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 |  | χ2(1) = 1.00, *p* = .32 |
| Violent crime arrest (y/n) | .16 | .24 |  | χ2(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], χ2(246) = 513.52, *p* < .001, χ2/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, χ2(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], χ2(246) = 516.45, *p* < .001, χ2/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 (*β* = .07, *p* = .22) or high-risk sexual behavior (*β* = .02, *p* = .76). Only violence predicted IPV victimization (*β* = .44, *p* < .01), while substance use (*β* = .11, *p* = .51) and high-risk sexual behavior (*β* = -.07, *p* = .56) did not. Indirect effects from coercive relationship talk to IPV via violent behavior were significant (*β* = .20, *p* < .05). Gender differences in model results were not significant, χ2(30) = 21.27, *ns*.