

Health Research: Why does looking it narrow if it is possible to see ample? The case of Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical)¹

Abstract (English)

Background: the purpose of this article is to show that it is possible to take a different approach than usual in health research analyzing a health phenomenon in a complex way, as well as its relationship with context, using complete analytical constructs. **Method:** Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical) was analyzed (from surveyed spouse to her/his couple and vice versa) and its context (sociodemographic variables, Conjugal Dynamics, Social Capital and Social Class). Cross-sectional descriptive study in a population sample from the commune of Belén, Medellín, 2013, interviewing 270 couples in their homes. **Results:** only some aspects of Conjugal Dynamics, some sociodemographic variables, and some dimensions of Social Capital, were related to some of the different types of this violence. No association was found with Social Class. **Conclusion:** It was possible to analyze the complexity of Conjugal Violence and its context. It was found that its prevalence was high, which makes it a public health problem.

Keywords: Violence between Intimate Partners, Conjugal Violence and its context, Conjugal Violence and Conjugal Dynamics, Conjugal Violence and Social Capital, Conjugal Violence and Social Class.

¹ Diego A. Sarasti V., MD, MPH, PhD Public Health. Associate Professor, Section of Social Pediatrics, Department of Pediatrics and Puericulture, Medical School, Universidad de Antioquia, Medellín-Colombia. E-mail: diego.sarasti@udea.edu.co

Investigación en salud: ¿Por qué mirar estrecho si se puede ver amplio? El caso de la Violencia conyugal (psicológica, física)

Resumen (español)

Antecedentes: el objetivo de este artículo es mostrar que es posible adoptar un enfoque diferente al habitual en la investigación en salud analizando un fenómeno de salud de forma compleja, así como su relación con el contexto, utilizando constructos analíticos completos. **Método:** Se analizó la Violencia Conyugal (psicológica, física) (del cónyuge encuestado a su pareja y viceversa) y su contexto (variables sociodemográficas, Dinámica Conyugal, Capital Social y Clase Social). Estudio descriptivo transversal en una muestra poblacional de la comuna de Belén, Medellín, 2013, entrevistando a 270 parejas en sus hogares. **Resultados:** sólo algunos aspectos de la Dinámica Conyugal, algunas variables sociodemográficas y algunas dimensiones del Capital Social, se relacionaron con algunos de los diferentes tipos de esta violencia. No se encontró asociación con la Clase Social. **Conclusión:** Fue posible analizar la complejidad de la Violencia Conyugal y su contexto. Se encontró que su prevalencia era alta, lo que la convierte en un problema de salud pública.

Palabras clave: Violencia de Pareja, Violencia Conyugal y su contexto, Violencia Conyugal y Dinámica Conyugal, Violencia Conyugal y Capital Social, Violencia Conyugal y clase social.

Pesquisa em Saúde: Por que olhar estreito quando podemos olhar amplamente? O caso de violência conjugal (psicológica, física)

Resumo (português)

Antecedentes: O objetivo deste estudo é mostrar que é possível realizar uma abordagem diferente da usual na pesquisa em saúde e analisar de forma complexa um fenômeno de saúde, bem como sua relação com o contexto, utilizando construtos analíticos completos. **Método:** Foi analisada a Violência Conjugal (psicológica, física) (do cônjuge pesquisado ao seu cônjuge e vice-versa) e seu contexto (variáveis sociodemográficas, Dinâmica Conjugal, Capital Social e Classe Social). Estudo descritivo transversal em uma amostra populacional do comuna de Belén, Medellín, 2013, entrevistando 270 casais em suas casas. **Resultados:** apenas alguns aspectos da Dinâmica Conjugal, algumas variáveis sociodemográficas e algumas dimensões do Capital Social, estavam relacionadas a alguns dos diferentes tipos dessa violência. Nenhuma associação foi encontrada com Classe Social. **Conclusão:** Foi possível analisar a complexidade da Violência Conjugal e seu contexto. Verificou-se que sua prevalência foi elevada, o que a torna um problema de saúde pública.

Palavras-chave: Violência entre Parceiros Íntimos, Violência Conjugal e seu contexto, Violência Conjugal e Dinâmica Conjugal, Violência Conjugal e Capital Social, Violência Conjugal e Classe Social.

Contributions of the study	
<p>Main results</p> <p>a) It was possible to analyze Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical) (from surveyed spouse to her/his couple and vice versa) and its context (sociodemographic variables, Conjugal Dynamics, Social Capital and Social Class), which shows that it is possible to adopt a different approach to usual in health research, analyzing a health phenomenon in a complex way, as well as its relationship with context, using complete analytical constructs and analyzing their interrelationships.</p> <p>b) Conjugal violence (psychological and physical) was a prevalent phenomenon in the commune of Belén, Medellín-Colombia, 2013, which highlights its importance in public health.</p>	<p>a) Psychological Conjugal Violence was much more frequent than Physical Conjugal Violence, both at some time in life and in the last 12 months.</p> <p>b) Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical), in the last 12 months, was mainly associated with itself. Thus, this population study confirms what has been reported in clinical research on people with this problem in relation to the Circularity of Conjugal Violence (Perrone and Nannini, 2002).</p> <p>c) This research findings showed that the Conjugal Violence act (psychological and physical) is within an interactional process, in which both, one person involved and the other, actively participate (circularity of violence). Conjugal Violence, additionally of being an act, is part of the couple's process.</p> <p>d) Regarding relationship between Conjugal Violence (psychological and physical) and its context, only some sociodemographic variables, some aspects of Conjugal Dynamics, as well as some dimensions of Social Capital, were related to some of the different types of Conjugal Violence (psychological and physical), from surveyed spouse to her/his couple and vice versa.</p> <p>e) There was no one single studied factor related to all the different types of Conjugal violence.</p> <p>f) Conjugal Violence (psychological and physical) was not found associated with Social Class.</p>
<p>Implications for services</p> <p>The above-stated questions the imaginary that Conjugal Violence</p>	<p>A complex view on Conjugal Violence will allow social systems to detect, manage and judicialize this problem and having a greater impact on it.</p>

<p>(psychological, physical) is an “abuser-abused” (or “victimizer-victim”) relationship between its participants, which is the basis on which social systems for detecting, managing and judicializing this problem are structured and operated.</p>	
<p>Perspectives</p> <p>A complex analysis of a health phenomenon allows to go beyond a view of isolated risk factors whose influence is taken for granted, as it allows to weigh involved factors complexity and use an explanatory theoretical framework that encompasses them.</p>	<p>a) A complex analysis of a health phenomenon makes it possible to determine, among all the risk factors, which factors influence this phenomenon, and allows focusing prevention actions in areas of greatest impact. Thus, in the case of Conjugal Violence, it allows public policies for prevention and management of this problem to be focused on both participants in the relationship (preventing the circularity of violence), reinforcing Conjugal Communication and preventing Authoritarianism in the conjugal relationship.</p> <p>b) The positivist health research heuristics is generally focused. This present research makes a methodological contribution by showing that with a broad heuristic it is possible to analyze a health phenomenon systematically, exhaustively, and comprehensively, as well as its context, obtaining a complex view of them.</p>

Background

The central thesis of this article is to show that the current predominant focus on inquiry and discovery technique (heuristics) in health research based on the empirical-analytical paradigm, which is the predominant one, usually investigates health problems only in some of their aspects and, seeing them only in themselves. Therefore, its context is not considered, or if it is analyzed, likewise, only some aspects are considered, taking them as risk factors, and without explaining context with some structured conceptual frameworks, hence establishing isolated and very empirical relationships.

This vision of how to investigate a problem and its context is explained because in this paradigm, as in any other, the researcher not only learns theory, methods, and norms that she/he shares with a community of scientists but also learns specific patterns of how to solve diverse research problems (1), that is, a specific heuristic. These specific patterns, as a positive heuristic strategy or method (2), have, in a correlated way, a fragmented or tubular vision characteristic. The above is perpetuated by habit, a system of provisions for practice, and is the objective basis for behavior regularity (3) (4).

This situation is paradoxical since there are advanced theoretical frameworks that are useful as analytical categories and, within this empirical-analytical paradigm, there are the conditions, in terms of methodology, method, and methodological instruments, to look at health problems in a complex way.

Initially, this article takes Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical) to show how it is usually studied in a focused manner and, subsequently, to propose its analysis in a complex way.

Conjugal Violence in the empirical-analytical scientific literature

Conjugal Violence term is polysemic, with varying meanings; therefore, some researchers assimilate it to Violence between intimate partners (5), and others equate it to the Violence of a man against his female partner (6) (7) (8) (9).

Conjugal Violence is a phenomenon of importance in Public Health. In a study by WHO on 24,000 women from 10 countries, between 15% and 71% of them reported having suffered physical and/or sexual violence. However, in most of these countries, it was between 29% and 62% (10). Research (11) showed a 68.2% prevalence of Conjugal Violence in Medellín.

For its part, in Colombia during 2013, Conjugal Violence represented nearly two-thirds (65,58%) of intrafamily violence cases reported by the National Institute of Legal Medicine and Forensic Sciences, and 77,58% (52,933) of these domestic

violence cases, victims were women. While, in Medellín, in 2013, cases of partner violence, within which is Conjugal Violence, reported in this institute were 459 men and 2.392 women, which was, respectively, 39,3% and 66,.2% of intrafamily violence total reported cases during that year (1167 men and 3615 women) (12).

On the other hand, among those variables usually used to measure their relationship with Conjugal Violence are home, individual, and neighborhood economic conditions, as shown by various research (13) (14) (15) (16) (17) (18). In these investigations, it is usual to assume a relationship between dependent variable(s) and independent variable(s), which may be conceptually important, and not verify the significance of this relationship(s). The latter would be possible if more variables were considered than only those of interest, allowing a framework conceptually structured to analyze relationships between phenomena under study.

Reviewing scientific literature on Conjugal Violence in the PubMed database between January 1990 and July 2015, using the "Conjugal violence" keyword, only one out of 128 studies was found to analyze the context of this violence using a defined conceptual framework (19).

For this present research, Conjugal Violence is defined as violence from a male spouse to a female spouse and vice versa; specifically, Psychological Violence and Physical Violence were investigated as they are the most frequent types of Conjugal Violence in the world (20) (5) and in Colombia (12); in this way, Conjugal Violence construct was measured. Social Capital and Social Class constructs were measured to address the context of this Violence, systematically and complexly, as well as Conjugal Dynamics and sociodemographic variables (sex, age, and educational level of surveyed spouse and her/his spouse; socioeconomic stratum and level of family expenses).

This research was conducted in the commune of Belén, Medellín city, Department of Antioquia, Republic of Colombia. Medellín is the second city in importance and population in Colombia and It is the capital of the department. Commune of Belén is in zone 6 (southwestern) in Medellín and is made up of different neighborhoods. Belén is the commune of Medellín with the largest population, which was 195,588 inhabitants, in 2013, distributed in 105,966 women and 89,622 men (21), corresponding to 8.09% of this city population (22).

This article shows the results of a research carried out by the author for his doctoral thesis in public health "Conjugal Violence, Social Capital and Social Class in the Belén commune, Medellín" (23), and incorporates Conjugal Dynamics to analyze correlation and modeling.

This research was approved by Committee of Ethics at E.S.E. Metrosalud, act 11-2011, November 15th, 2011; and by Committee of Bioethics at National Faculty of Public Health from Universidad de Antioquia, act 058 of December 7, 2011. In addition, respondents signed an informed consent at the time of being surveyed.

Method

This present research was carried out in a sample of heterosexual and cohabiting couples, from the commune of Belén, Medellín-Colombia, 2013. Universe or reference field was a civil, noninstitutionalized population residing in the commune of Belén, Medellín; it was 195,588 people (21). The study population consisted of all households in the Belén commune where the marital status of the household head was married or living with her/his couple for two or more years, and they were 38,408 couples (22)².

This study sample size was calculated based on the population proportion estimation formula, with a 95% confidence level and a 6% precision.³, and an estimated prevalence of 50.0% was used as the global prevalence for all Violence sought in this study. Thus, sufficient sample size was obtained to estimate different variable proportions in this population (multipurpose sampling) and to allow for bivariate and multivariate analyses.

Descriptive results (descriptive phase) from Conjugal Violence (psychological and physical) analyzed this Violence exerted by respondents, 270 people, as well as in their couples, 540 people in total; while, in correlational and analytical phases, Conjugal Violence (psychological and physical) exerted both by respondent and her/his couple was analyzed, 270 couples of spouses in total. Psychological Violence and Physical Violence subscales from the Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS) (M A. Straus, 2007), respectively, were used to collect information on Conjugal Violence.

Regarding Social Capital, its following dimensions were measured: Opinion about Local Area, Civic Participation, Social Networks and Support, Social Participation, Reciprocity, and Trust (Harper & Kelly, 2003). In addition, Access to Social

² Life Quality Survey (Encuesta de Calidad de Vida), Medellín 2013, Expanded. "Households" module, table "Households by commune or corregimiento according to marital status of the head", page 190. https://www.medellin.gov.co/irj/go/km/docs/pccdesign/SubportaldelCiudadano_2/PlandeDesarrollo_0_17/IndicadoresyEstadsticas/Shared%20Content/Encuesta%20Calidad%20de%20Vida/ECV2013/PDFs/O3Hogares.pdf

³ A precision of 6% was accepted for the present research since this is an exploratory study, as much precision is not needed in the search for association or causality relationships, as usually accepted 5% in an experimental study.

Resources and Information dimensions were measured; the first one was designed for the present research, and the second was taken from DANE (National Department of Statistics of Colombia). In this present investigation, the respondent' Social Capital was assumed as the spouse' Social Capital since the sample study was representative of both the respondents' total number and the spouses' total number in the commune of Belén, Medellín - 2013.

Conjugal Dynamics was studied in terms of: 1) satisfaction level (a lot, moderate, a little, not at all) in marital relationship, quality and frequency of marital communication; dialogue attitude, support among its members, rules characteristics (clear, confusing, nonexistent) and in communication (close, distant, cold, aggressive); 2) Marital relationship power (who makes the most important decisions, the existence of a member who imposes herself/himself, domination basis, decision-making capacity of each spouse); 3) Conflicts in a marital relationship (leading causes, frequency, habitual handling of conflicts).

The Harmonised Question Set, an instrument designed by the Office for National Statistics, United Kingdom (25), was used to collect information on Social Capital (26) (27). This questionnaire analyzes the following aspects of Social Capital: Opinion about Local area, Civic Participation, Social Networks and Support, Social Participation, Reciprocity, and Trust. In addition, Access to Social Resources and Information dimensions were measured.

On the other hand, Social Class was measured by insertion in the productive process (28) of each spouse to estimate the social class of spouses subsequently.

In the present research, the social class of each couple was estimated based on the social class of each spouse when both worked. When only one of the spouses worked, her/his social class estimate was extended to the couple. When neither spouse worked, the social class of the family member who lived with them and had the best occupation was assigned to the married couple. Also, "Pensions, savings, investments, property or any other benefit" "Rentiers") category was included to incorporate spouses with no family members who worked but lived on income.

The European Socioeconomic Classification (29) was used to collect data on Social Class. This instrument was applied in the present investigation in such a way that it would allow analyzing *each of the spouse's work characteristics*, in terms of their professions and trades, and *Control over the productive processes* that they could have, in terms of participation in decision-making processes at work.

A specific questionnaire was designed to collect data on Conjugal Dynamics.

Socioeconomic variables were used to adjust by confusion and interaction; they were socioeconomic stratum, family type, number of children, family income level, education of spouses, and neighborhood where they lived.

The Epidemiological Methodology was used to determine the behavior of Conjugal Violence and part of its context (Conjugal Dynamics, Sociodemographic Variables, Social Capital, and Social Class) and their interrelationships in the studied population. The statistical method was used to perform these analyses (descriptive phases of each of the mentioned analytical categories) and to find those analytical categories that could relate to this Violence (correlation and modeling phases).

Significant associations between Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical) in the last 12 months, from the surveyed spouse to his/her partner and vice versa, were analyzed. To this purpose, an association of Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical) as a dependent variable was modeled with all the analytical studied categories as independent variables, which were Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical), sociodemographic variables, Conjugal Dynamics, Social Capital, and Social Class; Conjugal Violence itself was included among independent variables to analyze how much it influenced itself and thus be able to measure all factors that could be related to it.

For this purpose, four multinomial logistic regression models were carried out: Psychological Violence from surveyed spouses against their partners; Physical Violence from surveyed spouses against their partners; Psychological Violence from their couples to surveyed spouses; and Physical Violence from their couples to surveyed spouses.

The multinomial logistic regression model for Psychological Violence from surveyed spouses to their partners was statistically significant ($X^2=1418,909$; $p=0,000$) and explained 62,1% (Nagelkerke's R^2 : 0,621) of this phenomenon in the commune of Belén, Medellín, 2013. On the other hand, the multinomial logistic regression model for Physical Violence from surveyed spouses to their partners was statistically significant ($X^2=815,987$; $p=0,000$) and explained 49,4% (Nagelkerke's R^2 : 0,494) of this phenomenon in this commune.

On the other hand, the multinomial logistic regression model for Psychological Violence from partners to surveyed spouses was statistically significant ($X^2=1236,653$; $p=0,000$) and explained 64,2% (Nagelkerke's R^2 : 0,642) of this phenomenon. Additionally, the multinomial logistic regression model for Physical Violence from partners to surveyed spouses was statistically significant ($X^2=1634,583$; $p=0,000$) and explained 48,6% (Nagelkerke's R^2 : 0,486) of this phenomenon in that commune.

The relationship between the independent variables (Sociodemographic variables, Conjugal Dynamics, Social Capital, Social Class) and the dependent variable (Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical)) was modeled to determine contextual factors of Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical) that could be related to this Violence; Conjugal Violence was not included among independent variables to be able to analyze only contextual factors.

To this purpose, four Multinomial Logistic Regression Models of the context of Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical) were performed, as follows: Psychological Violence from surveyed spouses to their partners; Physical Violence from surveyed spouses to their partners; Psychological Violence from partners to their surveyed spouses; Physical Violence from partners to their surveyed spouses.

The multinomial logistic regression model of the context for Psychological Violence from surveyed spouses to their partners was statistically significant ($X^2=506,363$; $p=0,437$) and explained 34,1% (Nagelkerke's R^2 : 0,341) of the context of this phenomenon in the commune of Belen, Medellin-2013. For its part, the multinomial logistic regression model of the context for Physical Violence by surveyed spouses to their partners was statistically significant ($X^2=474,457$; $p=0,881$) and explained 26,1% (Nagelkerke's R^2 : 0,261) of the context of this phenomenon in the said commune.

On the other hand, the multinomial logistic regression model of the context for Psychological Violence from partners to surveyed spouses was statistically significant ($X^2=528,227$; $p=0,239$) and explained 34,6% (Nagelkerke's R^2 : 0,346) of the context of this phenomenon. Additionally, the multinomial logistic regression model of the context for Physical Violence from partners to surveyed spouses was statistically significant ($X^2=189,971$; $p=1,000$) and explained 50,0% (Nagelkerke's R^2 : 0,500) of the context of this phenomenon in that commune.

Results

1. Significant associations in Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical) (from surveyed spouses to their partners and vice versa)

The following results show the significant relationships between Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical) from surveyed spouses to their partners and vice versa:

- a. The different types of Conjugal Violence were mainly associated with other types of this Violence (Circularity of Conjugal Violence).**

Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical) was mainly related to itself (Circularity of Conjugal Violence, psychological and physical), as the following findings showed:

Regarding psychological Violence:

When the surveyed spouse exerted:

- Minor Psychological Violence to her/his partner had 15,4 times more risk of suffering Psychological Violence (minor or severe) from a partner than a spouse who did not exert this Violence ($p=0,000$; CI95% 7,494 – 31,708).
- Severe Psychological Violence to her/his partner had 103,8 times more risk of suffering Psychological Violence (minor or severe) from a partner than a spouse who did not exert this Violence ($p=0,000$; CI95% 5 - 7).

When the partner of the surveyed spouse exerted:

- Minor psychological Violence against her/his surveyed spouse had 11,7 times more risk of receiving psychological Violence from a spouse than a partner who did not exert this Violence ($p =0,00$; 95% CI 6,013 – 22,753).
- Minor psychological Violence against her/his surveyed spouse had 5,6 times more risk of receiving physical Violence from a spouse than a partner who did not exert this Violence ($p=0,038$; 95% CI 1,099 – 28,244).
- Severe psychological Violence against her/his surveyed spouse had a 6,4% higher risk of not having good communication in marital relationship than a partner who did not exert this Violence ($p=0,013$; 95% CI 0,007 – 0,56).
- Severe psychological Violence against her/his surveyed spouse had 76,3 times more risk of receiving Psychological Violence from their spouse than the partner who did not exert it ($p=0,000$; 95% CI 26,799 – 217,14).
- Severe psychological Violence against her/his surveyed spouse had 13,3 times more risk of receiving physical Violence from a spouse than a partner who did not exert this Violence ($p=0,005$; 95% CI 2,189 – 80,37).

Regarding physical Violence:

When surveyed spouse exerted:

- Minor physical Violence against her/his partner was 3,3 times more likely to suffer psychological Violence from a partner than a surveyed spouse who did not exert this Violence (p=0,003; 95% CI 1,509 – 7,367).
- Severe physical Violence against her/his partner was 8,3 times more likely to suffer psychological Violence from a partner than the surveyed spouse who did not exert this Violence (p=0,028; 95% CI 1,265 – 55,228).
- Minor physical Violence against her/his partner was 20,5 times more likely to suffer physical Violence from a partner than a surveyed spouse who did not exert this Violence (p=0,000; 95% CI 6,755 – 62,261).
- Severe physical Violence against her/his partner was 80,1 times more likely to suffer physical Violence from a partner than a surveyed spouse who did not exert this Violence (p=0,000; 95% CI 13,779 – 465,777). Given the few cases of severe physical violence, this estimate had a very wide confidence interval.

When the partner of the surveyed spouse exerted:

- Minor physical Violence against her/his surveyed spouse had a 21,3 times greater risk of suffering physical Violence from a spouse than a partner who did not exert this Violence (p=0,00; 95% CI 7,873 – 57,646).
- Severe physical Violence against her/his surveyed spouse had a 326,6 times greater risk of suffering Physical Violence from a spouse than a partner who did not exert this Violence (p=0,000; 95% CI 22,641 – 4710,38). Given the few cases of severe physical violence, this estimate had a very wide confidence interval.

b. In Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical; from surveyed spouses to their partner and vice versa), only Psychological Violence from partner to surveyed spouse and Conjugal Communication showed a significant association.

When analyzing the association of all studied analytical categories and Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical), it was found that at a higher level of Conjugal Communication, the risk of severe Psychological Violence from partner to surveyed spouse was reduced by 6,4% (p=0,013; 95% CI 0,007 – 0,56).

This association was the only significant when performing these analyses. It reaffirms findings that Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical) was mainly related to itself (Circularity of Conjugal Violence, psychological and physical).

c. Psychological Violence from surveyed spouses to partners was associated with the female sex.

When the surveyed spouse sex was female, the risk of Psychological Violence from the surveyed spouse against her partner was level minor increased 2,7 times ($p=0,01$; 95% CI 1,26 – 5,672) and that it was level severe increased 3,8 times ($p=0,015$; 95% CI 1,288 – 10,947).

2. Significant associations of Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical) with its context

The following results show the significant relationships that Conjugal Violence (psychological and physical; from surveyed spouses to their partners and vice versa) had with its context:

a. When analyzing context, only some types of Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical) (from surveyed spouses to their partners and vice versa) were associated with some sociodemographic variables

When analyzing context, only the following associations of Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical) and sociodemographic variables showed significance:

1. When analyzing context, Psychological Violence of surveyed spouses to their partners was associated with female sex

When the surveyed spouse sex was female, the risk of Psychological Violence from the surveyed spouse to her partner was level minor increased 2,3 times ($p=0,008$; 95% CI 1,244 – 4,348), and that it was level severe increased 2,7 times ($p =0,020$, 95% CI 1,168-6.282).

Thus, female sex was a variable related to Psychological Violence (minor and severe) both in the model that included all factors and in the one that included only context factors.

2. When analyzing context, Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical) (from surveyed spouses to

their partners and vice versa) was associated with other sociodemographic variables.

At the older age of the surveyed spouse's partner, the risk of severe Psychological Violence from the surveyed spouse to her/his partner was reduced by 95,8% ($p=0,006$; 95%CI 0,929 – 0,988).

Also, at a higher socioeconomic stratum, there was a 23,7% reduction in risk of severe Physical Violence from the surveyed spouse to his/her partner ($p=0,000$; CI 0,111 -0,507). In addition, at a higher level of family expenditure on public services, the risk of severe Psychological Violence from the partner to the surveyed spouse was reduced by 46,2% ($p=0,01$; CI 0,256 – 0,832).

b. When analyzing context, only some types of Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical) (from surveyed spouses to their partners and vice versa) were associated with some aspects of Conjugal Dynamics.

Only the following associations of Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical) and Conjugal Dynamics showed significance when analyzing context:

At a higher level of Conjugal Communication, the risk of severe Psychological Violence from the surveyed spouse to her/his partner was reduced by 16,6% ($p=0,002$; 95%CI 0,054 – 0,516). In addition, risk of minor Physical Violence from surveyed spouse to her/his partner was reduced by 19,6% ($p=0,000$; 95%CI 0,098 – 0,392); risk of severe Psychological Violence from her/his partner to surveyed spouse was reduced by 3,7% ($p=0,002$; CI95% 0,005 – 0,291) and risk of Minor Physical Violence from her/his partner to surveyed spouse was reduced by 34,2% ($p=0,018$; CI95% 0,14 – 0,833).

On the other hand, at a higher level of Authoritarianism in marital relationships, the risk of severe Psychological Violence from the surveyed spouse to her/his partner increased 4,8 times ($p=0,004$; 95%CI 1,638 – 14,270); likewise, the risk of severe Psychological Violence from her/his partner to surveyed spouse increased 5,.2 times ($p=0,003$; 95%CI 1,754 – 15,535).

c. When analyzing context, only one of the types of Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical) (from surveyed spouse to his/her partner and vice versa) was associated with one of the studied family sociodemographic variables.

Considering the different family sociodemographic variables studied, only the following association with Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical) showed significance in analyzing context:

A family in the "Launching pad" stage had 28,6% lower risk of minor Physical Violence from the surveyed spouse to her/his partner ($p=0,013$; 95%CI 0,107 - 0,764).

d. When analyzing context, only some types of Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical) (from surveyed spouse to her/his partner and vice versa) were associated with some dimensions of Social Capital.

Only the following associations of Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical) and Social Capital showed significance when analyzing context:

At higher Social Involvement of a surveyed spouse, the risk that the surveyed spouse exerted Minor Psychological Violence to her/his partner was reduced by 48,4% ($p=0,024$; CI 0,258 – 0,910).

At higher Civic Involvement of a surveyed spouse, the risk of Minor Physical Violence from her/his partner to the surveyed spouse was reduced by 27,9% ($p=0,016$; CI 0,098 – 0,79).

e. Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical) (from surveyed spouse to her/his partner and vice versa) and Social Class were not associated.

When analyzing Social Class and Conjugal Violence (psychological and physical) association, findings from this population-based study showed no statistically significant differential distribution of such Violence among different social classes. Thus, in the studied population, Social Class was not associated with Conjugal Violence (psychological and physical). This finding supports the World Health Organization's statement that intimate partner violence, from which Conjugal Violence is part, occurs in all countries, regardless of social, economic, religious, or cultural group (20).

Discussion

The present research analyzed Conjugal Violence (psychological and physical), Conjugal Dynamics, sociodemographic variables, Social Capital, Social Class, and the association of the first one with the others. Data collection of these analytical categories was done simultaneously in the same population.

The purpose of the present research was to advance in a scarcely explored area, such as analyzing the possible relationship between mentioned analytical categories, as a means to understand context in a complex way, in this case, of Conjugal Violence (psychological and physical). A scientific literature review was conducted on Conjugal Violence published in the PubMed database from January 1990 to July 2015, using the "Conjugal violence" keyword, and no studies were found that analyzed such a possible relationship.

On the other hand, few studies analyze the context of Conjugal violence, and those analyzing it use only a few variables. It ultimately halts apprehending the complexity of the Conjugal Violence context. In this scientific literature review, only one study analyzed this violence context using socio-structural, patriarchal, cultural, and social exchange theories and created a hypothetical model explaining South Korean women's response to abuse in marital relationships (19).

For its part, present research findings conducted in the general population indicated that Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical) was an important public health problem in the studied population.

Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical) statistically significant associations

This research focused on answering the following questions: What factors are significantly related to Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical)? What are the significant relationships between Conjugal Violence (psychological and physical) and its context? (The latter measured by Conjugal Dynamics, sociodemographic variables, Social Capital, and Social Class).

In the "Results", section "Significant Associations of Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical) (from surveyed spouses to their partners and vice versa)", the first question was answered; it was shown that factors significantly related to Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical; from surveyed spouses to their partners and vice versa) came from itself. With this result, in this present population study, Conjugal Violence circularity was confirmed, which has been reported by clinical investigations in people involved in this problem (30).

On the other hand, findings shown in "Significant Associations of Conjugal Violence (Psychological, Physical) with its Context" answer the second question and point out that only some aspects of Conjugal Dynamics, some sociodemographic variables, as well as some dimensions of Social Capital, were related to some of the different types of Conjugal Violence, psychological and physical, from surveyed spouses and vice versa. Therefore, there was not a single factor of those studied related to all the diverse types of Conjugal Violence.

Therefore, the fact that the present investigation found that none of the studied analytical categories (Conjugal Dynamics, sociodemographic variables, Social Capital, Social Class), each taken in its entirety, was related to any of the different types of Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical) reconsiders, in this relationship debate, conceptual assumptions that relate them roughly, because these positions might not be sufficiently founded.

Conjugal Dynamics and Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical)

As findings show, only two of all studied Conjugal Dynamics aspects showed a relationship with Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical); they were:

When analyzing all factors that could be related to Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical), Conjugal Communication had an inverse relationship with severe Psychological Violence from partner to surveyed spouse. Even more, when analyzing the context of Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical), Conjugal Communication was inversely related to each Conjugal Violence type (psychological and physical; from surveyed spouse to her/his partner and vice versa).

On the other hand, when analyzing the context of Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical), Authoritarianism in conjugal relationships showed a direct relationship with Psychological Violence from the surveyed spouse to her/his partner and also with Psychological Violence from the partner to the surveyed spouse.

In an equivalent way to other studies, the present research highlights Conjugal Communication's importance in Conjugal Violence prevention. A study carried out in Colombia showed that assertive (constructive) communication in marital relationships was related to this relationship's durability (31). Another study showed the relationship between communication and marital functionality, defining the latter as cohesion, adaptability, and marital adjustment. In addition, it pointed out that negative communication permeated the entire marital life cycle, mainly in the first years of marriage (32). For its part, a study carried out on Korean immigrant couples in the United States of America indicated that marital communication problems were the best predictor of marital satisfaction (33).

Likewise, present research findings showed a direct relationship between Authoritarianism and Conjugal Violence. In a more general sense, this relationship could be inserted within family violence. The latter was shown by a study carried out in Hunan province, China, which pointed out the importance of family power structure to determine family violence risk profiles since authoritarian power structures in families were almost four times more common in violent homes than in non-violent

homes, particularly under stressful situations or in challenges to established power hierarchies (34).

Sociodemographic Variables and Conjugal Violence

This research explored the association of sociodemographic variables (sex, age, and educational level of surveyed spouses, socioeconomic stratum, and families' expense level) with Conjugal Violence (psychological and physical; from surveyed spouses to their partners and vice versa), finding an association only in some cases. This little-found association suggests that these sociodemographic variables are insufficient to analyze context and guides to use complete conceptual frameworks as analytical categories to study it, among which Social Capital and Social Class sociological constructs were useful.

In this way, the tendency to assume that sociodemographic variables are, per se, significant to understanding a health phenomenon, in this case, Conjugal Violence (psychological and physical), is questioned. Although numerous studies show that Domestic Violence is associated with socioeconomic indicators (35) (36) (37) (13), It is true that socioeconomic indicators are not the only ones nor are the best to understand Conjugal Violence context, since they are not enough to explain it because they do not measure vital sociological constructs (38).

Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical) and sex

In general terms, there were no significant differences between the male and female sexes in exerting the different types of Conjugal Violence, although there were some exceptions.

Already since descriptive findings of this research, carried out in the general population, at analyzing Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical) level (none, minor, severe), sometime during life and in last 12 months, exerted by each spouse in each couple (graphs 4 to 7) found that at these levels prevailed the same reciprocity between spouses to exert this Violence; except in severe Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical) at some time during life.

Nevertheless, in Psychological Violence, at some time during life, and in Physical Violence, at some time during life, when comparing those who were at level none against those who were at level minor of these violence types, women were at the highest level.

On the other hand, in analytical findings (from modeling), similar proportionality was found to exert Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical) between women and men in the last 12 months. However, when the surveyed spouse was from the female

sex, it showed a greater risk of exerting minor and severe Psychological Violence to her partner. Similarly, it happened in analyzing the context of these same types of Conjugal Violence when surveyed spouses from the female sex had a greater risk of exerting them. This finding must be considered, especially since psychological Violence was prevalent.

The above could be explained by the fact that women tend to maximize Conjugal Violence while men minimize it (39). However, debate remains on whether it was something subjective or objective.

In any case, the finding of an imbalance between sex to exert minor and severe psychological Violence in the last 12 months is hard to compare with the results of other investigations because, in general, the latter analyzes the occurrence of Violence throughout married life.

However, this finding contrasts with what has been stated in investigations indicating that approximately half of all women and men had suffered psychological abuse by an intimate partner during their lives, such as one carried out in Medellín and Valle de Aburrá (11), and one that was carried out in a representative sample of United States of America population, in 2010 (40).

On the other hand, the finding of similarity between women and men exert those other types of Conjugal Violence (psychological, from partners to their surveyed spouses; physical, from surveyed spouses to their partners and vice versa) is consistent with studies showing similar percentages of cases in Conjugal Violence between women and men, such as one carried out in a representative sample of heterosexual couples in United States of America (41), as well as another one carried out in that country, in a similar characteristics sample to previous study, which showed that intimate partner violence was reciprocal and that both men and women reported having been victims (42).

Similar rates of Conjugal Violence between men and women have been reported in the scientific literature (43) (44) (45) (46) (47) (48) (49) (50) (51) (52) (53) (54) (55) (56) (57) (58).

An extensive scientific literature review reported more than 200 studies indicating symmetry between sexes to cause physical Violence in couple relationships (59), which is also reported by a systematic review that analyzed percentages of physical partner violence for both sexes in research from different countries, which used representative samples of couples at national level (60). Another research indicated that physical Violence occurs in similar proportions in both sexes (61), and another (62) indicates that the same occurs in psychological Violence.

As mentioned by (41), all the preceding leaves little doubt about the similarity between women and men in Violence exerted in Conjugal and couple relationships.⁴, both in frequency and intensity.

On the other hand, some research has shown Conjugal Violence circularity, which different investigations have pointed out (Babcock et al., 1993) (64) (65) that showed a significant correlation in Violence reported between partners in a conjugal relationship (41); as well as, by another research (66), which pointed out that intimate partner violence warranting clinical attention, analyzed through epidemiological studies, did not meet the expectation that it was mainly from man towards woman.

Thus, it is evident that Violence in marital relationships is not specific to the male sex and that such Violence cannot be explained on a sex or gender roles basis, which, likewise, has been raised by the psychopathological approach to intimate partner violence (67).

On the other hand, present research showed Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical) circularity in the general population, as clinical attention to spouses in Violence has shown (30).

Socioeconomic status and Conjugal Violence

Present research only found that a higher socioeconomic stratum severe Physical Violence from surveyed spouse to her/his partner risk was reduced by 23,7%. There was no other significant association between socioeconomic stratum and Conjugal Violence. Other research reports similar findings on the non-relationship between socioeconomic stratum and Conjugal Violence. Thereby, (68) found that neighborhood or women's socioeconomic characteristics did not influence the probability that the latter would experience intimate partner violence in Sao Paulo, Brazil. Thus, they did not find that living in a depressed neighborhood increased women's risk of experiencing intimate partner violence.

A study systematic review on men abusing their partners' socioeconomic level reported that empirical evidence associating men's violent behavior against their partners in certain low-level socioeconomic groups is still insufficient and highlights that more information of better quality is needed to establish conclusive results in this regard (69).

However, other research did report that Conjugal Violence was greater in lower socioeconomic strata. A study conducted in various communities in Cali, Colombia, on intimate partner violence types and severity in a group of women affected by it

⁴Couple relationships include fiancées', spouses, and ex-spouses' relationships.

found that socioeconomic status had a significant negative correlation with violence threats and a positive correlation with physical Violence (70).

Meanwhile, a multilevel study carried out on a representative sample of married or cohabiting couples, white, African-American, and Hispanic, in the United States of America, in 1995 reported that neighborhood poverty is an intimate partner violence predictor (71). Another study, conducted in Duval County, Florida, United States of America 1992, reported that intimate partner violence was concentrated in poor inner-city neighborhoods (15). Relatedly, a study on men in Uttar Pradesh, a state in northern India, found that high socioeconomic status was a protective factor against physical Violence but not against sexual Violence against women (72).

Another study, which evaluated intimate partner violence prevalence and its association with social deprivation in a representative sample of men and women between 16 and 59 years old in England 2008, found that a woman's experience of Conjugal physical Violence during her life was associated with tenure of social interest house, low household income, low educational level, low social class, and living in a multifaceted deprived area. It also found that physical partner violence suffered by men and psychological partner violence suffered by both men and women were not associated with deprivation factors (73).

A study conducted among Canadian women, aboriginal and non-aboriginal, found that socioeconomic position was inversely related to any intimate partner violence occurrence and partially explained this violence occurrence (74).

Family sociodemographic variables studied and Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical)

On the different family sociodemographic variables studied only family type, one of the family nucleus Characteristics, and specifically, family in the "Launch Platform" stage was inversely related only to Minor Physical Violence from surveyed spouses to their partners.

This finding highlights the little association between the different family sociodemographic variables studied and Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical). It is consistent with the fact that the main factors associated with this Violence came from itself, exerted by both spouses.

In addition, it may indicate that children at the age they are in this stage (18 years and older) become a modulating factor of this specific type of Conjugal Violence, which they would not be able to do in previous family life course stages. Likewise, it points out that both spouses have already had at this married life stage, a sufficiently extended period of coupling and overcoming difficulties between them.

Historically, clinical research has studied interparental relationship influence on child and adolescent psychopathology (75) and not the other way around. The Probable modulatory effect of children in families on the "launching stage" suffering minor physical Violence by a spouse towards her/his partner opens the way to research that explores this regard; above all, in cases of children with specific conditions, such as chronic pathologies (diabetes type I, kidney failure, Etc.) or permanent conditions (cognitive disability, motor failure of central origin, Etc.).

Social Capital and Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical)

Social Capital, as a set of its dimensions studied, did not show an association with Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical). However, two of its dimensions were related, and only with some types of this Violence: the greater Social Participation of surveyed spouse reduced by 48,4% risk that surveyed spouse would exert minor Psychological Violence toward her/his partner ($p=0,024$; CI 0,258 – 0,910), and the greater Civic Participation of surveyed spouse reduced risk of minor Physical Violence from partner to surveyed spouse by 27,9% ($p=0,016$; CI 0,098 – 0,79).

Social Participation measured the respondent's participation in different group types (community, sports, environmental, educational, recreational, political, union, religious, support, Etc.) and providing personal help. Civic Participation measured the respondent's ability to participate and influence in different social spaces (neighborhood, neighborhood, commune, city, region, nation, workplace, home).

These two dimensions (Social Participation and Civic Participation) measure subject participation and involvement in her/his social environment. Thus, the issue that an inverse association has been found between Social Participation and minor Psychological Violence from surveyed spouse toward her/his partner, as well as between Civic Participation and minor Physical Violence from partner to her/his surveyed spouse, shows the social aspects of these prevailing types of Conjugal Violence. For its part, it is striking that Social Networks and Support, Reciprocity and Trust, which were some measured Social Capital dimensions, did not show a relationship to Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical), which could be an expression of the weak ties found between spouses and their environment.

Thus, the finding that Social Capital, as a set of its measured dimensions, did not show a relationship to Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical) opens the debate to positions that take this roughly relationship for granted.

Social Class and Conjugal Violence

For its part, the present research finding that there was no association between Social Class and Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical) opens debate on this topic.

In contrast, a study (73) carried out in England in 2008, which used occupation level as the only criterion to measure Social Class, found a relationship between Intimate Partner Violence and Social Class since it found that Physical Violence suffered by a woman in a couple's relationship was associated with low social class, as well as to social interest houses ownership, family income low level, poor educational achievements and living in areas with multiple depriving factors. However, it did not find an association between these factors and Physical Violence suffered by a man nor Emotional Violence (Psychological) suffered by both sexes in the couple's relationship.

The scientific literature on Conjugal Violence and Social Class is very scarce. Bearing that Conjugal Violence is part of Domestic Violence, a search was made in PubMed using "domestic violence" and "social class" keywords without limiting the period to search. The article review showed that only one study analyzed the Social Class and Conjugal Violence relationship ((73). Also, in this database, a search was made using "Conjugal violence" and "social class" keywords and no studies were found.

Likewise, it was searched with "marital violence" and "social class" keywords, finding only one ethnographic study on marital violence context carried out in rural communities in Karnataka state, southern India. It referred that this Violence was closely linked to experiences of gender, caste, and social class inequities and that women's ability to resist it depended on their access to economic and social resources (76).

Also, PubMed, Science Direct, and ... (*anonymized*)... databases ... (*anonymized*) ... were reviewed using the following keywords: ("Intimate Partner Violence", "Conjugal violence", or "Domestic Violence") and "Social Class"; from bibliographic references, this search yielded some few studies were found analyzing Social Class and Domestic Violence relationship (this latter occurs between family members) (77) (78) (79) (80).

Given research scarcity to analyze the Social Class and Conjugal Violence relationship, it is essential to delve deeper into this field with new studies. Likewise, analyzing the Social Class to health-disease phenomena existent association is beneficial, given this construct's conceptual relevance, the new fields of knowledge it would explore, and the practical implications of these findings.

Violence variation in Conjugal relationship

These research findings showed how Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical) from the surveyed spouse to her/his partner varied when measured at different moments in the marital relationship (ever in their lifetime (not including the last year) and in the last 12 months).

In addition, although Conjugal Psychological Violence was much more frequent than Conjugal Physical Violence, both at some time in life and in the last 12 months, both Conjugal Violence types had a similar pattern since they decreased in frequency between these two moments but increased in severity. Other studies indicate how this Violence decreases between different moments; one, carried out on women in rural areas (81), and other, carried out in the general population in rural, urban, and industrial areas of Hunan province (82).

This finding on Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical) variation at different moments may have therapeutic implications, as it highlights the need to support newly constituted spouses presenting these types of Violence to prevent them from increasing subsequently.

Actors' Relationship in Conjugal Violence

The present research showed that Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical), beyond a unidirectional relationship "abuser-battered", is an interactional process in which those involved alternately assume these roles.

Likewise, findings showed that the main factors influencing Conjugal Violence (psychological and physical; from surveyed spouse to her/his partner and vice versa) came from itself.

In addition, there were no significant differences between women and men exerting it, except in Psychological Violence from the surveyed spouse to her/his partner and in the context of this Violence, in which when the spouse surveyed was a woman, the risk of her exercising minor and severe psychological Violence to her partner increased.

Furthermore, findings showed that there were no significant differences between women and men in exerting Conjugal Violence (psychological and physical; from surveyed spouse to her/his partner and vice versa), except in Psychological Violence from surveyed spouse toward her/his partner, which occurred both when analyzing all factors influencing this Violence and when analyzing only context factors influencing it. Findings showed that when the surveyed spouse was a woman, the

risk she exerted minor and severe psychological Violence against her male spouse increased.

Thus, findings give support at a population level to the concept of Circular Communication Models in violent interactions (30), described in couples with Conjugal Violence, since they showed that spouses tend to exert Violence from one to the other in similar intensity.

Imaginary about what Conjugal Violence is

Present research findings of non-difference, in general, between women and men to exert Conjugal Violence (psychological and physical) breaks the traditional scheme conceiving Conjugal Violence exclusively as a "batterer-battered" relationship. (or, "offender-victim") among its participants. This position coincides with some authors (30), who state that: "...In the traditional imaginary of violence, as well as in journalistic accounts, way to narrate and explain consists simply in differentiating the "executioners" and the "victims"...".

As much as looking at Conjugal Violence itself, we must look at Conjugal Dynamics, in which the violent act is another manifestation of the latter to maintain itself. In this Conjugal Dynamic, both participants have a responsibility in this violence continuity: "... no "victim" will emerge from her/his condition if she/he cannot glimpse how to participate in it and, consequently, in its modification. No "executioner" will be able to get out of her/his role if she/he does not get to visualize that she/he has the freedom to do so..." (30).

Conjugal Psychological Violence and Conjugal Physical Violence Relationship

It is not common for Conjugal Psychological and Physical Violence to be measured simultaneously in the same sample in the general population, nor their relationship with each other. In a review of scientific literature published on Conjugal Violence in the PubMed database between January 1990 and July 2015, using the "Conjugal violence" keyword, only two out of 128 studies were found (81) (82), carried out in China, which made this measurement.

In the present population study, these violence types were related when exerting Conjugal Violence (Psychological and Physical) since surveyed spouses exerting one violence type tended to exert the other. Findings showed that one type of Violence increased as the other increased, occurring at the minor and the severe level of these kinds of Violence.

Methodological contributions of the present research

This research analyzed Conjugal Dynamics, sociodemographic variables, Social Capital, Social Class, and Conjugal Violence (psychological and physical) in a specific geographic area (Belén commune, Medellín-2013). In addition, an association that could exist between Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical) and the other mentioned analytical categories was analyzed.

In general terms, this research contributes to how health phenomena are investigated (health research heuristics) by going beyond the usual gaze focused on some variables and with a holistic perspective; since reality is greater than the sum of its parts, it exhaustively analyzed Social Capital, Social Capital, Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical) constructs, each one with complete conceptual frameworks, as well as Conjugal Dynamics and sociodemographic variables.

In addition, this research shows that it is possible to analyze a large context part of a health phenomenon systematically, exhaustively, and comprehensively, such as Conjugal Violence, using the aforementioned analytical categories based on epidemiological methodology and statistical method. Thus, a complex vision of Conjugal Violence (psychological and physical) context was achieved, considering some defined conceptual frameworks of these analytical categories, which were apprehended through dimensions and variables specific to each. This structured approach to understanding context goes beyond a risk factor approach.

The present research approach to analyzing context through complete conceptual frameworks of the mentioned analytical categories contrasts with the approach that considers only a few context variables. The latter can generate conceptual and methodological problems, among which are leaving out variables that are decisively associated with the phenomenon itself, as well as giving importance to variables that would not have it if they were analyzed within conceptual frameworks that intend to address the complexity that context has.

Study limitations

Because this research is a cross-sectional study, it is not possible to study causality; but, as it is an exploratory study of Conjugal Violence (psychological and physical) and its context relationships, it opens the way to future research on this topic and more generally, on the association between context and health phenomena.

Reviewed literature was predominantly in Spanish and English; therefore, literature that could be relevant in other languages still needs to be reviewed.

To carry out this study, the researcher had to choose, among several possible options raised in scientific literature, about what to understand on Conjugal Violence, Social Capital, and Social Class, which he tried to make as grounded as possible. However, he recognizes that there are other conceptual approaches to understanding them and other methodological approaches to apprehend them. Therefore, he raises caution when comparing the findings of this research with other studies that use different conceptual frameworks and methodologies.

Present research in its different phases (descriptive, correlational, and analytical) used statistical methodology to study Social Capital, Social Class, Conjugal Dynamics, sociodemographic variables, Conjugal Violence (psychological and physical), and relationships between the first and the latter. Although analytical phase fit quality in multinomial logistic regression models (83) reaching high levels to explain found significant relationships and showing trends, it must be kept in mind that variables relationships in any study cannot be reduced solely to mathematical forms (84).

Limitations of context analysis proposal using Social Capital, Social Class, Conjugal Dynamics, and sociodemographic variables are that it does not analyze context's cultural aspects or psychological aspects at the individual level, which are a set of factors that are associated with Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical).

The limitations of methodological instruments (questionnaires) used to measure Social Capital and Social Class are that they underwent partial validation. Also, the Conflict Tactics Scales (Previva version) questionnaire did not include the negotiation dimension from the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2), which would have helped understand Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical) management in marital relationships.

Conclusions

This research shows that it is possible to analyze a health phenomenon and its context using complete analytical categories. Thus, these constructs were exhaustively measured in Belén commune, Medellín, 2013: Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical), Social Capital, and Social Class, as well as Conjugal Dynamics and sociodemographic variables. Likewise, this study points out that analyzing these analytical categories' interrelationships is possible.

Thus, this research makes a methodological contribution showing that it is possible to analyze a large context part from a health phenomenon systematically, exhaustively, and comprehensively, such as Conjugal Violence, obtaining a complex vision of it. In addition, it showed how using an epidemiological approach and diverse statistical methods, it was possible to describe, correlate, and ponder (the latter through modeling) the very diverse and complex interrelationships of these constructs in a general population to determine those that were significant; Therefore, it goes beyond a vision of isolated risk factors whose influence is taken for granted, without weighing other factors and without using an explanatory theoretical framework that encompasses them.

For its part, Conjugal Violence (psychological and physical) was a prevalent phenomenon the Belén commune, Medellín-Colombia, 2013, which highlighting its importance in public health. Conjugal Psychological Violence was much more frequent than Conjugal Physical Violence, both once in life and the last 12 months.

On the other hand, Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical) in the last 12 months was mainly associated with itself. In addition, as stated in clinical investigations on people with this problem, this population study confirmed the importance of Conjugal Violence Circularity (30), indicating its prevention's primacy.

Likewise, present research findings showed that the act of Conjugal Violence (psychological and physical) is within an interactional process in which both one party and the other actively participate (circularity of Violence). Conjugal Violence, beyond an act, is inserted in a couple process. The above issue calls into question the imaginary that Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical) is a "batterer-battered" (or "offender-victim") relationship between its participants, which is the basis upon the social systems of detection, management, and prosecution of this problem are structured and operated.

Regarding Conjugal Violence (psychological and physical) and its context relationship, only some sociodemographic variables, some aspects of Conjugal Dynamics, as well as some dimensions of Social Capital, were related to some of

the different types of Conjugal Violence, psychological and physical, from surveyed spouse to her/his partner and vice versa. There was no single factor from those studied related to all the different types of Conjugal Violence. Likewise, Conjugal Violence (psychological and physical) was not associated with Social Class.

Therefore, positions that relate, roughly, as a whole, Social Capital and Conjugal Violence (psychological and physical) are questioned, as well as those relating Social Class to this Violence. The above makes it relevant that this conceptual debate would be based on research.

On the other hand, it is striking that Conjugal Dynamics, as the set of its studied aspects, showed no relationship with Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical). Only two of these aspects were associated with this Violence. Conjugal Communication showed a reduction in the risk of severe Psychological Violence from partner to surveyed spouse and Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical) from surveyed spouse to her/his partner and vice versa. When analyzing Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical) context, Authoritarianism in marital relationships increased the risk of severe Psychological Violence from the surveyed spouse to her/his partner and vice versa. The above findings guide the focus of public policies on preventing and managing such aspects of this problem.

Regarding sociodemographic variables, including socioeconomic status, and except sex in some types of Violence, they had truly little association with Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical).

There were no significant differences between female and male sex to exert the different types of Conjugal Violence, except that woman predominated exerting minor and severe psychological Violence in the last 12 months. This latter raises an area to be explored in population studies regarding Conjugal Violence and sex relationship since findings in this type of study could differ from those from clinical studies.

In another aspect, findings showed very little association between the different family sociodemographic variables studied and Conjugal Violence (psychological, physical); Only the family in the "Launch Platform" stage showed a relationship and only minor Physical Violence from the surveyed spouse to her/his partner. In this stage, children (18 years and older) could become a modulating factor in this Violence. Future research could explore possible associations and influences of children on their parents' Conjugal Dynamics.

Another aspect is pointed out as both types of conjugal Violence (psychological and physical) evolved with a similar pattern throughout married life, decreasing in frequency and increasing in severity.

Bibliographic references

1. Kuhn TS. La estructura de las revoluciones científicas [Internet]. octava edi. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Fondo de Cultura Económica; 2004. Available from: <https://materiainvestigacion.files.wordpress.com/2016/05/kuhn1971.pdf>
2. Lakatos I. La metodología de los programas de investigación científica [Internet]. Madrid, España: Alianza editorial S.A.; 1983. Available from: <https://epistemologiaufro.files.wordpress.com/2010/10/lakatos.pdf>
3. Bourdieu P. The forms of capital. In: J. Richardson, editor. Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education. New York, USA: Greenwood Press; 1986. p. 241–258.
4. Bourdieu P. El sentido práctico [Internet]. 1a ed. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Siglo XXI editores; 2007. 456 p. Available from: <https://sociologiaycultura.files.wordpress.com/2014/02/bourdieu-el-sentido-prc3a1ctico.pdf>
5. Hindin MJ, Kishor S, Ansara DL, Macro International Inc. Intimate Partner Violence among Couples in 10 DHS Countries: Predictors and Health Outcomes [Internet]. Calverton; 2008. Report No.: AS18. Available from: <http://www.measuredhs.com/publications/publication-as18-analytical-studies.cfm>
6. Bonomi AE, Thompson RS, Anderson M, Rivara FP, Holt VL, Carrell D, et al. Ascertainment of intimate partner violence using two abuse measurement frameworks. *Inj Prev J Int Soc Child Adolesc Inj Prev* [Internet]. 2006;12(2):121–4. Available from: <http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=2564437&tool=pmcentrez&rendertype=abstract>
7. Vives Cases C. Intimate partner violence against women in Spain. *J Epidemiol Community Health* [Internet]. 2006;60(8):652–3. Available from: <http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=2588068&tool=pmcentrez&rendertype=abstract>
8. Vos T, Astbury J, Piers LS, Magnus A, Heenan M, Stanley L, et al. Measuring the impact of intimate partner violence on the health of women in Victoria, Australia. *Bull World Health Organ* [Internet]. 2006;84(9):739–44. Available from: <http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=2627471&tool=pmcentrez&rendertype=abstract>
9. Frank S, Coelho EBS, Boing AF. Perfil dos estudos sobre violência contra a mulher por parceiro íntimo: 2003 a 2007. *Rev Panam Salud Pública* [Internet]. 2010 May;27(5):376–81. Available from: http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1020-49892010000500008&lng=pt&nrm=iso&tlng=pt
10. World Health Organization. WHO multi-country study on women's health and

domestic violence against women: summary report of initial results on prevalence, health outcomes and women's responses. Citado en Ravneet Kaur Suneela Garg (2008) Addressing Domestic violence against women an unfinished agenda Indian J Community Med, 33(2) 73–76. 2005;

11. Duque LF, Montoya NE. La violencia doméstica en Medellín y demás municipios del Valle de Aburrá, 2003-2004. Rev Fac Nac Salud Pública [Internet]. 2008;26(1):27–39. Available from: http://www.scielo.org.co/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0120-386X2008000100004&lng=en&nrm=iso&tlng=es
12. Hernández-Cardozo HW. Comportamiento de la violencia intrafamiliar, Colombia, 2013. Forensis [Internet]. 2014;15(1):333–402. Available from: <http://www.medicinalegal.gov.co/documents/10180/188820/FORENSIS+2013+7-+violencia+intrafamiliar.pdf/dd93eb8c-4f9a-41f0-96d7-4970c3c4ec74>
13. Fox GL, Benson ML. Household and neighborhood contexts of intimate partner violence. Public Health Rep [Internet]. 2006;121(4):419–27. Available from: <http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=1525351&tool=pmcentrez&rendertype=abstract>
14. Li Q, Kirby RS, Sigler RT, Hwang SS, LaGory ME, Goldenberg RL. A multilevel analysis of individual, household, and neighborhood correlates of intimate partner violence among low-income pregnant women in Jefferson County, Alabama. J Public Health (Bangkok). 2010;100:531–539.
15. Miles-Doan R, Kelly S. Geographic concentration of violence between intimate partners. Public Health Rep [Internet]. 1997;112(2):135–41. Available from: <http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=1381860&tool=pmcentrez&rendertype=abstract>
16. Benson ML, Fox GL, DeMaris A, Van Wyk J. Neighborhood disadvantage, individual economic distress and violence against women in intimate relationships. J Quant Criminol. 2003;19:207–235.
17. Burke JG, O'Campo P, Peak GL. Neighborhood influences and intimate partner violence: does geographic setting matter? J Urban Health [Internet]. 2006;83(2):182–94. Available from: <http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=2527159&tool=pmcentrez&rendertype=abstract>
18. O'Campo P, Gielen AC, Faden RR, Xue X, Kass N, Wang MC. Violence by male partners against women during the childbearing year: A contextual analysis. Am J Public Health. 1995;85:1092–1097.
19. Choi M, Harwood J. A Hypothesized Model of Korean Women's Responses to Abuse. J Transcult Nurs. 2004;15(3):1–9.
20. Krug EG, Mercy JA, Dahlberg LL, Zwi AB. World report on violence and

- health. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2002.
21. Convenio DANE – Municipio de Medellín. Municipio de Medellín, proyecciones de población 2006-2015. Medellín; 2009.
 22. Alcaldía de Medellín DA de P. Encuesta Calidad de Vida, Medellín-2013 [Internet]. Medellín, Colombia; 2013. Available from: [https://www.medellin.gov.co/irj/go/km/docs/pccdesign/SubportaldelCiudadano_2/PlandeDesarrollo_0_17/IndicadoresyEstadsticas/SharedContent/Encuesta Calidad de Vida/ECV2013/PDFs/03Hogares.pdf](https://www.medellin.gov.co/irj/go/km/docs/pccdesign/SubportaldelCiudadano_2/PlandeDesarrollo_0_17/IndicadoresyEstadsticas/SharedContent/Encuesta%20Calidad%20de%20Vida/ECV2013/PDFs/03Hogares.pdf)
 23. Sarasti-Vanegas DA. Violencia Conyugal, Capital Social y Clase Social en la comuna de Belén - Medellín, 2013 [Internet]. Universidad de Antioquia; 2016. Available from: http://bibliotecadigital.udea.edu.co/bitstream/10495/7997/1/SarastiDiego_2016_ViolenciaConyugalBelen
 24. Straus MA. Conflict tactics scales. Encyclopedia of Domestic Violence, N. A. Jackson. Taylor & Francis Group; 2007. p. 190–7.
 25. Harper R, Kelly M. Measuring social capital in the United Kingdom. London; 2003.
 26. Green H, Fletcher L. Social capital harmonised question set: a guide to questions for use in the measument of social capital. Alaska; 2003.
 27. Green H, Fletcher L. The development of harmonised questions on social capital. Ala; 2003.
 28. Wright EO, editor. Approaches to class analysis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2005.
 29. Rose D, Harrison E, editors. Social Class in Europe: An introduction to the European Socio-economic Classification. London & New York: Routledge; 2010.
 30. Perrone R, Nannini M. Violencia y abusos sexuales en la familia, un abordaje sistémico y comunicacional. Primera ed. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Paidós; 2002. 176 p.
 31. Cuervo- Rodríguez JJ. Parejas viables que perduran en el tiempo/Feasible Couples that Last Over Time. Rev Divers - Perspect en Psicol [Internet]. 2013;9(2):257–70. Available from: <http://www.scielo.org.co/pdf/dpp/v9n2/v9n2a03.pdf>
 32. König-Luz S, Pereira-Mosmann C. Funcionalidade e comunicação conjugal em diferentes etapas do ciclo de vida. Rev da SPAGESP [Internet]. 2018;19(1):21–34. Available from: <http://pepsic.bvsalud.org/pdf/rspagesp/v19n1/v19n1a03.pdf>
 33. Park T-Y, Harrison DF, Bailey MA. Predictors of Marital Satisfaction Among Korean Immigrant Spouses in the United States. J Fam Soc Work [Internet].

2000;4(1):35–45. Available from: https://www-tandfonline-com.udea.lookproxy.com/doi/abs/10.1300/J039v04n01_04

34. Cao Y, Yang S, Wang G, Zhang Y. Sociodemographic Characteristics of Domestic Violence in China: A Population Case-Control Study. *J Interpers Violence* [Internet]. 2014;29(4):683–706. Available from: <https://journals-sagepub-com.udea.lookproxy.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0886260513505218>
35. Cunradi CB, Mair C, Todd M. Alcohol Outlet Density, Drinking Contexts and Intimate Partner Violence: A Review of Environmental Risk Factors. *J Drug Educ*. 2014;44:19–33.
36. Bolin K, Lindgren B, Lindström M, Nystedt P. Investments in social capital--implications of social interactions for the production of health. *Soc Sci Med* [Internet]. 2003;56(12):2379–90. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12742602>
37. Martin SL, Tsui AO, Maitra K, Marinshaw R. Domestic Violence in Northern India. *Am J Epidemiol*. 1999;150(4).
38. Michalski JH. Explaining intimate partner violence: the sociological limitations of victimization studies. *Sociol Forum* [Internet]. 2005;20(4):613–40. Available from: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=19246190&lang=es&site=ehost-live>
39. Moreno- Martín F. La violencia en la pareja. *Rev Panam Salud Publica/Pan Am J Public Heal* [Internet]. 1999;5(4/5):245–58. Available from: <https://iris.paho.org/handle/10665.2/8943>
40. Black MC, Basile KC, Breiding MJ, Smith SG, Walters ML, Merrick MT, et al. The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS): 2010 summary report. Atlanta, GA; 2011.
41. Straus MA, Hamby SL, Warren WL. *The Conflict Tactics Scales Handbook*. first. Los Angeles, California: Western Psychological Services; 2003. 146 p.
42. Kessler RC, Molnar BE, Feurer ID, Appelbaum M. Patterns and mental health predictors of domestic violence in the United States: Results from the National Comorbidity Survey. *Int J Law Psychiatry*. 2001;24:487–508.
43. Kimmel MS. “Gender Symmetry” in Domestic Violence. *Violence Against Women* [Internet]. 2002;8(11):1332–63. Available from: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/107780102237407>
44. McNeely RL, Cook PW, Torres JB. Is Domestic Violence a Gender Issue, or a Human Issue? *J Human Behavior Soc Environ*. 2001;4(4):227–51.
45. Fiebert M, Gonzalez D. College women who initiate assaults on their male partners and the reasons offered for such behavior. *Psychol Rep*. 1997;80(2):583–90.

46. Brutz JL, Ingoldsby BB. Conflict resolution in Quaker families. *J Marriage Fam.* 1984;46:21–6.
47. Gelles RJ. *The violent home: a study of physical aggression between husbands and wives.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, Ltd.; 1974.
48. Giles-Sims J. *Wife-battering: A systems theory approach.* New York: Guilford Press; 1983.
49. Jouriles EN, O’Leary KD. Interspousal reliability of reports of marital violence. *J Consult Clin Psychol.* 1985;53:419–21.
50. Lane KE, Gwartney-Gibbs PA. Violence in the context of dating and sex. *J Fam Issues.* 1985;6:45–59.
51. Laner MR, Thompson J. Abuse and aggression in courting couples. *Deviant Behav An Interdiscip J.* 1982;3:229–44.
52. Makepeace JM. Life events stress and courtship violence. *Fam Relat.* 1983;32:101–9.
53. Sack AR, Keller JF, Howard RD. Conflict tactics and violence in dating situations. *Int J Sociol Fam.* 1982;12:89–100.
54. Saunders DG. When battered women use violence: Husband-abuse or self-defense? *Violence Vict.* 1986;1(1):47–60.
55. Scanzoni J. *Sex roles, women’s work, and marital conflict.* Lexington, MA: Lexington Books; 1978.
56. Steinmetz SK. The battered husband syndrome. *Victimology.* 1977;2(3–4):499–509.
57. Steinmetz SK. Wife beating, husband beatings: A comparison of the use of physical violence between spouses to resolve marital fights. In: Roy M, editor. *Battered women: A psychosociological study of domestic violence.* New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold; 1977. p. 63–72.
58. Szinovacz M. Using couple data as a methodological tool: The case of marital violence. *J Marriage Fam.* 1983;45:633–44.
59. Straus MA. Gender symmetry and mutuality in perpetration of clinical-level partner violence: Empirical evidence and implications for prevention and treatment. *Aggress Violent Behav.* 2011;16:279–288.
60. Esquivel-Santoveña EE, Dixon L. Investigating the true rate of physical intimate partner violence: A review of nationally representative surveys. *Aggress Violent Behav.* 2012;17:208–19.
61. Straus MA. Physical assaults by women partners: A major social problem. In: Walsh MR, editor. *Women, men and gender: Ongoing debates.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press; 1997. p. 210–21.

62. Fergusson D, Boden J, Horwood L. Developmental antecedents of interpartner violence in a New Zealand birth cohort. *J Fam Viol.* 2008;23:737–53.
63. Babcock J, Waltz J, Jacobson N, Gottman J. Power and violence: the relation between communication patterns, power discrepancies, and domestic violence. *J Consult Clin Psychol.* 1993;61:40–50.
64. Ballard ME, Cummings EM, Larkin K. emotional and cardiovascular responses to adults' angry behavior and to challenging tasks in children of hypertensive and normotensive parents. *Child Dev.* 1993;64:500–15.
65. Cantos AL, Neidig PH, O'Leary KD. Injuries of women and men in a treatment program for domestic violence. *J Fam Violence.* 1994;9:113–24.
66. Ehrensaft M, Moffitt T, Caspi A. Clinically abusive relationships in an unselected birth cohort: men's and women's participation and developmental antecedents. *J Abnorm Psychol.* 2004;113(2):258–71.
67. Dutton DG, Nicholls TL. The Gender Paradigm In Domestic Violence: Research And Theory. *Aggress Violent Behav.* 2005;10:680 – 714.
68. Kiss L, Schraiber LB, Heise L, Zimmerman C, Gouveia N, Watts C. Gender-based violence and socioeconomic inequalities: Does living in more deprived neighbourhoods increase women's risk of intimate partner violence? *Soc Sci Med.* 2012;74:1172–9.
69. Vives-Cases C, Gil-González D, Carrasco-Portiño M, Álvarez-Dardet C. Revisión sistemática de los estudios sobre el nivel socioeconómico de los hombres que maltratan a sus parejas. *Gac Sanit.* 2007;21(5):425–30.
70. Burgos D, Canaval GE, Tobo N, Bernal de Pheils P, Humphreys J. Types and severity of partner violence against women living in the community in Cali, Colombia. *Rev Salud Publica.* 2012;14(3):377–89.
71. Cunradi CB, Caetano R, Clark C, Schafer J. Neighborhood poverty as a predictor of intimate partner violence among White, Black, and Hispanic couples in the United States: A multilevel analysis. *Ann Epidemiol.* 2000;10:297–308.
72. Koenig MA, Stephenson R, Ahmed S, Jejeebhoy SJ, Campbell J. Individual and contextual determinants of domestic violence in North India. *Am J Public Health [Internet].* 2006;96(1):132–8. Available from: <http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=1470450&tool=pmcentrez&rendertype=abstract>
73. Khalifeh H, Hargreaves J, Howard LM, Birdthistle I. Intimate partner violence and socioeconomic deprivation in England: findings from a national cross-sectional survey. *Am J Public Health [Internet].* 2013 Mar [cited 2015 Mar 8];103(3):462–72. Available from: <http://www.scopus.com/inward/record.url?eid=2-s2.0->

84874080245&partnerID=tZOtx3y1

74. Daoud N, Smylie J, Urquia M, Allan B, O'Campo P. The contribution of socio-economic position to the excesses of violence and intimate partner violence among aboriginal versus non-Aboriginal Women in Canada. *Can J Public Heal.* 2013;104(4):e278-83.
75. Harold GT, Sellers R. Annual Research Review: Interparental conflict and youth psychopathology: an evidence review and practice focused update. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry* [Internet]. 2018;59(4):374–402. Available from: <https://acamh.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/jcpp.12893>
76. Krishnan S. Do structural inequalities contribute to marital violence? Ethnographic evidence from rural South India. *Violence Against Women.* 2005;11(6):759–75.
77. Anyanechi CE. Mandibular fractures associated with domestic violence in calabar, Nigeria. *Ghana Med J.* 2010;44(4):155–8.
78. Nagassar RP, Rawlins JM, Sampson NR, Zackeralli J, Chankadyal K, Ramasir C, et al. The prevalence of domestic violence within different socio-economic classes in Central Trinidad. *West Indian Med J* [Internet]. 2010;59(1):20–5. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20931908>
79. Guo SF, Wu JL, Qu CY, Yan RY. Domestic violence against women before, during and after pregnancy. *Zhonghua Liu Xing Bing Xue Za Zhi.* 2004;25(1):9–11.
80. González RA, Kallis C, Ullrich S, Zhang T, Coid JW. The protective role of higher intellectual functioning on violence in the household population of Great Britain. *Pers Individ Dif.* 2014;61–62:80–5.
81. Zhao F, Guo S, Wang L, Wu J, Wang L. Investigation on the patterns and knowledge regarding domestic violence among married women in rural areas of China. *Zhonghua Liu Xing Bing Xue Za Zhi.* 2006;27(8):664–8.
82. Cao Y, Zhang Y, Sun S, Guo G, Li Y, Yuan D, et al. An epidemiological study on domestic violence in Hunan, China. *Zhonghua Liu Xing Bing Xue Za Zhi.* 2006;27(3):200–3.
83. Pando-Fernández V, San Martín-Fernández R. Regresión logística multinomial. *Cuad Soc Esp Cien For.* 2004;18:323–7.
84. Grisales-Romero H. Usos y limitaciones de los métodos de análisis multivariados en la investigación epidemiológica. *Investig Andin.* 2006;8(13):81–4.