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• Relationship context and partner characteristics are linked to contraceptive use among young adults

• Intimate partner violence (IPV) is one important relationship characteristic

• Components of IPV
  • Severity
  • Frequency
  • Perpetration
Power dynamics

• Power imbalances reduce ability to negotiate condom use
• Male-dominant violence
• More severe and frequent violence
• Administrative data / court reports

Relationship conflict

• Lower condom use because of relationship turbulence
• Less severe, less frequent, more gender-balanced IPV
• National survey data
Hypotheses

1. IPV, in general, will be associated with reduced condom use

2. Stronger associations between IPV and condom use in relationships with more frequent and more severe violence (power imbalance)

3. Reciprocal violence will also be linked to lower condom use but not as strongly (relationship conflict)
National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (AddHealth Wave III)

- Respondents were asked questions about IPV for recent sexual relationships

Analysis Sample

- 8,599 heterosexual dating relationships from 6,465 young adults in which sex had occurred
- Does not include cohabiting or marital relationships
Methods

Dependent Variable
• Condom used at most recent sexual intercourse in a given relationship

Model
• Multivariate random-effects logistic regression
• Tested for interactions by gender
IPV Measures

For each relationship, respondents were asked the number of times in the previous year that they or their partner:

1. Threatened, threw something at, pushed, or shoved their partner
2. Slapped, hit, or kicked their partner
3. Injured their partner (e.g., sprain, bruise, or cut)

3 Measures:

• Severity, Frequency, Perpetration of IPV
Prevalence of IPV

Share of relationships reporting some IPV: either by partner or respondent

- **All relationships**: 18%
- **Female-reported relationships**: 21%
- **Male-reported relationships**: 15%

[Diagram showing prevalence of IPV]
Severity of IPV in relationships experiencing IPV

- **46%** Slapped, hit, or kicked
- **35%** Threatened, threw something at, pushed, or shoved
- **20%** Injured

**Date**, 2015
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Frequency of IPV

Annual frequency of IPV in relationships experiencing IPV

- >10 acts: 27%
- 1 act: 37%
- 2 acts: 19%
- 3 to 10 acts: 17%
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Perpetration of IPV

- Men were less likely than women to report perpetrating IPV against their partner.
IPV Latent Class Analysis

- Used response patterns across IPV survey items to identify violence typologies

- Latent class analysis conducted using LCA Stata Plugin (Lanza and Rhoades 2013)

- Selected a 5-class model based on model fit

- Created class labels based on IPV severity, frequency, and perpetration
1. Non-violent (ref)
   - 90% experienced no IPV
   - Remaining 10% reported low-frequency/low-intensity IPV

2. Respondent-dominant
   - 79% of relationships reported respondent-only violence or respondent-dominant IPV
   - 78% reported slapping/hitting/kicking
   - 75% reported 3-10 acts of IPV
IPV Typologies (3-4)

3. Partner-dominant/lower-intensity
- 61% of relationships reported partner-only or partner-dominant IPV
- 18% reported injury
- 3% reported more than 10 acts of IPV

4. Partner-dominant/higher-intensity
- 86% of relationships reported partner-only or partner-dominant IPV
- 49% reported injury
- 46% reported more than 10 acts of IPV
5. Reciprocal

- 100% involved both the respondent and their partner perpetrating IPV
- In 39% of relationships, respondent and partner initiated similar frequency and severity of IPV
- 73% reported injury
- 87% reported more than 10 acts of IPV
Gender across IPV Classes

% of IPV Class Reported by Male and Female Respondents

- **Non-violent**: Male - 51%, Female - 49%
- **Respondent-dominant**: Male - 11%, Female - 89%
- **Partner-dominant/ lower-intensity**: Male - 57%, Female - 43%
- **Partner-dominant/ higher-intensity**: Male - 65%, Female - 35%
- **Reciprocal**: Male - 30%, Female - 70%

Male | Female
--- | ---
Non-violent | 49% | 51%
Respondent-dominant | 11% | 89%
Partner-dominant/ lower-intensity | 57% | 43%
Partner-dominant/ higher-intensity | 65% | 35%
Reciprocal | 70% | 30%
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Controls in Multivariate Analyses

Individual controls

• Gender
• Age
• Race/ethnicity
• Living situation
• Educational Attainment
• Age at first sex
• Number of partners

Relationship controls

• Length of time knew partner before sex
• Partner age difference
• Use of hormonal/long-lasting contraception
• Type of dating relationship (casually or exclusively)
• Relationship duration
• History of violence in other dating relationships
## Multivariate Results

Odds ratios from random-effects logistic regressions predicting condom-use at last sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>With controls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-violent (ref)</td>
<td>(1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent-dominant</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner-dominant/lower-intensity</td>
<td>0.45*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner-dominant/higher-intensity</td>
<td>0.40**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocal</td>
<td>0.43*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ <0.10; * p<0.05; ** p<0.01

** No interactions by gender **
Implications

- Highlights the importance of incorporating violence prevention into STI-prevention and pregnancy-prevention program efforts
Limitations

• Testing for gender interactions was limited by small sample sizes

• We relied on respondent reports about their partner

• Findings are more descriptive than causal
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