</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Directly perpetrated</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>224.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>224.0</td>
<td>24453.5</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: EV = Exposure to violence, CPV = Child-to-parent violence, DV = Dating violence, M = Mean, U = Experimental value of Mann Whitney U Test, Z = Normal approximation, p = Bilateral significance, r = Size effect, Psest = Probability of superiority.

Below are the associations in the sample of males and females (see Table 4). In the sample of females, the exposure to inter-parental violence is positively related to severe direct violence suffered (\( \rho = .228^* \), \( p < .01 \)) and perpetrated in the dating relationship (\( \rho = .192^* \), \( p < .01 \)). In the same way, positive associations were found between the exposure to inter-parental violence and child-to-parent violence, for example: with psychological violence toward the mother figure (\( \rho = .284^* \), \( p < .01 \)) and with physical violence toward the father figure (\( \rho = .246^* \), \( p < .01 \)). Finally, positive associations were found between child-to-parent violence and violence toward the partner, for example: psychological violence toward the mother figure with severe direct violence perpetrated (\( \rho = .355^* \), \( p < .01 \)); this type of violence perpetrated in the dating relationship also correlated to the physical violence toward the father figure (\( \rho = .260^* \), \( p < .01 \)).

By other side, in the sample of males it should be mentioned that minor associations were found and some with lesser strength in comparison to the sample of females, for example, between inter-parental violence and violence perpetrated and suffered in the dating relationship. However, in the relationship between the exposure to inter-parental violence and CPV, there were associations found to have greater strength, for example: psychological violence toward the mother figure (\( \rho = .264^* \), \( p < .01 \)) and physical violence toward the father figure (\( \rho = .322^* \), \( p < .01 \)); as far as violence perpetrated toward the partner and violence perpetrated toward the parents, positive correlations were also identified, for example: between psychological violence toward the mother figure and verbal indirect violence perpetrated in the dating relationship (\( \rho = .233^* \), \( p < .01 \)) and psychological violence toward the father figure with controlled isolation violence perpetrated toward the partner (\( \rho = .197^* \), \( p < .01 \)).
5. Discussion and conclusions

The main objective of this study has been to analyze the prevalence, frequency and possible relationship between victimization by peers and inter-parentally, dating violence and child-to-parent violence. Therefore, in accordance with the results obtained, the first hypothesis was allowed to be accepted; it indicated that psychological violence would be mainly exerted toward both parents in comparison to physical violence, findings which coincide with studies previously carried out (Calvete & Orue, 2016; Vázquez-Sánchez et al., 2019). To this regard, it is important to state that this form of violence was mainly perpetrated toward mothers, as has been accordingly pointed out by Ibabe (2019); a fact that may be due to greater presence of mothers in children’s upbringing (Calvete et al., 2017; Santos-Villalba et al., 2021); as well as the fact that culturally speaking, mothers may be perceived as weaker (Cottrel & Monk, 2004).

That said, in the case of the second hypothesis it was expected that females would perpetrate psychological violence more frequently toward their parents and males more physical violence, this according to what was found by Lozano et al. (2013). In spite of the fact that there were differences found in psychological violence, such differences were not enough to be considered statistically significant; therefore, these results are not consistent with other studies (Cancino-Padilla, Romero-Méndez & Rojas-Solís 2020; Ibabe, 2019). With physical violence, there were significant differences detected only where it is perpetrated to the father figure, being males who exert it with greater frequency; such results find an echo with other studies carried out with samples of adolescent students (Ibabe & Jaureguizar, 2011; Ilabaca & Gaete, 2018; Romero-Méndez, Cancino-Padilla & Rojas-Solís, 2020); but they differ with other works which show that males and females have similar scores in perpetrating physical violence (Beckmann et al., 2017; Vázquez-Sánchez et al., 2019).

For the case of dating violence, the third hypothesis stated that control violence, perpetrated and suffered, would be more frequent in both

---

Table 4. Association between variables in the sample of females and males

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>-.115</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>.244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.340</td>
<td>-.308</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>.399</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.285</td>
<td>.322</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.254</td>
<td>-.387</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.336</td>
<td>-.483</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td>.224</td>
<td>.610</td>
<td>-.316</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>-.184</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>-.254</td>
<td>-.385</td>
<td>-.356</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td>.341</td>
<td>.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.224</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.295</td>
<td>.338</td>
<td>-.764</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>.382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.252</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>-.273</td>
<td>.361</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.419</td>
<td>.348</td>
<td>.383</td>
<td>.337</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.217**</td>
<td>.205**</td>
<td>.192**</td>
<td>.355**</td>
<td>.202**</td>
<td>.218**</td>
<td>.260**</td>
<td>.386**</td>
<td>.425**</td>
<td>.294**</td>
<td>.339**</td>
<td>.508**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01 Above the diagonal appear the associations in the sample of males, below the diagonal pertains to the sample of females. (1) Age, (2) Exposure to verbal by peers, (3) Exposure to inter-parental violence, (4) Psychological violence toward the mother, (5) Psychological violence toward the father, (6) Physical violence toward the mother, (7) Physical violence toward the father, (8) Verbal indirect violence suffered, (9) Verbal indirect violence perpetrated, (10) Controlled isolation violence suffered, (11) Controlled isolation violence perpetrated, (12) Severe direct violence suffered, (13) Severe direct violence perpetrated.
sexes, in comparison to psychological, physical and sexual violence, a fact that was accepted, and that they are found in the same line as that found in other studies, such as the one of Zamora-Damián et al. (2018); based on this, it has been suggested that this form of violence may be perpetrated as a result of jealousy and suspicion on a continuous basis, which cause insecurity and distrust in terms of contact established by the partner, causing restriction and isolation from their social circles (Lucariello & Fajardo, 2011); thus, the behaviors of jealousy and control may be justified due to an erroneous idea that they have about love, as they hold that dating relationships are based on supervision and control as proof of love and trust; it is important to mention that such violent behaviors may be more frequent if they involve technological media and social networks (Donoso, Rubí & Baños, 2018). In the face of these results it would be necessary to explore the different forms of violence in dating relationships, as the studies carried out up to now are focused on analyzing psychological, physical and sexual violence, while omitting that the phenomenon is not revealed uniformly and that there are even different typologies of violence, as in the case of control violence (Muñoz & Echeburúa, 2016).

Continuing with the following hypothesis, it was expected that dating violence would be bidirectional, and according to the results obtained this was also accepted, as males and females indicated that at some time of their relationship they were victims and perpetrators of violence, exactly as proved in the revision of Alegria y Rodríguez (2015). In addition, males indicated they had suffered severe direct violence and controlled isolation violence more frequently, in comparison to females. In view of these results, it must be mentioned that the introduction of the term bidirectional, recognizing males as victims of violence, has brought more than a few discrepancies to the scientific community, as dating violence had been commonly studied from a one-directional perspective, where males were considered to be the only perpetrators of violence (Muñoz-Rivas, González-Lozano, Fernández-González & Fernández-Ramos, 2015); however, this characteristic of violence needs to be recognized; otherwise, it would be difficult to have access to support and attention services for male victims (Rojas-Solís, Guzmán-Pimentel, Jiménez-Castro, Martínez-Ruiz & Flores-Hernández 2019).

That being said, in regard to the fourth hypothesis, it was estimated that exposure to violence would be related to child-to-parent violence and dating violence. In this sense, the strongest correlations between exposure to inter-parental violence and dating violence were found only in the sample of females, results which were similar to those of Rey-Anacona (2011), who found that associations between these variables were statistically stronger in females than in males, which may be due to the fact that adolescents more frequently witnessed acts of violence of the father toward the mother, which could then be normalized and tolerated especially by females, increasing their possibility of becoming victims in their dating relationships.

Conversely, significant associations were identified indeed between exposure to inter-parental violence and child-to-parent violence in both sexes, results that coincide with other studies on the matter (Contreras & Cano, 2016; Gámez-Guadix & Calvete, 2012), which made the fifth hypothesis acceptable. This has been explained in different ways; for example: that aggressive behaviors toward parents would be the result of a defense method of the children in response to violent acts of the parents, suggesting in this way an exchange or bi-directionality of violence between parents and children (Ibabe & Jaureguizar, 2011); it has also been explained through the intergenerational transmission of violence, which is basically sustained on the theory of social learning and postulates that witnessing violence between the parents could produce as a result the internalization of violent acts as a method for resolving conflicts, which can be used against the parents (Ibabe, Aronso & Elgorriaga 2020; Ibabe & Jaureguizar, 2013).

In the case of the latter hypothesis, it was expected that adolescents who inflict violence toward their parents could also do so toward their partners; in accordance with the data obtained it was found that the females who perpetrated violence, both physical and psychological, toward their parents also perpetrated verbal indirect violence, controlled isolation and severe direct violence toward their partner, while with males, these forms of dating violence were related only as psychological CPV toward both parents; in view of the above, this information may be similar to that found in other studies (Ibabe et al., 2020; Izaguirre & Calvete, 2016; Laporte et al., 2011). Thus, among some theoretical explanations, Aroca-Montolío, Lorenzo-Moledo & Miró-Pérez (2014) refer this may bee to the fact that the child or adolescent who has available victims in their family who they can attack will be more likely to perpetrate violent acts, with such acts becoming a natural strategy in their life, one which is not limited to their nuclear family, but is used in other social contexts; one example of this could be their relationship with their partner. In turn, Carrascosa, Buelga
and Cava (2018) offer another explanation, stating that adolescents of both sexes may internalize violence as an effective method for resolving conflicts which they can use with problems that come up both with their parents and with their partners. These explanations are understandable, considering that a person who perpetrates violence may exert more than one type of interpersonal violence, and there may even be a co-occurrence of different forms of violence (Rojas-Solís, 2015).

Among other important results to discuss, it was found that age seems to have an important role in the phenomenon of dating violence, where, in both sexes, it seems that the older the person is, the greater the perpetration of verbal indirect violence and severe direct violence, and, specifically in females, the older they are, the more control violence victimization, while with males it is severe violence, which are similar results to those found by other authors (Cortés-Ayala et al., 2015; Pazos, Oliva & Hernando, 2014) but which differ from those obtained by Redondo, Inglés & García (2017), who found that at an older age there was a decrease in violent behaviors.

Finally, some limitations of this study must be pointed out, such as those referring to sample aspects, specifically the selection of the sample which was non-representative and non-probabilistic, as well as the fact that for the evaluation of dating violence, only heterosexual adolescents were included, while CPV was only evaluated from the perspective of adolescents belonging to nuclear families; all of this without overlooking the fact that the adolescents of both sexes were students, for the most part coming from an urban area; therefore, such results cannot be generalized. That being said, in the section on instruments, another limitation can be found in the use of the sub-scales Peer & Community Victimization and Exposure to Domestic Violence which pertain to the Juvenile Victimization Questionnaire-Key Domains Short Form instrument, which has not been validated for the Mexican population; in addition, it should be mentioned that social desirability was not controlled in the responses of the participants of either sex. In view of the above, it would be pertinent for future researches to include representative, randomly selected samples and to integrate adolescents not in school and/or from areas frequently overlooked, such as rural areas or indigenous communities.
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