RICHTMANN PUBLISHING

Psychometric Properties of the Questionnaire of Violence in Young Couple Relationships (Virepa) in Metropolitan Lima, Peru

Monica Elisa Meneses-La-Riva[*]

Giovanni Di Deus Ocupa-Meneses

Roberto Carlos Fiestas-Flores

Víctor Hugo Fernández-Bedoya

Josefina Amanda Suyo-Vega

Hitler Giovanni Ocupa-Cabrera

Division of Research,
"Innovación Humanizadora",
Universidad César Vallejo,
Lima, Perú
*Corresponding Author

Abstract

Partner violence is a public health problem that seriously affects the population, which is why valid and reliable instruments are needed to measure this issue according to the cultural context. The objective is to determine the validity and reliability of the Violence in Partner Relationships Scale (VIREPA) aimed at citizens of Metropolitan Lima. The applied methodology was cross-sectional, instrumental, and non-experimental. The scale was applied to a sample of 433 subjects of both sexes, aged 16 to 60 years. Aiken's V was obtained for content validity, which was accepted by 100% of the experts. Reliability was verified through internal consistency using Cronbach's Alpha (0.977) and Omega (0.99). The descriptive analysis of the items also showed positive skewness and a tendency towards moderate to low kurtosis. Likewise, the confirmatory factor analysis provided a positive distribution of items with factor loadings ranging from (0.76 to 0.95). The CFA reported a good fit of the original model (Chi-square over degrees of freedom = 0.12; Root Mean Square Error of Approximation = 0.010; Standardized Root Mean Square Residual = 0.0026; Comparative Fit Index = 0.999; Tucker-Lewis Index = 0.998), and adequate factorial invariance was found when measuring the variable in both sexes. In conclusion, the psychometric scale effectively measures and evaluates violence in young couples' relationships, demonstrating high consistency, validity, and reliability, which was corroborated with the results obtained. It is essential to address this social problem properly and promote healthy and violence-free partner relationships.

Keywords: violence, couple relationships, psychometrics, validity, reliability, VIREPA, scale

1. Introduction

In Peru, there are currently no validated and reliable psychometric scales for measuring partner violence. Although some scales on violence do exist, they contain dissimilar dimensions and evaluate only past situations related to abuse. Furthermore, they also have few items, making it impossible to measure the phenomenon comprehensively. This incomplete assessment limits our ability to conduct a psychological evaluation, despite the enormous concern about the high rates of abuse in Peru, which result in high rates of mortality and morbidity, as various media outlets have reported. According to the Ministry of Women and Vulnerable Populations (MIMP), 13,346 cases of violence have been reported among individuals aged 18 to 29, with 97.4% of cases being women and 2.6% being men. Various public institutions have found that the emotional state of people who suffer from abuse varies considerably during interviews (Ministerio de la Mujer y Poblaciones vulnerables, 2020). The VIREPA (Violence in Partner Relationships) instrument, designed in Spain by González-Gijón and Soriano-Díaz (González-Gijón and Soriano-Díaz, 2021), has been confirmed to be valid and reliable in evaluating violence in partner relationships. In Peru, the current pandemic situation has led to an increase in violence rates, highlighting the need to recognize the individual characteristics of the sample and consider cultural, economic, and social aspects. This will enable us to obtain unique psychometric results supported by the use of the scale under similar conditions of use.

According to international organizations such as the World Health Organization (WHO), the COVID-19 virus has caused a global pandemic, which has resulted in social isolation and confinement of families to prevent its spread (OMS, 2020; OPS/OMS, 2020). Consequently, partner violence rates have significantly increased worldwide. According to global statistics, 20% of partner violence cases occur in the Western Pacific, 22% in Europe and first-world countries, 25% in the Americas, 33% in Africa, 31% in the Mediterranean, and 33% in Asia. Moreover, 38% of feminicides worldwide are committed by the partner, and 6% of women report having been sexually assaulted by their partner. Both physical and sexual violence are mainly perpetrated by men against women (Herrera Gómez and Martín Martínez, 2016; Organización Mundial de la Salud, 2021).

According to (Mendoza et al., 2019), jealousy is one of the most significant causes of violence among individuals from dysfunctional families with communication problems, alcohol and/or substance abuse issues, excessive attachment to their spouse, and impulsive tendencies. The consequences of such violence include low self-esteem, depression, submissive behavior, self-harm, abandoning life plans, unwanted pregnancies, and others. Meanwhile, (González-Gijón and Soriano-Díaz, 2021) suggest that it's crucial to measure violent behavior exhibited mainly by young people in their real context using an adapted and validated tool to recognize such situations and act more effectively.

In Latin America, there has been a surge in physical and sexual violence, with a variation from 23.68% to 29.51% of women experiencing abuse during their relationships, as reported by Pacheco (2015). In Mexico, (Rodríguez Hernández and Esquivel-Santoveña, 2020) indicated that 43.9% of young people over 15 years old had been mistreated by their partners during their relationships. Furthermore, statistics from 2019 showed that 16.3% of elderly women had suffered some form of abuse from their spouse.

In the Peruvian context, a violence rate of 63.2% has been reported, and these dominant figures are highly concerning since they reveal the substantial presence of some form of violence, mostly against women and their children, leading to morbidity and mortality in this population (ENDES, 2018). The COVID-19 pandemic and subsequent quarantine have changed people's way of life and how they interact socially. (Arroyo Chávez et al., 2020) express the need to broaden the diversity of and have new referential tools that allow us to evaluate cases of violence individually and collectively committed by couples, with the aim of preventing various situations that affect healthy emotional relationships.

(Mittal and Singh, 2020) describe that the quarantine has harmful consequences on people's psychological well-being, making them socially restless, known as the quarantine paradox, which

significantly increases the number of violence cases. It's essential to study this existing problem using reliable tools such as the VIREPA that allow evaluating the results to understand the violence scenario in-depth. This social problem is reported daily at the national level in police stations, where cases of domestic violence and disappearances of people prevail. Additionally, the media provides significant information on this topic, making it urgent to have adequate instruments that measure this type of violence among couples, which must be validated in the Peruvian context to be useful in developing strategies to improve and confront the situation.

Therefore, it's vital to know the violence rates during dating in Peru since machismo still prevails in society. In fact, abuse is a problem that hasn't been fully analyzed because people often think it's a private matter and not to be discussed publicly. Moreover, the pandemic's current context, with its confinement, has reinforced violence over time, damaging the individual well-being of people, especially women (Observatorio Nacional de Violencia contra las Mujeres, 2018).

In this study, a historical analysis of violence within romantic relationships was conducted. The author (Soriano Díaz, 2011) designed the instrument primarily based on Marshall's Severity of Violence Against Women Scale from 1992. Afterward, the questionnaire underwent validity tests by professionals who were experts in the field. Subsequently, a pilot test was conducted, which yielded a α of .9250. The questionnaire comprised 10 dimensions related to physical, psychological, sexual, economic, social, personal, psychological neglect, ideological/religious, and domestic abuse, with a total of 20 items. The author updated the instrument in 2011, which is now called Violence in Young Romantic Relationships (VIREPA), with the aim of confirming the validity and reliability of the test (Soriano Díaz, 2011).

Furthermore, a Likert scale with 5 options was used to validate and adapt the questionnaire to analyze the types and incidences of violence in young romantic relationships (González-Gijón and Soriano-Díaz, 2021). An exploratory and confirmatory analysis was conducted using a sample of two groups (n=253 and n=323) for comparison. The reliability and internal consistency were confirmed with values of .700, and a descriptive and correlational analysis was performed to verify the high internal consistency of the general scale and its dimensions. In conclusion, the version consisting of 5 factors and 20 items demonstrates appropriate validity and reliability, which is consistent with the theoretical assumptions.

In Spain, (Urbiola et al., 2020) aimed to measure and analyze the psychometric properties of the adapted version of the Violence Exerted, Received and Perceived Questionnaire in their context, which consists of 5 dimensions: sexual, psychological, humiliation-coercion, psychological-social, physical, and control-jealousy, with a total of 28 items. The questionnaire was exposed to expert judgment for its validity and then applied to a group of 286 young people and another sample of 695 study subjects. Both samples were analyzed under the factorial structure, with an internal consistency of α of .99. The questionnaire is reliable and relevant for evaluating the phenomenon under study.

Similarly, (Troisi, 2018) in Italy aimed to develop items for a new self-report instrument, the VITA Scale (Scale of Intimate Violence and Traumatic Affects), to measure the intensity of post-traumatic affect. The scale, consisting of 24 items and 4 factors (fear, terror, guilt, and shame), was tested on a sample of 302 individuals. The composite factorial structure demonstrated good consistency in theoretical and internal scales, with α ranging from .80 to .90, thereby ensuring the validity of the instrument. In conclusion, the VITA scale can be beneficial for various research and clinical settings.

In Spain, (Rodríguez-Díaz et al., 2016) analyzed the results of 5170 students from different nationalities, such as Mexico, Argentina, and Spain, using the Dating Violence Questionnaire (DVQR), which comprises 8 factors: detachment (7 items), humiliation (7 items), sexual (6 items), coercion (6 items), physical (5 items), gender (5 items), emotional punishment (3 items), and instrumental (3 items), totaling 42 items and a 5-option Likert scale. The study employed the Varimax rotation factor analysis with a .35 variance explained and a reliability analysis of α=.932. The frequency of victimization in Spain and Latin America differs, but both exhibit similar patterns of abuse.

Also in Spain, (Fernández-Fuertes et al., 2006) aimed to analyze the reliability and validity of the Conflict in Adolescent Dating Relationships Inventory (CADRI) to evaluate types of violence, including threats, verbal, emotional, sexual, relational, and physical dimensions. The instrument was applied to 572 subjects, resulting in a reliability of .85, an improvement from the original instrument's reliability of .83. However, the Cronbach's alpha reliability of the threats dimension was the lowest of all dimensions, at .53, indicating the need to reconsider the items to improve its consistency. Overall, the Spanish version of CADRI is considered applicable and valid, although some items need to be rephrased to enhance its psychometric properties.

In the United Kingdom, (Walker, 2005) aimed to construct the "Maudsley Violence Questionnaire (MVQ)" and investigate its factorial structure and reliability, consisting of two factors, "machismo and acceptance," with a total of 56 items. The instrument was applied to 785 study participants, followed by a principal axis factoring analysis, and two factors were rotated using the direct oblimin method, revealing slightly different factorial loads. The reliability was confirmed with α ranging from .74 to .91, indicating the test's consistency.

In a study conducted in Colombia by (Redondo Pacheco et al., 2021), the Spanish version of the Conflict in Adolescent Dating Relationships Inventory (CADRI) was validated. The CADRI consists of five dimensions: Sexual violence (α=.51), relational violence (α=.52), verbal-emotional violence (α=.82), threats (α=.66), and physical violence (α=.83), with 20 items and Likert-type questions. A pilot test was conducted with 2,058 adolescents, and the results indicated a Cronbach's alpha of .84, demonstrating high reliability and internal consistency indicators. The study also found similar results to the original study, further confirming the validity and reliability of the instrument.

Meanwhile, in Mexico, (Fernández de Juan et al., 2021) developed the Multiple Questionnaire of Partner Violence in University Students (CRVPU), which was based on 89 articles and adapted the instrument of González and Reyes from 2009. The objective was to evaluate the main types of violence in couples and the consistency of nominal responses. The instrument was evaluated by ten experts in the field based on the Delphi method, resulting in .97 CCI. The questionnaire had two dimensions: you as a victim (22 items) and you as a perpetrator (19 items). A pilot test was conducted with 72 individuals in 6 schools in Mexico, achieving an α of .90, Lambda of .99, and Omega of .94. The results confirmed that the test is reliable and current to specify violent attitudes in young couples, and the method used can be duplicated to validate other similar instruments.

Similarly, in Colombia, (Suárez Hernández et al., 2020) aimed to validate and design a psychometric scale on attitudes towards partner violence, resulting in the creation of the Scale of Attitudes towards Partner Violence. The questionnaire has six dimensions: cognitive, behavioral, affective, physical, psychological, and sexual, with 30 Likert-type items, which underwent expert validation. A pilot test was conducted with 357 university students, and the reliability analysis of Cronbach's alpha was .859, KMO was .88, and there are also high indices of content validity of the items that compose it.

Finally, in Bolivia, (Alfaro Urquiola, 2020) conducted a study to design and evaluate the Revised Dating Violence Questionnaire, adapted to their cultural context. The instrument consists of five factors: Coercion, humiliation, physical violence, sexual violence, and detachment, with 20 items. The validity test was conducted by five experts, and then a pilot test was conducted with a sample of 430 young people. An exploratory factorial analysis was carried out with KMO .944, and the percentage of variance explained for each factor ranges from 4.013 to 49.500%, and the α ranges from .729 to .901. Thus, the instrument is valid and reliable for measuring violence in couples.

In Brazil, (Tomaz Paiva et al., 2020) conducted a study to analyze the validity of the Psychological Abuse Scale in couples. This scale consists of 19 items and two factors, direct and indirect strategies of psychological abuse. The study used Likert-type responses and two samples, one with 303 women and the other with 380 women. In the first sample, exploratory factor analysis and internal consistency analysis were conducted, obtaining a high α of .89. In the second sample, confirmatory analysis was performed, and the parameters were validated, resulting in good fit and reliability indices of .90. The instrument was validated and consistent in evaluating psychological

abuse in couples.

In the Peruvian context, (Arroyo Chávez et al., 2020) aimed to construct and evaluate the psychometric properties of their instrument called "Violence in young couples." The instrument consists of 29 items and 5 factors: physical violence, verbal manipulation, coercion and prohibitions, and a Likert scale was used. The instrument was submitted to four experts, and an Aiken's V of 0.75 was obtained. A pilot test with 355 young people was conducted, and high reliability was obtained with a KMO of .937, a Cronbach coefficient of .943, and a McDonald's of .947. These results confirm high reliability and indicate that the instrument has adequate internal consistency and validity.

Similarly, in Mexico, (Galan Jimenez et al., 2019) conducted a chronological review of violence criteria to develop their Psychological Violence Scale in couples. The objective was to design a valid and reliable instrument to measure psychological violence during courtship. The scale consists of 34 items and 3 dimensions: control and isolation, emotional abuse and intimidation, and threat. Expert judges were used to validate the test, obtaining an Aiken's V of .91 and an AGFI of .959. In the pilot test, 382 women and 244 men participated, and a reliability of .89 was obtained in the confirmatory factor analysis. The test is considered useful and reliable in identifying violence in young couples.

Lastly, in Mexico, (López-Cepero et al., 2019) analyzed the psychometric properties of the Partner Violence Questionnaire (DVQ-8). This questionnaire consists of 8 items that evaluate prevalent symptoms and pathologies in students with dichotomous questions. The first study involved 990 young people, and a unifactorial structure with high reliability was obtained through exploratory factor analysis and oblimin rotation. In the second study with 355 subjects, the questionnaire was validated, obtaining a positive relationship with the original questionnaire, finding high significance with an α of .93, a KMO of .87, and an explained variance of 65.11%. These results demonstrate that there are valid and reliable indicators for the identification of this phenomenon.

Additionally, in their research conducted in Chile, (Gallardo and Concha-Salgado, 2017) aimed to evaluate the psychometric properties of the Manual for the Assessment of Risk for Violence Against Partners - SARA. The instrument was applied to two samples comprising 32 aggressors and 30 non-aggressors. Reliability was determined through Kappa with 0.7, Cronbach's Alpha with 0.827, and the Receiver Operating Characteristic curve with 0.976. They concluded that the instrument has good diagnostic validity for violence in couples.

In Mexico, (Moral De La Rubia and Ramos Basurto, 2015) aimed to adapt the questionnaire of violence suffered and perpetrated by couples to evaluate the frequency and harm of victimization and perpetration, and to study its psychometric properties of factorial structure and factorial invariance between sexes. The instrument was applied to 240 study subjects with 27 items and 5 Likert scale responses and four factors (Psychological/social violence, sexual violence, and economic violence). The results showed very high correlations and two invariant models that have structural consistency and validity, with an α of 0.90 and a Pearson correlation coefficient of r<0.10. They concluded that the questionnaire has structural validity and internal consistency, and the dimension of violence exercised in the CI is at an acceptable level.

Similarly, (Villafañe Santiago et al., 2012) et al. (2012) aimed to construct the Questionnaire of Experiences of Violence in Romantic and Family Relationships in University Students in Puerto Rico. They conducted an exploratory investigation with 266 participants, using an instrument with 41 items and four subscales (Student violence towards the partner, parental violence towards the student, observed violence towards parents, and violence in the partner towards the student). The validity analysis of experts was employed, obtaining adequate correlation with 0.23 and 0.93, and the reliability obtained on the scale was 0.88. They concluded that the prevalence of violence in couples and the severity experienced by university students in this issue requires evaluation to prevent emotional health risks.

From another perspective, in the United States, (Dyar et al., 2019) conducted a study to construct a culturally adapted and contextually appropriate scale that captures a wide range of types of intimate partner violence in sexual and gender minorities. They used the Conflict Tactics Scale, consisting of 74 items and five factors (psychological violence, physical violence, sexual violence,

injuries, negotiation, SGM-specific V, SGM-specific P, coercive control-V, and coercive control-P), applied to a population of 352 individuals. For reliability analysis, α (0.63-0.82) and ω (0.76-0.97) were obtained, which showed acceptable results for most subscales. They recommended further research on partner violence in different minorities in society as they are not immune to abuse.

In the United States, (Carlson et al., 2017) proposed in their research the objective to test the psychometric scales of the Conflict and Control Relationship Scale (CCC-RS) and to examine the differences between the severity of violence scales and the CCC-RS scales. The CCC-RS consists of three factors: conflict repair, relational conflict, and controlling violence, with a total of 22 items that were applied to 575 study participants. Confirmatory factor analysis was employed, revealing an α of .84, demonstrating adequate reliability, and the three factors explained 48.59% of the variance. In conclusion, the instrument has validity, and further studies are recommended to reinforce its quality.

Similarly, in Malaysia, (Wan Mohd et al., 2021) aimed to develop a questionnaire to assess perceptions and attitudes towards intimate partner violence (IPV) among premarital youth, which they named Perceptions and Attitudes towards Intimate Partner Violence (MY-PAIPVQ). The questionnaire included two factors, perceptions and attitudes, with a total of 87 items using a Likert-type response scale. For content validity, two forms were applied: the content validity index (CVI) with results greater than .83, and the facial validity index (FVI) with results of .83, both were used to estimate the internal structure of the test. Finally, further psychometric validation procedures are necessary before applying the test.

Partner abuse and violence are growing exponentially worldwide, causing emotional, physical, sexual, or psychological damage and accompanied by threats in private or public contexts. The pattern of abusive behavior is to maintain control, power, and authority over an individual (Herrera Gomez & Martin Martinez, 2016). Partner violence causes deterioration in human dimensions, including social, economic, religious, and cultural, among others. It should be noted that partner violence mostly affects females, and the majority of aggressors are males (Pacheco, 2015).

However, modifications have been observed in the nature of violence. It is important to note that men can also be victims of violence, often from friends or acquaintances (Organización Mundial de la Salud, 2021). Partner abuse, according to (Lopez-Rosales et al., 2013), is an attempt to exert power and control over an individual in a relationship. This type of violence occurs in five dimensions, which are:

Dimension 1: Emotional abuse (EA) involves feelings of abandonment, unfulfilled emotional needs, and mood swings, accompanied by various forms of abuse, aimed at pressuring the individual to believe they are worthless (González-Gijón and Soriano-Díaz, 2021). In addition, abuse may occur due to a lack of tolerance related to cultural and social norms in a relationship with a "macho" mindset (de la Villa Moral et al., 2017).

Dimension 2: Physical and psychological abuse (PPA) is characterized by violent actions or behaviors that cause harm or risk. These actions are often associated with control, fear, and physical aggression through contact (such as hitting, scratching, and pulling) or social isolation. In the psychological realm, the perpetrator exerts power to belittle their partner, aiming to make them feel worthless. Furthermore, the aggressor targets their victim with a repetitive pattern of psychologically destructive behavior that produces rejection, isolation, fear, ignorance, and corruption (González-Gijón and Soriano-Díaz, 2021).

Dimension 3: Personal devaluation (PD) is defined as various forms of abuse that promote the devaluation of aspects related to religion, culture, social beliefs, etc. (González-Gijón and Soriano-Díaz, 2021).

Dimension 4: Social and economic control (SEC) encompasses monitoring, surveillance, and manipulation to restrict individual activities of the couple within their social circle. Economically, one partner assumes control over the couple's income and abuses money and assets without consent for their own interests (González-Gijón and Soriano-Díaz, 2021). Similarly, (Córdova López, 2017) identifies actions that limit the free disposal of the couple's assets, cause harm to joint property, or exert economic control over personal income.

Dimension 5: Sexual violence (SV) includes various forms of coercion, harassment, and rape. Additionally, there is social pressure to maintain a romantic relationship, leading some to use intimidation and physical force (Garcia-Moreno, 2013). For (González-Gijón and Soriano-Díaz, 2021), abusive sexual behavior leads to rejection, feelings of degradation, and humiliation, as the victim is subjected to sexual pressure and coercion.

In addition, it is crucial to explore the theoretical foundations of couple violence, which seek to explain the issue from various psychological perspectives and approaches. Violence against women is a significant social issue, as the statistics continue to rise, and risk factors are often found in the economic sphere, such as a lack of resources, or in the marital sphere, such as the duration of the violent relationship (González-Gijón and Soriano-Díaz, 2021).

Observation of repeated inappropriate behavior in the social context can reveal evidence of violence. The theory of emotional dependence emphasizes the importance of understanding the extreme emotional attachment that an individual has to their partner, which can become toxic (Fabián Arias et al., 2019).

In Corsi's ecological model (1994), it is suggested that violence against women is caused by personal factors as well as familial and biological environments that result in the subject's impulsivity. Additionally, interpersonal factors consider the familial environment and the couple within a patriarchal organization with a degree of education and economic income. Due to the deficiencies of these conditions, there is a risk of emotional instability in the family and couple's (Fabián Arias et al., 2019).

Furthermore, systemic theory manages, interprets, and demonstrates partner violence, taking into account the evident organizational influence of the social macrosystem where the convictions and thoughts of a patriarchal system are generated. Exosystems involve organizations that act with acts of violence, frequently propagating hierarchical dominance and revictimizing women. Microsystems comprise interpersonal relationships, where aggression is justified, and violence is carried out (Alencar-Rodrigues, 2012).

At the international level, specifically in Europe, the VIREPA questionnaire was designed. In Spain, various tests of a similar nature were conducted, but with the same theme from another theoretical approach. The psychometric scale was subjected to statistical tests that confirm the content validity of the items supported by the experts, who agreed that the items adequately measured partner violence. The test obtained high reliability for both male and female populations (González-Gijón and Soriano-Díaz, 2021). In Spain in 2021, a psychometric property analysis is conducted by (Urbiola et al., 2020), who apply a statistical test to analyze Cronbach's alpha and the factorial structure of the instrument to have a test applicable to a specific population.

Similarly, (Rodríguez-Díaz et al., 2016) in the Spanish context, evaluated violence in three contexts: Mexico, Argentina, and Spain. The study included other statistical tests, such as factor analysis with varimax rotation and explained variances added to the validity and reliability of the instrument. (Fernández-Fuertes et al., 2006) analyzed the psychometric scale from the perspective of validity and reliability, focusing solely on that.

In Italy, the VITA scale was developed to evaluate partner violence. It employed statistical tests to evaluate the scale's factorial structure and content validity (Troisi, 2018). Similarly, in the United Kingdom, (Walker, 2005) created a scale to measure violence. The scale used statistical tests to evaluate factorial analysis, Cronbach's alpha reliability, and content validity.

In the Latin American context, (Fernández de Juan et al., 2021) designed an instrument to evaluate partner violence, which was adapted and subjected to tests of validity and reliability. The results were truthful and reliable. The authors recommend increasing the number of items to improve the scale. In the same context, (Galan Jimenez et al., 2019) created an instrument to measure psychological violence in couples. The scale used statistical tests to achieve optimal validity and reliability results. Similarly, in Mexico, (López-Cepero et al., 2019) applied the DVQ-8 partner violence scale. The scale underwent exploratory factorial analysis and oblimin with KMO statistics. It resulted in favorable results for the test.

Likewise, (Moral De La Rubia and Ramos Basurto, 2015) subjected a questionnaire on experienced and exercised violence to various statistical tests. The tests obtained favorable psychometric properties in relation to factorial structure and factorial invariance, achieving favorable internal consistency. Similarly, in Brazil, (Tomaz Paiva et al., 2020) established a scale of psychological abuse in couples. The scale underwent statistical tests to find fit indices, validity, and reliability. It obtained positive results. In Colombia, (Redondo Pacheco et al., 2021) analyzed the CADRI scale to validate its Spanish version for evaluating partner violence. They used Cronbach's alpha and inter-element correlation tests to find reliability and consistency. Similarly, (Suárez Hernández et al., 2020) designed and validated a psychometric scale to measure partner violence. The scale underwent various tests to evaluate content validity by expert testing, KMO, and Cronbach's alpha. The results were high indices to measure the variable.

Several studies have been conducted in different countries to develop and evaluate psychometric scales to measure partner violence. In Chile, (Gallardo and Concha-Salgado, 2017) used the SARA scale and statistical tests such as Kappa and Cronbach's alpha to obtain consistent validity and reliability. Similarly, in Bolivia, (Alfaro Urquiola, 2020) designed and evaluated a dating violence questionnaire adapted to the cultural context and subjected it to expert and reliability tests such as Cronbach's alpha, KMO, and exploratory factorial analysis with explained variance, resulting in a valid and reliable instrument. In Puerto Rico, (Villafañe Santiago et al., 2012) constructed a questionnaire to measure the experience of violence in romantic relationships, which was also subjected to expert and reliability tests to identify any type of violence in this population.

In Malaysia, (Wan Mohd et al., 2021) developed a questionnaire on perceptions and attitudes towards intimate partner violence and used statistical tests to obtain validity through the facial validity index. The internal structure of the scale was estimated, and the authors continue to conduct research to improve the scale.

In the United States, (Dyar et al., 2019) created and adapted a scale to the context and evaluated its reliability using statistical tests such as Cronbach's alpha and the Omega coefficient. (Carlson et al., 2017) also applied the psychometric scale of conflict and control in relationships and used statistical analysis to evaluate reliability and confirmatory factor analysis, which obtained ideal results.

In the national context (Peru), (Arroyo Chávez et al., 2020) conducted a study and constructed a psychometric scale to measure violence, which was reviewed by four experts to obtain content validity. They then used KMO, Cronbach's alpha, and McDonald's tests to evaluate the validity and reliability of the instrument in the population. However, the authors suggest that further psychometric studies should be conducted to improve the measurement of this variable. So, in Peru, there is currently no scale to estimate partner violence. Therefore, in the present study, the violence scale needs to be validated and adapted to the Peruvian cultural context reflected in the items.

The purpose of the study is to have a valid and reliable scale to avoid errors in diagnosis and provide timely treatment. Additionally, the instrument will serve as a basis for motivating similar and innovative studies with scientific rigor regarding the problem, and will be made available to promote personal well-being for citizens. Finally, the study is approached from a psychological perspective to solve existing problems of violence, allowing changes to be made that will help individuals in their development and quality of life.

Research hypotheses: The Spanish version of the Violence in Romantic Partner Relationships Scale (VIREPA) is a valid and reliable instrument for measuring violence in romantic relationships in the Peruvian context.

Research objective: Validate the Spanish version of the VIREPA scale in the Peruvian context, ensuring its reliability and internal consistency for future research and practical applications.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1 Participants

The sample consisted of 433 subjects, comprising 273 females (63%) and 160 males (37%). Following the recommendations of (Carretero-Dios and Pérez, 2005), who propose considering 10 participants per variable, we aimed to obtain the largest possible number of individuals for this study, given that the scale comprised 20 items. Additionally, we applied the criterion of obtaining reproducible results and utilized latent variables, such as structural modeling and confirmatory factor analysis, which require two to three times this sample size to account for all estimated parameters (Otzen and Manterola, 2017; Hernández-Sampieri and Mendoza Torres, 2018).

Furthermore, the sample was recruited online, and individuals participated voluntarily, meeting the inclusion criteria: individuals of both genders, aged 16 to 60 years, and residents of Lima Metropolitana.

2.2 The Scale(s) or instruments

The study utilized the Spanish version of the "Violence in Romantic Partner Relationships Scale" (VIREPA), developed by (González-Gijón and Soriano-Díaz, 2021). This scale consists of 20 items grouped into five dimensions: Emotional Abuse (EA), Physical and Psychological Abuse (PPA), Personal Devaluation (PD), Social and Economic Control (SEC), and Sexual Abuse (SA). Participants responded using a Likert-type scale with five response options (1 Never, 2 Sometimes (1 to 2), 3 Often (3 to 5), 4 Almost always (6 or more), and 5 Always). Each dimension's score was obtained by summing the item responses, and an overall score for the scale was calculated. These scores allowed for the evaluation of the presence or absence of violence.

2.3 Procedure

Data collection was conducted with the individual authorization through informed consent and assent of the study subjects. The questionnaire was administered using Google Forms during the months of October to December 2022. Participants were given approximately 10 minutes to respond to the questionnaire. The research received approval from the ethics committee of Universidad César Vallejo and adhered to the ethical guidelines of the Helsinki Declaration.

2.4 Data Analysis

Regarding validity and reliability, as indicated by (González-Gijón and Soriano-Díaz, 2021), internal consistency and reliability of the test were confirmed with values above 0.700 for all dimensions. Additionally, the Omega coefficient provided high reliability for the total value ($\omega=0.908$) and each of the factors, surpassing 0.826. The author also performed exploratory factor analysis (EFA) to identify the factorial structure, which was subsequently validated with confirmatory factor analysis (CFA).

Moreover, internal validity was verified by seven specialists, including three clinical psychologists, three research area professors, and one methodological advisor. The Cronbach's Alpha and Omega coefficients were calculated with the sample of 433 participants (Celina Oviedo and Campo Arias, 2005). The VIREPA test was applied to the Peruvian context using an online form distributed through social media platforms such as WhatsApp, Facebook, and Instagram. The results were then downloaded to Excel for statistical analysis.

Descriptive analysis included calculating the arithmetic mean, standard deviation, skewness, kurtosis, and item-test correlation coefficient to diagnose each item's characteristics. Additionally, CFA was performed, utilizing the following fit indices, as well as the established cutoffs for good fit (Cardona-Arias et al., 2015; Luján-Tangarife and Cardona-Arias, 2015; Hair et al., 2019): Chi-square

divided by degrees of freedom ($\chi2/df \leq 5$), Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA < 0.07), Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR < 0.80), Comparative Fit Index (CFI > 0.92), and Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI > 0.92). These indices were used to assess the model's adequacy. The CFA utilized the diagonally weighted least squares estimation method with the polychoric correlation matrix (Batista-Foguet et al., 2004; Lloret-Segura et al., 2014). The data analysis was performed using Microsoft Excel, IBM SPSS version 25.0, and R version 4.2.3 software.

3. Results

Table 1: Sociodemographic characteristics of the study sample

Sociodemographic characteristics	N	%
Gender		
Female	273	63.00%
Male	160	37.00%
Marital Status		
Single	263	60.70%
Married	142	32.80%
Divorced	24	5.50%
Widowed	4	1.00%
Education Level		
Basic	2	0.50%
Higher	245	56.50%
Graduate	186	43.00%
Alcohol consumpion		
Yes	385	88.90%
No	48	11.10%
Number of children		
0	216	49.90%
1	82	18.90%
2	81	18.70%
3	38	8.80%
4	11	2.50%
5	5	1.20%
Age	M=32.77	SD=11.216

Table 1 presents sociodemographic characteristics of the sample in the research study. The sample size was 433, and the table includes the number and percentage of participants in each category.

Regarding gender, the majority of participants identified as female (n=273, 63.0%), while the remainder identified as male (n=160, 37.0%).

In terms of marital status, most participants reported being single (n=263, 60.7%), while fewer reported being married (n=142, 32.8%), divorced (n=24, 5.5%), or widowed (n=4, 1.0%).

Education level was also assessed, with very few participants reporting only a basic education (n=2, 0.5%). The majority reported having a higher education degree (n=245, 56.5%) or a graduate degree (n=186, 43.0%).

Alcohol consumption was reported by most participants (n=385, 88.9%), with a minority reporting no alcohol consumption (n=48, 11.1%).

Participants were also asked about the number of children they had, with almost half reporting having no children (n=216, 49.9%). A range of 1-5 children was reported by the remaining participants (n=82, 81, 38, 11, and 5, respectively).

Finally, the table presents information on participants' age, reporting a mean age of 32.77 years (SD=11.216).

3.1 Content validity

Overall, these sociodemographic characteristics provide important information about the study sample and may help in understanding how the study findings generalize to other populations.

Table 2: Aiken's V general for judges' criterion.

	J1	J2	J3	J4	J5	J6	J7	Sum	Aiken's V
VRP_1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	1
VRP_2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	1
VRP_3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	1
VRP_4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	1
VRP_5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	1
VRP_6	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	1
VRP_7	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	1
VRP_8	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	1
VRP_9	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	1
VRP_10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	1
VRP_11	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	1
VRP_12	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	1
VRP_13	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	1
VRP_14	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	1
VRP_15	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	1
VRP_16	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	1
VRP_17	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	1
VRP_18	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	1
VRP_19	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	1
VRP_20	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	1

Table 2 presents the results obtained in the study. It shows that the scores obtained by evaluating the instrument based on the criteria of 7 expert judges (J), and processed by Aiken's V coefficient, demonstrated that all items were considered acceptable, with a score of 100%. This indicates that the questionnaire has content validity, as values above 80% indicate high validity (Escurra, 1988).

Table 3: Descriptive analysis of items in the questionnaire on violence in romantic relationships.

Items	N	Mean	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis	RITC
VRP_1	433	2.0	1.1	1.2	0.5	0.70
VRP_2	433	2.0	1.2	1.1	0.4	0.75
VRP_3	433	1.9	1.2	1.3	0.7	0.86
VRP_4	433	1.6	1.0	1.8	2.7	0.70
VRP_5	433	1.5	1.0	2.1	3.7	0.82
VRP_6	433	1.6	1.0	2.0	3.2	0.82
VRP_7	433	1.5	1.0	2.3	4.7	0.85
VRP_8	433	1.6	1.0	1.9	2.7	0.87
VRP_9	433	1.7	1.0	1.7	2.4	0.84
VRP_10	433	1.6	1.0	1.9	3.0	0.80
VRP_11	433	1.7	1.1	1.9	2.6	0.78
VRP_12	433	1.5	1.0	2.1	3.8	0.88
VRP_13	433	1.6	1.0	1.9	3.0	0.81
VRP_14	433	1.7	1.1	1.8	2.7	0.85
VRP_15	433	1.6	1.1	1.9	2.7	0.79
VRP_16	433	1.6	1.1	1.8	2.2	0.83
VRP_17	433	1.7	1.1	1.7	2.3	0.81
VRP_18	433	1.4	1.0	2.4	5.0	0.85
VRP_19	433	1.3	0.9	3.0	7.8	0.85
VRP_20	433	1.4	0.9	2.6	6.0	0.87

Table 3 presents the results of the descriptive analyses of the items in the VIREPA questionnaire. The values of skewness range from 1.1 to 2.90, indicating positive skewness for the items. On the other hand, items 7, 18, 19, and 20 exhibit leptokurtic kurtosis, with k values of 4.72, 4.98, 7.84, and 6.00, respectively. This indicates that there is a higher frequency of responses from the participants for these items. For the remaining items, 5, 6, 10, and 11, they display mesokurtic kurtosis, with k values of 3.71, 3.15, 3.03, and 2.58, respectively, indicating that the respondents answered these items moderately. The rest of the items exhibit platykurtic kurtosis, with very low frequency levels of responses (Balanda and MacGillivray, 1988).

Positive skewness indicates that the distribution of responses is skewed to the right, meaning that most responses are clustered at the lower end of the scale. This can suggest that most participants scored relatively low on the items, with fewer participants scoring high.

Low kurtosis (platykurtic distribution) implies that the distribution of responses is flatter than a normal distribution, with fewer scores in the tails. This suggests less variability and fewer extreme scores than expected in a normal distribution.

3.2 Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Table 4: Absolute fit and comparative fit.

Model	Absolute fit			Comparative fit	
	χ^2/gl	RMSEA	SRMR	CFI	TLI
Original	19.5/160=0.12	.010	0.026	0.999	0.998

We used confirmatory factor analysis (CFA; n = 433) to evaluate the fit of the model that assumed five dimensions. The item distribution was positive, as evidenced by the factor loadings, which ranged from .76 to .95.

Regarding the fit indices, the model showed a good fit with respect to χ^2/df (0.12), RMSEA (0.001), SRMR (0.026), CFI (0.999), and TLI (0.998) (see Table 4).

Table 5: Average variance extracted (AVE)

	Emotional Abuse (EA)	Physical and Psychological Abuse (PPA)	Personal Devaluation (PD)	Social and Economic Control (SEC)	Sexual Abuse (SA)
AVE	0.68	0.76	0.72	0.75	0.91

The average variance rxtracted (AVE) was assessed using the criterion of >0.50 for internal validity (Fornell and Larcker, 1981), which met the criterion.

Table 6: Statistics of Cronbach's Alpha and Omega coefficient of the overall sample and dimensions of the questionnaire on violence in intimate partner relationships.

	Violence in romantic relationships (VIREPA)	Emotional abuse (ME)	Physical and psychological abuse (MFP)	Personal devaluation (DP)	Social and economic control (CSE)	Sexual abuse (AS)
Cronbach's alpha coefficient	0.98	0.90	0.94	0.91	0.94	0.95
Omega coefficient	0.99	0.94	0.97	0.95	0.96	0.98

In Table 6, it is evident that the Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient for the 20-item violence in young couples' relationships scale is 0.977. Moreover, the dimensions of emotional abuse, physical and psychological abuse, personal devaluation, social and economic control, and sexual abuse have

reliability coefficients of 0.893, 0.939,0 .912, 0.936, and 0.952, respectively, indicating high reliability. Furthermore, the omega coefficients for the same scale are 0.99, with the dimensions of emotional abuse, physical and psychological abuse, personal devaluation, social and economic control, and sexual abuse having coefficients of 0.94, 0.97, 0.95, 0.96, and 0.98, respectively. These results suggest that the VIREPA and its subscales are valid and reliable measures of violence in romantic relationships.

Table 7: Factorial invariance of items on the questionnaire of violence in romantic relationships between men and women.

Model	Degrees of Freedom	Chi-square	Chi-square difference	Difference in degrees of freedom	Probability of Chi-square
Inv.sex.conf	320	41.2			
Inv.sex.metric	335	63.2	22	15	0.11
Inv.sex.scalar	350	78.1	14.9	15	0.46
Inv.sex.stric	370	87.8	9.7	20	0.97

Table 7 presents the results of a goodness-of-fit test for four models of invariance related to the measurement of sexual prejudice. The degrees of freedom for each model indicate the number of independent observations used to estimate the parameters in the model. The chi-square statistic is used to compare the fit of the models to the data. The chi-square difference indicates the change in chi-square from the previous model. The difference in degrees of freedom is the difference in the number of degrees of freedom between the models. The probability of chi-square is the probability that the observed chi-square value would be larger than the calculated value, assuming that the model is correct.

The first model, Inv.sex.conf, served as the baseline model and had 320 degrees of freedom and a chi-square value of 41.184. The subsequent models, Inv.sex.metric, Inv.sex.scalar, and Inv.sex.stric, added constraints to the previous models to test the invariance of the measurement of sexual prejudice across different groups. The chi-square values for these models increased, indicating a worse fit to the data than the previous model. However, only the chi-square difference for Inv.sex.metric was statistically significant, with a p-value of 0.1082, indicating that the difference in chi-square from the previous model was not significant for the other models. The results suggest that the metric invariance model may not be significantly different from the baseline model, while the other two models may have a significantly worse fit.

Table 8: Measurement invariance analysis with four models (Configural, Metric, Scalar, and Strict).

Invariance	Chi-square	Degrees of Freedom	RMSEA	TLI	CFI	AIC
Configural	41.18	320	0	1.03	1	NA
Metric	63.17	335	0	1.03	1	NA
Scalar	78.12	350	0	1.03	1	NA
Strict	87.81	370	0	1.03	1	NA

Table 8 presents the results of a measurement invariance analysis with four models (Configural, Metric, Scalar, and Strict) using the chi-square statistic, degrees of freedom, Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI), Comparative Fit Index (CFI), and Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) as fit indices. The table shows the values of these fit indices for each model. The Configural model has a chi-square of 41.18 with 320 degrees of freedom, which indicates a good fit. The subsequent models (Metric, Scalar, and Strict) have higher chi-square values but still show an acceptable fit. The RMSEA values are below the threshold of 0.08, which indicates a good fit for all models. The TLI and CFI values are equal to 1 for all models, which means that they have a

perfect fit. The AIC values are not applicable (NA) in this case. Overall, these results suggest that the measurement invariance holds across the four models.

In conclusion, the various contexts in which a psychometric scale of violence is employed reveal multiple components or dimensions that seek to identify, assess, and measure violence in both genders. These findings underscore the need to conduct further research on psychometric scales to improve the accuracy and precision of instruments used to measure this phenomenon.

4. Discussion

In Peru, there is a high rate of partner violence, which necessitates a validated and reliable scale for the national context, considering different types of abuse and prevalence among young couples (Arroyo Chávez et al., 2020). According to (ENDES, 2018), statistics on abuse in Peru have increased, with 76.9% of females reporting experiencing sexual, physical, and psychological violence at some point in their lives. On the other hand, (Mendoza et al., 2019) state that the most relevant causes are jealousy, alcohol and/or substance consumption, excessive attachment to the spouse, and regarding consequences, emotional problems and unwanted pregnancies, among others. In this sense, most women, facing dominance by their partners, feel vulnerable, incapacitated, and isolated to act against their aggressor, which reduces their motivations to seek immediate help or express any type of aggression, especially sexual ones, as a result of the violence perpetrated by their partner (Ruiz-Pérez and Pastor-Moreno, 2020).

The findings from the analysis revealed a structure consistent with the theoretical postulates of the instrument in its Spanish version (González-Gijón and Soriano-Díaz, 2021). Likewise, it was confirmed that the psychometric properties of the Violence in Partner Relationships Scale (VIREPA), with 5 dimensions: Emotional Abuse (EA), Physical and Psychological Abuse (PPA), Personal Devaluation (PD), Social and Economic Control (SEC), and Sexual Abuse (SA), consisting of 20 items, showed an acceptable Aiken's V of 100% as evaluated by 7 experts in the field in a sample of 433 Peruvian subjects. These findings are consistent with studies conducted in Spain (González-Gijón and Soriano-Díaz, 2021); Mexico (Galan Jimenez et al., 2019), which obtained an Aiken's V of .91, demonstrating the test's usefulness and validity in measuring violence among youth in various social contexts. However, the only study conducted in the Peruvian context found an Aiken's V of .75, suggesting the need to expand the sample to corroborate these results (Arroyo Chávez et al., 2020).

In this regard, it is essential to increase the study sample size to obtain Aiken's V values above 0.70, ensuring that the instruments are highly valid (Hernández-Sampieri and Mendoza Torres, 2018). Likewise, a valid instrument can be subjected to a pilot test to be reproducible in the study population. Therefore, the evaluation of reliability found an internal consistency of Cronbach's Alpha of .977, and its dimensions ranged from .89 to .93. These results can be compared with those of (González-Gijón and Soriano-Díaz, 2021), who found an overall Cronbach's Alpha of .93, and values above .70 were found in all five components. Similarly, similar results were obtained by (Walker, 2005; Fernández-Fuertes et al., 2006; Villafañe Santiago et al., 2012; Gallardo and Concha-Salgado, 2017; Dyar et al., 2019; Suárez Hernández et al., 2020; Tomaz Paiva et al., 2020; Redondo Pacheco et al., 2021), whose global results ranged from 0.80 to 0.97. Additionally, a Cronbach's Alpha between .70 and .90 was obtained, demonstrating high reliability of the instrument.

Likewise, the internal consistency of the Omega coefficient was assessed, which provided high reliability at the global level (.99), and its dimensions showed a range ranging from .94 to .98. These results can also be compared with those of the same authors (González-Gijón and Soriano-Díaz, 2021), who found an Omega of .90 in their scale and each of its components exceeding .82. Thus, it can be inferred that both statistics confirm the high internal consistency of the instrument in both samples. Similarly, (Fernández de Juan et al., 2021) achieved a similar reliable test, obtaining an Omega of .94, suggesting high internal consistency of the instrument.

Subsequently, a descriptive analysis of the items was conducted, revealing positive skewness and moderate to low kurtosis. Through confirmatory factor analysis of the scale on partner violence

among young couples, a positive distribution of the items was established, as indicated by factor loadings ranging from .76 to .95. The model was found to exhibit adequate factorial invariance, as it measures the variable well in both sexes.

Regarding the statistical analysis of the items, the results show skewness values ranging from 1.1 to 2.90, indicating positive skewness. As for kurtosis, there was a tendency towards moderate to low values. These findings align with those of (González-Gijón and Soriano-Díaz, 2021), who also observed a similar response pattern from the respondents, with no differences between male and female subjects. Other studies indicate that the majority of women have experienced some form of violence at some point in their lives (ENDES, 2018).

It should be noted that there are various types of violence, and the model establishes 5 dimensions, which several studies identify: Emotional Abuse, including behaviors of belittlement, emotional and intellectual denigration, indifference to pain, minimization of harm caused, unjustified blame allocation, lack of consideration in important decision-making, jealousy, infidelity, among others (Galan Jimenez et al., 2019). Physical and Psychological Abuse encompass physical injuries resulting from aggressions inflicted on an individual, as well as verbal, gestural, or behavioral destruction of an individual (Suárez Hernández et al., 2020). Personal Devaluation relates to personal criticisms that undermine self-esteem and personal pride (Alfaro Urquiola, 2020). Social and Economic Control indicates violence aimed at controlling income, expenses, and assets (Moral De La Rubia and Ramos Basurto, 2015). Lastly, Sexual Abuse is conceptualized as sexually abusive, degrading, and humiliating behavior imposed against the victim's will (Urbiola et al., 2020; González-Gijón and Soriano-Díaz, 2021).

Regarding the internal structure of the scale, it was determined through confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), which involves "the search for groupings, which will be called dimensions, as well as the number of items that will constitute each dimension." The CFA confirmed that the distribution of the items is positive, with factor loadings ranging from .76 to .95. The evaluation of these constructs demands a prior definition of the instrument's content, validated based on a theoretical-conceptual framework that allows for the interpretation of results. Likewise, construct validity consistently measures the topic of interest. Statistically, the scale's evaluation adequately discriminates the construct, which is valid in its internal consistency (Luján-Tangarife and Cardona-Arias, 2015). These results can be compared with those of (González-Gijón and Soriano-Díaz, 2021), who designed an instrument with high internal consistency both at the global scale and in its dimensions, with values adjusted to the sample size. Similarly, similar studies show adequate consistency (Alfaro Urquiola, 2020; Tomaz Paiva et al., 2020; Urbiola et al., 2020), indicating structural and internal validity.

Moreover, the factorial invariance analysis of the Violence in Young Couples Relationships Scale (VIREPA) shows that the model possesses internal consistency and structural validity in both males and females, and is consistent and coherent with theoretical assumptions. These results are consistent with those found by (Moral De La Rubia and Ramos Basurto, 2015).

The strength of using psychometric scales regarding partner violence lies in the ability to measure details in violent behavior and its types. This allows for timely diagnosis to avoid negative impacts on people's quality of life and identify risks faced by victims of violence. This, in turn, enables the application of strategies to provide timely protection to victims of violence. On the other hand, the weaknesses are primarily related to the choice of statistical methods and other more rigorous and precise methods that could confirm its utility in the application of the scale (Mamani-Ramos et al., 2023). Therefore, various contexts where psychometric violence scales have been applied exhibit different components or dimensions to identify, assess, and measure violence in both genders. This highlights the need for further research on psychometric scales to improve the instruments' assessment of this phenomenon (Mamani-Ramos et al., 2023).

As for some of the Uses of VIREPA instrument in practice to address partner violence effectively, they are described in Table 9.

Table 9: Uses of VIREPA instrument in practice to address partner violence effectively

Use in practice	Description
Screening and Early Identification	- VIREPA can be used in healthcare settings, community centers, or law enforcement to identify early signs of partner violence. - It helps in recognizing patterns of abuse before they escalate.
Assessment of Severity and Nature	- Evaluates the intensity and frequency of abuse, whether emotional, physical, or psychological. - VIREPA provides insights into the unique aspects of the abusive relationship for targeted interventions.
Risk assessment	- Determines the likelihood of repeated or escalated violence. - Assists professionals in prioritizing cases and allocating resources effectively based on the VIREPA scores.
Tailoring Intervention Strategies	- Informs the development of specific strategies for intervention based on the type and severity of abuse identified by VIREPA. - Guides decision-making for both victim support and perpetrator rehabilitation programs.
Evaluating the Efficacy of Interventions	- Used as a tool for follow-up assessments to gauge the success of interventions. - Helps in modifying or reinforcing intervention strategies based on post-intervention VIREPA scores.
Training and Sensitization	- Serves as a training tool for professionals working in the field of domestic violence. - Enhances understanding and awareness of the nuances of partner abuse.
Research and Policy Development	- Facilitates research by providing quantifiable data on partner violence. - Can influence policy-making by highlighting areas needing more focus or resources, backed by empirical evidence from VIREPA data.
Support and Empowerment of Victims	- Identifies specific support needs of victims. - Encourages victims to seek help by objectively showing the extent of abuse, which can be a catalyst for taking action.

The research also had limitations, such as the use of a non-probabilistic sample, which affects result generalization. The young participants from Lima Metropolitana come from different provinces in Peru, making this a particular and determining factor for result generalization. Additionally, the year and context of scale development can influence behavior and perspectives related to violence in young couples. Therefore, it is necessary to incorporate other study variables related to life stage, economy, level of education, origin (coast, highlands, and jungle), among others, to contrast the various multicultural and multilingual scenarios.

5. Conclusions

VIREPA stands validated as a robust tool for gauging partner violence within the Peruvian setting, offering a thorough approach by covering five violence dimensions - Emotional Abuse, Physical and Psychological Abuse, Personal Devaluation, Social and Economic Control, and Sexual Abuse.

Its high Aiken's V score and Cronbach's Alpha and Omega coefficients affirm its reliability and validity, ensuring VIREPA's consistency and dependability for assessing partner violence. The scale's design ensures it works effectively for both men and women, showing no bias across genders.

Beyond its role in diagnosis, VIREPA finds versatile use in healthcare, law enforcement, social services, and research sectors. It serves multiple functions, including screening, risk assessment, customizing intervention approaches, evaluating intervention success, and aiding in policy formulation.

6. Funding

References

Agudelo, M., Chomali, E., Nuñez, G., Jordán, V., Fernando, N. P. J., Bravo, J., Bertolini, P., Katz, R., Callorda, F., & Jung, J. (2020). Las oportunidades de la digitalización en América Latina frente al Covid-19 (pp. 2–33). UNESCO. https://www.cepal.org/es/publicaciones/45360-oportunidades-la-digitalizacion-america-latina-frente-al-covid-19

Agudelo, M., Chomali, E., Nuñez, G., Jordán, V., Fernando, N. P. J., Bravo, J., Bertolini, P., Katz, R., Callorda, F., & Jung, J. (2020). *Las oportunidades de la digitalización en América Latina frente al Covid-19* (pp. 2–33). UNESCO. https://www.cepal.org/es/publicaciones/45360-oportunidades-la-digitalizacion-america-latina-frente-al-covid-19

Cardini, A., Bergamaschi, A., D'Alessandre, V., Torre, E., & Ollivier, A. (2020). *Educar en pandemia: Entre el aislamiento y la distancia social*. https://doi.org/10.18235/0002494

Centro de estudios MINEDUC. (2020). *Impacto del COVID-19 en los resultados de aprendizaje y escolaridad en Chile. Análisis con base en herramienta de simulación proporcionada por el Banco Mundial*. World Bank Group. https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12365/14663

Delgado-García, M., García-Prieto, F. J., & Gómez Hurtado, I. (2017). Moodle y Facebook como herramientas virtuales didácticas de mediación de aprendizajes: opinión de profesores y alumnos universitarios. *Revista Complutense de Educación, 29*(3), 807–827. https://doi.org/10.5209/RCED.53968

Garcia Alonso, R., Caldas, J. M., Davila, D. E., & Thoene, U. (2020). Políticas públicas de inclusión digital en Colombia. Una evaluación del Plan Vive Digital I (2010-2014). *Revista Espacios, 41*(7), 13. https://www.revistaespacios.com/a20v41n07/20410713.html

Gonzales-Castillo, J. R., Varona-Castillo, L., Dominguez-Morante, M. G., & Ocaña-Gutierrez, V. R. (2020). Pandemia de la COVID-19 y las Políticas de Salud Pública en el Perú: marzo-mayo 2020. *Revista de Salud Pública, 22*(2), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.15446/rsap.v22n2.87373

Instituto Peruano de Economía. (2021). *Efectos del COVID-19 en la educación | Instituto Peruano de Economía* (p. 1).

Inter-American Commission on Human Rights. (2020). *¿Cómo garantizar el acceso al derecho a la educación para niñas, niños y adolescentes durante la pandemia de COVID-19?* Inter-American Commission on Human Rights. http://www.oas.org/es/cidh/prensa/Comunicados/2020/301A.pdf

Jiménez Guerra, Y., & Ruiz González, M. de los Á. (2021). Reflexiones sobre los desafíos que enfrenta la educación superior en tiempos de COVID-19. *Economía y Desarrollo, 165*, 1–16. http://scielo.sld.cu/pdf/eyd/v165s1/0252-8584-eyd-165-s1-e3.pdf

Mercado Borja, W. E., Guarnieri, G., & Rodríguez, G. L. (2019). Análisis y evaluación de procesos de interactividad en entornos virtuales de aprendizaje. *Trilogía Ciencia Tecnología Sociedad, 11*(20), 63–99. https://doi.org/10.22430/21457778.1213

Ministério da Educação Brasil. (2020). *Ministério da Educação*. https://www.gov.br/mec/pt-br

Ministerio de Educación de Argentina. (2020). *Aprender en Casa.* https://www.aprenderencasa.com.ar/

Ministerio de Educación de Chile. (2020). *Aprendo en línea. Ayuda Mineduc*. https://www.ayudamineduc.cl/ficha/aprendo-en-linea

Ministerio de Educación de Colombia. (2020). *El programa "Profe en Tu Casa" llega a los territorios a través de siete canales regionales para acompañar el proceso de aprendizaje de los estudiantes y apoyar a sus familias - Ministerio de Educación Nacional de Colombia.* https://www.mineducacion.gov.co/1759/w3-printer-395785.html

Ministerio de Educación de Costa Rica. (2020). *Aprendo en casa*. https://recursos.mep.go.cr/2020/aprendoencasa/

Ministerio de Educación de Cuba. (2020). *Caracterización general de la parrilla de programación escolar del Canal Educativo – Curso 2019-2020*. https://www.mined.gob.cu/canal-educativo/?print=pdf

Ministerio de Educación de Guatemala. (2020). *Conéctate con la Estrella archivos - Portal SERTV.* https://sertv.gob.pa/category/conectate-con-la-estrella/

Ministerio de Educación de Paraguay. (2020*). Paraguay Aprende*. https://aprendizaje.mec.edu.py/aprendizaje/

Ministerio de Educación de Perú. (2020). *Aprendo en casa*. https://aprendoencasa.pe/

Ministerio de Educación del Ecuador. (2020). *Plan Educativo "Aprendemos Juntos en Casa."* https://educacion.gob.ec/plan-educativo-aprendemos-juntos-en-casa/

Ministerio de Educación del Estado Plurinacional de Bolivia. (2020). *Educa Bolivia*. http://educa.minedu.gob.bo/

Ministerio de Educación y Cultura de Uruguay. (2020). *Plan Ceibal*. https://www.ceibal.edu.uy/es

Ministerio del Poder Popular para la Educación de Venezuela. (2020*). ¡Las escuelas están sembrando! ¡A unir trabajo y estudio! ¡Producción y educación*! http://me.gob.ve/

Nogueira, J., Rocha, D. G., & Akerman, M. (2021). Políticas públicas adoptadas en la pandemia de la COVID-19 en tres países de América Latina: contribuciones de la Promoción de la Salud para no volver al mundo que existía. *Global Health Promotion, 28*(1), 117–126. https://doi.org/10.1177/1757975920977837

Ramírez-Pereira, M., Pérez Abarca, R., & Machuca-Contreras, F. (2021). Políticas públicas de promoción de salud en el contexto de la COVID-19, en Chile, una aproximación desde el análisis situacional. *Global Health Promotion, 28*(1), 127–136. https://doi.org/10.1177/1757975920978311

Reimers, F. (2021). Oportunidades educativas y la pandemia de la COVID-19 en América Latina. *Revista Iberoamericana de Educación, 86*(1), 9–23. https://doi.org/10.35362/rie8614557

Reimers, F. M., & Schleicher, A. (2020). *A framework to guide an education response to the COVID-19 Pandemic of 2020*. Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development. https://learningportal.iiep.unesco.org/en/library/a-framework-to-guide-an-education-response-to-the-covid-19-pandemic-of-2020

Renna Gallano, H. (2020). *El derecho a la educación en tiempos de crisis: Alternativas para la continuidad educativa. Sistematización de estrategias y respuestas públicas en América Latina y el Caribe ante el cierre de escuelas por la pandemia del COVID19*. Universidad Abierta de Recoleta. https://reliefweb.int/report/venezuela-bolivarian-republic/el-derecho-la-educaci-n-en-tiempos-de-crisis-alternativas-para

Rojas, O., Martínez, M., & Vivas, A. (2021). Responsabilidad social universitaria en tiempos de pandemia: mirada desde la función docente (Universidad de Antofagasta – Chile). *Revista Ibero-Americana de Estudos Em Educação, 16*(2), 424–439. https://doi.org/10.21723/riaee.v16i2.14707

Scaff, E. A. da S., Souza, K. R., & Bortot, C. M. (2021). COVID-19 e educação pública no Brasil: efeitos e opções políticas em contexto de vulnerabilidade social. *Revista de Estudios Teóricos y Epistemológicos En Política Educativa, 6*, 1–19. https://doi.org/10.5212/retepe.v.6.18357.006

Secretaría de Educación Pública de México. (2020). Aprende en casa. https://aprendeencasa.sep.gob.mx/

Shi, Y., Pyne, K., Kulophas, D., & Bangpan, M. (2022). Exploring equity in educational policies and interventions in primary and secondary education in the context of public health emergencies: A systematic literature review. *International Journal of Educational Research, 111*, 101911. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2021.101911

Suyo-Vega, J. A., Meneses-La-Riva, M. E., & Fernández-Bedoya, V. H. (2021). Miradas divergentes sobre la metodología virtual universitaria. *3C TIC: Cuadernos de Desarrollo Aplicados a Las TIC, 10*(1), 69–91. https://doi.org/10.17993/3ctic.2021.101.69-91

Tiramonti, G., Volman, V., & Braga, F. (2021). *¿Cuáles son las consecuencias de la interrupción de clases presenciales? (p. 10)*. https://cms.argentinosporlaeducacion.org/media/reports/Consecuencias_de_interrupcion_de_clases.pdf

UNESCO. (2020*). IAU global survey on the impact of Covid-19 on higher education around the world*. https://www.iesalc.unesco.org/2020/04/02/el-coronavirus-covid-19-y-la-educacion-superior-impacto-y-recomendaciones/

United Nations Children's Fund. (2020). *COVID-19 Education: Contingency Planning Risk Reduction, Preparedness and Response Framework*. UNICEF. https://www.unicef.org/lac/media/11176/file

United Nations Sustainable Development Group. (2020). *Policy Brief: Education during COVID-19 and beyond. In Informe de políticas: la educación durante la COVID - 19 y después de ella (Vol. 1, Issue 1)*. https://unsdg.un.org/es/resources/informe-de-politicas-educacion-durante-la-covid-19-y-mas-alla