Supplement 1

Table 1

Missing data analysis (comparing those not missing IPV data versus those missing IPV data)

Variable	M not missing	M missing	Comparison
Coercive relationship talk			
Shallow talk	4.69	4.83	$F(1,719) = .58, p = .45$
Coercive joining	2.02	2.09	$F(1,719) = 1.41, p = .24$
Deviancy training	.07	.08	$F(1,711) = 1.25, p = .26$
Family conflict			
Child-report	2.29	2.27	$F(1,643) = .05, p = .83$
Mother-report	2.21	2.19	$F(1,605) = .03, p = .86$
Father-report	2.14	2.01	$F(1,305) = .77, p = .38$
Violent behavior			
Carried a weapon (y/n)	.09	.07	$\chi^2(1) = 1.00, p = .32$
Violent crime arrest (y/n)	.16	.24	$\chi^2(1) = 4.65, p < .05$
Mother-report aggressive behavior	53.22	53.56	$F(1,611) = .57, p = .45$
Father-report aggressive behavior	52.21	53.11	$F(1,289.62) = 2.62, p = .11$
Substance use			
Alcohol	7.59	7.75	$F(1,853) = .21, p = .65$
Marijuana	2.37	2.34	$F(1,842) = .01, p = .94$
High-risk sexual behavior			
Number of sexual partners	.37	.59	$F(1,687.26) = 2.90, p = .09$
Number of partners w/o dating	.45	.78	$F(1,690.50) = 15.13, p < .001$
Number of partners dating others	.73	1.10	$F(1,677.65) = 4.40, p < .05$
Number of partners not known well	.19	.31	$F(1,684.30) = 2.86, p = .09$
Number of partners IV drug users	.34	.25	$F(1,687) = .65, p = .42$

Note. For dichotomous outcomes, chi-square analysis was used for group comparison. For

continuous outcomes, ANOVA analysis was used with Welch correction as needed for violation of

assumption of homogeneity of variance.

Supplement 2

IPV perpetration

Target participants' self-reports about IPV perpetration and partners' reports about the target participants' IPV perpetration were used as indicators for the latent variable IPV perpetration. The mediation model fit was adequate, CFI = .92, TLI = .90, RMSEA = .033 [.029|.037], χ^2(246) = 513.52, p < .001, χ^2/df = 2.09. Factor loadings were generally above .30. Overall, results were similar to the dyadic IPV model. We found significant pathways from family conflict to high-risk sexual behavior (β = .12, p < .05) but not to violence (β = .10, p = .10) or substance use (β = .07, p = .24). Coercive relationship talk was related to violence (β = .47, p < .001) but not to substance use (β = .07, p = .23) or high-risk sexual behavior (β = .02, p = .74). Only violence predicted IPV perpetration (β = .34, p < .01), while substance use (β = .02, p = .92) and high-risk sexual behavior (β = -.04, p = .71) did not. Indirect effects from coercive relationship talk to IPV via violent behavior were significant (β = .16, p < .05). Gender differences in model results were not significant, χ^2(30) = 19.52, ns.

IPV victimization

Second, a model with IPV *victimization* as an outcome was tested. Target participants' self-reports about their partners' engagement in IPV and partners' reports about their own engagement in IPV were used as indicators for IPV victimization. The mediation model fit was adequate, CFI = .92, TLI = .90, RMSEA = .033 [.029|.037], χ^2(246) = 516.45, p < .001, χ^2/df = 2.10. Factor loadings were generally above .30. Overall, results were similar to the dyadic IPV and the IPV perpetration model. We found significant pathways from family conflict to high-risk sexual behavior (β = .12, p < .05) but not to violence (β = .11, p = .09) or substance use (β = .07, p = .22). Coercive relationship talk was related to violence (β = .47, p < .001) but not to

substance use ($\beta = .07$, $p = .22$) or high-risk sexual behavior ($\beta = .02$, $p = .76$). Only violence predicted IPV victimization ($\beta = .44$, $p < .01$), while substance use ($\beta = .11$, $p = .51$) and high-risk sexual behavior ($\beta = -.07$, $p = .56$) did not. Indirect effects from coercive relationship talk to IPV via violent behavior were significant ($\beta = .20$, $p < .05$). Gender differences in model results were not significant, $\chi^2(30) = 21.27$, *ns*.