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Presentation Outline

1. Define and discuss the salience of the “cycle of violence” hypothesis or theory of intergenerational transmission of violence
2. Discuss limitations in current literature
3. Focusing on research methods
   a. Methodological review of literature
   b. Findings from Young Adults Live & Learn (Y’ALL) Project
4. Future research directions and practical implications

The “Cycle of Violence” Defined

Youth who are exposed to family violence are at an increased future risk for violence later in life (social learning theory; Bandura, 1978)
The “Cycle of Violence” Defined

Youth who are exposed to family violence are at an increased future risk for violence later in life (social learning theory; Bandura, 1978)

Generalized
Exposure to family violence → Perpetration/ victimization during adolescence → Perpetration/ victimization during adulthood

Specific
Exposure to parental IPV → Perpetration/ victimization of dating violence → Perpetration/ victimization of IPV in adulthood
**My Focus: Exposure to IPV & Dating Violence and Intimate Partner Violence**

Exposure to IPV
- Childhood and adolescence (youth)
- Partner → Partner
- Partner → Partner
- Dual exposure

**My Focus: Exposure to IPV & Dating Violence and Intimate Partner Violence**

Exposure to IPV
- Childhood and adolescence (youth)
- Partner → Partner
- Partner → Partner
- Dual exposure

Dating violence and IPV
- Physical and/or sexual violence that may be accompanied by non-physical abuse tactics
- Developmental period

**How strong is the support for the “cycle of violence” hypothesis?**

- Most studied and cited risk markers for IPV
How strong is the support for the “cycle of violence” hypothesis?

- Most studied and cited risk markers for IPV
- Mixed findings but most find support
- Small effect size linking IPV exposure and adult IPV (Smith-Marek et al., 2015; Stith et al., 2001)
- Majority of IPV-exposed youth do not later experience IPV
- “Nontransmission of violence”? (Johnson & Cares, 2004)

So, what next? A focus on research methods.
Methodological Limitations

Holden (2003)

• Tremendous diversity in how one defines "exposure," "dating violence," and "IPV"
• Lack of differentiation in who was the perpetrator (e.g., mother, father, both), context in which violence occurs (e.g., coercive control), and type of IPV (e.g., physical, psychological)
Initial study purpose
Conduct a systematic review to examine how methodological decisions impacted whether researchers find support for or against the "cycle of violence" hypothesis

....not possible
Initial study purpose
Conduct a systematic review to examine how methodological decisions impacted whether researchers find support for or against the "cycle of violence" hypothesis

….not possible

Ultimate study purpose
Conduct a systematic review to better understand researchers' methodological decisions when examining the association between family violence (e.g., exposure to IPV, child abuse) and dating violence in young adulthood.

Gathering the Studies for Review

Study inclusion criteria:
• Young adults between 18 – 29
• Studies situated in the United States
• Peer reviewed journal articles published between 02-16

Databases
• Google Scholar, Psych Info, PubMed, Web of Science

Selected Keywords and Combination
• Emerging adulthood, young adulthood, college-age
• IPV, domestic violence, EIPV, family violence
• Dating violence/abuse/aggression

Analytic Sample (N = 16)
• Quantitative study design
• Cross-sectional with undergraduates (n = 11)
• Longitudinal (n = 5; n = 2 impoverished communities; 3 nationally representative)
Analytic Sample \((N = 16)\)

- Quantitative study design
- Cross-sectional with undergraduates \((n = 11)\)
- Longitudinal \((n = 5; n = 2\) impoverished communities; 3 nationally representative)·
- Half male/female \((n = 7)\); predominately/exclusively male \((n = 5)\); predominately female \((n = 4)\)
- Predominately White/European American samples \((n = 12)\)
- Opposite-sex relationships or marriages

IPV Exposure *Measurement*

- Young adult self-report \((n = 13)\)
- No EIPV time frame specified \((n = 10)\)
IBV Exposure Measurement

- Young adult self-report (n = 13)
- No EIPV time frame specified (n = 10)

**Parental IPV Perpetrator**

- Father
- Both parents
- Mutual
- No distinction

**Type of IPV**

- Physical only
- Both Physical & Psychological

---

**IBV Exposure Measurement**

- Young adult self-report (n = 13)
- No EIPV time frame specified (n = 10)

**Parental IPV Perpetrator**

- Father
- Both parents
- Mutual
- No distinction

**Type of IPV**

- Physical only
- Both Physical & Psychological

---

**Dating Violence Perpetration (DV-P) & Victimization (DV-V) Measurement**

**Time Frame**

- Past year or two (n = 9)
- No specified time frame (n = 6)
- Between age 14 and study (n = 1)
Dating Violence Perpetration (DV-P) & Victimization (DV-V) Measurement

Time Frame
- Past year or two \( (n = 9) \)
- No specified time frame \( (n = 6) \)
- Between age 14 and study \( (n = 1) \)

![Graph showing Dating Violence]

Types of Dating Violence
- Physical Only
- Physical & Sexual
- Physical & Psychological
- Physical, Sexual, & Psychological

All used CTS or CTS2
IPV Exposure & Dating Violence Analysis: Approach #1: Dichotomizing

- Either asking yes/no or collapsing items into yes/no

IPV exposure ($n = 9$)
- Collapsed all into yes/no ($n = 6$)
  - Two yes/no variables: mother or father perpetrated ($n = 2$)
  - Two yes/no variables: mild or severe violence ($n = 1$)

Dating violence ($n = 6$)
- Collapsed all dating violence types into yes/no ($n = 3$)
  - Two yes/no variables: mild or severe physical violence ($n = 1$)
  - Multiple yes/no variables for each type ($n = 2$)
IPV Exposure & Dating Violence Analysis: Approach #2: Summed Score

- IPV exposure ($n = 7$)
  - Frequency ($n = 6$) or severity score ($n = 1$)
  - Some assessed who perpetrated separately
  - Some assessed different types of violence/abuse exposure

- Dating violence ($n = 10$)
  - Frequency of perpetration ($n = 4$)
  - Frequency of victimization ($n = 1$)
  - Frequency of both ($n = 5$)
  - Only physical violence ($n = 4$)
  - Few reported findings for multiple types of dating violence or abuse

Key Take Away Points

1. Too Much Methodological Variability
   - Who perpetrated, which types, when, and was IPV was frequent, severe, unknown?
Key Take Awaay Points

1. Too Much Methodological Variability
   - Who perpetrated, which types, when, and was IPV was frequent, severe, unknown?

2. Too Little Methodological Complexity
   - Acts of physical violence only
   - Dichotomizing (yes/no) variables
   - No examination of context or degree of coercion

Research & Practical Implications

Research Implications
   - Clearly define variables (e.g., IPV exposure)
   - Add additional measures to examine context in which violence occurs
   - Avoid dichotomizing
   - Diversify study sample
   - Examine pathways and processes between IPV exposure and dating violence
     - Focus on discontinuity, not just continuity
Research & Practical Implications

Practical Implications
• Screen youth and young adults for physical violence and nonphysical abuse
• Apply research findings judiciously
• Be very cautious of assumptions regarding the “cycle of violence” since many exposed youth show patterns of “nontransmission”

“I would say [the violence I saw] has impacted me in a way where I am very cautious about the kind of person that I would get into a relationship with. The moment I see a sign of aggression or like if they are controlling or jealous I get out of it and get away because I always feel like those are the little signs that could lead into them being like my dad and you know… I just try to keep my eyes open, and the moment I see something that could be a sign of them being aggressive or abusive, I cut it off…

[My dad’s violence] has probably set my expectations a little higher. Just because I do look for those red flags a lot. I just really expect someone to treat me how I am supposed to be treated and you know be respectful and kind and not mean or abusive in any form—emotionally, verbally, physically or anything like that. I think it has made me a little more picky than others, but that’s just because I want to be cautious. I don’t want to end up in that same situation one day.” – London, young adult
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Young Adults Live & Learn Project (Y’ALL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th>Phase 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 college, attending young adults (19-25)</td>
<td>100 IPV-exposed &amp; 47 non-IPV-exposed young adults (18-25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical violence: Modified CTS2</td>
<td>Physical violence: Modified CTS2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercive control: Psychological Maltreatment of Women Inventory (Short Form), Dominance-Isolation Subscale (Tolman, 1989)</td>
<td>Coercive control: Psychological Maltreatment of Women Inventory (Short Form), Dominance-Isolation Subscale (Tolman, 1989)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional dating violence: Digital/online abuse, sexual coercion</td>
<td>Additional dating violence: Digital/online abuse, sexual coercion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relationship Type by Developmental Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Nonabusive</th>
<th>Abusive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Nonabusive</td>
<td>Abusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P14 – Anja</td>
<td>P19 – Saff</td>
<td>P17 – Ayla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P14 – Victoria</td>
<td>P19 – Saff</td>
<td>P17 – Ayla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P18 – Stephen</td>
<td>P20 – Jemima</td>
<td>P26 – Anna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P23 – Emma</td>
<td>P18 – Stephen</td>
<td>P20 – Jemima</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2: relationships</td>
<td>P22 – Rebecca</td>
<td>P21 – May</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P19 – Elle</td>
<td>P21 – May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P18 – Taylor</td>
<td>P20 – Jemima</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P17 – Ayla</td>
<td>P26 – Anna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P17 – Ayla</td>
<td>P26 – Anna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P20 – Jemima</td>
<td>P26 – Anna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P26 – Anna</td>
<td>P26 – Anna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Introduction

“Cycle of Violence” Hypothesis

“Cycle of Violence” Hypotheses
Earlier Research

Intergenerational Continuity of Maltreatment
(Thornberry, Knight, & Lovegrove, 2012)

- Conducted a methodological critique
- Established 11 criteria a study needed to satisfy
- Identified ~1000 → 194 → 47 studies

Almost all studies find support for the cycle of maltreatment hypothesis
But, few satisfy basic methodological criteria
Stronger studies find mixed support (n=7)
On average, met 5 of 11 criteria needed

Life Course & IG Research

- Assortative Mating (Knight, 2012)
- Intergenerational Continuity of Substance Use
  (Knight, Menard, & Simmons, 2014)
- Parental Predictors of Children’s Animal Abuse
  (Knight, Ellis, & Simmons, 2014; Simmons, Knight, & Ellis, 2015)
- Consequences of IPV
  (Simmons, Knight, & Menard, 2015; 2016)
- Life Course and Intergenerational Continuity of Intimate Partner Aggression and Physical Injury: A 20-Year Study (Knight et al., 2016)
**Intimate Partner Aggression**

Definition of IPA
- Aggressive behavior within romantic relationships
- Includes both physical violence (e.g., hitting, slapping, and choking) and emotional/psychological maltreatment (e.g., insults, threats, and withholding behavior)
- Belknap & Melton, 2005

**Hypotheses**

Research Question 1: Continuity of IPA across the Life Course?
- H1a: Respondent’s earlier IPA will be significantly and positively related to later IPA.
- H1b: The overall trajectory of IPA will decrease over time.

Research Question 2: Intergenerational Continuity of IPA?
- H2: Parents’ histories of IPA will be significantly and positively related to their adult children’s histories of IPA.

**Theoretical Background**

- Genetic
- Social learning
- Interactional life course
- Dyadic or developmental dynamic systems
- “Cycle of violence” hypothesis in popular discourse
- Ecological
Past Research

- The extant body of research is piecemeal, as it has historically and unavoidably relied on:
  - Small, retrospective, single-respondent, cross-sectional, short-term, high-risk, male-only, female-only, marital, developmentally-limited, or developmentally-nonequivalent samples of IPA prevalence

IG Literature Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Dev. Stage of SV</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Finding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capaldi &amp; Clark,</td>
<td>Ahnf 97-118</td>
<td>≤20 Males Only</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fite et al., 2008</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>≤21 Separate Analyses</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*n=92, **n=498</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under &amp; Collins,</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>&lt;23 Controlled</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>*n=77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGreal &amp; Ahnol,</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>≥31 Controlled</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>*n=143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green &amp; et al.,</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>≤18 Males Only</td>
<td>No Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>*n=113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith et al., 2011</td>
<td>Partial at risk</td>
<td>&lt;31 Controlled</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*n=498, **n=913</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n=analytic sample size, **imputed sample size

Study Goals

- Hypotheses: life course and intergenerational continuity
- National sample
- 8 waves of prospective data across a 20-year period
- 2 generations of respondents
- Men and women
- Liberal and conservative measure of IPA
Data

- NYSFS (multiple cohort sequential design: households)
- Time period – 27 years (1977-2004): 12 waves
- n = 1,725 families
- G1, G2, and G3 interviewed
- Retention – high

Measures

- Conflict tactic scales (Straus, 1979)
- Perpetration and victimization (82% overlap)
- 20 items
- Prevalence (0 or 1)
- Severity/variety (logged count of the number of different types)

IPA “Severity”
Measures

- Physical injury victimization (0 or 1)
- Physical injury perpetration (0 or 1)
- 6% overlap

- Felt in danger (0 or 1)
- G2 and G3 controls:
  - Age, education, nonwhite, public assistance, married, male

H1 Life Course

Research Question 1: Continuity of IPA across the Life Course?

- H1: Respondent's earlier IPA will be significantly and positively related to later IPA but the overall trajectory of IPA will decrease over time

H1 Analytic Sample

- G2 respondents
- IPA items asked at Waves 6 – Waves 11
- Married or living with partner
- n=1,401 across six waves
### Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IPA</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0-20</td>
<td>1,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Injury [Perp]</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>1,377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Injury [Vict]</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>1,377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt in Danger</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>1,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at Wave 6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>20.85</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>1,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at Wave 11</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>40.32</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>1,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>13.74</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>6-17</td>
<td>1,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonwhite</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>1,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Assistance</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>1,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>1,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>1,401</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### H1 Analytic Strategies

1. Individual Continuity Scores
2. Sequential Multivariate Regression Models
3. Multilevel Growth Curve Modeling

### H1 Individual Continuity Scores

Analytic Strategy:
- Respondents with 2+ waves of data
- # Waves IPA Reported ÷ # Waves IPA Measured x 100 = ICS

- Example: 1 ÷ 2 x 100 = 50%
- Example: 3 ÷ 6 x 100 = 50%

- Simple but uses as many respondents and waves as possible
**H1 Individual Continuity Scores**

IPA findings:
- For n = 52% (644/1,242), ICS = 100%
- For n = 80%, ICS = 50% or more
- For n = 8%, ICS = 0%

IPA findings for respondents in relationships at all 6 waves:
- For n = 44% (89/202), ICS = 100%
- For n = 83%, ICS = 50%
- For n = 5%, ICS = 0%

**H1 Individual Continuity Scores**

Physical injury perpetration findings:
- For n = 1% (5/1,206), ICS = 100%
- For n = 3%, ICS = 50%
- For n = 90%, ICS = 0%

Nearly identical findings for:
- Physical injury victimization
- Felt in danger

**H1 Regression Models**

- IPA correlations ranged from $r = .26$ to $r = .63$, $p < .0001$
- ICC = .47
- 5 sequential regression models
- Earlier IPA $\rightarrow$ Later IPA
- IV and DV logged = Elasticity (Gelman & Hill, 2007)
### Model 1

**DV = IPA (ln) – 3 Years Later**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>b</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonwhite</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Assistance</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPA (ln) x Male</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytic n</td>
<td>329</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Model 2

**DV = IPA (ln) – 3 Years Later**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>b</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonwhite</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Assistance</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPA (ln)</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPA (ln) x Male</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytic n</td>
<td>618</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Model 3

**DV = IPA (ln) – 3 Years Later**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>b</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonwhite</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Assistance</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPA (ln) x Male</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytic n</td>
<td>776</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Model 4
DV = IPA (ln) – 9 Years Later

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>b</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>b*</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonwhite</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Assistance</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| IPA (ln) x Male | 0.05 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.32 |
| R²              | 0.23 |
| Analytic n      | 746  |

Model 5
DV = IPA (ln) – 1 Years Later

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>b</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>b*</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonwhite</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Assistance</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| IPA (ln) | 0.62  | 0.04 | 0.64 | <.0001 |
| IPA (ln) x Male | -0.10 | 0.05 | -0.10 | 0.06 |
| R²       | 0.37  |
| Analytic n | 818  |

H1 Multilevel Growth Curves

[Graph showing multilevel growth curves with various lines indicating different models and parameters.]
H2 Intergenerational

Research Question 2: Intergenerational Continuity of IPA
- H2: Parents' histories of IPA will be significantly and positively related to their adult children's histories of IPA

H2 Analytic Sample

- G2 Respondents
  - IPA asked at W6 – W11
  - Married or living with partner
  - n=151/681/1,401/1,725
- G3 Respondents
  - Adult Children Only
  - IPA asked at W11 – W12
  - Married or living with partner
  - n=202/507/1,366

Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IPA</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0-18</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Injury [Perp]</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Injury [Vict]</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt in Danger</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at Wave 11</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>21.90</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>18-29</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at Wave 12</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>22.72</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>18-31</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>12.16</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>8-16</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonwhite</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Assistance</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
H2 Multi-level Models

- Bivariate Model 6: \( b = 0.17, SE = 0.08, p = 0.03 \)
- A 10% increase in parents’ IPA is associated with a 1.63% increase in their adult children’s IPA.

Model 7

\[
DV = G3\text{ IPA (ln)}
\]

\[
G2 \rightarrow G3\text{ (with G3 Controls)}
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>( b )</th>
<th>( SE )</th>
<th>( b^* )</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonwhite</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Assistance</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-0.66</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPA (ln)</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPA (ln) x Male</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- \( R^2 \) 0.10
- Analytic n 172

Summary of Findings

Hypothesis 1
- Support for life course IPA
- Little support for physical injury

Implications:
- Sustained, potentially low-level, involvement in IPA is common
- Long-term consequences for IPA
Summary of Findings

Hypothesis 2
- Support for intergenerational IPA
- For female adult children only
- Effects were not particularly strong

Implications
- More research is needed!

Contribution
- Piecemeal body of literature
- Nuanced support for intra- and inter-generational linkages
- Theoretical and program implications
- Education – continuum of violence

Current and Future Research
- More research using prospective, longitudinal, and gender-specific designs
- Explore mechanisms of continuity
- Occupational context
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