



DATING VIOLENCE AND FAMILY FUNCTIONALITY: A VIEW FROM VICTIMIZATION AND PERPETRATION

Edison Leonel Peñarreta Méndez¹ <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1080-9001>, Diana Maricela Vuele Duma² <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9188-0813>

¹Nursing student at the National University of Loja, Ecuador

²Professor of the Nursing Career at the National University of Loja, Ecuador

Received: August 2, 2023

Accepted: October 29, 2023

ABSTRACT

Introduction: Violence in dating relationships is considered a problem of great impact on society and inadequate family functioning can make its members vulnerable, thus turning them into victims or perpetrators. **Objective:** To relate dating violence and family functioning in university students, from victimization and perpetration. **Methods:** A study with a quantitative approach, non-experimental design, correlational and cross-sectional scope. 47 nursing students participated using the following instruments: perpetration and victimization in courtship and family Apgar, both of which are valid and reliable. **Results:** 72.3% were between 18 and 22 years of age, 62.1% were

women, 19.1% belonged to the third cycle of studies, 78.6% lived in the urban area, and 76.6% belonged to nuclear families. In accordance to dating violence, the dimension that shows the highest percentage of victimization was coercion with 51.1% in the alternative "sometimes"; while from perpetration, 48% in detachment, was the preferred dimension in the alternative "sometimes". **Conclusions:** There is no significant relationship between the dynamics of victimization and perpetration of dating violence and family functionality in students.

Keywords: violence, students, family dynamics, couple, dating violence.

Corresponding author: Diana Maricela Fly Duma. Email: diana.vuele@unl.edu.ec

INTRODUCTION

Violence is defined as the deliberate use of physical force or power, which can be presented as a threat or as a completed act, whether against oneself, another person, a group or community. It also causes or is highly likely to cause injury, death, psychological harm, developmental disorders and bullying (1). Violence can occur in various areas, with the relationship being one of the most common scenarios.

Some of the traits to identify a person that suffers from violence in their romantic relationships are: their partners distance themselves from the family group, cause them to have feelings of guilt, do not promote a secure attachment, are subjected to physical and emotional, verbal and/or sexual abuse, suffer from excessive control by their partner, generally evidenced by threats, tend to have immature or childish attitudes, and feel that affection justifies abuse. Likewise, the affected person usually develops low self-esteem and little self-confidence (2). On the other hand, violence in relationships occurs with various manifestations, such as: inadequate communication, negative attitudes towards the other person, jealousy, insecurities or fears, tendency to accept everything even when one does not agree, as well as than the expression of destructive criticism between the couple that arose during the relationship (3).

In this sense, dating violence has become a public health problem of global interest due to its impact on a physical and psychological level, both on adolescents and young adults. According to Rey et al (4), violence in couples produces repercussions such as: poor academic performance, problems in social and school relationships, unwanted pregnancies, abuse of psychoactive substances and alcohol, unhealthy weight control strategies, sexual behaviors. risk and suicidal ideation.

This problem has been evident in different population groups. However, it is adolescents and young adults who most frequently experience situations of violence. Dating violence is associated with increased guilt, anger, pain and anxiety and other negative effects such as a decrease in psychosocial well-being (5). Regarding this, the family as a basic and fundamental support of society, constitutes a protective or risk factor; since its inadequate functioning can make the members of the family unit vulnerable and therefore turn them into victims or perpetrators, depending on the perspective of the people involved in violent situations.

In this context, in relation to the family, it could be mentioned that the fact of having been abused in childhood has a negative impact on the cognitive-social development of adolescents, increasing aggression, behavioral problems and learning difficulties. This results in the acceptance of the use of violence in relationships, promoting dating violence (6).

Worldwide, one in three women (that is, 30%) has suffered physical and/or sexual violence by their partner or by someone outside their social connection. In most of these cases, the partner is their direct aggressor. Furthermore, almost a third (equivalent to 27%) of women between 15 and 49 years of age, who have been in a complex relationship, report having suffered some type of physical and/or sexual violence by their partner (7). In Latin American, there are no data related to the number of cases of violence and particularly dating violence.

In Ecuador, according to Chavez & Juarez (8), during 2011 it was evident that 6 out of 10 women in the country have suffered some type of gender violence by any person, where the type of violence

with the highest percentage is psychological at 53.9%, followed by physical violence with 38%, patrimonial violence with 35.3% and sexual violence with 25.7%. The same source indicates that violence perpetrated by a partner or ex-partner is much greater than that by other people, with the situation being more critical in divorced (85.4%) and separated women 78%. However, at the local level, there is no officially published data that demonstrates the prevalence of violence in the dating stage.

From the above, it is evident that violence in relationships continues to be an increasing social problem. Therefore, various authors in their studies have tried to measure this problem. At a global level, a study carried out in Mexico (9), aimed to establish the prevalence of dating violence in university students. 219 men and 315 women participated. They took the Dating Violence Survey (DVS) and it showed that 27.7% of young people experience sexual violence, 73% physical violence and 73% emotional violence. Likewise, they managed to show that gender violence in intimate relationships affects female students and thereby reinforces the system of gender inequalities in society.

In Latin America, a study carried out in Bolivia (10), which had the purpose of characterizing dating violence in 770 university students, demonstrated among the results that the main cause of violence is jealousy. Men are the most violent with 45.5%, be it physical, psychological or sexual violence, with women being the most affected. However, there is a significant percentage of university students 40.6% who recognize that both men and women exercise violence, a variable that is associated with sex and age.

Another study carried out in Bolivia by Mendoza (11) determined that that country ranks fourth in Latin America with the highest rate of intimate partner violence in young people, 24.6%. The intention of the study was to reveal the perception of young university students regarding the causes and consequences of violence in the dating stage to contribute to the generation of prevention actions and tactics. 770 young university students participated in this study, finding that the main cause of violence is jealousy, where the man is the most violent and the woman the most affected.

Similarly, a study carried out in Colombia by Rey et al (4), aimed at reporting on abusive behaviors exercised and received in dating using the Effectiveness in Family Functioning Scale (EFFS). It had the participation of 548 high school students (294 women and 295 men) between 12 and 22 years of age, showing as results that problems in family functionality could predispose to psychological, emotional, and physical abuse and suffering from it during courtship (4).

At the national level, a study carried out in Cuenca by Cabrera & Pillacela (12), whose objective was to identify the incidence of violence in adolescent dating using the CADRI scale to evaluate the violence committed and suffered by both men and women, had the participation of 242 students, of which 54% were men and 46% were women. The results showed the existence of different forms of dating violence, with verbal-emotional violence being the one that has the highest incidence in both the violence committed (45%) and the violence suffered (47%), both in men and women.

As mentioned above, violence in the relationships of young couples is considered one of the relevant social problems today due to the impact it causes on the physical and mental health of those involved. In addition, it must be understood as a risk of imminent danger that becomes a model of behavior that

subsequently manifests itself in marital and family life, becoming the worst scenario involving criminal acts, such as femicides or suicides. Based on this background, the present research was proposed, whose objective is to relate dating violence and family functionality in university students, from victimization and perpetration.

METHODS

Study approach and design: Study with a quantitative approach, with a non-experimental design, correlational and cross-sectional scope.

Study population: It was made up of 47 people who met the following inclusion criteria: being enrolled from the first to ninth cycle in the Nursing Career during the period October 2022 to February 2023, being over 18 years old and under 39 years old (young adults), of both sexes, have at the time of the study a romantic relationship (heterosexual, homosexual or bisexual) where they have experienced some type or indication of violence, that the romantic relationship is dating and does not involve marriage or cohabitation in a free union, and that they agree to participate of the study voluntarily.

Study variable: The study presents two variables: dating violence and family functionality.

Data collection technique and instruments: To collect the data, the survey was used as a technique and two questionnaires called "Perpetration and victimization of dating violence" and "Family APGAR". These were used as instruments and made it possible to fulfill the objectives set and, to respond to the study objective. A section related to the sociodemographic data of the participants were added in the initial part of the instrument. The instrument used is called victimization and perpetration of dating violence DVQ-VP carried out by F. Rodríguez et al., in 2016. It based on the original questionnaire through an adaptation of the DVS questionnaire which consisted of 42 items and currently the instrument adapted consists of 20 items. This instrument was validated in young adults, with a Cronbach's alpha that ranged between 0.64 and 0.74. So, it was considered a valid and reliable measurement questionnaire for the evaluation of dating violence in current members of couples. 5 different forms of violence are

measured: detachment, humiliation, sexual, coercion and physical. The items are rated according to a Likert-type scale, where: (0) never and (4) almost always (13).

As for the Family APGAR Questionnaire (for its meaning in English: Adaptation, Partnership, Growth, Affection, Resolve) designed by Smilkstein in 1978, was evaluated in multiple research studies. It reflected, in the validation process Cronbach's alpha, a ranged between 0, 71 and 0.83, which shows acceptable psychometric properties. The "Family APGAR" questionnaire evaluates five alternatives, each of which is rated from 0 to 4 where: 0 = Never, 1 = Almost never, 2 = Sometimes, 3 = Almost always and 4 = Always. The Interpretation of the score is: - Normal: 17-20 points, - Mild dysfunction: 16-13 points, - Moderate dysfunction: 12-10 points, - Severe dysfunction: less than or equal to 9 (14).

As part of the ethical considerations, prior to data collection, the proposal was made known to the participants and informed consent was applied that guaranteed the reliability of the information and its use for academic and research purposes.

Analysis of data: Data processing was carried out with the use of the statistical package SPSS version 2.2. The information analysis was carried out through descriptive statistics, using the non-parametric Kendall B Tau test with a p value of 0.05.

RESULTS

In relation to the sociodemographic characteristics of the participants, the majority are between 18 and 22 years of age, corresponding to 72.30%. As for gender, 68.1% are women, with the mestizo ethnicity predominating with 97.9%. All participants were Ecuadorians. In reference to the academic cycle, the majority of university students are going through the third cycle of the Nursing Career, represented by 19.1%. In addition, 78.7% lives in an urban area, with a socioeconomic level of 34.0. % (most of the participants between the high and low strata). Finally 76.6% belong to the nuclear family type, as summarized in Table 1 below.

Considering the dynamics of dating violence from perpetration and victimization shown in Table 2 below, one of the dimensions with the highest rate of violence was detachment, seen from the condition of victimization, where the most significant percentage relative to 48.9% is found in the alternative "sometimes" and a lower percentage corresponding to 2.1% is found in the alternative "almost always"; while, from the perpetration condition, the highest percentage of 48.9% is found in the alternative "sometimes" and the lowest percentage of 2.1% is found in the alternative "usually". Another dimension that

presented the highest index was coercion, where victimization reflected the highest percentage at 51.1%, found in the alternative "sometimes", in a lower percentage of 2.1% in the alternative "almost always"; while, in terms of perpetration, the highest percentage of 38.3% was found in the alternative "sometimes" and the lowest percentage of 2.1% was found in the alternative "almost always".

TABLE 1
SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERIZATION OF STUDENTS

ASPECTS		Frequency	Percentage
		F	%
Age	≤17	1	2.10
	18-22	3.4	72.30
	23-27	12	25.5
	Total	47	100.0
Sex	Women	32	68.1
	Man	15	31.9
	Total	47	100.0
Ethnicity	Mestizo	46	97.9
	Indigenous	1	2.1
	Total	47	100.0
Nationality	Ecuadorian	47	100.0
	Total	47	100.0
Academic period	First	2	4.3
	Second	5	10.6
	Third	9	19.1
	Room	6	12.8
	Fifth	8	17.0
	Sixth	3	6.4
	Seventh	6	12.8
	Eighth	3	6.4
	Nineth	5	10.6
	Total	47	100
Place of residence	Urban zone	37	78.7
	Rural zone	10	21.3
	Total	47	100.0
Civil status	Single	47	100.0
	Total	47	100.0
Socioeconomic level	High	16	34.0
	Half	15	31.9
	Low	16	34.0
	Total	47	100.0
Kind of family	Nuclear family	36	76.6
	Family of separated parents	4	8.5
	Reconstituted family	3	6.4
	single family	2	4.3
	extended family	1	2.1
	Blended family	1	2.1
	Total	47	100.0

TABLE 2
DYNAMICS OF DATING VIOLENCE

Items		N		S		F		U		AA		Total
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
Test love	V	25	53.2	19	40.4	2	4.3	0	0.0	1	2.1	47
	F	28	59.6	13	27.7	5	10.6	0	0.0	1	2.1	47
Force to have sex	V	35	74.5	8	17.0	3	6.4	1	2.1	0	0.0	47
	F	38	80.9	6	12.8	3	6.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	47
Hit	V	31	66.0	12	25.5	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	47
	F	35	74.5	11	23.4	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	47
Compliant with the study, but arrives late for appointments	V	16	34.0	23	48.9	4	8.5	2	4.3	3	6.4	47
	F	15	31.9	23	48.9	4	8.5	1	2.1	3	6.4	47
Imagine relationships with other people	V	19	40.4	22	46.8	2	4.3	2	4.3	2	4.3	47
	F	24	51.1	15	31.9	5	10.6	1	2.1	2	4.3	47
Insistence on touches that are not pleasant	V	28	59.6	14	29.8	4	8.5	1	2.1	0	0.0	47
	F	37	78.7	5	10.6	5	10.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	47
Slap	V	29	61.7	12	25.5	6	12.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	47
	F	33	70.2	12	25.5	2	4.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	47
Not recognizing responsibility as a couple	V	23	48.9	20	42.6	3	6.4	1	2.1	0	0.0	47
	F	25	53.2	16	34.0	5	10.6	1	2.1	0	0.0	47
Humiliation for the way of being	V	24	51.1	18	38.3	4	8.5	1	2.1	0	0.0	47
	F	30	63.8	13	27.7	3	6.4	1	2.1	0	0.0	47
Throw dangerous objects	V	29	61.7	15	31.9	2	4.3	1	2.1	0	0.0	47
	F	36	76.6	8	17.0	3	6.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	47
Hurt with an object	V	33	70.2	11	23.4	2	4.3	1	2.1	0	0.0	47
	F	35	74.5	9	19.1	3	6.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	47
Laugh at the way of expressing yourself	V	23	48.9	20	42.6	2	4.3	0	0.0	2	4.3	47
	F	24	51.1	20	42.6	2	4.3	0	0.0	1	2.1	47
Hold so you don't leave	V	18	38.3	24	51.1	2	4.3	1	2.1	2	4.3	47
	F	26	55.3	18	38.3	2	4.3	0	0.0	1	2.1	47
Force sexual behavior	V	27	57.4	17	35.8	5	10.6	1	2.1	0	0.0	47
	F	35	74.5	9	19.1	3	6.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	47
Ignore feelings	V	23	48.9	19	40.4	4	8.5	0	0.0	1	2.1	47
	F	26	55.3	18	38.3	3	6.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	47
Stop talking for several days, without giving explanations	V	20	42.6	20	42.6	4	8.5	1	2.1	2	4.3	47
	F	22	46.8	21	44.7	1	2.1	1	2.1	2	4.3	47
Invasde space	V	24	51.1	18	38.3	4	8.5	0	0.0	1	2.1	47
	F	30	63.8	15	31.9	1	2.1	1	2.1	0	0.0	47
Forced to undress without consent	V	35	74.5	8	17.0	3	6.4	1	2.1	0	0.0	47
	F	35	74.5	11	23.4	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	47
Insult about beliefs, religion or social class	V	23	48.9	11	23.4	4	8.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	47
	F	36	76.6	10	21.3	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	47
Ridicule for ideas, beliefs or social class	V	33	70.2	10	21.3	3	6.4	1	2.1	0	0.0	47
	F	34	72.3	12	25.5	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	47

Abbreviations: N: never, S: sometimes, F: frequently, D: usually, AA: always/always, P: victimization, P: perpetration. Physical Dimension: Items 7, 3, 10, 18; Sexual: Items 2, 8, 14, 15; Humiliation: Items 9, 12, 19, 20; Detachment: Items 4, 8, 15, 16; Coercion: Items 1, 5, 13, 17

With respect to the level of family functionality of the respective variable presented in table 3 below, it is evident that the majority indicate being immersed in the 76.6% that are within the level of normal functionality, 21.3% in the mild level of functionality and 2.1% with moderate level of functionality.

TABLE 3
FAMILY LEVEL OF FUNCTIONALITY

Functionality level	F	%
Normal	36	76.6
Mild dysfunction	10	21.3
Moderate dysfunction	1	2.1
Total	47	100

Regarding the relationship between dating violence and family functionality, from the dynamics of victimization, it can be seen that the highest percentage of 34.04% is at a level of violence with moderate frequency compared to the level of mild functionality. In a lower percentage of 2.12%, it reflects the level of violence with high frequency compared to the level of severe functionality. Likewise, Kendall's Tau-b statistical test did not demonstrate a significant relationship, given the approximate assignment (.345) being higher than the p value of 0.05 shown in Table 4 below.

TABLE 4
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DATING VIOLENCE AND FAMILY FUNCTIONALITY: VICTIMIZATION

TYPE OF VIOLENCE	Family functionality level							
	Mild dysfunction		Moderate dysfunction		Severe dysfunction		Total	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Violence with high frequency	8	17.02	2	4.25	1	2.12	11	23.40
Violence with moderate frequency	16	34.04	6	12.76	0	0.0	22	46.80
Low frequency violence	12	25.53	2	4.25	0	0.0	14	29.78
Total	36	76.59	10	21.27	1	2.12	47	100.00

Kendall's Tau-b	Value	Typical error Asympt ^a	T Approximation ^b	Next. Approximation
		-.127	.132	-.945

In attention to the relationship of violence in dating and family functionality, from the dynamics of perpetration, it can be seen that the highest percentage relative to 34.04% is found in the level of violence with low frequency regarding the mild functionality level; while a lower percentage of 2.12% is found in the level of violence with high frequency compared to the level of severe functionality. Similarly, Kendall's Tau-b statistical test did not show a significant relationship, given that the approximate assignment of (.345) was higher than the p value (0.05) observed in Table 5.

TABLE 5
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DATING VIOLENCE AND FAMILY FUNCTIONALITY: PERPETRATION

Type of violence	Family functionality level							
	Mild dysfunction		Moderate dysfunction		Severe dysfunction		Total	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Violence with high frequency	6	12.76	1	2.12	1	2.12	8	17.02
Violence with moderate frequency	14	29.78	6	12.76	0	0.0	20	42.55
Low frequency violence	16	34.04	3	6.38	0	0.0	19	40.42
Total	36	76.59	10	21.27	1	2.12	47	100.00

Kendall's Tau-b	Value	Typical error Asympt ^a	T Approximation ^b	Next. Approximation
		-.130	.135	-.943

DISCUSSION

Violence in dating relationships is considered a problem with great impact on society, since as a consequence of its manifestation in couples, it tends to cause physical and emotional damage to those involved (15). In this sense, regarding dating violence from the dynamics of victimization and perpetration, the 5 constant dimensions of 4 items for each were evaluated, and the results showed that:

a) Physical dimension: From victimization, the highest percentage (31.9%) was located in the item “throw dangerous objects” in the alternative “sometimes” and the lowest percentage (2.1%) in the item “hit” in the alternative “frequently”; while, since the perpetration, the highest percentage (25.5%) is found in the item “slap” in the alternative “sometimes” and the lowest percentage (2.1%) is found in the item “hit” in the alternative “frequently”. These results are similar to those found in the study carried out in Peru (16) where the 57.7% of the sample reported psychological violence, while 7% mentioned being victims of physical, psychological and sexual violence. 11.3% reported receiving words suggestive of sex from their partner. Among those who simultaneously received physical, psychological and sexual violence, 80% were women.

From this, it is indicated that dating violence from the physical dimension implies any intentional attack of a sexual, physical or psychological nature, by one member of the couple against the other, in a relationship where there is attraction and both parties agree to be together (17). The manifestations of the physical side are usually the most visible and easy to recognize due to their most tangible characteristics. However, sometimes they do not

usually present themselves so easily and are hidden through excuses or normalization of violence (18).

b) Sexual dimension: In victimization, the highest percentage (29.8%) is found in the item “insistence on unpleasant touching” in the alternative “sometimes” and a lower percentage (2.1%) in the item “force to have sex” in the alternative “usually”. On the other hand, as for the perpetration, the highest percentage (23.4%) is found in the item “force to undress without consent” in the alternative “sometimes” and the lowest percentage (2.1%) is located in the item “force to undress without consent” in the alternative “frequently”. Similar results are verified from the study carried out by Flores et al. (19), with respect to the sexual dimension, indicating having been victims of being forced to have sex with their partner in 9.1% for men 9.1% and 13.6% for women, evidencing in turn that this type aggression is always present in love relationships.

In this regard, sexual violence in romantic relationships manifests itself when one member of the couple tends to manipulate the other in order to force them to carry out an unwanted sexual activity without their consent. The most obvious expression of this is rape, whose forms of coercion can range from physical force to psychological blackmail (20).

c) Humiliation dimension: From victimization, the highest percentage (43.6%) is found in the item “laughing because of the way of expressing yourself” in the alternative “sometimes” and a lower percentage (2.1%) in the item “ridicule for ideas, beliefs or social class” in the alternative “usually”. On the contrary, as for perpetration, the highest percentage (42.6%) is found in the item “laughing because of the way of expressing yourself” with the

alternative “sometimes” and the lowest percentage (2.1%) is located in the item “laugh because of the way of expressing yourself” in the alternative “almost always”. These data are similar to the study carried out by Flores et al. (21) who reveals that 76% of young people of both sexes between 15 and 24 years of age were in a dating relationship where they had suffered emotional violence, highlighting insults, humiliation and threats. On the other hand, 15% declared that they had suffered physical violence, observing that both boys and girls minimize episodes of aggression.

Regarding humiliation in dating, it is considered a pattern of behavior used with the purpose of obtaining or maintaining control over the partner, which is produced by the violation of the victim's personal limits, using physical, psychological and/or moral (22) aggression. Humiliation makes the victim feel incapacitated and confused, perceiving herself to be unjustly degraded, ridiculed, deeply wounded in her self-esteem and identity (23).

d) Detachment dimension: In victimization, the most significant percentage (48.9%) is found in the item “compliance with the study but arrives late for couple appointments” in the alternative “sometimes” and in less percentage (2.1%) in the item “ignore feelings” in the alternative “almost always”. While, from perpetration, the highest percentage (48.9%) is found in the item “compliance with the study but arrives late for couple appointments” in the alternative “sometimes” and the lowest percentage (2.1%) is located in the item “not recognizing responsibility as a couple” in the alternative “usually”. Based on these results, related to the detachment dimension, it is evident that there are results similar to the study carried out by Warrior (10) where 70.4% of students presented violence due to detachment in their dating relationships, 47.5% being mild level violence, 12.7% severe level and 10.2% moderate level.

In this regard, violence due to detachment in dating involves the indifferent and distant treatment of one of the members of the couple, without ending the relationship. For example, forgetting the birthday or treating him or her like another acquaintance (24). It manifests itself in the disappearance of some member of the relationship for a few days, causing worry, anxiety and sadness (25).

e) Coercion dimension: Regarding victimization, the highest percentage (51.1%) is found in the item “hold so that he/she does not leave” in the alternative “sometimes” and a lower percentage (2.1%) in the item “test love” in the alternative “almost always”; while, from perpetration, the highest percentage (38.3%) is found in the item “hold so that he/she does not leave” in the alternative “sometimes” and the lowest percentage (2.1%) is located in the item “test love” in the alternative “almost always”.

These results are similar to those carried out by Montes & Quiroga (26) where they characterized dating violence in young university students as 55.3%, affirming the presence of violence due to mild coercion in couple relationships. Furthermore, 7.4% of the participants reported having experienced coercive violence moderately and 6.4% indicated that the level of coercive dating violence has been severe.

When analyzing the dynamics of violence by levels, the results found allowed us to identify that from victimization, 46.80% are victims of violence with a moderate frequency, 2.12% with a high frequency, finding themselves with a level of severe functionality. From perpetration, 42.55% have carried out some act of violence with a moderate frequency, and 2.12% have perpetrated

violence with a high frequency, finding themselves with a severe level of functionality.

Another of the variables analyzed corresponded to family functionality, where the results allowed us to identify that, both in victimization and perpetration, 76.59% of the study population are at a level of mild functionality, and 2.12% at a severe level of functionality. With these data, the statistical analysis allowed us to identify that, regarding dating violence (victimization) and family functionality, there is no significant relationship, since the p value was higher than 0.05 (.345). It was similar with dating violence (perpetration) and family functionality, where a significant relationship was not found with a p value of .345.

With these results, it is important to mention that, although in the present study there is no relationship between dating violence, victimization and perpetration with family functionality, some studies have found that such a relationship exists, although not with the same instrument. (DVS). Such is the case of the study carried out by Limo & Vásquez (27) in which they used the Conflict in Adolescent Dating Relationships Inventory (CADRI) and the Family APGAR. The results reflected that, between family functionality and violence of committed and suffered partner, there is a moderate inverse relationship with $\rho = -0.593$ and $\rho = -0.543$ (Pearson test) respectively. It is concluded that family functionality is inversely correlated with the violence committed and suffered by the couple respectively. That is, the less family functionality, the greater the violence committed and suffered. Therefore, the greater the violence in the couple.

In this regard, there are many factors that can trigger dating violence, one of them being inadequate family functionality, understood as a set of interactions between the members of the family group, a bond that allows them to face the different crises that originate within the home. This represents a space of tranquility and a protective factor against environmental risks that can complicate the health of its members (28).

Likewise, the identification of risk factors, whether individual or social, is a key aspect in the prevention of dating violence, which affects the risk of suffering or perpetrating this type of violence. Therefore, it is of interest to know them as an essential key to early recognition of their incidence in those adolescents and/or young people who are within risk groups (29).

The consequences that can arise from being a victim of violence in a dating relationship are diverse and are related to the decrease in psychosocial well-being and quality of life, with homicide (death of the victim) being the most worrying, since after a long process of suffering, those that include mistreatment, abuse and threats, are the most frequent to occur (30).

CONCLUSION

It was evident that there is no significant statistical association of dating violence from the perspective of perpetration and victimization in relation to family functionality, since the p value is higher than 0.05.

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

None declared by the authors.

THANKS

The support of the Faculty of Human Health, the Nursing program of the National University of Loja and the students who participated in carrying out the work and made it possible to obtain the data. They are appreciated.

REFERENCES

1. World Health Organization, Pan American Health Organization. Violence prevention. 2022. Available at: <https://acortar.link/XcWEW8>
2. González N, Suarez A, Hernández L, Rodríguez L. Agreement in the perception of violent behavior in adolescent couples. *Psychological ter.* 2019;37(2):154–165. Available at: <https://bitly.ws/36Xc2>
3. Gracia M, Puente A, Ubillos S and Páez D. Dating violence (DV): a meta-analysis review. *An Psychol.* 2019; 35 (2): 300–313. Available at: <http://bitly.ws/A3Bw>
4. Rey C, Bolívar Y and Martínez J. Family functionality, number of relationships and dating abuse in high school students. *Psicol from the Caribbean.* 2017;34. Available at: <http://bitly.ws/vL3f>
5. Gracia M, Puente A, Ubillos S, Páez D. Dating violence (DV): a meta-analysis review. *An Psychol.* 2019;35(2):300–313. Available at: <https://onx.la/48726>
6. Morillo J, Guerron S, Narváez M. Influence of domestic violence on academic performance in adolescents. *ACC CIETNA Rev la Esc Enfermería.* 2018;3(2):68–79. Available at: <https://bitly.ws/36WRd>
7. World Health Organization (WHO). World report on violence and health. Synopsis. 2021. Available at: <http://bitly.ws/xbUv>
8. Chavez M and Juárez A. *Bulletin of Gender Violence in Ecuador.* 2016; Available at: <http://bitly.ws/xbYa>
9. Flores-Garrido N, Barreto-Ávila M. Dating violence among students of the National Autonomous University of Mexico. *Ibero-American Journal of Higher Education (ries).* 2018;9 (26): 42-63. Available at: <http://bitly.ws/vLgn>
10. Mendoza L, Salgado R, Limachi D, Castillo T, Zamora A, Montes F. Causes and consequences of dating violence. *Ajayu.* 2019;17(2):283–316. Available at: <http://bitly.ws/xdv9>
- eleven. Mendoza L, Salgado R, Limachi D, Castillo T, Zamora A and Montes F. Causes and consequences of dating violence. *Ajayu.* 2019; 17 (2): 283–316. Available at: <http://bitly.ws/xdv9>
12. Cabrera S and Pillacela M. Violence in adolescent dating in the Cuenca canton. Degree thesis, University of Cuenca; 2018. Available at: <http://bitly.ws/vUdx>
13. Rodríguez F. Validation of Dating Violence Questionnaire-R (DVQ-R). *Int J Clin Heal Psychol.* 2016; 16:77–84. Available at: <http://bitly.ws/xvrH>
14. Suarez Cuba Miguel A., Alcalá Espinoza Matilde. Family APGAR: a tool to detect family dysfunction. *Rev. Med. Peace.* 2014; 20(1): 53-57. Available at: http://www.scielo.org.bo/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1726-89582014000100010&lng=es.
- fifteen. Ramos Y, López L, Pompa M, García D. Dating Violence in Medical Students from an Inclusive View. *Number.* 2022;18:1–10. Available at: <https://bitly.ws/SVWB>
16. Zeña S, Morocho N, Valladares M. Violence during falling in love in university students. *Rev Cuba Med Mil.* 2022;51(1):1–16. Available at: <https://bitly.ws/36Q6X>

17. Pérez N, Fontalvo R and Acosta J. Violence in adolescent dating. *AVFT*. 2016; 483–488. Available at: <http://bitly.ws/zplh>
18. Spencer K and Haffejee M. Intimate partner violence at a tertiary institution. *South African Med J*. 2016; 106 (11): 1129–1133. Available at: <http://bitly.ws/M5Dh>
19. Flores M, Bringas C, Rodríguez L, López J and Rodríguez J. Relationship abuse in the dating of young Mexicans. *Ter Psicol*. 2015; 33 (1): 5–12. Available at: <http://bitly.ws/zpKI>
- twenty. Sánchez I and Menkes C. Loving you hurts. Sexual rape in dating relationships. an analysis of its social determinants. *Population Papers*. 2016; 22 (87): 43–62. Available at: <http://bitly.ws/zpMR>
- twenty-one. Flores M, Bringas C, Rodríguez L, López J, Rodríguez J. Relationship abuse in the dating of young Mexicans. *Ter Psicol*. 2015;33(1):5–12. Available at: <http://bitly.ws/zpKI>
22. Ariza M. Shame, pride and humiliation: emotional counterpoints in the experience of female labor migration. *Sociological Studies El Col México*. 2017;35(103):65–89. Available at: <https://bitly.ws/36QvE>
23. Rodríguez R, Riosvelasco L and Castillo N. Dating violence, gender and social support in young university students. *Psychol Writings / Psychol Writings*. 2018; 11 (1): 1–9. Available at: <https://bit.ly/3zb8jk8>
24. Sotelo D, Rojas A, Molina H and Igreda A. Dating violence and experiential avoidance in psychology interns. *Socialium*. 2022; 6 (2): 1–15. Available at: <http://bitly.ws/zpSy>
25. Rubio J, Martinez P, Areense J. Violent relationships in university students and their association with gender training. 2020;14(2):14208. Available at: <https://bitly.ws/36QxA%0A>
26. Montes A and Quiroga N. Characterization of dating violence in university students. *Unisangil*. 2022; (8.5.2017): 2003–2005. Available at: <http://bitly.ws/zpTm>
27. Limo M and Vásquez T. Family functionality and intimate partner violence in students belonging to a state educational institution in Chiclayo, 2021. Degree thesis, Pedro Ruiz Gallo National University; 2019. Available at: <http://bitly.ws/A3ou>
28. Reyes S and Oyola M. Family functionality and risk behaviors in health sciences university students. *Rev Investig in Common and Development*. 2022; 13 (2): 127–137. Available at: <http://bitly.ws/wNEk>
29. Cienfuegos Y. Measurement of violence in couple relationships in psychology. *Rev Cult*. 2021;9:1–37. Available at: <https://bitly.ws/36Qza>
30. Rojas Y. Violence in dating. *Rev Strategies for Fulfilling the Mission*. 2015; 9 (2): 102–116. Available at: <http://bitly.ws/xbUR>