Supplementary Tables for

Rosenfeld, Michael J. 2014. "Couple Longevity in the Era of Same-Sex Marriage in the US." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 76:905-918.

Date: 10/5/2014

Table S4 added 2/18/2015

Supplementary Table S1, compare to Table 2 in the paper: Predicting Break-up in HCMST, Coefficients (and standard errors) from WEIGHTED Discrete Time Event History Logistic Regressions, with robust standard errors [weighted by the "base_weight"]

	M1	M2	M3	M4	M5	M6	M7
Couple Type (ref: Heterosexuals)							
Same-Sex Couples	0.45 (0.30)	-0.65* (0.32)	0.18 (0.32)	0.23 (0.34)	0.076 (0.29)	0.17 (0.28)	
Gay Male Couples							-0.25 (0.33)
Lesbian Couples							0.57 (0.30)
Married (or marriage-like)		-2.79*** (0.16)	-1.19*** (0.23)	-1.15*** (0.25)	-1.22*** (0.21)	-1.14*** (0.22)	-1.14*** (0.22)
Married× same-sex				-0.24 (0.41)			
Coresident			-1.61*** (0.22)	-1.62*** (0.23)	-1.41*** (0.20)	-1.39*** (0.20)	-1.42*** (0.22)
Relationship Duration, years			-0.034*** (0.010)	-0.035*** (0.009)	-0.039*** (0.010)	-0.042*** (0.011)	-0.042*** (0.011)
Relationship Duration ^(-1/2)			0.52*** (0.15)	0.52*** (0.15)	0.56*** (0.15)	0.56*** (0.14)	0.58*** (0.14)
Relationship Quality at Wave 1 (5 pt scale, 5 is best)					-0.77*** (0.08)	-0.74*** (0.09)	-0.74*** (0.09)
hetero couple, unmarried, together >17 yrs						0.32 (0.44)	0.30 (0.44)
ln of household income						-0.14 (0.09)	-0.13 (0.09)
Recsource (3 df)	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Additional non-significant predictors of stability (11 df)	no	no	no	no	no	yes	yes
N of person years	8043	8043	8043	8043	8043	8043	8043
df	4	5	8	9	9	22	23
Pseudo R-square	0.013	0.20	0.28	0.32	0.32	0.33	0.33

Source: How Couples Meet and Stay Together, waves 1, 2, and 3..* P<0.05; ** P<0.01; *** P<0.001, two tailed tests. "Married" means "Married or in Marriage-Like commitment." Models include 8,043 out of a possible8,172 person-years (remainder dropped using listwise deletion for missing values for any variable in the full model). The "additional potential predictors of couple stability" were all not significant in the final model, and include: respondent has college degree, respondent lives with minor children, respondent's relationship with partner started when respondent was a teenager, respondent and partner are an interracial couple, respondent and partner have equal earnings, respondent race (4 df) and parental approval (2 df). Weighted by "basewt" and with variable "recsource" to indicate and control for oversampling.

Supplementary Table S2, compare to Table 2 in the paper: Predicting Break-up in HCMST, Coefficients (and standard errors) from WEIGHTED Discrete Time Event History Logistic Regressions, with robust standard errors [weighted by "weight2"]

	M1	M2	M3	M4	M5	M6	M7
Couple Type (ref: Heterosexuals)							
Same-Sex Couples	0.94*** (0.22)	-0.095 (0.22)	0.48* (0.24)	0.53 (0.28)	0.43 (0.23)	0.46 (0.24)	
Gay Male Couples							0.09 (0.36)
Lesbian Couples							0.84** (0.30)
Married (or marriage-like)		-3.04*** (0.16)	-1.65*** (0.25)	-1.64*** (0.26)	-1.59*** (0.24)	-1.46*** (0.25)	-1.46*** (0.25)
Married× same-sex				-0.40 (0.50)			
Coresident			-1.33*** (0.22)	-1.34*** (0.23)	-1.24*** (0.20)	-1.22*** (0.21)	-1.23*** (0.21)
Relationship Duration, years			-0.036** (0.012)	-0.036** (0.012)	-0.041** (0.013)	-0.045*** (0.013)	-0.045*** (0.013)
Relationship Duration ^(-1/2)			0.43*** (0.13)	0.43*** (0.13)	0.45*** (0.13)	0.45*** (0.12)	0.45*** (0.12)
Relationship Quality at Wave 1 (5 pt scale, 5 is best)					-0.74*** (0.09)	-0.70*** (0.10)	-0.70*** (0.10)
hetero couple, unmarried, together >17 yrs						0.31 (0.46)	0.31 (0.46)
ln of household income						-0.07 (0.11)	-0.07 (0.10)
Additional non-significant predictors of couple stability (11 df)	no	no	no	no	no	yes	yes
N of person years	8043	8043	8043	8043	8043	8043	8043
df	1	2	5	6	6	19	20
Pseudo R-square	0.003	0.235	0.295	0.295	0.328	0.338	0.338

Source: How Couples Meet and Stay Together, waves 1, 2, and 3..* P<0.05; ** P<0.01; *** P<0.001, two tailed tests. "Married" means "Married or in Marriage-Like commitment." Models include 8,043 out of a possible8,172 person-years (remainder dropped using listwise deletion for missing values for any variable in the full model). The "additional potential predictors of couple stability" were all not significant in the final model, and include: respondent has college degree, respondent lives with minor children, respondent's relationship with partner started when respondent was a teenager, respondent and partner are an interracial couple, respondent and partner have equal earnings, respondent race (4 df) and parental approval (2 df). Weighted by Weight2.

Supplementary Table S3, Replication of Table 2, Model 5 (unweighted) from the paper, logistic regressions predicting break-up, with and without Heckman selection term; Heckman selection control leads to no substantive difference in the model.

	M5	M5+ selection correction
Same-Sex Couples (ref: heterosexuals)	0.18 (0.22)	0.20 (0.22)
Married (or marriage-like)	-1.23*** (0.16)	-1.23*** (0.16)
Coresident	-1.53*** (0.14)	-1.54*** (0.14)
Relationship Duration, years	-0.029*** (0.009)	-0.028*** (0.009)
Relationship Duration ^(-1/2)	0.59*** (0.10)	0.58*** (0.10)
Relationship Quality at Wave 1 (5 pt scale, 5 is best)	-0.74*** (0.07)	-0.74*** (0.07)
Heckman Selection Correction term (inverse mills ratio)		-0.73* (0.30)
Additional Factors that predict individual weights (7df)	yes	yes
N of person years	8043	8043
df (including additional factors that predict the weights)	13	14
LR Chisquare (compared to constant only)	1091.8	1098.2

Source: How Couples Meet and Stay Together, waves 1-4

* P<0.05; ** P<0.01; *** P<0.001, two tailed tests. “Married” means “Married or in Marriage-Like commitment.” Additional factors that predict weight are: respondent age, age squared, living in metropolitan area, having own Internet access at home, and recruitment source from Wave 1. The main predictor of the Heckman selection term is panel status at each wave, that is whether the subject was an active KN/GfK panelist (and could therefore be reached online), or whether the subject had withdrawn or retired from the panel.

Supplementary Table S4: Replication of Table 2, Model 5 (unweighted), discrete time logistic regressions predicting break-up based on a couple-year dataset, compared to discrete time and cox proportional hazard models based on a couple-month version of the data (with months imputed for some transitions)

	couple years, logistic regression same as JMF Table 2 model 5 M5	couple months, Cox proportional hazards model	couple months, logistic regression
Same-Sex Couples (ref: heterosexuals)	0.18 (0.22)	0.10 (0.18)	0.14 (0.18)
Married (or marriage-like)	-1.23*** (0.16)	-1.05*** (0.15)	-1.07*** (0.15)
Coresident	-1.53*** (0.14)	-1.24*** (0.13)	-1.27*** (0.13)
Relationship Duration, years	-0.029*** (0.009)	-0.028*** (0.0077)	-0.028*** (0.0077)
Relationship Duration ^(-1/2)	0.59*** (0.10)	0.53*** (0.11)	0.60*** (0.097)
Relationship Quality at Wave 1 (5 pt scale, 5 is best)	-0.74*** (0.07)	-0.65*** (0.054)	-0.67*** (0.055)
Additional Factors that predict individual weights (7df)	yes	yes	yes
N of couple- years	8043		
N of couple- months		95,547	95,547
df (including additional factors that predict the weights)	13	13	13
LR Chisquare (compared to constant only)	1091.8	931.4	1046.15

Source: How Couples Meet and Stay Together, waves 1-4

* P<0.05; ** P<0.01; *** P<0.001, two tailed tests. “Married” means “Married or in Marriage-Like commitment.” Additional factors that predict weight are: respondent age, age squared, living in metropolitan area, having own Internet access at home, and recruitment source from Wave 1.