

UC Davis

UC Davis Previously Published Works

Title

Recent partner violence and sexual and drug-related STI/HIV risk among adolescent and young adult women attending family planning clinics

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2fk7p3d2>

Journal

Sexually Transmitted Infections, 90(2)

ISSN

1368-4973

Authors

Decker, Michele R
Miller, Elizabeth
McCauley, Heather L
[et al.](#)

Publication Date

2014-03-01

DOI

10.1136/sextrans-2013-051288

Peer reviewed



Published in final edited form as:

Sex Transm Infect. 2014 March ; 90(2): 145–149. doi:10.1136/sextrans-2013-051288.

Recent partner violence and sexual and drug-related STI/HIV risk among adolescent and young adult women attending family planning clinics

Michele R. Decker¹, Elizabeth Miller², Heather L. McCauley², Daniel J. Tancredi³, Heather Anderson², Rebecca R. Levenson⁴, and Jay G. Silverman⁵

¹Department of Population, Family & Reproductive Health, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore, MD, USA

²Division of Adolescent Medicine, Children's Hospital of Pittsburgh of UPMC, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA, USA

³University of California Davis, Sacramento, CA 95217

⁴Futures Without Violence, San Francisco, CA, USA

⁵Center on Gender Equity and Health, Division of Global Public Health, University of California San Diego School of Medicine, La Jolla, CA, USA

Abstract

Background/Objectives—Adolescent and young adult women are at high risk for both STI/HIV and intimate partner violence (IPV). We evaluate the prevalence of IPV in the past three months and its associations with STI/HIV risk, STI, and related care-seeking over the same time period.

Methods—Female family planning clinic patients ages 16–29 (n=3,504) participated in a cross-sectional survey in 2011–2012 as a baseline assessment for an intervention study. We examined associations of recent IPV with sexual and drug-related STI/HIV risk behavior, self-reported STI, and STI-related clinical care seeking via logistic regression.

Results—Recent physical or sexual IPV (prevalence 11%) was associated with recent sexual and drug-related STI/HIV risk, specifically unprotected vaginal sex (AOR 1.93, 95% CI 1.52, 2.44),

Corresponding Author: Michele R. Decker, ScD, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, 615 N. Wolfe St., E4142, Baltimore, MD 21212, mdecker@jhsph.edu, 410-502-2747/fax 410-955-2303.

Competing interests: none declared

Author contributions

Study concept: MRD, EM, JGS, RRL

Acquisition of data: HLM, HA, EM

Analysis and interpretation of data: HLM, HA, DJT, MRD, EM, JGS

Drafting of manuscript: MRD, HLM, EM, JGS

Critical revision of manuscript for important intellectual content: DJT, HA, RRL

License for Publication

The Corresponding Author has the right to grant on behalf of all authors and does grant on behalf of all authors, an exclusive licence (or non-exclusive for government employees) on a worldwide basis to the BMJ Group and co-owners or contracting owning societies (where published by the BMJ Group on their behalf), and its Licensees to permit this article (if accepted) to be published in *Sexually Transmitted Infections* and any other BMJ Group products and to exploit all subsidiary rights, as set out in our licence.

unprotected anal sex (AOR 2.22, 95% CI 1.51, 3.27) and injection drug use, both their own (AOR 3.39, 95% CI 1.47, 7.79) and their partner's (AOR 3.85, 1.91, 7.75). IPV was also linked with coercive sexual risk: involuntary condom non-use (AOR 1.87, 95% CI 1.51, 2.33), and fears of requesting condoms (AOR 4.15, 95% CI 2.73, 6.30) and refusing sex (AOR 11.84, 95% CI 7.59, 18.45). STI-related care-seeking was also more common among those abused (AOR 2.49, 95% CI 1.87, 3.31).

Conclusions—Recent IPV is concurrent with sexual and drug-related STI/HIV risk, including coercive sexual risk, thus compromising women's agency in STI/HIV risk reduction. Clinical risk assessments should broaden to include unprotected heterosexual anal sex, coercive sexual risk, and IPV, and should promote safety and harm reduction.

Keywords

intimate partner violence; sexual risk; injection drug use; STI/HIV risk; adolescent

Introduction

Adolescents and young adults remain disproportionately burdened by STI/HIV, accounting for over half of new sexually transmitted infections (STI),¹ and over one in four new HIV infections.² Young women in particular are highly affected; those ages 15–24 demonstrate the highest rates of Chlamydia and gonorrhea,¹ with over 750,000 cases of Chlamydia reported for U.S. women ages 15–24 in 2011 alone.³ Young women also experience the highest rates of physical and sexual intimate partner violence (IPV),^{4–6} with recent national data confirming that over two thirds of those exposed to partner violence report that the first such incident occurred before the age of 24 years.⁴

IPV has emerged as a consistent STI/HIV risk factor for both adolescent and adult women;^{7–9} prospective research strongly indicates a causal linkage of IPV with incident STI/HIV infection.^{10–12} Associations of IPV with sexual risk behavior, including unprotected sex and multiple and concurrent partnering, are, in part, responsible for the links of violence with STI/HIV. For example, qualitative and quantitative data alike demonstrate that IPV and the threat of abuse can undermine women's ability to ensure successful condom use and refuse unwanted sex.^{8, 13–15} While relatively understudied as a correlate of violence, heterosexual anal intercourse has emerged as a prevalent HIV risk factor;¹⁶ its transmission efficiency¹⁷ affirms the need to similarly evaluate potential links with IPV. To date, gendered power imbalances, coercive and violent dynamics have been implicated in heterosexual anal intercourse.^{13, 14, 15, 18, 19} Violence is also closely associated with substance use, including injection drug use,^{20–23} which both directly causes HIV infection and increases risk through unsafe sex that is more likely in the context of substance use. Violence can be particularly influential for drug involved women, as abuse and the threat of violence undermine both sexual and drug-related HIV prevention.^{24, 25} So too, women may turn to substance use, including injection drug use, as a maladaptive coping mechanism in the face of violence.²⁵

Much of this past work has focused on the HIV-related risks imparted by a history of abuse, with evidence that violence can impart a *trajectory* of subsequent sexual risk-taking,^{8, 26, 27}

lower women's perceived control in sexual relationships, prompt fear of subsequent condom negotiation, and heighten vulnerability to coercive sexual risk.^{15, 28} Yet qualitative evidence also illustrates the potential for STI/HIV risk behavior and IPV to *co-occur* within relationships, with perpetrators using violence and threats of abuse to garner women's compliance with unwanted and unprotected sex.^{29–33} Clarifying the extent to which women's IPV experiences are concurrent with sexual and drug-related STI/HIV risk is critical to understanding the interwoven epidemics of IPV and STI/HIV. Such research is particularly important in health care settings most likely to encounter those affected. The high burden of IPV among patient populations that seek sexual and reproductive health services^{34–36} renders family planning clinics one such critical research and intervention setting. Sexual and reproductive health providers also stand to serve a crucial role in intervention, through patient risk assessment and risk reduction at the intersection of violence and sexual health.

To inform these gaps, we sought to evaluate the prevalence of IPV in the past 3 months and its associations with sexual and drug-related STI/HIV risk and related care-seeking over this same time period in a sample of adolescent and young adult female family planning patients. These data allow a new understanding of the concurrence of IPV with sexual and drug-related STI/HIV risk.

Methods

Data

A cross-sectional survey that served as baseline data for a prospective study was conducted among English- and Spanish-speaking females ages 16 to 29 years seeking care at one of 24 free-standing Title X family planning clinics in Western Pennsylvania. Data were collected between October 2011 and November 2012. Upon arrival, all women were screened for age eligibility by trained research staff. Eligible women interested in participating were escorted to a private area in the clinic for consent and survey administration. As participants were receiving confidential services, parental consent for participation was waived for minors.

Data were collected via Audio Computer Assisted Survey Instrument, a self-administered program that allows participants to complete surveys on a laptop computer with questions read aloud through headphones. Materials were in English or Spanish based on patient preference; materials were developed in English, professionally translated to Spanish, and back translated to English to check for accuracy. At the conclusion of the survey, participants were offered a resource sheet of local social services and received a \$15 prepaid debit card to thank them for their time. Further details have been described elsewhere.³⁷ All study procedures were reviewed and approved by Human Subjects Research Committees at the University of Pittsburgh. Data were protected with a federal Certificate of Confidentiality.

These procedures generated a total of 3,682 participants; for the current analyses the sample was further restricted, with women reporting never having sex (n=69) and women reporting primarily same-sex sexual partnerships (n=74) removed, as well as those providing incomplete data on IPV (n=35), resulting in a total analytic sample of 3,504.

Measures

All measures were self-reported. Single items assessed demographic characteristics, including age, race, education, and relationship status. Intimate relationship partners were defined as persons the respondent reported “dating or going out with.” All exposures and outcomes were assessed using a referent time period of the past 3 months. The primary exposure of interest, physical or sexual IPV was measured via three items modified from the Conflict Tactics Scale-2 (CTS-2) and the Sexual Experiences Survey,^{38, 39} specifically, “hit, pushed, slapped, choked or otherwise physically hurt”, “used force or threats to make you have sex (vaginal, oral, or anal sex) when you didn't want to?”, and “made you have sex (vaginal, oral, or anal sex) when you didn't want to, but didn't use force or threats?” Outcomes of interest were assessed via single items. Standard assessments were used for unprotected vaginal sex, anal sex, and unprotected anal sex, as well as self and partner use of injection drugs. Other sexual risk behaviors included condom non-use against her will (i.e. “how many times have you had sex without a condom when you wanted to use one?”), fear of condom request (i.e. “have you been afraid to ask your partner to use a condom?”), fear of refusing sex (i.e. have you been afraid to refuse sex with a sex partner?”). Participants were asked to self-report their history of STI over the past 3 months (“have you been told by a doctor or other health care professional that you had an STD such as Chlamydia, gonorrhea (also known as the clap), syphilis, herpes, genital warts, Hepatitis B, or crabs”). Participants also reported their primary reason for attending the clinic on the day of the survey; those indicating STI testing or treatment were classified as having sought STI-related care.

Analysis

Prevalence of recent IPV was calculated and differences across demographic characteristics were tested via Wald Log-Linear Chi Square tests for clustered survey data with significance set at $P < 0.05$. Estimates of the prevalence of recent sexual risk and drug injection behaviors are reported for the total sample, and by exposure to recent IPV. Logistic regression models for clustered survey data were specified to account for clinic-level clustering and statistically adjusted for demographic characteristics, including age, race, education, and relationship status. To preserve analytic power, small amounts of missing data on demographic characteristics (<2%) were recoded to the mean value; and the effective sample size was allowed to fluctuate in cases of missing data for outcomes of interest (<2%). All statistical analyses were conducted in SAS, Version 9.3.

Results

In this sample of family planning clinic patients, over one third were ages 16–20 (36.8%), 80.8% were white, and slightly more than half (54.4%) had at least some college education (Table 1). One third of the sample were single, while 59.6% reported being in a serious relationship. Recent IPV was reported by 11.0%, with significant demographic differences observed. This violence was most prevalent among those ages 16–20 (14.4%), and among multi-racial women (20.8%). Recent IPV prevalence was highest among women with less than a high school education (16.0%) and women who reported their relationship status as single or dating (13.2%).

More than two-thirds (68.2%) of the sample reported engaging in unprotected vaginal sex in the past 3 months (Table 2). One in ten (10.0%) women reported recent anal sex and 8.4% of women had recent unprotected anal sex, i.e., the majority of recent anal sex was unprotected. Women with histories of recent IPV were more likely than those who did not experience IPV in the past 3 months to engage in unprotected vaginal sex (AOR 1.93, 95% CI 1.52, 2.44), anal sex (AOR 2.17; 95% CI 1.49, 3.16), and unprotected anal sex (AOR 2.22, 95% CI 1.51, 3.27). Women with recent histories of abuse were also more likely to report being forced to have sex without a condom (AOR 1.87, 95% CI 1.51, 2.33), an outcome reported by one-fifth (21.9%) of the sample. Those in recent abusive relationships were more likely to report fear of condom requests (AOR 4.15, 95% CI 2.73, 6.30) and fear of refusing sex (AOR 11.84, 95% CI 7.59, 18.45). So too, significantly greater levels of recent injection drug use (AOR 3.39, 95% CI 1.47, 7.79) and having a partner who recently used injection drugs (AOR 3.85, 95% CI 1.91, 7.75) were identified based on recent IPV exposure.

Over a tenth (11.2%) of the sample reported coming to the clinic for STI testing or treatment, which was significantly more common for women with recent IPV (AOR 2.49; 95% CI 1.87, 3.31). Recent STI diagnosis was reported by 3.8%; difference in prevalence based on IPV exposure (6.4% vs. 3.5%) attenuated to a nonsignificant trend in the adjusted model (AOR 1.67, 95% CI 0.98, 2.87).

Discussion

Findings confirm high, recent, interrelated and concurrent burdens of IPV, STI/HIV risk, including coercive sexual and condom-related risk, among adolescent and young adult female family planning clinic patients. Recent IPV was significantly associated with sexual and drug-related risk, including unprotected vaginal and anal sex, coerced unprotected sex, as well as injection drug use. Likely as a result, IPV also related significantly to STI care-seeking. Findings build on prior reports,^{10, 15, 40–42} including prospective studies illustrating a longitudinal association of violence with STI/HIV risk²⁷, i.e., a *trajectory* pathway, by confirming an additional pathway of *concurrency* of IPV with sexual and drug-related risk. Specifically, adolescent and young adult women's experiences of IPV are not only related, but are often *simultaneous* with STI/HIV risk behavior. These data further affirm that mitigating the disproportionate burden of STI among young women¹ requires addressing the potential for physical harm as well as coercive sexual risk (e.g., fear of condom negotiation) in STI/HIV prevention and intervention efforts. Recent intervention evidence illustrates the value of clinical screening for violence and related reproductive coercion in the context of harm reduction and referral to violence support services;⁴³ current findings suggest the value of expanding this type of intervention approach to address STI/HIV risk and coercion that specifically inhibits STI/HIV risk reduction. That those exposed to IPV were more likely to present for STI-related clinical services further suggests the likely utility of such an intervention in family planning clinics as well other sexual health services. Referral to violence support services are critical components in the clinical response to IPV. While leaving an abusive relationship, even temporarily through shelter services, is often the desired outcome for patient safety, providers should maintain empathetic and hold realistic expectations in supporting patients to make the right decisions for themselves, as the

separation process is often lengthy with innumerable barriers⁴⁴ and heightened homicide risk⁴⁵

Current evidence of a two-fold increased risk for recent unprotected anal intercourse based on recent IPV is particularly relevant, and echoes past evidence linking lifetime IPV and sexual coercion with anal intercourse.^{15, 46} Growing awareness of the prevalence and STI/HIV transmission efficiency related to heterosexual anal intercourse^{16, 17} has prompted calls for routine assessment for anal intercourse.⁴⁷ These findings affirm the need to broaden sexual risk assessment and risk reduction counseling to include heterosexual anal intercourse, particularly in family planning clinics which have historically focused exclusively on sexual behavior that relates to pregnancy risk. These findings also suggest that, within such sexual risk assessment, it is critical to address the potential for violence and coercion in the context of unprotected anal intercourse.

Findings also illustrate the need to address young women's agency or control in sexual decision-making in abusive relationships in the context of STI/HIV risk reduction. One in five participants experienced condom non-use against their will in the past three months, with significantly elevated risk for this exposure among those in abusive relationships. Partner violence also elevated risk for women's reports of fearing both condom requests and refusing sex. These data highlight the challenges of STI/HIV risk reduction through condom promotion among young women; provision of condoms and condom promotion should be accompanied with an acknowledgement that condom use is not always within women's control, and probes for related patient concerns and for current partner abuse. As condom promotion alone may not be sufficient in reducing young women's STI/HIV risk, it is essential to ensure access and connection to STI/HIV testing and treatment across multiple care settings, including non-clinical services for abused women, to fully support the health needs of women in abusive relationships. Where possible, harm reduction strategies such as supporting women to negotiate lower-risk sexual activity may be valuable.

Providers working with abused women in crisis-based and long-term counseling should be aware of the heightened STI/HIV risk among their clients, including unprotected anal intercourse, coercive sexual risk and condom practices, and injection drug use of both abused women and their partners. Given these data, it is essential to support strong referral networks among STI/HIV clinics, needle exchange services, family planning clinics, and violence-related crisis/counseling programs to create a system of care that is responsive to STI/HIV risk, and the counseling and support needs that stem from IPV.

Finally we note that the impact of the elevated STI/HIV risk identified among those in abusive relationships is likely amplified by the STI/HIV risk behaviors enacted by their partners; prior reports illustrate that abusive men engage in greater sexual risk behavior and are more likely to be STI/HIV infected.⁴⁸⁻⁵¹ Current findings illustrating elevated STI/HIV risk to women in abusive relationships are best considered in the context of the broader literature, including evidence that violence can undermine safe and successful STI/HIV partner notification,^{52, 53} and that violence and other life stressors can compromise treatment uptake and adherence, and advance disease progression.⁵⁴⁻⁵⁷ Taken together, these data argue for a fuller consideration of the impact of IPV across the HIV treatment cascade.

Findings should be considered in light of several limitations. All data were self-reported; despite the use of self-administered computerized data collection, responses may be subject to social desirability biases, recall biases and other sources of inaccuracy. While our use of a clinical sample may enhance the accuracy of self-reported STI data in that participants are receiving routine medical care, reliance on self-reported STI is a particular limitation. The extent to which the anal sex reported herein was subject to force or coercion is unclear. Further research is needed to clarify elements of force, pressure and coercion in anal sex assessments. Findings illustrate the need to extend and modify standard violence assessment tools, such as the Conflict Tactics Scale-2,³⁹ to clarify the nature of unwanted or forced sexual activity (i.e., vaginal vs. anal intercourse) and, in turn, the likely STI/HIV risk introduced.

Together, findings demonstrate a high burden of recent IPV in a large, clinic-based sample of adolescent and young adult women, with significant and co-occurring sexual and drug-related STI/HIV risk. Mitigating the burden of STI/HIV among the youth most affected requires addressing IPV and the gendered power imbalances that impart risk. It is critical to engage sexual and reproductive health clinics in addressing violence and related sexual and drug-related STI/HIV risk among patients.

Acknowledgements

This study was supported by the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (R01HD064407 to Miller and Silverman). The findings and conclusions in this article are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc.

References

1. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). 2010 Sexually Transmitted Diseases Surveillance: STDs in Adolescents and Young Adults. Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; 2010.
2. MMWR. Vital signs: HIV infection, testing and risk behaviors among youths - United States. MMWR. 2012; 61(47):971–976. [PubMed: 23190571]
3. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). [Accessed July 1] NCHHSTP Atlas. 2013. <http://www.cdc.gov/nchhstp/atlas/>
4. Black, MC.; Basile, KC.; Breiding, MJ.; Smith, SG.; Walters, ML.; Merrick, MT.; Chen, J.; Stevens, MR. The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS): 2010 Summary Report. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; 2011.
5. Bureau of Justice Statistics. Intimate Partner Violence. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice; 2000.
6. Davis, A. Interpersonal and physical dating violence among teens. Oakland, CA: National Council on Crime and Delinquency; 2008.
7. Decker MR, Silverman JG, Raj A. Dating violence and sexually transmitted disease/HIV testing and diagnosis among adolescent females. *Pediatrics*. 2005 Aug; 116(2):e272–e276. [PubMed: 16061580]
8. Maman S, Campbell J, Sweat MD, et al. The intersections of HIV and violence: directions for future research and interventions. *Soc Sci Med*. 2000 Feb; 50(4):459–478. [PubMed: 10641800]
9. Silverman JG, Decker MR, Saggurti N, et al. Intimate partner violence and HIV infection among married Indian women. *Jama*. 2008 Aug 13; 300(6):703–710. [PubMed: 18698068]

10. Jewkes RK, Dunkle K, Nduna M, et al. Intimate partner violence, relationship power inequity, and incidence of HIV infection in young women in South Africa: a cohort study. *Lancet*. 2010 Jul 3; 376(9734):41–48. [PubMed: 20557928]
11. Kouyoumdjian FG, Calzavara LM, Bondy SJ, et al. Intimate partner violence is associated with incident HIV infection in women in Uganda. *AIDS*. 2013; 27:1331–1338. [PubMed: 23925380]
12. Weiss HA, Patel V, West B, et al. Spousal sexual violence and poverty are risk factors for sexually transmitted infections in women: a longitudinal study of women in Goa, India. *Sex Transm Infect*. 2008 Apr; 84(2):133–139. [PubMed: 17942576]
13. Davila YR. Influence of abuse on condom negotiation among Mexican-American women involved in abusive relationships. *J Assoc Nurses AIDS Care*. 2002 Nov-Dec;13(6):46–56. [PubMed: 12469543]
14. Logan TK, Cole J, Shannon L. A mixed-methods examination of sexual coercion and degradation among women in violent relationships who do and do not report forced sex. *Violence Vict*. 2007; 22(1):71–94. [PubMed: 17390564]
15. Silverman JG, McCauley HL, Decker MR, et al. Coercive forms of sexual risk and associated violence perpetrated by male partners of female adolescents. *Perspect Sex Reprod Health*. 2011 Mar; 43(1):60–65. [PubMed: 21388506]
16. Baggaley RF, Dimitrov D, Owen BN, et al. Heterosexual anal intercourse: a neglected risk factor for HIV? *Am J Reprod Immunol*. 2013 Feb; 69(Suppl 1):95–105. [PubMed: 23279040]
17. Baggaley RF, White RG, Boily MC. HIV transmission risk through anal intercourse: systematic review, meta-analysis and implications for HIV prevention. *Int J Epidemiol*. 2010 Aug; 39(4): 1048–1063. [PubMed: 20406794]
18. Hess KL, Javanbakht M, Brown JM, et al. Intimate partner violence and anal intercourse in young adult heterosexual relationships. *Perspect Sex Reprod Health*. 2013 Mar; 45(1):6–12. [PubMed: 23489852]
19. Madhivanan P, Krupp K, Reingold A. Correlates of Intimate Partner Physical Violence Among Young Reproductive Age Women in Mysore, India. *Asia Pac J Public Health*. 2011 Dec 20. [epub ahead of print].
20. Eaton DK, Davis KS, Barrios L, et al. Associations of dating violence victimization with lifetime participation, co-occurrence, and early initiation of risk behaviors among U.S. high school students. *J Interpers Violence*. 2007 May; 22(5):585–602. [PubMed: 17429024]
21. El-Bassel N, Gilbert L, Wu E, et al. Intimate partner violence prevalence and HIV risks among women receiving care in emergency departments: implications for IPV and HIV screening. *Emerg Med J*. 2007 Apr; 24(4):255–259. [PubMed: 17384378]
22. El-Bassel N, Gilbert L, Wu E, et al. Relationship between drug abuse and intimate partner violence: a longitudinal study among women receiving methadone. *Am J Public Health*. 2005 Mar; 95(3):465–470. [PubMed: 15727978]
23. Gilbert L, El-Bassel N, Chang M, et al. Substance use and partner violence among urban women seeking emergency care. *Psychol Addict Behav*. 2012 Jun; 26(2):226–235. [PubMed: 22023020]
24. El-Bassel N, Terlikbaeva A, Pinkham S. HIV and women who use drugs: double neglect, double risk. *Lancet*. 2010 Jul 31; 376(9738):312–314. [PubMed: 20650519]
25. El-Bassel N, Gilbert L, Rajah V, et al. Fear and violence: raising the HIV stakes. *AIDS Educ Prev*. 2000 Apr; 12(2):154–170. [PubMed: 10833040]
26. Young BJ, Furman W, Jones MC. Changes in adolescents' risk factors following peer sexual coercion: evidence for a feedback loop. *Dev Psychopathol*. 2012 May; 24(2):559–571. [PubMed: 22559131]
27. Lang DL, Sales JM, Salazar LF, et al. Rape victimization and high risk sexual behaviors: longitudinal study of african-american adolescent females. *West J Emerg Med*. 2011 Jul; 12(3): 333–342. [PubMed: 21731791]
28. Wingood GM, DiClemente RJ, McCree DH, et al. Dating violence and the sexual health of black adolescent females. *Pediatrics*. 2001 May.107(5):E72. [PubMed: 11331722]
29. Fox AM, Jackson SS, Hansen NB, et al. In their own voices: a qualitative study of women's risk for intimate partner violence and HIV in South Africa. *Violence Against Women*. 2007 Jun; 13(6): 583–602. [PubMed: 17515407]

30. Miller E, Decker MR, Reed E, et al. Male partner pregnancy-promoting behaviors and adolescent partner violence: findings from a qualitative study with adolescent females. *Ambul Pediatr*. 2007 Sep-Oct;7(5):360–366. [PubMed: 17870644]
31. Raj A, Reed E, Miller E, et al. Contexts of condom use and non-condom use among young adolescent male perpetrators of dating violence. *AIDS Care*. 2007 Sep; 19(8):970–973. [PubMed: 17851992]
32. Lichtenstein B. Domestic violence, sexual ownership, and HIV risk in women in the American deep south. *Soc Sci Med*. 2005 Feb; 60(4):701–714. [PubMed: 15571889]
33. Teitelman AM, Tennille J, Bohinski JM, et al. Unwanted unprotected sex: condom coercion by male partners and self-silencing of condom negotiation among adolescent girls. *ANS Adv Nurs Sci*. 2011 Jul-Sep;34(3):243–259. [PubMed: 21822072]
34. Keeling J, Birch L. The prevalence rates of domestic abuse in women attending a family planning clinic. *J Fam Plann Reprod Health Care*. 2004 Apr; 30(2):113–114. [PubMed: 15086997]
35. Miller E, Decker MR, Raj A, et al. Intimate partner violence and health care-seeking patterns among female users of urban adolescent clinics. *Matern Child Health J*. 2010 Nov; 14(6):910–917. [PubMed: 19760162]
36. Rickert VI, Wiemann CM, Harrykissoon SD, et al. The relationship among demographics, reproductive characteristics, and intimate partner violence. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2002 Oct; 187(4):1002–1007. [PubMed: 12388996]
37. Miller E, McCauley HL, Tancredi DJ, et al. Reproductive coercion and unintended pregnancy among female family planning clients. *Obstetrics & Gynecology*. Under review.
38. Koss MP, Abbey A, Campbell R, et al. Revising the SES: A Collaborative Process to Improve Assessment of Sexual Aggression and Victimization. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*. 2007 Dec 1; 31(4):357–370. 2007.
39. Straus MA, Hamby SL, Boney-McCoy S, et al. The Revised Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS2): Development and Preliminary Psychometric Data. *Journal of Family Issues*. 1996 May 1; 17(3): 283–316. 1996.
40. Dunkle KL, Jewkes RK, Brown HC, et al. Gender-based violence, relationship power, and risk of HIV infection in women attending antenatal clinics in South Africa. *Lancet*. 2004 May 1; 363(9419):1415–1421. [PubMed: 15121402]
41. Jewkes R, Vundule C, Maforah F, et al. Relationship dynamics and teenage pregnancy in South Africa. *Soc Sci Med*. 2001 Mar; 52(5):733–744. [PubMed: 11218177]
42. Pettifor AE, Measham DM, Rees HV, et al. Sexual power and HIV risk, South Africa. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2004 Nov; 10(11):1996–2004. [PubMed: 15550214]
43. Miller E, Decker MR, McCauley HL, et al. A family planning clinic partner violence intervention to reduce risk associated with reproductive coercion. *Contraception*. 2011 Mar; 83(3):274–280. [PubMed: 21310291]
44. Lutenebacher M, Cohen A, Mitzel J. Do we really help? Perspectives of abused women. *Public Health Nurs*. 2003 Jan-Feb;20(1):56–64. [PubMed: 12492826]
45. Wilson M, Daly M. Spousal homicide risk and estrangement. *Violence Vict*. 1993 Spring;8(1):3–16. [PubMed: 8292563]
46. Lescano CM, Houck CD, Brown LK, et al. Correlates of heterosexual anal intercourse among at-risk adolescents and young adults. *Am J Public Health*. 2009 Jun; 99(6):1131–1136. [PubMed: 19008522]
47. Jenness SM, Begier EM, Neaigus A, et al. Unprotected anal intercourse and sexually transmitted diseases in high-risk heterosexual women. *Am J Public Health*. 2011 Apr; 101(4):745–750. [PubMed: 20558790]
48. Decker MR, Seage GR 3rd, Hemenway D, et al. Intimate partner violence functions as both a risk marker and risk factor for women's HIV infection: findings from Indian husband-wife dyads. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2009 Aug 15; 51(5):593–600. [PubMed: 19421070]
49. Dunkle KL, Jewkes RK, Nduna M, et al. Perpetration of partner violence and HIV risk behaviour among young men in the rural Eastern Cape, South Africa. *AIDS*. 2006 Oct 24; 20(16):2107–2114. [PubMed: 17053357]

50. Decker MR, Seage GR 3rd, Hemenway D, et al. Intimate partner violence perpetration, standard and gendered STI/HIV risk behaviour, and STI/HIV diagnosis among a clinic-based sample of men. *Sex Transm Infect.* 2009 Dec; 85(7):555–560. [PubMed: 19625287]
51. Silverman JG, Decker MR, Kapur NA, et al. Violence against wives, sexual risk and sexually transmitted infection among Bangladeshi men. *Sex Transm Infect.* 2007 Jun; 83(3):211–215. [PubMed: 17301104]
52. Decker MR, Miller E, McCauley HL, et al. Intimate partner violence and partner notification of sexually transmitted infections among adolescent and young adult family planning clinic patients. *Int J STD AIDS.* 2011 Jun; 22(6):345–347. [PubMed: 21680673]
53. Makin JD, Forsyth BW, Visser MJ, et al. Factors affecting disclosure in South African HIV-positive pregnant women. *AIDS Patient Care STDS.* 2008 Nov; 22(11):907–916. [PubMed: 19025485]
54. Cohen MH, Cook JA, Grey D, et al. Medically eligible women who do not use HAART: the importance of abuse, drug use, and race. *Am J Public Health.* 2004 Jul; 94(7):1147–1151. [PubMed: 15226135]
55. Mugavero M, Ostermann J, Whetten K, et al. Barriers to antiretroviral adherence: the importance of depression, abuse, and other traumatic events. *AIDS Patient Care STDS.* 2006 Jun; 20(6):418–428. [PubMed: 16789855]
56. Mugavero MJ, Raper JL, Reif S, et al. Overload: impact of incident stressful events on antiretroviral medication adherence and virologic failure in a longitudinal, multisite human immunodeficiency virus cohort study. *Psychosom Med.* 2009 Nov; 71(9):920–926. [PubMed: 19875634]
57. Schafer KR, Brant J, Gupta S, et al. Intimate partner violence: a predictor of worse HIV outcomes and engagement in care. *AIDS Patient Care STDS.* 2012 Jun; 26(6):356–365. [PubMed: 22612519]

Key messages

- Recent (past three month) physical or sexual violence from intimate partners was common (11%) among adolescent and young adult female patients of family planning clinics
- Intimate partner violence was significantly associated with both sexual and drug-related STI/HIV risk during this same time period
- Findings affirm the concurrence of IPV with sexual and drug-related risk behaviors, and highlight the need for safety promotion and harm reduction for such patients.

Table 1

Sample Characteristics and Prevalence of Recent Physical or Sexual Partner Violence (n=3504)

	Total % (n)	%[‡] (n) past 3 months IPV
Total Sample		11.0% (390)
Age		
16–20	36.8% (1291)	14.4% (186)
21–24	35.7% (1251)	9.8% (122)
25–29	27.5% (962)	8.5% (82)
P value[^]		0.003
Race		
White	80.8% (2832)	10.4% (294)
Black/African American	13.1% (460)	13.0% (60)
Hispanic/Latina	1.6% (56)	7.1% (4)
Multi-racial	2.9% (101)	20.8% (21)
Asian/Other	1.6% (55)	20.0% (11)
P value[^]		0.002
Education		
Less than 12 th grade	18.6% (650)	16.0% (104)
Finished high school	27.0% (946)	11.8% (112)
Some college	33.9% (1189)	11.2% (133)
Finished college or grad school	20.5% (719)	5.7% (41)
P value[^]		<0.0001
Relationship Status		
Single / Dating	33.0% (1156)	13.2% (153)
In a serious relationship	59.6% (2088)	10.6% (222)
Married	7.4% (260)	5.8% (15)
P value[^]		0.002

[‡] Row percentages[^] P values from cluster survey adjusted (Wald log-linear) chi-square tests for association, to account for clustering effects arising from within-clinic residual correlation

Table 2

Associations of recent physical or sexual partner violence with recent sexual risk, sexually transmitted infection, and injection drug use (n=3504)

	%	% Among Recent IPV Yes n=390	% Among Recent IPV No n=3114	aOR (95% CI)
Recent sexual risk (p3m)				
Unprotected vaginal sex	68.2%	78.8%	68.4%	1.93 (1.52, 2.44)
Anal sex	10.0%	17.6%	9.3%	2.17 (1.49, 3.16)
Unprotected anal sex	8.4%	15.0%	7.7%	2.22 (1.51, 3.27)
Condom non-use against her will	21.9%	35.5%	20.6%	1.87 (1.51, 2.33)
Afraid to ask partner to use a condom	2.3%	7.3%	1.7%	4.15 (2.73, 6.30)
Afraid to refuse sex	2.7%	13.6%	1.3%	11.84 (7.59, 18.45)
Recent injection drug use (p3m)				
Self IDU	1.0%	2.8%	0.7%	3.39 (1.47, 7.79)
Partner IDU	1.4%	4.1%	1.1%	3.85 (1.91, 7.75)
Recent sexually transmitted infection (p3m)				
	3.8%	6.4%	3.5%	1.67 (0.98, 2.87)
Visited clinic for STI testing or treatment				
	11.2%	22.6%	9.8%	2.49 (1.87, 3.31)

* Adjusted odds ratios from logistic regression models for clustered surveys, with clinics specified as clusters, and with independent variables included for recent IPV (Yes vs. No) and for age, race, education and relationship status, to adjust for demographic confounders. A separate model was fit for each of the outcome risks reported here