

Oana Elena Bostangică

**Intimate Partner Violence and Risk and Protective Behaviors in College
Students: Is there any Relationship?**

Tese de mestrado em Temas de Psicologia do Desenvolvimento

orientada pela Professora Doutora Luiza Nobre Lima e pela Professora Doutora Maria do Rosário Pinheiro

2016



UNIVERSIDADE DE COIMBRA



FPCEUC FACULDADE DE PSICOLOGIA
E DE CIÊNCIAS DA EDUCAÇÃO
UNIVERSIDADE DE COIMBRA

Oana Elena Bostangică

Intimate Partner Violence and Risk and Protective Behaviors in College Students: Is there any Relationship?

Tese de mestrado em Temas de Psicologia do Desenvolvimento

Orientadora: Professora Doutora Luiza Isabel Gomes Freire Nobre Lima

Coorientadora: Professora Doutora Maria do Rosário Moura Pinheiro

Coimbra, 2016

Acknowledgements

I want to thank to my mother, Liliana. Without her I would never come so far. Thank you for your unconditional love and support.

I wish to thank to my beloved grandmother, Maria. She raised me, loved me and took a great care of me.

I want to express my gratitude to my beloved grandfather, Gheorghe. He is no longer near me. He loved me beyond the words and now he is watching over me from the sky.

I show my appreciation to my boyfriend, Oleh. He stayed with me in the worst moments. He helped me going forward with this thesis. I am grateful to have him in my life. His passion for learning pushed me to finish this dissertation, even when I thought I could not go further.

Last but not least, I want to thank to my coordinator Prof^a Doutor^a Luiza Isabel Gomes Freire Nobre Lima, for her patience, dedication and support. I also want to express my gratitude to my co-supervisor, Prof^a Doutor^a Maria do Rosário Moura Pinheiro for her support, understanding and orientation.

Thank you!

Resumo

Entre os estudantes universitários têm sido preocupantes os relatos que apontam para a existência de violência nas relações de intimidade, bem como são notícia os comportamentos de risco (por exemplo, o consumo exagerado de álcool) que eles parecem exibir em situações recreativas noturnas. Com o presente trabalho pretende-se: 1) identificar a prevalência de violência íntima entre os estudantes universitários; 2) identificar as crenças legitimadoras da violência íntima; 3) identificar os comportamentos de risco e de proteção que os alunos apresentam na recreação noturna; 4) estudar a relação entre a violência íntima e os comportamentos de risco e de proteção que estudantes adotam na recreação noturna; 5) estudar a relação entre as crenças sobre a violência íntima e o comportamento de risco e de proteção. Da amostra fizeram parte 175 estudantes (52.6% do sexo masculino e 47.4% do sexo feminino) com idades compreendidas entre 17 e 34 anos ($M=21.5\%$; $SD= 3.203$) da Universidade de Coimbra e dos Institutos Politécnicos de Coimbra. Os instrumentos utilizados foram: *Questionário Sócio-demográfico*, *Inventário de Violência Conjugal (I.V.C.)*, *Escala de Crenças sobre a Violência Conjugal (E.C.V.C.)*, *Questionário de Comportamentos de Proteção e Risco nas Saídas Noturnas (QCPR-Noturno)*. Os resultados mostraram que, na sua relação atual, os estudantes do sexo feminino são física e emocionalmente mais abusadas; os alunos mais velhos são física e emocionalmente mais abusados do que os alunos mais jovens; os estudantes que vivem com o namorado, namorada ou cônjuge indicam mais casos de abuso físico e psicológico; os estudantes do sexo masculino legitimam mais a violência íntima do que as estudantes do sexo feminino; os alunos mais velhos legitimam mais a violência íntima; os estudantes que vivem com os pais evocam mais crenças para legitimar a violência. Participantes do sexo masculino envolvem-se nos comportamentos de risco com maior frequência do que as mulheres. Não há nenhuma relação entre o abuso físico na relação atual e as crenças que legitimam a violência, mas existe uma associação, fraca e moderada entre estas mesmas crenças e os comportamentos de risco e de proteção.

Palavras-chave: estudantes universitários, violência no namoro, crenças sobre a violência, os comportamentos de risco, comportamentos de proteção

Abstract

Among college students have been worrying the reports that point to the existence of violence in intimate relationships, as well as the risk behaviors (eg, alcohol abuse) that they seem to display in night recreational situations. The present work is intended to 1) to identify the prevalence of intimate partner violence among university students; 2) to identify the legitimating beliefs of intimate partner violence; 3) to identify the risk and protection behaviors that students exhibit in their nightlife; 4) to study the relation between intimate partner violence in these students - risk and protective behavior they adopt in their nightlife; 5) to study the relation between beliefs about intimate partner violence - risk and protective behavior these students take in their nightlife. For that purpose, was carried out an analyses with 175 students (52.6% male and 47.4% female) aged between 17 and 34 years old ($M=21.5$; $SD= 3.203$) from University of Coimbra and Instituto Politécnico de Coimbra. The instruments used were: *Socio-demographic questionnaire*, *Inventário de Violência Conjugal (I.V.C.)*, *Escala de Crenças sobre a Violência Conjugal (E.C.V.C.)*, *Questionário de Comportamentos de Proteção e Risco nas Saídas Noturnas (QCPR-Noturno)*. Results showed that in their actual relationship, female students are physically and emotionally abused; for actual relationship, older students are more physically and emotionally abused than the younger students; the students whom live with boyfriend/girlfriend or spouse have been more victims of physical and emotional abuse; male students legitimizes more the violence on intimate relationships than female students; older students endorse more beliefs that legitimize violence in intimate relationship; students whom live with parents endorse more beliefs that legitimize violence. Male participants engage in more risk behaviors than women. There is no relationship between actual relation-physical and the beliefs that legitimize the violence but exist a weak and moderate relationship between these beliefs and risk and protective behaviors.

Key-words: university students, intimate partner violence, beliefs about violence, risk behaviors, protective behaviors

Index

List of symbols, abbreviations and conventions

Resumo

Abstract

PART I

Theoretical revision

Introduction.....	1
Chapter I – Theoretical revision	
1. University students.....	3
1.1. The transition and adjustment to University.....	3
1.2. Psychosocial development.....	6
2. Intimate partner violence.....	12
2.1. The concept of violence.....	12
2.2. Intimate partner violence.....	13
2.3. Intimate partner violence among university students.....	17
3. Risk behaviors.....	19
3.1. The consumption of psychoactive substances.....	21
3.2. Risk factors and protection factors.....	22

PART II

Chapter I – Objectives of the research

1. Objectives.....	26
--------------------	----

Chapter II – Methodology

1. Sample description.....	27
2. Instruments.....	32

2.1. Socio-demographic questionnaire.....	32
2.2. Inventário de Violência Conjugal (I.V.C.).....	32
2.3. Escala de Crenças sobre a Violência Conjugal (E.C.V.C.).....	33
2.4. Questionário de Comportamentos de Proteção e Risco nas Saídas Noturnas (QCPR-Noturno).....	34
3. Procedures of the investigation.....	35

Chapter III - Results

1. The experience of suffering and perpetrating violence in intimate relationships.....	36
1.1. The experience of being a victim of Intimate Partner Violence (IPV).....	36
1.1.1. In an actual relationship.....	36
1.1.1.1. Physical violence.....	36
1.1.1.2. Emotional violence.....	37
1.1.2. In a past relationship.....	37
1.1.2.1. Physical violence.....	37
1.1.2.2. Emotional violence.....	38
1.2. The experience of being a perpetrator of IPV.....	38
1.2.1. In an actual relationship.....	38
1.2.1.1. Physical violence.....	38
1.2.1.2. Emotional violence.....	39
1.2.2. In a past relationship.....	39
1.2.2.1. Physical violence.....	39

1.2.2.2. Emotional violence.....	40
1.3. Victimization experience in function of sex, age group and co-habitants.....	40
1.4. Experience of aggression in function of sex, age group and co-habitants.....	42
2. Analysis of beliefs about violence in intimate partner relationship in university students.....	44
2.1. Beliefs in function of sex, age group and co-habitants.....	44
3. Risk and protective behaviors in university students.....	47
3.1. Risk behaviors.....	47
3.1.1. Risk behavior in function of sex, age group and co-habitation.....	48
3.2. Protective behaviors.....	49
3.2.1. Protective behaviors in function of sex, age group and co-habitation.....	49
4. Associations between victimization and perpetration of violence in intimate relationship, beliefs about violence and risk and protective behaviors.....	51
4.1. Correlations between IVC and ECVC.....	51
4.2. Correlations between IVC and QCRP.....	52
4.3. Correlations between ECVC and QCRP.....	52
Chapter IV - Discussion.....	54
Conclusion.....	57

List of symbols, abbreviations and conventions

ECVC - Escala de Crenças sobre a Violência Conjugal

HIV - Human Immunity Deficiency Virus

IPV - Intimate Partner Violence

IVC - Inventário de Violência Conjugal

QCRP - Questionário de Comportamentos de Proteção e Risco nas Saídas Noturnas

SPA - Psychoactive Substances

SPSS - Statistical Package for Social Sciences

INDEX of Tables

Table 1a - General characteristics of the sample.....	27
Table 1b - General characteristics of the sample.....	27
Table 1c - General characteristics of the sample.....	28
Table 1d - General characteristics of the sample.....	28
Table 2 - Sex of the partners.....	29
Table 1e - Characteristics of the partners of the subjects from the sample	29
Table 1f - General characteristics of the sample.....	30
Table 1g - General characteristics of the sample n=175.....	30
Table 1h - General characteristics of the sample.....	31
Table 3 - Relative frequencies (%) of victimization of physical violence in an actual relationship according to sex and Chi-square test results	36
Table 4 - Relative frequencies (%) of victimization of emotional violence in an actual relationship according to sex and Chi-square test results.....	37
Table 5 - Relative frequencies (%) of victimization of physical violence in a past relationship according to sex and Chi-square test results	37
Table 6 - Relative frequencies (%) of victimization of emotional violence in a past relationship according to sex and Chi-square test results.....	38
Table 7 - Relative frequencies (%) of perpetration of physical violence in an actual relationship according to sex and Chi-square test results	38

Table 8 - Relative frequencies (%) of perpetration of emotional violence in an actual relationship according to sex and Chi-square test results.....	39
Table 9 - Relative frequencies (%) of perpetration of physical violence in a past relationship according to sex and Chi-square test results.....	39
Table 10 - Relative frequencies (%) of perpetration of emotional violence in a past relationship according to sex and Chi-square test results	40
Table 11 - Victimization (Independent T test) in function of sex in actual and past relationship.....	40
Table 12 - Victimization in function of age group for actual and past relation	41
Table 13 - Victimization in function of co-habitants for actual and past relation	41
Table 14 - Aggression (Independent T test) in function of sex in actual and past relationship.....	42
Table 15 - Aggression in function of age group for actual and past relation	42
Table 16 - Aggression in function of co-habitants for actual and past relation	43
Table 17 - Comparison of means on the ECVC factors considering sex of students (n=175)....	44
Table 18 - Comparison of means on the ECVC factors considering age of students (n=175)....	45
Table 19 - Comparison of means on the ECVC factors considering co-habitation of students (n=175).....	46
Table 20 - Relative frequencies (%) of risk behaviors according to sex and Chi-square test results.....	47
Table 21 - Comparison of means on the Risk behaviors considering sex of students (n=175)....	48
Table 22 - Comparison of means on the Risk behaviors considering age of students (n=175)....	48

Table 23 - Comparison of means on the Risk behaviors considering co-habitation of students (n=175).....	48
Table 24 - Protective behavior in function of sex.....	49
Table 25 - Comparison of means on the Protective behaviors considering sex of students (n=175).....	49
Table 26 - Comparison of means on the Protective behaviors considering age of students (n=175).....	49
Table 27 - Comparison of means on the Protective behaviors considering co-habitation of students (n=175).....	50
Table 28 - Correlations between IVC and EVCV (n=175) in function of sex.....	51
Table 29 - Correlations between IVC and QCRP (n=175) in function of sex.....	52
Table 30 - Correlations between ECVC and QCRP (n=175) in function of sex.....	52

PART I

Introduction

For Gonçalves (2012), the transition from secondary education to higher education is seen as the most important of the entire cycle of academic experiences, not only for the students, but also for their families and friends. In fact, the entrance in higher education marks the end of "mandatory education" and the beginning of the transition to the world of work and the autonomy of emerging adults.

In this new world of autonomy, new relationships are established and the experience of intimacy starts to be deeper. Unfortunately, these intimate relationships are sometimes marked by violence, changing the life of these students. Knowing that violence is such a common problem among university students, it is very important to try to understand what lies at the bottom of this type of abuse. The literature review is presenting this phenomenon, and how the students adapt to their new stage, which means college.

Students are facing various risk factors in their night out, which can lead to violent behavior. To diminish these risks, students employ in protective behaviors. As consequence, protective behaviors reduce the possibility of being a victim of any kind of violence.

These studies can prevent the occurrence of this socially disruptive phenomenon which is causing suffering to many individuals and families.

In this perspective, the present work aims to have a better understanding of the experience of intimate partner violence in the developmental period of emerging adults, specifically those who are attending university, by analyzing their behaviors and beliefs.

It is also a goal to know more about risk and protective behaviors that university students exhibit in their nightlife, and to look for relations between these kinds of behaviors and those of violence in intimate relationships.

The work is divided in two parts. The first is the literature review and the second is devoted to the empirical study. On the one hand, the first part attempts to understand the transition and

adaptation to university, by presenting the main psychosocial theories, such as the "Model of seven vectors of development" of Chickering and "The Emerging Adulthood" of Arnett.

On the other hand, it pretends to explain the intimate partner violence, its characteristics, backgrounds and effects, as well as risk behaviors and the influence of psychoactive substances during intimate violence, both on the victim and/or on the aggressor.

The second part presents the objectives and variables, as well as the methodology of the study, including the instruments and the procedures followed in the investigation. In the end, the study includes analysis and discussion of the results.

CHAPTER ONE - Theoretical revision

1. University students

University students have characteristics that suffer some transformations as they advance in their university years. Facing new ideas, experiences, discovering feelings, emotions, autonomy, are part of a university student's transition in establishing identity and developing individuality.

Leaving the parent's house implies new responsibilities, new roles, tasks of development and new academics challenges.

The transition from a structured group that is dominated by one or more adults, where all aspects are under someone's supervision and where many issues are not allowed, to a more independent group with demands of maturity and autonomy can be difficult (Silva, 2003).

Over the past years, it has been given a progressive focus on higher education; this attention is directed to a number of concerns regarding the behavior and psychosocial development of the university student, and as well as the contributions of higher education institutions in promoting this development (Diniz, 2001).

Theories of development and student integration turn out to be useful tools in understanding their development pathways, their concerns and expectations, to clarify how individuals experience the new education system and how the formal institutional factors interact with satisfaction, motivation, performance and permanence of the student (Silva, 2003).

In this chapter we will discuss the transition and adaptation to the university and the theories of psychosocial development of the student.

1.1. The transition and adaptation to University

The transition to college can be a hard time as students adjust to new academic and social demands such as adapting to the new environment. The capacity of students to deal with the stress of such a transition and show positive outcomes despite challenges has significant

implications for psychosocial well-being as well as educational accomplishment (Leary & DeRosier, 2012).

The transition to higher education has been a key stage in the psychosocial development of young students as it confronts them with a new reality filled with multiple challenges at different levels, and with the possibility of developing new life projects (Almeida, 2007; Pereira et al., 2006; Pinheiro, 2003; Seco et al., 2005).

In addition to the more academic aspects, the transition to higher education implies social integration and/or acquisition of coping strategies, in other words, cognitive and behavioral strategies used by students to control, reduce or change the internal or external requirements that they have to face in the academic context (Costa & Oliveira, 2010; Santos, 2000; Teixeira et al., 2007).

In order to overcome the challenges and the demands of the new context, it is necessary that students have some essential resources. These resources are the individual skills at cognitive, emotional and social levels; the importance of the peer group, associated with involvement in extracurricular tasks. The student has the chance to develop interpersonal skills and establish necessary support for their well-being. A close contact with the family is an important source of support in less positive situations; and a privileged love relationship (Seco et al., 2005; Verger et al., 2009).

Higher education gives young adults a kind of moratorium period (between adolescence and adulthood) that allows them to prepare to take on the responsibilities of adulthood, as well as analyze and test new roles, attitudes, beliefs and behaviors (Silva, 2008).

Although stressful, this transition can be an exciting time in students' lives, as many of them moves away from family and friends, and have to adapt to new progressively challenging social, academic, and financial pressures. According to Bayram and Bilgel (2008), first-year university students are likely to experience bigger anxiety, stress and psychological distress.

As presented earlier, moving away from home is a part of the transition to university for many students and being away from home has been associated to poorer mental and physical health. When a student moves away from his home to attend university, he has less opportunity to

interact with his usual support network and must form new friendships for support (Paul & Brier, 2001). In a study conducted by Kloep et al. (2015), it was found that starting university provides a platform for many different transitions, such as: changes in family relations, seeking independence, new social networks, finding new academic demands and making adaptations to new styles of living. Same study found that leaving home created emotional ambiguities, in which, students felt homesick about leaving their parents, but also enjoyed their new founded freedom (Kloep et al., 2015).

Going to college is a unique experience than can change a student's life. First year of college may not occur how the student is expecting. The process of adaptation is associated with past transition or other transitions, such as: change of the course, transference to another institution or repetition of the year (Pinheiro, 2003). The processes of adaptation to a new life and the processes of transition are influenced by various conditions: "(1) developmental characteristics of the student; (2) specific situations in which the student is living (3) the strategies they use to cope with either the environmental conditions or with their own developmental attributes; (4) structures of social support" (Pinheiro, 2003, 120).

Upcraft and Gardner (1989, in Pinheiro, 2003) have the opinion that the student from the first year of university can make a real improvement for achieving the academics and individual objectives, developing his intellectual capability, increasing interpersonal relations, choosing a project of carrier and a lifestyle.

Entering to university can be a great challenge, while for some can be a great chance to achieve autonomy and skills in a specific scientific area, for others it can be impossible to finish the course (Pinheiro, 2003).

Though the transition to university is a situation that may be related with a number of stressors that need adaptation through coping, it is very likely that some students will identify the transition situation as challenging, whereas others will perceive it to be threatening (Straub, 2002). Although most students experience stress, some students come out to be better at dealing with it and reducing stress through effective coping. According to Matheny et al. (2002), having more coping resources was associated to lower levels of stress and also more life satisfaction.

Adaptive coping is positively correlated to personal and academic adjustment to university. In addition, coping affects adjustment indirectly by lowering daily inconveniences. Known that high levels of problems are associated to poor academic and personal adjustment, it follows that at least some of the relation between adaptive coping and adjustment to university are achieved through a decrease of inconveniences-based stress (Kohn & Veres, 2001).

Schlossberg (1989, in Pinheiro, 2003), says that “today is not tomorrow”, which means that what a person feels today in full transition, is not how they will feel forever. Everything can change, the transition works more as a help to maximize the positive and minimize the negative aspects of its impact. The first year of transition can be seen as the first year of adaptation, in which the student is an individual in change in its educational process and in its development. This can raise the hypothesis that there are other years of adaptation beyond the year in which is proceeding to higher education (Pinheiro, 2003).

According with Schlossberg (1989, in Pinheiro, 2003) transitions are situations that create challenges and, changes on patterns of behavior, which can involve loss or gain.

The transition to university is bringing a number of changes in students’ health behaviors. Alcohol abuse in college populations is linked to a wide variety of negative consequences including academic failure, injuries, and illness (Perkins, 2002). A number of explanations for patterns of high frequency and quantities of alcohol consumption have been investigated, including social and coping reasons (Labouvie & Bates, 2002). Labouvie and Bates (2002) demonstrated that while some students were motivated to drink for social reasons (e.g., to fit in with friends), some drank to escape from the school pressure.

1.2. Psychosocial development

Psychosocial theories frequently consider that development occurs through a series of levels of development, in this way, individuals will evolve in a hierarchical sequence.

Many investigators, based on works of Erikson (1959, 1968, 1969, 1971, 1982, in Ferreira & Ferreira, 2001), try to characterize the way “how the development of student is processed”. One of the first investigators was Sanford (1962, 1966 in Ferreira & Ferreira, 2001). He had the

opinion that the development of the student was facilitated by two conditions that function in a dynamic way: 1) condition is of challenge; and another one 2) is support. Ferreira and Hood (1990:402, in Ferreira & Ferreira, 2001) believed that these two conditions were required if “individuals did not grow without challenges and the amount of tolerated challenges would be dependent on available support”.

Chickering (Chickering, 1969; Chickering & Reisser, 1993) is another researcher who called attention for psychosocial development of the student. In conformity with him, the impact of the course, the teachers, the curriculum or colleagues may possibly be different, according to the history of the development, personal characteristics and skills of the students.

Chickering “provided an overview of the developmental issues that college students face and examine environmental conditions that influence development” (Evans et al., 2010: 65)

Chickering propose a model, named “The model of seven vectors of development” based on the Erikson model that proves how the environment of higher education can influence the development of the student on the emotional, social, physical and intellectual levels in the formation of identity (Chickering, 1969; Chickering & Reisser, 1993, in Ferreira & Ferreira, 2001). This model was firstly proposed in 1969 and then revised in 1993 with the collaboration of Reisser. The sequence of seven vectors of development: 1) develop a sense of competence; 2) manage emotions; 3) develop autonomy towards independence; 4) develop identity; 5) develop interpersonal relations; 6) develop the sense of life; 7) develop integrity.

The first vector, “developing competence”, includes intellectual, physical and interpersonal qualities, and seems to be the most structured sphere of university student. Beyond critical thinking, intellectual ability manifests through capacity of identification, interpretation and problem solving of synthesis and combination of diverse information and expressing their ideas. Leisure activities can become lifelong pursuits and therefore part of identity. Students’ overall senses of competence increases as they learn to trust their abilities, receive accurate feedback from others, and integrate their skills into a stable self-assurance (Chickering, 1993).

The second vector, “managing emotions”, implies that the individual has conscience of his emotions and is able to integrate them. The student needs to confront himself with changing situations and learn how to better manage his emotions or feelings.

In vector three, “moving through autonomy toward interdependence”, which means stability and security of behaviors with individual and social ideas. Autonomy means acknowledgment and acceptance of interdependence, in other words, the student assumes a more rational and reliable view of his own life.

The fourth vector, “developing mature interpersonal relationships”, is a capacity of developing the tolerance, acceptance and respect of individual differences, and the ability of the student to establish intimate relationships (Chickering, 1993). “Maturing interpersonal relationships reflect an increasing awareness and openness to differences in ideas, people, backgrounds, and values” (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005: 22).

The fifth vector is “establishing identity”. This is important because it encompasses development that occurs in the first four vectors (Chickering and Reisser, 1993). The development of identity includes the next: “(1) comfort with body and appearance, (2) comfort with gender and sexual orientation, (3) sense of self in a social, historical, and cultural context, (4) clarification of self-concept through roles and life-style, (5) sense of self in response to feedback from valued others, (6) self-acceptance and self-esteem, and (7) personal stability and integration” (Chickering and Reisser, 1993: 49, in Ferreira & Ferreira, 2001).

Vector six, “developing purpose”, implies the clear answer of the direction the individual will take, developing the capacity of being designed, to evaluate the interests and alternatives, to make strategies and clarify objectives.

The last vector, “developing integrity”, according to Chickering, consist in three aspects: particular values of humanization, the personalization of values and development of similarity between values, beliefs and behaviors (Chickering, 1993).

The seven vectors of student development theory are well-known and frequently cited in studies for the reason that they are applicable to emotional, physical, intellectual and social development of university students.

For the majority of young people, the years from the late adolescence during the twenties are years of profound changes. In this time, many youngsters achieve the level of education and preparation that will offer the base for their profit and professional achievements for the remainder of their grown-up work lives (Chisholm & Hurrelmann, 1995; William T. Grant Foundation Commission on Work, Family, and Citizenship, 1988, in Ferreira & Ferreira, 2001). It is for several people a point in time of regular transformations as a variety of possibilities in work, love, and worldviews are explored (Rindfuss, 1991).

Another psychosocial theory is Emerging Adulthood by Arnett (2000). Social changes in the last fifty years, namely the extension in schooling and the increase in the average age of marriage and motherhood, caused changes in the developmental level of young teens and young adults, giving them more time to explore possible directions of the course of their lives.

Emerging Adulthood is defined as the phase of life from the age of 18 until the age of 25, approximately, during which young people are exploring the possibilities of their lives and start to identify themselves as adults, rather than teenagers.

According to Arnett (2004: 3) "for today's young people, the road to adulthood is a long one," which means that adulthood comes later in a gradual manner.

According to Arnett's theory (2004), emerging adulthood can be described as an "age of identity exploration". Young people determine who they are and what they want out of school, love and work. They do not have a certain plan; they do not have an idea about the path they will be taking from adolescence to adulthood. For example, entering college and choosing a subject, realizing it is not as interesting as they thought, and then coming with a different plan. Or entering university and not be able to focus, the grades decrease and again, it involves a change of plan. Another example is going to work after college, but after one year or two, finding out that they need more education for gaining decent money, makes it necessary to come with a changed plan.

Every change is like a new discover. Young people learn more things about themselves and go forward with what they really want for future (Arnett, 2004).

“Age of instability” means that the post-high school years are distinct by constant habitation changes. For most of the students, either they go to college or live with friends or romantic partner either they make their own family and establishing the careers later in life.

The “age of self-focus”, is described by Arnett as leaving the parents' house, trying to choose what they want to do, where they want to go and who they want to be with. As Arnett (2004) is saying: *“By focusing on themselves, emerging adults develop skills for daily living, gain a better understanding of who they are and what they want from life, and begin to build a foundation for their adult lives.”* (Arnett, 2004: 13).

In “age of feeling in-between”, various emerging adults say they are taking responsibility for themselves, but they are still not feeling completely as adults.

Last feature, “age of possibilities”, is governed by optimism. Mainly emerging adults consider they have good probability of living better than their parents and they believe they will find their soul mate.

According to Arnett (2006), emerging adulthood is applied only to developed societies, which suffered numerous demographic changes in recent years, delaying the entrance into adulthood. Even though investigation has been carried mostly in the United States and Denmark, the emerging adulthood appears to be a well-known phenomenon, applying to various countries in Europe, despite their cultural differences. (Arnett, 2006; Eccles, Templeton Barber, & Stone, 2003).

Diverse studies (Arias & Hernandez, 2007; Buhl & Lanz, 2007; Macek et al, 2007) have been done to compare emerging adulthood in different countries.

Buhl and Lanz (2007) examined studies across five countries in Europe to sustain the theory that emerging adulthood is a possible concept in Europe as well as in North America. They found out that traditional symbols of adulthood have changed over time in those countries, and also that there are diverse ways to adulthood. Starting to work and engaging in romantic relationships can influence the timing of emergence, and the identity formation.

Engaging in romantic relationships played different roles in defining and speeding up emerging adulthood, depending on the culture. For instance, in Italy, marriage frequently initiated a move from a parents home, while in Scandinavian countries, youth had tended to experiment a variety of living arrangements outside the home before leaving permanently and/or marrying (Fadjukoff, Kokko & Pulkkinen, 2007).

In 2007, Arias and Hernandez compared young adults with ages between 16 and 34 from Mexico and Spain, across a range of educational levels, in order to determine whether emerging adulthood might be relevant as a concept in those countries. These investigators evaluated different terms that have been used to portray this stage of development, together with late adolescence, youth, young adulthood, and transition to adulthood, and discussed why those could not be as apt as emerging adulthood.

Bowman (2010) found that among university freshmen, psychological well-being significantly decreased throughout the course of the freshman academic year. Similarly, Sharma (2012) demonstrated that first-year undergraduates experienced significantly greater emotional and social difficulties than other college students. A prominent focus that is present in first-year transition literature is the important role of attachment relationships.

Caspi (2002) had the opinion that at no other time in life, individuals were faced with so many changes and decisions as in emerging adulthood. On the one hand, the majority of the tasks that this period required were related with the distance from parents and with connections to peers and romantic partners. On the other hand, the tasks were related to obtaining education, work and financial independence. At this stage, individuals were as well very self-centered, having little obligations and commitments, which gave them great freedom of choice and independence regarding small or big decisions (Arnett, 1998).

2. Intimate partner violence

2.1. The concept of violence

Violence is a dynamic phenomenon that is not limited to economic, social or geographic specific groups. It is seen as a complex and paradoxical definition in constantly change (Machado, 2010).

Clarification of the concepts of *violence* and *aggression* is a necessary one, since their usages send often to synonyms, while the differences are essential. The concept of violence has many definitions, with multiple overlaps and customizations. Etymologically, the term is coming from the Latin *vis*, which means *strength*. So, it highlights the idea of power, domination, of using physical superiority over the other. According to Fischer's point of view (1994, in Ribeiro, 2007), violence is seen as "the use of force to reach the other in their physical and/or psychological integrity". From this affirmation it can be understood that violence is a specific way of force, in other words, the use of physical means to affect the other.

According to Wiselfisz (2002), nowadays, there is no *violence*, but rather a large quantity of manifestations of violence or violent acts. The difficulty on defining the concept comes from different acts that have a subtle framework, like emotional violence or verbal abuse.

Machado (2010: 7) has the opinion that the: "*violence arises often in an attempt to control and dominate the other person, through physical acts, as well as ways to control to ensure the sense of omnipotence of such offender as psychological violence - which can arise through the isolation, to limit or to control the exercise of certain tasks or roles, insulting, control and domination by threat or harm to himself or others, intimidation, jealousy, etc.*".

Violence is resulting from the use of power, aggression and psychological control. The intention is to physically or psychologically hurt another, manipulating, forcing and showing their power and authority (Matos, Negreiros & Gaspar, 2009).

There are numerous different types of violence, and since violence is studied from different actor perspectives (for example: perpetrator, victim, third party, neutral observer), literature displays

an ample diversity of definitions based on different theoretical assumptions (Riedel & Welsh, 2002).

Matos, Negreiros, Simões and Gaspar (2009) came with some factors that may predispose young people to engage in violent behaviors, as perpetrators or as victims, as follows: the early history of aggression; tobacco consumption/alcohol and/or drugs; low cognitive level; reduced school involvement and early school failure; the high level of boldness; the deficit family involvement; parental criminality; separation from parents and weak parental supervision; the lack of support from teachers and the lack of discipline in the classroom; discrimination and social exclusion in school and in the community; and belonging to a community with serious socio-economic needs and infrastructure.

2.2. Intimate partner violence

Intimate partner violence (IPV) is a significant public health problem. It can be understood as a constant abuse by one person in an intimate relationship, as means of gaining power over the other person.

It is a behavior in an intimate relationship that causes physical, sexual or psychological hurt, including physical aggression, sexual coercion, behavior control and psychological abuse (World Health Organization, 2002).

It is important to distinguish and define the different types of possible violence that occur in a dating relationship. A definition of physical violence was enunciated by Mouzos and Makkai (2004), and it included both physical attacks, referring to the use of physical force with the intent to cause damage to the victim, and attempts or threats about the use of physical force.

Physical violence is characterized by inflicting behaviors that have major consequences such as, physical harm to the victim. The most commonly used practices are the punches and slaps, kick, choke attempts, push, and pull of hair or bites. White or firearms can also be used, among others. The physical harm is reflected in particular by the presence of bruises, burns, fractures or internal injuries (Laurenco & Carvalho, 2001) and may, in extreme cases involve medical care and treatment, sometimes with fatal result.

Psychological abuse, according to Engel (2002), is any nonphysical behavior or attitude that is designed to control, subdue, punish, or isolate another person through the use of humiliation or fear. A psychologically abusive relationship can incorporate some factors, such as: *Emotional abuse* which contains verbal assault, dominance, control, isolation, ridicule, or the use of intimate knowledge for humiliation (Follingstad, Coyne & Gambone, 2005). It targets the emotional and psychological well-being of the victim, and it is often a precursor to physical abuse. *Physical isolation* involves controlling what the other is doing, who they see or speak to, and restricting where they go. *Jealousy and possessiveness* include accusations or recriminations of infidelity and refusal to let others to offer emotional support. *Intimidating behaviors* produce fear in partners by using looks, actions, gestures, or violence against property, households, pets or another person (Semple, 2001).

Psychological abuse is that kind of aggression that leaves no visible marks, but emotionally, it damage self-confidence and self-esteem of the person. Although this type of abuse is difficult to diagnose and prove, leaves very serious psychological consequences. The severity of these abuses varies according to the degree of violence against the victim and usually combines several types of abuse, because every time there is physical abuse, psychological abuse is also considered (Lourenco & Carvalho, 2001).

Another form of violence appears as sexual abuse, which refers to the forcing of one partner by another to do things pertaining to sex. Sexual abuse is defined as an attempt to obtain a sexual act, comments or unwanted sexual approaches (Jewkes, Sen & Garcia-Moreno, 2002).

Sexual violence is a problem that affects all socio-economic strata of society. Inherent to sexual violence are acts such as rape, accompanied by vaginal, oral and/or anal penetration, carried out by force, and the use of physical threats and coercion and violence several times (Koss, 1993, in Oliveira, 2009). Sexual violence may not include physical contact and can result, instead, on harassment, sexual acts relief or sexism. The physical and psychological scars of sexual violence are a permanent, not only referring to injury, sexually transmitted infections or unwanted pregnancies. The victim can, as a result, develop different symptoms, such as feelings of loneliness, vulnerability, depression and guilt, symptoms of post-traumatic stress disorder, fear,

anxiety, low self-esteem and/or difficulties in social adaptation (Matos, Negreiros, Simões & Gaspar, 2009).

Stalking can also be seen as a form of IPV. It is frequently used to harass victims, or terrorize them. A lot of times, the stalker may be disturbed due to the fact that the victim had once left him behind, and stalking can be a form of releasing his frustrations on the matter. According to Berry (1995, in L. Johnson, 2008), stalking is problematic for the reason that, it regularly escalates and can lead to violence.

Violence in dating relationships (most predominantly present among students in higher education) seems to be increasingly common and has been considered as a significant social problem, so it tends to be the focus of a growing number of studies. In a Portuguese study (Machado, Caridade & Martins 2010) it was reported by 25.4% the participants that at least one act of abuse was perpetrated by a dating partner (13.4% victims of physical abuse and 19.5% of emotional abuse) and 30.6% of respondents indicated they were also abusers of a partner, reporting 18.1% at least one act of physical abuse and 22.4% emotional abuse. It should be noted that psychological violence, despite of being more frequent (Feiring, Deblinger, Hoch-Espada, & Haworth, 2002; Scott & Straus, 2007), along with the controlling behavior, is considered more difficult to identify (Norris, Huss, & Palarea, 2011).

Research on intimate partner violence has been radically amplified over the past 20 years. Findings of intimate partner victimization differ widely from study to study. Some investigations conclude that women and men are equally likely to be victimized by their partners, but others conclude that women are more probable to be victimized (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000). There are a lot of gaps in the scientific literature on intimate partner violence, such as the level of violence committed against men and women by same-sex intimates (Renzetti, 1997, in Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000).

Due to shifts in community structure in the past thirty years, adolescents are prolonging their youth by achieving extra education and delaying marriage and children. One of the most important tasks of emerging adulthood is the development of intimate, satisfying romantic partnerships. Emerging adults, is a, combination between adolescence and adulthood that gives

investigators an exclusive chance to explore relationship structure and violence patterns established at an essential point of romantic development.

Dating is one of the main activities in the lives of many young people, whose identities depend, in part, of the various experiences they have (including romantic interactions) (Oliveira & Sani, 2005). In most cases, youngsters begin their relationships with expectations of love, friendship, sex and happiness (Oliveira & Sani, 2005). According to Sugarman & Hotaling (1991, in Oliveira & Sani, 2005) dating embarks three dimensions: commitment, future interaction and physical intimacy.

Adolescence is a good period for the prevention of violence in youth relationships and to limit future violent paths (Saavedra, 2010).

Thompson, et al (2006) found that, of all age groups sampled in their study, 18-24 year-old women had the highest percentages of IPV in the past five years of all age groups. Breiding et al., (2008) also dissected IPV prevalence by age and found that women in this development period had the highest prevalence of abuse experience annually of all age groups, indicating that relationship abuse is more present in younger women's lives.

Several studies have also shown that girls also engage in acts of violence and that men can as well be victimized in the context of their love relationships (Kaura & Allen, 2004). Caridades & Machado (2006) found that dating violence is marked by mutual exchange of aggression. O'Keefe (2005) is saying that it is important to note that the dynamics of violent dating relationships of youngsters appears to be different from the abusive relationships of adults, and the physical and psychological violence in dating relationships, in most cases, involves mutual use of violence by both partners.

The relation between the roles of gender and violence in intimate relationships has been dividing the scientific community. This awareness has contributed to the deepening study of this phenomenon.

2.3. Intimate partner violence among university students

College students perpetrate high rates of verbal, physical, and sexual violence and stalking within their intimate relationships. Studies estimated that between 80 and 90% of students perpetrate verbal abuse against their partners (Shook et al., 2000).

Since relationship violence among college students is such a common problem, it is important to understand what lies at the base of this type of abuse.

"Violence occurs on more than one occasion in half of students' physically violent intimate relationships and five or more times in 8% of their physically violent intimate relationships" (Makepeace, 1981, in Nabors, 2006: 3). Even though research found out that the prevalence of university students' sexual violence toward intimate partners is minimal. One study found that 0.3% of university students are sexually aggressive to their partners (Bryant & Spencer, 2003). Between 5 and 20% of college students engage in severe physical violence against their partners, perpetrating acts such as punching, choking, kicking, or attacking partners with a weapon (Arias et al., 1987; Makepeace, 1981; Riggs & O'Leary, 1996; Straus, 2004b; Straus et al., 1996, in Nabors, 2006).

According to a study conducted by Berry (2000, in Caridade & Machado, 2006), 20 % to 30% of young adults involved in a romantic relationship experience violence. Moffit, Caspi, and Fagan Silva (1997, in Caridade & Machado, 2006) also estimated that the prevalence of violence among young adults is between 21.8% and 55%. Some studies with university students have shown that a considerable percentage of students adopt violent behaviors in the context of their dating relationships (Machado, Matos & Moreira, 2003; Paiva & Figueiredo, 2004). Likewise and Day (1994, in Caridade & Machado), state that about 45% of the violations relating university students are perpetrated by their romantic partners.

Other authors such as Fisher, Cullen, and Turner (2000), suggested that 15% of attempted and 24% of concluded sexual aggressions against female students was perpetrated by a partner or ex-partner. A study investigating stalking rates among college students is also limited, mainly focusing on victimizations of female university students.

According to Glass et al. (2003), the studies seek to analyze the impact of violence on the physical and psychological health of aggressed adult women, and less in terms of consequences for male and juvenile victims, as well as for offenders.

The impact of violence on victims is not a linear process, and depends on a number of factors that can intensify or attenuate its effects, such as the existence of previous histories of victimization, frequency, duration and severity of violence, the proximity victim-offender and the types of victimization suffered (multiple or secondary) that will mediate the negative effects of violence (Caridade & Machado, 2006).

Investigations demonstrated that violence against women has significant consequences for their physical and mental health. Being the most severe murder or female suicide (Sharps & Campbell, 1999). Other consequences resulting from this type of victimization are post-traumatic stress disorder, low self-esteem and psychosomatic reactions, academic failure, depression and, anger (Chase, Treboux & O'Leary, 2002; Glass et al., 2003).

The effects of violence in intimate partner relationships are particularly notorious in those cases where it proceeds from family history of permanent abuse, direct or indirect suffering (Caridade & Machado, 2006).

3. Risk behaviors

Risk factor can be defined as "the probability of occurrence of an event during a given period of time or age" (Pais Ribeiro, 2007: 133).

Risk factors are characteristics related with an increased possibility that a problematic behavior will occur. It is important to note that the presence of a risk factor does not mean that the behavior will automatically occur, only that the chances of its occurrence are higher (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000).

Intimate partner violence poses a important threat to women's sexual health and increases women's vulnerability to human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) infection and other sexually transmittable infections (Coker et al., 2002; Coker, 2007; Meyer, Springer, & Altice, 2011). Psychological IPV can play a key role in sexual risk behavior. Psychological IPV includes the use of emotional and verbal abuse and tactics to inspire fear, demean women's self-esteem, isolate women from support networks, and/or control their activities (Tolman, 1989). Experiences of psychological IPV are very common, have damaging effects on women's psychological well-being, and frequently co-occur with other forms of IPV (Coker et al., 2000; Sullivan, McPartland, Armeli, Jaquier, & Tennen, 2012).

Very few studies have examined the unique effects of IPV on women's sexual health. Researchers have been focusing on IPV as a single construct measuring cumulative experiences of physical, sexual, and psychological IPV - or on the unique effects of physical and/or sexual IPV on sexual risk behavior (Coker, 2007; Meyer et al., 2011; Stockman, Lucea, & Campbell, 2013).

Psychological IPV is usually ignored by researchers when examining the relationship between IPV and sexual risk behavior, however, Overstreet *et al.* (2015), suggested that psychological IPV was associated with greater chances of engaging in sexual risk behavior.

According to Amaro (2000), intimate partner violence as a health issue is significantly connected with low contraceptive and condom use and adverse sexual and reproductive health outcomes,

such as pelvic pain, menstrual abnormalities, sexually transmitted disease/HIV, unwanted pregnancy, and multiple abortions.

The use of alcohol and other psychoactive substances is higher between the university populations. Factors that cause or make possible the interest for drugs are related with the set of personal and social dynamics, rather than the contact of the individual with psychoactive substances. The individual is seen as a "constantly changed", unprepared, immature and vulnerable to risk (Calafate et al., 1995, in Lukyanenko, 2014).

In addition to confirming the relation between dating violence and demographic variables, Roudsari *et al.* (2009) found empirical evidence that alcohol consumption is linked with dating violence among heavy-drinking college students. Roudsari *et al.* (2009) found, as well, that alcohol was present when abusive behaviors happened, especially verbal-emotional abuse and threatening behavior.

College students are considered a vulnerable group when it comes to the consumption of psychoactive substances. On the one hand, they enjoy temporary freedom between family and adult life (Grácio, 2009, in Lukyanenko, 2014) and, on the other hand, they enter in a new and unfamiliar environment, where most of their peers already belong to an adult age, legal to the consumption of psychoactive substances such as tobacco and alcohol. The problem is aggravated when we understand that the environment experienced by students has low risk perception. The risk is seen as a day-to-day constant (Lomba, 2010, in Lukyanenko, 2014).

DuRant *et al.* (2007) found that younger adolescent women were more likely than men to be perpetrators of intimate violence. Among men, intimate violence victimization was associated with consuming alcohol at younger ages, using tobacco and amphetamine at the time of the incidents, and threatening physical violence. In concordance with Doerner & Lab (2012), offenders often have a previous history of violent behavior, experience to domestic violence or other forms of abuse, previous trauma or loss, prior victimization, lack of guardianship, few friends, and a history of being verbally abusive or threatening.

Doerner and Lab (2012) stated that social roles might carry bigger responsibilities than others, creating diverse opportunities that may or may not support alcohol consumption. As an example,

university students can have less responsibility than non-university students and can be placed in social situations with peers that encourage risky behaviors, alcohol and aggression. Wells *et al.* (2007) had the opinion that young adults that were married or employed would have a history of lighter drinking and, as a result, less alcohol issues.

A research suggested that alcohol problems were associated with perpetration of aggressive and violent behavior in the intimate relationships of college students (Lundeberg *et al.*, 2004). In another study, examining risk factors and correlates of dating violence among students, male college students who had perpetrated violence in their intimate relations reported more problems linked with alcohol use than those who had not perpetrated violence (Follingstad *et al.*, 1999, in Fossos *et al.*, 2007).

3.1. The consumption of psychoactive substances

The term "drug" or more recently "psychoactive substance" is quite complex. The concept is connected both to individual use, and to the phenomenon of "drugs" in society (Lobo, 2008). The phenomenon of drug use refers to the diversity of substances, their effects and how each individual differently responds to the same chemical properties and the amount ingested. According to Lobo (2008), any "psychoactive substance" is potentially toxic and addictive. The level of dependency and intoxication depends directly on the regularity of use and the amount absorbed. Currently, the psychoactive substances are divided according to legality (legal or illegal). The classification depends not only on the spatial and temporal jurisdiction, but also on the reason of the use, curative purposes, or individual pleasure.

In concordance with DuPont (2005), "drugs" are chemicals that alter the natural autonomy of the brain. WHO (2008) defines the term "drugs" as a "psychoactive substance" that when inserted in a living organism is able to modify one or more functions, affecting the mental processes, at a cognitive and affective.

Lewin (1924, in Lukyanenko, 2014) stated that there were five types of psychoactive substances: the "calming of mental life", the "hallucinogenic agents", the "intoxicating substances", the "hypnotic substances" and the "stimulants".

In our society, over the years, consumption patterns have undergone diverse changes, marked by cultural influences and by the market. Nowadays, nicotine is scientifically considered as one of the most addictive substances; however, its use is legal. Anyways, certain substances, such as cannabis, for which the additive effects are not proven yet, the consumption remains illegal.

According to WHO (2009), involvement in drug use may increase the risk of being a victim and/or perpetrator of violence, and the opposite also happens, in which the experienced violence may increase the risk of starting the use of illicit drugs. The consumption of drugs and alcohol are mentioned as being associated with victimization and perpetration of intimate partner violence. Increased consumption rate (excessive alcohol consumption, use of marijuana and tobacco) is a relevant feature of the developmental period immediately following high school. This is where romantic relationships work as an important influence on the use of drugs (Fleming, White, & Catalano, 2010) and alcohol consumption.

Alcohol consumption in intimate relationships directly affects the physical and cognitive functions, reducing the controllability and problem solving capacities without using violence. It can even exacerbate financial difficulties, infidelity, among others, increasing the risk of violence between partners, due to the conflict and relational tension. Beliefs (personal and social) on the fact that alcohol causes aggression can encourage violent behavior after its consumption and can lead to its use as an excuse for violence (WHO, 2006).

Substance use (alcohol/drugs) is a common factor in intimate partner violence, regardless of the sex of the perpetrator (Stevens et al., 2010) and was considered as a significant predictor of intimate partner violence by various studies, although the use of illicit drugs is a stronger predictor, compared with alcohol (Stalans & Ritchie, 2008).

3.2. Risk factors and protection factors

According to Ribeiro (2001), the consumption of SPA is displayed in a triangular dimension. It unites 1) individual (biological, psychological and social); 2) cognitive and behavioral; and 3) social environment. An exposition to the risk factors can increase the consumption of psychoactive substances. Protection factors and risk factors are related to each other. They cannot be represented in a quantitative way. Risk factors and protection factors are represented in

a qualitative form. It is vital to have important protection factors that can reduce the effect of risk factors.

Agreeing with Botella (2000), high quality protection factors are the key for the prevention of consumption of psychoactive substances. The consumption depends on the risk and protection factors. Protection factors and risk factors are the core for the preventive intervention of problematic consumption of psychoactive substances. This intervention should not also reduce the amount and the size of the risk factors as it also should increase the protection factors. According to Lukyanenko (2014), risk factors and protection factors are widespread and it is difficult to understand their real nature (risk or protection). The source of protection factor can be source of risk factor. The most mediate example is the “anti-drugs” advertisements. The risk factors, according to Abraão (1999), are internal (psychological) and external (societal). Protection factors are mainly societal (Achirica & Arnedillo, 2002).

Achirica & Arnedillo (2002) state that the individual (as psychological entity) is risk and protection factor. The individual (as psychological entity) can collaborate or resist to internal and external pressures. Hawkins & Catalano (1989) indicate that the individual (as psychological entity) is the main risk factor. This risk factor (individual) can be powered by diverse eventualities. Protection factors are largely based on the society, public and family (Abraão, 1999). Risk factors and protection factors are ubiquitous. Some of them are less evident (or relevant) than others. They adjust their effects according to age, location, interests and psychological condition.

Risk and protection factors, regarding drugs use, are associated to six life domains, «1) individual (psychological), 2) family (and family history), 3) school and education (occupation and success), 4) mass media, 5) friends and peers, and 6) community”. All six spheres are linked to each other. Each research on this theme emphasizes certain variables (for example: gender, age, socioeconomic level, school performance, work, drugs use in the family, among others) (Schenker & Minayo, 2005).

According to Lukyanenko (2014), the most common factors on the university students, of Coimbra are the social and individual characteristics, family (historical of parenting SPA consumption, relation with parents and even the existence of parents), peers and groups (more

related to the group of closer friends that individuals interact with), professional life and occupation (success and occupation can reduce the consumption of determined substances, but rise the consumption of others), the community and its relation and reaction (with/to) individual and collective behavior (such as encouraging to the nightlife, ignoring nightlife etc.), and the last, but not least the leisure (types of leisure and the way of leisure).

The isolation imposed by the aggressor partner during dating relationship is also an important risk factor for violence, although it is often not recognized by young people. The commitment in the isolation of the victim and even some behaviors of stalking (for example, prevent social contacts with peers) are some of the warning signs for violence, but they may, however, be confused with partner's expressions of love, according to Callahan et al. (2003). The lack of relational experience, associated with the need for emancipation and independence of young people at this stage, not always facilitates the recognition of a condition of victimization, nor does it identify any resources to manage (for example, contact with other adults or peers).

Intimate partner violence can cause a significant impact on the victim, resulting in several short and long term damages (eating behavior disorders, post-traumatic stress, emotional disturbances, risky sexual behavior) (Glass et. al., 2003).

The risk factors for intimate partner violence, highlighted by the World Health Organization (2012) include low economic income, younger age, gender differences, reduced academic achievement, involvement in aggressive behavior and delinquent adolescence, history of violence in the family of origin, cultural factors and certain personality characteristics.

PART II

CHAPTER TWO – Objectives of the research

1. Objectives

The representations around the IPV play a key role in the behavior of the people, mirroring themselves in attitudes and behaviors, adopted in situations of violence. This study aims to understand and analyze the impact and the relationship between consumption and violence in close relationships. It intends to realize that there are differences between men and women in the way they understand, explain and experiencing violence in intimate relationships.

More specifically, the goals are:

1. To identify the prevalence of intimate partner violence among university students.
2. To identify the legitimating beliefs of intimate partner violence that university students endorse.
3. To identify the risk and protection behaviors that university students exhibit in their nightlife.
4. Study the relation between intimate partner violence in these students and 1) the risks they take when going out at night; 2) the protective behaviors they adopt in their nightlife.
5. Study the relation between beliefs about intimate partner violence in these students and 1) the risks they take when going out at night; 2) the protective behaviors they adopt in their nightlife.

Chapter III - Methodology

1. Sample

The sample used in this present study is composed by 175 (52.6% male and 47.4% female) (see Table 1a). The average age stands at 21 years old (SD=3.203). It can be seen that most of the subjects are single (93.7%).

Table 1a. General characteristics of the sample

Sex	n	%			
Masculine	92	52.6			
Feminine	83	47.4			
Total	175	100			
Marital status					
Single	164	93.7			
Married	7	4.0			
Civil partnership	4	2.3			
Total	175	100			
			Minimum	Maximum	Mode
Age			17	34	21
					Mean
					21.54
					SD
					3.203

The interpretation of the table 1b) below comes with the fact that most of the students come from University (88.6%), and the majority of them are Portuguese (89.7%). Noted that the subjects were grouped into seven distinct categories depending on the areas of study. Like this, Table 1b) shows that most of the sample subject attends the courses from Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences (41.1%), in the second row comes the courses from Faculty of Science and Technology (16.6%).

Table 1b. General characteristics of the sample

Student	n	%
University	155	88.6
Polytechnic	20	11.4
Total	175	100
Type of student		
National	157	89.7
International	10	5.7
Mobility	8	4.6
Total	175	100
Frequented Course		
Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences	72	41.1
Faculty of Science and Technology	29	16.6
Faculty of Letters	18	10.3
Faculty of Law	16	9.2
Faculty of Economics	13	7.4
Institute for Interdisciplinary Research	10	5.7
Others	17	9.7
Total	175	100

Students from the sample are attending predominantly the first year (42.0%). The majority of the subjects are regular students (84.0%), followed by the working students (6.3%). Studies are being mainly self-financed (88.6%) (see Table 1c).

Table 1c. General characteristics of the sample

Year of the course	n	%
1°	73	42.0
2°	31	17.8
3°	27	15.5
4°	28	16.1
5° ≥ 6°	15	8.6
Total	174	100
Statute		
Regular student	147	84.0
Student worker	11	6.3
Student Membership Manager	10	5.7
Student integrated in cultural Activities	4	2.3
Student athlete	3	1.7
Total	175	100
Financing of studies		
Personal	155	88.6
Scholarship	20	11.4
Total	157	100

According to table 1d), the majority of the subjects live with friends and with family of origin, only 13.1% live with boyfriend(girlfriend)/spouse and just 10.3% live alone (see Table 1d). Greater part had one, two, and three relationships during more than three months. Age of the partner it varies from 13 to 45 (Mean=22.73).

Table 1d. General characteristics of the sample

Living in the time of classes	N	%			
Alone	18	10.3			
With friends	91	52.0			
With family of origin	42	24.0			
With boyfriend (girlfriend)/Spouse	23	13.1			
University residence	1	0.6			
Total	175	100			
How many love relationships ever had					
No relationship	18	10.3			
One relationship	60	34.3			
Two relationships	54	30.9			
Three relationships	30	17.1			
4 ≥ 7 relationships	13	7.5			
Total	175	100			
Duration of the relationship	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Mode	SD
Age of partner	1	180	32.58	12	33.402
Sex of the partner	13	45	22.73	22	4.530
	Masculine	55	56.7		
	Feminine	42	43.3		
	Total	97	100		

According to Table 2, 10.9% masculine subjects currently have a male partner, this means that 12.5% are homosexual and 87.5% are heterosexual. In the case of feminine subjects, 100% are heterosexual.

Table 2. Sex of the partners

		Sex of the partner	
		Masculine	Feminine
Sex	Masculine	10.9%	89.1%
	Feminine	100%	0%

In Table 1e it can be seen that majority of partners of the subjects have an academic degree (81.4%), most of them having secondary education (38.9%) and graduation (33.7%), the maximum level of education is under-represented (2.0%). Regarding to professional situation of the partners, the greater part are workers for others (57.1%), and just 4.8% dropout school (see Table 1e).

Table 1e. Characteristics of the partners of the subjects from the sample

Academic situation		N	%
	Yes	79	81.4
	No	18	18.6
	Total	97	100
Professional situation			
	School dropout	1	4.8
	Unemployed	5	23.8
	Self-employed	3	14.3
	Worker for others	12	57.1
	Total	21	100
Literary abilities			
	1 ^o basic education cycle	1	1.0
	2 ^o basic education cycle	1	1.0
	3 ^o basic education cycle	7	7.1
	Secondary education	38	38.8
	Bachelor degree	8	8.2
	Graduation	33	33.7
	Master's degree	8	8.2
	PhD	2	2.0
	Total	98	100

Considering the use of violence under the influence of alcohol, it can be observed that that students see themselves more like victims than aggressors (5.7%) and 3.4% of the subjects were both victim and provocateur. Regarding to the violence under the influence of drugs as a provocateur, the obtained values shows that 2.3% of the subjects used verbal and psychological violence in their intimate relationships and same percentage for the subjects that used only verbal violence. It can be seen that 0.6% of the subjects were victims simultaneously of physical, verbal, sexual and psychological violence in their intimate partner relationships (see Table 1f).

Table 1f. General characteristics of the sample

Violence under the influence of alcohol	n	%
Yes as provocateur	3	1.7
Yes as victim	10	5.7
Victim and provocateur	6	3.4
No	155	89.1
Total	174	100
Violence under the influence of drugs (provocateur)		
Verbal	4	2.3
Verbal and psychological	4	2.3
No	166	95.4
Total	174	100
Violence under the influence drugs (victim)		
Verbal	4	2.3
Physical, verbal, sexual and psychological	1	0.6
No	169	96.6
Total	174	100

The intimate relationships cause certain personal, social and health problems between others. The table below (Table 1g) shows what kind of problems the subjects of this study lived in their lives in consequence of an intimate relationship. Sleeping problems (38.3%), stress (36.6%), anxiety (32.6%), problems of confidence in others (24.0%) and isolation (16.6%) are the most common problems these students refer to live in intimate relationships.

Table 1g. General characteristics of the sample n=175

Problems on intimate relationship	N	%
Sleeping problems	67	38.3
Isolation	29	16.6
Risky sexual behavior/unprotected	20	11.4
Alcohol consumption problems	7	4.0
Use of other drugs	8	4.6
Family problems	18	10.3
Problems with friends	30	17.1
Public image problems	14	8.0
Physical health problems	4	2.3
Health problems and psychological well being	18	10.3
Sexual health problems	1	0.6
Pregnancy	1	0.6
Voluntary interruption of pregnancy	2	1.1
Economic problems	9	5.1
Social problems	9	5.1
Anxiety	57	32.6
Depression	20	11.4
Violence	5	2.9
Stress	64	36.6
Eating Disorders	25	14.3
Autonomy loss	7	4.0
Loss of freedom	14	8.0
Auto confidence problems	36	20.6
Problems of confidence in others	42	24.0
Increase the dependency in another	21	12.0
Betray the partner	13	7.4
Being betrayed by the partner	33	18.9

The values shown in the Table 1h regarding to the victims and aggressors in an intimate relationships reveal that 12% of subjects were victims of violence and 9.7% were the aggressors in the relationship. The beliefs of the subjects regarding to violence in the future, 4.6% think that can be victims and 1.7% believe that can be aggressors in a relationship of love.

Table 1h. General characteristics of the sample

	n	%
Victim in intimate relation		
Yes	21	12
No	154	88.0
Provocateur in intimate relation		
Yes	17	9.7
No	158	90.3
Victim of violence in the future		
Yes	8	4.6
No	167	95.4
Aggressor in the future		
Yes	3	1.7
No	172	98.3

2. Instruments

2.1 Socio-demographic questionnaire

There are two forms to receive the information: quantitative and qualitative. Questionnaire is the quantitative form. The main objective of it is to take much information as possible about students' lives (early life and family) and also life as adult or young adult.

This questionnaire focus mainly on few details such as: university, status, love life and violence. The questionnaire contains (20) questions. First part includes personal and educational questions and the second part is referring to love life. The third part is referred to the violence, identify and characterizing the victim or/and the aggressor (see annex 1, page 72).

2.2. Inventário de Violência Conjugal - I.V.C (Matos, Machado & Gonçalves, 2000)

The purpose of this inventory is to identify the presence of victimization and/or the presence of violent behavior in marital relations and in this sense, the inventory allows to evaluate the prevalence of various acts of violence committed and received by intimate partners, and to identify the frequency with which these different manifestations of violence occur.

This inventory has two parts. Part A intends to evaluate the last year of the current affective relationship, while part B intends to evaluate the previous affective relationships. It consists of 21 items and every item comes to abusive behavior on the physical level, as is the case with slaps or kicks, emotional level, as is the case of insult or defamation, and ultimately coercive and bullying, such as the destruction of objects or preventing contact with other people.

This inventory was administered individual or in group and has no time limit.

The first part of inventory it refers to the actual relation of the participant. The second refers to the past relationships of the subject.

Items 3, 13, 10, 1, 8, 5, 4, 16, 11, 18, 12, 15, and 17 represent the different acts of physical abuse and the items 2, 20, 6, 9, 19, 7, and 13 represent different acts of bad emotional treatment (Machado *et al.*, 2000).

In response to this inventory, individuals are requested to refer to a) never adopted certain behavior, if adopted only once, or if taken more than once; repeating exactly the same for the partner, it means if b) the partner never adopted certain behavior, if adopted once or if the adopted more than once. Both in Part A and in Part B, item 21 have a blank space for the individual to fill in a behavior that has not been previously mentioned in scale but that has already experienced (see annex 1, page 78).

In the present study, Cronbach's Alpha is showing a good internal consistency, ($\alpha=.79$). Regarding to the actual relationship, physical abuse, $\alpha=.99$ and past relationship $\alpha=.97$. Related to the actual relationship, emotional abuse $\alpha=.99$ and past relationship $\alpha=.92$.

2.3. Escala de Crenças sobre a Violência Conjugal - E.C.V.C (Matos, Machado & Gonçalves, 2000)

This was one of the scales chosen as an evaluation tool in this research. In this sense, this scale allows us to evaluate the beliefs regarding the physical and psychological violence in the context of marital relationships.

The scale is adapted to the adult population in general and can be applied individually or as a group to individuals aged above 18 years old. This scale consists of 25 items. The answers are given according to of 5 points likert scale (1=strongly disagree to 5=totally agree). The scale has four factors. Factor 1 "legitimação e banalização da pequena violencia", is constituted by items 24, 16, 22, 20, 19, 25, 18, 23, 14, 17, 13, 21, 15, 2, 12, and 9. These items represent a set of beliefs that trivialize and normalize the minor violence, such as the trivialization of insults and slaps. The factor 2 "legitimação da violência pela conduta da mulher", consists of items 11, 12, 13, 14, 9, 10, 8, 5, 23, and 7 and represent the feminine behavior potentiates and/or legitimizing violence, for example, lack the wifely duties and be bad wife. The factor 3 "legitimação da violência pela sua atribuição a causas externas", consists of items 3, 6, 2, 10, 8, 5, 7, and 4 represent the attribution of violence to a group of factors external to the aggressor, such as

economic difficulties and/or unemployment. The factor 4 "legitimação da violência pela preservação da privacidade familiar", consists of items 1, 17, 15, 7, 9, and 8 (Matos *et al.*, 2000).

The total score will be determined by adding the answers to each of the items listed 1-5, and will assess the level of acceptance and/or tolerance of the individual in the face of domestic violence (physical and/or psychological). In this sense, the sum of the scores of the items making up each factor will allow realizing the mark given to each and thus get to know the kind of beliefs associated with that tolerance and/or acceptance (see annex 1, page 76).

In this study, Cronbach's Alpha is showing a very good internal consistency ($\alpha=.96$). Related to the four factors, first factor presents a good internal consistency ($\alpha=.96$), as well as the second factor ($\alpha=.92$). The third factor shows a Cronbach's Alpha of .86, which indicates a good internal consistency, as well as the fourth factor ($\alpha=.81$).

2.4. Questionário de Comportamentos de Proteção e Risco nas Saídas Noturnas - QCPR-Noturno (Pinheiro, R.)

This questionnaire asks students about their risk and protective behaviors when they go out at night. First part has 35 questions asking about risk behaviors like where the students spend time at night. Common days for going out, the number of peers and relation between them. As well, it attends to know what kind of drinks students usually consume and at what hour they go to sleep. Second part has 16 questions like keep cell phone, having condoms, going out accompanied (see annex 1, page 83), asking about protective behaviors. The questions between 1 and 35 refer to the risk factors of a night out and the questions between 36 and 51 refer to the protection factors.

For this study, Cronbach's Alpha is showing a very good consistency ($\alpha=.86$). Related to the risk behaviors $\alpha=.89$, and for protective behaviors $\alpha=.74$

3. Procedures

The sample of this study was collected at University of Coimbra and Instituto Politécnico de Coimbra by the researcher. Students have been contacted at their faculties, in the universities canteens and in university residences. The objectives of the study have been explained to them students, after which they agreed to participate. Anonymity and confidentiality were guaranteed.

To analyze the results it was used the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 22.0.

CHAPTER FOUR- RESULTS

1. The experience of suffering and perpetrating violence in intimate relationships

1.1. The experience of being a victim of Intimate Partner Violence (IPV)

1.1.1. In the actual relationship

From the 175 subjects of the sample, only 64.6% are at the moment in a relationship. Data will be presented considering the type of violence they have suffered in this relationship.

1.1.1.1. Physical violence

Table 3. Relative frequencies (%) of victimization of physical violence in an actual relationship according to sex and Chi-square test results

		Actual relationship				χ^2	p
		No		Yes			
		M	F	M	F		
Physic violence	Pulling hair	46.0%	47.8%	2.7%	3.5%	.101	.751
	Slapping	44.2%	50.4%	4.4%	0.9%	3.047	.081
	Strangle	45.1%	50.4%	3.5%	0.9%	2.055	.152
	Threatening with Weapons	48.7%	51.3%	0%	0%		
	Punching	47.8%	51.3%	0.9%	0%	1.064	.302
	Shooting with objects	45.1%	49.6%	3.5%	1.8%	.821	.365
	Beatings	48.7%	51.3%	0%	0%		
	Kicks	48.7%	51.3%	0%	0%		
	Violent shoves	46.9%	50.4%	1.8%	0.9%	.399	.527
	Banging head	48.7%	51.3%	0%	0%		
	Cause injury	48.7%	51.3%	0%	0%		
	Cause injury with medical intervention	48.7%	51.3%	0%	0%		
	Forced sexual acts	48.7%	49.6%	0%	1.8%	1.931	.165

Considering the results from table 3 it can be seen that does not exist differences between men and women concerning the victimization of physical violence in actual relationship.

1.1.1.2. Emotional violence

Table 4. Relative frequencies (%) of victimization of emotional violence in an actual relationship according to sex and Chi-square test results

		Actual relationship				χ^2	p
		No		Yes			
		M	F	M	F		
Emotional Violence	Insult/slander	41.6%	42.5%	7.1%	8.8%	.153	.695
	Breaking things	45.1%	47.8%	3.5%	3.5%	.006	.938
	Wake up the middle of the night to frighten	48.7%	51.3%	0%	0%		
	Prevent contact with other people	46.9%	49.6%	1.8%	1.8%	.003	.957
	Stalking	48.7%	51.3%	0%	0%		
	Stay with the salary of other	48.7%	51.3%	0%	0%		
	Yell or threaten	45.1%	51.3%	3.5%	0%	4.373	.037

We can see in table 4 that most of the subjects are not victims of emotional violence in their actual relationship. Results obtained showed that male endorse more emotional violence concerning the yelling or threatening.

1.1.2. In a past relationship

Most of the students of the sample (96%) reported the experience of victimization in a past relationship.

1.1.2.1. Physical violence

Table 5. Relative frequencies (%) of victimization of physical violence in an past relationship according to sex and Chi-square test results

		Past relationship				χ^2	p
		No		Yes			
		M	F	M	F		
Physic violence	Pulling hair	50.6%	44.6%	2.4%	2.4%	.030	.863
	Slapping	49.1%	44.9%	4.2%	1.8%	1.193	.275
	Strangle	50.6%	44.6%	2.4%	2.4%	.030	.863
	Threatening with Weapons	52.4%	46.4%	0.6%	0.6%	.007	.932
	Punching	51.8%	47.0%	1.2%	0%	1.797	.180
	Shooting with objects	44.0%	45.2%	8.9%	1.8%	7.458	.006
	Beatings	53.0%	45.8%	0.6%	0.6%	.011	.918
	Kicks	52.1%	46.2%	0.6%	1.2%	.458	.499
	Violent shoves	50.3%	42.6%	2.4%	4.7%	1.936	.164
	Banging head	52.1%	46.7%	0.6%	0.6%	.006	.940
	Cause injury	52.7%	45.6%	0%	1.8%	3.398	.065
	Cause injury with medical intervention	52.7%	47.3%	0%	0%		
	Forced sexual acts	52.7%	47.3%	0%	1.8%	3.398	.065

Table 5 shows us that male subjects are predominant victims of shooting with objects. For other items doesn't show any statistically difference, which means that doesn't exist differences between sexes.

1.1.2.2. Emotional violence

Table 6. Relative frequencies (%) of victimization of emotional violence in a past relationship according to sex and Chi-square test results

		Past relationship				χ^2	p
		No		Yes			
		M	F	M	F		
Emotional Violence	Insult/slander	40.5%	38.7%	12.5%	8.3%	.876	.349
	Breaking things	45.2%	45.2%	7.7%	1.8%	5.675	.017
	Wake up the middle of the night to frighten	49.4%	46.4%	3.6%	0.6%	3.143	.076
	Prevent contact with other people	48.8%	41.1%	4.2%	6.0%	1.057	.304
	Stalking	49.7%	45.0%	3.0%	2.4%	.032	.858
	Stay with the salary of other	52.7%	46.7%	0%	0.6%	1.119	.290
	Yell or threaten	44.4%	43.2%	8.3%	4.1%	1.886	.170

Victims of emotional violence in past relationship are predominantly males (victims of breaking things,). For other items don't exist any statistically significant difference (see table 6).

1.2. The experience of being a perpetrator of IPV

1.2.1. In an actual relationship

From the 175 subjects of the sample, only 64.6% are at the moment in a relationship. Data will be presented considering the type of violence used by the students against the intimate partner.

1.2.1.1. Physical violence

Table 7. Relative frequencies (%) of perpetration of physical violence in an actual relationship according to sex and Chi-square test results

		Actual relationship				χ^2	p
		No		Yes			
		M	F	M	F		
Physical Violence	Pulling hair	45.5%	48.2%	2.7%	3.6%	.086	.770
	Slapping	47.8%	46.9%	0.9%	4.4%	2.598	.107
	Strangle	48.7%	49.6%	0%	1.8%	1.931	.165
	Threatening with Weapons	47.8%	51.3%	0.9%	0%	1.064	.302
	Punching	48.7%	51.3%	0%	0%		
	Shooting with objects	46.0%	48.7%	2.7%	2.7%	.004	.947
	Beatings	48.7%	53.1%	0%	0%		
	Kicks	48.7%	50.4%	0%	0.9%	.957	.328
	Violent shoves	48.7%	47.8%	0%	3.5%	3.932	.047
	Banging head	48.7%	51.3%	0%	0%		
	Cause injury	48.7%	51.3%	0%	0%		
	Cause injury with medical intervention	48.7%	51.3%	0%	0%		
	Forced sexual acts	48.7%	51.3%	0%	0%		

We can see in the table 7 that majority of students doesn't use violence in their intimate relationship. However, female subjects give more violent shoves than men.

1.2.1.2. Emotional violence

Table 8. Relative frequencies (%) of perpetration of emotional violence in an actual relationship according to sex and Chi-square test results

		Actual relationship				χ^2	p
		No		Yes			
		M	F	M	F		
Emotional Violence	Insult/slander	39.8%	42.5%	8.8%	8.8%	.017	.896
	Breaking things	45.1%	47.8%	3.5%	3.5%	.006	.938
	Wake up the middle of the night to frighten	46.9%	51.3%	1.8%	0%	2.147	.143
	Prevent contact with other people	46.9%	49.6%	1.8%	1.8%	.003	.957
	Stalking	46.9%	51.3%	1.8%	0%	2.147	.143
	Stay with the salary of other	48.7%	51.3%	0%	0%		
	Yell or threaten	46.0%	50.4%	2.7%	0.9%	1.151	.283

Relatively to emotional violence in actual relationship, the data is showing that most of the subjects don't use this form of violence in their intimate relationships. Though, insult, breaking things and preventing the contact with other people is common for both sexes. Male subjects tend to use more violence, such as: wake up the partner in the middle of the night to frighten, stalking and yelling or threatening (see table 8).

1.2.2. In a past relationship

1.2.2.1. Physical violence

Table 9. Relative frequencies (%) of perpetration of physical violence in a past relationship according to sex and Chi-square test results

		Past relationship				χ^2	p
		No		Yes			
		M	F	M	F		
Physical Violence	Pulling hair	50.0%	46.4%	3.0%	0.6%	2.302	.129
	Slapping	50.0%	44.6%	3.0%	2.4%	.025	.873
	Strangle	51.2%	46.4%	1.8%	0.6%	.798	.372
	Threatening with Weapons	53.0%	47.0%	0%	0%		
	Punching	52.4%	47.0%	0.6%	0%	.893	.345
	Shooting with objects	46.4%	47.0%	6.5%	0%	10.448	.001
	Beatings	52.7%	46.7%	0.6%	0%	.882	.348
	Kicks	52.7%	46.7%	0%	0.6%	1.119	.290
	Violent shoves	49.7%	43.8%	3.0%	3.6%	.245	.620
	Banging head	52.7%	47.3%	0%	0%		
	Cause injury	52.7%	46.7%	0%	0.6%	1.119	.290
	Cause injury with medical intervention	53.0%	47.0%	0%	0%		
	Forced sexual acts	52.7%	47.3%	0%	0%		

In a more detailed analysis of the various abusive behaviors present in IVC for past relationship, it is found that these behaviors are most often perpetrated by the male subjects, concerning the physical violence (table 9).

1.2.2.2. Emotional violence

Table 10. Relative frequencies (%) of perpetration of emotional violence in a past relationship according to sex and Chi-square test results

		Past relationship				χ^2	p
		No		Yes			
		M	F	M	F		
Emotional Violence	Insult/slander	41.7%	42.9%	11.3%	4.2%	4.989	.026
	Breaking things	47.3%	45.5%	6.0%	1.2%	4.687	.030
	Wake up the middle of the night to frighten	50.6%	47.0%	2.4%	0%	3.637	.057
	Prevent contact with other people	49.7%	46.7%	3.6%	0%	5.454	.020
	Stalking	51.5%	46.7%	1.2%	0.6%	.240	.624
	Stay with the salary of other	52.7%	47.3%	0%	0%		
	Yell or threaten	46.7%	46.2%	5.9%	1.2%	4.874	.027

Table 10 it shows that male subjects are predominant of using emotional violence, such as: insult, breaking things, waking up in the middle of the night to frighten the partner, prevent contact with other people, stalking and yelling.

1.3. Victimization experience in function of sex, age group and co-habitants

Table 11. Victimization (Independent T test) in function of sex in actual and past relationship

	Sex	Mean	SD	p	t
AR_PA victim	M	7.97	6.60	.005	$t_{(172,900)}=-1.29$
	F	9.21	6.61		
AR_EA victim	M	4.38	3.66	.012	$t_{(172,855)}=-1.31$
	F	5.08	3.40		
PR_PA victim	M	13.01	2.59	.508	$t_{(172)}=0.43$
	F	12.82	2.97		
PR_EA victim	M	7.48	1.93	.258	$t_{(172,128)}=1.07$
	F	7.18	1.86		

*(AR=actual relationship; PR=past relationship; PA=physical abuse; EA=emotional abuse)

From Table 11 it can be seen that female participants are physically and emotionally more abused than male participants in their actual relationship. Concerning past relationship, no differences were found between the two sexes (M=7.48; SD=1.93; M=7.18; SD=1.86).

Table 12. Victimization in function of age group for actual and past relation

	Age	Mean	SD	p	T
AR_PA victim	G1	7.62	6.52	.004	$t_{(151,276)}=-1.93$
	G2	9.53	6.18		
AR_EA victim	G1	4.14	3.55	.031	$t_{(147,444)}=-2.13$
	G2	5.31	3.51		
PR_PA victim	G1	12.86	2.62	.826	$t_{(166)}=-0.738$
	G2	13.17	2.65		
PR_EA victim	G1	7.28	1.79	.318	$t_{(139,247)}=-0.97$
	G2	7.56	1.92		

Legend: (AR=actual relationship; PR=past relationship; PA=physical abuse; EA=emotional abuse; G1=100 students aged between 17 and 21 years old; G2=69 older students aged between 22 and 34 years old).

It's been running a t-test for independent sample to analyze the differences in media concerning the victimization in function of age group. For actual relationship, older students are more physically and emotionally abused than the younger ones. Concerning the past relationship and regarding the two forms of abuse it wasn't found any significant difference between age groups (see Table 12).

Table 13. Victimization in function of co-habitants for actual and past relation

	Co-habitants	Mean	SD	p	$F_{(3,169)}$
AR_PA victim	C1	2.94	5.67	.000	9.53
	C2	9.00	6.20		
	C3	7.92	6.63		
	C4	12.78	2.93		
	Total	8.61	6.37		
AR_EA victim	C1	1.66	3.23	.000	10.0
	C2	4.92	3.42		
	C3	4.28	3.61		
	C4	7.26	1.83		
	Total	4.74	3.54		
PR_PA victim	C1	13.72	2.05	.616	0.60
	C2	12.80	2.68		
	C3	12.78	2.99		
	C4	13.04	3.26		
	Total	12.92	2.77		
PR_EA victim	C1	7.77	1.69	.685	0.49
	C2	7.20	1.81		
	C3	7.33	2.11		
	C4	7.47	2.06		
	Total	7.33	1.90		

Legend: (AR=actual relationship; PR=past relationship; PA=physical abuse; EA=emotional abuse; C1=living alone; C2=living with friends; C3=Living with family of origin; C4=living with boyfriend/girlfriend or spouse).

Exist a significant difference at the level of $p < .05$ [$F_{(3,170)}=3.87$] for first and second item of IVC. According to the post-hoc analyzes through Scheffé test it was found that for each item, the differences were between the categories C1 and C2 ($p < .05$). For first and second item, the students that live with boyfriend/girlfriend or spouse have been more victims of physical and emotional abuse in actual relationship. For last two items of IVC concerning the past relationship it was not found any statistically significant difference ($p > .05$) (table 13).

1.4. Experience of aggression in function of sex, age group and co-habitants

Table 14. Aggression (Independent T test) in function of sex in actual and past relationship

	Sex	Mean	SD	p	t
AR_PA aggression	M	7.78	6.48	.018	$t_{(171,610)}=-1.59$
	F	9.31	6.61		
AR_EA aggression	M	4.43	3.74	.011	$t_{(172,983)}=-1.22$
	F	5.09	3.41		
PR_PA aggression	M	12.91	2.56	.490	$t_{(172)}=0.79$
	F	12.59	2.67		
PR_EA aggression	M	7.32	1.72	.121	$t_{(171,936)}=1.97$
	F	6.84	1.51		

*(AR=actual relationship; PR=past relationship; PA=physical abuse; EA=emotional abuse)

It was verified that in the actual relation, physical abuse is more practiced by women than men, as well as emotional abuse. In past relation it wasn't found any statistically significant difference (see Table 14).

Table 15. Aggression in function of age group for actual and past relation

	Age	Mean	SD	p	t
AR_PA aggression	G1	7.60	6.50	.006	$t_{(148,545)}=-1.86$
	G2	9.45	6.19		
AR_EA aggression	G1	4.15	3.56	.056	$t_{(147,247)}=-2.18$
	G2	5.37	3.59		
PR_PA aggression	G1	12.70	2.47	.694	$t_{(166)}=-0.793$
	G2	13.01	2.46		
PR_EA aggression	G1	6.98	1.50	.068	$t_{(137,139)}=-1.42$
	G2	7.34	1.66		

Legend: (AR=actual relationship; PR=past relationship; PA=physical abuse; EA=emotional abuse; G1=100 students aged between 17 and 21 years old; G2=69 older students aged between 22 and 34 years old).

It can be seen that for the younger students the physical aggression is more predominant in actual relationship. Concerning the actual relationship, for emotional aggression wasn't found any statistically significant difference, as well for past relationship (see Table 15).

Table 16. Aggression in function of co-habitants for actual and past relation

	Co-habitants	Mean	SD	p	F _(3,169)
AR_PA aggression	C1	3.05	5.91	.000	9.27
	C2	8.96	6.18		
	C3	7.80	6.52		
	C4	12.81	3.04		
	Total	8.56	6.35		
AR_EA aggression	C1	1.66	3.23	.000	9.83
	C2	4.93	3.43		
	C3	4.38	3.77		
	C4	7.30	1.84		
	Total	4.77	3.59		
PR_PA aggression	C1	13.33	1.02	.790	0.34
	C2	12.75	2.68		
	C3	12.61	2.89		
	C4	12.60	2.79		
	Total	12.76	2.62		
PR_EA aggression	C1	7.22	0.73	.969	0.08
	C2	7.11	1.71		
	C3	7.00	1.76		
	C4	7.08	1.75		
	Total	7.09	1.64		

Legend: (AR=actual relationship; PR=past relationship; PA=physical abuse; EA=emotional abuse; C1=living alone;C2=living with friends; C3=Living with family of origin; C4=living with boyfriend/girlfriend or spouse).

From Table 16 it can be seen that exist a statistically significant difference concerning actual relation, as an aggressor, predominates physical and emotional abuse for those who live with the intimate partner (fourth category). For past relation, doesn't exist any statistically significant difference concerning physical and emotional abuse ($p > .05$).

2. Analysis of beliefs about violence in intimate partner relationship in university students

2.1. Beliefs in function of sex, age group and co-habitants

We started to analyze the beliefs university students have about violence in intimate partner relationships according to their sex.

Table 17. Comparison of means on the ECVC factors considering sex of students (n=175)

ECVC	Sex	Mean	SD	p	t
Factor 1	M	31.19	13.62	.00	$t_{(118,34)}=7.67$
	F	19.46	5.10		
Factor 2	M	19.79	8.46	.00	$t_{(126,435)}=6.63$
	F	13.33	3.65		
Factor 3	M	16.84	6.25	.00	$t_{(143,956)}=5.44$
	F	12.84	3.42		
Factor 4	M	12.88	4.74	.00	$t_{(140,960)}=7.22$
	F	8.79	2.50		
Total	M	50.75	19.24	.00	$t_{(124,262)}=7.24$
	F	34.28	8.01		

Legend: (Factor1: "legitimação e banalização da pequena violência"; Factor2: "legitimação da violência pela conduta da mulher"; Factor3: "legitimação pela sua atribuição a causas externas"; Factor4: "legitimação da violência pela preservação da privacidade familiar".)

As it can be seen in table 17, for the total of the scale, male students legitimize more the violence on intimate relationships than female students ($t_{(124,262)}=7.24$, $p<.05$).

For all the types of beliefs, such as violence is common, normal and less grave; the wife is infidel, doesn't accomplish the needs of husband deserve to be abused; violence came from dysfunctional families, unemployment and other external causes; preserve the families of outside interference, all this are predominant for male students.

Table 17 shows that male students are predominant for all four factors of ECVC.

To look for differences considering age of the students, the sample was divided into two groups. First group (G1) includes 100 students aged between 17 and 21 years old and group 2 (G2) includes 69 older students aged between 22 and 34 years old. The criteria for the groups were the average age with which they usually finish the graduation (not including master).

Table 18. Comparison of means on the ECVC factors considering age of students (n=175)

ECVC	Age	Mean	SD	p	t
Factor1	G1	23.55	11.31	.021	$t_{(136,091)}=2.64$
	G2	28.52	12.49		
Factor2	G1	15.65	6.58	.006	$t_{(125,091)}=2.21$
	G2	18.27	8.19		
Factor3	G1	13.97	4.68	.002	$t_{(116,361)}=2.56$
	G2	16.28	6.41		
Factor4	G1	10.25	4.17	.162	$t_{(167)}=2.45$
	G2	11.89	4.46		
Total	G1	40.01	15.44	.004	$t_{(127,558)}=2.59$
	G2	47.08	18.71		

Legend: (Factor1: "legitimação e banalização da pequena violência"; Factor2: "legitimação da violência pela conduta da mulher"; Factor3: "legitimação pela sua atribuição a causas externas"; Factor4: "legitimação da violência pela preservação da privacidade familiar".)

It has been calculated a t-test for independent sample to analyze the differences in beliefs scale of conjugal violence according to the variable age.

It can be seen, from the total of ECVC that the older students (G2) endorse more beliefs that legitimize violence in intimate relationship.

About first Factor exist a statistically significant difference between the groups G1-G2, older students consider that violence is a normal and common thing.

Factor 2, it also shows a significant difference between this two groups, showing that G2 consider that a bad behavior of wife should be punished.

In relation to the Factor 3, older students believe that the violence came from external causes.

The last factor "*legitimação da violência pela preservação da privacidade familiar*", don't exist great statistically significant differences between the groups (see table 18).

Other analyzes were conducted, now considering kind of co-habitation, that is, with whom the students live. Four categories have been considered: C1 represents living alone, C2 is living with friends, C3 means is living with the family of origin, and C4 represents living with the boyfriend/girlfriend or spouse. Results can be read on table 19.

Table 19. Comparison of means on the ECVC factors considering co-habitation of students (n=175)

ECVC	Co-habitation	M	SD	p	F _(3,170)
Factor 1	C1	21.05	9.60	.010	3.87
	C2	24.28	10.51		
	C3	30.64	15.70		
	C4	25.82	8.81		
Factor 2	C1	13.77	5.18	.007	4.14
	C2	16.17	6.48		
	C3	19.92	9.61		
	C4	15.69	5.69		
Factor 3	C1	13.61	4.75	.093	2.16
	C2	14.45	5.18		
	C3	16.73	6.53		
	C4	14.52	4.72		
Factor 4	C1	8.66	2.86	.008	4.11
	C2	10.67	4.04		
	C3	12.64	5.38		
	C4	10.86	3.36		
Total	C1	36.55	13.56	.015	3.57
	C2	41.31	15.25		
	C3	49.88	21.88		
	C4	42.30	13.32		

Legend: (Factor1: "legitimação e banalização da pequena violência"; Factor2: "legitimação da violência pela conduta da mulher"; Factor3: "legitimação pela sua atribuição a causas externas"; Factor4: "legitimação da violência pela preservação da privacidade familiar".)

There is a significant difference at the level of $p < .05$ [$F_{(3,170)} = 3.87$] for Factor 1, 2 and 4. According to the post-hoc analyzes through Scheffé test it was found that for each factor, the differences were between the categories C1, C2 and C3 ($p < .05$). For all the ECVC factors, excluding factor 3 ($p > .05$), the students who live with parents (C3) endorse more beliefs (table 19).

3. Risk and protective behaviors in university students

One of the goals of this research was to analyze the kind of behaviors that students undertake when going out at night. These behaviors can either be risky or protective. Given the importance of knowing which behaviors are more salient, an extensive analysis has been done to the items that compose the QCPR instrument.

3.1. Risk behaviors

Table 20. Relative frequencies (%) of risk behaviors according to sex and Chi-square test results

	Masculine		Feminine		χ^2	p
	No	Yes	No	Yes		
Tobacco	14.3%	38.3%	22.9%	24.6%	8.257	.004
Alcohol heavy drinking	5.7%	46.9%	18.3%	29.1%	18.335	.000
Violence victim	40.6%	12.0%	42.9%	4.6%	5.489	.019
Unprotected sex	30.3%	22.3%	38.9%	8.6%	12.095	.001
Driving under the effect of alcohol	41.1%	11.4%	44.0%	3.4%	7.263	.007
Cannabis	32.6%	20.0%	37.7%	9.7%	6.443	.011
Beating someone	45.1%	7.4%	45.1%	2.3%	4.313	.038
Cocaine	48.6%	4.0%	46.3%	1.1%	2.418	.120
Sleeping in unknown place	36.6%	16.0%	45.1%	2.3%	19.161	.000
Use of alcohol	6.9%	45.7%	9.7%	37.7%	1.746	.186
Fall asleep after sunrise	10.3%	42.3%	8.0%	39.4%	.213	.645
Friends with drugs	17.1%	35.4%	22.9%	24.6%	4.415	.036
Casual sexual partner	31.4%	21.1%	42.3%	5.1%	19.430	.000
Consuming SPA bought online	50.3%	2.3%	46.3%	1.1%	.495	.482
Sitting on the street	32.6%	20.0%	37.7%	9.7%	6.443	.011
Going to places nobody knows where I am	38.3%	14.3%	44.0%	3.4%	11.908	.001
Ecstasy	49.1%	3.4%	46.3%	1.1%	1.691	.193
Become unreachable	32.6%	20.0%	42.9%	4.6%	18.995	.000
Mist substances	34.3%	18.3%	40.6%	6.9%	9.577	.002
Having sex under the influence of alcohol	26.3%	26.3%	36.0%	11.4%	12.464	.000
Problems with the authorities	42.3%	10.3%	46.9%	0.6%	15.198	.000
Take a ride by car from someone drunk	41.1%	11.4%	37.1%	10.3%	.000	.993
Accepting drinks from strangers	39.4%	13.1%	42.9%	4.6%	7.064	.008
Vomiting	24.6%	28.0%	25.7%	21.7%	.976	.323
Give the contact to strangers	34.9%	17.7%	41.1%	6.3%	9.997	.002
Accept car rides from strangers	49.1%	3.4%	45.1%	2.3%	.235	.628
Walking without shoes on street	45.7%	6.9%	38.3%	9.1%	1.262	.261
Meeting with strangers	44.6%	8.0%	44.6%	2.9%	3.810	.051
Car accident	48.0%	4.6%	47.4%	0%	7.563	.006
Suicide ideas	47.4%	5.1%	46.9%	0.6%	5.959	.015
Involved in dangerous games	36.6%	16.0%	42.9%	4.6%	11.549	.001
Praxes-psychological well being	45.7%	6.9%	44.6%	2.9%	2.451	.117
Praxes- physical well being	45.7%	6.9%	45.7%	1.7%	4.950	.026
Compromising pictures	37.7%	14.9%	44.0%	3.4%	12.917	.000
Kissing more than one person per night	38.9%	13.7%	41.7%	5.7%	5.494	.019

Results presented in table 20 show that male participants engage in more risk behaviors than women. Male students use more tobacco in their night going outs, as well drinking alcohol until getting drunk. They also become victims of violence or beating someone, driving under the

effect of alcohol; engage in unprotected sex and smoking cannabis. There is a statistically significant difference related to sleeping in unknown place, having unprotected sex, become unreachable, mix substances, and having sex under the influence of alcohol, revealing that male participants are predominant engage more on these risk behaviour. Also, the statistic shows that male participants are more involved in car accidents and have more suicidal ideas.

3.1.1. Risk behavior in function of sex, age group and co-habitation

Table 21. Comparison of means on the Risk behaviors considering sex of students (n=175)

	Sex	Mean	SD	P	t
Risk behavior	M	52.58	12.49	.010	$t_{(155,978)}=5.18$
	F	44.45	7.93		

It is visible (see Table 21) that male participants engage in more risk behavior than female participants.

Table 22. Comparison of means on the Risk behaviors considering age of students (n=175)

	Age	Mean	SD	P	t
Risk behavior	G1	48.50	12.02	.899	$t_{(167)}=-0.55$
	G2	49.47	10.16		

Legend: (G1=100 students aged between 17 and 21 years old; G2=69 older students aged between 22 and 34 years old).

As shown in table 22, the absence of statistically significant differences mean that risk behaviors don't vary when considering age of the students.

Table 23. Comparison of means on the Risk behaviors considering co-habitation of students (n=175)

	Co-habitation	Mean	SD	P	$F_{(3,170)}$
Risk behavior	C1	47.61	9.04	.197	1.57
	C2	48.52	9.41		
	C3	51.35	15.22		
	C4	45.21	11.08		
	Total	48.67	11.31		

Legend: (C1=living alone; C2=living with friends; C3=Living with family of origin; C4=living with boyfriend/girlfriend or spouse).

Concerning the co-habitation, doesn't exist statistically significant differences ($p>.05$) (see table 23).

3.2. Protective behaviors

Table 24. Protective behavior in function of sex

	Masculine		Feminine		χ^2	p
	No	Yes	No	Yes		
Mobile phone	8.0%	44.6%	4.0%	43.4%	1.901	.168
Telling to somebody where I am	6.9%	45.7%	3.4%	44.0%	1.599	.206
Having a contact for an emergency	31.4%	21.1%	23.4%	24.0%	1.900	.168
Condoms	17.1%	35.4%	33.7%	13.7%	25.846	.000
Walking with Identity Card	2.9%	49.7%	1.7%	45.7%	.331	.565
Go out accompanied	2.9%	49.7%	1.1%	46.3%	1.040	.308
Going home accompanied	3.4%	49.4%	1.1%	46.0%	1.648	.199
Sugary drinks	13.1%	39.4%	8.6%	38.9%	1.232	.267
Sending SMS to tell where I am	9.1%	43.4%	2.3%	45.1%	6.813	.009
Calling the emergency for me	40.6%	12.0%	39.4%	8.0%	.968	.325
Calling the emergency for someone	28.6%	24.0%	31.4%	16.0%	2.582	.108
Drinking water	5.7%	46.0%	3.4%	44.0%	.696	.404
Eating	3.4%	49.1%	2.9%	44.6%	.018	.892
Accompanied of someone sober	14.3%	38.3%	5.7%	41.7%	6.239	.012
Driving with seatbelt	9.2%	43.7%	7.5%	39.7%	.074	.786
Using public transportation	17.1%	35.4%	14.9%	32.6%	.033	.856

Male gender is involving in protective behavior, having condoms with them, which can lead to a protected sex.

However, women involve in protective behaviors, such as, sending SMS to someone telling where they are and being accompanied of someone sober (see table 24).

3.2.1. Protective behaviors in function of sex, age group and co-habitation

Table 25. Comparison of means on the Protective behaviors considering sex of students (n=175)

	Sex	Mean	SD	P	t
Protective behavior	M	41.55	6.73	.717	$t_{(171)}=-3.07$
	F	44.76	6.98		

It was not found out that doesn't exist any statistically significant difference between sex of the students when considering and the protective behaviors they have when going out at night ($p>.05$) (see Table 25).

Table 26. Comparison of means on the Protective behaviors considering age of students (n=175)

	Age	Mean	SD	P	t
Protective behavior	G1	44.24	6.74	.974	$t_{(165)}=2.49$
	G2	41.56	6.93		

Legend: (G1=100 students aged between 17 and 21 years old; G2=69 older students aged between 22 and 34 years old).

Table 26 is showing that between younger students (G1) and older students (G2) doesn't exist any variation concerning the protective behaviors.

Table 27. Comparison of means on the Protective behaviors considering co-habitation of students (n=175)

	Co-habitation	Mean	SD	P	F _(3,170)
Protective behavior	C1	43.41	6.34	.957	0.10
	C2	43.21	6.91		
	C3	42.75	7.91		
	C4	42.47	6.68		
	Total	43.02	7.02		

Legend: (C1=living alone; C2=living with friends; C3=Living with family of origin; C4=living with boyfriend/girlfriend or spouse).

Concerning the protective behaviors, it does not show any statistically significant difference at level of $p > .05$ (see Table 27), which means that protective behaviors do not differ when it is about co-habitation.

4. Associations between victimization and perpetration of violence in intimate relationship, beliefs about violence and risk and protective behaviors

4.1. Correlations between IVC and ECVC

Table 28. Correlations between IVC and EVCV (n=175) in function of sex

		EVCV											
		LBMV			LVCW			LVAEC			LVPFP		
		Total	M	F	Total	M	F	Total	M	F	Total	M	F
IVC	AR_PA Aggression	.017	.090	.116	-.006	.042	.094	-.017	.028	.043	-.032	.046	.000
	AR_PA Victim	.012	.069	.089	-.010	.023	.084	-.029	.004	.017	-.043	.019	-.031
	AR_EA Aggression	.014	.053	.134	-.008	.019	.093	-.016	.007	.049	-.034	.007	.021
	AR_EA Victim	.008	.057	.115	-.014	.016	.086	-.030	-.003	.031	-.044	.005	.001
	PR_PA Aggression	.047	.002	.078	.032	-.006	.040	-.007	-.081	.060	.017	-.014	-.012
	PR_PA Victim	.022	-.006	.045	.015	-.008	.020	-.021	-.096	.066	-.007	-.012	-.054
	PR_EA Aggression	.037	-.077	.073	.027	-.068	.029	.019	-.084	.062	.015	-.090	.003
	PR_EA Victim	-.040	-.139	.020	-.041	-.122	-.011	-.055	-.155	.028	-.070	-.146	-.088

*p<0.05

**p<0.01

Legend: (Factor1: "legitimação e banalização da pequena violência"; Factor2: "legitimação da violência pela conduta da mulher"; Factor3: "legitimação pela sua atribuição a causas externas"; Factor4: "legitimação da violência pela preservação da privacidade familiar".)
(AR=actual relationship; PR=past relationship; PA=physical abuse; EA=emotional abuse).

Table 28 shows that there is no relationship between actual relation-physical abuse as an aggressor and the factors of ECVC, both for men and for women. There is a weak and not significant correlation between PR_EA victims with the factors of ECVC in the case of men.

For example, victim of physical abuse in actual relationship has a negative correlation with Factor 3 "legitimação pela sua atribuição a causas externas"

4.2. Correlations between IVC and QCRP

Table 29. Correlations between IVC and QCRP (n=175) in function of sex

		QCRP					
		Risk behavior			Protective behavior		
		Total	M	F	Total	M	F
IVC	AR_PA Aggression	-.146	-.054	-.222*	.145	.179	.046
	AR_PA Victim	-.142	-.057	-.231*	.138	.171	.049
	AR_EA Aggression	-.129	-.044	-.220*	.106	.133	.023
	AR_EA Victim	-.136	-.054	-.212	.119	.153	.026
	PR_PA Aggression	.126	.153	.053	-.092	-.127	-.030
	PR_PA Victim	.127	.178	.053	-.069	-.147	.016
	PR_EA Aggression	.169*	.129	.123	-.070	-.044	-.031
	PR_EA Victim	.181*	.185	.133	-.059	-.057	-.023

*p<0.05

**p<0.01

Legend: AR=actual relationship; PR=past relationship; PA=physical abuse; EA=emotional abuse.

Regarding to the correlation between the items of IVC and the risk and protective factors, it can be seen that this relationship is either null or very weak. For the factors of IVC, namely AR_PA aggression; AR_PA victim; AR_EA aggression, there is a weak but significative association with the risk behaviors it shows a negative but significant correlation in case of women, were the value is more close to 1.

It can be observed on the last two items factors of IVC that they correlate with a correlation of total regarding risk behavior for the total sample (see Table 29).

4.3. Correlations between ECVC and QCRP

Table 30. Correlations between ECVC and QCRP (n=175) in function of sex

		QCRP					
		Risk behavior			Protective behavior		
		Total	M	F	Total	M	F
ECVC	LBMV	.195*	.050	-.101	-.237**	-.093	-.361**
	LVCW	.078	-.100	-.083	-.276**	-.190	-.284*
	LVAEC	-.042	-.221*	-.152	-.194*	-.130	-.144
	LVPFP	.171*	.003	-.003	-.261**	-.126	-.317**

*p<0.05

**p<0.01

Legend: (Factor1: "legitimação e banalização da pequena violêcia"; Factor2: "legitimação da violência pela conduta da mulher"; Factor3: "legitimação pela sua atribuição a causas externas"; Factor4: "legitimação da violência pela perservação da privacidade familiar".) (AR=actual relationship; PR=past relationship; PA=physical abuse; EA=emotional abuse).

Concerning the Table 30, the factors of ECVC are correlated with risk and protective factors.

The correlation between the factor of ECVC, "legitimação e banalização da pequena violência" and protective behaviors, negative and significant especially for women, which means, that when legitimization of minor violence increase, the protective factors decrease. There is a negative significant correlation between the second factor of ECVC and protective behavior for the total sample and for women; again, it means that when the beliefs about conduct of women increase, the protective behaviors decrease. Third factor, "legitimação pela sua atribuição a causas externas" correlates also negatively with the risk behaviors which mean that when the beliefs about external causes of violence increase, the risk behaviors diminish. On the last factor, the correlation with the risk behaviors shows to be positive and significant for the total sample. As well, last factor has a negative but significant correlation with protective behaviors regarding to the total sample and female students.

CHAPTER FIVE - Discussion

This study aimed to characterize the experiences of violence from actual and past relationship, as well as the beliefs of the participants regarding violence in intimate relationship. It was also a goal to describe the risk and protective behaviors that students experience during the night outs in order to identify possible links with violent behavior in intimate relationship. The results obtained demonstrate that most of the participants don't engage in violence in their actual and past relationship.

The results obtained demonstrate that most of the participants don't engage very much in violence both in their actual and past relationship.

Regarding to the actual relationship, results showed that when violent situations occur, women are being more victims of physical and emotional abuse. According to Lourenço and Carvalho (2001), emotional abuse is a side effect of physical abuse. Differences were also found concerning the age of the participants, with older students being more physically and emotionally abused in their actual relationship than younger ones. This might be related to the different types of relationships, because while younger couples are more on exploratory stage; the old couples are more on constructive stage of relationship. Regarding to the co-habitation, students that live with boyfriend/girlfriend or spouse have been more victims in their actual relationships in comparison with the ones that live alone, with friends or with family of origin. This can be linked to the fact that people have more obligations to each other.

Concerning the perpetration of violence, women are more abusive than men. In their actual relationship, women are using more physical and emotional abuse against their partners. In a study conducted by Kaura and Allen (2004), females also engage in acts of violence. Results show that older students use more physically abusive in their actual relationship than younger ones. Concerning the co-habitation, as an aggressor, physical and emotional abuse predominates for students that live with the boyfriend/girlfriend or spouse. In relation to the beliefs about violence, the results showed that male students legitimize more the violence on intimate relationships than female students. They believe that violence is a normal and common thing with no gravity, and also believe that if the woman does not accomplish the needs of the partner,

or is infidel, they deserve to be abused. Other beliefs are that violence came from external causes, such as unemployment, alcohol problems, drugs, economical difficulties, and dysfunctional families. These causes seem to be excusing the aggressor. Another belief is that violence preserves the families of outside interference. Other investigations conducted by Machado, Matos and Moreira (2003, by Caridade, 2008) and Matos and Silva (2001, by Caridade, 2008) indicates as well that males were more consistent with the use of violence than females, male consider violence justifiable as a sequence of woman's behavior.

Regarding to the comparison of the means concerning the factors of ECVC in function of the co-habitation of the students, it was found that students who live with the family of origin legitimize more the violence in intimate relationship. They believe that minor violence (insults, slaps) is normal and common. Factor two, it also showed that subjects who lives with family believe that women who does not accomplish the duties face of husband deserve to be abused

When considering the results for the behaviors undertaken during nocturnal life, male students, engage in more risk behaviors than female students. Men use more tobacco in their night going outs, as well drinking alcohol until getting drunk, becoming victims of violence or beating someone, driving under the influence of alcohol; engage in unprotected sex and smoking cannabis. It also shows that male participants are sleeping in unknown place, having unprotected sex, become unreachable, mix substances, and having sex under the influence of alcohol, are involved in car accidents and have suicidal ideas. In a study conducted by Pinheiro et al. (2013) as well were found differences between men and women regarding risk behaviors. World Health Organization (2009) states that consumption of alcohol or drugs are linked with the victimization and perpetration of intimate partner violence. In our study, the correlation between IVC regarding physical aggression and QCRP it shows a negative but significant association in case of women which means when risk behaviors increase, the use of violence decrease.

Considering the protective behaviors there is a difference between men and women in what respects "condoms", with male students being those who are usually more protected in their night outs. However, women are sending SMS to someone telling where they are and are accompanied of someone sober. According with Botella (2000), high quality protection factors are the solution for the prevention of consumption of psychoactive substances.

Concerning the correlation between IVC for past and actual relationship regarding to the physical and emotional abuse and QCRP it shows either null or very weak relation between them two. The correlation between IVC regarding physical aggression and QCRP it shows a negative but significant association in case of women which means when risk behaviors increase, the use of violence decrease.

Regarding to the negative correlation of the "legitimação e banalização da pequena violência" with the protective behaviors, in case of female students, it means that when the minor violence increases, the protective factor decrease. This is also true when they endorse the beliefs that legitimize violence through women' behavior. In the case of male students, the more they legitimize violence for its attribution to external causes, the less they engage in risk behaviors.

Beliefs that legitimize violence in order to preserve family privacy are negatively associated with protection behaviors, especially in the case of female students.

Conclusion

Emerging adulthood, establishing itself as a period of great autonomy and experiences, plays a key role in the development of young people.

Although, the research in the area of intimate violence is relatively recent, current data in the national and international literature reveal worrying percentages of intimate partner violence among young adults (Matos et al., 2006). That is why prevention of IPV becomes an increasingly pressing phenomenon.

The study we conducted involved a total of 175 college students. The obtained data showed lower levels of violence in close relationships among university students.

When we address the results that respect to beliefs about IPV, we see that they reinforce what had been shown by other preceding investigations, namely greater legitimization of violence by males and the high prevalence of violence in the relationship between intimate partners. However, in our study, male participants revealed to see themselves as victims in their actual relationship, more than female students.

The night life is one of the sources that affect individual and collective behavior of its participants. Recreative leisure brings positive and negative processes. The negative side of night life carries a vast number of risk behaviors, which can influence individual and collective security such as health problems and violence. This study shows that individuals enter in situations of risk, concerning their security, displaying behaviors like heavy drinking, using of drugs, having unprotected sex and, as consequence, being victims of violence.

To reduce the dark side of night life, students employ in some protective behaviors, such as telling to someone where they are, walking with identity card and going home accompanied with someone trustworthy. As result, protective behaviors reduce the possibility of being a victim of any sort of violence.

Regarding to the phenomenon of intimate partner violence, we should look from different angles, addressing not only issues related to the victim but also with the aggressor and in this sense, the objective cannot be to only cover the victims and punish the perpetrators; it would be appropriate

to promote the social re-education and rehabilitation in an attempt to modify or change behaviors and attitudes that legitimize and trivialize domestic violence. Machado and Gonçalves (2003) argue that it is relevant that societies condemn domestic violence, involving a set of recovery measures and prevention. Taking into account the developmental changes that occur in emerging adulthood, this could be a good moment to work with college students in order to defy their beliefs about intimate partner violence and help them relate in a healthy manner in their intimate relationships.

This study has contributed to a better understanding of intimate partner violence among university students and the beliefs and behaviors of students toward this phenomenon. We could also see how university students engage in risk behaviors during night outs, and as well, how they use the protective behaviors. The data highlights the importance of investing in the prevention of intimate partner violence among young people and in the promotion of more healthy behaviors concerning nightlife. It also is important to establish new paradigms of public health toward the passage from adolescence to adult life.

During the realization of this study some limitations have been encountered, which justify conducting further investigations. One limitation relates to the number of subjects in the sample. With a wider sample, more behaviors could have emerged. Also, the fact of having the researcher collecting data in small groups could raise the possibility of having less sincere responses, once the questionnaire was too personal.

In future research, it would be interesting to look for relations between intimate partner violence and some of the same risk behaviors but undertaken during the day, like drinking alcohol and smoking drugs.

Bibliographical References

- Abraão, I. (1999). Factores de risco e factores protectores para as toxicodependências – uma breve revisão. *Toxicodependências*, 2(5). 2, 3-11.
- Achirica, A., Arnedillo, G., Arnedillo, J., Pardo, L. (2002), “*La Prevencion De Las Drogodependencias en El Tiempo De Ocio*”. Madrid: JUMA.
- Amaro, H., & Raj, A. (2000). Theoretical and measurement issues in the study of women’s relational power in HIV risk reduction. *Sex Roles*, 42, 723–749.
- Ameida, L. S. (2007). Transição, adaptação acadêmica e êxito escolar no ensino superior. *Revista Galego-Portuguesa de Psicología e Educación*, 14(2), 203-215.
- Arias, D.F., & Hernandez, A.M. (2007). Emerging adulthood in Mexican and Spanish youth: Theories and Realities. *Journal of Adolescent Research*. 22, 476-503.
- Arnett, J. J. (1998). Learning to stand alone: The contemporary American transition to adulthood in cultural and historical context. *Human Development*, 41, 295-315.
- Arnett, J.J. (2000). Emerging adulthood: A Theory of Development From the Late Teens Through the Twenties. *American Psychologist*, 55 (5), 469-480.
- Arnett, J. J. (2004). *Emerging adulthood: The winding road from the late teens through the twenties*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Arnett, J. J. (2006). Emerging adulthood in Europe: a response to Bynner. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 9 (1), 111-123.
- Bayram, N. & Bilgel, N. (2008). The prevalence and socio-demographic correlations of depression, anxiety and stress among a group of university students. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 43 (8), 667-672.
- Bowman, N. A. (2010). The development of psychological well-being among first-year college students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 51, 180–200.

- Botella, J. N. (2000). *“Factores de riesgo y protección de carácter social relacionados con el consumo de drogas”*. Madrid, España: Ayuntamiento de Madrid. Área de servicios sociales. Plan municipal contra las drogas.
- Buhl, H. M., & Lanz, M. (2007). Emerging Adulthood in Europe Common Traits and Variability Across Five European Countries. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 22(5), 439-443.
- Breiding, M.J., Black, M.C., & Ryan, G.W. (2008). Chronic disease and health risk behaviors associated with intimate partner violence. *Annals of Epidemiology*, 18, 538–544.
- Bryant, S. A., & Spencer, G. A. (2003). University students' attitudes about attributing blame in domestic violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, 18(6), 369-376.
- Callahan, M. R., Tolman, R. M., & Saunders, D. G. (2003). Adolescent dating violence victimization and psychological well-being. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 18, 664-681.
- Caridade, S. (2008). *Violência nas relações de intimidade: Comportamentos e atitudes dos jovens*. Universidade do Minho: Braga.
- Caridade, S., & Machado, C. (2006). Violência na intimidade juvenil: da intimidação à perpetração. *Análise Psicológica*, 4 (XXIV), 485-493.
- Caspi, A. (2002). *Social selection, social causation and developmental pathways: Empirical strategies for better understanding how individuals and environments are linked across the life course*. In L. Pulkkinen & A. Caspi (Eds.), *Paths to successful development: Personality in the life course* (pp. 281 – 301). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Chase, K.A., Treboux, D. & O'Leary, K.D. (2002). Characteristics of High-Risk Adolescents' Dating Violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 17(1), 33-49.
- Chickering, A. (1969). *Education and Identity*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Chickering, A. & Reisser, L. (1993). *Education and identity*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Coker, A.L., Smith, P.H., McKeown, R.E., King, M.J. (2000). Frequency and correlates of intimate partner violence by type: physical, sexual, and psychological battering. *Am J Public Health* 90(4), 553-9.
- Coker, A.L., Davis, K.E., Arias, I., Desai, S., Sanderson, M., Brandt, H.M. & Smith, P.H. (2002). Physical and mental health effects of intimate partner violence for men and women. *Am J Prev Med* 23(4), 260-8.
- Coker, A. L. (2007). Does physical intimate partner violence affect sexual health? A systematic review. *Trauma Violence Abuse* 8(2), 149-77.
- Costa, L. & Oliveira, M. (2010). Vivências e satisfação acadêmica em alunos do ensino superior. In S. Gonçalves, D. Soeiro & S. Silva (Eds.), *Cadernos de Pedagogia no Ensino Superior*, 13, 13-32.
- Diniz, A. (2001). *Crenças, escolha de carreira e integração universitária*. Dissertação de Doutorado em Psicologia da Educação, apresentada à Universidade do Minho. Braga: Universidade do Minho.
- Doerner, W. & Lab, S.P. (2012). *Victimology*. Routledge.
- DuPont, R. L. (2005), “*Cérebro, álcool e drogas. O cérebro egoísta: Aprender com dependência*” (A. André, Trad.). Lisboa: Instituto Piaget.
- DuRant R., Champion H., Wolfson M., Morrow O., McCoy T., D’Agostino R.B., Wagoner K. & Mitra A. (2007). Date fighting experiences among college students: Are they associated with other health-risk behaviors? *Journal of American College Health* 55, 291–296.
- Eccles, J., Templeton, J., Barber, B. & Stone, M. (2003). *Adolescence and emerging adulthood: The critical passageways to adulthood*. In: M. H., Bornstein, L. Davidson, C. L. Keyes, K. A. More, the Centre for Child Wellbeing (Eds.), *Well-being: Positive development across the life course*. Cross-currents in contemporary psychology (383-406). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- Engel, B. (2002). *The emotionally abusive relationship: How to stop being abused and how to stop abusing*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.
- Evans, N. J., Forney, D. S., Guido, F. M., Patton, L. D., & Renn, K. A. (2010). *Student development in college: Theory, practice, and research* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Fadjukoff, P., Kokko, K., & Pulkkinen, L. (2007). Implications of timing of entering adulthood for identity achievement. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 22*, 504–530.
- Feiring, C., Deblinger, E., Hoch-Espada, A., & Haworth, T. (2002). Romantic relationship aggression and attitudes in high school students: The role of gender, grade, and attachment and emotional styles. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 31*(5), 373-385.
- Ferreira, J. A. & Ferreira, A. G. (2001). Desenvolvimento psicológico e social do jovem adulto e implicações pedagógicas no âmbito do ensino superior. *Revista Portuguesa de Pedagogia, 119-159*.
- Fisher, B. S., Cullen, F. T., & Turner, M. G. (2000). *The sexual victimization of college women* (NCJ No. 182369): U.S. Department of Justice.
- Fleming, C. B., White, H. R., & Catalano, R. F. (2010). Romantic relationships and substance use in early adulthood: An examination of the influences of relationship type, partner substance use, and relationship quality. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 51*(2), 153-167.
- Follingstad D.R., Coyne S., Gambone L. (2005). A representative measure of psychological aggression and its severity. *Violence and Victims, 20*, 25–38.
- Fossos N., Neighbors C., Kaysen D. & Hove M.C. (2007). Intimate partner violence perpetration and problem drinking among college students: The roles of expectancies and subjective evaluations of alcohol aggression. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs, 68*, 706–713.

- Glass N., Fredland N., Campbell J., Yonas M., Sharps P. & Kub J. (2003). Adolescent dating violence: prevalence, risk factors, health outcomes, and implications for clinical practice. *Journal of Obstetric, Gynecological, and Neonatal Nursing*, 32(2), 227–238.
- Gonçalves, I. (2012). *Transição do ensino secundário para o ensino superior -Núcleo de Apoio Psicológico*, IST. Accessed on <http://www.fc.ul.pt/a20> of November 2015.
- Hawkins, J., e Catalano, R. (1989), “Risk and protective factors for alcohol and other drug problems: Implications for substance abuse prevention”. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112, 64-105.
- Jewkes R., Sen P. & Garcia-Moreno C. (2002). *Sexual violence*. In: Krug EG et al., eds. World report on violence and health, pp. 149–181. Geneva, World Health Organization.
- Kaura, S.A. & Allen, C.M. (2004). Dissatisfaction with relationship power and dating violence perpetration by men and women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 19(5), 576-88.
- Kloep, M., Hendry, L., Taylor, R. & Stuart-Hamilton, I. (2015). *Development from Adolescence to Early Adulthood*. Psychology Press.
- Kohn, P. M., & Veres, E. (2001). *Fewer hassles mediate the auspicious effects of adaptive coping on student adjustment*. Unpublished manuscript, York University.
- Labouvie, E., & Bates, M. E. (2002). Reasons for alcohol use in young adulthood: Validation of a three dimensional measure. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 63, 45- 155.
- Leary, K.A. & DeRosier, M.E. (2012). Factors Promoting Positive Adaptation and Resilience during the Transition to College. *Psychology*, 3(12A), 1215-1222.
- Lobo, Maria Manuel de Campos (2008), “*Padrões de consumo em estudantes da universidade de Coimbra: Fatores associados ao uso e abuso de substâncias psicoativas*”. Dissertação do mestrado, Universidade de Coimbra.
- Lourenço, N., & Carvalho, M. (2001). Violência doméstica: coveito e âmbito. Tipos e espaços de violência. *Themis*. 3, 95-121.

- Lukyanenko, O. (2014), "*Razões e padrões do consumo das substâncias psicoativas entre os jovens estudantes da Universidade de Coimbra*". Dissertação do mestrado, Universidade de Coimbra.
- Lundeberg K., Stith S.M., Penn C.E. & Ward D.B. (2004). A comparison of nonviolent, psychologically violent, and physically violent male college daters. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 19, 1191–1200.
- Macek, P., Bejcek, J., & Vanickova, J. (2007). Contemporary Czech emerging adults: Generation growing up in the period of social changes. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 22, 444-175.
- Machado, C., Matos, M., & Moreira (2003). Violência nas relações amorosas: Comportamentos e atitudes na população universitária. *Psychologica*, 33, 69-83.
- Machado, C., Matos, M., Gonçalves, M. (2006). *Manual da Escala de Crenças sobre Violência Conjugal (ECVC) e do Inventário de Violência Conjugal (IVC)*. Braga: Psiquilibrios.
- Machado, L. M. (2010). "*Crenças e Representações Sociais dos Adolescentes sobre a Violência Interpessoal*." (Dissertação de Mestrado em Psicologia da Saúde e Intervenção Comunitária). Universidade Fernando Pessoa do Porto. Escola de Estudos Pós-Graduados e de Investigação.
- Machado, C., Caridade, S., & Martins, C. (2010). Violence in juvenile dating relationships self-reported prevalence and attitudes in a portuguese sample. *Journal of Family Violence*, 25, 43-52.
- Matheny, K. B., Curlette, W. L., Aysan, F., Herrington, A., Gfroerer, C. A., Thompson, D., et al. (2002). "Coping resources, perceived stress and life satisfaction among Turkish and American university students." *International Journal of Stress Management* 9, 81-97.
- Matos, M., Negreiros, J., Simões, C. & Gaspar, T. (2009). *Violência, Bullying e Delinquência*. Lisboa: Coisas de Ler.

- Meyer, J.P., Springer, S.A., Altice, F.L. (2011). Substance abuse, violence, and HIV in women: a literature review of the syndemic. *J Womens Health* 20(7), 991-1006.
- Moore, T.M., Stuart, G.L., Meehan, J.C., Rhatigan, D., Hellmuth, J.C. & Keen, S.M. (2008). Drug abuse and aggression between intimate partners: A meta-analytic review. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 28, 247– 274.
- Mouzos, J. & Makkai, T. (2004). Women's Experiences of Male Violence. Findings from the Australian Component of the International Violence Against Women Survey (IVAWS). *Australian Institute of Criminology*, 56.
- Nabors, E.L. (2003). *"Relationship Violence Among College Students: The Predictive Power of Sociodemographic Characteristics and Domestic Violence Beliefs."* A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in the Department of Sociology in the College of Arts and Sciences at the University of Central Florida, Orlando, Florida.
- Norris, S. M., Huss, M. T., & Palarea, R. E. (2011). A pattern of violence: Analyzing the relationship between intimate partner violence and stalking. *Violence and Victims*, 26(1), 103-114.
- O'Keefe, M. (2005). Teen Dating Violence: A Review of Risk Factors and Prevention Efforts. *National Online Resource Center on Violence Against Women*.
- Oliveira, M.S., & Sani, A. I. (2005). *"Comportamentos dos jovens universitários face à violência nas relações amorosas"*, Trabalho apresentado em Oliveira, M. S. & Sani, A. I. (2005). Comportamentos dos jovens universitários face à violência nas relações amorosas. In B. D. Silva & L. S. Almeida (Coords.), In Actas do VIII Congresso Galaico-Português de Psicopedagogia. Braga: Centro de Investigação em Educação, Braga.
- Oliveira, M. (2009). *Violência Intergeracional: da Violência na família à violência no namoro*. (Dissertação de Mestrado).

- Overstreet, N.M., Willie, T.C., Hellmuth, J., & Sullivan, T.P. (2015). Psychological intimate partner violence and HIV risk behavior: Examining the role of distinct PTSD symptoms in the partner violence-HIV risk link. *Women's Health Issues, 25*, 73-78.
- Paiva, C., & Figueiredo, B. (2003). Abuso no contexto do relacionamento íntimo com o companheiro: Definição, prevalência, causas e efeitos. *Psicologia, Saúde & Doenças, 4*(2), 165-184.
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students: A third decade of research* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Paul, E.L., & Brier, S. (2001). Friendsickness in the transition to college: College Predictors and college adjustment correlates. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 79*, 77-89.
- Pereira, A.M.S., Decq Motta, E., Vaz, A., Pinto, C., Bernardino, O., Melo, A., ...& Lopes, P. (2006). Sucesso e desenvolvimento psicológico do estudante universitário: estratégias de intervenção. *Análise Psicológica, 1* (XXIV), 51-59.
- Perkins, H.W. (2002). Surveying the Damage: A Review of Research on Consequences of Alcohol Misuse in College Populations. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol/Supplement, 14*.
- Pinheiro, M.R. (2003). *Uma época especial : suporte social e vivências académicas na transição e adaptação ao ensino superior*. Tese de doutoramento em Ciências da Educação (Psicologia da Educação) apresentada à Faculdade de Psicologia e Ciências da Educação de Coimbra.
- Pinheiro, M. R., Carvalho, C., Simões, A. F., Ferreira, J., Santos, R., Simões, H. (2013). *Álcool, tabaco, amigos consumidores e saídas noturnas no cotidiano dos estudantes universitários portugueses: estaremos face a um estilo de vida?*
- Ribeiro, S. (2001). *Distúrbio Pós Stress Traumático e violência conjugal*. Dissertação de Mestrado não publicada. Instituto Superior Miguel Torga, Coimbra.
- Ribeiro, A. (2007). *Bullying em contexto escolar: Estudo de caso*. Universidade Portucalense. (Dissertação de Mestrado).

- Ribeiro, J. L.P. (2007). *Introdução à Psicologia da Saúde* (2.^a ed.). Coimbra: Quarteto Editora.
- Riedel, M. & Welsh, W. (2002). *Criminal Violence. Patterns, Causes, and Prevention*. Los Angeles: Roxbury.
- Roudsari, B.S, Leahy, M.M. & Walters, S.T. (2009). Correlates of dating violence among male and female heavy-drinking college students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 24, 1892–2905.
- Saavedra, R.M.M. (2010). Prevenir antes de remediar: Prevenção da violência nos relacionamentos íntimos juvenis. Tese de Doutorado em Psicologia Especialidade de Psicologia da Justiça.
- Sani, M. N. (2010). Drug addiction among undergraduate students of private universities in Bangladesh. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 5, 498–501.
- Santos, L. (2000). *Vivências acadêmicas e rendimento escolar: estudo com alunos universitários do 1º ano*. Dissertação de Mestrado não publicada. Universidade do Minho, Braga.
- Seco, G., Casimiro, M., Pereira, M. I., Dias, M. I., & Custódio, S. (2005). *Para uma abordagem psicológica da transição do ensino secundário para o Ensino Superior: pontes e alçapões*. Leiria: Instituto Politécnico de Leiria.
- Semple, R. J. (2001). Psychological Abuse In Intimate Relationships: A New Zealand Perspective. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, 30 (2).
- Sharma, B. (2012). Adjustment and emotional maturity among first year college students. *Pakistan Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 9, 32–37.
- Sharps, P.W. & Campbell, J. (1999). *Health consequences for victims of violence in intimate relationships*. In X. B. Arriaga & S. Oskamp (Eds.), *Violence in intimate relationships* (pp. 163-180). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Shook, N. J., Gerrity, D. A., Jurich, J., & Segrist, A. E. (2000). Courtship violence among college students: A comparison of verbally and physically abusive couples. *Journal of Family Violence, 15*(1), 1-22.
- Schenker, M., Minayo, M.C.S.(2005). Fatores de risco e de proteção para o uso de drogas na adolescência. *Ciênc Saúde Col 10*(3), 707-17.
- Silva, S. (2003). *Adaptação Acadêmica, Pessoal e Social do Jovem Adulto ao Ensino Superior. Contributos do Ambiente Familiar e do Autoconceito*. Dissertação de Mestrado, Universidade de Coimbra.
- Silva, A. (2008). *A Construção de Carreira no Ensino Superior* (Dissertação de Doutoramento, Universidade do Minho).
- Stalans, L. J., & Ritchie, J. (2008). Relationship of substance use/abuse with psychological and physical intimate partner violence: Variations across living situations. *Journal of Family Violence, 29*, 9-24.
- Stevens, S., Korchmaros, J. D., & Miller, D. (2010). A comparison of victimization and perpetration of intimate partner violence among drug abusing heterosexual partner violence among drug abusin heterosexual and lesbian women. *Journal of Family Violence, 25*, 639-649.
- Stockman, J.K., Lucea, M.B. & Campbell, J.C. (2013). Forced sexual initiation, sexual intimate partner violence and HIV risk in women: a global review of the literature. *AIDS Behav 17*(3), 832-47.
- Sullivan, T.P., McPartland, T., Armeli, S., Jaquier, V. & Tennen, H. (2012). IS IT THE EXCEPTION OR THE RULE? DAILY CO-OCCURRENCE OF PHYSICAL, SEXUAL, AND PSYCHOLOGICAL PARTNER VIOLENCE IN A 90-DAY STUDY OF SUBSTANCE-USING, COMMUNITY WOMEN. *Psychol Violence 1, 2*(2).
- Teixeira, M., Castro, G. & Piccolo, P. (2007). Adaptação à Universidade em Estudantes Universitários: Um Estudo Correlacional. *Interação em Psicologia, 11*(2), 211-220.

- Tjaden, P. & Thoennes, N. (2000). Prevalence and Consequences of Male-to-female and Female-to-male Intimate Partner Violence as Measured by the National Violence Against Women Survey. *Violence Against Women*, 6(2), 142-161.
- Thompson, R.S., Bonomi, A.E., Anderson, M., Reid, R.J., Dimer, J.A., Carrell, D. & Rivara, F.P. (2006) Intimate Partner Violence: Prevalence, Types, and Chronicity in Adult Women. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 30, 447-57.
- Tolman, R.M..(1989). The development of a measure of psychological maltreatment of women by their male partners. *Violence and Victims* 4(3), 159-177.
- Verger, P., Combes, J., Kovess-Masfety, V., Choquet, M., Guagliardo, V., Rouillon, F. & Peretti-Wattel, P. (2009). Psychological distress in first year university students: socioeconomic and academic stressors, mastery and social support in young men and women. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 44, 643-650.
- Wells, J.E., Baxter, J., Schaaf, D. (2007). Substance Use Disorders in Te Rau Hinengaro: *The New Zealand Mental Health Survey*. Wellington: Alcohol Advisory Council of New Zealand.
- Wells, S., Flynn, A., Graham, K., et al. (2011). Using a mobile laboratory to study mental health, addictions, and violence: A research plan. *Challenges* 2(1):1-18.
- World Health Organization. (2002). *Prevention and promotion in mental health*.
- World Health Organization. (2006). *Intimate partner violence and alcohol*.
- World Health Organization. (2008). *Primary health care. Now more than ever*.
- World Health Organization. (2009). *Interpersonal violence and illicit drugs*.
- http://www.who.int/violenceprevention/interpersonal_violence_and_illicit_drug_use.pdf
12/10/2015
- World Health Organization. (2012). *Intimate partner violence*.

Annex I



COMPORTAMENTOS DE RISCO E DE VIOLÊNCIA NO NAMORO
EM ESTUDANTES UNIVERSITÁRIOS
(Mestrado em Temas de Psicologia do Desenvolvimento)

Pretende-se realizar uma investigação sobre o comportamento dos estudantes universitários no âmbito dos comportamentos de risco e proteção nas suas relações amorosas. Deste modo, a sua colaboração é muito importante para que este projeto se concretize. Será apenas necessário que responda, com SINCERIDADE, ao questionário que se segue. Este questionário é anónimo e estritamente confidencial e as respostas nunca serão tratadas individualmente. Muito obrigada pela sua colaboração!

QUESTIONÁRIO SOCIO-DEMOGRÁFICO

1. Sexo: Masculino(male) Feminino(female) 2. Idade_____
3. Estado civil: Solteiro/a Casado/a Divorciado/a União de Facto
4. Estudante: Universidade Politécnico
5. Tipo de estudante: Estudante Nacional Estudante Internacional
 Estudante de mobilidade (ex. Erasmus, Erasmus Mundus)
6. Curso que frequenta_____ 7. Ano do curso_____
8. Estatuto: Estudante regular Estudante trabalhador Estudante atleta
 Estudante dirigente associativo/membro órgãos da UC
 Estudante integrado em atividades culturais
 Estudante com participação em atividades de reconhecido mérito universitário

9. Financiamento dos estudos: Pessoal Bolsa: Entidade que financia _____

10. Com quem vive no tempo das aulas? Sozinho(a) Com amigos Com a família de origem

Com o namorado(a) Com o cônjuge Outro _____

Vida amorosa:

11. Quantas relações amorosas já teve que tenham durado mais de 3 meses? _____

12. Caso tenha no presente uma relação amorosa, responda as seguintes questões:

a. Duração do relacionamento: _____ anos _____ meses

b. Idade do(a) companheiro(a): _____

c. Sexo do(a) Companheiro(a): M(male) F(female)

d. Situação Académica do(a) Companheiro(a): Sim Não

e. Se respondeu *Não* na pergunta anterior, indique situação profissional do namorado/cônjuge:

Abandono escolar Desempregado Trabalhador por conta própria Trabalhador por conta de outrem

13. Habilitações literárias do(a) companheiro(a):

1° ciclo de ensino básico (1° - 4° ano)

2° ciclo do ensino básico (5° - 6° ano)

3° ciclo de ensino básico (7° - 9° ano)

Ensino secundário

Ensino superior: Bacharelato

Licenciatura

Mestrado

Doutoramento

14. Já alguma vez se envolveu em alguma situação de violência quando estava sob o efeito de álcool?

(Por favor, selecione a/s opções que se aplicarem ao seu caso.)

a. Sim como provocador

b. Sim como vítima

c. Não

15. Já se envolveu em alguma situação de violência quando estava sob o efeito de drogas? (Por favor,

selecione a/s opção/ões que se aplicar/em ao seu caso.)

a. Sim como provocador de violência: física verbal psicológica sexual

b. Sim como vítima de violência: física verbal psicológica sexual

c. Não

16. Por vezes os relacionamentos amorosos provocam determinados problemas pessoais, relacionais, sociais, saúde, entre outros.

Quais dos seguintes problemas já viveu na sua vida em consequência de uma relação amorosa?

Selecione as opções que se aplicarem ao seu caso.

<input type="checkbox"/> Problemas de sono	<input type="checkbox"/> Ansiedade
<input type="checkbox"/> Isolamento	<input type="checkbox"/> Depressão
<input type="checkbox"/> Comportamentos sexuais de risco/desprotegidos	<input type="checkbox"/> Violência
<input type="checkbox"/> Problemas de consumo de álcool	<input type="checkbox"/> Stresse
<input type="checkbox"/> Consumo de outras drogas	<input type="checkbox"/> Perturbações Alimentares
<input type="checkbox"/> Problemas Familiares	<input type="checkbox"/> Perda de Autonomia
<input type="checkbox"/> Problemas com os amigos	<input type="checkbox"/> Perda de Liberdade
<input type="checkbox"/> Problemas de imagem pública	<input type="checkbox"/> Problemas de autoconfiança
<input type="checkbox"/> Problemas de Saúde Física	<input type="checkbox"/> Problemas de desconfiança no outro
<input type="checkbox"/> Problemas de Saúde e Bem-Estar Psicológico	<input type="checkbox"/> Aumento da dependência do outro
<input type="checkbox"/> Problemas de Saúde Sexual	<input type="checkbox"/> Trair o companheiro/a
<input type="checkbox"/> Gravidez	<input type="checkbox"/> Ser traído/a pelo companheira/o
<input type="checkbox"/> Interrupção voluntária da gravidez	<input type="checkbox"/> Outro/s problemas: _____

<input type="checkbox"/> Problemas Económicos	
<input type="checkbox"/> Problemas sociais	<hr/> <hr/>

17. Já alguma vez se sentiu vítima de alguma forma de violência numa relação amorosa?

Sim Não

18. Já alguma vez se sentiu provocador de alguma forma de violência numa relação amorosa?

Sim Não

19. Acha que poderá vir a ser vítima de violência numa relação de namoro? Sim Não Por favor comente a sua resposta.

20. Acha que poderá vir a ser agressor numa relação de namoro? Sim Não

Por favor comente a sua resposta.

INSTRUÇÕES:

Vai encontrar de seguida um conjunto de afirmações em relação à situação de maus tratos e conflito dentro do casamento (ou relações maritais). Pede-se que **leia atentamente** essas frases e exprima a sua opinião em relação a cada uma delas. Não existem respostas certas ou erradas. A **sua opinião** é mais importante. Por favor, tente responder de acordo com a sua forma de pensar e sentir e **não como acha que deveria ser.**

Por favor, leia atentamente cada afirmação e responda:

1- **Discordo Totalmente** 2- **Discordo** 3- **Não concordo, nem discordo** 4- **Concordo** 5- **Concordo Totalmente**

	Discordo Totalmente	Discordo	Não concordo, nem discordo	Concordo	Concordo totalmente
	1	2	3	4	5
1. O problema dos maus tratos dentro do casamento afeta uma pequena percentagem da população.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Os maus tratos ocorrem apenas em famílias de baixo nível educacional e económico.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Os maus tratos só ocorrem quando há outros problemas dentro da família (p. ex. desemprego, consumo de drogas, problemas de dinheiro).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. O mais importante para as crianças é que a família permaneça unida, mesmo quando há violência no casal.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. É a ideia de as mulheres quererem ter tantos direitos como os homens que causa problemas entre o casal.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. A causa da violência é o abuso de álcool.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. A preocupação com a situação das mulheres que são maltratadas no casamento só serve para separar as famílias.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Os homens batem nas mulheres apenas quando "estão de cabeça perdida", por algum problema nas	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

suas vidas ou por alguma coisa que elas fizeram.					
9. Se as mulheres se portarem como boas esposas não serão maltratadas.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10. Os homens passam a agredir as mulheres porque se envolvem em relações extra-conjugais.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
11. Um(a) parceiro(a) infiel merece ser maltratado(a).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
12. Se o meu (minha) parceiro(a) me insulta, tenho razões para o(a) agredir.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
13. Algumas mulheres merecem que lhes batam.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
14. Um homem tem o direito de castigar a mulher se ela faltar ao cumprimento dos seus deveres conjugais.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
15. Em casos de violência conjugal, a polícia deve apenas tentar acalmar os ânimos e reconciliar o casal.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
16. Dar uma bofetada à(o) parceira(o) quando se está aborrecido ou irritado é normal; é uma coisa sem gravidade.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
17. A violência conjugal é um assunto privado. Deve ser resolvido em casa.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
18. Os insultos são normais entre um casal.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
19. Uma mulher deve retirar a queixa de maus tratos contra o marido sempre que este lhe peça desculpa pelo que fez.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
20. Se as pessoas permanecem numa relação violenta, é porque merecem a situação em que vivem.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
21. Entre marido e mulher ninguém deve “meter a colher”.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
22. Uma bofetada não magoa ninguém.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
23. Algumas mulheres fazem os homens “perder a cabeça” e, por isso, é natural que eles lhes batam.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
24. Maridos e mulheres sempre se bateram. É natural e não tem nada de mal.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
25. É mais aceitável um homem bater na mulher do que o contrário.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

INSTRUÇÕES:

Vai encontrar de seguida um conjunto de afirmações em relação a comportamentos que podem ocorrer entre os membros de um casal (ou de uma relação amorosa). Pede-se que leia atentamente essas frases e responda em relação a cada uma delas de acordo com a sua situação. Não existem respostas certas ou erradas. Por favor, tente responder de acordo com a sua experiência e não como pensa que deveria ser. Assegure-se de que respondeu a todas as questões, devendo optar apenas por uma das hipóteses apresentadas em cada uma das alíneas (a e b). As respostas a este inquérito são absolutamente anónimas. Obrigado pela sua colaboração!

A. EM RELAÇÃO A CADA UM DOS COMPORTAMENTOS ABAIXO INDICADOS, POR FAVOR INDIQUE OS QUE JÁ USOU COM O SEU PARCEIRO(A) ATUAL E OS QUE O SEU PARCEIRO(A) JÁ USOU CONSIGO, REPORTANDO-SE AO ÚLTIMO ANO. NO CASO DE COMPORTAMENTOS QUE JÁ TENHAM OCORRIDO, INDIQUE SE TAL ACONTECEU APENAS UMA VEZ OU MAIS DO QUE UMA VEZ.

Caso não esteja atualmente numa relação amorosa, por favor prossiga para a parte B (pag. 3) deste questionário.

1. Puxar os cabelos com força		
a) Nunca fiz na minha relação atual	Já fiz ao meu parceiro(a) atual uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz ao meu parceiro(a) atual mais do
b) O meu parceiro(a) atual nunca me fez <input type="checkbox"/>	O meu parceiro(a) atual já me fez uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	O meu parceiro(a) atual já me fez mais do que uma vez <input type="checkbox"/>
2. Insultar, difamar ou fazer afirmações graves para humilhar ou "ferir"		
a) Nunca fiz na minha relação atual	Já fiz ao meu parceiro(a) atual uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz ao meu parceiro(a) atual mais do
b) O meu parceiro(a) atual nunca me fez <input type="checkbox"/>	O meu parceiro(a) atual já me fez uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	O meu parceiro(a) atual já me fez mais do que uma vez <input type="checkbox"/>
3. Dar uma bofetada		
a) Nunca fiz na minha relação atual	Já fiz ao meu parceiro(a) atual uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz ao meu parceiro(a) atual mais do
b) O meu parceiro(a) atual nunca me fez <input type="checkbox"/>	O meu parceiro(a) atual já me fez uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	O meu parceiro(a) atual já me fez mais do que uma vez <input type="checkbox"/>
4. Apertar o pescoço		
a) Nunca fiz na minha relação atual	Já fiz ao meu parceiro(a) atual uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz ao meu parceiro(a) atual mais do
b) O meu parceiro(a) atual nunca me fez <input type="checkbox"/>	O meu parceiro(a) atual já me fez uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	O meu parceiro(a) atual já me fez mais do que uma vez <input type="checkbox"/>
5. Ameaçar com armas (p. ex. faca, pistola, objetos cortantes) ou usando de força física		
a) Nunca fiz na minha relação atual	Já fiz ao meu parceiro(a) atual uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz ao meu parceiro(a) atual mais do
b) O meu parceiro(a) atual nunca me fez <input type="checkbox"/>	O meu parceiro(a) atual já me fez uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	O meu parceiro(a) atual já me fez mais do que uma vez <input type="checkbox"/>

6. Partir ou danificar coisas intencionalmente (p. ex., móveis, objetos pessoais) ou deitar a comida para o		
a) Nunca fiz na minha relação atual	Já fiz ao meu parceiro(a) atual uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz ao meu parceiro(a) atual mais do
b) O meu parceiro(a) atual nunca me fez <input type="checkbox"/>	O meu parceiro(a) atual já me fez uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	O meu parceiro(a) atual já me fez mais do que uma vez <input type="checkbox"/>
7. Acordar a meio da noite, para causar medo		
a) Nunca fiz na minha relação atual	Já fiz ao meu parceiro(a) atual uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz ao meu parceiro(a) atual mais do
b) O meu parceiro(a) atual nunca me fez <input type="checkbox"/>	O meu parceiro(a) atual já me fez uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	O meu parceiro(a) atual já me fez mais do que uma vez <input type="checkbox"/>
8. Dar um murro		
a) Nunca fiz na minha relação atual	Já fiz ao meu parceiro(a) atual uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz ao meu parceiro(a) atual mais do
b) O meu parceiro(a) atual nunca me fez <input type="checkbox"/>	O meu parceiro(a) atual já me fez uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	O meu parceiro(a) atual já me fez mais do que uma vez <input type="checkbox"/>
9. Impedir o contacto com outras pessoas (p. ex., desviar correspondência, tirar as chaves, obrigar a pessoa a deixar de trabalhar/estudar,		
a) Nunca fiz na minha relação atual <input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz ao meu parceiro(a) atual uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz ao meu parceiro(a) atual mais do que uma vez <input type="checkbox"/>
b) O meu parceiro(a) atual nunca me fez <input type="checkbox"/>	O meu parceiro(a) atual já me fez uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	O meu parceiro(a) atual já me fez mais do que uma vez <input type="checkbox"/>
10. Atirar com objetos à outra pessoa		
a) Nunca fiz na minha relação atual	Já fiz ao meu parceiro(a) atual uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz ao meu parceiro(a) atual mais do
b) O meu parceiro(a) atual nunca me fez <input type="checkbox"/>	O meu parceiro(a) atual já me fez uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	O meu parceiro(a) atual já me fez mais do que uma vez <input type="checkbox"/>
11. Dar uma sova		
a) Nunca fiz na minha relação atual	Já fiz ao meu parceiro(a) atual uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz ao meu parceiro(a) atual mais do
b) O meu parceiro(a) atual nunca me fez <input type="checkbox"/>	O meu parceiro(a) atual já me fez uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	O meu parceiro(a) atual já me fez mais do que uma vez <input type="checkbox"/>
12. Dar pontapés ou cabeçadas		
a) Nunca fiz na minha relação atual	Já fiz ao meu parceiro(a) atual uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz ao meu parceiro(a) atual mais do
b) O meu parceiro(a) atual nunca me fez <input type="checkbox"/>	O meu parceiro(a) atual já me fez uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	O meu parceiro(a) atual já me fez mais do que uma vez <input type="checkbox"/>
13. Dar empurrões violentos		
a) Nunca fiz na minha relação atual	Já fiz ao meu parceiro(a) atual uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz ao meu parceiro(a) atual mais do
b) O meu parceiro(a) atual nunca me fez <input type="checkbox"/>	O meu parceiro(a) atual já me fez uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	O meu parceiro(a) atual já me fez mais do que uma vez <input type="checkbox"/>
14. Perseguir na rua, no emprego ou no local de estudo, para causar medo		
a) Nunca fiz na minha relação atual	Já fiz ao meu parceiro(a) atual uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz ao meu parceiro(a) atual mais do
b) O meu parceiro(a) atual nunca me fez <input type="checkbox"/>	O meu parceiro(a) atual já me fez uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	O meu parceiro(a) atual já me fez mais do que uma vez <input type="checkbox"/>
15. Bater com a cabeça contra a parede ou contra o chão		
a) Nunca fiz na minha relação atual	Já fiz ao meu parceiro(a) atual uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz ao meu parceiro(a) atual mais do
b) O meu parceiro(a) atual nunca me fez <input type="checkbox"/>	O meu parceiro(a) atual já me fez uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	O meu parceiro(a) atual já me fez mais do que uma vez <input type="checkbox"/>

16. Causar ferimentos que não precisaram de assistência médica (especificar p.f.		
a) Nunca fiz na minha relação atual	Já fiz ao meu parceiro(a) atual uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz ao meu parceiro(a) atual mais do que
b) O meu parceiro(a) atual nunca me fez <input type="checkbox"/>	O meu parceiro(a) atual já me fez uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	O meu parceiro(a) atual já me fez mais do que uma vez <input type="checkbox"/>
17. Causar ferimentos que precisaram de assistência médica (especificar p. f.		
a) Nunca fiz na minha relação atual	Já fiz ao meu parceiro(a) atual uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz ao meu parceiro(a) atual mais do que
b) O meu parceiro(a) atual nunca me fez <input type="checkbox"/>	O meu parceiro(a) atual já me fez uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	O meu parceiro(a) atual já me fez mais do que uma vez <input type="checkbox"/>
18. Forçar outra pessoa a manter atos sexuais contra a sua vontade		
a) Nunca fiz na minha relação atual	Já fiz ao meu parceiro(a) atual uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz ao meu parceiro(a) atual mais do que
b) O meu parceiro(a) atual nunca me fez <input type="checkbox"/>	O meu parceiro(a) atual já me fez uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	O meu parceiro(a) atual já me fez mais do que uma vez <input type="checkbox"/>
19. Ficar com o salário da outra pessoa ou não lhe dar o dinheiro necessário para as despesas quotidianas		
a) Nunca fiz na minha relação atual	Já fiz ao meu parceiro(a) atual uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz ao meu parceiro(a) atual mais do que
b) O meu parceiro(a) atual nunca me fez <input type="checkbox"/>	O meu parceiro(a) atual já me fez uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	O meu parceiro(a) atual já me fez mais do que uma vez <input type="checkbox"/>
20. Gritar ou ameaçar, para meter medo		
a) Nunca fiz na minha relação atual	Já fiz ao meu parceiro(a) atual uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz ao meu parceiro(a) atual mais do que
b) O meu parceiro(a) atual nunca me fez <input type="checkbox"/>	O meu parceiro(a) atual já me fez uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	O meu parceiro(a) atual já me fez mais do que uma vez <input type="checkbox"/>
21. Outros (especificar. p.f.		
a) Nunca fiz na minha relação atual	Já fiz ao meu parceiro(a) atual uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz ao meu parceiro(a) atual mais do que
b) O meu parceiro(a) atual nunca me fez <input type="checkbox"/>	O meu parceiro(a) atual já me fez uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	O meu parceiro(a) atual já me fez mais do que uma vez <input type="checkbox"/>

B. EM RELAÇÃO A CADA UM DOS COMPORTAMENTOS ABAIXO APRESENTADOS, POR FAVOR INDIQUE OS QUE JÁ OCORRERAM NO CONTEXTO DE QUALQUER RELAÇÃO AMOROSA QUE JÁ TENHA MANTIDO NO PASSADO (EXCLUINDO A SUA RELAÇÃO ATUAL). No caso de comportamentos que já tenham ocorrido, indique se tal aconteceu apenas uma vez ou mais do que uma vez.

1. Puxar os cabelos com força		
a) Nunca fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior <input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior
b) Nunca me fizeram <input type="checkbox"/>	Já me fizeram uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	Já me fizeram mais do que uma vez <input type="checkbox"/>
2. Insultar, difamar ou fazer afirmações graves para humilhar ou "ferir"		
a) Nunca fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior <input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior
b) Nunca me fizeram <input type="checkbox"/>	Já me fizeram uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	Já me fizeram mais do que uma vez <input type="checkbox"/>

3. Dar uma bofetada		
a) Nunca fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior <input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior
b) Nunca me fizeram <input type="checkbox"/>	Já me fizeram uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	Já me fizeram mais do que uma vez <input type="checkbox"/>
4. Apertar o pescoço		
a) Nunca fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior <input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior
b) Nunca me fizeram <input type="checkbox"/>	Já me fizeram uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	Já me fizeram mais do que uma vez <input type="checkbox"/>
5. Ameaçar com armas (p. ex. faca, pistola, objetos cortantes) ou usando de força física		
a) Nunca fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior <input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior
b) Nunca me fizeram <input type="checkbox"/>	Já me fizeram uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	Já me fizeram mais do que uma vez <input type="checkbox"/>
6. Partir ou danificar coisas intencionalmente (p. ex., móveis, objetos pessoais) ou deitar a comida para o chão,		
a) Nunca fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior <input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior
b) Nunca me fizeram <input type="checkbox"/>	Já me fizeram uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	Já me fizeram mais do que uma vez <input type="checkbox"/>
7. Acordar a meio da noite, para causar medo		
a) Nunca fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior <input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior
b) Nunca me fizeram <input type="checkbox"/>	Já me fizeram uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	Já me fizeram mais do que uma vez <input type="checkbox"/>
8. Dar um murro		
a) Nunca fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior <input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior
b) Nunca me fizeram <input type="checkbox"/>	Já me fizeram uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	Já me fizeram mais do que uma vez <input type="checkbox"/>
9. Impedir o contato com outras pessoas (p. ex., desviar correspondência, tirar as chaves, obrigar a pessoa a deixar de trabalhar/estudar,		
a) Nunca fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior <input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior
b) Nunca me fizeram <input type="checkbox"/>	Já me fizeram uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	Já me fizeram mais do que uma vez <input type="checkbox"/>
10. Atirar com objetos à outra pessoa		
a) Nunca fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior <input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior
b) Nunca me fizeram <input type="checkbox"/>	Já me fizeram uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	Já me fizeram mais do que uma vez <input type="checkbox"/>
11. Dar uma sova		
a) Nunca fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior <input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior
b) Nunca me fizeram <input type="checkbox"/>	Já me fizeram uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	Já me fizeram mais do que uma vez <input type="checkbox"/>
12. Dar pontapés ou cabeçadas		
a) Nunca fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior <input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior
b) Nunca me fizeram <input type="checkbox"/>	Já me fizeram uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	Já me fizeram mais do que uma vez <input type="checkbox"/>
13. Dar empurrões violentos		
a) Nunca fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior <input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior
b) Nunca me fizeram <input type="checkbox"/>	Já me fizeram uma única vez <input type="checkbox"/>	Já me fizeram mais do que uma vez <input type="checkbox"/>
14. Perseguir na rua, no emprego ou no local de estudo, para causar medo		

a) Nunca fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior	<input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior uma única vez	<input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior
b) Nunca me fizeram	<input type="checkbox"/>	Já me fizeram uma única vez	<input type="checkbox"/>	Já me fizeram mais do que uma vez
15. Bater com a cabeça contra a parede ou contra o chão				
a) Nunca fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior	<input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior uma única vez	<input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior
b) Nunca me fizeram	<input type="checkbox"/>	Já me fizeram uma única vez	<input type="checkbox"/>	Já me fizeram mais do que uma vez
16. Causar ferimentos que não precisaram de assistência médica (especificar p. f.				
a) Nunca fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior	<input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior uma única vez	<input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior
b) Nunca me fizeram	<input type="checkbox"/>	Já me fizeram uma única vez	<input type="checkbox"/>	Já me fizeram mais do que uma vez
17. Causar ferimentos que necessitaram de assistência médica (especificar p. f.				
a) Nunca fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior	<input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior uma única vez	<input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior
b) Nunca me fizeram	<input type="checkbox"/>	Já me fizeram uma única vez	<input type="checkbox"/>	Já me fizeram mais do que uma vez
18. Forçar outra pessoa a manter atos sexuais contra a sua vontade				
a) Nunca fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior	<input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior uma única vez	<input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior
b) Nunca me fizeram	<input type="checkbox"/>	Já me fizeram uma única vez	<input type="checkbox"/>	Já me fizeram mais do que uma vez
19. Ficar com o salário da outra pessoa ou não lhe dar o dinheiro necessário para as despesas quotidianas				
a) Nunca fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior	<input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior uma única vez	<input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior
b) Nunca me fizeram	<input type="checkbox"/>	Já me fizeram uma única vez	<input type="checkbox"/>	Já me fizeram mais do que uma vez
20. Gritar ou ameaçar, para meter medo				
a) Nunca fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior	<input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior uma única vez	<input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior
b) Nunca me fizeram	<input type="checkbox"/>	Já me fizeram uma única vez	<input type="checkbox"/>	Já me fizeram mais do que uma vez
21. Outros (especificar p. f.				
a) Nunca fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior	<input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior uma única vez	<input type="checkbox"/>	Já fiz a um(a) parceiro(a) anterior
b) Nunca me fizeram	<input type="checkbox"/>	Já me fizeram uma única vez	<input type="checkbox"/>	Já me fizeram mais do que uma vez
Informação adicional:				
1. Caso tenha assinalado algum dos comportamentos apresentados como tendo ocorrido na sua relação atual durante o último ano, por				
Casamento/União de facto	<input type="checkbox"/>	Divórcio/separação	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ligação afetiva sem
2. Caso tenha assinalado algum dos comportamentos apresentados como tendo ocorrido em qualquer relação do seu passado, por favor indique o tipo de ligação que mantinha então com essa pessoa:				
Casamento/União de facto	<input type="checkbox"/>	Divórcio/separação	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ligação afetiva sem
3. Já mantive alguma relação amorosa	<input type="checkbox"/>	Nunca mantive uma relação amorosa		

**Questionário de Comportamentos de Proteção e Risco
nas Saídas Noturnas (QCPR-Noturno)**

1. Quais os espaços onde vais habitualmente quando saís à noite?

Seleciona os **TRÊS ESPAÇOS** mais frequentes, e **COLOCA-OS POR ORDEM** (1° - O mais frequente, 2° - A seguir e 3° - A seguir).

Quando saio à noite, geralmente costumo:

- Ir a um bar
- Ir a uma discoteca
- Ir a um café
- Ir ao cinema
- Ir a um concerto
- Ir jantar fora
- Ir a uma festa
- Ir a convívios de carro/curso
- Outros (Diz quais por favor)_____

2. Em que dias da semana saís à noite?

- 2^af 3^af 4^af 5^af Sáb Dom

3. A que horas te costumavas deitar, quando saís à noite? _____ horas

4. Com quantas pessoas costumavas sair à noite? _____ pessoas

5. Qual o tipo de relação que têm contigo?

- Amigos Colegas de Curso Morado/a Outros _____

6. Que bebidas consumes quando saís à noite? _____

Por favor responde a cada uma das questões seguintes, assinalando com um **X**, a opção que melhor corresponde à tua **FORMA DE ESTAR e AGIR** quando **HABITUALMENTE SAIS À NOITE**.

Comportamentos e situações de <u>quando HABITUALMENTE SAIS À NOITE</u>				
	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou sempre
1. Consumir tabaco	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou sempre
2. Consumir bebidas alcoólicas até à embriaguez	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou sempre
3. Ficar em risco de ser vítima de violência	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou sempre
4. Ter relações sexuais sem preservativo	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou sempre
5. Conduzir sob o efeito de bebidas alcoólicas	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou sempre
6. Consumir cannabis	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou sempre
7. Bater em alguém	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou sempre
8. Consumir cocaína	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou sempre
9. Dormir fora de casa num local desconhecido	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou sempre
10. Consumir bebidas alcoólicas	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou Sempre
11. Deitar de madrugada ou depois do sol nascer	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou sempre
12. Andar com amigos que consomem drogas	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou sempre
13. Ter um(a) parceiro(a) sexual ocasional	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou sempre
14. Consumir substâncias psicoativas (drogas) compradas pela internet	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou Sempre
15. Deitar ou sentar na beira da estrada	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou sempre
16. Ir para sítios onde ninguém sabe onde estou	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou sempre
17. Consumir ecstasy	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou sempre
18. Ficar incontactável	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou sempre
19. Misturar substâncias (ex: álcool com cannabis)	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou sempre
20. Ter relações sexuais sob o efeito do álcool	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou sempre
21. Ter problemas com as autoridades (ex: polícia)	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou sempre
22. Apanhar uma boleia de carro de alguém embriagado	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou sempre
23. Aceitar bebidas de estranhos	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou sempre
24. Vomitar	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou Sempre
25. Dar o meu contacto a estranhos	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou sempre
26. Aceitar boleias de estranhos	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou sempre

27. Andar descalço pela rua ou em espaços públicos	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou sempre
28. Ter encontros com pessoas desconhecidas ou que só contacto pela internet	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou sempre
29. Ter um acidente rodoviário	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou sempre
30. Ter ideias suicidas	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou Sempre
31. Envolver-me em brincadeiras perigosas	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou sempre
32. Participar em praxes que põem em causa o meu bem-estar psicológico	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou sempre
33. Participar em praxes que põem em causa o meu bem-estar físico	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou sempre
34. Tirar fotografias comprometedoras	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou sempre
35. Beijar na boca mais do que uma pessoa por noite	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou sempre
36. Andar com o telemóvel sempre ligado	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou sempre
37. Dizer a alguém para onde vou ou estou	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou Sempre
38. Ter um cartão com o número de telefone/telemóvel de alguém próximo para ser contactado em caso de emergência	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou sempre
39. Andar com preservativos	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou sempre
40. Andar identificado (BI ou Cartão de Cidadão)	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou sempre
41. Sair acompanhado(a)	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou sempre
42. Voltar para casa acompanhado(a) com alguém de confiança	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou sempre
43. Beber bebidas açucaradas	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou sempre
44. Mandar SMS a alguém ao longo da noite a dizer onde estou ou para onde vou	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou sempre
45. Fazer uma chamada de emergência para obter ajuda para mim próprio	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou sempre
46. Fazer uma chamada de emergência para ajudar alguém	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou sempre
47. Beber água	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou sempre
48. Alimentar-me	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou Sempre
49. Andar acompanhado(a) com alguém que não bebe álcool	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou sempre
50. Conduzir com o cinto de segurança	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou sempre
51. Andar de transportes públicos	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou sempre
Outros comportamentos de proteção que tenhas quando saís à noite (diz quais por favor):	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou sempre
Outros comportamentos de risco que tenhas quando saís à noite (diz quais por favor):	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou sempre

Outras situações que te aconteçam quando saís à noite (diz quais por favor):	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou sempre
Já alguma vez tiveste medo que algo de mal te pudesse acontecer numa saída noturna?	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou sempre
Já alguma vez estiveste em perigo de vida numa saída noturna para te divertires?	Nunca	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes	Quase sempre ou Sempre