

DM

Consensual Non-Monogamies
Social Representations Among Family Therapists,
Sex Therapists, and Sexologists in the Iberian Context

MASTER DISSERTATION

Lara Isabel Rodrigues da Silva Quintal
MASTER IN CLINICAL HEALTH PSYCHOLOGY AND WELLBEING



UNIVERSIDADE da MADEIRA

A Nossa Universidade

www.uma.pt

July | 2025

Consensual Non-Monogamies
Social Representations Among Family Therapists,
Sex Therapists, and Sexologists in the Iberian Context

MASTER DISSERTATION

Lara Isabel Rodrigues da Silva Quintal

MASTER IN CLINICAL HEALTH PSYCHOLOGY AND WELLBEING

SUPERVISOR

Alda Patrícia Marques Portugal

CO-SUPERVISOR

José Alberto Ribeiro Gonçalves

Acknowledgements

To Professor Alda Portugal, for being the best supervisor I could have asked for. I would make the same choice a hundred times without hesitation. Thank you for your rigour, high standards, knowledge, and for your support and availability in clarifying any hesitation or doubt throughout this process. Above all, thank you for believing in me from the beginning of this dissertation. You are an example to me both professionally and personally. This thesis would not have been possible without your great support and constant guidance.

To Professor José Gonçalves, co-supervisor of this thesis. Thank you so much for your consistent presence throughout its development, for your vast knowledge, and for your always cheerful disposition and readiness to help. I am very grateful for the opportunity to have learnt from you.

To my father, Adelino, with whom I have had the pleasure of talking about the great names in psychology throughout these five years of study. There was always room to discuss these great figures, but I hope you know that the person I most admire is you. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to study the course that means so much to both of us and for your unwavering support.

To my mother, Isabel. Your love has shaped who I am. As the years passed and I moved forward, "*Slipping through my fingers all the time...*" played softly in the background of our lives. Thank you for letting me grow, for holding on and letting go all at once, and for giving me the strength to follow my path.

To my sister, Matilde. Being who you are is reason enough for gratitude.

To my grandparents, Guilherme and Anunciação, my favourite people, whom I lost during this final stage of my studies. Guilherme and Anunciação were kind, unfailingly

generous people, my twin pillars without whom I could not stand. I was so lucky to be able to grow up by your side. I am eternally grateful to have been your granddaughter, and I hope you are proud of me. I will always try to put a bit of what you taught me into everything I do.

To my grandmother Maria and my aunt Rita, my guardian angels. Thank you for teaching me that the only thing a woman must be is whatever she wants to be.

To my Lab Rats, Leonor and Mónica, thank you for making Lisbon feel a little more like home. To Mariana, for being my companion in this master's program. It wouldn't have been the same without you all.

Abstract

Consensual non-monogamies (CNM) have become increasingly visible in psychological and clinical research, yet there remains a substantial gap in understanding how these relational structures are perceived by mental health professionals with advanced training in fields such as family therapy and sexology. This study aims to explore the social representations held by family therapists, sexologists, and sex therapists regarding CNM. To investigate these representations, a qualitative, non-experimental approach was employed using the free word association method based on Abric's Central Nucleus Theory, with data collected online from a non-probabilistic sample of Portuguese and Spanish therapists ($N=156$) and analysed through EVOC software. The analysis revealed that "relational diversity", and "freedom" were central social representations across all Portuguese and Spanish professionals, while additional terms such as "complexity," "confusing," and "consent" varied in prominence depending on participants' therapeutic experience and nationality. The results also suggest that while "relational diversity" and "freedom" are core elements in the social representations of CNM across samples, therapists without clinical experience working with CNM clients tend to associate it more strongly with terms like "confusing" and "complexity". These results highlight the importance of including CNM-related content in therapist training programs, promoting less stigmatizing and more informed representations. Direct clinical exposure to these relationships may contribute to more sensitive, ethical, and informed interventions in the therapeutic context.

Key-words: Consensual non-monogamy, Social representations, Family therapy, Sexology, Transcultural study.

Resumo

As não-monogâmias consensuais (NMC) têm vindo a se tornar cada vez mais visíveis na investigação psicológica e clínica, contudo persiste uma falta substancial de estudos para a compreensão de como estas estruturas relacionais são percebidas por profissionais de saúde mental com formação avançada em áreas como terapia familiar e sexologia. Este estudo visa explorar as representações sociais que os terapeutas familiares, sexólogos e terapeutas sexuais mantêm relativamente às NMC. Para investigar essas representações, foi empregue uma abordagem qualitativa, não-experimental, utilizando o método de associação livre de palavras baseado na Teoria do Núcleo Central de Abric, com dados recolhidos online a partir de uma amostra não-probabilística de terapeutas portugueses e espanhóis ($N=156$) e analisados através do software EVOC. A análise revelou que "diversidade relacional" e "liberdade" eram representações sociais centrais em todos os profissionais portugueses e espanhóis, enquanto termos adicionais como "complexidade", "confuso" e "consentimento" variaram em proeminência dependendo da experiência terapêutica e nacionalidade dos participantes. Os resultados sugerem também que, embora "diversidade relacional" e "liberdade" sejam elementos centrais nas representações sociais das NMC em todas as amostras, os terapeutas sem experiência clínica de trabalho com clientes NMC tendem a associá-las mais fortemente com termos como "confuso" e "complexidade". Estes resultados sublinham a importância de incluir conteúdos relacionados com NMC nos programas de formação de terapeutas, promovendo representações menos estigmatizantes e mais informadas. A exposição clínica direta a estas relações pode contribuir para intervenções mais sensíveis, éticas e informadas no contexto terapêutico.

Palavras-chave: Não-monogamia consensual; Representações Sociais; Terapia familiar; Sexologia; Estudo transcultural.

Table of Contents

Introduction	8
Positionality Statements	9
1. Theoretical Framework	9
1.1. Couples: Definition and Overview	9
<i>1.1.1. Defining a Couple</i>	9
<i>1.1.2. Changes in Couples Over Time</i>	10
1.2. Consensual Non-Monogamies	14
<i>1.2.1. Definition</i>	14
<i>1.2.2. Functioning and Dynamics</i>	16
<i>1.2.3. Society’s Perceptions of Consensual Non-Monogamies</i>	17
<i>1.2.4. Perceptions of Consensual Non-monogamies in Health Settings</i>	21
1.3. Transcultural Study Rationale	23
2. Method	24
2.1. Participants	25
2.2. Materials	30
2.3. Data Collection and Analysis Procedures	31
3. Results	33
3.1. Social Representations of the Portuguese Sample	33
3.2. Social Representations of the Spanish Sample	35
3.3. Social Representations Based on Psychotherapeutic Experience With CNM	36
<i>3.3.1. Portuguese Therapists With Experience in Supporting Clients in CNM</i>	36
<i>3.3.2. Spanish Therapists With Experience in Supporting Clients in CNM</i>	39
<i>3.3.3. Portuguese Therapists Without Experience in Supporting Clients in CNM</i>	40

3.3.4. Spanish Therapists Without Experience in Supporting Clients in CNM	42
4. Discussion	43
4.1. General Social Representations about NMC among Portuguese and Spanish Therapists	44
4.2. Social Representations based on Professional Experience with CNM	47
5. Conclusion	52
6. References	54
Appendixes	66

Introduction

Consensual non-monogamies (CNM) are relational configurations in which all individuals involved consent explicitly to engage in non-exclusive romantic or sexual relationships (Conley et al., 2013), have gained increased visibility in psychological and clinical literature in recent years. These relational configurations include open relationships, polyamory, and swinging, among others, and challenge mononormative frameworks that continue to dominate Western cultural and clinical narratives (Orion, 2018). Despite a growing body of empirical work on CNM, there is still a notable gap in understanding how these relationships are perceived by mental health professionals, especially those with advanced training in fields such as family therapy and sexology.

Therapists' conceptualizations of CNM may be influenced by personal values, sociocultural norms, and professional models of intimacy that often privilege monogamy (Schechinger et al., 2018; Vaughan, 2019). Research has demonstrated that therapists may hold implicit biases or pathologizing assumptions about non-monogamous clients (Vaughan, 2019), which can negatively affect the therapeutic alliance, and the quality of care provided.

To better understand these professional perspectives, the present study draws on Abric's Central Nucleus Theory (Abric, 2003) to explore the social representations of CNM held by therapists. Social representations are collective, culturally embedded systems of meaning that influence how individuals and groups perceive complex phenomena (Moscovici, 1961). Using a qualitative and non-experimental design, involving free word association tasks, this study investigates the representational content of CNM among Portuguese and Spanish family therapists, sexual therapists and sexologists. Analyses were conducted with *Ensemble de Programmes Permettant l'Analyse des Evocations* (EVOC) software, allowing for the structural mapping of central

and peripheral elements of social representation (Vergès, 2002). This research aims to identify the symbolic boundaries shaping professional discourses around CNM and how these may vary across cultural contexts. Ultimately, this research seeks to inform more inclusive, ethical, and culturally sensitive clinical practices when supporting individuals engaged in consensual non-monogamies.

Positionality Statements

Two of the authors identify as cisgender, heterosexual, monogamous women and one as a cisgender, heterosexual, monogamous man. Among the research team, one is a professor and researcher specializing in family studies; another is a professor and researcher in the field of sexology, both within higher education institutions; and the third is a master's student in clinical, health and well-being psychology. All three researchers are white, without reported disabilities. The team acknowledges that their own identities and lived experiences may have shaped their perspectives and influenced the approach taken in exploring the lived experiences of individuals engaged in CNM.

1. Theoretical Framework

1.1. Couples: Definition and Overview

1.1.1. Defining a Couple

Defining the concept of a couple might initially seem straightforward, but upon closer examination, it reveals itself to be a complex and multifaceted construct. Heiden-Rootes and her collaborators (2019) defined it as two or more individuals engaged in a romantic and/or sexual relationship. The couple's formation serves as the initial stage in the development of a romantic partnership, it is seen for many authors, as the beginning of the family life cycle, as it is at this stage that the nuclear family is “born” (Relvas, 2006). From a systemic perspective, this represents the creation of a new family unit because it

involves the establishment of a new system (this system being understood as the emergence of its components) with its own unique norms and transactional patterns, reflecting a new emergence of an overlapping subsystem (Carter & McGoldrick, 1995; Morin, 1988).

However, this does not imply that the new couple (or the new family) completely severs ties with previous generations or that these earlier connections become irrelevant. Rather, it means that the formation of the couple leads to the creation of a distinct entity with its own characteristics, while still maintaining continuity with the past (Relvas, 2006). This dynamic introduces the first paradox of couple formation (Relvas, 2006). A family does not emerge out of nowhere; its formation involves transforming what belongs to two individuals into a shared legacy through a process of negotiation and renegotiation. This transformation fosters a sense of belonging to a new group, a new family, without fully detaching from their previous family affiliations. Balancing these different levels of attachment is necessary, as individuals must navigate loyalty conflicts that may arise during this transition. Resolving these conflicts relies on the dynamics of the couple's relationship itself (Relvas, 2006). Each couple creates a unique relational model that shapes the couple's shared identity while simultaneously delineating the boundaries of the relationship, this identity is unique and cannot be replicated with different individuals (Caillé, 1991; Narciso & Ribeiro, 2009).

1.1.2. Changes in Couples Over Time

In the 1950s, the term couple typically referred to a union between a man and a woman, formalized either through legal marriage or a stable, socially recognized partnership (Cherlin, 2004). During this period, male infidelity was nearly normalized, whereas the same tolerance did not extend to women, who were often regarded as the legal property

of their husbands and sexual relations within these unions were seldom openly discussed; instead, they were seen as a duty for women and a need and right for men (Emens, 2004).

Other classifications tended to view the new couple as the initial stage of the family system, but unlike the authors mentioned previously, they tended to do so from a somewhat distinct perspective. Duvall (1958), for instance, labelled this stage as “childless couples” and identifies one of its key tasks as preparing for pregnancy and parenthood, this second stage, marked by the arrival of the first child, referred to as the expansive stage, serves to establish or complete the family. While these aspects are certainly significant, they may not be the most crucial, and despite what this terminology might suggest as the formation of the couple itself plays a pivotal role in shaping the future of the family, independent of whether they have children (Relvas, 2006).

It is also important to note the sexual evolution from the reproductive sexual model of the 1960’s, where what was valued was the experience of sexuality only for reproductive purposes to a permissive and recreational model of sexuality. The first model is largely associated with the Church, with these institutions having had a major influence in spreading the idea of marriage as the exclusive means of reproduction (Araújo, 2002; Scorsolini-Comin & Santos, 2010). Before the approval of oral contraceptives, non-reproductive sexualities were largely marginalized. In societies where reproduction is considered the primary purpose of sexual relations, postmenopausal women are often not expected to remain sexually active (Bancroft, 2009), as the loss of reproductive capability after menopause can reinforce the notion that sexual activity is no longer necessary or relevant. Consequently, societal values may lead to or reinforce the cessation of sexual activity among older adults, even to this day (DeLamater, 2012). These sexual stereotypes are rooted in outdated societal beliefs about aging, and they persist because culturally ingrained ideas are slow to evolve (Kenny, 2013).

Thanks to sociocultural shifts during the decades of 1960-1970, such as feminism and the sexual revolution, the forced sexual dynamics and gender inequalities characteristic of these earlier definitions, have become less prominent in Western societies (Orion, 2018). Since the 1970s, divorce and marital separation have been increasingly recognized as legitimate life choices for spouses and have become more prevalent as social realities (Stevenson et al., 2007). In most Western societies, there was a large increase in divorce that peaked in the 1980s (Frank & Gertler, 1991). Studies on divorce and marital dissolution reveal the extensive range of impacts these events can have, influencing not only the individuals directly involved but also their broader social networks, including family members and friends (Volgy & Everett, 2014). From the perspective of the family life cycle, authors describe divorce as a disruption in the progression of life cycle stages, which creates a crisis that requires renegotiation of roles and redefinition of boundaries within the family system to restore balance (Carter & McGoldrick, 1995; Raley & Sweeney, 2020). Consequently, relationships have evolved to become more egalitarian, making it more acceptable to dissolve the union if the emotional needs of both partners are not met. This shift reflects a growing emphasis on personal freedom and the importance of creating a space for individual autonomy, especially in younger populations (Hull et al., 2010).

Despite the evolving nature of intimate relationships, lifelong sexual monogamy continues to be regarded as a fundamental expectation within many couples. The violation of this normative commitment is frequently associated with marital dissatisfaction and an increased likelihood of divorce (Orion, 2018). In contemporary nuclear couples, there is often an expectation for both spouses to work, manage their careers, raise children, purchase a home, and care for aging relatives (typically from their family of origin). This "supermonogamy" (the idea of one right person ever; Emens, 2004) represents a new

social norm, though there is limited evidence in literature or human nature to fully support the feasibility of these high expectations (Orion, 2018).

To further support this perspective, according to data from Eurostat (2022), Portugal went from having a divorce rate of 0.1 divorces per 1000 inhabitants in 1964 to a 1.8 per 1000 inhabitants in 2022, while Spain's divorce rate in 2022 was 1.9 divorces per 1000 inhabitants, with the earliest data available being from 1990 with a rate of 0.6 divorces. Today, couple relationships are understood as a form of partnership in which individuals aim to support and understand each other, fostering a safe environment conducive to personal growth, development, and fulfilling intimacy (Feeney & Collins, 2015). This perspective has allowed the definition of a couple to be more inclusive, encompassing a wide variety of relational configurations beyond the traditional heterosexual marriage (Compton & Kaufman, 2024). This expanded view includes LGBTQIA+ couples (a term covering various sexual and gender identities, such as Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer, Intersex, and Asexual, with the “+” representing other gender identities or orientations), reflecting the internal and individual nature of one’s gender experience, which may or may not align with the sex assigned at birth (American Psychological Association, 2015). Additionally, CNM configurations have increasingly gained visibility, with a greater emphasis on mutual consent, commitment, and emotional intimacy between partners, regardless of gender or legal marital status (Macmillan & Copher, 2005). It is evident that most literature on couples often refers to a heterosexual and monogamous couple, emphasizing furthermore the minimal attention non-monogamic relationships, and to sexual/gender minorities couples within outcome research (Green & Mitchell, 2015).

1.2. Consensual Non-Monogamies

1.2.1. Definition

Consensual non-monogamy is considered an umbrella term that encompasses various relational and sexual practices in which individuals have multiple partners with the full awareness and consent of all parties involved. This transparency differentiates CNM from infidelity, leading to its alternative descriptions as ethical or responsible non-monogamy (Conley et al., 2013). It is important to note however, that the wide variety of CNM configurations contributes to conceptual ambiguity (Cabral, 2024). As this topic is explored, challenges arise in distinguishing between certain relationship types, such as open relationships and monogamish relationships. This lack of clear differentiation is expected, given that research in this area is relatively recent and conceptually fluid (Hauptert et al., 2017). Consequently, although numerous classifications exist, they often lack precise definitions. This is understandable, as the core aspect of this subject involves an ongoing process of understanding and defining these relationship structures. Although consensual non-monogamy encompasses various relationship configurations, three main types have been most extensively documented in the literature: open relationships, swinging and polyamory.

In open relationships, the partners are romantically exclusive to only one partner and have other sexual partners at the same time. This primary couple can have sexual contact with other people, individually or together. The primary relationship is always the priority. Other forms of CNM, such as swinging, can be considered open relationships (Conley et al., 2017; Guskova et al., 2021; Moors et al., 2017; Sheff, 2015).

Swingers are typically described as individuals who participate in organized gatherings where they engage in sexual activities with people other than their primary partner (if they are in a committed relationship). However, they generally avoid forming romantic

emotional attachments, although friendships often emerge from these interactions (Harviainen & Frank, 2018). In this type of relationship, people can engage in as a couple or swap partners with another couple (Conley et al., 2017; Moors et al., 2017; Sheff, 2015).

Polyamory involves engaging in multiple romantic or intimate relationships with the consent of all parties involved (Conley et al., 2017; Moors et al., 2017; Sheff, 2015). These relationships may or may not include sexual activity. Polyamorous relationships can be structured either hierarchically or non-hierarchically: in hierarchical polyamory, partners are classified as primary or secondary, with different levels of commitment or priority (Barker, 2005). This hierarchy may be influenced by living arrangements, where cohabiting partners, commonly called "nesting partners" by those within the polyamorous community, are typically regarded as primary. Conversely, non-hierarchical polyamory assigns equal importance to the needs of all partners involved (Barker & Langdrige, 2010). According to Barker (2005) and Cardoso and his collaborators (2021), polyamory can be understood as a relational orientation grounded in the belief that it is both possible and acceptable to love multiple people and maintain several intimate and sexual relationships simultaneously. The people involved in this configuration can have group relationships involving three or more people, or they can have several independent relationships at the same time (Conley et al., 2017; Moors et al., 2017; Sheff, 2015). In polyamory, romantic love and emotional connection are often perceived as limitless rather than restricted to a single partner (Moors et al., 2019). Additionally, not all polyamorous relationships are open to external partners. For instance, polyfidelity refers to a structure in which individuals remain sexually and romantically exclusive within a specific multi-partner relationship. Another variation is the mono-poly dynamic, where one partner identifies as monogamous while the other engages in multiple romantic or sexual

relationships (Sheff, 2016). While the prevalence of asexual individuals participating in polyamory remains unclear, polyamorous relationships can also involve deep romantic and emotional intimacy without sexual involvement (Klesse, 2006; Scherrer, 2010).

People can also participate in consensual non-monogamous sexual activities without necessarily adopting specific relationship labels or identities. Examples of this include engaging in threesomes (Scoats et al., 2018; Scoats, 2019) or group sex (Frank, 2013).

1.2.2. Functioning and Dynamics

Consensual non-monogamies have emerged as a response to individual needs and the challenges associated with traditional monogamous relationships. As societal norms evolve, CNM represents an adaptive approach to intimacy and partnership, challenging traditional expectations of exclusivity while fostering personal authenticity and relational flexibility (Sheff, 2015). The extent to which monogamous relationships differ from CNM continues to be a topic of active scientific investigation and scholarly discourse (Conley et al., 2017). Research examining aspects such as love, commitment, jealousy, relationship satisfaction, and overall relationship quality generally shows no significant differences between individuals in monogamous relationships and those practicing CNM (Conley et al., 2017; Rubel & Bogaert, 2015; Wood et al., 2018). Consensual non-monogamies, are as successful, or not, as is monogamy (Emens, 2003; Orion, 2010; Sheff, 2014). When CNM individuals feel secure in their arrangements, they report levels of affection, eroticism, and overall relationship functioning, including satisfaction, commitment, trust, and intimacy on par with, or even exceeding, those observed in monogamous relationships (Balzarini et al., 2019; Lecuona et al., 2021; Mogilski et al., 2017; Rodrigues et al., 2017; Rubel & Bogaert, 2015). For instance, studies indicate that people in polyamorous relationships typically report higher levels of relationship satisfaction compared to those in open relationships, and individuals practicing non-

hierarchical polyamory tend to be more satisfied than those engaged in hierarchical polyamory (Balzarini, 2017); Murphy et al. (2021) observed that individuals who opted to practice non-monogamy experienced notable improvements in sexual satisfaction over time, even though their overall relationship quality remained unchanged.

When establishing non-monogamous dynamics, CNM partners emphasize open communication to collaboratively define and refine the boundaries of their arrangement (Andersson, 2022; Cabral, 2024; Cohen, 2016; Wood et al., 2021). Effective communication fosters a sense of fairness within the relationship, strengthens mutual trust and commitment (Hangen et al., 2020; McLean, 2004), allowing partners who feel uncertain to pause and renegotiate their agreement as needed (Philpot et al., 2018). Furthermore, compared to monogamous individuals, CNM partners tend to adopt more constructive conflict resolution strategies, such as engaging in active problem-solving rather than withdrawing during disagreements, and they also report greater overall well-being (Brooks et al., 2022).

This honesty and openness play a crucial role in addressing jealousy (de Visser & McDonald, 2007). In CNM, jealousy is not necessarily viewed as a threat to the relationship (Balzarini, 2021). Instead, it is often seen as a manageable emotion (Scoats & Anderson, 2019) or even as an opportunity for compersion, which involves experiencing joy from a partner's pleasure with another person (Cabral, 2024; Mogilski, 2019).

1.2.3. Society's Perceptions of Consensual Non-Monogamies

In 2013, Conley and collaborators carried out four studies evaluating the stigma towards CNM. These studies' large sample size (over 1000 participants) enabled an examination of whether perceptions of monogamy and CNM were consistent across different demographic groups, including college students, noncollege adults, men,

women, various ethnicities, and sexual orientations. Results indicated that all groups shared similar beliefs about monogamous and CNM relationships. Findings revealed a strong societal bias favouring monogamy, with it being associated with greater happiness, sexual satisfaction, and social value. Compared to monogamy, for example, CNM relationships were widely viewed as less acceptable, less sexually satisfying, lower in quality and more sexually risky. This bias persisted across all social and cultural groups, including individuals engaged in CNM relationships. Although CNM individuals were viewed positively in some respects, monogamy was overwhelmingly perceived as the superior relationship model, reinforcing stigma against CNM (Conley et al., 2013).

A Norwegian study involving 4,160 participants demonstrated that non-consensual non-monogamy remains considerably more prevalent than its consensual counterpart, with 26.3% of men and 17.8% of women reporting experiences of non-consensual non-monogamy, compared to only 3% reporting consensual non-monogamy. This substantial disparity highlights the distinction between infidelity and intentional relationship design, emphasizing the importance of consent as a defining characteristic in contemporary relationship categorizations (Træen, & Thuen, 2022).

American research further illuminates the complexity of relationship preferences and practices within Western populations. Notably, one-third of American adults describe their ideal relationship as diverging from complete monogamy, suggesting that traditional dyadic exclusivity may not align with contemporary relationship aspirations for a substantial portion of the population (Scoats & Campbell, 2022). However, the gap between idealization and practice remains evident, with only 6% of respondents reporting current engagement in completely non-monogamous relationships (Scoats & Campbell, 2022). This discrepancy between preference and practice may reflect societal constraints, practical challenges, or the influence of normative expectations that discourage

exploration of alternative relationship structures despite personal inclinations (Scoats & Campbell, 2022).

Fairbrother and his collaborators (2019), conducted a nationally representative study of 2 003 Canadian adults. Their findings reveal that 2.4% of all participants, and 4.0% of those currently in relationships, reported active engagement in open relationships. While these current engagement rates appear modest, the research uncovered substantially higher levels of historical experience and aspirational interest, with one-fifth of participants reporting prior open relationship engagement and 12% identifying open relationships as their ideal relationship configuration. Men demonstrated significantly greater likelihood than women to report both previous open relationship experience and identification of open relationships as their ideal type. Additionally, younger participants showed increased propensity for both engagement in and preference for open relationships, suggesting generational shifts in relationship orientation that may influence future prevalence rates.

Recent research on the British population by Thomas et al. (2024) provides additional nuanced insights into polygamous interest across gender lines. Their examination of two heterosexual samples revealed modest overall interest in polygamous relationships, with pronounced gender differences in specific configurations. Men demonstrated six times greater openness to polygyny compared to women, while gender differences in polyandry acceptance were minimal. Importantly, their analysis revealed that all forms of CNM were perceived as less desirable than both singlehood and monogamy, suggesting that despite some interest, traditional relationship models retain preferential status. However, the research crucially demonstrated that consensual multi-partner relationships were viewed as significantly less undesirable than non-consensual arrangements, reinforcing the critical importance of consent in determining relationship acceptability.

In 2016, Hutzler et al. performed a study about the misconceptions of the public toward polyamory. With a sample of over 100 participants, it was concluded that those in polyamory relationships, were perceived as having higher levels of promiscuity, unsafe sexual practices, and sex drive, being lower in trustworthiness and morality and demonstrating greater communication skills and extroversion. Additionally, participants viewed polyamorous individuals as more physically attractive, less jealous, and less satisfied in their relationships than their monogamous counterparts. However, beliefs about unsafe sexual practices are not supported by evidence, as research suggests that polyamorous individuals are more likely to engage in safer sexual practices, such as regular sexual transmitted infections (STI) testing (Conley et al., 2012; Cox et al., 2013). Despite this, misconceptions about polyamory and STI risk may contribute to discrimination against those in non-monogamous relationships.

In their study about lay-people's definition of polyamory, Cardoso et al. (2021) found that polyamory is primarily defined as a relationship structure involving specific behaviours, followed by the capacity for multiple emotional or romantic connections. Definitions also emphasize emotional, sexual, and ethical dimensions. Individuals in CNM relationships are more likely than those uninterested in CNM to view polyamory as a relational possibility, highlighting aspects such as emotional connections, ethical considerations, and the importance of consent. CNM individuals also tend to de-emphasize the centrality of sex in their relationships, which may challenge prevailing assumptions about sexuality in polyamorous dynamics within clinical and research contexts (Cardoso, 2021).

Consensual non-monogamies are also often viewed as lacking in relational quality, as immoral, and as harmful, particularly in the context of raising children (Sheff, 2015). According to Sheff (2015), such biases can create significant pressure to conceal the

nature of their relationships, even from close friends and family. Examples of these challenges include rejection by one's family of origin and criticism regarding parenting capabilities. In extreme cases, this stigma may lead to the loss of parental rights over children, underscoring the pervasive societal challenges faced by individuals practicing CNM. Despite the growing body of research on this topic, the perceptions and attitudes of health professionals toward these relational models remain relatively underexplored in scientific literature.

1.2.4. Perceptions of Consensual Non-monogamies in Health Settings

Stigmatization towards CNM is not confined to the general population; it extends to health professionals as well; judgment and prejudice from healthcare providers are frequently reported (Vaughan et al., 2019). In a study by Vaughan et al. (2019), conducted with a focus group of non-monogamous individuals, there were identified four key themes regarding the experiences of CNM individuals in healthcare settings. The first was lack of awareness about CNM, as many participants reported that healthcare providers assumed monogamy as the norm and displayed a general lack of knowledge about CNM relationships. They were rarely asked about their relationship style or number of partners, leading to feelings of invisibility. Secondly, sexual stigma was a noticeable theme, as participants frequently experienced explicit or subtle judgment from healthcare staff after disclosing their CNM status. Reactions such as disapproving facial expressions, avoidance of eye contact, and condescending tones contributed to a stressful and stigmatizing environment. The third theme was efforts to avoid stigma and find CNM inclusive providers: to mitigate discrimination, participants employed various strategies to find accepting healthcare professionals. These included seeking recommendations from other CNM individuals, visiting public health clinics or sexual health care associations for STI testing, and researching providers' websites for signs of inclusivity,

such as LGBTQIA+ support. Lastly, the fourth theme was the need for CNM inclusive care: participants emphasized the importance of healthcare providers offering judgment-free, open-minded care. They desired an approach that recognized the legitimacy of CNM relationships while addressing their specific healthcare needs, particularly in sexual health management. A central concern across all themes was the desire for respectful, non-judgmental interactions that foster trust and collaboration between CNM individuals and healthcare professionals (Vaughan et al., 2019).

A study by Schechinger et al. (2018) found that mental health practitioners (historically central in supporting marginalized groups) are not immune to perpetuating stigmatizing attitudes toward CNM. Without proper education and training, these professionals may unintentionally adopt biased, inappropriate, or harmful practices when working with CNM clients (Schechinger et al., 2018). In therapy contexts, one in ten individuals in CNM relationships reported that their mental health professionals lacked sufficient knowledge about CNM. Additionally, another 10% of participants felt pressured by therapists to end their CNM relationships, which often led to premature termination of therapy (Schechinger et al., 2018).

Findings by Baluck (2020) indicate that greater knowledge of CNM was linked to more positive attitudes toward CNM relationships. Conversely, therapists with lower CNM knowledge tended to hold more negative perceptions of polyamorous or sexually open relationships. However, factors such as prior experience with CNM clients did not appear to influence therapists' attitudes or evaluations of client well-being. Additionally, no significant differences were found in therapists' assessments of symptom severity, relationship dissatisfaction, or their own perceived competence based on the client's relationship style (Baluck, 2020).

While existing research has primarily focused on the perspectives of individuals in CNM relationships towards health professionals, there is a notable absence of studies exploring how therapists themselves perceive CNM, according to the literature reviewed for this research. Although literature has begun to examine how health professionals perceive consensual non-monogamies, there remains a significant gap in our understanding of how these relationships are viewed by mental health professionals with specialized training in areas directly related to intimate and relational dynamics, such as family therapists or sexologists, which constitutes the central focus of the present study.

1.3. Transcultural Study Rationale

From a theoretical perspective, the cross-cultural dimension of this investigation is particularly warranted given that social representations are fundamentally shaped by cultural contexts and collective meaning-making processes (Moscovici, 1988). The selection of Portuguese and Spanish samples for this cross-cultural investigation of social representations was strategically grounded in the comparable sociodemographic and cultural contexts of these Iberian nations. Both countries have experienced remarkably similar trajectories in relationship dissolution patterns, with Portugal's divorce rate evolving from 0.1 per 1000 inhabitants in 1964 to 1.8 per 1000 in 2022, while Spain demonstrated a parallel trend reaching 1.9 divorces per 1000 inhabitants in 2022 from 0.6 in 1990 (Eurostat, 2022). These comparable divorce rates suggest similar processes of relationship norm liberalization and acceptance of alternative relationship configurations. Furthermore, both nations occupy analogous positions regarding LGBTQIA+ rights and social acceptance, with Portugal achieving 62% and Spain 74% in ILGA-Europe's comprehensive ranking that evaluates 49 countries across 74 criteria encompassing equality, non-discrimination, family rights, hate crime legislation, legal gender recognition, intersex bodily integrity, civil society space, and asylum policies (ILGA

Europe, 2023). This contextual similarity proves particularly relevant, given that research indicates CNM practitioners are significantly more likely to identify as sexual and gender minorities, compared to non-CNM individuals (Borgogna et al. 2024). The comparable legal and social frameworks regarding minority rights in both countries provide an ideal context for examining how professional representations of CNM may vary despite similar sociocultural foundations, potentially revealing subtle cultural influences on therapeutic conceptualizations while controlling for broader structural factors that might otherwise confound cross-national comparisons.

2. Method

This study adopts a qualitative, non-experimental approach, as no variables were manipulated.

The main goal of this study was to collect and understand the social representations of family therapists, sexual therapists and sexologists towards CNM. The concept of social representations was first studied by Serge Moscovici, a social psychologist, in the 1960s. Moscovici emphasized that the perception of reality is not fixed but rather mutable, as reality is socially constructed. In this context, the meaning attributed to objects and reality itself is shaped by individuals' relationships, modes of communication, and behaviours within society. The interpretation of reality is thus the outcome of these interconnected social dynamics (Moscovici, 1988). According to this perspective, social representation has a dualistic nature. It involves not only the interpretation of the object that is the focus of representation but also the interpretation by the individual perceiving and representing it (Abric, 1993; Moscovici, 1988). This duality underscores the intricate interplay between subjective and objective dimensions, as the act of representing an object inherently reflects the sociocultural and individual framework through which it is perceived and understood.

To study social representations, the free word association method was used, based on Abric's Central Nucleus Theory (1993). This method allows for the spontaneous identification of latent terms related to the subject under study (in this case, CNM). By instructing participants to list the first five words that immediately come to mind when thinking about CNM, it becomes possible to understand how they cognitively organize and establish connections regarding the topic. A key advantage of this method lies in its ability to combine clear and direct instructions with the respondent's freedom of expression, minimizing researcher influence and response bias (Abric, 1993). While other approaches exist for studying social representations, free word association has proven effective in revealing the structure and internal organization of a representation, including its central nucleus, contrasting elements, and peripheral system (Sá, 1996, 1998).

2.1 Participants

The sample for this study consists of both Portuguese and Spanish family therapists, sexologists and sexual therapists with the following inclusion criteria: (a) proficiency in Portuguese or Spanish and (b) accredited training from recognized family, sexology or sexual therapy societies or institutions. Data were collected from various professionals (family therapists, sexologists, and sexual therapists) but were not analysed by professional category. Therefore, participants in this study will be generically referred to as therapists throughout.

The total sample consisted of 156 participants, including 91 from Portugal and 65 from Spain (the Portuguese sample was initially composed by 95 participants, however, due to responses not meeting the criteria necessary to be classified as coming from a family therapist, a sexual therapist or a sexologist, four questionnaires were excluded from the final analysis). Participants' ages ranged from 26 to 71 years ($M = 47.30$). Regarding gender distribution, most participants (75.6%) identified as female. In terms of sexual

orientation, the majority identified as heterosexual (136 participants, 87.2%). In terms of educational background, psychology was the most common field, with 116 participants (74.4%) holding a degree in this area.

Only a total of 9 participants (5.8%) reported having been directly involved in CNM. Regarding professional experience as psychotherapists, most of the sample 55 participants (35.3%) reported between 0 and 10 years of practice ($n = 55$; 35.3%) and between 10 and 20 years ($n = 47$; 30.1%). When asked about their experience working with CNM clients in psychotherapy, 109 participants (69.9%) reported never having worked with this population, while 47 (30.1%) had experience with CNM. For more details see Table 1.

Table 1*Sociodemographic and professional characterization of the total sample*

Sociodemographic Characteristics		<i>n</i>	%
Gender	Female	118	75.6
	Male	35	22.4
	Undisclosed	3	1.9
Sexual orientation	Heterosexual	136	87.2
	Bisexual	10	6.4
	Lesbian	2	1.3
	Gay	2	1.3
	Pansexual	2	1.3
	Other	2	1.3
	Undisclosed	1	0.6
Educational background	Psychology	116	74.4
	Social Services	14	9.0
	Education	9	5.8
	Medicine	8	5.1
	Nursing	5	3.2
	Sexology	1	0.6
Years of experience as a psychotherapist	Others	1	0.6
	0-10 years	55	35.3
	10-20 years	47	30.1
	20-30 years	39	25.0
	30-40 years	12	7.7
	Over 40 years	3	1.9

As illustrated in Table 2, the Portuguese sample, participants' ages ranged from 26 to 68 years ($M = 46.14$). Regarding gender, most participants (80.2%) identified as female, and 1 participant (1.1%) chose not to disclose their gender. In terms of sexual orientation,

83 participants (92.2%) identified as heterosexual. Regarding educational background, over half of the sample (76.9%) had training in psychology. Within this sample, 84 participants (93.3%) were already familiar with the term CNM, while 6 (6.7%) were not. Only 3 participants (3.3%) reported having been or currently being involved in a CNM relationship. Regarding experience in providing psychotherapy to individuals in CNM relationships, 59 participants (64.8%) reported never having worked with CNM clients, 32 (35.2%) had experience working with them.

Table 2*Sociodemographic and professional characterization of the Portuguese sample*

Sociodemographic Characteristics		<i>n</i>	%
Gender	Female	73	80.2
	Male	17	18.7
	Undisclosed	1	1.1
Sexual orientation	Heterosexual	83	87.2
	Bisexual	1	1.1
	Lesbian	2	2.2
	Gay	2	2.2
	Pansexual	1	1.1
	Other	1	1.1
	Others	1	1.1
Educational background	Psychology	70	76.9
	Social Services	9	9.9
	Nursing	5	5.1
	Medicine	4	3.2
	Others	1	0
Years of experience as a psychotherapist	0-10 years	31	34.1
	10-20 years	29	31.9
	20-30 years	23	25.3
	30-40 years	7	7.7
	Over 40 years	1	1.1

In the Spanish sample, participants' ages ranged from 29 to 71 years ($M = 48.9$). Regarding gender, most of the participants (69.2%) identified as female and 18 (27.7%) as male. In terms of sexual orientation most participants (81.5%) identified as heterosexual. Regarding educational background, over half the sample (70.6%) had training in psychology. Within the Spanish sample, only 6 participants (9.4%) reported

having been involved in a CNM relationship and only 15 participants (23.1%) reported having experience providing psychotherapy to individuals in CNM relationships. For a detailed breakdown, see Table 3.

Table 3

Sociodemographic and professional characterization of the Spanish sample

Sociodemographic Characteristics		<i>n</i>	%
Gender	Female	45	69.2
	Male	18	27.7
	Undisclosed	2	3.1
Sexual orientation	Heterosexual	53	81.5
	Bisexual	9	13.8
	Pansexual	1	1.5
	Other	1	1.5
	Undisclosed	1	1.5
Educational Background	Psychology	46	70.6
	Education	9	13.8
	Social services	5	7.7
	Medicine	4	6.2
	Sexology	1	1.5
Years of experience as a psychotherapist	0-10 years	24	34.1
	10-20 years	18	27.7
	20-30 years	16	24.6
	30-40 years	5	7.7
	Over 40 years	2	3.1

2.2. Materials

For the purposes of this study, two questionnaires were developed: (a) a questionnaire containing a single prompt (“When thinking about consensual non-monogamy, write the

Consensual Non-Monogamies: Social Representations Among Family Therapists, Sex Therapists, and Sexologists in the Iberian Context

Lara Quintal (larasilvaq@gmail.com)

first five words that immediately come to mind”) (cf. Appendices 1 and 2) accompanied by a brief definition of the concept and an instruction to consider the order in which the words emerged, with the order of evocation ranging from 1 (word or brief expression recalled first) to 5 (word or brief expression recalled last); and (b) a sociodemographic questionnaire designed to collect information on gender, age, sexual orientation, years of professional practice as a psychotherapist, prior experience in providing psychotherapy to individuals in CNM relationships, and the frequency of such cases (1–2 cases per year, 3–4 cases per year, 5–6 cases per year) (cf. Appendices 3 and 4). For each of these questionnaires, there was a Portuguese and a Spanish version. A final screening question was included as to assess where participants obtained their degree in either family and couple therapy or sexology.

2.3 Data Collection and Analysis Procedures

This study received approval from the Data Protection Office of the University of Madeira (UMa) as well as from UMa’s Ethics Committee (reference n. ° 144; cf. Appendix 5). All ethical and deontological principles outlined by the American Psychology Association’s Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct (2025).

Data collection took place online between October 2024 and February 2025. The online questionnaires were created using the Google Forms platform, preceded by an electronic informed consent (cf. Appendix 6; cf. Appendix 7), which participants were required to acknowledge before gaining access to the data collection questionnaire. The Spanish version of the questionnaires was revised by a bilingual investigator, fluent in both Portuguese and Spanish. All the questionnaires were then shared through the personal contacts of the investigating team and with the Portuguese Society of Family Therapy, the Portuguese Society of Clinical Sexology, and the Spanish Federation of Family Therapy Associations so that they could share the questionnaires with their

members. As a result, the sample constitutes a non-probabilistic selection, gathered through the snowball sampling method.

The data was standardized to ensure consistency. Similar or synonymous terms were emerged into a single category to maintain coherence in the analysis (cf. Appendices 8 and 9). Each word was examined individually, and synonym categories were constructed sequentially based on the order in which the terms appeared during analysis. In accordance with the Consolidated criteria for Reporting Qualitative research (COREQ) protocol (Tong et al., 2007), discussions were held among members of the research team regarding the word categories (Mays & Pope, 2000; Swindlehurst et al., 2023). These discussions contributed to a more refined and accurate analysis of the data, allowing for the review, adjustment, or exclusion of categories as needed (Tong et al., 2007). Final adjustments included harmonizing uppercase and lowercase letters, singular and plural forms, and gendered variations. Additionally, all punctuation and diacritical marks were removed, and hyphens were added to multi-word expressions. After this process, both Portuguese and Spanish words were translated to English.

Data processing and analysis were conducted using the EVOC software, 2005 version. In this study, four out of sixteen available programs were employed: *Lexique*, which identifies lexical units and generates a vocabulary of evoked terms; *Trievoc*, which arranges and organizes the evocations in alphabetical order; *Rangmot*, which provides the frequency counts and the average evocation order for each word; and *Rangfrq*, which displays the elements of the central nucleus, contrasting nucleus and peripheral systems in a four-quadrant framework (Machado & Aniceto, 2010). This software generates co-occurrence matrices of words, known as four-quadrant matrices (Machado & Aniceto, 2010; Vergès, 2002). The upper-left quadrant represents the central nucleus, which includes the most frequently mentioned words that were also evoked in the first and

second positions. The lower-left quadrant contains contrast elements, which are more idiosyncratic and reflect individual experiences: these terms appear in the first and second positions but are limited to a smaller group of respondents. The right-side quadrants correspond to the peripheral structure of the representation. The first periphery consists of frequently mentioned words that appear later in the evocation order (third, fourth, and fifth positions), whereas the second periphery comprises less frequently mentioned and more externally positioned terms. Unlike the central core, which is relatively stable, the second periphery is more flexible and context-dependent (Abric, 1993, 2001, 2003).

3. Results

3.1. Social Representations of the Portuguese Sample

In the Portuguese sample ($n = 91$), participants evoked a total of 455 terms, comprising 20 distinct words. The frequency of evocation ranged from 5 to 98, with a mean order of evocation of 3.00 (on a scale from 1 to 5), and values ranging between 1.67 and 4.00.

As shown in Table 4, the central nucleus is organized around three key terms: “consent” ($n = 13$; M.O.E. = 2.54), “relational diversity” ($n = 66$; M.O.E. = 2.26), and “freedom” ($n = 40$; M.O.E. = 2.58) (cf. Appendix 10).

Table 4

Social Representations Among the Portuguese Population: Central Nucleus, Contrasting Nucleus, First Periphery, and Second Periphery of Terms Evoked

		Rang <2,60			Rang >2,60		
		Central Nucleus			Periphery 1		
		Evoked Term	f	M.O.E.	Evoked Term	f	M.O.E.
Frequency ≥10		Consent	13	2.54	Openness to Experience	25	3.12
		Relational Diversity	66	2.26	Present Times	11	3.45
		Freedom	40	2.58	Challenging	11	3.73
					Infidelity	12	3.10
					Multiple Partners	15	3.20
					Negotiation	60	2.98
					Negative Feelings	28	3.89
					Positive Feelings	98	3.18
					Sexuality	22	3.27
		Contrasting Nucleus			Periphery 2		
		Evoked Term	f	M.O.E.	Evoked Term	f	M.O.E.
Frequency 5↔9		Confusing	6	2.17	Complexity	6	3.83
		Different	9	1.67	Community and Culture	9	3.44
					Immorality	6	3.33
					Individuality	7	4.00
					Limited Knowledge	6	3.50
					Violence	5	3.00

Note. f = frequency; M.O.E. = mean order of evocation; Rang = mean rank.

3.2. Social Representations of the Spanish Sample

In the Spanish sample ($n = 65$), participants evoked a total of 319 terms, encompassing 14 distinct words. The frequency of evocation ranged from 5 to 64, with a mean order of evocation of 2.97 (on a scale from 1 to 5), and values spanning from 2.00 to 3.89.

As presented in Table 5, the Central Nucleus highlights three terms: “complexity” ($n = 22$; M.O.E. = 2.50), “relational diversity” ($n = 48$; M.O.E. = 2.27), and “freedom” ($n = 32$; M.O.E. = 2.16). Within the contrasting nucleus, the only term is “infidelity” ($n = 5$; M.O.E. = 2.00) (cf. Appendix 11).

Table 5

Social Representations Among the Spanish Population: Central Nucleus, Contrasting Nucleus, First Periphery, and Second Periphery of Terms Evoked

		Rang <2,60			Rang >2,60		
		Central Nucleus			Periphery 1		
	Evoked Term	f	M.O.E.	Evoked Term	f	M.O.E.	
Frequency ≥10	Complexity	22	2.50	Present Times	12	3.75	
	Relational Diversity	48	2.27	Community and Culture	12	3.50	
	Freedom	32	2.16	Negotiation	30	2.93	
				Negative Feelings	53	3.45	
				Positive Feelings	64	3.28	
				Sexuality	14	3.00	
		Contrasting Nucleus			Periphery 2		
	Evoked Term	f	M.O.E.	Evoked Term	f	M.O.E.	
Frequency 5↔9	Infidelity	5	2.00	Confusing	9	3.89	
				Consent	6	2.83	
				Different	8	4.00	

Note. f = frequency; M.O.E. = mean order of evocation; Rang = mean rank.

3.3. Social Representations Based on Psychotherapeutic Experience With CNM

3.3.1. Portuguese Therapists With Experience in Supporting Clients in CNM

For Portuguese therapists with experience in providing care to individuals engaged in CNM relationships ($n = 32$), a total of 160 terms were generated, including 18 distinct words. Evocation frequencies ranged from 1 to 26, with a mean order of evocation of 3.00, and values ranging from 1.00 to 4.00.

Within the central nucleus, only one term emerged: “relational diversity” ($n = 16$; M.O.E. = 2.19). The term most frequently mentioned by these therapists was “positive feelings,” which was cited 35 times, although it had a higher mean order of evocation (M.O.E. = 3.00) (cf. Appendix 12).

Table 6

Social Representations of Portuguese Therapists With Experience in Supporting Clients in CNM: Central Nucleus, Contrasting Nucleus, First Periphery, and Second Periphery of Terms Evoked

		Rang <2,60			Rang >2,60		
		Central Nucleus			Periphery 1		
		Evoked Term	f	M.O.E.	Evoked Term	f	M.O.E.
Frequency ≥5		Relational Diversity	16	2.19	Openness to Experience	13	3.46
					Present Times	6	3.67
					Consent	5	3.00
					Freedom	19	2.79
					Negotiation	26	2.96
					Negative Feelings	6	3.67
					Positive Feelings	35	3.00
					Sexuality	7	3.57
					Violence	5	3.00
		Contrasting Nucleus			Periphery 2		
		Evoked Term	f	M.O.E.	Evoked Term	f	M.O.E.
Frequency 1↔4		Confusing	1	1.00	Complexity	2	4.00
		Different	4	1.75	Community and Culture	2	3.50
					Challenging	4	3.75
					Individuality	2	4.00
					Infidelity	3	2.67
					Multiple Partners	4	3.00

Note. f = frequency; M.O.E. = mean order of evocation; Rang = mean rank.

3.3.2. Spanish Therapists With Experience in Supporting Clients in CNM

In the Spanish sample of therapists with experience working with individuals in CNM relationships ($n = 16$), a total of 80 terms were analysed, with 13 of these being distinct words. The frequency of evocation ranged from 1 to 20, with a mean order of evocation of 3.00, with values spanning from 1.00 to 4.00.

The central nucleus includes the terms “relational diversity” ($n = 7$; M.O.E. = 2.14) and “freedom” ($n = 11$; M.O.E. = 1.82). As in the Portuguese sample, the most frequent category was “positive feelings” ($n = 20$; M.O.E. = 3.55) with the second most frequent being “negative feelings” ($n = 16$; M.O.E.= 3.44). (cf. Appendix 13).

Table 7

Social Representations of Spanish Therapists With Experience in Supporting Clients in CNM: Central Nucleus, Contrasting Nucleus, First Periphery, and Second Periphery of Terms Evoked

		Rang <2,60			Rang >2,60		
		Central Nucleus			Periphery 1		
	Evoked Term	f	M.O.E.	Evoked Term	f	M.O.E.	
Frequency ≥5	Relational Diversity	7	2.14	Complexity	6	2.67	
	Freedom	11	1.82	Negative Feelings	16	3.44	
				Positive Feelings	20	3.55	
	Contrasting Nucleus			Periphery 2			
Frequency 1↔4	Evoked Term	f	M.O.E.	Evoked Term	f	M.O.E.	
	Individuality	2	2.50	Present Times	3	3.33	
	Infidelity	1	1.00	Community and Culture	3	4.00	
	Sexuality	3	2.00	Confusing	3	4.00	
				Different	2	4.00	
				Negotiation	3	3.00	

Note. f = frequency; M.O.E. = mean order of evocation; Rang = mean rank.

3.3.3. Portuguese Therapists Without Experience in Supporting Clients in CNM

Among Portuguese therapists without prior experience in working with individuals in CNM relationships ($n = 59$), a total of 295 terms were evoked, including 19 distinct words. Evocation frequency varied between 1 and 63, with a mean order of evocation of 3.00, and values ranging from 1.00 to 4.00.

The central nucleus comprised the following terms: “Confusing” ($n = 5$; M.O.E. = 2.40), “Consent” ($n = 8$; M.O.E. = 2.25), “Different” ($n = 5$; M.O.E. = 1.60), “Relational Diversity” ($n = 50$; M.O.E. = 2.28), and “Freedom” ($n = 21$; M.O.E. = 2.38) (cf. Appendix 14).

Table 8

Social Representations of Portuguese Therapists Without Experience in Supporting Clients in CNM: Central Nucleus, Contrasting Nucleus, First Periphery, and Second Periphery of Terms Evoked

		Rang <2,60			Rang >2,60		
		Central Nucleus			Periphery 1		
	Evoked Term	f	M.O.E.	Evoked Term	f	M.O.E.	
Frequency ≥5	Confusing	5	2.40	Challenging	7	3.71	
	Consent	8	2.25	Immorality	6	3.33	
	Different	5	1.60	Individuality	5	4.00	
	Relational Diversity	50	2.28	Infidelity	9	3.22	
	Freedom	21	2.38	Multiple Partners	11	3.27	
				Negotiation	34	3.00	
				Limited Knowledge	6	3.50	
				Negative Feelings	22	3.96	
				Positive Feelings	63	3.29	
				Sexuality	15	3.13	
	Contrasting Nucleus			Periphery 2			
Frequency 1↔4	Evoked Term	f	M.O.E.	Evoked Term	f	M.O.E.	
				Complexity	4	3.75	

Note. f = frequency; M.O.E. = mean order of evocation; Rang = mean rank.

3.3.4. Spanish Therapists Without Experience in Supporting Clients in CNM

For the sample of Spanish therapists without prior experience in providing psychotherapy to CNM clients ($n = 49$), a total of 239 words were analysed, with 14 different terms reported. Word frequency ranged from 2 to 41. The mean order of evocation was 2.97, with values ranging between 2.25 and 4.00.

The central nucleus includes the terms “complexity” ($n = 16$; M.O.E. = 2.44), “relational diversity” ($n = 41$; M.O.E. = 2.29), and “freedom” ($n = 21$; M.O.E. = 2.33) (cf. Appendix 15).

Table 9

Social Representations of Spanish Therapists Without Experience in Supporting Clients in CNM: Central Nucleus, Contrasting Nucleus, First Periphery, and Second Periphery of Terms Evoked

		Rang <2,60			Rang >2,60		
		Central Nucleus			Periphery 1		
		Evoked Term	f	M.O.E.	Evoked Term	f	M.O.E.
Frequency ≥5		Complexity	16	2.44	Present Times	9	3.89
		Relational Diversity	41	2.29	Community and Culture	9	3.33
		Freedom	21	2.33	Confusing	6	3.83
					Consent	6	2.83
					Different	6	4.00
					Negotiation	27	2.93
					Negative Feelings	37	3.46
					Positive Feelings	44	3.16
					Sexuality	11	3.27
		Contrasting Nucleus			Periphery 2		
		Evoked Term	f	M.O.E.	Evoked Term	f	M.O.E.
Frequency 1↔4		Infidelity	4	2.25	Individuality	2	3.50

Note. f = frequency; M.O.E. = mean order of evocation; Rang = mean rank.

4. Discussion

The primary aim of this study is to explore how CNM are socially represented by professionals in the fields of family therapy, sexual therapy, and sexology. By examining the language and associations used by Portuguese and Spanish therapists, both with and without clinical experience working with CNM clients, this research seeks to uncover the underlying beliefs, values, and assumptions that shape professional perceptions of non-

monogamous relationships. Understanding these representations can provide valuable insights into how such relationships are conceptualized within therapeutic contexts and may contribute to more inclusive and culturally responsive clinical practices.

4.1. General Social Representations about NMC among Portuguese and Spanish Therapists

The analysis of central core elements reveals intriguing cross-cultural patterns in how therapists conceptualize consensual non-monogamy. The Portuguese sample identified “consent”, “relational diversity”, and “freedom” as central elements, while the Spanish sample emphasized “complexity”, “relational diversity”, and “freedom”. These findings illuminate both convergent and divergent aspects of professional understanding across cultural contexts.

The emergence of “relational diversity” and “freedom” in the central nucleus of both samples suggests these concepts represent fundamental, culturally transcendent aspects of how therapists understand CNM. This convergence aligns with theoretical frameworks that position relationship autonomy and choice as core principles underlying non-monogamous arrangements (Gupta et al., 2024).

However, the divergence between “consent” (Portuguese sample) and “complexity” (Spanish sample) in the central nucleus reveals culturally specific emphases in professional conceptualizations. The prominence of “consent” in the Portuguese sample suggests a rights-based, ethically focused understanding that prioritizes the foundational principle of informed agreement. Conversely, the Spanish sample's focus on “complexity” indicates a more systemic, process-oriented understanding that acknowledges the intricate dynamics inherent in multi-partner relationships (Cabral, 2024; Hauptert et al., 2017).

The centrality of “consent” found in the Portuguese sample is unsurprising, given that consent represents the fundamental pillar that distinguishes consensual non-monogamy from other forms of non-monogamy, appearing explicitly in the very terminology used to describe these relationship configurations. All academic definitions of CNM emphasize informed, ongoing consent as the essential characteristic that differentiates these arrangements from infidelity or deceptive practices (Conley et al., 2017; Moors et al., 2017; Sheff, 2015). This consensual foundation establishes the ethical framework within which all other aspects of CNM operate, making it unsurprising that Portuguese professionals would identify this as a central element of their understanding. The emphasis on consent reflects not merely a definitional requirement but a lived practice that governs negotiation, boundary-setting, and relationship maintenance within CNM contexts.

The emphasis on “freedom” observed in both samples corresponds with research indicating that CNM represents a form of relationship practiced despite widespread stigma, suggesting that professionals recognize the importance of choice and autonomy in relationship configurations (Conley, 2013; Sheff, 2015; Vaughan et al., 2019). This conceptualization extends beyond individual choice to encompass broader sociopolitical dimensions, as CNM can be perceived as a political movement that transcends personal relationship preferences, serving as a form of resistance against systemic patriarchal oppression. By challenging traditional relationship norms, CNM practitioners question established ideas of possession and control over partners that characterize patriarchal structures (Araújo, 2002; Orion, 2018; Scorsolini-Comin & Santos, 2010). The recognition of freedom as central to CNM understanding suggests that professionals appreciate both the personal liberation and broader social critique inherent in these relationship configurations.

The Spanish sample's focus on “complexity” appears consistent with emerging research that acknowledges the multifaceted nature of CNM relationships, (Füllgrabe & Smith, 2023), suggesting that professionals recognize the additional layers of consideration required in these relationship structures. However, it is important to acknowledge that despite growing research interest, non-monogamy remains a relatively nascent area of academic inquiry. The field continues to grapple with definitional challenges, methodological considerations, and theoretical frameworks that adequately capture the diversity and nuance of CNM experiences (Cabral, 2024; Hauptert et al., 2017). This ongoing evolution in understanding may contribute to why Spanish professionals emphasize complexity, recognizing that current knowledge represents an incomplete picture of phenomena that resist simple categorization or explanation.

Examination of words with low frequency but high accessibility reveals additional dimensions of professional understanding. Portuguese therapists occasionally evoked "confusing" ($n = 6$) and "different" ($n = 9$) as immediate associations, while Spanish therapists sometimes identified "infidelity" ($n = 5$) among their immediate but less frequent responses. Despite their infrequent mention, these terms appeared predominantly in first and second positions, suggesting they represent initial, automatic associations that emerge when therapists first encounter CNM concepts. The Portuguese identification of CNM as "confusing" and "different" may reflect honest acknowledgment of unfamiliarity with these relationship configurations, indicating professional awareness of knowledge limitations rather than negative judgment. Similarly, the Spanish association with "infidelity" likely represents an initial cognitive response that distinguishes familiar concepts of relationship transgression from the less familiar framework of consensual non-monogamy, possibly reflecting the mental effort required to differentiate between consensual and non-consensual forms of non-monogamy.

Conversely, analysis of highly frequent but peripherally positioned responses reveals the emotional dimensions of professional understanding. Portuguese therapists generated "positive feelings" as their most frequent association ($n = 98$), though these responses typically appeared in later positions within their word associations. Spanish therapists similarly demonstrated frequent associations with both "positive feelings" ($n = 64$) and "negative feelings" ($n = 53$), again in peripheral positions. The predominance of positive feelings in both samples suggests that therapists generally hold favourable attitudes toward CNM. The near-equal frequency of positive and negative feelings in the Spanish sample suggests a more ambivalent emotional response that may reflect the "complexity" identified as central to their understanding.

4.2. Social Representations based on Professional Experience with CNM

The stratification of results by clinical experience with CNM clients reveals profound differences in professional understanding that transcend cultural boundaries. Among therapists with CNM experience, both Portuguese and Spanish professionals demonstrated remarkably streamlined conceptualizations, with Portuguese therapists identifying solely relational diversity as central, while Spanish therapists emphasized "relational diversity" and "freedom". This suggests that direct clinical exposure refines professional understanding toward essential elements, stripping away peripheral concepts that may characterize initial impressions.

Portuguese therapists with CNM experience showed minimal immediate associations with "confusing" ($n = 1$) and "different" ($n = 4$) as first-position responses, suggesting that clinical familiarity eliminates initial uncertainty. Spanish experienced therapists similarly demonstrated infrequent first-position associations with "individuality" ($n = 2$), "infidelity" ($n = 1$), and "sexuality" ($n = 3$), indicating that direct clinical exposure reduces automatic linkages to broader sexual or relational concepts. The peripheral responses of

experienced therapists further illuminate cultural differences in professional processing. Portuguese experienced therapists demonstrated a pronounced positive emotional orientation, generating "positive feelings" 35 times compared to only 6 instances of "negative feelings", though these emotional associations appeared in later positions. Spanish experienced therapists showed a more balanced emotional response, with "positive feelings" occurring 20 times and "negative feelings" 16 times, again in peripheral positions. This pattern suggests that Portuguese therapists with CNM experience develop more uniformly positive emotional associations, while Spanish experienced therapists maintain a more nuanced emotional perspective that reveals an emotional ambivalence that is present throughout the sample, reinforcing that CNM remains an emotionally charged topic, even among professionals.

In contrast, therapists without CNM experience exhibited notably more complex and varied representational structures. Portuguese therapists without experience identified five central elements: "confusing", "consent", "different", "relational diversity", and "freedom", while Spanish therapists without experience focused on "complexity", "relational diversity", and "freedom". The emergence of "confusing" and "different" in the Portuguese inexperienced sample, alongside "complexity" in the Spanish inexperienced sample, suggests that unfamiliarity may breed conceptual uncertainty and othering processes.

The Portuguese sample without experience with CNM identification of "confusing" and "different" as central elements appears to reflect genuine uncertainty and recognition of unfamiliarity rather than judgmental attitudes, given that the most frequent category, although in later positions was "positive feelings". These characterizations suggest that without direct clinical exposure, therapists acknowledge their limited understanding of CNM dynamics and recognize these relationship configurations as distinct from their

typical clinical experience. This honest acknowledgment of confusion may represent professional humility and awareness of knowledge gaps, indicating that therapists recognize the need for additional learning and preparation when working with CNM clients, being consistent with results found by Vaughan and his collaborators (2019).

The Spanish inexperienced sample's emphasis on "complexity" appears to represent a realistic assessment of CNM's multifaceted nature rather than a pathologizing perspective. This characterization acknowledges the intricate dynamics inherent in multi-partner relationships without necessarily viewing them as problematic. As established earlier in this discussion, defining CNM proves to be a complex endeavour due to their multifaceted structures and diverse practices (Cabral, 2024; Hauptert et al., 2017). The identification of "complexity" by these therapists may reflect an accurate recognition of these dynamics, even if they may lack the practical familiarity that would allow them to navigate such "complexity" more effectively.

Portuguese experienced therapists' focus solely on "relational diversity" indicates recognition of CNM as fundamentally about relationship configuration rather than ethical complexity or social deviance. Spanish experienced therapists' dual focus on "relational diversity" and "freedom" suggests appreciation for both structural and autonomy dimensions without pathologizing complexity.

The peripheral elements among inexperienced therapists reveal distinct cultural patterns in professional uncertainty. Portuguese therapists without CNM experience demonstrated minimal reference to "complexity" ($n=4$), suggesting that this concept is less salient in their initial professional framework. Spanish inexperienced therapists showed infrequent but immediate associations with "infidelity" ($n=4$), indicating that initial cognitive processing may involve distinguishing CNM from familiar concepts of relationship transgression. The emotional dimensions of inexperienced therapists'

responses further illuminate cross-cultural differences in professional orientation. Portuguese therapists demonstrated a more emotionally polarized response, marked by a significant emphasis on "positive feelings" ($n= 63$) compared to "negative feelings" ($n= 23$) despite the latter appearing in later evocation positions. This trend may reflect a socially desirable stance or an openness within Portuguese professional discourse, even in the absence of direct clinical experience. In contrast, Spanish therapists displayed a more emotionally balanced response pattern, with a smaller gap between the frequency of "positive feelings" ($n= 44$) and "negative feelings" ($n= 37$) associations. This could indicate a more critical or nuanced engagement with CNM in the Spanish context, possibly shaped by differing professional discourses, cultural attitudes, or training frameworks. These differences suggest that cultural context plays a subtle yet meaningful role in shaping the emotional dimensions of how CNM is perceived by mental health professionals.

This pattern aligns with established research demonstrating that therapists frequently lack adequate knowledge about CNM, with clients often feeling the need to educate their therapists, and over half of participants reporting that their therapists held judgmental or pathologizing beliefs toward consensual non-monogamy (Schechinger et al., 2018; Vaughan et al., 2019). The literature emphasizes that therapists are not immune to being influenced by societal stigma and without education about CNM, they are subject to holding prejudiced attitudes (Baluck, 2020).

The consistent presence of "relational diversity" across all subgroups (Portuguese and Spanish Therapists with or without experience in CNM) suggests this concept represents a fundamental aspect of CNM understanding that transcends both cultural context and professional experience. However, the additional elements identified by inexperienced therapists warrant careful consideration.

It is essential for mental health professionals to approach CNM without pathologizing these relationship structures, particularly in clinical contexts. Pathologization can reinforce stigma, limit therapeutic alliance, and inadvertently reproduce dominant cultural biases rather than foster inclusive, client-centred care. Studies have shown that therapists' moral or cultural assumptions about monogamy can lead to implicit biases that frame CNM clients as inherently unstable or emotionally avoidant (Moors et al., 2013; Schechinger et al., 2018). Such assumptions risk undermining the legitimacy of clients' relational choices and may hinder open communication and trust. To support psychological well-being and ethical practice, clinicians must instead be guided by frameworks that recognize the diversity of intimate relationships and affirm their potential for health, stability, and satisfaction (Conley et al., 2017).

Despite growing visibility of CNM in psychological literature, keeping pace with its evolving conceptual landscape may be a significant challenge, even for experienced therapists. The field is marked by rapid terminological shifts, dynamic theoretical developments, and increasing intersectional complexity, which can be overwhelming for practitioners seeking to provide affirming care (Cabral, 2024). For some, this perceived instability may evoke uncertainty or even resistance, especially when training resources or institutional support are lacking (Finn et al., 2012). Furthermore, as CNM discourses intersect with broader sociocultural debates on identity, autonomy, and normativity, clinicians may struggle to maintain cultural competence without continual professional development (Orion, 2018).

These findings have significant implications for therapeutic training and practice. The differences between experienced and inexperienced therapists (with CNM) suggest that specialized education and supervised clinical exposure may be essential for developing appropriate therapeutic competence with CNM clients. The emergence of uncertainty-

based elements such as "confusing" and recognition of "complexity" among inexperienced therapists underscores the importance of providing comprehensive training that addresses knowledge gaps and equips professionals with the conceptual frameworks necessary to understand CNM dynamics effectively. Rather than indicating problematic attitudes, these findings suggest that inexperienced therapists demonstrate appropriate professional awareness of their limitations while recognizing the need for additional preparation when working with CNM populations. This highlights the necessity for targeted educational interventions that can transform honest acknowledgment of unfamiliarity into clinical competence through structured learning and supervised practice opportunities.

5. Conclusion

Several avenues for future research emerge from these findings that could significantly advance understanding of professional conceptualizations of consensual non-monogamy. Longitudinal studies tracking how therapist representations evolve throughout specialized CNM training programs would provide valuable insights into the mechanisms through which professional understanding develops and becomes more sophisticated. Such research could identify critical learning moments and effective pedagogical approaches for enhancing therapeutic competence with CNM populations. Additionally, expanding the cross-cultural scope to include therapists from diverse cultural contexts beyond the Iberian Peninsula would illuminate how broader cultural values, legal frameworks, and social norms influence professional conceptualizations of alternative relationship structures. Despite offering valuable insights into therapists' social representations of CNM, this study is not without limitations. One key limitation concerns the use of non-probabilistic sampling methods, such as convenience sampling, which may have introduced sampling bias by over-representing professionals who are more open or

interested in the topic of CNM. Additionally, selection bias cannot be ruled out, as participants who chose to respond may differ in significant ways from those who did not, particularly regarding familiarity or comfort with non-traditional relationship structures. The overall sample size ($N = 156$), while adequate for qualitative analysis, remains relatively small, limiting the generalizability of the findings. Furthermore, the reliance on the free word association method, while useful for capturing spontaneous cognitive associations, does not allow for in-depth exploration of the underlying reasoning or context behind each term. Lastly, the cross-sectional design prevents any analysis of changes in representations over time or in response to clinical training.

A central implication emerging from this research concerns the need to enhance curricular content within therapeutic training institutions to adequately address consensual non-monogamy topics. Such curricula should encompass the diversity of CNM configurations, ethical considerations surrounding consent and autonomy, communication strategies for navigating complex relationship dynamics, and methods for addressing societal stigma that may affect both clients and therapists. Additionally, educational programs must acknowledge the political and social justice dimensions of CNM, recognizing these relationships as forms of resistance against traditional patriarchal structures while promoting individual agency and empowerment. The incorporation of supervised clinical experiences with CNM populations, case study analyses, and reflective practices examining personal biases would further enhance professional preparation. Without such comprehensive educational reform, the therapeutic community risks perpetuating knowledge gaps that may compromise service quality for an increasingly visible and diverse client population seeking affirmative, competent mental health support.

6. References

- Abric, J.C. (1993). Central system, peripheral system: their functions and roles in the dynamics of social representations. *Papers on social representations*, 2, 75-78.
- Abric, J. (2001). L'approche structurale des représentations sociales: développements récents [The structural approach to social representations: recent developments]. *Psychologie et société*, 4, 81-106.
- Abric, J. C. (2003). La recherche du noyau central et de la zone muette des représentations sociales [The search for the central core and the silent zone of social representations]. In J. C. Abric (Ed.), *Méthodes d'étude des représentations sociales* (pp.59-80). Érès.
- American Psychology Association (2025). Apa.org.
<https://www.apa.org/ethics/code.com>
- American Psychology Association (2022) *Guidelines for Preparing Qualitative Manuscripts*. Apa.org. <https://www.apa.org/pubs/journals/rel/guidelines-preparing-qualitative-manuscripts>
- Andersson, C. (2022). Drawing the line at infidelity: Negotiating relationship morality in a Swedish context of consensual non-monogamy. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 39(7), 1917-1933.
- Araújo, M. D. F. (2002). Amor, casamento e sexualidade: velhas e novas configurações [Love, marriage and sexuality: old and new configurations]. *Psicologia: ciência e profissão*, 22, 70-77. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1414-98932002000200009>
- Baluck, Tara, "Assessing therapists' attitudes toward consensually non-monogamous clients" (2020). *Master's Theses and Doctoral Dissertations*. 1025.
<https://commons.emich.edu/theses/1025>

- Balzarini, R. N., Campbell, L., Kohut, T., Holmes, B. M., Lehmilller, J. J., Harman, J. J., & Atkins, N. (2017). Perceptions of primary and secondary relationships in polyamory. *PloS one*, *12*(5), e0177841.
- Balzarini, R. N., Dharma, C., Kohut, T., Holmes, B. M., Campbell, L., Lehmilller, J. J., & Harman, J. J. (2019). Demographic comparison of American individuals in polyamorous and monogamous relationships. *The Journal of Sex Research*, *56*(6), 681-694.
- Balzarini, R. N., Dharma, C., Muise, A., & Kohut, T. (2019). Eroticism versus nurturance: How eroticism and nurturance differs in polyamorous and monogamous relationships. *Social Psychology*, *50*(3), 185.
- Balzarini, R. N., McDonald, J. N., Kohut, T., Lehmilller, J. J., Holmes, B. M., & Harman, J. J. (2021). Compersion: When jealousy-inducing situations don't (just) induce jealousy. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *50*(4), 1311-1324.
- Bancroft, J. (2009). Sexuality and ageing. In J. Bancroft, *Human sexuality and its problems* (3rd ed., pp. 238–252). New York: Elsevier.
- Barker, M. (2005). This is my partner, and this is my...partner's partner: Constructing a polyamorous identity in a monogamous world. *Journal of Constructivist Psychology*, *18*(1), 75–88. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10720530590523107>
- Barker, M., & Langdrige, D. (Eds.). (2010). *Understanding non-monogamies* (Vol. 23). Routledge.
- Borgogna, N. C., Aita, S. L., & Aita, L. J. (2024). Minority stress in consensually non-monogamous individuals: Mental health implications. *Sexual and Relationship Therapy*, *39*(1), 46-65.

- Brooks, T. R., Shaw, J., Reysen, S., & Henley, T. B. (2022). The vices and virtues of consensual non-monogamy: A relational dimension investigation. *Psychology & Sexuality, 13*(3), 595-609.
- Cabral, S. (2024). *Não Monogamia Consensual Exploração do funcionamento e das dinâmicas destas configurações conjugais através de um estudo de caso* [Consensual Non-monogamy Exploring the functioning and dynamics of these marital configurations through a case study]. [Tese de Mestrado não publicada]. Universidade da Madeira.
- Caillé, P. (1991). Um e um são três: O casal se auto-revela [One and one are three: The couple reveals itself]. Summus Editorial.
- Cardoso, D., Pascoal, P.M. & Maiochi, F.H. (2021) Defining Polyamory: A Thematic Analysis of Lay People’s Definitions. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 50*, 1239–1252. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-021-02002-y>
- Carter, B., & McGoldrick, M. (1995). *As mudanças no ciclo de vida familiar: uma estrutura para a terapia familiar* [Changes in the family life cycle: a framework for family therapy]. Artes Médicas.
- Cherlin, A. J. (2004). The deinstitutionalization of American marriage. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 66*(4), 848–861. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0022-2445.2004.00058.x>
- Cohen, M. T. (2016). An exploratory study of individuals in non-traditional, alternative relationships: How “open” are we?. *Sexuality & Culture, 20*, 295-315.
- Compton, D. L., & Kaufman, G. (2024). Looking beyond marital status: What we can learn from relationship status measures. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 86*(5), 1432-1449.

- Conley, T. D., Moors, A. C., Ziegler, A., & Karathanasis, C. (2012). Unfaithful individuals are less likely to practice safer sex than openly non-monogamous individuals. *The Journal of Sexual Medicine*, *9*, 1559–1565. doi:10.1111/j.1743-6109.2012.02712.x
- Conley, T. D., Moors, A. C., Matsick, J. L., & Ziegler, A. (2013). The fewer the merrier?: Assessing stigma surrounding consensually non-monogamous romantic relationships. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, *13*(1), 1-30.
- Conley, T. D., Matsick, J. L., Moors, A. C., & Ziegler, A. (2017). Investigation of consensually nonmonogamous relationships: Theories, methods, and new directions. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *12*(2), 205-232.
- Cox II, D. W., Fleckenstein, J., & Bergstrand, C. R. (2013). What do polys want? An overview of the 2012 loving more survey. *Loving More Magazine*. Retrieved from <http://www.lovemore.com/polyamory-articles/2012-loving-more-polyamory-survey/>
- DeLamater, J. (2012). Sexual expression in later life: A review and synthesis. *Journal of Sex Research*, *49*, 125-141.
- De Visser, R., & McDonald, D. (2007). Swings and roundabouts: Management of jealousy in heterosexual ‘swinging’ couples. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *46*(2), 459-476.
- Duvall, E. M., & Kerckhoff, R. K. (1958). Implications for education through the family life cycle. *Marriage and family living*, *20*(4), 334-343.
- Eurostat. (2022, May). *Marriage and divorce statistics*. Ec.europa.eu. https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Marriage_and_divorce_statistics

- Emens, E. F. (2003). Monogamy's law: Compulsory monogamy and polyamorous existence. Working Paper No. 58. Chicago: Chicago Law School.
- Emens, E. F. (2004). Monogamy's law: Compulsory monogamy and polyamorous existence. *NYU Review of Law & Social Change*, 29, 277–376.
- Fairbrother, N., Hart, T. A., & Fairbrother, M. (2019). Open relationship prevalence, characteristics, and correlates in a nationally representative sample of Canadian adults. *The Journal of Sex Research*.
- Feeney, B. C., & Collins, N. L. (2015). Thriving through relationships. *Current opinion in psychology*, 1, 22–28. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsy.2014.11.001>
- Finn, Mark & Tunariu, Aneta & Kham, Chaya. (2012). A critical analysis of affirmative therapeutic engagements with consensual non-monogamy. *Sexual and Relationship Therapy*. 27. 1-12. 10.1080/14681994.2012.702893.
- Frank, R. G., & Gertler, P. (1991). Mental health and marital stability. *International journal of Law and Psychiatry*.
- Frank, K. (2013). *Plays well in groups: A journey through the world of group sex*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Füllgrabe, D., Smith, D.S. (2023). “Monogamy? In this Economy?”: Stigma and Resilience in Consensual Non-Monogamous Relationships. *Sexuality & Culture* 27, 1955–1976. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12119-023-10099-7>
- Green, R., & Mitchell, V. (2015). Gay, lesbian, and bisexual issues in couple therapy. In A.S. Gurman & J.L. Lebow (Eds.), *Clinical handbook of couple therapy* (5th ed., pp. 489–511). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Gupta, S., Tarantino, M., & Sanner, C. (2024). A scoping review of research on polyamory and consensual non-monogamy: Implications for a more inclusive

- family science. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 16(2), 151–190. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jftr.12546>
- Gusakova, S., Chin, K., Ascigil, E., Conley, T. D., Chakravarty, D., Neilands, T. B., ... & Darbes, L. A. (2021). Communication patterns among male couples with open and monogamous agreements. *Archives of sexual behavior*, 50, 1419-1431.
- Harviainen, J. T., & Frank, K. (2018). Group sex as play: Rules and transgression in shared non-monogamy. *Games and Culture*, 13(3), 220-239.
- Hauptert, M. L., Moors, A. C., Gesselman, A. N., & Garcia, J. R. (2017). Estimates and correlates of engagement in consensually non-monogamous relationships. *Current Sexual Health Reports*, 9, 155-165.
<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11930-017-0121-6>
- Hangen, F., Crasta, D., & Rogge, R. D. (2020). Delineating the boundaries between nonmonogamy and infidelity: Bringing consent back into definitions of consensual nonmonogamy with latent profile analysis. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 57(4), 438-457.
- Heiden-Rootes, K.M., Meyer, D., McDaniel, K., & Wilson, L. (2019). Couple. In J.L. Lebow, A.L. Chambers, & D.C. Breunlin (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Couple and Family Therapy* (pp. 619–625). Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-49425-8_583
- Hull, K. E., Meier, A., & Ortyl, T. (2010). The Changing Landscape of Love and Marriage. *Contexts (Berkeley, Calif.)*, 9(2), 32–37.
<https://doi.org/10.1525/ctx.2010.9.2.32>

- Hutzler, K. T., Giuliano, T. A., Herselman, J. R., & Johnson, S. M. (2016). Three's a crowd: Public awareness and (mis)perceptions of polyamory. *Psychology & Sexuality* 7(2), 69- 87. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/19419899.2015.1004102>
- ILGA Europe. (2023, May 11). *Rainbow Europe Map and Index 2023 | ILGA-Europe*. ILGA EUROPE. <https://www.ilga-europe.org/report/rainbow-europe-2023/>
- Kenny, R. (2013). A review of the literature on sexual development of older adults in relation to the asexual stereotype of older adults. *Canadian Journal of Family and Youth*, 5(1), 91-106.
- Klesse, C. (2006). Polyamory and its 'others': contesting the terms of non-monogamy. *Sexualities* 9:565. doi: 10.1177/1363460706069986
- Lecuona, O., Suero, M., Wingen, T., & de Rivas, S. (2021). Does “open” rhyme with “special”? Comparing personality, sexual satisfaction, dominance and jealousy of monogamous and non-monogamous practitioners. *Archives of sexual behavior*, 50(4), 1537-1549.
- Machado, L., & Aniceto, R. (2010). Núcleo central e periferia das representações sociais de ciclos de aprendizagem entre professores [Central core and periphery of social representations of learning cycles among teachers]. *Ensaio: Avaliação e Políticas Públicas em Educação*, 18(67), 345-364. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0104-40362010000200009>
- Macmillan, R., & Copher, R. (2005). Families in the Life Course: Interdependency of Roles, Role Configurations, and Pathways. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67(4), 858–879. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2005.00180.x>
- Mays, N., & Pope, C. (2000). Assessing quality in qualitative research. *Education and Debate*, 320(50), 50-52. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.320.7226.50>

- McLean, K. (2013). Negotiating (Non) Monogamy: Bisexuality and Intimate Relationships. In *Current research on bisexuality* (pp. 83-97). Routledge.
- Mogilski, J. K., Memering, S. L., Welling, L. L., & Shackelford, T. K. (2017). Monogamy versus consensual non-monogamy: Alternative approaches to pursuing a strategically pluralistic mating strategy. *Archives of sexual behavior*, *46*, 407-417.
- Mogilski, J. K., Reeve, S. D., Nicolas, S. C., Donaldson, S. H., Mitchell, V. E., & Welling, L. L. (2019). Jealousy, consent, and compersion within monogamous and consensually non-monogamous romantic relationships. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *48*, 1811-1828.
- Moors, A. C., Ryan, W. S., and Chopik, W. J. (2019). Multiple loves: the effects of attachment with multiple concurrent romantic partners on relational functioning. *Pers. Individ. Dif.* *147*, 102–110. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2019.04.023
- Morin, E. (1988). Pour une Reforme de la Pensée. *Cahiers Pédagogiques*, 29-32.
- Moscovici, S. (1988). Notes towards a description of social representations. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *18*(3), 211-250.
- Narciso, I., & Ribeiro, M. T. (2009). *Olhares sobre a conjugalidade* [Views on conjugalality]. Coisas de Ler.
- Philpot, S. P., Duncan, D., Ellard, J., Bavinton, B. R., Grierson, J., & Prestage, G. (2018). Negotiating gay men's relationships: how are monogamy and non-monogamy experienced and practised over time?. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, *20*(8), 915-928.

- Orion, R. (2010). *Unhappily ever after: Examining definitions and treatments of low desire and low-sex relationships*. Dissertation, Saybrook University, San Francisco.
- Orion, R. (2018). *A Therapist's Guide to Consensual Nonmonogamy*. Routledge.
- Raley, R. K., & Sweeney, M. M. (2020). Divorce, Repartnering, and Stepfamilies: A Decade in Review. *Journal of marriage and the family*, 82(1), 81–99.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12651>
- Relvas, A. P. (2006). *O Ciclo Vital da família* [The family's life cycle]. Perspectiva Sistémica. Edições Afrontamento.
- Rodrigues, D., Lopes, D., & Smith, C. V. (2017). Caught in a “bad romance”? Reconsidering the negative association between sociosexuality and relationship functioning. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 54(9), 1118-1127.
- Rubel, A. N., & Bogaert, A. F. (2015). Consensual nonmonogamy: Psychological well-being and relationship quality correlates. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 52(9), 961-982.
- Sá, C. P. (1996). Representações sociais: Teoria e pesquisa do núcleo central [Social representations: core nucleus theory and research]. *Temas em Psicologia*, (3), 19-33.
- Sá, C. P. (1998). *Núcleo central das representações sociais* [Central nucleus of social representations]. Vozes.
- Scherrer, K. S. (2010). “Asexual relationships: what does asexuality have to do with polyamory,” in *Understanding Non-Monogamies*, eds M. Barker and D. Langdrige (New York, NY: Taylor & Francis), 154–159.

- Scoats, R., Joseph, L. J., & Anderson, E. (2018). 'I don't mind watching him cum': Heterosexual men, threesomes, and the erosion of the one-time rule of homosexuality. *Sexualities*, 21(1-2), 30-48.
- Scoats, R., & Anderson, E. (2019). 'My partner was just all over her': jealousy, communication and rules in mixed-sex threesomes. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, 21(2), 134-146.
- Scoats, R. (2019). *Understanding threesomes: Gender, sex, and consensual non-monogamy*. Routledge.
- Scoats, R., & Campbell, C. (2022). What do we know about consensual non-monogamy?. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 48, 101468.
- Scorsolini-Comin, F., & dos Santos, M. A. (2010). Sustentabilidade dos afetos: Notas sobre a conjugalidade como dimensão de análise da família na contemporaneidade. *Psychologica*, (53), 259-274.
https://doi.org/10.14195/1647-8606_53_12
- Sheff, E. (2014, julho 22). 7 Different Kinds of Non-Monogamy. Exploring the wide world of extra-dyadic sexual relationships. *Psychology Today*.
<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/the-polyamorists-nextdoor/201407/7-different-kinds-non-monogamy>
- Sheff, E. (2015). *Polyamorists Next Door: Inside Multiple-Partner Relationships and Families*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Sheff, E. (2016). *When Someone you Love is Polyamorous: Understanding Poly People and Relationships*. Portland, OR: Thorntree Press LLC.
- Stevenson, Betsey, and Justin Wolfers. 2007. "Marriage and Divorce: Changes and their Driving Forces." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 21 (2): 27–52.

- Swindlehurst, S., Sweet, J., & Hoelterhoff, M. (2023). Room for growth: A qualitative study into the therapeutic experiences of consensually non-monogamous clients in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Couple & Relationship Therapy*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15332691.2023.2294856>
- Thomas, A. G., Harrison, S., Mogilski, J. K., Stewart-Williams, S., & Workman, L. (2024). Polygamous Interest in a Mononormative Nation: The Roles of Sex and Sociosexuality in Polygamous Interest in a Heterosexual Sample from the UK. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *53*(2), 611-627.
- Tong, A., Sainsburg, P., & Craig, J. (2007). Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *International Journal for Quality Health Care*, *19*(6), 349-357. <https://doi.org/10.1093/intqhc/mzm042>
- Træen, B., & Thuen, F. (2022). Non-consensual and consensual non-monogamy in Norway. *International Journal of Sexual Health*, *34*(1), 65-80.
- Vaughan, M. D., Jones, P., Taylor, B. A., & Roush, J. (2019). Healthcare experiences and needs of consensually non-monogamous people: Results from a focus group study. *Journal of Sexual Medicine*, *16*(1), 42-51.
- Vèrges, P., Scano, S., & Junique, C. (2002). *Essemble de programmes permettant l'analyse des évocations: Manuel* [Set of programs for evocative analysis: Manual]. Université d'Aix en Provence
- Volgy, S. S., & Everett, C. A. (2014). Systemic Assessment Criteria for Joint Custody. In D. H. Sprenkle (Ed.), *Divorce Therapy*, 85-100. Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.

Wood, J., Desmarais, S., Burleigh, T., & Milhausen, R. (2018). Reasons for sex and relational outcomes in consensually nonmonogamous and monogamous relationships: A self-determination theory approach. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 35*(4), 632-654.

Wood, J., De Santis, C., Desmarais, S., & Milhausen, R. (2021). Motivations for engaging in consensually non-monogamous relationships. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 50*(4), 1253-1272.

Appendixes

Appendix 1. Free Word Association Questionnaire in Portuguese

Questionário de Associação Livre de Palavras

1. Ao pensar no termo **não monogamia consensual***, escreva as primeiras cinco palavras que lhe surgem de imediato, respeitando a ordem pela qual lhe vão surgindo.

***Não monogamia consensual:** termo geral que abrange uma variedade de configurações de relacionamentos onde todos os parceiros envolvidos consentem explicitamente participar de relações românticas, íntimas e/ou sexuais com múltiplas pessoas.

Palavra/expressão breve, por ordem:
1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

Appendix 2. Free Word Association Questionnaire in Spanish

Cuando pienses en el término no monogamia consentida*, escribe las cinco primeras palabras que te vengan inmediatamente a la mente, en el orden en que aparecen.

*No monogamia consentida: término general que abarca una variedad de configuraciones de relaciones en las que todos los miembros de la pareja implicados consienten explícitamente en participar en relaciones románticas, íntimas y/o sexuales con varias personas.

Palabra/expresión corta, por orden:

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

Appendix 3. Sociodemographic Questionnaire in Portuguese

Questionário de dados sociodemográficos

Idade:	
--------	--

Gênero			
Feminino		Masculino	
			Se preferir, autoidentifique-se

Orientação sexual:

- Heterossexual
 Bissexual
 Lésbica
 Gay
 Pansexual
 Outro
 Prefiro não responder

Está ou já esteve envolvido numa não monogamia consensual?	
Sim	Não

Qual a sua área de formação?	
Psicologia	
Medicina	
Enfermagem	
Educação	
Outra (por favor, especifique):	

Tempo de prática profissional (como psicoterapeuta)		
0-5 anos	5-10 anos	10-15 anos
15-20 anos	20-25 anos	25-30 anos
30-35 anos	35-40 anos	+40 anos

Tem experiência no acompanhamento psicoterapêutico de não monogâmias consensuais?	
Sim	Não

Se respondeu "Sim" à questão anterior, com que frequência?	
1-2 casos por ano	
3-4 casos por ano	

5-6 casos por ano	
+ de 6 casos por ano	

Onde fez a sua formação em terapia familiar e de casal/em sexologia clínica/terapia sexual? (pergunta aberta)

Ainda se encontra em fase de formação? (pergunta aberta)

Em que ano se encontra? (pergunta aberta)

Appendix 4. Sociodemographic Questionnaire in Spanish

Cuestionario de datos sociodemográficos

Edad:	
--------------	--

Género			
mujer		hombre	
			Si lo prefiere, autoidentifíquese

Orientación sexual:

- Heterosexual Bisexual Lesbiana Gay
 Pansexual Otro Prefiero no contestar

¿Practica o ha practicado alguna vez la no monogamia consentida?	
Si	No

¿Cuál es su área de formación?	
Psicología	
Medicina	
Enfermería	
Educación	
Otra (especifique):	

Duración de la práctica profesional (como psicoterapeuta)					
0-5 años		5-10 años		10-15 años	
15-20 años		20-25 años		25-30 años	
30-35 años		35-40 años		+40 años	

¿Tiene experiencia en asesoramiento psicoterapéutico para la no monogamia consentida?	
Si	No

Si ha respondido «Si» a la pregunta anterior, ¿con qué frecuencia?	
1-2 casos al año	
3-4 casos al año	

5-6 casos al año	
+ de 6 casos al año	

¿Dónde se formó en terapia familiar y de pareja/sexología clínica/terapia sexual?

(abierta)

¿Sigues formándote? (abierta)

¿En qué año estás? (abierta)

Appendix 5. Approval from UMa's Ethics Committee



PARECER Nº 144/CEUMA/2024, de 17 de outubro

Sobre o pedido de apreciação pela Comissão de Ética da UMa do projeto de investigação: "Abordando a Diversidade Relacional: As representações sociais dos terapeutas familiares e de casal sobre as não monogâmias consensuais"

A – RELATÓRIO

A apreciação do processo referente ao Pedido nº 144 de 2024, respeita ao estudo intitulado: "Abordando a Diversidade Relacional: As representações sociais dos terapeutas familiares e de casal sobre as não monogâmias consensuais", no âmbito do projeto de dissertação do Mestrado, pela aluna Laura Quintal, aluna de mestrado da Faculdade de Artes e Humanidades da Universidade da Madeira, orientada pela Professora Alda Patrícia Marques Portugal, da Faculdade de Artes e Humanidades da Universidade da Madeira

O pedido em análise é constituído pelos seguintes documentos:

- a) Formulário de Pedido de Parecer à CEUMA;
- b) Consentimento Informado, Esclarecido e Livre para Participação em estudos de Investigação;
- c) Curriculum Vitae da investigadora e orientadoras
- d) Parecer favorável emitido pelo Encarregado de Proteção de Dados da Universidade da Madeira;
- e) Declaração da orientadora;

O estudo com **data** prevista de início a 15/10/2024 e de fim a 31/05/25, após aprovação da comissão de ética, tem como **objetivo geral**: "Identificar e compreender as representações sociais dos profissionais de saúde (e.g., terapeutas familiares e de casal, sexólogos, psicólogos) face às não monogâmias consensuais. Especificamente, pretende-se:

- a) identificar as palavras mais referidas e as menos referidas que emergem na consciência dos participantes;
- b) averiguar a existência de diferenças na utilização das palavras em função de experiência de atendimento psicoterapêutico a pessoas em não monogâmias consensuais.", sendo a **população alvo**: "Profissionais de saúde que intervêm com famílias, mais especificamente terapeutas familiares de casal e sexólogos", com **recrutamento**, por divulgação nas redes pessoais e sociais da equipa de investigação, participando apenas os profissionais que se voluntariem para o efeito e após darem o seu consentimento informado. O **tipo de estudo** é uma investigação qualitativa, os dados serão recolhidos através de um questionário de associação livre de palavras, fundamentado na Teoria do Núcleo Central de Abrie (1993). Trata-se de uma ferramenta que permite aceder de forma espontânea aos termos latentes relacionados com o objeto em estudo (neste caso as NMC). Ao instruir os participantes a mencionar as primeiras cinco palavras que lhes vêm à consciência quando pensam em NMC, pode compreender-se como é que estes organizam o seu conteúdo cognitivo e estabelecem conexões sobre o tema. E através de um questionário sociodemográfico que permita recolher informação sobre género, idade, tempo de prática profissional e se já tem experiência no acompanhamento psicoterapêutico de não monogâmias consensuais e com que frequência".

O estudo visa "contribuir para uma maior compreensão da problemática e promover estratégias de intervenção adequadas.", declarando a investigadora não existir qualquer **conflito de interesses** na realização do estudo, não estando previstos quaisquer tipo de **financiamento ou encargos monetários**.



A **participação** é voluntária com possibilidade de desistir em qualquer altura. “A informação recolhida será utilizada apenas para o propósito do estudo e não será recolhida para outros fins. Nenhuma informação pessoal será tornada pública ou cedida a terceiros. Não especifica onde são guardados os dados. Neste projeto serão implementados procedimentos de anonimização de dados para proteger os dados pessoais cumprindo as leis do Regulamento Geral de Proteção de Dados”. O **consentimento informado**, esclarecido e livre para participação em estudos de investigação seguiu a minuta da Universidade da Madeira, e tem o parecer positivo do **Encarregado de Proteção de Dados**

Os participantes são informados das especificidades no início do questionário e é-lhes fornecido os endereços eletrónicos dos investigadores, para esclarecimentos ou informações adicionais.

A equipa não **recolhe** dados de pessoas vulneráveis, é garantida a confidencialidade dos dados recolhidos, que apenas serão consultados pelos investigadores envolvidos no estudo e eliminados. Não especifica o tempo de guarda e a forma de destruição.

A **divulgação** dos dados será através da apresentação e defesa da dissertação de mestrado, publicação de artigos/comunicações científicas nacionais e internacionais assim como eventos científicos

B – CONCLUSÃO

Analizados todos os documentos apenas a este processo e ponderando os dados indicados pelos requerentes à luz dos critérios previstos na regulamentação da CEUMa, esta Comissão deliberou emitir **parecer favorável, com recomendações** para especificar o local e o tempo de guarda dos dados e a forma de destruição.

Parecer elaborado por Luis Filipe Fernandes

Funchal e Universidade da Madeira, 17 de outubro de 2024

A Presidente da CEUMa

Professora Doutora Liliana Rodrigues de Góis

Appendix 6. Portuguese Version of the Informed Consent

Convite à participação no estudo:

Abordando a Diversidade Relacional: As representações sociais dos terapeutas familiares e de casal sobre as não monogâmias consensuais

Qual é o objetivo do estudo?

Compreender as representações sociais dos terapeutas familiares e de casal face às Não Monogâmias Consensuais (NMC). As NMC dizem respeito a uma variedade de configurações de relacionamentos onde todos os parceiros envolvidos consentem explicitamente participar de relações românticas, íntimas e/ou sexuais com múltiplos/as parceiros/as.

Quem pode participar?

Pode colaborar com este estudo se for terapeuta sexual, familiar ou de casal que: (a) domine a língua portuguesa, (b) tenha uma formação acreditada pelas sociedades/escolas de terapia familiar ou que esteja em formação numa das mesmas.

Como posso participar?

A sua participação é voluntária. Para participar terá apenas de responder a um breve questionário (tempo médio de preenchimento: 3 minutos). Note que não existem respostas certas ou erradas; o importante é que as suas respostas exprimam o que lhe vem imediatamente à cabeça. Gostaríamos de lhe pedir que respondesse à totalidade do questionário para que as suas respostas possam ser consideradas válidas.

Como é tratada a confidencialidade dos dados é garantida?

A confidencialidade dos seus dados é totalmente garantida. As suas respostas serão tratadas em termos coletivos para efeitos de investigação e serão eliminadas assim que a investigação for concluída. Este estudo foi apreciado e aprovado pela Comissão de Ética da Universidade da Madeira.

Se desejar colocar alguma questão sobre o estudo quem posso contactar?

Pode entrar em contacto com a equipa de investigação através dos e-mails 2068723@student.uma.pt e alda.portugal@staff.uma.pt.

CONSENTIMENTO INFORMADO

Se aceitar participar neste projeto de investigação, por favor coloque um X no quadrado abaixo:

Tomei conhecimento dos objetivos deste estudo e aceito participar voluntariamente no mesmo.

A equipa de investigação:

Lara Quintal (Estudante de Mestrado em Psicologia Clínica, da Saúde e Bem-Estar da Universidade da Madeira)

Alda Portugal (Professora na Faculdade de Artes e Humanidades da Universidade da Madeira; Investigadora do Centro de Estudos Sociais, Universidade de Coimbra)

Appendix 7. Spanish Version of the Informed Consent

Invitación a participar en el estudio:

Abordar la diversidad relacional: representaciones sociales de los terapeutas familiares y de pareja y sexólogos sobre la no monogamia consentida.

¿Cuál es el objetivo del estudio?

Comprender las representaciones sociales de los terapeutas familiares y de pareja sobre la no monogamia consensual (NMC). La NMC se refiere a una variedad de configuraciones de relaciones en las que todos los miembros de la pareja implicados consienten explícitamente en participar en relaciones románticas, íntimas y/o sexuales con múltiples parejas.

¿Quién puede participar?

Puede participar en este estudio si es sexólogo, terapeuta sexual, terapeuta familiar o terapeuta de pareja que: (a) habla portugués, (b) tiene formación acreditada por sociedades/escuelas de terapia familiar o está en formación en una de ellas.

¿Cómo puedo participar?

Su participación es voluntaria, anónima y confidencial. Todo lo que tiene que hacer para participar es responder a un breve cuestionario (tiempo medio de respuesta: 3 minutos). Tenga en cuenta que no hay respuestas correctas o incorrectas; lo importante es que sus respuestas expresen lo que le viene inmediatamente a la mente. Le rogamos que complete todo el cuestionario para que sus respuestas puedan considerarse válidas.

¿Cómo se garantiza la confidencialidad de sus datos?

La confidencialidad y el anonimato de sus datos están plenamente garantizados. Sus respuestas se tratarán de forma colectiva con fines de investigación y se eliminarán una vez finalizada la investigación. Este estudio ha sido analizado y aprobado por el Comité de Ética de la Universidad de Madeira.

¿Con quién puedo ponerme en contacto si tengo alguna pregunta sobre el estudio?

Puede ponerse en contacto con el equipo de investigación en 2068723@student.uma.pt y alda.portugal@staff.uma.pt.

CONSENTIMIENTO INFORMADO

Si está de acuerdo en participar en este proyecto de investigación, marque con una X la casilla siguiente:

He tenido conocimiento de los objetivos de este estudio y acepto participar voluntariamente.

El equipo de investigación:

Lara Quintal (estudiante del Máster en Psicología Clínica, de la Salud y del Bienestar de la Universidad de Madeira)

Alda Portugal (Profesora de la Facultad de Letras y Humanidades de la Universidad de Madeira; Investigadora del Centro de Estudios Sociales de la Universidad de Coimbra)

José Alberto (Profesor de la Facultad de Letras y Humanidades de la Universidad de Madeira)

Appendix 8. Categories of the Portuguese Sample

Liberdade	Liberdade
	Escolha
	Liberal
	Direito
	Opção
	Liberdade sexual
	Liberdade afetiva

Diversidade Relacional	Poliamor
	Relação
	Relação aberta
	Poligamia
	Bigamia
	Relações abertas
	Relações
	Modelo próprio
	Relações múltiplas
	Relacionamento
	Menage
	Trois
	Swing
	Orgia
	Não exclusividade
	Família
	Casais
	Diversidade
Variedade	

Sentimentos Positivos	Amor
	Respeito
	Confiança
	Compromisso
	Admiração
	Ternura
	Segurança
	Seguro
	Honestidade
	Lealdade
	Afeto
	Afecto
	Concordância
	Não julgamento
	Transparência
	Sem qualquer julgamento
	Partilha
	Normalidade
	"compersion"
	Autenticidade
	Satisfação
	Dedicação
	Aceitação
	Aceitação social
	Concordância
	Plenitude
	Legítimo
	Tudo ok
	Tolerância
	Companheirismo
	Altruismo
	Normalidade
	Sinceridade
	Amizade
	Sentimento
	Parceria
	Recíproco
	Responsabilidade emocional
	Vulnerabilidade
	Realização
	Interessante
Coragem	
Vínculo	
Apego	
Complementaridade	

Infidelidade	Infidelidade
	Traição
	(in)fideliidade
	Promiscuo
	Promiscuidade

Sexualidade	Prazer
	Sexo
	Sexualidade
	Excitação
	Erótico
	Sexo em grupo
	Proteção contra IST's
	Desejo
	Mundo sexual
	Prazer sexual
	Intimidade
	Sedução
	Sexual
	Erótico
	Natureza
Mamíferos	

Sentimentos negativos	Ciúme
	Ciumes
	Ciúmes
	Frustração
	Ansiedade
	Insegurança
	Tristeza
	Dor
	Risco
	Riscos
	Superficial
	Imaturidade
	Desconforto
	Desgaste
	Estranho
	Distância
	Dificuldade em estabelecer compromissos
	Filhinha do papá
	Filhinho da mamã
	Desequilíbrio
Teceio (receio)	
Desligamento	
Desapego	
Despreendimento	

Confuso	Confusão
	Incerteza
	Desordem
	Limites difusos

Imoralidade	Imoralidade
	Nojo
	Configurações fora do que é natural
	Degradação
	Provocador
Vergonhoso	

Negociação	Comunicação
	Acordo
	Negociação
	Contrato
	Regras
	Regra
	Limites
	Regras/limites
	Entendimento
	Comunicação clara
	Decisão
	Ética
	Rutina
	Ordem
	Necessidades
	Construção
	Flexibilidade
	Fidelidade
Veracidade	
Exclusividade	
Papeis	

Violência	Violência
	Violação
	Agressão
	Maus tratos
	Abuso

Atualidade	Jovens
	Atualidade
	Sociedades pós-modernas
	Modernidade
	Mudança de paradigma
	Mudança
	Recente
	Novidade
	novas famílias
	Hobbies

Pouco conhecimento	Pouco conhecimento
	Necessidade de aprender
	Duvidas
	Dificuldade em elaborar
	Desconhecido

Abertura à experiência	Experiências
	Experiência
	Vivências
	Exploração de novas sensações
	Explorar novas experiências
	Abertura à experiência
	Explorar novas experiências
	Novas sensações
	Aventura
	Exploração de coisas novas
	Viver rápido
	Descoberta
	Abertura
	Ousadia
	Criatividade
	Horror à monotonia
	Curiosidade
Abertura	
Abertura à mudança	

Múltiplos parceiros	Vários parceiros (3x)
	Vários (1x)
	Multiparceiros (1x)
	Multi parceiro (1x)
	Pluralidade no amor
	Plural
	Numerosa
	Muitos parceiros
	Harém
	Dois
	Múltiplos
	Multiplos
	Multiplicidade

Diferente	Diferente
	Diferença
	Outro mundo
	Irreverente
	Outro
	Único

Individualidade	Individualidade
	Individualismo
	Autoconsciência
	Escolha individual
	Auto- confiança
	Pessoal

Comunidade e Cultura	Sociedades matriarcais/patriarcais
	Comunidade
	Cultura
	Pessoas
	Aldeia
	Interações
	Casal
	Casamento

Complexo	Difícil
	Complexidade
	Dificuldades

Desafio	Desafio
	Desafiador
	Exigência
	Crise

Consentimento	Prazer consensual
	Consenso
	Consentimento de todas as partes
	Consentimento
	Consensual

Appendix 9. Categories of the Spanish Sample

Libertad	Libertad
	Libres
	Liberal
	Derecho
	Elección

Sentimientos positivos	Compromiso
	Respeto
	Aceptación
	Confianza
	Amor
	Afectividad
	Respeto
	Apertura
	Apertura
	Valentía
	Tolerancia
	Responsabilidad
	Sinceridad
	Valor
	Seguridad
	Aceptación
	Aceptable
	Madurez
	Diversión
	Satisfacción
	Honestidad
	Convivencia
	Es posible
	Complicidad
	Asertividad
	Integración
	Tolerante
	Utópico
	Juicio
	Compartir
	Vinculación
Apego	
Transparencia	

Diversidad relacional	Relación abierta
	Compenetración
	Variedad
	Poliamor
	Diversidad
	Poligamia
	Bigamia
	Anarquía relacional
	Pareja abierta
	Abierta
	Intercambio parejas
	Poliafectividad
	Trio
	No exclusividad
	No exclusividad en el enamoramiento
	No exclusividad pareja
	Relación
	Relaciones
	Teoría queer
	Gays
	Amplitud
	Varias
	Varias parejas
Múltiples	

Actualidad	Actual
	Moda
	Novedad
	Progreso
	Modernidad
	Transformación social
	Actualidad
	Moda pasajera
	Tiempo
	Moderno
	Temporal
	Incremento

Comunicación/negociación	Comunicación
	Comunicación
	Acuerdo
	Negociación
	Pactos
	Limites
	Cambios
	Cambio
	Diálogo
	Pactos
	Contrato
	Acordada
	Acuerdos
	Gestión
	Pacto
	Poder
	Relaciones de poder
	Ética
Fidelidad	
Flexibilidad	
esfuerzo	

Consentimiento	Concenso
	Consentimiento

Diferente	Diferencia
	No normativo
	Alternativa
	Inusual
	Excéntrico
	Diferentes
	Diferente

Sexualidad	Sexo (6x)
	Placer
	Orgia
	Sexualidad
	Intimidad

Complejidad	Complejidad (
	Complejo
	Complejidad
	Difícil
	sintomatología – funcionalidad
	Difuso
	Dificultad

Confusión	Confusion
	Confusión
	Caos
	Ambiguo
	Dudas
	Desconocimiento

Infidelidad	Infidelidad
	Engaño
	Chifladura

Individualidad	Individualismo
	Necesidad individual
	Mimi (es una persona concreta)
	Exploración individual

Comunidad y Cultura	Red
	Comuna
	Hipie
	Secta
	Negacionistas
	Grupo
	Sociedad
	Común
	Frecuente
	Pareja
	Relación de pareja

Sentimientos negativos	Celos
	Superficialidad
	Soledad
	Locura
	Problemas
	Cara dura
	Malo para las mujeres
	Parodia
	Riesgo
	Evitación
	Complicación
	Conflictos
	Conflicto
	Disfuncionalidad
	montaña rusa emocional
	Miedo
	Inseguridad
	Daño
	Fragilidad
	Desorientación
	Desequilibrio
	Dolor
	Desventaja
	Inestabilidad,
	Implicación
	Transgresión
	Mentira
	Falso
	Muerte
	Suicidio
	Ilusión
	Dependencia
	Arriego
	Abuso
	Falta de compromiso
	No compromiso
	Corta duración
	Objetivos ocultos.
	Ética promiscua
	Inasumible
	Basura
Apego y trauma	
Seguridad afectiva versus sufrimiento	
Ruptura	
Divorcio	
Resignación	

Appendix 10. EVOC Outputs from the Portuguese Sample

fichier initial : C:\Users\larai\OneDrive\Ambiente de Trabalho\ficheiro excel
 pt certo\EXPERIENCIA 6 COLUNAS NUM.Tm2
 NOUS ALLONS RECHERCHER LES RANGS
 Nous avons en entree le fichier : C:\Users\larai\OneDrive\Ambiente de
 Trabalho\ficheiro excel pt certo\EXPERIENCIA 6 COLUNAS NUM.Tm2
 ON CREE LE FICHER : C:\Users\larai\OneDrive\Ambiente de Trabalho\ficheiro
 excel pt certo\EXPERIENCIA 6 COLUNAS NUM.dis et C:\Users\larai\OneDrive\Ambiente
 de Trabalho\ficheiro excel pt certo\EXPERIENCIA 6 COLUNAS NUM.tm3

ENSEMBLE DES MOTS	RANGS					
	:FREQ.:	1 *	2 *	3 *	4 *	5 *
abertura-a-experiencia	: 25 :	3*	6*	5*	7*	4*
moyenne : 3.12						
atualidade	: 11 :	1*	3*	1*	2*	4*
moyenne : 3.45						
complexo	: 6 :	0*	0*	3*	1*	2*
moyenne : 3.83						
comunidade-e-cultura	: 9 :	1*	0*	4*	2*	2*
moyenne : 3.44						
confuso	: 6 :	3*	1*	1*	0*	1*
moyenne : 2.17						
consentimento	: 13 :	2*	5*	4*	1*	1*
moyenne : 2.54						
desafio	: 11 :	1*	1*	3*	1*	5*
moyenne : 3.73						
diferente	: 9 :	7*	0*	0*	2*	
moyenne : 1.67						
diversidade-relacional	: 66 :	25*	15*	15*	6*	5*
moyenne : 2.26						
imoralidade	: 6 :	0*	1*	3*	1*	1*
moyenne : 3.33						
individualidade	: 7 :	1*	0*	1*	1*	4*
moyenne : 4.00						
infidelidade	: 12 :	4*	0*	2*	3*	3*
moyenne : 3.08						
liberdade	: 40 :	12*	8*	9*	7*	4*
moyenne : 2.58						
multiplos-parceiros	: 15 :	3*	3*	1*	4*	4*
moyenne : 3.20						
negociacao	: 60 :	10*	13*	12*	18*	7*
moyenne : 2.98						
pouco-conhecimento	: 6 :	1*	1*	0*	2*	2*
moyenne : 3.50						
sentimentos-negativos	: 28 :	0*	4*	6*	7*	11*
moyenne : 3.89						
sentimentos-positivos	: 98 :	13*	27*	13*	19*	26*
moyenne : 3.18						
sexualidade	: 22 :	3*	2*	7*	6*	4*
moyenne : 3.27						
violencia	: 5 :	1*	1*	1*	1*	1*
moyenne : 3.00						

DISTRIBUTION TOTALE : 455 : 91* 91* 91* 91* 91*
RANGS 6 ... 15 0* 0* 0* 0* 0* 0* 0* 0* 0* 0*
RANGS 16 ... 25 0* 0* 0* 0* 0* 0* 0* 0* 0* 0*
RANGS 26 ... 30 0* 0* 0* 0* 0*

Nombre total de mots differents : 20

Nombre total de mots cites : 455

moyenne generale des rangs : 3.00

DISTRIBUTION DES FREQUENCES

freq. *	nb. mots	* Cumul evocations	et cumul inverse
5 *	1	5	1.1 % 455 100.0 %
6 *	4	29	6.4 % 450 98.9 %
7 *	1	36	7.9 % 426 93.6 %
9 *	2	54	11.9 % 419 92.1 %
11 *	2	76	16.7 % 401 88.1 %
12 *	1	88	19.3 % 379 83.3 %
13 *	1	101	22.2 % 367 80.7 %
15 *	1	116	25.5 % 354 77.8 %
22 *	1	138	30.3 % 339 74.5 %
25 *	1	163	35.8 % 317 69.7 %
28 *	1	191	42.0 % 292 64.2 %
40 *	1	231	50.8 % 264 58.0 %
60 *	1	291	64.0 % 224 49.2 %
66 *	1	357	78.5 % 164 36.0 %
98 *	1	455	100.0 % 98 21.5 %

Les 3 colonnes correspondent respectivement :
 au Mot
 à sa Fréquence
 à son Rang Moyen

Le Fréquence minimale des mots est 5

Cas ou la Fréquence >= 10
 et
 le Rang Moyen < 2,6

consentimento	13	2,538
diversidade-relacional	66	2,258
liberdade	40	2,575

Cas ou la Fréquence >= 10
 et
 le Rang Moyen >= 2,6

abertura-a-experiencia	25	3,120
atualidade	11	3,455
desafio	11	3,727
infidelidade	12	3,083
multiplos-parceiros	15	3,200
negociacao	60	2,983
sentimentos-negativos	27	3,889
sentimentos-positivos	98	3,184
sexualidade	22	3,273

Cas ou la Fréquence < 10
 et
 le Rang Moyen < 2,6

confuso	6	2,167
diferente	9	1,667

Cas ou la Fréquence < 10
 et
 le Rang Moyen >= 2,6

complexo	6	3,833
comunidade-e-cultura	9	3,444
imoralidade	6	3,333
individualidade	7	4,000
pouco-conhecimento	6	3,500
violencia	5	3,000

Appendix 11. EVOC Outputs from the Spanish Sample

fichier initial : C:\Users\larai\OneDrive\Ambiente de Trabalho\SUBS ES.Tm2
 NOUS ALLONS RECHERCHER LES RANGS
 Nous avons en entree le fichier : C:\Users\larai\OneDrive\Ambiente de Trabalho\SUBS ES.Tm2
 ON CREE LE FICHIER : C:\Users\larai\OneDrive\Ambiente de Trabalho\SUBS ES.dis
 et C:\Users\larai\OneDrive\Ambiente de Trabalho\SUBS ES.tm3

ENSEMBLE DES MOTS	RANGS					
	:FREQ.:	1 *	2 *	3 *	4 *	5 *
actualidad	: 12 :	1*	1*	2*	4*	4*
moyenne : 3.75						
complejidad	: 22 :	9*	3*	4*	2*	4*
moyenne : 2.50						
comunidad-y-cultura	: 12 :	1*	2*	2*	4*	3*
moyenne : 3.50						
confusion	: 9 :	0*	1*	2*	3*	3*
moyenne : 3.89						
consentimiento	: 6 :	1*	1*	3*	0*	1*
moyenne : 2.83						
diferente	: 8 :	0*	1*	2*	1*	4*
moyenne : 4.00						
diversidad-relacional	: 48 :	18*	14*	7*	3*	6*
moyenne : 2.27						
individualidad	: 4 :	0*	1*	2*	1*	
infidelidad	: 5 :	3*	1*	0*	0*	1*
moyenne : 2.00						
libertad	: 32 :	16*	5*	4*	4*	3*
moyenne : 2.16						
negociacion	: 30 :	5*	7*	7*	7*	4*
moyenne : 2.93						
sentimientos-negativos	: 53 :	3*	9*	14*	15*	12*
moyenne : 3.45						
sentimientos-positivos	: 64 :	7*	14*	11*	18*	14*
moyenne : 3.28						
sexualidad	: 14 :	1*	5*	4*	1*	3*
moyenne : 3.00						
DISTRIBUTION TOTALE	: 319 :	65*	65*	64*	63*	62*
RANGS 6 ... 15	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*
RANGS 16 ... 25	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*
RANGS 26 ... 30	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*
Nombre total de mots differents	: 14					
Nombre total de mots cites	: 319					
moyenne generale des rangs	: 2.97					
DISTRIBUTION DES FREQUENCES						
freq. * nb. mots * Cumul evocations et cumul inverse						

4 *	1	4	1.3 %	319	100.0 %
5 *	1	9	2.8 %	315	98.7 %
6 *	1	15	4.7 %	310	97.2 %
8 *	1	23	7.2 %	304	95.3 %
9 *	1	32	10.0 %	296	92.8 %
12 *	2	56	17.6 %	287	90.0 %
14 *	1	70	21.9 %	263	82.4 %
22 *	1	92	28.8 %	249	78.1 %
30 *	1	122	38.2 %	227	71.2 %
32 *	1	154	48.3 %	197	61.8 %
48 *	1	202	63.3 %	165	51.7 %
53 *	1	255	79.9 %	117	36.7 %
64 *	1	319	100.0 %	64	20.1 %

Les 3 colonnes correspondent respectivement :
 au Mot
 à sa Fréquence
 à son Rang Moyen

Le Fréquence minimale des mots est 5

Cas ou la Fréquence >= 10
 et
 le Rang Moyen < 2,6

complejidad	22	2,500
diversidad-relacional	48	2,271
libertad	32	2,156

Cas ou la Fréquence >= 10
 et
 le Rang Moyen >= 2,6

actualidad	12	3,750
comunidad-y-cultura	12	3,500
negociacion	30	2,933
sentimientos-negativos	53	3,453
sentimientos-positivos	64	3,281
sexualidad	14	3,000

Cas ou la Fréquence < 10
 et
 le Rang Moyen < 2,6

infidelidad	5	2,000
-------------	---	-------

Cas ou la Fréquence < 10
 et
 le Rang Moyen >= 2,6

confusion	9	3,889
consentimiento	6	2,833
diferente	8	4,000

Appendix 12. EVOC Outputs from the Portuguese Sample With Experience in Supporting Clients in CNM

fichier initial : C:\Users\larai\OneDrive\Ambiente de Trabalho\PT NMC Sim.Tm2
 NOUS ALLONS RECHERCHER LES RANGS
 Nous avons en entree le fichier : C:\Users\larai\OneDrive\Ambiente de Trabalho\PT NMC Sim.Tm2
 ON CREE LE FICHER : C:\Users\larai\OneDrive\Ambiente de Trabalho\PT NMC Sim.dis et C:\Users\larai\OneDrive\Ambiente de Trabalho\PT NMC Sim.tm3

ENSEMBLE DES MOTS	RANGS					
	:FREQ.:	1 *	2 *	3 *	4 *	5 *
abertura-a-experiencia	: 13 :	2*	1*	2*	5*	3*
moyenne : 3.46						
atualidade	: 6 :	0*	2*	1*	0*	3*
moyenne : 3.67						
complexo	: 2 :	0*	0*	1*	0*	1*
moyenne : 4.00						
comunidade-e-cultura	: 2 :	0*	0*	1*	1*	
moyenne : 3.50						
confuso	: 1 :	1*				
moyenne : 1.00						
consentimento	: 5 :	0*	2*	2*	0*	1*
moyenne : 3.00						
desafio	: 4 :	0*	0*	2*	1*	1*
moyenne : 3.75						
diferente	: 4 :	3*	0*	0*	1*	
moyenne : 1.75						
diversidade-relacional	: 16 :	5*	6*	3*	1*	1*
moyenne : 2.19						
individualidade	: 2 :	0*	0*	1*	0*	1*
moyenne : 4.00						
infidelidade	: 3 :	1*	0*	1*	1*	
moyenne : 2.67						
liberdade	: 19 :	4*	4*	5*	4*	2*
moyenne : 2.79						
multiplos-parceiros	: 4 :	2*	0*	0*	0*	2*
moyenne : 3.00						
negociacao	: 26 :	5*	6*	3*	9*	3*
moyenne : 2.96						
sentimentos-negativos	: 6 :	0*	0*	4*	0*	2*
moyenne : 3.67						
sentimentos-positivos	: 35 :	7*	10*	3*	6*	9*
moyenne : 3.00						
sexualidade	: 7 :	1*	0*	2*	2*	2*
moyenne : 3.57						
violencia	: 5 :	1*	1*	1*	1*	1*
moyenne : 3.00						
 DISTRIBUTION TOTALE	 : 160 :	 32*	 32*	 32*	 32*	 32*
RANGS 6 ... 15	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*
RANGS 16 ... 25	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*
RANGS 26 ... 30	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*

Nombre total de mots differents : 18
 Nombre total de mots cites : 160

moyenne generale des rangs : 3.00

DISTRIBUTION DES FREQUENCES

freq. *	nb. mots	* Cumul	evocations et	cumul inverse
1 *	1	1	0.6 %	160 100.0 %
2 *	3	7	4.4 %	159 99.4 %
3 *	1	10	6.3 %	153 95.6 %
4 *	3	22	13.8 %	150 93.8 %
5 *	2	32	20.0 %	138 86.3 %
6 *	2	44	27.5 %	128 80.0 %
7 *	1	51	31.9 %	116 72.5 %
13 *	1	64	40.0 %	109 68.1 %
16 *	1	80	50.0 %	96 60.0 %
19 *	1	99	61.9 %	80 50.0 %
26 *	1	125	78.1 %	61 38.1 %
35 *	1	160	100.0 %	35 21.9 %

Les 3 colonnes correspondent respectivement :
 au Mot
 à sa Fréquence
 à son Rang Moyen

Le Fréquence minimale des mots est 1

Cas ou la Fréquence >= 5
 et
 le Rang Moyen < 2,6

diversidade-relacional	16	2,188
------------------------	----	-------

Cas ou la Fréquence >= 5
 et
 le Rang Moyen >= 2,6

abertura-a-experiencia	13	3,462
atualidade	6	3,667
consentimento	5	3,000
liberdade	19	2,789
negociacao	26	2,962
sentimentos-negativos	6	3,667
sentimentos-positivos	35	3,000
sexualidade	7	3,571
violencia	5	3,000

Cas ou la Fréquence < 5
 et
 le Rang Moyen < 2,6

confuso	1	1,000
diferente	4	1,750

Cas ou la Fréquence < 5
 et
 le Rang Moyen >= 2,6

complexo	2	4,000
comunidade-e-cultura	2	3,500
desafio	4	3,750
individualidade	2	4,000
infidelidade	3	2,667
multiplos-parceiros	4	3,000

Appendix 13. EVOC Outputs from the Spanish Sample With Experience in Supporting Clients in CNM

fichier initial : C:\Users\larai\OneDrive\Ambiente de Trabalho\SUBS ES SIM.Tm2
 NOUS ALLONS RECHERCHER LES RANGS
 Nous avons en entree le fichier : C:\Users\larai\OneDrive\Ambiente de Trabalho\SUBS ES SIM.Tm2
 ON CREE LE FICHER : C:\Users\larai\OneDrive\Ambiente de Trabalho\SUBS ES SIM.dis et C:\Users\larai\OneDrive\Ambiente de Trabalho\SUBS ES SIM.tm3

ENSEMBLE DES MOTS	RANGS
	:FREQ.: 1 * 2 * 3 * 4 * 5 *
actualidad	: 3 : 0* 1* 0* 2*
moyenne : 3.33	
complejidad	: 6 : 2* 1* 1* 1* 1*
moyenne : 2.67	
comunidad-y-cultura	: 3 : 0* 0* 1* 1* 1*
moyenne : 4.00	
confusion	: 3 : 0* 0* 1* 1* 1*
moyenne : 4.00	
diferente	: 2 : 0* 0* 1* 0* 1*
moyenne : 4.00	
diversidad-relacional	: 7 : 4* 1* 0* 1* 1*
moyenne : 2.14	
individualidad	: 2 : 0* 1* 1*
moyenne : 2.50	
infidelidad	: 1 : 1*
moyenne : 1.00	
libertad	: 11 : 6* 3* 1* 0* 1*
moyenne : 1.82	
negociacion	: 3 : 0* 1* 1* 1*
moyenne : 3.00	
sentimientos-negativos	: 16 : 1* 4* 3* 3* 5*
moyenne : 3.44	
sentimientos-positivos	: 20 : 1* 3* 5* 6* 5*
moyenne : 3.55	
sexualidad	: 3 : 1* 1* 1*
moyenne : 2.00	

DISTRIBUTION TOTALE	: 80 :	16*	16*	16*	16*	16*
RANGS 6 ... 15	0* 0*	0*	0*	0*	0*	0* 0* 0*
RANGS 16 ... 25	0* 0*	0*	0*	0*	0*	0* 0* 0*
RANGS 26 ... 30	0* 0*	0*	0*	0*		

Nombre total de mots differents : 13
 Nombre total de mots cites : 80

moyenne generale des rangs : 3.00

DISTRIBUTION DES FREQUENCES

freq. *	nb. mots *	Cumul evocations	et cumul inverse
1 *	1	1	1.3 % 80 100.0 %
2 *	2	5	6.3 % 79 98.8 %

3 *	5	20	25.0 %	75	93.8 %
6 *	1	26	32.5 %	60	75.0 %
7 *	1	33	41.3 %	54	67.5 %
11 *	1	44	55.0 %	47	58.8 %
16 *	1	60	75.0 %	36	45.0 %
20 *	1	80	100.0 %	20	25.0 %

Les 3 colonnes correspondent respectivement :
 au Mot
 à sa Fréquence
 à son Rang Moyen

Le Fréquence minimale des mots est 1

Cas ou la Fréquence >= 5
 et
 le Rang Moyen < 2,6

diversidad-relacional	7	2,143
libertad	11	1,818

Cas ou la Fréquence >= 5
 et
 le Rang Moyen >= 2,6

complejidad	6	2,667
sentimientos-negativos	16	3,438
sentimientos-positivos	20	3,550

Cas ou la Fréquence < 5
 et
 le Rang Moyen < 2,6

individualidad	2	2,500
infidelidad	1	1,000
sexualidad	3	2,000

Cas ou la Fréquence < 5
 et
 le Rang Moyen >= 2,6

actualidad	3	3,333
comunidad-y-cultura	3	4,000
confusion	3	4,000
diferente	2	4,000
negociacion	3	3,000

Appendix 14. EVOC Outputs from the Portuguese Sample Without Experience in Supporting Clients in CNM

fichier initial : C:\Users\larai\OneDrive\Ambiente de Trabalho\PT NMC NÃO.Tm2
 NOUS ALLONS RECHERCHER LES RANGS
 Nous avons en entree le fichier : C:\Users\larai\OneDrive\Ambiente de Trabalho\PT NMC NÃO.Tm2
 ON CREE LE FICHER : C:\Users\larai\OneDrive\Ambiente de Trabalho\PT NMC NÃO.dis et C:\Users\larai\OneDrive\Ambiente de Trabalho\PT NMC NÃO.tm3

ENSEMBLE DES MOTS	RANGS					
	:FREQ.:	1 *	2 *	3 *	4 *	5 *
abertura-a-experiencia	: 12 :	1*	5*	3*	2*	1*
moyenne : 2.75						
atualidade	: 5 :	1*	1*	0*	2*	1*
moyenne : 3.20						
complexo	: 4 :	0*	0*	2*	1*	1*
moyenne : 3.75						
comunidade-e-cultura	: 7 :	1*	0*	3*	1*	2*
moyenne : 3.43						
confuso	: 5 :	2*	1*	1*	0*	1*
moyenne : 2.40						
consentimento	: 8 :	2*	3*	2*	1*	
moyenne : 2.25						
desafio	: 7 :	1*	1*	1*	0*	4*
moyenne : 3.71						
diferente	: 5 :	4*	0*	0*	1*	
moyenne : 1.60						
diversidade-relacional	: 50 :	20*	9*	12*	5*	4*
moyenne : 2.28						
imoralidade	: 6 :	0*	1*	3*	1*	1*
moyenne : 3.33						
individualidade	: 5 :	1*	0*	0*	1*	3*
moyenne : 4.00						
infidelidade	: 9 :	3*	0*	1*	2*	3*
moyenne : 3.22						
liberdade	: 21 :	8*	4*	4*	3*	2*
moyenne : 2.38						
multiplos-parceiros	: 11 :	1*	3*	1*	4*	2*
moyenne : 3.27						
negociacao	: 34 :	5*	7*	9*	9*	4*
moyenne : 3.00						
pouco-conhecimento	: 6 :	1*	1*	0*	2*	2*
moyenne : 3.50						
sentimentos-negativos	: 22 :	0*	4*	2*	7*	9*
moyenne : 3.95						
sentimentos-positivos	: 63 :	6*	17*	10*	13*	17*
moyenne : 3.29						
sexualidade	: 15 :	2*	2*	5*	4*	2*
moyenne : 3.13						
 DISTRIBUTION TOTALE	 : 295 :	 59*	 59*	 59*	 59*	 59*
RANGS 6 ... 15	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*
RANGS 16 ... 25	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*

RANGS 26 ... 30 0* 0* 0* 0* 0*

Nombre total de mots differents : 19

Nombre total de mots cites : 295

moyenne generale des rangs : 3.00

DISTRIBUTION DES FREQUENCES

freq. *	nb. mots	* Cumul evocations	et cumul inverse		
4 *	1	4	1.4 %	295	100.0 %
5 *	4	24	8.1 %	291	98.6 %
6 *	2	36	12.2 %	271	91.9 %
7 *	2	50	16.9 %	259	87.8 %
8 *	1	58	19.7 %	245	83.1 %
9 *	1	67	22.7 %	237	80.3 %
11 *	1	78	26.4 %	228	77.3 %
12 *	1	90	30.5 %	217	73.6 %
15 *	1	105	35.6 %	205	69.5 %
21 *	1	126	42.7 %	190	64.4 %
22 *	1	148	50.2 %	169	57.3 %
34 *	1	182	61.7 %	147	49.8 %
50 *	1	232	78.6 %	113	38.3 %
63 *	1	295	100.0 %	63	21.4 %

Les 3 colonnes correspondent respectivement :
 au Mot
 à sa Fréquence
 à son Rang Moyen

Le Fréquence minimale des mots est 1

Cas ou la Fréquence >= 5
 et
 le Rang Moyen < 2,6

confuso	5	2,400
consentimento	8	2,250
diferente	5	1,600
diversidade-relacional	50	2,280
liberdade	21	2,381

Cas ou la Fréquence >= 5
 et
 le Rang Moyen >= 2,6

abertura-a-experiencia	12	2,750
atualidade	5	3,200
comunidade-e-cultura	7	3,429
desafio	7	3,714
imoralidade	6	3,333
individualidade	5	4,000
infidelidade	9	3,222
multiplos-parceiros	11	3,273
negociacao	34	3,000
pouco-conhecimento	6	3,500
sentimentos-negativos	22	3,955
sentimentos-positivos	63	3,286
sexualidade	15	3,133

Cas ou la Fréquence < 5
 et
 le Rang Moyen < 2,6

Cas ou la Fréquence < 5
 et
 le Rang Moyen >= 2,6

complexo	4	3,750
----------	---	-------

Appendix 15. EVOC Outputs from the Spanish Sample Without Experience in Supporting Clients in CNM

fichier initial : C:\Users\larai\OneDrive\Ambiente de Trabalho\SUBS ES NÃO.Tm2
 NOUS ALLONS RECHERCHER LES RANGS
 Nous avons en entree le fichier : C:\Users\larai\OneDrive\Ambiente de Trabalho\SUBS ES NÃO.Tm2
 ON CREE LE FICHER : C:\Users\larai\OneDrive\Ambiente de Trabalho\SUBS ES NÃO.dis et C:\Users\larai\OneDrive\Ambiente de Trabalho\SUBS ES NÃO.tm3

ENSEMBLE DES MOTS	RANGS	:FREQ.:	1 *	2 *	3 *	4 *	5 *
actualidad		: 9 :	1*	0*	2*	2*	4*
moyenne :	3.89						
complejidad		: 16 :	7*	2*	3*	1*	3*
moyenne :	2.44						
comunidad-y-cultura		: 9 :	1*	2*	1*	3*	2*
moyenne :	3.33						
confusion		: 6 :	0*	1*	1*	2*	2*
moyenne :	3.83						
consentimiento		: 6 :	1*	1*	3*	0*	1*
moyenne :	2.83						
diferente		: 6 :	0*	1*	1*	1*	3*
moyenne :	4.00						
diversidad-relacional		: 41 :	14*	13*	7*	2*	5*
moyenne :	2.29						
individualidad		: 2 :	0*	0*	1*	1*	
moyenne :	3.50						
infidelidad		: 4 :	2*	1*	0*	0*	1*
moyenne :	2.25						
libertad		: 21 :	10*	2*	3*	4*	2*
moyenne :	2.33						
negociacion		: 27 :	5*	6*	6*	6*	4*
moyenne :	2.93						
sentimientos-negativos		: 37 :	2*	5*	11*	12*	7*
moyenne :	3.46						
sentimientos-positivos		: 44 :	6*	11*	6*	12*	9*
moyenne :	3.16						
sexualidad		: 11 :	0*	4*	3*	1*	3*
moyenne :	3.27						
DISTRIBUTION TOTALE		: 239 :	49*	49*	48*	47*	46*
RANGS 6 ... 15	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*
RANGS 16 ... 25	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*
RANGS 26 ... 30	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*
Nombre total de mots differents :		14					
Nombre total de mots cites :		239					
moyenne generale des rangs :		2.97					

DISTRIBUTION DES FREQUENCES

freq. * nb. mots * Cumul evocations et cumul inverse

2 *	1	2	0.8 %	239	100.0 %
4 *	1	6	2.5 %	237	99.2 %
6 *	3	24	10.0 %	233	97.5 %
9 *	2	42	17.6 %	215	90.0 %
11 *	1	53	22.2 %	197	82.4 %
16 *	1	69	28.9 %	186	77.8 %
21 *	1	90	37.7 %	170	71.1 %
27 *	1	117	49.0 %	149	62.3 %
37 *	1	154	64.4 %	122	51.0 %
41 *	1	195	81.6 %	85	35.6 %
44 *	1	239	100.0 %	44	18.4 %

Les 3 colonnes correspondent respectivement :
 au Mot
 à sa Fréquence
 à son Rang Moyen

Le Fréquence minimale des mots est 1

Cas ou la Fréquence >= 5
 et
 le Rang Moyen < 2,6

complejidad	16	2,438
diversidad-relacional	41	2,293
libertad	21	2,333

Cas ou la Fréquence >= 5
 et
 le Rang Moyen >= 2,6

actualidad	9	3,889
comunidad-y-cultura	9	3,333
confusion	6	3,833
consentimiento	6	2,833
diferente	6	4,000
negociacion	27	2,926
sentimientos-negativos	37	3,459
sentimientos-positivos	44	3,159
sexualidad	11	3,273

Cas ou la Fréquence < 5
 et
 le Rang Moyen < 2,6

infidelidad	4	2,250
-------------	---	-------

Cas ou la Fréquence < 5
 et
 le Rang Moyen >= 2,6

individualidad	2	3,500
----------------	---	-------