Sosyoekonomi

2024, Vol. 32(59), 105-127

RESEARCH ARTICLE

ISSN: 1305-5577
DOI: 10.17233/sosyoekonomi.2024.01.05
Date Submitted: 24.01.2023
Date Revised: 01.12.2023
Date Accepted: 06.01.2024

Determination of the Factors Affecting Divorce in Türkiye According to Gender: A Research with TUIK Data

Özlem KURU-SÖNMEZ *(https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0208-4781), Osmaniye Korkut Ata University, Türkiye; ozlemkuru@osmaniye.edu.tr*

Emre YAKUT *(https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1978-0217), Osmaniye Korkut Ata University, Türkiye; emreyakut@osmaniye.edu.tr*

Türkiye'de Boşanmayı Etkileyen Faktörlerin Cinsiyete Göre Belirlenmesi: TUİK Verileri Üzerinde Bir Araştırma

Abstract

This study aims to determine the factors affecting the divorces of men and women in Türkiye and the effects of these factors on the probability of divorce. For this purpose, the survey data of 24200 people, 55% women and 45% men, were used in the Family Structure Research carried out by TUIK in 2016. In the research, Pearson's chi-square analysis was performed first to determine the factors affecting the divorces of individuals. Then, logit and probit regression analyses were applied to the variables found to be significant. As a result of the analysis, it was determined that some of the sociodemographic and socioeconomic variables significantly affect individuals' divorce status.

Keywords : Divorce Reasons, Divorce Probability, Logistic Regression Model, Probit Regression Model.

JEL Classification Codes : J12, J19, C19, C25.

Öz

Bu çalışmanın amacı Türkiye'deki kadın ve erkeklerin boşanmalarını etkileyen faktörleri ve bu faktörlerin boşanma olasılığı üzerindeki etkilerini belirlemektir. Bu amaç doğrultusunda TUİK'in 2016 yılında gerçekleştirdiği Aile Yapısı Araştırmasında %55'ni kadınların ve %45'ini erkeklerin oluşturduğu, 24200 kişinin anket verileri kullanılmıştır. Araştırmada ilk olarak bireylerin boşanmaları üzerinde etkili olan faktörleri belirlemek için Pearson ki-kare analizi gerçekleştirilmiş, sonrasında anlamlı bulunan değişkenlere logit ve probit regresyon analizleri uygulanmıştır. Analizler sonucunda sosyodemografik ve sosyoekonomik değişkenlerin bazılarının bireylerin boşanma durumları üzerinde anlamlı bir etkiye sahip olduğu belirlenmiştir.

Anahtar Sözcükler : Boşanma Sebepleri, Boşanma Olasılıkları, Lojistik Regresyon Modeli, Probit Regresyon Modeli.

1. Introduction

In our century, technological developments have led to radical socioeconomic changes in social and business life. As evidence of these changes, people from different nations have similar experiences on a global scale (Sütçü & Duyan, 2021). Thus, cultures come closer, and nations quickly and easily get news from others, changing family structures and social relations and revealing different family roles for women, men and children. In addition to technological developments, legal developments favouring gender equality also create differences in individuals' perceptions of divorce. Divorce has become more achievable in many societies compared to the past. However, this is not enough to eliminate the negative effects of divorce on family structure and spouses. In Türkiye, women have difficulties starting immediately with their decision to divorce. They are often exposed to negative reactions from many parts of society, especially their families. They also have severe social and legal challenges when their husbands are not willing to divorce. After the divorce, women often face economic difficulties and social pressure (Kucur & Kelebek, 2021). Aktaş (2018) reported that all divorced men were disappointed in their spouses, did not receive their wife's support and attention in material and moral senses, and had communication problems with their wives. However, psychological problems, social alienation, performance and motivation problems at work, economic problems and social pressure occur in men after divorce. Divorce also affects children. Divorce is not just about a couple ending their married life but a process leading to lifestyle changes of other family members (Aktaş & Uray, 2021). Therefore, the psychological development of children is negatively affected both during and after divorce, causing child attachment issues. In addition, psychological issues such as anger control problems, feelings of guilt, sleep and nutrition problems, introversion, academic failure, separation anxiety and restlessness are seen in children of different ages during and/or after divorce (Sütçü & Duyan, 2021: 35-38). As divorces in which children are affected negatively cause social problems, it has become more of an issue to understand and prevent the causes of the increased number of divorces for the future of children.

Divorce is a situation that affects all family members and causes psychological and sociological problems that lead to social dimensions. However, although it is stated that various factors are effective in divorce for men and women, it is noted that the most critical factor is the differentiation of expectations about life with the breaking of ties between spouses (Crowley, 2019; Güven & Köroğlu, 2023: 3). When divorce is evaluated psychologically, it is seen as a phenomenon that causes serious problems that profoundly affect all members of the family by disrupting family integrity (Arpacı & Tokyürek, 2012: 2).

Since divorce has been increasing in recent years and individuals' attitudes towards it differ, it has become a situation that needs to be emphasised since it causes a severe problem in social life (Uğur, 2014: 294). It is stated that the changing responsibilities of women in family and business life, economic factors, and the rise of the individual instead of the family coming to the forefront are effective in the increase in divorce rates (Elmas &

Adak, 2023: 86). In addition, another reason for the rise in divorces is that women are exposed to domestic violence, and women who have economic freedom can decide to divorce more easily by arousing the thought that they can live alone (Kutlar et al., 2012). In addition, many reasons, such as technological developments, the health status of spouses, having children, and consumption-oriented individualisation, affect domestic divorces (Kaya & Eren, 2020: 710).

While the increase in divorce rates in Türkiye has been examined in a problem-oriented manner, the detailed analysis of the studies on the differentiation of the reasons for divorce by gender has not been sufficiently addressed. In this context, examining the divorce issue in more detail is important. Today's increasing divorce problem can be solved if the reasons for divorce by gender are known. In this context, as pointed out above, to analyse the divorce phenomenon, which causes the end of families and marriages and causes the emergence of social and psychological situations, it is important to examine the factors that affect the divorce of women and men according to gender. Thus, it is thought that the findings obtained from the research results can play a decisive role in preventing divorces by determining the reasons for divorce of women and men.

The study consists of four chapters: the first chapter is the introduction, the second chapter is the literature review of the study, the third chapter is the purpose of the study under the title of material and method study, the fourth chapter is the analysis application, and the last chapter is the discussion and conclusion.

2. Literature Review

In this part of the study, a literature review of the studies on divorce research is given.

Savaya and Cohen (2003), in their study on the social image of 312 divorced Muslim women and men in Israel, tried to examine the adaptation of divorced individuals after divorce and how they evaluate themselves in terms of social image. As a result of the study, they revealed that women were exposed to social stigmatisation more than men.

Bulut (2008) conducted a study on 40 women who received treatment after divorce in the Ankara University Faculty of Medicine Psychiatry Department and tried to explain that although the majority of divorced women were educated and working individuals, they faced domestic violence and the difficulties they faced after divorce.

Arpacı & Tokyürek (2012) tried to examine the views of divorced individuals on remarriage in a study conducted on 106 divorced individuals in Ankara. In the process of the study, they determined that divorced individuals' differences of opinion, intervention of relatives such as parents, economic reasons, incompatibility due to differences in social environment, and physical and psychological violence were among the reasons for divorce.

Uğur (2014) conducted a study on divorced academic women at Akdeniz University and tried to determine the factors affecting women's divorce decisions. As a result of the

study, she emphasised that miscommunication between spouses, failure to meet the expectations of women from marriage, financial problems, unemployment of the spouse and inability to fulfil family responsibilities were influential in the decision to divorce.

Can & Aksu (2016), in a study with ten women between the ages of 33-67 conducted with the interview technique, stated that women who decide to divorce are educated, have income, are self-confident women and women who receive support from their families choose to divorce more quickly. However, they also stated that women were worried about children, social pressure and family-environment reactions before deciding to divorce.

Kaya (2016), in a study conducted on divorced women and men in Istanbul, tried to determine the problems affecting divorce by examining their divorce experiences. As a result of the study, while the common issues among the reasons for divorce of women and men were economic, family-related and sexual problems, it was revealed that at the point where the reasons for divorce differed, deception and irresponsibility were prominent for women. In contrast, jealousy and the end of the feeling of excitement were important for men.

Sevim et al. (2016) conducted a sociological study on men's perspective on divorce, the divorce process and the problems they experience during and after the divorce in a study in which they analysed 300 divorce cases in Elazığ Courthouse between 2008-2010. As a result of the study, they revealed that the reasons for divorce among men include factors such as severe incompatibility, infidelity, disagreement, cultural differences and abandonment.

Aktaş (2018) conducted a study on divorced men and investigated the impact of divorce on men. In the study, he stated that divorce affects men. He emphasised that urbanisation, social mobility, understanding, women's participation in the labour force and happiness concepts affect men's divorce preferences.

Leopold (2018) examined whether the reasons for divorce of individuals differ according to gender by using the panel regression model in a study conducted on 18,030 individuals, 1220 of whom were divorced in Germany. As a result of the study, it was revealed that there is a general similarity rather than a differentiation between the reasons for divorce of men and women. In this context, they concluded that economic factors, home ownership, satisfaction with housework, mental health, physical health and psychological well-being are influential in the divorce phenomenon.

Gökmen et al. (2019) tried to determine the factors affecting divorce using the Cox regression method with data from TurkStat's 2016 Family Structure Survey. As a result of the study, they decided that income, education, place of residence, having children, internet, gambling, and betting games have a negative impact on marital life.

Altun et al. (2020) tried to evaluate the reasons for divorce in terms of communication in a study applied to 208 divorced individuals. As a result of the study, they revealed that the reasons for divorce included change in expectations, infidelity, the inability of the spouse

to fulfil duties and responsibilities, communication problems with the spouse's family and child-rearing problems.

Kaya & Eren (2020) tried to examine the factors that cause the increase in divorce in the family through TUIK's divorce data for 2019-2020. As a result of the study, they emphasised that the first five years of marriage are critical. They stated that sociocultural and socio-economic reasons, as well as religious beliefs, health status, technology, spouses' perspective on marriage, spousal violence and psychological reasons, are effective among the reasons for divorce.

Gavcar et al. (2020) applied regression analysis and t-test analysis to the survey data to determine the factors affecting divorce and the factors affecting the duration of marriage in a study used on 250 divorced individuals in the Fethiye district of Muğla. As a result of the survey, they emphasised that the most influential factor in divorce is the severe incompatibility between spouses and that the most affected family members after divorce are children.

Aktaş & Uray (2021), in a sociological study conducted on divorced men, tried to investigate men's perspective on marriage, how the process before and after divorce is experienced, and the impact of divorce on their social lives. The study stated that the most critical factor affecting the decision to divorce was the failure to meet economic and emotional expectations. As a result of the study, it was revealed that men experienced psychological problems, withdrawal from the social environment, issues of performance and motivation at work, economic problems and social pressure after divorce.

Khan and Hamid (2021) conducted a study on 20 divorced women residing in the Kashmir region of India. He found that the reasons for divorce were domestic violence, infidelity, second marriage of the spouse, lack of children and incompatibility. In addition, they tried to explain how the social relations of divorced women are restricted in many ways and how the negative perspective of society towards them affects their lives as a result.

Kucur & Kelebek (2021) conducted sociological research to determine the divorce process and the problems experienced by 14 divorced women who received help from the Social Service Centre Unit in Istanbul. As a result of the study, they tried to determine that the spouse's substance abuse, violence and miscommunication were influential in the divorce process, that this situation damaged the marriage process, and the problems faced by women after divorce.

Kelebek-Küçükarslan & Cankurtaran (2022) conducted a study on 13 divorced women in Ankara and tried to investigate the problems experienced by women during and after the divorce process. As a result of the study, they mentioned spousal violence as one of the reasons for divorce and mentioned coping strategies and practices to raise awareness.

Elmas & Adak (2023) tried to use multiple reciprocity analyses to determine whether the factors affecting the divorce of men and women differ by gender using the Family

Structure Survey of TurkStat data for 2021. As a result of the study, they emphasised that the reasons for divorce in Türkiye differed for men and women and determined that the irresponsible and indifferent behaviour of the spouse, the inability to provide for the household economically and the participation of family elders in the family relations are among the most important reasons affecting divorce.

3. Data and Methodology

In statistical modelling, binary logit and probit regression methods are applied in categorical structures where the dependent variable has two categories. These two methods are preferred in cases such as yes-no and successful-failure in two-choice data, which is the most common use of categorical data.

3.1. Logit Regression Model

The logit regression model is the model preferred by users because the dependent variable has two categories, there is no normality assumption condition, and it is based on the cause-and-effect relationship between dependent and independent variables (Alkan, 2017: 37). While the odds ratio determines the basis of the logit regression model, the model is established by taking the natural logarithm of the ratio of the probability of an event occurring to the probability of not happening, and the likelihood method is used when estimating the parameters of the model (Hosmer et al., 2013). The two-category binary logit regression model is as follows (O'Connell, 2006: 13):

$$L_i = \ln\left(\frac{P_i}{(1-P_i)}\right) = \beta_0 + \beta_i X$$

In the logit regression model, marginal effects should be calculated and interpreted to estimate the impact of independent variable coefficients on the probability of the dependent variable. In this context, while keeping other variables constant in the logit model, the marginal effect of each variable is calculated as follows (Özer et al., 2006; Alkan & Demir, 2019: 1231):

$$\frac{dP_i}{dx_i} = P_i(1-P)\beta_1$$

3.2. Probit Regression Model

The Probit regression model, used as an alternative to the logistic regression model, is a non-linear modelling analysis applied to categorical data analysis. This method calculates the probability of categorical data falling into one of the binary states (Çiçek & Arlı, 2021: 656). In the probit regression model, the classification process is carried out by applying the cumulative normal distribution using the standard normal distribution (Gujarati & Porter, 2009). The calculation formulation of the probability of selection in the probit regression model is given below (Kalaycı, 2010: 301; Altıntaş, 2021: 445):

$Y_i = 1$ and if $\alpha + \beta X_i > 0$; $Y_i = 0$ and if $\alpha + \beta X_i \leq 0$ where the dependent variable category takes the value 1 when $Y_i^* > 0$ and 0 when $Y_i^* \leq 0$. If $\Phi(z)$ is expressed as a cumulative normal distribution function for the normal standard variable z, the equation is obtained as follows.

$$\Phi(z) = P(Z \leq z)$$

$$P(Y_i = 1) = 1 - \Phi(\frac{-\alpha-\beta X_i}{\sigma}) \text{ and } P(Y_i = 0) = 1 - \Phi(\frac{-\alpha-\beta X_i}{\sigma})$$

When more than one independent variable is used, the probit regression model is defined as $P\left(Y = \frac{1}{X}\right) = \Phi(X\beta)$.

3.3. Subject, Purpose, Importance and Contribution to the Literature

Divorce is the legal termination of marriage, which causes social problems by deeply affecting all members of the family. Considering the divorce situation in today's social life, it is possible to say that divorce negatively affects women, men and children who are members of the family. For this reason, understanding the reasons for divorce is important in terms of preventing divorce. The fact that the reasons for divorce and the post-divorce situations of women and men may differ has been tried to be explained in some of the above studies in the literature. Since divorce causes severe changes in psychological, social and economic terms, it is understood how important it is to take precautions before divorce causes challenging individual and social problems. In this context, this study aims to determine the factors affecting the divorce of women and men in Türkiye according to gender differences and the effects of these factors on the probability of divorce.

The gains that the study can contribute to the literature are summarised as follows:

To contribute to social cohesion by determining the causes of this process, which has negative psychological and social effects on individuals and children. When the research on divorce is examined, the research on the differentiation of the reasons for divorce according to gender has not been sufficiently studied except for a few studies (Elmas & Adak, 2023; Leopold, 2018; Kaya, 2016). At this point, it is important to analyse in depth by determining that the phenomenon of divorce is not so simple and how the reasons for divorce differ according to gender. This research is thought to contribute to this gap in the literature to identify the factors that affect the reasons for divorce of men and women and to determine the effect of these factors on the likelihood of divorce. In this way, it is thought that understanding the reasons for divorce can help to create healthier family relationships and reduce social problems by preventing divorce. In addition, it may provide suggestions to organisations and policymakers who offer support services for families.

3.4. Data and Variable Definitions Used in the Study

The dataset of this study is obtained the data from the Family Structure Survey: 2016 (Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu [TUIK], 2017) published by the Turkish Statistical Institute (TUIK); the data is not available to the public and is used subject to the specific permission of the institution.

Dependent variable: The study's dependent variable is the divorce status variable according to gender differences. In this study, the dependent variable is the divorce status variable, and the dependent variable category takes the value 1 for those who have been married and divorced before and 0 for those who have not been divorced. The family structure survey eliminated single "never married" participants from the data set.

Independent variables: The independent variables of the study consist of the variables available in TUIK's Family Structure Survey and the variables highlighted by the literature review. The independent variables of the study are age (16-25, 26-35, 36-45, 46-55, 55+), place of residence (city centre, district centre, village and rural area), employment status (private sector, public sector, not working), average monthly income level (0-1300 TL, 1301-2600 TL, 2601-3900 TL and 3901 TL and above), age at first marriage (12-17, 18-23, 24-29, 30+), age of the spouse in marriage (12-17, 18-23, 24-29, 30+), age difference with the spouse in marriage (0-5, 6-10, 11-15, 16+), duration of marriage (0-12, 13-25, 26-38, 39+), marriage decision variable (arranged marriage by asking, without asking, own decision without family permission, own decision with family permission, other (abduction, etc.)), having children (yes, no), do you find it appropriate for women to work (yes, no), individual happiness (happy, moderate, unhappy), family happiness (happy, moderate, low), smoking status (yes, no), alcohol use status (yes, no), region (TR1, TR2, TR3, TR4, TR5, TR6, TR7, TR8, TR9, TRA, TRB, TRC). In addition to demographic and socioeconomic variables, 22 questions could cause divorce.

3.5. Research Analyses

The frequency and percentage values were calculated for the survey data. Pearson's chi-square analysis was performed in the SPSS 18 package program to determine the relationship between the dependent (divorce status) and independent variables. Then, independent variables that had a statistically significant relationship with the divorce status were included in logit and probit regression analyses using the Stata 14 package program, and the marginal effects of the variables affecting the probability of divorce were calculated and interpreted.

In the two-state logit and probit regression models, there is no need to perform any operation if the independent variables are numerical independent variables. Still, when two-category independent variables are included in the model, one of the desired categories can be selected as the reference category. The change in the logit and probit on the dependent variable can be calculated accordingly. For example, when the dependent variable is the

cancer status of the individual, and the independent variable is smoking status, the risk of smokers getting cancer compared to non-smokers can be explained by giving the code 0 to non-smokers and 1 to smokers. However, suppose the independent variable is an independent variable with more than two categories. In that case, a dummy variable is created as one less than the number of categories, and the change in the logit and probit on the dependent variable according to the reference category is interpreted. The reference category usually has the lowest or highest risk among the independent variable categories. For example, when examining the effect of a family history of cancer, which is a three-category independent variable, on the dependent variable, the individual's risk of developing cancer, the code 0 is given for no history of cancer, 1 for second-degree relatives with a history of cancer, 0 for other categories, 1 for first-degree relatives with a history of cancer and 0 for different categories. Thus, an independent variable with three categories is created. From this point, to determine a reference category for one of the categories, the category with the lowest or highest risk is selected, and the change of the dependent variable in logit and probit is interpreted according to the reference category of the other categories. In other words, when those without a history of cancer are selected as the reference category among the categories of cancer history, the risk or marginal effects are calculated, and the probabilities obtained are interpreted (O'Connell, 2006; Alpar, 2011: 654, 655; Çokluk et al., 2012; Hosmer et al., 2013).

A multicollinearity test was performed to determine the multicollinearity between the independent variables included in the logit and probit regression models. As a result, variables with a variance inflation factor (VIF) of 10 or higher were excluded from the models, assuming they caused multicollinearity (Alkan & Abar, 2020).

The IRB review of the study was approved by the Social Sciences Research and Publication Ethics Committees of Osmaniye Korkut Ata University with document number 12369 dated October 7, 2022, and the decision numbered 2022/16/7.

4. Findings

4.1. Descriptive Statistics

In the research, 13995 participants who participated in the Family Structure Survey conducted by TURKSTAT in 2016 were female and 10805 were male. As seen in Table 1, 8.46% of the female and 7.58% of the male respondents were divorced.

Descriptive statistics in Table 1 are summarised as follows: It was determined that 29.4% of the women and 33.4% of the men were 55 years of age or older, 42.5% of the women and 44.1% of the men resided in the village, 75.8% of the women were not employed, and 55.4% of the men were private sector employees. When the monthly net income variable was analysed, it was determined that 85.4% of women and 42.7% of men had a monthly net income between 0-1300 TL and 1301-2600 TL, respectively. When the age of the participants' first marriage was analysed, it was determined that 53.3% of the women were between 18 and 23, and 43.4% of the men were between the ages of 24 and 29.

When the duration of marriage of the respondents was analysed, 29.1% of women and 28.6% of men were in the 13-25 year range, and 47.6% of women and 49.2% of men explained that they decided to marry without an arranged marriage according to the marriage decision variable. Regarding the type of marriage, 97.3% of the women and 97.4% of the men stated that they had both civil and religious marriages, while 49.8% of the women and 47.1% of the men indicated that they met their spouses through family relatives. 93% of the women and 93% of the men who participated in the survey indicated they had children. 91.2% of women and 76.6% of men agreed with "Do you find it appropriate for women to work?". When the individual happiness of the participants was analysed, 73% of women and 76.6% of men stated that they were happy, while 74.4% of women and 77.2% of men indicated that they were happy when family happiness was analysed. When the smoking status of the individuals was analysed, it was understood that 18.5% of women and 45.1% of men smoked cigarettes, and 11.2% of women and 23.4% of men used alcohol. When the statistical regions of the respondents were analysed, it was determined that 15.4% were located in the TR3 region.

Table 1 presents the frequencies and percentages of the participants' demographic and socioeconomic characteristics and the p values of the chi-square test performed for the relevant variables. The chi-square test results showed that all demographic and socioeconomic variables were significant.

Table: 1
Frequencies and Percentages of Some Demographic and Socioeconomic Characteristics of the Participants

Variable	Male (n=10805)				Female (n=13995)			
	Divorced (n= 819)	Not divorced (n=9986)	All Male (N=10805)	χ^2	Divorced (n=1184)	Not divorced (n=12811)	All Female (N=13995)	χ^2
Age				0.000[a]				0.000[a]
16-25 years	5 (0.6%)	159 (1.6%)	164 (1.5%)		49 (4.1%)	759 (5.9%)	808 (5.8%)	
26-35 years	102 (12.5%)	1802 (18.0%)	1904 (17.6%)		226 (19.1%)	2707 (21.1%)	2933 (21%)	
36-45 years	219 (26.7%)	2469 (24.7%)	2688 (24.9%)		368 (31.1%)	2998 (23.4%)	3366 (24.1%)	
46-55 years	212 (25.9%)	2232 (22.4%)	2444 (22.6%)		255 (21.5%)	2521 (19.7%)	2776 (19.8%)	
55 years or above	281 (34.3%)	3324 (33.3%)	3605 (33.4%)		286 (24.2%)	3826 (29.9%)	4112 (29.4%)	
Residential type				0.000[a]				0.000[a]
City centre	318 (38.8%)	2934 (29.4%)	3252 (30.1%)		487 (41.1%)	3832 (29.9%)	4319 (30.9%)	
Town centre	225 (27.5%)	2421 (24.2%)	2646 (24.5%)		330 (27.9%)	3148 (24.6%)	3478 (24.9%)	
Village	262 (32%)	4499 (45.1%)	4761 (44.1%)		333 (28.1%)	5608 (43.8%)	5941 (42.5%)	
Abroad	14 (1.7%)	132 (1.3%)	146 (1.4%)		34 (2.9%)	223 (1.7%)	257 (1.8%)	
Employment Status				0.000[a]				0.000[a]
In private sector	434 (53%)	5550 (55.6%)	5984 (55.4%)		332 (28%)	2362 (18.4%)	2694 (19.2%)	
In public sector	60 (7.3%)	1261 (12.6%)	1321 (12.2%)		77 (6.5%)	611 (4.8%)	688 (4.9%)	
Not working	325 (39.7%)	3175 (31.8%)	3500 (32.4%)		775 (65.5%)	9838 (76.8%)	10613 (75.8%)	
Average monthly net income				0.005[b]				0.000[a]
0-1300 TL	318 (38.8%)	3311 (33.2%)	3629 (33.6%)		861 (72.7%)	11085 (86.5%)	11946 (85.4%)	
1301-2600 TL	316 (38.6%)	4301 (43.1%)	4617 (42.7%)		195 (16.5%)	1106 (8.6%)	1301 (9.3%)	
2601-3900 TL	101 (12.3%)	1408 (14.1%)	1509 (14%)		66 (5.6%)	432 (3.4%)	498 (3.6%)	
3901 TL or above	84 (10.3%)	966 (9.7%)	1050 (9.7%)		62 (5.2%)	188 (1.5%)	250 (1.8%)	
Age at first marriage				0.000[a]				0.000[a]
12-17	53 (6.5%)	543 (5.4%)	596 (5.5%)		383 (32.3%)	3438 (26.8%)	3821 (27.3%)	
18-23	348 (42.5%)	4118 (41.2%)	4466 (41.3%)		582 (49.2%)	6879 (53.7%)	7461 (53.3%)	
24-29	308 (37.6%)	4380 (43.9%)	4688 (43.4%)		172 (14.5%)	2091 (16.3%)	2263 (16.2%)	
30 or above	110 (13.4%)	945 (9.5%)	1055 (9.8%)		47 (4%)	403 (3.1%)	450 (3.2%)	
Age of spouse in first marriage				0.000[a]				0.000[a]
12-17	131 (16%)	2255 (22.6%)	2386 (22.1%)		58 (4.9%)	698 (5.4%)	756 (5.4%)	
18-23	466 (56.9%)	5518 (55.3%)	5984 (55.4%)		476 (40.2%)	5207 (40.6%)	5683 (40.6%)	
24-29	173 (21.1%)	1877 (18.8%)	2050 (19%)		467 (39.4%)	5485 (42.8%)	5952 (42.5%)	
30 or above	49 (6%)	336 (3.4%)	385 (3.6%)		183 (15.5%)	1421 (11.1%)	1604 (11.5%)	

Age difference with spouse in first marriage				0.003[b]				0.000[a]
0-5	637 (77.8%)	7252 (72.6%)	7889 (73%)		739 (62.4%)	8727 (68.1%)	9466 (67.6%)	
6-10	154 (18.8%)	2398 (24%)	2552 (23.6%)		331 (28%)	3329 (26%)	3660 (26.2%)	
11-15	22 (2.7%)	299 (3%)	321 (3%)		75 (6.3%)	575 (4.5%)	650 (4.6%)	
16 or above	6 (0.7%)	37 (0.4%)	43 (0.4%)		39 (3.3%)	180 (1.4%)	219 (1.6%)	
Year of last (or longest) marriage				0.000[a]				0.000[a]
0-12	459 (56.1%)	2620 (26.2%)	3079 (28.5%)		690 (58.3%)	3298 (25.7%)	3988 (28.5%)	
13-25	209 (25.5%)	2876 (28.8%)	3085 (28.6%)		337 (28.5%)	3740 (29.2%)	4077 (29.1%)	
26-38	88 (10.7%)	2365 (23.7%)	2453 (22.7%)		106 (9%)	3001 (23.4%)	3107 (22.2%)	
39 or above	63 (7.7%)	2125 (21.3%)	2188 (20.2%)		51 (4.3%)	2772 (21.6%)	2823 (20.2%)	
Marriage decision method				0.002[b]				0.000[a]
Arranged by asking	63 (7.7%)	864 (8.7%)	927 (8.6%)		182 (15.4%)	1853 (14.5%)	2035 (14.5%)	
Arranged, without being asked	357 (43.6%)	4960 (49.7%)	5317 (49.2%)		439 (37.1%)	6226 (48.6%)	6665 (47.6%)	
Own decision without family permission	28 (3.4%)	228 (2.3%)	256 (2.4%)		65 (5.5%)	301 (2.3%)	366 (2.6%)	
Own decision, with family permission	303 (37%)	3253 (32.6%)	3556 (32.9%)		388 (32.8%)	3468 (27.1%)	3856 (27.6%)	
Other (abduction, bride exchange, etc.)	68 (8.3%)	681 (6.8%)	749 (6.9%)		110 (9.3%)	963 (7.5%)	1073 (7.7%)	
Type of wedding				0.000[a]				0.000[a]
Both civil and religious marriage	731 (89.3%)	9788 (98%)	10519 (97.4%)		1055 (89.1%)	12562 (98.1%)	13617 (97.3%)	
Only civil marriage	52 (6.3%)	145 (1.5%)	197 (1.8%)		49 (4.1%)	153 (1.2%)	202 (1.4%)	
Only religious marriage	36 (4.4%)	53 (0.5%)	89 (0.8%)		80 (6.8%)	96 (0.7%)	176 (1.3%)	
Way to meet your spouse				0.000[a]				0.000[a]
Family-relative	272 (33.2%)	4817 (48.2%)	5089 (47.1%)		412 (34.8%)	6563 (51.2%)	6975 (49.8%)	
Neighbourhood	214 (26.1%)	3041 (30.5%)	3255 (30.1%)		327 (27.6%)	3684 (28.8%)	4011 (28.7%)	
School-course	20 (2.4%)	413 (4.1%)	433 (4%)		41 (3.5%)	486 (3.8%)	527 (3.8%)	
Business environment	134 (16.4%)	706 (7.1%)	840 (7.8%)		156 (13.2%)	792 (6.2%)	948 (6.8%)	
Circle of friends	161 (19.7%)	952 (9.5%)	1113 (10.3%)		231 (19.5%)	1214 (9.5%)	1445 (10.3%)	
Other (internet, etc.)	18 (2.2%)	57 (0.6%)	75 (0.7%)		17 (1.4%)	72 (0.6%)	89 (0.6%)	
Having children				0.000[a]				0.000[a]
Yes	701 (85.6%)	9352 (93.7%)	10053 (93%)		1009 (85.2%)	12014 (93.8%)	13023 (93.1%)	
No	118 (14.4%)	634 (6.3%)	752 (7%)		175 (14.8%)	797 (6.2%)	972 (6.9%)	
Do you find it appropriate for women to work?				0.001[b]				0.000[a]
Yes	666 (81.3%)	7615 (76.3%)	8281 (76.6%)		1115 (94.2%)	11642 (90.9%)	12757 (91.2%)	
No	153 (18.7%)	2371 (23.7%)	2524 (23.4%)		69 (5.8%)	1169 (9.1%)	1238 (8.8%)	
Individual happiness				0.000[a]				0.000[a]
Happy	506 (61.8%)	7771 (77.8%)	8277 (76.6%)		686 (57.9%)	9533 (74.4%)	10219 (73%)	
Medium	231 (28.2%)	1940 (19.4%)	2171 (20.1%)		363 (30.7%)	2807 (21.9%)	3170 (22.7%)	
Unhappy	82 (10%)	275 (2.8%)	357 (3.3%)		135 (11.4%)	471 (3.7%)	606 (4.3%)	
Family happiness				0.000[a]				0.000[a]
Happy	532 (65%)	7807 (78.2%)	8339 (77.2%)		736 (62.2%)	9680 (75.6%)	10416 (74.4%)	
Medium	214 (26.1%)	1711 (17.1%)	1925 (17.8%)		329 (27.8%)	2452 (19.1%)	2781 (19.9%)	
Unhappy	73 (8.9%)	468 (4.7%)	541 (5%)		119 (10.1%)	679 (5.3%)	798 (5.7%)	
Smoking				0.000[a]				0.000[a]
Yes	454 (55.4%)	4419 (44.3%)	4873 (45.1%)		469 (39.6%)	2121 (16.6%)	2590 (18.5%)	
No	365 (44.6%)	5567 (55.7%)	5932 (54.9%)		715 (60.4%)	10690 (83.4%)	11405 (81.5%)	
Alcohol				0.000[a]				0.000[a]
Yes	310 (37.9%)	2214 (22.2%)	2524 (23.4%)		208 (17.6%)	1364 (10.6%)	1572 (11.2%)	
No	509 (62.1%)	7772 (77.8%)	8281 (76.6%)		976 (82.4%)	11446 (89.3%)	12422 (88.8%)	
Statistical regional units' class				0.000[a]				0.000[a]
TR1	129 (15.8%)	1295 (13%)	1424 (13.2%)		179 (15.1%)	1561 (12.2%)	1740 (12.4%)	
TR2	63 (7.7%)	710 (7.1%)	773 (7.2%)		67 (5.7%)	811 (6.3%)	878 (6.3%)	
TR3	177 (21.6%)	1485 (14.9%)	1662 (15.4%)		243 (20.5%)	1852 (14.5%)	2095 (15%)	
TR4	73 (8.9%)	985 (9.9%)	1058 (9.8%)		121 (10.2%)	1210 (9.4%)	1331 (9.5%)	
TR5	118 (14.4%)	1334 (13.4%)	1452 (13.4%)		182 (15.4%)	1696 (13.2%)	1878 (13.4%)	
TR6	108 (13.2%)	1032 (10.3%)	1140 (10.6%)		147 (12.4%)	1333 (10.4%)	1480 (10.6%)	
TR7	33 (4%)	625 (6.3%)	658 (6.1%)		73 (6.2%)	854 (6.7%)	927 (6.6%)	
TR8	34 (4.2%)	633 (6.3%)	667 (6.2%)		53 (4.5%)	790 (6.2%)	843 (6%)	
TR9	20 (2.4%)	399 (4%)	419 (3.9%)		23 (1.9%)	540 (4.2%)	563 (4%)	
TRA	10 (0.01%)	322 (0.03%)	332 (0.03%)		15 (1.3%)	511 (4%)	526 (3.8%)	
TRB	20 (0.02%)	468 (0.04%)	488 (0.04%)		33 (2.8%)	688 (5.4%)	721 (5.2%)	
TRC	34 (0.04%)	698 (0.06%)	732 (0.06%)		48 (4.1%)	964 (7.5%)	1012 (7.2%)	

Note: Values in parentheses in the table show percentiles. [a]p<.001; [b]p<.05

The independent variables used in the study and the frequency, percentage values and chi-square test results related to the divorce status of individuals by gender are shown in Table 1. According to the results of the chi-square independence test, there is a significant relationship between the divorce status of individuals by gender and socio-economic and demographic variables. Table 2 presents the participants' demographic and socioeconomic variables and the frequency and percentage values of the factors that could affect the probability of divorce alone.

Table: 2
Frequency and Percentage of Variables That Alone Can Cause Divorce

Variable	Male (N=10805)				Female (N=13995)			
	Divorced (n= 819)	Not divorced (n=9986)	All Male (N=10805)	χ^2	Divorced (n=1184)	Not divorced (n=12811)	All Female (N=13995)	χ^2
DR_1 Is a woman's failure to do housework properly a definite reason for divorce?				0.000[a]				0.404[x]
Yes	186 (22.7%)	1536 (15.4%)	1722 (15.9%)		186 (15.7%)	1897 (14.8%)	2083 (14.9%)	
No	633 (77.3%)	8450 (84.6%)	9083 (84.1%)		998 (84.3%)	10914 (85.2%)	11912 (85.1%)	
DR_2 Is the man's failure to do his housework properly a definite reason for divorce?				0.000[a]				0.005[b]
Yes	67 (8.2%)	476 (4.8%)	543 (5%)		63 (5.3%)	474 (3.7%)	537 (3.8%)	
No	752 (91.8%)	9510 (95.2%)	10262 (95%)		1121 (94.7%)	12337 (96.3%)	13458 (96.2%)	
DR_3 Is the woman's inability to provide for the household economically a definite reason for divorce?				0.006[b]				0.000[a]
Yes	50 (6.1%)	408 (4.1%)	458 (4.2%)		96 (8.1%)	660 (5.2%)	756 (5.4%)	
No	769 (93.9%)	9578 (95.9%)	10347 (95.8%)		1088 (91.9%)	12151 (94.8%)	13239 (94.6%)	
DR_4 Is the man's inability to provide for the house economically a definite reason for divorce?				0.000[a]				0.000[a]
Yes	401 (49%)	4057 (40,6%)	4458 (41,3%)		692 (58,4%)	5404 (42,2%)	6096 (43,6%)	
No	418 (51%)	5929 (59,4%)	6347 (58,7%)		492 (41,6%)	7407 (57,8%)	7899 (56,4%)	
DR_5 Is a woman's catching a disease that is difficult to treat a definite reason for divorce?				0.000[a]				0.001[b]
Yes	26 (3.2%)	131 (1.3%)	157 (1.5%)		40 (3.4%)	253 (2%)	293 (2.1%)	
No	793 (96.8%)	9855 (98.7%)	10648 (98.5%)		1144 (96.6%)	12558 (98%)	13702 (97.9%)	
DR_6 Is a man's catching a disease that is difficult to treat a definite reason for divorce?				0.001[b]				0.000[a]
Yes	23 (2.8%)	138 (1.4%)	161 (1.5%)		42 (3.5%)	221 (1.7%)	263 (1.9%)	
No	796 (97.2%)	9848 (98.6%)	10644 (98.5%)		1142 (96.5%)	12590 (98.3%)	13732 (98.1%)	
DR_7 Women's theft, fraud, extortion, harassment, etc. Is committing a crime on its own a sure reason for divorce?				0.219[x]				0.593[x]
Yes	752 (91.8%)	9039 (90.5%)	9791 (90.6%)		1085 (91.6%)	11681 (91.2%)	12766 (91.2%)	
No	67 (8.2%)	947 (9.5%)	1014 (9.4%)		99 (8.4%)	1130 (8.8%)	1229 (8.8%)	
DR_8: Theft, fraud, extortion, harassment, etc. Is committing a crime on its own a sure reason for divorce?				0.251[x]				0.743[x]
Yes	754 (92.1%)	9074 (90.9%)	9828 (91%)		1088 (91.9%)	11737 (91.6%)	12825 (91.6%)	
No	65 (7.9%)	912 (9.1%)	977 (9%)		96 (8.1%)	1074 (8.4%)	1170 (8.4%)	
DR_9 Is a woman's inability to get along with her husband's family a definite reason for divorce?				0.000[a]				0.000[a]
Yes	200 (24.4%)	1244 (12.5%)	1444 (13.4%)		306 (25.8%)	1920 (15%)	2226 (15.9%)	
No	619 (75.6%)	8742 (87.5%)	9361 (86.6%)		878 (74.2%)	10891 (85%)	11769 (84.1%)	
DR_10 Is a man's inability to get along with his wife's family a definite reason for divorce?				0.000[a]				0.000[a]
Yes	193 (23.6%)	1174 (11.8%)	1367 (12.7%)		305 (25.8%)	1850 (14.4%)	2155 (15.4%)	
No	626 (76.4%)	8812 (88.2%)	9438 (87.3%)		879 (74.2%)	10961 (85.6%)	11840 (84.6%)	
DR_11 Is a woman's irresponsible and uninterested treatment of home, spouse and children a definite reason for divorce?				0.000[a]				0.000[a]
Yes	601 (73.4%)	6057 (60.7%)	6658 (61.6%)		883 (74.6%)	7892 (61.6%)	8775 (62.7%)	
No	218 (26.6%)	3929 (39.3%)	4147 (38.4%)		301 (25.4%)	4919 (38.4%)	5220 (37.3%)	
DR_12 Is a man's irresponsible and uninterested treatment of his home, spouse and children a definite reason for divorce?				0.000[a]				0.000[a]
Yes	596 (72.8%)	6076 (60.8%)	6672 (61.7%)		900 (76%)	8039 (62.8%)	8939 (63.9%)	
No	223 (27.2%)	3910 (39.2%)	4133 (38.3%)		284 (24%)	4772 (37.2%)	5056 (36.1%)	
DR_13 Is the woman's ill-treatment of her husband (beating. insulting. etc.) a definite reason for divorce on its own?				0.001[b]				0.000[a]
Yes	713 (87.1%)	8216 (82.3%)	8929 (82.6%)		1083 (91.5%)	10999 (85.9%)	12082 (86.3%)	
No	106 (12.9%)	1770 (17.7%)	1876 (17.4%)		101 (8.5%)	1812 (14.1%)	1913 (13.7%)	
DR_14 Is the man's maltreatment of his wife (beating. insulting, etc.) a definite reason for divorce on its own?				0.003[b]				0.000[a]
Yes	711 (86.8%)	8263 (82.7%)	8974 (83.1%)		1098 (92.7%)	11115 (86.8%)	12213 (87.3%)	
No	108 (13.2%)	1723 (17.3%)	1831 (16.9%)		86 (7.3%)	1696 (13.2%)	1782 (12.7%)	
DR_15 Is the woman's family getting too involved in family relations a definite reason for divorce?				0.000[a]				0.000[a]
Yes	326 (39.8%)	2454 (24.6%)	2780 (25.7%)		482 (40.7%)	3669 (28.6%)	4151 (29.7%)	
No	493 (60.2%)	7532 (75.4%)	8025 (74.3%)		702 (59.3%)	9142 (71.4%)	9844 (70.3%)	
DR_16 Is the man's family getting too involved in family relations a definite reason for divorce?				0.000[a]				0.000[a]
Yes	309 (37.7%)	2315 (23.2%)	2624 (24.3%)		476 (40.2%)	3599 (28.1%)	4075 (29.1%)	
No	510 (62.3%)	7671 (76.8%)	8181 (75.7%)		708 (59.8%)	9212 (71.9%)	9920 (70.9%)	
DR_17 Is the woman's absence of children a definite reason for divorce?				0.000[a]				0.039[b]
Yes	70 (8.5%)	532 (5.3%)	602 (5.6%)		115 (9.7%)	1025 (8%)	1140 (8.1%)	
No	749 (91.5%)	9454 (94.7%)	10203 (94.4%)		1069 (90.3%)	11786 (92%)	12855 (91.9%)	
DR_18 Is the man's absence of children a definite reason for divorce?				0.001[b]				0.005[b]
Yes	64 (7.8%)	509 (5.1%)	573 (5.3%)		113 (9.5%)	934 (7.3%)	1047 (7.5%)	
No	755 (92.2%)	9477 (94.9%)	10232 (94.7%)		1071 (90.5%)	11877 (92.7%)	12948 (92.5%)	
DR_19 Is the woman's bad habits, such as drinking and gambling, a definite reason for divorce?				0.917[x]				0.135[x]
Yes	710 (86.7%)	8644 (86.6%)	9354 (86.6%)		1059 (89.4%)	11270 (88%)	12329 (88.1%)	
No	109 (13.3%)	1342 (13.4%)	1451 (13.4%)		125 (10.6%)	1541 (12%)	1666 (11.9%)	
DR_20 Is the man's bad habits, such as drinking and gambling, a definite reason for divorce?				0.980[x]				0.014[b]
Yes	704 (86%)	8587 (86%)	9291 (86%)		1064 (89.9%)	11197 (87.4%)	12261 (87.6%)	
No	115 (14%)	1399 (14%)	1514 (14%)		120 (10.1%)	1614 (12.6%)	1734 (12.4%)	
DR_21 Is a woman cheating on her husband (even once) a definite reason for divorce?				0.632[x]				0.453[x]
Yes	781 (95.4%)	9558 (95.7%)	10339 (95.7%)		1094 (92.4%)	11912 (93%)	13006 (92.9%)	
No	38 (4.6%)	428 (4.3%)	466 (4.3%)		90 (7.6%)	899 (7%)	989 (7.1%)	
DR_22 Is **a** man cheating on his wife (even once) a definite reason for divorce on its own?				0.170[x]				0.415[x]
Yes	766 (93.5%)	9207 (92.2%)	9973 (92.3%)		1064 (89.9%)	11414 (89.1%)	12478 (89.2%)	
No	53 (6.5%)	779 (7.8%)	832 (7.7%)		120 (10.1%)	1397 (10.9%)	1517 (10.8%)	

Note: Values in parentheses in the table show percentiles. DR stands for the reason for divorce. [a] p<.001; [b] p<.05; [x]>.05

Table 2 also includes the chi-square test results of the divorce reason (DR) variables. Accordingly, the chi-square test results for the variables 7, 8, 19, 20, 21 and 22 in the DR variable group were found to be insignificant for men, whereby these variables were excluded from all subsequent analyses for men. In addition, the chi-square test results for the variables 1, 7, 8, 19, 21 and 22 in the DR variable group were found to be insignificant for women, whereby these variables were excluded from all subsequent analyses for women.

As stated in the literature and understood from Table 2, some of the variables that had insignificant chi-square test results and, therefore, were not included in the model (crimes such as theft, fraud, extortion and harassment, and unpleasant habits such as alcohol use, gambling, and cheating) affect the probability of divorce. However, as both groups included in the divorced and nondivorced dependent variable categories had similar responses, these variables were not included in the logit and probit models. Therefore, whether the variables to be used were independent of the divorce status was considered while evaluating the results.

4.2. Model Estimation

By using the data of the Family Structure Survey conducted by TUIK in 2016, this study aimed to examine the gender factors of divorce and the effect of these factors on the probability of divorce. For this, logit and probit regression analyses were performed in the study. Tables 3 and 4 present the marginal effect values obtained from the analyses. The logit and probit models were statistically significant ($p<0.000$). McKelvey and Zavoina's R^2 values of the logit and probit models for men were 0.330 and 0.290, respectively, while the values for women were 0.414 and 0.377.

In the light of the explanations in the analysis section of the research, in Binary Logit and probit regression analysis, when the independent variable has two categories, the category that is not risky on the divorce status is selected as the reference category, and a dummy variable is created by giving the code 0. The other category is given the code 1. If an independent variable has more than two categories, a dummy variable is created as one less than the number of categories. In selecting the reference category, the category with the lowest or highest risk of divorce is chosen as the reference category. In this case, the reference category is given a code of 0; the related category is given a code of 1, and the dummy process is performed. In addition, the marginal effects of categorical variables with VIF values above ten on the probability of divorce are excluded from the analysis (Alkan & Demir, 2019; Alkan & Abar, 2020).

Table: 3
Marginal Effects of Participants' Demographic and Socioeconomic Characteristics on Divorce

Variable	Male			Female		
	Logit regression	Probit regression	VIF	Logit regression	Probit regression	VIF
Age (Reference: 16-25 years)						
26-35 years:1, others:0	Excluded	Excluded	>10	0.0102[x] (0.0069)	0.0100[c] (0.0067)	2.31
36-45 years:1, others:0	Excluded	Excluded	>10	0.0400[a] (0.0061)	0.0401[a] (0.0061)	2.47
46-55 years:1, others:0	Excluded	Excluded	>10	0.0251[a] (0.0067)	0.0247[a] (0.0066)	1.99
55 years or above:1, others:0	Excluded	Excluded	>10	Excluded	Excluded	>10
Residential type (Reference: City centre)						
Town center:1, others:0	-0.0107[c] (0.0063)	-0.0109[c] (0.0065)	1.42	-0.0147[b] (0.0057)	-0.0151[b] (0.0059)	1.40
Village:1, others:0	-0.0432[a] (0.0061)	-0.0429[a] (0.0060)	1.64	-0.0584[a] (0.0057)	-0.0576[a] (0.0056)	1.70
Abroad:1, others:0	-0.0015[x] (0.0200)	-0.0015[x] (0.0206)	1.06	0.0139[c] (0.0146)	0.0147[c] (0.0155)	1.07
Employment Status (Reference: In private sector)						
In public sector:1, others:0	-0.0346[a] (0.0099)	-0.0331[a] (0.0092)	1.40	-0.0084[x] (0.0103)	-0.0088[x] (0.0108)	1.83
Not working:1, others:0	0.0188[a] (0.0053)	0.0189[a] (0.0054)	1.65	-0.0445[a] (0.0054)	-0.0453[a] (0.0055)	1.40
Average monthly net income (Reference: 0-1300 TL)						
1301-2600 TL:1, others:0	-0.0187[b] (0.0058)	-0.0187[b] (0.0058)	1.45	0.0625[a] (0.0065)	0.0644[a] (0.0070)	1.23
2601-3900 TL:1, others:0	-0.0204[b] (0.0083)	-0.0204[b] (0.0082)	1.66	0.0516[a] (0.0104)	0.0526[a] (0.0111)	1.69
3901 TL or above:1, others:0	-0.0069[x] (0.0089)	-0.0070[x] (0.0090)	1.52	0.1104[a] (0.0115)	0.1186[a] (0.0134)	1.22
Age at first marriage (Reference: 12-17 years)						
18-23 years:1, others:0	-0.0100[x] (0.0107)	-0.0102[x] (0.0110)	5.44	-0.0212[a] (0.0053)	-0.0214[a] (0.0054)	1.86
24-29 years:1, others:0	-0.0229[b] (0.0108)	-0.0229[b] (0.0110)	6.79	-0.0234[b] (0.0074)	-0.0235[b] (0.0073)	2.53
30 years or above:1, others:0	0.0123[x] (0.0122)	0.0012[x] (0.0126)	4.10	0.0035[x] (0.0126)	0.0036[x] (0.0130)	1.65
Age of spouse in first marriage (Reference: 12-17 years)						
18-23 years:1, others:0	0.0261[a] (0.0071)	0.0254[a] (0.0068)	1.99	0.0073[x] (0.0111)	0.0073[x] (0.0110)	5.51
24-29 years:1, others:0	0.0322[a] (0.0084)	0.0316[c] (0.0082)	2.65	0.0018[x] (0.0112)	0.0018[x] (0.0110)	6.98
30 years or above:1, others:0	0.0642[a] (0.0124)	0.0652[a] (0.0130)	1.61	0.0338[b] (0.0122)	0.0344[b] (0.0121)	5.02
Age difference with spouse in first marriage (Reference: 0-5 years)						
6-10 years:1, others:0	-0.0219[b] (0.0065)	-0.0216[b] (0.0063)	1.47	0.0124[b] (0.0053)	0.0123[b] (0.0053)	1.60
11-15 years:1, others:0	-0.0123[x] (0.0157)	-0.0123[x] (0.0154)	1.27	0.0333[b] (0.0099)	0.0339[b] (0.0103)	1.52
16 years or above:1, others:0	0.0428[x] (0.0309)	0.0452[c] (0.0340)	1.07	0.0725[c] (0.0140)	0.0765[c] (0.0156)	1.35
Year of last (or longest) marriage (Reference: 0-12 years)						
13-25 years:1, others:0	-0.0595a (0.0060)	-0.0609a (0.0060)	1.68	-0.0621a (0.0052)	-0.0636a (0.0052)	2.18
26-38 years:1, others:0	-0.1048a (0.0084)	-0.1024a (0.0075)	1.98	-0.1312a (0.0081)	-0.1260a (0.0071)	2.77
Marriage decision method (Reference: Arranged without being asked)						
Arranged by asking	-0.0009[x] (0.0098)	-0.0008[x] (0.0097)	3.58	-0.0255[a] (0.0070)	-0.0250[a] (0.0070)	2.44
Own decision without family permission:1, others:0	0.0364[b] (0.0167)	0.0371[b] (0.0173)	1.31	0.0606[a] (0.0121)	0.0644[a] (0.0132)	1.22
Own decision with family permission:1, others:0	0.0171[c] (0.0100)	0.0171[c] (0.0099)	3.99	0.0100[x] (0.0072)	0.0101[x] (0.0073)	2.85
Other (abduction, bride exchange etc.):1, others:0	0.0219[c] (0.0127)	0.0220[c] (0.0128)	1.82	0.0116[x] (0.0097)	0.0118[x] (0.0099)	1.55
Type of wedding (Reference: Both civil and religious marriage)						
Only civil marriage:1, others:0	0.1074[a] (0.0115)	0.1180[a] (0.0136)	1.06	0.1008[a] (0.0126)	0.1091[a] (0.0147)	1.05
Only religious marriage:1, others:0	0.1511[a] (0.0151)	0.1722[a] (0.0189)	1.05	0.1728[a] (0.0116)	0.1970[a] (0.0144)	1.06
Way to meet your spouse (Reference: Family-relative)						
Neighbourhood	0.0150[b] (0.0064)	0.0143[b] (0.0061)	1.22	0.0263[a] (0.0058)	0.0253[a] (0.0056)	1.19
School-course:1, others:0	-0.0105[x] (0.0162)	-0.0097[x] (0.0149)	1.24	0.0224[b] (0.0129)	0.0215[b] (0.0126)	1.25
Business environment :1, others:0	0.0830[a] (0.0079)	0.0850[a] (0.0083)	1.33	0.0869[a] (0.0078)	0.0885[a] (0.0082)	1.33
Circle of friends:1, others:0	0.0751[a] (0.0074)	0.0763[a] (0.0076)	1.34	0.0843[a] (0.0068)	0.0856[a] (0.0070)	1.35
Other (internet, etc.):1, others:0	0.1179[a] (0.0191)	0.1251[a] (0.0223)	1.05	0.1007[a] (0.0209)	0.1039[a] (0.0234)	1.04
Having children (Reference: Yes)						
No:1	0.0632[a] (0.0076)	0.0664[a] (0.0083)	1.15	0.0737[a] (0.0069)	0.0777[a] (0.0076)	1.15
Do you find it appropriate for women to work? (Reference: Yes)						
No:1	-0.0212[b] (0.0065)	-0.0209[b] (0.0063)	1.09	-0.0374[a] (0.0099)	-0.0363[a] (0.0093)	1.06
Individual happiness (Reference: Happy)						
Medium:1, others:0	0.0415[a] (0.0058)	0.0417[a] (0.0059)	1.62	0.0446[a] (0.0052)	0.0446[a] (0.0053)	1.67
Unhappy:1, others:0	0.1048[a] (0.0094)	0.1123[a] (0.0107)	1.30	0.1053[a] (0.0081)	0.1114[a] (0.0091)	1.46
Family happiness (Reference: Happy)						
Medium:1, others:0	0.0422[a] (0.0060)	0.0427[a] (0.0061)	1.63	0.0436[a] (0.0054)	0.0440[a] (0.0055)	1.68
Unhappy:1, others:0	0.0575[a] (0.0093)	0.0592[a] (0.0100)	1.28	0.0641[a] (0.0082)	0.0660[a] (0.0088)	1.42
Smoking (Reference: No)						
Yes:1	0.0313[a] (0.0051)	0.0312[a] (0.0051)	1.12	0.0900[a] (0.0050)	0.0927[a] (0.0051)	1.16
Alcohol (Reference: No)						
Yes:1	0.0527[a] (0.0054)	0.0536[a] (0.0055)	1.18	0.0448[a] (0.0063)	0.0461[a] (0.0066)	1.10
Statistical regional units' class (Reference: TR1)						
TR2:1, others:0	-0.0080[x] (0.0111)	-0.0081[x] (0.0112)	1.51	-0.0251[b] (0.0114)	-0.0252[b] (0.0113)	1.49
TR3:1, others:0	0.0124[x] (0.0084)	0.0129[c] (0.0087)	1.92	0.0103[x] (0.0080)	0.0107[x] (0.0082)	1.96
TR4:1, others:0	-0.0205[x] (0.1061)	-0.0205[x] (0.0105)	1.62	-0.0105[x] (0.0095)	-0.0106[x] (0.0096)	1.64
TR5:1, others:0	-0.0082[x] (0.0092)	-0.0083[x] (0.0093)	1.82	-0.0050[x] (0.0085)	-0.0051[x] (0.0086)	1.88
TR6:1, others:0	0.0034[x] (0.0095)	0.0035[x] (0.0097)	1.67	-0.0029[x] (0.0090)	-0.0030[x] (0.0092)	1.72
TR7:1, others:0	-0.0441[b] (0.0140)	-0.0431[b] (0.0133)	1.44	-0.0225[b] (0.0111)	-0.0226[b] (0.0111)	1.50
TR8:1, others:0	-0.0429[b] (0.0138)	-0.0420[b] (0.0132)	1.45	-0.0411[b] (0.0124)	-0.0406[b] (0.0120)	1.47
TR9:1, others:0	-0.0477[b] (0.0172)	-0.0464[b] (0.0161)	1.30	-0.0760[a] (0.0175)	-0.0726[a] (0.0158)	1.32
TRA:1, others:0	-0.0810[b] (0.0233)	-0.0763[a] (0.0204)	1.25	-0.1046[a] (0.0211)	-0.0974[a] (0.0181)	1.31
TRB:1, others:0	-0.0588[b] (0.0171)	-0.0566[a] (0.0158)	1.38	-0.0669[a] (0.0150)	-0.0644[a] (0.0138)	1.41
TRC:1, others:0	-0.0497[a] (0.0138)	-0.0483[a] (0.0130)	1.54	-0.0641[a] (0.0129)	-0.0619[a] (0.0120)	1.60

Notes: The values in parentheses are the standard errors, and the others are dy/dx values in marginal effect analysis. Categories with a VIF coefficient greater than ten were excluded from the analysis and labelled as Excluded. [a] p<.001; [b] p<.05; [x]>.05

As seen in Table 3, The probability of divorce was 4% higher for women in the 36-45 age group than those in the 16-25 age group. Women in the 46-55 age group also had a higher probability of divorce than those in the 16-25 age group. Men living in the district centre and those living in the village had a lower probability of divorce than those living in the city centre. Similarly, women living in the district centre and those living in the town had a lower probability of divorce than those living in the city centre. There was no significant effect on the probability of divorce for men and women living abroad compared to those living in the city centre. In addition, men working in the public sector had a lower probability of divorce than those working in the private sector. Unemployed men had a 1.8% higher probability of divorce than those working in the private sector. On the contrary, unemployed women were 4.5% less likely to divorce than women working in the private sector.

Men with an income of 1301-2600 TL and those with an income of 2601-3900 TL had 1.8% and 2% lower divorce probability than those with an income of 0-1300 TL, respectively. There was no significant effect of the monthly income on the probability of divorce in those with an income of 3900 TL and above compared to those with an income of 0-1300 TL. On the other hand, when the variable of average monthly income of women is analysed, it is determined that those with an income of 1301-2600 TL, 2601-3900 TL and 3901 TL and above have higher probabilities of divorce calculated by logit and probit analysis than those with an income of 0-1300 TL.

Men who had their first marriage in the 24-29 age group were 2.2% less likely to divorce than those in the 12-17 age group, and the effect of other age groups on the likelihood of divorce was not found to be significant. Women who were first married between the ages of 18-23 years and those who were first married between the ages of 24-29 years were 2.1% and 2.3% less likely to divorce compared to those who were first married at 12-17 years, respectively. Men with a wife aged 30 years and older at first marriage had the highest probability of divorce, followed by those aged between 24-29 years, those aged between 18-23 years and those aged between 12-17 years. Women with a husband aged between 30 years and older at first marriage had a higher probability of divorce than those with a husband aged 12-17 years. When the age difference between spouses is analysed, men 6-10 years older than their wives are 2.1% less likely to divorce than men 0-5 years older. On the other hand, the effect of the age difference between 11-15 and 16+ on the probability of divorce is not significant.

Women whose age difference with their husband was 16 years and above at first marriage had the highest probability of divorce, followed by those whose age difference with their husbands was 11-15 years, those whose age difference with their husbands was 6-10 years, and those whose age difference with their husband were 0-5 years, respectively.

When the probability of divorce is compared according to the most extended marriage duration of 0-12 years for women and men, it is found that divorce decreases for

those whose marriages lasted 13-25 years and 26-38 years. In other words, as the marriage duration increased, the divorce probability decreased for women and men.

Men who got married in an arranged manner (without being asked) had the lowest probability of divorce, followed by those who married by their own decision with family permission, those who married by other methods (bride exchange, etc.), and those who married by their own decision without family permission, respectively. On the other hand, women who married by their own decision without family permission had the highest probability of divorce, followed by those who got married in an arranged manner (without being asked) and those who got married in an organised manner (by being asked), respectively.

Men who had both religious and civil marriages had the lowest probability of divorce, followed by those who had only civil marriage and those who had only religious marriage, respectively. Similarly, women who had both religious and civil marriages had the lowest probability of divorce, followed by those who had only civil marriages and those who had only religious marriages, respectively.

Men who were married from their family-relative circle had the lowest possibility of divorce, followed by those who were married from their neighbourhood, those who were married from their work environment, those who were married from their friend circle, and those who were married from other platforms (internet, dating agency etc.), respectively. Similarly, women who were married from their family-relative circle had the lowest possibility of divorce, followed by those who were married from their neighbourhood, those who were married from their school environment, those who were married from their work environment, and those who were married from their friend circle, and those who were married from other platforms (internet, dating agency etc.), respectively. In addition, it was found that those who met at school curricula were less likely to divorce than those who met in the neighbourhood, and those who met in the circle of friends were less likely to divorce than those who met in the work circle.

Men without children had a higher probability of divorce than those with children. Similarly, women without children had a higher probability of divorce than those with children. Men who approved women's employment had a higher probability of divorce than those who did not. Similarly, women who agreed to women's jobs had a higher probability of divorce than those who did not.

Happy men had the lowest probability of divorce, followed by moderately happy men and unhappy men, respectively. Similarly, happy women had the lowest probability of divorce, followed by moderately happy and unhappy women, respectively. Men with happy family lives had the lowest probability of divorce, followed by those with moderately happy family lives and those with unhappy family lives. Similarly, women with happy family lives had the lowest probability of divorce, followed by those with moderately happy family lives and those with unhappy family lives.

Smoking women were 9% more likely to divorce than non-smokers, while smoking men were 3% more likely to divorce than non-smokers. Women who used alcohol had a higher probability of divorce than those who did not. Similarly, men who used alcohol had a higher probability of divorce than those who did not.

Table 3 presents the results regarding the statistical regional classification. Accordingly, men and women living in the TRA region were less likely to divorce than those in the TR1 region. TR1 region included Istanbul, one of the most populated and developed provinces of Türkiye, located between the continents of Europe and Asia, while the TRA region consisted of seven provinces located in the Northeast Anatolia of Türkiye. Table 4 shows the marginal effects of the variables that can cause divorce alone.

Table: 4
Marginal Effects of Variables That Alone Can Cause Divorce

Variable	Male			Female		
	Logit regression	Probit regression	VIF	Logit regression	Probit regression	VIF
DR_1 Is a woman's failure to do housework properly a definite reason for divorce? (Reference: No)						
Yes:1	0.0335[a] (0.0061)	0.0342[a] (0.0064)	1.47	0.0054[c] (0.0064)	0.0054[c] (0.0065)	1.37
DR_2 Is the man's failure to do his housework properly a definite reason for divorce? (Reference: No)						
Yes:1	0.0403[a] (0.0095)	0.0417[a] (0.0102)	1.36	0.0294[b] (0.0106)	0.0301[b] (0.0111)	1.32
DR_3 Is the woman's inability to provide for the household economically a definite reason for divorce? (Reference: No)						
Yes:1	0.0296[b] (0.0108)	0.0304[b] (0.0114)	1.14	0.0375[a] (0.0088)	0.0386[a] (0.0093)	1.17
DR_4 Is the man's inability to provide for the house economically a definite reason for divorce? (Reference: No)						
Yes:1	0.0236[c] (0.0051)	0.0236[c] (0.0051)	1.25	0.0504[a] (0.0048)	0.0501[a] (0.0047)	1.31
DR_5 Is a woman's catching a disease that is difficult to treat a definite reason for divorce? (Reference: No)						
Yes:1	0.0631[a] (0.0152)	0.0671[a] (0.0171)	3.45	0.0426[b] (0.0134)	0.0442[b] (0.0144)	3.19
DR_6 Is a man's catching a disease that is difficult to treat a definite reason for divorce? (Reference: No)						
Yes:1	0.0506[b] (0.0160)	0.0532[b] (0.0172)	3.44	0.0572[a] (0.0132)	0.0601[a] (0.0145)	3.19
DR_9 Is a woman's inability to get along with her husband's family a definite reason for divorce? (Reference: No)						
Yes:1	0.0569[a] (0.0061)	0.0589[a] (0.0065)	6.05	0.0524[a] (0.0055)	0.0538[a] (0.0057)	6.58
DR_10 Is a man's inability to get along with his wife's family a definite reason for divorce? (Reference: No)						
Yes:1	0.0582[a] (0.0062)	0.0603[a] (0.0066)	6.03	0.0553[a] (0.0055)	0.0569[a] (0.0058)	6.62
DR_11 Is a woman's irresponsible and uninterested treatment of her home, spouse and children a definite reason for divorce? (Reference: No)						
Yes:1	Excluded	Excluded	>10	0.0464[a] (0.0054)	0.0455[a] (0.0051)	8.26
DR_12 Is a man's irresponsible and uninterested treatment of his home, spouse and children a definite reason for divorce? (Reference: No)						
Yes	Excluded	Excluded	>10	0.0486[a] (0.0055)	0.0476[a] (0.0052)	8.30
DR_13 Is the woman's ill-treatment of her husband (beating. insulting. etc.) a definite reason for divorce on its own? (Reference: No)						
Yes:1	0.0259[b] (0.0075)	0.0254[a] (0.0072)	5.23	0.0439[a] (0.0083)	0.0425[a] (0.0077)	4.24
DR_14 Is the man's maltreatment of his wife (beating. insulting, etc.) a definite reason for divorce on its own? (Reference: No)						
Yes:1	0.0221[b] (0.0074)	0.0218[b] (0.0072)	5.27	0.0515[a] (0.0089)	0.0494[a] (0.0082)	4.32
DR_17 Is the woman's absence of children a definite reason for divorce? (Reference: No)						
Yes:1	0.0354[a] (0.0093)	0.0366[a] (0.0098)	5.64	0.0164[b] (0.0080)	0.0166[b] (0.0082)	5.76
DR_18 Is the man's absence of children a definite reason for divorce? (Reference: No)						
Yes:1	0.0319[b] (0.0096)	0.0328[b] (0.0102)	5.63	0.0227[b] (0.0081)	0.0231[b] (0.0083)	5.74
DR_20 Is the man's bad habits, such as drinking and gambling, a definite reason for divorce? (Reference: No)						
Yes:1	Excluded*	Excluded*	Chi-square p>0.05	0.0189[b] (0.0077)	0.0187[b] (0.0075)	1.22
McKelvey and Zavoina's R^2	0.330	0.290		0.414	0.377	

Notes: The values in parentheses are the standard errors, and the others are dy/dx values in marginal effect analysis. Categories with a VIF coefficient greater than ten were excluded from the analysis and labelled Excluded. As a result of the chi-square test, the DR_20 variable was found to be insignificant for males, so it was excluded from the analysis and labelled as Excluded*. DR stands for the reason for divorce. [a]p<.001; [b]p<.05; [c]>.05

As seen in Table 4, men who agree with the statement "a woman's failure to do housework properly is a definite reason for divorce" are more likely to get divorced than those who disagree. This statement did not have a significant effect on the probability of divorce for women. Both men and women agree with the statement, "Is the man's failure to do housework properly a definite reason for divorce?", "Is the woman's inability to provide for the household economically a definite reason for divorce?", "Is the man's inability to provide for the household economically a definite reason for divorce?" are more likely to divorce than those who disagree. I agreed with the statement, "Is a woman's catching a disease that is difficult to treat a definite reason for divorce?", "Is a man's inability to get

along with his wife's family a definite reason for divorce?" and "Is a woman's inability to get along with her husband's family a definite reason for divorce?" had the highest effects on the probability of divorce for men, respectively, while being agreed with the statement of "Is the man's maltreatment of his wife (beating. insulting etc.) a definite reason for divorce on its own?" had the most negligible impact on the probability of divorce for men. In other words, agreeing with the statement "Is a woman's catching a disease that is difficult to treat a definite reason for divorce?" increased the probability of divorce in men compared to other statements. Similarly, I agree with the statement, "Is a man's catching a disease that is difficult to treat a definite reason for divorce?", "Is a man's inability to get along with his wife's family a definite reason for divorce?" and "Is the man's maltreatment of his wife (beating. insulting, etc.) a definite reason for divorce on their own?" had the highest effects on the probability of divorce for women, respectively, while being agreed with the statement of "Is the woman's absence of children a definite reason for divorce?" had the most negligible impact on the probability of divorce for women. Accordingly, agreeing with the statement, "Is a man's catching a disease that is difficult to treat a definite reason for divorce?" increased the probability of divorce in women compared to other statements.

5. Conclusion and Discussion

Divorce affects the spouses' psychology, daily life, social life, and socioeconomic status. Although it was harder to divorce, especially for women in the past in Türkiye, it has become normalised and more accessible due to several factors such as technological developments, legal developments, active participation of women in business life, increased individualisation, and urbanisation. Preventing divorce, which has heavy psychological effects on spouses and their children, as much as possible can contribute to solving the problem of social disintegration.

Divorce is a problem that closely concerns all members of the family, reaches social dimensions and causes severe psychological, sociological and economic damage. Along with social and economic changes, gender differences are the main factors that increase divorce rates. The distinguishing feature of this study from other studies is to determine the reasons for divorce according to gender differences. In this context, the study aims to determine the factors that are effective on divorce according to gender differences and the effects of these factors on the probability of divorce.

This study used the data of 24,800 individuals who participated in the 2016 Family Structure Survey conducted by TurkStat. Among the respondents, 8.46% of women and 7.58% of men were divorced. The study used binary logit and probit regression analysis methods to determine the socio-demographic and economic factors that affect divorce according to the gender differences of the individuals surveyed.

Both men and women living in the village and those living in the district centre had a lower probability of divorce than those living in the city centre. This result is supported by different studies on many cultures (Gautier et al., 2009; Swenson, 1996; Zhang et al., 2014).

This may be because economic opportunities are more accessible in cities, whereby individuals are more active in working life.

Employment status affects the probability of divorce differently in men and women. Unemployed men were more likely to get divorced than others, whereas unemployed women had a lower probability of divorce. Economic explanations for divorce are closely related to the cultural values of the study sample (Kalmijn et al., 2004). Therefore, this result may be because men are responsible for earning a living for their families in the Turkish family structure. The participation rate of women in active working life is even less than half that of men (TÜİK, 2018). Unemployed women depend more on their husbands due to their poor economic status. Notably, the probability of divorce decreases in men as their income increases, while it increases in women as their income rises. Thus, this result supports our previous results, suggesting that women with economic freedom are more likely to divorce. Some studies have equivalent results (Killewald, 2016; Mansour et al., 2020).

Our study found that early marriage increased the probability of divorce for both men and women. However, a first marriage age of 18 years and over also increased the likelihood of divorce in women. There are studies with equivalent results regarding the effect of early marriage on divorce in women (Lowenstein, 2005; Widyastari, 2020). Gentleman and Park (1994) examined the age difference between spouses and found that the probability of divorce decreased when the husband was older and increased when the wife was older. Our study considered the age difference in absolute value. However, our result suggests that the probability of divorce increased as the age difference increased for women, which is consistent with those introduced by Gentleman and Park (1994).

The divorce probability decreased for both women and men as the marriage duration increased. According to the TUIK (TÜİK, 2020; 2021; 2022), more than half of the divorces in Türkiye in 2019, 2020 and 2021 were realised within the first ten years of marriage. The United States Census Bureau reported a similar result for the USA (Kreider, 2005).

Alcohol use increased the probability of divorce in both men and women. Studies in the literature support this result (Caces et al., 1999; Can & Aksu, 2016; Salvatore et al., 2017). Excessive use of alcohol harms not only oneself but also one's family structure and members. Erdim (2019) has argued that an alcoholic spouse causes psychiatric problems in family members, leading to divorce and several negative effects on children. Therefore, controlling alcohol use can be an important effort to prevent divorce.

As a result of the analysis, it was concluded that the variable of women's inability to do housework has a significant effect on the probability of divorce for men, but it does not have a substantial effect on women. On the other hand, men's not doing housework has a significant impact on the probability of divorce for both men and women. Some studies report that housework is distributed more equally between spouses in cultures where access to divorce is easier (Cooke, 2006; Ruppanner, 2012; Yodanis, 2005). Therefore, Turkish

women expect their husbands to fulfil their housework duties, even if they cannot be impartial about their share of housework.

According to the research results, the probability of divorce was higher in men who had only religious marriages, met their spouses through the Internet or dating agencies, and had the longest marriage between 0-12 years. In addition, the fact that the spouse suffered from a severe illness and that the husband could not establish good relations with his own family in terms of communication were among the factors that had the highest impact on the probability of divorce for men. On the other hand, it was determined that women who had only religious marriages, whose marriage duration was between 0-12 years and who were unhappy individually were more likely to divorce. In addition, the fact that the husband suffered from a severe illness, that he could not establish good relations with his own family in terms of communication and that the husband mistreated his wife (beating, insult) were found to be the most critical determinants of the probability of divorce for women.

As a result of the research, it has been revealed that the statement of not being able to provide for the household has a significant effect on the probability of divorce for both women and men. However, it was determined that men had a slightly higher effect on the likelihood of divorce than women.

Another finding obtained as a result of the research is that the spouse's having a difficult-to-treat illness is a factor that has the most significant effect on the probability of divorce for both men and women. Glantz et al. (2009) and Karraker & Latham (2015) explained that the risk of having a severe illness of the spouse has a significant effect on the probability of divorce, which is in line with this finding of the study.

All variables that increased the probability of divorce for women were related to men. However, some variables that increased this probability for men were related to both men and women. In other words, while women hold their husbands responsible for the most influential factors leading to divorce, men stated that they were also responsible for these factors related to divorce.

According to the findings of the study, it was understood that the factors affecting the probability of divorce of men and women differed according to gender. In this context, individuals need to get to know each other and their families before marriage to prevent divorces that increase the social structure of society. In addition, it is evaluated that directing and supporting individuals to practices that provide family counselling and family therapy services to solve problems occurring in the family can play a decisive role in reducing divorces. Another suggestion to prevent divorces is that civil marriage can be an important deterrent factor in divorces as it protects the rights of spouses before the law.

The results of this study will allow policy developers to improve and maintain the family structure. Our study contributed to the literature by determining the variables that increase divorce through statistical methods. For future studies, examining the subject in

samples from different countries and comparing the cultural reasons for divorce is recommended.

References

Aktaş, Ç. (2018), "Boşanmanın erkekler üzerindeki etkisi: İstanbul örneği", *İmgelem*, 2(2), 29-57.

Aktaş, G. & D. Uray (2021), "Erkeklerin Boşanma Sürecine İlişkin Deneyimleri: Denizli'de Nitel Bir Çalışma", *Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 45(2), 1-28.

Alkan, Ö. & A. Demir (2019), "Tütün kullanımını bırakma başarısını etkileyen faktörlerin lojistik regresyon ile analizi", *Atatürk Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, 33(4), 1227-1244.

Alkan, Ö. & H. Abar (2020), "Determination of factors influencing tobacco consumption in Turkey using categorical data analyses", *Archives of Environmental & Occupational Health*, 75(1), 27-35.

Alkan, Ö. (2017), "Türkiye'de gençlerin tütün kullanımında cinsiyet farklılıklarının araştırılması", *Bağımlılık Dergisi*, 18(2), 35-45.

Alpar, R. (2011), *Uygulamalı Çok Değişkenli İstatistiksel Yöntemler*, Detay Yayıncılık, Ankara.

Altıntaş, F.F. (2021), "Müşteri Memnuniyeti ve Beklentisi İlişkisi: Probit Regresyon Analizi ile Bir Uygulama", *Journal of Academic Social Science Studies*, 14(84), 439-455.

Altun, B.N.İ. et al. (2020), "Boşanma Nedenlerinin İletişim Bağlamında Değerlendirilmesi Üzerine Ampirik Bir Çalışma", *Kocaeli Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi Araştırma Dergisi*, (15), 116-139.

Arpacı, F. & Ş. Tokyürek (2012), "Boşanmış Bireylerin Yeniden Evlilik Konusundaki Görüşlerinin İncelenmesi", *Akademik Bakış Dergisi*, 31, 1-15.

Caces, M.F. et al. (1999), "Alcohol consumption and divorce rates in the United States", *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 60(5), 647-652.

Can, Y. & N.B. Aksu (2016), "Woman during the divorce process and after", *Electronic Journal of Social Sciences*, 15(58), 888-902.

Çavlin, A. (2014), "Türkiye'de Boşanma", in: M. Turğut & S. Feyzioğlu (eds.), *Türk Aile Yapısı Araştırması Tespitler Öneriler* (196-207), T.C. Aile ve Sosyal Politikalar Bakanlığı Aile ve Toplum Hizmetleri Genel Müdürlüğü.

Çiçek, Z. & N.B. Arli (2021), "Probit Model Yaklaşımı ile Kayıt Dışı İstihdamı Etkileyen Faktörlerin Belirlenmesi", *Çankırı Karatekin Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 11(2), 649-671.

Çokluk, Ö. et al. (2012), *Sosyal Bilimler İçin Çok Değişkenli İstatistik: SPSS ve LISREL Uygulamaları*, (Vol. 2), Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Cooke, L. (2006), "'Doing' gender in context: Household bargaining and risk of divorce in Germany and the United States", *American Journal of Sociology*, 112(2), 442-472.

Crowley, J.E. (2019), "Once bitten, twice shy? Gender differences in the remarriage decision after a gray divorce", *Sociological Inquiry*, 89(1), 150-176.

Elmas, Ç. & N. Adak (2023), "Türkiye'de Boşanma Nedenlerinin Toplumsal Kökenleri ve Boşanma Sonrası Deneyimler", *İstanbul University Journal of Sociology*, 43(1), 84-97.

Erdim, L. (2019), "The impact of alcoholism on family and children", *Journal of Health Sciences and Professions*, 6(1), 193-200.

Gautier, P.A. et al. (2009), "Sin City? Why is the divorce rate higher in urban areas?", *Scandinavian Journal of Economics*, 111(3), 439-456.

Gavcar, E. et al. (2020), "Boşanmayı Etkileyen Faktörlerin Belirlenmesine Yönelik Bir Araştırma (Muğla İli Fethiye İlçesi Örneği)", *Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli Üniversitesi SBE Dergisi*, 10(2), 730-745.

Gentleman, J.F. & E. Park (1994), "Age differences of married and divorcing couples", *Health Reports*, 6(2), 225-240.

Glantz, M.J. et al. (2009), "Gender disparity in the rate of partner abandonment in patients with serious medical illness", *Cancer*, 115(22), 5237-5242.

Gökmen, Ş. et al. (2019), "İlk evlilik süresini etkileyen faktörlerin yaşam analizi: Türkiye Örneği", *Optimum Ekonomi ve Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 6(1), 63-76.

Gujarati, N.D. & D.C. Porter (2009), *Temel Ekonometri*, (Çev. Ü. Şenesen & G. Günlük-Şenesen), İstanbul: Literatür Yayıncılık.

Güven, N. & A. Köroğlu (2023), "Boşanma Nedenleri ve Boşanma Sonrası Psikososyal Uyum: Trabzon İli Örneği", *Ordu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Sosyal Bilimler Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 13(Sosyal Bilimler Lisansüstü Öğrenci Sempozyumu Özel Sayısı), 1-24.

Hosmer, D.W. Jr. et al. (2013), *Applied Logistic Regression*, Vol 398, Wiley, New York.

Kalaycı, Ş. (2010), *SPSS Uygulamalı Çok Değişkenli Istatistik Teknikleri*, Ankara, Türkiye: Asil Yayın Dağıtım.

Kalmijn, M. et al. (2004), "Interactions between cultural and economic determinants of divorce in the Netherlands", *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66(1), 75-89.

Karraker, A. & K. Latham (2015), "In sickness and in health? Physical illness as a risk factor for marital dissolution in later life", *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 56(3), 420-435.

Kaya, K. & G.T. Eren (2020), "Boşanma ve Erken Boşanmaların Artış Nedenleri", *Sosyal, Beşeri ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, 3(9), 708-728.

Killewald, A. (2016), "Money, work, and marital stability: Assessing change in the gendered determinants of divorce", *American Sociological Review*, 81(4), 696-719.

Kreider, R.M. (2005), *Number, Timing, and Duration of Marriages and Divorces: 2001*, Household Economic Studies, U.S. Census Bureau.

Kucur, F. & Ö. Kelebek (2021), "The stages of divorce and difficulties experienced by divorced women: an Esenler SHM example", *Journal of Social Policy Conferences*, 80, 231-266.

Kutlar, A. et al. (2012), "Kadınların İşgücüne Katılması ile Doğurganlık, Boşanma ve Ücret Haddi Arasındaki İlişki: Türkiye Üzerine Bir Araştırma", *Bilgi Ekonomisi ve Yönetimi Dergisi*, 7(1), 149-168.

Lowenstein, L.F. (2005), "Causes and associated features of divorce as seen by recent research", *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*, 42(3-4), 153-171.

Mansour, S. et al. (2020), "The effects of sociodemographic characteristics on divorce rates in Oman: Spatial modeling of marital separations", *The Professional Geographer*, 72(3), 332-347.

O'Connell, A.A. (2006), *Logistic Regression Models for Ordinal Response Variables*, Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks, CA, USA.

Özer, H. et al. (2006), "Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Cep Telefonu Hat Tercih Olasılığının Belirlenmesi: Atatürk Üniversitesi Örneği", *Gazi Üniversitesi İİBF Dergisi*, 7(2), 39-52.

Ruppanner, L. (2012), "Housework conflict and divorce: A multi-level analysis", *Work, Employment and Society*, 26(4), 638-656.

Salvatore, J.E. et al. (2017), "Alcohol use disorder and divorce: evidence for a genetic correlation in a population-based Swedish sample", *Addiction*, 112(4), 586-593.

Sevim, Y. et al. (2016), "Boşanan Erkeklerin Sorunları Üzerine Sosyolojik Bir Araştırma (Elazığ İli Örneği)", *Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 26(2), 293-312.

Sütçü, S. & V. Duyan (2021), *Aile İçi Şiddet ve Boşanma Davalarının Görünmeyen Mağdurları: Çocuk Tanıklar*, İstanbul; Türkiye: Efeakademi.

Swenson, D. (1996), "A logit model of the probability of divorce", *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*, 25(1-2), 173-194.

Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu (2017), *Aile Yapısı Araştırması: 2016*, <https://data.tuik.gov.tr/Bulten/Index?p=aile-yapisi-arastirmasi-2016-21869&dil=1>, 29.12.2022.

Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu (2018), *İstatistiklerle Kadın: 2017*, <https://data.tuik.gov.tr/>, 29.12.2022.

Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu (2020), *Evlenme ve Boşanma İstatistikleri: 2019*, <https://data.tuik.gov.tr/Bulten/Index?p=Evlenme-ve-Bosanma-Istatistikleri-2019-33708>, 29.12.2022.

Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu (2021), *Evlenme ve Boşanma İstatistikleri: 2020*, <https://data.tuik.gov.tr/Bulten/Index?p=Evlenme-ve-Bosanma-Istatistikleri-2020-37211>, 29.12.2022.

Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu (2022), *Evlenme ve Boşanma İstatistikleri: 2021*, <https://data.tuik.gov.tr/Bulten/Index?p=Evlenme-ve-Bosanma-Istatistikleri-2021-45568>, 29.12.2022.

Uğur, S.B. (2014), "Günümüzde kadının boşanma deneyimleri: akademisyen kadınlar üzerine bir araştırma", *Mediterranean Journal of Humanities*, 4(2), 293-326.

Widyastari, D.A. et al. (2020), "Marital Dissolution in Postmodern Java, Indonesia: Does Early Marriage Increase the Likelihood to Divorce?", *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*, 61(8), 556-573.

Yodanis, C. (2005), "Divorce culture and marital gender equality: A cross-national study", *Gender & Society*, 19(5), 644-659.

Zhang, C. et al. (2014), "Urbanization, unemployment rate and China's rising divorce rate", *Chinese Journal of Population Resources and Environment*, 12(2), 157-164.