



Family stressors and children's outcomes

Dr Elizabeth Jones, Dr Leslie Gutman & Prof Lucinda Platt¹
Childhood Wellbeing Research Centre²

The research reported here aimed to identify the family stress factors and parental behaviours that were associated with worse children's outcomes at age 7 and those family factors and parental behaviour that helped children to succeed. It also set out to identify whether stressful life events experienced at different periods of childhood were associated with worse outcomes in adolescence.

In order to target interventions, it is clearly important to understand which family circumstances are significant for child wellbeing at different ages, and how that varies across outcomes. A range of children's outcomes were examined using data from the Millennium Cohort Study (MCS) and the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC). At age 7, these were verbal cognitive skills, non-verbal cognitive skills, maths skills, Key Stage 1 (KS1) attainment and behavioural difficulties. For teenagers, the following outcomes were explored at age 13-14: Key stage 3 (KS3) attainment; emotional, behavioural, social, and school wellbeing; and Key Stage 4 (KS4) results at age 16.

Key findings

- A wide range of family background factors and parental behaviours are associated with children's outcomes at age 7. These tend to be the same factors that are important at earlier ages, and include parenting behaviours, family structure and socio-economic position of the family.
- Family poverty, child disability and the child's mother having higher qualifications are consistently associated with children faring respectively worse (poverty and disability) and better (higher maternal qualifications) across all five age 7 outcomes, holding other factors constant.
- Different aspects of family background matter for different outcomes.
- Children can experience a range of stressful life events. Extreme stressful events, such as homelessness, victimisation or abuse, can have long-term effects on children's outcomes.
- Some stressful events impact on children's emotional and social wellbeing but not their educational outcomes: their negative impacts may thus be harder to pick up.
- Children are very varied and they can show great resilience. Even given the associations between early circumstances and subsequent outcomes, children perform very differently across a wide range of cognitive and behavioural outcomes.
- There is little evidence, however, that any positive parental behaviours have more impact in disadvantaged families, reducing the relative effect of that disadvantage.

¹ All authors were based at the Department of Quantitative Social Science, Institute of Education, University of London at the time of writing. Contact for the report, Lucinda Platt: l.platt@ioe.ac.uk.

² The Childhood Wellbeing Research Centre is an independent research centre with funding from the Department for Education. It is a partnership between the Thomas Coram Research Unit (TCRU), other centres at the Institute of Education, the Centre for Child and Family Research (CCFR) at Loughborough University and the Personal Social Services Research Unit, University of Kent.

Data and methodology

The research reported here set out to:

- a) ascertain from the existing research what types of factors have been associated with worse children's outcomes, and which with helping children to succeed,
- b) whether such factors are associated with worse outcomes across five different domains at age 7,
- c) conversely, which factors promote better outcomes for children at age 7,
- d) whether there are any such promotive factors or parental behaviours which specifically protect children from the negative impact of certain stressors,
- e) whether stressful life events experienced at different ages in childhood impact on attainment at Key Stage 3 and 4 (age 14 and 16) and on wellbeing at age 13.

Differences in children's outcomes have been shown to emerge early in life, and to be linked to both family circumstances, such as social disadvantage, and parenting behaviours, such as parenting style and activities with the child. Both these aspects of a child's environment are important for their early cognitive and emotional development. But it is not clear whether these early differences, and the factors associated with them, persist up to age 7.

Previous research has also shown that stressful life events are associated with worse outcomes for children. However, it has not previously been possible to explore whether particular life events are especially detrimental, whether they impact across different sorts of children's outcomes (educational, social etc.), and whether the effects of early childhood events persist into adolescence.

To investigate these questions, a light-touch literature review was carried out to highlight existing associations between family background factors and parental behaviours and children's outcomes. This was followed by analysis of two large-scale longitudinal data sources: the Millennium Cohort Study (MCS) and the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC). Further details on these two surveys are provided in Box 1.

Box 1: Data sources

The Millennium Cohort Study (MCS) is a survey of over 19,000 children born in 2000-2001 who are being followed over time. The families have been surveyed at ages 9 months, 3 years, 5 years and 7 years. The study provides a great deal of information on children's family background, and offers a range of measures of their wellbeing at age 7. Linked education data provide information on their attainment at this age. This report focuses on the approximately 9,000 MCS children who were born in England and who provided data at all the surveys.

The Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC) is a study of children born to over 14,000 mothers recruited in the Avon area during pregnancy in 1991 and 1992. The children have been surveyed year on year, and their health and development has been tracked in great detail since that initial recruitment. They and their parents have provided a great deal of genetic and direct physical measures as well as questionnaire data and environmental measures.

The literature review built on existing reviews of the field of family context and children's outcomes, supplemented by recent studies that have been carried out since the main reviews, and with a focus on earlier analyses of the MCS and ALSPAC.

Age 7 outcome measures and family stressors

The MCS research employed a series of statistical regression analyses to explore the relationships between each of various family and parental factors and age 7 outcomes, both separately and when all the

other factors were held constant. This enabled the specific association of each factor with each outcome to be assessed.

The five age 7 outcome measures considered were:

- non-verbal cognitive skills,
- verbal cognitive skills,
- maths skills,
- Key Stage 1 (KS1) attainment,
- Behaviour.

These are all standard, validated measures and widely used in the assessment of children's development. They are described in more detail in Box 2.

Box 2: Age 7 outcome measures

Non-verbal cognitive skills are measured through the British Ability Scales (BAS) Pattern Construction measure. In this assessment the child reproduces designs by putting together flat squares or solid cubes with black and yellow patterns on each side. The test is timed and the score is based on accuracy and speed. A higher score represents greater non-verbal cognitive ability.

Verbal skills are measured through the BAS Word Reading assessment. The children are shown words on cards and asked to read them out. The score is based on the number and difficulty of words they manage to read, where a higher score represents greater verbal ability.

Maths skills are measured by the National Foundation for Educational Research Progress in Maths assessment. Children are given a variety of mathematical problems covering numbers, shape, space, measures and data handling. Their score is based on the number of problems they manage to complete with a higher score representing greater maths ability.

KS1 attainment is measured through performance at age 7. This measure derives from educational records from the National Pupil Database (NPD) linked in to the MCS data. The children were teacher-assessed in 2008, at the same time as the age 7 survey data were collected. The measure used was the aggregate score comprising reading, writing, speaking and listening, maths and science. A higher score represents higher KS1 attainment.

Behaviour is measured using the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire, which comprises responses by the parent to a series of 25 questions and is used to evaluate emotional-behavioural difficulties. The score for difficulties can range from 0 to 40, and a higher score means more difficulties.

Over 40 factors were evaluated for their association with children's age 7 outcomes. These were grouped into: child characteristics, family characteristics, parental characteristics and behaviours, and social and neighbourhood factors, mostly measured when the child was aged 5. These are illustrated in more detail in Box 3.

They were further split into:

- *risk factors* which are associated with, or predictive of, worse outcomes on a given measure; and
- *promotive factors*, which are associated with, or predictive of, better outcomes on a given measure.

When investigating the net association of any given factor, *all* groups of factors were held constant.

Additional statistical analyses investigated whether there were family or parental factors that made a particular difference to disadvantaged children. Family poverty has consistently been associated in research with worse performance on a range of children's outcomes. This was also the case in the

analyses carried out in this study. Income poverty, measured as having an income less than 60 per cent of the median after adjusting for family size, was significantly associated with all five outcomes, after holding all the other factors constant.

Box 3: Factors used in analysis of age 7 outcomes

Child characteristics, which covers factors such as whether the child has a longstanding illness or disability and the amount of time the child spends watching TV.

Family characteristics, which covers factors such as the length of time the mother has spent as a lone parent, the number of brothers and sisters the child has, or whether the family has experienced poverty.

Parental interactions with the child, which includes factors such as whether the child's mother or father smokes, the extent of rules and their enforcement, child care by grandparents or other relatives and mothers' and fathers' report of how close they feel to the child.

Child's peer relationships, which includes factors such as how often the child sees friends outside school.

Parental social support and area characteristics, which covers factors such as whether the child's mother has friends or family in the area, whether relatives or friends help out financially – or would if needed, whether the mother regards the area as good for raising children.

The associations between these factors and the five outcomes can rarely be considered to be directly causal, since the factors addressed in the survey and included in the analyses typically act as 'indicators' of unmeasured practices and aspects of family context. However, the factors are measured prior to the age 7 outcomes to increase the chances of identifying a causal relationship.

The gap in outcomes between children who experience family poverty and those who do not is a policy concern. The analysis attempted to ascertain if there were any family factors that mattered more for poor families, that is, that helped to reduce the gap. These statistical analyses involved interacting each factor with family poverty, to ascertain if the factor had a different impact for children in poor and non-poor families.

Age 13-16 analysis, outcomes and stressful events

For the teenage outcomes, the statistical analysis using ALSPAC data tested whether there was an association between stressful life events and each of the following outcomes: emotional, behavioural, social and school wellbeing (described further in Box 4) as well as KS3 (age 14) and KS4 (age 16) educational attainment. These associations were tested both individually and after controlling for a small set of relevant factors. The controls included the same outcome measure at an earlier time point, plus free-school meals status and special educational needs. The analysis could thereby identify whether there was a long-term as well as short-term association between the stressful event and the adolescent outcome.

Box 4: Age 13 wellbeing outcomes

Emotional wellbeing includes questions to parents about their teenagers' separation anxiety, fears, compulsions and obsessions, anxiety and moods.

Behavioural wellbeing includes questions about their teenagers' attention, awkward and troublesome behaviours, such as not listening, not following rules and telling lies.

Social wellbeing includes questions about their teenagers' friendships and social interactions and awareness, such as having at least one good friend, liked by other children and awareness of other people's feelings.

School wellbeing includes questions about their teenagers' satisfaction and engagement in school, such as whether they enjoyed school and found it stimulating.

The stressful life events measured up to age 7, between age 7 and age 11, and between age 11 and age 13 were individually coded and then grouped into 18 types of event, ranging from bereavement to problems in school. The events were reported by parents and were those that they considered to be “exceptionally stressful” and “that would really upset almost anyone”. The full list can be found in Box 5. The majority of children experienced no stressful events.

Box 5: Stressful life events

1. Death of parent
2. Death of family member or friend
3. Child was seriously ill or injured
4. Family member was seriously ill or injured
5. Friend was ill or injured
6. Saw crime or accident
7. Negative change in parent’s financial situation
8. Domestic violence/abuse including alcohol and drugs
9. Victim of abuse, violence or bullying (not within immediate family)
10. Parents separated /divorced/ left
11. Moved/attended new school
12. Got a new (step) brother or sister
13. Pet died
14. Parents/family argued more than previously
15. Family member arrested
16. Homeless/Living in refuge/Foster care
17. Not seeing parents/siblings as much as usual
18. Problems in school or with friends

The results reported here for both the MCS and the ALSPAC analysis summarise whether the associations between family factors or stressful events and children’s outcomes were statistically significant, that is whether they could reasonably be generalised to all children of the same age.

Findings: Age 7 outcomes and family factors

Earlier research has shown that different family factors can be associated with different types of children’s outcomes. The MCS analysis was able to identify earlier childhood circumstances, parenting and family background factors that were each independently associated with specific aspects of children’s outcomes; that is, with non-verbal skills, verbal skills, maths skills, KS1 attainment and behaviour.

Risk factors important for age 7 outcomes

Table 1 shows those risk factors associated in the statistical analysis with *worse* outcomes on the different child outcome measures. It summarises the associations after all other parental behaviours and family and contextual characteristics had been held constant.³ Few risk factors were associated with worse outcomes on all outcome measures, once all other characteristics and behaviours were held constant. There were two exceptions.

One was if the child’s family was in poverty at one or more occasions on which an MCS survey took place. Family poverty was associated with children having poorer non-verbal, verbal and maths skills, lower KS1

³ There were few ‘surprises’, that is factors where past research indicated a significant relationship, but this was not found for any outcome in the age 7 analysis.

attainment and more behavioural difficulties. The second exception was if the child had a longstanding illness or disability.

Among family risk characteristics, the more siblings the child had, the worse their outcomes were predicted to be on four of the five measures. That is, greater numbers of siblings were associated with lower scores on the three measures of cognitive ability and of KS1 attainment. But increasing numbers of siblings was not associated with worse behavioural outcomes.

A number of other factors were negatively associated with one or more of the outcome measures. The more television the child watched daily, the worse their verbal ability scores tended to be, other things being equal. Having a mother who suffered or had suffered depression was associated with lower KS1 attainment and greater behavioural difficulties. Where the mother was a lone parent at previous MCS surveys, the child was predicted to have more behavioural difficulties. Where the family was on means-tested benefits or behind with bills, this was associated, over and above their poverty status, with lower verbal ability scores. Being behind with bills was also associated with worse behavioural outcomes.

Table 1: Family and parental risk factors and their association with children’s cognitive, educational and behavioural outcomes at age 7

	Non-verbal skills	Verbal skills	Maths skills	KS1 attainment	Behaviour
<i>Child factors</i>					
Child has a longstanding illness or disability	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
The more hours child watches TV		✓			
<i>Family Characteristics</i>					
Family was in poverty on one or more occasions	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
The more siblings the child has	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Mother is a lone parent					✓
Mother suffers from depression				✓	✓
Family is on means-tested benefits		✓			
Family is behind with their bills		✓			✓
<i>Family behaviours and interactions</i>					
Mother smokes		✓			✓
Father smokes		✓			
Father has difficulty with basic reading		✓	✓	✓	
Child is disciplined more often			✓	✓	✓
Grandparents care regularly for the child	✓				

• Note: All factors were included in all analysis. Ticks show that the factor is a significant risk factor for the outcome (associated with worse outcomes) after controlling for all other factors. Blank cells represent no significant association.

Turning to behavioural indicators, father’s and mother’s smoking was associated with lower verbal ability scores and, for mother’s smoking, with the child having more behavioural difficulties. The child’s father having difficulty with basic reading, was associated with poorer verbal skills, maths skills and KS1

attainment. More frequent disciplining was associated with poorer maths skills, KS1 outcomes and behaviour. Finally, regular grandparental care was associated with worse non-verbal skills.

Promotive factors important for age 7 outcomes

Table 2 shows those factors associated in the statistical analysis with better outcomes on the different measures. Once again, it summarises the associations after all other parental behaviours and family and contextual characteristics had been held constant.

One promotive factor that was consistently associated with all outcomes was mother's higher levels of educational qualifications, specifically, level 4 (diplomas) and above for cognitive skills and KS1 attainment, and level 5 (degrees) for behaviour.

Table 2: Family and parental promotive factors and their association with children's cognitive, educational and behavioural outcomes at age 7

	Non-verbal skills	Verbal skills	Maths skills	KS1 attainment	Behaviour
<u>Family characteristics</u>					
Mother has a higher level of qualifications	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Family is owner-occupier of home				✓	
The more rooms there are in the home	✓	✓	✓	✓	
<u>Family interactions and behaviour</u>					
Mother drinks alcohol more regularly					✓
Mother considers she is a good parent		✓			✓
Mother reads to the child more often		✓	✓	✓	
Father reads to the child more often		✓			
Mother says she is close to child					✓
Rules are strictly enforced		✓		✓	
Parents have contact with the child's school		✓			
<u>Peer factors</u>					
Child sees friends more often outside school					✓
<u>Social support</u>					
Grandparents <i>would</i> help financially if needed		✓		✓	
<u>Neighbourhood or area</u>					
Mother feels safe in the area		✓			
Family lives in less deprived area			✓		

- Note: All factors were included in all analysis. Ticks show that the factor is a significant promotive factor for the particular outcome (associated with better outcomes) after controlling for all other factors. Blank cells represent no significant association.

Two aspects of housing were associated with better outcomes. Bigger houses corresponded to higher scores (for each additional room) on all three measures of cognitive ability and for KS1 attainment. In addition, living in an owner-occupied home was associated with higher educational attainment at age 7, though not with any of the other outcomes.

Various parental behaviours were also associated with more positive outcomes for children. These included the frequency with which mothers and fathers read to the child for verbal ability scores and, for mothers, also for maths skills and for KS1 attainment. A mother's positive perception of her parenting was associated with both better verbal skills and fewer behavioural difficulties. Mothers' feelings of particular closeness to the child were also associated with fewer behavioural difficulties. The strict enforcement of

rules was positively associated with better verbal skills and higher KS1 attainment, other things being equal.

Parental contact with the school was associated with the child having better verbal skills. Children’s own frequency of contact with friends was associated with better behavioural outcomes. Potential financial support from grandparents was associated with better verbal skills and with higher KS1 attainment, while the mother feeling safe in the area was associated with the child having higher verbal skills. Living in a less deprived area was associated with the child having better maths skills.

Clearly these relationships cannot be considered to be directly or causally linked to the child’s cognitive, educational and behavioural outcomes. However, such indicators may help to reveal the particular sets of family circumstances or the conditions under which more favourable cognitive skills, KS1 attainment and fewer behavioural difficulties occur.

Protective factors

The analysis also aimed to identify whether there were any protective factors; that is, factors that were associated with a reduction in the gap in cognitive skills, KS1 attainment or behaviour between those children with experience of family poverty and those without. Existing research has not looked extensively at this question, but has typically assumed that positive factors are equally positive for disadvantaged and advantaged children. Further statistical analysis showed that there were only a small number of protective factors, and they differed according to outcome. This indicates that the assumptions of early research are largely validated. Where factors are positive (such as parents reading to their child) they tend to be positive for advantaged and disadvantaged children alike. The exceptions are illustrated in Table 3.

Table 3: Protective factors for children in poverty and age 7 outcomes

	Non-verbal skills	Verbal skills	Maths skills	KS1 attainment	Behaviour
<u>Family characteristics</u>					
Mother has a higher level of qualifications			✓	✓	
Family is not on benefits		✓			
Family is owner-occupier of home				✓	
<u>Peer factors</u>					
Child sees friends more often outside school					✓
<u>Neighbourhood or area</u>					
Mother feels safe in the area		✓			

The analysis showed that:

- Children living in family poverty but with highly educated mothers had maths and KS1 scores that were closer to non-poor children; and those children living in poverty with less well educated mothers had bigger gaps.
- The combination of family poverty and being on means-tested benefits resulted in a bigger gap in verbal ability scores compared with children not in poverty, than poverty on its own.
- Poor children whose families lived in owner-occupied housing had KS1 scores that were closer to children who had never been in poverty. Those poor children who lived in social housing had a bigger gap.

- Children in poverty who saw friends more often had behavioural scores that were closer to otherwise similar children not in poverty. Those poor children who saw their friends less often tended to have worse behaviour.
- Similarly, children in poor families whose mothers felt safe in the area tended to have verbal skills that were more like those of non-poor children.

Findings: Age 13-16 outcomes and stressful life events

Turning to the impact of stressful life events, the analysis of the ALSPAC data provided a richer understanding of the role of specific stressful life events. It showed that these events could sometimes have enduring effects on educational outcomes and on wellbeing. Stressful events which were associated with lower KS3 attainment and worse wellbeing for teenagers, no matter what age they occurred, included:

- Domestic abuse
- Victimization or abuse outside of the family
- Homelessness/placed in care

Stressful events which were associated with lower wellbeing but not educational attainment, no matter what age they occurred, included:

- Death in the family
- Serious illness in the family
- Family member arrested

Stressful events which were associated with lower educational attainment or worse wellbeing, but only when the event occurred when the child was older than 7 years, included:

- Parental divorce
- Parents arguing
- Not seeing parents/siblings as much as usual
- Moving/attending a new school

It is clear that stressful events can potentially disrupt teenagers' lives; and in some cases have enduring effects from early childhood. Some events are likely to be beyond the scope of intervention, such as parental separation and divorce. Indeed, in some cases parental separation may bring an end to stressful family experiences related to abuse and violence in the home. However, the analysis highlights the diversity and extent of stressful events in childhood, and their negative consequences across a range of outcomes. It also showed how some events remain significant for later outcomes only if they occur later in childhood, such as changing school after the transition to secondary school rather than moving schools within primary education.

Conclusions and implications

The research on age 7 outcomes is, by and large, consistent with earlier analyses. It shows that a wide range of family and parental characteristics are associated with one or more child outcome, but few are consistently associated with all outcomes. Moreover, the results largely confirmed the pattern highlighted in earlier analyses of the MCS that, in a nutshell, both parenting and poverty matter for children's outcomes.

Tackling child poverty and supporting positive parenting are thus both important for ensuring children achieve their potential. However, there are few family or parental characteristics where intervention would lead to closing the gap between advantaged and disadvantaged children: positive parenting behaviours are equally positive for all children.

The analysis was able to include a range of measures of fathers' characteristics and behaviours. While relatively few of these were associated with children's outcomes, father reading to the 7-year-old more frequently was associated with better verbal skills over and above how much the mother read to the child. The effect of a father reading to the child every day compared to never reading was about half that of having a highly educated mother rather than a mother with no qualifications, but about the same as the effect of not being poor compared to being poor. Conversely, where the father had poor basic skills, this was associated with the child having lower verbal skills, maths skills and KS1 scores, other things being equal.

KS1 scores might be expected to be more independent of family context and parenting than cognitive ability measures, once the child had been in school for a few years. The factors that are associated with KS1 outcomes are also likely to be important for subsequent educational attainment. Child disability, an increasing number of siblings, having a depressed mother, having a father with limited literacy skills, and being frequently disciplined were all significant risk factors and associated with lower KS1 scores. The scale of the effects indicated that each additional sibling reduced KS1 scores by an equivalent amount to the impact of the family being in poverty, holding all factors constant; but the impact of disability on KS1 scores was somewhat larger. Having three siblings compared to no siblings was commensurate with the disadvantage associated with having a mother with no qualifications rather than a highly qualified mother, other things being equal. On the other hand, having a highly educated mother, living in owner occupation, having more rooms in the house, mother reading to the child more often, enforcement of rules, and having grandparents willing to help out financially if needed were all associated with higher KS1 scores. This tends to suggest that children's learning is promoted not only by specific parental behaviours, but also in contexts where there is some degree of financial security and support.

The age 7 analyses included a very wide range of factors to help account for the differences in children's outcomes across the five measures. Nevertheless, there remains much that cannot be 'explained', even by all those aspects of family and parenting that were included. Children are both varied in their outcomes and often resilient. Thus these reported associations, while they may support better outcomes or put children at risk of worse ones, are clearly far from being deterministic.

In relation to the role of stressful life events in adolescence, the analysis showed how particular stressful life events impact on outcomes across a range of domains. It is clear that children can experience a range of stressful life events across their childhoods, including some extreme experiences, though, fortunately, this is true for a minority of children. Extreme stressful events, such as homelessness, victimisation or domestic violence/abuse, can have longer-term effects on attainment and wellbeing. Moreover, some stressful events impact on children's emotional and social wellbeing but not their educational outcomes: the negative impacts on their wellbeing may thus more easily be missed. Some stressful events appear to have no long-term impacts on the outcomes measured here, if they occur at younger ages.

Figure 1: Family stressors and children's outcomes at age 7

<p>Non verbal skills</p> <p>Risk factors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Child has illness or disability - Family was in poverty - The more siblings the child has - Family is behind on bills - Child is cared for by grandparents - Grandparents or others <i>do</i> help family financially <p>Promotive factors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mother has higher level of qualifications - The more rooms in the home <p>Protective factors</p> <p>None</p>	<p>Verbal skills</p> <p>Risk factors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Child has illness or disability - Family was in poverty - The more TV the child watches - The more siblings the child has - Family is on benefits - Family is behind on bills - Grandparents or others <i>do</i> help family financially - Father has difficulty with basic reading - Father smokes <p>Promotive factors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mother has higher level of qualifications - Mother and father read more to child - The more rooms in the home - Mother thinks she is a good parent - Parents have contact with school - Grandparents <i>would</i> help financially - Mother feels safe in the area <p>Protective factors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mother feels safe in the area - Family is not on benefits 	<p>Maths skills</p> <p>Risk factors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Child has illness or disability - Family was in poverty - The more siblings the child has - Child is disciplined more often - Grandparents or others <i>do</i> help family financially - Father has difficulty with basic reading <p>Promotive factors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mother has higher level of qualifications - Family lives in less deprived area - The more rooms in the home <p>Protective factors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mother has higher level of qualifications 	<p>KS1</p> <p>Risk factors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Child has illness or disability - Family was in poverty - The more siblings the child has - Mother suffers from depression - Father has difficulty with basic reading - Child is disciplined more often <p>Promotive factors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mother has higher level of qualifications - The more rooms in the home - The more mother reads to child - Rules are strictly enforced - Grandparents <i>would</i> help financially <p>Protective factors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mother has higher level of qualifications - Family is owner occupier of home
<p>KEY</p> <p>Risk factor: linked to worse cognitive ability or behaviour</p> <p>Promotive factor: linked to better cognitive ability or behaviour</p> <p>Protective factor: reduces the gap between those in poverty and those not in poverty</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Common Risk factors</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Child has a longstanding illness or disability Family was in poverty on one or more occasions</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Common Promotive factors</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Mother has higher level of qualifications</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Common Protective factors</p> <p style="text-align: center;">None</p>		

Additional Information

The full report can be accessed at <http://www.education.gov.uk/publications/>

Further information about this research can be obtained from

Jessica Dunn, Level 5, 2 St Paul's Place, 125 Norfolk St, Sheffield, S1 2FJ

jessica.dunn@education.gsi.gov.uk

The views expressed in this report are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect those of the Department for Education.

The Childhood Wellbeing Research Centre is an independent research centre with funding from the Department for Education. It is a partnership between the Thomas Coram Research Unit (TCRU) and other centres at the Institute of Education, the Centre for Child and Family Research (CCFR) at Loughborough University and the Personal Social Services Research Unit at the University of Kent.