





Research Article

Lifestyle and Violence among Dating in University Students

Ana Belén Arredondo Provecho ^{1,2}, María-Gema Cid-Expósito ¹,
Marta Losa-Iglesias ¹ and Inmaculada Corral-Liria ¹

¹Faculty of Health Sciences, Department of Nursing and Stomatology, Rey Juan Carlos University, Madrid, Spain

²Hospital Universitario Fundación Alcorcón, Madrid, Spain

Correspondence should be addressed to María-Gema Cid-Expósito; gema.cid@urjc.es

Received 7 September 2022; Revised 6 January 2023; Accepted 10 January 2023; Published 7 February 2023

Academic Editor: Georgian Badicu

Copyright © 2023 Ana Belén Arredondo Provecho et al. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Purpose. The aim of the study is to analyse the relationship between the lifestyle of university students in relation to the violence they exert or receive. **Design and Method.** A cross-sectional descriptive study of young university students with a current or recent partner was conducted. Their lifestyle was analysed by administering a questionnaire that included the Multidimensional Scale of Dating Violence. **Findings.** The percentage of women in both roles was higher but that of an unhealthy lifestyle (use of tobacco, alcohol, or other drugs, as well as sexual intercourse without condoms) favours violence, regardless of gender. **Practice Implications.** It is essential to develop training programs that educate young people about equality and healthy lifestyles to create healthy relationships and prevent violence in them.

1. Introduction

In 1998, the World Health Organization (WHO) defined lifestyle as the number of habitual reactions of a person and the patterns of behaviour developed during socialization processes [1]. Habits such as regular exercise, adequate nutrition and sleep, good management and enjoyment of leisure, healthy social relationships, and mental health care are keys to leading a healthy lifestyle. It should also be noted that there are factors such as smoking, drug and alcohol consumption, negative influences in the social environment, and little education received about sexual relations or emotional intelligence that negatively affect an individual's lifestyle and can prompt violent behaviour. All these causes are variable since they are subject to social and personal factors that can positively or negatively influence the life of each human being [2].

A healthy lifestyle has a positive impact on the physical and mental health of individuals. Some habits are very important to lead a healthy lifestyle. Nevertheless, there are factors that may negatively influence an individual's social environment; a clear example is the lack of education on sexual relations and emotional intelligence [3].

Adolescence is a stage in which physical, psychological, and social changes occur [4]. It is important to establish equal relationships between men and women at this stage since there is a high risk of developing sexist or traditional attitudes that may follow a stereotyped gender model [5].

Young people start to show their feelings, attitudes, and sexual interests at this stage of their life. However, considering the problematic behaviours of some teenagers, their parents and teachers are the ones who must educate them in the affective-sexual sphere. This will allow young people to lead with future problems and avoid violent relationships [6].

Several studies have analysed situations of gender violence at universities, in which participants claimed to have been involved in situations of both physical and psychological or sexual violence [7–13].

Different studies show that women of university age are more likely to suffer physical or sexual violence, while men tend to suffer mostly surveillance and cyberbullying by their partners [7, 9, 10, 13, 14].

In recent years, studies related to gender violence in universities [15–18] have shown that lessons in the

classroom about how to avoid situations of intimate partner violence are necessary, but have they related lifestyles related to the consumption of psychoactive substances and/or alcohol with gender violence? [19, 20]. Some universities [16, 21–23] have proposed programs or other options to combat gender-based violence. So, their purpose is to reduce cases of violence in college-age couples by promoting awareness and knowledge.

It should be noted that in Spain, an innovative project was promoted in 2018 with a duration of three academic courses, it is called “PRO-Move healthy relationships: prevention of gender violence in adolescents.” The aim of this programme is to provide young people with information about gender violence, sexist attitudes, myths of romantic love, and healthy relationships through collaborative learning and active participation based on practical and dynamic exercises, play activities, and discussion groups [23].

These questions raise the following ones: what elements of university students’ lifestyles are related to the violence they exercise or receive? And, what are the differences depending on the sex of the person?

The objective of the present study is to analyse the relationship between the lifestyle of students at different university degrees in relation to the violence they exert or receive, taking into account the training acquired in this field, disaggregating the analysis by sex.

The manuscript hypothesis states that a healthy lifestyle is a protective factor against violence, both exercised and received, in university students’ relationships. The variables that we will deal with not only include the study of risk factors but also the study of protective factors.

2. Methods

A cross-sectional descriptive study was conducted through a self-administered online survey provided to a university for distribution among its students on all campuses.

2.1. Participants. The students who participated did so completely voluntarily and anonymously and gave their consent to use the data. The inclusion criteria were as follows: students enrolled in a degree program of the Universidad Rey Juan Carlos and having had a couple. There were no exclusion criteria.

2.2. Instruments. Data collection was performed using the Survey Monkey platform. The statistical programs SPSS 21.0 and STATA 14 were used.

The sent survey included the following variables: sex, age, grade and year of university enrolment, regular physical activity (150–300 minutes per week of moderate physical activity), daily use of tobacco, weekly consumption of alcohol, consumption of some other type of drug (cannabis or derivatives, cocaine, heroin, amphetamines, and ecstasy), sexual relations without the use of a condom, daily hours of sleep (average number of hours per week), work (working hours of less than or more than 20 hours per week), number

of sexual relations with a partner (understood as the average number of hours per week), number of relationships with a partner (understanding a relationship as that agreed between two people that includes companionship in social and leisure activities together with expression of feelings through speech and body contact), duration of the current relationship in months, training in gender violence (if it has not been received, or if it has been received either in pre-university or university training), and the Multidimensional Scale of Dating Violence (MSDV), validated by García-Carpintero et al. [7]; was applied.

This scale consists of 32 items and is composed of two subscales that measure the violence exerted and suffered. It is easy to apply and interpret and allows the detection and verification of attitudes of violence and abuse towards the partner. The reliability of the scale is demonstrated by Cronbach’s α values above 0.9 points, both in the subscale of violence exerted and in the subscale of violence suffered. When analysing the construct validity and discriminated validity of the scale, the scale shows that in the subscale of violence exerted, the items are grouped into six factors (physical and sexual abuse, harassment, surveillance, cyberbullying, domination, and denigration) and offer information on three dimensions of violence (physical, control, and psycho-emotional). In the subscale of violence suffered, five factors are addressed (physical abuse, harassment, surveillance, domination, and denigration) on the same dimensions of violence mentioned above.

2.3. Access to the Sample. Students were invited to participate via institutional e-mail and given access to the questionnaire. In addition, the coordinators of the different degree programs of the university were asked to post this information through the collaborative space for each program in the virtual classrooms.

The calculation of the sample size was performed considering the total number of students enrolled in the entire university: 46.450, with a margin of error of 5% and a confidence level of 95%. Adjusting for a 10% loss, a total of 420 responses were proposed. Once the favourable report of the ethics committee was received, the survey was distributed from April to August, 2021. Two reminders were made during the time of data collection: in May and June.

2.4. Data Analysis. In the statistical analysis, the qualitative variables were described by absolute and relative frequencies, and the quantitative data were described by means and standard deviations (SDs) or medians and interquartile ranges (p 25– p 75), according to the distribution of the data. The nonparametric Mann–Whitney U test was used to analyse the differences in the total scores of violence exerted and suffered and by components according to sex and lifestyle. As a measure of effect size, the statistic is presented as U of the Mann–Whitney test, which measures the probability that, given two random observations of each group, the value of the quantitative variable will be higher in one group than in another [24].

2.5. Ethical Aspects. The Research Ethics Committee of the University of Rey Juan Carlos issued a favourable opinion on 17th December, 2020, for the conduct of this project with internal registration number 0909202016920.

3. Results

Data from 382 complete surveys were analysed. A total of 72.3% of the sample ($n = 276$) were women. The average age of the students was 21.9 years (SD 2.8) and 38% had worked at a job. The students who participated the most, according to the field of study, were health sciences majors with 32% ($n = 119$), followed by social and legal sciences with 25.3% ($n = 94$), science with 22.3% ($n = 83$), engineering and architecture with 15.6% ($n = 58$) and art and humanities with 4.8% ($n = 18$). Regarding the university year (from first to fourth year), students in 4th grade participated to a greater extent than 1st-year students (31.5% versus 19%).

Regarding lifestyle habits (see Table 1), we found that 62.1% performed weekly physical activity, with a higher frequency among men (59.4% compared to 69.2%, $p = 0.079$). Of these participants, 21.4% reported having varied the frequency of physical activity since they acquired a partner. Participants reported sleeping a median of 7 hours (7–8). A total of 12.9% smoked daily and 34.7% drank alcohol weekly, with a higher frequency in men (31.5% versus 43.3%, $p = 0.032$). A total of 7.1% consumed some other type of drug, with a higher frequency also in men (4.7% versus 13.6%, $p < 0.003$). Sixteen percent report having varied the frequency of consumption since they acquired a partner. A total of 47.9% reported having sex without a condom, and the number of partners was a median of 2 (1–2, 25) in relationships with a median duration of 26 months (11.5–48). Thirty-six percent of the sample had never received training on gender violence, with no differences between men and women.

Regarding the results of the MSDV shown in Table 2, it is worth highlighting the control dimension, which contributes the highest score to the total score and covers the aspects of surveillance and cyberbullying, is more relevant in terms of violence and surveillance.

Statistically significant differences were observed in the overall score of violence perpetrated (see Figure 1), with 3 points more than the median in the group of women ($p < 0.001$) and in the overall score of violence suffered ($p < 0.001$), with 4 points more than the median in the group of women; both had a similar effect size, approximately 0.63, which indicates that the probability that a woman scores more than a man is 63%. Regarding the components, statistically significant differences are shown in the factors of harassment, surveillance, and domination in the violence exerted, which have a probability of approximately 60%. Women scored higher as perpetrators of harassment and surveillance and as victims of physical and sexual abuse, vigilance, domination, and denigration.

When analysing the association between lifestyles and the subscale of violence perpetrated (Table 3), we found that those who vary their frequency of regular physical

activity have a statistically significant higher overall score ($p = 0.002$), as do those who vary their consumption of tobacco, alcohol, or other drugs ($p = 0.008$), those who do not use a condom ($p < 0.001$), and those who work ($p = 0.022$).

In addition, those who consume alcohol or other drugs have higher scores for harassment ($p = 0.034$) and cyberbullying ($p = 0.009$). Those who have had more than three partners also had a higher score for harassment ($p = 0.034$). In all cases, the effect size is approximately 60%. There are no differences with respect to whether the individuals received training in gender violence.

4. Discussion

When analysing the lifestyle of university students in relation to the violence they receive, it is worth highlighting elements such as cyberbullying and surveillance as the most relevant of the violence suffered by them. Women obtain a significantly higher overall score than men when completing the Multidimensional Dating Violence Scale (EMVN), both in violence exercised and suffered. The factors of harassment, surveillance, and domination are the most exercised by women towards men. Physical and sexual abuse, surveillance, domination, and denigration are the factors most exercised by men towards women. When we are referring to lifestyle and training in violence, one-third of these young people have no knowledge about it. This increases the probability of falling into it. When talking about the subdimension of domination and submission, the patterns learned in childhood were traditionally accepted, although today they are considered violent and negative.

Taking into account the previous information, Alp Yilmaz and Şener Taplak [25] used the Dating Violence Attitude Scale (DVAS) in a study that obtained the highest scores for physical and emotional violence, and in the economic and sexual violence dimensions and were most frequently detected in dating relationships among university students. These relationships were characterized as challenging and stressful, with partners complaining predominantly of physical and psychological abuse. In this sense, this research and ours are very similar, although the economic sphere is not considered. In relation to physical violence, it continues to stand out and is the one sub-component is most widely studied among the dating relationships of university students according to research conducted by a university in Spain and another in South Korea led by Arenas-Carbellido et al. [26]. Similarly, in the study of Medina-Maldonado et al. [27]; the most common violent relationships among adolescents are psychological, mild, and severe.

When disaggregating the data regarding lifestyle, we find that one-third of youth drink alcohol on a weekly basis, and a lower percentage consume some other type of drug, with the percentage being higher in men than in women. This factor increases the possibilities of exercising violence in the subdimensions of harassment and cyberbullying, resulting in negative pressures on both lifestyle and healthy relationships. In our study, factors such as the variation of weekly physical activity (greater in men than in women),

TABLE 1: Living habits of the sample were disaggregated by sex.

Life habits	Total		Female		Male		p value
	N	%	N	%	N	%	
	382		276		106		
Do you perform regular physical activity (150-300 minutes per week) every week?							
No	144	37.9	112	40.6	32	30.8	0.079
Yes	236	62.1	164	59.4	72	69.2	
Has your frequency changed since you acquired a partner?							
No	295	78.7	217	80.1	78	75	0.283
Yes	80	21.3	54	19.9	26	25	
Do you consume tobacco on a daily basis?							
No	331	87.1	241	87.3	90	86.5	0.840
Yes	49	12.9	35	12.7	14	13.5	
Do you consume alcohol on a weekly basis?							
No	248	65.3	189	68.5	59	56.7	0.032
Yes	132	34.7	87	31.5	45	43.3	
Do you consume any type of drug?							
No	352	92.9	263	95.3	89	86.4	0.003
Yes	27	7.1	13	4.7	14	13.6	
Has your pattern of consumption of tobacco, alcohol, or other drugs changed since you acquired a partner?							
No	314	84	224	83	90	86.5	0.399
Yes	60	16	46	17	14	13.5	
Have you ever had sex without using a condom?							
No	197	52.1	144	52.6	53	51	0.782
Yes	181	47.9	130	47.4	51	49	
How many hours do you sleep daily?	7	7-8	7	7-8	7	6.5-8	0.772
Do you work in addition to studying?							
No	237	62	173	62.7	64	60.4	0.678
Yes	145	38	103	37.3	42	39.6	
Working time < 20 H	91	63.2	65	63.7	26	61.9	0.837
>20	53	36.8	37	36.3	16	38.1	
How many relationships have you had? A couple relationship is defined as a relationship agreed between two people that includes companionship in social and leisure activities along with the expression of feelings through speech and body contact	2	1-2,25	2	1-2	2	1-3	0.240
If you currently have a partner, what is the duration of the relationship in months?	26	11.5-48	27.5	12-48	26	7-50	0.519
Have you received training on gender violence?							
Yes, in preuniversity	145	38.1	102	37	43	41	0.672
No, never	137	36	99	35.9	38	36.2	
Yes, in university	30	7.9	23	8.3	7	6.7	0.240
Other	44	11.5	31	11.2	13	12.4	
Yes, in preuniversity and university	25	6.6	21	7.6	4	3.8	

TABLE 2: Total scores and dimensions of the MSDV were disaggregated by sex.

Multidimensional scale of violence		Total 382		Female 276		Male 106		p value	Effect size
		M	IQR	M	IQR	M	IQR		
Exercise violence		13	9–18	14	10–19.8	11	7–16	≤0.001	0.625
<i>Physical dimension</i>	Physical and sexual abuse	0	0–0	0	0–0	0	0–0	0.390	0.52
	Harassment	0	0–2	1	0–2	0	0–1	0.001	0.6
<i>Control dimension</i>	Surveillance	6	4–9.3	7	4–10	5	2.8–8.3	0.006	0.59
	Cyberbullying	4	2–6	5	2–6	3.5	1–5	0.054	0.563
<i>Psychoemotional dimension</i>	Domination	1	0–3	1	0–3	1	0–2	0.023	0.573
	Denigration	0	0–0	0	0–0	0	0–0	0.053	0.534
Suffering violence		15	10–20	15	11–21.8	11	7–18	≤0.001	0.638
<i>Physical dimension</i>	Physical and sexual abuse	0	0–1	0	0–1	0	0–0	0.031	0.564
	Harassment	1	0–3	1	0–3	1	0–3	0.627	0.516
<i>Psychoemotional dimension</i>	Surveillance	10	6.8–14	11	8–15	8	4–12	≤0.001	0.662
	Domination	1	0–4	2	0–4	1	0–3	0.022	0.58
	Denigration	0	0–0	0	0–1	0	0–0	0.027	0.559

M: Median; IQR. p 25 – p 75. Effect size: probability that a woman’s score is higher than that of a man.

tobacco consumption, or an active work situation negatively influence the MSDV, increasing the percentages of both perpetrated and suffered violence. This is also reflected in other similar studies, such as that of Sánchez Villegas et al. [28] and Rubio-Laborda et al. [29], in which it is shown how the consumption of alcohol, tobacco, and other drugs can lead to violence. In this way, in our study, violent patterns related to unhealthy lifestyles can be identified, considering all their factors and how they can affect young people. Similarly, the work carried out by Barroso-Corroto et al. [30] found a high prevalence of dating violence among students in this case, nursing students, with significant factors such as coexistence, alcohol consumption, socioeconomic status, and history of conflict.

Likewise, the lack of training is intrinsically related to the percentage of young people surveyed who have sex without a condom. This is a question that implies a greater possibility of catching or transmitting a sexually transmitted infection, showing hidden violence behind it. Aspects such as domination or physical and sexual abuse can cause men to refuse to wear a condom, with the victim being denied participation in the decision or negotiation. Studies by Anicama Queneche [31], Boira et al. [32], and Casique [33] show that women who are victims of intimate partner violence are forced to have sex without a condom or do not have a say in the final decision of whether to use a condom or not, which is intrinsically related to our data. Llano-Suárez et al. [34] used the Dating Violence Questionnaire-R (DVQ-R) aimed at university students in Spain and found that most of them were passive, submissive, coerced, and detached; they suffered humiliation and experienced sexual and physical violence by a dominant and aggressive partner. The studies of Anitha and Lewis [15], Díaz Martínez [16], Diéguez Méndez et al. [35], López Francés and Tapía [17], and Sharoni and Klocke [18] like ours established that training and education regarding dating violence is essential for both men and women. Without this type of training, the essential pillars that cement a healthy relationship begin to crumble because individuals do not know how healthy relationships should be and why some behaviours are



FIGURE 1: Total MSDV subscale score disaggregated by sex.

classified as violent and should not be normalized. According to Dalouh and Soriano [6], this training should be basic so that youth learn how to build healthy relationships from adolescence until they are adults, become aware of how certain factors influence lifestyles and learn to discern whether a relationship is healthy or not. Studies are fundamental for planning prevention and intervention programs against dating violence in university environments, according to Alp Yilmaz and Şener Taplak [25]. Llano-Suárez et al. [34] also stated that universities should adopt policies about gender equality and raise awareness about dating violence.

In relation to lifestyle, the study carried out by Aceijas et al. [36] highlighted that 60% of university students did not do enough physical exercise. These data are similar to the one obtained in this study. Similarly, Aceijas et al. [36] and Griban et al. [37] affirmed that alcohol consumption is elevated throughout students. They both claim that physical activity, active leisure, rest, and couple relationships (attending to both the love aspect, as well as the sexual aspect of the couple relationship) are the most important factors for preserving health.

TABLE 3: Scores in the subdimension of violence perpetrated according to lifestyle habits.

	No			Yes			p value	Effect size
	M	RIC	M	RIC	M			
<i>Do you perform regular physical activity (150–300 minutes per week) every week?</i>	Exercise violence	14	8–18	13	9–19	0.560	0.518	
	Physical and sexual abuse	0	0–0	0	0	0.442	0.517	
	Harassment	0	0–2	0	0–1.8	0.959	0.501	
	Surveillance	6	3–9	7	4–10	0.107	0.549	
	Cyberbullying	5	2–6	4	2–6	0.603	0.484	
	Domination	1	0–3	1	0–3	0.514	0.519	
	Denigration	0	0–0	0	0–0	0.456	0.512	
	Exercise violence	13	8–18	15	10.3–23.8	0.002	0.614	
	Physical and sexual abuse	0	0–0	0	0–1	0.021	0.560	
	Harassment	0	0–1	1	0–2	0.042	0.568	
<i>Has your frequency changed since you acquired a partner?</i>	Surveillance	6	3–9	8	5.3–11.8	0.003	0.609	
	Cyberbullying	4	2–6	4	2–6	0.836	0.493	
	Domination	1	0–2	2	0–3.8	0.004	0.602	
	Denigration	0	0–0	0	0–0	0.011	0.550	
	Exercise violence	13	8–18	14	9.3–19	0.168	0.543	
	Physical and sexual abuse	0	0–0	0	0–1	0.118	0.535	
	Harassment	0	0–1	1	0–2	0.034	0.560	
	Surveillance	6	4–10	6	4–9	0.708	0.488	
	Cyberbullying	4	2–5	5	2–6	0.009	0.580	
	Domination	1	0–2	1	0–3	0.261	0.534	
Denigration	0	0–0	0	0–0	0.609	0.509		
<i>Alcohol/drug use</i>	Exercise violence	13	8–18	16	11–24	0.008	0.608	
	Physical and sexual abuse	0	0–0	0	0–1	≤0.001	0.615	
	Harassment	0	0–1.3	1	0–2	0.048	0.573	
	Surveillance	6	3–9	7	5–10	0.101	0.567	
	Cyberbullying	4	2–5	4.5	2–6.8	0.166	0.556	
	Domination	1	0–2	1.5	0–4	0.039	0.582	
	Denigration	0	0–0	0	0–0	0.036	0.546	
	Exercise violence	12	8–16.5	15	10–21.5	≤0.001	0.608	
	Physical and sexual abuse	0	0–0	0	0–1	0.023	0.548	
	Harassment	0	0–1	1	0–2	0.007	0.573	
<i>Has your pattern of consumption of tobacco, alcohol, or other drugs changed since you acquired a partner?</i>	Surveillance	5	3–9	8	5–11	≤0.001	0.623	
	Cyberbullying	4	2–5	5	2–6	0.194	0.538	
	Domination	1	0–3	1	0–3	0.435	0.523	
	Denigration	0	0–0	0	0–0	0.230	0.519	
	Exercise violence	12	8–16.5	15	10–21.5	≤0.001	0.608	
	Physical and sexual abuse	0	0–0	0	0–1	0.023	0.548	
	Harassment	0	0–1	1	0–2	0.007	0.573	
	Surveillance	5	3–9	8	5–11	≤0.001	0.623	
	Cyberbullying	4	2–5	5	2–6	0.194	0.538	
	Domination	1	0–3	1	0–3	0.435	0.523	
Denigration	0	0–0	0	0–0	0.230	0.519		
<i>Have you ever had sex without using a condom?</i>	Exercise violence	12	8–16.5	15	10–21.5	≤0.001	0.608	
	Physical and sexual abuse	0	0–0	0	0–1	0.023	0.548	
	Harassment	0	0–1	1	0–2	0.007	0.573	
	Surveillance	5	3–9	8	5–11	≤0.001	0.623	
	Cyberbullying	4	2–5	5	2–6	0.194	0.538	
	Domination	1	0–3	1	0–3	0.435	0.523	
	Denigration	0	0–0	0	0–0	0.230	0.519	
	Exercise violence	12	8–16.5	15	10–21.5	≤0.001	0.608	
	Physical and sexual abuse	0	0–0	0	0–1	0.023	0.548	
	Harassment	0	0–1	1	0–2	0.007	0.573	

TABLE 3: Continued.

	No		Yes		p value	Effect size	
	M	RIC	M	RIC			
<i>How many hours do you sleep daily? 7 hours or more</i>	Exercise violence	14, 5	10-21.5	13	8-18	0.074	0.432
	Physical and sexual abuse	0	0-1	0	0-0	0.230	0.467
	Harassment	1	0-2	0	0-1	0.030	0.425
	Surveillance	7	4.8-10	6	3-9	0.162	0.447
	Cyberbullying	5	2-5.3	4	2-6	0.967	0.498
	Domination	1	0-3	1	0-2	0.140	0.445
	Denigration	0	0-0	0	0-0	0.506	0.514
	Exercise violence	12	8-17.5	14	10-19	0.022	0.569
	Physical and sexual abuse	0	0-0	0	0-0.8	0.154	0.531
	Harassment	0	0-1	0	0-2	0.382	0.524
<i>Do you work in addition to studying?</i>	Surveillance	6	3-9	8	5-10.5	≤0.001	0.606
	Cyberbullying	5	2-6	4	2-6	0.508	0.480
	Domination	1	0-3	1	0-2	0.235	0.535
	Denigration	0	0-0	0	0-0	0.868	0.503
	Exercise violence	13	9-18	14.5	9-23	0.126	0.553
	Physical and sexual abuse	0	0-0	0	0-0	0.512	0.516
<i>How many relationships have you had? 3 or more</i>	Harassment	0	0-1	1	0-2	0.017	0.575
	Surveillance	6	4-9	7	4-10	0.582	0.519
	Cyberbullying	4	2-5.8	4.5	2-6	0.299	0.535
	Domination	1	0-2	1.5	0-3.3	0.209	0.542
	Denigration	0	0-0	0	0-0	0.816	0.504
	Exercise violence	13	9-19	13	9-18	0.834	0.494
<i>Have you received training on gender violence?</i>	Physical and sexual abuse	0	0-0	0	0-0	0.904	0.503
	Harassment	1	0-2	0	0-1	0.104	0.454
	Surveillance	6	3-9	6.5	4-10	0.221	0.538
	Cyberbullying	4	2-6	5	2-6	0.611	0.516
	Domination	1	0-3	1	0-2	0.133	0.455
	Denigration	0	0-0	0	0-0	0.782	0.505

M: Median; IQR: p 25-p 75; effect size: probability that the “Yes” response score is higher.

4.1. Limitations. This study is limited because it was based on the students of a single Spanish university and because the response rate in some degree programs does not keep a proportion with the total number of students. The higher response rate is in health sciences students (54.3%); this may change the overall picture of the lifestyle of all students. Thus, results may not be generalized to other contexts or communities.

Future studies should be extended to include multiple universities in different parts of Spain to obtain a more accurate analysis, in addition to modifying the data collection of some variables (alcohol consumption: healthy and unhealthy (alcohol abuse and addiction) and use of condoms during sexual contacts (not using condoms at all, inconsistent use of condoms, and one-time episodes of not using condoms during sexual contacts).

5. Conclusions

The students in this study point out the main factors of violence surveillance and cyberbullying when it is exercised and surveillance when it is suffered. Likewise, women exert violence against men, with harassment and surveillance predominating. Physical and sexual abuse, surveillance, domination, and denigration in the case of being the man who assaults.

There is a relationship between the lifestyle of young university students and the violence they exert or receive, with drug use (tobacco, alcohol, and others) being the main association for their exercise in greater number and intensity, along with the avoidance of violence and condoms during sexual intercourse.

5.1. Implications for Nursing Practice. It is essential to develop training programs that educate young people about equality and healthy lifestyles to create healthy relationships and prevent violence in them. Therefore, universities should provide policies for gender equality and raise awareness about dating violence.

Data Availability

The data used to support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon request.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest.

Authors' Contributions

All authors have met the authorship criteria established by International Nursing Review and Wiley Editing Services, and all authors agree with the content of the manuscript. All authors participated in the editing and approval of the final version of the manuscript. Study design: ABAP, MGCE, MLI and ICL. Data collection: MGCE, ABAP and ICL. Data analysis: ICL, MGCE and ABAP. Study supervision: ABAP, MGCE, MLI and ICL. Manuscript writing: ABAP, MGCE,

MLI and ICL. Critical revision of important intellectual content: ABAP, MGCE, MLI and ICL.

References

- [1] World Health Organization, "Health promotion: glossary," 1998, https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/67246/WHO_HPR_HEP_98.1_spa.pdf?sequence=112.
- [2] P. Hautekiet, N. D. Saenen, D. S. Martens et al., "A healthy lifestyle is positively associated with mental health and well-being and core markers in ageing," *BMC Medicine*, vol. 20, no. 1, 2022.
- [3] R. Sánchez Rizo, *Social integration in adolescents: sociometric status and social centrality*, PhD Thesis, Pablo de Olavide University, Seville, Spain, 2017.
- [4] J. A. Martínez-Gómez, Y. Bolívar-Suárez, C. A. Rey-Anacona, L. C. Ramírez-Ortiz, A. M. Lizarazo-Ojeda, and L. Y. Yanez-Peñúñuri, "Traditional schemes of sexual gender roles, power in relationships and dating violence," *Iberoamerican Journal of Psychology and Health*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 1–16, 2021.
- [5] G. Merma-Molina, D. Gavilán-Martín, D. Molina Motos, and M. Urrea-Solano, "El impacto de los roles de género en las actitudes sexistas de los adolescentes, en el ámbito escolar," *Bordón. Revista de Pedagogía*, vol. 73, no. 2, pp. 113–131, 2021.
- [6] R. Dalouh and E. Soriano, "Education in values as a prevention of violence in adolescent couples in transcultural environments," *Publications*, vol. 50, no. 1, pp. 61–81, 2020.
- [7] M. A. García-Carpintero, J. Rodríguez-Santero, and A. M. Porcel-Gálvez, "Design and validation of the scale for the detection of violence in courtship in young people in the Sevilla University (Spain)," *Gaceta Sanitaria*, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 121–128, 2018.
- [8] V. García-Díaz, A. Fernández-Feito, C. Bringas-Molleda, F. J. Rodríguez-Díaz, and A. Lana, "Tolerance of intimate partner violence and sexist attitudes among health sciences students from three Spanish universities," *Gaceta Sanitaria*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 179–185, 2020.
- [9] F. Rubio-Garay, M. A. López-González, M. A. Carrasco, and P. J. Amor, "Prevalence of dating violence: a systematic review," *Psychologist papers*, vol. 38, no. 2, pp. 135–147, 2017.
- [10] S. H. Kim, K. Wills, J. P. Canfield et al., "Assessment of college students with the revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2): sociodemographic characteristics and relationship," *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, vol. 28, no. 6, pp. 787–797, 2018.
- [11] M. Trujillo Cristoffanini and I. Pastor-Gosálbez, "Gender violence in university students: a challenge for higher education," *Psicoperspectiv*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 83–96, 2021.
- [12] R. Valls, L. Puigvert, P. Melgar, and C. Garcia-Yeste, "Breaking the silence at Spanish universities: findings from the first study of violence against women on campuses in Spain," *Violence Against Women*, vol. 22, no. 13, pp. 1519–1539, 2016.
- [13] K. Wincentak, J. Connolly, and N. Card, "Teen dating violence: a meta-analytic review of prevalence rates," *Psychology of Violence*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 224–241, 2017.
- [14] Working group Iguales, *Teaching Innovation Project "Teaching on Gender Equality and Inclusion"* Valladolid University, Valladolid, Spain, 2017.
- [15] S. Anitha and R. Lewis, *Gender Based Violence in university Communities: Policy, Prevention, and Educational Initiatives*, Bristol University Press, Bristol, UK, 2018.
- [16] C. Díaz Martínez, "Obstacles to gender equality in universities," *Wheel Magazine*, vol. 1, no. 5, pp. 60–76, 2020.

- [17] I. López Francés and P. Tapía, “Machist violence in the university classrooms,” *Pedagogical issues*, vol. 27, pp. 53–66, 2018.
- [18] S. Sharoni and B. Klocke, “Faculty confronting gender-based violence on campus: opportunities and challenges,” *Violence Against Women*, vol. 25, no. 11, pp. 1352–1369, 2019.
- [19] V. Del Pino and J. Astray, “Hábitos de salud en la población juvenil de la comunidad de madrid, 2019. Resultados del sistema de vigilancia de factores de riesgo asociados a enfermedades no transmisibles en población juvenil (SIVFRENT-J),” in *Boletín Epidemiológico de la Comunidad de Madrid*, Servicio de Epidemiología, Consejería de Sanidad, Spain, 2019.
- [20] World Health Organization, “Violence against women. Geneva,” 2021, <https://www.who.int/es/news-room/factsheets/detail/violence-against-women>.
- [21] M. J. Muñoz-Rivas, N. Redondo-Rodríguez, and R. C. Ronzón-Tirado, “Dating violence prevention: evaluation of the program PREVIO,” *Journal of Clinical Psychology with children and adolescents*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 1–6, 2019.
- [22] K. Peterson, P. Sharps, V. Banyard et al., “An Evaluation of Two Dating Violence Prevention Programs on a College Campus,” *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, vol. 33, no. 23, pp. 3630–3655, 2016.
- [23] L. Velasco, H. Thomas-Currás, Y. Pastor-Ruiz, and A. Arcos-Rodríguez, “PRO-mueve relaciones sanas – a gender-based violence prevention program for adolescents: assessment of its efficacy in the first year of intervention,” *Frontiers in Psychology*, vol. 12, Article ID 744591, 2021.
- [24] R. M. Conroy, “What hypotheses do “nonparametric” two-group tests actually test?” *STATA Journal*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 182–190, 2012.
- [25] F. Alp Yilmaz and A. Şener Taplak, “Relationship between self-esteem, perception of gender and attitudes towards dating violence among university students,” *Perspectives in Psychiatric Care*, vol. 57, no. 2, pp. 911–919, 2021.
- [26] C. Arenas-Carbellido, A. Arias Astray, and C. R. Emery, “Dating violence heterogeneity in University Couples. The cases of Spain and South Korea,” *Social Work in Public Health*, vol. 35, no. 6, pp. 368–379, 2020.
- [27] V. Medina-Maldonado, M. del Mar Pastor-Bravo, E. Vargas, J. Francisco, and I. J. Ruiz, “Adolescent dating violence: results of a mixed study in quito, Ecuador,” *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, vol. 37, no. 17-18, pp. NP15205–NP15230, 2021.
- [28] M. Sánchez Villegas, M. C. Martínez de Biava, N. Pérez Ruiz, J. Acosta-López, and R. Fontalvo-Peralta, “An integrative look of intervention of violence in dating relationships,” *Venezuelan Archives os Pharmacology and Therapeutics*, vol. 37, no. 5, pp. 483–488, 2018.
- [29] J. F. Rubio-Laborda, P. Almansa-Martínez, and M. D. M. Pastor-Bravo, “Sexist relationships in generation X and millennials,” *Atención Primaria*, vol. 53, no. 4, Article ID 101992, 2021.
- [30] E. Barroso-Corroto, A. I. Cobo-Cuenca, J. A. Laredo-Aguilera et al., “Dating violence, violence in social networks, anxiety and depression in Nursing degree students: a cross-sectional study,” *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, pp. 1–12, 2022.
- [31] B. I. Anicama Queneche, “Relationship between gender-based violence in women and the use of contraceptive methods,” Bachelor’s Thesis, Universidad Norbert Wiener, Spain, 2021.
- [32] S. Boira, E. Chilet-Rosell, S. Jaramillo-Quiroz, and J. Reinoso, “Sexismo, pensamientos distorsionados y violencia en las relaciones de pareja en estudiantes universitarios de Ecuador de áreas relacionadas con el bienestar y la salud,” *Universitas Psychologica*, vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 1–41, 2017.
- [33] I. Casique, “Intertwined dimensions: empowerment and attitudes of Mexican teenagers regarding condom use,” *Revista Latinoamericana de Población*, vol. 10, no. 19, pp. 149–168, 2016.
- [34] A. Llano-Suárez, A. Lana, A. Gasch-Gallén, and A. Fernández-Feito, “Gender roles and intimate partner violence among female university students in Spain: a cross-sectional study,” *PLoS One*, vol. 16, no. 11, 2021.
- [35] R. Diéguez Méndez, I. M. Martínez-Silva, M. Medrano Varela, and M. S. Rodríguez-Calvo, “Beliefs and attitudes of university students towards gender violence,” *Educación Médica*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 3–10, 2020.
- [36] C. Aceijas, S. Wslidhaäusl, N. Lambert, S. Cassar, and R. Bello-Corassa, “Determinants of health-related lifestyles among university students,” *Perspect Public Health*, vol. 137, no. 4, pp. 227–236, 2017.
- [37] G. P. Griban, Z. M. Dikhtiarenko, E. A. Yeromenko et al., “Influence of positive and negative factors on the university students’ health,” *Wiadomosci Lekarskie*, vol. 73, no. 8, pp. 1735–1746, 2020.