

## **Family Relations (in press)**

### Intimate Partner Violence in Interracial and Monoracial Couples

Brittney A. Martin

Ming Cui

Koji Ueno

Frank D. Fincham

The Florida State University

#### Author Note

Brittney A. Martin and Ming Cui, Family and Child Sciences, The Florida State University; Koji Ueno, Department of Sociology, The Florida State University; Frank D. Fincham, The Family Institute, The Florida State University.

This research was supported by a grant (1R03HD064836) from the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. This study uses data from Add Health, a program project directed by Kathleen Mullan Harris and designed by J. Richard Udry, Peter, S. Bearman, and Kathleen Mullan Harris at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and funded by a grant P01-HD31921 from the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, with cooperative funding from 23 other federal agencies and foundations. Special acknowledgement is due Ronald R. Rindfuss and Barbara Entwisle for assistance in the original design. Information on how to obtain the Add Health data files is available on the Add Health website (<http://www.cpc.unc.edu/addhealth>). No direct support was received from grant P01-HD31921 for this analysis.

Correspondence should be addressed to Brittney A. Martin, Department of Family and Child Sciences, 225 Sandels Building, The Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL 32306-1491 ([bmartin@fsu.edu](mailto:bmartin@fsu.edu)).

### Abstract

This study investigated intimate partner violence in interracial and monoracial relationships. Using a nationally representative sample, regression analyses indicated that interracial couples demonstrated a higher level of mutual IPV than monoracial white couples but a level similar to monoracial black couples. There were significant gender differences in IPV, with women reporting lower levels of victimization than men. Regarding relationship status, cohabiting couples demonstrated the highest levels of IPV and dating couples reported the lowest levels. Finally, no significant interactions were found among couple racial composition, relationship status and respondents' gender. Implications for practitioners and directions for future research are discussed.

Keywords: intimate partner violence, interracial relationships, relationship status.

### Intimate Partner Violence in Interracial and Monoracial Couples

Rates of interracial marriage have increased over the last forty years from less than 1% of all marriages in 1970 to over 5% in 2000 (Batson, Qian, & Lichter, 2006; Forry, Leslie, & Letiecq, 2007). Even though this represents a relatively small percentage of all marriages in the U.S., the increase indicates that individuals are expanding their views of who is considered a potential dating or marriage partner. Historically, interracial couples have experienced discrimination and prejudice and have struggled to gain acceptance. Prior to the repeal of anti-miscegenation laws in the 1950s and 1960s, many states barred people from engaging in interracial relationships. The Supreme Court case of *Loving v. Commonwealth of Virginia* in 1967 officially banned anti-miscegenation across the country, citing a violation of civil rights. Although the legal ramifications of engaging in an interracial relationship have diminished, couples continue to face stressors that are likely to impact the couple's relationship, and may leave interracial couples at greater risk of relationship violence than their monoracial counterparts (Fusco, 2010).

Only one known study has explored intimate partner violence (IPV) within interracial relationships in comparison to monoracial relationships (Fusco, 2010). No study to date has investigated IPV within interracial couples in the general population while also examining the effects of relationship status and gender differences. The present study addresses this lacuna by examining IPV among interracial couples as compared to monoracial couples, and exploring the effects of gender and relationship status on IPV. Specifically, we used a large, nationally representative data set to examine whether a) levels of IPV differ between interracial and monoracial couples, b) there are gender differences in levels of IPV, c) there are relationship

status differences in levels of IPV, and d) there are interactions by racial composition, gender and relationship status.

### **Theoretical Perspective**

The Centers for Disease Control defines IPV as threats, emotional abuse, physical and/or emotional violence between two people in a committed relationship (CDC, 2009). IPV is a serious public health issue, and costs the nation nearly \$4.1 billion annually in direct medical and mental health care services (National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, 2003). It not only affects the physical, emotional, and mental health of the direct victims of violence, but also affects the indirect victims such as children and other family members (see Edelson, 1999; Edelson et al, 2007).

A cultural ecological framework proposes that behaviors in families or relationships are best understood in reference to a family's social class, culture, ethnicity, and race (García Coll & Magnuson, 1997). From this perspective, the rate and nature of IPV would best be explained by the couples' cultural background. Accordingly, interracial couples may experience more cultural differences and couple conflict, which could potentially lead to higher levels of violence. For example, interracial couples may experience more communication differences (Hecht, Collier, & Ribeau, 1993; Kochman, 1981). Additionally, African Americans within black-white interracial unions have reported an unwillingness to share negatives experiences and feelings of racism and discrimination with their partners (Killian, 2001). Individuals in interracial relationships also report negative attitudes toward their relationships from outsiders (Lewandowski & Jackson, 2001). Finally, interracial couples may experience lack of support from family members (Fusco, 2010). These factors could lead to more challenges and conflict in interracial couples. Even though conflicts do not usually end up in violence, more conflict provides greater opportunities

for violence to occur or can lead to more frustration and/or psychological distress leading to the use of violence (Bratter & Eschbach, 2006; Fusco, 2010).

### **IPV among Interracial Couples and Monoracial Couples**

Most studies on IPV have focused on monoracial couples. Among monoracial couples, rates of IPV are higher among black couples than white couples (Caetano, Ramisetty-Mikler, & Field, 2005; Caetano, Ramisetty-Mikler, & Harris, 2010). In their study of racial differences in unidirectional and bidirectional partner violence, Caetano et al. (2005) found that though rates of unidirectional violence were similar among the two groups, black couples were twice as likely as white couples to report bidirectional violence. Results also indicated that violence among black couples was more likely to be bidirectional than unidirectional. Fusco (2010) also found support for this finding that 56.3% of monoracial minority couples were involved in police-substantiated reports of IPV compared to 25.8% of White couples.

Little research exists on IPV in interracial relationships. In an examination of violence within monoracial and interracial couples, Fusco (2010) utilized police-substantiated reports of IPV to analyze event and household characteristics. She found that rates of bidirectional IPV were higher among interracial couples compared to both racial minority and White couples. Interracial couples represented as many as 17.9% of substantiated events, and these couples were 1.5 times more likely to mutually assault each other than ethnic minority couples, and twice as likely as White couples to experience a mutual assault. Interracial couples were also more likely than their monoracial counterparts to report an arrest, prior abuse, and a victim injury as a result of the current event. However, the study was based on police reports; the findings may underestimate overall IPV and only represent more serious IPV. Therefore, the first goal of this study is to examine the level of IPV among interracial couples as compared to monoracial black

and white couples using a representative sample. Based on cultural ecological theory and Fusco's study, we propose that interracial couples experience higher levels of IPV than monoracial couples.

### **Relationship Status and IPV**

A few studies comparing violence across relationships (i.e. dating, cohabiting, and married) have indicated that cohabiting couples have a higher risk of violence than married couples (Brown & Bulanda, 2008; Brownridge, 2010; Brownridge & Halli, 2000). Some researchers attribute cohabiting couples' higher IPV rates than married couples to their unconventional characteristics and lower levels of SES, both of which are linked to IPV (e.g., Browne, Salomon, & Bassuk, 1999; Brownridge, 2010; Joshi, Quane, & Cherlin, 2009). Further, previous research also suggested that individuals in dating relationships report lower levels of IPV than those in cohabiting and married unions (Kurdek, 1998). One potential reason that dating couples reported the lowest level of IPV may be that individuals in dating relationships are exploring their common interests and therefore are likely to avoid violence so not to disrupt their evolving relationships (Cui, Lorenz, Conger, Melby, & Bryant, 2005). This is consistent with the investment model (Rusbult, 1983); couples living together have invested a significant amount of time and energy in their relationship and so are less likely to terminate it because they have more to lose (Henning & Connor-Smith, 2011). Based on this line of reasoning, couples who are married or cohabiting are at a higher risk for IPV than those that are relatively casual (e.g., dating couples). To date there are no known studies that have examined relationship status and racial composition in their associations with IPV. Based on past research, we propose that couple IPV is highest among cohabiting couples and lowest among dating couples.

### **Gender and IPV**

Social role theory has been widely used in social psychology to explain gender difference in behaviors (Eagly, 1987; Eagly, Wood, & Diekmann, 2000). It proposes that gender differences in social behavior are the result of gender role expectancy through socialization processes. The gender symmetry approach suggests that there are no significant differences in gender on couple violence and that women are as violent as men in intimate relationships (Straus & Gelles, 1990). Indeed, Straus (2009) suggested equal or higher rates of relationship violence by women. Consistent with such propositions, most studies on gender and partner violence suggested an overall lower level of female victimization and higher level of female perpetration (Archer, 2006; Cunradi, 2007).

Few studies have examined gender differences and racial composition in IPV. Based on the cultural ecological framework, gender and relationship status may have different effects on couples with different racial composition. Specifically, because interracial couples face challenges associated with racial issues, gender issues- though they exist- may be less salient than among monoracial white couple (García Coll et al., 1996; Killian, 2001). Therefore, gender effects may be stronger in monoracial white couples than in racial minority couples (e.g., monoracial black couples, interracial couples). Taken together, we proposed that women would report a lower level of victimization, and that this gender effect is stronger in monoracial white couples than interracial couples.

### **The Present Study**

The goal of the current research is to examine IPV among interracial couples as compared to monoracial white and black couples, and to examine the effects of gender and relationship status on IPV. Based on theory and previous research, we propose the following hypotheses: 1) IPV would be higher among interracial couples than among monoracial couples

(couple level, H1), 2) couples in cohabiting relationships would report the highest levels of IPV and those in dating relationships would report the lowest levels of IPV (couple level, H2), and 3) women would report lower levels of IPV victimization than men (individual level, H3). In addition, we examined the interaction effects among racial composition, gender, and relationship status. Because of the exploratory nature of this aspect of the study, no specific hypothesis regarding these interactions was proposed. We also controlled for important covariates, including relationship length, respondents' income, and education.

## **Method**

### **Sample and Procedures**

Data comprised Wave IV of the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health). Add Health is a nationally representative sample of people who were attending US schools as 7 through 12 graders in 1994. During the initial stage of the study a total of 132 middle and high schools were selected using a stratified sampling technique to ensure the representative nature of the sample with regard to ethnicity, urbanicity, school size and type, and region of the country. Certain groups including minority students were oversampled in order to obtain an accurate assessment of the experiences of these groups.

Data for the first wave of the study collected in 1994 and 1995 included 20,745 students who participated in an in-home interview (Harris et al, 2009). Lasting one to two hours, the in-home interview covered topics including self-esteem, friendships, and risk behaviors. A computer-assisted interview program (CAI) was used for more sensitive topics. Respondents were re-interviewed in Wave II, III, and IV. Collected in 2007 and 2008, Wave IV included 15,701 of original Add Health respondents. In Wave IV, respondents were between the ages of 24 and 32. It is expected that the inclusion of the latest wave will provide an accurate depiction



of recent union formation that is representative of the young adult population in the United States with a sample adequate for analyzing interracial unions.

Among the 15,701 respondents, 10,110 reported involvement in a heterosexual romantic relationship, and reported on couple-level variables including the status of the current relationship (married, cohabiting, or dating), self and partner race, relationship length, and answered questions relating to IPV within the current relationship. Individual-level analysis was conducted with a subsample of 9,088 respondents who additionally reported on income and level of education. When respondents reported multiple relationships, priority was given first to marriage, then cohabiting relationships, and then dating and other relationships. Respondents who identified and selected more than one racial category (e.g., biracial) were excluded from the study because their relationships could not be determined as interracial or monoracial. Respondents who reported involvement in a same-sex relationship were also excluded from the current study, as one goal of the study was to investigate gender differences in IPV toward or from opposite-sex partners.

## **Measures**

### **Couple-level variables (testing H1 & H2).**

*Mutual intimate partner violence (IPV-M).* Violence within the relationship was measured through participant's report of victimization and perpetration to reflect a mutual level of IPV. The measure used eight items from the Revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS-2; Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, & Sugarman, 1996). Each respondent was asked to report on the frequency of both victimization and perpetration within the past year (or the entire relationship if duration was less than a year). Four items were used to measure victimization; respondents were asked how often they 1) were pushed, shoved, or had objects thrown at them by their partner, 2)

threatened by their partner with violence or slapped, kicked, or hit by them, 3) had an injury caused by their partner; or 4) had their partner insist on having sexual relations when they did not want to. Each response ranged from 0= never to 7= more than 20 times in the last year. The four items were summed together, with a higher score indicating a high level of victimization. Similarly, respondents were also asked to report their perpetration of these same events (e.g., how often they hit their partner) to reflect their partner's victimization. Finally, respondents' report of victimization and perpetration (partner's victimization) were summed to create a composite score of mutual IPV.

***Racial composition.*** Based on respondents' report of their own race and their partner's race, three dummy variables were created to measure couple racial composition: monoracial black, monoracial white, and interracial, where monoracial white couples served as the reference group and monoracial black and interracial couples served as the comparison groups.

***Relationship status.*** In addition to reporting on their current relationship, respondents were also asked to classify the type of relationship as either married, dating, or cohabiting. Three dummy variables were created: married, dating, and cohabiting, where dating couples serving as the reference group and cohabiting and married couples serving as the contrast groups.

***Relationship length.*** Relationship length represents respondent report of the length of the current relationship, as measured in years, and months.

### **Individual- level Variables (testing H3).**

***Intimate partner violence- victimization (IPV-V).*** To measure individual violence, only victimization responses from the aforementioned 'mutual IPV' measure were used because it is assumed that one's experience of victimization is due to his/her partner's perpetration. The

measure was described earlier. The four victimization items were summed to create a composite score to reflect victimization of IPV.

*Participant's gender.* Respondents were asked to report their gender. Gender was coded as 0=male, 1= female, and male respondents were treated as the reference group in analyses. Because only heterosexual couples were included in the study, the partner's gender was assumed.

*Participant's income.* Income was measured as a categorical variable that represents the participant's report of total income before taxes. The variable was coded from 0 to 5, with 5 representing the highest level of income.

*Participant's education.* Respondents were asked to report their highest level of education, where 1= less than high school and 4= college degree or higher.

## Results

To analyze the data based on a multi-stage stratified sample, Stata's 'svy' estimation was used. This procedure incorporated a weight variable to correct estimates for the oversampling of the aforementioned demographic groups and the unequal chance of attrition across waves. The procedure also corrected standard errors to reduce bias that might result from data clustering (i.e., students attending the same schools in adolescence).

### Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 provides descriptive information about the sample. The sample consisted of 10,110 respondents in couple-level analyses and 9,088 respondents in individual-level analyses who reported involvement in a heterosexual romantic relationship during the Wave IV interview. Respondents reported a mean of 1.68 events of mutual IPV. Respondents also reported their relationship status as married (46 %), cohabiting (27%) or dating (27%), and reported a mean

relationship length of 4.87 years. Regarding couple race compositions, 22% of the couples were monoracial Black, 73% were monoracial White, and 5% reported involvement in an interracial relationship. At the individual level, 25 % of the respondents identified themselves as Black and 75% as White. Respondents reported an individual mean level of victimization of 1.10. The majority of respondents had attended college, with 35% attaining at least a bachelor's degree and 44% having completing some college. Six percent of the sample had less than a high school education.

Table 1 about here

### **Hypothesis Testing**

To test H1 and H2 concerning couple level IPV, IPV-M was used as the dependent variable in regression where couples' racial composition, relationship status and relationship length served as predictor variables. The results are shown in Table 2. There were significant differences in IPV among the three groups of different racial composition. Both interracial couples ( $b = 0.95, p < 0.05$ ) and monoracial black couples ( $b = 1.13, p < 0.01$ ) reported significantly higher levels of mutual IPV than monoracial white couples. In addition, Bonferroni tests further suggested that the IPV levels were similar between interracial couples and monoracial black couples ( $n.s.$ ), both of which were significantly higher than that of the monoracial white couples ( $p < 0.05$  monoracial White vs. interracial;  $p < 0.01$  monoracial White vs. monoracial Black).

Table 2 about here

As regards relationship status (H2), the results suggested a difference, with both married ( $b = 0.72, p < 0.01$ ) and cohabiting ( $b = 1.61, p < 0.01$ ) couples reporting higher levels of IPV than dating couples. The Bonferroni tests suggested that married and cohabiting couples also

differed from each other in reported levels of IPV ( $p < 0.01$ ), suggesting that cohabiting couples reported higher levels of IPV than married couples. Relationship length was added as a covariate in couple level analyses; no significant associations were found between relationship length and IPV.

To test gender differences (H3), individual level victimization (IPV-V) among racial groups was examined. The results from the regression analysis are shown in Table 3. There were no significant gender differences in victimization for either interracial or black couples. However, gender differences were found for monoracial white couples. Specifically, among white couples, white women were less likely than white men to report victimization ( $b = -0.45, p < 0.01$ ). We also controlled for income and level of education in analyses of individual level victimization and found no association between these controls and IPV among respondents in interracial relationships. However, among respondents in monoracial black relationships, a negative relationship existed between income and IPV victimization ( $b = -0.27, p < 0.01$ ). Results for those in monoracial white relationships showed that both income ( $b = -0.12, p < 0.01$ ) and the attainment of a college degree ( $b = -0.54, p < 0.001$ ) were significantly and negatively associated with IPV victimization.

Table 3 about here

Finally, interactions among couples' racial composition, relationship status, and respondents' gender were examined (see Table 4). The main effect model (Model 1) included variables for gender, racial composition, and relationship status. This model was different from the one in Table 2 in that violence in Table 2 was a measure of couple-level violence whereas violence in this table (Model 1, Table 4) was individual level victimization, due to the inclusion of the individual level variables. In Model 2, interactions between racial composition and

respondents' gender were added. Neither interaction was significant. In Model 3, the interactions between racial composition and relationship status were added, and yielded a significant interaction between cohabiting and black couples on IPV victimization ( $b = 0.44, p < 0.05$ ). This suggested that, compared with monoracial white couples, monoracial black couples reported more IPV in cohabiting relationships than in dating relationships. In other words, compared with dating couples, the higher level of IPV found in cohabiting couples was more pronounced among monoracial black couples than among monoracial white couples. In Model 4, three-way interactions between couple race, gender, and relationship status were examined. Results indicated no significant interactions between the variables.

Table 4 about here

### **Discussion**

The goal of this study was to examine IPV among couples by racial composition, paying special attention to interracial couples, and to determine the effects of gender and relationship status on IPV. Findings revealed interracial couples reported higher levels of mutual IPV than monoracial white couples, yet similar to monoracial black couples. Additionally, cohabiting couples reported the highest levels of IPV and dating couples reported the lowest levels of IPV. Gender was also significantly associated with IPV, as women reported lower levels of IPV victimization.

Our first hypothesis, that levels of IPV among interracial couples were higher than those of monoracial couples, was only partially supported. Specifically, we found that interracial couples reported higher IPV than monoracial white couples. The finding of higher levels of IPV for interracial couples compared to white couples is consistent with Fusco's (2010) results. Differences in levels of violence may be explained by the socio-cultural issues interracial

couples face, including negative responses from others and lack of acceptance from neighbors and the community (Troy, Lewis-Smith, & Jean-Philippe, 2006). These stressors may be exacerbated by the lack of social support from family and friends.

Contrary to our first hypothesis, however, we found that the levels of IPV among interracial couples were not higher than among monoracial black couples. Our findings showed that interracial couples and monoracial black couples reported similar levels of IPV, both of which were higher than monoracial white couples. This is different from Fusco's (2010) findings, which suggested interracial couples having higher rates of mutual IPV than ethnic minority monoracial couples. Our finding may suggest that, from a cultural ecological perspective, even though monoracial black couples may not face the same challenges of interracial racial couples (e.g., lack of support from family and friends, difference in communication), they do face other challenges as ethnic minority couples, such as racial discrimination, unemployment, and lack of advancement opportunities (García Coll, et. al, 1996). Such challenges may act as stressors and lead to higher levels of violence (Caetano et al., 2005).

Findings supported our second hypothesis, that levels of IPV were highest among cohabiting couples and lowest among dating couples. This may be due to the lower SES among cohabiting couples, as it has been established that individuals with lower income are less likely to marry than those with higher income, and are more likely to cohabit, particularly if children are present (Berzin & De Marco, 2010; Joshi et al., 2009; Nakosteen, & Zimmer, 1997). Lower SES was associated with higher IPV (e.g., Browne et al., 1999; Brownridge, 2010). These results were also consistent with those of previous studies which suggested that cohabiting and married unions require more commitment and investment, and present barriers for individuals attempting

to dissolve these unions, even while experiencing IPV (Arriaga, 2002; Kurdek, 2008; Wiersma, Cleveland, Herrera, Fisher, 2010). Individuals in dating relationships have the ability to dissolve the romantic relationship with few legal and financial ramifications, making it easier to pursue more beneficial options.

Our third hypothesis proposed lower levels of IPV victimization for women than men. Results from the current study supported the hypothesis in that women were less likely than men to experience victimization. Such findings were consistent with previous studies on gender and IPV that suggested an overall lower level of female victimization (Archer, 2006; Cunradi, 2007). We found such significant gender differences in white monoracial couples and the sample as a whole because the sample was primarily White. For ethnic minorities, however, we did not find gender differences in interracial couples or monoracial black couples. For minority couples (e.g., interracial and monoracial Black), gender may be less salient than race, considering the unique challenges racial minority couples face (García Coll et al., 1996; Killian, 2001). However, it is also possible that the nonsignificant findings among interracial couples and monoracial black couples were due to smaller sample size. Therefore, caution is needed when interpreting the findings. Examination of two-way interactions revealed that, compared with monoracial white couples, monoracial black couples reported more IPV in cohabiting relationships than in dating relationships. This finding may suggest that cohabiting black couples are particularly vulnerable to IPV.

The current study is the first to examine IPV among monoracial and interracial couples using a nationally-representative data set. It is also the first to explore relationship status and gender differences in IPV among couples of different racial composition. First, our examination of differences among couples of different racial compositions can help to inform prevention and



intervention programs against couple violence. As interracial and monoracial black couples appear to have similar rates of IPV, it is important that practitioners not assume interracial couples are at a greater disadvantage simply due to their couple racial composition. Second, the majority of studies on interracial couples in adulthood are limited to the areas of marital quality, satisfaction, and stability (see Batson et al., 2006; Bratter & Eschbach, 2006; Forry et al., 2007), overlooking potential differences between dating, cohabiting, and married couples. Exploration of these relationship types revealed significant differences in IPV among all three groups. Finally, our findings suggested that gender also played a role in IPV, especially among monoracial white couples.

Although this study contributes to the sparse literature on IPV among interracial couples, its limitations should be noted. First, all data were based on the target's self report. Respondents may over- or under-estimate levels of perpetration or victimization. However, several studies have used respondent-only report of partner IPV perpetration (see Harville, Taylor, Tesfai, Xiong, & Buekens, 2011; Stein, Tran, & Fisher, 2009; Todhunter & Deaton, 2010), giving us confidence in our methodology. Second, due to the complex nature of the data, target report of perpetration and victimization were combined in order to create a single variable. It is assumed that if the respondent reports an incidence of victimization within a relationship, the partner is the perpetrator. Future studies should attempt to obtain dyadic reports of IPV by using responses from both partners. Third, this study is also limited by the exclusion of races beyond Black and White. Future studies can expand on the present study by examining IPV among other racial and ethnic groups, as this study was limited to monoracial black, monoracial white, and interracial black-white couples.

Despite these limitations, the current study investigated IPV as it relates to race, specifically to interracial couples. As a growing demographic group in the United States, interracial couples face unique challenges that affect relationship satisfaction and stability, placing them at risk for experiencing IPV. Overall, our findings suggested that interracial couples experience levels of IPV that are similar to monoracial black couples, both of which display greater levels of IPV than monoracial white couples. Further, gender and relationship status also played an important role in IPV. Such findings would help practitioners working with couples to better assess their risk and prevent IPV.

## References

- Archer, J. (2006) Cross-cultural differences in physical aggression between partners: A social-role analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology, 10, 2*, 133-153.
- Arriaga, X. B. (2002). Joking violence among highly committed individuals. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 17*, 591 – 610.
- Batson, C.D., Qian, Z., & Lichter, D. T. (2006). Interracial and intraracial patterns of mate selection among america's diverse black populations. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 68*, 658-672.
- Berzin, S. C., & De Marco, A. C. (2010). Understanding the impact of poverty on critical events in emerging adulthood. *Violence Against Women, 12*, 1003-1018.
- Bratter, J. L., & Eschbach, K. (2006). What about the couple? Interracial marriage and psychological distress. *Social Science Research, 35*, 1025-1047.
- Brown, S. L., & Bulanda, J. R. (2008). Relationship violence in young adulthood: A comparison of daters, cohabitators, and marrieds. *Social Science Research, 37*, 73- 87.
- Browne, A., Salomon, A., & Bassuk, S. S. (1999). Impact of recent partner violence on poor women's capacity to maintain work. *Violence Against Women, 5*, 393-426.
- Brownridge, D. A. (2010). Does the situational couple violence- intimate terrorism typology explain cohabitators' high risk of intimate partner violence? *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 25*, 1264- 1283.
- Brownridge, D. A., & Halli, S.S. (2000). "Living in sin" and sinful living: Toward filling a gap in the explanation of violence against women. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 5*, 565-583.

- Caetano, R., Ramisett-Mikler, S., & Field, C. A. (2005). Unidirectional and bidirectional intimate partner violence among white, black, and hispanic couples in the united states. *Violence and Victims, 20, 4*, 393-403.
- Caetano, R. Ramisetty- Milker, S. & Harris, T. R. (2010). Neighborhood characteristics as predictors of male to female and female to male partner violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 25*, 1986- 2009.
- Centers for Disease Control. (2010). Intimate partner violence: Data sources. Retrieved from <http://www.cdc.gov/ViolencePrevention/intimatepartnerviolence/datasources.html>
- Cui, M., Lorenz, F. O., Conger, R. D., Melby, J. N., & Bryant, C. M. (2005). Observer, self, and partner reports of hostile behaviors in romantic relationships. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 67*, 1169-1181.
- Cunradi, C. B. (2007). Drinking level, neighborhood social disorder, and mutual intimate partner violence. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research, 31*, 1012-1019.
- Eagly, A. H. (1987). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social-role interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ, England: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Eagly, A. H., Wood, W., & Diekmann, A. B. (2000). In Eckes T., Trautner H. M. (Eds.), *Social role theory of sex differences and similarities: A current appraisal*. Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Edelson, J. L. (1999). Children's witnessing of adult domestic violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 14*, 839-870.
- Edelson, J. L., Ellerton, A. L., Seagren, E. A., Kirchberg, S. L., Schmidt, S. O., & Ambrose, A. T. (2007). Assessing child exposure to adult domestic violence. *Children and Youth Services Review, 29*, 961-971.

Forry, N. D., Leslie, L.A., & Letiecq, B. L. (2007). Marital quality in interracial relationships:

The role of sex role ideology and perceived fairness. *Journal of Family Issues*, 28, 12, 1538-1552.

Fusco, R. A. (2010). Intimate partner violence in interracial couples: A comparison to white

and ethnic minority monoracial couples. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 25, 10, 1785-1800.

Garcia Coll, C., Crnic, K., Lamberty, G., Wasik, B. H., Jenkins, R., Garcia, H. V., McAdoo, H.

P. (1996). An integrative model for the study of developmental competencies in minority children. *Child Development*, 67, 1891-1914.

García Coll, C.T., & Magnuson, K. (1997). The psychological experience of immigration: A

developmental perspective. In A. Booth (Ed.), *Immigration and the Family: Research and Policy on US Immigrants* (pp. 91-131). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Harris, K.M., Halpern, C.T., Whitsel, E., Hussey, J., Tabor, J., Entzel, P. & Udry, J.R. (2009).

The National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health: Research. URL:

<http://www.cpc.unc.edu/projects/addhealth/design>.

Harville, E. W., Taylor, C. A., Tesfai, H., Xiong, X., & Buekens, P. (2011). Experience of

hurricane Katrina and reported intimate partner violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 26, 833-845.

Hecht, M., Collier, M., & Ribeau, S. (1993). *African American Communication: Ethnic identity*

*and cultural interpretation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Henning, K., & Connor-Smith, J. (2011). Why doesn't he leave? Relationship continuity and

satisfaction among male domestic violence offenders. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 26(7), 1366-1387.

Joshi, P., Quane, J. M., & Cherlin, A. J. (2009). Contemporary work and family issues affecting

- marriage and cohabitation among low-income single mothers. *Family Relations*, 58, 647-661.
- Killian, K. D. (2001). Crossing borders: Race, gender, and their intersections in interracial couples. *Journal of Feminist Family Therapy*, 13(1), 1-31.
- Kochman, T. (1981). *Black and white styles in conflict*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kurdek, L. A. (1998). Relationship outcomes and their predictors: Longitudinal evidence from heterosexual married, gay cohabiting, and lesbian cohabiting couples. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 60, 553 – 568.
- Lewandowski, D., Jackson, L., 2001. Perceptions of inter-racial couples: prejudice at the dyadic level. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 27, 288–303
- Nakosteen, R. A., & Zimmer, M. A. (1997). Men, money, and marriage: Are high earners more prone than low earners to marry? *Social Science Quarterly*, 78, 66-82.
- National Center for Injury Prevention and Control. (2003). *Costs of Intimate Partner Violence Against Women in the United States*. Atlanta (GA): Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
- Rusbult C. E. (1983). A longitudinal test of the investment model: The development (and deterioration) of satisfaction and commitment in heterosexual involvements. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45, 101-117.
- Stein, A. L., Tran, G. Q., & Fisher, B. S. (2009). Intimate partner violence experience and expectations among college women in dating relationships: Implications for behavioral interventions. *Violence and Victims*, 24, 2, 153-162.
- Straus, M. A. (2009). In Whitaker D. J., Lutzker J. R. (Eds.), *Gender symmetry in partner violence: Evidence and implications for prevention and treatment*. Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association.

- Straus, M.A., & Gelles, R.J. (Eds.). (1990). *Physical violence in american families: Risk factors and adaptations to violence in 8,145 families*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transactions.
- Straus, M.A., Hamby S.L., Boney-McCoy, S., Sugarman, D.B. (1996). The revised conflict tactics scales (CTS2): Development and preliminary psychometric data. *Journal of Family Issues*, 17, 3, 283–316.
- Todhunter, R. G., & Deaton, J. (2010). The relationship between religious and spiritual factors and the perpetration of intimate personal violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, 25, 745-753.
- Troy, A. , Lewis-Smith, J., & Jean-Philippe, L. (2006). Interracial and intraracial romantic relationships: The search for differences in satisfaction, conflict, and attachment style. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 23, 1, 65-80.
- Wiersma, J. D, Cleveland, H. H., Herrera, V., & Fischer, J. L. (2010). Intimate partner violence in young adult dating, cohabiting, and married drinking partnerships. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 72, 360-374.

Table 1

*Couple and Individual Level Descriptive Information (weighted)*

Variables	<i>M</i> or <i>n</i> (%)	<i>Std. Dev.</i>	<i>Range</i>
<b>Couple-Level Characteristics</b>			
Level of IPV	1.68	3.88	0 – 49
Relationship Status			
Married	46%		
Cohabiting	27%		
Dating (reference)	27%		
Racial composition			
Monoracial Black	22%		
Monoracial White (reference)	73%		
Interracial	5%		
Relationship Length	4.87	3.78	
<b>Individual Level Characteristics</b>			
IPV- Victimization	1.10	2.68	0 – 28
Respondent Race			
Black	25%		
White (reference)	75%		
Respondent Gender			
Female (reference)	52%		
Male	48%		
Income	3.0	1.28	0-5
Respondent Education			
Less than High School	6%		
High School Graduate	15%		
Some College	44%		
Bachelor's degree or higher	35%		

*Note: N= 10,110 for couple-level variables and N= 9,088 for individual-level variables. Based on weighted data from Wave IV of Add Health.*



Table 2

*Couple-level Combined Violence (N = 10,110)*

Variables	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	95% CI ( <i>b</i> )	
Racial composition				
Monoracial Black	1.13**	6.34	0.77	1.48
Interracial	0.95*	2.44	0.18	1.72
Relationship Status				
Married	0.72**	4.23	0.38	1.06
Cohabiting	1.61**	10.16	1.30	1.93
Relationship Length	0.00	0.22	-0.04	0.04
Constant	0.69**	8.09	0.52	0.86
$F(5, 124) = 31.03, p < .001$				

---

Note: \*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$

Table 3

*Gender and Relationship Status Differences in IPV across Relationship Compositions (Individual Level Victimization)*

Variables	Interracial			Monoracial Black			Monoracial White		
	<i>b</i>	95% <i>CI</i>		<i>b</i>	95% <i>CI</i>		<i>b</i>	95% <i>CI</i>	
Female	-0.54	-1.14	0.06	-0.42	-0.92	0.08	-0.45****	-0.60	-0.30
Married	1.05**	0.13	1.97	0.85**	0.32	1.38	0.37****	0.19	0.55
Cohabiting	1.49****	0.74	2.24	1.18****	0.81	1.53	0.76****	0.54	0.97
Income	-0.26	-0.58	0.05	-0.27**	-0.47	-0.07	-0.12**	-0.19	-0.04
College	-0.25	-1.05	0.56	-0.37	-1.22	0.49	-0.54****	-0.77	-0.30
Some College	0.23	-0.49	0.95	-0.18	-0.99	0.64	-0.16	-0.43	0.11
Less than high school	1.25	-0.44	2.95	0.75	-0.36	1.85	0.45	-0.07	0.98
Constant	1.31**	0.27	2.35	2.05****	1.23	2.87	1.39****	0.98	1.80
	<i>F</i> (7, 122)= 3.02, <i>p</i> < 0.01			<i>F</i> (7, 122)= 9.76, <i>p</i> < 0.001			<i>F</i> (7, 122)= 25.95, <i>p</i> < 0.001		

Note. \**p* < 0.05. \*\**p* < 0.01. \*\*\*\**p* < 0.001.

Table 4

*Interactions between Racial Composition, Relationship Status, and Gender (Individual Level Victimization)*

Variable	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>
Monoracial Black	0.63**	0.12	0.60**	0.19	0.34	0.16	0.31	0.21
Interracial	0.31	0.20	0.30	0.26	-0.18	0.17	-0.35	0.20
Married	0.47**	0.08	0.48**	0.08	0.38**	0.09	0.38**	0.09
Cohabiting	0.88**	0.10	0.88**	0.10	0.75**	0.11	0.76**	0.11
Female	-0.47**	0.07	-0.48**	0.08	-0.46**	0.08	-0.47**	0.08
Income	-0.14**	0.04	-0.14	0.04	-0.14**	0.04	-0.14**	0.04
College	-0.50**	0.11	-0.50	0.11	-0.50**	0.11	-0.50**	0.11
Some College	-0.15	0.12	-0.15	0.12	-0.15	0.12	-0.15	0.12
< High School	0.55*	0.24	0.55	0.24	0.56*	0.24	-0.55*	0.24
Interactions								
Female* bb			0.05	0.24			0.05	0.27
Female* inter			0.02	0.32			0.31	0.30
Married* bb					0.42	0.30	0.11	0.35
Married * inter					0.65	0.44	1.71	0.91
Cohabiting* bb					0.44*	0.21	0.64*	0.32

Cohabiting * inter			0.74		0.39		0.59	0.48
Fem * mar * bb							0.57	0.45
Fem * coh * bb							-0.36	0.45
Fem * mar * inter							-1.81	0.95
Fem * coh * inter							0.21	0.63
Constant	1.38	0.20	1.39**	0.19	1.45**	0.20	1.45**	0.20
	$F(9, 120) = 29.25, p <$		$F(11, 118) = 24.67, p$		$F(13, 116) = 21.29, p$		$F(19, 110) = 15.87, p$	
	0.001		< 0.001		< 0.001		< 0.001	

---

*Note.* \* $p < 0.05$ . \*\* $p < 0.01$ . *bb*= monoracial black, *inter*= interracial, *fem*= female, *mar*= married, *coh*= cohabiting.