

#### # 4 A Systematic Review of Risk Factors for Intimate Partner Violence

Deborah M. Capaldi, Naomi B. Knoble, Joann Wu Shortt, and Hyoun K. Kim

Full article available in *Partner Abuse*, Volume 3, Issue 2, 2012.

(Article available for free at: <http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/springer/pa>)

The purpose of the current study was to provide a comprehensive compilation and systematic review of studies involving risk factors for perpetration of or victimization by physical, psychological, and sexual abuse. From a dynamic developmental systems perspective, IPV in couples is conceptualized as an interactional behavior that is responsive to the conjoint developmental characteristics and behaviors of each partner, as well as contextual factors and relationship influences and processes. Guided by this perspective, risk factors were organized by: (a) contextual characteristics of partners such as demographic factors (age, gender, socioeconomic status, race/ethnicity, acculturation, stress), neighborhood and community factors, school context factors; (b) developmental characteristics and behaviors of the partners such as family factors (family-of-origin exposure to IPV violence, experience of child abuse, parenting), peer associations and influences (association with deviant peers, social and emotional support), psychological and behavioral factors (conduct problems/antisocial behavior, anger, hostility, personality disorders, depression, suicide attempts, substance use), cognitive factors (hostile attributions, attitudes, and beliefs); and (c) relationship influences and interactional patterns (marital/relationship status, relationship discord, relationship satisfaction, attachment, negative emotionality, jealousy).

Study inclusion criteria were as follows: articles published in a peer-reviewed journal that examined one or more risk factors for partner aggression, recruitment of a representative community sample or a clinical sample with a control-group comparison and a response rate of 50% or greater, use of a physical or sexual violence outcome measure (not solely a psychological aggression measure), and control of confounding factors in the analyses. A total of 228 articles were included in the review – 170 articles with adult samples over age 18 years (see tables 1, 2, 3 and 4); and 58 articles with adolescent samples age 18 years or younger (see tables 5 and 6). The Conflict Tactics Scale persists as the primary form of IPV measurement across studies.

In the area of demographic risk factors, younger age, deprivation, including unemployment and low income, and minority group membership was predictive of IPV. For

Hispanics, being born in the U.S. is a risk factor, but degree of acculturation is not predictive. Stress, including acculturation stress is predictive of IPV. Findings regarding risk from neighborhood/community and school context were mixed.

Exposure to violence between parents in the family of origin and experience of child abuse are still much researched risk factors that show evidence of low to moderate risk for IPV and of mediation by more proximal factors such as antisocial behavior and adult adjustment.

Studies of protective factors included parenting – particularly positive involvement in the adolescent’s life (monitoring, support) and encouragement of nonviolent behavior, which were relatively robust low-to-moderate predictors of dating violence. In general social support and tangible help are protective for perpetration and victimization

In the realm of social and behavioral risk factors evident in adolescence, involvement with aggressive peers is a relatively strong predictor of involvement in dating aggression, whereas higher friendship quality is a protective factor. Regarding risk from psychopathology, conduct problems or antisocial behavior has emerged consistently as a substantial risk factor for later IPV involvement for men and women. In contrast, the findings for depressive symptoms indicate an association that is not robust in multivariate analyses. Depressive symptoms may be a stronger risk factor for IPV perpetration for women than for men.

Findings in the area of substance use were particularly interesting. Whereas some evidence was found for an association of alcohol use and IPV, it was of a low magnitude and not found consistently, especially when controlling for other factors. On the other hand, there was evidence that there could be a stronger association between drug use and IPV. There was some indication that alcohol use could be a stronger risk factor for women’s than for men’s perpetration of IPV.

Regarding relationship factors, relationship status (e.g., married, cohabiting, separated) is related to IPV, with married individuals being at lowest risk and separated women being particularly vulnerable. Low relationship satisfaction and high discord or conflict are proximal predictors of IPV, with high discord in particular being a robust predictor.

One notable finding of this review is that regardless of any differences in frequency and/or severity of engagement in IPV by girls/women and boys/men, overall there are more similarities than differences in risk factors. The main areas with indications of gender differences

were in higher risk for women's perpetration of IPV associated with internalizing problems and alcohol use.

### **Implications for Intervention and Policy**

Eight implications for intervention and policy are drawn from the review. These include focusing on proven (particularly on malleable) risk factors; raising public awareness of the importance of risk factors for both men's and women's perpetration and victimization; awareness of risks from internalizing factors and alcohol use for women in particular; increased awareness of risk contexts such as relationship breakdown; addressing drug use as a risk factor; adding an IPV prevention component to youth interventions for associated problems such as substance use and conduct problems; improve couples' problem-solving and interaction skills to reduce conflict; start preventive interventions at an early age.

### **Recommendations for Future Research**

Twelve recommendations are made for future research including areas where increased understanding is needed, particularly how conflicts escalate to IPV, the interfaces among risk factors, the roles of drug use, deviant associations, and stress, further understanding of protective factors and the role of moderators of risk. Regarding study design issues, the need for more studies based on strong theoretical models, particularly models of dyadic behavior, is highlighted, along with the need to include both partners in more studies; the importance of examining the effects of changing partners (break up and repartnering) on dyadic behavior and IPV, and the need for studies with stronger methodology within well-designed community or clinical control studies, including observational methodology. Finally, most studies are of male-female couples, and more well-designed studies of same-sex couples are needed.

### **About the Authors**

**Deborah Capaldi** is a Senior Scientist at the Oregon Social Learning Center in Eugene, Oregon, U.S.A. Her Ph.D. is in Developmental Psychology, from the University of Oregon. Her research focuses on antisocial and co-occurring behaviors across the life span within a dynamic developmental systems framework. She is the Principal Investigator of a 20-year study of development and adjustment in romantic relationships (funded by NICHD), with a particular focus on intimate partner violence development, change over time, and outcomes including physical health, and including observation of couples' interactions. Dr. Capaldi is on the editorial board of a number of journals, and a grant reviewer for NIH and CDC. She is the author of over 90 journal articles and book chapters. In 1998, she was awarded the Boyd McCandless Award for scientific achievement in early career from American Psychological Association, Division 7 (Developmental), and is a Fellow of APA Division 43 (Family). She was co-chair of the 2007 conference on Teen Dating Violence: Developing a Research Agenda to Meet Practice Needs. (NIH, NIJ, CDC) Arlington, VA., and is co-editor of the February 2012 special section of the *Journal Prevention Science* on the etiology and prevention of intimate partner violence.

Contact:

[deborahc@oslc.org](mailto:deborahc@oslc.org)

[www.oslc.org](http://www.oslc.org)

**Naomi Knoble** is a doctoral student in Counseling Psychology at the University of Oregon. Ms. Knoble earned a M.Ed. in Couples and Family Therapy from the University of Oregon in 2005. She is currently a predoctoral research fellow (funded through NIMH) at the Child and Family Center at the University of Oregon. Her research focuses on risk and protective factors for violence in family and romantic relationships.

Contact:

[naomik@oslc.org](mailto:naomik@oslc.org)

[naomiknoble.com](http://naomiknoble.com)

**Joann Wu Shortt** is a Research Scientist at the Oregon Social Learning Center. She received her Ph.D. from the University of Washington. Shortt investigates how family and peer relationships including siblings and couples shape our development across the life span. Her research focuses on emotion processes such as emotion regulation, physiological functioning, and parent socialization of children's emotions. This work has involved observational methodology to understand interactional processes and mechanisms at work in predicting relationship outcomes, intimate partner violence, and child/adolescent/adult psychopathology. Shortt has been a co-investigator on the Oregon Youth Study-Couples Study for over 10 years. She is currently the Principal Investigator on a cross-site study developing an emotion-focused parenting intervention for high-risk mothers to promote emotion regulation and emotion-coaching skills.

Contact:

[joanns@oslc.org](mailto:joanns@oslc.org)

[www.oslc.org](http://www.oslc.org)

**Hyoun K. Kim, Ph.D.** is a research scientist at Oregon Social Learning Center. Dr. Kim received her Ph.D. in the Department of Human Development and Family Science at the Ohio State University in 1999. Her research interests center on the development of psychopathology – including depression, delinquency, drug use, health-risking sexual behavior, and intimate partner violence – in adolescents and young adults from at-risk backgrounds. Dr. Kim's work has focused on understanding the developmental trajectories of these health-risk behaviors from early adolescence through young adulthood, with a strong focus on mediating effects of self-regulatory systems and social influence processes on the development of health-risking behaviors. She has been working on multiple longitudinal studies on health-risk behaviors of at-risk adolescent populations, including two long-term longitudinal studies of at-risk young men and their romantic partners (Oregon Youth Study and OYS-Couples Study), in which the effects of romantic relationships on the developmental pathways of psychopathology have been examined. She is an author on over 50 publications and has been serving on the editorial board of the *Journal of Marriage and Family* for the past 2 years.

Contact:

[hyoung@oslc.org](mailto:hyoung@oslc.org)

[\(www.oslc.org\)](http://www.oslc.org)

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
---------------------------	---	------------------------------------	-------------------	---------

**Table 1. Longitudinal, large community adult samples**

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Huang, C. C., Son, E., &amp; Wang, L. R. (2010). Prevalence and factors of domestic violence among unmarried mothers with a young child. <i>Families in Society</i>, 91(2), 171-177.</p>	<p>2,237</p>	<p>Female sample of unmarried mothers, average age 20-24 years at baseline assessment. Race/ethnicity: 53.91% African American, 28.34% Hispanic, 15.34% Non-Hispanic White, 2.41% other. Income: 48.72% received welfare in past year. Relationship with child's father: 52.93% cohabitating, 35.98% not living together, 11.09% married.</p>	<p>Longitudinal data from the first three waves of the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study. Stratified, random sample of marital and nonmarital births within hospitals in U.S. cities between 1998 and 2000. Follow-up interviews at ages 1, 3, and 5 years. Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: self-report physical violence 2-items, emotional control 3-items, sexual abuse 1-item; Maternal characteristics at child's birth: age, race/ethnicity, education, substance abuse problems, relationship quality with the child's father and social support. Also assessed were welfare status and relationship status with the child's father at Years 1 and 3. MFPV and victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> In Year 1, in multiple regressions including age, race, and education, it was found that none of these demographic variables predicted to physical violence or sexual abuse victimization. Substance abuse problems and receiving welfare increased the chance of physical violence victimization, whereas relationship quality with child's father (RQ) and married or cohabitating mothers were less likely to be victims of IPV. Mothers who had a higher relationship quality with the child's father and were married or cohabiting were also less likely to be victims of sexual abuse. The demographic variables did not show significant associations with either of these outcomes in the multiple regressions. In predicting violence/sexual abuse in Year 3,</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 1: Longitudinal, large community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				violence/sexual abuse in Year 1 was significant along with being black, RQ, the Social Support Index, and being married or cohabiting. These factors all reduced the odds with Year 1 violence in the model.
Roberts, A. L., Gilman, S. E., Fitzmaurice, G., Decker, M. R., & Koenen, K. C. (2010). Witness of intimate partner violence in childhood and perpetration of intimate partner violence in adulthood. <i>Epidemiology</i> , 21(6), 809-818.	14,564	Adult males, average age 46-47 years. Response rate at baseline 81%, cumulative response 70% at Wave 2.	Longitudinal data from the National Epidemiologic Survey on Alcohol and Related Conditions, United States. Multistage sampling design. Data collected in 2001-2002 (Wave 1) and follow-up interviews in 2004-2005 (Wave 2). Self-report.	<i>Measures:</i> IPV perpetration - from CTS 6-items; Childhood witnessing of male-to-female IPV - 4-items; Childhood circumstances and adverse events - childhood neglect 5-items, childhood psychological abuse 3-items, childhood physical abuse 2-items, childhood sexual abuse 3-items, assessing family structure and characteristics 6-items, traumatic event 1-item, family liability for antisocial personality disorder and alcoholism; Childhood family emotional support – 5-items. MFPV, perpetration.  <i>Results:</i> After controlling for childhood circumstances and adverse events and demographic variables, witnessing IPV as a child was positively associated with IPV perpetration in adulthood; family emotional support was not a protective factor against IPV perpetration.
Halpern, C. T., Spriggs, A. L., Martin, S. L., & Kupper, L. L. (2009). Patterns of intimate partner violence victimization from	4,134	Male (46%) and female (54%) young adults, ages 18-26 year, in opposite-sex romantic relationship. Race/ethnicity: Non-Hispanic White 72.8%,	Longitudinal. Sample from National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health), Waves I–III, 1994-2002. Systematic stratified clustered	<i>Measures:</i> IPV victimization - CTS2 for each relationship at Wave II 3-items; from CTS2 assessing frequency of IPV for each relationship at Wave III 3-items. Adolescent depression - CES-D at Wave I 19-items. Childhood physical abuse - parental/caretaker physical aggression at



PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 1: Longitudinal, large community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>adolescence to young adulthood in a nationally representative sample. <i>Journal of Adolescent Health</i>, 45(5), 508-516.</p>		<p>Non-Hispanic Black 13.2%, Hispanic 10.4%, Non-Hispanic other 3.6%.</p>	<p>sampling from 132 representative schools (public, private, urban, rural) from Grades 7-12 in 1994-1995. Multimodal data collection from multiple sources (school administrators, parents, adolescent, romantic partners) via in-school questionnaires and in-home interviews. United States</p>	<p>Wave III 2-items. Early sex: vaginal intercourse before age 16 years. MFPV, FMPV, and victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> Grouped sample by no IPV victimization, adolescent only victimization, young adult onset, and adolescent young adult persistent. Female sex, Hispanic and non-Hispanic black race/ethnicity, atypical family structure (not two bios, step, or single parent), more romantic partners, experiencing childhood abuse and early sex were each associated with one or more patterns of victimization versus none. After controlling for SES characteristics, early age at intercourse and number of partner were the most consistent predictors of victimization, its early onset, and persistence. The associations did not vary by gender. Depressive symptoms were predictive of IPV victimization in univariate but not multivariate analyses.</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 1: Longitudinal, large community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Huesmann, L. R., Dubow, E. F., &amp; Boxer, P. (2009). Continuity of aggression from childhood to early adulthood as a predictor of life outcomes: Implications for the adolescent-limited and life-course-persistent models. <i>Aggressive Behavior</i>, 35(2), 136-149.</p>	<p>523</p>	<p>Sample of adult males (51%) and females (49%), age 48 years. Race/ethnicity: White &gt; 90%, African American 3%, Hispanic &lt; 1%, Asian &lt;1%. Retention rate 61%.</p>	<p>Longitudinal data from the Columbia County Longitudinal Study, New York, United States. The sample comprised all third-grade students in Columbia County in 1960. Multi-informant (participant, teacher, parent, spouse) data collected through interviews and questionnaires in 1970, 1981, and 1999-2002.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Peer-nominated aggression (measured all four waves), physical, verbal, acquisitive, and indirect acts of IPV as observed by peers 10-items. Severe physical aggression (measured ages 19, 30, and 48 years); self-report, frequency, or if ever threatened to choke someone, slap or kick someone, punch or beat someone, knife or shot at someone. Aggressive personality (measured ages 19, 30, and 48 years), Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory; Self-report of criminal behavior, antisocial behavior, aggression; IPV toward spouse; Home Violence Questionnaire, self-report and spouse report, threaten with knife or gun, pushed, shoved, or beat up partner in last 12 months 9-items. MFPV and FMPV.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> Both life-course persistent antisocial behavior and adult-onset antisocial behavior (vs. childhood or adolescence only) were predictive of IPV perpetration.</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 1: Longitudinal, large community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Lanier, C., &amp; Maume, M. O. (2009). Intimate partner violence and social isolation across the rural/urban divide. <i>Violence Against Women, 15</i>(11), 1311-1330.</p>	<p>8,643</p>	<p>Sample of married or cohabitating adults with an opposite-sex partner. Detailed demographic information was not available in the article.</p>	<p>Longitudinal data from National Survey of Families and Households. Data from Wave I (1987-1988) and II (1992-1994). Randomized, representative sample of American households. Data included from U.S. Census (1990) of Population and Housing. Self-report only.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: 3 items; Social support in four domains: received help 4-items, social interaction 4-items, church involvement 2-items, participation in events and activities 5-items. Control factors: income to needs ratio, male job spells, male drinking, male education, ethnicity, age, number of children, County disadvantage, County Gini index, and MFPV at Wave 1. Analyses run separately for Metro and Nonmetro counties. MFPV and victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> In multivariate models including Wave 1 MFPV, the only support area related to MFPV was help received (lowered risk) for nonmetro counties only. Control factors predictive were male drinking, Black ethnicity, and age in both metro and nonmetro counties. In addition, male job spells was predictive in nonmetro counties, and both number of children and County GINI index were predictive in metro counties only. Male education was not predictive.</p>
<p>Caetano, R., Ramisetty-Mikler, S., &amp; Harris, T. R. (2008). Drinking, alcohol problems and intimate partner violence among White and Hispanic</p>	<p>1,586 (793 couples )</p>	<p>Married or cohabitating opposite-sex couples, age range 38-50 years. Race/ethnicity of sample: White 40%, Hispanic 38%. Response rate 72%.</p>	<p>Longitudinal survey data. Sample of couples from the 1995 National Alcohol Survey, a national multistage area household probability sample with oversamples of African American and</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Self-report, face to face in preferred language; IPV items from (CTS-R) and questions about: frequency of alcohol consumption and problems associated with drinking, childhood exposure to violence, ethnicity, and IPV measurements. MFPV, FMPV, and perpetration.</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 1: Longitudinal, large community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>couples in the U.S.: Longitudinal associations. <i>Journal of Family Violence</i>, 23(1), 37-45.</p>			<p>Hispanic households. Follow-up survey in 2000. In-person interviews conducted separately with each partner. Self-report. United States</p>	<p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for childhood exposure to parents' violence, age, education, and employment status, findings indicated that MFPV and FMPV in 1995 were significant predictors for MFPV and FMPV in 2000. For White couples, female alcohol problems predicted FMPV in 1995. For Hispanics, female alcohol problems predicted FMPV only in 2000. The associations between alcohol usage and MFPV and FMPV change across ethnic groups over time, but established patterns tend to persist.</p>
<p>Fang, X., &amp; Corso, P. S. (2008). Gender differences in the connections between violence experienced as a child and perpetration of intimate partner violence in young adulthood. <i>Journal of Family Violence</i>, 23(5), 303-313.</p>	<p>9,352</p>	<p>Male (48%) and female (52%) young adults, ages 18-26 years, in an opposite-sex relationship within the past 2 years. Race/ethnicity: White 68.4-69.9%, Black 14.2-14.8%, Asian 3.3-3.2%, Native American 0.5-1%, Other race 0.7-0.9%, Hispanic 10.9-12.2%. Income: family of origin in poverty 21.9%-22.1%.</p>	<p>Longitudinal. Sample from National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health), Waves I–III, 1994-2002. Systematic stratified clustered sampling from 132 representative schools (public, private, urban, rural) from Grades 7-12 in 1994-1995. Multimodal data collection from multiple sources (school administrators, parents, adolescent, romantic partners) via in-school questionnaires and in-</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV perpetration 2-items; youth violence 5-items; neglect 2-items; physical abuse 1-item; sexual abuse 1-item. MFPV, FMPV, and perpetration.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for age, age squared, gender, race, adolescent individual factor, adolescent community factors, family background characteristics, and individual characteristics during young adulthood, the findings indicated that gender differences exist for the association between child maltreatment and young adult IPV perpetration and the effects of SES factors on youth violence and IPV perpetration. For males, the direct effect (2.09%) of being neglected was not significant, but the indirect effect (0.57%) was significant. For effects of physical</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 1: Longitudinal, large community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
			home interviews. United States.	abuse as a child on IPV perpetration, there was a positive and significant effect (7.96%) for men. For women, the direct effects of being neglected (6.46%) and physically abused (7.96%) on IPV perpetration were significant. The indirect effect of being neglected on IPV perpetration was significant (0.57%), although the indirect effect of childhood physical abuse was not significant for females. Childhood sexual abuse was not significantly directly associated with IPV perpetration for women; however, for men it was the strongest direct predictor of IPV perpetration, increasing the likelihood of IPV perpetration by 17.63%.
Fergusson, D. M., Boden, J. M., & Horwood, L. J. (2008). Developmental antecedents of interpartner violence in a New Zealand birth cohort. <i>Journal of Family Violence</i> , 23(8), 737-753.	828	Sample of adult males (47%) and females (53%), average age 25 years, in an intimate relationship of at least 1 month duration within the past year. Relationship status: 12.3% married. Initial response rate 97%, retention rate 80%.	Longitudinal data from the Christchurch Health and Development Study. Sample was an unselected birth cohort from Christchurch, New Zealand, in mid 1977. Assessments were conducted at birth, 4 months, 1 year, and annually to age 16 years, and at ages 18, 21, and 25 years. Multimodal, multi-informant data collection (parent, teacher, child, police records).	<i>Measures:</i> Family economic circumstances (e.g., SES); experiences of childhood abuse; parental use of physical punishment; interparental violence: CTS 8-items; family functioning (e.g., parental criminality); childhood and adolescent adjustment (e.g., conduct problems age 7 - 13); mental disorders: DISC at age 16, CIDI at age 18; IPV at age 24-25: CTS2 22-items. MFPV, FMPV, perpetration, victimization.  <i>Results:</i> After controlling for all IPV predictors, risk factors associated with IPV victimization at ages 24-25 years were: conduct problems (ages 7-13 years), family adversity, overall abuse exposure in childhood; risk factors associated with IPV

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 1: Longitudinal, large community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>perpetration at ages 24-25 years were the same as victimization plus alcohol abuse/dependence. After controlling for all IPV predictors and gender, the same risk factors were related to IPV for males and females with the following statistically significant differences: conduct disorder (ages 7-13 years) stronger predictor for IPV perpetration and victimization for females, exposure to family adversity was a stronger predictor of IPV victimization for males; no gender differences were found for IPV perpetration or victimization or for alcohol use/dependence in adolescence and later IPV perpetration.</p>
<p>Herrera, V. M., Wiersma, J. D., &amp; Cleveland, H. H. (2008). The influence of individual and partner characteristics on the perpetration of intimate partner violence in young adult relationships. <i>Journal of Youth and Adolescence</i>, 37(3), 284-296.</p>	<p>1,275</p>	<p>Couples sample of married, cohabitating, or dating partners. The sample comprised 54% female and 46% male participants ranging from ages 18 to 27 years. (mean age 22 years). Race/ethnicity: White 69%, African American 14%, Asian 8%, Native American 3%.</p>	<p>Longitudinal. Sample from National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health), Waves I–III, 1994-2002. Systematic stratified clustered sampling from 132 representative schools (public, private, urban, rural) from Grades 7-12 in 1994-1995. Multimodal data collection from multiple sources (school administrators, parents, adolescent, romantic partners) via in-school</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV self and partner reports shoving, pushing, throwing, slapping, hitting, kicking, unwanted and insistent sexual advances, and causing injury because of a fight; General violence perpetration 8-items; Perceived parental support 10-items; Communication with parents 8-items; Decisional autonomy 7-items; School support 13-items; GPA; School problems 3-items; MFPV, FMPV, and perpetration.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> In bivariate correlations, IPV was associated with general violence, partner’s IPV, gender (females higher), Black ethnicity, lower parental support, poorer communication with parents, poorer school support, and school problems. After</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 1: Longitudinal, large community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
			questionnaires and in-home interviews. United States	controlling for effects of family and school correlates, dating couples were less likely to perpetrate IPV than cohabitating couples; being generally violent as well as being victimized by violence increased likelihood of perpetrating IPV. FMPV was more likely in relationships with aggressive males, and females with aggressive characteristics did not lead to FMPV. No significant interaction was found between males' aggression and FMPV.
Schluter, P. J., Abbott, M. W., & Bellringer, M. E. (2008). Problem gambling related to intimate partner violence: Findings from the Pacific Islands Families Study. <i>International Gambling Studies</i> , 8(1), 49-61.	1,400 (700 couples )	Couples sample of Pacific Island parents. Ages range from 25-34 years. Race/ethnicity: Samoan 55%, Tonga 20%, Cook Island Maori 11-15%, Other Pacific Island ethnicity 5%. Income: average range NZ \$20,000 to \$40,000. Employment: 80% of fathers employed full time. 77% of eligible mothers and 81% of eligible fathers participated.	Longitudinal data from the Pacific Island Families Study, a birth cohort hospital sample from South Auckland in 2000. Follow-up interviews conducted at 12 and 24 months. In-person interviews. Self-report. Australia.	<i>Measures:</i> IPV: CTS Form R; Gambling: women asked if they had gambled within the last 12 months, if affirmative they were asked (a) how much they usually spent on gambling each week and (b) whether people ever criticized their involvement in these gambling activities; men, same as women, but additionally they completed the SOGS-R; Problem drinking in mothers: Screening for Problem Drinking: Quantity/Frequency Questionnaire; for fathers, the Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test. MFPV, FMPV, and victimization.  <i>Results:</i> Victimization of any and severe physical IPV was 33% and 18% for mothers and 38% and 22% for fathers, respectively. Only 1% of mothers and 2% of fathers were problem gamblers. After controlling for smoking frequency, ethnicity, age, highest educational

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 1: Longitudinal, large community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				attainment, current employment situation, marital status, household income, and problem drinking, the study found no association between current problem gamblers and IPV victimization. Problem drinking in the couple was related to IPV victimization in both men and women.
<p>Fang, X., &amp; Corso, P. S. (2007). Child maltreatment, youth violence, and intimate partner violence: Developmental relationships. <i>American Journal of Preventive Medicine</i>, 33(4), 281-290.</p>	9,368	<p>Male (44.8%) and female (55.2%) young adults, ages 18-26 years. Race/ethnicity: 71% White, 14% Black, 3% Asian, 1% Native American, 11% Hispanic. Income: 21.5% family-of-origin household income below \$20,000 annually.</p>	<p>Longitudinal. Sample from National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health), Waves I–III, 1994-2002. Systematic stratified clustered sampling from 132 representative schools (public, private, urban, rural) from Grades 7-12 in 1994-1995. Multimodal data collection from multiple sources (school administrators, parents, adolescent, romantic partners) via in-school questionnaires and in-home interviews. United States.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV measured by male-and-female perpetration and victimization report: physical aggression 4-items; sexual aggression 2-items. Youth violence perpetration violent behavior and acts 5-items. Youth violence victimization experience of violence victimization 4-items. Childhood maltreatment: report of neglect, physical abuse, and sexual abuse 4-items. MFPV, FMPV, perpetration, and victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for individual SES, family background, and contextual factors, victims of child maltreatment were more likely to perpetrate youth violence and IPV in young adulthood. For males, youth violence perpetration and childhood sexual abuse directly predicted IPV perpetration; whereas for females youth violence perpetration, physical abuse, and childhood neglect directly predicted IPV perpetration. Youth violence victimization predicted IPV victimization in males but not for females. Child maltreatment was not predictive of IPV victimizations for</p>



PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 1: Longitudinal, large community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Lehrer, J. A., Buka, S., Gortmaker, S., &amp; Shrier, L. A. (2006). Depressive symptomatology as a predictor of exposure to intimate partner violence among U.S. female adolescents and young adults. <i>Archives of Pediatric Adolescent Medicine</i>, 160(3), 270-276.</p>	<p>1,659</p>	<p>Young women, ages 18-27 years, in an opposite-sex relationship. Race/ethnicity: White 68.5%, African American 15.6%, Hispanic 10.6%, Other 5.3%. Relationship status: married 25.7%, cohabitating 24.9%, dating 49.4%.</p>	<p>Longitudinal. Sample from National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health), Waves I–III, 1994-2002. Systematic stratified clustered sampling from 132 representative schools (public, private, urban, rural) from Grades 7-12 in 1994-1995. Multimodal data collection from multiple sources (school administrators, parents, adolescent, romantic partners) via in-school questionnaires and in-home interviews. United States.</p>	<p>either gender.</p> <p><i>Measures:</i> Questions on childhood physical and sexual abuses, Items on forced sex or dating IPV, ever threatened them with violence, pushed or shoved them, or thrown something at them that could hurt and whether they were ever physically forced to have sexual intercourse against their will. Wave 3 asked frequency of IPV and injuries. Depression symptoms measured (CES-D) 19-item. MFPV and victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for age, race/ethnicity, and parental education and then adjusting for childhood physical/sexual abuse and dating violence/forced sex, findings indicated 28% of participants with severe depression symptoms experienced IPV or injury, 17.5% with lower depression symptoms experience IPV or injury. The more depressive symptoms a young female experiences, the more likely she is to be a victim of IPV.</p>
<p>Renner, L. M., &amp; Slack, K. S. (2006). Intimate partner violence and child maltreatment: Understanding intra- and intergenerational</p>	<p>1,005</p>	<p>Sample of adult women, mean age 33.43 years, currently parenting a biological or adopted child. Race/ethnicity: African American 81%, White 7%, Hispanic</p>	<p>Longitudinal data from the Illinois Families Study, United States. Stratified, random sample of families, representative of Illinois, receiving Temporary Aid</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Items from CTS (female report) and Massachusetts study of women on welfare; self-report of adverse childhood experiences 4-items. Controls age when first child was born, race/ethnicity, marital status, age when first employed, childhood history, and SES variables. Childhood</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 1: Longitudinal, large community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
connections. <i>Child Abuse &amp; Neglect</i> , 30(6), 599-617.		12%. Income: welfare recipient 43%. Retention rate 79%.	to Needy Families, a government assistance program. Data was collected at three annual intervals: 1999-2000, 2001, 2002. In-person interviews. Self-report.	maltreatment reports from Illinois Department of Children and Family Services; Parent-to child aggression. MFPV.  <i>Results:</i> After controlling for age when first child was born, race/ethnicity, marital status, age when first employed, childhood history, and SES variables, findings indicated that childhood physical abuse, sexual abuse, and witnessing IPV were predictive of IPV victimization.
Caetano, R., Field, C. A., Ramisetty-Mikler, S., & McGrath, C. (2005). The 5-year course of intimate partner violence among White, Black, and Hispanic couples in the United States. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i> , 20(9), 1039-1057.	1,025	Married or cohabitating opposite-sex couples, average age range 38-50 years. Race/ethnicity: White 40%, African American 23%, Hispanic 38%. Response rate 72%.	Longitudinal survey data. Sample of couples from the 1995 National Alcohol Survey, a national multistage area household probability sample with oversamples of African-American and Hispanic households. Follow-up survey in 2000. In-person interviews conducted separately with each partner. Self-report. United States	<i>Measures:</i> Self-report; CTS-R; Alcohol consumption prior 12 months; Alcohol problems 14-items; Heavy episodic drinking; Psychosocial variables: Retrospective childhood exposure to parental aggression; childhood physical abuse; approval of marital IPV; Demographic variables: Ethnicity, couple mean age, income, marital status, unemployment. MFPV/FMPV, either.  <i>Results:</i> The prevalence of IPV was higher among Black and Hispanic than White Couples, and the incidence rate was approximately 2 times higher. Decrease over time in IPV for couples was much more common than increase. After controlling for household income, findings indicated that the recurrence of IPV was more common for younger couples, Black couples, couples with male partner

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 1: Longitudinal, large community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				unemployment, female partner drinking (5+ drinks at one time per month or more), and either partner experienced childhood physical abuse. Remission was more likely among older couples and among couples who witnessed parental IPV, remission less likely among Black couples. Initiation more likely among Hispanic couples and less likely among older couples.
<p>Caetano, R., McGrath, C., Ramisetty-Mikler, S., &amp; Field, C. A. (2005). Drinking, alcohol problems and the 5-year recurrence and incidence of male to female and female to male partner violence. <i>Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research</i>, 29(1), 98-106.</p>	<p>2,784 1,392 couples</p>	<p>Couples sample, representative of married and cohabitating couples in the 48 contiguous United States. In 1995, the mean age for men was 47.2 years and for women was 46.6 years. In 1995, approximately 90% were married. Income: mean family income was \$42,222 in 1995. Employment rates for males were 74% in 1995 and 2000, and for women were 61% in 1995 and 63% in 2000. 85% response rate.</p>	<p>Longitudinal survey data. Sample of couples from the 1995 National Alcohol Survey, a national multistage area household probability sample with oversamples of African American and Hispanic households. Follow-up survey in 2000. In-person interviews conducted separately with each partner. Self-report. United States</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: CTS Form R; Alcohol consumption 11-items; Alcohol problems 14-items; Psychosocial variables 3-items; SES characteristics 5-items. MFPV, FMPV, and perpetration.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> In multivariate analysis, Black ethnicity, male unemployment, and severe physical abuse during childhood were associated with recurrence of MFPV. Black ethnicity, male unemployment, male employment status as “retired/other,” female age, and couples in which the female drank more were associated with recurrence of FMPV. Incidence of MFPV was associated with cohabitation, Hispanic ethnicity, and man’s observation of violence between parents. Male unemployment, male observation of violence between parents, and man’s drinking volume predicted incidence of FMPV. After controlling for psychosocial variables and SES characteristic, the study indicated volume of drinking was the only</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 1: Longitudinal, large community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Fagan, A. A. (2005). The relationship between adolescent physical abuse and criminal offending: Support for an enduring and generalized cycle of violence. <i>Journal of Family Violence</i>, 20(5), 279-290.</p>	<p>1,725</p>	<p>Sample of male (53%) and female (47%) adults, ages 27-33 years. Race/ethnicity: 79% White, 21% non White. Income: 47% middle-class families. Response rate was 73%.</p>	<p>Longitudinal data from the National Youth Survey, United States. Multistage cluster, national probability sample of youth ages 11-17 years selected in 1976. Data collected over 17 years annually from 1976–1980, every 3 years from 1983–1992. In-home interviews. Self-report.</p>	<p>alcohol indicator associated with IPV.</p> <p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: CTS, serious partner violence 7-items, minor partner violence 3-items; adolescent physical abuse was measured in Waves 1 and 2 of the National Youth Survey (ages 11-18 years), number of times in the past year they had been beaten up by a parent; criminal offending measured at Waves 3, 6, and 9: general offending scale comprised of 20-22 crimes and for index offending (a subset of this scale) 7-9 items. MVPV, FMPV, and perpetration.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for demographic characteristics and prior offending, findings indicated that adolescent physical abuse victims were later significantly more likely to report minor violence toward partner in both the transition to adulthood and in early adulthood. Associations with serious partner violence were relatively large but nonsignificant likely due to the relatively low prevalence of serious IPV. Associations were stronger for those from broken homes and with low income for both minor and major IPV, and for ethnic minorities and suburban versus rural residence for major IPV.</p>
<p>Field, C. A., &amp; Caetano, R. (2005). Longitudinal model</p>	<p>1,136 couples</p>	<p>Married or cohabitating opposite-sex couples, average age range 38-50</p>	<p>Longitudinal survey data. Sample of couples from the 1995 National</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Mutual partner violence (MPV), reports by both partners: CTS-R, prior 12 months; Exposure to Childhood physical</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 1: Longitudinal, large community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>predicting mutual partner violence among White, Black, and Hispanic couples in the United States general population. <i>Violence and Victims</i>, 20(5), 499-511.</p>		<p>years. Race/ethnicity: White 40%, African American 23%, Hispanic 38%. Response rate 72%.</p>	<p>Alcohol Survey, a national multistage area household probability sample with oversamples of African American and Hispanic households. Follow-up survey in 2000. In-person interviews conducted separately with each partner. Self-report. United States</p>	<p>abuse; exposure to parental IPV. MFPV, FMPV, and MPV.  <i>Results:</i> Controlled for demographic variables and correct for clustering effects of multicluster sample design. African Americans and Hispanics were more likely to experience IPV than Whites. Regardless of ethnicity, MPV was the most common form of IPV. The risk factors associated with IPV were more common in ethnic minorities; MPV was associated with male exposure to parental IPV and female exposure to severe childhood abuse; MFPV was associated with history of childhood abuse despite severity and alcohol abuse; alcohol use by both males and females was significantly associated with FMPV; younger females were at greater risk of FMPV.</p>
<p>Ehrensaft, M. K., Moffitt, T. E., &amp; Caspi, A. (2004). Clinically abusive relationships in an unselected birth cohort: Men's and women's participation and developmental antecedents. <i>Journal of Abnormal Psychology</i>, 113(2), 258-270.</p>	<p>980</p>	<p>Sample of male (52%) and female (48%) participants, ages 24-26 years. Race/ethnicity: primarily White with fewer than 9% identifying as Maori or Pacific Islander. Response rate 91%.</p>	<p>Longitudinal (nearly 40 years), prospective, from Dunedin Multidisciplinary Health and Development Study. Unselected birth cohort sample born between 1972-1973 in Dunedin, NZ. Data from Phase 0 – Phase XXVI (1998-1999). Multimodal data collection from multiple sources (e.g.,</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: Partner Conflict Calendar, Dunedin Study Abuse Scale, Controlling Abuse Scale; Parenting: observed negative mother-child interactions, harsh discipline 10-items, inconsistent discipline 2-items; Child behavior problems: Rutter Child Behavior Scale, Hyperactive and Antisocial Behavior Scale; Psychiatric Diagnoses: Diagnostic Interview Schedule for Children Scale (DISC-C); Personality profiles: Multidimensional Personality Questionnaire (MPQ); Family-of-origin characteristics: SES, Mother's age at first</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 1: Longitudinal, large community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
			<p>observation, parent, teacher, court reports).</p>	<p>birth, number of caretaker changes child experienced, years with a single parent. MFPV, FMPV, perpetration, and victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> Individuals in abusive relationships causing injury and/or official intervention (9% prevalence) were compared with participants reporting physical abuse without clinical consequences and with control participants who reported no abuse. After controlling for family-of-origin characteristics, parenting, child behavior problems, adolescent psychiatric disorders, and adolescent personality traits, the study indicates that in the nonclinically abusive relationships, perpetrators were primarily women. In clinically abusive relationships, men and women used physical abuse; although more women needed medical treatment for injury. Women in clinically abusive relationships had childhood family adversity, adolescent conduct problems, and aggressive personality; men had disinhibitory psychopathology since childhood and extensive personality deviance.</p>
<p>DeMaris, A., Benson, M. L., Fox, G. L., Hill, T., &amp; Van Wyk, J. (2003). Distal and proximal factors in</p>	<p>8,190</p>	<p>Sample of 4,095 opposite-sex couples who were cohabiting or married and living together in Wave 1, were</p>	<p>Longitudinal data from National Survey of Families and Households. Data from Wave I (1987-1988) and</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: none, any physical aggression, more intense aggression by the man versus the woman-- A couple was classified as exhibiting intense male violence if either partner in either wave</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 1: Longitudinal, large community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>domestic violence: A Test of an integrated model. <i>Journal of Marriage and Family</i>, 65(3), 652-667.</p>		<p>resurveyed in Wave 2, and were still in an intact relationship with the same partner in Wave 2. Analysis was limited to couples in which the male partner was either employed or unemployed but looking for work in Wave 1. Additional sample characteristics not available.</p>	<p>II (1992-1994). Randomized, representative sample of American households. U.S. Census 1990 data also analyzed. Self-report only.</p>	<p>reported that (a) the man was violent more frequently than the woman, (b) the man was the only violent partner, or (c) the man was violent or both were violent but the woman was the only one injured; a couple was considered to exhibit physical aggression if any other pattern of violence was reported; relationship characteristics: duration, number of children, woman's age at relationship beginning, first relationship for both partners, and substance abuse; social isolation 10-items; economic disadvantage 8-items; employment; difference in years of education between partners; gender ideology 7-items; conflict management 6-items. MFPV, FMPV, mutual.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> Of the couples in the study, 3.6% were intense male violence; 9.9% were physical IPV, and 86.4% were nonviolent. Each of two types of violence (any physical IPV versus more intense male) was compared with no violence in multinomial logistic regression. Couples were at higher risk for one or both forms of violence if they were younger at union inception, had been together for less time, were both in their first union, had only one partner who was employed, both had low education, had a nontraditional woman paired with a traditional man, had at least one partner who abused substances, had more children,</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 1: Longitudinal, large community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				had more frequent disagreements, or exhibited a more hostile disagreement style. Controlling for other factors, economic disadvantage and educational disparities were not predictive.
Field, C. A., & Caetano, R. (2003). Longitudinal model predicting partner violence among White, Black, and Hispanic Couples in the United States. <i>Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research</i> , 27(9), 1451-1458.	3,850  1,635 couples	Sample of married or cohabitating couples age 18 years or older. Race/ethnicity: African American ( $n = 232$ ), Hispanic ( $n = 387$ ), White ( $n = 406$ ). Response rate = 85%; Retention rate = 72%.	Longitudinal survey data. Sample of couples from the 1995 National Alcohol Survey, a national multistage area household probability sample with oversamples of African American and Hispanic households. Follow-up survey in 2000. In-person interviews conducted separately with each partner. Self-report. United States	<i>Measures:</i> IPV: CTS-R; Childhood physical abuse, exposure to parental IPV, approval of marital IPV. MFPV, and FMPV.  <i>Results:</i> Controlled for nonresponse rates and probability of selection and adjusted for demographic variables and SES. Ethnicity is a predictor of MFPV/FMPV: African American and Hispanic couples were three times more likely to experience MFPV, and two times more likely to experience FMPV than White couples. FMPV is more prevalent than MFPV in White, Hispanic, and African American couples; longitudinal risk factors vary by ethnicity with IPV present in first wave predicting IPV at follow-up.
Lackey, C. (2003). Violent family heritage, the transition to adulthood, and later partner violence. <i>Journal of Family Issues</i> , 24(1), 74-98.	903	Male and female adults, ages 24-30 years, who were married or cohabitating. Retention rate 83.5%.	Longitudinal data from the National Youth Survey, United States. Multistage cluster, national probability sample of youth ages 11-17 years selected in 1976. Data collected over 17 years annually from 1976–1980, every 3 years	<i>Measures:</i> IPV - CTS; Victimization by parents - “beaten up” by their parents in past year 1-item; Transition to adulthood - several items for two categories (bond to partner and bond to work); Violence prior to young adulthood - frequency of six violent behaviors. MFPV, FMPV, and perpetration.  <i>Results:</i> After controlling for witnessing



PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 1: Longitudinal, large community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
			<p>from 1983–1992. In-home interviews. Self-report.</p>	<p>interparental aggression, family size, and family-of-origin income, results indicated that for men, commitments to the partner and to work significantly mediate the effect of victimization by parents as an adolescent on later IPV. Victimization by parents decreases commitment to both the partner and work, both of which subsequently increase IPV later in life. For women, victimization by parents during adolescence does not appear to significantly affect later IPV. Also, decreases in attachment to the partner and commitments to the partner or work do not subsequently increase IPV. Only weakening work beliefs significantly increase later IPV for women.</p>
<p>White, H. R., &amp; Widom, C. S. (2003). Intimate partner violence among abused and neglected children in young adulthood: The mediating effects of early aggression, antisocial personality, hostility and alcohol problems. <i>Aggressive Behavior</i>, 29(4), 332-345.</p>	<p>1,196</p>	<p>Adult male and female participants, mean age 28.7 years. Approximately one half the sample was female. Race/ethnicity: two thirds White. Retention rate 76%.</p>	<p>Longitudinal, retrospective data. The sample comprised a matched cohort of substantiated child abuse and neglect cases from a Midwestern county database between 1967-1971; the nonabused control sample was matched through hospital records. Between 1989-1995, participants completed in-person interviews. Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV assessed using physical abuse 3-items. Official court records of childhood physical abuse, sexual abuse, and neglect were dichotomized. The DIS was used to gather information on early aggression 6-items, antisocial personality disorder (measured by total number of positive adult lifetime symptoms, from 0-30), and alcohol abuse/dependence (total number of lifetime symptoms, 0-9). Hostility was based on a six-item scale taken from the Symptom Checklist. MFPV, FMPV, and perpetration.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for age and ethnicity, findings indicated that childhood</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 1: Longitudinal, large community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>abuse and neglect was a significant predictor of ever hitting a partner for both men and women. For men, child abuse and neglect significantly predicted antisocial personality disorder but not early aggression, alcohol problems, or hostility. For women, child abuse and neglect significantly predicted antisocial personality disorder, alcohol problems, and hostility, but not aggression. All four mediators significantly predicted ever hitting a partner for both men and women. Antisocial personality disorder mediated the effects of child abuse and neglect on later IPV for men. Antisocial personality disorder, alcohol problems, and hostility mediated the effects of child abuse and neglect on later IPV for females, but early aggression did not.</p>
<p>Fox, G. L., Benson, M. L., DeMaris, A. A., &amp; Van Wyk, J. (2002). Economic distress and intimate violence: Testing family stress and resources theories. <i>Journal of Marriage and the Family</i>, 64(3), 793-807.</p>	<p>Wave 1 N = 5,493 couples  Wave 2 N = 4,583 couples</p>	<p>Sample of married and cohabitating couples. Average age at Wave 1 for men was 36.2 years and women 34.3 years. Race/ethnicity: White 82%, Black 12%, Hispanic 6.6%. Employed at Wave 1: men 90%, women 64%; Wave 2 men 90%, women 71%. Average household income at Wave 1: 445% above</p>	<p>Longitudinal data from National Survey of Families and Households. Data from Wave I (1987-1988) and II (1992-1994). Randomized, representative sample of American households. U.S. Census 1990 data also analyzed. Self-report only.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV 2-items; Employment 2-items; Financial adequacy 2-items. MFPV.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> With only demographic predictors in the model, Black ethnicity (but not Hispanic), neighborhood SES, men’s (but not women’s) low education, number of children in the household, and lower men’s age were predictive of MFPV. Adding in work variables the woman working was a risk factor whereas the man working was a protective factor. Men’s preference that the women work more was also a risk factor. His and her financial well being were</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 1: Longitudinal, large community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>White, H. R., &amp; Chen, P. H. (2002). Problem drinking and intimate partner violence. <i>Journal of Studies on Alcohol</i>, 63(2), 205-214.</p>	<p>725</p>	<p>poverty line. Male and female adults from working-class and middle-class families. Race/ethnicity: White 90%. Religious affiliation: Catholic 50%, Protestant 30%, Jewish 9%, Other 11%. Marital status: 81.5% married, 18.5% cohabitating (ages 28-31 years).</p>	<p>Longitudinal data from the Rutgers Health and Human Development Project, New Jersey, United States. A quota sampling method was used to recruit 12, 15, and 18 year olds. Data was collected from 1979-2000. Analyses for present study conducted when all participants were ages 18, 21-25, and 28-31 years. In-home and office-based interviews. Self-report.</p>	<p>protective factors.  <i>Measures:</i> IPV: frequency of perpetration and victimization (ages 28-31 years) CTS 3-items; Problem drinking: Rutgers Alcohol Problem Index (ages 28-31 years) 18-items. Risk factors: Negative affectivity: Global Severity Index from SCL-90 (ages 21-25 years); Gender role ideology: traditional gender role (ages 21-25 years) 18-items; Childhood family violence: (at ages 12, 15, 18 years) 2-items; Mediators - Relationship dissatisfaction: Dyadic Adjustment Scale and Life Stressors and Social Resources Inventory (ages 28-31 years) 20-items; Partner current drinking (ages 28-31 years). MFPV, FMPV, perpetration, and victimization.  <i>Results:</i> After controlling for other risk factors (negative affectivity, gender role ideology, childhood family violence), partner drinking fully mediated the association of women’s drinking with their IPV perpetration, however, it did not mediate the effects of women’s problem drinking on their IPV victimization (mediation was not tested for men); relationship dissatisfaction fully mediated the effects of problem drinking on IPV perpetration for women and men, however, it only partially mediated the effects of</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 1: Longitudinal, large community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Jasinski, J. L. (2001). Pregnancy and violence against women. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i>, 16(7), 712-733.</p>	<p>3,500</p>	<p>Sample consisted of couples who were cohabitating or married at Wave 1 and still together at Wave 2. Age of participants restricted to males with female partners age 50 years or younger and females who were age 50 years or younger. Race/ethnicity: White 86.4%, Hispanic 7.1%, and African American 6.5%; above median income, average number of children was three, mean length of relationship 16.7 years.</p>	<p>Longitudinal data from National Survey of Families and Households. Data from Wave I (1987-1988) and II (1992-1994). Randomized, representative sample of American households. Self-report only.</p>	<p>problem drinking for men’s IPV victimization but not for women.</p> <p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: Adapted from CTS (MFPV); Pregnancy: whether female partner currently pregnant or given birth during survey year; Unplanned children 1-item. MFPV.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for cohabitation, husband's race/ethnicity, income, number of children, and husband's age, findings indicated that pregnancy was not significantly associated with male-to-female partner violence; having a first child during the second wave of the survey was significantly associated with violence cessation; the male partner's perception that a pregnancy was sooner than desired predicted violence persistence, and the age of parents when the first child was born was not significantly associated with violence.</p>
<p>Rodriguez, E., Lasch, K. E., Chandra, P., &amp; Lee, J. (2001). Family violence, employment status, welfare benefits, and alcohol drinking in the United States: What is the relation? <i>Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health</i>,</p>	<p>4,780</p>	<p>The sample consisted of married and cohabitating couples, 2,100 males and 2,680 females. Average age in 1992 was 33.4 for couples in which both partners reported violent arguments, and 40.3 for couples reporting no violence. Race/ethnicity: 3,876 were White, 529</p>	<p>Longitudinal data from National Survey of Families and Households. Data from Wave I (1987-1988) and II (1992-1994). Randomized, representative sample of American households. Self-report only.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: In the past year, did both respondent and partner become physically violent in an argument; Employment: several items on employment and sources of income; Alcohol use: total number of drinks within 30 days; Partnership stability: same partner over 5 years versus different partner, versus new couple at Time 2 (not in a relationship in 1987). MFPV, FMPV, and mutual violence only (those reporting violence by just one partner excluded).</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 1: Longitudinal, large community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
55(3), 172-178.		were African American, and 375 were reported as “Other.” Family income: average range between \$42K and \$57K. Retention rate 77%,		<p><i>Results:</i> About 60% of respondents who engaged in violent arguments reported that both partners used physical violence. Predictions were to mutual violent arguments versus no violent arguments. After controlling for respondent's gender, age, ethnicity, partnership stability, years of education, total household income, number of children in the household, satisfaction with friends and family, and having a mental or physical condition that could limit the ability to work for pay, several results were significant. Nonemployed respondents were not at higher risk for family violence, in comparison with employed respondents. However, employed persons receiving welfare benefits were four times more likely to report violence. For the nonemployed relative to full-time workers, more alcoholic drinks and higher numbers of children in the family significantly increased the risk of violence. Satisfaction with social relationships and age significantly protected against violence. Ethnicity was not a significant factor in predicting violence.</p>
Moffitt, T. E., Krueger, R. F., Caspi, A., & Fagan, J. (2000). Partner abuse and general crime:	815	Males (52%) and females (48%) in a relationship for at least 1 month within past year. Average age 21 years.	Longitudinal (nearly 40 years), prospective, from Dunedin Multidisciplinary Health and Development Study.	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: at age 21 years via interview on physical and psychological aggression 33-items; Personality: age 18 years via MPQ including Behavioral Constraint, Negative Emotionality, Positive</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 1: Longitudinal, large community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>How are they the same? How are they different? <i>Criminology</i>, 38(1), 199-232.</p>		<p>Race/ethnicity: Predominantly European ancestry, with fewer than 7% identifying as Maori or Polynesian. Response rate 91%.</p>	<p>Unselected birth cohort sample born between 1972-1973 in Dunedin, NZ. Data from Phase 0 – XXI (1993-1994). Multimodal data collection from multiple sources (e.g., observation, parent, teacher, court reports).</p>	<p>Emotionality; General crime: at age 21 years Self-Report Delinquency 49-items. MFPV, FMPV, and perpetration.  <i>Results:</i> After controlling for personality factors (positive emotionality, negative emotionality constraint [low self-control]), results showed that IPV and general crime represent different constructs, not just two aspects of underlying antisocial propensity. Personality analyses showed that IPV and general crime shared a strong propensity from a trait called Negative Emotionality. However, crime was related to weak constraint, but IPV was not.</p>
<p>Magdol, L., Moffitt, T. E., Caspi, A., &amp; Silva, P. A. (1998). Developmental antecedents of partner abuse: A prospective-longitudinal study. <i>Journal of Abnormal Psychology</i>, 107(3), 375-389.</p>	861	<p>Males (52%) and females (48%) in a relationship for at least 1 month within past year. Average age 21 years. Race/ethnicity: Predominantly European ancestry, with fewer than 7% identifying as Maori or Polynesian. Response rate 91%.</p>	<p>Longitudinal (nearly 40 years), prospective, from Dunedin Multidisciplinary Health and Development Study. Data from Phase 0 – XXI (1993-1994). Unselected birth cohort sample born between 1972-1973 in Dunedin, NZ. Data from Phase 0 – XXI (1993-1994). Multimodal data collection from multiple sources (e.g., observation, parent, teacher, court reports).</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: Physical abuse CTS Form R and 4 additional items, Psychological abuse CTS 2-items and an additional 18-items. Other measures: Family SES 2-items; Family relations 5-items, including interviewer observation at initial assessment (child age 3), the Moos Family Relations Index, harsh discipline 10-items, Inventory of Parent Attachment; mothers' mental health 24-items; Educational achievement: 4 measures, Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-Revised (WISC-R), Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale, the Burt Word Reading Test, and age at leaving school; Problem behaviors: 6 measures including, temperament ratings by tester, Antisocial Behavior and Hyperactivity subscales of the Rutter Child</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 1: Longitudinal, large community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>Scales, Conduct Disorder subscale of the Revised Behavior Problem Checklist, police contact, and substance abuse at age 15 years. MFPV, FMPV, and perpetration.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for age, family SES resources, family relations, educational achievements, and problem behaviors, the study demonstrated that antecedents of IPV perpetration included risk factors from all four domains (family relations, educational achievements, and problem behavior), with the presence of early problem behaviors being the most consistent predictor of physical and psychological abuse for both men and women. The interaction effects of gender showed that family relations and problem behaviors were more predictive for physical abuse perpetration for women and problem behaviors were more predictive of women’s physical abuse victimization; lower educational achievement and problem behaviors predicted physical abuse perpetration for men while problem behaviors also predicted men’s victimization.</p>
Magdol, L., Moffitt, T. E., Caspi, A., & Silva, P. A. (1998). Hitting without a license: Testing explanations for	777	Males (52%) and females (48%), age 21 years, who have been in a relationship for at least 1 month. Race /ethnicity: primarily	Cross-sectional analysis of a longitudinal, prospective study. Data from Dunedin Multidisciplinary Health and Development Study.	<i>Measures:</i> Physical Abuse Scale: CTS 9-items; Margolin's Domestic Conflict Index-twisting partner's arm, forcing sex with physical violence, shaking and throwing partner 4-items. 13 measures of the individual, relationship, and social

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 1: Longitudinal, large community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>differences in partner abuse between young adult daters and cohabiters. <i>Journal of Marriage and the Family</i>, 60(1), 41-55.</p>		<p>White, 7% of sample of Maori or Polynesian ethnicity. Retention rate at age 21 years assessment 83%.</p>	<p>Unselected birth cohort sample born between 1972-1973 in Dunedin, NZ. Data from Phase XXI (1993-1994). Multimodal data collection from multiple sources (e.g., observation, parent, teacher, court reports).</p>	<p>factors that contribute to IPV. Individual factors 3-measures; Relationship factors 5-measures; Social control and support 5-measures. MFPV and FMPV.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for relationship status; IPV is more likely in cohabitating relationships than dating or married. No statistical difference in gender or relationship type interactions. In subsample who reported IPV, cohabitating was also more likely to result in IPV. Results of cohabitation on IPV perpetration after controlling for separate factors of individual, relational, and social support, as well as the combined effects: young individuals living together had more aggression in their histories, were less educated, and had more life stressors; these did not account for the differences in IPV. Relational factors also did not account for IPV, nor did social factors. However, when all the factors were added together as controls, these cumulative factors indicated that cohabitation relationships were almost twice as likely to experience physical IPV.</p>



Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
---------------------------	---	------------------------------------	-------------------	---------

**Table 2. Longitudinal, small community adult samples**

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Kerr, D. C. R., &amp; Capaldi, D. M. (2011). Young men’s intimate partner violence and relationship functioning: Long-term outcomes associated with suicide attempt and aggression in adolescence. <i>Psychological Medicine</i>, 41(4), 759-69. DOI:10.1017/S0033291710001182</p>	<p>153</p>	<p>Young men, ages 23-25 years, in a heterosexual relationship. Race/ethnicity: 90% Euro American. Income: 75% lower and working class. Retention rate 94%.</p>	<p>Longitudinal data from the Couples Study and Oregon Youth Study (OYS), Pacific Northwest, United States. The sample of boys, selected between 1984-1985 at ages 9 to 10 years for the OYS from neighborhoods at-risk for delinquency, were assessed annually through ages 29 to 31 years (21 years). Couples Study assessments of OYS males and their female partners occurred at Time 1 (ages 17–20 years), Time 2 (ages 23-25 years), and Time 3 (ages 25-27 years). Multimodal (observational, self-report, official documents), multi-informant data collection (parent, teacher, participant, partner/spouse).</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Parent/family risk factors - CESD, CTS, DAS (mother and father report) 4-items, observational coding inter-parent negative engagement and parental monitoring; Adolescent psychopathology – suicide-attempt history from DISC 1-item, suicidal ideation from BDI, CESD depressive symptoms, aggression Elliott Delinquency Scale, CBCL (mother and teacher) 10-items, substance use frequency; Young adult outcomes: relational distress - jealousy Couples Study Interview 2-items, Partner Issues Checklist, observational coding impressions FPPC, relationship satisfaction Couples Study Interview and DAS (participant and partner); maladaptive relationship behavior: composite of items from CTS, DAS, Adjustment with Partner Scale, Dyadic Social Skills Questionnaire, Partner Interaction Questionnaire, Couples Interview, observational codes FPPC, court records of domestic violence arrests, relationship instability, injury to partner.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for the effects of unskilled parenting, jealousy, and relationship satisfaction, suicide attempt history and aggressive behavior in adolescence remained significant predictors</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 2. Longitudinal, small community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>of partner aggression; the indirect effects of adolescent aggression on partner aggression were statistically significant via low relationship satisfaction. However, there was no significant indirect effect of suicide-attempt history. After controlling for the effects of relationship satisfaction, jealousy, adolescent substance use, and aggression in adolescent, suicide-attempt history was a significant predictor of injury of a partner.</p>
<p>Cui, M., Durtschi, J. A., Donnellan, M. B., Lorenz, F. O., &amp; Conger, R. D. (2010). Intergenerational transmission of relationship aggression : A prospective longitudinal study. <i>Journal of Family Psychology, 24</i>(6), 688 - 697. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021675">DOI:10.1037/a0021675</a></p>	<p>213</p>	<p>Adult males and females, average age 32 years, who were married or in cohabitating relationships. Race/ethnicity: 99% European American. Retention rate 90%.</p>	<p>Longitudinal data from the Family Transitions Project, a combined sample from the Iowa Youth and Families Project and Iowa Single Parent Project. Sample recruitment for the Iowa Youth and Families Project was two-parent families with a seventh grader (enrolled in public or private school) and sibling within 4 years of age recruited in 1989 from eight rural counties in northern Iowa, United States. In 1991, the sample for the Iowa Single Parent Project comprised single-parent families with a ninth</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Interparental verbal and physical aggression - observational data, frequency in past month verbal 4-items and physical aggression (mother and father report) 5-items; parent-child verbal and physical aggression - observational data of mother and father, frequency in past month of verbal 4-items and physical aggression (child report of mother and father) 5-items; Youth verbal and physical aggression toward partner/spouse - observational data, frequency in past month of verbal 4-items and physical aggression (partner/spouse report) 5-items; Spouse/partner verbal and physical aggression - observational data, frequency in past month of verbal 4-items and physical aggression (youth report) 5-items.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for parents' years of education, youth gender, marital status, and relationship duration, interparental</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 2. Longitudinal, small community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
			<p>grader throughout the state of Iowa. Multimodal, multi-informant data was collected annually from 1989-1992, 1994-1995, 1997, 2003, 2005, and 2007.</p>	<p>aggression had a statistically significant direct effect on youth's aggression toward spouse/partner, mediated by parents physical aggression to youth; there was no evidence for gender differences for the full model; however, cohabitators were more likely to exhibit physical aggression than married couples.</p>
<p>Friesen, M. D., Woodward, L. J., Horwood, L. J., &amp; Fergusson, D. M. (2010). Childhood exposure to sexual abuse and partnership outcomes at age 30. <i>Psychological Medicine</i>, 40(4), 679-688.</p>	<p>987</p>	<p>Male (48%) and female (52%) adults, age 30 years, in a cohabitating or married relationship. Retention rate 78%.</p>	<p>Longitudinal data from the Christchurch Health and Development Study. Sample was an unselected birth cohort from Christchurch, New Zealand, in mid 1977. Assessments were conducted at birth, 4 months, 1 year, and annually to age 16 years, and at ages 18, 21, 25, and 30 years of age. Multimodal, multi-informant data collection (parent, teacher, child, medical and official</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV - CTS2 at age 30 years, perpetration and victimization summed together for total measure of IPV in any partner relationship over the past 12 months; Exposure to Childhood Sexual Abuse - retrospective account at ages 18 and 21 years. MFPV, FMPV, perpetration, and victimization averaged. Other variables included childhood: family living standards, mother age at first birth, parental risk behaviors, changes of parents, physical punishment, gender, IQ; Intervening factors: adolescent self-esteem, substance use, sexual activity; Relationship factors age 30 years: cohabitation/marriage and offspring, relationship quality. MFPV, FMPV, an perpetration and victimization</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 2. Longitudinal, small community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
			records).	combined.  <i>Results:</i> After controlling for early childhood and family factors, severe forms of childhood sexual abuse were associated with earlier and more frequent cohabitation and higher rates of perpetrated IPV. After further adjustment for intervening variables (i.e., self-esteem, number of sexual partners, and cohabitating/married relationships), exposure to childhood sexual abuse was still significantly associated with IPV.
<p>Jain, S., Buka, S. L., Subramanian, S. V., &amp; Molnar, B. E. (2010). Neighborhood predictors of dating violence victimization and perpetration in young adulthood: A multilevel study. <i>American Journal of Public Health, 100</i>(9), 1737-1744. DOI:<a href="https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2009.169730">10.2105/AJPH.2009.169730</a></p>	633	<p>Male (44.4%) and female (55.6%) young adults, ages 18-25 years. Race/ethnicity: Black 36.5%, Hispanic 43.6%, White 15.8%, Other 4.1%. Parent's education: less than high school 34.8%, high school graduate 18.8%, some college 32.7%, college graduate 13.8%. Response rate at baseline 71.3%.</p>	<p>Longitudinal data from the 1995-2002 Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods Community Survey, United States. Participants recruited by multistage stratified neighborhood probability design and random sampling. Self-report questionnaire and interview.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Physical dating violence (perpetration, victimization) CTS2 – 7-items; Neighborhood-level confounders - concentration of poverty in neighborhood, percentage of African American residents, frequency of witnessing violent crimes in past 6 months 5-items; Neighborhood-level predictors: collective efficacy - social cohesion 5-items, social control 3-items.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for individual covariates, neighborhood poverty, and perceived neighborhood violence, increased collective efficacy predicted a decrease in youth dating violence victimization for men but not women; collective efficacy was not associated with dating violence perpetration.</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 2. Longitudinal, small community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Ireland, T. O., &amp; Smith, C. A. (2009). Living in partner-violent families: Developmental links to antisocial behavior and relationship violence. <i>Journal of Youth and Adolescence</i>, 38(3), 323-339.</p>	<p>846</p>	<p>Sample of male (72.9%) and female (27.1%) adults, average ages 29-31 years. Race/ethnicity: African American 68%, Hispanic 17%, and White 15%. Income: in early adolescence, 45.6% lived in chronic poverty. Retention rate 85%.</p>	<p>Longitudinal data from the Rochester Youth Development Study, New York, United States. The original study sample was selected from high-risk seventh and eighth graders from public schools in 1988. Data was collected every 6 months from ages 14-18 years, then at ages 21-23 years and 29-31 years. Multi-informant (police records, self-report) data collected.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> G2 IPV assessed using CTS. Any physical abuse experienced by G1 (up to age 18 years) was measured using records from Child Protective Agency records in Monroe County. In Phase 2, behavioral outcomes were assessed. Data on crime was acquired via self-report and official arrest records. In addition to crime or violence against strangers, the data collected includes CTS measures of G2 IPV and severe IPV. And finally, G1 is asked about physical violence in relationship with G2.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for gender, race/ethnicity, chronic family poverty, multiple family transitions, and caregiver high school completion, results indicate that G1 IPV was unrelated to G2 IPV and severe IPV. However, those midadolescents raised in severe partner-violent homes were at increased risk for relationship violence and for engaging in violent crimes.</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 2. Longitudinal, small community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Lussier, P., Farrington, D. P., &amp; Moffitt, T. E. (2009). Is the antisocial child father of the abusive man? A 40-year prospective longitudinal study on the developmental antecedents of intimate partner violence. <i>Criminology</i>, 47(3), 741-780.</p>	202	<p>Sample of adult males from London, England, age 48 years, living with an intimate female partner. 49% retention rate from original study, 90.2% response rate from participants' partners. Detailed demographic information not reported.</p>	<p>Longitudinal data from the Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development, United Kingdom. Participants recruited from schools in inner-city, working-class area in London in 1961. Multi-informant (parent, youth, peer, teacher, partner) data collected from 1961–2002. Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: self-report by participants' partners CTS--psychological abuse 3-items, minor physical violence 4-items, and major physical violence 8-items; Neurological deficits in childhood: Mill Hill Vocabulary Scale; Criminogenic family environment: low family income, low SES of the family of origin, criminal record of the parents, parental conflict, and inadequate parenting; Antisocial behavior: at childhood, early adolescence, and late adolescence over four domains (overt behavior, covert behavior, reckless behavior, authority–conflict behavior). MFPV and perpetration.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> Both late and early adolescent antisocial behavior onset were significant predictors of MFPV in adulthood. After controlling for antisocial behavior in late adolescence, only one developmental risk factor remained a significant predictor of IPV in adulthood, low verbal IQ (neurological deficit).</p>
<p>O'Donnell, L., Agronick, G., Duran, R., Myint-U, A., &amp; Stueve, A. (2009). Intimate partner violence among economically disadvantaged young adult women:</p>	526	<p>The sample comprised economically disadvantaged, urban, young adult women, average age 23 years. Race/ethnicity: African American 75.1%, Hispanic/Latina 17.9%, Other 7.0%.</p>	<p>Longitudinal data from the Reach for Health study. School-sample of all youth in Grades 7 or 8 between 1994-1996 recruited from three public middle schools in urban, economically disadvantaged areas of</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: CTS Version 1; Self-report; baseline in middle school and two follow-ups, ages 19-20 and 22-25 years: Sexually active 1-item; aggression &lt; 90 days 5-items; pregnant, Y/N with follow-up questions; Relationships 3-items. MFPV, FMPV, perpetrator, and victim.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for age,</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 2. Longitudinal, small community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Associations with adolescent risk-taking and pregnancy experiences. <i>Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health, 41(2), 84-91.</i></p>		<p>Employment: unemployed 32.5%, part time 21.5%, full time 46%. Relationship status: married 11.4%, living with partner 30.2%, raising a child 60.1%. Response rate 89%, Retention rate 76%.</p>	<p>Brooklyn, NY. Sample assessed at Grades 7, 8, 10, and 11 (1999-2000); at ages 19-20 (2002-2003), ages 22-25 (2005-2007). Paper-pencil self-report surveys.</p>	<p>race/ethnicity, education, and employment status, findings indicated that middle school aggression, lifetime number of sex partners, unintended pregnancies, and pregnancy problems were associated with increased risk for IPV victimization and perpetration; living with a partner was also a risk factor for IPV perpetration; early sexual initiation was negatively associated with IPV perpetration.</p>
<p>Teten, A. L., Hall, G. C. N., &amp; Capaldi, D. M. (2009). Use of coercive sexual tactics across 10 years in at-risk young men: Developmental patterns and co-occurring problematic dating behaviors. <i>Archives of Sexual Behavior, 38(4), 574-582.</i></p>	<p>201</p>	<p>Sample of men, ages 27-29 years. Race/ethnicity: European American 90%, Hispanic 3.4%, African American 3.4%, American Indian/Alaskan Native 2%, and Asian/Pacific Islander 1%. Males' families of origins were lower and working class. 95% retention rate.</p>	<p>Longitudinal data from the Oregon Youth Study (OYS), Pacific Northwest, United States. The sample of boys, selected between 1984-1985 at ages 9 to 10 years for the OYS from neighborhoods at-risk for delinquency, were assessed annually through ages 27-29 years (19 years). Multimodal (observational, self-report, official documents), multi-informant data collection (parent, teacher, participant, partner/spouse).</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: self-report Adjustment with Partner Scale 2-items; Sexual coercion: through substance use and through ignoring woman's negative response to sexual advances 3-items. High-risk sexual behaviors 3-items. MFPV and perpetration.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for patterns of coercive behaviors (noncoercive, low-level and high-level coercive), IPV by men was significantly associated to both types of sexual coercion (substance use and ignoring woman's negative response) until age 22 years. High-risk sexual behaviors were not associated to either types of sexual coercion.</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 2. Longitudinal, small community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Feingold, A., Kerr, D. C. R., &amp; Capaldi, D. M. (2008). Associations of substance use problems with intimate partner violence for at-risk men in long-term relationships. <i>Journal of Family Psychology</i>, 22(3), 429-438.</p>	150	<p>Sample of men, ages 25-26 years, in one or more long-term opposite-sex romantic relationship (duration of 3 or more years). Race/ethnicity: White 90%. Males' families of origins were lower and working class.</p>	<p>Longitudinal data from the Couples Study, Pacific Northwest, United States. The sample of boys, selected between 1984-1985 at ages 9 to 10 years for the Oregon Youth Study (OYS) from neighborhoods at-risk for delinquency, were assessed annually through ages 29 to 31 years (21 years). Couples Study assessments of female partners of OYS males spans five time points: Time 1 (ages 17–20 years), Time 2 (ages 23-25 years), Time 3 (ages 25-27years), Time 4 (ages 27-29 years), Time 5 (ages 29-31 years). Multimodal (observational, self-report, official documents), multi-informant data collection (parent, teacher, participant, partner/spouse).</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> multimodal - Face-to-face interviews, self-report questionnaires of participant and partner, observational interaction; Substance use measured via CIDI (at ages 25-26 years); antisocial behavior measured via number lifetime arrests, interviewer ratings, lifetime diagnosis of antisocial personality disorder; six measures of IPV: Adjustment with Partner Questionnaire (for psychological and physical IPV), observation and coding, injuries, and emergency room visits; Observational Measures: Video of couples problem-solving interaction.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for SES and antisocial behavior, men with substance use -- especially cannabis, hallucinogens, and nicotine -- committed more IPV than did men with no substance use; alcohol dependence was a significant predictor of IPV. However, after controlling for problems with cannabis and other hard drugs, the association was nonsignificant. Co-occurrence of alcohol with cannabis and hard drugs predicted higher IPV incidence.</p>
Fite, J. E., Bates, J.	511	Male (52%) and female	Longitudinal data from	<i>Measures:</i> Parental IPV measure Year 1



PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 2. Longitudinal, small community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>E., Holtzworth-Munroe, A., Dodge, K. A., Nay, S. Y., &amp; Pettit, G. S. (2008). Social information processing mediates the intergenerational transmission of aggressiveness in romantic relationships. <i>Journal of Family Psychology</i>, 22(3), 367-376.</p>		<p>(48%) young adults, average age 21 years, in romantic relationships within the past year. Race/ethnicity: White 82%, African American 17%, Other 2%. Retention rate 81%.</p>	<p>the Child Development Project, Tennessee, United States. The sample comprised families from the cities of Nashville and Knoxville, Tennessee, and Bloomington, Indiana, with a child entering kindergarten in 1987 and 1988. Follow-up assessments conducted annually through age 21 years. Multi-informant (parent, child, court records) and multimodal (task completion, self-report) data collected.</p>	<p>(child 5 years), CTS 11-items, both parents interviewed individually; Offspring dating relationship conflict measure (annually ages 18 to 21 years), CTS 11-item; Social Information Processing constructs measures age 13 and 18 years, 4 Social Information Processing measures (encoding, hostile attributions, generation of aggressive responses, and positive evaluation of aggressive responses).  <i>Results:</i> Model 1 (<math>n = 498</math>), controlling for encoding, there was a significant association between parental IPV and offspring dating IPV; Model 2 (<math>n = 498</math>), controlling for hostile attributions, there was some significant association between parental IPV and dating IPV. Model 3 (<math>n = 498</math>), controlling for generation of aggressive responses, parental IPV significantly predicted offspring dating IPV. Model 4 (<math>n = 498</math>), controlling for positive evaluation of aggressive responses, parental IPV predicted offspring dating IPV. There were no significant gender differences in any of these results.</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 2. Longitudinal, small community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Kim, H. K., Laurent, H. K., Capaldi, D. M., &amp; Feingold, A. (2008). Men's aggression toward women: A 10-year panel study. <i>Journal of Marriage and Family</i>, 70(5), 1169-1187.</p>	<p>194</p>	<p>The sample comprised men, ages 29-31 years, in opposite-sex relationships. Race/ethnicity: White 90%. Males' families of origins were lower and working class. Sample retention rate 93%.</p>	<p>Longitudinal data from the Couples Study, Pacific Northwest, United States. The sample of boys, selected between 1984-1985 at ages 9 to 10 years for the Oregon Youth Study (OYS) from neighborhoods at-risk for delinquency, were assessed annually through ages 29 to 31 years (21 years). Couples Study assessments of female partners of OYS males spans five time points: Time 1 (ages 17–20 years), Time 2 (ages 23-25 years), Time 3 (ages 25-27 years), Time 4 (ages 27-29 years), Time 5 (ages 29-31 years). Multimodal (observational, self-report, official documents), multi-informant data collection (parent, teacher, participant, partner/spouse).</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> The data used in the present study included the Oregon Youth Study men's and their partners' physical and psychological aggression over 10 years, and both partners' antisocial behavior and depressive symptoms from each time point sampled. Self-report, interview, questionnaires, and observation for IPV (both of self and current partner) using: CTS, Antisocial behavior measured; Elliot Behavior Checklist, Young Adult Behavior Checklist, and observation; Depressive symptoms (CES-D) 20-item; Association variables Dyadic Adjustment Scale 32-items. Observational coding (of the couples' problem-solving interaction): The Family and Peer Process Code 24-items, 6 affective ratings. Male-to-female IPV</p> <p><i>Results:</i> Men's IPV decreased with age. In models controlling for women's level of relationship satisfaction and relationship commitment, and including both men's and women's antisocial behavior and depressive symptoms, findings indicated that higher levels of both women's antisocial behavior and depressive symptoms were associated with relatively higher levels of men's physical aggression. Men's antisocial behavior and depressive symptoms were not predictive in the model, neither were the interactions between men's and women's scores for</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 2. Longitudinal, small community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				either of these variables.
<p>Marie, D., Fergusson, D. M., &amp; Boden, J. M. (2008). Ethnic identity and intimate partner violence in a New Zealand birth cohort. <i>Social Policy Journal of New Zealand/Te Puna Whakaaro</i>, 33(33), 126-145.</p>	804	<p>Male (50%) and female (50%) adults, average ages 24-25 years, in romantic relationships for at least 1 month. Race/ethnicity: Maori 5%, Maori/other ethnic identity 6%, and non Maori 89%. 64% response rate.</p>	<p>Longitudinal data from the Christchurch Health and Development Study. Sample was an unselected birth cohort from Christchurch, New Zealand, in mid 1977. Assessments were conducted at birth, 4 months, 1 year, and annually to age 16 years, and at ages 18, 21, and 25 years. Multimodal, multi-informant data collection (parent, teacher, child, medical and official records).</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV was measured at age 25 years by self-report of male and female victimization and perpetration from items on CTS2 22-items.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for SES factors, family functioning factors, and individual factors, both men and women reporting Maori ethnicity were at higher risk of both IPV victimization and perpetration, as well as higher risk of injuries related to IPV than were non Maori participants. Risk of IPV did not vary with the degree of Maori identity.</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 2. Longitudinal, small community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Temcheff, C. E., Serbin, L. A., Martin-Storey, A., Stack, D. M., Hodgins, S., Ledingham, J., &amp; Schwartzman, A.E. (2008). Continuity and pathways from aggression in childhood to family violence in adulthood: A 30-year longitudinal study. <i>Journal of Family Violence</i>, 23(4), 231-242.</p>	<p>(1) 365, spousal PV  (2) 357, parental PV</p>	<p>Original sample were children from inner-city areas of Montreal, Canada in Grades 1, 4, and 7; who were recruited in 1976 from schools. Response rate of 95%. This data from those ongoing participants who had at least one child living with them and/or in long-term relationship, and who had completed the CTS survey. The sample of the spousal violence data: mean age = 33.9 years. The sample of the parental violence: mean age = 34.10, 90% of biological mothers married or cohabitating, 92% of biological fathers married or cohabitating.</p>	<p>Longitudinal data from the Concordia Longitudinal Risk Project, Montreal, Quebec, Canada. Original sample recruited in 1976-1978 of aggressive inner-city school children with matched controls. Analyses from participants mean age 33 years. Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> The participants were sampled during the Concordia Longitudinal Risk Project. Over sampled on negative behavior using 50% of participants who had extreme scores on withdrawal and aggression. Current sample is subset of Concordia Project participants in long-term relationship and/or who were parents living with at least one child and had completed self-report, CTS questions; FMPV, MFPV, and parent-to-child physical aggression.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for relationship status, childhood conduct disorders of aggression and withdrawal, and parental status, this study found that aggressive patterns in childhood are direct risk factors for IPV.</p>
<p>Capaldi, D. M., Kim, H. K., &amp; Shortt, J. W. (2007). Observed initiation and reciprocity of physical aggression in young, at-risk couples. <i>Journal of Family Violence</i>,</p>	<p>206</p>	<p>Couples sample, ages 18 to 26 years, in dating, cohabitating, or married relationships. Race/ethnicity: White 90%. 75% were lower SES. Retention rate 94%.</p>	<p>Longitudinal data from the Couples Study, Pacific Northwest, United States. The sample of boys, selected between 1984-1985 at ages 9 to 10 years for the Oregon Youth Study (OYS) from</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Couples problem-solving interaction coded with Family and Peer Process code—observed physical aggression; Self-report questionnaire, National Survey of Health and Stress, physical aggression 2-items; MFPV and FMPV.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> Females were observed to use</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 2. Longitudinal, small community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
22(2), 101-111.			neighborhoods at risk for delinquency, were assessed annually through ages 29 to 31 years (21 years). Couples Study assessments of female partners of OYS males from Time 1 (ages 17–20 years), Time 2 (ages 23-25 years), Time 3 (ages 25-27 years), Time 4 (ages 27-29 years). Multimodal (observational, self-report, official documents), multi-informant data collection (parent, teacher, participant, partner/spouse).	more IPV toward a partner and to be more likely to initiate physical aggression than males at younger ages, but the prevalence of any observed IPV and of initiating was similar for males and females around age 26 years; Both males and females likelihood of responding to physical aggression was similar. There were strong correlations between observed and reported IPV; Observed IPV and probable injury: Both females and males more likely to report injury at some time in relationship if mutual IPV was observed.
Herrenkohl, T. I., Kosterman, R., Mason, W. A., & Hawkins, J. D. (2007). Youth violence trajectories and proximal characteristics of intimate partner violence. <i>Violence and Victims</i> , 22(3), 259-274.	644	Male (48.4%) and female (51.6%) young adults, age 24 years, in a romantic relationship within the past year. Race/ethnicity: European American 48.0%, African American 25.0%, Asian or Pacific Islander American 21.6%, and Native American or Alaska Native 5.4%. Income: 46% of	Longitudinal data from the Seattle Social Development Project, Seattle, United States. Sample of fifth-grade students (age 10 years) recruited from 18 public schools in high-crime neighborhoods in 1985. Multi-informant (teacher, parents, youth) data collected annually through participant age	<i>Measures:</i> IPV: perpetration of IPV (moderately severe behaviors) CTS 3-items. Trajectory of Youth Violence: three or more serious violent acts reported at each age. Proximal characteristics: self and partner's alcohol and drug use, mental health problems; partner's antisocial behavior history and current unemployment; perceived characteristics of community (norms of antisocial behavior, mobility of residents, social disorganization). MFPV and FMPV.

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 2. Longitudinal, small community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
		<p>participants' parents reported yearly incomes under \$20,000 in 1985 Response rate 77%.</p>	<p>33 years. Present analyses through age 24 years. Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Results:</i> In bivariate analyses, the individual's getting drunk from alcohol, arrests because of drinking and use of other drugs were not related to IPV perpetration, but partner's heavy alcohol use, use of marijuana, use of other drugs, and selling drugs were predictive. After controlling for gender, the odds of moderately severe IPV perpetration was double for chronic youth offenders compared to nonoffenders. After controlling for gender and proximal characteristics, chronic and late increaser youth offenders had a marginally significant direct effect on severe IPV perpetration. The impact of chronic and late-onset youth violence trajectories on severe IPV perpetration was partially mediated by proximal characteristics (individual, partner, and community). Partner characteristics (substance use, antisocial behavior) also had a unique effect on severe IPV while controlling for gender, other proximal characteristics, and youth violence trajectories.</p>
<p>Keenan-Miller, D., Hammen, C., &amp; Brennan, P. (2007). Adolescent psychosocial risk factors for severe intimate partner violence in young adulthood. <i>Journal of</i></p>	<p>610</p>	<p>Young adult male (46%) and female (54%) participants, age 20 years. Race/ethnicity: White 92.1%, Asian 3.6%, Australian Aborigine 1%, Maori 0.8%. Income: 64% financial support from</p>	<p>Longitudinal data from a birth cohort study from Brisbane, Queensland, Australia. The sample comprised a birth cohort between 1981-1984 with an oversample of mothers with depressive</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Self-report on three items severe physical male and female IPV over last 5 years: physically hurt, needed medical attention, or called the police. Close relationships interview on close friendships, romantic relationships/dating interests, and family relationships. Included the overall quality of these relationships and chronic stressors in each area over the</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 2. Longitudinal, small community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<i>Consulting and Clinical Psychology</i> , 75(3), 456-463.		parents. Relationship status: single 43%, dating casually 17%, serious relationship 14%, cohabitating 20%, married 2%, separated/divorced 2%. Retention rate 75%.	symptoms. Data collected prenatally, three times by age 5 years, and at ages 15 and 20 years. In-home interviews. Self-report.	past 6 months.  <i>Results:</i> Youth history of depression by age 15 years predicted victimization at age 20 years. Severe violence perpetration was predicted by maternal depressive history among young women but not men. Youth social functioning was a partial mediator of both associations.
Lansford, J. E., Miller-Johnson, S., Berlin, L. J., Dodge, K. A., Bates, J. E., & Pettit, G. S. (2007). Early physical abuse and later violent delinquency: A prospective longitudinal study. <i>Child Maltreatment</i> , 12(3), 233-245.	465	Male (52%) and female (48%) young adult participants, age 21 years. Race/ethnicity: European American 81%, African American 17%. Retention rate 81%.	Longitudinal data from the Child Development Project, Tennessee, United States. The sample comprised families from the cities of Nashville and Knoxville, Tennessee, and Bloomington, Indiana, with a child entering kindergarten in 1987 and 1988. Follow-up assessments conducted annually through age 21 years. Multi-informant (parent, child, court records) and multimodal (task completion, self-report) data collected.	<i>Measures:</i> multimodal - early physical abuse: lifetime incidence, mother report (age 5 years); delinquency: Young Adult Self-Report (ages 18, 21 years) 126-items, court records; IPV: modified CTS (age 21 years); substance use/social problems: various items (age 21 years).  <i>Results:</i> After controlling for SES, single-parent status, family stress, maternal social support, child exposure to violence, child temperament, and child health and looking at the moderating effects of race and gender, the research indicated that individuals who had been physically abused in the first 5 years of life were at greater risk for being arrested as juveniles for violent, nonviolent, and status offenses. When controlling for the above variables, the effect of abuse was nonsignificant for IPV perpetration or victimization.

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 2. Longitudinal, small community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Ehrensaft, M. K., Cohen, P., &amp; Johnson, J. G. (2006). Development of personality disorder symptoms and the risk for partner violence. <i>Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 115</i>(3), 474-483.</p>	<p>543</p>	<p>Male and female adults, average age 31 years, in a romantic relationship within past year. Race/ethnicity: Caucasian 91%. 66% response rate of original study sample.</p>	<p>Longitudinal data from the Children in the Community Study, upstate New York, United States. Randomly selected sample of families from two upstate New York counties in 1975 with additional sample included in 1983. Three follow-up assessments were conducted with youths and mothers in 1983, 1985-1986, 1991-1993, and an assessment of youth only in 1999. Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV was measured by self-report of male and female victimization and perpetration from items on CTS. Conduct disorder in childhood was measured by the DISC. Personality disorder was measured by items from the Personality Disorder Questionnaire and SCID-II. Personality disorders divided into Cluster A (paranoid, schizoid, and schizotypal), Cluster B (histrionic, narcissistic, and borderline disorders), Cluster C (avoidant, dependent, and obsessive compulsive disorder) according to DSM-IV. Child punishment was measured by maternal report of power-assertive punishment of child. Parent-to-parent violence and child abuse was measured by retrospective self-report of participant.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for SES, race, sex, age, and personality disorder symptoms, Cluster A and B symptoms in early 20's predicted later perpetration of IPV. Cluster C symptoms decreased risk of IPV in participants that experienced childhood abuse and adolescent conduct disorder. Cluster A, B, C symptoms had a slower age-based decline of symptoms in those who perpetrated IPV compared to their nonviolent peers.</p>
<p>Fergusson, D. M., Boden, J. M., &amp;</p>	<p>807</p>	<p>Adult males (47%) and females (53%), age 25</p>	<p>Longitudinal data from the Christchurch Health</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Self-report, youth report at age 18 years of interparental IPV before age 16</p>



PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 2. Longitudinal, small community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Horwood, L. J. (2006). Examining the intergenerational transmission of violence in a New Zealand birth cohort. <i>Child Abuse &amp; Neglect, 30</i>(2), 89-108.</p>		<p>years, in a relationship within past 12 months. Response rate 79%.</p>	<p>and Development Study. Sample was an unselected birth cohort from Christchurch, New Zealand, in mid 1977. Assessments were conducted at birth, four months, age 1 year, and annually to age 16 years, and at ages 18, 21, and 25 years. Multimodal, multi-informant data collection (parent, teacher, child, medical and official records).</p>	<p>years 8-items, CTS; Partner IPV ages 24-25 years, CTS2 22-items, and medical history of domestic violence injuries; criminal justice involvement for violent crimes; history of childhood sexual abuse; and physical punishment experienced before age 16 years. Control factors SES, parental risk behaviors and parent-child relationship, child abuse, and conduct/attentional problems. MFPV, FMPV, perpetration, and victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> Findings indicated no association between exposure to interparental violence and physical IPV perpetration or victimization. Exposure was related to psychological perpetration and victimization. After controlling for family, social, and demographic factors, the associations between parental IPV exposure and later violent behaviors were weak. There were weak associations between parental IPV exposure and psychological MFPV/FMPV but not physical aggression. Parental IPV was associated with low SES, family dysfunction, child abuse, and impaired attachments.</p>
<p>Cui, M., Lorenz, F. O., Conger, R. D., Melby, J. N., &amp; Bryant, C. M. (2005). Observer, self-, and</p>	<p>236</p>	<p>Male (44%) and females (52%) young adults, average age 21 years, in an exclusive heterosexual relationship (average</p>	<p>Longitudinal data from the Family Transitions Project, a combined sample from the Iowa Youth and Families</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Self-report, partner-report, and observation of IPV: Targets self-reports of own IPV perpetration, in past month 5-items: get angry at partner, criticize them or their ideas, shout or yell because you</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 2. Longitudinal, small community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>partner reports of hostile behaviors in romantic relationships. <i>Journal of Marriage and Family</i>, 67(5), 1169-1181.</p>		<p>length 1.7 years). Race/ethnicity: European-American 99%, minority ethnicity less than 1%. Income: mean \$12,633 annually. Retention rate 90%.</p>	<p>Project and Iowa Single Parent Project. Sample recruitment for the Iowa Youth and Families Project was two-parent families with a seventh grader (enrolled in public or private school) and sibling within age 4 years recruited in 1989 from eight rural counties in northern Iowa, United States. In 1991, the sample for the Iowa Single Parent Project comprised single-parent families with a ninth grader throughout the state of Iowa. Multimodal, multi-informant data was collected annually from 1989-1992, 1994-1995, and 1997.</p>	<p>were mad, argue with partner because you disagreed about something, and hit, push, grab, or shove your partner; Partners report of targets' behavior same 5-items; Observational coding via videotape of hostility during task: answering questions to issues that would incite disagreements (i.e., chores, recreation, money). Observers' ratings of reports of young adults' hostile behavior toward their partners. Three behaviors, antisocial, hostility, angry coercion on a 9-point scale (the Iowa Interaction Rating Scales). MFPV and FMPV.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for income, student status, length of relationship and if parents' divorced, findings indicated that length of relationship was positively associated with partners' report of IPV; parents' divorce was positively and significantly associated with young adult IPV as reported by all three informants. There were significant differences in partners' and young adults' reports of IPV. Couples who live together were significantly more likely to experience higher levels of IPV than those who were dating; females were more likely to demonstrate IPV toward their partners than males.</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 2. Longitudinal, small community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Linder, J. R., &amp; Collins, W. A. (2005). Parent and peer predictors of physical aggression and conflict management in romantic relationships in early adulthood. <i>Journal of Family Psychology, 19</i>(2), 252-262.</p>	121	<p>Sample of male (48%) and female (52%) young adults, ages 21 to 23 years, in romantic relationships of at least 4 months duration. Race/ethnicity: White 67.8%, African American 9.9%, Native American 2.5%, Other/Mixed 19.8%. All participants from families in poverty. Relationship length: average 25.07 months.</p>	<p>Longitudinal data from the Minnesota Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children, United States. Sample comprised of children developmentally at risk because of poverty at birth in 1975. Multimodal (observational, self-report) and multi-informant (parent, child) data collected over 23 years.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Experiences of child abuse, witnessing parental IPV; Physical aggression CTS 8-items; Conflict management, observational, and Relationship Problem Inventory. Coded videotaping, audio taping of problem-solving sessions.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for early familial violence, findings indicated that individuals who experienced early childhood abuse, witnessed parental IPV, and experienced parental boundary violations (i.e., parental seductiveness or role reversal) reported higher levels of MFPV/FMPV in their romantic relationships; Higher quality peer relationships at age 16 years reduced the likelihood of IPV at age 21 years; Childhood physical abuse was associated with MFPV/FMPV at age 23 years but not significantly at age 21 years.</p>
<p>Martino, S. C., Collins, R. L., &amp; Ellickson, P. L. (2005). Cross-lagged relationships between substance use and intimate partner violence among a sample of young adult women. <i>Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 66</i>(1), 139-148.</p>	509	<p>Sample of women living with a partner or spouse at assessments at age 23 and age 29 years. Race/ethnicity: White 74%; Hispanic 10%, Black 5%, Asian 6%, and Other 5%. Mean level of education 13.3 years with 85% having earned a high school degree. Response rate at baseline</p>	<p>Longitudinal data from the RAND Adolescent/Young Adult Panel Study. School-based sample of adolescents recruited in 1985 from seventh-grade classes from 30 middle and junior high schools in California and Oregon. Follow-up surveys conducted in Grades 8, 9,</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: perpetration 1-item; victimization 1-item; drinking behavior 1-item; marijuana use 1-item; other drug use 1-item. MFPV, FMPV, perpetration, and victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for educational attainment, income level, and race, the results suggest that substance use does not increase women's long-term risk of perpetrating or being a victim of IPV.</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 2. Longitudinal, small community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
		assessment 86%.	10, and 12, and again at ages 23 and 29 years. Paper and pencil surveys. Self-report. United States.	
Caetano, R., Ramisetty-Mikler, S., & McGrath, C. (2004). Acculturation, drinking, and intimate partner violence among Hispanic couples in the United States: A longitudinal study. <i>Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences</i> , 26(1), 60-78.	387	Sample of married or cohabitating adult Hispanic couples. Response rate 85%, retention rate 2000 72%.	Longitudinal survey data. Sample of couples from the 1995 National Alcohol Survey, a national multistage area household probability sample with oversamples of African American and Hispanic households. Follow-up survey in 2000. In-person interviews conducted separately with each partner. Self-report. United States	<p><i>Measures:</i> Self-report, face-to-face interviews with men and women separately. CTS-R; degree of severity for moderate or severe physical violence; Childhood abuse victimization, been hit, beaten up, choked, burned, scalded, threatened with weapons; Childhood exposure to parental IPV; Approval of marital aggression; Frequency of alcohol use. MFPV, FMPV, and perpetration.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> Differences in prevalence rates of MFPV and FMPV, incidence, and recurrence across acculturation groups were not significant. Couples with mixed acculturation level (high-medium) were less at risk for MFPV. An increase of five standard drinks per week in men’s drinking decreased the risk of FMPV by 10%. Acculturation level at Time 1 was not associated with MFPV and FMPV status 5</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 2. Longitudinal, small community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				years later.
<p>Herrenkohl, T. I., Mason, W. A., Kosterman, R., Lengua, L. J., Hawkins, J. D., &amp; Abbott, R. D. (2004). Pathways from physical childhood abuse to partner violence in young adulthood. <i>Violence and Victims, 19</i>(2), 123-136.</p>	644	<p>Sample of male (49%) and female (51%) young adults, age 24 years, in a current intimate relationship or within the past year. Race/ethnicity: European American 47%, African American 24%, Asian American 21%, and Other 9%. Annual income: 46% families reported \$20,000 or less. Response rate 77%.</p>	<p>Longitudinal data from the Seattle Social Development Project, Seattle, United States. Sample of fifth-grade students (age 10 years) recruited from 18 public schools in high-crime neighborhoods in 1985. Multi-informant (teacher, parents, youth) data collected annually through participant age 33 years. Present analyses through age 24 years. Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV measured by self-report at age 24 years by male and female CTS 3-items; Physical child abuse before age 10 years 5-items; Childhood aggression: teacher, parent, and participant reports at age 10 years; Adolescent violence at ages 15 and 18 years (2-items each time); Negative emotionality age 21 years: Emotionality, Activity, and Sociability; Relationship Quality 9-items. MFPV, FMPV, and perpetration.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> Correlations indicated most risk factors predicted IPV perpetration at age 24 years; namely, aggression at age 10 years, abuse before age 10 years, adolescent violence, negative emotionality predictive for females only, relationship quality with partner protective for males and females. After controlling for all variables, child abuse was found to be related to later IPV,</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 2. Longitudinal, small community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				but with no significant mediation by childhood aggression, adolescent violence, or negative emotionality. For females, the quality of one’s relationship influenced the effect that childhood abuse had on later IPV, showing a protective effect. Although for males, childhood abuse remained a direct predictor of IPV.
<p>Kim, H. K., &amp; Capaldi, D. M. (2004). The association of antisocial behavior and depressive symptoms between partners and risk for aggression in romantic relationships. <i>Journal of Family Psychology, 18</i>(1), 82-96.</p>	79 couples	<p>Sample of men, ages 27-29 years, and their female partners. Race/ethnicity: European American 90%, Hispanic 3.4%, African American 3.4%, American Indian/Alaskan Native 2%, and Asian/Pacific Islander 1%. Males’ families of origins were lower and working class. Relationship status: married 53%, cohabitating 32%, dating or engaged 15%. Average length of relationship 4.5 years. 95% retention rate.</p>	<p>Longitudinal data from the Couples Study, Pacific Northwest, United States. The sample of boys, selected between 1984-1985 at ages 9 to 10 years for the Oregon Youth Study (OYS) from neighborhoods at-risk for delinquency, were assessed annually through ages 29 to 31 years (21 years). Couples Study assessments of female partners of OYS males Time 1 (ages 17–20 years), Time 2 (ages 23-25 years), Time 3 (ages 25-27 years). Multimodal (observational, self-report, official documents), multi-informant data collection</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Observed couples’ problem-solving interaction coded with the Family and Peer Process were used for summary scores of physical and psychological aggression. Additional physical and psychological aggression measures (self and partner reports: CTS and CTS-R, interviewer ratings; Antisocial behavior, court records, self-report, and court records).</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for aggressive behavior and concurrent risk characteristics, young males and females both had significant associations between antisocial behavior and perpetration of physical and psychological IPV; Males depressive symptoms were related to psychological IPV at Time 2 and both physical and psychological aggression Time 3; Females depressive symptoms were related to IPV perpetration Time 2 and Time 3; Females depressive symptoms were predictive of males psychological aggression; Males risk factors were not</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 2. Longitudinal, small community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
			(parent, teacher, participant, partner/spouse).	significantly associated with FMPV.
<p>Capaldi, D. M., Shortt, J. W., &amp; Crosby, L. (2003). Physical and psychological aggression in at-risk young couples: Stability and change in young adulthood. <i>Merrill-Palmer Quarterly</i>, 49(1), 1-27.</p>	<p>210  105 couples</p>	<p>Sample of young men and their female partners, ages 17 to 23 years. Race/ethnicity: European American 90%, Other 10%. Economic status: 75% lower and working class. 74.4% response rate.</p>	<p>Longitudinal data from the Couples Study, Pacific Northwest, United States. The sample of boys, selected between 1984-1985 at ages 9 to 10 years for the Oregon Youth Study (OYS) from neighborhoods at-risk for delinquency, were assessed annually through ages 23-25 years. Couples Study assessments of female partners of OYS males from Time 1 (ages 17–20 years) to Time 2 (ages 23-25 years). Multimodal (observational, self-report, official</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV was measured by self and partner report of male and female victimization and perpetration with items based on CTS; summary items on physical aggression 4-items and summary items on psychological aggression 4-items. Also, coded observation and ratings of a couple problem-solving interaction for rate per minute of physically aversive/aggressive behaviors and negative verbal/verbal attack/verbal coercion was used to measure IPV.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for previous aggression and relationship factors, it was found that the longer length of relationship predicted increases in male perpetration of physical but did not predict male perpetration psychological IPV. IPV was more stable with same versus new partners.</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 2. Longitudinal, small community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
			documents), multi-informant data collection (parent, teacher, participant, partner/spouse).	
<p>Ehrensaft, M. K., Cohen, P., Brown, J., Smailes, E., Chen, H. N., &amp; Johnson, J. G. (2003). Intergenerational transmission of partner violence: A 20-year prospective study. <i>Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 71</i>(4), 741-753.</p>	543	<p>Male and female adults, average age 31 years, in a romantic relationship within past year. Race/ethnicity: Caucasian 91%. Response rate of original study sample 66%.</p>	<p>Longitudinal data from the Children in the Community study, upstate New York, United States. Randomly selected sample of families from two upstate New York counties in 1975 with additional sample included in 1983. Three follow-up assessments were conducted with youths and mothers in 1983, 1985-1986, 1991-1993, and an assessment of youth only in 1999. Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV measure by self-report of male and female victimization and perpetration from items on CTS. Oppositional defiant disorder, conduct disorder, alcohol abuse, and marijuana abuse measured by parent and youth version of the DISC. Parenting practices measured by items assessing power assertive punishment, maternal inconsistent rule enforcement, autonomy from parents, and closeness to mother. Child maltreatment measured by participant report and official records of abuse and neglect in childhood. Parent-to-parent violence measured by participant report of exposure in childhood. MFPV, FMPV, perpetration, and victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for demographic factors, findings indicated that exposure to violence between parents, power assertive punishment, and conduct disorder were risk factors for perpetrating IPV, with conduct disorder being the greatest risk. Of the</p>



PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 2. Longitudinal, small community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				three risk factors, conduct disorder mediated the effect of child abuse on IPV, whereas the other two remained direct predictors. Also, emerging adult substance abuse did not influence the effect of adolescent conduct disorder on IPV and did not predict IPV controlling for other factors. Exposure to violence between parents was a significant risk factor for victimization of IPV.
Testa, M., Livingston, J. A., & Leonard, K. E. (2003). Women's substance use and experiences of intimate partner violence: A longitudinal investigation among a community sample. <i>Addictive Behaviors</i> , 28(9), 1649-1664.	724	Sample of women ages 18-30 years (mean age 24 years). Race/ethnicity: White 75%, African American 17%. Average relationship length = 3.96 years ( <i>SD</i> = 3.96). Median household income between \$30,000 and \$40,000. 61% response rate.	Longitudinal data from the Women 2000 Survey of the Buffalo, NY area. Regionally representative sample recruited via random-digit dialing. In-person interviews. Self-report. United States.	<i>Measures:</i> Self-report. IPV measure: CTS-2; Relationship satisfaction 2-items; Substance use: Alcohol 2-items; Drugs: type and frequency. MFPV and victimization.  <i>Results:</i> After controlling for age, race, and married and cohabitating status, the results provide evidence that women who use hard drugs are at increased risk of victimization. Both marijuana and hard drug use were associated with increased likelihood of victimization in new relationships. Women's heavy episodic drinking did not predict subsequent experiences of partner violence in ongoing or new relationships.
Woodward, L. J., Fergusson, D. M., & Horwood, L. J. (2002). Romantic relationships of young people with childhood and	495	Sample of males (41%) and females (59%), ages 21 years, in a stable romantic relationship of at least 1 month. Average relationship length 21.5 months. Retention rate	Longitudinal data from the Christchurch Health and Development Study, New Zealand. Sample was an unselected birth cohort from Christchurch, New	<i>Measures:</i> Antisocial behavior, ages 8, 9, and 10 years, parent and teacher report (e.g., aggression and cruelty toward others). Ages 12 to 16 years, self and parent report using Self-Report of Early Delinquency Scale 29-items. Self-Report Delinquency Instrument at ages 18 and 21

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 2. Longitudinal, small community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>adolescent onset antisocial behavior problems. <i>Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology</i>, 30(3), 231-243.</p>		<p>55.5%.</p>	<p>Zealand, in mid 1977. Assessments were conducted at birth, 4 months, 1 year, and annually to age 16 years, and at ages 18 and 21 years. Multimodal, multi-informant data collection (parent, teacher, child, medical and official records).</p>	<p>years, self and partner report--including assault, fighting, using a weapon, physical coercion, and cruelty toward animals 43-items. Partner relationship outcomes: IPV measure, age 21 years self and partner report CTS 9-items. Intimate Relations Scale--including conflict scales that measures disputes and ambivalence 15-items. Parent-Child Relations, observational measures--including mothers punitive responses to child, physical punishment. Interparental measures, extent of parental IPV and CTS, self and parental reports. MFPV and FMPV.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> Controlled for confounding factors known or suspected to be associated with the onset of antisocial behavior problems and later partner outcomes (i.e., maternal age, SES, family living standards), parent-child relationship (maternal punitive behavior, maternal emotional responsiveness, parental physical punishment), interparental relationship (marital conflict, partner violence, parental change), and individual factors (gender, attention problems, IQ). Earlier onset of antisocial behavior is associated with a greater risk of IPV and conflictual relationships at age 21 years, Younger onset antisocial behavior were more likely than those with later or no onset antisocial behavior to be perpetrators or victims of</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 2. Longitudinal, small community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				IPV; there was no gender difference in IPV perpetration.
<p>Capaldi, D. M., Dishion, T. J., Stoolmiller, M., &amp; Yoerger, K. (2001). Aggression toward female partners by at-risk young men: The contribution of male adolescent friendships. <i>Developmental Psychology</i>, 37(1), 61-73.</p>	206	<p>Sample of men, ages 20 to 24 years, in opposite-sex relationships. Female partner mean age 20 years. Race/ethnicity: White 90%. Males' families of origins were lower and working class. Relationship status: dating/engaged 45%, cohabitating 37%, married 18%. Response rate 74.4%. Retention rate 97% - 99%.</p>	<p>Longitudinal data from the Couples Study and Oregon Youth Study (OYS), Pacific Northwest, United States. The sample of boys, selected between 1984-1985 at ages 9 to 10 years for the OYS from neighborhoods at-risk for delinquency, were assessed annually through ages 29 to 31 years (21 years). Couples Study assessments of female partners of OYS males spans two time points: Time 1 (ages 17–20 years), Time 2 (ages 23-25 years). Multimodal (observational, self-report, official documents), multi-informant data collection (parent, teacher, participant, partner/spouse).</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Multimodal; Problem-solving couples' interaction tasks, Family and Peer Process Code for psychological and physical aggression; Antisocial behaviors in childhood, self, peer, parent, and teacher report, along with Juvenile Court records; Hostile talk about women, adjustment with partner, self and partner report, threats, push, grab, shove, throw something, slap, or hit; Physical aggression, CTS, and Dyadic Social Skills Questionnaire; Psychological aggression, Partner Interaction Questionnaire partner report property destruction, controlling behavior, coercion, and verbal attacks. Outcome variable of MFPV was combined self and partner reports and observed behavior of both physical and psychological aggression.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> The males' antisocial behavior in late childhood and adolescence, deviant peer association, and hostile talk about women (observed during male peer interactions at ages 17-18 years) all predicted MFPV. In a structural equation model, controlling for other factors, hostile talk was still significantly predictive of later MFPV (at ages 20-23 years). Antisocial and delinquent behavior at ages</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 2. Longitudinal, small community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				17-18 years was also predictive of MFPV.
<p>Andrews, J. A., Foster, S. L., Capaldi, D., &amp; Hops, H. (2000). Adolescent and family predictors of physical aggression, communication, and satisfaction in young adult couples: A prospective analysis. <i>Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology</i>, 68(2), 195-208.</p>	254	<p>Sample of male (37%) and female (63%) young adults, average age 22.51 years. Race/ethnicity: Caucasian 93%, Other 7%. Education: 5% less than high school, 25% high school, and 70% above high school. Relationship status: 51% were married and 49% dating (cohabiting couples excluded). 60% response rate.</p>	<p>Longitudinal data from school-based sample, Western Oregon, United States. Students participated from a stratified random sample of six high schools in two urban areas. Multimodal (observational, self-report) and multi-informant (parent, adolescent) data collected at baseline and 6 years later.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: CTS physical aggression 7-items; Family aversive communication, Antisocial behavior of participant, Depression -- all measured at adolescence by parent-report, clinical interviews, and observations of family interaction; Couple satisfaction/adjustment (Dyadic Adjustment Scale); Couple aversive/facilitative communication; Partner antisocial behavior: Self-Report of Delinquency Scale and Young Adult Self-Report. MFPV, FMPV, perpetration, and victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for all variables and interactions, family aversive communication and participant antisocial behavior predicted IPV in couples. Male partner antisocial behavior predicted IPV victimization for dating women (not married). Depressive symptoms did not predict IPV.</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 2. Longitudinal, small community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Swinford, S. P., DeMaris, A., Cernkovich, S. A., &amp; Giordano, P. C. (2000). Harsh physical discipline in childhood and violence in later romantic involvements: The mediating role of problem behaviors. <i>Journal of Marriage and the Family</i>, 62(2), 508-519.</p>	608	<p>Sample of male (45%) and female (55%) young adults, ages 22 to 29 years. Race/ethnicity: White 52% and Black 48%. Relationship status: married 36.5%, cohabiting 33.4%, and dating 29.8%. Response rate 77%.</p>	<p>Longitudinal data from a study of adolescents in Toledo, Ohio, United States. Representative, modified probability sample of adolescents between ages 12 and 19 years in 1982. Follow-up interviews conducted between 1992 and 1993. In-person interviews. Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV measured by self-report of male and female victimization and perpetration from items on CTS. Child abuse measured by possible harsh physical discipline experienced in childhood 5-items. Problem behaviors measured participation in deviant actions for adolescent 26-items and for adulthood 20-items.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for all variables, childhood abuse and deviant behavior significantly predicted perpetration of IPV. Women are more likely to perpetrate IPV and men are more likely to be victimized by IPV. It was found that greater levels of perpetration of IPV increased the extent to which one is victimized by IPV.</p>
<p>Capaldi, D. M., &amp; Clark, S. (1998). Prospective family predictors of aggression toward female partners for at-risk young men. <i>Developmental Psychology</i>, 34(6), 1175-1188.</p>	206	<p>Sample of males, ages 17 to 20 years, in opposite-sex relationships. Race/ethnicity: White 90%. Males' families of origins were lower and working class. Relationship status: dating/engaged 70%, cohabitating 26%, and married 4%. Response rate 74%.</p>	<p>Longitudinal data from the Couples Study and Oregon Youth Study (OYS), Pacific Northwest, United States. The sample of boys, selected between 1984-1985 at ages 9 to 10 years for the Oregon Youth Study (OYS) from neighborhoods at-risk for delinquency, were assessed annually through ages 29 to 31 years (21 years).</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Multimodal measures; Interaction tasks, Family and Peer Process Code for observed psychological and physical aggression during problem-solving discussion; Antisocial behaviors in childhood, self, peer, parent, and teacher report, along with Juvenile Court records; self and partner reports of physical aggression (threats, push, grab, shove, throw something, slap, or hit); CTS (on parents' aggression); self and partner reports of psychological aggression (Adjustment with Partner and Dyadic Social Skills Questionnaires ). MFPV.</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 2. Longitudinal, small community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
			<p>Analyses include the Couples Study assessment of female partners of OYS males at Time 1 (ages 17-20). Multimodal (observational, self-report, official documents), multi-informant data collection (parent, teacher, participant, partner/spouse).</p>	<p><i>Results:</i> Outcome variable is combined physical and psychological aggression toward a partner. Correlations between constructs indicated that parental antisocial behavior and unskilled parenting (boys' age 9-14 years) and boys' antisocial behavior (age 15-16 years) were significantly associated with MFPV (at mean age 18.7 years), whereas parental dyadic aggression was not predictive.</p>
<p>Capaldi, D. M., &amp; Crosby, L. (1997). Observed and reported psychological and physical aggression in young, at-risk couples. <i>Social Development, 6</i>(2), 184-206.</p>	<p>118</p>	<p>Couples sample of males and their female partners. The average age for men was 18.7 years and 18.0 years for women. Race/ethnicity: White 90%. 75% were lower SES. Relationship status: dating/engaged 70%, cohabitating 26%, married 4%. Response rate 74.4%.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from the Couples Study, Pacific Northwest, United States. The sample of boys, selected between 1984-1985 at ages 9 to 10 years for the Oregon Youth Study (OYS) from neighborhoods at risk for delinquency, were assessed annually through ages 17-20 years. Couples Study assessments of female partners of OYS males at Time 1 (ages 17-20 years). Multimodal (observational, self-report, official</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Observed physical and psychological aggression from couples' problem-solving interaction task coded with Family and Peer Process Code; also: Physical aggression, self and partner reports of behaviors--including, pushing, grabbing, shoving, throwing slapping, hitting, kicking, biting hitting with object, beating up, choking, or burning; Psychological aggression, self and partner reports--including insulting, swearing, threatening, and ridiculing the partner. MFPV and FMPV.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> Psychological aggression predicted physical aggression. Length of relationship and type of relationship predicted psychological but not psychological aggression by both men and women. Depressive symptoms and low</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 2. Longitudinal, small community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
			documents), multi-informant data collection (parent, teacher, participant, partner/spouse).	self-esteem predicted both psychological and physical aggression by women, whereas antisocial behavior was not predictive for women. In contrast, for males, antisocial behavior predicted both physical and psychological aggression; whereas depressive symptoms and self-esteem were not predictive.
Aldarondo, E., & Sugarman, D. B. (1996). Risk marker analysis of the cessation and persistence of wife assault. <i>Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology</i> , 64(5), 1010-1019.	532	Sample of male (43%) and female (57%) married or cohabitating adults, mean ages 41-42 years. Race/ethnicity: White 70%, African American 14%, Latino 9%, other ethnic group 7%. Income: median family income was between \$25,000 and \$30,000. Response rate was about 80%.	Longitudinal data from the National Family Violence Survey and Panel Study on Deterrence Processes. The sample for the 1985 National Family Violence Survey comprised a national stratified probability sample selected by random digit dialing. Follow-up interviews were conducted with respondents annually from 1986-1987. Self-report.	<i>Measures:</i> IPV: CTS 19-items, verbal aggression 5-items; Experiencing physical violence from parents during teenage years 1-item; Witnessing spousal violence 1-item; Level of marital agreement 4-items. MFPV and perpetration.  <i>Results:</i> After controlling for all risk factors, it was found that lower levels of marital agreement and lower SES increase the risk of persistent MFPV. Men who witnessed family/spousal violence were at greater risk for perpetrating IPV over both short and long time periods.
Simons, R. L., Wu, C. I., Johnson, C., & Conger, R. D. (1995). A test of various perspectives on the intergenerational transmission of domestic violence.	451	Sample of White, two-parent families with a child in Grade 7 at Wave 1. Income up to \$135,000, mean \$29,462. Response rate 78%, retention rate above 90%.	Longitudinal data from the Iowa Youth and Families Project. Sample of two-parent families with a seventh grader (enrolled in public or private school) and sibling within ages 4	<i>Measures:</i> Grandparents harsh discipline, CTS 4-items; Parent aggression toward children, CTS 2-items and past month parent-child physical aggression 1-item; Marital IPV victimization, hit, pushed, or shoved 1-item; Parental antisocial behavior: fighting, traffic violations, lying, gambling, and having been arrested

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 2. Longitudinal, small community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<i>Criminology</i> , 33(1), 141-172.			years recruited in 1989 from eight rural counties in northern Iowa, United States. Multimodal, multi-informant data taken from annual assessments between 1989-1992.	5-items. MFPV, FMPV, and victimization.  <i>Results:</i> After controlling for the effects of grandparent harsh discipline, antisocial behavior (parents), aggression toward children, and aggression toward spouse, findings indicated that antisocial behavior of both mothers and fathers predicted marital violence.
Williams, K. R., & Hawkins, R. (1989). Controlling male aggression in intimate relationships. <i>Law and Society Review</i> , 23(4), 591-612.	424	Sample of men, married or cohabitating in an opposite sex relationship. Detailed demographic information not reported.	Longitudinal data from the National Family Violence Survey and resurveys. The sample for the 1985 National Family Violence Survey comprised a national stratified probability sample selected by random digit dialing. Follow-up interviews were conducted with respondents annually from 1986-1987. Self-report.	Measure: IPV: CTS; Attachment: importance respondents place on certain social activities; Commitment: years with present partner and living in present community; Involvement: an index of social activities; Perceived risk of arrest from perpetrating violence; Moral disapproval of assault. MFPV and perpetration.  <i>Results:</i> After controlling for all variables, it was found that men who placed greater importance on socializing with significant others, perceived a greater risk for arrest for wife assault and more strongly disapproved of such aggressive behaviors, were significantly less likely to perpetrate IPV.
Fergusson, D. M., Horwood, L. J., Kershaw, K. L., & Shannon, F. T. (1986). Factors associated with	960	Sample of women who were married mothers. Average age 25-29 years. Race/ethnicity: White 94% and non White 6%.	Longitudinal data from the Christchurch Health and Development Study. Sample was an unselected birth cohort from Christchurch, New	Measure: IPV: from general questionnaire on family life events 1-item; Family characteristics: type of marriage, length of marriage, planning of pregnancy, and SES factors. MFPV and victimization.



PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 2. Longitudinal, small community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>reports of wife assault in New Zealand. <i>Journal of Marriage and the Family</i>, 48(2), 407-412.</p>			<p>Zealand, in mid 1977. Assessments were conducted at birth, 4 months, age 1 year, and annually to age 7 years. Multimodal, multi-informant data collection (parent, teacher, child, medical records).</p>	<p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for all variables, it was found that length of marriage, the planning of pregnancy, the age of the husband, family SES, maternal education level, and frequency of religious attendance were significant risk factors for IPV victimization of mothers. Specifically, the women with the least risk of IPV victimization had been married for 5 or more years and husband was over age 25 years before having children, planned their pregnancy, received tertiary education, of professional SES, and had regular church attendance.</p>

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
---------------------------	---	------------------------------------	-------------------	---------

**Table 3. Cross-Sectional, Large Community Adult Samples**

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Afifi, T. O., Brownridge, D. A., MacMillan, H., &amp; Sareen, J. (2010). The relationship of gambling to intimate partner violence and child maltreatment in a nationally representative sample. <i>Journal of Psychiatric Research</i>, 44(5), 331-337.</p>	<p>3,334</p>	<p>Adult males (40%) and females (60%), age 18 years or older. Race/ethnicity: White 73.1%, Black 13.6%, Hispanic 5.9%, and Other 7.4%. Household annual income (USD): 689 made between \$0-\$19,999; 526 made between \$20,000-\$34,999; 1,046 respondents made between \$35,000-\$69,999; and 1,033 respondents made \$70,000+. Response rate 70.9%.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from the 2001 to 2003 National Comorbidity Survey Replication, United States. Nationally representative, multistage clustered sampling design.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: both dating violence and marital violence CTS; Gambling problems: DSM-IV; Child maltreatment: minor physical assault and severe physical abuse CTS. Mental disorders: CIDI. MFPV, FMPV, perpetration, and victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for SES variables and mental disorders, found that pathological gambling was associated with increased odds of the perpetration of minor dating violence, severe dating violence, and marital violence. Also related to victimization.</p>
<p>Ansara, D. L., &amp; Hindin, M. J. (2010). Exploring gender differences in the patterns of intimate partner violence in Canada: A latent class approach. <i>Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health</i>,</p>	<p>15,416</p>	<p>Males and females, age 15 years or older, with a current or former spouse or common-law partner. Response rate 74.5%.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from the 2004 General Social Survey (Cycle 18). Nationally representative, geographically stratified random sample interviewed by telephone in English or French. Self-report. Canada.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: Emotional-financial abuse 7-items; physical-sexual abuse CTS 10-items. MFPV, FMPV, and victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> Results showed more variation in the patterns of IPV found for women (six classes) than for men (four classes). Women: no violence or abuse 94.1% current partner, 51.4% expartner; jealousy, verbal abuse 3.7% current partner, 25.1%</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 3. Cross-sectional adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
64, 849-854.				<p>expartner; physical aggression 1.7% current partner, 4.9% expartner; severe violence, control, verbal abuse 0.2% current partner, 8.1% expartner; physical aggression, control, verbal abuse 0.2% current partner, 5.2% expartner; Control, verbal abuse 0.1% current partner, 5.3% expartner. Men: no violence or abuse 95.2% current partner, 66.2% expartner; Jealousy, verbal abuse 2.3% current partner, 21.1% expartner; physical aggression 2.3% current partner, 5.3% expartner; moderate violence, control, verbal abuse 0.3% current partner, 7.4% expartner. Only women experienced a severe and chronic pattern of violence and control involving high levels of fear and injury. For men and women, the more severe patterns of violence and control were only substantially identified in the expartner sample.</p>
<p>Caetano, R., Ramisetty-Mikler, S., &amp; Harris, T. R. (2010). Neighborhood characteristics as predictors of male to female and female to male partner violence. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i>, 25(11),</p>	1,392 couples	<p>Married or cohabitating heterosexual couples, age 18 years or older, with a partner with the same racial/ethnic identity. Race/ethnicity: African American 23%, Hispanic 38%, White 40%. Response rate=85%; Retention rate= 72%.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional analysis of national survey data (2000), United States. Sample of couples from the 1995 National Alcohol Survey, a national multistage area household probability sample with oversamples of African-American and Hispanic households. Follow-up survey</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV - subscale of CTS-R 11-items, both MFPV and FMPV; Neighborhood-level socioeconomic variables - 2000 U.S. Census data; perceived neighborhood social cohesion - 5-items; perceived informal social control - 5-items; average alcohol consumption per week - frequency in past year; binge drinking - frequency in past year.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for age, alcohol consumption, and binge drinking,</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 3. Cross-sectional adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
1986-2009. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260509354497">DOI:10.1177/0886260509354497</a>			conducted in 2000. In-person interviews conducted separately with each partner. Self-report.	neighborhood characteristics of perceived social cohesion and perceived social control did not mediate the effect of poverty on IPV perpetration.
Cannon, E. A., Bonomi, A. E., Anderson, M. L., Rivara, F. P., & Thompson, R. S. (2010). Adult health and relationship outcomes among women with abuse experiences during childhood. <i>Violence and Victims</i> , 25(3), 291-305.	3,568	Adult women, mean age 45.5 years, who were English speaking. Race/ethnicity: approximately 80% of sample European American, Income: 61.4% household income of \$50,000 or greater. Response rate 56.4%.	Cross-sectional, retrospective data from a health care sample. A random sample of women enrolled for 3 years or more at Group Health Cooperative, a health care service, between 1991-2001. Self-report.	<i>Measures:</i> Women's reports. General health, physical, social, and mental functioning; Short Form-36 Health Survey, Version 2 (SF-36), Physical Component Summary, Mental component Summary. Depression; CES-D. Physical Symptoms; 14-items. Health care utilization; data collected from January 1, 1992 to December 31, 2002, using Group Health's automated database. IPV; BRFSS, Women's Experience with Battering Scale. MFPV Victimization only measured.  <i>Results:</i> After controlling for age and education, the study indicated greater IPV victimization among women who had experienced child abuse as a child.
Slep, A. M. S., Foran, H. M., Heyman, R. E., & Snarr, J. D. (2010). Unique risk and protective factors for partner aggression in a large scale air force survey. <i>Journal</i>	42,744	Male (81.2%) and female (18.8%) active duty Air Force members. Race/ethnicity: Non-Hispanic Caucasian 74.1%, Black 13.2%, Hispanic/Latino 7.4%, Other 3.2%, Unknown	Cross-sectional data from the 2006 Community Assessment conducted with 82 United States Air Force sites worldwide. Linear programming method used to systematically select a	<i>Measures:</i> Physical partner aggression (perpetration and victimization) assessing frequency - 15-items; Individual-level constructs: depression 7-items, financial stress 5-items, personal coping 9-items, physical health 6-items, alcohol problems 10-items, spirituality/religion 5-items, years in the military; Family-level

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 3. Cross-sectional adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p><i>of Community Health</i>, 35(4), 375-83. DOI:10.1007/s10900-010-9264-3</p>		<p>2.1%. Military pay grade: E-5 to E-6 40.6%. Relationship status: married 83.9%, single in a relationship 16.1%.</p>	<p>stratified representative sample. Online self-report survey administered between April and June 2006.</p>	<p>constructs: length of marriage, parental status, family income, relationship satisfaction 4-items, career support from spouse/partner 3-items, family coping 3-items, spouse ability to cope with deployment 2-items, parent-child relationship satisfaction 3-items, parent-child physical aggression 18-items. Work-level constructs: hours worked per week, length of commute, weeks deployed in past year, work group cohesion/preparedness 6-items, work relationships 3-items, support from leadership 17-items; Community-level constructs: community safety 6-items, community stressors 13-items, community unity 21-items, community support for youth 3-items, support from formal agencies 6-items, support from neighbors 7-items, social support 5-items. MFPV, FMPV, perpetration, victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for gender, parenting, and marital status, none of the parenthood-specific variables were significant predictors for women with children; for married women, spouse deployment support, relationship satisfaction, alcohol problems, military years, and financial stress were significant predictors of women's aggression across all ecological levels; for men with children, relationship satisfaction, alcohol problems, financial stress, support from neighbors,</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 3. Cross-sectional adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>and child physical aggression were unique predictors of aggression; for married men with children, relationship satisfaction, financial stress, support from neighbors, and marital length were unique predictors of aggression; for married men, relationship satisfaction, alcohol problems, financial stress, support from neighbors, marital length, spouse deployment support, parental status, and support from formal agencies were unique predictors. The models generalized across U.S. geographical regions and non-US Air Force Bases.</p>
<p>Whitaker, D. J., Le, B., &amp; Niolon, P. H. (2010). Persistence and desistance of the perpetration of physical aggression across relationships: Findings from a national study of adolescents. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 25</i>(4), 591-609.</p>	<p>6,446</p>	<p>Sample of male (45%) and female (55%) young adults, age 18-26 years, who had at least 2 relationships in prior 5 years. Race/ethnicity: White= 73.7%, African American 13.2%, Hispanic 9.4%, Other 3.7%. Education: &lt;high school 9.2%, high school grad 34.6%, some college 44.9%, college grad 11.2%. Retention rate 77.4%.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional. Sample from National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health), Wave III, 2001-2002. Systematic stratified clustered sampling from 132 representative schools (public, private, urban, rural) from grades 7-12 in 1994-1995. Multimodal data collection from multiple sources (school administrators, parents, adolescent, romantic partners) via in-school questionnaires and in-</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Physical aggression in last year of each relationship 2-items, child abuse or maltreatment 4-items, early violence to peers 3-items, recent peer violence 4-items, measures for drug and alcohol use. MFPV, FMPV, perpetration.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for demographic variables, drug use, history of child maltreatment, and aggression to peers, significant predictors of IPV persistence across relationships were: IPV frequency in first relationship, younger age at the start of second relationship, living together, respondent more educated than partner, concurrent IPV victimization in second relationship. The persistence of physical IPV across relationships was relatively low, with desistance being much more common.</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 3. Cross-sectional adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Wright, E. M., &amp; Benson, M. L. (2010). Relational aggression, intimate partner violence, and gender: An exploratory analysis. <i>Victims and Offenders</i>, 5(4), 283-302.</p>	<p>2,807 couples</p>	<p>Male and female adult caregivers, average age 33-36 years, in a married or cohabitating romantic relationship who completed the CTS.</p>	<p>home interviews. United States. Cross-sectional data from Wave 1 of the 1995-1997 Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods Community Survey, United States. Participants recruited by multistage stratified neighborhood probability design and random sampling. Self-report questionnaire and interview.</p>	<p>Factors specific to the second relationship were the strongest predictors of persistence. <i>Measures:</i> IPV (perpetration and victimization) - severe violence items from CTS; Romantic relational aggression - frequency of sulking and spite from CTS 2-items. <i>Results:</i> After controlling for age, ethnicity, relationship status, socioeconomic status, and educational attainment, women and men who engaged in romantic relational aggression were more likely to perpetrate and be victimized by IPV; additional predictors for women's IPV perpetration included single and cohabitating, younger age, African American ethnicity, and college graduate (negative association); additional predictors for women's IPV victimization included single and cohabitating, household above poverty (negative association), younger age, and college graduate (negative association); additional predictors for men's IPV perpetration included single and cohabitating, household above poverty (negative association), younger age, Hispanic ethnicity, and African American ethnicity; additional predictors for men's IPV victimization included single and cohabitating, younger age, and African American ethnicity.</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 3. Cross-sectional adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Cunradi, C. B. (2009). Intimate partner violence among Hispanic men and women: The role of drinking, neighborhood disorder, and acculturation-related factors. <i>Violence and Victims, 24</i>(1), 83-97.</p>	<p>2,547</p>	<p>Hispanic adult males (45%) and females (55%) in a married or in a cohabitating relationship. Response rate 73.9%.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from the 2000 National Household Survey on Drug Abuse (NHSDA), United States. Nationally representative, multistage area probability sample of each of the 50 States. Computer-assisted In-home interviews. Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV victimization 1-item, IPV perpetration 1-item; Alcohol consumption: quantity and frequency over past 12 months; Neighborhood disorder 5-items; Acculturation: country of birth and language preference for interview (English or Spanish). MFPV, FMPV, perpetration, victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> No significant differences in the proportion of men and women reporting perpetration and victimization. Younger men reported more IPV victimization and younger women more IPV perpetration. After adjusting for SES factors, correlates of IPV perpetration for males were post-secondary education, neighborhood disorder, and binge drinking within past month and correlates of IPV victimization for males were age (18 to 25), post-secondary education, and household income below \$10,000/yr.; acculturation factors were not significant for males. Correlates of IPV perpetration for women were younger age and lower household income and correlates for IPV victimization were age (18 to 25), unemployment, neighborhood disorder, and alcohol abuse; acculturation factors were not significant for females.</p>
<p>Daigneault, I., Hebert, M., &amp; McDuff, P. (2009).</p>	<p>16,993</p>	<p>Adult males (46%) and females (54%), mean age 45.4 years, currently or</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from the 1999 General Social Survey (Cycle 13).</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: self-report CTS -- psychological 6-items, physical 9-items, sexual 1-item; CSA and child physical</p>



Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Men's and women's childhood sexual abuse and victimization in adult partner relationships: A study of risk factors. <i>Child Abuse &amp; Neglect</i>, 33(9), 638-647.</p>		<p>previously (past 5 years) married or in a common law relationship. Response rate 81.3%.</p>	<p>Nationally representative random sample interviewed by telephone in English or French. Self-report. Canada.</p>	<p>assault: prevalence and age of onset; Respondent characteristics: age, household income, high-school diploma, aboriginal status, current marital status, place of birth outside Canada, disability, and ownership of residence; Partner characteristics: age, length of the relationship (in years) and excessive alcohol consumption in the past month. MFPV, FMPV, victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for characteristics of the respondent and partner, CSA predicted all types of IPV experienced by both men and women. CSA was less predictive of IPV later in life for men than women. Age (being younger) significantly predicted IPV at first, but was not significant after considering respondent's partner's characteristics.</p>
<p>Hill, T. D., Nielsen, A. L., &amp; Angel, R. J. (2009). Relationship violence and frequency of intoxication among low-income urban women. <i>Substance Use and Misuse</i>, 44(5), 684-701.</p>	<p>2,280</p>	<p>Adult females, mean age 33 years, from low-income households with children. Race/ethnicity: African American 41%, Hispanic 54%, White 4%. Income: welfare benefits 28%. Relationship status: single 54%, married or cohabitating 28%. Response rate 75%.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from the Welfare, Children, and Families project, Boston, Chicago, and San Antonio, United States. Stratified random sample of women below Federal Poverty line in three urban areas in 1999. In-home interviews. Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Self-report; IPV during childhood and adolescence for sexual assault and MFPV victimization (i.e., hit, beaten up, burned, assaulted with weapon, or life threatened by adult in family or household &lt; 18 years old) 2-items; Sexual victimization from stranger, friend, acquaintance, date or relative. MFPV in prior year CTS2; psychological MFPV (i.e., threats to hit, use a weapon, or threats toward child) 3-items; minor physical IPV 2-items; severe physical IPV 3-items; sexual coercion 1-item; frequency of alcohol intoxication of the women; MFPV.</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 3. Cross-sectional adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for age, race/ethnicity, education, employment, welfare status, marital status, and church attendance, as well as independent IPV variables, findings indicated physical assault and sexual coercion were associated with greater alcohol use; Minor and severe IPV, sexual coercion, and physical assault are associated with frequency of intoxication. Psychological aggression and sexual coercion in the past year were not statistically significant in prior year MFPV.</p>
<p>Kimerling, R., Alvarez, J., Pavao, J., Mack, K. P., Smith, M. W., &amp; Baumrind, N. (2009). Unemployment among women. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i>, 24(3), 450-463.</p>	6,698	<p>Adult females, age 18-64 years. Race/ethnicity: White 32.6%, African American 7.6%, Hispanic 40.9%, Asian/Pacific Islander 14.5%, Native American 4.4%; nonUS born 42.4%. Response rate for 2004 survey 74%.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from the 2001, 2003, and 2004 California Women’s Health Survey (CWSHS), United States. Random digit dialing, telephone interview; self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: Self-report CTS; PTSD: 4-items. MFPV, victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for sociodemographic variables, physical partner violence within past year was not associated with greater likelihood of unemployment; however, psychological partner violence within past year was associated with a greater likelihood of unemployment for women.</p>
<p>McKinney, C. M., Caetano, R., Harris, T. R., &amp; Ebama, M. S. (2009). Alcohol availability and intimate partner violence among US couples. <i>Alcoholism: Clinical and</i></p>	3,194 1,597 couples	<p>Married or cohabitating couples. Race/ethnicity: White 74%, Black 8.5%, Hispanic 7.5%.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from the 9<sup>th</sup> National Alcohol Survey and 1990 U.S. Census. National multistage area household probability sample with oversamples of African-American and Hispanic households. In-</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: CTS; Alcohol problems and experiencing parent to child aggression. MFPV, FMPV, perpetration.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for age, education, employment, substance use, ethnicity, income, marital status, and percent living in poverty as well as those who own home, found that increased</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 3. Cross-sectional adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<i>Experimental Research, 33(1), 169-176.</i>			person interviews conducted separately with each partner. Self-report. United States.	alcohol availability (more outlets per zip code) was associated with increased rates of MFPV/FMPV. There were stronger associations with outlet availability and MFPV among those couples who reported alcohol related issues than those who did not have alcohol problems.
McKinney, C. M., Caetano, R., Ramisetty-Mikler, S., & Nelson, S. (2009). Childhood family violence and perpetration and victimization of intimate partner violence: findings from a national population-based study of couples. <i>Annals of Epidemiology, 19(1), 25-32.</i>	3,230 (1,615 couples )	Adult males (50%) and females (50%), age 18 years or older. Race/ethnicity: 76.6% White, 7% African American, 7% Hispanic, 9.4% other. Response rate 85%.	Cross-sectional data from the National Study of Couples obtained in conjunction with the 9th National Alcohol Survey. National multistage area household probability sample with oversamples of African-American and Hispanic households. In-person interviews conducted separately with each partner. Self-report. United States.	<i>Measures:</i> IPV: self-report CTS, coded into: non-reciprocal MFPV (male-to-female), nonreciprocal FMPV (female-to-male), reciprocal IPV (MFPV and FMPV) and no IPV; Family violence in childhood: childhood physical abuse and witnessing of interparental violence; Alcohol consumption, substance use, and attitudes toward IPV measured. MFPV, FMPV, mutuality.  <i>Results:</i> After controlling for all variables, exposure to child family violence was a significant risk factor for perpetrating nonreciprocal and reciprocal IPV in males and females. For males, those who experienced moderate or severe child physical abuse were more likely to perpetrate nonreciprocal IPV. For women, those who witnessed interparental threats of violence or physical violence were at increased risk of perpetrating nonreciprocal IPV. Reciprocal IPV in particular was likely to be associated with attitudes approving of IPV.

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 3. Cross-sectional adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Taft, C. T., Monson, C. M., Hebenstreit, C. L., King, D. W., &amp; King, L. A. (2009). Examining the correlates of aggression among male and female Vietnam veterans. <i>Violence and Victims</i>, 24(5), 639-652.</p>	<p>1,632</p>	<p>Male (74%) and female (26%) Vietnam War era veterans and nurses, average age 41-45 years. Racial/ethnic minority: 6.6% females, 18.6% males.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from the National Survey of the Vietnam Generation, United States. Data collected between 1986 – 1988. Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Physical aggression: CTS 8-items; Childhood abuse: had been hit or spanked enough to cause bruises, to require stay in bed, or medical attention 1-item; Interparental violence: parents or guardians hit one another 1-item; Combat exposure: typical combat experiences (i.e., being shot at or shooting at others, going on missions) 36-items; Malevolent environment 18-items, Perceived threat 9-items, Exposure to atrocities 9-items, PTSD 35-items, other psychiatric problems: DIS, MFPV, FMPV, perpetration.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> Controlled for, oversampling of females, African American and Hispanic males, and veterans with service-connected injuries. For males lower SES, lower age, minority status, higher unemployment, amount of exposure to war-zone variables, malevolent environment and perceived threat, as well as mental health variables including: PTSD, antisocial personality disorder, major depressive episode, alcohol abuse/dependence, drug abuse/dependence increased the likelihood of MFPV. Childhood trauma, traditional combat and violence, were not associated with MFPV. For females risk factors for FMPV were younger age and unemployment.</p>
<p>Brownridge, D. A., Chan, K. L., Hiebert-Murphy, D., Ristock,</p>	<p>7,369</p>	<p>Adult women, average age 42-47 years, in a current or former</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from the 1999 General Social Survey (Cycle 13).</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Women’s report of men’s IPV - CTS (within 1 year of the interview); Employment - categorizing respondent’s</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 3. Cross-sectional adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>J., Tiwari, A., Leung, W.-C., &amp; Santos, S. C. (2008). The elevated risk for non-lethal post-separation violence in Canada. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i>, 23(1), 117-135.</p>		<p>opposite sex relationship within past 5 years.</p>	<p>Nationally representative random sample interviewed by telephone in English or French. Self-report. Canada.</p>	<p>main employment activity within past year; Patriarchal dominance - 1-item; Sexual jealousy - 1-item; Possessiveness: 1-item. MFPV, victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for the microsystem variables (education, employment, children) and ontogenic variables (age, ethnicity, expartners jealousy, expartners possessiveness), only married women whose partners behaved in a patriarchal domineering manner reported experiencing significantly elevated odds of violence. Married women whose husbands engaged in patriarchal domination had 210% greater odds of violence than their counterparts whose husbands did not. Divorced women who were employed had 63% lower odds of violence by their expartner. Separated women who were Aboriginal had 451% greater odds of violence than their Non-Aboriginal separated counterparts. Married women who were Aboriginal had 166% greater odds of violence than Non-Aboriginal married women. Married women with a jealous husband had 332% higher odds of violence, and married women with possessive husbands had 486% higher odds of violence, compared with their married counterparts.</p>
<p>Caetano, R., Vaeth, P. A. C., &amp; Ramisetty-</p>	<p>2,722</p>	<p>Married or cohabitating heterosexual couples,</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from follow-up survey in</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: CTS (11-items each for MFPV, FMPV). Alcohol Problems (Past 12</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 3. Cross-sectional adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Mikler, S. (2008). Intimate partner violence victim and perpetrator characteristics among couples in the United States. <i>Journal of Family Violence</i>, 23(6), 507-518.</p>		<p>average age 50-52 years. Race/ethnicity: White 36%, Black 20%, Hispanic 34%, and 10% of mixed ethnicity. Relationship status: married 95%, cohabitating 5%. 85% response rate.</p>	<p>2000. Sample of couples from the 1995 National Alcohol Survey, a national multistage area household probability sample with oversamples of African-American and Hispanic households. Follow-up survey in 2000. In-person interviews conducted separately with each partner. Self-report. United States.</p>	<p>Months): social and dependence alcohol-related problems past 12 months 27-items; Depressive symptoms: modified CES-D 20-items; Feelings of Powerlessness (3-items self-report); Impulsivity (3-items self-report). Also ethnicity, age, length of relationship, marital status, education, employment. MFPV, FMPV, perpetration, victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> In White, Black, and Hispanic couples, violence was most likely to be mutual, and most frequent in relationships of 10 years or less. Education and employment less related (retired in with unemployed). After controlling for SES factors, alcohol, psychological variables, and level of violence in the relationship, findings indicated for MFPV that higher impulsivity, ethnicity, and younger age were predictive factors; for men's IPV victimization, one or more men's alcohol related problems was a predictor. For FMPV, younger age, employment status, and higher levels of powerlessness were predictive factors; for women's IPV victimization, ethnicity and powerlessness were predictive.</p>
<p>Probst, J. C., Wang, J.-Y., Martin, A. B., Moore, C. G., Paul, B. M., &amp; Samuels, M. E. (2008). Potentially</p>	<p>11,023</p>	<p>Adult males and females with children age 17 years or younger in the household. Race/ethnicity of</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from the 2003 National Survey of Children's Health 2003, United States. Nationally representative,</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Disagreement type: three categories: Violent (MFPV), Heated (shouting/heated arguing), Calm (calm discussion); Parenting stress: Parent Stress Index and Parental Attitudes about</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 3. Cross-sectional adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>violent disagreements and parenting stress among American Indian/Alaska native families: Analysis across seven states. <i>Maternal and Child Health Journal</i>, 12(Suppl1), S91-S102.</p>		<p>children: non-Hispanic White 91%, Alaska Native/Native American 9%. Family income below poverty: 35.5% American Indian/Alaska Native, 14.1% non-Hispanic White. Response rate 54%.</p>	<p>random sample. Self-report.</p>	<p>Childrearing scale 3-items; Perceived neighborhood support (neighbors' willingness to help 4-items). MFPV.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for characteristics of parents and children, parental stress, perceived neighborhood support, and disagreement type, findings indicated both violent and heated disagreements were associated to parenting stress in AI/AN and White parents. The risk of violent disagreements was increased for families with boys more so than families with girls. Parents of children age 12-17 years and parents of children in poor to fair health were less likely to report violent disagreements. Among AI/families, parenting for children with special healthcare needs and having a parent in poor to fair physical health contributed directly to parenting stress.</p>
<p>Smith, D. L. (2008). Disability, gender and intimate partner violence: Relationships from the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System. <i>Sexuality and Disability</i>, 26(1), 15-28.</p>	<p>356,112</p>	<p>Adult males (38%) and females (62%), age 18-65 years. 14% of women who identified as having an activity limitation or a disability.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from the 2005 Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS), United States. Nationally representative stratified random sample. Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: self-report of physical, emotional, or sexual violence victimization, (BRFSS) 3-items; Disability: self-report of limited in any activities because of physical, mental, or emotional problems.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for age, race/ethnicity, education, employment, and relationship status, women with disabilities were at a higher risk of experiencing all forms of IPV than women without disabilities and men with disabilities.</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 3. Cross-sectional adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>Women with disabilities experienced abuse at about twice the rate of the other populations. Also, women with disabilities who experienced some form of IPV had less education, were more likely to be unemployed, and less likely to be in a relationship.</p>
<p>Stalans, L. J., &amp; Ritchie, J. (2008). Relationship of substance use/abuse with psychological and physical intimate partner violence: Variations across living situations. <i>Journal of Family Violence</i>, 23(1), 9-24.</p>	<p>19,131</p>	<p>Adult males (45.3%) and females (54.7%) in current relationships. Race/ethnicity: Whites 75.6%, Hispanics 12%, African American 7.1%, Asian 3.0%, Bi-racial 1.0% Native American 0.9%, Other 0.4%. Response rate 73%.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from the 2001 National Household Survey on Drug Abuse (NHSDA), United States. Nationally representative, multistage area probability sample of each of the 50 States. Computer-assisted In-home interviews. Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Verbal aggression, hitting or threatening to hit, been hit or threatened to hit, regular serious emotional abuse; MFPV, FMPV.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> Controlled for minority status, SES, education level. Marijuana use/abuse was associated with minority and low SES IPV but not for White and higher SES status. Low SES and minority status emotional abuse was also associated with marijuana use/abuse however this mediated the effect of marijuana use/abuse on IPV. Emotional abuse was the strongest predictor of IPV. After controlling for psychological abuse, findings indicated that stimulant use, sedative use, and alcohol abuse or dependence were associated with IPV.</p>
<p>Bradley, C. (2007). Veteran status and marital aggression: Does military service make a difference? <i>Journal of Family Violence</i>, 22(4), 197-</p>	<p>10,836 participants  5,418 couples</p>	<p>Married or cohabiting heterosexual couples, average age 41-44 years, who were not active duty military personnel.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional. Data from National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH). Data, Wave I (1987-1988). Randomized, representative sample of</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV was measured by self-report of male and female victimization and perpetration, 5-items coded into three categories: ‘Nonviolent,’ ‘Common Couple Violence,’ and ‘Intense Male Violence.’ Veteran status based on previous military service. Stress was measured over the total</p>



PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 3. Cross-sectional adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
209.			American households. Self-report only. United States.	debt of couple, employment, and alcohol/drug use.  <i>Results:</i> After controlling for age, race, education and SES, findings indicated that male veteran status was not significantly predictive of IPV.
Cunradi, C. B. (2007). Drinking level, neighborhood social disorder, and mutual intimate partner violence. <i>Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research, 31</i> (6), 1012-1019.	19,035	Married or cohabitating adults, age 18 years or older. Race/ethnicity: non-Hispanic White, N= 6,779 35.6%, Non-Hispanic black 4%, Hispanic 6%.	Cross-sectional data from the 2000 National Household Survey on Drug Abuse (NHSDA), United States. Nationally representative, multistage area probability sample of each of the 50 States. Computer-assisted In-home interviews. Self-report.	<i>Measures:</i> IPV victimization 1-item; IPV perpetration 1-item; Neighborhood social disorder 5-items; alcohol consumption: from Drug Abuse survey. MFPV, FMPV, mutual violence.  <i>Results:</i> After controlling for race/ethnicity, education, age and number of past 12 month drinking days the study did not find an association between drinking level, neighborhood social disorder and mutual IPV in the male sample. However, for the female sample, an association between drinking level, neighborhood social disorder and mutual IPV was found.
Ellison, C. G., Trinitapoli, J. A., Anderson, K. L., & Johnson, B. R. (2007). Race/Ethnicity, religious involvement, and	6,800	Married or cohabitating adults, average age 40-43 years. Race/ethnicity: Ethnic distribution: White 79-80%, African American 12-13%, African American Hispanic 7-8%.	Cross-sectional. Data from National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH). Data, Wave I (1987-1988). Randomized, representative sample of American households.	<i>Measures:</i> IPV: Self-reports by each partner (perpetrator or victim) used in final scores (dichotomous, any versus no physical violence past year); religious involvement: eight levels of church attendance from never to several times per week. MFPV, perpetration, victimization

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 3. Cross-sectional adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>domestic violence. <i>Violence Against Women, 13(11), 1094-1112.</i></p>			<p>Self-report only. United States.</p>	<p><i>Results:</i> 32% of Males and 42% of Females attended church at least once weekly. Younger age, unemployment, and cohabiting increased odds of victimization for women. Controlled for ethnicity, age, education, marital, and employment status. For women, attending religious services frequently decreased the likelihood of MFPV. When controlling for religion, African American women were 43% more likely to experience MFPV, there is little difference for Hispanic or White women; Men who attend church are 72% less likely to perpetrate IPV; African American males are twice as likely to commit MFPV as Whites; Religious attendance is more preventive of MFPV for African American and Hispanic Males than Whites.</p>
<p>Felson, R. B., &amp; Outlaw, M. C. (2007). The control motive and marital violence. <i>Violence and Victims, 22(4), 387-407.</i></p>	<p>15,275</p>	<p>Married couples, average age 45-49 years. Race/ethnicity: African American 5.6-10%. Employed: 62.8-70%. Length of marriage: 19.2 years.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from the National Violence Against Women Survey conducted between 1995 and 1996. Nationally representative sample selected by random-digit dialing. Computer assisted interview conducted in English or Spanish. Self-report. United States.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Verbal aggression: self-report shouts or swears at you, calls you names, makes you feel inadequate, or tries to provoke you; IPV: threw something that could hurt, pushed, grabbed, shoved; pulled hair; slapped, hit, kicked, bit, choked, attempted to drown, hit with an object, beat up, threatened with a gun, threatened with a knife or other weapon, used a gun, used a knife or other weapon; MFPV, FMPV.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> Controlled for length of marriage and SES. Control behaviors were rare for both males and females, when they did occur it was in different areas, indicating</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 3. Cross-sectional adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>that males were more strongly motivated to control than females. For current marriages, males were less likely to be controlling or jealous; African Americans and low SES were more likely to have controlling and jealous spouses. However, there were no significant differences in former marriages. Predicting IPV: For both current and former marriages husband and wives were both equally likely to engage in verbal aggression, former husbands were more likely to perpetrate MFPV and generate fear and controlling behavior was positively associated with IPV.</p>
<p>Felson, R. B., Burchfield, K. B., &amp; Teasdale, B. (2007). The impact of alcohol on different types of violent incidents. <i>Criminal Justice and Behavior</i>, 34(8), 1057-1068.</p>	<p>5,861</p>	<p>Adult males (54.5%) and females (45.5%). Race/ethnicity: White 78.7%, Black 9.9%, Other 11.2%. Education: No schooling 0.1%, Grade 1-8 1.6%, Some high school 7.4%, High school graduate 31.2%, Some college 32.0%, Postgraduate 9.5%.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from the National Violence Against Women Survey conducted between 1995 and 1996. Nationally representative sample selected by random-digit dialing. Computer assisted interview conducted in English or Spanish. Self-report. United States.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV and assault by others: physical assault 12-items, sexual assault 4-items, and asked to identify relationship of person (e.g., partner, stranger); alcohol consumption: location of assault 1-item. MFPV, victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> Analyses on subgroup reporting at least one assault as victim. After controlling for gender, type of offense (physical versus sexual), and offenders relationship to victim, analysis indicated that offenders were much more likely to be intoxicated when they physically assaulted a stranger than when they assaulted someone they knew and least likely to be intoxicated when they assaulted an intimate partner. Offenders who committed sexual assaults were no more likely to be drinking</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 3. Cross-sectional adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Moracco, K. E., Runyan, C. W., Bowling, J. M., &amp; Earp, J. A. (2007). Women's experiences with violence: a national study. <i>Women's Health Issues, 17</i>(1), 3-12.</p>	<p>1,800</p>	<p>Adult women, average age 43 years. Race/ethnicity: White 81.6%, African American 9.1%, Latina/Hispanic 4.8%, Native-American 1.4%, Asian/Asian American 1.2%. Relationship status: never married 14%, married 62.7%, separated/divorced 13.3%, widowed 10%. Sexual orientation: majority heterosexual, Lesbian/bisexual 2.3%; Response rate 73%.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from a 1997 survey, United States. Random probability sample. Self-report.</p>	<p>than offenders who committed physical assaults.</p> <p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: Self-report CATI on stalking, physical violence, sexual coercion, sexual assault, and rape by either a stranger or someone they were involved with. MFPV (mostly), victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for age and education: being younger than 35 years was a risk factor for MFPV over lifetime and in prior year. Low SES a risk factor for MFPV and sexual assault by someone they know. Differences in female victimization between Whites and minorities were not significant. However among ethnic minorities Asian Americans women experience less MFPV than other ethnicities; while multiracial women were more likely to experience all forms of MFPV and Native American women reported more MFPV and sexual assault. After controlling for covariates, lesbians and bisexual females were more likely experience IPV in their lifetimes.</p>
<p>Ramisetty-Mikler, S., Caetano, R., &amp; McGrath, C. (2007). Sexual aggression among White, Black, and Hispanic Couples in the U.S.: Alcohol use, physical assault</p>	<p>2,050 1,025 couples</p>	<p>Married or cohabitating adult couples, age 18 years or older, who shared the same ethnic identity as their partner/spouse. Race/ethnicity: White 40%, Black 23%, and</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from follow-up survey in 2000. Sample of couples from the 1995 National Alcohol Survey, a national multistage area household probability sample with oversamples</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV (sexual, physical, psychological): CTS2; alcohol problems: weekly consumption, binge drinking in past 12 months, alcohol problems survey 27-items. Also ethnicity, age, marital status, employment, household income. MFPV, FMPV, perpetration of sexual aggression (SA).</p>

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>and psychological aggression as its correlates. <i>The American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse</i>, 33(1), 31-43.</p>		<p>Hispanic 38%.</p>	<p>of African-American and Hispanic households. Follow-up survey in 2000. In-person interviews conducted separately with each partner. Self-report. United States</p>	<p><i>Results:</i> Minor acts of SA (insisted on sex without physical force, and having sex without a condom) were most frequently reported. The male minor SA rate for Blacks was the highest (22%) compared to Hispanic (13%) and White (11.3%) couples. The male severe aggression rate for Blacks was 2%, for Hispanics 1.2%, and for Whites it was .5%. The female minor SA rate for Blacks was 13.5%, for Hispanics 8.7%, and for Whites it was 5.5%. Female severe aggression was nearly absent across all the groups (Blacks 0%, Hispanics .6%, and Whites .1%).</p> <p>Significant associations among sexual, physical and psychological aggression were more frequently found for Black and Hispanic couples. In general, higher rates of SA were reported among any race couples who also report other forms of aggression. Significant association was found between MFSA and psychological aggression across all groups. Male SA was associated with physical assault only among Black and Hispanic couples, but not among White couples. Only male-to-female severe psychological aggression, female-to-male minor and severe psychological aggression were significantly associated with MFSA among White couples. Fewer associations were found in</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 3. Cross-sectional adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>the case of FMSA, mostly with female psychological aggression among Hispanic and White couples. Male psychological aggression was also associated with female SA among minority couples. Only female physical assault was associated with FMSA in Hispanic couples.</p> <p>After controlling for all SES factors in a logistic regression, Couples who report male-to-female severe psychological aggression were nearly 4.5 times at risk for MFSA. Couples reporting female severe psychological aggression were 4 times at risk, and couples with male alcohol problems were also 5.5 times at risk for FMSA.</p>
<p>Whitaker, D. J., Haileyesus, T., Swahn, M., &amp; Saltzman, L. S. (2007). Differences in frequency of violence and reported injury between relationships with reciprocal and nonreciprocal intimate partner violence. <i>American Journal of Public Health, 97</i>(5), 941-947.</p>	<p>11,370</p>	<p>Male (46%) and female (54%) young adults, ages 18-28 years. Race/ethnicity: Whites 70.1%, African American 15.3%, Hispanic 10.3%, Other 4.3%. Education: &lt; high school=12.8%, = high school is 30.2%, Some college=40.5%, college grad=2.6%. Relationship status: never married or cohabitated 59.7%, cohabitating 25.4%, married 14.9%. Response rate 77.4%.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional. Sample from National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health), Wave III (2001-2002). Systematic stratified clustered sampling from 132 representative schools (public, private, urban, rural) from grades 7-12 in 1994-1995. Self-report data via in-home interviews. United States.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Respondent and partners frequency of perpetration of physical IPV over last year, e.g., pushed, shoved, hit, thrown something, slapped, hit, or kicked; injuries received or given 1-item. MFPV, FMPV, mutual violence, perpetration, victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for gender, race/ethnicity, education, length of relationship, and type of relationship, serious MFPV was more likely than FMPV, in violent relations about one half were reciprocal; in nonreciprocal violence FMPV was reported in the majority (70.7%) of cases. Females reported more</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 3. Cross-sectional adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>perpetration and victimization than males. Reciprocal IPV was associated with more frequent violence for females but not males; males were more likely to cause injury than females; Reciprocal IPV is associated with greater likelihood of injury for both males and females.</p>
<p>Bell, N. S., Harford, T. C., Fuchs, C. H., McCarroll, J. E., &amp; Schwartz, C. E. (2006). Spouse abuse and alcohol problems among White, African American, and Hispanic U.S. Army soldiers. <i>Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research, 30</i>(10), 1721-1733.</p>	<p>7,996</p>	<p>Active duty adult males, age 18 years or older, who were married. Race/ethnicity: African-American 39%, White 33%, Hispanic 8%.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from the Total Army Injury and Health Outcomes Database (TAIHOD), United States. Spouse abuse data from 1991-1998. Military police records and self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Health records and demographic data (1991-1998) of enlisted males who had complete data on alcohol usage, controlling for soldiers with first time report of IPV, from Total Army Injury and Health Outcomes Database (TAIHOD). This data includes the Army Central Registry (ACR) of child and married/spousal abuse data, Health Risk Appraisal (HRA) on frequency, and problems associated with alcohol use, (CAGE questionnaire). Demographic data from the Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC). MFPV, perpetration.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling demographic and psychosocial factors, heavy drinking and the problems associated with overuse of alcohol were risk factors for IPV among Whites and Hispanics. For Whites alcohol-related issues on IPV were mediated by family problems. For all ethnicities drinking during IPV events was related to problems with alcohol use. However, the association was moderated by typical</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 3. Cross-sectional adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				alcohol use for Whites and Hispanics. The presence of alcohol induced problems increased the likelihood of alcohol use during IPV perpetration through complex associations which are variable due to the difference in psychosocial and behavioral patterns within the individual racial groupings.
Cohen, M. M., Forte, T., Du Mont, J., Hyman, I., & Romans, S. (2006). Adding insult to injury: intimate partner violence among women and men reporting activity limitations. <i>Annals of Epidemiology</i> , 16(8), 644-651.	16,216	Males (46%) and females (54%), age 15 years or older, with activity limitations. Activity limitations reported: women 17.3%, men 17.0%. Response rate 81.3%.	Cross-sectional data from the 1999 General Social Survey (Cycle 13). Nationally representative random sample interviewed by telephone in English or French. Self-report. Canada.	<i>Measures:</i> IPV: modified CTS (IPV within 5 years); Activity limitations - physical limitation with past 6 months 1-item.  <i>Results:</i> After controlling for SES variables, gender was not a predictor of IPV victimization among individuals with activity limitations.
Hyman, I., Forte, T., Du Mont, J., Romans, S., & Cohen, M. M. (2006). The association between length of stay in Canada and intimate partner violence among immigrant women. <i>American Journal of Public Health</i> , 96(4), 654-659.	1,596	Adult women, age 15 years or older, with a current or former partner within past five years. Sample was 18% immigrant to Canada: recent (0-9 years) 23.5%, nonrecent (10 years and longer) 76.5%. Response rate 81.3%.	Cross-sectional data from the 1999 General Social Survey (Cycle 13). Nationally representative random sample interviewed by telephone in English or French. Self-report. Canada.	<i>Measures:</i> Women's report IPV: modified CTS (within last 5 years) physical, sexual, and emotional abuse against women by their partner; also age, marital status, education, household income, presence of children under age 14 in home, and activity limitation (disability). MFPV, victimization.  <i>Results:</i> After controlling for age and other factors, the risk for IPV was significantly lower for recent immigrant women compared with nonrecent immigrant



PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 3. Cross-sectional adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>women. The strongest risk factor for IPV was marital status; with women who were single, divorced, separated or widowed being 10 times more likely to report IPV as compared to women who were married or living with a common-law partner.</p>
<p>Schewe, P., Riger, S., Howard, A., Staggs, S. L., &amp; Mason, G. E. (2006). Factors associate with domestic violence and sexual assault victimization. <i>Journal of Family Violence</i>, 21(7), 469-475.</p>	<p>897</p>	<p>Adult female participants, mean age 33 years. Race/ethnicity: 81% African American. Education: 58% had graduated from high school or obtained a GED. All participants were TANF recipients. Response rate 72%.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from the 2002 Illinois Families Study, United States. Stratified, random sample of families, representative of Illinois, receiving Temporary Aid to Needy Families (TANF), a government assistance program. Data was collected at three annual intervals: 1999-2000, 2001, 2002. In-person interviews. Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV was measured by self-report of female victimization; domestic violence measured for psychological, physical, and sexual abuse on 8-items; and sexual assault measured on 1-item. Childhood exposure to violence variables, job skills, number of children, social support, alcohol/drug use, depression, and health problems all measured. MFPV, victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for SES variables, health factors, and childhood punishment and neglect, it was found that childhood exposure to domestic violence was a significant risk factor for both types of IPV, specifically domestic violence and sexual assault victimization. Childhood physical abuse was a significant risk factor for domestic IPV, but not sexual assault IPV.</p>
<p>Atkinson, M. P., Greenstein, T. N., &amp; Lang, M. M. (2005). For women, breadwinning can be dangerous: Gendered</p>	<p>4,296</p>	<p>Married adults, age 19 years or older. Husbands mean education in years was 12.77, wives 12.62 years. Husbands' earnings averaged 64%</p>	<p>Cross-sectional. Data from National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH). Data, Wave I (1987-1988). Randomized,</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: CTS – both husband's and wives' reports of MFPV – dichotomized to ever any versus none; husband's income and income relative to wife's; Respondent's traditionalism 6-items. Region of residence: coded using the</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 3. Cross-sectional adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>resource theory and wife abuse. <i>Journal of Marriage and Family</i>, 67(5), 1137-1148.</p>		<p>of total couple earnings. Response rate 76%.</p>	<p>representative sample of American households. Self-report only. United States.</p>	<p>Census Bureau’s four regions. Also husband’s age, wife’s and husband’s education, and marital duration. MFPV, male perpetration, female victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> All models controlled for marital duration, number of children, and residing in standard metropolitan statistical area. Model 1: Controlled for husbands’ age, wife’s and husband’s education (in years), husband ethnicity, husband substance use (drug and alcohol problems), and found husband’s earnings did not have a significant association with the likelihood of MFPV. Model 2: husband’s earnings relative to wife’s added; husbands who earned all of the couple’s income were about half as likely to engage in MFPV than were those with no earnings. Model 3: husband’s traditionalism added and did not have a significant association with the likelihood of MFPV. Low-income husbands in the sample were no more or less likely to abuse their wives than were high-income husbands. When husbands held egalitarian gender ideologies, relative resources had little effect on the likelihood of MFPV. Wives with relatively traditional husbands who had no earnings are predicted to have about a .11 probability of being abused, whereas wives with traditional husbands who were the sole breadwinner—that is, wives with no</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 3. Cross-sectional adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>earnings—were predicted to have only about a .01 probability of being abused. Note sample average MFPV prevalence was .04. Wives’ share of relative incomes was positively related to likelihood of abuse only for traditional husbands.</p>
<p>Bookwala, J., Sobin, J., &amp; Zdaniuk, B. (2005). Gender and aggression in marital relationships: A life-span perspective. <i>Sex Roles</i>, 52(11-12), 797-806.</p>	<p>6,185</p>	<p>Adult males (46%) and females (54%), average age range 20-39 years. Race/ethnicity: 80% Caucasian, 11% Black/African American, and 9% other. Response rate 74%.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional. Data from National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH). Data, Wave I (1987-1988). Randomized, representative sample of American households. Self-report only. United States.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: self-report on occurrence of physical arguments in past year 3-items, expressed physical aggression, and received physical aggression; Injury from IPV: injury during conflict 2-items; Conflict resolution strategies: four different types ranging from low to high confrontation. MFPV, FMPV, perpetration, victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> Consistent age effect were found such that younger participants used more maladaptive conflict resolution strategies, engaged in more physical arguments, and sustained more injuries than older participants. After controlling for marital history (number of marriages) and duration of current marriage, women compared to men used calm discussions less (the least reported by women who were young) and heated arguments more. Analyses on the relation among age, gender, and injuries showed that more young and middle-aged women than men reported that they had sustained injuries at the hands of their spouse and more young men than women reported inflicting injury on their spouse.</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 3. Cross-sectional adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Cohen, M. M., Forte, T., Du Mont, J., Hyman, I., &amp; Romans, S. (2005). Intimate partner violence among Canadian women with activity limitations. <i>Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health</i>, 59(10), 834-839.</p>	<p>8,771</p>	<p>Adult women, age 15 years or older, in heterosexual relationship prior 5 years. Activity limitations: often 8.8%, sometimes 8.6%. Response rate 81.3%</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from the 1999 General Social Survey (Cycle 13). Nationally representative random sample interviewed by telephone in English or French. Self-report. Canada.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: Self-Report physical MFPV of current or expartner in the prior 5 years, CTS; Sexual abuse: forced sexual activity through violence or threat; Emotional abuse: name calling, putting down, limiting associations, threat making, and destruction or damage of possessions; Financial abuse: knowledge of and limiting access to funds. MFPV, victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for aboriginal status, age, marital status, region, and SES, females who had mental and physical disabilities were more likely to be victims of MFPV than women who are not facing the same factors.</p>
<p>Williams, S. L., &amp; Frieze, I. H. (2005). Patterns of violent relationships, psychological distress, and marital satisfaction in a national sample of men and women. <i>Sex Roles</i>, 52(11-12), 771-784.</p>	<p>3,519</p>	<p>Adult males (49.8%) and females (50.2%) who were in a married or cohabitating relationship. Response rate 82.4%.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from the 1990 to 1992 National Comorbidity Survey, United States. Nationally representative, stratified multistage area probability sample of the 48 contiguous states.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: Self-report, CTS; Distress past 30 days: e.g., worry 14-items; Marital satisfaction 1-item; Also age, education, income, employment status, and race/ethnicity. Six patterns of violent relationships (severe and mild victimization, perpetration, and mutual violence). MFPV, FMPV, perpetration, victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> Violence pattern most frequent was mutual severe and mild. Controlled for demographic variables of age, education, income, employment status, and race. Females reported perpetration and victimization more frequently than males; males also reported being victimized by</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 3. Cross-sectional adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>severe FMPV with marginally significant results; almost one half the relationships were characterized by mutual violence; 60% of couples reported mild violence and 38% reported severe violence.</p> <p>Psychosocial outcomes for males and females controlling for gender differences in mental health: Females were more likely to experience greater distress than males although both males and females distress was associated with higher levels of IPV. MFPV was significantly associated with more psychosocial harm for females. Males and females experienced mutual violence similarly.</p>
<p>Bell, N. S., Harford, T., McCarroll, J. E., &amp; Senier, L. (2004). Drinking and spouse abuse among U.S. Army soldiers. <i>Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research</i>, 28(12), 1890-1897.</p>	<p>9,534</p>	<p>Adult males, age 18 years or older, enlisted in the Army Central Registry (ACR) and married.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from the Total Army Injury and Health Outcomes Database (TAIHOD), United States. Spouse abuse data from 1991-1998. Military police records and self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Health records and demographic data (1991-1998) from Total Army Injury and Health Outcomes Database (TAIHOD). This data includes the Army Central Registry (ACR) of child and married spouse abuse data (1st time offenders only), Health Risk Appraisal of use, frequency, and problems associated with alcohol use, Demographic data from the Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC); MFPV, perpetration.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for demographics and alcohol us, findings indicated that heavy drinking, lower rank, four or more children, and race/ethnicity of young enlisted males increases the likelihood of MFPV; When both spouses drink the</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 3. Cross-sectional adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Benson, M. L., Wooldredge, J., Thistlethwaite, A. B., &amp; Fox, G. L. (2004). The correlation between race and domestic violence is confounded with community context. <i>Social Problems</i>, 51(3), 326-342.</p>	<p>5,647</p>	<p>Adult males and females, age 18 years or older, who were married or in a cohabitating relationship. Respondent were either African American or Caucasian.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional. Data from National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH). Data, Wave II (1992-1994). Randomized, representative sample of American households. Self-report only. U.S. Census 1990 data on neighborhood characteristics. United States.</p>	<p>likelihood of MFPV is associated with heavier drinking.</p> <p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: CTS perpetration (last 12 months); Community Context: data abstracted from 1990 Census and NSFH survey, disadvantage within community 4-items; Individual Economic Status - employment instability, economic deprivation, respondent's subjective financial strain 2-items. Social Class - male's educational attainment. MFPV</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for age, economic distress, educational attainment and male drinking behaviors, the odds of MFPV remained twice as high for African American women relative to Caucasian. However, after controlling for neighborhood disadvantage as well as all individual-level risk measures listed above, the difference in the risk of violence between Caucasian and African American women decreased notably. Also, the odds ratio for race was substantially reduced (2.4 to 1.5), suggesting that neighborhood disadvantage was responsible for much of the covariance between race and MFPV. Further testing showed neighborhood disadvantage maintained essentially the same influence on likelihoods of MFPV for African Americans and Caucasians. Subjective financial strain, male drinking problems, and male job instability were</p>

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				positively associated with the likelihood of MFPV. Age was a slightly stronger predictor for Caucasian males and male drinking problems were a slightly stronger predictor for African Americans.
Kaukinen, C. (2004). Status compatibility, physical violence, and emotional abuse in intimate relationships. <i>Journal of Marriage and Family</i> , 66(2), 452-471.	7,408	Adult women, age 15 years or older, in a married or cohabitating relationship. Response rate 81%.	Cross-sectional data from the 1999 General Social Survey (Cycle 13). Nationally representative random sample interviewed by telephone in English or French. Self-report. Canada.	<p><i>Measures:</i> Women’s report IPV measures from the 1999 Canadian General Social Survey: violence and threats of violence, emotional abuse in past 5 years, categorized as no abuse, emotional abuse, violence without emotional abuse, and violence with emotional abuse. Predictors: Status compatibility in women’s and their male partner’s education, income, and employment used to categorize couples as traditional status, status parity, and status reversal. MFPV, victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for age, spouse's age, ethnicity, marital status, length of relationship, children in the home disabilities, and men's heavy drinking; the study found that status incompatibilities between partners that favor women (status reversal) increase the likelihood of emotional abuse.</p>
Schafer, J., Caetano, R., & Cunradi, C. B. (2004). A path model of risk factors for intimate partner violence among couples in the United	2,854  1,427 couples	Heterosexual couples, average age 40-49 years. Race/ethnicity: African American 25%, Hispanic 37%, White 38%. Household income: 20K-30K African American,	Cross-sectional data from the 9th National Alcohol Survey. National multistage area household probability sample with oversamples of African-American and	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: Modified CTS; Child abuse: adapted from CTS; Impulsivity 3-items; Alcohol problems 26-items. MFPV, FMPV.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> African American couples: for women, childhood physical abuse had a</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 3. Cross-sectional adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>States. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i>, 19(2), 127-142.</p>		<p>White 15K-20K, Hispanic 40K-60K.</p>	<p>Hispanic households. In-person interviews conducted separately with each partner. Self-report. United States.</p>	<p>significant effect on both partner's IPV victimization while for men it was associated with impulsivity, alcohol problems, and IPV perpetration and victimization; for men, higher impulsivity was significant for alcohol problems while for women it was associated with alcohol problems and IPV perpetration and victimization. Alcohol problems were associated with all reports of IPV.</p> <p>Hispanic couples: for women, childhood physical abuse had a significant effect on impulsivity, alcohol problems, and IPV perpetration and victimization while for men it was associated with impulsivity, IPV perpetration and victimization; for both men and women, impulsivity had a significant effect on alcohol problems and IPV reports; for men, alcohol problems had a significant effect on IPV perpetration and women's alcohol problems were associated with higher MFPV. African American and Hispanic couples had significant differences between the effects of alcohol and partner's IPV report.</p> <p>White couples: for women, childhood physical abuse was associated with alcohol problems and IPV perpetration and victimization while for men it had significant direct effects on impulsivity; for women and men, impulsivity had</p>



Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>significant direct effects on alcohol problems and IPV perpetration and victimization; for men, alcohol problems were associated with IPV perpetration and victimization while for women it was associated with higher IPV perpetration.</p>
<p>Thompson, M. P., &amp; Kingree, J. B. (2004). The role of alcohol use in intimate partner violence and nonintimate partner violence. <i>Violence and Victims</i>, 19(1), 63-74.</p>	<p>5,620</p>	<p>Adult males (60%) and females (40%). Race/ethnicity: 76.8% White/Caucasian, 9.8% Black/African American, 7.4% Hispanic, 5.9% other. Education: 91% more than a high school education, 58% married, average age of 39.8 years. 72% female and 69% male response rate.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from the National Violence Against Women Survey conducted between 1995 and 1996. Nationally representative sample selected by random-digit dialing. Computer assisted interview conducted in English or Spanish. Self-report. United States.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Subsample of NVAWS used here reported at least one of 12 types of physical assault on CTS and identified type of perpetrator. Categorized into IPV and non-IPV physical assault. Victim and perpetrator alcohol use measured by 2-items, use at time of incident and type. MFPV, FMPV, victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for SES and recent alcohol misuse, alcohol use by both the perpetrator and the victim was less likely to be involved with IPV assaults than non-IPV assaults. When also controlling for location of incident, perpetrator alcohol use was more likely to occur in IPV assaults for females and in non-IPV assaults for males. For females, IPV victimizations were 2 xs more likely to involve alcohol use by the perpetrator than were non-IPV victimizations. For males though, IPV victimizations were 4 xs less likely to involve alcohol use by the perpetrator than were non-IPV victimizations. Results indicated that among women, perpetrator alcohol use was twice as likely in IPV incidents than in</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 3. Cross-sectional adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				non-IPV incidents, but among men, perpetrator alcohol use was four times less likely in IPV incidents than in non-IPV incidents.
Newby, J. H., Ursano, R. J., McCarroll, J. E., Martin, L. T., Norwood, A. E., & Fullerton, C. S. (2003). Spousal aggression by U.S Army female soldiers toward employed and unemployed civilian husbands. <i>American Journal of Orthopsychiatry</i> , 73(3), 288-293.	1,185	Female active duty soldiers, mean age 30 years, married to civilian husbands. Race/ethnicity: 59% White and 41% African American. Approximately 18% were officers, 82% enlisted.	Cross-sectional data from an Army needs assessment conducted between 1990 and 1994, United States. Random sample of 15% of all deployed and non-deployed active duty soldiers at 50 Army installations in U.S. Self-report.	<i>Measures:</i> IPV was measured by self-report of female perpetration and victimization from items on the CTS. Coded into three categories: no aggression, moderate aggression, severe aggression. FMPV, perpetration.  <i>Results:</i> After controlling for age, race, rank, years married, and number of previous marriages, findings indicated that unemployed male spouses were at increased risk for female perpetrated severe IPV compared to employed male spouses. For moderate IPV, there was no significant risk found for unemployed male spouses.
Slashinski, M. J., Coker, A. L., & Davis, K. E. (2003). Physical aggression, forced sex, and stalking victimization by a dating partner: An analysis of the National Violence Against Women Survey. <i>Violence and Victims</i> , 18(6), 595-617.	13,912	Adult males (51%) and females (49%), age 18-55 years, in dating relationships. Male response rate 68.9%, female response rate 72.1%.	Cross-sectional data from the National Violence Against Women Survey conducted between 1995 and 1996. Nationally representative sample selected by random-digit dialing. Computer assisted interview conducted in English or Spanish. Self-report. United States.	<i>Measures:</i> Abbreviated CTS physical aggression; sexual assaults; stalking; Childhood physical aggression 12-items; childhood sexual abuse 4-items; Stalking: Power and Control scale 20-items; substance use. Demographics including age and marital status. MFPV, FMPV.  <i>Results:</i> After controlling for odds ratios for health insurance status and age. Females more likely to report sexual assaults, IPV, and being stalked than males; no significance in age of dating violence between genders; Experiencing childhood

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>aggression increased the likelihood of dating IPV for both males and females, dating physical aggression was associated with antidepressants, tranquilizers, pain medication, and recreational drug use for females; younger age is associated with both MFPV and FMPV; Married individuals less likely to report IPV than divorced or separated couples; Non-White males were twice as likely to report FMPV than Whites; being stalked was associated with IPV for both males and females.</p>
<p>Van Wyk, J. A., Benson, M. L., Fox, G. L., &amp; DeMaris, A. (2003). Detangling individual-, partner-, and community-level correlates of partner violence. <i>Crime and Delinquency</i>, 49(3), 412-438.</p>	<p>6,610</p>	<p>Adult male and female participants, age 18 years or older, in a married, separated, or cohabitating relationship.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional. Data from National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH). Data, Wave II (1992-1994). Randomized, representative sample of American households. Self-report only. U.S. Census 1990 data on neighborhood characteristics. United States.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Self-report IPV: physical aggression over preceding year; items included hitting, shoving, or throwing. Male respondents who admitted physical aggression toward spouse used as additional control variable. Social support: contacts and assistance. Community social disorganization or disadvantaged status: SES indicators. Compared with tract level data from the 1990 U.S. Census. MFPV.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for individual- and couple-level characteristics (length of relationship, cohabitating vs. married, age, minority status, SES, education, employment), risk factors for MFPV varied by neighborhood demographics as well as individual and relational characteristics: (1) In neighborhoods characterized by low-level disadvantage; the likelihood of IPV was increased by financial dissatisfaction,</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 3. Cross-sectional adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>shorter length of relationship, and for females who do not have many other outside contacts. (2) For medium-level disadvantaged areas; financial dissatisfaction, short-term relationship, those with less financial satisfaction than peers, for those with fewer outside contacts and Non-White minorities. (3) For neighborhoods with high levels of disadvantage, the risk factors were financial dissatisfaction, cohabitation vs. marriage, and short duration of relationship. Risk factors associated with social support: Women with low levels of assistance, who lived in disadvantaged neighborhoods, were more likely to be victims of MFPV. However, race, marital status and social support from acquaintances all interacted differently depending on the locale they live in. No effect of race was apparent in the most disadvantaged neighborhoods where 69% of participants Non-White. However, in medium-level disadvantaged areas where 11% of those sampled were Non-White significant racial/ethnicity effects were evident.</p>
<p>Aldarondo, E., Kantor, G. K., &amp; Jasinski, J. L. (2002). A risk marker analysis of wife assault in Latino</p>	<p>1,193</p>	<p>Sample of married or cohabitating heterosexual couples, mean age for men 45.3 years and women 42.6 years. Race/ethnicity: White</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from the 1992 National Alcohol and Family Violence Survey (NAFVS), United States. National probability</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV measure: CTS. Family-of-origin violence 2-items. Relationship conflict measure 5-items. MFPV.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for age, violence approval, alcohol consumption, verbal</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 3. Cross-sectional adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>families. <i>Violence against Women</i>, 8(4), 429-454.</p>		<p>52%, Latino 43%, African American 4%, and Other 1% (data analyzed in this study included White and Latino participants only). 653 female participants and 539 male participants in this analysis. Response rate, 75.4%.</p>	<p>sample, with an oversample of Hispanic participants. In-person interviews in English or Spanish. Self-report.</p>	<p>aggression, violence in family of origin, family income, employment, occupation, marital status, and relationship conflict, the study found that level of conflict was the strongest and most stable factor across ethnic groups and gender, affecting risk of violence.</p>
<p>Brownridge, D. A., &amp; Halli, S. S. (2002). Double jeopardy?: Violence against immigrant women in Canada. <i>Violence and Victims</i>, 17(4), 455-471.</p>	<p>7,115</p>	<p>All female, living married or as common-law wives in Canada. 5,737 Canadian-born women, 844 immigrant women from developed countries, and 534 women who have immigrated from developing countries.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from the 1999 General Social Survey (Cycle 13). Nationally representative random sample interviewed by telephone in English or French. Self-report. Canada.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: self-report of female victimization of physical assault, psychological aggression, and sexual coercion. Place of origin dichotomous: immigration from a developed versus developing nation. Time period and age of immigration recorded. Patriarchal dominance: knowledge about or access to family income, 1-item. Sexual proprietariness was measured by jealousy of partner and if partner demands to know who participant is with and where she is. MFPV, victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for all variables, the risk of IPV in immigrant women from developed and developing nations was not significantly different. For both groups, those that had been in Canada the longest or those who immigrated at an older age had the highest odds of violence. Sexual proprietariness was the biggest risk factor for IPV for both groups of immigrant</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 3. Cross-sectional adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Cunradi, C. B., Caetano, R., &amp; Schafer, J. (2002). Religious affiliation, denominational homogamy, and intimate partner violence among US couples. <i>Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion</i>, 41(1), 139-151.</p>	<p>1,440 couples</p>	<p>Adult males (57%) and females (43%), age 18 years or older, in a married or cohabitating relationship. Race/ethnicity: White 38.5%, African American 25%, Hispanic 36.5%. Response rate 85%</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from the National Study of Couples obtained in conjunction with the 9th National Alcohol Survey. National multistage area household probability sample with oversamples of African-American and Hispanic households. In-person interviews conducted separately with each partner. Self-report. United States.</p>	<p>women, although immigrant women from developing countries were more likely to have a sexually proprietary partner.</p> <p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: CTS-R 11-items; Religious affiliation, denominational homogamy, Group status (Liberal, Moderate, or Fundamentalist religion); Religious attendance, Importance of religion; Alcohol problems: dependence symptoms 11-items, social consequences 12-items; Sociodemographics: race/ethnicity, marital status, income, relationship length, number of children, age, education, history of childhood violence victimization, approval of marital aggression. MFPV, FMPV, perpetration, victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> Findings indicated that rates of IPV did not significantly differ by couple religious homogamy, heterogamy or type of denominational affiliation. Attendance at religious services at least weekly was associated with lower rates of IPV perpetration among men and with lower rates of IPV victimization among men and women. These findings were attenuated in the multivariate logistic regression analyses. Alcohol problems may be a medicating factor. Male and female alcohol problems, female approval of IPV, and female childhood victimization plus couples age were associated with MFPV. African American, female alcohol</p>

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Cunradi, C. B., Caetano, R., &amp; Schafer, J. (2002). Socioeconomic predictors of intimate partner violence among White, Black, and Hispanic couples in the United States. <i>Journal of Family Violence, 17</i>(4), 377-389.</p>	<p>2,880  1,440 couples</p>	<p>Adults in a married or cohabitating relationship. Race/ethnicity: 38.5% White, 24.9% Black, 36.6% Hispanic. 85% response rate.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from the National Study of Couples obtained in conjunction with the 9th National Alcohol Survey. National multistage area household probability sample with oversamples of African-American and Hispanic households. In-person interviews conducted separately with each partner. Self-report. United States.</p>	<p>problems, female approval of IPV, female childhood victim, low education and younger age risk factors for FMPV.</p> <p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: self-report of male and female victimization and perpetration of items on CTS, Form R. SES: income, employment, education.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for alcohol use/abuse, childhood parent-perpetrated violence, approval of IPV, impulsivity, age, and relationship factors, it was found that annual household income was the most important predictor of IPV for White, Black, and Hispanic couples. Lower levels of mean years of couples' education was predictive of FMPV in White and Hispanic couples, but was not predicative of MFPV. Employment status was not predictive of IPV.</p>
<p>Desai, S., Arias, I., Thompson, M. P., &amp; Basile, K. C. (2002). Childhood victimization and subsequent adult revictimization assessed in a nationally representative sample of women and men. <i>Violence and Victims, 17</i>(6), 639-653.</p>	<p>13,284</p>	<p>Adult males (51%) and females (49%), average age 42-44 years. Race/ethnicity: = White 82.2%, African American 9.9%, Hispanic 7.9%, Other 7.9%. Response rate: females 72.1%, males 68.9%.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from the National Violence Against Women Survey conducted between 1995 and 1996. Nationally representative sample selected by random-digit dialing. Computer assisted interview conducted in English or Spanish. Self-report. United States.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Physical IPV CTS 12-items; Sexual victimization: force or threats 5-items; Childhood victimization 12-items; Childhood sexual victimization 5-items. MFPV, FMPV, victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for age, race, Hispanic ethnicity, education employment status, marital status; also controlled for childhood sexual and physical victimization for predictor analyses. Females who experienced childhood physical abuse were 3 times more likely to</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 3. Cross-sectional adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>experience adulthood IPV and childhood sexual abuse was also a significant risk factor at 2 times more likely to be victimized as an adult. Females who experienced both adverse experiences were also 3 times more likely to experience physical MFPV than females with none of these adverse childhood experiences. Males who experienced childhood physical victimization were 4 times more likely to experience adulthood victimization through physical IPV, 2 times more likely to be sexually victimized in adulthood. Males with childhood sexual abuse histories were two and a half times more likely to be physically victimized and six times more likely to be sexually victimizes in adulthood. For males with both adverse childhood experiences, they were 5 times more likely to experience physical IPV victimization and 6 times more likely to be sexually abused in adulthood. IPV victimization was more likely in females than males. Childhood adverse experiences increased the likelihood of adult victimization for both males and females.</p>
<p>Heyman, R. E., &amp; Slep, A. M. S. (2002). Do child abuse and interparental violence lead to adulthood family violence? <i>Journal of Marriage</i></p>	<p>6,002</p>	<p>Adult male and female individuals, age 18 years or older, who were married, cohabitating in a heterosexual relationship, widowed, divorced, or separated within two</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from the 1985 National Family Violence Survey. Sample comprised a national stratified probability sample selected by random digit dialing.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Violence - CTS used to measure IPV and parent-child violence; Exposure to family-of-origin violence - assessing victimization and frequency by parent 2-items; assessing exposure to interparental violence frequency by parent 2-items. MFPV, FMPV, victimization.</p>



PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 3. Cross-sectional adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<i>and the Family</i> , 64(4), 864-870.		years.	Self-report.	<i>Results:</i> Males exposed to both child victimization and interparental violence had an increased risk of partner violence victimization in adulthood compared to men exposed to only one form of family violence; for women, exposure to both forms of family of origin violence increased risk of partner violence victimization compared to women exposed to one form of family-of-origin violence.
Melzer, S. A. (2002). Gender, work, and intimate violence: Men's occupational violence spillover and compensatory violence. <i>Journal of Marriage and the Family</i> , 64(4), 820-832.	5,208	Adult males, mean age 40years, married or cohabiting with a female partner living in the contiguous U.S. Education: 17% no high school degree, 13% high school degree, 40% associates degree, 17% bachelor's degree, 13% master's or doctorate degree. Response rate 92.6%.	Cross-sectional. Data from National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH), Wave I (1987-1988). Randomized, representative sample of American households. Self-report only. United States.	<i>Measures:</i> IPV was measured by self-report of the occurrence of male perpetration and female victimization of violence 3-items. Men's occupation was classified as physically violent base on the 1980 Occupational Classification System (OCS). Unemployment assessed for men and women. Male's alcohol and drug abuse and the presence of children under 18 years of age living at home were assessed.  <i>Results:</i> After controlling for SES factors, it was found that men in physically violent occupations were 43% more likely than men in managerial positions to perpetrate IPV. Men in clerical support occupations were the most likely to perpetrate IPV overall (47%). The hypothesis that men in male-dominated occupations were more likely to perpetrate IPV was not supported.
O'Donnell, C. J., Smith, A., &	6,332	Women age 18 years and older living in Australia.	Cross-sectional data from the 1996 Australian	<i>Measures:</i> demographics (marital status, economic disadvantage, education,

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 3. Cross-sectional adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Madison, J. R. (2002). Using demographic risk factors to explain variations in the incidence of violence against women. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 17</i>(12), 1239-1262.</p>		<p>Response rate 78%.</p>	<p>Women’s Safety Survey, Australia. Nationally representative sample, multistage area sampling methods. Self-report.</p>	<p>employment status, English-speaking nation background); IPV victimization (physical, sexual, psychological) measured - details not provided. MFPV, victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for, geographical, social and economic boundaries the study found higher risk of victimization for younger women, lower income, younger children, and separated/divorced versus married. Also women with undergraduate diplomas were at higher risk than others, and the probability of experiencing violence was lower if women or their parents were born in a non-English speaking country. Employment status, school-leaving age, and SES had no significant effect on the risk of experiencing violence once other factors were considered.</p>
<p>Vest, J. R., Catlin, T. K., Chen, J. J., &amp; Brownson, R. C. (2002). Multistate analysis of factors associated with intimate partner violence. <i>American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 22</i>(3), 156-164.</p>	<p>18,415</p>	<p>Adult women, age 18 years or older. Race/ethnicity: White 83.8%, African American 8.3%, Hispanic 4.7%, Other 3.0%. Relationship status: married 58.1%, divorced/separated 12%, single 18.6%, widowed 11.1%. Income: ≥\$25,000 52.3%, &lt;\$25,000 30.4%,</p>	<p>Cross sectional data from the 1994-1999 Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS), United States.. Pooled sample from a random, multistage clustered sample from 8 states. Data collected between 1994-1999. Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: Self-report of having been victimized by sexual or physical violence in the last year. MFPV, victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for age, gender, and race to reflect the adult population of each individual state; the combined state results indicated that young adults, single, divorced or separated marital status, low income, and children in the home were factors that increased the likelihood of MFPV. Poor mental health was associated</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 3. Cross-sectional adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
		Unknown=17.2%. 60.3% had children in the home.		with victimization and victims were likely to be cigarette smokers. However after controlling for age, marital status, and income, race was not a risk factor.
Ellison, C. G., & Anderson, K. L. (2001). Religious involvement and domestic violence among US couples. <i>Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion</i> , 40(2), 269-286.	4,885	Sample of married or cohabitating heterosexual couples, mean age 42.5 years. Race/ethnicity: White 84%, African American 10%, Hispanic 6%.	Cross-sectional. Data from National Survey of Families and Households. Data from Wave I (1987-1988). Randomized, representative sample of American households. Self-report only. United States.	<i>Measures:</i> Face-to-face interviews and self-report questionnaire; arguments that became physical and frequency 1-item; MFPV, FMPV, perpetration.  <i>Results:</i> After controlling for SES, marital status, and race/ethnicity, findings indicated that regular religious attendance was inversely associated with the perpetration of IPV; Males who attend regularly were 60.7% less likely than non-religious attendees to perpetrate MFPV; however, their partners report a 48.7% difference in MFPV. Females who attend regularly are 44.2% less likely to perpetrate FMPV than non-religious counterparts, according to their partners they are 34.8% less likely to perpetrate. Results after controlling for social support, drug and alcohol abuse, as well as depression and low self-esteem indicated that religious attendance is inversely associated with IPV perpetration for both males and females.
Jasinski, J. L., & Kantor, G. K. (2001). Pregnancy, stress and wife assault: Ethnic differences in	2,655	Adult males and females in married or cohabitating relationships with female partner under age 50 years.	Cross-sectional data from the 1992 National Alcohol and Family Violence Survey (NAFVS), United States.	<i>Measures:</i> IPV measured by self-report of male and female victimization and perpetration from items on CTS; coded into severe violence and minor violence. Violence history in relationship also

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 3. Cross-sectional adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
prevalence, severity, and onset in a national sample. <i>Violence and Victims</i> , 16(3), 219-232.		Race/ethnicity: 52% Anglo and 48% Hispanic. 75.4% response rate.	National probability sample, with an oversample of Hispanic participants. In-person interviews in English or Spanish. Self-report.	recorded. Life stressors measured by The Holmes and Rahe Social Readjustment Rating Scale. MFPV, FMPV, perpetration, victimization.  <i>Results:</i> After controlling for SES status, stressful life events, and age, it was found that that among both Anglo and Hispanic families, pregnancy was not a significant risk factor for IPV victimization of women. Age was a significant predictor of female victimization of IPV, such that younger husbands are at a greater risk of assaulting their wives.
Lown, E. A., & Vega, W. A. (2001). Prevalence and predictors of physical partner abuse among Mexican American women. <i>American Journal of Public Health</i> , 91(3), 441-445.	1,155	Adult women, age 18-59 years, of Mexican origin in heterosexual relationships. Response rate 90%	Cross-sectional data from a sample in Fresno, CA, United States. Stratified random household sample. Computer Assisted Personal Interview (CAPI). Self-report.	<i>Measures:</i> IPV: Self report Abuse Assessment Screen, e.g., “has your current partner ever pushed you, hit you with a fist, used a knife or gun, tried to choke or burn you?” MFPV, victimization.  <i>Results:</i> After controlling for age, larger families, poverty, urban locale, lack of social connections and church attendance, findings indicated that the odds of victimization were 2.45 times higher for US-born females of Mexican ethnicity than for those who were born in Mexico. Females in urban areas were 2.5 times more likely to report MFPV than those in rural areas (living in town was not a risk factor). Also infrequent or no church attendance, having 4 or more children and higher U.S. acculturation increased

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>White, J. W., Merrill, L. L., &amp; Koss, M. P. (2001). Predictors of premilitary courtship violence in a Navy recruit sample. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 16</i>(9), 910-927.</p>	<p>2,784</p>	<p>Male (47%) and female (53%) U.S. Navy recruits, average age 20 years. Race/ethnicity: White 63-72%, African American 16-23%, Hispanic 7-8%, Asian American 3%, Native American 1.2-1.8%, other 1.2-2.3%. Response rate: Women, 90%; Men, 93%</p>	<p>Cross sectional. Survey in 1994 of U.S. Navy recruits stationed at RTC Orlando, Florida, United States. Self-report.</p>	<p>likelihood of MFPV.</p> <p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: verbal, physical, sexual, CTS; Background variables: Child abuse: witnessing and experiencing interparental aggression, childhood sexual abuse, Parent-Child CTS 15-items, sexual abuse and witnessing aggression 2-items; Attitudes accepting aggression: Hostility Toward Women Scale, Hostility Toward Men Scale; Angry/impulsive personality: subscale of Trauma Symptom Inventory; Prior aggressive behavior: Tension Reduction Behavior subscale of Trauma Symptom Inventory; Situational variables: Victimization by partner CTS; Alcohol problems and use: Michigan Alcoholism Screening Test 25-items.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> For male perpetration, block of background variables entered in regression accounted for 25% of the variance, and block of situational components additionally significant, the 2 blocks accounting for 67% of variance in total. Partner’s verbal aggression (26%) was the strongest predictor, followed by partner’s physically aggressive behavior (7%). Also significant were alcohol problems (3%), past sexually aggressive behavior (2%), anger/irritability (3%) and hostility toward women (1%). In model for female perpetration, 1st block was 18% of</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 3. Cross-sectional adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				variance and with 2nd block was 55% of variance. Partner’s verbal aggression was the strongest predictor, with partner’s physical aggression accounting for 4% of the variance and anger/irritability 3% of the variance.
<p>Caetano, R., Cunradi, C. B., Clark, C. L., &amp; Schafer, J. (2000). Intimate partner violence and drinking patterns among white, black, and Hispanic couples in the U.S. <i>Journal of Substance Abuse, 11</i>(2), 123-138.</p>	1,440 couples	Married or cohabitating couples, age 18 and older. Race/ethnicity: White 39%, African American 25%, Hispanic 37%. Response rate 85%.	Cross-sectional data from the 9th National Alcohol Survey. National multistage area household probability sample with oversamples of African-American and Hispanic households. In-person interviews conducted separately with each partner. Self-report. United States.	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: Self-report CTS-R 11-items; Childhood exposure to violence: if witnessed parental IPV or if victim of parent to child aggression; Approval of marital aggression 4-items; MFPV/FMPV, perpetration.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> Controlled for SES. African Americans were more likely to be consuming alcohol when IPV occurred than the other subgroups. There were no associations between perpetrator drinking patterns and IPV. For female African Americans there was a significant association between drinking patterns and FMPV. Race was not a significant predictor of MFPV, however FMPV was twice as likely in African American couples. Risk factors by ethnicity: For White couples, Low SES, history of victimization, approval of IPV, and alcohol use; For African Americans, higher number of children, heavy alcohol use childhood victimization, and approval of IPV; For Hispanics, low SES, impulsivity, and unemployment.</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 3. Cross-sectional adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>McCarroll, J. E., Ursano, R. J., Liu, X., Thayer, L. E., Newby, J. H., Norwood, A. E., &amp; Fullerton, C. S. (2000). Deployment and the probability of spousal aggression by U.S. Army soldiers. <i>Military Medicine</i>, 165(1), 41-44.</p>	<p>26,835</p>	<p>Male and female enlisted, active duty Army soldiers. Gender: 95.1% males, 4.9% females. Race/ethnicity: 62.6% White, 37.4% non-White. Deployment in past year: 43% deployed, 57% not deployed.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from an Army needs assessment conducted between 1990 and 1994, United States. Random sample of 15% of all deployed and non-deployed active duty soldiers at 50 Army installations in U.S. Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV perpetration: CTS. MFPV, FMPV, perpetration.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for sex, age race, rank, spousal employment, children living with the respondent, and whether the respondent lived on or off the military installation, findings indicated the probability of severe aggression perpetration was significantly greater for soldiers who had deployed in the past year compared with soldiers who had not. Although deployment contributed significantly, the effect was small and for severe violence perpetration only.</p>
<p>Cunradi, C. B., Caetano, R., Clark, C. L., &amp; Schafer, J. (1999). Alcohol-related problems and intimate partner violence among white, black, and Hispanic couples in the U.S. <i>Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research</i>, 23(9), 1492-1501.</p>	<p>1,440</p>	<p>Married or cohabitating couples, age 18 and older. Race/ethnicity: White 39%, African American 25%, Hispanic 37%. Response rate 85%.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from the 9th National Alcohol Survey. National multistage area household probability sample with oversamples of African-American and Hispanic households. In-person interviews conducted separately with each partner. Self-report. United States.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: CTS-R 11-items; Childhood violence victimization 5-items; Approval of marital aggression 4-items. MFPV.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for SES factors, psychosocial variables, and alcohol consumption, White couples with male alcohol abuse were twice as likely to experience MFPV, and female alcohol abusers were four times as likely to experience MFPV. African American couples with alcohol use were seven times more likely to experience MFPV, and female alcohol abusers were 5 times more likely to experience MFPV. Hispanic couples with male alcohol abuse are two times more likely to experience MFPV.</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 3. Cross-sectional adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Ellison, C. G., Bartkowski, J. P., &amp; Anderson, K. L. (1999). Are there religious variations in domestic violence? <i>Journal of Family Issues, 20</i>(1), 87-113.</p>	<p>4,662</p>	<p>Sample of married or cohabitating heterosexual couples, mean age 42 years. Race/ethnicity: White 84%, African American 10%, Hispanic 6%.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional. Data from National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH), Wave I (1987-1988). Randomized, representative sample of American households. Self-report only. United States.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: During the past year how many fights with your partner resulted in you hitting, shoving or throwing things at him/her 1-item; Religious variables: Denominational affiliation and homogamy between partners on this; Religious attendance and partner similarity on attendance, Theological conservatism and theological similarity; Control variables: age, education, income, employment status, marital status, race/ethnicity, relative power resources of partners (income and educational differences. MFPV, FMPV, perpetration.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> Controlled for age, education, income, employment status, marital status, and race/ethnicity: There was no evidence that conservative Protestant denominations were more likely to perpetrate MFPV or FMPV; Frequency of attendance was inversely associated with IPV perpetration; FMPV was less likely for those who attend services, even occasionally, than those who go once a year or less. Those with shared religious beliefs are less likely to perpetrate than couples who have mixed faiths.</p>
<p>Heyman, R. E., &amp; Neidig, P. H. (1999). A comparison of spousal aggression prevalence rates in U.S. Army and</p>	<p>36,806</p>	<p>Adult males and females, age 18 years or older, who were either married, active-duty Army soldiers (92%) or employed civilians in a</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from an Army needs assessment conducted between 1990 and 1994 and the 1985 National Family Violence Survey</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: CTS - 18 items; demographics (race, SES, military status). MFPV, FMPV, perpetration.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for age and race, reported rates of husband-to-wife violence</p>



PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 3. Cross-sectional adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>civilian representative samples. <i>Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology</i>, 67(2), 239-242.</p>		<p>current or recent relationship within two years (8%). Army sample: age 22-31 years 49%, male 91%, race/ethnicity: 64% White, 27% Black, 5% Hispanic, 1% American Indian. Civilian sample: age 22-31 27%, male 52%, race/ethnicity: 72% White, 12% Black, 11% Hispanic, 4% American Indian.</p>	<p>(NFVS), United States.  NFVS: Sample comprised a national stratified probability sample selected by random digit dialing. Self-report.  Army survey: Random sample of 15% of all deployed and non-deployed active duty soldiers at 50 Army installations in U.S. Self-report.</p>	<p>were slightly but significantly higher in a large U.S. Army sample than in a nationally representative civilian sample. Men in the Army reported 10.8% prevalence of moderate IPV and 2.5% severe IPV compared to male civilians who reported 9.9% moderate and 0.7% severe IPV. Women in the Army reported 13.1% moderate and 4.4% severe IPV whereas civilian women reported 10.0% moderate and 2.0% severe IPV.</p>
<p>MacMillan, R., &amp; Gartner, R. (1999). When she brings home the bacon: Labor-force participation and the risk of spousal violence against women. <i>Journal of Marriage and the Family</i>, 61(4), 947-958.</p>	<p>8,461</p>	<p>Adult women, age 18 years or older (mean age 30 years), in a married or common-law relationship. Response rate 64%.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from the Violence Against Women Survey conducted in 1993. Representative stratified probability sample of adult women surveyed by phone. Self-report. Canada.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV - CTS 10-items; Demographic variables (employment, SES, age, marital status, size of household, urban residence, length of relationship, husband's alcohol consumption, disability of respondent, spousal abuse of respondent's mother); Coercive patriarchal control - 4-items. MFPV, victimization only.  <i>Results:</i> After controlling for demographic variables and coercive control, found that employed women with unemployed spouses were at increased risk for partner violence victimization. It was found that the effect of employment status of the wife on the risk of MFPV was dependent on the employment status of the husband.</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 3. Cross-sectional adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				Employment of the wife lowered the risk of IPV victimization when the husband was also employed, but wife employment increased the risk of IPV victimization when the husband was unemployed.
Avakame, E. F. (1998). Intergenerational transmission of violence, self-control, and conjugal violence: A comparative analysis of physical violence and psychological aggression. <i>Violence and Victims, 13</i> (3), 301-316.	2,143	Male (45%) and female (55%) adult individuals.	Cross-sectional data from the 1975 National Family Violence Survey. Sample comprised an area probability sample. Self-report by in-person interview.	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV - physical and psychological violence CTS; Self-control: getting drunk, hostility while drunk, instigating arguments, losing temper 4-items; Physical punishment: mothers' and fathers' physical punishment when respondent was an adolescent 2-items; Interparental violence: mother and father interparental violence 2-items. MFPV, FMPV, perpetration.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for the effects of interparental violence, adolescent experiences of physical punishment, and self-control, findings indicated that experiencing fathers' physical punishment as an adolescent was a risk factor for males' and females' psychological aggression and males' MFPV. Fathers' interparental violence against mothers' predicted females' FMPV; lower self-control was a risk factor for both males' and females' physical and psychological aggression. The authors interpret the results to support the concept of the intergenerational transmission of violence.</p>
Jasinski, J. L. (1998). The role of	743	Adult male (47.2%) and female (52.8%)	Cross-sectional data from the 1992 National	<i>Measures:</i> IPV - CTS ; Acculturation - assessing language preference in different

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 3. Cross-sectional adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>acculturation in wife assault. <i>Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences</i>, 20(2), 175-191.</p>		<p>participants. Race/ethnicity: Puerto Rican (14%), Mexican (44%), Mexican American (23.5%), Cuban (18.5%). Overall response rate 75.4%, Hispanic response rate 80.3%.</p>	<p>Alcohol and Family Violence Survey (NAFVS), United States. National probability sample, with an oversample of Hispanic participants. In-person interviews in English or Spanish. Self-report.</p>	<p>situations, nation of origin, age of arrival in US; demographic variables 4-items. MFPV</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for SES, younger husbands were more likely to assault wives; third-generation Hispanic American husbands were three times more likely to assault their wives than first-generation husbands, and younger age of immigration to US increased risk of wife assault.</p>
<p>Kershner, M., Long, D., &amp; Anderson, J. E. (1998). Abuse against women in rural Minnesota. <i>Public Health Nursing</i>, 15(6), 422-431.</p>	<p>1,693</p>	<p>Adult females, mean age 34.95 years. Race/ethnicity: White 94%, Native American 4%, Hispanic, Asian, and African American &lt;1%. Relationship status: married 64%, single 23%, divorced or separated 7%, widowed 5%. Response rate 82.4%.</p>	<p>Cross sectional data, West-central Minnesota and South Dakota, United States. Medical care survey data collected in 1997. Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: Self-administered questionnaire, physical: hit, slapped, kicked, pushed, choked, grabbed or physically hurt; emotional or verbal: yelling, swearing, put down, threats, jealousy, stalking, or other types of controlling words or actions; and sexual abuse: any forced or unwanted sexual activity in last 12 months 3-items; Other abuse: the same 3-items were used to identify abuse prior to age 18 and abuse since age 18 but prior to the last 12 months. MFPV, victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for age, WIC survey location, and education, findings indicated that proportional increases in risk for MFPV victimization relative to married women were 2.1 for single, 2.5 for divorced, and 6.5 for separated women. Single women who recently changed their relationship status were at higher risk for MFPV than women with other types of</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 3. Cross-sectional adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>status change. A childhood history of abuse and history of abuse prior to the 12 months were also risk factors, and larger numbers of children and more than 2 adults in household were associated with MFPV.</p>
<p>Grandin, E., &amp; Lupri, E. (1997). Intimate violence in Canada and the United States: A cross-national comparison. <i>Journal of Family Violence</i>, 12(4), 417-443.</p>	<p>5,582</p>	<p>Sample of male and female adults from United States (72%) and Canada (28%). 73.4% response rate for Canadian sample and 84% response rate for American sample.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from two national studies. Data from the 1986 Canadian National Family Life Survey and the 1985 U.S. National Family Violence Survey. Both surveys recruited participants through probability sampling. Canadian survey used self-report, mail-return questionnaires. U.S. survey used self-report telephone interviews.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: self-report of male and female perpetration from items on modified CTS, physical abuse 8-items, coded into 2 levels: minor and severe.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> Findings indicated that Canadian males and females were significantly more likely to perpetrate minor and severe IPV than Americans. Controlling for country and age, no gender differences in the odds of committing minor violence. Canadian females were 2 times more likely than Canadian males to commit severe IPV and American females were 4 times more likely to commit severe IPV than American males. Being older decreased the odds of both minor and severe violence.</p>
<p>Jasinski, J. L., Asdigian, N. L., &amp; Kantor, G. K. (1997). Ethnic adaptations to occupational strain. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i>, 12(6), 814-831.</p>	<p>1,514</p>	<p>Adult males, age 18 years or older, who were in a married or cohabitating relationship. Race/ethnicity: White 54%, Hispanic American 46%. ( Income: \$44,999 White participants, \$17,499 Hispanic-Americans.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from the 1992 National Alcohol and Family Violence Survey (NAFVS), United States. National probability sample, with an oversample of Hispanic participants. In-person interviews in English or Spanish. Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Partner Violence - CTS (partner's behavior, own behavior); Work-related stress - from Social Readjustment Rating Scale 2-items; Drinking - 6-category measure of quantity and frequency. MFPV, perpetration.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for SES variables, White men's work-related stress was most likely to be caused by difficulties with their employers, whereas Hispanic</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 3. Cross-sectional adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				men were most likely to face extended periods of unemployment. Hispanic American husbands' work-related stress was associated with increased levels of alcohol use and MFPV; For White husbands, work-related stress was associated with increased levels of alcohol use; For both samples men's heavy drinking was associated with MFPV.
Sorenson, S. B., Upchurch, D. M., & Haikang, S. (1996). Violence and injury in marital arguments: Risk patterns and gender differences. <i>American Journal of Public Health</i> , 86(1), 35-35.	6,779	Male (49.9%) and female (50.1%) adults. Race/ethnicity: White 86.1%, African American 7.4%, Hispanic 6.5%. Education: < high school 19.5%, high school graduate 39.8%, some college 19.5%, college graduate 21.0%. Response rate 74%.	Cross-sectional. Data from National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH), Wave I (1987-1988). Randomized, representative sample of American households. Self-report only. United States.	<i>Measures:</i> IPV: verbal arguments, physical aggression, and resulting injuries 9-items; Demographic variables: age, gender, income, education, ethnicity, religion, number of children in home, duration of marriage. MFPV, FMPV, perpetration, victimization.  <i>Results:</i> After controlling for oversampling and non-response rates, FMPV was slightly more likely than MFPV as reported by respondents; Males and females were equally likely to report victimization by partner; Females reported higher rates of injury as well as of injuring their partner; Physical IPV was more likely in urban areas than rural and suburban areas; Protestants were less likely to report IPV; Less education, Non-White, lower SES, and younger age were risk factors.
Sugarman, D. B., Aldarondo, E., & Boney-McCoy, S. (1996). Risk marker	6,002	Adult males (39%) and females (61%) who were married, cohabitating, divorced or separated	Cross-sectional data from the 1985 National Family Violence Survey. Sample comprised a national	<i>Measures:</i> IPV perpetration by husband: CTS 19-items classified as no violence, verbal aggression only, minor physical violence, severe physical violence; Marital

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 3. Cross-sectional adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>analysis of husband-to-wife violence: A continuum of aggression. <i>Journal of Applied Social Psychology</i>, 26(4), 313-337.</p>		<p>within the last two years and with a child younger than 18 years old at home.</p>	<p>stratified probability sample selected by random digit dialing. Self-report.</p>	<p>agreement 5-items; Depressive symptoms 7-items; Alcohol use 3-items; SES: 5-indicators, inc. Teriman's Occupational Prestige scores; Violence in family-of-origin 4-items; Attitudes toward marital violence 2-items; Nonfamilial violence 4-items. MFPV (perpetration reported by men and victimization by women, not in couples).</p> <p><i>Results:</i> Controlled for the effects of all risk marker variables. For males depressive symptoms, SES, marital agreement, alcohol use, attitudes toward marital violence, violence in family of origin, and nonfamilial violence predicted MFPV. For females depressive symptoms, SES, marital agreement, approval of marital violence, experiencing and witnessing family-of-origin violence, alcohol use, and spouses' alcohol use were factors for MFPV. After controlling for type of violence, for males and females an increase in male partner violence severity was associated with increased depressive symptoms, greater acceptance of marital violence, higher likelihood of family of origin violence, greater alcohol use, and higher nonfamilial violence.</p>
<p>Choice, P., Lamke, L. K., &amp; Pittman, J. F. (1995). Conflict resolution strategies</p>	<p>1,836</p>	<p>Adult males, mean age 41.83 years, who were married or cohabitating. Race/ethnicity: White</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from the 1985 National Family Violence Survey. Sample comprised a national</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Male reports. Witnessed inter-parental violence, hit or threw at mother/stepmother; verbal aggression, CTS; Physical aggression, CTS; MFPV.</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 3. Cross-sectional adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>and marital distress as mediating factors in the link between witnessing interparental violence and wife battering. <i>Violence and Victims</i>, 10(2), 107-119.</p>		<p>73.2%, African American 10.9%, Hispanic 9.6%. Employment: employed full-time 77.4%, retired 10.7%, part-time 4.3%, unemployed 3.8%. Mean relationship length 15.57 years.</p>	<p>stratified probability sample selected by random digit dialing. Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for SES, ethnicity, and age, males who witnessed parental MFPV were more likely to be verbally aggressive during marital conflicts that were associated with greater likelihood of marital distress. High levels of marital distress were associated with MFPV; MFPV was less likely in males with higher SES; Males with more education were more likely to report marital distress; White and Hispanic males were less likely to report marital distress or MFPV; Older males experience less IPV and marital distress than younger males.</p>
<p>Neff, J. A., Holamon, B., &amp; Schluter, T. D. (1995). Spousal violence among Anglos, Blacks, and Mexican Americans: The role of demographic variables, psychosocial predictors, and alcohol consumption. <i>Journal of Family Violence</i>, 10(1), 1-21.</p>	<p>1,374</p>	<p>Adult male (44%) and female (56%) participants, mean age 39 years. Race/ethnicity: 33% Anglos, 18% Blacks, 49% Mexican American. Response rate 66%.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from a multi-stage area probability sample, San Antonio, Texas, United States. In-person interviews conducted in 1988. Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: self-report of male and female victimization and perpetration from items on CTS. Social desirability: Crowne-Marlowe Scale 29-items. Financial strain: perception of financial stress. Sex-role traditionalism 12-items. Alcohol consumption: quantity consumed per drinking episode, frequency (days per week), and total weekly consumption. Marital status: currently married or formerly married. MFPV, FMPV, perpetration, victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for demographic variables and all other factors, it was found that formerly married men and women had higher rates of both IPV perpetration and victimization than did currently married</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 3. Cross-sectional adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>individuals and this was the case for Anglo, African American and Mexican American adults, at close to or over double the prevalence of violence among the formerly married in most cases. In addition, women and African American women in particular were at the greatest risk for victimization and perpetration of IPV. Ethnic differences were not a significant risk factor for IPV victimization in males. Mexican American females were less likely to perpetrate IPV than Anglos and African Americans. Also, financial stress and high quantity drinkers increased the likelihood of perpetrating IPV for males and females.</p>
<p>Kantor, G. K., Jasinski, J. L., &amp; Aldarondo, E. (1994). Sociocultural status and incidence of marital violence in Hispanic families. <i>Violence and Victims</i>, 9(3), 207-222.</p>	<p>1,970</p>	<p>Adult males and females, mean age 37.5 years, married or in a cohabitating opposite sex relationship. Race/ethnicity: Puerto Rican 5%, Mexican 17%, Cuban 7%, Anglo-American 52%. Response rate 75.4%.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from the 1992 National Alcohol and Family Violence Survey (NAFVS), United States. National probability sample, with an oversample of Hispanic participants. In-person interviews in English or Spanish. Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: self-report of male and female victimization and perpetration from items on CTS. Acculturation: National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey 4-items. Approval of violence (norms tolerating wife abuse 1-item). MFPV, perpetration.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for cultural norms regarding violence approval, age, and economic stressors, findings indicated that Hispanics/Latino Americans did not differ from Anglo-Americans in their odds for MFPV. Being born in the United States was a significant risk for perpetration of IPV by Mexican and Puerto Rican American husbands. Also, normative approval of violence more than doubled the</p>



PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 3. Cross-sectional adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Pan, H. S., Neidig, P. H., &amp; O'Leary, K. D. (1994). Predicting mild and severe husband-to-wife physical aggression. <i>Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology</i>, 62(5), 975-981.</p>	<p>11,870</p>	<p>Male military personnel, mean age 30 years, who were married or cohabitating. Race/ethnicity: White 100%. Average income \$20,189 (1989-1992). Average length of relationship 7.5 years.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from an Army needs assessment conducted between 1989 and 1992, United States. Random sample of 15% of all deployed and non-deployed active duty soldiers at 38 Army installations in U.S. Self-report.</p>	<p>odds of husband perpetration of IPV for both Hispanic American and Anglo American husbands.</p> <p><i>Measures:</i> Self-report by men, MCTS 23-items; Marital stress and discord, marital stress: Dyadic Adjustment Scale 15-items; work environment survey 26-items; depressive symptomatology similar items to BDI 15-items. MFPV, perpetration; general Job stress 9-items; home/household stress 7-items; also, age, salary, and problems with alcohol or drugs. MFPV, perpetration.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> Multivariate analysis including age, salary, substance use, marital discord, spouse concerns, and depressive symptoms. Mild and severe MFPV (each compared with none) were associated with males who were younger, had less income, had a drinking problem, had marital discord, poor spousal adjustment, and experienced more symptoms of depression. In addition severe IPV also associated with drug use. Severe compared to mild IPV associated with lower income, alcohol use, drug use, marital discord, and depressive symptoms.</p>
<p>Straus, M. A., &amp; Kantor, G. K. (1994). Corporal punishment of adolescents by parents: a risk factor in the epidemiology</p>	<p>4,500</p>	<p>Adult male and female respondents, families with a child under age of 18 years living at home. Response rate 84%</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from the 1985 National Family Violence Survey. Sample comprised a national stratified probability sample selected by</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV perpetration: within past year CTS; child abuse perpetration within past year CTS; Corporal punishment in family of origin 2-items; Depressive symptoms PERI; Suicidal Ideation 2-items; Drinking index: frequency and quantity 2-</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 3. Cross-sectional adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>of depression, suicide, alcohol abuse, child abuse, and wife beating. <i>Adolescence</i>, 29(115), 543-561.</p>			<p>random digit dialing. Self-report.</p>	<p>items. MFPV, perpetration.  <i>Results:</i> After controlling for age, gender, SES, violence between parents, and depression, findings indicated that males who experienced corporal punishment in adolescence had an increased risk later in life of depressive symptoms, suicidal thoughts, alcohol abuse, physical abuse of children and MFPV.</p>
<p>Sorenson, S. B., &amp; Telles, C. A. (1991). Self-reports of spousal violence in a Mexican-American and Non-Hispanic White population. <i>Violence and Victims</i>, 6(1), 3-15.</p>	<p>3,132</p>	<p>Married adult males and females. Race/ethnicity: Mexican American 40%, White 37%. Response rate 68%.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from the Los Angeles Epidemiologic Catchment Area project, United States. Two-stage, stratified random sample interviewed between 1983 – 1984 in English or Spanish. Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> lifetime IPV 3-items and lifetime pressured or forced sexual contact and characteristics 1-item. Questions for physical IPV have you ever hit or thrown things at your spouse/partner, who initiated it, and frequency. MFPV, FMPV.  <i>Results:</i> After controlling for age and gender; Mexican-born Hispanics were significantly less likely to experience spousal IPV than Mexican-Americans and Whites born in the US. Statistically significant risk factors were: birthplace, mental health disorders, marital status (divorced or separated had higher incidence and never married had lowest rates), age over 45 lower risk. The following factors did not predict IPV: gender, education, or the presence of children. When Whites were added to predict spousal IPV: Mexican ethnicity was more predictive of spousal violence than Non-Hispanic White. White women more likely to perpetrate</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 3. Cross-sectional adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				FMPV than Mexican American women. Sexual assault victimization for Mexican Americans was higher for women, for females with mental health disorders, and married women.
Stets, J. E. (1991). Cohabiting and marital aggression: The role of social isolation. <i>Journal of Marriage and the Family</i> , 53(3), 669-680.	6,231	Adult males and females, mean age 44 years, who were married or cohabitating. Response rate 74%.	Cross-sectional. Data from National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH), Wave I (1987-1988). Randomized, representative sample of American households. Self-report only. United States.	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV self-report by males and females: the frequency of fights with their partner that involved hitting, shoving, or throwing things. Social support: who participants would go to for help in three different situations. Social control: three layers of integration: ties to groups/organizations, family/friends, and one's partner. Depressive symptoms 12-items; and alcohol problems. MFPV, FMPV.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for all variables, it was found that cohabiters were more likely to engage in IPV than married couples. IPV was more likely in cohabiters that were younger, Black, lacking social control in certain social relations (organizations), have more depressive symptoms, and more alcohol problems.</p>
Gelles, R. J. (1988). Violence and pregnancy: Are pregnant women at greater risk of abuse? <i>Journal of Marriage and the Family</i> , 50(3), 841-847.	6,002	Heterosexual adults who were married, cohabitating, divorced, separated within 2 years, or single parent with child under 18 years. Response rate=84%.	Cross-sectional data from the 1985 National Family Violence Survey. Sample comprised a national stratified probability sample selected by random digit dialing. Self-report.	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV – CTS. MFPV.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for age of male and female respondents, there was no support for the hypothesis that pregnant women experience MFPV at greater rates than non-pregnant counterparts; however there was some evidence that males over</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables – Table 3. Cross-sectional adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Coleman, D. H., &amp; Straus, M. A. (1986). Marital power, conflict, and violence in a nationally representative sample of American couples. <i>Violence and Victims</i>, 1(2), 141-157.</p>	<p>2,143</p>	<p>Adult men (45%) and women (55%) who were married or cohabiting.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from the 1975 National Family Violence Survey. Sample comprised an area probability sample. Self-report by in-person interview.</p>	<p>age 25 to perpetrate MFPV on pregnant wives compared with their non-expectant counterparts.</p> <p><i>Measures:</i> Marital violence (IPV): CTS. Marital Power was measured by 6-items. Power norm consensus -- the agreement between spouses on who has the right to have the final say on decisions 6-items. Marital conflict: Marital Conflict Index 7-items. MFPV, FMPV.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for power norm consensus, equalitarian couples had the lowest rates of conflict and violence and male-dominant and female-dominant couples had the highest rates. Equalitarian couples experienced little increase in the violence rate when conflict increased, especially for husband-to-wife violence. Male-dominant couples were most likely to have experienced a high degree of conflict and were almost twice as likely to have high conflict as equalitarian relationships.</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 4. Cross-sectional, small community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
---------------------------	---	------------------------------------	-------------------	---------

**Table 4. Cross-sectional, small community adult samples**

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>McKinney, C. M., Caetano, R., Rodriguez, L. A., &amp; Okoro, N. (2010). Does alcohol involvement increase the severity of intimate partner violence? <i>Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research</i>, 34(4), 655-658.</p>	<p>872 (436 couples)</p>	<p>Married or cohabitating adult couples. Response rate 85%</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from the National Study of Couples obtained in conjunction with the 9<sup>th</sup> National Alcohol Survey. National multistage area household probability sample with oversamples of African-American and Hispanic households. In-person interviews conducted separately with each partner. Self-report. United States.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: CTS Form R (both partners reports of own and partner behavior), and respondents classified into mutually exclusive categories according to the most serious type of violence reported; Alcohol use: whether self or partner was drinking when each type of IPV occurred in past year. Classified male and female respondents as either exposed or unexposed to alcohol involvement for mild or severe MFPV and/or FMPV (perpetration and victimization). Included couples with any IPV past year only.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> In most unadjusted analyses those reporting any severe IPV were approximately twice as likely to report any male or female alcohol involvement as those reporting mild only IPV. After adjusting for confounding factors including female alcohol use, race/ethnicity, age, income and illicit drug use: there appeared to be no association between male alcohol involvement and severe (vs. mild only) MFPV or FMPV; female alcohol involvement was associated with more than a 3-fold increased risk of severe (vs.</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 4. Cross-sectional, small community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				mild only) MFPV and 2.5-fold increased risk of FMPV.
<p>Reed, E., Silverman, J. G., Ickovics, J. R., Gupta, J., Welles, S. L., Santana, M. C., &amp; Raj, A. (2010). Experiences of racial discrimination and relation to violence perpetration and gang involvement among a sample of urban African American men. <i>Journal of Immigrant and Minority Health</i>, 12(3), 319-326.</p>	569	<p>African American men, ages 18-65 years, who were sexually active (reporting sex with two or more partners in the past year) and demonstrating no cognitive impairment. Economic indicators: 61% were unemployed, and 22% were homeless in a shelter or on the street. Response rate 81%.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from the Black and African American Men’s Health Study, Boston, Massachusetts, United States. Sample comprised African American men from health centers recruited between 2005 – 2006. Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV perpetration: physical abuse, sexual abuse, and injuries from abuse 4-items; Racial discrimination from Everyday Discrimination Scale 7-items. MFPV, perpetration.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After adjusting for age and education, experiencing racial discrimination was significantly associated with IPV perpetration.</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 4. Cross-sectional, small community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Wiersma, J. D., Cleveland, H. H., Herrera, V., &amp; Fischer, J. L. (2010). Intimate partner violence in young adult dating, cohabitating, and married drinking partnerships. <i>Journal of Marriage and Family</i>, 72(2), 360-374.</p>	<p>741 (hetero sexual couples)</p>	<p>Sample of male and female young adults, age 18 to 30 years old. Race/ethnicity: White/Caucasian 68%, African American 9%, Hispanic 11%, Native American 4%, and Asian/Pacific Islander 8%. Education: Average educational attainment 1 year beyond high school (M = 13.36 years, SD = 2.02) and 41% were currently attending college. Relationship status: dating 32%, cohabitating 38%, and married 31%.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional. Sample from National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health), Wave III, 2001-2002. Systematic stratified clustered sampling from 132 representative schools (public, private, urban, rural) from grades 7-12 in 1994-1995. Multimodal data collection from multiple sources (school administrators, parents, adolescent, romantic partners) via in-school questionnaires and in-home interviews. Self-report measures only used in analyses. United States.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV (both MFPV and FMPV victimization and perpetration) 8-item. Using a cluster analysis, drinking partnerships were identified via couples' reports of both frequency and quantity of alcohol consumption. Four partnerships (clusters) were identified: (a) congruent light and infrequent, (b) discrepant male heavy and frequent, (c) discrepant female heavy and infrequent, and (d) congruent moderate/heavy frequent drinkers.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> There was no support for the hypothesis that dating couples would experience less IPV than cohabitating and married couples. There was no significant support of the hypothesis that heavy discrepant drinking partnerships (cluster 2 and cluster 3) would have higher rates of IPV.</p>
<p>Golinelli, D., Longshore, D., &amp; Wenzel, S. L. (2009). Substance use and intimate partner violence: Clarifying the relevance of women's use and partners' use. <i>The Journal of Behavioral</i></p>	<p>590</p>	<p>Adult women, age 18-55 years, who were homeless and low-income with a current male or female partner. Race/ethnicity: African American 64.9%, Hispanic/Latina 23.9%, Euro-American or other 11.2%. Education: high</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from a sample of low-income women, Los Angeles, California, United States. Stratified random sampling of Section 8 housing and homeless shelters. Data collected from 2001-2002. Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: physical victimization CTS 13-items, sex victim 4-items, psychological victim 3-items; Substance Use: CIDI-SF alcohol or illicit drug use past 6 months for self and partner; childhood physical abuse: occurrence of any of 6 severe types of physical aggression prior to age 18; mental health distress: RAND Mental Health Inventory 5-items; Social support: RAND Medical</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 4. Cross-sectional, small community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<i>Health Services and Research</i> , 36(2), 199-211.		school 37%, less than high school 26.1%, more than high school 36.9%. Response rate 76%.		<p>Outcomes Study 4-items. MFPV, victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for own and partner's independent substance use, found that childhood physical abuse, poor mental health and residing in a homeless shelter were predictive of women's MFPV victimization. Greater social support moderated effect of MFPV among nonsubstance using women only. The interaction of own and partner's substance use was not found to be significant.</p>
<p>Reed, E., Silverman, J. G., Welles, S. L., Santana, M. C., Missmer, S. A., &amp; Raj, A. (2009). Associations between perceptions and involvement in neighborhood violence and intimate partner violence perpetration among urban, African American men. <i>Journal of Community Health</i>, 34(4), 328-335.</p>	569	<p>African American men, ages 18-65 years, who were sexually active (reporting sex with two or more partners in the past year) and demonstrating no cognitive impairment. Economic indicators: 61% were unemployed, and 22% were homeless in a shelter or on the street. Response rate 81%.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from the Black and African American Men's Health Study, Boston, Massachusetts, United States. Sample comprised African American men from health centers recruited between 2005 – 2006. Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV perpetration 4-items; Sexual IPV perpetration 2-items; IPV injury perpetration 1-item. Respondents indicating yes on any of these items were defined as having perpetrated IPV in their current relationship; Alcohol use to intoxication 1-item; Illicit drug use 1-item; Neighborhood violence (street violence involvement, gang involvement; 2-items; Perceptions of neighborhood violence 2-items MVPV, perpetration.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for age, findings indicated that involvement with street violence and neighborhood violence variables were associated with IPV perpetration.</p>



PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 4. Cross-sectional, small community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Whiting, J. B., Simmons, L. A., Havens, J. R., Smith, D. B., &amp; Oka, M. (2009). Intergenerational transmission of violence: The influence of self-appraisals, mental disorders and substance abuse. <i>Journal of Family Violence</i>, 24(8), 639-648.</p>	<p>590</p>	<p>Males (42.95%) and females (57.05%), age 15-54 years. Race/ethnicity: White 84.35%, African American 4.1%, Hispanic 10.2%. Response rate=82.6%.</p>	<p>Cross sectional/ Retrospective; Secondary analysis data from the National Comorbidity Survey (NCS) 1990-1992; Nationally representative stratified, multistage probability sample; Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: Self-report CTS; Childhood abuse and victimization; Traumatic lifetime events; Mental health and substance abuse. Mutual IPV.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> A frequency table showed that most respondents who reported IPV reported being a perpetrator as well as a victim (n=277). Just 36 respondents reported being a victim without perpetrating and 57 respondents reported perpetrating without being a victim. Controlled for income, other self-appraisals and mental disorders. Adults who experienced childhood abuse and adult IPV were insecure in their self-appraisals and had greater likelihood of mental health and substance abuse issues. Individuals who reported IPV in present relationship were more likely to view themselves as more dependent, more enmeshed with others, more insecure, and lower self-esteem; The mental health correlates for people reporting IPV were depression, generalized anxiety disorder, PTSD, alcohol dependence, and substance abuse.</p>
<p>Hazen, A. L., Connelly, C. D., Soriano, F. I., &amp; Landsverk, J. A. (2008). Intimate</p>	<p>282</p>	<p>Latinas, age 18 to 45 years, in an intimate relationship within the prior year. Country of birth: US</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from a Latina community sample, San Diego, California, United States. Sample of Latinas</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: self-report on CTS2 and self-report of psychological abuse victimization using PMWI-SF; Childhood maltreatment: CTSPC-CA; Stressful Life-events past 12 months: LTE; Psychological</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 4. Cross-sectional, small community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>partner violence and psychological functioning in Latina women. <i>Health Care for Women International</i>, 29(3), 282-299.</p>		<p>44.9%, Mexico 53%, other 2%. Income: 32% at or below the federal poverty threshold.</p>	<p>selected from a community health care system in 2002. In-home interviews conducted in English or Spanish. Self-report.</p>	<p>symptom: BSI on anxiety, depression, hostility, phobic anxiety, and somatization; Self-esteem: Rosenberg Inventory. MFPV, victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for age, immigrant/migrant status, education, stressful life events, and childhood maltreatment findings indicated the psychological symptoms varied for the different forms of intimate partner violence. Specifically, psychological victimization was associated with hostility, depression, and somatization, and physical victimization was associated with depression and hostility. Sexual victimization was negatively related to phobic anxiety and no relation was found between IPV and self-esteem.</p>
<p>Caetano, R., Ramisetty-Mikler, S., Vaeth, P. A. C., &amp; Harris, T. R. (2007). Acculturation stress, drinking, and intimate partner violence among Hispanic couples in the U.S. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i>, 22(11), 1431-1447.</p>	<p>774 participants (387 couples)</p>	<p>Married or cohabitating Hispanic adult couples. Relationship status: 94% married, 6% cohabiting. Response rate 73%.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from follow-up survey in 2000. Sample of couples from the 1995 National Alcohol Survey, a national multistage area household probability sample with oversamples of African-American and Hispanic households. Follow-up survey in 2000. In-person interviews conducted</p>	<p>Measures IPV: CTS 11-items; Acculturation Level: language use, values, media preference, ethnicity of respondent's friends/acquaintances/neighbors 12-items; Acculturation Stress: conflicts with family/friends due to changing values, communication problems, and culture adjustment problems 11-items; Average alcohol consumption and binge drinking: quantity and frequency of alcohol consumption over a 12-month period. MFPV, FMPV, perpetration.</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 4. Cross-sectional, small community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
			separately with each partner. Self-report. United States.	<i>Results:</i> After controlling for SES, a low level of acculturation with a high level of acculturation stress predicted a greater risk for IPV. For both men and women, high acculturation stress was directly related to IPV. High level of acculturation was directly related to IPV in women only. There was no association between drinking and IPV and there was no mediation effect of drinking on the association of acculturation and acculturation stress with IPV either.
Hazen, A. L., & Soriano, F. I. (2007). Experiences with intimate partner violence among Latina women. <i>Violence Against Women, 13</i> (6), 562-582.	292	Latinas, age 18 to 45 years, in an intimate relationship within the prior year. Country of birth: US 44.9%, Mexico 53%, other 2%. Income: 32% at or below the federal poverty threshold.	Cross-sectional data from a Latina community sample, San Diego, California, United States. Sample of Latinas selected from a community health care system in 2002. In-home interviews conducted in English or Spanish. Self-report.	<i>Measures:</i> IPV: CTS-2; Psychological aggression: Psychological Maltreatment of Women Inventory–Short Form 14-items; Partner substance abuse: AUDIT 10-items, DAST 10-items. MFPV, victimization.  <i>Results:</i> After controlling for age, marital status, poverty level, partner education, partner substance use, immigration group, predictors of IPV victimization were younger age, divorce or separation, and partner substance use; for sexual coercion, predictors were marital status (divorce, separation, or never married), US-born women, and seasonal migrants; for psychological aggression, predictors were being at or below poverty index, having one or more children (compared to no children), partner with high school diploma, US born.

PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 4. Cross-sectional, small community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Taft, C. T., O'Farrell, T. J., Torres, S. E., Panuzio, J., Monson, C. M., Murphy, M., et al. (2006). Examining the correlates of psychological aggression among a community sample of couples. <i>Journal of Family Psychology</i>, 20(4), 581-588.</p>	<p>290 (145 couples)</p>	<p>Heterosexual couples, age 18-64 years, in a relationship for at least 1 year. The majority or participants were White and employed full-time.</p>	<p>Cross sectional/ Retrospective; Plymouth County, MA, United States. Random digit dialing sampling. In-person, in-home interview conducted separated with each partner. Self-report</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: Physical aggression: CTS2 12-items, Psychological aggression CTS2 8-items, Psychological Maltreatment of Women Inventory 14-items for MFPV (modified for FMPV); Parent-to-child physical aggression: modified CTS2 14-items. MFPV, FMPV.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for excessive violence and alcohol abuse, risk factors for men who perpetrated psychological aggression were childhood experiences of father-to-child and father-to-mother aggression, with the fathers' aggression more of a risk factor than mother's; psychological aggression was associated with increased mental and physical health symptoms for both genders and for depression in females.</p>
<p>Lafontaine, M.-F., &amp; Lussier, Y. (2005). Does anger towards the partner mediate and moderate the link between romantic attachment and intimate violence? <i>Journal of Family Violence</i>, 20(6), 349-361.</p>	<p>632 individuals (316 couples)</p>	<p>Adult male and female couples, mean age 39 years. 63.2% Response rate 63.2%.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional study, random sample recruited by telephone, Quebec, Canada. Self-report questionnaires through mail.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: CTS2, psychological and physical violence only; Attachment: Experiences in Close Relationships Scale questionnaire 36-items on anxiety of abandonment and avoidance of intimacy; Anger: experience and expression of anger in intimate relationships 32-items including 5 types: Anger state, anger trait, anger-in, anger-out, and anger control. MFPV, FMPV, perpetration.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for anger in couples, findings indicated that state anger</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 4. Cross-sectional, small community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>and trait anger in men mediated the association between avoidant attachment and use of psychological IPV. For women, anger-out mediated the association of anxious attachment and psychological IPV. For both men and women, trait anger and anger-out mediated the association between female anxiety and use of physical IPV. Men who had low anxiety of abandonment with high trait anger or low anger control were more likely to use physical IPV.</p>
<p>Seedat, S., Stein, M. B., &amp; Forde, D. R. (2005). Association between physical partner violence, posttraumatic stress, childhood trauma, and suicide attempts in a community sample of women. <i>Violence and Victims</i>, 20(1), 87-98.</p>	<p>637</p>	<p>Adult females, age 18-65 years. Race/ethnicity: White 52.7%, African American 45.9%. Response rate 71%.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from a 1997 Memphis Area Study, Tennessee, United States. Sample comprised respondents to random-digit dialing telephone survey. Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: “Did your partner ever beat up or attack you?” also frequency, onset, and most recent occurrence of attack; PTSD: symptom checklist of DSM-IV criteria; Child abuse and neglect: Childhood Trauma Questionnaire 28-items; Hazardous Alcohol Intake: Alcohol Use Disorders and Identification Test 10-items. MFPV, victimization</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for predictor variables individually (marital status, educational level, alcohol use, and type of childhood trauma), the model showed that childhood sexual abuse, childhood emotional abuse, and low educational attainment were the only significant statistical predictors of IPV victimization. These data also showed that victimized women were more likely to have PTSD,</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 4. Cross-sectional, small community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				drunk heavily, attempted suicide, and suffered childhood trauma.
<p>O'Leary, K. D., &amp; Schumacher, J. A. (2003). The association between alcohol use and intimate partner violence: Linear effect, threshold effect, or both? <i>Addictive Behaviors</i>, 28(9), 1575-1585.</p>	4527	<p>NFVS: Sample of male respondents; married or cohabitating adults, single parents with children under age 18 in the household, or had been married or living with partner of the opposite sex in the last 2 years. 84.01% response rate.</p> <p>NSFH: Sample of male respondents age 19 years or older. Detailed demographics not available.</p>	<p>Data from NFVS and NSFH surveys.</p> <p>NFVS: Cross-sectional data from the 1985 National Family Violence Survey. Sample comprised a national stratified probability sample selected by random digit dialing. Self-report.</p> <p>NSFH: Longitudinal data from National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH). Data from Wave I (1987-1988) and II (1992-1994). Randomized, representative sample of American households. Self-report only.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Self-report. NFVS: IPV measure; CTS. NSFH: IPV measure; 1 question. Drinking measure: NFVS; 2 questions. NSFH; 2 questions. Male-to-female IPV only measured.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> Analyses of the association between IPV and drinking category revealed both linear and threshold effects; although linear associations between drinking classification and IPV were significant in both samples, the associated effect sizes were very small. Further, only heavy drinkers and binge drinkers were major contributors to the significant chi-squares.</p>
<p>Rosen, L. N., Kaminski, R. J., Parmley, A. M., Knudson, K. H., &amp; Fancher, P. (2003). The effects of peer</p>	713	<p>Adult male active duty Army soldiers, mean age 28 years.</p> <p>Race/ethnicity: 60.0% White, 20.6% African American, 6.3% White</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from an Army survey, Alaska, United States. The sample comprised 27 companies in the Alaska interior in 1998. Self-</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: modified CTS (coded by severity and frequency); Individual attributes: marital adjustment, symptoms of depression, negative masculinity (measure of antisocial and narcissistic traits), alcohol problems, and history of childhood</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 4. Cross-sectional, small community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>group climate on intimate partner violence among married male U.S. Army soldiers. <i>Violence Against Women</i>, 9(9), 1045-1071.</p>		<p>Hispanic, 2.7% Black Hispanic, 1.2% Asian, 3.0% multiracial, and 6.2% other. Rank: 47% noncommissioned officers 45% junior enlisted men, 8% officers. Response rate 97%.</p>	<p>report.</p>	<p>physical and emotional abuse. Military groups characteristics: peer support (bonding among soldiers in group), group disrespect (culture of hyper masculinity), and support for spouses, leadership support, and percent of women in group. MFPV, perpetration.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for all variables, race (African American), symptoms of depression, poor marital adjustment, alcohol problems, and a history of childhood abuse (physical and emotional) were found to be significant individual risk factors for MFPV. Lower leadership support, increased group disrespect (culture of hyper masculinity), and lower support for spouses were found to be significant risk factors for MFPV. Negative masculinity, military rank, and percent of females in the group were not related to MFPV.</p>
<p>Browning, C. R. (2002). The span of collective efficacy: Extending social disorganization theory to partner violence. <i>Journal of Marriage and the Family</i>, 64(4), 833-850.</p>	<p>199</p>	<p>Adult women, average age 30-44 years, in a married, cohabitating, or dating relationship. Race/ethnicity: 29% White, 46% African American, 21% Latina, 4% other. Response rate 75%.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional study, data drawn from Decennial Census, the 1994–95 Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods Community Survey, Chicago homicide data and the 1995–1997 Chicago Health and</p>	<p><i>Measure:</i> IPV: (a) self-report of female victimization CTS, coded into 3 categories: no violence, low, and high, (b) Number of homicides involving a female victim and intimate partner; Neighborhood collective efficacy: social cohesion 5-items and informal social control 5-items; 3 neighborhood structural characteristics: level of concentrated disadvantage, residential stability, and immigrant</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 4. Cross-sectional, small community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
			<p>Social Life Survey, United States. Participants recruited by stratified neighborhood sampling technique. Self-report questionnaire and interview.</p>	<p>concentration; Neighborhood IPV attitudes: nonintervention norms 2-items; Early sexual experience 1-item; Individual network embeddedness type of social interactions; Number of conflict disclosures to social support measured. MFPV, victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for individual, relational, and network variables, none of the 3 neighborhood structural characteristics were associated with IPV. Neighborhood collective efficacy was predictive of nonlethal and lethal IPV. Increased prevalence of nonintervention norms was associated with nonlethal IPV. Collective efficacy mediated the association between concentrated disadvantage and lethal IPV. Also, collective efficacy interacted with nonintervention norms in its association to nonlethal IPV, such that as nonintervention norms increased, the protective effect of collective efficacy decreased.</p>



PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 4. Cross-sectional, small community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Feerick, M. M., Haugaard, J. J., &amp; Hien, D. A. (2002). Child maltreatment and adulthood violence: the contribution of attachment and drug abuse. <i>Child Maltreatment</i>, 7(3), 226-240.</p>	<p>115</p>	<p>Adult women, mean age 32, who were currently receiving substance abuse treatment for cocaine or control group comparison. Race/ethnicity: 68% African American, 26% Hispanic, 4% Native American, and 3% Caucasian. Education: 42% less than high school, 22% high school, 30% attended college, 7% college graduate or postgraduate work. Response rate 95%.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from the Women’s Health Project, New York City, United States. Data was collected between 1994–1996. Randomly selected women recruited from medical settings. Medical records and self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Adult violence: The Physical Aggression subscale of the CTS; Sexual assault measure: Sexual Assault Inventory; Nonpartner physical violence: The Physical Assault Inventory; Childhood sexual abuse: The Childhood Sexual Abuse Interview; childhood physical abuse: the Physical Abuse Scale of the Childhood Trauma; Childhood attachment: A modified version of the Experiences in Close Relationships Scale. MFPV, FMPV, perpetration, victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for income, family history of alcoholism, ethnicity, age, and public assistance status, findings indicated that whereas childhood physical abuse was associated with adult sexual victimization for cocaine-abusing women, sexual abuse was associated with both partner violence victimization and perpetration for comparison women. Insecure working models of attachment were associated with partner violence victimization for comparison women, independent of the effect of sexual abuse.</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 4. Cross-sectional, small community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Rosen, L. N., Parmley, A. M., Knudson, K. H., &amp; Fancher, P. (2002). Gender differences in the experience of intimate partner violence among active duty U.S. Army soldiers. <i>Military Medicine</i>, 167(12), 959-963.</p>	<p>576</p>	<p>Married adult male (83%) and female (17%) active duty Army personnel, average age 26-28 years. Race/ethnicity: males – White 55%, African American 25%, Hispanic 9%, Asian 1%, other 9%; females - White 39%, African American 36%, Hispanic 10%, Asian 5%, other 9%.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from an Army survey, Alaska, United States. The sample comprised 27 companies in the Alaska interior in 1998. Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: Modified CTS; Psychological distress: CES-D depression 20-items; Marital adjustment: DAS 14-items; Social support: Horizontal cohesion scale of peer support 5-items; Vertical cohesion scale of leader support 9-items. MFPV and FMPV, perpetration, victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for other variables psychological distress was not associated with physical IPV for males or females. After controlling for psychological distress variables, findings indicated males psychological distress was associated with lower rank, poor marital adjustment, and lower levels of peer and leadership support; females psychological distress was associated with lower leader support and psychological abuse victimization. Females reported more perpetration of psychological abuse and males reported receiving more psychological abuse.</p>
<p>Markowitz, F. E. (2001). Attitudes and family violence: Linking intergenerational and cultural theories. <i>Journal of Family Violence</i>, 16(2), 205-</p>	<p>386</p>	<p>386 total participants. 245 participants from the general population and 141 ex-offenders. 212 married participants. Mean age of general population was 37 years and mean</p>	<p>Cross-sectional study, Albany, New York, United States. Community sample recruited via multistage process. Ex-offender sample recruited from Albany County parole</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV 3-items; Attitudes: approval of violence against spouse and children 6-items; Childhood violence: retrospective frequency of witnessing/experiencing violence during childhood 3-items. MFPV, FMPV, perpetration.</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 4. Cross-sectional, small community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
218.		age for ex-offenders was 27 years. 51% male and 49% female in general population. 75% male and 25% female of ex-offenders. 76% general population response rate and 50% ex-offender response rate.	list. In-person interviews. Self-report.	<i>Results:</i> After controlling for SES, experiencing childhood violence was predictive of perpetrating IPV; Attitudes toward violence was related to the frequency of perpetrating IPV. Also, the association between childhood violence and perpetrating IPV in adulthood was explained by accepting attitudes toward violence.
Caetano, R., Schafer, J., Clark, C. L., Cunradi, C. B., & Raspberry, K. (2000). Intimate partner violence, acculturation, and alcohol consumption among Hispanic couples in the United States. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i> , 15(1), 30-45.	527	Hispanic married or cohabitating couples, age 18 years or older. Response rate 85%.	Cross-sectional data from the 9th National Alcohol Survey. National multistage area household probability sample with oversamples of African-American and Hispanic households. In-person interviews conducted separately with each partner. Self-report. United States.	<i>Measures:</i> IPV: Self-report CTS-R 11-items; Childhood exposure to violence: if witnessed parental IPV or if victim of parent to child aggression 2-items; Approval of marital aggression 4-items; MFPV, FMPV.  <i>Results:</i> After controlling for SES variables, approval of aggression between partners, childhood experiences of violence and impulsive behavior, findings indicated the medium acculturation group experienced the most MFPV and the high acculturation group experienced more MFPV than the low acculturation group. Similar results for FMPV. Higher levels of alcohol consumption were associated with MFPV in the high acculturation group, in the medium acculturation group a MFPV was associated with men who drank once a week compared to those who seldom drink. FMPV was associated with alcohol use in the medium and high acculturation group.

PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 4. Cross-sectional, small community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>Both male and female medium acculturation groups showed greater approval of IPV. Couples with 1 partner who was medium acculturated were 3 times more likely to experience MFPV than low acculturated couples and 11 times more likely to have FMPV. Low acculturated couples were least likely to experience FMPV. Additional risk factors for MFPV were childhood victimization, infrequent female alcohol use, and female impulsive behavior. Additional risk factors for FMPV were female childhood victimization, frequent heavy drinking of male partner, and male impulsive behavior.</p>
<p>Brinkerhoff, M. B., Grandin, E., &amp; Lupri, E. (1992). Religious involvement and spousal violence: The Canadian case. <i>Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion</i>, 31(1), 15-31.</p>	<p>770</p>	<p>Adult males (44%) and females (56%) in married or cohabitating relationships. Religion: 21.2% Catholic, 24.1% Mainline Protestant, 28.4% Conservative Protestant, 10.1% Other, 26.7% none. Response rate 73.4%.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional study, data drawn from a national survey conducted in Canada in 1987. Participants recruited through probability sampling. Self-report personal interviews and mail-return questionnaires.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: modified CTS 18-items; Religious affiliation; Religious commitment: frequency of service attendance 1-item; Interactional factors: authoritarianism, feminism, self-esteem, marital satisfaction, marital conflict, verbal aggression, and symbolic aggression. MFPV, FMPV, perpetration.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for religious and interactional factors, it was found that neither religious affiliation nor commitment were significantly predictive of IPV for either men or women.</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 4. Cross-sectional, small community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
Leonard, K. E., & Blane, H. T. (1992). Alcohol and marital aggression in a national sample of young men. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i> , 7(1), 19-30.	320	Young men, average age 23 years, currently married or living with a partner. Race/ethnicity: White 76.5%, African American 9%, Hispanic 14%. Education: Less than high school 11.4%, high school graduate 62.4%, college degree 16.3%. Response rate 82%.	Cross sectional data from the third wave of the longitudinal High School and Beyond Study, United States .Stratified cluster design of stratified national probability sample of 1,100 secondary schools (public, alternative, private) selected in 1979. Self-report.	<i>Measures:</i> Marital aggression: frequency of hitting partner while drinking and while sober 2-items; Marital satisfaction Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Test; Alcohol dependence Alcohol Use Inventory 25-items; Personality: various measures assessing negative affect, hostility, and self-consciousness. MFPV, perpetration.  <i>Results:</i> After controlling for SES, martial satisfaction, hostility, negative affect, and self-consciousness, findings indicated that higher scores on alcohol dependence were significantly related to MFPV and moderated by level of hostility and level of marital satisfaction.
Smith, M. D. (1990). Sociodemographic risk factors in wife abuse: Results from a survey of Toronto women. <i>Canadian Journal of Sociology/Cahiers Canadiens de Sociologie</i> , 15(1), 39-58.	604	Adult women, average age 25-34 years, in a current or former married or cohabitating relationship. Race/ethnicity: Canadian, British, Irish 70%, Italian 4%, Portuguese 2%, Greek 2%, Other 23%; Response rate 56.4%.	Cross-sectional data from the 1987 Toronto Survey, Canada. Simple random sample of Toronto metropolitan area. Phone interviews. Self-report.	<i>Measures:</i> IPV – CTS 19-item. MFPV, victimization.  <i>Results:</i> After controlling for SES factors, findings indicated that low SES, age, and divorce or separations were risk factors for MFPV.

PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 4. Cross-sectional, small community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Sugarman, D. B., &amp; Hotaling, G. T. (1989). Violent men in intimate relationships: An analysis of risk markers. <i>Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 19</i>(12, Pt 1), 1034-1048.</p>	<p>608</p>	<p>Adult males who were married or in cohabitating relationships.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from the 1975 National Family Violence Survey. Sample comprised an area probability sample. Self-report by in-person interview.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: self-report CTS; includes reasoning scale, verbal aggression scale, and violence scale; Childhood violence: witnessing violence and experiencing violence (retrospective); Marital conflict: couple agreement on 5 dyadic issues; Sex-role traditionalism: a power norm index on 6 issues; Self-esteem: participant and partner each 3-items. MFPV, perpetration.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for all variables, it was found that higher levels of marital conflict increased the likelihood of MFPV. Also, men with lower SES and a higher frequency of witnessing violence against women during their childhood were more likely to perpetrate IPV. The experience of violence had no effect on the likelihood of perpetrating IPV.</p>
<p>Howell, M. J., &amp; Pugliesi, K. L. (1988). Husbands who harm: Predicting spousal violence by men. <i>Journal of Family Violence, 3</i>(1), 15-27.</p>	<p>960</p>	<p>Married or cohabitating adult males, average age 39 years, Employment: white collar 44%, blue collar 56%, unemployed 16%.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from the 1975 National Family Violence Survey. Sample comprised an area probability sample. Self-report by in-person interview.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: Self-report of male perpetration, Verbal aggression did or said something to spite or insult the other, Minor violence slaps, kicks, hit with object, Severe violence beat up other, threatened or used knife or gun. MFPV, perpetration.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for age, witnessed parental aggression, low SES, occupational and employment status, risk factors for male-to-female partner violence were age, employment status, blue collar</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 4. Cross-sectional, small community adult samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				occupation and witnessing parental aggression.
<p>Leonard, K. E., Bromet, E. J., Parkinson, D. K., Day, N. L., &amp; Ryan, C. M. (1985). Patterns of alcohol use and physically aggressive behavior in men. <i>Journal for the Study of Alcohol</i>, 46(4), 279-282.</p>	484	<p>Adult, Caucasian males, mean age 36.7 years, who were union members. Religion: 65% Protestant. Education: 53% high-school educated. Response rate 73%.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from union memberships at four factories, eastern Pennsylvania, United States. Self-report, in-person interview.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Alcohol indicators: Alcohol diagnosis (DSM), pathological consumption, social consequences, dependence symptoms: The Alcohol Abuse section of the DIS. IPV: self-report of male perpetration from modified CTS; Hostility: State-Trait Personality Inventory; Marital satisfaction: modified from Dyadic Adjustment Scale. MFPV, perpetration.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> Current alcohol consumption was not related to either the number of fights that subjects were involved in since age 18 or MFPV. Pathological alcohol consumption but not social consequences or dependence symptoms were associated with MFPV. A pathological pattern of consumption and a recent diagnosis (within the previous 3 years) of alcohol misuse or alcohol dependence were related to physical marital conflict. Furthermore, these associations remained significant after sociodemographic factors, and hostility and marital satisfaction were controlled.</p>

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
---------------------------	---	------------------------------------	-------------------	---------

**Table 5. Longitudinal adolescent samples**

Large community samples

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Foshee, V. A., Reyes, H. L. M., Ennett, S. T., Suchindran, C., Mathias, J. P., Karriker-Jaffe, K. J., Bauman, K. E., &amp; Benefield, T. S. (2011). Risk and protective factors distinguishing profiles of adolescent peer and dating violence perpetration. <i>Journal of Adolescent Health, 48</i>(4), 344-350. DOI:10.1016/j.jadoheal.2010.07.030</p>	<p>2,907</p>	<p>Male (47.1%) and female (52.9%) adolescents in Grades 8-10 who had ever been on a date. Race/ethnicity: 59.4% White, 30% Black, 10.7% Other. Household income: low 7.9%, medium 57.2%, high 34.9%. Response rate 79%, retention rate 85%.</p>	<p>Longitudinal data from students in Grades 8-10 in three nonmetropolitan counties in North Carolina, United States. Baseline data collected in the Fall 2003 and again in the Spring 2004. Self-report and sociometric methods.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Dating violence (past 3 months) from the Safe Dates Physical Violence Perpetration Scale - 6-items; Risk and protective factors anger - 3-items, anxiety 7-items, depression 3-items, substance use 2-items, GPA 4-items, social bonding 9-items, family aggression 3-items, parental monitoring 3-items, peer context 6-items, school context 9-items, neighborhood context 6-items.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> All results controlled for demographic variables. <i>Both vs. dating violence only:</i> for both boys and girls having friends who perpetrate peer violence is associated with increased odds of perpetrating both peer and dating violence, but having peers who only perpetrate dating violence is associated with decreased odds of perpetrating both peer and dating violence; higher levels of social bonding was associated with decreased odds of perpetrating both peer and dating violence and, for boys only, increased peer social control was associated with decreased odds of perpetrating both forms of violence. <i>Both vs. peer violence only:</i> for both boys and girls, higher levels of depression, substance</p>



PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 5. Longitudinal adolescent samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>use, and neighborhood models of deviant behavior were associated with increased odds for perpetrating both dating violence and peer violence, whereas a higher level of social bonding was associated with decreased odds of perpetrating both forms of violence; family and school risk factors were associated with increased odds of perpetrating both forms of violence and was increased for boys; peer social control was associated with decreased odds of perpetrating both forms of violence, an association that was stronger for boys; for girls, school bonding was associated with decreased odds of perpetrating both forms of violence, whereas for boys it was associated with increased odds. <i>Both from no violence:</i> for both boys and girls, higher anger, anxiety, substance use, friend's peer violence, and neighborhood models of deviance were associated with increased odds, whereas higher social bonding, parental monitoring, and neighborhood social control were associated with decreased odds of perpetration; for girls only, school bonding was associated with decreased odds of perpetration.</p>

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Reyes, H. L. M., Foshee, V. A., Bauer, D. J., &amp; Ennett, S. T. (2011). The role of heavy alcohol use in the developmental process of desistance in dating aggression during adolescence. <i>Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology</i>, 39(2), 239-50. DOI:10.1007/s10802-010-9456-4</p>	<p>2,311</p>	<p>Male (47%) and female (53%) adolescents, age 12-19 years, in Grades 8, 9, and 10 at baseline through Grades 10, 11, and 12, who had dated. Race/ethnicity: White 45%, Black 47%, and other 8%. Parent's education: high school or less 40%. Response rate at baseline 79%, retention rate 75%.</p>	<p>Longitudinal data from two public school systems in rural counties, United States. Data were collected at 6-month intervals (Wave 1-3) and 1 year after Wave 3 (Wave 4). In-school assessments. Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Physical dating aggression (perpetration from brief form of Safe Dates Physical Perpetration Scale) - 6-items; Heavy alcohol use assessing quantity and frequency - 4-items; Psychosocial covariates peer aggression from Safe Dates Physical Perpetration Scale - 6-items, family conflict 3-items, anger from Multiple Affective Adjective Checklist 3-items, anxiety from Revised Children's Manifest Anxiety scale, depression from Short Mood and Feelings Questionnaire 3-items, composite scale for social bonding.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> The results of the physical dating aggression perpetration trajectory suggested that there was an increase in early adolescence, a peak in perpetration at the end of Grade 10, and desistance during late adolescence. After controlling for demographic and psychosocial covariates, the results of the between-person effects of heavy alcohol use suggest that heavy alcohol use was significantly positively associated with the overall cohort trajectory of physical dating aggression perpetration with no evidence of sex differences; adolescents with heavy alcohol use at baseline reported relatively high levels of dating aggression perpetration during early and middle adolescence, yet by late adolescence there were no differences in perpetration levels between heavy alcohol</p>

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>users and nonusers. After controlling for demographic and psychosocial covariates, the results of the within-person effects of heavy alcohol use suggest a negative interaction between heavy alcohol use and grade, such that the effect of heavy alcohol use on dating violence perpetration diminished as grade level increased; there was a positive interaction between heavy alcohol use and semester, suggesting greater perpetration in the spring than fall semester.</p>
<p>Foshee, V. A., McNaughton Reyes, H. L., &amp; Ennett, S. T. (2010). Examination of sex and race differences in longitudinal predictors of the initiation of adolescent dating violence perpetration. <i>Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment and Trauma, 19</i>(5), 492-516. DOI:<a href="https://doi.org/10.1080/10926771.2010.495032">10.1080/10926771.2010.495032</a></p>	<p>1,666</p>	<p>Male (51%) and female (49%) adolescents in Grades 8-10 who had been on a date. Race/ethnicity: Black 25%, White 75%.</p>	<p>Longitudinal data from students in Grades 8-10 in three nonmetropolitan counties in North Carolina, United States. Baseline data collected in the Fall 2003 and again in the Spring 2004. Self-report and sociometric methods.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Dating violence perpetration - 1-item assessing frequency; Peer context - identification of five peers in social network.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for parent education, family structure, age of adolescent, and number of in-school friends who completed the survey, sex moderated the associations of depression, use of marijuana, and aggression against peers with dating violence perpetration; for girls, significant predictors of dating violence perpetration were depression, greater use of marijuana, and aggression against peers; for boys, there was a negative association between marijuana use and the initiation of dating violence perpetration; race was a significant risk factor, more so for girls than boys because race moderated the associations of sex, anxiety, and anger with dating violence perpetration as Black girls</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 5. Longitudinal adolescent samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>were more likely than Black boys and White girls to initiate dating violence perpetration, however, there were no significant sex differences among White adolescents; the number of friends using dating violence was a significant predictor of dating violence initiation and was not moderated by sex or race.</p>
<p>Maas, C. D., Fleming, C. B., Herrenkohl, T. I., &amp; Catalano, R. F. (2010). Childhood predictors of teen dating violence victimization. <i>Violence and Victims</i>, 25(2), 131-149.</p>	<p>941</p>	<p>Adolescent males (53.5%) and females (46.5%), approximate age 16-18 years. Race/ethnicity: 83% White, 6% Asian/Pacific Islander, 4% Hispanic, 4% Black, and 3% Native American. Income: 30% qualified for free or reduced price school lunch. Response rate 76%.</p>	<p>Longitudinal from the randomized trial Raising Healthy Children Project, Pacific Northwest, United States. A random sample recruited from 10 public elementary schools during Grades 1 and 2 in a suburban school district in 1993. Multi-informant (teacher, parent, youth) data collected annually through age 18 years.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV self-report of victimization at Grades 11 and 12 1-item. Childhood family risk factors: parental IPV, personal alcohol consumption, poverty, and childhood maltreatment. Childhood protective factors: bonding to parents; social skills. Behavioral risk: physically violent behaviors 3-items; depressive symptoms 6-items. MFPV, FMPV, victimization; alcohol consumption.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for all variables, higher bonding to parents had a protective effect on the risk of IPV victimization for both girls and boys. Better social skills though, only had a protective effect from experiencing IPV victimization for girls.</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 5. Longitudinal adolescent samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>For boys, externalizing behavioral problems predicted IPV victimization; for girls, internalizing, externalizing, and alcohol consumption predicted IPV victimization.</p>
<p>Foshee, V. A., Benefield, T., Suchindran, C., Ennett, S. T., Bauman, K. E., Karriker-Jaffe, K. J., Reyes, H. L. M., &amp; Mathias, J. (2009). The development of four types of adolescent dating abuse and selected demographic correlates. <i>Journal of Research on Adolescence, 19</i>(3), 380-400.</p>	<p>973</p>	<p>Adolescents males (49.13%) and females (50.87%), age 16-19 years. Race/ethnicity: White 74.41%. Participants from two-parent households: 80.37%. Response rate 81%.</p>	<p>Longitudinal data from the control group of the Safe Dates Project, a randomized intervention trial with a school-based sample of eighth- and ninth-grade students from 14 schools in rural North Carolina. Data was collected in five waves: baseline (Wave 1, October 1994), 6 months (Wave 2, March 1995), 1 year (Wave 3, 1995), 2 years (Wave 4, 1996), and 3 years (Wave 5, 1997). Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Self-report; psychological IPV perpetration 14-items; moderate and severe IPV perpetration 18-items; sexual abuse perpetration 2-items. MFPV, FMPV, and perpetration.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for SES variables, peak age for moderate dating IPV = 17.1 years, peak age for severe dating IPV = 16.3 years, the peak age for sexual abuse perpetration = 16.3 years; adolescents from ages 13-19 years increased psychological IPV over time; Adolescent males were more likely to perpetrate more severe physical MFPV and sexual abuse than adolescent females; minority IPV was more prevalent than White IPV--except for psychological IPV and sexual dating abuse, which was equivalent; single-parent households</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 5. Longitudinal adolescent samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>reported more psychological and severe dating IPV than two-parent households; adolescents whose parents had not graduated high school were more likely to perpetrate psychological IPV and moderate physical IPV; and high school graduate households were more likely perpetrators than college graduate households. There were no gender differences in moderate IPV perpetration.</p>
<p>Spriggs, A. L., Halpern, C. T., Herring, A. H., &amp; Schoenbach, V. J. (2009). Family and school socioeconomic disadvantage: Interactive influences on adolescent dating violence victimization. <i>Social Science and Medicine</i>, 68(11), 1956-1965.</p>	<p>10,650</p>	<p>Male (49%) and female (51%) adolescent sample, mean age 16.5 years. Race/ethnicity: 58% White, 20% African American, 16% Hispanic, and 6% other. 78% response rate.</p>	<p>Longitudinal. Sample from National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health), Waves I–II, 1994-1996. Systematic stratified clustered sampling from 132 represent-ative schools (public, private, urban, rural) from Grades 7-12 in 1994-1995. Multi-modal data collection from multiple sources (school administrators, parents, adolescent, romantic partners) via in-school questionnaires and in-home interviews. United States.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: self-report CTS2 5-items; Family disadvantage: family SES; school disadvantage: school-level prevalence of each family disadvantage indicator. MFPV, FMPV, and victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for race/ethnicity and age (minority status was related to male but not female victimization, age was associated with both male and female victimization), findings indicated that family and school disadvantage were not significantly related to male IPV victimization. For females though, family disadvantage was significantly related to IPV victimization. This finding was modified by school disadvantage, such that family disadvantage was more strongly associated with IPV victimization in more advantaged schools.</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 5. Longitudinal adolescent samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Brown, S. L., &amp; Bulanda, J. R. (2008). Relationship violence in young adulthood: A comparison of daters, cohabiters, and marrieds. <i>Social Science Research</i>, 37(1), 73-87.</p>	<p>3,295</p>	<p>Male and female young adults, ages 18-28 years, married or in an exclusive, opposite sex dating or cohabitating relationship.</p>	<p>Longitudinal. Sample from National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health), Waves I–III, 1994-2002. Systematic stratified clustered sampling from 132 representative schools (public, private, urban, rural) from Grades 7-12 in 1994-1995. Multimodal data collection from multiple sources (school administrators, parents, adolescent, romantic partners) via in-school questionnaires and in-home interviews. United States.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Self report IPV 4-items. MFPV, FMPV, perpetration, and victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for SES and family-of-origin characteristics, findings indicated that among women, cohabiters report significantly higher levels of relationship violence than either married or dating women. Among men, cohabiters and marrieds report similar levels of relationship violence and both groups experience more violence perpetration and victimization than dating men.</p>
<p>Foshee, V. A., Karriker-Jaffe, K. J., Reyes, H. L. M., Ennett, S. T., Suchindran, C., Bauman, K. E., &amp; Benefield, T. S. (2008). What accounts for demographic differences in trajectories of adolescent dating</p>	<p>959</p>	<p>Male (49.22%) and female (50.78%) adolescents from Grades 8 and 9, ages 13 to 19 years. Race/ethnicity: White 74.66%; Ethnic minority 25.34%. 81% response rate.</p>	<p>Longitudinal data from the control group of the Safe Dates Project, a randomized intervention trial with a school-based sample of eighth- and ninth-grade students from rural North Carolina. Data was collected in five waves: baseline (Wave 1, October 1994), 6 months (Wave 2,</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: The Safe Dates Physical Abuse Perpetration Scale; Psychological Distress: Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale 10-items; Depressive mood: Kandel and Davies Scale 6-items; Destructive Communication Skills: destructive responses to anger 7-items; Poor communication 5-items; Dating Abuse Acceptance 22-items. MFPV, FMPV, and perpetration.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> Demographic variables: Minority</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 5. Longitudinal adolescent samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>violence? An examination of intrapersonal and contextual mediators. <i>Journal of Adolescent Health</i>, 42(6), 596-604.</p>			<p>March 1995), 1 year (Wave 3, 1995), 2 years (Wave 4, 1996), and 3 years (Wave 5, 1997). Self-report. United States.</p>	<p>status predicted both moderate and severe aggression perpetration, Family Structure predicted severe only, and age and parent education predicted moderate only. After controlling for seven mediators (psychological distress, destructive communication, dating abuse acceptance, low perceived penalties, gender stereotyping, friends as perpetrators, and family violence), gender (males less likely to perpetrate) and age (older ages more likely to perpetrate) were associated with both moderate and severe violence. All of the mediators, except psychological distress, were associated with moderate violence. All but psychological distress and friends as perpetrators were associated with severe violence, in the expected directions. Neighborhood disadvantage was not associated with severe or moderate IPV perpetration.</p>
<p>O'Donnell, L., Stueve, A., Myint-U, A., Duran, R., Agronick, G., &amp; Wilson-Simmons, R. (2006). Middle school aggression and subsequent intimate partner physical violence. <i>Journal of Research on Adolescence</i>, 35(5),</p>	<p>977</p>	<p>Male (44%) and female (56%) young adults, age 19-20 years. Race/ethnicity: 78% Black/African American, 20% Hispanic/Latino, 2% other. Income: 80% eligible for free or reduced lunch. 66% response rate.</p>	<p>Longitudinal data from the Reach for Health study. School-sample of all youth in Grades 7 or 8 between 1994-1996 recruited from three public middle schools in urban, economically disadvantaged areas of Brooklyn, NY. Sample assessed at Grades 7, 8,10, and 11 (1999-2000)</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV : CTS; Middle school aggression 5-items; Other middle school risk behaviors (substance use and sexual initiation 2-items). Exposures to physical aggression in childhood: items from Adverse Childhood Experience Survey and on parental physical aggression and on witnessing parental IPV. MFPV, FMPV, perpetration, and victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for SES, other middle school risk behaviors, and exposures</p>



PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 5. Longitudinal adolescent samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
693-703.			and at ages 19-20 (2002-2003). Paper-pencil self-report surveys.	to physical aggression in childhood, middle school aggression was a significant predictor of IPV victimization and perpetration in males and IPV perpetration in females.
Foshee, V. A., Ennett, S. T., Bauman, K. E., Benefield, T., & Suchindran, C. (2005). The association between family violence and adolescent dating violence onset: Does it vary by race, socioeconomic status, and family structure? <i>Journal of Early Adolescence</i> , 25(3), 317-344.	1,218	Male (43.4%) and female (56.6%) adolescents, average age 14 years. Race/ethnicity: Black 16.4%, White 83.6%. Participation rate 84%.	Longitudinal data from the control and treatment groups of the Safe Dates Project, a randomized intervention trial with a school-based sample of eighth- and ninth-grade students from 14 schools in rural North Carolina. Data was collected in three waves: baseline (Wave 1, October 1994), 6 months (Wave 2, March 1995), and 1 year (Wave 3, 1995. Self-report.	<i>Measures:</i> Self-report. IPV measure 1-item. Family violence (witnessing violence between parents) 1-item; corporal punishment 2-items; severe parental violence (corporal punishment) 1-item. Race 1-item, SES 1-item, and family structure 1-item. Perpetration.  <i>Results:</i> After controlling for race, SES, and family structure, the study found many subgroup differences in the associations between family violence and dating violence; the most consistent being across race. In most cases, exposure to family violence predicted dating violence by Black adolescents but was not associated with dating violence for White adolescents.
Wolfe, D. A., Wekerle, C., Scott, K., Straatman, A.-L., & Grasley, C. (2004). Predicting abuse in adolescent dating relationships over 1 year: The role of child	1,317	Male (45%) and female (55%) adolescent high school students, ages 14-19 years. Race/ethnicity: Caucasian 79%, Pacific Rim 6%, Aboriginal 5%, African descent 2%,	Longitudinal data from school-based sample, Ontario, Canada. Sample comprised students in Grades 9-11 from 10 high schools (urban, semirural, rural). Data collected at baseline and	<i>Measures:</i> IPV: Conflict in Adolescent Dating Relationships Inventory 35-items; History of child maltreatment: Childhood Trauma Questionnaire-Short Form 28-items; Trauma Symptom: Trauma Symptoms Checklist for Children 54-items; Attitudes justifying dating violence: Inventory of Knowledge and Attitudes

PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 5. Longitudinal adolescent samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>maltreatment and trauma. <i>Journal of Abnormal Psychology</i>, 113(3), 406-415.</p>		<p>Other or Unknown 8%. Response rate (average across schools) 62%.</p>	<p>1-year via in-class questionnaires. Self-report.</p>	<p>(used 12-items attitudes subscale only); Empathy and self efficacy with dating partners 13-items. MFPV, FMPV, collapsed to couple score.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for the three risk constructs, namely trauma symptoms, attitudes justifying dating violence, and empathy and self-efficacy in dating relationships, findings indicated that child maltreatment was a significant distal correlate of dating violence. Additionally, of the three constructs, trauma-related symptoms was the only construct that had a significant cross time effect on predicting incidents of dating violence for both boys and girls.</p>
<p>Halpern, C. T., Oslak, S. G., Young, M. L., Martin, S. L., &amp; Kupper, L. L. (2001). Partner violence among adolescents in opposite-sex romantic relationships: Findings from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health. <i>American Journal of Public Health</i>, 91(10), 1679-1685.</p>	<p>6,897</p>	<p>Male and female adolescents in heterosexual dating relationships, 46.8% male and 53.2% female with an average age range of 15 – 17 years. Race/ethnicity: Hispanic/Latino 88.3%, White 73.6%, Black 13.7%, American Indian/Alaskan Native 1.0%, Asian/Pacific Islander 2.4%, Other 9.3%. Number of relationships reported:</p>	<p>Longitudinal. Sample from National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health), Waves I–II, 1994-1996. Systematic stratified clustered sampling from 132 representative schools (public, private, urban, rural) from Grades 7-12 in 1994-1995. Multimodal data collection from multiple sources (school administrators, parents,</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: CTS 5-items; SES factors including religious importance variable. MFPV, FMPV, and victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> Findings indicated that males were more likely to report physical victimization if they were in mid to late adolescence (versus early adolescence), if they were Black or Asian/Pacific Islander versus White, if they had less than a high school education (versus college graduate), and if they reported multiple romantic relationships. Females were only more likely to report physical victimization if they reported multiple romantic relationships. Nonsignificant predictors for</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 5. Longitudinal adolescent samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
		67.3% reported one relationship; 21.5% reported two; 11.2% reported three. Response rate 88%.	adolescent, romantic partners) via in-school questionnaires and in-home interviews. United States.	both sexes included Hispanic/Latino versus other, most types of family structure, religion, and school size.

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
---------------------------	---	------------------------------------	-------------------	---------

Small Community Samples

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Connolly, J., Friedlander, L., Pepler, D., Craig, W., &amp; Laporte, L. (2010). The ecology of adolescent dating aggression: Attitudes, relationships, media use, and socio-demographic risk factors. <i>Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment &amp; Trauma, 19</i>(5), 469-491. DOI:10.1080/10926771.2010.495028</p>	<p>627</p>	<p>Adolescent males (47%) and females (53%), mean age 15.93 years, with a current or recent romantic partner within past 6 months. Race/ethnicity: 63% Euro-Canadian, 11% African/Carribbean Canadian, 9% Asian Canadian, 4% South Asian Canadian, 3% Latin American Canadian, 2% Native Canadian, 8% mixed heritage. Income: middle-class, 50% parents had some post-secondary education. Retention rate 60%.</p>	<p>Longitudinal data from a high school-based study, Canada. The sample comprised students in Grades 9-12 at eight high schools. Data was collected at baseline and 1 year follow-up. Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Dating aggression: CTS 7-items, MFPV and FMPV perpetration and victimization; dating partner status; mass media - Teen Media Culture Questionnaire; aggression tolerant attitudes: Adolescents' Romantic Relationship Attitudes Scale 9-items; hostile couple relationship - Conflict 3-items and Hostility subscales from Network of Relationships Inventory 3-items.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for gender, the linear risk score (comprising the sum of media, attitudes, and relationship risk factors) was a significant predictor of dating aggression involvement 1 year later, especially for ethnic minority youth. After controlling for all other pathways, aggression-tolerant attitudes and hostile couple relationships were significantly related to dating aggression involvement; there was no direct link from media influence to dating aggression for Euro Canadians, but there was a direct and indirect effect of media to dating aggression for ethnic minority youth.</p>

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Miga, E. M., Hare, A., Allen, J. P., &amp; Manning, N. (2010). The relation of insecure attachment states of mind and romantic attachment styles to adolescent aggression in romantic relationships. <i>Attachment and Human Development, 12</i>(5), 463-481. doi: <a href="https://doi.org/10.1080/14616734.2010.501971">10.1080/14616734.2010.501971</a>.</p>	93	<p>Male (42%) and female (58%) adolescents and young adults, mean age 18.25 years, with romantic partners, mean age 19.07 years. Race/ethnicity: 53% Caucasian, 33% African American, 14% mixed ethnicity or other. Income: \$40,000 - \$59,999 median family income. Response rate 63%.</p>	<p>Longitudinal data from a study of adolescent social development, Southeastern United States. Sample comprised seventh- and eighth-grade students from urban and suburban public middle schools. Multimodal (observational, self-report) and multi-informant (parent, adolescent, peer, romantic partner) data collected annually over 10 years.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Conflict in relationships (victimization) Conflict in Relationships Scale (youth and partner report) - 27-item; Psychological maltreatment subscale of Psychological Maltreatment Experience Scale - 16-item; Attachment style - Adult Attachment Interview and Q-set classification; Experiences in close relationships - anxious attachment 18-items and avoidant attachment 18-items.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for gender and race/ethnicity, the romantic partner's attachment anxiety significantly and positively predicted verbal and physical aggression victimization of youth; romantic partner's male gender was a moderator; youth's attachment anxiety significantly and positively predicted physical aggression perpetration but not verbal aggression or victimization; youth's avoidant attachment was not a significant predictor of aggression.</p>
<p>Fritz, P. A. T., &amp; Slep, A. M. S. (2009). Stability of physical and psychological adolescent dating aggression across time and partners. <i>Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology, 38</i>(3),</p>	664	<p>Male (49.7%) and female (50.3%) adolescents, mean age 16.28 years, in a recent dating relationship. Race/ethnicity: Non-Hispanic/White 59.6%, Black 16.0%, Hispanic 12.0%, Asian 1.7%, mixed 8.1%, and other</p>	<p>Longitudinal data from the control group of a randomized trial of a dating violence prevention program, Suffolk County, New York. The sample comprised students from seven ethnically diverse, high-risk high schools</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> modified version of the CTS 18-items. Relationship continuity: staying with the same romantic partner over time. MFPV, FMPV, perpetration, and victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> This study utilized both nonparametric and growth curve modeling tests and found moderate levels of stability of all forms of aggression. The</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 5. Longitudinal adolescent samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
303-314.		2.5%	who were enrolled in health education courses in the spring of 1995 and fall of 1996. Assessments were conducted at baseline, 14 weeks, and 1 year. Self-report.	nonparametric tests also revealed higher rates of stability among those students with relationship continuity. Although growth curve analyses indicated that significant increases in psychological aggression perpetration were associated with relationship continuity, staying with the same partner did not place adolescents at heightened risk for physical perpetration or physical or psychological victimization. Being female was associated with significant decreases in psychological victimization and perpetration across time.
Hare, A. L., Miga, E. M., & Allen, J. P. (2009). Intergenerational transmission of aggression in romantic relationships: the moderating role of attachment security. <i>Journal of Family Psychology</i> , 23(6), 808-818.	75	Sample of male (36%) and female (64%) adolescents, age 18 years, in a romantic relationship of 3 months or longer. Race/ethnicity: 57% Caucasian, 28% African American, 15% other/mixed ethnicity. Income: adolescents' parents reported a median family income between \$40,000 to \$59,999 (13% of the sample reported annual family income less than \$20,000 and 37% reported greater than \$60,000). 63%	Longitudinal data from a study of adolescent social development, Southeastern United States. Sample comprised Grades 7 and 8 from urban and suburban public middle schools. Multimodal (observational, self-report) and multi-informant (parent, adolescent, peer, romantic partner) data collected at two time points over 3 years.	<i>Measures:</i> Parent IPV - physical aggression subscale of CTS 11-items; Parent Marital satisfaction Dyadic Adjustment Scale 8-items; adolescent attachment security – Adult Attachment Interview 18-items; Adolescent romantic relationship aggression – adolescent and romantic partner reports of perpetration each using 15-items Physical Abuse/Coercion subscale of the Conflict in Relationships questionnaire; Adolescent romantic relationship satisfaction – satisfaction subscale of the Network of Relationships Inventory 3-items. MFPV, FMPV, perpetration, and victimization.  <i>Results:</i> After controlling for gender and income, the results for age 18 years perpetration indicated a significant effect of early adolescent paternal aggression and

PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 5. Longitudinal adolescent samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
		participation rate.		attachment security, as well as a significant interaction between paternal aggression and adolescents' attachment security--the relation of paternal aggression to perpetration of IPV 5 years later was positive and significant for less secure adolescents and was nonsignificant for secure adolescents. In predicting to victimization, there was also a significant effect of paternal aggression but not of attachment security. There was a similar interaction effect.
<p>Jouriles, E. N., Garrido, E., Rosenfield, D., &amp; McDonald, R. (2009). Experiences of psychological and physical aggression in adolescent romantic relationships: Links to psychological distress. <i>Child Abuse &amp; Neglect</i>, 33(7), 451-460.</p>	125	<p>Male (48%) and female (52%) high school students, mean age 15.4 years, currently in a romantic relationship. Race/ethnicity: Hispanic 39%, Caucasian 34%, African American 18%, Other 9%. Average length of relationship was 25 weeks. Response rate 60%</p>	<p>Longitudinal data of adolescents from three urban high schools, Southwestern United States. Assessments conducted with interviewers at baseline and at 2 week intervals (2, 4, 6, 8 weeks). Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> CADRI 14 questions IPV and emotional/verbal abuse (victimization only); RVI scale measuring frequency of both positive and negative (physical and psychological) occurrences in relationships and degree of pleasantness 44-items, CITES-R scale 19-items; CES-D scale 20-items. Victimization only.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for physical aggression victimization and age, psychological aggression victimization was associated with psychological distress symptoms, However, physical aggression victimization was not associated with symptoms of psychological distress; psychological aggression victimization was positively associated with relationship anxiety but not with symptoms of trauma or depression.</p>

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Tschann, J. M., Pasch, L. A., Flores, E., Marin, B. V., Baisch, E. M., &amp; Wibbelsman, C. J. (2009). Nonviolent aspects of interparental conflict and dating violence among adolescents. <i>Journal of Family Issues, 30</i>(3), 295-319.</p>	<p>150</p>	<p>Male (48%) and female (52%) adolescents, average age 18 years, in an opposite-sex dating relationship within the past 6 months. Race/ethnicity: Mexican American 48%, born in the U.S. 75%; European American 52%. Parental education in years by ethnicity: Mexican American mothers/fathers = 8.0/8.8 years, European American mothers/fathers = 15.4/15.6 years. Response rates were 82% for mothers, 73% for fathers, and 81% for adolescents.</p>	<p>Longitudinal data from a health care sample, United States. Random sample selected from HMO membership. Data collected at baseline, 6-months, and 1 year later. In-person interview in English or Spanish. Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Interparental conflict: Multidimensional Assessment of Interparental Conflict. Parental IPV: CTS-R. Adolescents' appraisals were measured by 6-items. Adolescents' emotional distress (depression, anxiety, and anger): Center for Epidemiological Studies–Depression 20-items, State Anxiety subscale of the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory 20-items, State Anger subscale of the State-Trait Anger Expression Inventory 10-items. Adolescent Dating verbal aggression and physical violence: CTS2. MFPV, FMPV, perpetration, and victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for gender, ethnicity, and SES, findings indicated that that when parents had more frequent conflict, were more verbally aggressive during conflict, had poor conflict resolution, or were physically violent during conflict at baseline, adolescents were more involved in dating violence, both perpetration and victimization, at 1-year follow-up. Adolescents' appraisals of parental conflict and their emotional distress mediated the associations between nonviolent parental conflict and dating violence. In contrast, interparental violence directly predicted involvement in dating violence.</p>



Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Schnurr, M. P., &amp; Lohman, B. J. (2008). How much does school matter? An examination of adolescent dating violence perpetration. <i>Journal of Research on Adolescence</i>, 37(3), 266-283.</p>	765	<p>Male (47%) and female (53%) adolescents, ages 16-20 years. Race/ethnicity: African American 41.9%, Hispanic 52.9%, White or other 5.3%. Sample recruited from low-income neighborhoods. Response rate 74%, retention rate 66%</p>	<p>Longitudinal data from the Welfare, Children, and Families project, Boston, Chicago, and San Antonio, United States. Stratified random sample of women below Federal Poverty line in three urban areas in 1999. Data collected via in-home interviews in 1999, 2001, and 2005. Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Dating violence in any past or current relationship, ACASI with a modified version of CTS (perpetration 9-items, victimization 9-items; Predictor variables mother report domestic violence victimization modified CTS 12-items; maternal report school difficulties 1-item; youth externalizing behaviors (CBC-L); father involvement 7-items; harsh physical punishment 2-items. Youth reports on: school involvement 7-items; antisocial peer involvement 11-items; lack of school safety 1-item; drug and alcohol use from the National Longitudinal Study of Youth 17-items; mental health problems (BSI-18); childhood sexual abuse 1-item; mother-child relationship (IPPA, 12-items); father-child relationship (IPPA, 12-items); parental monitoring (multiple items). Also ethnicity, gender, family structure, maternal education and age. MFPV, FMPV, perpetration, and victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for individual and family characteristics from early adolescence, the findings indicated that for adolescent males and females, African American females, and Hispanic males early involvement and an increase in involvement with antisocial peers was linked to perpetrating dating IPV; in addition, drug and alcohol use were</p>

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>predictive of perpetration for females; mother-child hostility was predictive for Hispanic females, and father child hostility was protective for females Also, not enough safety in school and difficulties in academics exacerbated the impact of parental IPV exposure for African American and Hispanic males; however, early school involvement exacerbated this effect for females who were Hispanic.</p>
<p>Williams, T. S., Connolly, J., Pepler, D., Craig, W., &amp; Laporte, L. (2008). Risk models of dating aggression across different adolescent relationships: A developmental psychopathology approach. <i>Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology</i>, 76(4), 622-632.</p>	<p>621</p>	<p>Adolescent males (45%) and females (55%), ages 14-19 years, in dating relationships. Race/ethnicity: Euro Canadian 70% , Asian Canadian 10%, African/ Caribbean Canadian 7%, multiethnic 7%, Latin American Canadian 3%, and Native Canadian 3%. Economic status: participants' parents education -graduated from high school 24%, postsecondary education 57%.</p>	<p>Longitudinal data from a high school-based study, Canada. The sample comprised students in Grades 9-12 at eight high schools. Data was collected at baseline and 1 year follow-up. Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Dating aggression: CTS 7-items; dating partner status; peer aggression and delinquency: perpetration and victimization physical aggression 9-items, deviancy 16-items, negative relationship characteristics, namely dating conflict and hostility 3-items; acceptance of aggression 9-items. MFPV, FMPV, perpetration, and victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for all predictor variables, acceptance of aggression was associated with IPV perpetration only; negative relationship characteristics and aggressive peer contexts were related to both perpetration and victimization. Controlling for all predictors, the longitudinal model of dating aggression across relationships indicated that adolescents in the low acceptance group with negative relationship characteristics were associated with recurrent perpetration and victimization; adolescents in the high</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 5. Longitudinal adolescent samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Arriaga, X. B., &amp; Foshee, V. A. (2004). Adolescent dating violence: Do adolescents follow in their friends', or their parents' footsteps? <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 19</i>(2), 162-184.</p>	526	<p>Male (47%) and female (53%) adolescents, age range 12-17 years. Race/ethnicity: White 83%, Black 13%, Hispanic 1%, Other 3%. Response rate 81%.</p>	<p>Longitudinal data from the control group of the Safe Dates Project, a randomized intervention trial with a school-based sample of eighth- and ninth-grade students from 14 schools in rural North Carolina. Data from baseline (Wave 1, October 1994) and 6 month (Wave 2, March 1995) assessments. Self-report.</p>	<p>acceptance group with peer aggression and delinquency were associated with recurrent perpetration and victimization.</p> <p><i>Measures:</i> Self-report. IPV: CTS-R, victimization 1-item; friend dating violence measure 4-items; interparental violence 1-item.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for interparental violence and peer IPV, results suggest that having friends who are perpetrators or victims of dating violence is strongly associated with an adolescent's own experiences as both a perpetrator and a victim of dating violence.</p>
<p>Buzy, W. M., McDonald, R., Jouriles, E. N., Swank, P. R., Rosenfield, D., Shimek, J. S., &amp; Corbett-Shindler, D. (2004). Adolescent girls' alcohol use as a risk factor for relationship violence. <i>Journal of Research on Adolescence, 14</i>(4), 449-470.</p>	106	<p>Female high school students, mean age 15.68 years, in a dating relationship within the past 4 months. Race/ethnicity: Hispanic 69%, African American 29%, White 1%, Biracial 1%. Response rate 70%.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional and longitudinal analyses conducted from longitudinal data of adolescents an urban high school, Southwestern United States. Subset of larger sample from 3 schools. Two assessments conducted at 4 month intervals. Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Physical violence and sexual victimization without and with alcohol - CTS2 subscales; Alcohol and illicit drug use - previous 4 months frequency of use. MFPV</p> <p><i>Results:</i> For cross-sectional analysis, after controlling for alcohol use and demographic variables, findings indicated that greater alcohol use was associated with greater risk for physical violence victimization for the girls. For longitudinal analysis, after controlling for alcohol use and demographic variables, higher alcohol use at the first assessment increased risk for both physical and sexual victimization</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 5. Longitudinal adolescent samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				4 months later for the girls.
<p>Cleveland, H. H., Herrera, V. M., &amp; Stuewig, J. (2003). Abusive males and abused females in adolescent relationships: Risk factor similarity and dissimilarity and the role of relationship seriousness. <i>Journal of Family Violence</i>, 18(6), 325-339.</p>	<p>603 couples</p>	<p>Sample of adolescent dating couples, average age 17 years, in a relationship within the past 18 months. Race/ethnicity for males and females: White 56-59%, African American 17-20%, Hispanic 14-15%, Asian/Pacific Islander 7-8%.</p>	<p>Longitudinal. Sample from National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health), Waves I–II, 1994-1996. Systematic stratified clustered sampling from 132 representative schools (public, private, urban, rural) from Grades 7-12 in 1994-1995. Multimodal data collection from multiple sources (school administrators, parents, adolescent, romantic partners) via in-school questionnaires and in-home interviews. United States.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Wave I: School - GPA of most recent grades; IQ Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test - abbreviated 78-items; Family assessing closeness with parents - 4-items; Attitudes about sex in relationships - self-report number of sexual partners, card ordering of ideal relationship; Drinking - total drinking and drinking by volume; Externalizing behavior fighting and non-fighting delinquency – 7-items; Internalizing behavior depression and self-esteem - 19-items. Wave II: IPV victimization by males in the relationship yes or no, threatened, pushed, shoved, had something thrown at her - 3-items; Relationships - sexual behavior items, seriousness of relationship via card task.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for gender and relationship seriousness, the first set of analysis found that male-to-female abuse was predicted by six individual characteristics of males and six individual characteristics of females. Only one of these characteristics, GPA, was a significant predictor of the occurrence of male-to-female abuse for both male and female relationship participants. The other characteristics were each only predictive</p>

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>for either males—Verbal IQ, Fighting, Attitudes About Sex and Relationships, and Past Sexual Behavior—or females—Mother Relationship, School Attachment, Drinking Behaviors, and Depression. Analyses also revealed that associations between different individual-level characteristics and relationship abuse were dependent on relationship seriousness.</p>
<p>O'Leary, K. D., &amp; Smith Slep, A. M. (2003). A dyadic longitudinal model of adolescent dating aggression. <i>Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology</i>, 32(3), 314-327.</p>	<p>206</p>	<p>Male and female adolescents, mean age 16.5 years, in a continuous relationship for 14 weeks. Race/ethnicity for males and females: White 59.2%-69.8%, African American 12.8%-17.5%; Asian-American 7%-9.2%, Mixed race 5.8%-8.3%.</p>	<p>Longitudinal data from the control group of a randomized trial of a dating violence prevention program, Suffolk county, New York. The sample comprised students from seven ethnically diverse, high-risk high schools who were enrolled in health education courses in the spring of 1995 and fall of 1996. Analyses from assessments conducted at baseline and 14-weeks. Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Modified CTS 19-items, Psychological Maltreatment of Women Inventory: measuring control and jealousy 22-items, and measuring frequency of 7 control and 4 jealousy tactics. Self-report, self-administered classroom questionnaire; MFPV and FMPV.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for participation in dating violence education program, for both males and females there is a much greater likelihood of engaging in physical aggression if they had indicated engaging in IPV in first assessment. It was also not likely for IPV to be perpetrated if there was no indication of it in the initial assessment. There was no significant difference in the levels of physical aggression over time; for both males and females, psychological aggressions were interrelated from mild to more serious tactics and not differentially related--suggesting the power balance is relatively equivalent in teen relationships.</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 5. Longitudinal adolescent samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Lavoie, F., Hebert, M., Tremblay, R., Vitaro, F., Vezina, L., &amp; McDuff, P. (2002). History of family dysfunction and perpetration of dating violence by adolescent boys: A longitudinal study. <i>Journal of Adolescent Health, 30</i>(5), 375-383.</p>	<p>717</p>	<p>Adolescent males, age 16-17 years, in a dating relationship within the past year. Race/ethnicity not reported. Income: participants from low-income families. Retention rate 69%</p>	<p>Longitudinal data from school-based sample, Montreal, Canada. Sample from 53 low-income kindergarten classes in 1984. Data collected for the present study at ages 11, 12, 15, 16, and 17 years. Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: Dating violence perpetration; Psychological abuse: put down, control, accusations, acted cold, ordering around 6-items; Physical abuse, CTS 7-items; delinquency scale 27-item; Frequency of parental IPV 4-items; Parent-child aggression 4-items; Parental monitoring 2-items. MFPV and perpetration.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for parental variables (i.e., parental monitoring, witnessed parental IPV, and parent-to-child aggression), only two variables contributed independently to MFPV, namely poor monitoring in late childhood and antisocial behavior at age 15 years (i.e., substance abuse and delinquency). Parent-to-child aggression was also predictive of MFPV dating violence.</p>
<p>Gorman-Smith, D., Tolan, P. H., Sheidow, A. J., &amp; Henry, D. B. (2001). Partner violence and street violence among urban adolescents: Do the same family factors relate? <i>Journal of Research on Adolescence, 11</i>(3), 273-295.</p>	<p>141</p>	<p>Sample of adolescent males, ages 16-20 years, in a dating relationship of at least 2 months duration. Race/ethnicity: African-American (67%) and Latino (33%). Income: males' family yearly income below \$20,000 per year for 71% of participants. Response rate 82%.</p>	<p>Longitudinal data from the Chicago Youth Development Study, United States. School-based sample of boys ages 11- 15 years recruited in 1991 from 17 high-risk Chicago public schools. Multi-informant data collected (youth, mother, teacher) annually over 5 years. In-home interviews. Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Partner violence - physical violence within past 12 months, subscale of CTS – 11-items. Delinquent violence and nonviolent delinquency Self-Report of Delinquency Questionnaire from National Youth Survey - 38-items. Family relationship characteristics assessed at Wave I - 92-items. Parenting practices - 4 subscales from Pittsburgh Youth Study Questionnaire (positive, discipline effectiveness, avoidance of discipline, monitoring/involvement in child's life).</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 5. Longitudinal adolescent samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for the effects of the first discriminant function analysis, findings indicated that adolescent males from poorer functioning families participated in both partner violence and street violence more than other males (no violence, street violence only, partner violence only). There were no significant differences in family functioning between males who participated in street-only or partner-only violence.</p>

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
---------------------------	---	------------------------------------	-------------------	---------

**Table 6. Cross-sectional adolescent samples**

Large community samples

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Rothman, E. F., Johnson, R. M., Young, R., Weinberg, J., Azrael, D., &amp; Molnar, B. E. (2011). Neighborhood -level factors associated with physical dating violence perpetration: Results of a representative survey conducted in Boston, MA. <i>Journal of Urban Health</i>, 88(2), 201-13. DOI:10.1007/s11524-011-9543-z.</p>	<p>1,614</p>	<p>Boston Youth Survey sample: Male (47%) and female (53%) adolescents, mean age 16.4 years, who had dated. Race/ethnicity: Black 44.2%, Hispanic/Latino 35.6%. Response rate 68.9%. Boston Neighborhood Survey sample: Adults, age 18 years or older. Completion rate 31%.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from two sources: the 2008 Boston Youth Survey and 2008 Boston Neighborhood Survey, United States. Boston Youth Survey: stratified (by grade), random sample of classrooms from 22 public high schools. In-class, self-report questionnaires. Boston Neighborhood Survey: English and Spanish language telephone surveys.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Physical dating violence (perpetration) from CTS2 within past month (youth report) - 2-items; Collective efficacy, social cohesion, and social control (youth and adults) - 10-items; Neighborhood disorder physical and social disorder (youth and adults) - 6-items; Gang problems and trust in police (youth and adults) - 2-items.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for gender, race, nativity, and school clustering, adolescent report of neighborhood factors suggested that lower collective efficacy, lower social control, and neighborhood disorder were associated with dating violence perpetration. However, results from the adult neighborhood report data suggested no significant neighborhood factors; for female adolescents, collective efficacy, social control, and neighborhood disorder were significant predictors of dating violence perpetration, however the female adult data yielded no significant factors.</p>
<p>Temple, J. R., &amp; Freeman, D. H. (2011). Dating</p>	<p>1,565</p>	<p>Male and female high school students. Race/ethnicity: Hispanic</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from one high school, southeast Texas, United</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Dating violence victimization-- physical aggression - 1-item; Alcohol, cigarette, marijuana, glue sniffing - number</p>



PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 6. Cross-sectional adolescent samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>violence and substance use among ethnically diverse adolescents. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i>, 26(4), 701-18. DOI:<a href="https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260510365858">10.1177/0886260510365858</a></p>		<p>37%, Black 31%, White 29%. Income: 49% classified as economically disadvantaged. Response rate 71%.</p>	<p>States. In-class assessments administered in the spring of 2007. Self-report.</p>	<p>of days in past month; Ecstasy, Vicodin, Xanax - ever used (lifetime prevalence).  <i>Results:</i> After controlling for demographic variable and alcohol use, lifetime use of any controlled substance significantly increased the likelihood of reporting dating violence victimization.</p>
<p>Giordano, P. C., Soto, D. A., Manning, W. D., &amp; Longmore, M. A. (2010). The characteristics of romantic relationships associated with teen dating violence. <i>Social Science Research</i>, 39(6), 863-874. DOI:<a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2010.03.009">10.1016/j.ssresearch.2010.03.009</a></p>	<p>956</p>	<p>Male (48.9%) and female (50.2%) adolescents, mean age 15.49 years, in Grades 7, 9, and 11. Race/ethnicity: White 69%, Black 19.8%, Hispanic 11.2%.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from the Toledo Adolescent Relationships Study, Lucas County, Ohio, United States. Stratified, random sample of student records from 7 school districts and 62 schools. In-home, laptop-assisted interviews. Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Relationship violence (current or most recent partner) - CTS 4-items; Relationship qualities - verbal conflict 3-items, youth and partner's jealousy 1-item, lack of identity support 2-items, frequency of cheating and partner's cheating; Rewards of the relationship - intimate self-disclosure 5-items, love 4-items, caring 1-item, instrumental support from partner and from youth 4-items; Patterns of interaction and influence - relationship duration 1-item, time spent together per week 2-items, time spent with friends per week 1-item, sex with partner 1-item, partner's influence 6-items; Traditional violence predictors - parental monitoring 6-items, parental conflict 1-item, CTS parent-child violence 4-items, friends' violence 1-item, academic performance 1-item.  <i>Results:</i> Analyses controlled for traditional violence predictors and sociodemographic</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 6. Cross-sectional adolescent samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>characteristics. Relationship qualities: verbal conflict, partner and youth's jealousy, partner's cheating, and lack of identity support were predictors of experiencing relationship violence. Intrinsic rewards: adolescents who gave and received greater instrumental support with their partner had significantly higher odds of relationship violence perpetration. Patterns of influence and interaction: longer relationships, more time spent together during the week, having sex, and having a less favorable power balance in the relationship were associated with greater odds of relationship violence.</p>
<p>Gover, A. R., Jennings, W. G., &amp; Tewksbury, R. (2009). Adolescent male and female gang members' experiences with violent victimization, dating violence, and sexual assault. <i>American Journal of Criminal Justice</i>, 34(1-2), 103-115.</p>	<p>4,591</p>	<p>Adolescent males (47%) and females (53%), mean age 16 years. Race/ethnicity: African American 42.3%, Caucasian 49%, other ethnic groups 7.7%. 51.64% lived in nuclear families with two-parent households. Response rate 83%.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from the 1999 South Carolina Youth Risk Behavior Survey, state-level data from the national Youth Risk Behavior Survey. A three-stage cluster sampling design of public high schools that are representative of South Carolina's student demographics. Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Violent victimization: 3 types, namely injury from physical fight 1-item; dating violence 1-item, lifetime forced sexual intercourse 1-item; self reported gang membership. All dichotomous variables. MFPV, FMPV, and victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> Male and female gang members were more likely to experience all 3 types of violent victimization (2 to 4 times as likely). After controlling for family structure, age, and race, the findings indicated that the risk of sexual assault was significantly higher for females compared to males. There were no statistically significant gender differences in the prevalence of dating violence victimization for gang members. Male gang members reported higher rates of violent</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 6. Cross-sectional adolescent samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>victimization (14.0%) than female gang members (9.0%). Gang membership was significantly related to a higher risk of violent victimization. Gang membership increased the odds of sexual assault victimization by 266% and of violent dating victimization by 253%.</p>
<p>Miller, S., Gorman-Smith, D., Sullivan, T., Orpinas, P., &amp; Simon, T. R. (2009). Parent and peer predictors of physical dating violence perpetration in early adolescence: Tests of moderation and gender differences. <i>Journal of Clinical and Child Adolescent Psychology</i>, 38(4), 538-550.</p>	<p>2,824</p>	<p>Adolescent males (49%) and females (51%) in Grade 6 with a boyfriend or girlfriend within 3 months. Race/ethnicity: 48% African American, 18% White, 21% Latino, 13% other ethnicity or multiracial.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from a longitudinal multisite study, United States. Random sampling by school of middle school students from 37 participating schools in North Carolina, Virginia, Illinois, and Georgia. Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV perpetration 7-items; drug use and delinquency 14-items; peer deviancy 10-items; parental support of aggressive/nonaggressive solutions 10-items; parental involvement 12-items. MFPV, FMPV, and perpetration.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for site, cohort, gender, and ethnicity, findings indicated IPV perpetration was positively associated with peer deviancy; IPV was negatively associated with parental involvement and parental support of nonaggressive solutions. After controlling for parenting variables, gender was a moderator of parenting, peer, and dating violence associations, such that increased parental monitoring was related to lower levels of physical dating violence perpetration for boys; girls reporting parental support for nonaggressive solutions reported lower levels of dating violence.</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 6. Cross-sectional adolescent samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Champion, H., Foley, K. L., Sigmon-Smith, K., Sutfin, E. L., &amp; DuRant, R. H. (2008). Contextual factors and health risk behaviors associated with date fighting among high school students. <i>Women and Health</i>, 47(3), 1-22.</p>	2,090	<p>Adolescent male and female high school students. Race/ethnicity: White 61.1%, Black 30%, Other 8.9%. Response rate 84%.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from a school-based sample, North Carolina, United States. Simple random sample of high school students in a combined urban-rural school system. Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Date fighting 2-items; Parental connectedness 6-items; School integration: number of clubs/groups; School support 3-items; Community safety and fear 4-items; Neighborhood organization 4-items; local laws enforced 5-items; Drugs and guns not available 4-items; Neighborhood connectedness 4-items; health-risk behaviors scale adapted from Youth Risk Behavior Survey. MFPV, FMPV, perpetration, and victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for health-risk behaviors, SES, and contextual variables, findings indicated date fighting perpetration was predicted by being female, Black or other racial minority, and past drug and alcohol use; protective factors were higher levels of parental connectedness, greater neighborhood organization, lower availability of drugs and guns. Date fighting victimization was predicted by being female, recent marijuana use, and recent physical fights; protective factors were greater school support and greater neighborhood organization.</p>
<p>Champion, H., Wagoner, K., Song, E.-Y., Brown, V. K., &amp; Wolfson, M. (2008). Adolescent date fighting</p>	13,422	<p>Adolescent males and females, ages 14-20 years. Race/ethnicity: 80% White, 9% African American, 6% Hispanic, 5% other. Survey in</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from the 2004 and 2006 Youth Surveys, United States, A random, age-targeted sample from California, Connecticut,</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: self-report of victimization and perpetration of physical violence (2-items); Heath-risk behaviors: alcohol use, alcohol-related risk factors, and other substance use (9-items); Forced sex victimization/perpetration and use of weapon</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 6. Cross-sectional adolescent samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>victimization and perpetration from a multicomunity sample: Associations with substance use and other violent victimization and perpetration. <i>International Journal of Adolescent Medicine and Health</i>, 20(4), 419-429.</p>		<p>2004 had 74% response rate, 2006 had 50% response rate.</p>	<p>Florida, Missouri, and New York. Phone interviews. Self-report.</p>	<p>to threaten/hurt. MFPV, FMPV, perpetration, and victimization.  <i>Results:</i> After controlling for demographic variables, alcohol use, and risk behaviors, findings indicated that older age, living in a single-parent household, being African American or Hispanic, alcohol use, and other substance use were risk factors for both IPV victimization and perpetration. There was greater risk of IPV victimization and perpetration with alcohol use when the first drink occurred before age 15 years. IPV victimization was also associated with riding with a drinking driver and experiencing sexual victimization; whereas IPV perpetration was associated with forced sex perpetration and use of a weapon to hurt/threaten.</p>
<p>Howard, D. E., Wang, M. Q., &amp; Yan, F. (2008). Psychosocial factors associated with reports of physical dating violence victimization among U.S. adolescent males. <i>Adolescence</i>, 43(171), 449-460.</p>	<p>6,528</p>	<p>Adolescent males in Grades 9-12. Response rate 67%.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from 2005 Youth Risk Behavior Survey. The sample of students Grades 9 through 12 was selected through a three-stage cluster sample design consisting of 203 schools (public, private) in the United States. Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: "During the past 12 months, did your boyfriend or girlfriend ever hit, slap, or physically hurt you on purpose?"; General violence: frequency of physical fights in the past 30 days and carrying a gun in the past year; Suicide: frequency of suicidal thoughts and attempts in the past year; Sad/hopeless feelings: duration and effect on activity (1-item); Substance use: frequency and quantity of cigarette, alcohol, and other substances used in the past 30 days (4-items); Sexual risk behaviors: sexual activity and the number of sexual partners in</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 6. Cross-sectional adolescent samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>the last 3 months, condom use and alcohol/drugs use with most recent sexual partner (3-items total). FMPV and victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for race/ethnicity, grade in school/age, emotional distress, and high-risk behaviors, adolescent males who had sad or hopeless feelings, engaged in physical fighting, carried a gun, and were sexually active with unprotected sex were more likely to be a victim of physical dating violence.</p>
<p>Swahn, M. H., Simon, T. R., Arias, I., &amp; Bossarte, R. M. (2008). Measuring sex differences in violence victimization and perpetration within date and same-sex peer relationships. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i>, 23(8), 1120-1138.</p>	<p>2,888</p>	<p>Adolescent males (47.9%) and females (52.1%) in Grades 7, 9, 11, and 12 who had dated within past year. Race/ethnicity: Hispanic 44.5%, Non-Hispanic African American 27.4%, Other 4.5% (e.g., Indian/Alaskan Native, Asian, or Hawaiian or Pacific Islander), and Non-Hispanic White 23.6%. Response rate 81%.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from the 2004 Youth Violence Survey, United States. A high-risk school district of 16 schools was selected and students in Grades 7, 9, 11, and 12 participated. Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Physical dating violence victimization 18-items and perpetration 18-items; Psychological dating aggression victimization 14-items and perpetration 14-items; Male-to-female, female-to-male and same-sex peer violence. MFPV, FMPV, perpetration, and victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for age and gender, analyses indicate that girls were significantly more likely than boys to report physical violence and psychological aggression perpetration within dating relationships. However, boys were significantly more likely than girls to report physically injuring a date.</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 6. Cross-sectional adolescent samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Eaton, D. K., Davis, K. S., Barrios, L., Brener, N. D., &amp; Noonan, R. K. (2007). Associations of dating violence victimization with lifetime participation, co-occurrence, and early initiation of risk behaviors among U.S. high school students. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i>, 22(5), 585-602.</p>	<p>15,123</p>	<p>Adolescent males (51.3) and females (48.7%), age 14 years or older, in Grades 9-12. Race/ethnicity: 61.5% White, 13.9% Black, 16.6% Hispanic, and 8.1% other.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from 2003 Youth Risk Behavior Survey. The sample of Grade 9 through 12 students was selected through a three-stage cluster sample design consisting of 158 schools (public, private) in the United States. Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Self-report. IPV 1-item; Risk behavior: Smoking, alcohol use, marijuana use, and sexual intercourse 4-items; grades earned. MFPV, FMPV, and victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for race/ethnicity, age, and grades earned in school, the study indicates that dating violence victimization was associated with alcohol use, marijuana use, and having ever had sexual intercourse for female students and having ever had sexual intercourse among male students. Additionally, the odds of dating violence victimization increased as the number of risk behaviors increased and as the number of lifetime sexual partners increased.</p>
<p>Howard, D. E., Wang, M. Q., &amp; Yan, F. (2007). Psychological factors associated with reports of physical dating violence among U.S. adolescent females. <i>Adolescence</i>, 42(166), 311-324.</p>	<p>7,179</p>	<p>Adolescent females in Grades 9-12. Response rate 67%.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from 2005 Youth Risk Behavior Survey. The sample of Grade 9 through 12 students was selected through a three-stage cluster sample design consisting of 203 schools (public, private) in the United States. Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: "During the past 12 months, did your boyfriend or girlfriend ever hit, slap, or physically hurt you on purpose?"; General violence: frequency of physical fights in the past 30 days and carrying a gun in the past year; Suicide: frequency of suicidal thoughts and attempts in the past year; Sad/hopeless feelings: duration and effect on activity 1-item; Substance use: frequency and quantity of cigarette, alcohol, and other substances used in the past 30 days 4-items; Sexual risk behaviors: sexual activity and the number of sexual partners in the last 3 months, condom use and alcohol/drugs use with most recent sexual partner 3-items total. MFPV and</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 6. Cross-sectional adolescent samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for demographic, psychological, and behavioral factors, findings were that Black ethnicity, sad/hopeless feelings, suicidal thoughts, physical fighting, recent sexual activity, and lack of condom use were identified as risk factor for IPV victimization. No association between substance use and IPV was found.</p>
<p>Banyard, V. L., Cross, C., &amp; Modecki, K. L. (2006). Interpersonal violence in adolescence: Ecological correlates of self-reported perpetration. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 21</i>(10), 1314-1332.</p>	<p>980</p>	<p>Adolescent males (48%) and females (52%) in Grades 7-12.</p>	<p>Teen Assessment Project. Cross-sectional data from the Teen Assessment Project, New Hampshire, United States. The sample comprised students in Grades 7 to 12 in 10 school administration units. In-class questionnaires administered in 2000-2001. Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Dating violence 2-items, one taken from the Youth Risk Behavior Survey; Individual-level risk 17-items; Family-level risk measure 12-items; Community-level risk 13-items. MFPV, FMPV, and perpetration.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> At bivariate level, males more likely to perpetrate sexual violence (not physical). IPV perpetration also related to higher depressed mood, substance use, being a victim of physical or sexual abuse, parental divorce. Factors related to lower likelihood of IPV perpetrations: perceived risk of substance use, parental monitoring, maternal and paternal support, neighborhood monitoring, neighborhood support, school attachment, and social responsibility. In multivariate logistic regressions. findings indicated that for males substance use and sexual abuse victimization were predictive; whereas for females, depressive mood and parental were most significant in explaining</p>



PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 6. Cross-sectional adolescent samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Roberts, T. A., Auinger, P., &amp; Klein, J. D. (2006). Predictors of partner abuse in a nationally representative sample of adolescents involved in heterosexual dating relationships. <i>Violence and Victims</i>, 21(1), 81-89.</p>	3,076	<p>Adolescents, ages 11-21 years, in heterosexual relationships. Race/ethnicity: White 68.4-69.9%, Black 14.2-14.8%, Asian 3.2-3.3%, Native 0.5-1.0% Other 0.7-0.9% Hispanic 10.9-12.2%.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional. Sample from National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health), Wave II, 1996. Systematic stratified clustered sampling from 132 representative schools (public, private, urban, rural) from Grades 7-12 in 1994-1995. Multimodal data collection from multiple sources (school administrators, parents, adolescent, romantic partners) via in-school questionnaires and in-home interviews. United States.</p>	<p>variance in perpetration.</p> <p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: CTS physical and psychological aggression 5-items; Sexual intercourse with partner; Pregnancy with partner; Being in a “special romantic relationship”: Duration of the relationship; Age at relationship initiation; Age difference between partners. MFPV, FMPV, and victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for age and relationship characteristics, the findings indicated that involvement in a sexual or "special romantic" relationship was associated with greater likelihood of being a victim of IPV in both males and females. Longer relationship duration was associated with verbal abuse in both genders, and involvement in a pregnancy was associated with being verbally and physically abused among males.</p>
<p>Kaestle, C. E., &amp; Halpern, C. T. (2005). Sexual intercourse precedes partner violence in adolescent romantic relationships. <i>Journal of Adolescent Health</i>, 36(5), 386-392.</p>	6,548	<p>Adolescent males (44%) and females (56%), average age 16-17 years. Race/ethnicity: White (81.9%), Black (13.7%), and Other (4.4%). 57.1% of the sample had parents with education beyond high school. Average relationship duration for this sample</p>	<p>Cross-sectional. Sample from National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health), Wave II, 1996. Systematic stratified clustered sampling from 132 representative schools (public, private, urban, rural) from Grades 7-12 in 1994-</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV victimization: CTS-R 5-items; Sexual status of relationship: number of times of vaginal intercourse with partner. MFPV, FMPV, and victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for gender, age, race, parental education, and relationship duration, the odds for each item of violent victimization remained significantly higher for respondents who reported intercourse with their partner compared to those who did</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 6. Cross-sectional adolescent samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
		was 9.7 months. Response rate 76%.	1995. Multimodal data collection from multiple sources (school administrators, parents, adolescent, romantic partners) via in-school questionnaires and in-home interviews. Only self-report data used in analyses. United States.	not. Also, longer relationship duration was significantly associated with higher odds of each item of violence victimization. However, there was no clear pattern relating all violence types to age or gender of the respondent.
Gover, A. R. (2004). Risky lifestyles and dating violence: A theoretical test of violent victimization. <i>Journal of Criminal Justice</i> , 32(2), 171-180.	5,545	Adolescent males (51%) and females (49%), average age 15 years. Race/ethnicity: Black 44%, White 49% Other 7%. Income: 51% of respondents lived in two-parent households. Response rate 88%.	Cross-sectional data from the 1997 South Carolina Youth Risk Behavior Survey, state-level data from the national Youth Risk Behavior Survey. A three-stage cluster sampling design of public high schools that are representative of South Carolina's student demographics. Self-report	<i>Measures:</i> IPV: CTS : Physically beaten up by someone dating 1-item; Drug abuse: marijuana and other drug use 6-items; Alcohol abuse 4-items; DUI: self-report within past 30 days; Sexual behavior 3-items; Family structure: two-parent household (excluding stepparents); Church (or other religious activities): attendance in the past 30 days 1-item; Life Satisfaction modified Multidimensional Student's Life Satisfaction Scale 6-items. MFPV, FMPV, and victimization.  <i>Results:</i> Only 8% of respondents reported being beaten up. After controlling for demographic factors, life satisfaction, family structure, and church attendance, results suggest that the effects of the latter three predictors were mediated by risk-taking behaviors. Only life satisfaction still had a direct (but diminished) effect on dating violence victimization in the full model.

PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 6. Cross-sectional adolescent samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				Drug use, DUI, and promiscuous sexual behaviors were significantly related to dating violence victimization. The odds of experiencing IPV were reduced by being male (76%) or African American (52%).
<p>Wolf, K. A., &amp; Foshee, V. A. (2003). Family violence, anger expression styles, and adolescent dating violence. <i>Journal of Family Violence</i>, 18(6), 309-316.</p>	1,405	<p>Adolescent males (51%) and females (49%) in current or prior dating relationships. Race/ethnicity: White 82%, African American 18%. Response rate 96%.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from Safe Dates Project baseline data. The Safe Dates Project was a randomized intervention trial with a school-based sample of eighth- and ninth-grade students from rural North Carolina. Baseline data was collected in October, 1994, via in-school questionnaires. Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: Self-report of male and female perpetration 18-items. Experiencing family violence and witnessing family violence: frequency 2-items. Anger expression: three types: destructive direct, destructive indirect, and constructive 11-items. MFPV, FMPV, and perpetration.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for all variables, findings indicated that experiencing family violence was strongly associated with IPV perpetration by males but not females. Witnessing family violence was associated with FMPV, but not by MFPV. Destructive direct and destructive indirect anger styles were positively associated with FMPV. For males, destructive direct anger style was positively associated with MFPV. Constructive anger style was not associated with IPV perpetration for either gender. For females, destructive direct and destructive indirect anger styles mediated the association between experiencing family violence and FMPV. For males, this association was mediated primarily by destructive direct anger style. The association between witnessing family violence and FMPV was</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 6. Cross-sectional adolescent samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				mediated by destructive direct anger expression style only.
<p>Coker, A. L., McKeown, R. E., Sanderson, M., Davis, K. E., Valois, R. F., &amp; Huebner, S. (2000). Severe dating violence and quality of life among South Carolina high school students. <i>American Journal of Preventative Medicine, 19</i>(4), 220-227.</p>	5,414	<p>Adolescent males (50.4%) and females (49.6%), mean age 16 years, in Grades 9-12. Race/ethnicity: White 49.4%, African American 44.3%, Hispanic 1.8%, Asian 1.1%, Native American 0.9%, Other 2.6%. Participant response rate 88%, school response rate was 72% and overall response rate 63%.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from the 1997 South Carolina Youth Risk Behavior Survey, state-level data from the national Youth Risk Behavior Survey. A three-stage cluster sampling design of public high schools that are represent-ative of South Carolina's student demographics. Self-report</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Severe dating violence past year: CTS 2-items; Lifetime forced sex victimization and perpetration 1-item; Perceived health-related quality of life: physical and mental health 4-items; Life satisfaction Multidimensional Students' Life Satisfaction Scale 6-items. MVPV, FMPV, perpetration, and victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for the effects of health-related quality of life, suicide ideation and attempts, and life satisfaction, findings for females indicated increased IPV victimization was associated with poor health-related quality of life, suicide ideation and attempts, and dissatisfaction with friends and one's overall life; whereas female IPV perpetration was associated with a suicide attempt, dissatisfaction with friends, and with oneself. For males, IPV victimization was associated with poor perceived physical health, suicidal ideation but not attempts, and low scores on life satisfaction; whereas IPV perpetration was associated with poor ratings on health-related quality of life, suicide attempts, and low life-satisfaction scores. After controlling for IPV, for females, forced</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 6. Cross-sectional adolescent samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				sex victimization was associated with low quality of life scores, suicidal ideation and attempts, and dissatisfaction with one's life and living situation; whereas forced-sex perpetration for females was associated only with dissatisfaction with friends and one's overall life. For males, both forced-sex victimization and perpetration were associated with low life-satisfaction scores and only victimization was associated with suicide attempts.
Foshee, V. A., Bauman, K. E., & Linder, G. F. (1999). Family violence and the perpetration of adolescent dating violence: Examining social learning and social control processes. <i>Journal of Marriage and the Family</i> , 61(2), 331-342.	1,405	Adolescent males (50%) and females (50%), mean age 14 years, in Grades 8-9. Race/ethnicity: White 78-79%. Response rate 81%.	Cross-sectional data from Safe Dates Project baseline data. The Safe Dates Project was a randomized intervention trial with a school-based sample of eighth- and ninth-grade students from rural North Carolina. Baseline data was collected in October, 1994, via in-school questionnaires. Self-report.	<p><i>Measures:</i> Dating violence 18-items; Witnessing parental IPV and parent-to-child aggression 4-items; Social acceptance of dating IPV 14-items; Aggressive response to conflict 7-items. MFPV, FMPV, and perpetration.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for social-learning-theory variables, females and males who perpetrated dating violence had more positive outcome expectations for using dating violence, were more accepting of dating violence, and had a more aggressive conflict response style than nonperpetrators. Exposure to family violence and dating violence perpetration was mediated by social-learning-theory variables for males and females. After controlling for all other control-theory variables, commitment to conventional activities was related to female dating violence perpetration, and belief in</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 6. Cross-sectional adolescent samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				conventional rules of society was related to male dating violence perpetration.
<p>O'Keefe, M. (1997). Predictors of dating violence among high school students. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i>, 12(4), 546-568.</p>	939	<p>Adolescent males (41%) and females (59%) in dating relationships. 84% juniors or seniors. Race/ethnicity: Latino 53%, White 20%, African American 13%, Asian American 6.7%, other ethnic group 7%. Socioeconomic status: low SES 51%, middle 30%, high 19%. Response rate 75%-80%.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from a school-based sample, Los Angeles, CA, United States. The sample comprised students in Grades 11 and 12 from six high schools. In-class questionnaires. Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Dating violence perpetration: modified CTS; Childhood experience of physical aggression: modified CTS-Child; Interparental aggression: modified CTS-Parent; Acceptance of violence: Justification of Violence Scale; History of aggression: Personal History Questionnaire; Community and school violence: modified CTS; Alcohol/drug use: alcohol, marijuana, and other drug use frequency; Relationship conflict: Conflictual Relationship Scale 5-items; Seriousness of relationship: emotional commitment; Relationship satisfaction: Relationship Assessment Scale 7-items; Number of dating partners and length of relationship. MFPV, FMPV, and perpetration.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for SES factors, contextual and situational variables, and gender, findings indicated that witnessing interparental violence, endorsing beliefs that male-to-female dating violence is justifiable, being the recipient of dating violence, alcohol/drug use, and greater conflict in the dating relationship predicted dating violence</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 6. Cross-sectional adolescent samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>perpetration for males. For females, predictors of dating violence perpetration were the belief that female-to-male violence is justifiable, belief that male-to-female violence is unjustifiable, greater conflict in the dating relationship, greater relationship seriousness, being the recipient of dating violence, African American racial/ethnic group, and alcohol/drug use.</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 6. Cross-sectional adolescent samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
---------------------------	---	------------------------------------	-------------------	---------

Small Community Samples

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Grych, J. H., &amp; Kinsfogel, K. M. (2010). Exploring the role of attachment style in the relation between family aggression and abuse in adolescent dating relationships. <i>Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment and Trauma</i>, 19(6), 624-640.  <a href="https://doi.org/10.1080/10926771.2010.502068">DOI:10.1080/10926771.2010.502068</a></p>	<p>391</p>	<p>Male (48%) and female (52%) high school students, mean age 15.6 years. Race/ethnicity: Anglo American 56%, Latino 21%, African American 13%, Asian American, American Indian, or other 10%. Response rate 75%.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data of a high school sample, United States. Students in social studies classes completed in-class questionnaires. Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Dating aggression - Negative Communication and Abuse/Coercion subscales of Conflict in Relationships Scale; Romantic Attachment Style Avoidance Scale - 18-items, Anxiety Scale from Experiences in Close Relationships Scale - 18-items; Interparental aggression CTS - 15-items; Parent-child aggression (past year) - verbal and physical aggression subscales of CTS; Beliefs about aggression - Self-Defense and Humiliation subscales of the Attitudes About Dating Index; Anger regulation from Trait Anger Scale – 15-items.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> Analyses controlled for gender. For boys, anxiety moderated the association between exposure to family aggression and dating aggression perpetration such that family aggression had a stronger association with dating aggression perpetration for boys who were more anxious (1 <i>SD</i> above mean); anxious attachment moderated the effect of aggressive attitudes in predicting dating abuse such that viewing aggression as acceptable behavior predicted dating abuse for boys high in anxiety; for boys high on avoidant attachment, avoidant attachment</p>



PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 6. Cross-sectional adolescent samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>moderated aggressive attitudes and abuse perpetration. For girls, greater anxiety had a significant, direct relationship with verbal aggression such that the greater the anxiety the more likely they engaged in verbal aggression; there was an association between family aggression and dating aggression perpetration for girls who were high in avoidance such that greater family aggression exposure was associated with abuse perpetration; avoidance moderated the association between attitudes and victimization for girls who were low in avoidance.</p>
<p>Kim, K. L., Jackson, Y., Hunter, H. L., &amp; Conrad, S. M. (2009). Interparental conflict and adolescent dating relationships. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i>, 24(5), 844-865.</p>	<p>169</p>	<p>Adolescent males (53%) and females (47%), mean age 16 years, in Grades 9-12. Race/ethnicity: African American 11.8%, Hispanic 5.3%, Asian or Pacific Islander 11.2%, European American 56.8%, biracial 5.9%, multiracial 2.4%, other 6.5%. Response rate 100%.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from school-based study, southeastern United States. The sample comprised students in Grades 10 and 11 from one public high school. Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: Child and Adolescent Dating Relationships Inventory with five subscale scores: Sexual Aggression, Relational Aggression, Emotional and Verbal Abuse, Threatening Behaviors, and Physical Abuse (3-items in total); Interparental Conflict: Children's Perception of Interparental Conflict Scale with three subscales: Conflict Properties, Threat, and Self-Blame 49-items. MFPV, FMPV, and IPV scores collapsed across victim/perpetrator (to any aggression in dating relationship).</p> <p><i>Results:</i> There was not a significant association between interparental conflict and relational aggression. Adolescents exposed to higher levels of interparental</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 6. Cross-sectional adolescent samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>conflict did not display significantly more maladaptive conflict dating behaviors compared with adolescents exposed to lower levels of interparental conflict. There was a significant association between interparental conflict and threat appraisal and between threat appraisal and sexual aggression. Self-blame appraisal was significantly related to interparental conflict, sexual aggression, relational aggression, and threatening behavior.</p>
<p>Josephson, W. L., &amp; Proulx, J. B. (2008). Violence in young adolescents' relationships: A path model. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i>, 23(2), 189-208.</p>	<p>290</p>	<p>Adolescent males (49%) and females (51%), average age 13 years, in Grades 7-9. Response rate about 70%.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from baseline assessment of a dating violence prevention program, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada. Students from Grades 7 to 9 participated from four schools. Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: CTS-R physical violence 9-items; Reasoning and Escalation/Blame Scales; Knowledge about abuse definitions 14-items; Self-efficacy 4-items; Attitudes toward dating violence: ATDVS short form 6-items. MFPV and FMPV.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for knowledge about abuse definitions, self-efficacy, and attitudes toward dating violence, a direct causal effect was supported for violence-tolerant attitudes and psychologically aggressive (escalation/blame) strategies on physical violence against dating partners and friends. Knowledge and self-efficacy contributed to using reasoning-based strategies, but this reduced violence only in boys' friendships. Knowledge reduced violence-tolerant attitudes, thus reducing escalation/blame and physical violence. Attitudes toward male and female dating</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 6. Cross-sectional adolescent samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>violence (ATMDV and ATFDV) were indicators of general attitudes toward violence among nondating students, but ATFDV affected physical violence and ATMDV affected psychological aggression for both dating boys and girls.</p>
<p>Leadbeater, B. J., Banister, E. M., Ellis, W. E., &amp; Yeung, R. (2008). Victimization and relational aggression in adolescent romantic relationships: The influence of parental and peer behaviors, and individual adjustment. <i>Journal of Research on Adolescence</i>, 37(3), 359-372.</p>	<p>149</p>	<p>Adolescent males (22%) and females (78%), mean age 16.5 years, in a current dating relationship. Race/ethnicity: European-Canadian 85%, Asian 4%, and Other 11%.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from the 2003 Healthy Youth Survey, Victoria, British Columbia, Canada. Random sampling method employed with the specific criteria of a household youth between ages 12-19 years in residence. Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: relational dating victimization 8-items; Relational dating aggression (perpetration; 5-items); Parental psychological control measure: Psychological Control Scale- Youth Self-Report; Parental Monitoring 5-items; Victimization by peers: Social Experiences Questionnaire; Aggression against Peers: Children's Peer Relations Scale; Adjustment problems: Brief Child and Family Phone Interview. MFPV, FMPV, and victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for age, gender, and physical dating violence victimization, there were no effects of parental psychological control or parental monitoring on adolescent relational dating victimization. After controlling for relational dating victimization, higher levels of parental monitoring were significantly related to less physical dating victimization.</p>
<p>Swahn, M. H., Bossarte, R. M., &amp; Sullivent, E. E.</p>	<p>856</p>	<p>Adolescent males (46%) and females (54%) in Grade 7. Race/ethnicity:</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from the 2004 Youth Violence Survey, United States. A</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Dating violence: perpetration 9-items and victimization 9-items. Alcohol use: "How old were you when you had</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 6. Cross-sectional adolescent samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>(2008). Age of alcohol use initiation, suicidal behavior, and peer and dating violence victimization and perpetration among high-risk, seventh-grade adolescents. <i>Pediatrics</i>, 121(2), 297-305.</p>		<p>Black 24%, Hispanic 51%, White 20%, Other 5%. Response rate 81%.</p>	<p>high-risk school district of 16 schools was selected and students in Grades 7, 9, 11, and 12 participated. Self-report.</p>	<p>your first drink of alcohol other than a few sips?" MFPV, FMPV, perpetration, and victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for age, race/ethnicity, gender, heavy episodic drinking, other drug use, peer drinking, depression, and impulsivity, the findings indicated that early alcohol initiation was associated with dating violence, victimization, and perpetration, relative to nondrinkers. Lastly, when controlling for confounders already listed and peer delinquency and parental monitoring, findings indicated that early alcohol initiation was associated with dating violence victimization but not perpetration, relative to nondrinkers.</p>
<p>Espelage, D. L., &amp; Holt, M. K. (2007). Dating violence and sexual harassment across the bully victim continuum among middle and high school students. <i>Journal of Research on Adolescence</i>, 36(6), 799-811.</p>	<p>684</p>	<p>Adolescent males (47%) and females (53%), mean age 14.5 years, who were middle and high school students. Race/ethnicity: Caucasian Non-Hispanic 60.7%, African American 34.3%. School-district records indicated that approximately 42% of middle school students and 43% of high school</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from a school-based sample, Midwestern United States. All students from one middle school and one high school participated. In-class questionnaire. Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Self-reported bullying behaviors: University of Illinois Bully Scale 9-items; self-reported victimization: University of Illinois Victimization Scale 4-items; Peer sexual harassment victimization: AAUW Sexual Harassment Survey 14-items; physical victimization: Victimization in Dating Relationship scale 18-items; emotional abuse victimization: Abusive Behavior Inventory 9-items; anxiety/depression: Youth Self-Report 16-items. MFPV, FMPV, and victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> Associations among bullying, peer</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 6. Cross-sectional adolescent samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
		students were classified as low income.		victimization, sexual harassment, and dating violence victimization were examined. Four bully victim clusters were formed: uninvolved, bullies, bully victims, victims. Each group contained boys and girls though some gender differences in group membership. African American students comprised the bully cluster more than White students but did not report higher rates of dating violence victimization. Bully victims reported significantly more physical dating violence victimization than members of all other groups, and more emotional abuse victimization in dating relationships than uninvolved students and victims. The bully only and victim only groups showed intermediate levels of dating violence and the uninvolved group the lowest levels.
Sears, H. A., Byers, E. S., & Price, E. L. (2007). The co-occurrence of adolescent boys' and girls' use of psychologically, physically, and sexually abusive behaviors in their dating relationships. <i>Journal of Adolescence</i> , 30(3),	633	Adolescent males (52%) and females (48%), mean age 14.64 years, in Grades 7, 9, and 11. Race/ethnicity: majority Caucasian, English Canadian 85%, French Canadian 6%, and Native Canadian 6%.	Cross-sectional study stratified random sample recruited from four different schools in a Canadian province, Canada. Self-report survey.	<i>Measures:</i> IPV: CTS on physical abuse 3-items, psychological abuse (4-items), and sexual abuse 9-items; Attitudes towards women: Attitudes towards Women Scale for Adolescence 12-items; Attitudes towards male use of dating violence: Attitudes Towards Male Psychological Dating Violence Scale 15-items; Attitudes Towards Male Physical Violence Scale 12-items, and Attitudes Towards Male Sexual Dating Violence Scale 12-items; females the Attitudes Towards Female Psychological Dating Violence Scale 13-

PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 6. Cross-sectional adolescent samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
487-504.				<p>items, Attitudes Towards Female Physical Dating Violence Scale 12-items, and Attitudes Towards Female Sexual Dating Violence Scale 12-items: Fear of family violence 4-items; Peer use of dating violence: friends who are physically or sexually abusive in dating relationships 2-items. MFPV, FMPV, and perpetration.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for general abusiveness, boys who had more accepting attitudes toward sexual dating violence, had peers who were abusive in their dating relationships, and had not experienced dating violence were more likely to perpetrate sexual dating violence. Girls who had less accepting attitudes of physical dating violence and who had experienced psychological abuse in a dating relationship were more likely to perpetrate psychological dating violence. Co-occurrence of at least two types of dating violence was significantly more likely in females (26%) than males (19%).</p>
Gagné, M.-H., Lavoie, F., & Hébert, M. (2005). Victimization during childhood and revictimization in dating relationships in adolescent girls. <i>Child Abuse &amp; Neglect</i> ,	622	Adolescent females, age 14-20 years, in a dating relationship within past year. Response rate 98%	Cross-sectional, retrospective; nested sample of 10 <sup>th</sup> - and 11 <sup>th</sup> - grade females in Montreal and Quebec, Canada; Self-report, questionnaire self-administered in	Measure: Dating violence: Total of 40-items: psychological violence 19-items, physical violence or threatening behavior 17-items, Sexual IPV 4-items; Parental violence toward youth 10-items, exposure to marital violence 2-items, sexual abuse 3-items, and sexual harassment at school 5-items, all retrospective; Previous dating

PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 6. Cross-sectional adolescent samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
29(10), 1155-1172.			classroom.	<p>victimization (dichotomous); Exposure to community violence 2-items; Violent and/or victimized peers: Violence and victimization in dating relationships among friends past year. MFPV and victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for number of years dating and intra-familial IPV experiences, some experiences such as involvement with peers who were also IPV perpetrators or victims, previous dating MFPV, and sexual and/or verbal harassment were predictive of continued dating victimization by MFPV.</p>
Kinsfogel, K. M., & Grych, J. H. (2004). Interparental conflict and adolescent dating relationships: Integrating cognitive, emotional, and peer influences. <i>Journal of Family Psychology</i> , 18(3), 505-515.	391	Adolescent males (48%) and females (52%), average age 15-16 years. Race/ethnicity: European American 51%, African American 21%, Latino 21%, Native American 3%, and Asian 2%. Response rate 75%.	Cross-sectional study. Sample recruited from social studies classes in public high schools in a mid-sized Midwestern city, United States. Self-report questionnaires.	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: Self-report on the Conflict in Relationships Scale -- negative communication 15-items and abuse/coercion 13-items; Interparental aggression: participants' exposure to verbal/physical IPV between their parents; Beliefs about aggression: Attitudes about Dating Index; Anger regulation: Trait Anger Scale; Peer dating aggression: perceptions of the frequency of verbal/physical aggression of their peers. MFPV, FMPV, perpetration, and victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> Boys exposed to greater parental discord were more likely to view aggression as justifiable in a romantic relationship, had more difficulty managing</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 6. Cross-sectional adolescent samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>anger, and believed that aggressive behavior was more common in their peers' dating relationships. Each of these variables in turn linked witnessing interparental conflict to higher levels of verbal and physical aggression toward their own romantic partners. Interparental conflict was not related to girls' aggressive behavior.</p>
<p>Chapple, C. L. (2003). Examining intergenerational violence: Violent role modeling or weak parental controls? <i>Violence and Victims</i>, 18(2), 143-162.</p>	<p>580</p>	<p>Adolescents males (49%) and females (51%), average age 15-16 years, in Grades 9 to 11. Race/ethnicity: White 86.4%, African American 5.2%, Native American 2.2%, Asian 2.2%, and Hispanic 3.5%. Income: 17% of sample were current or past welfare recipient families, 47% families earned &lt; \$25,000 , 55.7% families earned &gt; \$40,000. Response rate: 69% Grade 9, 62% Grade 10, and 58% Grade 11.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional data from a school-based sample, Southerntown, Arkansas, United States. Self-report, questionnaire; Sample from two public high school districts in Grades 9 through 11. In-class questionnaires completed in 1997. Self-report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> Dating violence: Have you ever hit your partner 1-item; Perceived likelihood of dating violence 4-items; Witnessed interparental violence 2-items; Parental control: parental attachment 6-items and parental monitoring 2-items; Dating frequency 1-item; Controls: gender, welfare status, race. MFPV and FMPV. Multiple Analyses</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for gender, welfare status, and race, participants who had ever witnessed parental IPV were below the mean in parental attachment and involvement and above mean levels of dating hours, dating IPV, and the perceived likelihood of dating IPV. The significant risk factors for perpetration of dating IPV in multivariate analyses were witnessed parental IPV, gender (girls higher), race (Non-White higher), low parental monitoring, and greater dating frequency.</p>



PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 6. Cross-sectional adolescent samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Wekerle, C., &amp; Wolfe, D. A. (1998). The role of child maltreatment and attachment style in adolescent relationship violence. <i>Development and Psychopathology</i>, 10(3), 571-586.</p>	<p>321</p>	<p>Adolescent males (40%) and females (60%), age 14-20 years, in Grades 9-10 in current or former dating relationships. Race/ethnicity: White &gt; 80%, Asian &lt; 4%, Native Canadian &lt; 4%. Response rate 54%.</p>	<p>Cross sectional, retrospective. Secondary analysis of study examining adolescent relationships, sample from Ontario, Canada. Classroom administered self-report questionnaire.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: Conflict in Relationships Questionnaire, 9 of these items are similar to CTS, the others cover emotional and sexual abuse as either victim or perpetrator 80-items; Childhood maltreatment: witnessing parental IPV, Parent-to-child aggression, and Childhood sexual abuse 13-items. MFPV, FMPV, perpetration, and victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for gender, child maltreatment history, and current attachment style, found that childhood maltreatment predicted relationship violence perpetration for males but not females. Avoidant attachment style increased risk of violence perpetration for both genders. Predictors of victimization included childhood maltreatment for both males and females; insecure and avoidant attachment style predicted victimization for girls but not boys.</p>
<p>Malik, S., Sorenson, S. B., &amp; Aneshensel, C. S. (1997). Community and dating violence among adolescents: Perpetration and victimization. <i>Journal of Adolescent Health</i>, 21(5), 291-302.</p>	<p>707</p>	<p>Adolescent males (40%) and females (60%), mean age 15.7 years. Race/ethnicity: African American 28.0%, Asian American 28.3%, Hispanic/Latino 25.3%, White 18.4%.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional study, stratified sample drawn from 5 different high schools in the Long Beach Unified School District, California, United States. Self-report questionnaire.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: CTS, physical violence only; Exposure to violence: community and family violence exposure: Dating violence attitudes: Personal Norms Scale 36-items. MFPV, FMPV, perpetration, and victimization.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> After controlling for SES, females were significantly more likely to perpetrate IPV than males. For both males and</p>

PASK#4 Online Tables - Table 6. Cross-sectional adolescent samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				females, exposure to weapon and injury in the community predicted victimization and perpetration of IPV. Also, dating violence attitudes were positively related to perpetration and victimization of IPV for both genders.
Schwartz, M., O'Leary, S. G., & Kendziora, K. T. (1997). Dating aggression among high school students. <i>Violence and Victims</i> , 12(4), 295-305.	288	Adolescent males (42%) and females (58%) in Grade 11 who had dated. Race/ ethnicity: White 86.8-90.2%, African American 2.5-3.8%, Asian 2.8-3.3%, Hispanic 0.8-2.8%, other 3.3-3.8%. Median family income \$65,703 USD. Response rate 84%.	Cross-sectional data from school-based sample, United States. Sample of high school students in two public schools. Data collected in 1993. Self-report.	<i>Measures:</i> IPV: CTS 21-items; Acceptance of violence 12-items; Family violence 4-items; MFPV and FMPV.  <i>Results:</i> After controlling for aggression, females were more likely to engage in aggressive behavior than males; females were more likely to believe that aggression was justifiable. Frequency of exposure to IPV and belief that aggression was justifiable was predictive of MFPV but not FMPV.