



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

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

**Bowling Green State University**

*Working Paper Series 06-06*

**RELATIONSHIP VIOLENCE IN YOUNG ADULthood:  
A COMPARISON OF DATERS, COHABITORS, AND MARRIEDS\***

Susan L. Brown

Jennifer Roebuck Bulanda

Department of Sociology and  
Center for Family and Demographic Research  
222 Williams Hall  
Bowling Green State University  
(419) 372-9521  
[browns1@bgnet.bgsu.edu](mailto:browns1@bgnet.bgsu.edu)

RELATIONSHIP VIOLENCE IN YOUNG ADULTHOOD:  
A COMPARISON OF DATERS, COHABITORS, AND MARRIEDS\*

Susan L. Brown

Jennifer Roebuck Bulanda

Department of Sociology and  
Center for Family and Demographic Research  
222 Williams Hall  
Bowling Green State University  
(419) 372-9521  
[browns1@bgnet.bgsu.edu](mailto:browns1@bgnet.bgsu.edu)

\*An earlier version of this paper was presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, Philadelphia, PA (August 2005). The research for this paper is supported by a grant to the first author from the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (K01-HD42478) and by the Center for Family and Demographic Research, Bowling Green State University, which has core funding from the National Institute for Child Health and Human Development (R21- HD042831). This research uses data from the Add Health project, a program project designed by J. Richard Udry (PI) and Peter Bearman, and funded by grant P01-HD31921 from the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development to the Carolina Population Center, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, with cooperative funding from 17 other agencies. Persons interested in obtaining data files from The National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health should contact Add Health, Carolina Population Center, 123 West Franklin Street, Chapel Hill, NC 27516-2524 (<http://www.cpc.unc.edu/addhealth>). The authors thank Al DeMaris and Stephen Demuth for helpful comments on earlier versions of this manuscript.

RELATIONSHIP VIOLENCE IN YOUNG ADULTHOOD:  
A COMPARISON OF DATERS, COHABITORS, AND MARRIEDS

Abstract

Intimate partner violence is most common in early adulthood. A key developmental task of young adulthood is the formation of intimate partner relationships whether through dating, cohabitation, or marriage. Although violence varies considerably across these relationship types, thus far comparisons have been restricted to either dating versus cohabitation or cohabitation versus marriage; no study has compared partner violence across all three relationship types using nationally representative data. We extend this line of inquiry by using the first and third waves of the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health to examine the linkages between relationship type and relationship violence perpetration and victimization among young adults. Among women, cohabitators report significantly higher levels of relationship violence than either marrieds or daters. Among men, cohabitators and marrieds report similar levels of relationship violence and both groups experience more violence perpetration and victimization than daters. Our hypothesis that the poorer relationship quality of cohabitators would account for their higher levels of violence is not supported.

Key words: cohabitation, dating, gender, marriage, violence, young adulthood

## RELATIONSHIP VIOLENCE IN YOUNG ADULTHOOD:

### A COMPARISON OF DATERS, COHABITORS, AND MARRIEDS

Intimate partner violence is a significant social problem that appears to be most prevalent in early adulthood. Recent estimates indicate that between 25 and 55 % of young adults experienced violence in their intimate relationships in the past year, depending on the measures used and relationship type (Halpern et al. 2001; Kaura and Allen 2004). Young adult intimate relationships range in intensity from dating to cohabitation to marriage and relationship type is associated with violence. Yet, to our knowledge, no study has used nationally representative data to compare intimate partner violence across dating, cohabiting, and married relationships among young adults.

With the rising age at first marriage and the rapid increase in cohabitation, it is important to consider the role of relationship type in the intimate violence experiences of young adults. Young adults now have longer periods of exposure to the risks of dating and cohabiting (Casper and Bianchi 2002). Although most young adults are currently involved in dating relationships, about one-quarter are currently cohabiting (Bumpass and Lu 2000). We use data from waves one and three of the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health) to investigate whether and how violence perpetration and victimization differs among daters, cohabitators, and marrieds in early adulthood.

### BACKGROUND

In their decade review of research on intimate partner violence, Johnson and Ferraro (2000) discuss the significance of relationship type. Researchers have devoted considerable attention to courtship and dating violence and there is now a small but growing body of work on partner violence among cohabitators (Johnson and Ferraro 2000). Still, studies that compare

violence across relationship types (i.e., dating, cohabitation, and marriage) are scarce. Stets and Straus' (1990) comparison of partner violence among daters, cohabitators, and marrieds revealed that assault rates were highest for cohabiting couples, regardless of severity of assault and, in most cases, who perpetrated it. In the year prior to interview date, 35% of cohabitators, 20% of daters, and 15% of marrieds experienced a form of violence (Stets and Straus 1990). Among cohabiting and married couples who experienced assaults, the distribution of perpetration of assault was similar. About 27% reported female only violence, 21% male only violence, and about 50% reported violence perpetrated by both partners. Male-only violence (among those who experienced violence) was twice as common among cohabitators and marrieds as daters, suggesting a fundamental difference in the nature of assault in dating versus cohabiting and marital unions (Stets and Straus 1990). Although the study's data on marrieds and cohabitators comes from the 1985 National Family Violence Survey (a sample of adults ages 18 and over), the daters are from a separate, non-representative sample ages 18-24 derived from a large Midwestern university, confounding age and relationship type and thereby compromising the integrity of the findings. Moreover, both the prevalence of cohabitation and the characteristics of cohabitators have changed considerably since 1985 (Bumpass and Lu 2000). Cohabitation has become a normative feature of the family life course (Smock 2000) and thus its association with violence may have changed, too (Johnson and Ferraro 2000).

Indeed, a recent study (Frias and Angel 2005) yields a different conclusion about relationship type and violence: women who are married are less likely to experience violence than their unmarried counterparts. Using data from the Three Cities Study, which is a sample of poor, urban families, Frias and Angel (2005) differentiated among married, cohabiting, and single women in their analysis of racial-ethnic differences in violence victimization experiences.

Marrieds were less likely to report victimization than singles, although cohabitators and singles did not differ. This pattern of findings may be distinct from that of Stets and Straus (1990) because the sample is restricted to poor women. Additionally, the number of cohabiting women (n=142) in the sample is relatively modest. Ultimately, the findings from both studies are unlikely to be generalizable, whether because they are dated and confounded by age (Stets and Straus 1990) or they are derived from a low-income sample and exclude men (Frias and Angel 2005).

Studies of relationship violence among *young adults* typically focus only on those in dating relationships. Unfortunately, many of these studies have relied on non-representative student samples, limiting the generalizability of the findings (e.g., Cate et al. 1982; Christopher, Madura, Weaver 1998; Gaertner and Foshee 1999; Lane and Gwartney-Gibbs 1985; Ronfeldt, Kimerling, Arias 1998; Stets and Pirog-Good 1990). Nonetheless, we do know that relationship violence is remarkably common among daters, albeit less prevalent than violence among cohabitators. Consistent with Stets and Straus' (1990) finding among a sample of U.S. adults, a recent study of young adults in New Zealand revealed that cohabitators report more relationship violence than daters (Magdol, Moffitt, Caspi, and Silva 1998). The authors were unable to include marrieds in their analyses due to small sample size. About one-half of cohabitators reported physically abusing their partner in the past year compared to one-quarter of daters. Even after controlling for individual, relationship, and social control factors, cohabitators were almost twice as likely to report having perpetrated violence in the past year (Magdol et al.). Whether these findings obtain using a U.S. sample remains an empirical question.

#### EXPLANATIONS FOR VIOLENCE VARIATION BY RELATIONSHIP TYPE

Relatively few studies have attempted to explain differences in violence by relationship type, and with the exceptions of Stets and Straus (1990) and Frias and Angel (2005), these studies have

compared only two relationship types (i.e., cohabitation versus marriage or cohabitation versus dating) (Brownridge and Halli 2002; Magdol et al. 1998; Stets 1991; Stets and Straus 1990; Yllo and Straus 1981). Researchers have identified relationship features that tend to vary across dating, cohabitation, and marriage that may account for violence variation by relationship type, including social support, commitment, and relationship quality.

Stets (1991) contended that cohabitators are more socially isolated than marrieds which means they receive lower levels of social support and social control, placing them at risk for relationship violence. Although this social isolation argument was supported statistically, it remains substantively problematic (Johnson and Ferraro 2000). For instance, social support had no effect on aggression, nor did ties to family and friends. And, cohabitators actually reported more social support and informal network ties than marrieds. More troubling perhaps is the indicator of social control: ties to a spouse/partner. This construct was operationalized as the respondent's assessment of the probability that the relationship will dissolve, but it ignores the fact that relationship dissolution can be initiated by *either* partner. The respondent could be strongly tied to her partner, yet know that he is not tied to her (i.e., the relationship will likely dissolve).

Researchers (Yllo and Straus 1981; Stets and Straus 1990; Stets 1991) also maintain that cohabitators' weaker commitment to their relationships is central to understanding their higher rates of violence relative to marrieds'. Indeed, Johnson and Ferraro (2000) interpret Stets' (1991) finding about ties to a spouse/partner as showing that commitment is negatively associated with violence (causality here is unclear). Still, daters are arguably less committed to their relationships than cohabitators, yet they are less likely to experience violence in their relationships. Several studies show that as the seriousness of the dating relationship increases,

violence increases (see Hanley and O'Neill 1997 for a summary), although others find that relationship commitment and satisfaction are negatively associated with violence (Gaertner and Foshee 1999). Individuals who report higher levels of relationship commitment may believe they have the right to control their partner's behavior. Additionally, the expectations for a partner's behavior may change as a relationship becomes more serious (Hanley and O'Neill).

Relationship conflict and disagreements set the stage for violence. Young adult cohabitators report more areas of conflict in their relationships than do daters, which in turn is positively associated with violence (Magdol et al. 1998). Cohabitators also report more disagreements than their married counterparts and are more likely to resolve these disagreements through "minor" forms of violence (Brown and Booth 1996; Nock 1995). Magdol et al. (1998) suggest that there may be fewer opportunities for violence among daters versus cohabitators since dating relationships are nonresidential. Additionally, cohabitators who formalize their relationships through marriage report a significant decrease in relationship violence (Brown 2004).

Relationship violence is often a manifestation of individuals' attempts to exert control or gain power over their partner (see Johnson and Ferraro 2000 for a summary). Issues of control could be more central to cohabitators than daters or marrieds (Magdol et al. 1998; Stets and Straus 1990). Daters probably do not feel as if they can control their partner, whereas marrieds likely believe they have a right to control (men) and be controlled (women). For both of these groups, control issues will be relatively minimal (Stets and Straus 1990). In contrast, cohabitators could face numerous control issues. Similar to marrieds, they are involved in an intimate relationship that entails daily, close interaction. Yet, cohabitators' roles are not clearly prescribed such as those for husbands and wives (Nock 1995). Rather, it is the responsibility of individual cohabitators to negotiate these roles. The uncertainties pertaining to partners' roles in cohabitation could



contribute to high levels of conflict and low levels of relationship quality, which in turn would augment partners' control attempts and possibly lead to violence. For example, Stets and Straus (1990) suggest that cohabitators may experience more violence than marrieds because they enter cohabitation expecting to maintain their independence, but find that this only leads to more conflict, which can escalate into violence. To the extent that cohabitators do not follow the prescribed roles of husband and wife, they are likely to be involved in more negotiation and consequently more often exposed to the risk of relationship violence.

In sum, relationship features probably are most central in cohabiting unions because cohabitation is an "incomplete institution" in which norms surrounding the relationship are not clearly defined and universally known (Nock 1995). Nock (1995) contends that "no matter how widespread the practice, nonmarital unions are not governed by strong consensual norms or formal laws" (74). Hence, cohabitators themselves must devise norms for their relationships. This negotiation process likely increases control attempts and power struggles, especially when disagreements and conflicts ensue from negotiation, which in turn depresses relationship quality. In fact, this pattern is consistent with the relatively low reports of relationship quality provided by cohabitators versus marrieds (Brown and Booth 1996; Nock 1995) as well as the finding that cohabitators report more areas of conflict in their relationships than do daters (Magdol et al. 1998). Thus, the higher level of conflict in cohabiting unions stemming from the lack of institutionalization of the practice reduces relationship quality and contributes to the higher rates of violence among cohabitators relative to marrieds and daters.

#### THE PRESENT STUDY

In the current investigation, we examine the levels and correlates of violence perpetration and victimization among young men and women in dating, cohabiting, and married relationships.

Specifically, we test whether young adults involved in cohabiting relationships are more likely to report violence than those in dating and married relationships. Less clear is how young daters and marrieds will compare in terms of violence perpetration and victimization. Drawing on Stets and Straus' (1990) work, we would expect marrieds to be more likely to report partner violence. Frias and Angel's (2005) conclusions would lead us to expect the opposite; marrieds will be less likely to report violence than daters.

Variation in violence across relationship types appears to be largely a function of relationship features such as quality and duration and thus these constructs will figure prominently in our investigation. Lower levels of relationship quality will be associated with a greater likelihood of violence. And, relationship duration will be positively associated with violence (Foshee and Gartner 1999). These patterns should be evident across all three relationship types and controlling for relationship quality should attenuate relationship type differences in violence. Still, we will test for interactions between these relationship features and relationship type to determine whether they are especially consequential for violence among cohabitators.

Studies of relationship violence among young adults have emphasized the salience of family-of-origin factors (Foshee, Bauman, and Linder 1999; Halpern 2001; Heyman and Slep 2002; Simons et al. 1998). Not only are family background characteristics, such as parental education and family structure, associated with relationship violence, but so too are the dynamics of the parent-child relationship. Specifically, parent-adolescent relationship quality is negatively associated with relationship violence (Linder and Collins in press; Simons et al. 1998). Simons et al. (1998) found that involved and supportive parenting was negatively associated with adolescent males' delinquency, which in turn decreased their dating violence. Additionally,

young adults who had been exposed to parental intimate violence or were abused as children are most likely to engage in abuse of their partners (Foshee et al. 1999; Heyman and Slep 2002; Kaura and Allen 2004; Ronfeldt et al. 1998; Simons, Lin, and Gordon 1998), although these effects are typically modest (Johnson and Ferraro 2000; Stith et al. 2000).

There are also important sociodemographic differences that not only distinguish daters, cohabitators, and marrieds but are also related to violence (Magdol et al. 1998; Stets and Straus 1990). Blacks report more relationship violence than whites, on average, but do not differ from some Hispanic groups (Frias and Angel 2005). Economic disadvantage can create stress and tension in close relationships that can escalate into violence, although the associations between education, employment, and violence are inconsistent (Cunradi, Caetano, and Schafer 2002). The presence of children is also positively related to partner violence. Gender is central to the experience of intimate partner violence. Even though situational violence appears to be as likely among women as men, nonetheless there is growing evidence that the underlying causes differ by gender (Johnson and Ferraro 2000). Thus, all analyses are conducted separately for women and men.

#### A NOTE ON THE CONTEXT OF VIOLENCE

Johnson and colleagues (Johnson 1995; Johnson and Ferraro 2000; Johnson and Leone 2005) argue that there are several distinct forms of intimate violence, including situational violence and intimate terrorism. Situational violence primarily results from conflicts that "get out of hand" and is typically manifested in "minor" forms of violence. This type of violence is most likely to be tapped by nationally representative surveys. Intimate terrorism, also termed patriarchal terrorism, is characterized by systematic control of a partner, typically a woman, not only through physical violence, but also emotional and economic abuse, intimidation, threat and

coercion, and so on. Patriarchal terrorism is "a product of patriarchal traditions of men's right to control 'their' women," (Johnson 1995:284) whereas situational violence is much less gendered. Situational violence is unlikely to escalate into more frequent and "severe" violence because it occurs in response to a desire to control in a specific situation. In contrast, intimate terrorism is likely to escalate over time, either in response to a partner's resistance, or simply to display control. Intimate terrorism is inaccurately gauged by national sample surveys, which include neither appropriate questions to tap the phenomenon nor an adequate sample of this population (Johnson 1995; Johnson and Leone 2005). Johnson's typology not only applies to the U.S. context but also has been replicated using various British samples, suggesting its broad applicability across Western cultures (Graham-Kevan and Archer 2003).

From Johnson's typology, we only know that cohabitators are more likely to experience situational violence than are marrieds or daters since prior research on relationship status has relied on large survey samples. Cohabitators and daters are probably *less* likely than marrieds to experience intimate terrorism because these informal relationships do not confer to men the power over women that marriage has historically (Macmillan and Gartner 1999). Relative to marrieds, many cohabitators have less esteem for marriage as an institution (Thomson and Colella 1992) and are less likely to enact traditional marital roles in their relationship (Brines and Joyner 1999). In fact, some cohabitators live together rather than marry precisely because they object to the patriarchal ideology that pervades marriage (Yllo and Straus 1981). In this study, we are only able to examine situational violence.

## METHOD

Designed to examine adolescent health and health behaviors, the Add Health is a sample of 80 high schools and 52 middle schools from the U.S. that were chosen with unequal probability of

selection (Udry 2003). Incorporating systematic sampling methods and implicit stratification into the Add Health study design ensured that this sample is representative of U.S. schools with respect to region of country, urbanicity, school type, ethnicity, and school size. Respondents were selected using a multistage, stratified, school-based cluster sampling procedure. Several oversamples were drawn, including physically disabled adolescents, African Americans from highly educated families, various ethnic groups, monozygotic and dizygotic samples of twins, and saturated samples from 14 schools.

We examine the respondents who completed in-home interviews at both the first and third waves. Of the 20,745 adolescent interviews at wave one, 15,197 were successfully reinterviewed at wave three. The present study includes 3,295 respondents who report being in an exclusive dating (N=1,394), cohabiting (N=933), or married (N=968) relationship at wave three, who were selected as part of a subsample asked a series of detailed questions about their relationships, and who did not have missing values on the relationship violence questions. Respondents range in age from 18 to 28.

#### *Dependent Variables*

Respondents self-reported how many times in the past year they perpetrated or were the victim of physical violence. Two questions were asked about the respondent's perpetration of violence: (1) "How often in the past year have you threatened <PARTNER> with violence, pushed or shoved HIM/HER, or thrown something at HIM/HER that could hurt?" (2) "How often in the past year have you slapped, hit, or kicked <PARTNER>?" Analogous questions were asked of the respondent about the partner's perpetration of violence (i.e., the respondent's victimization experiences). We took affirmative responses to either (or both) question(s) to create two dummy variables measuring whether in the past year the respondent *perpetrated violence* or *experienced*

*violent victimization* by their partner. These two measures have Cronbach alphas of 0.77 and 0.84, respectively. This coding strategy was employed in a published study on dating violence using the Add Health (Halpern et al. 2001). These relationship violence measures tap situational violence (Johnson 1995, 2000).

#### *Focal Independent Variable*

The variable *relationship type*, reported by respondents at wave three, gauges whether they are currently involved in a *dating*, *cohabiting*, or *married* relationship. Adolescents in same-sex relationships are excluded because of insufficient sample size. Those respondents in non-exclusive dating relationships are also excluded from these analyses since they are at risk of violence with more than one partner.

#### *Other Variables*

We control for the respondent's *sociodemographic characteristics* measured at wave three, which may be related to both relationship type and the likelihood of violence perpetration or victimization. *Education* is available for both the respondent and the partner. Both measures are coded as follows: less than high school, high school degree, some college, and college degree or more (reference). Other relevant measures are available only for the respondent. *School enrollment* is coded 1 if the respondent reports being in school and 0 otherwise. *Employment* distinguishes among those respondents working full-time (reference), part-time, or not at all. *Income* measures the respondent's own earnings and is logged in the multivariate analyses to correct for skewness. The *presence of children* is captured using three mutually exclusive and exhaustive dummy variables: no children (reference), shared biological children only, stepchildren. *Race-ethnicity* is coded into dummy categories: non-Hispanic White (reference), non-Hispanic Black, Hispanic, and Other race-ethnicity. *Age* is coded in years.

*Family of origin factors* are measured at wave one. *Family structure* distinguishes among respondents who lived in a married two biological parent family (reference), single-mother family, step family, or other family structure at first interview. *Parental education* is dummy coded into four categories: less than high school, high school only, some college, and college degree or more (reference). If two biological parents are present in the household, then the measure reflects the education level of the parent with more education. *Parental closeness* measures the quality of the mother-adolescent relationship, as reported by the respondent. It is comprised of the following four items summed together: how close you feel to your mother, your mother is warm and loving toward you, you are satisfied with the way your mother and you communicate with each other, you are satisfied with your relationship with your mother. Values for each item range from 1 to 5, with higher values indicating better relationship quality. *Religiosity* measures the importance of religion to the respondent, with values ranging from 1 not at all important to 4 very important. *Mistreatment by adults*, measured retrospectively at wave three, gauges whether the respondent was ever neglected (i.e., basic needs such as hygiene, food, and clothing not met by family members), physically abused (i.e., slapped, hit, or kicked), or sexually abused (i.e., touched, forced to touch others, or have sexual relations) by a parent or adult caregiver before sixth grade.

*Relationship features.* To appraise the significance of the couple relationship, we include a measure of *relationship quality* that is comprised of three items (Cronbach's alpha = 0.75). The first item is the respondent's answer to the question: "In general, how satisfied are you with your relationship with <PARTNER>?" Responses range from 1 very satisfied to 5 very dissatisfied and are reverse coded such that higher values indicate greater relationship satisfaction. The second item taps the respondent's amount of love for the partner, with values

ranging from 0 a lot to 3 not at all and reverse coded such that higher values correspond to more love. Finally, the third item is derived from a question that asks whether the respondent or the partner gets more out of the relationship relative to what s/he puts in. Responses range from 1 one of us is getting a much better deal to 2 one of us is getting a little better deal to 3 we are getting about the same deal. These items are standardized and then summed to form the relationship quality scale. *Relationship duration* is measured in months.

### ANALYTIC STRATEGY

We begin by establishing the bivariate relationships between violence perpetration and victimization for women and men by relationship type (i.e., dating, cohabitation, or marriage). In addition to describing these zero-order associations, we also summarize significant mean differences across relationship types in the other variables used in the analyses. Then, we estimate logistic regression models predicting violence perpetration and victimization separately for women and men to determine whether individual factors, family of origin factors, and relationship factors account for variation in violence according to relationship type. The complex sampling procedure of the Add Health requires statistical correction for design effects (Chantala and Tabor 1999). Thus, all analyses were conducted in Stata using the survey procedure to ensure correct standard errors.

### RESULTS

Table 1 shows the means of the variables used in the multivariate analyses. These means are presented separately for women and men by relationship type. Among women, the bivariate association between violence and relationship type follows the pattern documented by Stets and Straus (1990) for young adults. Cohabiting women are most likely to perpetrate or be the victims of violence, followed by married women, and finally dating women. For perpetration of



violence in the past year, the percentages are 38, 28, and 20 for cohabiting, married, and dating women, respectively. The analogous figures for violent victimization are 27, 18, and 11 percent, respectively.

[TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE]

Among men, there are fewer differences in perpetration or victimization by relationship type. Dating men are significantly less likely to report having perpetrated violence than either cohabiting or married men. Cohabiting and married men do not differ in their perpetration of violence. Whereas 9% of dating men reported abusing their partners, 18% of cohabiting and married men reported partner abuse in the past year. A similar pattern of findings emerges for men's victimization experiences. About one-quarter of cohabiting and married men (22% and 26%, respectively) experienced violent victimization in the past year versus 11% of dating men.

Daters are slightly younger than cohabitators and marrieds. They are also more likely to be enrolled in school and are less involved in the labor force. Daters report higher levels of education, on average, than cohabitators and marrieds. Dating women earn less than cohabiting and married women. Among men, marrieds earn more than cohabitators and daters. Marrieds are most likely to have shared biological children whereas cohabitators are most likely to have at least one stepchild. Average levels of relationship quality do not vary by relationship type among women, whereas among men, cohabitators and daters report poorer relationship quality than marrieds. Relationship duration varies by relationship type. For both women and men, average relationship duration is shortest among daters (about 25 months), then cohabitators (29 to 33 months), and finally marrieds (49 to 52 months).

Table 2 shows the logistic regression coefficients for models predicting the likelihood of partner violence perpetration separately for women and men. Controlling for individual, family

of origin, and relationship factors associated with both relationship type and violence, cohabiting women are more likely than either marrieds or daters to perpetrate relationship violence. The odds of married women perpetrating violence are roughly 60 % those of cohabiting women and the odds for dating women are one-third those of cohabiting women. The regression coefficient for daters is of significantly smaller magnitude than is that for marrieds (denoted by a superscript  $a$  in the table), meaning daters are less likely than marrieds to engage in violence perpetration. Black and Hispanic women are nearly twice as likely to report violent behavior as Whites. Education is negatively associated with violence perpetration. Mistreatment by adults is positively associated with violence. As anticipated, relationship quality is negatively related to violence perpetration whereas relationship duration is positively associated. However, controlling for these relationship features does not alter the bivariate association between relationship type and violence documented in Table 1.

[TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE]

Similarly, among men, the findings observed at the bivariate level persist in the full model. Dating men are less likely to report violence perpetration than either cohabiting or married men, but cohabiting and married men do not differ in their odds of partner violence. The likelihood that dating men perpetrate violence is only one-half that of cohabiting men. Apart from the positive association between lower levels of partner education and violence perpetration, none of the individual or family of origin factors is associated with violence among men. Consistent with the findings just described for women, relationship quality is negatively associated with violence whereas relationship duration is positively associated with the likelihood of violent behavior among men.

Turning now to violent victimization, we find that both married and dating women are less likely to experience victimization than are cohabiting women, net of individual, family of origin, and relationship factors, as shown in Table 3. The odds that married women experience violent victimization are half those of cohabiting women. The gap is even larger for daters, whose odds of victimization are less than one-third those of cohabiting women. Dating women are also less likely than married women to be victimized. Younger women are less likely to report victimization than older women. Black women are more likely to report victimization than White women. Being enrolled in school is related to lower odds of victimization. Parental closeness is associated with reduced odds of experiencing partner violence whereas mistreatment by an adult is positively related to violence victimization. The linkages between relationship quality, duration, and victimization are analogous to those obtained for violence perpetration. Relationship quality is negatively associated with women's victimization experiences, but the likelihood of victimization increases with relationship duration.

[TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE]

Among men, cohabitators and marrieds are similarly likely to experience violent victimization, and dating men are significantly less likely than either of these groups to be victimized. Daters are about 40% as likely as either cohabitators or marrieds to experience violent victimization. Consistent with the findings shown in the model in Table 2 predicting violence perpetration among men, individual level factors are not associated with variation in violent victimization among men. Parental closeness is associated with a reduced likelihood of victimization among men, whereas mistreatment by an adult is positively related to victimization. Relationship quality is associated with lower odds of reports of victimizing

experiences, and longer relationships are associated with a greater likelihood of violent victimization.

Supplemental analyses (not shown) tested for interaction effects between relationship duration and relationship type to evaluate whether the effects of duration on violence perpetration or victimization depended on the type of relationship the respondent was in (Yllo and Straus [1981] found such an effect). None of these interaction terms was significant meaning that duration is similarly positively associated with both violence perpetration and victimization for women and men alike regardless of relationship type. Additionally, tests for interactions between relationship type and relationship quality yielded no significant results. In other words, poor relationship quality is a risk factor for violence regardless of relationship type.

## DISUCSSION

Using data from the first and third waves of the Add Health, we examined the linkages between relationship type and violence among a nationally representative sample of young adults.

Consistent with prior work on adult samples by Stets and Straus (1990) as well as research comparing dating and cohabiting young adults (Magdol et al. 1998), we found that cohabiting young adults report relatively high levels of violence. However, our results indicate that the association between relationship type and violence perpetration and victimization depends on gender. Cohabiting women are more likely to report violent behavior towards their partner than either dating or married women. In turn, married women are more likely to report violent behavior towards their partner than are dating women. A similar pattern obtains for violent victimization among women. Among men, cohabitators are more likely to report violence perpetration than daters but not marrieds. They are also more likely to report violent victimization than daters but not marrieds. Dating men are less likely to experience violence (as

perpetrator or victim) in their relationships than married men. Although relationship quality is negatively associated with the violence perpetration and victimization, controlling for it does not attenuate the linkage between relationship type and violence.

Gender is a salient factor in understanding how relationship type is associated with violence. Among women, cohabitation is a more violent relationship context than is marriage. In contrast, the likelihood of violence experiences among men, whether it is perpetration or victimization, does not differ in cohabitation and marriage. Cohabiting women are more likely to behave violently toward their partners and at the same time are more likely to experience violence at the hands of their partners than are married women, suggesting that cohabitation is a unique relationship environment, at least for women. Notably, despite controlling for three sets of factors (including individual sociodemographic characteristics, family of origin factors, and relationship quality) known to be related to both relationship type and violence, the pattern of findings obtained in the bivariate analyses persisted in the multivariate models. That is, we were unable to fully account for the relationship type differences in partner violence, suggesting there may be other unidentified mechanisms at work. Moreover, it is not readily apparent why relationship violence among cohabitators and marrieds would differ for women, but not for men.

We might have expected the findings for women and men to dovetail such that the patterns observed for men's perpetration would be consistent with those for women's victimization and vice versa. For instance, if cohabiting women are more likely to report being victimized than married women, it stands to reason that cohabiting men ought to be more likely than married men to admit to perpetrating partner violence. These apparent discrepancies point to the importance of examining relationship violence within couples, although considerable discrepancies in reporting would likely persist (Bohannon, Dosser, and Lindley 1995; Hanley

and O'Neill 1997; Schafer, Caetano, and Clark 2002; Szinovacz and Egley 1995). Caetano et al. (2002) found less agreement about relationship violence among cohabiting versus married couples, which may partially explain our seemingly inconsistent results. Notably, there is essentially no gender discrepancy in reporting among marrieds whereas the potential reporting errors among daters and especially cohabitators are quite large.

We acknowledge that this study has some weaknesses. As noted above, we are not able to use couple-level data to examine the association between relationship type and violence which might help to illuminate why we observe gender asymmetry in reports of violence perpetration and victimization within relationship type. Also, we were not able to control for the frequency of disagreements, which are indicative of the level of opportunities for violence (Johnson and Ferraro 2000; Magdol et al. 1998). Unfortunately, relationship quality measures are not extensive in the Add Health. Moreover, the cross-sectional design of our study does not allow us to rule out the possibility that relationship quality worsens as a consequence of relationship violence. Instead, our assumption is that poor relationship quality sets the stage for violence, but admittedly this relationship is likely reciprocal.

A second limitation is the lack of measures of the partner's economic resources. The Add Health only contains information on partner education. Ideally, we would have constructed measures of status compatibility that tapped the relative economic contributions of women and men as research shows that women's higher relative education, earnings, and labor force participation are positively associated with intimate partner violence (Anderson 1997; Johnson and Ferraro 2000; Kaukinen 2004).

A third data limitation is the age range of the sample: 18 to 28 years old. The rising age at first marriage means that our sample perhaps contains a selective group of early marriers who

may be at greater risk of relationship violence than those who marry at later ages. Nonetheless, this limitation does not hinder our ability to test our research questions and in fact provides a more conservative test. The findings from this study apply specifically to young adults who are the group most likely to experience partner violence.

We believe this study has significant strengths that make it an important contribution to the literature on partner violence. It includes a dual focus on perpetration and victimization and examines the experiences of both women and men. Our developmental lens on young adulthood is enhanced by the use of longitudinal data which permit inclusion of family of origin factors (prospectively measured at time one) that are related to subsequent relationship violence. To our knowledge, this is the first study to compare relationship violence among daters, cohabitators, and marrieds using a large, nationally representative sample.

Our study contributes to the growing literature on relationship violence among young adults, the group most at risk of experiencing violence, by identifying the relationship contexts in which violence is most (and least) likely. Cohabitation is a distinct relationship environment for women, whose levels of violence perpetration and victimization alike significantly exceed those of married and dating women. In contrast, cohabitation appears similar to marriage in terms of relationship violence experiences for men. Taken together, these findings demonstrate the importance of distinguishing among dating, cohabitation, and marriage as relationship contexts involving various levels of risks of violent behavior for young adults at the same time that they highlight the centrality of gender in intimate partner violence.

## REFERENCES

- Anderson, Kristin L. 1997. "Gender, Status, and Domestic Violence: An Integration of Feminist and Family Violence Approaches." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 59: 655-69.
- Bohannon, J. R., Dosser, D. A., & Lindley, S. E. 1995. "Using Couple Data to Determine Domestic Violence Rates: An Attempt to Replicate Previous Work." *Violence & Victims* 10:133-141.
- Brines, Julie and Kara Joyner. 1999. "The Ties that Bind: Principles of Cohesion in Cohabitation and Marriage." *American Sociological Review* 64: 333-355.
- Brown, Susan L. 2004. "Moving from Cohabitation to Marriage: Effects on Relationship Quality." *Social Science Research* 33:1-19.
- Brown, Susan L. and Alan Booth. 1996. "Cohabitation versus Marriage: A Comparison of Relationship Quality." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 58: 668-678.
- Brownridge, Douglas A. and Shiva S. Halli. 2002. "Understanding Male Partner Violence Against Cohabiting and Married Women: An Empirical Investigation with a Synthesized Model." *Journal of Family Violence* 17: 341-361.
- Bumpass, Larry L. and Hsien-Hen Lu. 2000. "Trends in Cohabitation and Implications for Children's Family Contexts in the United States." *Population Studies* 54:29-41.
- Caetano, Raul, John Schafer, Craig Field, and Scott M. Nelson. 2002. "Agreement on Reports of Intimate Partner Violence among White, Black, and Hispanic Couples in the United States." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 17:1308-1322.
- Casper, Lynne M. and Suzanne Bianchi. 2002. *Continuity and Change in American Families*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.



- Cate, R. M., J. M. Henton, J. Koval, F. S. Christopher, and S. Lloyd. 1982. "Premarital Abuse: A Social Psychological Perspective." *Journal of Family Issues* 3:79-90.
- Chantala, Kim and Joyce Tabor. 2001. "Strategies to Perform a Design-Based Analysis Using the Add Health." *Add Health User Guide*.  
<http://www.cpc.unc.edu/projects/addhealth/files/weight1.pdf>.
- Christopher, F. Scott, Mary Madura, and Lori Weaver. 1998. "Premarital Sexual Aggressors: A Multivariate Analysis of Social, Relational, and Individual Variables." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 60:56-69.
- Frias, Sonia and Ronald J. Angel. 2005. "The Risk of Partner Violence among Low-Income Hispanic Subgroups." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 67:552-564.
- Foshee, Vangie A., Karl E. Bauman, and G. Fletcher Linder. 1999. "Family Violence and the Perpetration of Adolescent Dating Violence: Examining Social Learning and Social Control Processes." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 61:331-342.
- Gaertner, Lowell and Vangie Foshee. 1999. "Commitment and the Perpetration of Relationship Violence." *Personal Relationships* 6:227-239.
- Graham-Kevan, Nicola and John Archer. 2003. "Intimate Terrorism and Common Couple Violence." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 18:1247-1270.
- Halpern, Carolyn Tucker, Selene G. Oslak, Mary L. Young, Sandra L. Martin, and Lawrence L. Kupper. 2001. "Partner Violence Among Adolescents in Opposite-Sex Romantic Relationships: Findings From the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health." *American Journal of Public Health* 91:1679-1685.
- Hanley, M. Joan and Patrick O'Neill. 1997. "Violence and Commitment: A Study of Dating Couples." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 12:685-703.

- Heyman, Richard E. and Amy M. Smith Slep. 2002. "Do Child Abuse and Interparental Violence Lead to Adulthood Family Violence?" *Journal of Marriage and Family* 64:864-870.
- Johnson, Michael P. 1995. "Patriarchal Terrorism and Common Couple Violence: Two Forms of Violence Against Women." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 57:283-94.
- Johnson, Michael P. and Kathleen J. Ferraro. (2000). Research on domestic violence in the 1990s: Making Distinctions." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 62:948-63.
- Johnson, Michael P. and Janel M. Leone. 2005. "The Differential Effects of Intimate Terrorism and Situational Couple Violence." *Journal of Family Issues* 26:322-349.
- Kaukinen, Catherine. 2004. "Status Compatibility, Physical Violence, and Emotional Abuse in Intimate Relationships." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 66:452-471.
- Kaura, Shelby A. and Craig M. Allen. 2004. "Dissatisfaction with Relationship Power and Dating Violence Perpetration by Men and Women." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 19:576-588.
- Lane, Katherine E. and Patricia A. Gwartney-Gibbs. 1985. "Violence in the Context of Dating and Sex." *Journal of Family Issues* 6:45-59.
- Linder, J.R. and W. Andrew Collins. In press. "Parent and Peer Predictors of Physical Aggression and Conflict Management in Romantic Relationships in Early Adulthood." *Journal of Family Psychology*.
- Magdol, Lynn, Terrie E. Moffitt, Avshalom Caspi, and Phil A. Silva 1998. "Hitting Without a License: Testing Explanations for Differences in Partner Abuse Between Young Adult Daters and Cohabiters." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 60:41-55.

- Nock, Steven L. 1995. "A Comparison of Marriages and Cohabiting Relationships." *Journal of Family Issues* 16:53-76.
- Ronfeldt, Heidi M., Rachel Kimerling, and Ileana Arias. 1998. "Satisfaction with Relationship Power and the Perpetration of Dating Violence." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 60: 70-78.
- Schafer, John, Raul Caetano, and Catherine L. Clark. 2002. "Agreement about Violence in U.S. Couples." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 17:457-470.
- 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.
- Smock, Pamela. J. 2000. "Cohabitation in the United States: An Appraisal of Research Themes, Findings, and Implications." *Annual Review of Sociology* 26: 1-20.
- Stets, Jan E. 1991. "Cohabiting and Marital Aggression: The Role of Social Isolation." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 53:669-80.
- Stets, Jan E. and Maureen A. Pirog-Good. 1990. "Interpersonal Control and Courtship Aggression." *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* 7:371-94.
- Stets, Jan E. and Murray A. Straus. 1990. "The Marriage License as Hitting License: A Comparison of Assaults in Dating, Cohabiting, and Married Couples." In Murray A. Straus and Richard J. Gelles (Eds.), *Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families* (pp.227-44). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

- Stith, Sanda 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 the Family* 62:640-654.
- Szinovacz, Maximiliane E., and Lance C. Egley. 1995. "Comparing One-Partner and Couple Data on Sensitive Marital Behaviors: The Case of Marital Violence." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 57:995-1010.
- Udry, J. Richard. 2003. The National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health), Waves I & II, 1994–1996; Wave III, 2001–2002 [machine-readable data file and documentation]. Chapel Hill, NC: Carolina Population Center, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
- Yllo, Kersti and Murray A. Straus. 1981. "Interpersonal Violence among Married and Cohabiting Couples." *Family Relations* 30:339-47.

**Table 1. Weighted Means of All Variables by Gender and Marital Status**

	<b>Women</b>			<b>Men</b>		
	Dating	Cohabiting	Married	Dating	Cohabiting	Married
<i>Dependent Variables</i>						
Any Physical Violence—Perpetrated	0.20 <sup>a, b ***</sup>	0.38 <sup>b ***</sup>	0.28 <sup>a **</sup>	0.09 <sup>a, b</sup>	0.18	0.18
	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)
Any Physical Violence—Victimized	0.11 <sup>a, b</sup>	0.27 <sup>b</sup>	0.18 <sup>a</sup>	0.11 <sup>a, b</sup>	0.22	0.26
	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.03)
<i>Individual Factors</i>						
Education < H.S.	0.06 <sup>a, b</sup>	0.11	0.11	0.05 <sup>a, b</sup>	0.17	0.14
	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.03)	(0.03)
Finished H.S.	0.25 <sup>a, b</sup>	0.46	0.47	0.29 <sup>a, b</sup>	0.45	0.50
	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.04)	(0.04)
Some College	0.54 <sup>a, b</sup>	0.33	0.32	0.50 <sup>a, b</sup>	0.31	0.27
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.07)	(0.03)
College Degree or More	0.15 <sup>a</sup>	0.09	0.10	0.16 <sup>a, b</sup>	0.07	0.10
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.02)
Partner Education < H.S.	0.06 <sup>a, b</sup>	0.17	0.17	0.06 <sup>a, b</sup>	0.12	0.17
	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.03)
Partner Finished H.S.	0.44	0.46	0.44	0.50	0.50	0.45
	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.04)	(0.04)
Partner had Some College	0.32	0.28	0.28	0.27	0.25	0.24
	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
Partner has College Degree or More	0.18 <sup>a, b</sup>	0.09	0.11	0.17	0.14	0.14
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.03)
Currently Enrolled in School	0.54 <sup>a, b</sup>	0.25	0.18	0.49 <sup>a, b</sup>	0.16	0.13
	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.02)
Employed Full-time	0.41 <sup>a</sup>	0.54	0.47	0.50 <sup>a, b</sup>	0.67 <sup>b</sup>	0.82 <sup>a</sup>
	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.04)	(0.03)
Employed Part-time	0.30 <sup>a, b</sup>	0.18	0.16	0.22 <sup>a, b</sup>	0.11	0.07
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.01)
Not Working	0.30	0.28 <sup>b</sup>	0.37 <sup>a</sup>	0.28 <sup>b</sup>	0.23 <sup>b</sup>	0.12 <sup>a</sup>
	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.03)
Income	10459.5 <sup>a, b</sup>	12929.7	13463.2	14444.9 <sup>a, b</sup>	18914.0 <sup>b</sup>	21988.6
	(596.4)	(670.0)	(710.2)	(693.3)	(1037.3)	(1219.8)

No Children in Household	0.85 <sup>a, b</sup> (0.02)	0.66 <sup>b</sup> (0.03)	0.42 (0.03)	0.99 <sup>a, b</sup> (0.01)	0.75 <sup>b</sup> (0.03)	0.48 (0.04)
Only Couple's Children in Household	0.08 <sup>a, b</sup> (0.02)	0.23 <sup>b</sup> (0.03)	0.51 (0.03)	0.01 <sup>a, b</sup> (0.00)	0.24 <sup>b</sup> (0.03)	0.50 (0.04)
Other Children in Household	0.07 (0.01)	0.11 (0.02)	0.07 (0.02)	0.01 (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)	0.02 (0.01)
White	0.68 <sup>b</sup> (0.03)	0.71 (0.04)	0.77 (0.04)	0.70 (0.04)	0.74 (0.04)	0.74 (0.04)
Black	0.18 <sup>b</sup> (0.03)	0.13 <sup>b</sup> (0.03)	0.07 <sup>a</sup> (0.02)	0.12 (0.03)	0.10 (0.02)	0.08 (0.02)
Hispanic	0.09 (0.02)	0.11 (0.02)	0.13 (0.03)	0.11 (0.03)	0.12 (0.03)	0.15 (0.03)
Other Race/Ethnicity	0.06 (0.01)	0.05 (0.01)	0.03 (0.01)	0.07 <sup>b</sup> (0.02)	0.04 (0.01)	0.03 (0.01)
Age	21.34 <sup>a, b</sup> (0.14)	21.75 <sup>b</sup> (0.03)	22.51 <sup>a</sup> (0.13)	21.69 <sup>a, b</sup> (0.15)	22.43 <sup>b</sup> (0.16)	22.98 <sup>a</sup> (0.13)
<i>Family of Origin Factors</i>						
Two-Parent Biological/Adoptive Family	0.60 <sup>a</sup> (0.03)	0.48 (0.03)	0.54 (0.03)	0.63 <sup>a</sup> (0.03)	0.48 (0.03)	0.56 (0.03)
Step-Family	0.14 <sup>a</sup> (0.02)	0.20 (0.02)	0.18 (0.02)	0.14 <sup>a</sup> (0.02)	0.20 (0.03)	0.16 (0.03)
Single Mother	0.22 (0.02)	0.22 (0.02)	0.18 (0.02)	0.19 (0.03)	0.21 (0.03)	0.14 (0.02)
Other Family Structure	0.04 <sup>a, b</sup> (0.01)	0.09 (0.02)	0.10 (0.01)	0.04 <sup>a, b</sup> (0.01)	0.10 (0.02)	0.14 (0.03)
Parent Education < H.S.	0.10 <sup>a, b</sup> (0.01)	0.16 (0.03)	0.18 (0.03)	0.08 <sup>a, b</sup> (0.02)	0.20 (0.03)	0.19 (0.03)
Parent finished H.S.	0.30 <sup>a</sup> (0.03)	0.39 (0.03)	0.32 (0.03)	0.22 <sup>a, b</sup> (0.02)	0.36 (0.03)	0.30 (0.03)
Parent had Some College	0.20 <sup>b</sup> (0.02)	0.24 (0.03)	0.29 (0.02)	0.23 (0.03)	0.19 <sup>b</sup> (0.02)	0.31 <sup>a</sup> (0.03)
Parent Finished College	0.40 <sup>a, b</sup> (0.03)	0.22 (0.03)	0.22 (0.03)	0.47 <sup>a, b</sup> (0.04)	0.25 (0.03)	0.19 (0.03)
Parental Closeness	17.51 (0.17)	17.50 (0.17)	17.29 (0.15)	18.16 <sup>b</sup> (0.14)	17.72 (0.18)	17.56 (0.23)
Religiosity	3.04 <sup>a</sup> (0.07)	2.86 <sup>b</sup> (0.08)	3.16 <sup>a</sup> (0.06)	3.02 <sup>a</sup> (0.06)	2.68 (0.10)	2.91 (0.09)

Mistreatment by Adult(s)	0.27 (0.02)	0.31 (0.03)	0.26 (0.02)	0.31 (0.03)	0.38 (0.03)	0.34 (0.03)
<i>Relationship Factors</i>						
Relationship Quality	1.94 (0.11)	2.04 (0.14)	2.32 (0.15)	1.33 <sup>d</sup> (0.19)	1.69 <sup>d</sup> (0.19)	2.40 (0.14)
Duration	26.17 <sup>a, b</sup> (1.29)	33.72 <sup>b</sup> (1.59)	52.65 (1.42)	24.86 <sup>a, b</sup> (1.22)	29.01 <sup>b</sup> (1.72)	49.01 (1.87)
N	823	547	597	571	386	371

<sup>a</sup> Significantly different from cohabitators  $p < 0.05$

<sup>b</sup> Significantly different from marrieds  $p < 0.05$

Significantly different from men, \* $p < 0.05$ , \*\* $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\* $p < 0.001$  (tested for dependent variables only)

Note: All analyses are corrected for the complex sampling design of the Add Health

**Table 2. Logistic Regression Predicting Perpetration of Physical Violence, for Women and Men**

	Women (n=1967)			Men (n=1328)		
	b	(SE)	O.R.	b	(SE)	O.R.
<i>Relationship Type</i>						
Married	-0.524 *	0.20	0.592	-0.135	0.27	0.874
Dating	-1.022 *** <sup>a</sup>	0.18	0.360	-0.731 *	0.29	0.481
<i>Individual Factors</i>						
Education < H.S.	0.433 **	0.36	1.542	-0.545	0.59	0.580
Finished H.S.	0.110 ***	0.31	1.116	-0.107	0.49	0.898
Some College	0.081 **	0.25	1.085	-0.458	0.50	0.632
Partner Education < H.S.	1.168	0.42	3.214	1.731 **	0.58	5.647
Partner Finished H.S.	1.281	0.31	3.601	1.008 *	0.48	2.740
Partner had Some College	0.930	0.30	2.534	0.821	0.48	2.273
Currently enrolled in school	-0.118	0.18	0.888	-0.227	0.31	0.797
Employed Part-time	0.143	0.21	1.153	-0.069	0.35	0.933
Not Working	0.196	0.18	1.216	-0.128	0.30	0.880
Income (Logged)	0.032	0.03	1.032	-0.029	0.04	0.972
Children of Couple in Household	-0.429 *	0.20	0.651	-0.033	0.30	0.968
Other Children in Household	-0.759 *	0.36	0.468	0.025	0.76	1.025
Black	0.592 *	0.23	1.808	0.331	0.36	1.392
Hispanic	0.628 *	0.24	1.874	0.144	0.31	1.154
Other Race/Ethnicity	0.339	0.30	1.404	-0.184	0.44	0.832
Age	-0.078	0.04	0.925	0.002	0.07	1.002
<i>Family of Origin Factors</i>						
Step-Family	-0.607	0.28	0.545	-0.268	0.40	0.765
Single Mother	-0.349	0.18	0.705	-0.050	0.35	0.952
Other Family Structure	-0.234	0.20	0.792	-0.250	0.32	0.779
Parent Education < H.S.	-0.362 *	0.21	0.696	-0.032	0.33	0.969
Parent finished H.S.	-0.137	0.21	0.872	0.208	0.35	1.232
Parent had some college	-0.373	0.31	0.689	-0.205	0.43	0.815
Parental Closeness	-0.030	0.02	0.971	-0.078	0.04	0.925
Religiosity	0.043	0.07	1.044	0.103	0.10	1.108
Mistreatment by Adult(s)	0.548 ***	0.14	1.730	0.445	0.23	1.560
<i>Relationship Factors</i>						
Relationship Quality	-0.129 ***	0.03	0.879	-0.139 ***	0.04	0.870
Duration	0.012 ***	0.00	1.012	0.009 *	0.00	1.009
Intercept	0.167	1.21		-1.045	1.91	
F	4.740 ***			2.670 ***		

\*p < 0.05, \*\*p<0.01, \*\*\*p<0.001

<sup>a</sup>Significantly different from married, p<0.05

Note: All analyses are corrected for the complex sampling design of the Add Health



**Table 3. Logistic Regression Predicting Victimization of Physical Violence, for Women and Men**

	Women (n=1967)			Men (n=1328)		
	b	(SE)	O.R.	b	(SE)	O.R.
<i>Relationship Type</i>						
Married	-0.631 *	0.25	0.532	0.19	0.24	1.209
Dating	-1.245 *** <sup>a</sup>	0.24	0.288	-0.899 *** <sup>a</sup>	0.26	0.407
<i>Individual Factors</i>						
Education < H.S.	1.138 *	0.49	3.12	-0.522	0.63	0.594
Finished H.S.	0.696	0.42	2.005	0.296	0.52	1.344
Some College	1.272 **	0.42	3.569	0.487	0.53	1.628
Partner Education < H.S.	0.61	0.46	1.841	0.824	0.52	2.279
Partner Finished H.S.	0.478	0.38	1.613	0.534	0.44	1.706
Partner had Some College	0.241	0.35	1.273	0.441	0.37	1.555
Currently enrolled in school	-0.594 **	0.22	0.552	-0.395	0.25	0.674
Employed Part-time	0.156	0.26	1.169	-0.12	0.31	0.887
Not Working	0.074	0.22	1.077	0.266	0.28	1.305
Income (Logged)	0.029	0.04	1.03	-0.021	0.04	0.980
Children of Couple in Household	-0.174	0.23	0.84	-0.105	0.24	0.900
Other Children in Household	-0.612	0.41	0.542	-0.041	0.73	0.960
Black	0.605 *	0.28	1.831	0.475	0.29	1.609
Hispanic	-0.249	0.32	0.78	0.42	0.34	1.522
Other Race/Ethnicity	0.27	0.29	1.31	-0.169	0.4	0.845
Age	-0.107 *	0.05	0.899	-0.032	0.06	0.968
<i>Family of Origin Factors</i>						
Step-Family	-0.51	0.31	0.6	-0.235	0.36	0.790
Single Mother	-0.4	0.24	0.67	0.08	0.33	1.083
Other Family Structure	-0.172	0.25	0.842	0.011	0.31	1.011
Parent Education < H.S.	-0.124	0.23	0.884	-0.301	0.32	0.740
Parent finished H.S.	-0.193	0.26	0.824	0.038	0.3	1.039
Parent had some college	-0.568	0.32	0.567	-0.644	0.43	0.525
Parental Closeness	-0.068 **	0.02	0.934	-0.081 *	0.04	0.922
Religiosity	0.111	0.08	1.117	0.099	0.09	1.104
Mistreatment by Adult(s)	0.554 ***	0.16	1.739	0.646 **	0.23	1.907
<i>Relationship Factors</i>						
Relationship Quality	-0.206 ***	0.03	0.814	-0.153 ***	0.04	0.858
Duration	0.01 ***	0	1.01	0.01 ***	0	1.010
Intercept	0.979	1.47		-0.24	1.76	
F	6.080 ***			3.460 ***		

\*p < 0.05, \*\*p<0.01, \*\*\*p<0.001

<sup>a</sup>Significantly different from married, p<0.05

Note: All analyses are corrected for the complex sampling design of the Add Health

