

Bowling Green State University
The Center for Family and Demographic Research

<http://www.bgsu.edu/organizations/cfdr>

Phone: (419) 372-7279 cfdr@bgsu.edu

2015 Working Paper Series

**FAMILY OF ORIGIN AND PEER INFLUENCES ON
INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE DURING EMERGING ADULTHOOD**

Mallory Minter
Monica A. Longmore
Peggy C. Giordano
Wendy D. Manning

Department of Sociology & Center for Family and Demographic Research
Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, OH

*This research received support from The Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (HD036223 and HD044206), the Department of Health and Human Services (5APRPA006009), the National Institute of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, U. S. Department of Justice (Award Nos. 2009-IJ-CX-0503 and 2010-MU-MU-0031), and the Center for Family and Demographic Research, Bowling Green State University, which received core funding from The Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (R24HD050959). The opinions, findings, conclusions and recommendations expressed in this publication/program/exhibition are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official views of the Department of Justice or National Institutes of Health.

ABSTRACT

Purpose: Prior researchers have documented significant effects of witnessing marital violence and experiencing coercive parenting on adult children's own later risk for intimate partner violence (IPV). To develop a more comprehensive portrait of social influence processes, the current study examined the effect of family background relying on interviews with a large, heterogeneous sample of emerging adults, and included an assessment of the degree to which their peers' attitudes and behaviors contributed to risk, net of familial effects.

Methodology/Approach: Using data from the Toledo Adolescent Relationships Study (TARS) (n = 928) we examined associations between family violence indicators, peers' behaviors and attitudes regarding partner violence, and respondents' self-reports of IPV among emerging adults ages 22-29. We used ordinary least squares regression, and controlled for other known correlates of IPV.

Findings: For men and women, we found a significant relationship between witnessing parental violence during adolescence and IPV in emerging adulthood, as well as a positive relationship between current peers' own IPV experience and attitudes and respondents' intimate partner violence in emerging adulthood. We also found that when respondents indicated higher, compared with lower, peer involvement in partner violence, the effects of parental violence were stronger.

Originality/Value of Paper: We brought new and more comprehensive questions assessing peers' IPV to this body of research, and extended the examination of both familial and peer influences on IPV into emerging adulthood.

Keywords: intimate partner violence, peers' influence, family violence, emerging adulthood

INTRODUCTION

Emerging adulthood is a distinct stage in the life course characterized by the development of intimate relationships. Although prevalence rates vary, many researchers have found that rates of physical violence peak during the life stage of emerging adulthood (e.g., Breiding, Black & Ryan, 2008; Halpern, Spriggs, Martin & Kupper, 2009; Thompson, Bonomi, Anderson, Reid, Dimer, Carrell & Rivara, 2006), and that much of this violence is mutual or reciprocal. Prior theorizing has suggested that the family of origin often provides a direct model for how to be violent toward loved ones. As such, researchers have examined intergenerational or family influences, such as witnessing parental violence (e.g., Franklin & Kercher 2012; Turcotte-Seabury, 2010), experiencing coercive parenting (e.g., Herrenkohl, Mason, Kosterman, Lengua, Hawkins & Abbott, 2004), or both (e.g., Ehrensaft, Cohen, Brown, Smailes, Chen, & Johnson, 2003) to explain emerging adults' self-reports of violence toward their own intimate partners.

In addition to the family of origin, peers may influence emerging adults' acceptance and tolerance of intimate partner violence by their own involvement in violent relationships (Arriga & Foshee, 2003) and their expressed support for violence against partners (Silverman & Williamson, 1997; Williamson & Silverman, 2001). Moreover, there may be linkages between the intergenerational transmission of violence and the influence of peers in that emerging adults who witnessed parental violence or experienced violence first hand while growing up may be more likely to associate with a deviant crowd as emerging adults (Silverman & Williamson, 1997). Yet, few studies have examined whether, both, exposure to family violence while growing up as well as emerging adults' reports of their peers' behaviors and attitudes affect their self-reports of intimate partner violence.

We analyzed data from a community sample, the Toledo Adolescent Relationships Study (TARS). This dataset focuses on individuals' experiences with parents, peers, and intimate partners as they transitioned from adolescence to emerging adulthood. Drawing on experiences when respondents were ages 22 - 29 (n = 1,021), we examined two indicators of family violence (i.e., witnessing parental violence, and coercive parenting), and two indicators of peer influence (i.e., intimate partner violence experiences, and attitudes toward partner violence). We included other known correlates of emerging adults' intimate partner violence including their own and peers' general deviance, as well as prior intimate partner violence, and current relationship characteristics, such as union status, relationship duration, and sociodemographic background characteristics. We hypothesized that in addition to the family violence indicators, peers' experiences with and attitudes toward intimate partner violence would positively influence emerging adults' self-reports of relationship violence. Building on prior research, we expected that peer influence may be stronger than family violence indicators, and that women, compared with men, may be more susceptible to peer influences.

BACKGROUND

Intimate Partner Violence and the Intergenerational Transmission of Violence

Intimate partner violence is common among emerging adults. Estimates from the Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health) indicated that 25% of unmarried women and men, ages 18-24, experienced relationship violence (Halpern et al. 2009). That so many individuals report intimate partner aggression during this stage in the life course underscores the need to understand its precursors because a key developmental task during emerging adulthood is learning to get along with intimate partners.

A large body of literature has theorized ways in which violence is learned (Bandura,

1977), and that witnessing parental violence as well as experiencing harsh or coercive parenting while growing up teaches individuals to be violent (e.g., Ehrensaft et al., 2003). Through these early experiences of violence, children and adolescents learn meanings, symbols and definitions that can be called on and continually re-shaped when exposed to other situations with potential for violence (Burke, Stets & Pirog-Good, 1988). In other words, violence is learned in the home by witnessing and experiencing violence first hand, and may be re-created in subsequent intimate relationships.

There is an extensive empirical literature that supports the notion of the intergenerational transmission of violence during emerging adulthood. Turcotte-Seabury's (2010) multi-national study (n = 14,252), for example, concluded that witnessing parental violence limited individuals' capabilities of managing anger and that this was significantly associated with emerging adults' perpetration of intimate partner violence. Maas, Herrenkohl, and Sousa (2008) reviewed 12 recent studies on the effect of child maltreatment on teenagers and emerging adults including their involvement in intimate partner violence. They concluded that coercive parenting consistently predicted subsequent intimate partner violence. Jouriles, Mueller, Rosenfield, McDonald and Dodson (2012) found that both parental violence and corporal punishment as a teenager predicted severe teen dating violence. Other studies (e.g., Ehrensaft et al., 2003; Herrenkohl et al., 2004) have also concluded that both witnessing parental violence and experiencing coercive parenting are associated with the intergenerational transmission of violence.

Peer Influences

Even when behavior is learned at home, there are other factors that contribute to its actual imitation at later stages of the life course. Deviant peer associations may exacerbate aggressive

behaviors witnessed and experienced at home. Scholars (e.g., Booth, Farrell & Varano, 2008; Lonardo, Giordano, Longmore & Manning 2009; Olds, Thombs & Tomasek, 2005; Piquero, Gover, MacDonald & Piquero, 2005; Thornberry et al., 1994; Williams & Guerra, 2007) have theorized and empirically examined ways in which peers influence various anti-social and criminal activities. Recently, researchers have examined both parental violence and peer dating violence as direct models for teen dating violence. Evaluating a dating violence prevention program for adolescents, ages 12-17, Arriaga and Foshee (2004) found among the untreated portion of the sample ($n = 526$) both peer dating violence and parental violence significantly increased teens' victimization and perpetration of intimate partner violence, but that only peers' dating violence was associated with respondents' dating violence six months later. There are several limitations of this study, however, that we attempted to overcome in the current studying, such as the use of a single item to examine peers' relationship violence, and assessing intimate partner violence among a younger age group, although emerging adulthood is associated with higher rates of intimate partner violence (e.g., Breiding, Black & Ryan, 2008; Halpern et al. 2009; Thompson, et al., 2006). Moreover, this study did not take into account characteristics of the relationship in which the violence occurred.

In addition to peers' behaviors, some prior studies have examined the influence of peers' support and attitudes about violence. Silverman and Williamson (1997), examining college men ($n = 193$), mean age 21, reported that controlling for witnessing violence between parents, male peers' support for the use of violence had a direct effect on men's perpetration of relationship violence. DeKeseredy and Kelly (1993) analyzed peers' support for violence in their study of Canadian college men ($n = 1,037$) who were asked about advice received from male peers that encouraged sexual, physical, and psychological assaults on dating partners. They found a

significant correlation between peer support and men's views regarding abuse of female dating partners. Rosen et al. (2003) found that among married male soldiers ($n = 713$) a normative climate that included conversations that degraded women significantly increased the frequency of intimate partner violence. Moreover, group recognition of respect and needs of spouses and importance of family life, and specific attitudes of fidelity and non-violence toward partners, significantly reduced the severity and frequency of perpetrating intimate partner violence.

Taken as a whole, these studies highlight significant relationships between peers' views and attitudes regarding the use of partner violence and their influences on individuals' own intimate partner violence by accepting and normalizing this specific violent behavior. However, because many prior studies examined adolescent peer influences and the data sets either excluded women and adults, or utilized samples that are too specific for generalization, such as college or military samples, there is a gap in the empirical research. While building on these studies, we sought to overcome these limitations. In the current study, we accounted for the influence of family violence experiences as well as current peer relationship violence on young adults' intimate partner violence. Few prior studies have examined these influences on intimate partner violence perpetration among individuals who are older than age 21 so this will allow us to develop a more comprehensive portrait of emerging adults' perpetration of intimate partner violence.

CURRENT STUDY

This study examined the extent to which exposure to family violence as well as peers' intimate partner violence and attitudes toward violence influenced emerging adults' self-reports of intimate partner violence. This study extended prior literature in several ways. Prior research that has examined family violence and peers' intimate partner violence and attitudes toward

intimate partner violence is limited in using single questions or only examining female victimization. Recognizing that peers may use a range of violent tactics and approve of partner violence for different reasons, we assessed these influences with multiple questions. This study is based on a community sample of emerging adults, therefore making it more generalizable and relevant to the age group associated with high rates of intimate partner violence.

In the multivariate models, we included relationship, sociodemographic/background and family of origin characteristics found in prior studies to also influence intimate partner violence. Relationship characteristics including union status influenced intimate partner violence with individuals, who were cohabiting, compared with married and dating, reporting higher odds (Brown & Bulanda, 2008; Cui, Gordon, Ueno, & Fincham, 2013). Longer relationship duration was associated with increased odds of intimate partner violence (Kenney & McLanahan, 2006; Rickert, Wiemann, Harrykisson, Berenson & Kolb, 2002). We also controlled for the following sociodemographic and background characteristics: gender (Whitaker, Haileyesus, Swahn & Saltzman, 2007), age (Foster, Hagan & Brooks-Gunn, 2004; Thompson et al., 2006), race and ethnicity (Martin, Cui, Ueno, & Fincham (2013), respondents' education (Tillyer & Wright , 2014), employment status (Alvira-Hammond et al., 2013), and individual and peer deviance (Capaldi, Dishion, Stoolmiller & Yoerger, 2001; Johnson et al., 2014; Ramizek, Paik, Sanchagrin, & Heimer, 2012). Family of origin factors included household structure (Brown & Bulanda, 2008; Fang & Corso, 2007), and mother's education, a proxy for social class background (Alvira-Hammond et al., 2013). We expected in multivariate analyses that exposure to family violence, and peers' attitudes and behaviors would positively influence respondents' self-reports of intimate partner violence net of the other variables. We then assessed whether the effects of the peer variables were stronger than the family variables, and whether effects were

stronger for women based on prior research (e.g., Foshee et al., 2001), which found that peers had a greater influence for women than men.

METHODS

The data, from the Toledo Adolescent Relationships Study (TARS), are based on a stratified random sample derived from enrollment records in the 2000 academic year from Lucas County, Ohio adolescents in 7th, 9th, and 11th grades. There were five interviews of data collected, beginning in 2001, and in 2002, 2004, and 2006, with the fifth interview recently collected in 2012. Additionally in the 2001 interview we collected information directly from respondents' parents (primarily mothers) or guardians. The original sample (n = 1,321), devised by the National Opinion Research Center, encompassed 62 schools across seven different school districts. Students did not have to attend school to be included in the sample. Data from the 2000 U.S. Census indicated that Lucas County has similar socioeconomic and demographic characteristics compared to national averages with respect to marital status, income, educational levels and racial distribution. The TARS sample included oversamples of African American and Hispanic respondents. Respondents at the time of the fifth interview ranged from age 22 to 29, with a mean age 25. The dataset is well suited for the study since it included multiple measures of respondents' perceptions of peers' involvement in intimate partner violence and attitudes toward violence. At the fifth interview there were 1,021 respondents, or 77.3% of the initial interview. The analytic sample included all respondents who participated in the fifth interview, but excluded those who reported that they have never dated (n=71). We excluded those who reported their race/ethnicity to be other than non-Hispanic Anglo, non-Hispanic African American and Hispanic due to small sample size (n=22). The final analytic sample was composed of 928 respondents.

Measures

Dependent variable

Intimate partner violence frequency measured at the time of the fifth interview included likert responses to twelve items regarding physical violence from the revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2) (Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, & Sugarman, 1996). These included how often the respondent and the current or most recent partner had done the following: (1) “thrown something at”; (2) “twisted arm or hair”; (3) “used a knife or gun”; (4) “punched or hit with something that could hurt”; (5) “choked”; (6) “slammed against a wall”; (7) “beat up”; (8) “burned or scalded on purpose”; (9) “kicked”; (10) “pushed, shoved, or grabbed”; (11) “slapped in the face or head with an open hand”; and (12) “hit” ($\alpha = .99$). Responses ranged from “never” to “very often.” About 23.3% of respondents reported any physical violence. This study analyzed partner violence as a continuous variable, which is a logged (due to skewness) summation of respondents’ perpetration and victimization acts, the non-logged measure ranged from 0 to 24.

Family Violence

We measured *coercive parenting* at the time of the first interview when respondents were adolescents. This was dichotomous measure composed of two questions that respondents answered in the initial questionnaire when they were adolescents. These questions asked the following: “When you and your parents disagree about things, how often do they do the following:” “call you names or insult you”; “push, slap, or hit you” ($\alpha = .67$). Affirmative responses to either of these questions were coded as 1 (46%) to indicate experiences with coercive parenting.

We measured *witnessing parental violence* using retrospective responses, from the fifth

interview, in which respondents were asked the following: “How often did either one of your parents:” “throw something at the other”; “push, shove, or grab the other”; “slap the other in the face or head with an open hand”; and “hit the other” ($\alpha = .95$). This is an abbreviated version of the physical component of the Revised Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus et al., 1996). We dichotomized scores with affirmative responses coded as 1 (31%) to indicate witnessing any parental violence.¹

Peers’ Behaviors and Attitudes

Peers’ intimate partner violence referred to responses at the fifth interview when individuals were asked to think about their friends over the past 12 months and answer the following questions from the abbreviated version of the Revised Conflict Tactics Scale, “How often did your friends and their romantic partners:” “throw something at each other,” “push, shove, or grab each other,” “slap each other in the face or head with an open hand,” and “hit each other.” Responses ranged from “never” to “very often.” This scale is a mean score with imputed responses for respondents missing on each variable (1.19%; $n = 11$), and results range from 1 to 5. Higher scores represented greater frequency of violence ($\alpha = .94$).

We measured *peers’ attitudes toward intimate partner violence* with the following statement: “Regardless of how you feel about it, how strongly would you say your friends agree or disagree with the following reasons why it might be understandable that someone could hit a partner.” The four reasons included the following: (1) “A partner hit them first”; (2) “They catch a partner cheating on them”; (3) “A partner embarrasses or belittles them in front of others”; and (4) “A partner continually nags them.” Responses ranged from “strongly disagree” to “strongly

¹ Additional analyses were done with Witnessing Parental Violence designed as an interval variable and results had similar outcomes.

agree” with higher scores indicating greater agreement with reasons for participating in intimate partner violence. This scale is a mean score with imputed responses for respondents missing on each variable (0.32%; $n = 3$) and ranged from 1 to 5 ($\alpha = .85$).

Relationship Characteristics

Union status included dichotomous indicators for dating (44.4%), cohabiting (32.3%), and married (23.3%), with dating as the reference category in the multivariate analyses.

Duration referred to how long respondents have been with their current or most recent partners, measured in years with mean imputation for missing data, and a mean of 3.43 and range of 0.5-14.

Family of Origin Characteristics

Family structure during adolescence, from the first respondent interview asked, “During the past 12 months, who were you living with most of the time?” Respondents selected one of 25 categories, which we collapsed into four categories: two biological parents (reference group) (53.45%), single parent (21.01%), stepparents (13.58%), or ‘other family’ including living with other family members or foster care (11.96%). *Mother’s Education* from the parent’s questionnaire at the time of the first interview, was a proxy for socioeconomic background, and responses included less than high school (10.78%), high school (32.44%), some college (33.41%) and college graduate (23.38%), with high school as the reference.

Sociodemographic and Background Characteristics

Female, a dichotomous variable, indicated whether the respondent was female (54.53%). *Age* (mean = 25.42) was the difference between date of birth and the fifth interview date. *Race/ethnicity* consisted of three self-reported categories: Anglo (reference group) (66.92%), Black (21.34%), and Hispanic (11.31%). *Respondent’s education*, included less than high

school (8.19%), high school graduate (reference group) (18.43%), some college (38.69%), or college or more (34.70%). *Employment status* was measured as full-time (55.93%), part-time (19.18%), and unemployed (24.89%).

Respondents' prior IPV, measured from all previous interviews assessed whether the respondent had any involvement in intimate partner violence. At each prior interview (1 – 4) a short version of the CTS2 was distributed and asked how often the respondent's and the current or most recent partner had done the following “thrown something at; punched or hit with something that could hurt; pushed, shoved, or grabbed; or hit.” We dichotomized scores with affirmative responses coded as 1 (55.6%) to indicate any violence in previous relationships.

Respondents' general deviance measured at the fifth interview asked respondents, “In the last two years (or 24 months), how often have you: stolen (or tried to steal) things worth \$5 or less; damaged or destroyed property on purpose, carried a hidden weapon other than a plain pocket knife, stolen (or tried to steal) something worth more than \$50, attacked someone with the idea of seriously hurting him/her, sold drugs, been drunk in a public place, broken into a building or vehicle (or tried to break in) to steal something or just to look around, and used drugs to get high (not because they were sick)” (Elliott & Ageton, 1980). We calculated a mean score with the mean imputed for missing responses (0.54%; $n = 5$). Scores ranged from 0 to 3.4 ($\alpha = .73$).

Peers' general deviance asked respondents the same items as partners' general deviance. We calculated a mean score with imputed responses for respondents missing on each variable (0.22%; $n = 2$). Scores ranged from 0 to 5.6 ($\alpha = .82$).

Analytic Plan

In Table 1, we first presented the means/percentages for each variable, by total sample, and then for men and women separately, with significant differences indicated. To assess the relationship between family violence indicators, peers' intimate partner violence indicators, and respondents' own involvement with intimate partner violence, in Table 2, we examined the zero-order associations (model 1) between intimate partner violence and the independent variables. We then examined models that included the two indicators of family violence (model 2), and then the association between the two indicators of peers' intimate partner violence (model 3) in separate models, predicting respondents' intimate partner violence using ordinary least squares (OLS) regression. Each of these models included the control variables. Model 4, the full model, included all of the variables. In Table 3, we presented interaction models showing the interactions between gender and peers intimate partner violence and peers' attitudes towards intimate partner violence, and in Table 4 we presented these interaction models with the family violence indicators.

RESULTS

Descriptive Analysis

Examining Table 1, the average level of intimate partner violence on the CTS2 is 1.54 (range = 0-24), with a standard deviation of 3.85 indicating relatively low levels of partner violence. Moreover, 23.3% (n = 216) of respondents reported any relationship violence. About 15.5% (n = 144) of the total sample reported perpetrating violence, and 20.5% (n = 190) reported being victimized by their current or most recent partner. Consistent with prior literature (e.g., Alvira-Hammond et al., 2013; Jennings, Reingle, Staras & Maldonado-Molina, 2012), there is much overlap with these individuals as 54.6% (n=118) reported perpetration and victimization (not shown), indicating that the majority of relationship violence reported was mutual.

[TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE]

Table 1 included descriptive results, and whether the distribution of each characteristic was significantly different by gender. Examining intimate partner violence, the only significant gender difference was that women compared with men reported higher rates of perpetration of violence (18.1% compared to 12.1%, respectively), which is consistent with other studies based on community samples such as TARS (Johnson et al., 2014). Regarding family violence there was a marginally significant difference between men and women for experiencing coercive parenting; women compared to men reported slightly higher levels (48.0% compared to 42.4%, respectively). In contrast, witnessing parental violence was reported at similar levels among men and women. With regard to peers' influence, there were no significant gender differences between peers' intimate partner violence behaviors (mean score of 1.47 on a five point scale). Women, on average, (women = 2.40, men = 2.08) had friends who were significantly more likely to report supportive attitudes toward violence. In terms of peers anti-social or deviant behavior, men, on average, (women = 0.54; men = 0.97) reported higher mean levels.

Predicting Intimate Partner Violence

In Table 2, at the zero order, witnessing parental violence, coercive parenting, peers' intimate partner violence, and peers' attitudes supportive of partner violence were positively associated with respondents' greater frequency of intimate partner violence. Cohabiting and relationships of longer duration were associated with higher frequency of intimate partner violence. African American and Hispanic compared with Anglo respondents were significantly more likely to report intimate partner violence. Respondents' lower educational level was positively associated, and higher educational levels were negatively associated with intimate partner violence. Respondents who were unemployed, reported prior intimate partner violence,

as well as general deviance and peers' general deviance were significantly more likely to report intimate partner violence. Growing up in any household other than a two-parent biological family structure was significantly associated with increases in intimate partner violence. Mothers' self-reports of having less than a high school education was positively associated with an increase, and a college education was negatively associated with frequency of intimate partner violence.

[TABLE TWO ABOUT HERE]

Model 2 examined the influence of family violence indicators on respondents' intimate partner violence net of the other variables. Although coercive parenting was not significantly related to increases in violence, witnessing parental violence was associated with a positive increase in respondent's intimate partner violence. Model 3 included the influence of peers' participation in intimate partner violence and peers' attitudes about the use of violence in a relationship under certain circumstances on respondents' intimate partner violence in young adulthood, net of the control variables. Peers' increased participation in intimate partner violence was associated with respondents' intimate partner violence. Additionally, peers' attitudes accepting of the use of intimate partner violence were significantly related to respondents' frequency of intimate partner violence.

The full model (Model 4) estimated the influence of all of the variables. Witnessing parental violence during adolescence was related to greater frequency of intimate partner violence. Peers' intimate partner violence behaviors and attitudes continued to be significantly related to respondents' frequency of intimate partner violence net of control variables. Regarding the control variables, cohabiting relationships compared to dating and relationships of

longer duration were associated with greater frequency of intimate partner violence.

Unemployment, as compared to full-time employment, was marginally related to an increase in intimate partner violence. Respondents' prior intimate partner violence, general deviance, and peers' general deviance were associated with intimate partner violence. Respondents who reported living with a single parent or other family structure during adolescence, compared to those who lived with both biological parents, had significantly increased frequency of intimate partner violence.

[TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE]

A set of interaction models (Table 3) examined the moderating effects of gender with each key peer variable on respondents' intimate partner violence. Model 1 showed no significant moderating relationship between gender and peers' intimate partner violence, and Model 2 similarly showed no moderating relationship between gender and peers' attitudes toward partner violence. Thus, the influences of peers' intimate partner violence, and peers' attitudes toward partner violence were similar for men and women. Additionally, a set of interaction models (Table 4) examined the moderating effects of gender with both indicators of family violence. Model 1 showed no significant moderating relationship between gender and coercive parenting, and Model 2 also showed no moderating relationship between gender and witnessing parental violence. Therefore, the influences of coercive parenting and witnessing parental violence on intimate partner violence were similar for men and women.

Another set of supplemental analyses (available from authors) tested whether the effects of having prior family violence and higher levels of peers' involvement with intimate partner violence on respondents own partner violence was significantly different from those that had family violence, but lower levels of peers' involvement with intimate partner violence. It was

found that compared to those with low peers' involvement in intimate partner violence, respondents with high peer involvement, combined with witnessing parental violence or experiencing coercive parenting in adolescence were significantly related to respondents' intimate partner violence.²

DISCUSSION

Many researchers have reported that rates of mutual intimate partner violence peak during the life stage of emerging adulthood. Much research has examined the influence of family and peers during the life stage of adolescence (e.g., Arriaga and Foshee, 2004; Haynie and Osgood, 2005). Yet, scholars often theorize that peers' influences eclipses parents' influence as individuals' transition to young adulthood. Although researchers have found that peers' attitudes and behaviors significantly affect older teens' and young adults' behavior with respect to substance use including alcohol, cigarettes, and various drugs (Andrews, Tildesley, Hops & Li, 2002; Gardner & Steinberg, 2005), studies have not emphasized both parents and adult peers' influence on intimate partner violence among emerging adults.

Regarding family violence, this study has shown that witnessing parental violence still has a significant impact on individuals into young adulthood. This study has also shown that peers have a significant impact on emerging adults' involvement with intimate partner violence. Although the influence of peers was significant in adolescence and the intergenerational transmission of violence has lasting influence into adulthood, until now, it has been assumed that among young adults, a major deterrent to deviant lifestyles is involvement in intimate relationships with prosocial individuals. Researchers (e.g., Beaver, Wright, DeLisi & Vaughn, 2008; Sampson, Laub & Wimer, 2006) have demonstrated, for example, that marriage positively

² Supplemental analyses available upon request

influences young adults' desistance from crime. Other scholars (e.g., Giordano, Cernkovich & Holland, 2003; Wyse, Harding & Morenoff, 2008) suggest that it is not simply union status (i.e., marriage), but that relationship quality, whether married, cohabiting or dating, affects desistance. However, as we have shown, this association becomes complicated when the romantic relationship is characterized by physical conflict, and peers' continue to be an integral part of young adults' lives as they further model violence within the context of intimate relationships.

Theories and empirical studies often focused on adolescent peer influences on intimate partner violence through reports of peers' violence, peers' attitudes about violence, peers' general violence, and the quality of peer relationships. This study established that peers' intimate partner violence behaviors, and attitudes regarding those behaviors, were associated with individuals' intimate partner violence in young adulthood. We found that these relationships were generally similar for men and women as well. In addition, we also found that when individuals have prior histories of parental violence, whether coercive parenting or witnessing parental violence, having peers' who were highly involved in this relationship violence in emerging adulthood strongly influenced an individual's own intimate partner violence.

These findings contribute to the literature by highlighting the lasting impact of witnessing parental violence into emerging adulthood in addition to the influence of current peers. Although the experiences of coercive parenting may no longer be significant at this point in time in the life course, the memory of witnessing parental violence and contemporary peer groups have a distinct impact on respondents' current intimate partner violence. Combined, parental violence and peers' involvement in relationship violence can be particularly detrimental in emerging adulthood. The association between current peers' behaviors and attitudes regarding

intimate partner violence, and emerging adults' intimate partner violence remains significant. While family of origin factors are important, the learning process of this violence obviously does not cease. Although the influence of peers may be lessened in emerging adulthood with regard to general deviance and violence, they can continue to create a normative climate of violence among intimate partners into young adulthood.

While this paper addresses an important issue of the continued influence of peers and prior family violence, there are a few limitations. First, it is cross-sectional and only captures one time period of peer characteristics, which have been shown to have a lasting effect as teenage interactions with friends can influence adult behaviors, particularly with regard to intimate partner violence (Capaldi, et al., 2001). Future work should take a more comprehensive longitudinal examination of these connections, as well as the continued influence of peers further into adulthood. Second, this study also did not incorporate other peer factors that have been identified as influential on intimate partner violence (e.g., Casey & Beadnell, 2010; Connolly, Furman & Konarski, 2000; Ramirez et al., 2012), such as peer group characteristics, gender composition and the number of peers involved in delinquent acts. Third, although the distributions of race, gender and familiar background characteristics are comparable to national samples, this study was not itself nationally representative.

Our next research step is to examine how family violence, peers' attitudes and behaviors regarding intimate partner violence influence other aspects of the individual's life, such as their pro-violent attitudes as well as experiencing depressive symptoms, both of which are likely correlates of intimate partner violence. Further examination of the influences of family and peer normative climates should consider the community level, such as community norms regarding the experience of family violence, and peers' experiences of intimate partner violence. We

would expect that both of these variables would contribute to a normalizing climate where individual intimate partner violence is more likely to occur (Raghavan, Rajah, Gentile, Collado & Kavanagh, 2009). Future investigation will take a more in-depth look at the processes behind these peer influences in emerging adulthood, looking at more qualitative aspects of this relationship, particularly with regard to gender differences. As Arriaga and Foshee (2004) pointed out, it may be the witnessing of peers as solely perpetrators or victims of this violence that causes gender differentiations, which this study could not distinguish.

Although these limitations exist within the present study and there are several concepts to expand upon, this study highlighted the continued importance of families and peers within the context of intimate partner violence in emerging adulthood. This study showed that even after controlling for various sociodemographic, familial background and relationship characteristics that parents and peers' partner violence are significantly influential on respondents and how they act within their own relationships as far as physical violence. Although peers' influence on general deviance has been shown previously to decrease as individuals grow older (e.g., Monahan, Steinberg & Cauffman, 2009), this study shows that this is not necessarily the case with regard to intimate partner violence and that peers' current involvement in this specific violent behavior can influence respondent's own involvement in this same violent fashion. These findings are potentially useful in designing programs and policies surrounding intimate partner violence and the role that families and friends have in an individual's life. For example, although a person cannot control their parents' or friends' violence, they can recognize it and their reasoning for the use of violence, but chose not to accept it. Individuals can then remain non-violent themselves, and become better models for their own peers.

REFERENCES

- Alvira-Hammond, M., Longmore, M. A., Manning, W. D., & Giordano, P. C. (2013). Gainful activity and intimate partner aggression in emerging adulthood. *Working Paper No. 2013-06, Center for Family and Demographic Research, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, OH.*
- Andrews, J. A., Tildesley, E., Hops, H., & Li, F. (2002). The influence of peers on young adult substance use. *Health Psychology, 21*(4), 349-357.
- Arriaga, X. B., & Foshee, V. A. (2004). Adolescent dating violence: Do adolescents follow in their friends', or their parents', footsteps? *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 19*(2), 162-184.
- Beaver, K. M., Wright, J. P., DeLisi, M., & Vaughn, M. G. (2008). Desistance from delinquency: the marriage effect revisited and extended. *Social Science Research, 37*, 736-752.
- Booth, J. A., Farrell, A., & Varano, S. P. (2008). Social control, serious delinquency, and risky behavior: a gendered analysis. *Crime and Delinquency, 54*(3), 423-456.
- Breiding, M. J., Black, M. C., & Ryan, G. W. (2008). Prevalence and risk factors of intimate partner violence in eighteen U.S. States/Territories, 2005. *American Journal of Preventative Medicine, 34*(2), 112-118.
- Brendgen, M., Vitaro, F., Trembley, R. E., & Wanner, B. (2002). Parent and peer effects on delinquency-related violence and dating violence: a test of two mediational models. *Social Development, 11*(2), 225-244.
- Brown, S. L., & Bulanda, J. R. (2008). Relationship violence in young adulthood: a comparison of daters, cohabitators, and married. *Social Science Research, 37*, 73-87.

- Burke, P., Stets, J., & Pirog-Good, M. (1988). Gender identity, self-esteem, and physical and sexual abuse in dating relationships. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *51*, 272-285.
- Capaldi, D. M., Dishion, T. J., Stoolmiller, M., & Yoerger, K. (2001). Aggression toward female partners by at-risk young men: the contribution of male adolescent friendships. *Developmental Psychology*, *37*(1), 61-73.
- Casey, E. A., & Beadnell, B. (2010). The Structure of Male Adolescent Peer Networks and Risk for Intimate Partner Violence Perpetration: Findings from a National Sample. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *39*, 620-633.
- Connolly, J., Furman, W., & Konarski, R. (2000). The role of peers in the emergence of heterosexual romantic relationships in adolescence. *Child Development*, *71*(5), 1395-1408.
- Cui, M., Ueno, K., Gordon, M., & Fincham, F. D. (2013). The continuation of intimate partner violence from adolescence to young adulthood. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *75*(2), 300-313.
- DeKeseredy, W. S., & Kelly, K. (1993). Woman abuse in university and college dating relationships: the contribution of the ideology of familial patriarchy. *Journal of Human Justice*, *4*(2), 25-52.
- Ehrensaft, M. K., Cohen, P., Brown, J., Smailes, E., Chen, H., & Johnson, J. G. (2003). Intergenerational transmission of partner violence: a 20-year prospective study. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *71*(4), 741-753.
- Elliott, D. S., & Ageton, S. S. (1980). Reconciling race and class differences in self-reported and official estimates of delinquency. *American Sociological Review*, *45*, 95-110.

- Fang, X., & Corso, P. S. (2007). Child maltreatment, youth violence, and intimate partner violence: developmental relationships. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 33*(4), 281-290.
- Foshee, V. A., Linder, F., MacDougall, J. E., & Bangdiwala, S. (2001). Gender differences in the longitudinal predictors of adolescent dating violence. *Preventive Medicine, 32*, 128-141.
- Foster, H., Hagan, J., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2004). Age, puberty, and exposure to intimate partner violence in adolescence. *Annals of New York Academy of Sciences, 1036*, 151-166.
- Franklin, C. A., & Kercher, G. A. (2012). The intergenerational transmission of intimate partner violence: differentiating correlates in a random community sample. *Journal of Family Violence, 27*(3), 187-199.
- Gardner, M., & Steinberg, L. (2005). Peer influence on risk taking, risk preference, and risky decision making in adolescence and adulthood: an experimental study. *Developmental Psychology, 41*(4), 625-635.
- Giordano, P. C., Cernkovich, S. A., & Holland, D. D. (2003). Changes in friendship relations over the life course: implications for desistance from crime. *Criminology, 41*(2), 293-327.
- Johnson, W. L., Giordano, P. C., Manning, W. D., & Longmore, M. A. (2014). The Age-IPV Curve: Changes in the Perpetration of Intimate Partner Violence during Adolescence and Young Adulthood. Working Paper No. 2014-07, Center for Family and Demographic Research, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, OH.
- Halpern, C. T., Spriggs, A. L., Martin, S. L., & Kupper, L. (2009). Patterns of Intimate Partner Violence Victimization from Adolescence to Young Adulthood in a Nationally Representative Sample. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 45*(5), 508-516.
- Haynie, D. L., & Osgood, D. W. (2005). Reconsidering peers and delinquency: how do peers

- matter? *Social Forces*, 84(2), 1109-1130.
- Henning, K., Martinsson, R., & Holford, R. (2009). Gender differences in risk factors for intimate partner violence recidivism. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment and Trauma*, 18(6), 623-645.
- Herrenkohl, T. I., Mason, W. A., Kosterman, R., Lengua, L. J., Hawkins, J. D., & Abbott, R. D. (2004). Pathways from physical childhood abuse to partner violence in young adulthood. *Violence and Victims*, 19(2), 123-136.
- Jennings, W. G., Reingle, J. M., Staras, S. A., & Maldonado-Molina, M. M. (2012). Substance use as a risk factor for intimate partner violence overlap: Generational differences among Hispanic young adults. *International Criminal Justice Review*, 22(2), 139-152.
- Jouriles, E. N., Mueller, V., Rosenfield, D., McDonald, R., & Dodson, M. C. (2012). Teens' Experiences of harsh parenting and exposure to severe intimate partner violence: adding insult to injury in predicting teen dating violence. *Psychology of Violence*, 2(2), 125-138.
- Kenney, C. T., & McLanahan, S. S. (2006). Why are cohabiting relationships more violent than marriages?. *Demography*, 43(1), 127-140.
- Lonardo, R. A., Giordano, P. C., Longmore, M. A., & Manning, W. D. (2009). Parents, friends, and romantic partners: enmeshment in deviant networks and adolescent delinquency involvement. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 38, 367-383.
- Maas, C., Herrenkohl, T. I., & Sousa, C. (2008). Review of research on child maltreatment and violence in youth. *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse*, 9(1), 56-67.
- Martin, B., Cui, M., Ueno, K., & Fincham, F. D. (2013). Intimate partner violence in interracial and monoracial couples. *Family Relations*, 62, 202-211.
- Monahan, K. C., Steinberg, L., & Cauffman, E. (2009). Affiliation with antisocial peers,

- susceptibility to peer influence, and antisocial behavior during the transition to adulthood. *Developmental Psychology*, 45(6), 1520-1530.
- Olds, S. R., Thombs, D. L., & Tomasek, J. R. (2005). Relations between normative beliefs and initiation intentions toward cigarette, alcohol and marijuana. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 37, 75.e7-75.e13.
- Piquero, N. L., Gover, A. R., MacDonald, J. M., & Piquero, A. R. (2005). The influence of delinquent peers on delinquency: does gender matter? *Youth and Society*, 36(3), 251-275.
- Raghavan, C., Rajah, V., Gentile, K., Collado, L., & Kavanagh, A. M. (2009). Community violence, social support networks, ethnic group differences, and male perpetration of intimate partner violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 24(10), 1615-1632.
- Ramirez, M., Paik, A., Sanchargin, K., & Heimer, K. (2012). Violent peers, network centrality, and intimate partner violence perpetration by young men. *Journal of adolescent health*, 51, 503-509.
- Rickert, V. I., Wiemann, C. M., Harrykissoon, S. D., Berenson, A. B., & Kolb, E. (2002). The relationship among demographics, reproductive characteristics, and intimate partner violence. *American Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology*, 187(4), 1002-1007.
- Rosen, L. H., Kaminski, R. J., Parmley, A. M., Knudson, K. H., & Fancher, P. (2003). The effects of peer group climate on intimate partner violence among married male U.S. army soldiers. *Violence Against Women*, 9(9), 1045-1071.
- Sampson, R. J., Laub, J. H., & Wimer, C. (2006). Does marriage reduce crime? A counterfactual approach to within-individual causal effects. *Criminology*, 44(3), 465-508.
- Silverman, J. G., & Williamson, G. M. (1997). Social ecology and entitlements involved in battering by heterosexual college males: contributions of family peers. *Violence and*

Victims, 12(2), 147-164.

- Straus, M. A., Hamby, S. L., Boney-McCoy, S., & Sugarman, D. B. (1996). The revised conflict tactics scales (CTS2): development and preliminary psychometric data. *Journal of Family Issues*, 17(3), 283-316.
- Thompson, R. S., Bonomi, A. E., Anderson, M., Reid, R. J., Dimer, J. A., Carrell, D., & Rivara, F. P. (2006). Intimate partner violence: prevalence, types, and chronicity in adult women. *American Journal of Preventative Medicine*, 30(6), 447-457.
- Thornberry, T. P., Lizotte, A. J., Krohn, M. D., Farnworth, M., & Jang, S. J. (1994). Delinquent peers, beliefs, and delinquency behaviors: a longitudinal test of interactional theory. *Criminology*, 32(1), 47-83.
- Tillyer, M. S., & Wright, E. M. (2014). Intimate partner violence and the victim-offender overlap. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 51(1), 29-55.
- Turcotte-Seabury, C. (2010). Anger management and the process mediating the link between witnessing violence between parents and partner violence. *Violence and Victims*, 25, 306-318.
- Whitaker, D., Haileyesus, T., Swahn, M., & Saltzman, L.S. (2007). Differences in frequency of violence and reported injury between relationship with reciprocal and nonreciprocal intimate partner violence. *American Journal of Public Health*, 97(5), 941-947.
- Williams, T. S., Connolly, J., Pepler, D., Craig, W., & Laporte, L. (2008). Risk Models of Dating Aggression Across Different Adolescent Relationships: A Developmental Psychopathology Approach. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 76(4), 622-632.
- Williams, K. R., & Guerra, N. G. (2007). Prevalence and Predictors of internet bullying.

Journal of Adolescent Health, 41, S14-S21.

Williamson, G. M., & Silverman, J. G. (2001). Violence against female partners: direct and interactive effects of family history, communal orientation, and peer-related variables.

Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 18(4), 535-549.

Wyse, J., Harding, D. L., & Morenoff, J. (2008). Presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association Annual Meeting, July 31: *Romantic relationships and criminal desistance: moving beyond marriage*. Boston, MA: Sheraton Boston and the

Boston Marriott Copley Place. Retrieved on February 14, 2014

(http://citation.allacademic.com/meta/p241187_index.html)

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Emerging Adults' Intimate Partner Violence, Family Violence, Peers' Intimate Partner Violence Behaviors and Attitudes, and Control Variables (n = 928)

Dependent Variable	Mean/Percentages			Ranges	
	Total Sample	Males	Females		
Intimate Partner Violence Frequency	1.54	1.37	-	1.68	0-24
Perpetration	15.5%	12.1%	**	18.4%	
Victimization	20.5%	22.3%	-	19.0%	
<i>Independent Variable</i>					
<i>Family Violence</i>					
Coercive Parenting ^a	45.5%	42.4%	†	48.0%	
Witnessing Parental Violence	31.3%	31.3%	-	31.2%	
<i>Peers' Behaviors and Attitudes</i>					
Peers' Partner Violence	1.47	1.46	-	1.47	1-5
Peers' Attitudes toward Partner Violence	2.26	2.08	***	2.40	1-5
<i>Relationship Characteristics</i>					
Union Status (Dating)	44.4%	46.2%	-	42.9%	
Cohabiting	32.3%	34.8%	-	30.2%	
Married	23.3%	18.9%	**	26.9%	
Duration	3.43	3.19	*	3.62	0.5-14
<i>Sociodemographic/Background Characteristics</i>					
Female	54.6%				
Age	25.43	25.47	-	25.39	22-29
Race/Ethnicity (Anglo) ^a	66.9%	66.6%	-	67.2%	
African American	21.3%	21.3%	-	21.3%	
Hispanic	11.3%	11.4%	-	11.3%	
Respondent Education (High School)	18.4%	22.3%	**	15.2%	
Less than High School	8.2%	8.5%	-	7.9%	
Some College	38.7%	37.4%	-	39.7%	
College or more	34.7%	31.8%	†	37.2%	
Employment Status (Full-Time)	55.9%	63.0%	***	50.0%	
Part-Time	19.2%	15.2%	**	22.5%	
Unemployed	24.9%	21.8%	*	27.5%	
Respondents' Prior Intimate Partner Violence	55.6%	61.1%	**	51.0%	
Respondents' General Deviance	0.28	0.38	***	0.20	0-3.4
Peers' General Deviance	0.74	0.97	***	0.54	0-5.6
<i>Family of Origin Factors^b</i>					
Family Structure (Two Biological)	53.5%	58.1%	*	49.6%	
Single Parents	21.0%	19.9%	-	21.9%	
Step Parent	13.6%	12.3%	-	14.6%	
Other	12.0%	9.7%	†	13.8%	
Mother's Education (High School)	32.4%	32.5%	-	32.4%	
Less than High School	10.8%	9.7%	-	11.7%	
Some College	33.4%	33.4%	-	33.4%	
College or more	23.4%	24.4%	-	22.5%	

Source: Toledo Adolescent Relationships Study 2011/2012

Note: ^a Constructed from initial interview, respondent questionnaire; ^b Variables constructed from initial interview, parent questionnaire; remaining variables constructed from fifth interview of interviewing; reference categories in parentheses

†p<0.10 *p<0.05. **p<0.01. ***p<0.001.

Table 2. Coefficients and Standard Errors for the OLS Regression of Family Violence, and Peers' Intimate Partner Violence Behaviors and Attitudes on Frequency of Any Intimate Partner Violence (n = 928)

	Model 1 (Zero Order)		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
	b	(SE)	b	(SE)	b	(SE)	B	(SE)
<i>Family Violence</i>								
Coercive Parenting ^a	0.14*	(0.05)	0.04	(0.05)			0.04	(0.05)
Witnessing Parental Violence	0.51***	(0.06)	0.30***	(0.06)			0.23***	(0.06)
<i>Peers' Behaviors and Attitudes</i>								
Peers' Partner Violence	0.40***	(0.04)			0.22***	(0.04)	0.20***	(0.04)
Peers' Attitudes toward Partner Violence	0.30***	(0.03)			0.11**	(0.03)	0.09**	(0.03)
<i>Relationship Characteristics</i>								
Romantic Relationship (Dating)								
Cohabiting	0.19**	(0.06)	0.12*	(0.06)	0.14*	(0.06)	0.14*	(0.06)
Married	-0.04	(0.06)	0.04	(0.08)	0.07	(0.08)	0.07	(0.08)
Duration	0.03**	(0.01)	0.03**	(0.01)	0.03**	(0.01)	0.03**	(0.01)
<i>Sociodemographic/Background Characteristics</i>								
Female	0.04	(0.06)	0.14**	(0.05)	0.08	(0.05)	0.08	(0.05)
Age	-0.01	(0.02)	-0.01	(0.01)	-0.01	(0.01)	-0.01	(0.01)
Race/Ethnicity (Anglo) ^a								
Black	0.30***	(0.07)	0.10	(0.07)	0.02	(0.07)	-0.00	(0.07)
Hispanic	0.26**	(0.09)	0.10	(0.08)	0.10	(0.08)	0.09	(0.08)
Respondent Education (High School)								
Less than High School	0.30**	(0.10)	-0.09	(0.10)	-0.11	(0.10)	-0.10	(0.10)
Some College	0.10†	(0.06)	-0.03	(0.07)	-0.00	(0.07)	0.01	(0.07)
College or more	-0.35***	(0.06)	-0.07	(0.08)	-0.03	(0.08)	-0.00	(0.08)
Employment Status (Full-Time)								
Part-Time	0.03	(0.07)	0.04	(0.07)	0.02	(0.07)	0.02	(0.07)
Unemployed	0.35***	(0.06)	0.24***	(0.06)	0.20**	(0.06)	0.20**	(0.06)
Respondents' Prior Intimate Partner Violence	0.38***	(0.05)	0.22***	(0.05)	0.20***	(0.05)	0.19***	(0.05)
Respondents' General Deviance	0.35***	(0.06)	0.16*	(0.07)	0.20**	(0.07)	0.18**	(0.06)
Peers' General Deviance	0.28***	(0.03)	0.18***	(0.04)	0.13***	(0.04)	0.12***	(0.04)
<i>Family of Origin Factors^b</i>								
Family Structure (two biological)								
Single Parents	0.31***	(0.07)	0.15*	(0.07)	0.17*	(0.07)	0.15*	(0.07)
Step Parent	0.02	(0.08)	-0.05	(0.08)	-0.01	(0.08)	-0.04	(0.08)
Other	0.26**	(0.08)	0.13	(0.08)	0.17*	(0.08)	0.16*	(0.08)
Mother's Education (High School)								
Less than High School	0.32***	(0.09)	0.05	(0.09)	0.05	(0.09)	0.02	(0.09)
Some College	0.05	(0.06)	0.07	(0.06)	0.05	(0.06)	0.05	(0.06)
College or more	-0.27***	(0.06)	-0.02	(0.07)	-0.02	(0.07)	-0.01	(0.07)
R ²				0.23		0.25		0.27

Source: Toledo Adolescent Relationships Study 2011/2012

Note: ^a Constructed from initial interview, respondent questionnaire; ^b Variables constructed from initial interview, parent questionnaire; remaining variables constructed from fifth interview of interviewing; reference categories in parentheses

†p<0.10 *p<0.05. **p<0.01. ***p<0.001.

Table 3. Coefficients and Standard Errors for the OLS Regression of Family Violence, Peers' Intimate Partner Violence Behaviors and Attitudes, and Interaction Effects of Gender and Peers Behaviors and Attitudes on Frequency of Any Intimate Partner Violence (n = 928)

	Model 1		Model 2	
	b	(SE)	B	(SE)
<i>Family Violence</i>				
Coercive Parenting ^a	0.04	(0.05)	0.04	(0.05)
Witnessing Parental Violence	0.23***	(0.06)	0.23***	(0.06)
<i>Peers' Behaviors and Attitudes</i>				
Peers' Partner Violence	0.23***	(0.06)	0.20***	(0.04)
Peers' Attitudes toward Partner Violence	0.09**	(0.03)	0.10*	(0.05)
<i>Relationship Characteristics</i>				
Romantic Relationship (Dating)				
Cohabiting	0.13*	(0.06)	0.13*	(0.06)
Married	0.06	(0.08)	0.06	(0.08)
Duration	0.03**	(0.01)	0.03**	(0.01)
<i>Sociodemographic/Background Characteristics</i>				
Female	0.16	(0.11)	0.10	(0.13)
Age	-0.01	(0.01)	-0.01	(0.01)
Race/Ethnicity (Anglo) ^a				
Black	0.00	(0.07)	-0.00	(0.07)
Hispanic	0.09	(0.08)	0.09	(0.08)
Respondent Education (High School)				
Less than High School	-0.09	(0.10)	-0.10	(0.10)
Some College	0.01	(0.07)	0.01	(0.07)
College or more	0.00	(0.08)	-0.00	(0.08)
Employment Status (Full-Time)				
Part-Time	0.02	(0.07)	0.02	(0.07)
Unemployed	0.20**	(0.06)	0.20**	(0.06)
Respondents' Prior Intimate Partner Violence	0.19***	(0.05)	0.19***	(0.05)
Respondents' General Deviance	0.18**	(0.06)	0.18**	(0.06)
Peers' General Deviance	0.12**	(0.04)	0.12***	(0.04)
<i>Family of Origin Factors^b</i>				
Family Structure (two biological)				
Single Parents	0.15*	(0.07)	0.15*	(0.07)
Step Parent	-0.04	(0.08)	-0.04	(0.08)
Other	0.16*	(0.08)	0.17*	(0.08)
Mother's Education (High School)				
Less than High School	0.02	(0.09)	0.02	(0.09)
Some College	0.06	(0.06)	0.05	(0.06)
College or more	-0.01	(0.07)	-0.01	(0.07)
<i>Interaction of Gender and Peers' Attitudes and Behaviors</i>				
Female* Peers' Partner Violence	-0.05	(0.07)		
Female* Peers' Attitudes toward Partner Violence			-0.01	(0.06)
R ²		0.27		0.27

Source: Toledo Adolescent Relationships Study 2011/2012

Note: ^a Constructed from initial interview, respondent questionnaire; ^b Variables constructed from initial interview, parent questionnaire; remaining variables constructed from fifth interview of interviewing; reference categories in parentheses

†p<0.10 *p<0.05. **p<0.01. ***p<0.001.

Table 4. Coefficients and Standard Errors for the OLS Regression of Family Violence, Peers' Intimate Partner Violence Behaviors and Attitudes, and Interaction Effects of Gender and Family Violence on Frequency of Any Intimate Partner Violence (n = 928)

	Model 1		Model 2	
	b	(SE)	b	(SE)
<i>Family Violence</i>				
Coercive Parenting ^a	0.02	(0.07)	0.04	(0.05)
Witnessing Parental Violence	0.23***	(0.06)	0.20*	(0.08)
<i>Peers' Behaviors and Attitudes</i>				
Peers' Partner Violence	0.20***	(0.04)	0.19**	(0.04)
Peers' Attitudes toward Partner Violence	0.09**	(0.03)	0.09*	(0.03)
<i>Relationship Characteristics</i>				
Romantic Relationship (Dating)				
Cohabiting	0.14*	(0.06)	0.14*	(0.06)
Married	0.07	(0.08)	0.07	(0.08)
Duration	0.03**	(0.01)	0.03**	(0.01)
<i>Sociodemographic/Background Characteristics</i>				
Female	0.06	(0.07)	0.06	(0.06)
Age	-0.02	(0.01)	-0.01	(0.01)
Race/Ethnicity (Anglo) ^a				
Black	0.00	(0.07)	0.00	(0.07)
Hispanic	0.09	(0.08)	0.09	(0.08)
Respondent Education (High School)				
Less than High School	-0.10	(0.10)	-0.10	(0.10)
Some College	0.01	(0.07)	0.01	(0.07)
College or more	0.00	(0.08)	-0.00	(0.08)
Employment Status (Full-Time)				
Part-Time	0.02	(0.07)	0.02	(0.07)
Unemployed	0.20**	(0.06)	0.20**	(0.06)
Respondents' Prior Intimate Partner Violence	0.19***	(0.05)	0.19***	(0.05)
Respondents' General Deviance	0.18**	(0.06)	0.18**	(0.06)
Peers' General Deviance	0.12***	(0.04)	0.13***	(0.04)
<i>Family of Origin Factors^b</i>				
Family Structure (two biological)				
Single Parents	0.15*	(0.07)	0.15*	(0.07)
Step Parent	-0.04	(0.08)	-0.04	(0.08)
Other	0.16*	(0.08)	0.16*	(0.08)
Mother's Education (High School)				
Less than High School	0.02	(0.09)	0.02	(0.09)
Some College	0.05	(0.06)	0.05	(0.06)
College or more	-0.01	(0.07)	-0.01	(0.07)
<i>Interaction of Gender and Family Violence</i>				
Female* Coercive Parenting	0.04	(0.10)		
Female* Witnessing Parental Violence			0.05	0.05 (0.10)
R ²		0.27		0.27

Source: Toledo Adolescent Relationships Study 2011/2012

Note: ^a Constructed from initial interview, respondent questionnaire; ^b Variables constructed from initial interview, parent questionnaire; remaining variables constructed from fifth interview of interviewing; reference categories in parentheses †p<0.10 *p<0.05. **p<0.01. ***p<0.001.

