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**Abstract:**

You probably know someone who has been tackled by divorce, and know most of the time it brings a lot of adverse effects with it. Issues around rights over children, money, and mental health are some of the popular ones. What if divorce can be predicted and evitable if dealt with the correct issues? In this paper, we will try to predict if couples are divorced using different machine learning methods. We will use a dataset with different questions for couples that were answered using a scale from 0-4, 0 being not applicable and 4 being applicable. We will try categorizing the questions into groups, finding the most important variables, and using all variables on their own so we can find out what method results in the highest accuracy and predictability of divorce.
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# Introduction

The research question for our paper is: How strongly do different answers to questions about values in marriage forecast divorces? This question was a result of two questions we would like to have answered. These are: 1. What is the predictive power of machine learning models when predicting divorce? And 2. What are the most important factors that drive divorce? These are the questions that we are going to find out, and the research question is allowing us to test and try to find the answers. Our goal is to provide these insights to couples considering marriage. By reflecting on the questions and ideally reaching a mutual understanding before getting married, couples may reduce the risk of divorce and increase the likelihood of a happier marriage.

In our analysis, we identified the three most important variables in our dataset, which correspond to the following questions. We employed four different machine learning models to evaluate the importance of these variables, including Random Forest, Bagging, Lasso, and Ridge regression. The variables we highlighted are those that ranked the highest overall across all models in the importance plots.

# Data

The dataset used in this paper is the divorce\_data dataset from Kaggle.com. It consists of 54 questions, ranging from “If one of us apologizes when our discussion deteriorates, the discussion ends” to “I'm not afraid to tell my spouse about their incompetence.” Each question is answered with a number from 0 to 4, where 0 indicates that the statement is not valid for the couple and 4 indicates that it is very true. In addition to the 54 questions, there is a 55th question that indicates whether the couple is divorced (1) or not (0). The questions were answered by 170 different couples, of which 84 were divorced (1) and 86 (0).

# Descriptive Analyses

Initially, we began by cleaning the data. This was not a significant task, as the dataset was fairly clear and contained few, if any, missing values. Some variables had backticks in their names, which we had to remove due to problems with the coding. For instance, the variable “I’m\_right” became “I\_am\_right”. This solved the coding errors that occurred when working with these variables. At last, we ensured that the 55th question was formatted as binary to facilitate our analysis.

Next, we experimented with different methods to determine which yielded the highest predictability regarding divorce. We divided the questions into three distinct groups: Communication\_data, Value\_alignment\_data, and Knowledge\_of\_spouse\_data. Communication\_data included questions about communication skills, Value\_alignment\_data focused on whether the life values of the couples were aligned, and Knowledge\_of\_spouse\_data contained questions about the couples' understanding of each other.

However, we quickly realized that splitting the questions into three groups did not effectively address our research question or help us identify the most significant variables. As a result, we decided to abandon this grouping method and proceed with alternative machine learning techniques. These were Random Forest, Bagging, Lasso, and Ridge.

To start testing these techniques, we decided to remove 20% of the 170 rows of data. The 20% consisting of 34 rows became the dataset “unseen\_data”, and the remaining 80% consisting of 136 rows became the dataset “seen\_data”. The seen\_data became our testing data for the 4 named models. The internet and different AI tools suggested that we split the 80% again in 80/20% to test for Random Forest and Bagging. We deliberately choose not to do this since our dataset is fairly small, and this might change some of the predictive power of our models.

# Empirical Approach

[Explain the empirical approach of your project – how this should look like strongly depends on your specific type of project]

# Results

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Random Forest | Bagging | Lasso | Ridge |
| Accuracy | 100% 95% CI : (0.8972, 1) | 100% 95% CI : (0.8972, 1) |  |  |
| (Important variable of mean decrease accuracy) 1 | Humiliate | Anxieties |  |  |
| 2 | Anxieties | Humiliate |  |  |
| 3 | Marriage | Marriage |  |  |
| 4 | Sudden\_discussion | Harmony |  |  |
| 5 | Trust | Idk\_what\_is\_going\_on |  |  |
| 6 | Idk\_what\_is\_going\_ on | Hopes\_wishes |  |  |
| 7 | Harmony | Sudden\_discussion |  |  |
| 8 | Roles | Roles |  |  |
| 9 | Enjoy\_travel | Happy |  |  |
| 10 | Happy | Enjoy\_travel |  |  |

The results of the random forest model had a predictive power of 100%. This is great, but it might have some underlying reasons. The dataset is relatively small, so the predictive power might not be the same on a bigger dataset. It is possible a result of overfitting, which is why we added Lasso to our model choices. The random forest model's confusion matrix resulted in 21 true negatives and 13 true positives from the unseen dataset. It also showed a Kappa score of 1, which means perfect agreement between prediction and reality.  
The results of the bagging model also had a predictive power of 100%, possibly due to the same reasons as the random forest model. The bagging model’s confusion matrix resulted in 21 true negatives and 13 true positives from the unseen dataset. Same as the random forest model, it showed us a Kappa score of exactly 1.

Comparing the random forest and bagging models, they are identical to each other. This is not that surprising since they almost work the same way. Although this is the case, the importance plots showed different results, as shown in the table above. The overlapping variables from these two models in importance order are: “Humiliate”, “Anxieties”, “Marriage”, “Harmony”, “Sudden\_discussion”, “Idk\_what\_is\_going\_on”, “Roles”, “Enjoy\_travel” and “Happy”. The random forest model also showed “Trust” and the bagging model “Hopes\_wishes”.

The questions that come with these overlapping variables from the random forest and bagging model are (in the same order as given above):

* I can be humiliating when we discussions.
* I know my spouse's basic anxieties.
* My spouse and I have similar ideas about how marriage should be.
* I think that one day in the future, when I look back, I see that my spouse and I have been in harmony with each other.
* Our discussions often occur suddenly.
* We're just starting a discussion before I know what's going on.
* My spouse and I have similar ideas about how roles should be in marriage.
* I enjoy traveling with my wife.
* We share the same views about being happy in our life with my spouse.

# Conclusion

Although we have to keep in mind that our dataset is small and the models might not work as well on bigger datasets, we can conclude that our machine learning models are giving a great prediction on divorce. Random Forest and bagging scored a 100% accuracy on the unseen data, which indicates great predictive power. The overlapping variables with the associated questions are an indicator of what should be discussed before marriage to reduce the chances of getting divorced.

To come back to our research question: How strongly do different answers to questions about values in marriage forecast divorces?, we can see that those answers to the questions have a huge impact on forecasting divorce since the accuracy of the models is extremely high. This is a result of the fact that the scores of both the random forest and bagging models were 100%. Our research shows that chances of divorce can be lowered if the right questions are asked. This can contribute to a lower divorce rate around the world if the research is applied to a larger scaled data set. Our suggestion focuses mainly on new couples to think about these questions before getting into marriage and the already married couples to rethink their choices.

The main question we have left after the research we conducted is what would have happened to the predictive power if we had a dataset that was so much larger than the 170 rows we have right now. If further projects allow us to dive deeper into this issue, it would be an extremely interesting topic.
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