

Article

Contrasting Cognitive Competence of Victimized Youngsters in Dating Relations

Verónica Marcos , Blanca Cea , Mercedes Novo , & Dolores Seijo 

Unidad de Psicología Forense, Facultad de Psicología, Universidad de Santiago de Compostela, Spain

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 21/01/2023
Accepted: 21/05/2023

Keywords:

Sexism
Conflict
Behaviours
Victimization
Adolescence

Palabras clave:

Sexismo
Conflicto
Conducta
Victimización
Adolescencia

ABSTRACT

Background/Objective: Dating violence is a serious social and public health problem worldwide. The literature has pointed out that future research should be focused to examining differences between victimised and non-victimised in teen dating relationships. Thus, a field study was designed to estimate the victimization prevalence in dating relationships and the effects of victimization in sexist beliefs and conflict resolution strategies. **Method:** A sample of 467 youngsters (56.1% females and 43.9% males), aged between 14 and 18 years ($M = 15.41$, $SD = 1.06$) responded to measures of experience of victimization (objective and subjective), strategies for conflict resolution, and sexism beliefs. **Results:** A significant prevalence of victimization, 32.8%, in dating relationships was observed, meanwhile 77.1% of youngsters who experienced dating violence did not perceive victimization. The results also exhibited significantly higher scores in benevolent sexism and aggressive tactics for conflict resolution in persons victimized in dating violence. **Conclusions:** The extremely high prevalence of victimization requires for a strong policy to eradicate or minimize it. The observed deficits of victimized youngsters in cognitive competences in conflict resolution skills and in cognitive distortions empathise that both should be contents of prevention and intervention programmes.

Contraste de la Competencia Cognitiva de Jóvenes Víctimas en Relaciones de Noviazgo

RESUMEN

Antecedentes/objetivo: La violencia en el noviazgo es un grave problema social y de salud pública en todo el mundo. La literatura ha señalado que la investigación futura debería centrarse en examinar las diferencias entre victimizados y no victimizados en las relaciones de noviazgo entre adolescentes. Así, se diseñó un estudio de campo para estimar la prevalencia de victimización en las relaciones de noviazgo y los efectos de la victimización en las creencias sexistas y las estrategias de resolución de conflictos. **Método:** Una muestra de 467 jóvenes (56.1% chicas y 43.9% chicos), con edades comprendidas entre los 14 y los 18 años ($M = 15,41$, $DT = 1,06$) respondieron a medidas de experiencia de victimización (objetiva y subjetiva), estrategias de resolución de conflictos y creencias sexistas. **Resultados:** Se observó una prevalencia significativa de victimización, del 32.8%, en las relaciones de noviazgo, mientras que el 77.1% de los jóvenes que experimentaron violencia en el noviazgo no percibieron victimización. Los resultados también mostraron puntuaciones significativamente más altas en sexismo benevolente y tácticas agresivas en la resolución de conflictos en las personas victimizadas de violencia en el noviazgo. **Conclusiones:** La elevada prevalencia de la victimización exige una sólida política que la erradique o la minimice. Los déficits observados en los jóvenes victimizados en cuanto a competencias cognitivas en habilidades de resolución de conflictos y en distorsiones cognitivas enfatizan que ambas deben ser contenidos de los programas de prevención e intervención.

Introduction

Dating violence (DV) is a worldwide serious social and public health problem (Dosil et al., 2022; Soller et al., 2020; Taylor & Mumford, 2016), with a prevalence rate ranging from 23% to 30% (Viejo et al., 2016), despite of victimization rates vary depending on the characteristics of the samples (i.e., gender, age, race/ethnicity, country, measurement instruments) (Exner-Cortens et al., 2021; Shamu et al., 2016). In this regard, in a meta-analytic review, Wincentak et al. (2017) found that one in ten adolescents reported victimization in their dating relationship. According to international organisations, DV includes aggressive behaviour of a physical, psychological and/or sexual nature towards a partner or ex-partner during adolescence and/or young adulthood taking place in person or electronically (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC], 2020; World Health Organization [WHO], 2021). DV has specific characteristics (López-Cepero et al., 2015; Rodríguez-Franco et al., 2016; Marcos et al., 2022), in contrast to intimate partner violence (Pereira et al., 2020). Specially, the main characteristic refers to the role played by both members of the relationship, characterised by the role of victim and aggressor simultaneously (Cava et al., 2021; Marcos et al., 2020; Moral et al., 2017). In this line, several studies found that this type of victimization cause negative consequences, in the short and long term, on the physical, psychological and social well-being of the person who suffers it (Reyes et al., 2018; Théorêt et al., 2021) (CDC, 2020; MacGregor et al., 2019; Taquette & Monteiro, 2019); and mainly in those cases of victimization where the severity of the violence is high (Muñoz-Rivas et al., 2007; Wolitzky-Taylor et al., 2008).

The literature has examined how this phenomenon is related to gender and/or age (Cava et al., 2021; Marcos et al., 2020); as well as its association with cognitive variables (e.g., sexist beliefs, romantic love myths), psychological adjustment (e.g., anxiety, depression), social adjustment (e.g., conflict resolution strategies, social competence, coping), and family variables (e.g., parenting styles, parental breakdown) (Garthe et al., 2017; Hebert et al., 2019). Noteworthy, it was found that those who have a lower perception of the seriousness of violent behaviour are more likely to engage in victimization than those who have a higher perception of the severity of violent behaviour (Ameral et al., 2020). Thus, perception of severity is shown to be fundamental in preventing victimization (Ameral et al., 2020; Lelaurain et al., 2021) and, hence, essential for the victim to be able to detect that such victimization is being produced (Marcos et al., 2020). The perception of violent behaviours is mediated by gender schemas (cognitive constructs internalised in early childhood) due to the dichotomisation between feminine and masculine (Gender Schema Theory; Bem, 1981, 1983), with violence being more coherent and socially accepted for the male role (Marcos et al., 2020). Likewise, the feminine gender is related to qualities such as submissiveness and passivity, while the masculine is linked to aggressiveness, strength and dominance (Hyde, 2005; Reyes et al., 2016). Therefore, gender schemas modulates the beliefs of each individual and, in sum, the relationships between females and males (Novo et al., 2016). In this sense, the literature adds that sexist beliefs are a factor that influences dating relationships (Sánchez-Hernández et al., 2020), differentiated into hostile sexism and benevolent sexism (Ambivalent Sexism Theory; Glick & Fiske, 2001, 2011). Hostile sexism refers to the attitude of prejudice or

discriminatory behaviour based on the supposed inferiority or difference of women as a group; while benevolent sexism is conceived as a set of interrelated attitudes towards women that are sexist in that it views them in a stereotypical way and limited to certain roles. The former is characterised by a stereotypical view of women as 'mentally inferior' and the latter advocates that women as 'weak' beings need the protection of a man (Glick & Fiske, 2001). Sexist beliefs are elements that favour the appearance, continuity and permanence of violent behaviours in early dating relationships (Marcos et al., 2020; Martínez-Gómez et al., 2021).

On the other hand, research notes about the influence of conflict resolution strategies (Bonache et al., 2017; Courtain & Glowacz, 2021), and the way as conflict is managed, in the acceptance and execution of violent behaviours within interpersonal relationships (Garaigordobil et al., 2016). Conflict resolution skills (classified empirically in collaborative, passive and aggressive strategies; Fariña et al., 2021) are developed during adolescence (Espelage et al., 2014), meaning that at this stage is hard to implement appropriate conflict resolution strategies (Ha et al., 2019; Mestre et al., 2012). Under this approach, it is evident that, in general, the young population employs more aggressive and passive strategies (Gao et al., 2017), as opposed to collaborative strategies that are appropriate for promoting effective communications (Bonache et al., 2017) and also for preventing possible violent behaviours in dating relationships (Courtain & Glowacz, 2021; Moral & González-Sáez, 2020). Conflict resolution strategies may be key pillars to violence prevention programmes (Wang et al., 2020).

Bearing in mind the literature, a field study with the aim of exploring victimization in dating relationships, as well as possible differences between the victimized and non-victimized populations in associated variables (sexist beliefs and conflict resolution strategies) was designed; with the ultimate aim of providing scientific knowledge in order to guide prevention and intervention programmes applied at this stage of development.

Method

Participants

A total of 467 Spanish young participated in the study, 56.1% females ($n = 262$) and 43.9% males ($n = 205$), aged between 14 and 18 years old ($M = 15.41$, $SD = 1.06$). Regarding the academic year, 32.5% were in 3rd of Compulsory education (14-15 years) and 34.3% in 4th of Compulsory education (15-16 years), while 23.1% were in 1st of Baccalaureate (16-17 years), 8.6% in 2nd of Baccalaureate (17-18 years) and the remaining 1.5% in Formative Cycles. Regarding the type of secondary school, 73.0% were to a public school, 21.2% in a state-subsidised school and 5.8% in a private school.

Design and Procedure

An ex post facto study was designed in order to analyse victimization in adolescent dating relationships, as well as possible differences between victimised and non-victimised populations on associated variables (sexist beliefs and conflict resolution strategies). To obtain the sample, authorization with the secondary school, the permission of the parents and the consent of the participants (informed consent) were processed. Participation was

voluntary. The instruments were managed by staff trained and in a single session, and all participants completed the instruments, responding individually and anonymously. Data were processed and stored according with the Spanish Data Protection Law (Ley Orgánica 3/2018, de 5 de diciembre del 2018, de Protección de Datos Personales y Garantía de los Derechos Digitales).

Measure Instruments

An ad hoc questionnaire for the collection of socio-demographic information (i.e., gender, age, academic year and type of the school) was designed.

The *Dating Violence Questionnaire-R* (DVQ-R; Rodríguez-Díaz et al., 2017) was used to evaluate the experience of victimization in young people within a couple's relationship. The DVQ-R is composed of 20 items measuring five different forms of dating violence victimization (e.g., "Has beaten you", "Has treated you as a sexual object", "Ridicules or insults you for the ideas you uphold"): Physical (i.e., has beaten you), Sexual (e.g., insists on touching you in ways and places that you do not like and do not want), Humiliation (e.g., criticizes you, underestimates the way you are, or humiliates your self-esteem), Detachment (e.g., does not recognize any responsibility regarding both of you), and Coercion (i.e., has physically kept you); on a 5-point Likert-type scale, ranging from 0 (*Never*) to 4 (*All the time*). In the present research, the questionnaire and the subscales showed adequate reliability (internal consistency) ($\alpha = .88$ on the total scale).

The Escala de Medios de Resolución de Conflictos Interpersonales (MERCÍ) [Interpersonal Conflict Resolution Scale] (Fariña et al., 2021) was applied to measure the conflict resolution strategies employed by individuals in interpersonal conflicts. It involves of 22 items (e.g., "I try to have a clear dialogue", "I give in to avoid conflict", "I insult the other person") divided into three factors: Collaborative, Passive and Aggressive strategies, on a 5-point Likert-type scale, ranging from 0 (*It never happens to me or I never do it*) to 4 (*It happens to me or I do it very often*). The scale showed sufficient reliability (internal consistency) in this study (Nunnally, 1978): α of .87 for Collaborative Strategies, α of .70 for Passive Strategies and α of .74 for Aggressive Strategies.

To measure sexism, the Spanish adaptation for adolescents of the *Ambivalent Sexism Inventory* (ASI; Lemus et al., 2008) was used. This instrument is composed of 20 items (e.g., "In the evenings, men must accompany women home for nothing bad happens to them", "Women must be loved and protected by men", "Men should take care of women"), grouped into two subscales (Hostile Sexism and Benevolent Sexism), on a 6-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*Strongly Disagree*) to 6 (*Strongly Agree*). For this study, adequate internal consistency indices for the research were obtained ($> .80$; Nunnally, 1978): $\alpha = .89$ for Hostile Sexism and $\alpha = .82$ for Benevolent Sexism.

Data Analysis

Rates of victimization and perceived severity of victimization were calculated by recoding the variables on these scales into absence of victimization (non-victimization), when the participant reported not having been the target of any dating violence behaviour(s) and presence of victimization (victimization). Likewise, the variable

perception of severity was dichotomised into absence of severity (non-severe) and presence of severity (severe). Contingency prevalence was analysed by contrasting (Z) the observed probability with a constant: .05 for a trivial effect; .5 for a common effect and .95 for a normal effect (Fandiño et al., 2021), and the effect in Cohen's h . The association between variables was tested with chi-squared, obtaining the effect size in odds ratio (ϕ if a cell case was 0 because OR cannot be computed) which are of a small magnitude if $OR > 1.47$ or $\phi > .14$ (an effect size larger than 55.6%), moderate if $OR > 2.47$ or $\phi > .33$ (an effect size larger than 63.7%), large if $OR > 4.25$ or $\phi > .50$ (an effect size larger than 71.6%) and more than large if $OR > 8.82$ or $\phi > .67$ (an effect size larger than 80.2%) (Arce et al., 2015). Mean comparison analyses for independent samples were executed, two-sample t-test, and with one test value, on-sample t-test. Effect size was measured with Cohen's d (Cohen's formula for the comparison with a test value and unbiased Hedges's formula as $N_1 \neq N_2$), interpreting the effect as small if $d = 0.20$, medium if $d = 0.50$, and large if $d = 0.80$ (Cohen, 1988), quantifying the magnitude of the effect in terms of the increase (+) or decrease (-) with an adaptation of the BESD (Rosenthal & Rubin, 1982), r (Gancedo et al., 2021). In addition, the reliability (internal consistency) of the measurement instruments in the sample of the present study using Cronbach's α coefficient was calculated.

Results

The results showed that 32.8% of the sample reported having experienced victimization in their dating relationship during the last year, a prevalence that was significant ($> .05$), $Z = 27.56$, $p < .001$, $h = 1.57$, 95% CI[1.53, 1.61]. Likewise, the results exhibited a significant association, $\chi^2(1, N = 467) = 6.25$, $p = .012$, between victimization and continuation of the relationship, such that 35.7% of youngsters who did not perceive victimization continue the relationship, while 24.2% of females who had perceived victimization continue the relationship, i.e., those who did not perceive victimization were 1.74, OR = 1.74, 95% CI [1.12, 2.69], more likely to continue the relationship.

Furthermore, the results revealed a significant association between having been exposed to victimizing behaviour(s) in the dating relationship (objective measure of victimization) and feeling victimised (subjective measure of victimization), $\chi^2(1, N = 466) = 77.42$, $p < .001$, so that 77.1% of young people who experienced dating violence did not perceive victimization, while all (100%) of those who did not experience victimization did not perceive themselves to be victims of dating violence, an association between variables with a moderate effect size, $\phi = .377$. In addition, the mismatch between perception of subjective victimization and objective victimization was highlighted, which is only limited to 28.9%, a contingency that is far away, with a moderate effect size, $h = -0.61$, 95% CI[-0.65, -0.57], of being common ($< .50$), $Z = -9.12$, $p < .001$, when it is expected to be normal ($= .95$).

On the perceived severity of dating violence behaviours, 61.7% ($N = 288$) rated the severity of dating violence behaviours experienced as serious, a more than common contingency ($> .50$), $Z = 5.06$, $p < .001$, with a small to moderate effect, $h = 0.33$, 95% CI[0.30, 0.36].

The results of the comparison of means on sexist beliefs for the victimization factor (Yes vs. No) showed (see Table 1) that young

Table 1
Differences According to the Existence of Victimization in Sexist Beliefs

Variable	Victimization	N	t(df)	p	M(SD)	M _{diff} [95% CI]	d
Hostile sexism	No	305	-1.61(260)	.110	20.85(9.45) 22.50(10.74)	-1.66 [-3.70, 0.38]	0.17
	Yes	148					
Benevolent sexism	No	294	-2.37(441)	.018	24.60(9.46) 26.89(9.97)	-2.29 [-4.20, -0.39]	0.24
	Yes	149					

victims of dating violence share significantly more benevolent sexism beliefs than non-victims. Specifically, young victims had, on average, 11.9% ($r = .119$) more benevolent sexism bias than non-victims.

With regard to interpersonal conflict resolution strategies, the population reported significantly more use (95% Confidence Intervals do not overlap with a higher mean score in collaborative conflict resolution strategies than in passive and aggressive conflict resolution strategies) of collaborative ($M = 21.42$, 95% CI[20.84, 22.00]) than passive strategies ($M = 14.35$, 95% CI[13.84, 14.86]) or aggressive strategies ($M = 6.73$, 95% CI[6.27, 7.19]); and passive (95% Confidence Intervals do not overlap with a higher mean score in passive than in aggressive conflict resolution strategies) rather than aggressive strategies. In turn, in line with the norms of the scale, young people reported a moderately high (≥ 16 AND < 24) likelihood of using collaborative strategies ($M = 21.42$, 95% CI[20.84, 22.00]) in coping with conflict; a probability of using between probable (≥ 7 AND < 14) and a moderately high (≥ 14 AND < 21) likelihood of using passive strategies ($M = 14.35$, 95% CI[13.84, 14.86]) in conflict coping, and a likelihood of employment of aggressive strategies ($M = 6.73$, 95% CI[6.27, 7.19]) in conflict coping between improbable (≥ 0 AND < 7) and probable (≥ 7 AND < 14).

The study of the use of conflict resolution strategies (see Table 2) disclosed that victims of dating violence used significantly less collaborative conflict resolution strategies than non-victims, with up to 15.8% ($r = .158$) less use of this strategy. By contrast, victims of dating violence were significantly more likely to use aggressive conflict resolution strategies, with a 22.9% ($r = .229$) increase compared to non-victims (see Table 2).

Discussion

Before discussing the results, it must take into account the limitations of the present research. First, the size and homogeneity of the sample must be borne in mind, since this issue makes it difficult to generalise the results. Second, the sampling procedure

employed limits its representativeness. Third, the measurement instruments used, as they are self-report measures; consequently, the potential bias in responding mediated by under- (social desirability) and over-reporting; thus, this variance is attributable to the measure method, not the measured construct (Fariña et al., 2017). Fourth, the influence of other types of variables not measured in this study (e.g., individual, contextual). With these limitations in mind, the following conclusions may be extended.

First, the results revealed the existence of victimization in adolescent dating relationships (32.8% of the sample), in line with previous studies that have examined the prevalence of this phenomenon (Viejo et al., 2016; Marcos et al., 2022). This finding is consistent with the need to emphasize that this type of victimization is a serious social and public health problem (Dasil et al., 2022; Soller et al., 2020); which should be addressed in the educational, social and health fields among the younger population, to: a) minimise the mismatch between the perception of objective victimization and subjective victimization; b) reduce violent behaviours in dating relationships; c) raise awareness of the severity of violent behaviours that occur in interpersonal relationships.

Second, the results revealed the existence of benevolent sexism beliefs to a greater extent in the victimised group than in the non-victimised group, in line with previous research (Rey-Anacona et al., 2017; Fernández-Fuentes et al., 2018). Hence, sexist beliefs may be an anchorage that favours the appearance and permanence of violent behaviours in early dating relationships (Marcos et al., 2020; Martínez-Gómez et al., 2021), and, therefore, contents on this issue should be included in prevention and intervention programmes on violence in adolescence.

Thirdly, the victims of dating violence were more likely to use aggressive and passive strategies than the non-victimised group, which manage to cope with conflict preferably collaborative strategies. This means that the victimised population uses more conflict resolution strategies (aggressive and passive) that promote inappropriate and disruptive social interactions (Bonache et al., 2017; Courtain & Glowacz, 2021; Moral & González-Sáez, 2020).

Table 2
Differences According to the Existence of Victimization in Conflict Resolution Strategies

Variable	Victimization	N	t(df)	p	M(SD)	M _{diff} [95% CI]	d
Collaborative strategies	Absence	299	3.23(446)	< .001	22.10(6.36) 20.07(5.98)	2.02[0.79, 3.25]	-0.32
	Presence	149					
Passive strategies	Absence	303	-1.64(441)	.102	14.07(5.42) 14.98(5.53)	-0.91[-2.01, 0.18]	0.17
	Presence	140					
Aggressive strategies	Absence	297	-4.81(438)	< .001	5.96(4.09) 8.33(6.09)	-2.37[-3.33, -1.40]	0.49
	Presence	143					

Furthermore, the youngsters who use collaborative strategies are more likely to have non-conflictual interpersonal relationships (Gao et al., 2017), which is the case for the non-victimised group. In fact, it has been corroborated that the way conflicts are managed mediates the acceptance and execution of violent behaviours within interpersonal relationships (Garaigordobil et al., 2016).

For future lines of research, it is proposed that studies should focus on factors associated with the adolescent stage, in order to contribute the creation of action plans that improve the well-being of young people and foster healthy and appropriate relationships (Seijo et al., 2023). Notwithstanding, it should be kept in mind that adolescence is a time of numerous physical and psycho-emotional changes (Özdemir et al., 2016; Mills & Tamnes, 2014), with effects in the skills to establish relationships with others (Bonache et al., 2017) and, consequently, the conceptualisation of romantic relationships. Thus, violence that occurs in early dating relationships is identified as a unique phenomenon, with particular characteristics (Rodríguez-Franco et al., 2016; Marcos et al., 2020) and factors associated with this stage of development (Garthe et al., 2017; Hebert et al., 2019; Marcos et al., 2022). Therefore, these issues should be kept in mind when designing, developing and implementing prevention programmes addressing adolescent violence in general (López-Cepero et al., 2015; Marcos et al., 2020), and intimate partner violence in particular (Novo et al., 2019; Wincentak et al., 2017).

References

- Ameral, V., Reed, K. M., & Hines, D. A. (2020). An analysis of help-seeking patterns among college student victims of sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 35*(23-24), 5311–5335. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260517721169>
- Arce, R., Fariña, F., Seijo, D., & Novo, M. (2015). Assessing impression management with the MMPI-2 in child custody litigation. *Assessment, 22*(6), 769-777. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191114558111>
- Bem, S. L. (1981). Gender schema theory: A cognitive account of sex typing. *Psychological Review, 88*(4), 354-364. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.88.4.354>
- Bem, S. L. (1983). Gender schema theory and its implications for child development: Raising gender-aschematic children in a gender-schematic society. *Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 8*(4), 598-616. <https://doi.org/10.1086/493998>
- Bonache, H., Gonzalez-Mendez, R., & Krahé, B. (2017). Romantic attachment, conflict resolution styles, and teen dating violence victimization. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 46*(9), 1905-1917. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-017-0635-2>
- Cava, M. J., Buelga, S., & Tomás, I. (2021). Peer victimization and dating violence victimization: The mediating role of loneliness, depressed mood, and life satisfaction. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 36*(5-6), 2677-2702. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260518760013>
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2020). *Preventing teen dating violence: What is teen dating violence?* https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/ipv/TDV-factsheet_2020.pdf
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). LEA. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203771587>
- Courtain, A., & Glowacz, F. (2021). Exploration of dating violence and related attitudes among adolescents and emerging adults. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 36*(5-6), NP2975-NP2998. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260518770185>
- Dosil, M., Jaureguizar, J., & Bernaras, E. (2022). Dating violence in adolescents in residential care: Frequency and associated factors. *Child & Family Social Work, 27*(2), 311-323. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cfs.12886>
- Espelage, D. L., Polanin, J. R., & Low, S. K. (2014). Teacher and staff perceptions of school environment as predictors of student aggression, victimization, and willingness to intervene in bullying situations. *School Psychology Quarterly, 29*(3), 287-305. <https://doi.org/10.1037/spq0000072>
- Exner-Cortens, D., Baker, E., & Craig, W. (2021). The national prevalence of adolescent dating violence in Canada. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 69*(3), 495-502. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2021.01.032>
- Fandiño, R., Basanta, J., Sanmarco, J., Arce, R., & Fariña, F. (2021). Evaluation of the executive functioning and psychological adjustment of child to parent offenders: Epidemiology and quantification of harm. *Frontiers in Psychology, 12*, 616855. <https://dx.doi.org/10.3389%2Ffpsyg.2021.616855>
- Fariña, F., Novo, M., Seijo D., & Arce, R. (2021). Diseño y validación de la Escala de Medios de Resolución de Conflictos Interpersonales (MERCÍ) para Adolescentes [Design and validation of the Interpersonal Conflict Resolution Scale (MERCÍ) for Adolescents]. *Bordón. Revista de Pedagogía, 73*, 11-26. <https://doi.org/10.13042/Bordon.2021.90037>
- Fariña, F., Redondo, L., Seijo, D., Novo, M., & Arce, R. (2017). A meta-analytic review of the MMPI validity scales and indexes to detect defensiveness in custody, evaluations. *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology, 17*(2), 128-138. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijchp.2017.02.002>
- Fernández-Fuertes, A. A., Carcedo, R. J., Orgaz, B., & Fuertes, A. (2018). Sexual coercion perpetration and victimization: Gender similarities and differences in adolescence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 33*(16), 2467-2485. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260518774306>
- Gancedo, Y., Fariña, F., Seijo, D., Vilariño, M., & Arce, R. (2021). Reality Monitoring: A meta-analytical review for forensic practice. *European Journal of Psychology Applied to Legal Context, 13*(2), 99-110. <https://doi.org/10.5093/ejpalc2021a10>
- Gao, Q., Bian, R., Liu, R. D., He, Y., & Oei, T. P. (2017). Conflict resolution in Chinese adolescents' friendship: Links with regulatory focus and friendship satisfaction. *Journal of Psychology, 151*(3), 268-281. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00223980.2016.1270887>
- Garaigordobil, M., Machimbarrena, J. M., & Maganto, C. (2016). Adaptación española de un instrumento para evaluar la resolución de conflictos (Conflictalk): Datos psicométricos de fiabilidad y validez [Spanish adaptation of an instrument to assess conflict resolution (Conflictalk): Psychometric data of reliability and validity]. *Revista de Psicología Clínica con Niños y Adolescentes, 3*(2), 59-67. <https://www.revistapcna.com/sites/default/files/16-23.pdf>
- Garthe, R. C., Sullivan, T. N., & McDaniel, M. A. (2017). A meta-analytic review of peer risk factors and adolescent dating violence. *Psychology of Violence, 7*(1), 45-57. <https://doi.org/10.1037/vio0000040>
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (2001). Ambivalent sexism. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 33*, 115-188. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601\(01\)80005-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(01)80005-8)
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (2011). Ambivalent sexism revisited. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 35*(3), 530-535. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684311414832>
- Ha, T., Kim, H., & McGill, S. (2019). When conflict escalates into intimate partner violence: The delicate nature of observed coercion in adolescent romantic relationships. *Development and Psychopathology, 31*(5), 1729-1739. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0954579419001007>

- Hebert, M., Daspe, M. È., Lapierre, A., Godbout, N., Blais, M., Fernet, M., & Lavoie, F. (2019). A meta-analysis of risk and protective factors for dating violence victimization: The role of family and peer interpersonal context. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 20*(4), 574-590. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838017725336>
- Hyde, J. S. (2005). The gender similarities hypothesis. *American Psychologist, 60*, 581-592. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.60.6.581>
- Lelaurain, S., Fonte, D., Giger, J. C., Guignard, S., & Lo Monaco, G. (2021). Legitimizing intimate partner violence: The role of romantic love and the mediating effect of patriarchal ideologies. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 36*(13-14), 6351-6368. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260518818427>
- Lemus, S. de., Castillo, M., Moya, M. C., Padilla, J. L., & Ryan, E. (2008). Elaboración y validación del Inventario de Sexismo Ambivalente para Adolescentes [Elaboration and evaluation of the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory for Adolescents]. *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology, 8*(2), 537-562. http://www.aepc.es/ijchp/articulos_pdf/ijchp-292.pdf
- Ley Orgánica 3/2018, de 5 de diciembre, de Protección de Datos Personales y Garantía de los Derechos Digitales (2018). *Boletín Oficial del Estado, 294*, 119788-119857. <https://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2018/12/06/pdfs/BOE-A-2018-16673.pdf>
- López-Cepero, J., Rodríguez-Franco, L., Rodríguez-Díaz, F. J., Bringas, C., & Paíno, S. (2015). Percepción de la victimización en el noviazgo de adolescentes y jóvenes españoles [Perception of victimization in dating in Spanish teen and young]. *Revista Iberoamericana de Psicología y Salud, 6*(2), 64-71. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.rips.2015.04.001>
- MacGregor, K. E., Villalta, L., Clarke, V., Viner, R., Kramer, T., & Khadr, S. N. (2019). A systematic review of short and medium-term mental health outcomes in young people following sexual assault. *Journal of Child & Adolescent Mental Health, 31*(3), 161-181. <https://doi.org/10.2989/17280583.2019.1665533>
- Marcos, V., Allende, M., & Bliesener, T. (2022). Violencia en el noviazgo: una revisión sistemática. En I. Loinaz, J. Sanmarco, y V. Marcos (Eds.), *XIV Congreso [Inter]Nacional de Psicología Jurídica y Forense: Libro de Actas* (págs. 209-215). Andavira.
- Marcos, V., Gancedo, Y., Castro, B., & Selaya, A. (2020). Dating violence victimization, perceived gravity in dating violence behaviors, sexism, romantic love myths and emotional dependence between female and male adolescents. *Revista Iberoamericana de Psicología y Salud, 11*(2), 132-145. <https://doi.org/10.23923/j.rips.2020.02.040>
- Martínez-Gómez, J. A., Bolívar-Suárez, Y., Rey-Anacona, C. A., Ramírez-Ortiz, L. C., Lizarazo-Ojeda, A. M., & Yanez-Peñúñuri, L. Y. (2021). Esquemas tradicionales de roles sexuales de género, poder en las relaciones y violencia en el noviazgo [Traditional schemes of sexual gender roles, power in relationships and dating violence]. *Revista Iberoamericana de Psicología y Salud, 12*(1), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.23923/j.rips.2021.01.041>
- Mestre, V., Samper, P., Tur-Porcar, A. M., Richaud de Minzi, M. C., & Mesurado, B. (2012). Emociones, estilos de afrontamiento y agresividad en la adolescencia [Emotions, coping style and aggression during adolescence]. *Universitas Psychologica, 11*(4), 1263-1275. <https://revistas.javeriana.edu.co/index.php/revPsycho/article/view/1831/3356>
- Mills, K. L., & Tammes, C. K. (2014). Methods and considerations for longitudinal structural brain imaging analysis across development. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience, 9*, 172-190. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2014.04.004>
- Moral, M. V., García, A., Cuetos, G., & Sirvent, C. (2017). Violencia en el noviazgo, dependencia emocional y autoestima en adolescentes y jóvenes españoles [Dating violence, emotional dependence and self-esteem in spanish adolescents and young adults]. *Revista Iberoamericana de Psicología y Salud, 8*(2), 96-107. <https://doi.org/10.23923/j.rips.2017.08.009>
- Moral, M. V., & González-Sáez, M. E. (2020). Distorsiones cognitivas y estrategias de afrontamiento en jóvenes con dependencia emocional [Cognitive distortions and coping strategies in young people with emotional dependence]. *Revista Iberoamericana de Psicología y Salud, 11*(1), 15-30. <https://doi.org/10.23923/j.rips.2020.01.032>
- Muñoz-Rivas, M. J., Graña, J. L., O'Leary, K. D., & González, M. S. (2007). Aggression in adolescent dating relationships: Prevalence, justification and health consequences. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 40*, 298-304. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2006.11.137>
- Novo, M., Fariña, F., Seijo, D., Vázquez, M. J., & Arce, R. (2019). Assessing the effects of a parental separation education program on mental health problems. *Psicothema, 31*(3), 284-291. <https://doi.org/10.7334/psicothema2018.299>
- Novo, M., Herbón, J., & Amado, B. G. (2016). Género y victimización: efectos en la evaluación de la violencia psicológica sutil y manifiesta, apego adulto y tácticas de resolución de conflictos [Victimization and gender: Effects in the evaluation of subtle and overt violence, adult attachment and conflict resolution tactics]. *Revista Iberoamericana de Psicología y Salud, 7*(2), 89-97. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rips.2016.05.002>
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Özdemir, A., Utikalp, N., & Palloş, A. (2016). Physical and psychosocial effects of the changes in adolescence period. *International Journal of Caring Sciences, 9*(2), 717-723. http://internationaljournalofcaringsciences.org/docs/39_Ozdemir_special_9_2.pdf
- Pereira, M. E., Azeredo, A., Moreira, D., Brandão, I., & Almeida, F. (2020). Personality characteristics of victims of intimate partner violence: A systematic review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 52*, 101423. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2020.101423>
- Rey-Anacona, C. A., Cruz, Y. C. G., Jiménez, V. S., & Guajardo, E. S. (2017). Sexismo y agresiones en el noviazgo en adolescentes españoles, chilenos y colombianos [Sexism and aggressions in the engagement in spanish, Chilean and Colombian adolescents]. *Behavioral Psychology/Psicología Conductual, 25*(2), 297-315. <https://www.behavioralpsycho.com/producto/sexismo-y-agresiones-en-el-noviazgo-en-adolescentes-espanoles-chilenos-y-colombianos/>
- Reyes, H. L. M., Foshee, V. A., Niolon, P. H., Reidy, D. E., & Hall, J. E. (2016). Gender role attitudes and male adolescent dating violence perpetration: Normative beliefs as moderators. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 45*(2), 350-360. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-015-0278-0>
- Reyes, H. L., Foshee, V. A., Chen, M. S., Gottfredson, N. C., & Ennett, S. T. (2018). Consequences of involvement in distinct patterns of adolescent peer and dating violence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 47*(11), 2371-2383. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-018-0902-x>
- Rodríguez-Díaz, F. J., Herrero, J., Rodríguez-Franco, L., Bringas-Molleda, C., Paíno-Quesada, S. G., & Pérez, B. (2017). Validation of Dating Violence Questionnaire-R (DVQ-R). *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology, 17*(1), 77-84. <https://doi.org/10.1174/021347413806196708>
- Rodríguez-Franco, L., López-Cepero, J., López, M. I., Paíno, S., Antuña, M. A., Bringas, C., & Rodríguez, F. J. (2016). Evolution of victimization,

tolerance and detection of intimate partner violence among young Spanish women. *Revista de Psicología Social*, 31(1), 137-156. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02134748.2015.1101316>

- Rosenthal, R., & Rubin, D. B. (1982). A simple, general purpose display of magnitude of experimental effect. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 74(2), 166-169. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.74.2.166>
- Sánchez-Hernández, M. D., Herrera-Enríquez, M. C., & Expósito, F. (2020). Controlling behaviors in couple relationships in the digital age: Acceptability of gender violence, sexism, and myths about romantic love. *Psychosocial Intervention*, 29(2), 67-81. <https://doi.org/10.5093/pi2020a1>
- Seijo, D., Vázquez, M. J., Novo, M., & Fariña, F. (2023). Studying the effects of sense of belonging to virtual communities in psychological well-being and adjustment academic setting. *Educación XXI*, 26(1), 229-247. <https://doi.org/10.5944/educxx1.31818>
- Shamu, S., Gevers, A., Mahlangu, B. P., Jama Shai, P. N., Chirwa, E. D., & Jewkes, R. K. (2016). Prevalence and risk factors for intimate partner violence among Grade 8 learners in urban South Africa: Baseline analysis from the Skhokho supporting success cluster randomised controlled trial. *International Health*, 8(1), 18-26. <https://doi.org/10.1093/inthealth/ihv068>
- Soller, B., Copp, J. E., Haynie, D. L., & Kuhlemeier, A. (2020). Adolescent dating violence victimization and relationship dissolution. *Youth & Society*, 52(2), 187-208. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0044118X17736537>
- Taquette, S. R., & Monteiro, D. L. M. (2019). Causes and consequences of adolescent dating violence: A systematic review. *Journal of Injury and Violence Research*, 11(2), 137-147. <https://doi.org/10.5249/jivr.v11i2.1061>
- Taylor, B. G., & Mumford, E. A. (2016). A national descriptive portrait of adolescent relationship abuse: Results from the national survey on teen

relationships and intimate violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 31(6), 963-988. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260514564070>

- Théorêt, V., Hébert, M., Fernet, M., & Blais, M. (2021). Gender-specific patterns of teen dating violence in heterosexual relationships and their associations with attachment insecurities and emotion dysregulation. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 50(2), 246-259. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-020-01328-5>
- Viejo, C., Monks, C. P., Sánchez, V., & Ortega-Ruiz, R. (2016). Physical dating violence in Spain and the United Kingdom and the importance of relationship quality. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 31(8), 1453-1475. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260514567963>
- Wang, Z., Chen, X., Liu, J., Bullock, A., Li, D., Chen, X., & French, D. (2020). Moderating role of conflict resolution strategies in the links between peer victimization and psychological adjustment among youth. *Journal of Adolescence*, 79, 184-192. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2020.01.002>
- Wincentak, K., Connolly, J., & Card, N. (2017). Teen dating violence: A meta-analytic review of prevalence rates. *Psychology of Violence*, 7(2), 224-241. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0040194>
- Wolitzky-Taylor, K. B., Ruggiero, K. J., Danielson, C. K., Resnick, H. S., Hanson, R. F., Smith, D. W., & Kilpatrick, D. G. (2008). Prevalence and correlates of dating violence in a national sample of adolescents. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 47(7), 755-762. <https://doi.org/10.1097/CHI.0b013e318172ef5f>
- World Health Organization. (2021, March 9). *Violence against women prevalence estimates, 2018: Global, regional and national prevalence estimates for intimate partner violence against women and global and regional prevalence estimates for non-partner sexual violence against women*. WHO. <https://apps.who.int/iris/rest/bitstreams/1347689/retrieve>

Funding: This research was funded, in part, by a grant of the Ministry of Science and Innovation of Spain (PID2020-115881RB-I00), and by a grant to Verónica Marcos from the Spanish Ministry of Universities under the program “Formación de Profesorado Universitario” (FPU19/00399).

Institutional Review Board Statement: This study was approved by the Comité de Bioética of the University of Santiago de Compostela (Code: USC-06/2021).

Informed Consent Statement: Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

Data Availability Statement: The raw data supporting the conclusions of this article will be made available by the correspondence author, without undue reservation.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.