

Website:www.jriiejournal.com

ISSN 2520-7504 (Online) Vol.9, Iss.2, 2025 (pp. 1025 - 1036)

Social-Demographic Predictors of Marital Disruption: A Case Study of Homa Bay County, Kenya

Hezron O. Agili¹ & Daniel O. Odaro² ¹Faculty of Physical and Biological Sciences, Tom Mboya University, Kenya ²Department of Geography and Natural Resources Management, Maseno University, Kenya Email: <u>agili.hez@gmail.com</u> / <u>danielodaro79@gmail.com</u>

Abstract: Most research on marital disruption tends to focus on the developed countries while socio-demographic studies on the phenomenon from sub-Saharan Africa are relatively limited. The study considered this knowledge gap through an investigation of the predictors of marital disruption. It aimed at establishing the major factors that contribute to marital disruptions with special focus in Homa Bay County, Kenya. The study used a cross sectional research design to collect retrospective and present status data. The respondents for this study consisted of 420 married women. The respondents were selected using simple random sampling technique. The data were analyzed by inferential statistics using Kaplan-Meier mean estimate, survival curve, log rank Chi-square test (Q) and binary logit regression. The study established that marital disruption is significantly influenced by the number of lifetime partners, housing tenure, childlessness, nature of employment - whether permanent or temporal - and maternal level of education. The findings also showed that in order of largest contribution by mean score, social factors (13.59), economic status (13.57), behavioral and emotional problems (13.52), marital factors (13.47), parental characteristics (13.43), sexual habits (13.13) and domestic factors (13.08) influence marital disruption. The study therefore recommends policy interventions that encourage one lifetime partner in nuptial relations, family life education, marriage and pre-marital counseling through seminars, lectures and workshops that inform and promote skills that maintain good marital relationships and foster re-union in case of separation or divorce.

Keywords: Marriage, Marital Disruption, Divorce, Separation, Re-union.

How to cite this work (APA):

Agili, H. O. & Odaro, D. O. (2025). Social-demographic predictors of marital disruption: A case study of Homa Bay County, Kenya. *Journal of Research Innovation and Implications in Education*, 9(2), 1025 – 1036. <u>https://doi.org/10.59765/73hye</u>.

1. Introduction

Marriage institution was initiated and ordained by God. It was intended to last forever since it is a holy union (Brown & Brown, 2012; Isiugo-Abanihe, 2018). The union of Adam and Eve in the garden of Eden marked the first marriage ordained by God upon which God blessed them

with His pronouncement that they would be fruitful, multiply and fill all the earth. It has been then a vicious circle till this contemporary time that marriage institution primarily groomed humankind into adulthood. Isiugo-Abanihe (2018) defines marriage as a formal union between a man and a woman, characteristically as recognized legally, in body and soul to form a sexual, productive, and reproductive union. He further opines that marital disruption is the dissolution of a marriage by verdict of a court or by acknowledged tradition. The marriage institution assumes the sharing of economic and social resources and coinsurance against life's misfortunes (Olaniyi, 2015). Married couples also tend to have better physical and emotional health than single individuals (Brown & Brown, 2012; Burnham, 2018). Sadly, an institution once believed to be irrevocable after its establishment through proper customs and rituals today end up in disruption (Burnham, 2018).

According to the Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (KNBS), the proportion of separated women aged 12 and above was 2.5%, while in men it was 1.7% in 2019 (KNBS, 2022). Latest approximations from the Kenya Demographic and Health Survey (KDHS) reveal that divorce rates have risen since 2022, where the separation rate among married women aged 15-49 was 7.9. Among married men of similar age group, the separation rate was 4.6% (KNBS, 2023). Therefore, today, Kenyan couples are more likely to separate and divorce than a few decades ago. This has led to rising conjugal and family instability (Carlson, 2021; KNBS, 2023). There is limited research on the drivers of marital disruption in Homa Bay County. This underscores the heterogeneity of marital disruption and the importance of its predicting factors hence the study.

The objective of the study was to investigate the sociodemographic predictors of marital disruption in Homa Bay County, Kenya. The study was guided by two research questions:

- 1. How do individual socio-economic factors relate to marital disruption among women in the County?
- 2. What is the influence of parental characteristic on marital disruption among women in the County?

2. Literature Review

In Tanzania, Shabani & Kuname (2011) associated marital disruption with low educational level, high school dropout and younger age at marriage. Young couples have consistently higher risks of marital disruption due to their lower psychological and economic maturity, potentially unreasonable expectations; a shorter search for an appropriate partner that led to an unstable match or the seemingly better outside options; and a lack of knowledge of the longer-term characteristics of the future spouse (Arugu, 2014). In contrast, Phillips & Sweeney (2005) found that higher levels of education lowers the probability of marital disruption. It is argued that highly educated couples should have more resources to overcome marital challenges. Marrying at an early age, previous marriages, and premarital births were found to increase the risk of marital disruption in the United States (Gheshlaghi & Najafabadi, 2014). Another empirical study in the United

Kingdom by Kierna & Cherlin (1999) reported that the offspring of divorced parents were more likely to have dissolved their first partnerships by the age of 33.

Childlessness is a major contributor to marital disruption. For instance, Lyngstad & Jalovaara (2010) established that spouses with younger children ever born, in some cases particularly males, have lower risk of marital disruption than couples without children. Couples who have children would make a bigger effort to overcome marital difficulties as well as stay together for the "sake of the children". Furthermore, high income couples would not suffer the negative effect of stress-inducing economic problems. This would reduce the probability of marital disruption. Other predictors for marital disruption include housing tenure; living apart; always arguing; infidelity; psychological and relational problems as well as reasons to do with division of housework; low marital satisfaction, incompatibility, behavioural and relationship problems that include gender violence; parents' socio-economic status as well as parental separation (Voena, 2015; Munsch, 2015; Tuttle & Davis, 2015). The inter-generational transmission of divorce risk is attributed to the lack of appropriate marital role models and reduced parental supervision of those whose parents separate (Mbiti, 2018). The empirical evidence from developed countries (Cohen, 2014), predicts that home or apartment owner and/or occupiers are indeed less likely to experience marital dissolution than those living in private rented accommodation. In Africa, research by Mbiti (2018) established that marital disruption in some communities is linked with aspects such as, sterility or barrenness, cruelty, use of magic and witchcraft by the wife, unfaithfulness and desertion by either of the partners.

Higher levels of marital disruption in developed countries have been manifested among marriages legalized in civil as opposed to religious ceremonies (Frederick & Fales, 2016). Another study in Australia established religious practice to be strongly associated with a reduced level of marital breakdown (Jones et al. (2015). The scholars observe that differences in religious affiliation in a marriage would be a source of nuptial stress leading to mental health problems for one or both of the partners. Moreover, Jones et al. (2015) opine that some people who marry outside their religion often indicate a tendency or rebellion toward cultural norms. This propensity may also operate in that the person feels tempted to leave a marriage if it does not meet his/her hopes. Poortman & Lyngstad (2007) opined that previous experience of partnership disruption leads to higher divorce risk because of a lack of skill either in selecting a compatible partner or in staying married; or previously divorced persons are more likely to view separation as a solution to conflict, or to be members of groups that find divorce more acceptable. Couples who had premarital cohabitation are more likely to experience marital disruption since they are usually less traditional and may have different ideals and marriage expectations (Lyngstad & Jalovaara, 2010; Nelson & Salawu, 2017; Mbiti 2018). Other divergent views from other scholars posit that once cohabiting couples have more experience and information about each other and life together, they then tend to have more stable marriages (Amato, 2010; Lyngstad & Jalovaara, 2010).

Several studies (Lyngstad & Jalovaara, 2010; Harkonen, 2014; Nelson & Salawu, 2017; Tanaka, 2021; King, 2022; Roy, 2022) found that men's higher social and economic status such as higher educational attainment, prestigious occupations, labour force participation and adequate income are associated with marital stability whereas wives' resources destabilize them (Lyngstad & Jalovaara, 2010). This is attributed to weakened household division of labour: increased opportunities for maintaining independent households; and chances to meet new partners (Harkonen, 2014). In the USA, Ruggles (2020) established a significant relationship between the rise in female employment in non-farm jobs and the rates of divorce and separation. Cooke et al. (2013) observe that female employment may stabilize marital unions by strengthening the family's economic security, balancing the spouses' roles and responsibilities. Other socio-demographic predictors explored with marital disruption are migration, legislative changes in divorce law, abusive behavior, poor communication, sudden character changes, financial hardships as well as adultery among young couples (Nelson & Salawu, 2017; Dolfani, 2018). Nevertheless, Mostafaei (2021) opined that couples find it perplexing to work through their emotional, financial and sexual conflicts when there is a lack of or poor communication between them.

The negative effects of marital disruption for most women include feelings of bitterness or sadness, a change in the place of residence, a decline and/or change in the quality of life and adopting a single lifestyle (Fagan & Churchil, 2022; Amato & James, 2010). Individuals also exhibit symptoms of misery, anxiety, more health problems especially in societies where stigmatization is high, excessive alcohol and drug abuse and a greater risk of mortality (Amato & James, 2010). Parental marital disruption can lower the educational performance of their children compared to their counterparts as well as distract their educational career through affecting their economic or psychological well-being, relationships with parents, friends or teachers. The children may also likely be more prone to divorce themselves as they may hold interpersonal skills that are not conducive to marital stability or are more likely to see marital dissolution as a workable solution to marital challenges (Amato & James, 2010).

Due to the positive contribution of marital union to humankind's life satisfaction (Agili, 2024) and the negative effects that divorce can have on their socioeconomic stability and mental health (Musau, 2016), investigations of predictors of marital disruption among households in Homa Bay County are crucial. Most studies have focused on socio-economic factors causing crude rates of divorce. Existing knowledge about how sociodemographic dynamics affect what occurs in contemporary marriages in Homa Bay County is quite scanty. A number of the associated drivers of marital disruption in many countries have been established by the foregoing empirical investigations. The objective of the study therefore was to establish whether or not the Homa Bay County's additional marital disruption-related variables are different from those in other parts of the world. The study used a microdemographic survey data to establish the predictors of marital disruption.

2.1 Conceptual framework

The predictors of marital disruption are placed in three groups or categories, namely, parents' characteristics, marital factors (demographic factors associated with the couples' partnership history and childbearing experience) and the individual's socio-economic characteristics. Socioeconomic factors are likely to influence the risk of marital disruption both directly and indirectly (through their effect on marital factors). Socio-demographic predictors can affect the risk of marital disruption through their impact on interpersonal behaviour and the couple's attitudes towards divorce. The linkages of these socio-economic and demographic factors and their influence on marital disruption are shown in Figure 1 below.



3. Methodology

The study was conducted in Homa Bay County within the Lake Victoria Basin, Kenya (Fig. 2). The County extends

approximately from latitude $0^{\circ}15'$ South to $0^{\circ}52'$ South, and from longitudes 34° East to 35° East. Its total area is 4,267.1 Km² inclusive of the water surface, which covers an area of 1,227 Km² (GOK, 2018).



Figure 2: Study Area Source: Homa Bay County Integrated Development Plan (2018-2022)

3.1 Research design, data collection and analysis

The study used a cross-sectional survey design. It took into consideration the analysis of marital history and current status data collected using a sample of individuals to administer retrospective questionnaire. Optimum sample size of 420 was estimated using Taro Yamane sample size equation. The survey design seemed appropriate as it enabled the researcher to collect information, summarize and interpret data mainly for clarification (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). The selection of respondents was done in their de jure place of residence using simple random sampling. Structured questionnaires and interviews were used to collect primary data.

Data was analyzed using the Statistical Package of Social Sciences (SPSS) software version 21. A descriptive summary of independent variables was done using frequency distributions, simple percentage and mean. The product limit (PL) analysis technique using Kaplan-Meier (1958) (equation 3.5) survival function was used at the bivariate stage to estimate differentials in the length of time a woman spent in her first union before marital disruption and the proportion surviving marital disruption (divorce or separation) at 95% confidence interval (p < 0.05). Thus:

$$\hat{S}(t) = \prod_{t(i) \le t} \frac{n_i - d_i}{n_i} \tag{3.5}.$$

Where:

 n_i = number of people at risk for the event at time $t_{(i)}$; d_i = number of events observed at time $t_{(i)}$; $\frac{n_i - d_i}{n_i}$ = conditional likelihood of surviving past a given

time $t_{(i)}$ given survival to that time.

Further, the Kaplan-Meier mean estimate, survival curve and log rank Chi-square test (Q), equation 3.6, were used to measure significant differences between time to marital disruption and plausible independent variables. Thus:

$$Q = \frac{\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} d_{1i} - \sum_{i=1}^{m} \hat{e}_{1i}\right)^{2}}{\sum_{i=1}^{m} \hat{v}(\hat{e}_{1i})}$$
(3.6).

Where:

 d_{1i} = total number of women who experienced the event in both groups;

 $\hat{1}_{li}$ = the expected number of women who married at time (t);

 \hat{V} = variance of \hat{e}_{1i} .

The study also employed binary logit regression (equation 2) to estimate net effect of fixed and time-varying covariates to "survival time-to-marital disruption due to divorce or separation" which, in this study, was the response variable. Potential predictor variables were duration of marriage, age at first marriage, age cohort, religious affiliation, level of educational attainment, employment status, total number of children ever born, number of lifetime partners, migration status and place of residence. Thus:

$$log\left[\frac{p_i}{1-p_i}\right] = \alpha_o + \alpha_1 X_{1i} + \alpha_2 X_{2i} + \alpha_3 X_{3i} + \dots + \alpha_k X_{ki} + \epsilon_{ij} \dots (2).$$

Where:

 p_i is the probability of marital disruption,

 $1 - p_i$ is the probability of not experiencing marital disruption,

 $\alpha_0 \dots \alpha_k$ are partial intercept and slope coefficients,

 $X_{1i} \dots X_{ki}$ are response variables,

 \in_{ii} is the error term.

4. Results and Discussion

The micro-demographic household survey reached a total of 420 women aged 20-49 years, who were ever married. Descriptive statistics for all variables used in the analysis are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Kaplan-Meier estimate and Log Rank χ2 of the mean time to first marriage disruption by background characteristics, Homa Bay County, Kenya

Selected Covariates	Number	Percentage ever disrupted after first marriage	Mean time to disruption (Kaplan Meier estimate)	Log Rank χ2-value, p	
Age cohort					
20-24	56	12.5	4.6	54.456;	
25-29	113	14.9	4.4	p=0.013	
30-34	87	23.6	3.4		
35-39	100	34.1	3.1		
40-44	47	8.7	6.2		
45-49	17	6.2	7.1		
Number of lifetime partner					
> One life partner	145	66.2	3.8	4.165;	
One life partner	275	33.8	6.8	p=0.019	
Age at first marriage					
<18 Years	148	67	4.3	12.571;	
18+ Years	272	33	8.2	p=0.124	
Housing tenure					
Owner occupier	297	36.7	7.3	3.812;	
Privately rented accommodation	123	63.3	4.2	P=0.014	
Children ever born					
Childless/No child	67	49.8	3.0	23.363;	

Up to 2 children	128	43.9	6.4	p=0.004
3 Children and higher	225	6.3	7.4	
Employment in paid work				
No work	49	17.4	6.5	15.113;
Temporary job	133	31.2	4.3	p=0.003
Permanent job	32	51.4	3.4	
Rite of wedding				
Civil	112	68.4	4.1	3.145;
Religious	308	31.6	7.8	p=0.223
Broken family structure before				
Divorced	73	47.3	3.4	4.379;
Separation	81	42.8	6.3	p=0.147
Intact	266	9.9	7.2	
Highest educational level				
No formal	40	12.6	8.6	6.043;
Primary	65	20.4	5.3	p=0.024
Secondary	172	26.7	4.8	
Tertiary	143	40.3	3.5	
ALL	420	16.52	6.4	

The results of the study show that 16.5% of the women in the study area have ever disrupted their first marriage. The mean time to first marriage disruption was found to be about 6.4 years (Table 1). The study reveals that, in Homa Bay County, by the end of the sixth year following first marriage, women would, on average, have disrupted their first marriage. The background variables analyzed include woman's age cohort, number of lifetime partner, age at first marriage, housing tenure, children ever born, employment in paid work, rite of wedding, broken family structure before marriage and highest educational level.

In comparison, the KM mean time to marital disruption was about 7 years among women in age cohort of 45-49, followed by approximately 6 years for the 40-44 age cohort and approximately 3 years for those women in the age cohort between 35-38 years. The findings corroborate that of Rohany & Sakdiah (2010) who found that at the age cohort of 35-39, the women shall have passed through the stage of adjustment and adaptation, and it is here that the majority who experience more psychological problems and distress opt to dissolve their first marriage. As a result of low self-esteem and self-respect in perpetual circumstances of disagreements and chaotic relationships, they dissolve the marriage. The KM estimates for the mean time to disruption indicate that women who had more than one life partner disrupted their first marriage 3 years after first marriage; women who had only one life partner disrupted their first marriage after 6 years. The observed differentials are therefore significant ($\chi 2=4.165$, p<0.019).

The KM estimate for the mean time to disruption for paternal parents who were divorced was 3.4 years and 7.2 years for intact marriages. The variation between the nature of broken family structure and time to disrupt marital union is, however, not statistically significant ($\chi 2=4.379$, p=0.147). Studies conducted by Munsch (2015) and Tuttle & Davis (2015) also found out that being raised by parents whose marriages are intact is expected to have a negative effect on marital disruption among women due to the benefits associated with marriage which children observe while growing up.

The survival estimates further show that, at every duration, marriage stability is most likely among women who married after the age of 18 years, with no formal or primary levels of education, those with three (3) children and above, and those with permanent job. A study carried out by Cohen (2014) corroborates this finding in relation to employment in paid work. This could be attributed to the weak marital ties resulting from spatial mobility for women who were working and lack of economic opportunities outside the home for women not working which might explain why they have a lower risk of marital disruption. Therefore, despite the challenges that they may face, women who are not working might have decided to stay in a marriage to depend on their husbands for survival (Cohen, 2019).

The findings in regard to age at first marriage may be understood in the context of the importance of education attainment among those who marry after age 18 years in the socio-economic life of most women in Homa Bay County. Additionally, being mature and having adequate role performance skills required in a union and associated with adulthood could be used to explain the observed trend in age at first marriage (Shabani & Kuname, 2018). The average mean number of years taken to disrupt a marriage for a woman with no formal education was nearly 9 years compared to nearly 4 years for those with tertiary level of education. This variation is statistically significant ($\chi 2$ =6.043, p<0.024). The reason for the observed pattern may conform to the economic theory of marriage opined by Becker (1974) that low education level among women trap them in marriage due to the advantages they expect from their husbands' incomes while the educated ones are less interested in marriage because their personal skills could be maximized elsewhere in the job market. Compared to type of marriage ceremonies, women who married through civil rite stay shorter in marital unions. The KM estimate for the mean time to disruption for civil marriage. The variation between rite of wedding and time to disrupt marital union is, however, not statistically significant ($\chi 2$ =3.145, p=0.223).

The KM mean time to disruption estimate for women with permanent jobs was 3.4 years compared to 6.5 years for those with no paid work ($\chi 2=15.113$, p=0.003). This finding may suggest that women with permanent jobs have increased opportunities for maintaining independent households; and chances to meet new partners in case of marital disagreements (Harkonen, 2014). Employed women can be motivated to divorce or separate since they can easily use their resources to look after themselves or their children.

S/N	FACTORS	MEAN SCORE	RANKING
1	Social	13.59	1 st
2	Economic status	13.57	2 nd
3	Behavioral and emotional problems	13.52	3 rd
4	Marital	13.47	4 th
5	Parents characteristics	13.43	5 th
6	Sexual	13.13	6 th
7	Domestic	13.08	7 th

Table 3. C	- Charrison Fastana	Luflue an aim a Manifal	Diama Alan ha Maan	Coore Douling
I anie Z' Niimmary	v Nnowing Factors	Infiliencing Wigrifgi	DISCUDITION DV VIESO	Score Ranking
rabic 2. Summar	y Showing I actors	innucheng maritar	Distuption by mean	Score manning

Table 2 shows that factors influencing marital disruption are: social factors, for example respect and love by husband to wife, effective communication and fear of God, which ranked as the highest factor (13.59). This was followed by economic status; such as prevalence of poverty, adequacy of income, type of occupation and adequate provision by husband of basic needs (13.57); behavioral and emotional problems (as measured at age 16) was ranked third; such as ability to solve conflicts, conduct disorder, adherence to consensus and endurance by both spouses (13.52); marital factors include age at marriage, premarital cohabitation, number of lifetime partners, children ever born and age of children (13.47); parental characteristics such as socioeconomic status and separation/divorce (13.43); sexual factors include; regular sexual intercourse, petting, kissing, hugging and extra-marital involvement (13.13). Lastly, domestic factors include delicious/timely cooking of meals, severe physical Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) and care for children and spouse (13.08).

VALUE) for Odds Ratio Lower Upper Age cohort 20-24 (RC) 1.00 25-29 1.082 (.062) .250 1.332 30-34 1.183 (.013) .436 1.235 35-39 1.376 (.018) .356 1.231 40-44 .406 (.523) .165 1.006 45-49 .312 (.070) .406 .867 Number of lifetime - - - > One life partner 1.123 (.001) .804 2.554 One life partner (RC) 1.00 - - Age at first marriage - - - - 1.87 (cars) .706 (.059) .557 1.082 Housing tenure - - - - Owner occupier (RC) 1.00 - - - Children and higher (RC) 1.00 - - - Temporary job 1.028 (.037) .342 1.431 Permanent job 1.136 (.006) .467 1.415	Selected Covariates	Logit Odds (P-	95% Confidence Interval for Odds Ratio	
Lower Upper Age cohort 20-24 (RC) 1.00 25-29 1.082 (.062) .250 1.332 30-34 1.183 (.013) .436 1.235 35-39 1.376 (.018) .356 1.231 40-44 .406 (.523) .165 1.006 45-49 .312 (.070) .406 .867 Number of lifetime - - - > One lifetime partner 1.123 (.001) .804 2.554 One life partner (RC) 1.00 - - Age at first marriage - - - < 18 Years (RC)		VALUE)		
Age cohort $20-24$ (RC)1.00 $25-29$ 1.082 (.062).2501.332 $30-34$ 1.183 (.013).4361.235 $35-39$ 1.376 (.018).3561.231 $40-44$.406 (.523).1651.006 $45-49$.312 (.070).406.867Number of lifetime> One lifetime partner1.123 (.001).8042.554One life partner (RC)1.00Age at first marriage<18 Years.706 (.059).5571.082Housing tenureOwner occupier (RC)1.00Privately rented accommodation1.189 (.043).7432.073Children ever bornChildren and higher (RC)1.00Employment in paid workNo work (RC)1.00Temporary job1.028 (.037).3421.431Permanent job1.136 (.006).4671.415Rite of wedding </th <th></th> <th></th> <th>Lower</th> <th>Upper</th>			Lower	Upper
20-24 (RC) 1.00 $25-29$ 1.082 (.02) .250 1.332 $30-34$ 1.183 (.013) .436 1.235 $35-39$ 1.376 (.018) .356 1.231 40.44 .406 (.523) .165 1.006 45.49 .312 (.070) .406 .867 Number of lifetime - - - > One life ime partner 1.123 (.001) .804 2.554 One life partner (RC) 1.00 - - Age at first marriage - - - Stars (RC) 1.00 - - By Years .706 (.059) .557 1.082 Housing tenure - - - Owner occupier (RC) 1.00 - - Privately rented accommodation 1.189 (.043) .743 2.073 Children ever born - - - Children and higher (RC) 1.00 - - Partonal ducational beyet 1.028 (.037) .342 1.431 Permanent job 1.028	Age cohort			
25-29 1.082 (.062) .250 1.332 $30-34$ 1.183 (.013) .436 1.235 $35-39$ 1.376 (.018) .356 1.231 $40-44$.406 (.523) .165 1.006 $45-49$.312 (.070) .406 .867 Number of lifetime - - - > One lifetime partner (RC) 1.00 .804 2.554 One life partner (RC) 1.00 .804 2.554 One life partner (RC) 1.00 . - Star (RC) 1.00 . . . Star (RC) 1.00 Owner occupier (RC) 1.00 Children ever born .	20-24 (RC)	1.00		
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	25-29	1.082 (.062)	.250	1.332
35-39 1.376 (.018) .356 1.231 40-44 .406 (.523) .165 1.006 45-49 .312 (.070) .406 .867 Number of lifetime . .	30-34	1.183 (.013)	.436	1.235
40-44 406 (.523) .165 1.006 $45-49$.312 (.070) .406 .867 Number of lifetime	35-39	1.376 (.018)	.356	1.231
45.49 $.312 (.070)$ $.406$ $.867$ Number of lifetime $$	40-44	.406 (.523)	.165	1.006
Number of lifetime \geq One lifetime partner (RC) 1.00 .804 2.554 One life partner (RC) 1.00	45-49	.312 (.070)	.406	.867
> One lifetime partner $1.123 (.001)$ $.804$ 2.554 One life partner (RC) 1.00 Age at first marriage 100 18 Years (RC) 1.00 $18 + Years$ $.706 (.059)$ $.557$ Housing tenure 00 Privately rented accommodation $1.189 (.043)$ $.743$ 2.073 Children ever bor 00 $$	Number of lifetime			
One life partner (RC) 1.00 Age at first marriage	> One lifetime partner	1.123 (.001)	.804	2.554
Age at first marriage <18 Years (RC) 1.00 $18 + Years$.706 (.059) .557 1.082 Housing tenure	One life partner (RC)	1.00		
<18 Years (RC)	Age at first marriage			
18+ Years .706 (.059) .557 1.082 Housing tenure 0wner occupier (RC) 1.00 Privately rented accommodation 1.189 (.043) .743 2.073 Children ever born 0 1.00 287 1.546 Up to 2 children 1.084 (.065) .496 1.093 3 Children and higher (RC) 1.00 1.00 1.00 Employment in paid work No work (RC) 1.00 1.00 Temporary job 1.028 (.037) .342 1.431 Permanent job 1.136 (.006) .467 1.415 Rite of wedding 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 Religious .824 (.118) .328 2.921 Broken family structure before marriage 1.00 1.00 Separation .974 (.041) .804 3.254 Intact .425 (.134) 1.735 2.217 Maternal educational level 1.00 1.00 1.081 Less than high school 1.092 (.112) .513 .687 More than high school 1.427 (.015) .566 1.081<	<18 Years (RC)	1.00		
Housing tenure1.00Owner occupier (\mathbb{RC})1.00Privately rented accommodation1.189 (.043).7432.073Children ever born1.392 (.014).2871.546Childless/No child1.392 (.014).2871.546Up to 2 children1.084 (.065).4961.0933 Children and higher (\mathbb{RC})1.00.4961.0935 Children and higher (\mathbb{RC})1.00.4671.415Employment in paid workNo work (\mathbb{RC})1.00.4671.415Permanent job1.036 (.006).4671.415Rite of wedding	18+ Years	.706 (.059)	.557	1.082
Owner occupier (\mathbf{RC}) 1.00 Privately rented accommodation 1.189 (.043) .743 2.073 Children ever born	Housing tenure			
Privately rented accommodation $1.189 (.043)$ $.743$ 2.073 Children ever born $1.392 (.014)$ $.287$ 1.546 Up to 2 children $1.084 (.065)$ $.496$ 1.093 3 Children and higher (RC) 1.00 $Reine (RC)$ 1.00 Employment in paid work $No work (RC)$ 1.00 $Reine (RC)$ 1.00 Temporary job $1.028 (.037)$ $.342$ 1.431 Permanent job $1.136 (.006)$ $.467$ 1.415 Rite of wedding $Civil (RC)$ 1.00 $Religious$ $.824 (.118)$ $.328$ 2.921 Broken family structure before $marriage$ $Uivorced (RC)$ 1.00 $Separation$ $.974 (.041)$ $.804$ $.3254$ Intact $.425 (.134)$ 1.735 2.217 Maternal educational level $Less$ than high school (RC) 1.00 $Reisen and Reisen and Re$	Owner occupier (RC)	1.00		
Children ever born $1.392 (.014)$ $.287$ 1.546 Up to 2 children $1.084 (.065)$ $.496$ 1.093 3 Children and higher (RC) 1.00 $Employment in paid work$ No work (RC) 1.00 $Employment in paid work$ No work (RC) 1.00 $Employment in paid work$ No work (RC) 1.00 $Employment in paid work$ Permanent job $1.136 (.006)$ $.467$ Permanent job $1.136 (.006)$ $.467$ Rite of wedding $Civil (\mathbf{RC})$ 1.00 Religious $.824 (.118)$ $.328$ 2.921 Broken family structure before $marriage$ $Divorced (\mathbf{RC})$ 1.00 Separation $.974 (.041)$ $.804$ 3.254 Intact $.425 (.134)$ 1.735 2.217 Maternal educational level Ess than high school (\mathbf{RC}) 1.00 Ess than high school (\mathbf{RC}) 1.00 High school $1.427 (.015)$ $.566$ 1.081 Paternal educational level Ess Ess than high school $.745 (.136)$ $.286$ $.821$	Privately rented accommodation	1.189 (.043)	.743	2.073
Childless/No child $1.392 (.014)$ $.287$ 1.546 Up to 2 children $1.084 (.065)$ $.496$ 1.093 3 Children and higher (RC) 1.00 1.00 Employment in paid work 1.00 No work (RC) 1.00 Temporary job $1.028 (.037)$ $.342$ Permanent job $1.028 (.037)$ $.342$ Rite of wedding $.467$ 1.415 Civil (RC) 1.00 $.467$ Religious $.824 (.118)$ $.328$ 2.921 Broken family structure before $.824 (.118)$ $.328$ 2.921 Broken family structure before $.425 (.134)$ 1.735 2.217 Maternal educational level $.425 (.134)$ 1.735 2.217 Less than high school (RC) 1.00 $.427 (.015)$ $.566$ 1.081 Paternal educational level $.427 (.015)$ $.566$ 1.081 Paternal educational level $.427 (.015)$ $.566$ $.1.081$ Paternal educational level $.427 (.015)$ $.566$ $.821$ More than high school $.745 (.136)$ $.286$ $.821$ More than high school $.745 (.136)$ $.286$ $.821$ More than high school $.745 (.136)$ $.743$ 1.314 Highest educational level $.100$ $.745 (.136)$ $.286$ $.821$ More than high school $.745 (.136)$ $.286$ $.821$ More than high school $.745 (.136)$ $.743$ 1.314 Highest educational level $.100$ $.745 (.136)$ <td>Children ever born</td> <td>× ,</td> <td></td> <td></td>	Children ever born	× ,		
Up to 2 children $1.084(.065)$ $.496$ 1.093 3 Children and higher (RC) 1.00 1.00 1.00 Employment in paid work 1.00 1.00 $1.028(.037)$ $.342$ 1.431 No work (RC) $1.028(.037)$ $.342$ 1.431 Permanent job $1.136(.006)$ $.467$ 1.415 Rite of wedding 1.00 $Religious$ $.824(.118)$ $.328$ 2.921 Broken family structure before $marriage$ 1.00 804 3.254 Divorced (RC) 1.00 804 3.254 Intact $.425(.134)$ 1.735 2.217 Maternal educational level $1.092(.112)$ $.513$ $.687$ Less than high school $1.092(.112)$ $.513$ $.687$ More than high school $1.427(.015)$ $.566$ 1.081 Paternal educational level $I.00$ $I.00$ $I.092(.112)$ $.513$ $.687$ More than high school $1.427(.015)$ $.566$ $I.081$ Paternal educational level $I.00$ $I.00$ $I.00$ High school $.514(.153)$ $.743$ $I.314$ Highest educational level $I.00$ $I.00$ $I.00$ High school $.514(.153)$ $.743$ $I.314$ Highest educational level $I.00$ $I.00$ $I.00$ Primary $I.184(.214)$ $.175$ 2.142 Secondary $I.321(.220)$ $I.87$ $I.118$	Childless/No child	1.392 (.014)	.287	1.546
3 Children and higher (RC) 1.00 Employment in paid work	Up to 2 children	1.084 (.065)	.496	1.093
Employment in paid workNo work (RC) 1.00 Temporary job $1.028 (.037)$ $.342$ Permanent job $1.136 (.006)$ $.467$ I.415Rite of weddingCivil (RC) 1.00 Religious $.824 (.118)$ $.328$ Broken family structure beforemarriageDivorced (RC) 1.00 Separation $.974 (.041)$ $.804$ $.825 (.134)$ 1.735 2.217 Maternal educational levelLess than high school (RC) 1.00 High school $1.092 (.112)$ $.513$ More than high school (RC) 1.00 High school $1.427 (.015)$ $.566$ More than high school (RC) 1.00 High school $.514 (.153)$ $.743$ More than high school $.514 (.153)$ $.743$ More than high school $.514 (.153)$ $.743$ Mare than high school $.514 (.153)$ $.743$ Highest educational level $.514 (.153)$ $.743$ Less than high school $.514 (.153)$ $.743$ More than high school $.514 (.153)$ $.743$ Highest educational level $.514 (.214)$ $.175$ No formal (RC) 1.00 $.100$ Primary $1.184 (.214)$ $.175$ Secondary $1.321 (.220)$ $.187$ High school $.1220$ $.187$ High school $.1220$ $.187$	³ Children and higher (RC)	1.00		
No work (RC) 1.00 Temporary job $1.028 (.037)$ $.342$ 1.431 Permanent job $1.136 (.006)$ $.467$ 1.415 Rite of wedding $1.136 (.006)$ $.467$ 1.415 Rite of wedding 1.00 $Religious$ $.824 (.118)$ $.328$ 2.921 Broken family structure before $.824 (.118)$ $.328$ 2.921 Maternal educational level $.425 (.134)$ 1.735 2.217 Maternal educational level $.1692 (.112)$ $.513$ $.687$ More than high school $1.427 (.015)$ $.566$ 1.081 Paternal educational level $.1427 (.015)$ $.286$ $.821$ More than high school $.514 (.153)$ $.743$ 1.314 Highest educational level $.100$ $.1184 (.214)$ $.175$ 2.142 Secondary $1.321 (.220)$ $.187$ 1.118	Employment in paid work			
Temporary job $1.028 (.037)$ $.342$ 1.431 Permanent job $1.136 (.006)$ $.467$ 1.415 Rite of wedding 1.00 $.467$ 1.415 Civil (RC) 1.00 $.824 (.118)$ $.328$ 2.921 Broken family structure before $.804$ 3.254 Intact $.425 (.134)$ 1.735 2.217 Maternal educational level $.425 (.134)$ 1.735 2.217 Less than high school (RC) 1.00 $.687$ More than high school $1.427 (.015)$ $.566$ 1.081 Paternal educational level $.514 (.136)$ $.286$ $.821$ More than high school $.514 (.153)$ $.743$ 1.314 Highest educational level $.514 (.153)$ $.743$ 1.314 Highest educational level $.514 (.220)$ $.187 (.118)$ No formal (RC) 1.00 $.100$ $.100$ Primary $1.184 (.214)$ $.175 (.2.142)$ Secondary $1.321 (.220)$ $.187 (.118)$	No work (RC)	1.00		
Permanent job $1.136(.006)$ $.467$ 1.415 Rite of wedding 1.00 1.00 Civil (RC) 1.00 Religious $.824(.118)$ $.328$ 2.921 Broken family structure before $.974(.041)$ $.804$ 3.254 Intact $.425(.134)$ 1.735 2.217 Maternal educational level $.100$ $.100$ $.100$ High school $.745(.136)$ $.286$ $.821$ More than high school $.514(.153)$ $.743$ 1.314 Highest educational level $.514(.153)$ $.743$ 1.314 No formal (RC) 1.00 $.100$ Primary $1.184(.214)$ $.175$ 2.142 Secondary $1.321(.220)$ $.187$ 1.118	Temporary job	1.028 (.037)	.342	1.431
Rite of wedding1.00Civil (RC)1.00Religious.824 (.118)Broken family structure beforemarriageDivorced (RC)1.00Separation.974 (.041).8043.254Intact.425 (.134)1.7352.217Maternal educational levelLess than high school (RC)1.00High school1.092 (.112).513.687More than high school1.427 (.015).5661.081Paternal educational levelLess than high school.745 (.136).286.821More than high school.514 (.153).7431.314Highest educational levelNo formal (RC)1.00Primary1.184 (.214).1752.142Secondary1.321 (.220).1871.118	Permanent job	1.136 (.006)	.467	1.415
Civil (RC) 1.00 Religious .824 (.118) .328 2.921 Broken family structure before marriage	Rite of wedding	()		
Religious.824 (.118).3282.921Broken family structure before marriage	Civil (RC)	1.00		
Broken family structure before marriage Divorced (RC) 1.00 Separation .974 (.041) .804 3.254 Intact .425 (.134) 1.735 2.217 Maternal educational level Less than high school (RC) 1.00 .687 More than high school 1.092 (.112) .513 .687 More than high school 1.427 (.015) .566 1.081 Paternal educational level Less than high school (RC) 1.00 .513 .687 More than high school (RC) 1.00 .1427 (.015) .566 1.081 Paternal educational level .1743 1.314 High school .514 (.153) .743 1.314 .1314 .1314 Highest educational level .100	Religious	.824 (.118)	.328	2.921
marriage Divorced (RC) 1.00 Separation .974 (.041) .804 3.254 Intact .425 (.134) 1.735 2.217 Maternal educational level	Broken family structure before			-
Divorced (RC) 1.00 Separation.974 (.041).804 3.254 Intact.425 (.134) 1.735 2.217 Maternal educational level 1.00 Less than high school (RC) 1.00 High school 1.092 (.112).513More than high school 1.427 (.015).566Paternal educational levelLess than high school 1.427 (.015)More than high school 1.427 (.015)More than high school 745 (.136)Less than high school.514 (.153)More than high school.514 (.153)Maternal educational level.514 (.153)More than high school.514 (.153)More than high school.514 (.153)More than high school.514 (.214)More than high school.514 (.214)	marriage			
Separation.974 (.041).804 3.254 Intact.425 (.134) 1.735 2.217 Maternal educational levelImage: Constraint of the second sec	Divorced (RC)	1.00		
Intact .425 (.134) 1.735 2.217 Maternal educational level	Separation	.974 (.041)	.804	3.254
Maternal educational level 1.00 Less than high school (RC) 1.00 High school 1.092 (.112) .513 .687 More than high school 1.427 (.015) .566 1.081 Paternal educational level 1.00 1.00 1.00 High school .745 (.136) .286 .821 More than high school .514 (.153) .743 1.314 Highest educational level 1.00 1.00 1.314 Highest educational level 1.00 .745 (.126) .286 .821 More than high school .514 (.153) .743 1.314 Highest educational level No formal (RC) 1.00 .745 Primary 1.184 (.214) .175 2.142 Secondary 1.321 (.220) .187 1.118	Intact	.425 (.134)	1.735	2.217
Less than high school (RC) 1.00 High school 1.092 (.112) .513 .687 More than high school 1.427 (.015) .566 1.081 Paternal educational level 1.00 1.00 1.00 Less than high school (RC) 1.00 1.00 1.00 High school .745 (.136) .286 .821 More than high school .514 (.153) .743 1.314 Highest educational level No formal (RC) 1.00 1.00 Primary 1.184 (.214) .175 2.142 Secondary 1.321 (.220) .187 1.118	Maternal educational level	()		
High school 1.092 (.112) .513 .687 More than high school 1.427 (.015) .566 1.081 Paternal educational level 1.00 1.00 1.00 High school .745 (.136) .286 .821 More than high school .514 (.153) .743 1.314 Highest educational level 1.00 1.00 1.314 Highest educational level No formal (RC) 1.00 1.184 (.214) .175 2.142 Secondary 1.321 (.220) .187 1.118 1.118	Less than high school (RC)	1.00		
More than high school 1.427 (.015) .566 1.081 Paternal educational level 1.00 1.00 Less than high school (RC) 1.00 .286 .821 More than high school .745 (.136) .286 .821 More than high school .514 (.153) .743 1.314 Highest educational level 1.00 .745 .743 1.314 No formal (RC) 1.00 .745 .175 2.142 Secondary 1.321 (.220) .187 1.118	High school	1.092 (.112)	.513	.687
Paternal educational level 1.00 Less than high school (RC) 1.00 High school .745 (.136) .286 .821 More than high school .514 (.153) .743 1.314 Highest educational level .514 (.153) .743 1.314 No formal (RC) 1.00 .745 .743 1.314 Primary 1.184 (.214) .175 2.142 Secondary 1.321 (.220) .187 1.118	More than high school	1.427 (.015)	.566	1.081
Less than high school (RC) 1.00 High school .745 (.136) .286 .821 More than high school .514 (.153) .743 1.314 Highest educational level .743 1.314 No formal (RC) 1.00 .743 .2142 Primary 1.184 (.214) .175 2.142 Secondary 1.321 (.220) .187 1.118	Paternal educational level			
High school .745 (.136) .286 .821 More than high school .514 (.153) .743 1.314 Highest educational level .745 (.136) .743 1.314 No formal (RC) 1.00 .745 .745 .743 Primary 1.184 (.214) .175 2.142 Secondary 1.321 (.220) .187 1.118	Less than high school (RC)	1.00		
More than high school .514 (.153) .743 1.314 Highest educational level 1.00 2.142 2.142 No formal (RC) 1.184 (.214) .175 2.142 Secondary 1.321 (.220) .187 1.118	High school	.745 (.136)	.286	.821
Highest educational level 1.00 Primary 1.184 (.214) .175 2.142 Secondary 1.321 (.220) .187 1.118	More than high school	.514 (.153)	.743	1.314
No formal (RC) 1.00 Primary 1.184 (.214) .175 2.142 Secondary 1.321 (.220) .187 1.118	Highest educational level			
Primary1.184 (.214).1752.142Secondary1.321 (.220).1871.118	No formal (RC)	1.00		
Secondary 1.321 (.220) .187 1.118	Primary	1.184 (.214)	.175	2.142
	Secondary	1 321 (220)	187	1 118
Tertiary $1.541(.023)$ $.316$ 894	Tertiary	1.541 (.023)	.316	.894

Table 3: Logistic regression results for Marital Disruption (*p<0.05)

RC: Reference Category

Table 3 presents the results of the logistic regression model. The results in the table shows that the odds of marital disruption were significantly higher for women with tertiary level of education (OR=1.54), greater than one

lifetime partner (OR=1.12), civil marriage rite (OR=1.00). The results further show that the odds were considerably lower for women who had religious rite of marriage (OR=0.82), those with paternal education was more than

high school (OR=0.51). The effect was highly significantly lower for women whose paternal family structure was intact (OR=0.43). The effect was non-significant among women whose age at first marriage was greater than 18 years (OR=0.29). Women employed on permanent job were more likely to experience marital disruption than their counterparts with no work (OR=1.14). The reasons for the phenomena are similar to those of the manifestations in table 2 above.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

5.1 Conclusion

It is concluded that marriage dissolution was significantly influenced by the number of lifetime partners, housing tenure, childlessness, being employed in permanent job and maternal level of education. However, factors such as age cohort, age at first marriage, rite of wedding, and paternal divorce history were found to be non-significant predictors of marital disruption. The study has also established that in terms of mean score, social (13.59), economic status (13.57), behavioral problems (13.52), marital (13.47), parental characteristics (13.43), sexual (13.13) and domestic (13.08) factors influence marital disruption in descending order.

5.2 Recommendations

Based on the research findings, the study recommends the following:

- 1. Policy interventions by the national and county governments that encourage one lifetime partner in nuptial relations. The study findings also highlight the potential.
- 2. Promoting family life education and marriage counseling through seminars, lectures and workshops by marriage counselors that inform and promote awareness on the negative effects of divorce and separation as well as skills that maintain good marital relationships.
- 3. Pre-marital counseling should be regularly organized for young adults contemplating marriage techniques of enhancing marital happiness, satisfaction and stability.

References

Agili, H. O. (2024). Demographic dynamics and spatiotemporal dimensions of early marriages in Homa Bay County, Kenya. Unpublished PhD Thesis, JOOUST (2024). Socio-economic and cultural barriers to utilization of contraceptives among

women in Ndhiwa Sub-county, Homa Bay County, Kenya. Unpublished PhD Thesis, JOOUST.

- Amato, P. R. (2010). Research on divorce: Continuing trends and new developments. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 72(3), 650-666.
- Amato, P. R., & James, P. R. (2010). Divorce in Europe and the United States: Commonalities
- and differences across nations. Family Science, 1(1), 2-13.

https://doi.org/10.1080/19424620903381583.

- Arugu, L. O. (2014). Social indicators and effects of marriage divorce in African societies. The Business & Management Review, 4(4):374-383.
- Berrington, A. & Diamond, I. (1997). Marital Dissolution among the 1958 British Birth Cohort: the role of cohabitation. Forthcoming in *Population Studies Journal*.
- Becker, G. (1974). *The theory of Marriage. In Schultz TW* (ed) Eonomics of the Family: Marriage, Children, and Human Capital. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Brown, J. & Brown, P. (2012). *The Total Marriage: A guide to successful marriage*. Autumn House, England.
- Burnham, P. (2018). Changing themes in the analysis of African marriage. In Transformations of African marriage. London: Routledge
- Carlson, L. (2021). Age variation in the divorce rate 1990 & 2019. Family Profiles, FP- 21, 16.
- Cohen, P. N. (2014). Recession and divorce in the United States, 2008–2011. *Population research and policy review*, 33(5), 615-628.
- Cohen, P.N. (2019). The coming divorce decline. Socius: Sociological Research for a Dynamic World 5. doi:10.1177/2378023119873497.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (5thed.).* University of Michigan: Sage publications.
- Dolfani, M.A. (2018). Family resilience factors influencing teenagers' adaptation following parental divorce

in Limpopo Province South Africa. *Journal of Psychology*, 5 (1): 19-34.

- Fagan, P.F and Churchill, A. (2012). The effects of divorce on children. Marriage and religion research institute. Washington DC.
- Frederick, D. A., & Fales, M. R. (2016). Upset over sexual versus emotional infidelity among gay, lesbian, bisexual, and heterosexual adults. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 45(1), 175-191.
- Gheshlaghi, F., & Najafabadi, G. M. (2014). The study of sexual satisfaction in Iranian women applying for divorce. *International Journal of fertility & sterility*, 8(3), 281.
- GOK (2018). Homa Bay County Integrated Development Plan (2018-2022). GPO,Nairobi.
- Härkönen, J. (2014). Divorce: Trends, patterns, causes, consequences. In: Treas, J.K., Scott, J., and Richards, M. (eds.). The Wiley–Blackwell companion to the sociology of families. Chichester: John Wiley: 303–322.
- Isiugo-Abanihe, U. (2018). Stability of Marital Unions and Fertility in Nigeria. *Journal of Biosocial Science*, *30*(1), 33-41.
- Jones, G. W., Hull, T. H., & Mohamad, M. (Eds.). (2015). Changing marriage patterns in Southeast Asia: Economic and socio-cultural dimensions. Manila: Routledge.
- Kaplan, E. L., & Meir, P. (1958). Nonparametric estimation from incomplete observations. *Journal* of the American Statistical Association, 58(282):457-481
- Kierna, K. E. and Cherlin, A.J. (1999). "Parental Divorce and Partnership Dissolution in Adulthood: Evidence from a British Cohort Study", *Population Studies* 53(1): 39-48.
- King, Lu. M. (2022). *Human sexuality today*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- KNBS (2022). 2019 Kenya Population and Housing Census: Analytical report on fertility and nuptiality. Vol. VI
- KNBS and ICF. (2023). *Kenya Demographic and Health Survey 2022*. Volume 1. Nairobi, Kenya, and Rockville, Maryland, USA: KNBS and ICF.

- Lyngstad, T. H. & Jalovaara, M. (2010). A review of antecedents of union dissolution. *Demographic Research* 23(10):257-292. DOI:10.4054/DemRes.2010.23.10
- Mbiti S.J, (2018). African Religions and Philosophy (2nded.). Nairobi, Kenya: Heinemann.
- Mostafaei, A. (2021). Evaluating the factors affecting in divorce in the city of Mahabad. Journal of Biosciences Biotechnology Research Asia, 13(1), 369–374.
- Munsch, C. L. (2015). Her support, his support: Money, masculinity, and marital infidelity. *American Sociological Review*, 80(3), 469-495.
- Musau, S. (2016). Spatial-temporal dimensions of marital instability and its effects on the family livelihoods in Machakos County, Kenya. Kenyatta University.
- Nelson, O., & Salawu, A. (2017). Can my wife be virtualadulterous? An experiential study on Facebook, emotional infidelity and self-disclosure. *Journal* of International Women's Studies, 18(2), 166-179.
- Olaniyi, A. A. (2015). Analytical Study of the Causal Factors of Divorce in African Homes, *Research* on Humanities and Social Sciences 5(14), 18-29.
- Phillips, J. and Sweeney, M. (2005). "Can Differential Exposure to Risk Factors Explain Recent Racial and Ethnic Variation in Marital Disruption?" California Center for Population Research: Online Working Paper Series 034-05.
- Poortman, A. R. & Lyngstad, T. H. (2007). Dissolution risks in first and higher order marital and cohabiting unions. Social Science Research 36(4):1431-1446:10.1016/j.ssresearch.2007.02.005.
- Rohany, N., & Sakdiah, M. A. (2010). Job satisfaction, job performance and marital satisfaction among dualworker Malay couples. *The International Journal* of Interdisciplinary Social Science. 5, 299-305.
- Roy, R. E. (2022). Behavioral pattern and social problems. Reformed and Presbyterian Publishing; 2022.
- Ruggles, S. (2020). Marriage, family systems, and economic opportunity in the United States since 1850. In S. M. McHale, V. K. Susan, J. Van Hook,

& A. Booth (Eds.), *Gender and couple relationships* (pp. 3–41). New York: Springer.

- Shabani, M. & Kuname, R (2011). Discussion on Experience on Marital Dissolution and Effect on Children, 6 July 2011. Social Welfare Department, Kinondoni District, Dar es Salaam.
- Tanaka, K. (2021). The Effect of Divorce Experience on Religious Involvement: Implications for Later Health Lifestyle. J Divorce Remarriage; 51(1).
- Tuttle, J. D., & Davis, S. N. (2015). Religion, infidelity, and divorce: Reexamining the effect of religious behavior on divorce among long-married couples. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*, 56(6), 475-489.
- Voena, A. (2015). Yours, mine, and ours: Do divorce laws affect the inter-temporal behavior of married couples? *American Economic Review*, 105(8), 2295-2332.