# Unemployment and relationship happiness in the United Kingdom

Niels Blom

Brienna Perelli-Harris

# ABSTRACT

Here we investigate the association between unemployment and relationship quality between partners in the United Kingdom. We investigate multiple dimensions of unemployment – current unemployment, changes in unemployment, duration of unemployment, and past unemployment – each of which provides unique insights into how economic uncertainty can strain relationships. This work improves our understanding of the long-term effect of unemployment and indicates how relationships become most vulnerable to dissolution. Using British longitudinal data (UKHLS), we employ random and fixed regression analyses. The results highlight the gendered nature of relationships and employment within British couples. As found in previous studies, unemployment is related to lower quality partner relationships, particularly men's unemployment. We find that problems within the relationship accumulate over the course of men's unemployment. In addition, men's re-employment does not solve problems rising from unemployment, especially for women, who continue to be less happy with the relationship when their male partner was unemployed in the recent past. Our results further indicate that the association between unemployment and relationship quality does not differ by parental status. Overall, the research showed that unemployment is not only related to relationship quality at the time of unemployment, but has a scarring effect on partner relationship quality.

# KEYWORDS

# EDITORIAL NOTE

Niels Blom is a Research Fellow at the University of Southampton and a member of the ESRC Centre for Population Change

Brienna Perelli-Harris is Professor of Demography at the University of Southampton and a member of the ESRC Centre for Population Change.

Corresponding author: Dr Niels Blom, Department of Social Statistics and Demography, University of Southampton, United Kingdom. Email: n.blom@soton.ac.uk

**UNEMPLOYMENT AND RELATIONSHIP HAPPINESS IN THE UNITED KINGDOM**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

# 1.    INTRODUCTION

A large body of evidence has found that unemployment adversely affects economic and psychological well-being for individuals (e.g. Gangl, 2006; Heggebø & Elstad, 2018; Strandh, Hammarström, Nilsson, Nordenmark, & Russel, 2013). However, less research has examined the association between economic adversity and the well-being of couples. Prior studies have found that couples who experience economic hardship have on average lower quality relationships (Blom, Kraaykamp, & Verbakel, 2019; Conger, Conger, & Martin, 2010; Hardie, Geist, & Lucas, 2014). In particular, unemployment and the experience of job loss are detrimental to relationships (Doiron & Mendolia, 2012; Hansen, 2005). However, it is unclear how long unemployment affects people's happiness with their relationships; only as long as the employment spell lasts, or are the effects are enduring? The impact of unemployment may be temporary, and couples may recover from the initial experience of job loss (Luhmann, Hofmann, Eid, & Lucas, 2012), or relationship problems may accumulate the longer unemployment lasts (Hansen, 2005). Additionally, even though people may reenter the labor force, their past unemployment experience may have scarred the relationship, preventing a full recovery of relationship happiness after reemployment. Each of these dimensions -- current unemployment, past experiences of unemployment, and the accumulation of long-term disadvantage -- provide unique insights into how economic uncertainty can strain relationships over time.

The context of our study – the United Kingdom – was particularly affected by economic uncertainty and changes in unemployment during the period under study (2009-2017). The Great Recession started in mid-2008 and led to a steep decline in GDP (Allen, 2010). This economic slow-down resulted in the unemployment rate rising from 5.5 percent in early 2007 to 8.4 in late 2011, before declining to 4.4 percent in late 2017 (Office for National Statistics, 2019). During the Great Recession, the government also implemented a program of austerity, reducing unemployment benefits and placing greater obligations on the unemployed to search for work (Shahidi, 2015). Thus, in addition to the economic uncertainty created by the Great Recession, the government's austerity measures weakened the economic positions of the unemployed, potentially placing even greater financial strain on couples.

The UK context provides an important backdrop to better understand how past and present unemployment experiences shape relationship functioning and maintenance. Prior

studies which did not take these temporal dimensions into account, may have underestimated the full association between unemployment and relationship happiness. If the experience of unemployment continues to scar relationship happiness after reemployment, the association between unemployment and poor relationship happiness may be larger than previously anticipated. Similarly, if prolonged unemployment continues to degrade relationship functioning, couples could be at greater risk of worse outcomes and potential relationship dissolution. These nuanced views remain hidden when only a simple dichotomous indicator of employment status is used.

Given that both partners can contribute to the household economy, the unemployment of one partner may severely impact household finances and functioning. The loss of income and general strain of one partner's unemployment may worsen the other partner's perception of the relationship. The stress of one partner being unemployed may also spill over to the other partner (Inanc, 2018), resulting in more conflict and less communication (Conger et al., 2010). Thus, it is important to evaluate the effect of partners' unemployment on the respondents' reported relationship happiness. Additionally, the effect of unemployment on relationship quality may differ for men and women (Blom & Hewitt, 2019; Hardie et al., 2014; Kinnunen & Feldt, 2004; Kinnunen & Pulkkinen, 1998). Traditionally, men were considered responsible for breadwinning, whereas women were primarily responsible for care-work. Although these norms have declined over the decades, many people still adhere to these conceptions in the UK (Scott & Clery, 2013). Finally, it is also important to find out whether the association between economic uncertainty and relationship happiness differs between childless individuals compared to parents. Children tend to lower parental relationship quality (Keizer & Schenk, 2012); however, children also represent an investment in the relationship, and are often indicative of more committed couples (Berrington, Perelli-Harris, & Trevena, 2015). Because children place an additional financial burden on couples, couples with children may face greater strain during unemployment spells than childless couples, although this was not found for family life satisfaction (Blom et al., 2019).

The household longitudinal panel data from the UK (the UK Household Longitudinal Study 2009-2017), is uniquely suited to examine the association between multiple dimensions of employment and relationship quality from both partners' perspectives. The large dataset includes detailed employment histories, tracking respondents as they experience job loss and recovery and allowing us to calculate the duration of unemployment spells for both partners,

often unavailable in smaller datasets. In addition, the UKHLS has a wealth of variables that control for important socio-demographic variables, including childhood selection mechanisms. While our analyses cannot account for unobserved heterogeneity or claim a causal relationship, they do move us towards a better understanding of how and why steady employment matters for the maintenance of healthy relationships.

## 2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND HYPOTHESES

Several theoretical frameworks guide our hypotheses, most notably the family-stress model (Conger et al., 2010). The family-stress model posits that negative economic events, such as job loss, leads to more pressures on household finances, creates more stress and distress, erodes couple communication and support, and eventually results in a decline in relationship happiness (Conger et al., 2010). However, the family stress model does not posit how couples are affected by the duration of the economic events, potentially leading to cumulative disadvantage, or the scarring of past events, which could leave a long-term stain on couples' perceptions. Below we expand the family-stress model to incorporate a concept of time – how past and present circumstances, shape current relationships.

### 2.1. UNEMPLOYMENT

As discussed in the family stress-model, unemployment often creates economic pressures that lead to stress and strain in the household (Conger et al., 2010). With the loss of income, households can experience an erosion in standard of living and struggle to make ends meet. These stressors can impact both the individual's perception of the relationship and the way that couples interact and communicate. Aside from the financial difficulties, with the loss of a job, the individual loses many of the benefits that come with employment, such as time structure, regular activity, purpose in life, social contacts, status and identity (Jahoda, 1982). Both the loss of financial resources and other benefits of employment can impact mental well-being, lower self-esteem, and induce the risk of emotional and behavioral problems (e.g. depression, anxiety, anger, and antisocial behavior) (Strandh et al., 2013; Suh, Diener, & Fujita, 1996). Individuals who experience job loss can become withdrawn and uncommunicative, as they struggle to cope with the lack of structured economic activity. The feelings of inadequacy and frustration can spill over to how they perceive their own relationship.

The unemployment situation of one partner could also affect the quality of the partner relationship, also known as crossover (Inanc, 2018). Stressful events could affect couples' communication and problem solving processes, for instance it may induce social undermining, hostility, and communication (Neff & Karney, 2017). One partner may begin to feel resentment and blame the other for the loss of income and stability. This distress could also lead couples to engage in less supportive behaviors and positive interactions, with emotional withdrawal, conflict and negative responses becoming more recurrent (Merolla, 2017). Individuals under strain are less able to support the partner and communicate less constructively (Bodenmann et al., 2015). As a result, job loss could lead to a drop in relationship happiness.

> (Hypothesis 1a) *People who are unemployed have lower quality relationships than their employed counterparts.*

> (Hypothesis 1b) *People whose partners are unemployed have lower quality relationships than those whose partners are employed.*

These hypotheses relate to employment status and compare employed and unemployed individuals. However, we are also interested in how a *change* in employment alters relationship happiness. According to the family stress model, unemployment leads to a deterioration in financial stability and new stressors that impact the relationship (Conger et al., 2010). Becoming unemployed is also associated with a decline in wellbeing (e.g. Inanc, 2018; Lucas, Clark, Georgellis, & Diener, 2004) and worsening of emotional states (Schauss, Howell, & Ellmo, 2019; von Scheve, Esche, & Schupp, 2017). Thus, transitions between being employed and unemployed change financial and social circumstances, as well as emotional states, which can lower the quality of partner relationships.

> (Hypothesis 2) *People become less happy with their partner relationship when they (a) or their partner (b) experience unemployment after being employed.*

## 2.2. DURATION OF EMPLOYMENT

Previous studies on the association between unemployment and relationship quality have only examined a snapshot in time (e.g. Blom et al., 2019). Yet long-term unemployment may be very important for the persistence and happiness of the relationship. Couples may either; adapt after the initial shock of job loss and return to their original happiness; or their relationship

quality may gradually degrade. Set-point theory is a useful framework for positing the return to previous levels of relationship happiness. According to set-point theory, people have an established level of subjective wellbeing, and life events only lead to a temporary change in wellbeing (Headey, 2008, 2010). The theory posits that after the initial shock of an event, wellbeing reverts to its pre-event level (Lucas et al., 2004; Suh et al., 1996). This suggests that changes in employment could to lead to a temporary change in relationship quality, but not necessarily to long-term change.

(Hypothesis 3a) *Following unemployment, after an initial decline in relationship quality, relationship quality rises.*

However, set-point theory has been critiqued as many longitudinal studies do not find a quick or full return to former wellbeing after negative life events, such as unemployment (Headey, 2010; Lucas et al., 2004; Luhmann et al., 2012). Even after being unemployed for several years, not having a job can continue to negatively affect one's wellbeing (Lucas et al., 2004; Lynch, Kaplan, & Shema, 1997). The duration of men's unemployment has been shown to negatively impact men's and women's relationship quality via economic strain and men's psychological distress (Kinnunen & Feldt, 2004). For women it was also directly negatively related to her relationship quality (Kinnunen & Feldt, 2004). Thus, although the initial shock of unemployment may have passed, couples continue to deal with the negative consequences of unemployment, which may accumulate over time. Financially, people may have savings to immediately buffer the loss of income following unemployment, but this will generally not be sustainable long-term. The longer someone is unemployed, the less likely they will be hired again (Van Belle, Di Stasio, Caers, De Couck, & Baert, 2018), making their unemployment situation less likely to change. Furthermore, spousal support may decline the longer an individual is exposed to stressful circumstances (Lepore, Evans, & Schneider, 1991). Rao's (2017) qualitative study on American women shows that some wives increasingly abstained from emotionally supporting their partner when he was long-term unemployed, because it became too emotionally costly for them. Based on accumulative disadvantage, we therefore expect:

(Hypothesis 3b) *The longer one is unemployed, the lower their relationship quality.*

## 2.3. SCARRING

Unemployment can cause a scar on future prospects, jeopardizing reentry to the labor market (Eliason & Storrie, 2006), and straining mental health and psychological well-being (Mousteri, Daly, & Delaney, 2018). Studies in the UK, US, and Sweden found that even after reemployment, individuals continued to have worse mental health (Daly & Delaney, 2013; Mossakowski, 2009; Strandh, Winefield, Nilsson, & Hammarström, 2014), although this was not found for life satisfaction in the UK (Zhou, Zou, Woods, & Wu, 2019). Unemployment may also permanently scar a relationship, resulting in a drop in relationship quality that may not recover after reentry into the labor force. Past experiences may continue to cast a shadow over the couple, affecting communication and support (Schauss et al., 2019). Schauss et al. (2019) showed that while reemployment decreased depression symptoms among US couples, it was not associated with a rise in supportive behavior or a decline in social undermining between partners, suggesting that the influence of unemployment on relationship happiness is long lasting. During unemployment, the unemployed seek support from the partner; however, these emotional resources become drained, especially when the emotional support is not reciprocal. Consistently seeking support from the partner may ultimately result in negative interactions (Lepore et al., 1991). After people are reemployed, these drained emotional resources may not immediately return to the initial level. Thus the unemployment experience may have scarred the dynamics within the relationship (Schauss et al., 2019).

(Hypothesis 4) *Employed individuals who have been unemployed recently, have lower quality relationships than their continuously employed counterparts.*

## 2.4. GENDER AND CHILDREN

The association between an individual's or their partner's unemployment experiences and relationship happiness could differ by gender. Traditionally men were responsible for the household income, and employment has been more strongly related to being a 'good' partner for men than for women (Scott & Clery, 2013; Townsend, 2002; West & Zimmerman, 1987). Men's unemployment is thus a greater deviation from the gendered ideal of being a 'good breadwinner' than women's unemployment is from the ideal of caregiver (Blom & Hewitt, 2019; Inanc, 2018; Strandh et al., 2013; West & Zimmerman, 1987). Men's inability to provide income could diminish their own sense of self-worth and social status, making them less supportive or engaged. Women may lose respect for their unemployed partner, as their

expectations about being a 'good breadwinner' may not have been met. The deviation from gendered expectations would result in lower relationship happiness. Thus, we hypothesize:

> (Hypothesis 5) *Men's (a) unemployment transition, (b) unemployment duration, and (c) re-employment matter more for both men's and women's relationship quality than women's unemployment situation.*

Furthermore, couples with dependent children could react differently to unemployment than couples without dependent children. Parents have financial responsibilities for their children, especially when they are still living in the household, and may feel more pressure to financially provide for them (Chaulk, Johnson, & Bulcroft, 2003). Particularly for men, breadwinning may be perceived as an important aspect of being a good parent (Townsend, 2002). If employment is especially important for parents, their relationship may suffer more from unemployment experiences than for their childless counterparts. The pressure of not living up to financial pressures, which are heightened when children are involved, could impact both the individual's wellbeing, as well as the regard of the partner. While employment differences in satisfaction with family life by parental status were not found by Blom et al. (2019), that study only investigated employment status cross-sectionally and with a different measure, possibly overlooking more nuanced differences when temporal dimensions are taken into account. We therefore hypothesize:

> (Hypothesis 6) *(a) Unemployment transitions, (b) unemployment duration, and (c) re-employment are more strongly associated with lower relationship quality for couples who have dependent children than those who do not.*

## 2.5.    SELECTION

One of the key issues is whether the association between employment status and relationship quality is causal or due to selection. The same characteristics which lead to unemployment may also result in lower relationship quality. Selection processes can begin early in childhood and continue into adulthood. For example, parental divorce is strongly associated with adult divorce (Dronkers & Härkönen, 2008) and poor relationship quality (Cui & Fincham, 2010). Socioeconomic status is also related to both adult economic uncertainty and partnership behaviors. Parents' education and occupational status is often predictive of children's

employment trajectories (Macmillan, 2014), but also associated with adult partnership behaviors, such as divorce (Brons & Härkönen, 2018). In adulthood, low education and persistent youth unemployment can be associated with both the likelihood of long-term unemployment and low chances of re-employment (Gregg, 2001). People with lower education were less likely to report trying to solve relationship problems together, thus influencing the quality of their relationship (Woszidlo & Segrin, 2013). Given that selection mechanisms can potentially produce a spurious relationship between unemployment and relationship happiness, it is important to control for as many factors as possible and use methods to address selection as appropriate.

## 3.    METHOD

### 3.1.   DATA

We used the UK Household Longitudinal Study (UKHLS) to test our hypotheses www.understandingsociety.ac.uk). The UKHLS is an annual household panel survey which began in 2009 with approximately 40,000 households in the United Kingdom, and included an ethnic minority boost sample. Later the UKHLS was expanded with former members of the British Household Panel Survey (BHPS) and another ethnic minority boost sample, but these extensions were not included in the study to preserve representativeness. Household members age 16 or older are interviewed annually. The interviews for each wave were held over a 24-month period, and thus waves overlap, but individual respondents were interviewed around the same time each year. Most interviews were computer aided face-to-face interviews (CAPI) and included a self-completion questionnaire (via paper in Wave 1 and 2, via computer from Wave 3 onward), which included the questions on relationship happiness. The household response rate was 57.3 percent in Wave 1 and the individual response rate was 81.8 percent in Wave 1. The individual re-interview rate ranges from 72.4 percent in Wave 2 to 82.0 percent in Wave 7. Attrition between Wave 1 and 2 was higher among people aged under 30, singles, students, the unemployed, renters, and among those in urban areas (Lynn, Burton, Kaminska, Knies, & Nandi, 2012).

People were asked about their relationship quality in Wave 1, 3, 5, and 7 (N= 141,876 observations). We selected observations of people in a cohabiting or married different-sex relationship (N= 87,204 observations), since the number of same-sex couples was too small to carry out meaningful analysis. Next, we selected observations where both partners where of

working age (age 20 to 60) (N= 59,346) and were not retired or in fulltime education (N= 50,921). We selected only observations with a valid answer on our dependent variables (N= 44,971). Some people separated and then repartnered and have valid observations with both partners (147 people). For these people we selected the observations with the first partner to ensure changes in partner's employment reflected changes in employment, not having a new partner (219 observations were dropped).Based on this criteria our main sample consists of 44,752 observations (23,706 female, 21,046 male observations) from 20,768 respondents (10,906 women, 9,862 men), see also Table A1 of the appendix.

Valid employment histories were needed to study the duration of current unemployment spells and past experiences, resulting in a lower sample size for these analyses. People in our sample were interviewed about their unemployment history in Wave 1 and their employment transitions in subsequent waves were added to this history if they continuously participated. For some observations the last employment transition did not match the stated employment status in that wave; these observations were considered invalid. See Table A1 of the appendix for the number of observations and respondents for each sample.

Characteristics of the partner were asked of the partner directly, therefore respondents have missing values on these characteristics if their partner was not interviewed. If the value for the duration of the relationship was missing, we imputed it with the value of the partner. Missing values of all independent variables were imputed in Stata with multiple imputation methods; multiple logistic; logistic; linear; and truncated regression (5 datasets) based on gender, the variables described in the measurement section below, and age of the partner, using a long format, but not whole-wave missing data (Young & Johnson, 2015).

## 3.2.  MEASUREMENTS

*Relationship happiness*, our dependent variable, ranged from 1 ("extremely unhappy") to 7 ("perfect"), and respondents were instructed that the middle point ("happy") represented the degree of happiness in most relationships. This measurement has been frequently used to investigate the quality of partner relationships (Schoen, Rogers, & Amato, 2006). We employ relationship happiness as a continuous variable. Descriptive statistics for all variables in the various samples are shown in Table A2 and A3of the appendix.

*Unemployment* is operationalized in different ways depending on the analysis. 1) *Employment status* consists of three categories: employed, unemployed, and other. The latter category is composed of homemakers, long-term sick or disabled, on maternity leave, doing something else, and other smaller categories. 2) *Unemployment duration* captures the number of months an individual was unemployed up to a maximum of five years. We tested different specifications of the duration of unemployment, including linear and quadratic, to investigate possible curve linearity. 3) To study *past unemployment experience* we differentiated the employed between whether they have been unemployed in the past two years for at least one month and those who have not been unemployed in the past two years. Robustness checks included whether people were employed in the past year and past three years, which led to similar conclusions and are available upon request.

*Presence of children* was categorized in three categories: did not have a child, had a child living in the home, and had a child but none living in the same household. The couples who did not have a child were differentiated from those with children who did not live in the household because parents may (perceive they) have economic responsibilities towards the children even when these children do not live in the household. The category of children in the home was not further differentiated by children's age because we aimed to have a parsimonious model, and the sizes of the categories became particularly small in some of the analyses.

We take *household income* into account in additional analyses to study whether the association between unemployment and relationship quality goes beyond merely an individual income effect. Income was operationalized as OECD equivalized net household income, and couples were categorized in quartiles per wave to take economic growth into account.

To control for selection mechanisms that might be associated with both unemployment and relationship quality, we include various individual, partner, relationship, and childhood background characteristics. The individual characteristics we control for are *age* (in five-year categories), *educational attainment* (higher degree, other higher degree, A level or similar, GCSE or similar, other qualification, no qualification), *ethnicity* (white native, other white, mixed, Asian, black, other), *health status* (good versus poor self-rated health), and prior relationship history (whether they cohabited or were married to a previous partner). The partner controls are the *partner's health status* (good versus poor self-rated health). The controls of relationship characteristics are *marital status* (cohabiting versus married) and *relationship*

*duration* (in five-year categories). We also control for *region* (Government Office Region, Northern Ireland, Scotland, Wales). Lastly, in order to account for selection mechanisms that may influence relationship quality throughout adulthood, we include the following childhood background characteristics: *Parental socioeconomic status* was operationalized as the National Statistics Socio-economic Classification category of the parent with the highest status when the respondent was age 14. These categories are management and professional, intermediate, small employers and own account, lower supervisory and technical, semi-routine and routine, and not employed. The other two childhood background characteristics are *relationship status of parents* (at age 14 married or living together, separated or divorced, other reason not living together, missing) and *age of mother at birth* (<20, 20-24, 25<, missing). The last two variables contain a missing category and are not imputed because the first variable was asked of respondents in Wave 1 and the latter only for people whose mother was alive at time of the interview. Lastly, we control for personality characteristics (Big 5: Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Openness) in additional analyses as these were only available in Wave 3; these were characteristics were considered time-invariant. Any difference between these analyses and the main analyses will be mentioned in the result section. For the unemployment duration analyses categories are combined because of sample size (see Appendix A3).

## 3.3.    ANALYTICAL STRATEGY

We take several approaches to examine the effect of 1) current unemployment; 2) changes in one's current unemployment, 3) the duration of unemployment; and 4) the scarring effects of unemployment after re-employment.

In this study, we use both random and fixed effect models, because each approach addresses different research questions. To analyse 1) current unemployment, 3) the duration of unemployment[1], and 4) the scarring effect, we used linear random effect models with robust standard errors. To investigate 2) how changes in employment status are related to changes in relationship happiness we use linear fixed effect models. Random effect models address between-person variation, whereas fixed effect models investigate within-person variation. For instance, the random effects models estimated whether people who are unemployed suffer from

---

[1] The number of men whose partner was unemployed and the duration of her unemployment was known was very low, making random effect analyses impossible. Therefore OLS regression was employed for this group.

lower relationship quality than people who are employed. This approach allows us to compare individuals directly and take into account long-term disadvantage. Nonetheless, while we control for a range of selection mechanisms, random effects models cannot completely take into account unobserved heterogeneity from stable characteristics. Therefore, we turn to fixed effects models to study how individuals react to the experience of unemployment. By comparing individuals with themselves, the fixed effect analyses take into account unobserved heterogeneity, but they also suffer from the reduction of statistical power, as changes within individuals are typically less common than differences between persons, which could lead to falsely rejecting hypotheses. As a whole, these strategies complement each other, providing unique insights into different dimensions of unemployment.

We first estimated our analyses separately for men and women, and then tested for significant differences on a pooled sample with interactions between gender and all variables. Significant differences ($p<.10$) between men and women are indicated by bold coefficients. As mentioned before, we controlled for the level of household income in additional analyses. The models without household income are the 'a' models and we add income in the 'b' models in Tables 1 to 4.

## 4.    RESULTS

### 4.1.    CURRENT UNEMPLOYMENT

Using random effects models, we began by examining whether respondents' and their partners' employment status were associated with relationship happiness in Table 1. Model 1a included the individual's and partner's employment status and the controls; household income was included in Model 1b. Model 1a for men, showed that unemployed men were less happy with their relationship than their employed counterparts (B=-0.087, p<.05). The association remained similar when household income was included in Model 1b, but disappeared when personality characteristics were included. Among men, women's employment status did not significantly affect men's happiness with the relationship.

Results differed for women. While women who were unemployed were less happy with the relationship than employed women in Model 1a (B=-0.104, p<.05), this was no longer significant when income differences or personality characteristics were taken into account.

12

Women whose male partner was unemployed were less happy with the relationship than women whose partner was employed (B=-0.157, p<.001). While this difference declined when the level of household income was taken into account in Model 1b, it remained significant (B=-0.130, p<.001).

Furthermore, the difference in relationship happiness between the employed and unemployed was similar for men and women. However, the association between the partner's unemployment status and relationship happiness differed between men and women, where women's happiness was significantly lower when her male partner was unemployed.

| | Men | | | | Women | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Model 1a | | Model 1b | | Model 1a | | Model 1b | |
| | B | SE | B | SE | B | SE | B | SE |
| *Own Job status* | | | | | | | | |
| Employed | Ref. | | Ref. | | Ref. | | Ref. | |
| Unemployed | -0.087 * | 0.043 | -0.086 # | 0.045 | -0.104 * | 0.051 | -0.083 | 0.052 |
| Other | **-0.075** | **0.058** | **-0.070** | **0.058** | **0.032** | **0.026** | **0.047** # | **0.027** |
| *Partner job status* | | | | | | | | |
| Employed | Ref. | | Ref. | | Ref. | | Ref. | |
| Unemployed | **-0.020** | **0.049** | -0.012 | 0.050 | **-0.157** *** | **0.043** | **-0.130** ** | **0.045** |
| Other | **0.045** # | **0.026** | 0.047 # | 0.026 | **-0.164** ** | **0.055** | **-0.143** ** | **0.055** |
| *Household income* | | | | | | | | |
| 1st quartile | | | Ref. | | | | Ref. | |
| 2nd quartile | | | -0.031 | 0.028 | | | 0.027 | 0.027 |
| 3rd quartile | | | **-0.033** | **0.030** | | | **0.074** * | **0.030** |
| 4th quartile (highest income) | | | 0.092 ** | 0.033 | | | 0.108 *** | 0.032 |

**Table 1:** Relationship happiness and employment status, random effect models.

**Source:** UKHLS, 2009-2017.  21,046 observations of 9,862 men, 23,706 observations of 10,906 women.
# p<.1, * p<.05, ** p<.01, *** p<.001, bold significant (p<.1) difference between men and women.
Controlled for presence of children, age, educational attainment, ethnicity, individual health status, prior relationship history, partner's health status, marital status, relationship duration, region, parental socioeconomic status, relationship status of parents, and age of mother at birth.

## 4.2. CHANGES IN UNEMPLOYMENT

Next, in Table 2 we examined whether changes in unemployment were associated with changes in relationship happiness using fixed effect models. In contrast to the random effect models, changes in men's and women's own unemployment status was unrelated to changes in their relationship happiness. Similarly, when women became unemployed, men generally did not experience a change in relationship happiness. However, similar to the random effect models,

women became less happy with the relationship when men became unemployed, (B=-0.123, p<.05) in Model 2a. Women were significantly more affected by changes in the partner's unemployment status than men were.

| | Men | | | | Women | | | |
| | Model 2a | | Model 2b | | Model 2a | | Model 2b | |
| | B | SE | B | SE | B | SE | B | SE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Own Job status* | | | | | | | | |
| Employed | Ref. | | Ref. | | Ref. | | Ref. | |
| Unemployed | -0.094 | 0.067 | -0.090 | 0.068 | 0.042 | 0.070 | 0.047 | 0.071 |
| Other | 0.012 | 0.107 | 0.017 | 0.107 | 0.088 * | 0.040 | 0.091 * | 0.040 |
| *Partner Job status* | | | | | | | | |
| Employed | Ref. | | Ref. | | Ref. | | Ref. | |
| Unemployed | **0.030** | **0.069** | 0.033 | 0.069 | **-0.123** * | **0.062** | -0.119 # | 0.063 |
| Other | **0.107** ** | **0.040** | **0.108** ** | **0.040** | **-0.124** | **0.099** | -0.121 | **0.100** |
| *Household income* | | | | | | | | |
| 1st quartile (lowest income) | | | Ref. | | | | Ref. | |
| 2nd quartile | | | -0.026 | 0.038 | | | -0.008 | 0.035 |
| 3rd quartile | | | -0.020 | 0.044 | | | 0.016 | 0.043 |
| 4th quartile highest income) | | | 0.084 | 0.053 | | | 0.042 | 0.050 |

**Table 2:** Changes in relationship happiness and employment status, fixed effect models

**Source:** UKHLS, 2009-2017. 21,046 observations of 9,862 men, 23,706 observations of 10,906 women.
# $p<.1$, * $p<.05$, ** $p<.01$, *** $p<.001$, bold significant ($p<.1$) difference between men and women.
Controlled for presence of children, age, individual health status, partner's health status, marital status, and relationship duration.

## 4.3.    DURATION OF UNEMPLOYMENT SPELL

The association between the length of the current unemployment spell and relationship happiness was investigated in Table 3. Models 3a, 3b, and 4a and 4b for women, and Models 3a and 3b for men were estimated as random effect models. There was a small number of observations for men whose partner was unemployed and the duration of her unemployment was known. This number was insufficient for random effect analyses, therefore Models 4a and 4b for men were estimated with Ordinary Least Squares (OLS). First, Models 3a and 3b indicated that men's and women's relationship happiness was similar over the duration of their own unemployment spell; the coefficients for their unemployment duration did not reach significance. When personality characteristics were included, for men longer unemployment duration was negatively associated with relationship happiness (p<.1). Models 4a and 4b for men indicated that men's relationship happiness did not differ over the course of his partner's unemployment. However, models 4a and 4b indicated that over the course of men's unemployment spell, women became less happy with the relationship. Both the linear and quadratic term were significant at the p<.1 level. The quadratic term did not reach significance when personality characteristics were included. Women were less happy during the first years of the unemployment spell, reaching its lowest point after 3 years and then rising again.

| | Men | | | | Women | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Model 3a | | Model 3b | | Model 3a | | Model 3b | |
| | B | SE | B | SE | B | SE | B | SE |
| Own unemployment duration | -0.006 | 0.004 | -0.006 | 0.004 | -0.008 | 0.006 | -0.008 | 0.007 |
| Own unemployment duration squared | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.001 | 0.000 | 0.001 | 0.000 |
| *Partner Job status* | | | | | | | | |
| Employed | | | | | | | | |
| Unemployed | -0.141 | 0.228 | -0.179 | 0.231 | 0.460 | 0.318 | 0.474 | 0.340 |
| Other | -0.027 | 0.191 | -0.056 | 0.197 | 0.315 | 0.433 | 0.318 | 0.415 |
| *Household income* | | | | | | | | |
| 1st quartile (lowest income) | | | | | | | | |
| 2nd quartile | | | -0.373 | 0.215 | | | -0.346 | 0.313 |
| 3rd quartile | | | -0.150 | 0.318 | | | -0.020 | 0.504 |
| 4th quartile highest income) | | | -0.476 | 0.563 | | | 0.750 | 0.457 |

| | Men | | | | Women | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Model 4a | | Model 4b | | Model 4a | | | Model 4b | | |
| | B | SE | B | SE | B | | SE | B | | SE |
| Partner's unemployment duration | -0.009 | 0.010 | -0.009 | 0.010 | -0.008 | # | 0.004 | -0.008 | # | 0.004 |
| Partner's unemployment duration squared | 0.000 | 0.001 | 0.000 | 0.001 | 0.000 | # | 0.000 | 0.000 | # | 0.000 |
| *Own Job status* | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employed | | | | | | | | | | |
| Unemployed | 0.084 | 0.521 | 0.045 | 0.527 | -0.074 | | 0.231 | -0.111 | | 0.235 |
| Other | 0.066 | 0.701 | -0.275 | 0.651 | -0.196 | | 0.217 | -0.206 | | 0.219 |
| *Household income* | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1st quartile (lowest income) | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2nd quartile | | | -0.171 | 0.349 | | | | -0.020 | | 0.225 |
| 3rd quartile | | | -0.050 | 0.580 | | | | -0.325 | | 0.390 |
| 4th quartile highest income) | | | 1.608 * | 0.619 | | | | -0.152 | | 0.521 |

**Table 3:** Relationship happiness and duration of current unemployment spell, random effect and OLS models

**Source:** UKHLS, 2009-2017. Model 4a and 4b for men use OLS regression instead of random effects due to few observations per person. Model 3a and 3b: 413 observations of 334 men, 188 observations of 165 women. Model 4a and 4b: 98 observations of 98 men 415 observations of 337 women. # p<.1, * p<.05, ** p<.01, *** p<.001, bold significant (p<.1) difference between men and women in Models 3a and 3b. No gender difference for Models 4a and 4b are tested because of different modelling strategy. Controlled for presence of children, age, educational attainment, ethnicity, individual health status, prior relationship history, partner's health status, marital status, relationship duration, and parental socioeconomic status.

## 4.4.    PAST UNEMPLOYMENT

Table 4 presents the analysis of re-employment. We focus on differences in relationship happiness between the employed with and without the experience of unemployment in the past two years. First, men and women who experienced unemployment in the past period were similarly satisfied with their relationship as people who did not. Again, women's unemployment experience was not related to men's relationship happiness. Women whose male partner was employed but experienced unemployment in the recent past were less happy with their relationship compared to women whose partner did not experience unemployment

(B=-0.211, p<.01)[2]. This difference remained similar when the level of household income was included, indicating that the lower level of income among those who had experienced unemployment did not explain differences in relationship happiness. Nonetheless, the difference in relationship happiness by partner's unemployment history was not found among men. However, the difference in the association between men and women did not reach significance indicating that the gender differences were not very robust.

| | Men | | | | Women | | | |
| | Model 5a | | Model 5b | | Model 5a | | Model 5b | |
| | B | SE | B | SE | B | SE | B | SE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Own Job status* | | | | | | | | |
| Employed, wasn't unemployed | Ref. | | Ref. | | Ref. | | Ref. | |
| Employed, was unemployed | -0.039 | 0.071 | -0.035 | 0.071 | -0.046 | 0.088 | -0.043 | 0.088 |
| Unemployed | -0.083 # | 0.049 | -0.078 | 0.051 | -0.039 | 0.060 | -0.023 | 0.061 |
| Other | **-0.107** | **0.065** | **-0.100** | **0.066** | **0.036** | **0.033** | **0.046** | **0.033** |
| *Partner job status* | | | | | | | | |
| Employed, wasn't unemployed | Ref. | | Ref. | | Ref. | | Ref. | |
| Employed, was unemployed | -0.049 | 0.088 | -0.043 | 0.088 | -0.211 ** | 0.078 | -0.205 ** | 0.078 |
| Unemployed | **-0.083** | **0.059** | **-0.072** | **0.060** | **-0.248** *** | **0.051** | **-0.226** *** | **0.053** |
| Other | **0.022** | **0.031** | **0.028** | **0.032** | **-0.256** *** | **0.062** | **-0.238** *** | **0.063** |
| *Household income* | | | | | | | | |
| 1st quartile (lowest income) | | | | | | | | |
| 2nd quartile | | | -0.010 | 0.035 | | | 0.016 | 0.034 |
| 3rd quartile | | | -0.034 | 0.039 | | | 0.046 | 0.039 |
| 4th quartile (highest income) | | | 0.113 ** | 0.042 | | | 0.105 * | 0.042 |

**Table 4:** Relationship happiness and past unemployment experience, random effect models

**Source:** UKHLS, 2009-2017. 14,225 observations of 6,124 men, 14,582 observations of 6,229 women.
# p<.1, * p<.05, ** p<.01, *** p<.001, bold indicates significant (p<.1) difference between men and women. Controlled for presence of children, age, educational attainment, ethnicity, individual health status, prior relationship history, partner's health status, marital status, relationship duration, region, parental socioeconomic status, relationship status of parents, and age of mother at birth.

---

[2] Using a three year cut-off point for unemployment experience did not change the results, but the difference became larger but non-significant when a one year cut-off point was used, probably due to small sample size.

## 4.5. PRESENCE OF CHILDREN

In the next step we investigated whether the associations between (dimensions of) unemployment and relationship happiness differed by parental status. We estimated interaction coefficients between the unemployment dimensions and the presence of children, which indicated whether a person did not have children, had children living in the household, or had children but not living in the household. The results, available in Appendix Tables A4 to A7, indicated largely no significant interaction effects. Thus, the associations between unemployment dimensions and relationship happiness seemed similar between parents and non-parents. There was one exception: compared to childless women, unemployed women were especially less happy with the relationship when their children had left the household.

## 4.6. DIMENSIONS OF RELATIONSHIP QUALITY: DYADIC SATISFACTION AND DYADIC COHESION

Relationship happiness is a measurement of global relationship quality. However, unemployment may be differently related to specific aspects of relationship quality. For example, while the couple may be less happy within the relationship, that does not necessarily mean they have more conflict or do fewer activities together. Here, we investigate the *dyadic satisfaction* and *dyadic cohesion* subscales of the Revised Dyadic Adjustment Scale (as available in UKHLS) (Busby, Christensen, Crane, & Larson, 1995)[3]. Dyadic satisfaction concerns the stability of the relationship and conflict within the relationship. Dyadic cohesion asks about the shared activities and the way the couple converses (Appendix Table A8).

Overall, the different dimensions of unemployment appear to be more associated with the general measure of relationship happiness than to dyadic satisfaction and especially to dyadic cohesion (see Tables A9 to A12 of the Appendix). For instance, men's unemployment is negatively related to lower dyadic satisfaction for both men and women in random effect analyses, but not dyadic cohesion, and not in fixed effect analyses. Similarly, women whose partner was previously unemployed but returned to employment, do not differ in their dyadic satisfaction and cohesion from women whose partner was continuously employed, even though they reported being less happy with their relationship. These analyses also showed, however, that the longer men were unemployed, the lower they scored on dyadic satisfaction and

---

[3] The third subscale, dyadic consensus, is not available in the UKHLS.

cohesion, but not on relationship happiness. In total, unemployment seems to be related to how happy men and women are within their relationship, but less so to how much conflict and thoughts about dissolution they have or how much the couple does together.


## 5.    CONCLUSION

Many couples in Britain have experienced precarious economic positions such as unemployment, which became particularly acute during the Great Recession but declined after the recession to the lowest point in several decades (Allen, 2010; Office for National Statistics, 2019). While prior studies have found that unemployment has a detrimental impact on outcomes such as wellbeing (Inanc, 2018; Strandh et al., 2014), few studies have investigated relationship quality. Given the strong association between relationship quality, divorce (Tach & Halpern-Meekin, 2012), and children's outcomes (Harold & Sellers, 2018), it is important to first understand how unemployment is associated with relationship quality. The limited studies that have examined unemployment and relationship quality were largely cross-sectional in nature, not looking at different temporal dimensions of unemployment (e.g. Blom et al., 2019; Kinnunen & Feldt, 2004). Here, we have expanded on the extant literature by investigating how relationship quality is related to current and past experiences of unemployment, and by including both the individuals' and the partner's unemployment experiences.


Men and women were both less happy with their relationship when they were themselves unemployed, compared to their employed counterparts. However, these differences become insignificant when personality characteristics are taken into account. Additionally, when we investigated changes over time the association did not hold; an individual's new experience of unemployment did not lead to a change in relationship quality. This suggests that while the unemployed are less happy with their relationship, the association may be due to the long-term economic hardship that they experience, which would not be picked up by fixed-effect analyses. However, it could also be the case that the original difference in relationship quality was caused by unobserved confounders or potentially small numbers who experienced unemployment. The latter seems unlikely however given the number of transitions observed. The lack of significant effect found in the fixed-effects models and when personality characteristics were included raises doubts that the association between unemployment and relationship quality is causal. However, women became less happy with their relationship when

their partners became unemployed, suggesting causality for the influence of partner's employment status on relationship quality.

Furthermore, the effect of unemployment on one's own relationship happiness did not change throughout the period of unemployment for men or women. And after unemployment, when people have re-entered employment, their own relationship happiness seemed to revert to its 'original' level, as the relationship quality of those who re-entered employment did not differ from those who were never unemployed. Thus, in accordance with the family stress model, current unemployment differentiates unhappy couples from happy couples, but our findings indicate that over the long-term, unemployment does not have enduring effects for the individual.

On the other hand, unemployment did seem to affect the relationship quality of the female partner. Women whose husbands were unemployed were less happy with their relationship than women whose partners were employed, and when their husbands changed from employed to unemployed, women became less happy. Changes in employment status appeared to affect the quality of partner relationships, but primarily as crossover; women's relationship quality was affected by her partner's employment status. Additionally, women were increasingly less happy with the relationship over the course of their partner's unemployment, but the effect levelled off after several years of unemployment. This levelling off was potentially caused by dissolution as the unhappiest relationships may have dissolved after several years of unemployment. Lastly, women were less happy when their partner had experienced unemployment in the recent past, despite the fact that he had become re-employed. Thus, relationship quality seems to be scarred by men's past unemployment irrespective of his current status.

This study highlights the gendered nature of relationships and employment among British couples. Although attitudes have changed in recent decades, many people continue to regard breadwinning as particularly men's responsibility where mothers are often expected to be non- or part-time employed (Scott & Clery, 2013). This traditional pattern may explain why men's unemployment experiences affect women's relationship quality but not vice versa. The involuntary deviation from gendered expectations, in which men are expected to provide income, appears to affect the quality of partner relationships, at least regarding unemployment.

Furthermore, although parenthood exacerbates the normative and financial responsibilities people have (Chaulk et al., 2003), particularly for men (Townsend, 2002), we find no evidence that failing to live up to this parenthood ideal affects the quality of the partner relationship. Our results indicate that parent's relationship quality is similarly affected by unemployment as people who are not parents, providing further evidence for the negative association between unemployment and relationship quality, irrespective of one's parental status (Blom, Kraaykamp, & Verbakel, 2017; Blom et al., 2019).

Some limitations of our study must be noted. Our analysis cannot simultaneously model selection into partnerships and relationship quality, since individuals must be in a partnership to answer the questions on relationship quality. In addition, our models do not account for partnership dissolution, therefore we may underestimate associations between unemployment and relationship quality since the lowest quality relationships are more likely to dissolve. Furthermore, although the UKHLS has a large sample size, the number of unemployed was quite small due to the relatively low unemployment rate in the UK. This was specifically the case when we investigated unemployment duration and re-employment. In addition, we could not differentiate the unemployed based on whether they were unemployed due to redundancy, the end of a temporary contract, or dismissal, due to small sample sizes particularly with later analyses. However, the association with relationship quality may depend on the reason for job loss (Doiron & Mendolia, 2012). This is a promising avenue for future research.

Overall, this research indicates that unemployment is related to lower quality partner relationships, particularly when the man is unemployed. For women, relationships are especially at risk during their partner's unemployment, which can have long-term scarring effects and result in the accumulation of problems over time. Solely focussing on the currently unemployed thus overlooks partners' experiences and past experiences. The family stress model has – to our knowledge –previously not included these temporal dimensions of economic hardship; yet identifying time points when couples are especially susceptible to economic hardship is extremely important for informing policies. For example, the British Troubled Families Programme, which aims to reduce the strain faced by vulnerable families, could recognize the impact of unemployment. However, these programmes should not only offer relationship support to the unemployed, but also their partners, guiding them through the period of unemployment and subsequent re-employment.

# 6. REFERENCES

**Allen, G.** (2010). Recession and recovery. In A. Mellows-Facer (Ed.), *Key Issues for the New Parliament 2010. House of Commons Library Research* (pp. 28–29). London: House of Commons Library.

**Berrington, A., Perelli-Harris, B., & Trevena, P.** (2015). Commitment and the changing sequence of cohabitation, childbearing, and marriage: Insights from qualitative research in the UK. *Demographic Research*, *33*(12), 327–362. doi:10.4054/DemRes.2015.33.12

**Blom, N., & Hewitt, B.** (2019). Becoming a Female-Breadwinner Household in Australia: Changes in Relationship Satisfaction. *Journal of Marriage and Family.* doi:10.1111/jomf.12653

**Blom, N., Kraaykamp, G., & Verbakel, E.** (2017). Couples' division of employment and household chores and relationship satisfaction: A test of the specialization and equity hypotheses. *European Sociological Review*, *33*(2), 195–208. doi:10.1093/esr/jcw057

**Blom, N., Kraaykamp, G., & Verbakel, E.** (2019). Current and Expected Economic Hardship and Satisfaction With Family Life in Europe. *Journal of Family Issues*, *40*(1), 3–32. doi:10.1177/0192513X18802328

**Bodenmann, G., Meuwly, N., Germann, J., Nussbeck, F. W., Heinrichs, M., & Bradbury, T. N.** (2015). Effects of Stress on the Social Support Provided by Men and Women in Intimate Relationships. *Psychological Science*, *26*(10), 1584–1594. doi:10.1177/0956797615594616

**Brons, M. D., & Härkönen, J.** (2018). Parental Education and Family Dissolution: A Cross-National and Cohort Comparison. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *80*, 426–443. doi:10.1111/jomf.12461

**Busby, D. M., Christensen, C., Crane, D. R., & Larson, J. H.** (1995). A Revision of the Dyadic Adjustment Scale for Use with Distressed and Nondistressed Couples: Construct Hierarchy and Multidimensional Scales. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, *21*(3), 289–308. doi:10.1111/j.1752-0606.1995.tb00163.x

**Chaulk, B., Johnson, P. J., & Bulcroft, R.** (2003). Effects of Marriage and Children on Financial Risk Tolerance: A Synthesis of Family Development and Prospect Theory. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, *24*(3), 257–279.

**Conger, R. D., Conger, K. J., & Martin, M. J.** (2010). Socioeconomic Status, Family Processes, and Individual Development. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *72*(3), 685–704. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2010.00725.x.Socioeconomic

**Cui, M., & Fincham, F. D.** (2010). The differential effects of parental divorce and marital conflict on young adult romantic relationships. *Personal Relationships*, *17*, 331–343. doi:10.1111/j.1475-6811.2010.01279.x

**Daly, M., & Delaney, L.** (2013). The scarring effect of unemployment throughout adulthood on psychological distress at age 50: Estimates controlling for early adulthood distress and childhood psychological factors. *Social Science & Medicine*, *80*, 19–23. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2012.12.008

**Doiron, D., & Mendolia, S.** (2012). The impact of job loss on family dissolution. *Journal of Population Economics*, *25*(1), 367–398. doi:10.1007/s00148-010-0353-5

**Dronkers, J., & Härkönen, J.** (2008). The intergenerational transmission of divorce in cross-national perspective: Results from the Fertility and Family Surveys. *Population Studies*, *62*(3), 273–288. doi:10.1080/00324720802320475

**Eliason, M., & Storrie, D.** (2006). Lasting or Latent Scars? Swedish Evidence on the Long-Term Effects of Job Displacement. *Journal of Labor Economics*, *24*(4), 831–856.

**Gangl, M.** (2006). Scar Effects of Unemployment: An Assessment of Institutional Complementarities. *American Sociological Review*, *71*(6), 986–1013.

**Gregg, P.** (2001). The impact of youth unemployment on adult unemployment in the NCDS. *The Economic Journal*, *111*, F626–F653.

**Hansen, H. T.** (2005). Unemployment and marital dissolution: A panel data study of Norway. *European Sociological Review*, *21*(2), 135–148. doi:10.1093/esr/jci009

**Hardie, J. H., Geist, C., & Lucas, A.** (2014). His and hers: Economic factors and relationship quality in Germany. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *76*(4), 728–743. doi:10.1111/jomf.12129

**Harold, G. T., & Sellers, R.** (2018). Annual Research Review: Interparental conflict and youth psychopathology: an evidence review and practice focused update. *The Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, *59*(4), 374–402. doi:10.1111/jcpp.12893

**Headey, B.** (2008). The set-point theory of well-being: Negative results and consequent revisions. *Social Indicators Research*, *85*(3), 389–403. doi:10.1007/s11205-007-9134-2

**Headey, B.** (2010). The set point theory of well-being has serious flaws: On the eve of a scientific revolution? *Social Indicators Research*, *97*(1), 7–21. doi:10.1007/s11205-009-9559-x

**Heggebø, K., & Elstad, J. I.** (2018). Is it Easier to Be Unemployed When the Experience Is More Widely Shared ? Effects of Unemployment on Self-rated Health in 25 European Countries with Diverging Macroeconomic Conditions. *European Sociological Review*, *34*(1), 22–39. doi:10.1093/esr/jcx080

**Inanc, H.** (2018). Unemployment, Temporary Work, and Subjective Well-Being: The Gendered Effect of Spousal Labor Market Insecurity. *American Sociological Review*, *83*(3), 536–566. doi:10.1177/0003122418772061

**Jahoda, M.** (1982). *Employment and unemployment. A social-psychological analysis*. Campbridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

**Keizer, R., & Schenk, N.** (2012). Becoming a Parent and Relationship Satisfaction: A Longitudinal Dyadic Perspective. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *74*(4), 759–773. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2012.00991.x

**Kinnunen, U., & Feldt, T.** (2004). Economic stress and marital adjustment among couples: Analyses at the dyadic level. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *34*(5), 519–532. doi:10.1002/ejsp.213

**Kinnunen, U., & Pulkkinen, L. E. A.** (1998). Linking Economic Stress to Marital Quality Among Finnish Marital Couples: Mediator Effects. *Journal of Family Issues*, *19*(6), 705–724. doi:10.1177/019251398019006003

**Lepore, S. J., Evans, G. W., & Schneider, M. L.** (1991). Dynamic Role of Social Support in the Link Between Chronic Stress and Psychological Distress. *Interpersonal Relations and Group Processes*, *61*(6), 899–909.

**Lucas, R. E., Clark, A. E., Georgellis, Y., & Diener, E.** (2004). Unemployment Alters the Set Point for Life Satisfaction. *Psychological Science*, *15*(1), 8–13.

**Luhmann, M., Hofmann, W., Eid, M., & Lucas, R. E.** (2012). Subjective Well-Being and Adaptation to Life Events: A Meta-Analysis on Differences Between Cognitive and Affective Well- Being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *102*(3), 592–615. doi:10.1037/a0025948

**Lynch, J. W., Kaplan, G. A., & Shema, S. J.** (1997). Cumulative Impact of Sustained Economic Hardship on Physical, Cognitive, Psychological, and Social Functioning. *New England Journal of Medicine*, *337*(26), 1889–1895. doi:10.1056/NEJM199712253372606

**Lynn, P., Burton, J., Kaminska, O., Knies, G., & Nandi, A.** (2012). *An Initial Look at Non-Response and Attrition in Understanding Society* (Understanding Society Working Paper Series No. 2012-02).

**Macmillan, L.** (2014). Intergenerational worklessness in the UK and the role of local labour markets. *Oxford Economic Papers*, *66*, 871–889. doi:10.1093/oep/gpt046

**Merolla, A. J.** (2017). A longitudinal analysis of financial loss, anxiety, destructive conflict, and relational maintenance. *Personal Relationships*, *24*(4), 729–747. doi:10.1111/pere.12206

**Mossakowski, K. N.** (2009). The Influence of Past Unemployment Duration on Symptoms of Depression Among Young Women and Men in the United States. *American Journal of Public Health*, *99*(10), 1826–1832. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2008.152561

**Mousteri, V., Daly, M., & Delaney, L.** (2018). The scarring effect of unemployment on psychological well-being across Europe. *Social Science Research*, *72*(January), 146–169. doi:10.1016/j.ssresearch.2018.01.007

**Neff, L. A., & Karney, B. R.** (2017). Acknowledging the elephant in the room: how stressful environmental contexts shape relationship dynamics. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, *13*, 107–110. doi:10.1016/j.copsyc.2016.05.013

**Office for National Statistics.** (2019). Unemployment rate (aged 16 and over, seasonally adjusted). Retrieved August 30, 2019, from

https://www.ons.gov.uk/employmentandlabourmarket/peoplenotinwork/unemployment/time series/mgsx/lms

Rao, A. H. (2017). Stand By Your Man: Wives' Emotion Work During Men's Unemployment. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *79*(3), 636–656. doi:10.1111/jomf.12385

Schauss, E., Howell, K., & Ellmo, F. (2019). How Do Couples Cope With Unemployment: Examining Relationships Among Support, Undermining, and Depression. *The Family Journal*. doi:10.1177/1066480719835338

Schoen, R., Rogers, S. J., & Amato, P. R. (2006). Wives' Employment and Spouses' Marital Happiness. *Journal of Family Issues*, *27*(4), 506–528. doi:10.1177/0192513X05283983

Scott, J., & Clery, E. (2013). Gender roles: An incomplete revolution? In A. Park, C. Bryson, E. Clery, J. Curtice, & M. Phillips (Eds.), *British Social Attitudes 30* (pp. 115–139). London: NatCen Social Research.

Shahidi, F. V. (2015). Welfare Capitalism in Crisis: A Qualitative Comparative Analysis of Labour Market Policy Responses to the Great Recession. *Journal of Social Policy*, *44*(4), 659–686. doi:10.1017/S004727941500029X

Strandh, M., Hammarström, A., Nilsson, K., Nordenmark, M., & Russel, H. (2013). Unemployment, gender and mental health: The role of the gender regime. *Sociology of Health and Illness*, *35*(5), 649–665. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9566.2012.01517.x

Strandh, M., Winefield, A., Nilsson, K., & Hammarström, A. (2014). Unemployment and mental health scarring during the life course. *European Journal of Public Health*, *24*(3), 440–445. doi:10.1093/eurpub/cku005

Suh, E., Diener, E., & Fujita, F. (1996). Events and subjective well-being: only recent events matter. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *70*(5), 1091–1102.

Tach, L. M., & Halpern-Meekin, S. (2012). Marital Quality and Divorce Decisions: How Do Premarital Cohabitation and Nonmarital Childbearing Matter? *Family Relations*, *61*(4), 571–585.

Townsend, N. W. (2002). *The package deal: Marriage, work, and fatherhood in men's lives*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Van Belle, E., Di Stasio, V., Caers, R., De Couck, M., & Baert, S. (2018). Why Are Employers Put Off by Long Spells of Unemployment? *European Sociological Review*, *34*(6), 694–710. doi:10.1093/esr/jcy039

von Scheve, C., Esche, F., & Schupp, J. (2017). The Emotional Timeline of Unemployment: Anticipation, Reaction, and Adaptation. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *18*(4), 1231–1254. West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1987). Doing Gender. *Gender & Society*, *1*(2), 125–151.

Woszidlo, A., & Segrin, C. (2013). Negative Affectivity and Educational Attainment as Predictors of Newlyweds ' Problem Solving Communication and Marital Quality. *The Journal of Psychology*, *147*(1), 49–73. doi:10.1080/00223980.2012.674069

Young, R., & Johnson, D. R. (2015). Handling Missing Values in Longitudinal Panel Data With Multiple Imputation. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *77*(1), 277–294. doi:10.1111/jomf.12144

Zhou, Y., Zou, M., Woods, S. A., & Wu, C. (2019). The Restorative Effect of Work After Unemployment: An Intraindividual Analysis of Subjective Well-Being Recovery Through Reemployment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. doi:10.1037/apl0000393

# 7. APPENDIX

| | Samples | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Unemployment Status | Unemployment duration | | Past unemployment experience |
| | | Respondent | Partner | |
| | (Models 1 and 2) | (Models 3) | (Models 4) | (Models 5) |
| *Women* | | | | |
| Observations | 23,706 | 188 | 415 | 14,582 |
| Respondents | 10,906 | 165 | 337 | 6,229 |
| *Men* | | | | |
| Observations | 21,046 | 413 | 98 | 14,225 |
| Respondents | 9,862 | 334 | 98 | 6,124 |
| *Total* | | | | |
| Observations | 44,752 | 601 | 513 | 28,807 |
| Respondents | 20,768 | 499 | 435 | 12,353 |

**Table A1:** Number of observations and respondents in the different samples

**Source:** UKHLS 2009-2017

| | Unemployment Status (Models 1 and 2) | | | | Unemployment history (Models 5) | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | Men | | Women | | Men | | Women | |
| | Mean/% | SD | Mean/% | SD | Mean/% | SD | Mean/% | SD |
| Relationship happiness | 4.9 | 1.3 | 4.9 | 1.4 | 4.9 | 1.3 | 4.9 | 1.4 |
| *Job status* | | | | | | | | |
| Employed | 90.2 | | 74.6 | | | | | |
| Employed, wasn't unemployed | | | | | 85.1 | | 70.2 | |
| Employed, was unemployed | | | | | 2.4 | | 1.3 | |
| Unemployed | 5.7 | | 3.5 | | 7.1 | | 4.2 | |
| Other | 4.1 | | 21.9 | | 5.4 | | 24.4 | |
| *Partner job status* | | | | | | | | |
| Employed | 74.4 | | 90.4 | | | | | |
| Employed, wasn't unemployed | | | | | 69.4 | | 83.9 | |
| Employed, was unemployed | | | | | 1.3 | | 2.3 | |
| Unemployed | 3.6 | | 5.5 | | 4.3 | | 7.6 | |
| Other | 22.0 | | 4.2 | | 25.0 | | 6.1 | |
| *Income* | | | | | | | | |
| Lowest quartile | 25.1 | | 25.0 | | 25.7 | | 25.7 | |
| 2nd quartile | 24.9 | | 25.0 | | 24.9 | | 24.9 | |
| 3rd quartile | 24.9 | | 25.0 | | 24.5 | | 24.5 | |
| Highest quartile | 25.1 | | 25.0 | | 24.9 | | 24.9 | |
| *Age (years)* | | | | | | | | |
| 20-24 | 2.3 | | 4.1 | | 1.9 | | 3.6 | |
| 25-29 | 7.6 | | 10.2 | | 6.7 | | 10.0 | |
| 30-34 | 12.4 | | 15.0 | | 12.1 | | 14.8 | |
| 35-39 | 15.7 | | 16.7 | | 15.8 | | 16.5 | |
| 40-44 | 17.6 | | 17.1 | | 17.7 | | 17.2 | |
| 45-49 | 16.5 | | 16.1 | | 16.7 | | 16.4 | |
| 50-54 | 14.7 | | 12.5 | | 15.1 | | 12.8 | |
| 55-60 | 13.2 | | 8.3 | | 13.8 | | 8.7 | |
| *Relationship duration (years)* | | | | | | | | |
| 0-4 | 19.5 | | 19.1 | | 18.1 | | 18.3 | |
| 5-9 | 20.7 | | 20.2 | | 21.1 | | 20.6 | |
| 10-14 | 17.6 | | 17.7 | | 17.7 | | 17.9 | |
| 15-19 | 13.7 | | 14.2 | | 14.0 | | 14.3 | |
| 20-24 | 11.6 | | 11.8 | | 11.8 | | 11.7 | |
| 25-29 | 8.3 | | 8.4 | | 8.2 | | 8.3 | |
| 30-60 | 8.6 | | 8.6 | | 9.1 | | 9.0 | |
| *Had previous relationship* | | | | | | | | |
| No | 67.2 | | 68.1 | | 66.9 | | 67.3 | |
| Yes | 32.8 | | 31.9 | | 33.1 | | 32.7 | |
| *Marital status* | | | | | | | | |
| Cohabiting | 22.1 | | 22.2 | | 21.2 | | 21.5 | |
| Married | 77.9 | | 77.8 | | 78.8 | | 78.5 | |
| *Parental Status* | | | | | | | | |
| No child | 18.4 | | 17.8 | | 16.9 | | 17.4 | |
| Child in household | 70.3 | | 72.3 | | 71.2 | | 71.9 | |
| Child outside household | 11.3 | | 9.9 | | 11.9 | | 10.6 | |
| *Health* | | | | | | | | |
| Not poor | 85.7 | | 85.2 | | 84.7 | | 84.0 | |
| Poor | 14.3 | | 14.8 | | 15.3 | | 16.0 | |
| *Health partner* | | | | | | | | |
| Not poor | 85.7 | | 85.2 | | 84.7 | | 84.0 | |
| Poor | 14.3 | | 14.8 | | 15.3 | | 16.0 | |

| | Unemployment Status (Models 1 and 2) | | | | Unemployment history (Models 5) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Men | | Women | | Men | | Women | |
| | Mean/% | SD | Mean/% | SD | Mean/% | SD | Mean/% | SD |
| *Education* | | | | | | | | |
| Higher degree | 32.0 | | 33.6 | | 31.7 | | 34.1 | |
| Other higher | 12.0 | | 14.7 | | 11.7 | | 14.2 | |
| A level | 21.1 | | 17.8 | | 21.3 | | 17.6 | |
| GCSE | 20.0 | | 21.8 | | 20.0 | | 21.6 | |
| Other qualification | 8.9 | | 6.4 | | 9.0 | | 6.5 | |
| No qualification | 6.0 | | 5.6 | | 6.3 | | 6.1 | |
| *Parental socioeconomic status* | | | | | | | | |
| Management & professional | 34.8 | | 35.7 | | 35.2 | | 35.8 | |
| Intermediate | 14.5 | | 13.9 | | 15.0 | | 14.1 | |
| Small employers & own account | 10.5 | | 10.7 | | 9.9 | | 10.1 | |
| Lower supervisory & technical | 9.0 | | 8.6 | | 8.8 | | 8.5 | |
| Semi-routine & routine | 24.2 | | 23.2 | | 24.4 | | 24.0 | |
| Not employed | 7.0 | | 7.8 | | 6.8 | | 7.5 | |
| *Parental relationship status* | | | | | | | | |
| Together | 71.9 | | 73.5 | | 73.6 | | 74.2 | |
| Separated | 10.7 | | 12.2 | | 11.0 | | 12.2 | |
| Other reason not living together | 5.6 | | 6.3 | | 5.6 | | 6.3 | |
| Missing | 11.8 | | 8.0 | | 9.8 | | 7.4 | |
| *Mothers age at birth* | | | | | | | | |
| <20 | 6.2 | | 6.2 | | 6.1 | | 6.1 | |
| 20-24 | 26.3 | | 27.2 | | 26.8 | | 27.4 | |
| 25-45 | 45.9 | | 49.6 | | 46.0 | | 49.6 | |
| missing | 21.6 | | 16.9 | | 21.1 | | 16.9 | |
| *Ethnicity* | | | | | | | | |
| White British | 79.0 | | 77.5 | | 81.9 | | 79.9 | |
| Other white | 4.1 | | 5.7 | | 3.5 | | 5.5 | |
| Mixed | 1.4 | | 1.5 | | 1.3 | | 1.5 | |
| Asian | 11.5 | | 11.6 | | 10.2 | | 10.1 | |
| Black | 3.1 | | 2.9 | | 2.3 | | 2.2 | |
| Other | 0.9 | | 0.8 | | 0.8 | | 0.8 | |
| *Region* | | | | | | | | |
| North East | 4.4 | | 4.4 | | 4.7 | | 4.8 | |
| North West | 10.9 | | 10.7 | | 10.9 | | 10.7 | |
| Yorkshire and the Humber | 8.6 | | 8.7 | | 8.7 | | 8.6 | |
| East Midlands | 8.1 | | 8.2 | | 8.4 | | 8.2 | |
| West Midlands | 8.8 | | 8.3 | | 8.8 | | 8.7 | |
| East of England | 9.6 | | 9.8 | | 9.4 | | 9.5 | |
| London | 12.7 | | 12.4 | | 11.1 | | 10.8 | |
| South East | 13.4 | | 13.7 | | 13.9 | | 14.0 | |
| South West | 8.7 | | 8.9 | | 9.3 | | 9.6 | |
| Wales | 4.3 | | 4.2 | | 4.2 | | 4.4 | |
| Scotland | 6.8 | | 6.8 | | 7.0 | | 7.1 | |
| Northern Ireland | 3.8 | | 3.8 | | 3.5 | | 3.5 | |

**Table A2 (Continued):** Descriptive statistics for the samples on unemployment status and unemployment history

**Source:** UKHLS 2009-2017

| | Own unemployment duration (Models 3) | | | | Partner unemployment duration (Models 4) | | | |
| | Men | | Women | | Men | | Women | |
| | Mean/% | SD | Mean/% | SD | Mean/% | SD | Mean/% | SD |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Relationship happiness | 4.7 | 1.4 | 4.7 | 1.5 | 4.6 | 1.5 | 4.6 | 1.5 |
| Own unemployment duration | 23.7 | 23.0 | 21.7 | 22.0 | | | | |
| Partner unemployment duration | | | | | 20.8 | 21.0 | 23.6 | 22.9 |
| *Job status* | | | | | | | | |
| Employed | | | | | 70.4 | | 48.7 | |
| Unemployed | | | | | 22.4 | | 15.9 | |
| Other | | | | | 7.1 | | 35.4 | |
| *Partner job status* | | | | | | | | |
| Employed | 48.7 | | 65.4 | | | | | |
| Unemployed | 17.2 | | 24.5 | | | | | |
| Other | 34.1 | | 10.1 | | | | | |
| *Education* | | | | | | | | |
| Higher | 24.2 | | 30.3 | | 32.7 | | 25.4 | |
| Not higher | 75.8 | | 69.7 | | 67.3 | | 74.6 | |
| *Age* | | | | | | | | |
| 20-39 | 43.3 | | 49.5 | | 46.9 | | 54.5 | |
| 40-60 | 56.7 | | 50.5 | | 53.1 | | 45.5 | |
| *Relationship duration* | | | | | | | | |
| 0-4 | 28.7 | | 40.3 | | 47.6 | | 31.7 | |
| 5-14 | 33.2 | | 29.8 | | 25.9 | | 33.7 | |
| 15-60 | 38.1 | | 29.9 | | 26.5 | | 34.6 | |
| *Had previous relationship* | | | | | | | | |
| No | 64.2 | | 51.1 | | 55.1 | | 60.3 | |
| Yes | 35.8 | | 48.9 | | 44.9 | | 39.7 | |
| *Marital status* | | | | | 0.0 | | 0.0 | |
| Cohabiting | 41.4 | | 41.5 | | 45.9 | | 42.2 | |
| Married | 58.6 | | 58.5 | | 54.1 | | 57.8 | |
| *Parental Status* | | | | | | | | |
| No child | 17.9 | | 29.8 | | 28.6 | | 17.8 | |
| Child in household | 67.6 | | 54.8 | | 45.9 | | 70.4 | |
| Child outside household | 14.5 | | 15.4 | | 25.5 | | 11.8 | |
| *Health* | | | | | | | | |
| Not poor | 74.6 | | 72.3 | | 76.5 | | 67.0 | |
| Poor | 25.4 | | 27.7 | | 23.5 | | 33.0 | |
| *Health partner* | | | | | | | | |
| Not poor | 66.5 | | 74.9 | | 74.5 | | 76.3 | |
| Poor | 33.5 | | 25.1 | | 25.5 | | 23.7 | |
| *Parental socioeconomic status* | | | | | | | | |
| Higher | 24.8 | | 26.1 | | 29.6 | | 20.4 | |
| Middle | 20.2 | | 21.9 | | 11.2 | | 20.2 | |
| Lower | 41.7 | | 34.0 | | 47.6 | | 41.5 | |
| Not employed | 13.3 | | 18.0 | | 11.6 | | 17.8 | |
| *Ethnicity* | | | | | | | | |
| White British | 77.2 | | 75.9 | | 69.4 | | 74.6 | |
| Other | 22.8 | | 24.1 | | 30.6 | | 25.4 | |

**Table A3:** Descriptive statistics for the samples on own and partners unemployment duration unemployment

**Source:** UKHLS, 2009-2017

| | Men Model 6 B | | SE | Men Model 7 B | | SE | Women Model 6 B | | SE | Women Model 7 B | | SE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Own Job status* | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employed | Ref. | | | Ref. | | | Ref. | | | Ref. | | |
| Unemployed | 0.035 | | 0.094 | -0.085 | # | 0.045 | -0.053 | | 0.097 | -0.085 | | 0.052 |
| Other | -0.250 | | 0.155 | -0.067 | | 0.058 | 0.058 | | 0.086 | 0.048 | # | 0.027 |
| *Partner job status* | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employed | Ref. | | | Ref. | | | Ref. | | | Ref. | | |
| Unemployed | -0.014 | | 0.050 | -0.007 | | 0.091 | -0.131 | ** | 0.045 | -0.014 | | 0.096 |
| Other | 0.049 | # | 0.026 | 0.033 | | 0.092 | -0.146 | ** | 0.055 | -0.175 | | 0.166 |
| *Children in household* | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Childless | Ref. | | | Ref. | | | Ref. | | | Ref. | | |
| Child in household | -0.175 | *** | 0.032 | -0.178 | *** | 0.033 | -0.268 | *** | 0.032 | -0.264 | *** | 0.031 |
| Child outside household | 0.058 | | 0.045 | 0.050 | | 0.046 | -0.013 | | 0.047 | -0.020 | | 0.046 |
| *Interactions* | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| *Own Job status*Children in household* | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Unemployed*Child in household | -0.141 | | 0.106 | | | | 0.020 | | 0.115 | | | |
| Unemployed*Child outside household | -0.164 | | 0.153 | | | | -0.324 | # | 0.183 | | | |
| Other*Child in household | 0.234 | | 0.166 | | | | -0.017 | | 0.089 | | | |
| Other*Child outside household | 0.090 | | 0.204 | | | | 0.037 | | 0.120 | | | |
| *Partner job status*Children in household* | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Unemployed*Child in household | | | | -0.027 | | 0.110 | | | | -0.158 | | 0.106 |
| Unemployed*Child outside household | | | | 0.064 | | 0.140 | | | | 0.001 | | 0.148 |
| Other*Child in household | | | | 0.020 | | 0.096 | | | | 0.046 | | 0.175 |
| Other*Child outside household | | | | -0.039 | | 0.122 | | | | -0.001 | | 0.206 |

**Table A4:** Relationship happiness and employment status, depending on the presence of children in the household, random effect models.

**Source:** UKHLS, 2009-2017. 21,046 observations of 9,862 men, 23,706 observations of 10,906 women. # p<.1, * p<.05, ** p<.01, *** p<.001. Controlled for household income, age, educational attainment, ethnicity, individual health status, prior relationship history, partner's health status, marital status, relationship duration, region, parental socioeconomic status, relationship status of parents, and age of mother at birth.

|  | Men | | | | Women | | | |
|  | Model 8 | | Model 9 | | Model 8 | | Model 9 | |
|  | B | SE | B | SE | B | SE | B | SE |
| *Own Job status* | | | | | | | | |
| Employed | Ref. | | Ref. | | Ref. | | Ref. | |
| Unemployed | -0.001 | 0.139 | -0.090 | 0.068 | 0.230 # | 0.137 | 0.046 | 0.071 |
| Other | -0.189 | 0.248 | 0.016 | 0.107 | -0.013 | 0.136 | 0.091 * | 0.040 |
| *Partner job status* | | | | | | | | |
| Employed | Ref. | | Ref. | | Ref. | | Ref. | |
| Unemployed | 0.032 | 0.069 | 0.030 | 0.129 | -0.118 # | 0.063 | 0.032 | 0.150 |
| Other | 0.108 ** | 0.040 | 0.188 | 0.143 | -0.118 | 0.099 | -0.384 | 0.325 |
| *Children in household* | | | | | | | | |
| Childless | Ref. | | Ref. | | Ref. | | Ref. | |
| Child in household | -0.109 | 0.067 | -0.102 | 0.068 | -0.159 * | 0.067 | -0.160 * | 0.064 |
| Child outside household | 0.085 | 0.091 | 0.100 | 0.092 | 0.008 | 0.086 | 0.028 | 0.083 |
| *Interactions* | | | | | | | | |
| *Own Job status*Children in household* | | | | | | | | |
| Unemployed*Child in household | -0.118 | 0.160 | | | -0.182 | 0.161 | | |
| Unemployed*Child outside household | -0.018 | 0.232 | | | -0.485 # | 0.258 | | |
| Other*Child in household | 0.253 | 0.266 | | | 0.092 | 0.141 | | |
| Other*Child outside household | 0.169 | 0.353 | | | 0.340 # | 0.201 | | |
| *Partner job status*Children in household* | | | | | | | | |
| Unemployed*Child in household | | | -0.029 | 0.150 | | | -0.179 | 0.163 |
| Unemployed*Child outside household | | | 0.152 | 0.220 | | | -0.147 | 0.227 |
| Other*Child in household | | | -0.081 | 0.148 | | | 0.300 | 0.341 |
| Other*Child outside household | | | -0.169 | 0.200 | | | 0.308 | 0.386 |

**Table A5:** Relationship happiness and employment status, depending on the presence of children in the household, Fixed effect models.

**Source:** UKHLS, 2009-2017. 21,046 observations of 9,862 men, 23,706 observations of 10,906 women. # p<.1, * p<.05, ** p<.01, *** p<.001. Controlled for presence of children, age, individual health status, partner's health status, marital status, and relationship duration.

| | Men | | | | Women | | | |
| | Model 10 | | Model 11 | | Model 10 | | Model 11 | |
| | B | SE | B | SE | B | SE | B | SE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Own unemployment duration | -0.007 | 0.008 | | | -0.017 | 0.012 | | |
| Own unemployment duration squared | 0.000 | 0.001 | | | -0.001 | 0.001 | | |
| Partner's unemployment duration | | | -0.009 | 0.020 | | | 0.001 | 0.010 |
| Partner's unemployment duration squared | | | -0.001 | 0.001 | | | 0.000 | 0.001 |
| *Children in household* | | | | | | | | |
| Childless | | | | | | | | |
| Child in household | -0.137 | 0.397 | -0.754 | 0.808 | -0.325 | 0.537 | -0.509 | 0.459 |
| Child outside household | -0.924 | 0.582 | 0.110 | 0.866 | -1.172 # | 0.690 | -0.340 | 0.618 |
| *Interactions* | | | | | | | | |
| Own unemployment duration*Children in household | | | | | | | | |
| Own unemployment duration*Child in household | 0.003 | 0.009 | | | 0.012 | 0.014 | | |
| Own unemployment duration*Child outside household | -0.001 | 0.011 | | | -0.004 | 0.018 | | |
| Own unemployment duration SQ* Child in household | 0.000 | 0.001 | | | 0.001 | 0.001 | | |
| Own unemployment duration SQ*Child outside household | 0.001 | 0.001 | | | 0.003 ** | 0.001 | | |
| Partner unemployment duration*Children in household | | | | | | | | |
| Partner unemployment duration*Child in household | | | -0.002 | 0.024 | | | -0.011 | 0.011 |
| Partner unemployment duration*Child outside household | | | 0.040 | 0.025 | | | -0.004 | 0.013 |
| Partner unemployment duration SQ* Child in household | | | 0.001 | 0.001 | | | 0.000 | 0.001 |
| Partner unemployment duration SQ*Child outside household | | | 0.000 | 0.002 | | | 0.001 | 0.001 |

**Table A6:** Relationship happiness and duration of current unemployment spell, depending on the presence of children in the household, random effect and OLS models.

**Source:** UKHLS, 2009-2017. Source UKHLS, 2009-2017. Model 11 for men use OLS regression instead of random effects because of few observations per person. # p<.1, * p<.05, ** p<.01, *** p<.001. Controlled for presence of children, age, educational attainment, ethnicity, individual health status, prior relationship history, partner's health status, marital status, relationship duration, and parental socioeconomic status.

| | Men | | | | Women | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Model 12 | | Model 13 | | Model 12 | | Model 13 | |
| | B | SE | B | SE | B | SE | B | SE |
| *Own Job status* | | | | | | | | |
| Employed, wasn't unemployed | Ref. | | Ref. | | Ref. | | Ref. | |
| Employed, was unemployed | -0.001 | 0.152 | -0.037 | 0.071 | 0.030 | 0.149 | -0.041 | 0.087 |
| Unemployed | 0.078 | 0.108 | -0.077 | 0.051 | 0.029 | 0.113 | -0.025 | 0.061 |
| Other | -0.221 | 0.180 | -0.095 | 0.065 | -0.008 | 0.110 | 0.048 | 0.033 |
| *Partner job status* | | | | | | | | |
| Employed, wasn't unemployed | Ref. | | Ref. | | Ref. | | Ref. | |
| Employed, was unemployed | -0.046 | 0.088 | 0.000 | 0.169 | -0.204 ** | 0.078 | -0.298 | 0.192 |
| Unemployed | -0.076 | 0.060 | -0.059 | 0.110 | -0.229 *** | 0.053 | -0.167 | 0.114 |
| Other | 0.030 | 0.032 | 0.056 | 0.106 | -0.248 *** | 0.063 | -0.327 # | 0.185 |
| *Children in household* | | | | | | | | |
| Childless | Ref. | | Ref. | | Ref. | | Ref. | |
| Child in household | -0.179 *** | 0.042 | -0.182 *** | 0.043 | -0.283 *** | 0.042 | -0.286 *** | 0.041 |
| Child outside household | 0.063 | 0.056 | 0.056 | 0.059 | -0.068 | 0.061 | -0.084 | 0.060 |
| *Interactions* | | | | | | | | |
| *Own Job status*Children in household* | | | | | | | | |
| Employed, was unemployed*Child in household | -0.065 | 0.174 | | | -0.060 | 0.187 | | |
| Employed, was unemployed*Child outside household | 0.102 | 0.232 | | | -0.448 | 0.348 | | |
| Unemployed*Child in household | -0.188 | 0.121 | | | -0.009 | 0.132 | | |
| Unemployed*Child outside household | -0.157 | 0.175 | | | -0.323 | 0.208 | | |
| Other*Child in household | 0.167 | 0.192 | | | 0.043 | 0.113 | | |
| Other*Child outside household | 0.017 | 0.233 | | | 0.208 | 0.146 | | |
| *Partner job status*Children in household* | | | | | | | | |
| Employed, was unemployed*Child in household | | | -0.171 | 0.208 | | | 0.086 | 0.212 |
| Employed, was unemployed*Child outside household | | | 0.228 | 0.245 | | | 0.381 | 0.320 |
| Unemployed*Child in household | | | -0.046 | 0.132 | | | -0.099 | 0.124 |
| Unemployed*Child outside household | | | 0.089 | 0.165 | | | 0.139 | 0.171 |
| Other*Child in household | | | -0.023 | 0.110 | | | 0.107 | 0.193 |
| Other*Child outside household | | | -0.119 | 0.138 | | | 0.087 | 0.227 |

**Table A7:** Relationship happiness and past unemployment experience, depending on the presence of children in the household, random effect models.

**Source:** UKHLS, 2009-2017]. # p<.1, * p<.05, ** p<.01, *** p<.001. Controlled for presence of children, age, educational attainment, ethnicity, individual health status, prior relationship history, partner's health status, marital status, relationship duration, region, parental socioeconomic status, relationship status of parents, and age of mother at birth.

*Dyadic Satisfaction*

| | |
|---|---|
| How often do you discuss or consider divorce, separation or terminating your relationship? | 0 "All of the time" – 5 "Never" |
| Do you ever regret that you married or lived together? | 0 "All of the time" – 5 "Never" |
| How often do you and your partner quarrel? | 0 "All of the time" – 5 "Never" |
| How often do you and your partner "get on each other's nerves"? | 0 "All of the time" – 5 "Never" |

*Dyadic Cohesion*

| | |
|---|---|
| How often do you have a stimulating exchange of ideas? | 0 "Never" – 5 "More often" [than once a day] |
| How often do you calmly discuss something? | 0 "Never" – 5 "More often" [than once a day] |
| Do you and your partner engage in outside interests together? | 0 "None of them"- 4 "All of them" |
| How often do you work together on a project? | 0 "Never" – 5 "More often" [than once a day] |

**Table A8:** Measurements Dyadic Satisfaction and Dyadic Cohesion

| | Men | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Dyadic Satisfaction | | | | Dyadic Cohesion | | | |
| | Model 1a | | Model 1b | | Model 1a | | Model 1b | |
| | B | SE | B | SE | B | SE | B | SE |
| *Own Job status* | | | | | | | | |
| Employed | Ref. | | Ref. | | Ref. | | Ref. | |
| Unemployed | -0.182 * | 0.085 | -0.153 # | 0.088 | -0.046 | 0.129 | 0.013 | 0.134 |
| Other | -0.157 | 0.121 | -0.137 | 0.121 | -0.267 # | 0.159 | -0.225 | 0.160 |
| *Partner job status* | | | | | | | | |
| Employed | Ref. | | Ref. | | Ref. | | Ref. | |
| Unemployed | -0.172 # | 0.104 | -0.149 | 0.105 | -0.189 | 0.144 | -0.140 | 0.145 |
| Other | 0.110 * | 0.049 | 0.126 * | 0.049 | 0.161 * | 0.070 | 0.195 ** | 0.072 |
| | Women | | | | | | | |
| | Dyadic Satisfaction | | | | Dyadic Cohesion | | | |
| | Model 1a | | Model 1b | | Model 1a | | Model 1b | |
| | B | SE | B | SE | B | SE | B | SE |
| *Own Job status* | | | | | | | | |
| Employed | Ref. | | Ref. | | Ref. | | Ref. | |
| Unemployed | -0.097 | 0.113 | -0.059 | 0.114 | -0.162 | 0.151 | -0.061 | 0.152 |
| Other | 0.154 ** | 0.050 | 0.179 *** | 0.051 | 0.053 | 0.073 | 0.126 # | 0.074 |
| *Partner job status* | | | | | | | | |
| Employed | Ref. | | Ref. | | Ref. | | Ref. | |
| Unemployed | -0.369 *** | 0.097 | -0.321 ** | 0.100 | -0.145 | 0.131 | -0.009 | 0.135 |
| Other | -0.204 # | 0.120 | -0.168 | 0.120 | -0.217 | 0.164 | -0.120 | 0.165 |

**Table A9:** Dyadic Satisfaction, Dyadic Cohesion and employment status, random effect models.

**Source:** UKHLS, 2009-2017. # p<.1, * p<.05, ** p<.01, *** p<.001. Controlled for presence of children, age, educational attainment, ethnicity, individual health status, prior relationship history, partner's health status, marital status, relationship duration, region, parental socioeconomic status, relationship status of parents, and age of mother at birth.

| | Men | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Dyadic Satisfaction | | | | | | Dyadic Cohesion | | | | | |
| | Model 2a | | | Model 2b | | | Model 2a | | | Model 2b | | |
| | B | | SE | B | | SE | B | | SE | B | | SE |
| *Own Job status* | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employed | Ref. | | | Ref. | | | Ref. | | | Ref. | | |
| Unemployed | -0.075 | | 0.111 | -0.069 | | 0.114 | 0.015 | | 0.177 | 0.065 | | 0.180 |
| Other | 0.041 | | 0.183 | 0.045 | | 0.184 | -0.345 | | 0.250 | -0.313 | | 0.251 |
| *Partner job status* | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employed | Ref. | | | Ref. | | | Ref. | | | Ref. | | |
| Unemployed | 0.037 | | 0.123 | 0.035 | | 0.124 | -0.165 | | 0.187 | -0.136 | | 0.188 |
| Other | 0.199 | ** | 0.064 | 0.199 | ** | 0.064 | 0.285 | ** | 0.098 | 0.306 | ** | 0.098 |
| | Women | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Dyadic Satisfaction | | | | | | Dyadic Cohesion | | | | | |
| | Model 2a | | | Model 2b | | | Model 2a | | | Model 2b | | |
| | B | | SE | B | | SE | B | | SE | B | | SE |
| *Own Job status* | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employed | Ref. | | | Ref. | | | Ref. | | | Ref. | | |
| Unemployed | 0.078 | | 0.136 | 0.083 | | 0.137 | 0.027 | | 0.196 | 0.089 | | 0.197 |
| Other | 0.230 | *** | 0.066 | 0.232 | *** | 0.066 | 0.245 | * | 0.100 | 0.284 | ** | 0.100 |
| *Partner job status* | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employed | Ref. | | | Ref. | | | Ref. | | | Ref. | | |
| Unemployed | -0.194 | | 0.125 | -0.190 | | 0.128 | 0.040 | | 0.180 | 0.122 | | 0.184 |
| Other | 0.016 | | 0.183 | 0.020 | | 0.182 | -0.140 | | 0.269 | -0.089 | | 0.270 |

**Table A10:** Dyadic Satisfaction, Dyadic Cohesion and employment status, fixed effect models.

**Source:** UKHLS, 2009-2017. # p<.1, * p<.05, ** p<.01, *** p<.001. Controlled for presence of children, age, individual health status, partner's health status, marital status, and relationship duration.

|  | Men | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | Dyadic Satisfaction | | | | Dyadic Cohesion | | | |
|  | Model 3a | | Model 3b | | Model 3a | | Model 3b | |
|  | B | SE | B | SE | B | SE | B | SE |
| Own unemployment duration | -0.020 ** | 0.007 | -0.019 ** | 0.007 | -0.004 | 0.012 | -0.004 | 0.012 |
| Own unemployment duration squared | 0.000 | 0.001 | 0.000 | 0.001 | -0.001 # | 0.001 | 0.001 * | 0.001 |

|  | Women | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | Dyadic Satisfaction | | | | Dyadic Cohesion | | | |
|  | Model 3a | | Model 3b | | Model 3a | | Model 3b | |
|  | B | SE | B | SE | B | SE | B | SE |
| Own unemployment duration | -0.007 | 0.018 | -0.004 | 0.018 | -0.030 # | 0.017 | -0.032 # | 0.017 |
| Own unemployment duration squared | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.001 | -0.001 | 0.001 | -0.001 | 0.001 |

|  | Men | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | Dyadic Satisfaction | | | | Dyadic Cohesion | | | |
|  | Model 4a | | Model 4b | | Model 4a | | Model 4b | |
|  | B | SE | B | SE | B | SE | B | SE |
| Partner's unemployment duration | 0.004 | 0.026 | 0.010 | 0.025 | -0.011 | 0.027 | -0.006 | 0.028 |
| Partner's unemployment duration squared | 0.000 | 0.002 | 0.000 | 0.002 | 0.000 | 0.001 | 0.000 | 0.002 |

|  | Women | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | Dyadic Satisfaction | | | | Dyadic Cohesion | | | |
|  | Model 4a | | Model 4b | | Model 4a | | Model 4b | |
|  | B | SE | B | SE | B | SE | B | SE |
| Partner's unemployment duration | -0.022 ** | 0.008 | -0.022 ** | 0.008 | -0.006 | 0.012 | -0.006 | 0.012 |
| Partner's unemployment duration squared | -0.001 | 0.000 | -0.001 | 0.001 | -0.001 | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.001 |

**Table A11:** Dyadic Satisfaction, Dyadic Cohesion and duration of current unemployment spell, random effect and OLS models.

**Source:** UKHLS, 2009-2017. Model 4a and 4b for men use OLS regression instead of random effects because of few observations per person. # p<.1, * p<.05, ** p<.01, *** p<.001. Controlled for partner's employment status (Models 3a and 3b), respondent's employment status (Models 4a and 4b), presence of children, age, educational attainment, ethnicity, individual health status, prior relationship history, partner's health status, marital status, relationship duration, and parental socioeconomic status.

|  | Men | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | Dyadic Satisfaction | | | | Dyadic Cohesion | | | |
|  | Model 5a | | Model 5b | | Model 5a | | Model 5b | |
|  | B | SE | B | SE | B | SE | B | SE |
| *Own Job status* | | | | | | | | |
| Employed, wasn't unemployed | Ref. | | Ref. | | Ref. | | Ref. | |
| Employed, was unemployed | -0.082 | 0.109 | -0.076 | 0.110 | -0.134 | 0.170 | -0.117 | 0.169 |
| Unemployed | -0.306 ** | 0.096 | -0.277 ** | 0.100 | -0.104 | 0.151 | -0.029 | 0.156 |
| Other | -0.433 ** | 0.142 | -0.412 ** | 0.142 | -0.362 * | 0.182 | -0.307 # | 0.184 |
| *Partner job status* | | | | | | | | |
| Employed, wasn't unemployed | Ref. | | Ref. | | Ref. | | Ref. | |
| Employed, was unemployed | 0.005 | 0.149 | 0.008 | 0.149 | -0.346 | 0.234 | -0.335 | 0.233 |
| Unemployed | -0.234 * | 0.118 | -0.215 # | 0.119 | -0.158 | 0.169 | -0.103 | 0.171 |
| Other | 0.086 | 0.056 | 0.101 # | 0.057 | 0.127 | 0.085 | 0.167 # | 0.086 |
|  | Women | | | | | | | |
|  | Dyadic Satisfaction | | | | Dyadic Cohesion | | | |
|  | Model 5a | | Model 5b | | Model 5a | | Model 5b | |
|  | B | SE | B | SE | B | SE | B | SE |
| *Own Job status* | | | | | | | | |
| Employed, wasn't unemployed | Ref. | | Ref. | | Ref. | | Ref. | |
| Employed, was unemployed | -0.007 | 0.154 | -0.004 | 0.154 | -0.307 | 0.249 | -0.301 | 0.249 |
| Unemployed | -0.029 | 0.132 | 0.010 | 0.133 | -0.061 | 0.178 | 0.017 | 0.179 |
| Other | 0.186 ** | 0.060 | 0.212 *** | 0.061 | -0.029 | 0.091 | 0.027 | 0.093 |
| *Partner job status* | | | | | | | | |
| Employed, wasn't unemployed | Ref. | | Ref. | | Ref. | | Ref. | |
| Employed, was unemployed | -0.182 | 0.139 | -0.171 | 0.139 | -0.332 # | 0.179 | -0.307 # | 0.179 |
| Unemployed | -0.500 *** | 0.113 | -0.439 *** | 0.118 | -0.288 | 0.150 | -0.161 | 0.156 |
| Other | -0.382 ** | 0.139 | -0.334 * | 0.140 | -0.378 * | 0.181 | -0.284 | 0.183 |

**Table A12:** Dyadic Satisfaction, Dyadic Cohesion and past unemployment experience, random effect models.

**Source:** UKHLS, 2009-2017. # p<.1, * p<.05, ** p<.01, *** p<.001. Controlled for presence of children, age, educational attainment, ethnicity, individual health status, prior relationship history, partner's health status, marital status, relationship duration, region, parental socioeconomic status, relationship status of parents, and age of mother at birth.

## ESRC Centre for Population Change

Building 58
Faculty of Social Sciences
University of Southampton
SO17 1BJ

Tel: +44(0)2380592579
Email: cpc@southampton.ac.uk

To subscribe to the CPC newsletter and keep
up-to-date with research activity, news and
events, please register online:
**www.cpc.ac.uk/news/newsletter**

For our latest research updates you can also follow
CPC on Twitter, Facebook and Mendeley:

🐦 @CPCpopulation
f /CPCpopulation
👥 Centre-for-population-change



**Improving knowledge on population change**
cpc.ac.uk