

Intimate partner violence in persons released from prison and convicted prisoners (INPE, Lima- Perú)

Violencia de pareja en personas liberadas con beneficio penitenciario y sentenciados (INPE, Lima-Perú)

Melani Janet Quispe-Guzmán

Facultad de Psicología, Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos, Lima, Perú.

<https://orcid.org/0009-0003-6433-1140>
melani.quispe@unmsm.edu.pe

Daysi Elena Trujillo-Garay

Facultad de Psicología, Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos, Lima, Perú.

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9166-1933>
daysi.trujillo@unmsm.edu.pe

Cite: Quispe-Guzmán, M; Trujillo-Garay, D. (2025). Violencia de pareja en personas liberadas con beneficio penitenciario y sentenciados (INPE, Lima-Perú). *Mujer Andina*, 3(2), e030205. <https://doi.org/10.36881/ma.v3i2.1018>

Mujer Andina, Enero-Junio 2025, Vol. 3(2)

Abstract

The purpose of this article is to analyze the incidence of intimate partner violence in people released from prison and sentenced inmates attending an ML-INPE in Lima-Perú and determine whether there are significant differences in intimate partner violence according to sociodemographic data. Using a quantitative approach with a descriptive and cross-sectional design, the Revised Conflict Tactics Questionnaire (CTS-2) was applied to a sample of 113 released and sentenced inmates between 18 and 69 years of age. The results showed that participants who experienced high or very high levels of violence experienced psychological violence in 25.7% and physical violence in 25.7%, as well as sexual violence in 23%. On the other hand, they perceived high or very high levels of psychological violence, reaching 8%, and physical violence at 25.7%. Psychological violence is the most frequent (12.89), followed by physical violence to a lesser degree (8.73) and sexual violence (2.39). A difference was found in the means concerning execution of violence (12.89) and victimization (18.88), finding a greater perception of violence in the parti-



Corresponding author

Melani Janet
Quispe-Guzmán

No conflicts of interest

Received: 15/03/2025

Reviewed: 19/04/2025

Accepted: 25/04/2025

Published: 16/05/2025

cipants by their partner in the three types of violence; psychological (12.89 in execution and 18.88 in victimization), physical (8.73 and 11.39) and sexual (2.39 and 2.90). In addition, no significant differences were found regarding socio demographic data, partner relationship, or crime characteristics ($p > 0.05$). It is concluded that participants perceive a greater amount of violence than they exert, and that sociodemographic data do not influence these differences.

Keywords: intimate partner violence, ML-INPE, psychological violence, physical violence, sexual violence, victimization.

Resumen

El propósito del artículo es analizar la incidencia de la violencia de pareja en personas liberadas con beneficio penitenciario y sentenciados que asisten a un Medio Libre del INPE (ML-INPE) en el Perú, así como determinar si existen diferencias significativas en la violencia de pareja según los datos sociodemográficos. A partir de un enfoque cuantitativo con diseño descriptivo y transversal, se aplicó el Cuestionario de Tácticas de Conflicto Revisada (CTS-2) a una muestra de 113 liberados y sentenciados de un medio libre que tenían entre 18 a 69 años. Los resultados evidenciaron que los participantes que ejecutaron niveles altos o muy altos de violencia realizaron violencia psicológica en 25.7% y física en 25.7%, así como, violencia sexual en 23%. Por otro lado, perciben violencia en niveles altos o muy altos en violencia psicológica, llegando al 8% y violencia física en 25.7%. La violencia psicológica es la más frecuente (12.89), seguida de la violencia física en menor grado (8.73) y la violencia sexual (2.39). Se encontró una diferencia en las medias respecto a ejecución de violencia (12.89) y victimización (18.88), observándose una mayor percepción de violencia en los participantes por parte de su pareja en los tres tipos de violencia; psicológica (12.89 en ejecución y 18.88 en victimización), física (8.73 y 11.39) y sexual (2.39 y 2.90). Además, no se encontraron diferencias significativas en relación con los datos sociodemográficos, la relación de pareja o las características del delito ($p > 0.05$). Se concluye que los participantes perciben una mayor cantidad de violencia de la que ejercen, y que estas diferencias no están influenciadas por los datos sociodemográficos.

Palabras clave: violencia de pareja, ML - INPE, violencia psicológica, violencia física, violencia sexual, victimización.

Introduction

Intimate partner violence is defined as any action within an intimate relationship that results in harm. This can manifest in various forms, including psychological, physical, economic, and social violence. The purpose of such violence is to establish control and dominance over one's partner (Méndez et al., 2022). From an ecological perspective, violence against women arises through the interplay of individual factors, familial or personal relationship dynamics, community influences, and societal factors (Incháustegui & Olivares, 2011).

Globally, violence against women constitutes a problem of significant magnitude. According to the World Health Organization (WHO, 2021), one in three women worldwide has experienced physical or sexual violence at the hands of an intimate partner at some point in their lives. Furthermore, 27% of women aged 15 to 49 in a relationship have experienced physical or sexual violence. Notably, 38% of femicides are perpetrated by the victim's own partner. In Latin America, it is estimated that 25% of women have been victims of physical or

sexual violence by their partner (UN, 2021). These statistics reflect a reality that transcends borders and cultures, underscoring the necessity for the implementation of effective measures for the prevention, care, and legal prosecution of intimate partner violence.

In the Peruvian context, the Demographic and Family Health Survey, conducted by the National Institute of Statistics and Informatics (INEI), reported that 53.8% of women have experienced psychological, physical, or sexual violence. Within this percentage, 49% correspond to instances of psychological violence, 27.2% to physical violence, and 6.5% to sexual violence. In the preceding 12 months, 7.3% of women reported having suffered physical violence, and 1.9% sexual violence (INEI, 2023). Violence against women has become a relevant and persistent issue affecting the population, for which the state must undertake preventive, promotional, and intervention measures (Ministry of Women and Vulnerable Populations, 2014).

Femicide represents the most extreme manifestation of intimate partner violence. It is estimated that 71.4% of femicides are perpetrated by the victim's current or former partner. The Ministry of Women and Vulnerable Populations (MIMP, 2017) reported 121 cases of femicide in 2017, of which 54% of the perpetrators were detained, 22% were fugitives from justice, and only 3% were sentenced. Additionally, 247 cases of attempted femicide were reported, of which 41% of the aggressors were not detained, and only 27% were apprehended. In 2022, INEI recorded 147 cases of femicide, a figure indicating a consecutive increase in this form of violence against women. It has been found that the number of femicide cases from 2015 to 2022 totals 1,045, with 44.2% of the femicide victims being under 30 years of age (INEI, 2022). This not only reflects the prevalence of femicide in the country but also the deficiencies within the justice system that limit the protection and access to justice for women.

Numerous women who are victims of violence by their current or former partners filed complaints with various entities. In 2023, a total of 4,104 complaints of sexual violence were reported, of which

93.2% pertained to female victims. The city of Lima recorded the highest number with 1108 complaints, followed by Arequipa with 284 complaints and Junín with 274 complaints. Regarding physical aggression, a total of 93,277 cases were reported in 2023, in contrast to 2017 when 76,011 cases were reported. Conversely, complaints of psychological violence amounted to 120,144 in 2023, representing a 42% increase compared to 2017 (INEI, 2023).

The Judiciary evaluated a total of 808,483 cases of violence against women between 2018 and 2023; however, only 0.044% of the aggressors were sentenced. In 2023, 161,177 cases were reported, of which only 94 aggressors received sentences. The primary reason for this is that 72% of cases are archived. Furthermore, the process of reporting violence takes approximately three years from the time the victim files the complaint. This constitutes a critical reality for many women who are consequently affected by revictimization and other factors, hindering their judicial process and impacting their mental health (Huerta, 2023). These indicators highlight the disparity between the number of women who experience violence and those who decide to report it. Although the reports represent a small percentage in relation to the total number of cases, many women still choose to report these incidents despite the existing barriers.

The issue of access to justice for women in Peru necessitates an analysis of intimate partner violence. Therefore, it is important to identify the factors that contribute to its perpetuation. In this regard, Abokor et al. (2025) analyzed demographic data from a survey in Somalia, identifying socio-demographic determinants such as age, geographic location, type of residence, and the educational and employment levels of the partner as influential factors. For their part, Rivas-Rivero and Bonilla-Algovia (2022) analyzed men who had assaulted their partners and were in pre-trial detention, finding that 23.3% had suffered psychological maltreatment, 24.2% showed evidence of physical maltreatment, and 19.2% had been exposed to violence perpetrated by their father against their mother. Other factors related to intimate partner violence include negative relationships, adverse

childhood experiences, and the lack of significant figures, which play a crucial role for victims (Valdés et al., 2023).

Men who perpetrate violence against their partners exhibit specific patterns of behavior. Along these lines, Rivas-Rivero and Bonilla-Algovia (2022) found that 38% of participants had a secondary education, 24% had higher education, 28.1% had completed upper basic education, and 7.4% had no formal education. De Stéfano (2023) mentions that the traits exhibited by a violent man include rigid thinking, a lack of honesty, and stereotypical beliefs based on machismo.

The consequences of violence against women are diverse. Regarding physical violence, it can cause severe injuries, traumatic brain injuries, wounds, strangulation, fractures, and neurological impairment. Psychological consequences can include depression, anxiety, post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), somatization of stress with symptoms such as chronic pain, and can generate a negative impact on children's behavior (Lutgen-dorf, 2019). At a psychological level, violence can cause mental health problems, suicide attempts, and alcohol or drug use; at a physical level, injuries, STIs, and abortion. At a social level, it causes estrangement from friends and job loss. Regarding economic violence, it involves preventing work and excessive control of money (Méndez et al., 2022). Thus, violence not only affects the physical and emotional integrity of women but also profoundly impacts their family, social, and economic environment, making its comprehensive and preventive approach an urgent priority for public health and social justice.

Various studies have analyzed the level of intimate partner violence in different contexts. López (2021) analyzed the level of intimate partner violence in 384 adults aged 18 to 29 from a human settlement in Chiclayo, finding that 3.91% of the analyzed sample suffered high-level violence and 13.28% experienced medium-level violence, 9.38% presented moderate-level physical violence, 18.23% presented a medium level of coercion, and 4.95% showed evidence of having suffered high-level sexual vio-

lence. Similarly, Manchego-Carnero et al. (2022) determined the risk of violence in women and older adults who filed complaints at a police station in Arequipa, finding that 44.7% of women aged 18 to 25 presented a severe risk of violence, 34.5% of women with primary education presented a severe risk of violence, followed by illiterate women with a 25% incidence, and 30.3% of women with greater economic dependence had a severe risk of suffering violence, considering those who receive a salary higher than the minimum wage, followed by 17.3% of women with the minimum wage.

Along these lines, González-Monzón and García (2024) determined the relationship between types of intimate partner violence and coping styles in a sample of 299 individuals, 61.5% of whom were women. In this regard, they reported that 23.4% of participants had experienced some form of violence from their current partner, 30.4% reported having been victims of violence in a previous relationship, and 38.8% mentioned having perpetrated some form of violence against their current partner. Rivas-Rivero and Bonilla-Algovia (2022) found that the majority of cases began with a violent situation during courtship (27.3%), followed by 21.2% where violence occurred after the birth of the first child. The most frequent type of violence was psychological violence, present in 95.8% of cases, followed by physical violence at 65% and sexual violence at 10.3%.

Faced with this concerning issue, various entities have collaborated to intervene in the phenomenon of violence against women. Among these entities is the National Penitentiary Institute (INPE), which implements programs for reintegration. Likewise, the Institutional Care Center (CAI) provides care to men who have been prosecuted for gender-based violence, attending to 2,698 abusive men in 2019 and 656 during the first quarter of 2020 (Government of Peru, August 9, 2020). Furthermore, the ML-INPE are responsible for the rehabilitation and resocialization of sentenced individuals and those released from prison with benefits, offering various programs to address the issue specifically. In 2023, they attended to 1,247 individuals, with 5.1% included in the Yupaychay

program, which serves those sentenced for intimate partner violence (INPE, 2023). It is important to reinforce the strategies of these institutions with comprehensive, differentiated, and sustained interventions that include work with families, the community environment, and inter-institutional coordination.

Martínez (2019) evaluated reintegration in Spain and criticized several aspects of the penitentiary system, such as the isolation of inmates, the adoption of a prison subculture incompatible with society, the scarcity of resources, overcrowding, and the limited consideration of the social environment. These limitations question the effectiveness of current programs, making it essential to strengthen them with specialized approaches, rigorous evaluations, and continuous monitoring to achieve effective intervention, especially in the prevention of intimate partner violence.

The analysis of the incidence of violence in sentenced and released individuals will provide insight into the reality within a ML-INPE, which can serve as input for the design of intervention and prevention programs in educational institutions and communities, considering theoretical and practical implications aimed at men who perpetrate violence, and as a basis for the creation of public policies (Rivas-Rivero and Bonilla-Algovía, 2022). The adoption of a comprehensive approach that considers individual rehabilitation, strengthening social environments, modifying patriarchal attitudes and gender roles, and women's economic empowerment (Abokor et al., 2025). These strategies could strengthen the prevention of intimate partner violence, which could contribute to building a safer and more peaceful environment, promoting coexistence and reducing violence in society.

Based on the foregoing, the present study aims to analyze the incidence of perpetrated and perceived intimate partner violence in individuals released with penitentiary benefits and sentenced individuals attending an ML-INPE, and to determine if there are significant differences in intimate partner violence according to sociodemographic data.

Methodology

The present study is based on non-experimental research, as no variables were manipulated. Its scope is descriptive and comparative, as the levels of different types of violence were quantified, and the means of perpetrated and perceived intimate partner violence among the participants were analyzed. Furthermore, significant differences were determined based on sociodemographic data (Hernández-Sampieri & Mendoza, 2018). Additionally, the research employs a cross-sectional cohort design, as the evaluation was conducted at a specific point in time to compare the types of violence and the sociodemographic data of the population (Ato et al., 2013).

The study population consists of individuals released with penitentiary benefits and sentenced individuals attending an ML-INPE in Lima, Peru, totaling 250 individuals. From this population, a sample of 113 individuals sentenced for various crimes within the ML-INPE program was selected, using convenience sampling due to the available access to this population and considering those participants who provided their informed consent and agreed to participate.

Table 1 presents the sociodemographic data of the participants. The majority (83.2%) of the participants are male, while 15% are female, and 1.8% belong to the LGBTQ community. Regarding age, the largest group (34.5%) is between 35 and 44 years old, followed by 33.6% of participants aged 25 to 34. In terms of educational level, the majority of participants (69%) attained secondary education, while 23% have university studies, and only 8% have primary education. Regarding occupation, most participants (77.9%) are employed, 13.3% are self-employed, a smaller percentage are home-makers (5.3%), or unemployed (3.5%). The largest proportion of participants (38.1%) resides in Callao, followed by Ventanilla (23.9%), Ancón (8%), and San Miguel (7.1%). Table 2 presents the characteristics of the intimate relationships of the released and sentenced individuals. The majority of participants (42.5%) cohabit with their partners, while

40.7% do not cohabit, and 15.9% are married. Regarding the duration of the relationship, 34.5% have been with their partner for 10 to 19 years, followed by 29.2% who have been in a relationship for 1 to 4 years, 22.1% for 5 to 9 years, and 14.2% who have maintained their relationship for more than 20 years. Concerning the age of the partner, 35.4% of the participants' partners are between 25 and 34 years old, followed by another 35.4% who are between 35 and 44 years old, and 20.4% who are between 45 and 59 years old. In terms of the number of children, 30.1% of the evaluated individuals have two children, followed by 22.1% who have three children, 20.4% who have one child, and 16.8% who have no children. Regarding living arrangements, 23.1% reside with their partner and children, while 16.9% live with their parents, 15.9% live alone, 14.1% live only with their children, and 9.7% live only with their partner.

Table 1.
Sociodemographic characteristics of the participants

Variable		n	%
Sex	Woman	17	15%
	Man	94	83.20%
	LGBTQ	2	1.80%
Age	18-24	2	1.80%
	25-34	38	33.60%
	35-44	39	34.50%
	45-59	29	25.70%
	60 a más	5	4.40%
Level of education	Primary education	9	8%
	Secondary education	78	69%
	University education	26	23%
Type of occupation	Dependent	88	77.90%
	Self-employed	15	13.30%
	Housewife	6	5.30%
	Not working	4	3.50%
District	Callao	43	38.10%
	Ventanilla	27	23.90%
	Ancón	9	8%
	Bellavista	8	7.10%
	San Miguel	8	7.10%
	Other districts	18	15.80%

Table 3 analyzes the characteristics of the participants' offenses. The most frequently committed offense among the participants is the crime against public safety, accounting for 32.7%, followed by crimes against life, body, and health (C/V/C/S) at 26.6%, crimes against property at 15.9%, crimes against freedom at 7.9%, and crimes against the family at 6.2%. Regarding the type of sentence, 27.5% of the participants are serving community service, 25.6% are serving a sentence with parole, 24.8% are in a semi-open regime, while a smaller percentage (6.2% of the total participants) use an electronic ankle monitor. Concerning the length of the sentence, 43.4% have received sentences of 1 to 5 years, followed by those serving 6 to 10 years at 37.2%, participants serving sentences between 11 and 15 years represent 9.7% of the total, and 4.5% of those evaluated are serving sentences of more than 15 years. In relation to the age of onset of the offense, the largest group (31.9%) began between 25 and 34 years old, 22.1% began committing crimes between 35 and 44 years old, 17.7% between 19 and 24 years old, and 5.3% before the age of 18. Regarding substance use, 56.6% of participants indicate that they do not consume alcohol or drugs, 28.3% report alcohol consumption, 13.3% have used drugs, and 1.8% have used both substances.

Conflict Tactics Scales CTS-2

The instrument was originally developed by Straus et al. (1992) and revised in 2007 for a Spanish adaptation by the same authors. Subsequently, it was adapted by Loinaz et al. (2012), and this version will be used in the present study. The instrument consists of 78 items, with 39 items directed at victims of aggression and 39 directed at aggressors. This instrument has five dimensions: physical violence, psychological violence, sexual coercion, severe injuries, and negotiation. The present study utilized the dimensions of psychological violence, physical violence, and sexual coercion. The scale employs a Likert scale (0 = never occurred, 6 = more than 20 times, 7 = never happened this year, but did occur before). Regarding the reliability analysis, Loinaz et al. (2012) reported a Cronbach's Alpha of .88 for the total scale, .83 for physical vio-

lence, .83 for negotiation, .81 for psychological violence, .80 for sexual coercion, and .59 for injuries. Similarly, Villagrán et al. (2023) analyzed the psychometric properties of the scale in the Ecuadorian population

Table 2.
Characteristics of the couple relationship

Variable		n	%
Couple relationship	Married	18	15.9%
	Cohabitant	48	42.50%
	Not living together	46	40.70%
	Separated	1	0.90%
Length of relationship	1 to 4 years	33	29.20%
	5 to 9 years	25	22.10%
	10 to 19	39	34.50%
	20 years or more	16	14.20%
Partner's age	18-24	3	2.70%
	25-34	40	35.40%
	35-44	40	35.40%
	45-59	23	20.40%
	60 or more	7	6.20%
Number of children	None	19	16.80%
	1	23	20.40%
	2	34	30.10%
	3	25	22.10%
	4	11	9.70%
	5	1	0.90%
Live with	Parents	19	16.90%
	Children	16	14.10%
	Couple and children	26	23.10%
	Siblings	6	5.30%
	Couple	11	9.70%
	Alone	18	15.90%
	Other relatives	12	10.60%
	Did not answer	5	4.40%

Table 3.
Crime characteristics

Variable		n	%
Type of crime	C/V/C/S	30	26.6%
	Against public safety	37	32.70%
	Against patrimony	18	15.90%
	Against freedom	9	7.90%
	Against the family	7	6.20%
	Other crimes	5	4.50%
Sentence	Did not answer	7	6.20%
	Semi-liberty	28	24.80%
	Probation	29	25.60%
	Electronic Tag	7	6.20%
	Community Service	31	27.50%
Time of sentencing	Did not answer	18	15.90%
	1 to 5 years	49	43.40%
	6 to 10 years	42	37.20%
	11 to 15 years	11	9.70%
	16 to 20 years	2	1.80%
	20 years or more	3	2.70%
Age of onset of crime	Did not answer	6	5.30%
	15 to 18 years	6	5.30%
	19 to 24 years	20	17.70%
	25 to 34 years	36	31.90%
	35 to 44 years	25	22.10%
	45 to 59 years	10	8.80%
Substance use	60 or more	2	14.20%
	Alcohol	32	28.30%
	Drugs	15	13.30%
	Both	2	1.80%
None		64	56.60%

aged 18 to 65 years, demonstrating validity and reliability in the Ecuadorian sample.

Table 4 presents the reliability analysis of the scale. A Cronbach's Alpha of .974 was found for the total scale. Regarding the psychological violence dimension, a value of .925 was reported, .967 for physical violence, and .947 for sexual coercion. The obtained values exceeded the threshold of .90, indicating high internal consistency of the scale. Therefore, it accurately and consistently measures the dimensions of psychological violence, physical violence, and sexual coercion (Bonett & Wright, 2014). The instrument was administered in February 2025.

Results

Table 5 illustrates the levels of aggression perpetrated by the participants. The majority (51.4%) of those evaluated perpetrated psychological violence against their partners at a low or very low level, while 20.4% perpetrated violence at a high level, and 5.3% at a very high level. Regarding physical violence, 69% committed violence at a low or very low level, 21.2% perpetrated violence at a high level, and 4.4% at a very high level. Sexual violence occurred with less frequency, as 73.5% perpetrated violence at a very low level, 18.6% at a high level, and 4.4% at a very high level.

Table 6 illustrates the levels of aggression perceived by the participants from their partners. The majority (79.6%) of those evaluated perceived psychological violence from their partners at a

Table 4.
Reliability of CTS-2

	Cronbach's Alpha
Psychological aggression	.925
Physical aggression	.967
Sexual coercion	.947
Total scale	.974

low or very low level, while 6.2% perceived violence at a high level, and 1.8% at a very high level. Regarding physical violence, 56.6% perceived violence at a low or very low level, 17.7% perceived violence at a high level, and 8% at a very high level. Sexual violence occurred with less frequency, as 83.2% reported experiencing this type of violence at a very low level, 8.8% at a high level, and 4.4% at a very high level.

Table 7 presents a contrast between inflicted and experienced violence, indicating disparities between the violence perpetrated by the evaluated individuals and the violence they perceive from their partners. Regarding psychological aggression, a mean of 12.89 is observed in perpetration, in contrast to 18.88 in victimization. When analyzing severe psychological violence, participants reported a mean of 6.13 in perpetration and 9.96 in reception. In the realm of severe physical violence, the released and sentenced individuals exhibited a mean of 7.48, while the violence perceived by the participants reached a mean of 10.40. Severe sexual coercion showed a mean of 3.44 in perpe-

Table 5.
Levels of violence perpetrated by released and sentenced prisoners

	Violence executed			
	Psychological V.	Physical V.	Sexual V.	Total V.
Very Low	25.7%	51.30%	73.50%	28.30%
Low	25.7%	17.70%	0%	23%
Medium	23 %	5.30%	3.50%	23.90%
High	20.4	21.20%	18.60%	17.70%
Very High	5.30%	4.40%	4.40%	7.10%

Table 6.
Levels of violence perceived by released and sentenced prisoners

	Victimization of violence			
	Psychological V.	Physical V.	Sexual V.	Total V.
Very Low	26.5%	47.80%	75.20%	30.10%
Low	53.1%	8.80%	8%	37.20%
Medium	12.4%	17.70%	3.50%	7.10%
High	6.20%	17.70%	8.80%	15%
Very High	1.80%	8%	4.40%	10.60%

Table 7.
Comparison of means by type of violence perpetrated and perceived

	Execution		Victimization	
	Media	DE	Media	DE
Minor Psychological V.	12.89	22.12	18.88	26.5
Severe psychological V	6.13	16.35	9.96	20.06
Minor physical V.	8.73	21.44	11.39	24.21
Severe physical V.	7.48	23.25	10.4	26.05
Minor sexual coercion	2.39	6.86	2.9	7.99
Severe sexual coercion	3.44	12	4.21	13.4

trated violence, compared to 2.39 in minor sexual coercion. Concerning victimization, participants indicated having suffered severe sexual coercion with a mean of 4.21 and minor sexual coercion with a mean of 2.90.

Table 8 presents the chi-square (χ^2) analysis examining the relationship between various sociodemographic variables and the manifestation of violence, both in its perpetration and perception. The results revealed an absence of statistically significant associations between the demographic factors considered and the presence of violence. Regarding the data of participants who have perpetrated violence, no significant differences were found based on sex ($\chi^2 = 0.734$), age ($\chi^2 = 2.83$), educational level ($\chi^2 = 0.261$), or work status ($\chi^2 = 2.50$). Similarly, participants who reported perceiving violence in their relationship were not significantly affected by sex ($\chi^2 = 2.343$), age ($\chi^2 = 3.26$), educational level ($\chi^2 = 0.931$), or work status ($\chi^2 = 1.90$). Concerning the

offense data of participants who perpetrate violence, no differences were observed by type of offense ($\chi^2 = 4.48$), type of sentence ($\chi^2 = 6.62$), or substance use ($\chi^2 = 0.880$). Participants who perceive violence from their partners were also not significantly affected regardless of the type of offense ($\chi^2 = 3.07$), type of sentence ($\chi^2 = 6.52$), or substance use ($\chi^2 = 0.23$). Likewise, the type of relationship ($\chi^2 = 5.46$), relationship duration ($\chi^2 = 2.91$), partner's age ($\chi^2 = 1.90$), and number of children ($\chi^2 = 4.86$) did not show significant differences in inflicted violence. Similarly, victimization did not present relevant associations with the variables of relationship type ($\chi^2 = 6.92$), relationship duration ($\chi^2 = 1.51$), partner's age ($\chi^2 = 1.55$), and number of children ($\chi^2 = 5.43$). In all cases, the p-values exceeded the threshold of 0.05, confirming the lack of a statistically significant relationship between the sociodemographic variables and violence.

Table 8.
Comparison of executed and perceived violence according to sociodemographic data

	Execution/ Victimization		
	χ^2	gl	p
Sex	0.734 / 2.343	2	.693/ .310
Age	2.83 / 3.26	4	.587 / .516
Educational level	0.261 / 0.931	2	.877 / .955
District of residence	14.3 / 15.3	5	.219 / .168
Work	2.50 / 1.90	3	.476 / .590
Type of crime	4.48 / 3.07	6	.612 / .800
Type of sentence	6.62 / 6.52	4	.676 / .687
Relationship	5.46 / 6.92	3	.141 / .075
Duration of relationship	2.91 / 1.51	4	.573 / .825
Age of partner	1.90 / 1.55	4	.753 / .817
N° of children	4.86 / 5.43	5	.433 / .366
Lives with	8.72 / 9.88	7	.464 / .361
Substance abuse	0.880 / 0.230	2	.644 / .891

Discussion

This study analyzed intimate partner violence perpetrated by released and sentenced individuals from a ML-INPE in Lima, Peru. The results indicate that psychological violence was the most prevalent type of violence among the participants, which aligns with findings reported by other authors (Tiravanti-Delgado et al., 2021; Garrido et al., 2020). Psychological violence occurs more frequently than physical and sexual violence, highlighting the high incidence of behaviors such as hostility, blaming, recalling past mistakes, and jealousy. Specifically, a mean of 12.89 was found for minor psychological violence. In this vein, Fete-ne et al. (2025) reported that 22.3% of a sample of 4720 women experienced psychological violence, making it the most common form of violence in their study. Similarly, Mateo-Fernández et al. (2025) found a mean of 8.42 for this type of violence, a value comparable to that observed in the present research.

In contrast, the violence perceived by the sentenced individuals was greater than the violence they

perpetrated, presenting a mean of 18.88 for minor psychological violence and 9.96 for severe psychological violence. This suggests a discrepancy between the sentenced individuals' perception of the violence they inflict and what they indicate they suffer, which may be explained by a possible minimization of violence by the aggressors or the use of justification strategies. Regarding the physical violence reported by individuals belonging to the ML-INPE program, the results revealed a mean of 8.73 for less frequent physical violence and 7.48 for severe violence. These findings contrast with those of Mateo-Fernández (2024), who reported a mean of 2.19 for intimate partner physical violence. In our research, a predominance of low or very low levels of physical violence was observed. This discrepancy is notable compared to studies such as that by Lahav (2021), which reported 64% of women as victims of physical violence.

Furthermore, Wiem et al. (2023) found that 76.9% of women between 19 and 49 years old experienced intimate partner violence, while López (2021) reported 27.2% of physical violence. A mean of 11.39 was recorded for less frequent violence and 10.40

for severe violence. These data are closer to those of Bardales-Rodríguez et al. (2024), who found a higher prevalence of physical violence in men and highlighted exposure to violence in childhood as a risk factor. Nevertheless, the levels of violence perceived by the participants remained mostly in the low or very low range. These findings suggest that the results may be influenced by the context and the type of population, as most research reports violence from the perspective of women victims, unlike the present study. This implies that prioritizing the analysis of violence from the perspective of the perpetrator is necessary. Understanding the subjectivities of the aggressor may help comprehend their functioning, which could aid in addressing this complex problem.

Regarding sexual violence, a mean of 2.39 was obtained for lower frequency and 3.44 for severe frequency, data that approximate those reported by Mateo-Fernández (2024), who found a mean of 1.09 for physical violence. The distribution of sexual violence levels in our sample revealed a predominance of low to very low levels (73.5%), with 23% reporting high to very high levels, which contrasts with the 6.5% recorded by López (2021). Additionally, studies such as that by Rivas-Rivero and Bonilla-Algovía (2022) indicate a prevalence of 10.3% of sexual violence in women, while Lahav (2021) reported 52%.

A significant finding was that participants perceived greater victimization from sexual violence compared to the violence they themselves perpetrated. In this direction, 13.2% reported high or very high levels of perceived violence, which aligns with the findings of Bardales-Rodríguez et al. (2024), who point out that sexual violence is one of the most frequent forms of violence against men and can lead to social isolation and low self-fulfillment. These results underscore the complexity of sexual violence and the disparity between its perception and perpetration. The high perception of victimization among participants, despite reporting generally low levels of perpetration, suggests the presence of underlying factors, such as fear, shame, or minimization of their own actions, which warrant further exploration in future research.

The aforementioned discrepancy underscores the necessity of considering multiple sources of information, such as the testimony of those affected partners, to obtain a more comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon. This is crucial for the design of intervention programs that address not only violent behavior but also the perception and justification of this behavior by aggressors. The findings suggest that future studies should explore the factors that contribute to the minimization of perpetrated violence, such as a lack of introspection, the normalization of violence, or the influence of sociocultural variables.

Sociodemographic data were analyzed to examine differences between groups in relation to the types of violence, but no significant differences were found. Lahav (2021) found a relationship between past experience of violence and age and economic level, observing that younger women with greater economic dependence were more exposed to intimate partner violence. Calizaya-López (2025) reported that adult women with greater economic dependence and a higher number of children are at greater risk of experiencing violence.

On the other hand, Bardales-Rodríguez et al. (2024) found a higher prevalence of violence against men aged 18 to 35 (44.3%), those with higher education (42.1%), and those who consume alcoholic beverages (37.7%). These differences in results can be explained by cultural contrast, as cultural norms and attitudes towards violence vary between different countries or regions, which can affect how individuals report the violence they perpetrate and perceive. Methodological differences can also affect the results; the sample used in some research has specifically been women who have experienced violence, unlike the present study, which analyzed from the perspective of the perpetrator.

Based on the analysis of the present research, strategies focused on an ecological analysis are proposed. At the individual level, it is recommended to explore the design of interventions centered on the rehabilitation of men who perpe-

trate violence, specifically in the development of emotional skills, couple communication, cognitive restructuring regarding gender roles, psychoeducation on violence, conflict resolution training, assertive communication, and emotion identification. In this regard, it is necessary to prioritize women in situations of physical and economic vulnerability, as well as to intervene in at-risk relationships characterized by high levels of conflict, low socioeconomic status, and previous histories of family violence (Enríquez-Canto et al., 2019). It is suggested to continue investigating perpetrators, with qualitative studies being relevant to understand their experiences and the risk factors associated with the perpetration of violence, with the aim of preventing these behaviors.

Regarding external factors, different strategies are proposed. At the relational level, it is pertinent to create intervention spaces for both men who perpetrate violence and victims, addressing issues related to conflict resolution, assertive communication, active listening, empathy, anger management, a gender equality perspective, healthy relationships, and support networks. This would strengthen family and couple bonds, promoting dynamics based on respect, equity, and communication.

In the community sphere, it is fundamental to propose prevention programs in schools and social organizations, as well as intervention programs in penitentiary centers and ML-INPE, with the aim of fostering support networks and collective awareness regarding intimate partner violence. At the social level, the formulation of new public policies oriented towards education based on gender equality, the promotion and economic empowerment of women, and the restructuring of cultural beliefs and norms are required (Abokor et al., 2025). These strategies can favor the construction of more peaceful coexistence, offering a comprehensive framework to prevent intimate partner violence from a systemic and sustainable perspective.

Conclusions

The present study indicates that psychological violence is the most common form of aggres-

sion among sentenced individuals in the ML-INPE in Lima, especially in its minor manifestation. It is therefore important to focus rehabilitation efforts on this type of violence due to its significant impact on victims and its potential as a precursor to more severe aggressions. Although physical violence is present, the majority of participants deny having perpetrated it, possibly as a justification mechanism. Sexual violence is the least frequent, but its severity demands attention in the design of interventions and prevention strategies for this population. These findings highlight the importance of considering the various forms of violence in rehabilitation programs for offenders.

The discrepancy between the perception of aggressors and the reality of their violent acts is due to the fact that the evaluated individuals report having been victims of more violence than they acknowledge having perpetrated. This could be related to the denial of responsibility or justification of their actions. Based on this result, it is suggested that intervention programs aimed at violent men should not only focus on behavior modification but also on the self-awareness and accountability of the aggressors.

Sociodemographic data, the characteristics of intimate relationships, and the crimes committed do not influence intimate partner violence, neither in its perpetration nor in its perception. This means that violence can occur regardless of age, location, educational level, or occupation, the type of crime, the sentence, the age of onset of the offense, and substance use, and that victimization does not vary according to the duration of the relationship or the presence of children. Vulnerability to intimate partner violence is independent of these factors.

Author contributions:

Melani Janet Quispe-Guzmán: conceptualization, methodology, project development, initial writing, final writing.

Daysi Elena Trujillo-Garay: conceptualization, methodology, analysis, initial writing, final writing.

References

- Abokor, A. Adam, O., Abdillahi, M., Chesneau, C. y Hassan, A. (2025). Magnitude and determinants of intimate partner violence against women in Somalia: evidence from the SDHS survey 2020 dataset. *BMC Women 's Health*, 25(22). <https://bmcmwomens-health.biomedcentral.com/counter/pdf/10.1186/s12905-024-035395.pdf>
- Ato, M., López, J., Benavente, A. (2013). Un sistema de clasificación de los diseños de investigación en psicología. *Anales de Psicología*, 29(4), 1038-1059. https://scielo.isciii.es/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0212-97282013000300043
- Bardales-Rodríguez, A., Ubillus-Landa, S., Echeburúa, E. y Páez-Rovira, D. (2024). Factores de riesgo en la violencia de pareja: Un enfoque desde la violencia ejercida por hombres. *Revista de Psicología Forense*, 12(3), 45-63. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pmedr.2024.102948>
- Bonett, D. y Wright, T. (2014). Fiabilidad alfa de Cronbach: estimación de intervalos, prueba de hipótesis y planificación del tamaño de la muestra. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 6 (1), 3-15. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1002/job.1960>
- Calizaya-López, M. (2025). Violencia de pareja en mujeres con dependencia económica y carga familiar en América Latina. *Estudios de Género y Sociedad*, 18(2), 75-89. <https://ojs.haaj.org/?journal=haaj&page=article&op=view&path%5B%5D=924>
- De Stéfano, M. (2023). Estás humanizando a los violentos. Reflexiones sobre las tensiones y resistencias en el trabajo y la investigación con varones que ejercen violencia. *Pasado Abierto*, 0(17). <https://fh.mdp.edu.ar/revistas/index.php/pasadoabierto/article/view/6930/7247>
- Fetene, M. Cherie, S. y Mekonnen, F. (2025). Spatial distributions and determinants of intimate partner violence among married women in Ethiopia across administrative zones. *Plos One*, 22(2). <https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0310039>
- Garrido, M., Arribas-Rey, A., de Miguel, J. y García-Collantes, A. (2020). La violencia en las relaciones de pareja de jóvenes: prevalencia, victimización, perpetración y bidireccionalidad. *Logos Ciencia & Tecnología*, 12 (2). <https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=517764862002>
- Gobierno del Perú. (9 de agosto de 2020). MIMP: Servicio reeducación para hombres procesados por violencia de género inician sus labores presenciales. <https://www.gob.pe/institucion/aurora/noticias/286981-mimp-servicio-reeducativo-para-hombres-procesados-por-violencia-de-genero-inician-sus-labores-presenciales>
- González-Monzón, A., y García, F. (2024). Violencia en la pareja, familia de origen y estrategias de afrontamiento en adultos paraguayos. *Revista AJAYU*, 22(2), 181-199. <https://doi.org/10.35319/ajayu.222265>
- Hernández-Sampieri, R., y Mendoza, C. (2018). *Metodología de la investigación, las rutas cuantitativa cualitativa y mixta*. McGraw Hill-educación. <https://virtual.cuautitlan.unam.mx/rudics/?p=2612>
- Huerta, P. (2023). Indiferencia judicial, menos del 1% de casos de violencia contra la mujer obtienen sentencia. *La República*. <https://data.larepublica.pe/genero/2023/08/25/indiferencia-judicial-menos-del-1-de-casos-de-violencia-contra-la-mujer-obtiene-sentencia-1339656>
- Incháustegui, T. y Olivares, E. (2011). Modelo ecológico para una vida libre de violencia de género. Comisión Nacional para Prevenir y Erradicar la Violencia contra las Mujeres. INEI. <http://cedoc.inmujeres.gob.mx/lgamv/v/MoDecoFinalPDF.pdf>
- INEI. (2022). 147 víctimas de feminicidio se registraron en el año 2022. <https://m.inei.gob.pe/prensa/noticias/147-victimas-de-feminicidio-se-registraron-en-el-ano-2022-14592/>
- INEI. (2023). Encuesta demográfica y de salud familiar 2023. <https://cdn.www.gob.pe/uploads/document/file/6389989/5601739-resumen-peru-encuesta-demografica-y-de-salud-familiar-2023.pdf?v=1716478980>
- INPE. (2023). Tratamiento penitenciario. Informe estadístico. https://siep.inpe.gob.pe/Archivos/2023/Informes%20tratamiento/informe_final_2023_tratamiento.pdf
- Lahav, Y. (2025). Painful bonds: Identification with the aggressor and distress among IPV survivors. *Journal of Psychiatric Research*, 144, 26-31. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022395621005860?via%3Dihub>
- Loinaz, I., Echeburúa, E., Ortiz-Tallo, M. y Amor, P. (2012). Propiedades psicométricas de la Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS-2) en una muestra española de agresores de pareja. *Psicothema*, 24(1), 142-148. <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/727/72723431022.pdf>
- López, S. (2021). *Violencia de pareja en adultos del asentamiento humano Esperanza Alta, Chimbote, 2021* [Tesis de licenciatura, Universidad César Vallejo]. https://repositorio.ucv.edu.pe/bitstream/handle/20.500.12692/64476/Lopez_TSG-SD.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y
- Lutgendorf, M. (2019). Violencia de pareja y salud de la mujer. Intimate Partner Violence and Women 's Health. *Obstetricia y Ginecología* 134(3), 470-480. https://journals.lww.com/greenjournal/abstract/2019/09000/intimate_partner_violence_and_women_s_health.7.aspx
- Manchego-Carnero, B., Manchego-Carnero, R. y Leyva-Márquez, E. (2022). Salud mental y riesgo de violencia en mujeres y adultos mayores víctimas de violencia. *Enfermería Global*, 21(68). https://scielo.isciii.es/scielo.php?pid=S1695-61412022000400010&script=sci_arttext

- Martínez, S. (2019). *Reinserción social en España: métodos utilizados en la actualidad y sus efectos sobre la reincidencia* [Tesis de licenciatura, Universidad Pontificia Comillas]. https://repositorio.comillas.edu/xmlui/bitstream/handle/11531/30876/TFG_MartA-nez%20Munuera%2C%20Sara.pdf?sequence=1
- Mateo-Fernández, P., Osa-Subtil, I., Ronzón-Tirado, R. y Peña, M. (2025). Batterer typologies: substance use, impulsivity and results of an IPVAW offender treatment program in Spain. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 15. <https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/psychiatry/articles/10.3389/fpsy.2024.1492218/full>
- Méndez, M., Barragan, A., Peñaloza, R. y García. (2022). Severidad de la violencia de pareja y reacciones emocionales en mujeres. *Psicumex*, 12. <https://psicumex.unison.mx/index.php/psicumex/article/view/400/343>
- Ministerio de la Mujer y Poblaciones Vulnerables. (2017). Informe estadístico de diciembre. https://www.mimp.gob.pe/files/programas_nacionales/pncvfs/publicaciones/informe-estadistico-05-PNCVFS-UGIGC.pdf
- Ministerio de la Mujer y Poblaciones Vulnerables. (2014). ¿Qué son los Centros de Emergencia Mujer?. <https://repositorio.aurora.gob.pe/bitstream/handle/20.500.12702/54/CentroEmergenciaMujer.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>
- ONU. (9 de marzo de 2021). Una de cada tres mujeres en el mundo sufre de violencia física o sexual desde que es muy joven. <https://news.un.org/es/story/2021/03/1489292>
- OMS. (2021). Violencia contra la mujer. <https://www.who.int/es/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/violence-against-women>
- Rivas-Rivero, E. y Bonilla-Algovia, E. (2022). Creencias sexistas en hombres en situación de suspensión de condena que han ejercido violencia contra las mujeres en la pareja. *Acta Colombiana de Psicología*, 25(2), 65-77. <https://doi.org/10.14718/ACP.2022.25.2.4>
- Tiravanti-Delgado, D., Chuquizuta-Lucero, M., Barja-Ore, J. Y Valverde-Espinoza, N. (2021). Prevalencia y factores asociados a distintos tipos de violencia íntima de pareja en mujeres peruanas. *Revista Cubana de Medicina Militar*, 50(4). <https://revmedmilitar.sld.cu/index.php/mil/article/view/1562/1123>
- Valdés, P., Cuadra-Martínez, D., Vigorena, F., Madrigal, B. y Muñoz, A. (2023). Violencia contra la mujer: estudio cualitativo en mujeres víctimas de violencia de pareja. *Liberabit*, 29(1). <https://ojs3.revistaliberabit.com/index.php/Liberabit/article/view/685/408>
- Villagrán, A., Martín-Fernández, M. Gracia, E. y Lila, M. (2023). Validación de la escala de gravedad percibida de la violencia de pareja contra la mujer en población ecuatoriana. *Revista Latinoamericana de Psicología*, 55, 29-37. <https://doi.org/10.14349/rp.2023.v55.4>
- Wiem, B., Hela, S., Jihen, J., Hatem, K., Narjes, K., Malek, Z, Fatma, D., Samir, M. y Zouhir, H. (2023). Physical violence against women in southern Tunisia: Epidemiology and risk factors. *Journal of Forensic and Legal Medicine*, 94. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jflm.2022.102482>