Systematic review of dating violence questionnaires in Ibero-America and evaluation of their measurement properties

Abstract  Being a victim or perpetrator of dating violence has been associated with poor mental health, substance abuse, and sexual risk behaviors. The aim of this study was to carry out a systematic review and to evaluate the quality of the measurement properties of dating violence questionnaires, created or adapted in Ibero-America from 1981 to 2017, for a population aged 12 to 29 years and published in Spanish, English, Portuguese or French. The search was conducted in PubMed, ISI Web of Knowledge, EBSCO, ScienceDirect, SCOPUS, SciELO and included manual searches. Two independent researchers conducted both the systematic review and the evaluation of measurement properties. Of 5,812 articles identified, 22 studies involving 16 different questionnaires of dating violence were included. In general, the questionnaires showed evidence of internal consistency, content validity and construct validity, although no study presented evidence of criterion validity, reproducibility, sensitivity, or floor and ceiling effects. Among the cross-cultural adaptations, 42% of them included translation, back translation, committee of experts in translation and piloting. Two questionnaires created, CMN and VADRI/Spain-Mexico and two adaptations of the same questionnaire CTS/Brazil-Mexico received the highest scores.
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**Introduction**

The study of dating violence (DV) has expanded in the last three decades, as DV has increasingly been considered a public health problem by different experts. Indeed, it has been associated with sexual risk behaviors, substance abuse, alcohol consumption, eating disorders, smoking, and suicidal behavior.

The literature proposes different definitions of DV. One of them, defines DV as acts that hurt the other person in the context of a romantic relationship in which the two members of the pair are said to be going out together. Lavoie et al. define it as: «any behavior that is prejudicial to the partner’s development or health by compromising his or her physical, psychological, or sexual integrity», while the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) characterizes DV as a type of intimate partner violence whose nature may be physical, psychological or sexual and may include harassment via electronic media. However, the lack of consensus in defining DV has generated variations in terms of classification and measurement and, therefore, in the prevalence obtained.

Measurement is one of the pillars of scientific research, so that one of the main challenges in the study of DV is to have valid and reliable questionnaires to obtain accurate and objective information in order to contribute to the development of educational programs and health promotion. Thus, a systematic review of available questionnaires and the evaluation of their measurement properties may help identify the most appropriate ones by evaluating their scope and limitations and systematically and objectively synthesizing the evidence of empirical studies. Such reviews are valuable methodological tools for researchers because they allow new questionnaires to be created or existing ones to be adapted based on the resulting recommendations.

We are aware of four reviews of DV measurement questionnaires, of which only one is a systematic review. In Spain, López-Cepero Borrego et al. in a non-systematic international study identified a total of 54 questionnaires measuring partner violence (including domestic violence and DV) published between 1974 and 2012, among which only three questionnaires were specifically developed for DV in adolescents and/ or young people: the Conflict in Adolescent Dating Relationships Inventory (CADRI), the Dating Questionnaire (CUVINO) and Violence faite aux Filles dans les Fréquentations à l’Adolescence (VIF-FA). This work evidenced the incipient field of study with regard to the measurement of DV.

In a non-systematic review performed in the United States by Smith et al., 48 DV measures developed and used between 1976 and 2011 were identified. The most commonly used measures were the Safe Dates Scale (SDS), the Conflict in Adolescent Dating Relationships Inventory (CADRI) and the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS). The authors also identified multiple conceptual definitions in the instruments and emphasized the need to obtain more information about the measurement properties of the questionnaires used.

In Caselman et al. the authors performed a non-systematic review comparing five DV questionnaires frequently used in English-speaking countries. The five questionnaires analyzed were Aggression in Dating Situations (AADS), the Acceptance of Violence Questionnaire (AVQ), the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS), the Conflict in Adolescent Dating Relationships Inventory (CADRI) and the Justification of Verbal/Coercive Tactics Scale (JVCT). The criteria of analysis and comparison included the usefulness of the questionnaire, the relevance for the study of DV and the reported measurement properties. Regarding the usefulness of the measures, it was found that the CTS and the CADRI were the most frequently used; these questionnaires are recommended by the authors as the most relevant for the study of DV. In relation to measurement properties, the authors suggest further investigation regarding the precision and sensitivity of the questionnaires evaluated in the article. However, this review was not exhaustive and was not conclusive with respect to the analysis of measurement properties.

In the systematic review by Exner-Cortners et al., the measurement properties of 13 DV questionnaires developed between 2006 and 2016 for use with adolescents were analyzed. This work was a thorough evaluation of the measurement properties of the analyzed questionnaires, which included a classification of measurement types in terms of behaviors and attitudes, presented in two parts. They included four questionnaires (CADRI, AADS, AMDV, AFDV) adapted to Spanish-speaking countries (Spain and Mexico). The authors, similarly to Caselman et al., found that the most frequently used questionnaire was the CTS followed by the CADRI. However, it was concluded that the CADRI had greater reliability and validity with regard to measurement.

In the four reviews mentioned, a common denominator is the lack of information on mea-
measurement properties of questionnaires used to measure DV in adolescents and young people in Ibero-America. Taking into account the high prevalence of DV in Ibero-America\textsuperscript{25-29}, it is necessary to pursue an approach that considers the current situation regarding the measurement properties of questionnaires used in the region to measure DV\textsuperscript{30}.

Therefore, the present research aimed to perform a systematic review to evaluate the quality of measurement properties of DV questionnaires used in the literature in Ibero-America.

Methods

To perform this systematic review, the guidelines established by the PRISMA statement\textsuperscript{31} were followed. To identify and determine the eligibility of articles, six scientific databases were used – PubMed, ISI Web of Knowledge, ScienceDirect, SCOPUS, SciELO, and EBSCO – along with manual searches (understood as the identification of articles through the reference section of the selected articles).

The search was conducted using combinations of keywords referenced in the Health Science Descriptors (DeCS) and in the Medical Subject Headings (MeSH): child* OR adolescent* OR teenage* OR pediatr* AND dating violence* OR intimate partner violence OR dating aggression OR dating abuse OR partner abuse OR date fight* OR teen dating violence AND questionnaire OR survey* OR scale* OR assess* OR measure* OR instrument*. All searches were performed in English, Spanish, Portuguese, and French, and filters were applied for each Ibero-American country.

Inclusion and exclusion criteria

Original research articles and book chapters published and accepted for publication between 1 January 1981 and 5 March 2017 including information on the measurement properties of questionnaires created or adapted and used for measuring DV in a youth population aged 12 to 29 years\textsuperscript{32} were considered.

Articles or questionnaires in which the participants were married were excluded. The lower limit of this search was 1981 because it was the year the first research article on dating violence was published\textsuperscript{33}.

Extraction and selection of articles

Two authors of the present study participated in the extraction and evaluation of the studies by performing the article search and holding consensus meetings between them to make a decision regarding the inclusion or exclusion of each selected articles.

After the search, the articles were classified into four categories: 1) creation of a questionnaire, 2) validation and/or cultural adaptation of a measurement questionnaire 3) analysis of measurement properties, and 4) observational studies showing the measurement properties of validated or non-standardized DV questionnaires. The recommendation of Caselman et al.\textsuperscript{16} to differentiate between questionnaires evaluating behaviors or attitudes in DV were incorporated because it is an essential difference in relation to the construct validity and reliability of the measuring questionnaires\textsuperscript{34,35}.

Evaluation of the measurement properties of questionnaires and quality of the articles

The measurement properties of questionnaires were evaluated using the criteria of Terwee et al.\textsuperscript{36} These criteria evaluate quality and measurement properties in the following domains: content validity, internal consistency, criterion validity, construct validity, reproducibility (including agreement and reliability), responsiveness, floor and ceiling effects and interpretability. Each dimension is evaluated based on whether the measurement properties of the questionnaires meet methodological quality criteria using four rating categories: a) positive rating (+), b) indeterminate rating (?), c) negative rating (-) and d) no information available (0). Based on this tool, two authors independently assessed each of the studies. The agreement index was calculated using Cohen's kappa coefficient.

In addition, other characteristics of the studies were recorded for the analysis: questionnaire name, country of origin, role of violence (e.g., victimization, perpetration), number of items and dimensions, age range and mean age of the sample, type of population (e.g., students), sample size, measurement theory (e.g., classical test theory, item response theory) and the four classification categories identified above (creation, adaptation, review of measurement properties and observational study).

In reference to cross-cultural adaptation, four of fourteen points were considered in the
section on cross-cultural validation of the COS-MIN checklist, namely, translation, retro-translation, piloting and inclusion of a committee of translation experts. The selection of these four points is based on international guidelines for questionnaires cross-cultural adaptation.

**Results**

A total of 22 articles were included for the analysis (Figure 1): nine articles were from Spain, three from Brazil, three from Mexico, two from Chile, one from Colombia, one from Puerto Rico, while three studies included several countries (Brazil and Mexico; Spain, Mexico and Argentina; and Spain, Mexico and Guatemala). It should be noted that no articles were published between 1981 and 2003; the selected articles were published as of 2004.

A total of 16 questionnaires were identified: 12 of them measured violent dating behaviors, two measured attitudes, and two questionnaires measured attitudes and behaviors.

Of the 22 studies identified, seven studies reported on seven questionnaires creations in Ibero-America: Experiences of Violence in Partner and Family Relationships in University Students (CEV-RPF); Dating Abuse Questionnaire (CMN); Questionnaire on Psychological Violence in Courtship (PDV-Q); Revised Dating Violence Questionnaire (CUVINO-R); Violence in Adolescents’ Dating Relationships Inventory (VADRI); VEC Scale; and VGP Scale. In 10 studies, seven cross-culturally adapted questionnaires as well as validations were analyzed: AADS; CADRI; CADRI RI; CTS2; VEC Scale; CUVINO; JVCT; M-CTS and PAJ. Three articles analyzed the measurement properties of three questionnaires, CADRI, CMN and VEC Scale, and two observational studies refer to the measurement properties of two questionnaires, CVP and Checklist of Experiences of Partner Abuse.

The first work in the scientific literature to measure DV in Ibero-America was published in 2004 and refers to the cross-cultural adaptation and validation of the CTS scale. The study was conducted simultaneously in 17 countries, including two Ibero-American countries: Brazil and Mexico. The first questionnaire created in Ibero-America was the Checklist of Experiences of Partner Abuse. It was implemented in Colombia in 2008, and its measurement properties were reported in 2010. This questionnaire evaluated the frequency of physical, verbal, emotional, psychological, sexual, and economic abuse and negligence towards the partner.

Spain accounted for the greatest number of studies: four transcultural adaptations, five questionnaires creations and two articles analyzing the measurement properties of two questionnaires. Similarly, between 2009 and 2017, six questionnaires were created in Ibero-America.

Regarding the role of DV, of the fourteen questionnaires measuring behaviors, six questionnaires considered the victim and perpetrator roles in DV: CADRI, CEV-RPF, CTS2, M-CTS, PDV-Q and VADRI; and eight questionnaires measured victimization in DV: CMN, CUVINO, CUVINO-R, CVP, LCMP, PAJ, VEC, and VGP.

One of the behavioral questionnaires, CADRI, evaluated street adolescents; students (secondary, high school and/or university) comprised the sample set in the other studies. The number of participants in the reviewed studies

---

**Figure 1.** Flow chart of the selection of articles on dating violence measurement questionnaires in Ibero-America.
ranged from 36 to 5,596. The number of items in the measurement questionnaires ranged from 10 to 95. The measurement items reported by the scales ranged from one to eight factors (Table 1). In relation to measurement theory, only the VADRI questionnaire\(^3\) considers item response theory; the rest of the questionnaires use classical test theory.

Regarding cross-cultural adaptation, four aspects of validation were considered: translation, back translation, piloting and committee of translation experts\(^3\). Five of twelve measures, AADS Mexico, CADRI Mexico\(^4\), CTS2-Brazil, CTS2-Mexico\(^5\) and PAF\(^6\), reported the process including all four points. Three questionnaires, AADS Spain, JVCT\(^7\) and M-CTS\(^8\), fulfilled three aspects: translation, committee of experts and piloting. The CADRI inventory\(^9\) reported two aspects: back translation and expert committee, while the same questionnaires validated in the same country (Brazil) by Minayo et al.\(^{10}\) only included back translation. Three questionnaires, CADRI Spain, CUVINO Chile and CUVINO Argentina-Mexico-Spain, did not report information on cross-cultural adaptation. From the above, it is observed that most of the processes of cross-cultural adaptation and validation were not performed according to the aspects evaluated, except for five measures (Table 1).

**Results of the evaluation of measurement properties**

The evaluation of the measurement properties was performed considering the criteria of Terwee et al.\(^{11}\). This review was performed by two of the authors independently, and to evaluate mutual agreement Cohen’s kappa coefficient was used, whose result was .905, considered very good.

**Content validity**

According to the criteria of Terwee et al.\(^{11}\), a positive (+) rating is given to questionnaires that provide a clear description of the questionnaire’s objective, the population and the selection of the items. In the present review, six of seven scales describing the construction and validation of questionnaires, CEV-RPP\(^12\), CMN\(^13\), PDV-Q\(^14\), VADRI\(^15\), VEC\(^16\) and VGP Scale\(^17\), obtained a positive (+) rating. The CUVINO-R questionnaire\(^18\) did not provide information about content validity so it was scored with (0) (no information). This section does not apply to adaptations and/or validations or observational studies because content validity is only pertinent to the creation of questionnaires\(^11\).

**Internal consistency**

For the evaluation of internal consistency, Terwee et al.\(^{11}\) propose assigning a positive (+) rating to studies that perform factor analysis and Cronbach’s alpha calculated per dimension ranging from .70 to .95.

It was found that five questionnaires, CMN\(^11\), PDV-Q\(^12\), VADRI Spain-Mexico\(^13\), VEC\(^14\) and VGP Scale\(^15\), reported an adequate consistency, for which they received a positive (+) rating.

In relation to the intermediate rating (?) Terwee et al.\(^{11}\) apply this rating to questionnaires that do not report factor analysis. Such was the case of CADRI Brasil\(^14\), CTS2\(^15\), CEV-RPI\(^16\) and CVPU\(^17\).

A negative (-) rating was given when Cronbach’s alpha was <.70 or >.95. This was the case of eight questionnaires: CADRI Spain, Mexico and Brazil\(^18,22,30,36\), CVPU\(^19\), M-CTS\(^20\), AADS Spain and Mexico, JVCT\(^21,22\), Checklist of Experiences of Partner Abuse\(^23\), CUVINO revised Spanish, Chilean version\(^24,32,33\) and VADRI Guatemala\(^34\).

In one inventory, no internal consistency information was found, PAF\(^25\), and it was scored (0) (no information available) (Table 2).

**Construct validity**

A score (+) was given when the questionnaires had convergent and/or divergent validity using known or relevant questionnaires and when at least 75% of the results were found in the expected direction and size\(^26\). Five scales, VADRI\(^3\), CTS2\(^21\), CMN\(^11\), AADS and JVCT\(^7\) demonstrated adequate construct validity (+). In the rest of the questionnaires no construct validity information was found, so a value of (0) was assigned (without information) (Table 3).

**Validity of criterion, reproducibility: agreement and reliability, responsiveness and floor and ceiling effects**

In the questionnaires that were included in the analysis, no information was found on the extent to which questionnaires scores conformed to a “gold standard”, reproducibility, measurement error, responsiveness and floor and ceiling effects so that the questionnaires received a score of (0) in these sections.
Table 1. Description of measurement questionnaires created or adapted for dating violence in Ibero-America.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
<th>Country of origin</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Violence role</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Type of study</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>% of women</th>
<th>Mean age (SD)</th>
<th>Theory of measurement</th>
<th>Cross-cultural adaptation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AADS b</td>
<td>Mx 2006 n/a</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Justification of female, male, and peer aggression.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>307 EB</td>
<td>62.5 - ( - )</td>
<td>TCT</td>
<td>TRT, P, CE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CADRI a</td>
<td>Mx 2006 V, P</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Sexual, physical, relational, verbal-emotional violence, threats.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>307 EB</td>
<td>62.5 - ( - )</td>
<td>TCT</td>
<td>TRT, P, CE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Es 2006</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>572 ES, EB</td>
<td>58.4 M. 16.7 (1.0), H.16.7 (1.0)</td>
<td>TCT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Br 2011</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>440 EB</td>
<td>- - ( - )</td>
<td>TCT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Br 2012</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>43 ASC</td>
<td>26.0 15.3 (1.1)</td>
<td>TCT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEV-RPF a</td>
<td>PR 2012 V, P</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Violence of the partner toward the student, violence of the partner towards the student, violence observed between the parents and violence of the parents towards the student.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>267 U</td>
<td>74.0 -</td>
<td>TCT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Es 2013</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Physical, verbal, relational violence and conflict resolution.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>571 U</td>
<td>70.1 18.7 (1.)</td>
<td>TCT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMN a</td>
<td>Mx 2012 V</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Psychological, physical, sexual, economic abuse and sociocultural influence.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1,092 U</td>
<td>100.0 20.9 (2.6)</td>
<td>TCT</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mx 2014 V</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2,157 EB, U</td>
<td>100.0 18.9 (2.6)</td>
<td>TCT</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mx 2004</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Negotiation, psychological aggression, physical aggression, sexual violence and physical harm.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>308 U</td>
<td>83.7 20.7 ( - )</td>
<td>TCT</td>
<td>P, CE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI 2014</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>470 U</td>
<td>51.3 21.3 (2.1)</td>
<td>TCT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

it continues
Table 1. Description of measurement questionnaires created or adapted for dating violence in Ibero-America.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
<th>Country of origin</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Violence role</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Type of study</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Population % of women</th>
<th>Mean age (SD)</th>
<th>Theory of measurement</th>
<th>Cross-cultural adaptation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CUVINO a</td>
<td>Ar, Es y Mx</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Emotional punishment, coercion, detachment, physical, gender, humiliation, instrumental and sexual.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>5,170 EB, U</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>19.1 (2.4)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>150 ES</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUVINO-R a</td>
<td>Es</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Detachment, humiliation, coercion, physical and sexual violence.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1,138 EB, U</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>18.5 (2.1)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Violencia psicológica, violencia física y actitudes hacia la violencia íntima.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>427 U</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>16.2 (1.0)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JVCT b</td>
<td>Es</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Justificación de agresión verbal femenina, masculina, de tácticas de control femeninas, tácticas de control masculinas, de tácticas de celos femenina, de tácticas de celos masculina.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2,856 EB</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>17.1 (1.1)</td>
<td>T, P, CE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUVINO</td>
<td>Ar, Es y Mx</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Maltrato físico, verbal, emocional, psicológico, sexual, económico y negligente.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>562 U</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>18.3 (1.1)</td>
<td>TCT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>5,596 EB, U</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>19.7 (2.8)</td>
<td>T, P, CE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-CTS a</td>
<td>Es</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>V,P</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Argumentación, agresión psicológica/verbal, agresión física leve y agresión física grave.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>5,596 EB, U</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>19.7 (2.8)</td>
<td>T, P, CE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAJ ab</td>
<td>Br</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Relaciones afectivas y de amor, experiencias difíciles, comportamientos sexuales, familia, comportamientos y estilos de vida, sentimientos y emociones.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>36 EB, U</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TRT, CE, P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDV-Q a</td>
<td>Es</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>V,P</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Agresión y victimización de la violencia psicológica.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>670 U</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>22.0 (1.8)</td>
<td>TCT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VADRI a</td>
<td>Es</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>V,P</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Violencia física, verbal-emocional, sexual, relacional, amenazas.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>162 EB, U</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18.5 (1.2)</td>
<td>TRI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gt</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>V,P</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>91 EB, U</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19.8 (.04)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mx</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>V,P</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>213 EB, U</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18.3 (1.1)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 1. Description of measurement questionnaires created or adapted for dating violence in Ibero-America.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
<th>Country of origin</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Violence role</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Type of study</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>% of women</th>
<th>Mean age (SD)</th>
<th>Theory of measurement</th>
<th>Cross-cultural adaptation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VEC&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Es</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Unidimensional</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>21 (-)</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VGP&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Es</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Hostile domination and possessive-control domination.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1338</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>20.3 (2.9)</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: CMN, Dating Abuse Questionnaire; CEV-RPF, Questionnaire of Experiences of Violence in Partner and Family Relationships in University Students; CUVINO-R, Revised Dating Violence Questionnaire; CUVINO, Dating Violence Questionnaire; LCMP, Checklist of Experiences of Partner Abuse; PDV-Q, Psychological Dating Violence Questionnaire; VADRI, Violence in Adolescents’ Dating Relationships Inventory; VGP, Gender Violence Perception. Scoring: + Positive, - negative, 0 no information available.

Table 2. Quality analysis of the measurement properties of dating violence questionnaires created in Ibero-America.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
<th>Country of origin</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Content validity</th>
<th>Internal Consistency</th>
<th>Criterion validity</th>
<th>Construct validity</th>
<th>Reproducibility Agreement</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>Responsiveness</th>
<th>Floor and ceiling effects</th>
<th>Interpretability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEV-RPF</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMN</td>
<td>Mx</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUVINO-R</td>
<td>Es</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVPU</td>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCMP</td>
<td>Co</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDV-Q</td>
<td>Es</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VADRI</td>
<td>Es</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gt</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mx</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEC</td>
<td>Es</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VGP</td>
<td>Es</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: CMN, Dating Abuse Questionnaire; CEV-RPF, Questionnaire of Experiences of Violence in Partner and Family Relationships in University Students; CUVINO-R, Revised Dating Violence Questionnaire; CVPU, Questionnaire on partner violence in university students; LCMP, Checklist of Experiences of Partner Abuse; PDV-Q, Psychological Dating Violence Questionnaire; VADRI, Violence in Adolescents’ Dating Relationships Inventory; VGP, Gender Violence Perception. Scoring: + Positive, ? indeterminate, - negative, 0 no information available.
Interpretability

According to the criteria of Terwee et al., a questionnaire receives an intermediate score (?) if it has less than four comparative categories for the study sample (means and standard deviation). In the three questionnaires CTS2 in Brazil, Mexico, VEC and CUVINO information on means and standard deviations by gender was included as a category of analysis. In the other questionnaires, no information was found (0).

Discussion

In this systematic review, 22 articles were analyzed that reported on 16 questionnaires of DV measurement used in Ibero-America and were published as of 2004. Fourteen of them measured DV behaviors, while only two of them measured behaviors and attitudes and two measured attitudes. Because attitudes have been linked to violent dating behaviors, in recent years the study of attitudes in DV has been emphasized as a fundamental aspect in its prevention.

It should be noted that most of the studies involved young people attending school, thus generating the opportunity for the creation or adaptation of questionnaires aimed at young populations not attending school who may have different social roles, which could influence how they relate to their partner.

In terms of the cross-cultural adaptation of DV questionnaires in Ibero-America, only five of twelve questionnaires reported the complete adaptation process according to the international guidelines for the adaptation of questionnaires. The process of cross-cultural adaptation of questionnaires must guarantee semantic and linguistic equivalence to the original version, which highlights the need for more methodological rigor in the adaptation process of the questionnaires analyzed. Borsa et al. suggests that most research on cross-cultural adaptation is invalid when inadequate or incomplete procedures are performed in the adaptation of instruments.

Considering the criteria of Terwee et al. for the evaluation of the quality of properties measured in scale creation it was found that two questionnaires, CMN and VADRI/Spain-Mexico, received the highest scores in content validity, construct validity and adequate internal consistency. It is important to note that the CMN and VADRI/Spain-Mexico questionnaires had not been evaluated in previous reviews.

Table 3. Quality analysis of the measurement properties of dating violence questionnaires adapted in Ibero-America.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
<th>Country of adaptation</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Internal consistency</th>
<th>Construct validity</th>
<th>Criterion validity</th>
<th>Reproducibility</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>Interpretability</th>
<th>Floor and ceiling effects</th>
<th>Responsiveness</th>
<th>Agreement reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AADS</td>
<td>Mx</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CADRI</td>
<td>Es</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mx</td>
<td>Br</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Br</td>
<td>Br</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Es</td>
<td>Es</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTS2</td>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUVINO</td>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JVCT</td>
<td>Es</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-CITS</td>
<td>Br</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: AADS: Attitudes Towards Dating Violence Scales; CADRI: Conflict in Adolescent Dating Relationships Inventory; CTS2: Revised Conflict Tactics Scale; CUVINO: Dating Violence Questionnaire; JVCT: Justification of verbal/coercive Tactics Scale. Score: + Positive, ? indeterminate, - negative, 0 no information available.
Regarding the adapted questionnaires, the CTS-Brazil and Mexico obtained the highest score, receiving an intermediate score in internal consistency and a positive score in construct validity.

On the findings of psychometric properties in previous reviews, Exner-Cortners et al. concluded that the questionnaire with greatest statistical support was the CADRI. However, in the present review according to the criteria of Terwee et al. only information about internal consistency was found, and in terms of transcultural adaptation only the CADRI version Mexico considered the four aspects of validation evaluated. López-Cepero Borrego et al., in their review of questionnaires measuring intimate partner violence, recommended the use of the CADRI and CUVINO in adolescents and young people because of their superior structural stability compared to the M-CTS.

The questionnaires most used in this review were the CADRI, CTS and CUVINO, as reported in previous reviews of DV measures.

It is important to note that three questionnaires adaptations received an intermediate rating with respect to interpretability. Neither created nor adapted measures included information about criterion validity, reproducibility, responsiveness and floor ceiling effects. Therefore, in conducting research on the creation and adaptation of DV questionnaires, greater effort must be made to report these properties.

However, it is important to clarify that the questionnaires without high scores included in the analysis are not necessarily invalid or unreliable questionnaires but rather that no available evidence demonstrating such properties was found.

It is necessary to have standardized tools and criteria to evaluate the measurement properties of evaluation questionnaires. For this review there was no tool available in the field of psychology to evaluate the quality of properties measured, so the criteria of Terwee et al. were used. However, some of these criteria are more responsive to clinical measures. It is important to note that the authors of this review were aware of the latest version of the criteria by Terwee et al. However, the version by Terwee et al. was used instead due to its feasibility and clear interpretation of results.

The findings of this study demonstrate that research on DV measurement in young Ibero-Americans has recently been increasing, as reflected by the fact that previous reviews of DV questionnaires were published only since 2015.

Furthermore, a high prevalence of DV has been demonstrated in Ibero-America. Many studies are focused on women, the results of which show a violation of women’s human rights, as in the case of Mexico, specifically in Ciudad Juarez, where attacks against women and the number of femicides has increased. Similarly, Ramos-Lira et al. report that organized crime in Mexico has led to violence against women, as seen by the decrease in denunciations for fear of identifying victims with drug trafficking and the pressure on women to become involved with criminals.

Increased attacks and femicides demonstrate the importance of preventing violent dating relationships at an early age and the relationship between organized crime or intrafamily violence.

For future research, it is recommended that the following measurement properties of questionnaires be reported: agreement, reliability, responsiveness and floor and ceiling effects. Similarly, we suggest improving the measurement properties of existing DV questionnaires and following standardized guidelines for cross-cultural adaptation, which would allow for international comparisons of DV prevalence, behaviors and attitudes, facilitating the establishment of objectives and goals in DV interventions.
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