

Table 6. Logistic regression predicting who remained in the same marriage at T2 for those who were unhappily married at T1.

| Variables | Model I | Model II | Model III | Model IV |
|---|---------|----------|-----------|----------|
| <i>Demographics at T1</i> | | | | |
| Black | .84 | 1.02 | .99 | 1.00 |
| Female | .97 | .96 | .91 | .88 |
| Age | 1.05*** | 1.05*** | 1.05*** | 1.05*** |
| Education | .97 | .97 | .97 | .97 |
| Household income (log) | 1.18 | 1.29* | 1.25* | 1.29* |
| Missing income | .66 | .75 | .84 | .83 |
| Presence of children<=18 | 1.33 | 1.10 | 1.15 | 1.19 |
| Employment status | .80 | .81 | .88 | .87 |
| <i>Domestic conflict and violence at T1</i> | | | | |
| Open arguments | .79+ | | | |
| Arguments physical | | .90 | | |
| Husband hit wife | | | .56* | |
| Wife hit husband | | | | .83 |
| -2 log likelihood | 606.86 | 691.81 | 658.08 | 664.24 |
| <i>N</i> | 557 | 622 | 592 | 597 |

^a Odds ratio is presented .

*** p<.001, ** p<.01, * p<.05, + p<.1.