Bowling Green State University
The Center for Family and Demographic Research
http://www.bgsu.edu/organizations/cfdr
Phone: (419) 372-7279 cfdr@bgsu.edu

2013 Working Paper Series

ANGER, CONTROL, AND INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE IN YOUNG ADULTHOOD: A SYMBOLIC INTERACTIONIST PERSPECTIVE

Peggy C. Giordano

Jennifer E. Copp

Wendy D. Manning

Monica A. Longmore

Department of Sociology
and Center for Family and Demographic Research
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, OH 43403
pgiorda@bgsu.edu

*This research was supported by grants from The Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (HD036223 and HD044206), the Department of Health and Human Services (5APRPA006009), and by the Center for Family and Demographic Research, Bowling Green State University, which has core funding from The Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (R24HD050959). Direct correspondence to Peggy C. Giordano, Department of Sociology, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, OH 43403 pgiorda@bgsu.edu.

ANGER, CONTROL, AND INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE IN YOUNG ADULTHOOD: A SYMBOLIC INTERACTIONIST PERSPECTIVE

ABSTRACT

Drawing on a symbolic interactionist perspective, we critically evaluate the assertion that intimate partner violence (IPV) is not about anger, but about (male) power and control. This perspective provides a basis for expecting that: a) anger as well as control dynamics will be associated with higher odds of IPV perpetration, and that b) women's as well as men's attempts to control partners or aspects of the relationship will be associated with higher risk. To empirically evaluate these two hypotheses, we rely on the fourth wave of interviews conducted with respondents who participated in a longitudinal study (Toledo Adolescent Relationships Study) (n = 985). Results indicate that after controlling for traditional predictors such as exposure to coercive parenting practices, residing in a disadvantaged neighborhood and affiliating with violent peers (assessed at wave one), both male and female control attempts are associated with higher risk of young adult IPV, and the index of female control contributes to model fit. Subsequently we include two dimensions of anger (anger identity and relationship-based anger), and results indicate that these are significant, and also add to the fit of the model. Supplemental models explore the association between various combinations of anger and control and violence reports and incorporate interactions of gender and the anger and control constructs.

ANGER, CONTROL, AND INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE IN YOUNG ADULTHOOD: A SYMBOLIC INTERACTIONIST PERSPECTIVE

INTRODUCTION

A key premise of theorizing about intimate partner violence (IPV) is that such actions are not about anger as much as about (male) power and control (Anderson, 2005; Dobash and Dobash, 1979; Komter, 1989; Smith, White, and Moracco, 2009; Yllo, 1993). This is a very useful insight, as the emphasis on violence as a form of control serves to highlight that IPV can be conceptualized as an extension of fundamentally gendered, often inequitable power arrangements. Consistent with this view, prior research has demonstrated a link between men's controlling actions and IPV (Whitaker, 2013). Yet recent theoretical developments in the sociology of emotions tradition stress that emotional processes are central to all but the most routine of human actions (Massey, 2002), and more focused theories have highlighted that anger has an intuitive connection to violent behavior and other forms of crime (Agnew, 2001; Giordano, Schroeder, and Cernkovich, 2007). Thus, the current investigation represents an integration of these traditions in considering the role of both anger and control as factors associated with variations in the perpetration of intimate partner violence. We focus here on the period of young adulthood when self-report and official statistics indicate that levels of IPV are especially high (Capaldi et al., 2012; Catalano, 2012; Rennison, 2001).

A second objective of the study is to investigate women's own feelings of anger and actions (control attempts) within violent and non-violent relationships. Traditional feminist theorizing has focused primarily on men's controlling actions, as violence against women is associated with more severe consequences, both in terms of degree of emotional and physical harms to female victims (Reed et al, 2010; Tjaden and Thoennes, 2006). Nevertheless, our view is that a comprehensive treatment of IPV will include attention to women's relationship concerns and associated emotions/control attempts, as these may also be associated with violence risk. Thus, we consider men and women's emotions (anger) and relationship behaviors (control attempts) associated with IPV, recognizing that the meanings of control attempts, sources of anger and even the use of violence may be distinctly gendered (Anderson, 2013). We

outline a symbolic interactionist perspective on anger and control within intimate relationships that provides a conceptual basis for the following hypotheses: 1) both control attempts and anger will be associated with reports of IPV perpetration; and 2) women's as well as men's control attempts will be associated with higher odds of IPV, relative to the more frequently emphasized situation characterized only by high levels of male control.

Analyses rely on structured interview data collected from the Toledo Adolescent Relationships Study (TARS). The TARS is a longitudinal investigation of the intimate relationships of 1,092 respondents interviewed four times, first as adolescents (ages 12-17), and subsequently as they have entered the phase of young adulthood (ages 18-23 at the fourth interview). We focus primarily on perpetration, as these actions have a more intuitive association with the respondent's own reports of angry emotions, and perceptions of control dynamics, relative to factors that may influence a partner's actions. However, supplemental analyses examine associations between the focal variables and IPV victimization. Models assess whether anger, the individual's own control attempts and reports of partner's attempts to control are associated with IPV perpetration, once sociodemographic characteristics and traditional predictors (parental coercion, residing in a disadvantaged neighborhood, affiliation with violent peers, antisocial behavior of respondent, antisocial behavior of partner) are taken into account. Next we consider interactions of gender with the anger and control factors, in order to determine whether negative emotions and control dynamics have a similar or distinct influence on men's and women's reports of IPV perpetration. Finally, we move beyond the traditional variable centered approach by considering how anger and control coalesce at the individual level, to explore directly the idea that anger combined with mutual control is an especially risky pattern-- relative to the traditional situation characterized by elevated levels of male control.

BACKGROUND

Traditional risk factors

Much prior research on etiological factors associated with IPV has emphasized the role of early exposure to violence within the family, and researchers have accordingly focused attention on risk factors such as witnessing parents' violence as well as being abused as a child (see also Gomez, 2011; Cui et al., 2013). In an assessment of this research tradition, Foshee and colleagues (2011) concluded that child abuse, relative to witnessing marital violence, has a greater influence on IPV. Although many studies rely on retrospective reports, some longitudinal investigations have documented the impact of these family dynamics on subsequent IPV (e.g., O'Donnell et al., 2006; Simons, Lin, and Gordon, 1998). Wolf and Foshee (2003) explicitly suggested a role for anger as a mediator of these family experiences, concluding that children exposed to family violence may "develop different anger expression styles than children who are not exposed to family violence" (p. 311).

Other research studies connecting anger and IPV have documented a general association, but have not always been explicit about the meaning of anger or its place in the etiology of IPV. Although researchers such as Wolf and Foshee have suggested a link to family history, other studies conceptualize anger as an individual difference/personality trait (Eckhardt, Samper, and Murphy, 2008; Follingstad et al., 1991; Moffitt et al., 2000; Swan et al., 2005). A variant of this approach focuses on the antisocial tendencies of the individual (e.g., delinquency involvement), which further supports the idea of a general propensity toward violence. And indeed, prior research has consistently documented that delinquency and other risky behaviors are significantly associated with IPV (Capaldi et al., 2012; Herrera, Wiersma, and Cleveland, 2008; Lussier, Farrington, and Moffitt, 2009; O'Donnell et al., 2006; Theobold, and Farrington, 2012).

Nevertheless, more general research on patterns of IPV has also shown that even when risk is elevated (based on family history, delinquent background), individuals frequently exhibit considerable variability in behavior across time and different relationships (Capaldi, Shortt, and Crosby, 2003). Such findings suggest the utility of exploring more proximal, relationship-based processes that are associated with variations in IPV perpetration. Feminist perspectives have moved theory and applied efforts forward in this regard by extending the lens beyond general risk factors to consider uniquely gendered relationship

dynamics associated with this form of violent behavior.

Feminist perspectives on Power, Control, and IPV

Feminist perspectives have shed light on ways in which structural sources of inequality such as gender differences in access to resources and specific cultural attitudes (e.g., beliefs about male privilege) are directly connected to intimate partner violence (Walker, 1984). Analyses in this tradition thus theorize about the specifics of male-female relationships rather than relying on more generic concepts. A central theme is that violence against women is an extension of these broader structural and cultural forces, and is best understood as a means of maintaining power and control over female partners (Boonzaier, 2008; Jackson, 1999; Larkin and Popaleni, 1994).

Power and control issues are also central to many prevention and treatment efforts. For example, numerous programs rely on a teaching tool, the Minnesota Power and Control Wheel, which depicts power and control at the center of a wheel highlighting related relationship dynamics (Pence and Paymar, 2006). Various spokes describe controlling actions and other forms of abuse (e.g., emotional abuse, isolating the partner) associated with unhealthy relationships and violence. The concept of male privilege (defined as: "Treating her like a servant; Making all the decisions; Acting like the 'master of the castle'; Being the one to define men's and women's roles") is one of the spokes, highlighting that traditional gender beliefs are connected to these negative relationship dynamics.

Several empirical studies support this emphasis on male dominance assertion. For example, Lloyd and Emery (2000), in a qualitative study, recruited respondents based on their prior experience in an abusive relationship. Women described accounts of almost complete male dominance within their relationships. As one young woman interviewed put it, "it was like I was his. I didn't speak unless spoken to… I was his property, and I had no use except making his life more easy" (p. 72). Results of analyses of survey data have also documented an association between controlling behaviors and violence, suggesting the need to account for such proximal features of the relationship (Stets and Pirog-Good, 1987).

Although this line of theorizing has been an important underpinning of research and applied efforts, our view is that it is potentially useful to further problematize the relationship dynamics and emotional processes that may be connected to male control attempts, and to focus additional attention on women's perspectives, emotions and actions within relationships. This emphasis is consistent with some third wave feminist treatments of power relations, which have increasingly focused on the idea that even subordinate groups have modes of resistance or opportunities to contest their current situation (Schippers and Sapp, 2012). This broader focus also accords with a symbolic interactionist viewpoint, which highlights the fundamentally interpersonal nature of the meaning construction process (Blumer, 1969).

A SYMBOLIC INTERACTIONIST PERSPECTIVE ON ANGER AND CONTROLLING BEHAVIORS: THE ROLE OF 'BLOCKED ACTION'

Overt control attempts and violence are appropriately viewed as dominance moves, as feminist perspectives on IPV have previously argued. However, attempts to control the partner and violence itself signal the presence of problematic situations or 'blocked action,' as elaborated by Mead and other symbolic interaction theorists (Matsueda, 2006; Reynolds and Herman-Kenney, 2003). This emphasis on concrete situations that intimate partners confront differs from the view of IPV as a relatively straightforward extension of male privilege, or as a reflection of a general need to demonstrate control and dominance within the relationship. Thus, the more localized perspective favored by symbolic interaction theorists is consistent with the notion that male partners may not be as concerned with solidifying their own power positions as they are with moving ahead in terms of specific goals or desired lines of action. These intentions and actions need not be lofty or prosocial, and are subjectively experienced. For example, a young man may hope for a high degree of commitment from a partner, while simultaneously wishing to 'play the field' (Miller and White, 2003). A partner's actions may signify to the individual a lack of relationship commitment, even though objective evidence does not support this interpretation. Some desires may appear to transcend relationship concerns, but in the long run have implications for the state of the relationship (e.g., declaring an intention to spend the evening

with friends rather than the partner). The SI perspective recognizes that prior socialization across multiple levels figures heavily into what is brought into concrete situations, but does not fully constitute them. Instead, interaction and communication within the intimate context are integral to the meaning construction process, and the lines of action that eventually unfold.

As Mead (1934) noted, routine, habitual actions occasion little reflection or emotion. In those situations in which actions are blocked, however, the individual cannot move forward relying solely on previously taken-for-granted repertoires. It is within situations involving blocked action, then, that thoughts (cognitions) and feelings (emotions) arise. Thus, in our view, the presence of control attempts itself reflects a previous or immediate failure to control, manage, or complete action relating to specific contested domains. These domains have been rendered problematic through the process of communication that occurs within the relationship. Logically, if men had achieved an all-powerful position within a given relationship, violence would not be necessary and compliance with the male partner's interests would always be forthcoming (see Athens, 2005; Griffiths, Yule, and Gartner, 2011; Komter, 1989). That verbal conflict is a strong predictor of physical violence is generally supportive of a view of power as contested terrain, not as a stable, agreed upon state reliably favoring the male partner (Jacobson et al., 1994; Murphy and O'Leary, 1989; Schumacher and Leonard, 2005). Further, if we accept the general notion that control attempts derive from the perception that desired actions are blocked, then it follows that emotions should also come to the fore within these same situations. This lends support to our first hypothesis, namely that control attempts and anger often coexist as dynamic processes associated with IPV, and should not be opposed conceptually (i.e., the notion that it is not about anger, but about power and control). Violence extends the control attempt to a new level, but is likely to be understood as evolving from one or more failure (to control) experiences. Emotions are integral to this set of experiences.

Incorporating anger into the sequences of action and reaction associated with IPV is intuitive, and also provides a conceptual bridge between traditional predictors (e.g., violence within the family, growing up in a disadvantaged context) and concerns that are specific to a given intimate relationship. In the

current study, we consider two manifestations of anger. First, as scholars have previously noted, the emotional self is a recognized and relatively stable feature of one's identity (Engdahl, 2004; Lupton, 1998). Although one's *anger identity* is likely to be shaped by earlier experiences, it represents a unique crystallization and interpretation of those experiences. In turn, emotional identity gains meaning as a cognitive filter that influences actions into the future, as one inevitably encounters novel situations. However, a second dimension of anger is further situated in light of the specific concerns within a given relationship. In the current study, then, we focus not only on anger identity but also *relationship-based feelings of anger*.

Incorporating women's views and actions

Feminist perspectives on IPV and programmatic efforts have focused central attention on male controlling behaviors as a warning sign and key relationship dynamic within violent relationships. Our first hypothesis suggests that the emphasis is appropriate, but could be broadened to incorporate emotional processes (anger) as well. However, the focus on 'blocked action' also provides a conceptual basis for including greater attention to women's own perspectives, feelings and relationship behaviors. Scholars have been somewhat reluctant to explore women's perspectives and actions to avoid 'blaming the victim' or otherwise suggesting that either their discourse or behaviors are related to the violence that occurs. However, the SI perspective suggests that meanings and lines of action are not preordained, but emergent from interaction and communication. Thus, it may be limiting to the goal of developing a comprehensive portrait of relationship dynamics associated with IPV to bracket off women's own concerns and relationship-based behaviors. This can be accomplished within a feminist framework, and without arguing that there is 'sexual symmetry' in the experience and consequences of IPV (Dobash et al., 1992; Kimmel, 2002).

Our focus on blocked action provides a general rationale for including attention to women's feelings and relationship behaviors. Thus, we emphasize that women are not inured to the experience of 'blocked action' within intimate contexts, as partners resist their desired goals, intentions, and preferred ideas about

the direction of the relationship. This in turn suggests that women's feelings of anger and attempts to control their partners may also be present, heighten discord, and significantly associated with the odds of experiencing violence. This conceptual focus leads to the second hypothesis, namely that women's feelings of anger and attempts to control the partner are also likely to be elevated in relationships characterized by IPV.

Recent studies of gender and relationship dynamics

Contemporary research on dynamics within intimate relationships during adolescence and young adulthood provides further support for the hypotheses we will examine in the current investigation. Early studies of power and control dynamics were based largely on studies of married couples (Komter, 1989), and portraits of violent relationships often centered on clinic or shelter populations that also included older married or cohabiting women. Yet recent research indicates that during adolescence and early adulthood, a majority of individuals do not report that men hold a dominant position within their intimate relationships. In a recent study of characteristics of adolescent romantic relationships, based on a large heterogeneous sample, male respondents on average reported higher levels of partner control attempts and greater 'actual' influence of the partner than their female counterparts, and overall both male and female adolescents were more likely to report either an egalitarian pattern or a power balance that favored the female partner (author citation, 2006; see also Galliher et al., 1999). Importantly, at subsequent follow-ups, similar patterns by gender were observed as respondents navigated the transition to adulthood (i.e., male respondents continued to report higher levels of partner control attempts across all of the ages covered by the study, as well as a less favorable power balance—see author citation, 2012).

Because heterosexual relationships during this time bridge considerable difference and are typically fluid and unsettled, it is perhaps inevitable that some elements of mismatch will occur. Thus, in contrast to friendships, which proceed on the basis of considerable similarity, power, defined as the ability to get one's way, given a disagreement, becomes a fundamentally more important construct within the context of dating relationships. However, within the confines of romantic relationships, particularly during

adolescence and young adulthood, the power balance is often not perfectly stable or finalized. This notion is consistent with treatments of power favored by symbolic interaction theorists (Dennis and Martin, 2005), and as suggested at the outset, with some third wave feminist perspectives. For example, Schippers and Sapp (2012: 32) recently suggested that third wave treatments "conceive of power as relational, having multiple tactics and strategies, and as available to subordinate groups and not just the possession of dominant groups" (see also Martin, 1988). This unfinished view seems especially appropriate as we explore behaviors such as attempts to control the partner that are taking place during this phase of life. The period itself is characterized by much uncertainty, and the dating and cohabiting relationships common during this period lack the clear cultural and legal weight of marriage bonds (Manning and Smock, 2005).

During young adulthood, both women and men are in the process of changing their style of socializing from a heavy emphasis on peers to a more concentrated focus on romantic relationships, developing a greater level of commitment to a particular partner, and attempting to solidify their present and future economic prospects (Arnett, 2004; Settersten and Ray, 2010; Zimmer-Gembeck, 2002). Partners may not be on the same timetable or hold the same perspective regarding these important transitions, suggesting that these may emerge as key contested domains within relationships during this period. Further, if we consider that control attempts are often linked to such domains of contestation, the relatively high scores of young men on partner control attempts and women's own self-reports about their controlling actions are rendered more intuitive and understandable. For example, prior research has shown that young men are more likely to engage in problem behaviors such as drug and alcohol use, earn lower grades, and in the contemporary economic climate may face difficulties securing steady employment (Duckworth and Seligman, 2006; Moffitt et al., 2001; Settersten and Ray, 2010). In addition, young men may prefer spending a significant amount of time with their friends (Weerman and Hoeve, 2012), and also typically report higher levels of cheating or 'concordance' (Ford, Sohn, and Lepkowski, 2002; Miller, 2008). Thus, it is reasonable to expect that young women may attempt to influence intimate partners about one or more of these areas that are also having a significant influence on

their own lives (Manning et al., 2011).

Young people may try to move partners toward their own positions by engaging in control attempts. While prior theorizing has tended to emphasize the controlling behaviors of male partners, the base rates of female control attempts described above suggest the need to incorporate attention to women's behaviors within the romantic realm as well. Consistent with this view, Stets and colleagues' research showed that not only were men's reports of controlling behaviors significantly related to the experience of IPV, but that women generally reported higher levels of control attempts, which were associated with violence inflicted and sustained (Stets, 1992; Stets and Pirog-Good, 1987). Building on this prior research, we hypothesize that situations involving high levels of control attempts on the part of both individual and partner may be especially risky, as this involves reciprocal and potentially escalating negative feedback.

The feminist emphasis on patterns of male socialization is potentially important to the process of establishing meaning, however, as the level of resentment about control may map onto traditionally gendered beliefs and understandings. As young men are the historically favored gender, and are often socialized to develop a more competitive interaction style, some young men may view women's attempts to control as aversive and something to be avoided. This dynamic is conceptually distinct from the traditional focus on men's general desire to control their partners that has been stressed in prior research and in most programmatic efforts. In turn, young women may be demoralized and angry not only about their partner's control attempts, but about their own failure to control their partner's actions or other aspects of the relationship.

Thus, control attempts are likely to be associated with negative emotions, but our intent is to highlight further the localized nature of these dynamic processes. For example, the partner who searches the other's cell phone is engaging in a behavior that is 'controlling,' but this encompasses the individual's own view of the seriousness of the relationship and attempt to control the level of commitment that characterizes it. These are relationship specific concerns that may be experienced by women as well as men, and arguably have more felt impact as individuals begin to mature into adulthood. Increasingly,

one's romantic partner becomes a reflection on one's own identity in ways that friends and even the family of origin do not. In addition, it may be difficult to carry out one's life plans and impossible to construct one's ideal intimate relationship without the partner's cooperation. But while the relationship stakes may be higher than during adolescence, and thus disappointments to weigh more heavily, the strength of the angry reaction is also likely to have been shaped by previous social exposure, as described in investigations emphasizing social learning mechanisms (e.g., violence within the family of origin). Thus, both processes emphasized by traditional criminological/family violence scholars and relationship specific dynamics are important to a comprehensive treatment of this form of violent behavior. And gender socialization inevitably comes into play, as the male partner's generally greater size, strength and socialization in the use of violence often combine to upend what may have been an earlier pattern of mutual control attempts and even a balance of power that in some respects favored the female partner. Thus, the endpoint of violence is aptly described in prior feminist treatments of the subject, but as currently developed may not offer a comprehensive view of the progression of relationship dynamics that eventuate in violent episodes.

The Current Study

We draw on structured interview data from young adults who participated in a longitudinal study, to explore the linkages between the respondent's own attempts to control/change the partner, the respondent's report of partner's control attempts, feelings of anger, and odds of IPV perpetration. We move beyond prior work by including measures of emotional processes as well as control attempts of male and female partners. A further contribution is that models focus on proximal relationship dynamics, but control for traditional predictors of IPV, including parental coercion, association with violent peers and residing in a disadvantaged neighborhood (Cunradi et al., 2000; Foster and Brooks-Gunn, 2009; Haynie and Payne, 2006). In addition, analyses incorporate indices tapping early and contemporaneous reports of criminal involvement, in order to control for a general propensity toward antisocial behavior. To account for similar effects of the partner's antisocial orientation, we include a measure of the partner's

criminal involvement (Herrera, Wiersma, and Cleveland, 2008). Our goal is to determine whether relationship dynamics and emotional processes make a difference for understanding variations in IPV perpetration, once early social exposure and the delinquency profiles of the partners have been taken into account. Our analyses focus principally upon IPV perpetration, as feelings of anger and resentment about control dynamics may be related more directly to the individual's own actions, relative to those of the partner. However, supplemental models explore these relationships relying on a measure of victimization and subsequently reports of 'any violence' (whether as perpetrator or victim) as the dependent variable. Next, we explore whether gender influences the nature of the association between the focal variables and IPV. This makes a contribution by exploring whether the traditional focus on male control is appropriate, or requires expansion to include a role for women's control attempts. Finally, in contrast the tendency of prior research to treat emotions and control dynamics as independent elements, we estimate a model that includes a range of combinations of anger and control. This will allow us to examine more directly the hypothesis that relationships characterized by anger and mutual control are an especially risky pattern, relative to other combinations.

DATA AND METHODS

This research draws on data from the TARS, which is based on a stratified random sample of 1,321 adolescents and their parents/guardians. The TARS data were collected in the years 2001, 2002, 2004, and 2006. The analyses rely on structured interviews conducted at waves 1 and 4. A majority of responses were entered directly by respondents on preloaded laptops. Wave 1 also included the administration of a questionnaire to a parent/guardian (typically the mother), and these responses were used to assess parental coercion, neighborhood disadvantage and other sociodemographic information described in more detail below. The sampling frame of the TARS study encompassed 62 schools across seven school districts. The initial sample was drawn from enrollment records for 7th, 9th, and 11th grades, but school attendance was not a requirement for inclusion in the study. The stratified, random sample was devised by the National Opinion Research Center and includes over-samples of black and

Hispanic adolescents. The initial sample included 1,321 respondents and wave 4 retained 1,092 valid respondents, or 83% of wave 1.[1] The respondents' average age is 15 years in wave 1, 16 in wave 2, 18 in wave 3, and 21 years in wave 4. The analytic sample includes all those who participated in the wave 4 interview, but individuals who were not identified as black, white or Hispanic were excluded (n = 22), as were those respondents who did not report about a current or most recent relationship (n = 85). The final analytic sample thus consists of 985 respondents (460 males and 525 females), of which 701 were dating, 218 were cohabiting, and 66 were married.

Measures

Appendix Table A1 presents descriptive statistics for all study variables by gender and IPV status (whether or not the respondent self-reported IPV perpetration).

Dependent Variables

Our analyses explore variations in self-reported IPV perpetration. However, we also estimate all models focusing on similar items indexing victimization, a measure of "any violence" (whether as perpetrator or victim), and various measures of severity.[2] Results are similar, regardless of the form of the dependent variable. However, we recognize the limitations of the CTS measure for capturing important contextual variations in the experience of IPV. Accordingly, we also conducted extensive open-ended qualitative interviews with a subset of the TARS respondents who had reported IPV (n = 102), as well as additional couple-level interviews (46 partners of core respondents). Although it is beyond the scope of the current analysis to analyze these materials in depth, the in-depth interview data provided additional context for developing our theoretical discussion, hypotheses, and the manner in which we structured the quantitative analyses.

Relationship violence perpetration is measured at wave 4 and is based on responses to four items from the revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS) (Straus and Gelles, 1990), including whether the respondent had "thrown something at," "pushed, shoved, or grabbed," "slapped in the face or head with

an open hand," and "hit," in reference to experiences with the current/most recent partner (alpha = .88).

Key Independent Variables

We note that while traditional predictors and other sociodemographic factors are all measured at wave 1, control, anger, and IPV are all assessed at wave 4. This approach is appropriate within the context of the current study, as our goal is to provide a descriptive portrait of dynamics within these relatively fluid dating and cohabiting relationships. It is thus critical that the reports about relationship dynamics and emotional reactions reference the same partner who is the focus of the IPV reports. However, this limits our ability to firmly establish a causal order in relation to what may be best characterized as a package of interrelated and dynamic relationship processes.

Control attempts are derived from two measures. The first measure consisting of two items asking how much the respondent agreed with the following statements: "X sometimes wants to control what I do" and "X always tries to change me" (alpha=.79). In addition two items index the *respondent's attempt to control their partners* (alpha = .78) and asks how strongly respondents agree with the following two statements: "I sometimes try to control what X does" and "I always try to change X." In order to capture men and women's control attempts within these relationships, a measure of *female control attempts* was constructed that includes reports from women about their own behavior and those of male respondents referencing female partners. Similarly, *male control attempts* includes reports from male respondents and from women reporting about male partner behavior. We also estimated more gender neutral models retaining the focus on respondent reports about their controlling actions and reports regarding partners, and results do not differ significantly from those presented in Table 1.

Anger. Anger is conceptualized as including an identity component as well as being an emotion potentially linked to interactions with the romantic partner. *Anger identity* is based on a question from a roster of various descriptors and includes the instruction to indicate the level of agreement or disagreement that others would describe you as _____ (e.g., studious, troubled, sexy, angry). Thus, anger identity reflects the respondent's level of agreement that others would describe them as angry (see

Matsueda, 1992). *Relationship-based anger* includes 3 items from a larger list of emotions experienced "the last time you were with your partner." Of the possible responses (e.g., excited, afraid, comforted, etc.), we included in this index respondents' levels of agreement that they had felt "hostile," "frustrated," and "upset" the last item they were with the partner (alpha = .81). In the interest of parsimony, supplemental models that construct dummy variables referencing a large number of anger and control combinations rely on a composite index of anger that includes both of these dimensions (alpha = .75).

Traditional Predictors

Coercive Parenting is measured using a six-item scale (alpha = .80) from the wave 1 parent questionnaire asking parents to indicate, during the past month, how often they have: "gotten angry at their child," "criticized their child," "shouted or yelled at their child," "argued with their child," "threatened to physically hurt their child," and "pushed, grabbed, slapped, or hit their child" (responses range from "never" to "very often").

Disadvantaged Neighborhood is a ten-item scale (alpha = .91) from the wave 1 parent questionnaire in which parents were asked about ten potential problems in their neighborhoods (e.g., rundown buildings, fights, unemployment). Responses were first dichotomized to indicate whether these items posed a problem (1 = yes),

Violent Peers is a single wave 1 item asking respondents: "In the last 12 months, how often have your friends attacked someone with the idea of seriously hurting them?" Responses range from 1 (never) to 9 (more than once a day).

Respondent Delinquency is measured at wave 1 (alpha = .81) and *criminal involvement* at wave 4 (alpha = .68) using a ten-item self-report scale composed of the mean of reported frequencies of items such as: stolen (or tried to steal) things worth $5 or less, worth more than $50; "carried a hidden weapon other than a plain pocket knife"; "damaged or destroyed property on purpose"; "attacked someone with the idea of seriously hurting him/her". *Partner's Criminal Involvement* (alpha = .71) is measured at wave 4 using a ten-item scale identical to the delinquency scale described above, as reported by the respondent.

Sociodemographic Variables, Adult Status Characteristics and Basic Relationship Indices

We include a series of sociodemographic indicators: *gender* (male is the contrast category), and *age*, measured in years using a continuous variable reported from respondent's age at wave 4, as well as three dummy variables to measure *race/ethnicity* including non-Hispanic white (contrast category), non-Hispanic black, and Hispanic. *Family structure* (wave 1) includes the following categories: two biological parents (contrast category), step-family, single-parent family, and any "other" family type. To control for *socioeconomic status*, we use the highest level of education reported in the wave 1 parent questionnaire. Because the parental sample consists primarily of women, this measure is referred to as "mother's education" and is represented by the following indicators: less than high school, high school (contrast category), some college, and college or more. Additionally, we include measures of the respondent's adult status characteristics. A dichotomous measure from wave 4, *in school*, indicates whether the respondent was attending school at the time of the interview. Three dummy indicators, *full-time, part-time, and unemployed* (contrast category) are used to account for respondent's employment status at wave 4, and status as a *parent* is determined by a question asking whether the respondent has any children.

We include a series of basic relationship variables in the models. To control for relationship status, three dummy indicators indicate whether the relationship of interest is *dating* (contrast category), *cohabiting*, or *married*. Additionally, a dummy variable is used to denote whether responses reference a *current relationship* or their most recent romantic relationship (1 = current).[3] Relationship *duration* is measured by asking how long respondents have/had been with their current or most recent partners. The range is from less than a week (1) to a year or more (8).

Analytic Strategy

We estimate zero-order logistic regression models predicting IPV perpetration. Next we estimate a model that includes all of the traditional predictors of IPV (parental coercion, disadvantage neighborhood,

violent peers, early and current delinquency/criminal involvement and current partner's criminal involvement along with other relevant controls. Subsequently, models examine the associations between the two indices of control (male and female) followed by a model that introduces the two anger indices (anger identity, relationship-based anger). In addition to the violence predictors and sociodemographic characteristics, these models also include controls for basic characteristics of the relationship (duration of the relationship, cohabitation/marital status, whether the report references a current or most recent relationship), as well as adult status characteristics indicators (marital and employment status). Similar models are estimated focusing on victimization or 'any violence' as the dependent variable, and OLS models explore a range of seriousness levels (see methods above). Next we estimate models that include interactions of gender and each of the focal relationship variables. Finally, we include dummy variables indexing various combinations of control dynamics and anger, to explore whether, as predicted in the above discussion, anger and mutual control attempts are associated with especially high levels of risk for IPV.

RESULTS

Descriptive results included in Appendix A indicate that approximately 24% of the sample report IPV perpetration within the context of their current/most recent relationship. This includes 17.25% of males and 30.67% of female respondents. Table 1 presents the zero order associations between the focal variables (indices tapping anger and control), the traditional violence predictors and other covariates. As shown in the first column, the zero order models indicate significant associations for each of the focal variables (men's control attempts, women's control attempts, anger identity, relationship-based anger), and other traditional predictors. Of the traditional predictors assessed, coercive parenting, residing in a disadvantaged neighborhood, and affiliation with violent peers (all wave 1 predictors) were significantly related to later IPV perpetration as reported at wave 4. Further, the respondent's initial (wave 1) self-report of delinquency involvement, and partner's (wave 4) criminal involvement were significantly related to reports of IPV perpetration.

Of the sociodemographic and other control variables, gender (female) is positively related to self-reports of IPV perpetration, as is single parent, stepparent, or 'other' household family background relative to two-parent family background. Mother's education (less than high school) is related to higher risk, while having a mother with college or greater is associated with reduced odds. Among the adult status characteristics, being in school or employed part-time are also related at the zero order in the expected directions. Having one or more children is associated with higher odds of IPV perpetration. Finally, respondents who are married or cohabiting, relative to dating, and those in longer relationships are also significantly more likely to report IPV perpetration.

Model 2 presents results of a logistic regression model that includes traditional predictors and other covariates. In this model, parental coercion and the partner's criminal involvement remain significant predictors. Model 3 introduces the variable indexing male control attempts. Results indicate that higher levels of male control are associated with greater odds of IPV perpetration. Model 4 adds the measure of female control, which is also significantly related to IPV, and contributes to model fit. Results are thus consistent with our hypothesis that both male and female control attempts are significantly related to IPV perpetration, after taking into account traditional violence predictors and other relevant covariates. Parallel multivariate models are tested that rely on the more straightforward measures of respondent and partner control attempts and we observe similar findings. In these models, respondent and partner control attempts are related to higher odds of IPV perpetration (results not shown). In Model 4, of the traditional predictors, only partner's criminal involvement remains significantly related to perpetration. Parental coercion is no longer significant, which suggests that some of the effects of parental coercion are indirect, through an increased likelihood of being in relationships characterized by higher levels of control, as well as greater likelihood of involvement with an antisocial partner. Model 5 adds the two anger indices. Results reveal that both forms of anger are significantly associated with IPV perpetration, net of the other covariates, including male and female control. Adding the anger indices contributes to model fit, when contrasted with models including only the traditional predictors and measures of control attempts. These results suggest that, consistent with our hypothesis, both anger and control processes are significantly

related to self-reports of IPV perpetration. In addition, that relationship-based anger is significantly tied to IPV net of the "characterological" measure (i.e. anger identity) supports the SI perspective on the situated nature of emotional experiences.

To determine whether gender influences the significant associations described above, we also estimated a series of interactions. These interactions are not significant, indicating that both male and female respondents' reports about control dynamics are similarly linked with self-reports of IPV perpetration. We also find that anger is similarly associated with IPV perpetration for male and female respondents. The lack of gender interactions across multiple predictors, including the relationship dynamics and anger indices, suggests that while the problem of IPV is appropriately viewed as a gendered phenomenon, some processes may operate similarly across gender as influences on violent actions within the relationship. Supplemental analyses indicate that results shown in Table 2 and those including gender interactions are similar when models are estimated focusing on victimization rather than perpetration, a composite index that reflects "any violence" (whether as perpetrator, victim, or both) or in OLS models, on variations in the severity of violence.

The results of analyses show similar effects across gender in the influence of the traditional violence predictors on IPV (results not shown). While not the primary focus of our analyses, these findings are potentially important as they indicate that each of these forms of early social exposure (coercive parents, residing in a disadvantaged neighborhood, and affiliation with violent peers) are similarly linked to variations in female and male respondents' reports of IPV perpetration. In addition, interactions of gender and the individual's own and partner's criminal involvement are not significant, suggesting the general importance of taking into account the individual and partner's antisocial histories (Herrera, Wiersma, and Cleveland, 2008).

The above findings suggest generally that controlling behaviors and anger are associated with IPV perpetration reported by male and female respondents. Yet the traditional variable-centered approach does not provide a window on how these factors combine within the life course experiences of particular individuals. Theoretically, we hypothesized that where both male and female partners are engaged in

high levels of control attempts and respondents experience feelings of anger, this combination may pose a particularly high level of risk. We explore this notion more directly via analyses that include dummy variables indexing the various combinations.[4] As shown in Table 2, the combination of mutual control and higher than average scores on the composite anger index is associated with 826% greater odds of violence as a contrast to individuals reporting lower levels of each of the control dimensions and lower agreement with the items comprising the anger index. These analyses control for variations in early exposure to violence and coercive parenting, suggesting the utility of including attention to more localized relationship and emotional processes, consistent with the symbolic interactionist perspective we outlined. Further, in a model changing the reference category, results show that anger with mutual control is tied to greater relationship violence relative to respondents who report mutual control but do not agree with the angry self-descriptions (results not shown). However, as the results of Table 2 reveal, other combinations of control and anger are also significantly associated with reports of violence. These results suggest that neither the ideal type emphasized in many theoretical discussions and prevention programs (high levels of male control, limited attention to feelings of anger) nor our own emphasis here (mutual control attempts accompanied by anger) are comprehensive as portraits of all of the scenarios that may be linked to elevated IPV risk. Supplemental models (not shown) examine interactions of these combinations with gender, and none of these interactions are statistically significant.

CONCLUSION

The results of our analyses indicate that for many of the respondents who participated in this study, emotional processes and relationship dynamics 'matter' for understanding variations in the likelihood of reporting IPV perpetration in a current/most recent relationship. Relying on a large, heterogeneous sample of young adult respondents, logistic regression analyses showed that higher levels of reported anger and male and female partners' control attempts were significantly related to greater odds of IPV. The supplemental analyses indicate that various combinations of control and anger were observed and linked to heightened risk, relative to relationships that were characterized by low anger and control. Such

findings suggest the need to temper the general assertion that "it's not about anger," as well as to broaden the discussion of control attempts to include attention to women's as well as men's attempts to control the partner's behavior or aspects of the relationship.

These findings challenge some key emphases of traditional theoretical perspectives. The focus on relationship dynamics adds to prior treatments based on social learning arguments, which have necessarily emphasized what is brought into the relationship by virtue of early modeling/social exposure. And while traditional feminist theorizing has drawn attention to the unique dynamics involved in male-female relationships, the current findings add a layer of complexity to the prior emphasis on male controlling actions and the tendency to bracket off emotional processes. In some respects, the feminist perspective shares the tendency of social learning arguments to focus on what is imported into the relationship based on earlier socialization, although the emphasis is on gender socialization rather than on family, peer or neighborhood effects. Yet the symbolic interactionist perspective further highlights the situated or 'grounded' nature of human behavior, and the role of blocked action in defining and reacting to situations as problematic based on interaction within the immediate social setting.

The need to incorporate relationship-specific influences is also suggested by variability in responses across the various waves of interviews in patterns of reported IPV. For example, of those who scored higher than average on the self-reported delinquency index at wave 1 (used here as an index of general propensity toward antisocial behavior), only 3.72% reported IPV at all four waves of the study. Relying on the Add Health data, Herrera et al. (2008) documented that the delinquency of both respondents and their partners contributed to variance in IPV risk. This is an important finding, but nevertheless retains the focus on general propensities and what both members of the couple bring with them to their relationship. The current results show that reports of control attempts and anger (including relationship-based anger) are significantly associated with IPV, net of partner and respondent levels of criminal involvement and other relevant covariates (e.g., parental coercion). The symbolic interactionist lens and our findings highlight that one's background experiences or broad-based conceptions of gender role requirements are incomplete as guides to action. Instead, situational elements (that is, dynamics within

the intimate relationship context) are a more immediate site of social influence and the process of 'doing gender' (Simon and Gangon, 1986).

A significant caveat about these results is that they may well be life-course specific, and relate directly to our focus on the relatively fluid dating and cohabiting relationships that characterize the young adult phase of the life course. We suggested that key transitions that often take place during this time (such as moving away from a heavy emphasis on peer socializing, becoming more seriously committed to a given partner, and solidifying career prospects) may become contested domains within relationships during this life course stage. The idea that issues of power and control tend to be localized around such contested terrain further situates control attempts within the period, and highlights concerns that are likely to be recognizable to the individuals involved. Some men's actions can best be understood in light of a generalized desire to dominate and control their partners, but others may be interested in control that relates to specific contested areas within the relationship. This situated approach also allows us to interpret the relatively high scores of young women on attempts to control their partners observed across the sample as a whole, and within relationships characterized by IPV. This emphasis on interactive elements within the relationship is thus consistent with a general symbolic interactionist perspective on interpersonal violence (Athens, 2005), but highlights that the specific locus of the conflict may vary--based on unique concerns of different stages of the life course, the character of the relationship, as well as gendered socialization processes.

A limitation of the study is that reports about relationship characteristics, anger, and IPV were assessed contemporaneously. Thus, it is not possible to establish a precise causal order regarding processes that are undoubtedly reciprocally related. Although we posited a particular theoretical sequence, to an unknown degree control attempts and anger may follow from the experience of IPV. Young adult relationships are often quite fluid, and IPV itself is associated with relationship 'churning' (breaking up, or breaking up and getting back together (Halpern-Meekin et al., 2013)). Thus, it would be difficult to capture a sufficiently large number of intact couples across waves of interviews who report high levels of anger and control but no violence at the initial wave (the pure condition that would enable

us to predict IPV from anger and control reports). Yet the content of the in-depth qualitative interviews we also conducted with a subset of these respondents provide an additional level of confidence regarding the hypothesized sequencing of the focal relationship and emotional processes. In addition, even if it were to be established, for example, that angry emotions emerge only as a consequence of IPV, it would be inappropriate to conclude that anger is not associated with these experiences. It is even less intuitive to theorize that control attempts only appear within relationships after acts of violence. Nevertheless, it would be useful in future research to experiment with methods that permit a more fine-grained assessment of sequencing (e.g., using diary methods, more frequent assessment periods). Future research could also examine other potentially important relationships in more detail, such as the association between coercive parenting and reports of control attempts, or negative cases for intergenerational theories (e.g., individuals who experience coercive parenting but do not develop an angry identity or experience feelings of anger in their own intimate relationships—see e.g., Stith et al., 2000).

As research on IPV has developed, researchers have noted differences in approach and findings based on population-based surveys as contrasted with targeted samples, such as those focused on victims in shelters and perpetrators identified by criminal justice agencies. Johnson and Leone (2005) have proposed that a way to reconcile the two different portraits is to consider that these may be different forms of IPV, which likely have different precursors and characteristics. Accordingly, we recognize that the theoretical discussion and analysis developed may not generalize to the experiences of victims or perpetrators of severe violence. As we focused on young adults in dating and cohabiting relationships, these respondents often do not face as many economic and social dependence issues as married older men and women.[5] Nevertheless, the sampling strategy and follow-up procedures we relied upon (e.g., school attendance was not a requirement for inclusion; those in jail or prison were thoroughly pursued) were designed to capture a large, heterogeneous sample of young adults. Further, as research indicates that adolescence and especially young adulthood represent peak periods of risk, our theoretical framework and findings may be useful in the development of prevention efforts whose objectives are to interrupt these processes before violence patterns become more firmly entrenched. In addition, it would be useful to

explore in future research the degree to which these portraits reflect points in a sequence of relationship processes, rather than two discrete patterns or subgroups. Research designs that use common measurement across population-based and criminal justice or victim-services samples would serve to highlight similar and distinctive processes across the full spectrum of IPV experiences.

In spite of these limitations, the current study provides a descriptive portrait that complicates traditional theorizing, and has implications for prevention and intervention efforts targeting IPV within younger populations. Curricula directed at young people may benefit from increased attention to the variability in relational processes that appear to be associated with heightened risk of experiencing IPV (Capaldi and Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 2012). Thus, prevention messages that ignore female partners' attempts to control their partners or aspects of the relationship may be limited to the extent that they lead women and men to dismiss prevention messages as not matching the realities of their own relationship circumstances. In addition, further connecting violence to feelings of vulnerability and a lack of control of specific contested domains may serve to construct more uniformly negative meaning(s) around the resort to violence within the context of one's intimate relationships.

It may also be useful to bring anger and other emotions into such discussions, even while delivering messages that clearly communicate that emotions in themselves don't "cause" an action and cannot be used to justify or explain an action away. There is also a need for additional research on cognitive processes and attitudes that connect to these angry reactions and in turn amplify risk. For example, prior studies of attitudes supporting IPV have often relied on global items (it's ok to hit a partner), and accordingly rates of endorsement of such attitudes are very low (see e.g., Price et al., 1999). Yet consistent with our theoretical discussion, emotional experiences occur in tandem with certain understandings (cognitions) that support the use of violence under what are viewed as extreme circumstances. For example, several of the in-depth interviews suggested that high levels of anger and associated violence were related to a partner cheating and then lying about it (see also Miller and White, 2003). Recognizing that there are several areas that challenge the view of gender as a set of "binary oppositions" (Thorne, 1993) could provide a basis for subsequently underscoring that some precursors

and consequences (feelings of fear and intimidation; injury; emotional distress) nevertheless remain highly gendered phenomena.

NOTES

1. Attrition analyses indicate that participation at wave 4 is not related to most characteristics assessed at wave 1 (mother's education, race/ethnicity, age, parent's report of coercive parenting, or relationship dynamics). However, the follow-up sample is more likely to be female (53% as contrasted with 51% at wave 1), and less likely to report an 'other' family structure.
2. We relied on: (1) a weighted frequency scale (alpha = .89) of perpetration and victimization items (ranging from 0-25), (2) a composite, or variety score (alpha = .88) constructed by adding the number of acts perpetrated or received with equal weight (ranging from 0-8), (3) a dichotomous measure of relationship violence based on perpetration, victimization, and mutual violence, (4) a dichotomous measure of perpetration based on respondents' reports of their own use of violence, and (5) an ordinal measure of relationship violence based on the level of severity (0 = no IPV, 1 = less severe IPV, 2 = more severe IPV). We found that measuring violence using continuous, ordinal, or dichotomous variables yielded similar results. This is consistent with recent research examining measurement issues associated with IPV, such as Kwong et al.'s (2003) conclusion that whether or not violence is present may be most pivotal for distinguishing these relationships.
3. In addition to including this dummy variable in the analyses, we estimated all models relying only on the sample of respondents reporting on a current relationship. Results do not differ.
4. The interview schedule did not include a measure of partner anger. Thus the combinations focus on respondents' reports about their own feelings of anger, along with assessments of their own and partner's attempts to control.
5. The small number of respondents in the study who were married at wave 4 precludes a more systematic examination of the impact of marriage on these relationship dynamics.

REFERENCES

Anderson, Kristin L. 2005. Theorizing gender in intimate partner violence research. *Sex Roles* 52:853-865.

———. 2013. Why do we fail to ask "why" about gender and intimate partner violence? *Journal of Marriage and Family* 75:314-318.

Agnew, Robert. 2001. Building on the foundation of general strain theory: Specifying the types of strain most likely to lead to crime and delinquency. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 38:319-361.

Arnett, Jeffrey J. 2004. *Emerging Adulthood: The Winding Road from the Late Teens through the Twenties*. England: Oxford University Press.

Athens, Lonnie. 2005. Violent encounters: Violent engagements, skirmishes, and tiffs. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 34:631-678.

Blumer, Herbert. 1969. *Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Boonzaier, Floretta. 2008. 'If the man says you must sit, then you must sit': The relational construction of woman abuse: gender, subjectivity and violence. *Feminism and Psychology* 18(2):183-206.

Capaldi, Deborah M., Naomi B. Knoble, Joann Wu Shortt, and Hyoun K. Kim. 2012. A systematic review of risk factors for intimate partner violence. *Partner Abuse* 3(2):231-280.

Capaldi, Deborah M., and Jennifer Langhinrichsen-Rohling. 2012. Informing intimate partner violence prevention efforts: Dyadic, developmental, and contextual considerations. *Prevention Science* 13:323-328.

Capaldi, Deborah M., Joanne W. Shortt, and Lynn Crosby. 2003. Physical and psychological aggression in at-risk young couples: Stability and change in young adulthood. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly* 49:1-27.

Catalano, Shannon. 2012. *Intimate Partner Violence in the United States*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Cui, Ming, Koji Ueno, Mellissa Gordon, and Frank D. Fincham. 2013. The continuation of intimate partner violence from adolescence to young adulthood. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 75:300-313.

Cunradi, Carol B., Raul Caetano, Catherine Clark, and John Schafer. 2000. Neighborhood poverty as a predictor of intimate partner violence among white, black, and Hispanic couples in the United States: A multilevel analysis. *Annals of Epidemiology* 10:297-308.

Dennis, Alex, and Peter J. Martin. 2005. Symbolic interactionism and the concept of power. *The British Journal of Sociology* 56:191-213.

Dobash, R. Emerson, and Russell Dobash. 1979. *Violence against Wives: A Case against the Patriarchy*. New York: Free Press.

Dobash, Russell P., R. Emerson Dobash, Margo Wilson, and Martin Daly. 1992. The myth of sexual symmetry in marital violence. *Social Problems* 39:71-91.

Duckworth, Angela E., and Martin E. P. Seligman. 2006. Self-discipline gives girls the edge: Gender in self-discipline, grades, and achievement test scores. *Journal of Educational Psychology* 98:198-208.

Eckhardt, Christopher I., Rita E. Samper, and Christopher M. Murphy. 2008. Anger disturbances among perpetrators of intimate partner violence: Clinical characteristics and outcomes of court-mandated treatment. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 23:1600-1617.

Engdahl, Emma. 2004. A theory of the emotional self: From the standpoint of a neo-Meadian. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Sociology, Örebro University, Örebro, Sweden.

Felson, Richard B., and Kelsea J. Lane. 2010. Does violence involving women and intimate partners have a special etiology? *Criminology* 48(1):321-338.

Follingstad, Diane R., Shannon Wright, Shirley Lloyd, and Jeri A. Sebastian. 1991. Sex differences in motivations and effects in dating violence. *Family Relations* 40:51-57.

Ford, Kathleen, Woosung Sohn, and James Lepkowski. 2002. American adolescents: Sexual mixing patterns, bridge partners, and concurrency. *Journal of the American Sexually Transmitted Diseases Association* 29:13-19.

Foshee, Vangie A., Heath L. M. Reyes, Susan T. Ennett, Chirayath Suchindran, Jasmine P. Mathias, Katherine J. Karriker-Jaffe, Karl E. Bauman, and Thad S. Benefield. 2011. Risk and protective factors distinguishing profiles of adolescent peer and dating violence perpetration. *Journal of Adolescent Health* 48:344-350.

Foster, Holly, and Jeanne Brooks-Gunn. 2009. Toward a stress process model of children's exposure to physical family and community violence. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review* 12:71-94.

Galliher, Renee V., Sharon S. Rostosky, Deborah P. Welsh, and Myra C. Kawaguchi. 1999. Power and psychological well-being in late adolescent romantic relationships. *Sex Roles* 40:689-710.

Giordano, Peggy C., Ryan D. Schroeder, and Stephen A. Cernkovich. 2007. Emotions and crime over the life course: A neo-Meadian perspective on criminal continuity and change. *American Journal of Sociology* 112:1603-1661.

Gomez, Anu M. 2011. Testing the cycle of violence hypothesis: Child abuse and adolescent dating violence as predictors of intimate partner violence in young adulthood. *Youth and Society* 43:171-192.

Griffiths, Elizabeth, Carolyn Yule, and Rosemary Gartner. 2011. Fighting over trivial things: Explaining the issue of contention in violent altercations. *Criminology* 49(1):61-94.

Halpern-Meekin, Sarah C., Wendy D. Manning, Peggy C. Giordano, and Monica A. Longmore. 2013. Relationship churning, physical violence, and verbal abuse in young adult relationships. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 75(1):2-12.

Haynie, Dana L., and Danielle C. Payne. 2006. Race, friendship networks, and violence delinquency. *Criminology* 44:775-805.

Herrera, Veronica M., Jacquelyn D. Wiersma, and H. Harrington Cleveland. 2008. the influence of individual and partner characteristics on the perpetration of intimate partner violence in young adulthood relationships. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 37:284-296.

Jackson, Susan M. 1999. Issues in the dating violence research: A review of the literature. *Aggression and Violent Behavior* 4(2):233-247.

Jacobson, Neil S., John M. Gottman, Jennifer Waltz, Regina Rushe, Julia Babcock, and Amy Holtzworth-Munroe. 1994. Affect, verbal conflict and psychophysiology in the arguments of couples with a violent husband. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 62(5):982-988.

Johnson, Michael P., and Janel M. Leone. 2005. The differential effects of intimate terrorism and situational couple violence: Findings from the National Violence against Women Survey. *Journal of Family Issues* 26:322-349.

Kimmel, Michael S. 2002. 'Gender Symmetry' in domestic violence: A substantive and methodological research review. *Violence against Women* 8:1332-1363.

Komter, Aafke. 1989. Hidden power in marriage. *Gender and Society* 3:187-216.

Kwong, Marilyn J., Kim Bartholomew, Antonia J. Z. Henderson, and Shanna J. Trinke. 2003. The intergenerational transmission of relationship violence. *Journal of Family Psychology* 17:288-301.

Larkin, June, and Katherine Popaleni. 1994. Heterosexual courtship violence and sexual harassment: The private and public control of young women. *Feminism and Psychology* 4(2):213-227.

Lloyd, Sally A., and Beth C. Emery. 2000. *The Dark Side of Courtship: Physical and Sexual Aggression.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lupton, Deborah. 1998. *The Emotional Self: A Sociocultural Exploration.* London: Sage Publications.

Lussier, Patrick, David P. Farrington, and Terrie E. Moffitt. 2009. Is the antisocial child father of the abusive man?: A 40-year prospective longitudinal study of the developmental antecedents of intimate partner violence. *Criminology* 47(3):741-780.

Manning, Wendy D., Peggy C. Giordano, Monica A. Longmore, and Andrea Hocevar. 2011. Romantic relationships and academic/career trajectories in early adulthood. In *Romantic Relationships in Emerging Adulthood,* eds. Frank Fincham and Ming Cui. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Manning, Wendy D., and Pamela J. Smock. 2005. Measuring and modeling cohabitation: New perspectives form qualitative data. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 67:989-1002.

Martin, Biddy. 1988. Feminism, criticism, and Foucault. In *Feminism and Foucault: Reflections on Resistance,* eds. Irene Diamond and Lee Quinby. Boston, MA: Northern University Press.

Massey, Douglas S. 2002. A brief history of human society: The origin and role of emotion in social life. *American Sociological Review* 67:1-29.

Matsueda, Ross L. 1992. Reflected appraisals, parental labeling, and delinquency: Specifying a symbolic interactionist theory. *American Journal of Sociology* 97(6):1577-1611.

Matsueda, Ross L. 2006. Criminological implications of the thought of George Herbert Mead. In *Sociological Theory and Criminological Research: Views from Europe and the United States,* ed. Mathieu Deflem. Oxford, UK: Elsevier Science

Mead, George H. 1934. *Mind, Self, and Society from the Standpoint of a Social Behaviorist*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Miller, Jody. 2008. *Getting Played: African American Girls, Urban Inequity, and Gendered Violence.* New York: New York University Press.

Miller, Jody, and Norman A. White. 2003. Gender and adolescent relationship violence: A contextual examination. *Criminology* 41:1501-1541.

Moffitt, Terrie E., Avshalom Caspi, Michael Rutter, and Phil A. Silva. 2001. *Sex Differences in Antisocial Behavior: Conduct Disorder, Delinquency, and Violence in the Dunedin Longitudinal Study*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Moffitt, Terrie E., Robert F. Krueger, Avshalom Caspi, and Jeff Fagan. 2000. Partner abuse and general crime: How are they the same? How are they different? *Criminology* 38(1):199-232.

Murphy, Christopher M., and K. Daniel O'Leary. 1989. Psychological aggression predicts physical aggression in early marriage. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 57(5):579-582.

O'Donnell, Lydia, Ann Stueve, Athi Myint-U, Richard Duran, Gail Agronick, and Renee Wilson-Simmons. 2006. Middle school aggression and subsequent intimate partner physical violence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 35:693-703.

Pence, Ellen, and Michael Paymar. 2006. *Education Groups for Men Who Batter: The Duluth Model.* New York: Springer.

Price, E. Lisa, E. Sandra Byers, and the Dating Violence Research Team. 1999. The attitudes towards dating violence scales: Development and initial validation. *Journal of Family Violence* 14(4):351-375.

Reed, Elizabeth, Anita Raj, Elizabeth Miller, and Jay G. Silverman. 2010. Losing the "gender" in gender-based violence: The missteps of research on dating and intimate partner violence. *Violence against Women* 16(3):346-354.

Rennison, Callie M. 2001. Intimate partner violence and age of victim, 1993-1999. Bureau of Justice Statistics Report. Retrieved July 23, 2012.

Reynolds, Larry T., and Nancy J. Herman-Kinney, eds. 2003. *Handbook of Symbolic Interactionism.* Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Schippers, Mimi, and Erin G. Sapp. 2012. Reading pulp fiction: Embodied femininity and power in second and third wave feminist theory. *Feminist Theory* 13:27-42.

Schumacher, Julie A., and Kenneth E. Leonard. 2005. Husbands' and wives' marital adjustment, verbal aggression, and physical aggression as longitudinal predictors of physical aggression in early marriage. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 73(1):28-37.

Settersten, Richard A, and Barbara E. Ray. 2010. *Not Quite Adults: Why 20-Somethings are Choosing a Slower Path to Adulthood, and Why It's Good for Everyone.* New York: Random House.

Simon, William, and John H. Gagnon. 1986. Sexual scripts: Permanence and change. *Archives of Sexual Behavior* 15(2):97-120.

Simons, Ronald L., Kuei-Hsiu Lin, and Leslie C. Gordon. 1998. Socialization in the family of origin and male dating violence: a prospective study. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 60:467-478.

Smith, Paige H., Jacquelyn W. White, and Kathryn E. Moracco. 2009. Becoming who we are: A theoretical explanation of gendered social networks that shape adolescent interpersonal aggression. *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 33:25-29.

Stets, Jan E. 1992. Interactive processes in dating aggression: A national study. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 54:165-177.

Stets, Jan E., and Maureen A. Pirog-Good. 1987. Violence in dating relationships. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 50:237-246.

Stets, Jan E., and Jonathan Turner. 2006. *Handbook of the Sociology of Emotions.* New York: Springer.

Stith, Sandra M., Karen H. Rosen, Kimberly A. Middleton, Amy L. Busch, Kirsten Lundeberg, and Russell P. Carlton. 2000. The intergenerational transmission of spouse abuse: A meta-analysis." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 62:640-654.

Straus, Murray A., and Richard J. Gelles. 1990. *Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families.* New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Swan, Suzanne C., Laura J. Gambone, Alice M. Fields, Tami P. Sullivan, and David L. Snow. 2005. Women who use violence in intimate relationships: The role of anger, victimization, and symptoms of posttraumatic stress and depression. *Violence and Victims* 20:267-285.

Theobald, Delphine, and David P. Farrington. 2012. Child and adolescent predictors of male intimate partner violence. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 53(12):1242-1249.

Thorne, Barry. 1993. *Gender Play: Girls and Boys in School.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Tjaden, Patricia, and Nancy Thoennes. 2006. *Extent, Nature, and Consequences of Rape Victimization: Findings from the National Violence against Women Survey.* Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Walker, Lenore E. 1984. *The Battered Woman Syndrome.* New York: Springer.

Walker, Kate, Erica Bowen, and Sarah Brown. 2013. Desistance from intimate partner violence: A critical review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior* 18:271-280.

Weerman, Frank M., and Machteld Hoeve. 2012. Peers and delinquency among girls and boys: Are sex differences explained by peer factors? *European Journal of Criminology* 9:228-244.

Whitaker, M. Pippin. 2013. Centrality of control-seeking in men's intimate partner violence perpetration. *Prevention Science* 14(5):513-523.

Wolf, Kimberly A., and Vangie A. Foshee. 2003. Family violence, anger expression styles, and adolescent dating violence. *Journal of Family Violence* 18:309-316.

Yllo, Kersti A. 1993. Through a feminist lens: Gender, power, and violence. In *Current Controversies on Family Violence,* eds. Richard J. Gelles and Donileen R. Loseke. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Zimmer-Gembeck, Melanie J. 2002. The development of romantic relationships and adaptations in the system of peer relationships. *Journal of Adolescent Health* 31:216-225.

Table 1. Odds Ratios for the Association between Control, Anger, IPV, and Reports of Perpetration (n = 985)

	Zero Order	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Control Dynamics					
Male control	1.43***		1.40***	1.24***	1.17**
Female control	1.46***			1.29***	1.23***
Anger					
Anger identity	1.55***				1.23*
Relationship-based anger	2.05***				1.57***
Traditional Predictors					
Coercive parenting	1.07**	1.07**	1.06*	1.05	1.04
Disadvantaged neighborhood	1.11***	1.02	1.03	1.03	1.03
Violent peers	1.22***	1.11	1.10	1.09	1.10
Respondent and Partner Characteristics					
Respondent's delinquency (Wave 1)	1.26*	1.02	0.95	0.96	0.91
Respondent's delinquency (Wave 4)	1.19	0.90	0.91	0.93	0.92
Partner's delinquency (Wave 4)	1.80***	1.96***	1.79***	1.72***	1.60***
Sociodemographic Characteristics					
Gender					
(Male)					
Female	2.09***	1.65**	2.06***	2.23***	2.47***
Age	1.01	0.91	0.94	0.93	0.94
Race					
(White)					
Black	2.07	1.92**	1.54	1.54	1.37
Hispanic	2.64	1.78*	1.56	1.67	1.76*
Family Factors					
Family structure					
(Two biological parents)					
Single parent	1.81**	1.14	1.18	1.21	1.18
Step-parent	2.52***	1.89**	1.71*	1.72*	1.73*
Other	2.18***	1.35	1.49	1.54	1.58
Mother's education					
Less than HS	1.82**	1.45	1.43	1.41	1.45
(HS)					
Some college	1.03	0.98	1.06	1.07	1.10
College or more	0.55**	0.82	0.82	0.88	0.92
Adult Status Characteristics					
Education					
In school	0.57***	0.91	1.03	1.03	1.07
(Not in school)					
Employment Status					
Part-time	0.63*	0.89	0.87	0.92	0.99
Full-time	0.88	1.16	1.23	1.32	1.38
(Unemployed)					
Parent					
(No)					
Yes	2.33***	1.02	0.91	0.90	0.84
Relationship Characteristics					
Relationship status					
(Dating)					
Married	2.12**	1.88	1.97	2.02*	2.13*
Cohabiting	2.40***	1.48	1.63*	1.48	1.52
Current relationship	1.51*	1.08	1.26	1.34	1.69*
(Most recent relationship)					
Duration	1.27***	1.20**	1.17*	1.14*	1.13*
R^2_{MZ}		0.23	0.31	0.35	0.38
Model χ^2		155.90***	208.01***	233.89***	259.65***
Nested χ^2			52.11***	25.88***	25.76***

* p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001

Table 2. The Association Between Specific Combinations of Anger and Controlling Behaviors and Reports of IPV Perpetration (n=985)[a]

Angry, both control	9.29***
Not angry, both control	5.76***
Angry, male control	4.07***
Not angry, male control	2.34
Angry, female control	4.59***
Not angry, female control	2.89**
Angry, neither control	3.81***
(Not angry, neither control)	
Model χ^2	237.97***

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

[a] Model includes controls for traditional violence predictors, early and current delinquency/criminal involvement and current partner's criminal involvement, sociodemographic characteristics, family factors, adult status characteristics, and relationship characteristics.

Appendix 1A:Table Descriptive Statistics by Gender and IPV Status

	Male		Female	
Dependent Variable	Yes	No	Yes	No
Perpetration	17.25%	82.75%	30.67%	69.33%
Independent Variables	Perpetration	No Perpetration	Perpetration	No Perpetration
Control Dynamics				
Male control	5.43	4.07	4.74	3.45
Female control	5.70	4.25	5.25	3.76
Anger				
Anger identity	2.58	2.16	2.44	1.87
Relationship-based anger	2.36	1.74	2.18	1.50
Traditional Predictors				
Coercive parenting	12.07	10.75	11.38	10.85
Disadvantaged neighborhood	2.77	1.69	2.64	1.66
Violent peers	2.02	1.65	1.85	1.34
Sociodemographic Characteristics				
Age	20.42	20.41	20.36	20.26
Race				
(White)	56.92%	68.17%	54.68%	76.66%
Black	30.21%	25.31%	34.95%	17.55%
Hispanic	12.87%	5.90%	10.37%	5.50%
Family Factors				
Family structure				
(Two biological parents)	37.68%	57.63%	37.49%	52.94%
Single parent	19.83%	20.90%	27.42%	21.91%
Step-parent	25.67%	11.46%	18.31%	12.08%
Other	16.81%	10.00%	16.78%	13.07%
Mother's education				
Less than HS	11.34%	10.04%	19.48%	7.28%
(HS)	30.96%	30.76%	33.61%	32.57%
Some college	43.47%	33.60%	32.35%	34.77%
College or more	14.23%	25.60%	14.55%	25.37%
Adult Status Characteristics				
Education				
In school	42.66%	53.53%	44.44%	66.04%
(Not in school)	57.34%	46.47%	55.56%	33.96%
Employment Status				
Part-time	20.17%	27.75%	27.71%	40.83%
Full-time	39.22%	38.74%	32.82%	26.40%
(Unemployed)	40.61%	33.51%	39.47%	32.77%
Parent				
(No)	67.04%	81.17%	51.25%	72.33%
Yes	32.96%	18.83%	48.75%	27.67%
Relationship Characteristics				
Relationship status				
(Dating)	62.53%	81.97%	55.89%	71.91%
Married	10.91%	3.43%	8.51%	6.82%
Cohabiting	26.56%	14.60%	35.61%	21.27%
Current relationship	71.82%	61.20%	80.39%	78.52%
(Most recent relationship)	28.18%	38.80%	19.61%	21.48%
Duration	6.63	6.27	7.38	6.71

[a] All means and standard deviations are weighted