

## **When couples part: understanding the consequences for adults and children**

### **Foreword**

Many people hold strong views about marriage and divorce based on religious beliefs or ideology, but One Plus One sought, instead, to approach the topic of the effects of couple relationship breakdown on the basis of a dispassionate, thoughtful, critical assessment of the evidence. We are delighted, therefore, to publish this excellent review, which does just that. The aim was not a technical treatise, but rather a readable account that would be accessible to a wide audience. It is scholarly, however, in the important sense of being firmly based on research evidence and sensitive to the crucial methodological considerations.

The enduring importance of the topic reflects the fact that humans are social beings; committed partnerships are an intrinsic part of human functioning and breakdown in those partnerships constitutes a major source of stress throughout the whole of the life span. The contemporary relevance is underlined by the declining rate of marriage, the widening range of other forms of couple relationships, and the very high rate of couple relationship breakdown. The prime focus is on the psychological and physical consequences of relationship breakdown for the two adults concerned and for their children. The key questions concern the frequency, severity, pattern and duration of adverse effects. To what extent are these universal and inevitable and to what extent do people vary in the extent to which they are affected? The focus on the couple and their children does not imply a lack of concern for the others involved. Thus, grandparents are also very much part of the situation, both as possible buffers and supports and as fellow sufferers, but they are largely outside the scope of this review.

On the face of it, the questions seem deceptively simple. Surely, it is just a matter of quantifying the various outcomes following couple relationship breakdown? Unfortunately, that is not so. To begin with, associations cannot be assumed to reflect causal influences. For example, might the apparent ill-effects of the breakdown really be a function of the sorts of people who have fragile relationships? Alternatively, might the supposed effects be a consequence of associated features (such as conflict and discord) rather than the breakdown as such? Even more basically, could the assessment of consequences reflect biases in measurement? Although longitudinal studies on their own do not solve the problem of causal

inference, nevertheless they are much more powerful than cross-sectional studies. Accordingly, the review places most weight on longitudinal studies spanning the period before and after the relationship breakdown.

The review notes the substantial associations between relationship breakdown and worsening of physical and psychological health – especially in the early years after the relationship breakdown. It is noted that the finding of the overall better health of the married (as compared with the divorced or single) is dependent on the marriage relationship being of high quality. In other words, there is much to be said for interventions that can improve couple relationships sufficiently to prevent breakdown. On the other hand, maintaining a hostile, unloving, relationship ‘for the sake of the children’ is not usually a good solution.

Adverse effects on the children are well documented but there are similar questions about whether the main risk stems from the stresses of the breakdown or from the multiple associated adversities. It is clear that conflict is a key issue but it reflects a process that usually begins before the breakdown and, all too often, continues long after the breakdown. But, importantly, it seems that it is not so much conflict as such that is harmful, but how it is dealt with.

Does the major increase over time in the rate of divorce mean that the ill-effects are less now that couple relationship breakdown is so common? The finding that the adverse effects seem as marked as ever suggests that the risks stem, not from the atypicality, but rather from other key features of the family situation. It is noteworthy, too, that the risks for the children seem to be greater when there are multiple experiences of parental relationship breakdown.

Despite the evidence that ill-effects for both the adults and the children of couple relationship breakdown are common and substantial, the findings also show the marked heterogeneity in people’s responses. That raises the critical question of what are the moderating factors? The evidence is not as decisive as we would like but the suggestion is that aspects of the parent-child relationship are operative as one of multiple moderators. As researchers have long noted, the relationship between any pair of individuals in a family is likely to involve repercussions for others in the family groups.

In seeking to understand the processes involved, it is essential to determine what sorts of people, from what sorts of background, in what sorts of social circumstances are likely to suffer a breakdown in a hitherto committed relationship? Findings indicate that both an unusually early age at marriage (or cohabitation leading to children being born), and coming from a family in which the individual's parents' marriage broke down, are relevant. In addition, however, it cannot be assumed that either cohabitations or marriage have the same meaning, or carry the same expectations, as in previous generations.

The review seeks to bring together the implications for interventions both with respect to the couple relationship and the parent-child relationships – recognising the importance of connections between the two. In addition, attention needs to be paid to poverty and disadvantage as factors predisposing to breakdown and as moderators of the effects of breakdown.

The report does not provide, nor could it provide, a simple remedy for all the problems, but what it does do is provide the evidence and the concepts that need to be considered when dealing with policy and practice. Furthermore, it provides good guides on what might be done to alleviate the problems. It makes for a thought-provoking, as well as helpful, read.

**Michael Rutter, Professor of Developmental Psychopathology at the Institute of Psychiatry, Trustee of One Plus One and chair of its Research Committee.**

# When couples part: understanding the consequences for adults and children

## INTRODUCTION

From a review of the international literature, this summary provides an understanding into the consequences of couple relationship breakdown for adults and children. The full review, available from [www.oneplusone.org.uk](http://www.oneplusone.org.uk), outlines the consequences on the physical and psychological health and well-being of adults and children, includes recent statistical data on couple relationships, and outlines factors that need to be considered when estimating the economic costs associated with couple relationship breakdown. The review also addresses the dilemmas in interpreting the data (e.g. attributing outcomes that are an effect rather than a cause of the relationship breakdown), details factors that are associated with an increased likelihood of relationship breakdown, explores the theoretical and empirical mechanisms seeking to explain the consequences of relationship breakdown, and outlines why some people fare worse than others when couples part. The latter is especially relevant when understanding how to protect and improve outcomes for adults and children when breakdown occurs. By providing such an understanding, this review will be relevant for a broad audience to include researchers, policy-makers, practitioners and students working in the field of parenting, families and couple relationships.

Couple relationship breakdown is more frequent in today's society. It is estimated that 45% of marriages will end in divorce.<sup>1</sup> Alongside declining rates of marriage and more recent reductions in divorce,<sup>2,3</sup> the married population are arguably becoming more homogenous than ever.<sup>4</sup> This review includes the breakdown of a range of couple relationship statuses (where possible), and thus reflects the changes in relationship formation that have been evident over the last 40 years or so. Recent increases in the numbers of people cohabiting,<sup>5</sup> relationships described as 'closely involved',<sup>6</sup> and children raised by 'single-parent' families<sup>7,8</sup> support these trends. This increased fragility and diversity of family forms, in tandem with a growing political interest,<sup>9-17</sup> illustrates the timely production of this review.

This review is underpinned by recognising that strengthening couple relationships has profound benefits for adult and child well-being, as well as improved parenting.<sup>4,18-22</sup> In acknowledging the detrimental effects of relationship breakdown, this review is able to provide support for developments in policy and practice that can either help prevent relationship breakdown (where appropriate) or minimise the negative effects on adults and children when the relationship is irretrievable. It is important to emphasise that there is convincing evidence that some relationships can be repaired, improved and prevented from breaking down.<sup>22-28</sup>

The primary focus of this review is on assessing the impacts of couple relationship breakdown on the physical and psychological health of adults and children. Although reference to relationship conflict and relationship support interventions are made, for more comprehensive reviews in these two areas readers are referred to studies cited in the main body of the report.<sup>19,29</sup>

Presenting the evidence from this review has involved a number of complex issues. One central to this study has been assessing the precise contribution that couple relationship breakdown has on the reported impacts. The key to establishing whether the association between relationship breakdown and outcome is causal, is to assess the extent to which 'selection' effects are occurring. Selection bias occurs when

comparing samples (e.g. married and divorced) that differ in a number of ways (e.g. history of mental health problems) such that any reported impacts that are directly attributed to the breakdown are difficult to discern. The possibility of reverse causation, for example alcohol use *causing* relationship breakdown rather than vice versa, and the inability to rule out other influences such as behaviour, genetics and personality, bring further complications. In appreciation of these complexities, priority in this review has been given to prospective longitudinal cohort studies where, essentially, sample members serve as their own control group with the impact of relationship breakdown observed by comparing outcomes pre- and post-breakdown. Reference in the review is also made to the role of multiple measures, innovative designs and statistical advances that can help unravel some of these complex issues and forge conclusions with more certainty over whether relationship breakdown is causally associated with outcomes.<sup>30-32</sup>

## MAIN FINDINGS

The review has generated a great number of insights into the effects of couple relationship breakdown. With Chapters 1 and 2 providing an important context to the report, including the latest statistics on family formation and dissolution, the following presents a synopsis of the headline findings derived from the remaining chapters. The chapter headings are used to guide readers towards more substantive evidence in the full review:

### Adult impacts (Chapters 3 and 4 of main report)

1. There is an unequivocal association between couple relationship breakdown and adult ill-health.<sup>33-50</sup> Mortality statistics for England and Wales (in 2007) show elevated mortality rates for non-married (single, widowed and divorced) males and females, compared to those married, for all age groups between 25 and 64 years. From middle age (late 40's onwards) the single (never married) group show the highest rates of mortality.<sup>51</sup> Evidence of a causal relationship between relationship status and the mortality statistics cannot be confirmed.
2. Overall, the elevation of mortality rates among unmarried groups is greatest among men of all ages.<sup>42,51,52</sup> Office for National Statistics (ONS) data from England and Wales show that, between the ages of 30 and 50, single men have death rates about three times that of married men, and single women have rates about double those of married women.<sup>51</sup> There is also evidence of an 'accumulative effect', with the strength of these mortality associations increasing by number of years non-married.<sup>40</sup>
3. Associations between marital status and general health status and more specific health conditions such as Coronary Heart Disease (CHD) and raised blood pressure are also evident, with more detrimental outcomes among the non-married groups.<sup>33,34,53-65</sup> The same association applies to the greater involvement in health-damaging behaviours.<sup>34,64,66-68</sup> Studies indicate that the emotional and social 'protective effect' of marriage operates over and above selection effects (of people being selected out of marriage due to their poor health status) in explaining these health differences.<sup>34,60</sup>
4. Couple relationship breakdown is associated with poorer adult mental health<sup>69-74</sup>. Some research suggests that these impacts are observed from two years prior to breakdown, with a peak at the time of separation. This is then followed by a drop in psychological strain over the following two years to a lower level than observed *before* the separation (indicating a relief from stress over the longer-term).<sup>69</sup>

However, these findings are not consistent with some research showing poorer mental health outcomes over the long-term following divorce or separation.<sup>70-74</sup> This may be partly due to differences in the ways mental health is measured.

5. In studying couple relationships and health, it is clear that the marriage must be of a high quality to be advantageous.<sup>42,75-84</sup> Indeed, evidence suggests that the health outcomes for some single people may be more positive than those reporting unhappy marriages.<sup>34,81</sup> Therefore, preventing relationships from breaking down (where appropriate) *and* improving relationship satisfaction are both important in maintaining the well-being of adults and children.

### **Child impacts (Chapters 5 and 6 of main report)**

6. Evidence from extensive reviews of other studies has reported strong associations between couple relationship breakdown and poor child outcomes. These include: poverty and socio-economic disadvantage (especially), physical ill-health, psychological ill-health, lower educational achievement, substance misuse and other health-damaging behaviours, and behavioural problems including conduct disorder, anti-social behaviour and crime.<sup>4,21,34,60,73,74,85-110</sup> Longitudinal, cohort studies have shown that these effects may be long-term for some children, and include socio-economic disadvantage in later life, cohabitation or marriage at an early age, teenage pregnancy, and increased risk of their own marital breakdown.<sup>73,92, 95-97,103,107,108,111</sup>
7. These negative impacts of relationship breakdown on children are far from universal.<sup>4,86,89,90,112-114</sup> The majority of children are able to adjust to a changing situation after a period of instability whilst others are less fortunate with negative impacts extending into adulthood.
8. The impact of multiple relationship transitions are particularly detrimental to children.<sup>4,86,87,89-92</sup> Changes in family structure (e.g. from marriage to divorce, to remarriage, involving new half-siblings, etc.) may be more disruptive to children than maintaining a stable family structure, even if that is with a single parent.<sup>4,89</sup> The effects are also considered to be accumulative, with the increased number of transitions leading to more negative consequences for children.<sup>4,87,89-92</sup> Of those experiencing parental separation for the first time, younger children have a greater potential to face multiple transitions (because of their age) compared to older children.
9. Studying the effects of conflict illustrates that couple relationship breakdown should be viewed as a 'process' with events prior, during and after the breakdown affecting the impacts.<sup>21,60,85,87,92,97,115</sup> There is unequivocal evidence highlighting the detrimental impact of adult relationship conflict and distress on children (that may precede a separation as well as continue afterwards).<sup>19,24,86,116-126</sup> However, research also indicates that it is not necessarily whether parents are in conflict that is key, but *how* this conflict occurs and is managed. For example, 'destructive' conflict (e.g. physical violence) can be particularly harmful to children, although 'constructive' conflict (e.g. mild conflict effectively resolved) can be important in children learning how to resolve disputes in an effective manner.<sup>19,125</sup> Similarly, unresolved conflict that involves children as messengers or recipients of negative information is particularly harmful.<sup>4</sup>
10. Paradoxically, divorce following low pre-divorce conflict, compared to high pre-divorce conflict, has been shown to be more detrimental to the health and well-being of children.<sup>97,127,128</sup> This is because low levels of conflict often mean

children have little time to anticipate the relationship breakdown, and may result in some children blaming themselves for the separation. Therefore, even though relationships with least conflict may have a greater chance of reconciliation or a less stressful separation, they may result in more harm for children. Consequently, although interventions need to foster a continued parent-child relationship to alleviate the impact of relationship breakdown, they also need to consider ways in which children perceive and attribute the conflict and breakdown.<sup>129</sup>

11. Although divorce is more common nowadays, there is evidence suggesting that the adverse outcomes for adults and children are still equally apparent.<sup>88,96,130</sup> This contradicts the argument that increasing divorce rates diminish the negative impacts in line with reduced stigma and greater acceptance of relationship breakdown. Furthermore, the difference in adult mortality rates by marital status, in England and Wales, has actually increased since divorce has become more common.<sup>34</sup>

### **Additional issues and explanations (Chapters 7 and 8 of main report)**

12. The dissolution of a relationship results in the loss of the protective benefits from being in a partnership (such as effects on physical and psychological health), as well as in further strains associated with the process of separation. This is illustrated by research showing that never-married women report less detrimental health outcomes in terms of psychological and physical health compared to those who have experienced the stressful events of divorce or separation.<sup>34</sup> However, this does not apply when observing mortality data that show single, never-married people, reporting higher death rates from middle age onwards in comparison to those who were married, divorced or widowed.<sup>34,38,41</sup>
13. There are a number of moderating factors\* that can influence the impact of couple relationship breakdown and explain why, for some, the impacts are worse than for others. For children, these include:<sup>4,60,86,113,131</sup>
  - parenting quality;
  - financial resources;
  - maternal mental health;
  - children's age (older children tend to face more problems adjusting to new family forms than younger children, although for a younger child who cannot recognise the distress, the removal of one parent may cause confusion and anxiety, and lead to self-blaming);
  - sex of child (mixed evidence);
  - pre-divorce conflict (high levels are detrimental to children although low levels may mean children have little time to anticipate the separation);
  - communication between parent and child about the separation;
  - child's relationship and contact with both parents after separation;
  - supportive family members;
  - new family setting after separation;

---

\* Moderating factors affect the direction and/or strength of the relation between, in this instance, relationship breakdown and its impacts. Essentially, they can exacerbate or protect people from the effects of relationship breakdown.

- whether one parent is re-partnering at any one time (rather than at the same time) with the latter presenting greater difficulties.

Moderating factors affecting the impact on adults include social and economic support, ability to forgive, and consideration of who initiated the separation.<sup>60,132</sup>

14. When considering the moderating factors that may influence how much children are affected by relationship breakdown, there is a strong case for all being mediated to some extent through the parent-child relationship.<sup>4,86</sup> Therefore, good and effective parenting, although not always possible, may be one of the most potent means of reducing the negative impacts on children. In addition, with the unequivocal link between couple relationship satisfaction and supportive parenting,<sup>4,19-22,133,134</sup> the role of strengthening couple relationships (including new, post-separation relationships) in order to minimise the impacts on children is clear. In view of these various risk and protective factors, there is a powerful argument that the way a family *functions*, rather than the family *type*, may be more important in shaping child outcomes.<sup>86,131</sup>
15. Review evidence on the predictors of relationship breakdown suggests that demographic factors (especially those more volitional) are more predictive of marital breakdown compared to socio-economic factors. These factors are: early age at marriage, pre-marital conception, pre-marital cohabitation, previous partnership breakdown, and parental divorce.<sup>1,115,135</sup> The latter is particularly important and maintains a predictive effect when controlling for early age at partnership, premarital cohabitation and premarital childbearing.<sup>115</sup>
16. Evidence from prospective longitudinal designs shows that the transition to parenthood is associated with relationship breakdown.<sup>136-140</sup> The impacts are reported to have increased in contemporary samples due to the greater contrast between the lifestyle and choices open to young childless adults compared to those available to parents of young children. Reasons for the decline in relationship satisfaction through new parenthood include less time together, increased sleeplessness, increased depression (including post-natal depression), and increased fatigue.<sup>137</sup> Protective factors include high pre-pregnancy relationship satisfaction, planned rather than unplanned pregnancy, and a low-demanding baby.<sup>139,141,142</sup>

### **Estimating the economic costs of relationship breakdown (Chapter 9 of main report)**

17. Women in Britain are 40% more likely to enter poverty if they divorce than if they remain married.<sup>143</sup> Their income falls by an average of 17% after divorce, with a larger decrease among younger women, particularly mothers, and a smaller decrease among older women.<sup>144</sup> Relative to married and cohabiting families, single-mother families are also found to be the most economically disadvantaged<sup>74,145</sup> although subsequent partnerships can change the financial outlook.<sup>74,146</sup>
18. The main economic outcomes of couple relationship breakdown can be summarised as: financial costs in terms of legal fees; moving; the need to maintain two households rather than one; additional childcare costs; impact on employment and earning prospects; impact on disposable income; and impact on services supporting the detrimental health and social impacts of couple relationship breakdown.

19. From an alternative perspective, it is important to note that some groups benefit from the costs of couple relationship breakdown. Divorce lawyers, mediators, counsellors and estate agents derive income from the consequences of couple relationship breakdown. This income generation should also be considered when establishing the financial impacts of divorce at a national level.

## **IMPLICATIONS OF THE REVIEW FOR PRACTICE, POLICY AND RESEARCH**

The resounding conclusion from this review is that the association between couple relationship breakdown and disadvantage is evident through a wide range of health and socio-economic indicators. There are a number of ways in which this has clear implications for practice and policy. Key points to note include:

- couple relationships can be strengthened and that breakdown, in some cases, can be prevented;<sup>22-28</sup>
- the opportunities available to minimise the burden on adults and children when breakdown occurs (in light of factors that moderate the impacts);<sup>4,60,86,113,131,132</sup>
- the importance of maintaining relationship quality;<sup>34,42,75-84</sup>
- recognition of opportune moments where relationship strain is more pronounced (e.g. transition to parenthood, the birth of a disabled child, etc.).<sup>136-142</sup>

This review supports the case for more investment to help strengthen family relationships and to minimise the burden when relationship breakdown does occur. Helping adults to become more informed about couple relationships (e.g. expected transitions and changes), the increased ability (of practitioners and couples) to identify relationship difficulties at an early stage, and the provision of appropriate and accessible support where applicable, are leading requirements.

A further theme central throughout this review is evidence for the link between couple relationships and parenting. Poor quality couple relationships are associated with poor parenting and consequently poor quality parent-child relationships.<sup>4,19-22,133,134</sup> Conversely, children raised by parents (including those previously separated or divorced) reporting high relationship quality and satisfaction tend to have high levels of well-being.<sup>4,18-20</sup> Also, improvements in coparenting (supporting a partner during parenting) have been shown to improve partner and parent-infant relationships and their well-being.<sup>22,134</sup> Collectively, this evidence demonstrates the need for parenting interventions that emphasise the importance of the couple relationship in improving adult and child outcomes.

These main findings have highlighted a number of areas requiring further research.

- Research to investigate more precisely why couple relationships break down or why contemporary relationships show more fragility. Although it is clear that attitudes to marriage have changed with shifts in the 1960s and 1970s from the 'companionate' marriage to the more 'individualized' marriage of modern day,<sup>147</sup> the attitudinal and personality-based origins of couple relationship breakdown, relative to the broader socio-demographic predictors, are still under-researched.<sup>115</sup>
- Understanding more about the relationship support needs and unique experiences of population subgroups, for example, teenage parents or those of 'mixed' heritage, is essential in providing tailored support.

- Evaluating the effectiveness of preventative relationship support programmes on couple relationship quality requires expansion, especially in the UK. Research is required among more ethnically diverse, disadvantaged and relationship-distressed couples. More research is also required to understand *how* changes in relationship quality occur in order to inform even more effective interventions. Perhaps most critically of all, research evidence demonstrating the effectiveness of relationships skills programmes has rarely extended beyond 12 months and so the long-term effectiveness of these programmes is, as yet, unknown.
- Given the changing nature of relationship formation, there is a need to develop measures of relationship satisfaction and quality that reflect contemporary trends. Such measures could also help practitioners quickly and opportunistically assess the relationship support needs of adults and help examine the impact of any support provided.
- With the association/causation complexities between couple relationship breakdown and impact outlined earlier, there is a need to assess, through advanced research designs and statistical techniques, the ways in which evidence of causation can be derived with more certainty.

## CONCLUSION

Although the evidence demonstrating the impact of couple relationship breakdown is highly complex, the overriding conclusion is the association it has with adult and child disadvantage. This association remains strong despite the fact that divorce and separation is widespread in today's society with research showing that the negative impacts have not diminished through time. Rather, the increased exposure of adults and children to couple relationship breakdown means that more people are affected compared to those of a previous generation. Hence the urgent need to increase the policy recognition of promoting family functioning and stability.

Indeed, while much of the evidence of impacts is relatively well established, arguably one of the more innovative strands for practice and policy has been the increased understanding of the factors known to prevent long-term detrimental outcomes for children in particular. With couple relationship breakdown becoming more widespread, and the impacts not thought to diminish through time, establishing the protective factors for adults and children is a necessity for ongoing research and practice developments in this field. The recent policy directive from the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF), 'The Children's Plan: One Year On',<sup>148</sup> outlines the importance of minimising harmful outcomes as a priority for 2009:

*"Introduce new ways to support parents at times when their relationships come under strain, and give more support to children when family relationships break down"* (p.7<sup>148</sup>).

Although the 'protection' offered by couple relationships (in terms of social support, companionship and intimacy) has been shown to explain the association between relationship breakdown and health over and above selection effects, the relative contribution of this to economic support still remains unanswered. The issue of poverty and economic resource remains central to our understanding of the impacts of relationship breakdown. There is a case for well-being being affected mostly by a decline in economic resources which, in turn, have arisen from relationship breakdown. At the time of writing, the recession and rising unemployment and financial stress among many families is most pertinent to this conclusion.

Although many factors may affect well-being, some of which are unknown and unmeasured, the role of poverty and financial disadvantage must not be understated. Research has shown that financial capability (often reduced following a separation) acts as a powerful protective factor against the potential harmful outcomes from relationship breakdown. With positive parenting, linked to the quality of the couple relationship, offering an additional protective factor, family functioning and within-family effects (from finance and parenting especially) may be particularly significant in shaping the outcomes when couples part. Moreover, although the impact of couple relationship breakdown can be considered detrimental as an 'average effect' (which may disguise instances of differing impacts), the financial situation and positive parenting are important influences on adult and child outcomes that must be integrated in any related practice and policy.

## References

1. Office for National Statistics. (2008d). The Proportion of Marriages Ending in Divorce. *Population Trends*, **131**, 28-36.
2. Office for National Statistics. (2009). *Marriages: UK marriages decrease by 2.7%*. London: Office for National Statistics. [online]. Available from: <http://www.statistics.gov.uk/cci/nugget.asp?id=322> [cited 9<sup>th</sup> March 2009].
3. Office for National Statistics. (2007b). *Divorces Fall by 7 Per Cent in 2006*. London: Office for National Statistics.
4. Hawthorne, J., Jessop, J., Pryor, J. & Richards, M. (2003). *Supporting Children through Family Change: A Review of Interventions and Services for Children of Divorcing and Separating Parents*. London: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
5. Office for National Statistics. (2008f). *Social Trends 38. Households and Families*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
6. Benson, H. (2006). *The Conflation of Marriage and Cohabitation in Government Statistics – a Denial of Evidence Rendered Untenable by an Analysis of Outcomes*. Bristol: Bristol Family Trust.
7. Office for National Statistics. (2006). *Divorces: 1957-2003, Couples, and children of divorced couples, numbers, age of child*. London: Office for National Statistics. [online]. Available from: <http://www.statistics.gov.uk/STATBASE/xsdataset.asp?vlnk=7079> [cited 19<sup>th</sup> November 2008].
8. Office for National Statistics. (2008c). *Divorce rate lowest for 26 years*. London: Office for National Statistics. [online]. Available from: <http://www.statistics.gov.uk/pdfdir/div0808.pdf> [cited 19<sup>th</sup> November 2008].
9. Cabinet Office. (2008). *Social Exclusion Definition*. [online]. Available from: [http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/social\\_exclusion\\_task\\_force/context.aspx](http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/social_exclusion_task_force/context.aspx) [cited 9<sup>th</sup> October 2008].
10. Social Exclusion Taskforce. (2008). *Reaching Out: Think Family*. London: Social Exclusion Taskforce.
11. DfES (2003). *Every Child Matters Green Paper*. London: HM Government.
12. DfES (2004). *Every Child Matters: The Next Steps*. Nottingham: Department for Education and Skills.
13. DfES (2007a). *Aiming High for Children: Supporting Families*. London: HMSO.
14. DfES (2007b). *Every Parent Matters*. Nottingham: Department for Education and Skills.
15. DCSF (2007). *The Children's Plan: Building Brighter Futures*. London: HMSO.
16. DCSF (2008a). *The Child Health Promotion Programme: Pregnancy and the First Five Years of Life*. London: Department of Health.
17. DCSF (2008b). *The Children's Plan: One Year On*. London: HMSO.
18. Cummings, E.M. & Davies, P. (1994). *Children and Marital Conflict: The Impact of Family Dispute and Resolution*. London: Guilford.
19. Reynolds, J., Harold, G. & Pryor, J. (2001). *Not in Front of the Children? How Conflict between Parents Affects Children*. London: One Plus One.
20. Hetherington, E.M. & Kelly, J. (2002). *For Better or for Worse? Divorce Reconsidered*. London: W.W.Norton.
21. Strohschein, L. (2005). Parental Divorce and Child Mental Health Trajectories. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, **67**, 1,286-1,300.
22. Feinberg, M.E. & Kan, M.L. (2008). Establishing Family Foundations: Intervention Effects on Co-Parenting, Parent/Infant Well-Being and Parent-Child Relations. *Journal of Family Psychology*, **22** (2), 253-263.

23. Halford, W.K., Markman, H.J. & Stanley, S. (2008). Strengthening Couples' Relationships with Education: Social Policy and Public Health Perspectives. *Journal of Family Psychology*, **22** (4), 497-505.
24. Hart, G. (1999). The Funding of Marriage Support: Review. London: Lord Chancellor's Dept.
25. Hawkins, A.J., Blanchard, V.L., Baldwin, S.A. & Fawcett, E.B. (2008). Does Marriage and Relationship Education Work? A Meta-Analytic Study. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, **76**(5), 723-734.
26. Wood, N.D., Crane, D.R., Shaalje, G.B. & Law, D.D. (2005). What Works for Whom: A Meta-Analytic Review of Marital and Couples Therapy in Reference to Marital Distress. *The American Journal of Family Therapy*, **33**, 273-287.
27. Schulz, M.S., Cowan, C.P. & Cowan, P.A. (2006). Promoting Healthy Beginnings: A Randomised Controlled Trial of a Preventive Intervention to Preserve Marital Quality During the Transition to Parenthood. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, **74** (1), 20-31.
28. Gottman, J.M. & Silver, N. (1999). *The Seven Principles for Making Marriage Work*. New York: Three Rivers Press.
29. Chang, Y-S. & Barrett, H. (2009). *The nature and effectiveness of support services targeting adult couple relationships: A literature review*. London: Family and Parenting Institute.
30. Rutter, M. (2007). Proceeding from observed correlation to causal inference: the use of natural experiments. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, **2**, 377-395.
31. Rutter, M. (2009). Epidemiological methods to tackle causal questions. *International Journal of Epidemiology*, **38**, 3-6.
32. Sampson, R.J., Laub, J.H. & Wimer, C. (2006). Does Marriage Reduce Crime? A Counterfactual Approach to Within-Individual Causal Effects. *Criminology*, **44**, 465-508.
33. Murphy, M., Glaser, K. & Grundy, E. (1997). Marital Status and Long Term Illness in Great Britain. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, **59**, 156-164.
34. Murphy, M. (2007). Family Living Arrangements and Health. In Office for National Statistics. (Ed.) *Focus on Families*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
35. Murphy, M., Grundy, E. & Kalogirou, S. (2007). The Increase in Marital Status Differences in Mortality up to the Oldest Age in Seven European Countries 1990-1999. *Population Studies*, **61** (3), 1-12.
36. Hadju, P., Mckee, M. & Bojan, F. (1995). Changes in Premature Mortality Differentials by Marital Status in Hungary and in England and Wales. *European Journal of Public Health*, **5** (4), 259-264.
37. Martikainen, P., Martelin, T., Nihtila, E., Majamaa, K. & Koskinen, S. (2005). Differences in Mortality by Marital Status in Finland from 1976 to 2000: Analyses of Changes in Marital-Status Distributions, Socio-Demographic and Household Composition, and Cause of Death. *Population Studies*, **59** (1), 99-115.
38. Cheung, Y.B. (2000). Marital Status and Mortality in British Women: A Longitudinal Study. *International Journal of Epidemiology*, **29** (1), 93-99.
39. Lund, R., Christensen, U., Holstein, B.E., Due, E. & Osler, M. (2006). Influence of Marital History over Two and Three Generations on Early Death. A Longitudinal Study of Danish Men Born in 1953. *Journal of Epidemiological Community Health*, **60** (6), 496-501.
40. Lund, R., Holstein, B.E. & Osler, M. (2004). Marital History from Age 15 to 40 Years and Subsequent 10-Year Mortality: A Longitudinal Study of Danish Males Born in 1953. *International Journal of Epidemiology*, **33** (2), 389-397.
41. Kaplan, R.M. & Kronick, R.G. (2006). Marital Status and Longevity in the United States Population. *Journal of Epidemiological Community Health*, **60**, 760-765.
42. Robles, T.F. & Kiecolt-Glaser, J.K. (2003). The Physiology of Marriage: Pathways to Health. *Physiology and Behaviour*, **79** (3), 409-416.
43. Spreeuw, J. & Wang, X. (2008). Modelling the Short Time Dependence between Two Remaining Lifetimes. [online] Available from: [www.actuaries.org.uk/data/assets/pdf\\_file/0006/128832/Spreeuw\\_modelling.pdf](http://www.actuaries.org.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0006/128832/Spreeuw_modelling.pdf)
44. Lillard, L.A., & Waite, L.J. (1995). Till Death Do Us Part: Marital Disruption and Mortality. *American Journal of Sociology*, **100** (5), 1,131-1,156.
45. Ebrahim, S., Wannamethee, G., Mccallum, A., Walker, M. & Shaper, A. G. (1995). Marital Status, Change in Marital Status, and Mortality in Middle-Aged British Men. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, **142** (8), 834-842.
46. Tucker, J.S., Friedman, H.S., Wingard, D.L. & Schartzwz, J.E. (1996). Marital History at Midlife as a Predictor of Longevity: Alternative Explanations to the Protective Effect of Marriage. *Health Psychology*, **15** (2), 91-101.
47. Kposowa, A.J. (2000). Marital Status and Suicide in the National Longitudinal Mortality Study. *Journal of Epidemiological Community Health*, **54** (4), 254-261.
48. Van Poppel, F. & Jong, I. (2001). Long Term Trends in Marital Status Mortality Differences in the Netherlands 1850-1970. *Journal of Biosocial Science*, **33** (2), 279-303.
49. Martikainen, P., Martelin, T., Nihtila, E., Majamaa, K. & Koskinen, S. (2005). Differences in Mortality by Marital Status in Finland from 1976 to 2000: Analyses of Changes in Marital-Status Distributions, Socio-Demographic and Household Composition, and Cause of Death. *Population Studies*, **59** (1), 99-115.

50. Eaker, E.D., Sullivan, L.M., Kelly-Hayes, M., D'agostino, R.B. & Benjamin, E.J. (2007). Marital Status, Marital Strain, and Risk of Coronary Heart Disease or Total Mortality: The Framingham Offspring Study. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, **69** (6), 509-513.
51. Office for National Statistics. (2007d). *Mortality Statistics: Review of the Registrar General on Deaths in England and Wales, 2005*. London: HMSO.
52. Grundy, E.M.D., Butterworth, S., Henretta, J., Wadsworth, M.E.J. & Tomassini, C. (2005). *Partnership and Parenthood History and Health in Mid and Later Life*. London: Economic and Social Research Council.
53. Donkin, A. (2001). Does Living Alone Damage Men's Health? *Health Statistics Quarterly*, **Autumn**, 11-17.
54. Benzeval, M. (1998). The Self-Reported Health Status of Lone Parents. *Social Science and Medicine*, **46** (10), 1337-53.
55. Prior, P. M. & Hayes, B.C. (2003). The Relationship between Marital Status and Health: An Empirical Investigation of Differences in Bed Occupancy within Health and Social Care Facilities in Britain 1921-1991. *Journal of Family Issues*, **24** (1), 124-148.
56. Macintyre, S. (1992). The Effects of Family Position and Status on Health. *Social Science and Medicine*, **35** (4), 453-64.
57. Wyke, S. & Ford, G. (1992). Competing Explanations for Associations between Marital Status and Health. *Social Science and Medicine*, **34** (5), 523-532.
58. Joung, I.M., Stronks, K., Van De Mheen, H., Van Poppel, F.W.A, Van Der Meer, J.B.W. & Mackenbach, J.P. (1997). The Contribution of Intermediary Factors to Marital Status Differences in Self-Reported Health. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, **59**, 476-490.
59. Aldous, J. & Ganey, R.F. (1999). Family Life and the Pursuit of Happiness: The Influence of Gender and Race. *Journal of Family Issues*, **20**, 155-180.
60. Amato, P.R. (2000). The Consequences of Divorce for Adults and Children. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, **62** (4), 1269-1287.
61. Ashby, S. & Step, J. (2004). *NHS Patient Experiences - Patient Survey*. London: National Audit Office. [online]
62. Meadows, S.O. (2007). *Family structure and fathers' well-being: Trajectories of mental and physical health*. Centre for Research on Child Wellbeing: Working Paper #2007-19-FF. NJ: Princeton University.
63. Wood, R. G., Goesling, B. & Avellar, S. (2007). *The Effects of Marriage on Health: A Synthesis of Recent Research Evidence*. Washington DC: Mathematica Policy Research.
64. Schoenborn, C.A. (2004). Marital Status and Health: United States, 1999-2002. *Advance Data*, **351**, 1-32.
65. Nilsson, C.J., Lund, R. & Avlund, K. (2008). Cohabitation Status and Onset of Disability among Older Danes: Is Social Participation a Possible Mediator? *Journal of Aging and Health*, **20**, 235-253.
66. Power, C., Rodgers, B. & Hope, S. (1999). Heavy alcohol consumption and marital status: disentangling the relationship in a national study of young adults. *Addiction*, **94**, 1,477-1,487.
67. Leonard, K.E. & Rothbard, J.C. (1999). Alcohol and the Marriage Effect. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, **13**, 139-146.
68. Kissman, K. (2001). Interventions to Strengthen Non-Custodial Father Involvement in the Lives of Their Children. *Journal of Divorce and Remarriage*, **35** (1/2), 135-146.
69. Gardner, J. & Oswald, A.J. (2006). Do Divorcing Couples Become Happier by Breaking Up? *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A*, **169** (2), 319-336.
70. Afifi, T.O., Cox, B.J. & Enns, M.W. (2006). Mental Health Profiles among Married, Never-Married, and Separated/Divorced Mothers in a Nationally Representative Sample. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, **41** (2), 122-9.
71. Barrett, A.E. (2000). Marital Trajectories and Mental Health. *Journal of Health and Social Behaviour*, **41** (4), 451-464.
72. Lucas, R.E. (2005). Time Does Not Heal All Wounds: A Longitudinal Study of Reaction and Adaptation to Divorce. *Psychological Science*, **16** (12), 945-950.
73. Richards, M., Hardy, R. & Wadsworth, M. (1997). The Effects of Divorce and Separation on Mental Health in a National UK Birth Cohort. *Psychological Medicine*, **27** (5), 1,121-1,128.
74. Kiernan, K.E. & Mensah, F.K. (forthcoming 2010) Unmarried Parenthood, Family Trajectories, Parent and Child Well Being. In, *Children of the 21st Century: From birth to age 5*. Bristol: Policy Press
75. De Vogli, R., Chandola, T. & Marmot, M.G. (2007). Negative Aspects of Close Relationships and Heart Disease. *Archives of International Medicine*, **167** (18), 1951-1957.
76. Orth-Gomer, K., Wamala, S.P., Horsten, M., Schenck-Gustafsson, K., Schneiderman, N. & Mittleman, M.A. (2000). Marital Stress Worsens Prognosis in Women with Coronary Heart Disease: The Stockholm Female Coronary Risk Study. *Journal of American Medical Association*, **284** (23), 3008-3014.
77. Lakka, H.M., Laaksonen, D.E., Lakka, T.A., Niskanen, L.K., Kumpusalo, E., Tuomilehto, J. & Salonen, J.T. (2002). The Metabolic Syndrome and Total and Cardiovascular Disease Mortality in Middle-Aged Men. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, **288** (21), 2,709-2,716.

78. Hanson, R.L., Imperatore, G., Bennett, P.H. & Knowler, W.C. (2002). Components of The "Metabolic Syndrome" And Incidence of Type 2 Diabetes. *Diabetes*, **51** (10), 3,120-3,127.
79. Troxel, W.M., Matthews, K.A., Gallo, L.C. & Kuller, L.H. (2005). Marital Quality and Occurrence of the Metabolic Syndrome in Women. *Archives of Internal Medicine*, **165** (9), 1,022-1,027.
80. Coyne, J.C., Rohrbaugh, M.J., Shoham, V., Sonnega, J.S., Nicklas, J.M. & Cranford, J.A. (2001). Prognostic Importance of Marital Quality for Survival of Congestive Heart Failure. *American Journal of Cardiology*, **88** (5), 526-529.
81. Holt-Lunstad, J., Birmingham, W. & Jones, B.Q. (2008). Is There Something Unique About Marriage? The Relative Impact of Marital Status, Relationship Quality, and Network Social Support on Ambulatory Blood Pressure and Mental Health. *Annals of Behavioural Medicine*, **35** (2), 239-244.
82. Gallo, L.C., Troxel, W.M., Matthews, K.A. & Kuller, L.W. (2003). Marital Status and Quality in Middle-Aged Women: Associations with Levels and Trajectories of Cardiovascular Risk Factors. *Health Psychology*, **22** (5), 453-463.
83. Grewen, K.M., Girdler, S.S. & Light, K.C. (2005). Relationship Quality: Effects on Ambulatory Blood Pressure and Negative Affect in a Biracial Sample of Men and Women. *Blood Pressure Monitoring*, **10** (3), 117-124.
84. Weihs, K.L., Enright, T.M. & Simmens, S.J. (2008). Close Relationships and Emotional Processing Predict Decreased Mortality in Women with Breast Cancer: Preliminary Evidence. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, **70** (1), 117-124.
85. Rodgers, B. & Pryor, J. (1998). *Divorce and Separation: The Outcomes for Children*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
86. Mooney, A., Oliver, C. & Smith, M. (2009). *Impact of Family Breakdown on Children's Well-Being: Evidence Review*. London: Department for Children, Schools and Families (RB113).
87. Elliot, J. & Vaitilingam, R. (2008). *Now We Are 50: Key Findings from the National Child Development Study*. London: The Centre for Longitudinal Studies.
88. Ely, M., Richards, M.P.M., Wadsworth, M.E.J. & Elliott, B.J. (1999). Secular Changes in the Association of Parental Divorce and the Children's Educational Attainment: Evidence from Three British Birth Cohorts. *Journal of Social Policy*, **28** (3), 437-455.
89. Wu, L.L. & Martinson, B.C. (1993). Family Structure and the Risk of a Pre-Marital Birth. *American Sociological Review*, **16**, 386-406.
90. Formby, P. & Cherlin, A.J. (2007). Family Instability and Child Well-Being. *American Sociological Review*, **72**, 181-204.
91. Ahrons, C.R. (2007). Family Ties after Divorce: Long-term Implications for Children. *Family Process*, **46** (1), 53-65.
92. Juby, H. & Farrington, D.P. (2001). Disentangling the Link between Disrupted Families and Delinquency. *British Journal of Criminology*, **41**, 22-40.
93. Wilcox, W.B., Doherty, W., Glenn, N. & Waite, L. (2005). *Why Marriage Matters, Second Edition: Twenty Six Conclusions from the Social Services*. New York: Institute for American Values.
94. Meltzer, H., Gatward, R., Goodman, R. & Ford, T. (2000). *The Mental Health of Children and Adolescents in Great Britain*. London: Office for National Statistics.
95. Chase-Lansdale, P.L., Cherlin, A.J. & Kiernan, K. (1995). The Long-term Effects of Parental Divorce on the Mental Health of Young Adults: A Developmental Perspective. *Child Development*, **66**, 1,614-1,634.
96. Gruber, J. (2004). Is Making Divorce Easier Bad for Children? The Long-Run Implications of Unilateral Divorce. *Journal of Labour Economics*, **22** (4), 799-833.
97. Booth, A. & Amato, P. (2001). Parental Pre-divorce Relations and Offspring Post-Divorce Well Being. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, **63** (1), 197-212.
98. O'Connor, T.G. & Jenkins, J.M. (2000). *Marital Transitions and Children's Adjustment: Understanding Why Families Differ from One Another and Why Children in the Same Family Show Different Patterns of Adjustment*. Quebec: Human Resources Development Canada.
99. Strohschein, L. (2007). Prevalence of Methylphenidate Use among Canadian Children Following Parental Divorce. *Canadian Medical Association Journal*, **176** (12), 1,711-1,714.
100. Smyth, C. & Maclachlan, M. (2004). The Context of Suicide: An Examination of Life Circumstances Thought to Be Understandable Precursors to Youth Suicide. *Journal of Mental Health*, **13** (1), 83-92.
101. Herberth, G., Weber, A., Roder, S., Elvers, H.D., Kramer, U., Schins, R.P.F., Diez, U., Borte, M., Heinrich, J., Schafter, T., Herbarth, O. & Lehman, I. (2008). Relation between Stressful Life Events, Neuropeptides and Cytokines: Results from the Lisa Birth Cohort Study. *Paediatric Journal of Allergy and Immunology*. Online First.
102. Ledoux, S., Miller, P., Choquet, M. & Plant, M. (2002). Family Structure, Parent-Child Relationships, and Alcohol and Other Drug Use among Teenagers in France and the United Kingdom. *Alcohol and Alcoholism*, **37** (1), 52-60.
103. Gregg, P. & Machin, S. (1998). *Child Development and Success or Failure in the Youth Labour Market*. London: London School of Economics.
104. Miller, P. (1997). Family Structure, Personality, Drinking, Smoking and Illicit Drug Use: A Study of UK Teenagers. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, **45** (1-2), 121-129.

105. Kiernan, K. & Hobcraft, J. (1997). Parental Divorce During Childhood: Age at First Intercourse, Partnership and Parenthood. *Population Studies*, **51** (1), 41-55.
106. Wellings, K., Nanchahal, K., Maccowall, W., Mcmanus, S., Erens, B., Mercer, C. H., Johnson, A.M., Copas, A. J., Korovessis, C., Fenton, K.A. & Field, J. (2001). Sexual Behaviour in Britain: Early Heterosexual Experience. *Lancet*, **358** (9296), 1,843-1,850.
107. Hope, S., Power, C. & Rodgers, B. (1998). The Relationship between Parental Separation in Childhood and Problem Drinking in Adulthood. *Addiction*, **93** (4), 505-514.
108. Jeynes, W.H. (2001). The Effects of Recent Parental Divorce on Their Children's Sexual Attitudes and Behaviour. *Journal of Divorce and Remarriage*, **35** (1/2), 115-133.
109. Farrington, D.P. (1996). The Explanation and Prevention of Youthful Offending. In Hawkins, J.D. (Ed.) *Delinquency and Crime: Current Theories*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
110. Amato, P. & Cheadle, J. (2005). The Long Reach of Divorce: Divorce and Child Well-Being across Three Generations. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, **67**, 191-206.
111. Hansagi, H., Brandt, L. & Andreasson, S. (2000). Parental Divorce: Psychosocial Well-Being, Mental Health and Mortality During Youth and Young Adulthood: A Longitudinal Study of Swedish Conscripts. *European Journal of Public Health*, **10** (2), 86-92.
112. Maclean, M. (2004). *Together and Apart: Children and Parents Experiencing Separation and Divorce*. London: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
113. Flowerdew, J. & Neale, B. (2003). Trying to Stay Apace: Children with Multiple Challenges in Their Post Divorce Family Lives. *Childhood*, **10** (2), 147-161.
114. Wallerstein, J.S. & Kelly, J.B. (1980). *Surviving the Break-up: How Children and Parents Cope with Divorce*. London: Grant McIntyre.
115. Clarke, L. & Berrington, A. (1999). *Socio-Demographic Predictors of Divorce*. London: One Plus One.
116. Grych, J.H. & Fincham, F.D. (1990). Marital Conflict and Children's Adjustment: A Cognitive-Contextual Framework. *Psychological Bulletin*, **108** (2), 267-290.
117. Grych, J.H., Fincham, F.D., Jouriles, E.N. & McDonald, R. (2000). Interparental Conflict and Child Adjustment: Testing the Mediational Role of Appraisals in the Cognitive-Contextual Framework. *Child Development*, **71** (6), 1,648-1,661.
118. Cherlin, A.J., Furstenberg, F.F., Chase-Lansdale, P.L., Kiernan, K.E., Robins, P.K., Morrison, D.R. & Teitler, J.O. (1991). Longitudinal Studies of Effects of Divorce on Children in Great Britain and the United States. *Science*, **252**, 1,386-1,389.
119. Wallerstein, J.S. (1991). The Long-Term Effects of Divorce on Children: A Review. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, **30** (3), 349-360.
120. Haveman, R. & Wolfe, B. (1995). The Determinants of Children's Attainments: A Review of Methods and Findings. *Journal of Economic Literature*, **33**, 1,829-1,878.
121. Seltzer, J.A. (1994). Consequences of Marital Dissolution for Children. *Annual Review of Sociology*, **20**, 235-266.
122. Davies, P.T. & Cummings, E.M. (1998). Exploring Children's Emotional Security as a Mediator of the Link between Marital Relations and Child Adjustment. *Child Development*, **69** (1), 124-139.
123. Margolin, G., Oliver, P. & Medina, A. (2001). Conceptual Issues in Understanding the Relation between Inter-Parental Conflict and Child Adjustment: Integrating Developmental Psychopathology and Risk/Resilience Perspectives. In Grych, J. & Fincham, F. (Eds.) *Inter-Parental Conflict and Child Development*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
124. Cummings, E.M. & Davies, P.T. (2002). Effects of Marital Conflict on Children: Recent Advances and Emerging Themes in Process-Oriented Research. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, **43** (1), 31-63.
125. Cummings, E.M., Faircloth, W.B., Mitchell, P.M., Cummings, J.S. & Schermerhorn, A.C. (2008). Evaluating a Brief Prevention Program for Improving Marital Conflict in Community Families. *Journal of Family Psychology*, **22** (2), 193-202.
126. McIntosh, J. (2003). Enduring Conflict in Parental Separation: Pathways of Impact on Child Development. *Journal of Family Studies*, **9** (1), 63-80.
127. Jekielek, S. (1998). Parental Conflict, Marital Disruption and Children's Emotional Well-Being. *Social Forces*, **76**, 905-936.
128. Amato, P., Loomis, L. & Booth, A. (1995). Parental Divorce, Marital Conflict and Offspring Well-Being During Early Adulthood. *Social Forces*, **73**, 895-915.
129. Harold, A.T., Aitken, J.J. & Shelton, K.H. (2007). Inter-Parental Conflict and Children's Academic Attainment: A Longitudinal Analysis. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, **48** (12), 1223-1232.
130. Sigle-Rushton, W., Hobcraft, J. & Kiernan, K. (2005). Parental Divorce and Subsequent Disadvantage: A Cross Cohort Comparison. *Demography*, **42** (3), 427-446.
131. Dunn, J. (2008). *Family Relationships: Children's Perspectives*. London: One Plus One.
132. Rye, M.S., Folck, C.D., Heim, T.A., Olszewski, B.T. & Traina, E. (2004). Forgiveness of an Ex-Spouse: How Does It Relate to Mental Health Following a Divorce? *Journal of Divorce and Remarriage*, **41** (3/4), 31-51.
133. Cummings, E.M. & Davies, P. (1994). *Children and Marital Conflict: The Impact of Family Dispute and Resolution*. London: Guilford.

134. One Plus One (2006). *The Transition to Parenthood: The 'magic moment'*. London: One Plus One. Available from: <http://www.oneplusone.org.uk/Publications/InformationSheets/Transitiontoparenthood.pdf> [cited 1st July 2009]
135. Smart, C. & Stevens, P. (2000). *Cohabitation Breakdown*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
136. Cowan, P. & Cowan, C. (2000). *When Partners Become Parents: The Big Life Change for Couples*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
137. Shapiro, A.F. & Gottman, J.M. (2005). Effects on Marriage of a Psycho-Education Intervention with Couples Undergoing the Transition to Parenthood, Evaluation at 1-Year Post-Intervention. *Journal of Family Communication*, **5** (1), 1-24.
138. Twenge, J.M., Campbell, K.W. & Foster, C.A. (2003). Parenthood and Marital Satisfaction: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, **65**, 574-583.
139. Lawrence, E., Rothman, A.D., Cobb, R.J., Rothman, M.T. & Bradbury, T.N. (2008). Marital Satisfaction across the Transition to Parenthood. *Journal of Family Psychology*, **22** (1), 41-50.
140. Doss, B.D., Rhoades, G.K., Stanley, S.M. & Markman, H.J. (2009). The Effect of the transition to Parenthood on relationship Quality: An 8-Year Prospective Study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **96** (3), 601-619.
141. Glenn, F. (2007). *Growing Together, or Drifting Apart?* London: One Plus One.
142. Cowan, P. & Cowan, C. (2003). Normative Family Transitions, Normal Family Process, and Healthy Child Development. In Walsh, F. (Ed.) *Normal Family Processes*. New York: Guilford Press.
143. Aassve, A., Betti, G., Mazzucco, S. & Mencarini, L. (2006). *Marital Disruption and Economic Well-Being: A Comparative Analysis*. Colchester: Institute for Social and Economic Research.
144. Jansen, M., Snoeckx, L. & Mortelmans, D. (2007). *Repartnering and Re-Employment: Strategies to Cope with the Economic Consequences of Partnership Dissolution British Household Panel Survey 2007*. Colchester, University of Essex: Institute for Social and Economic Research.
145. DWP (2008). *Households Below Average Income: an analysis of the income distribution 1994/95-2006/07*. London: Department for Work and Pensions.
146. Jenkins, S.P. (2008). *Marital splits and income changes over the longer-term*. Working Paper of Institute for Social and Economic Research. Colchester: University of Essex.
147. Cherlin, A. (2004). The Deinstitutionalization of American Marriage. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, **66**, 848-861.
148. DCSF (2008b). *The Children's Plan: One Year On*. London: HMSO.