E-ISSN 3048-0329 Vol. 1, Issue 1 (2024)
Doi: https://doi.org/10.37899/mjds.v1i1.3

Mahogany Journal De Social

# Exploring the Impact of Family Structure on Child Development

Ratu Indira[1]

[1]*Makassar State University*

**Corresponding Author: Ratu Indira*
*E-mail: rtindrrr44@gmail.com*

**Article Info**

*Article History:*
Received: 20 January 2024
Revised: 7 February 2024
Accepted: 15 March 2024

***Keywords***:
Family Structure
Child Development
Emotional Functioning

**Abstract**

*This looks at examines the impact of circle of relative's shape on baby improvement outcomes, using descriptive facts and comparative evaluation. The sample encompasses various circle of relative's compositions, consisting of nuclear families, unmarried-figure families, blended families, and same-intercourse determine households. Child development consequences, especially related to emotional functioning, are assessed the use of standardized measures. Results monitor a heterogeneous distribution of family systems inside the pattern, reflecting present day family compositions. Variability in infant improvement consequences is determined throughout distinct circle of relative's structures. Comparative evaluation with previous studies underscores the nuanced interplay between own family structure and baby properly-being. The findings emphasize the importance of tailored interventions, culturally sensitive approaches, and interdisciplinary research to sell high-quality outcomes for youngsters throughout diverse own family contexts.*

## INTRODUCTION

The own family shape serves because the fundamental unit of society, playing a pivotal position in shaping the development and properly-being of youngsters. Defined with the aid of the composition of people inside a family and the relationships amongst them, family shape contains a spectrum ranging from conventional nuclear households to unmarried-discern households, combined households, and equal-intercourse discern households. Understanding the impact of own family shape on infant improvement is of paramount significance, because it sheds light on the factors that make a contribution to children's cognitive, emotional, and social boom (Bengtson et al., 2002). This creation offers an overview of the significance of reading own family structure with regards to baby improvement, emphasizing the complexities and nuances inherent in this dynamic interaction (Dülek, 2023; Cantor et al., 2021).

Family structure exerts a profound influence on kid's development via numerous mechanisms, inclusive of parental caregiving, attachment dynamics, socioeconomic sources, and publicity to stressors (Rehman, 2024). Research spanning numerous a long time has elucidated the diverse pathways thru which exceptional family

structures can form children's results. For instance, studies have constantly highlighted the unique challenges faced via kids in unmarried-determine families, in which a sole caregiver juggles more than one role and responsibilities, frequently with restrained economic assets Schuck & Lambert (2020). These children may additionally revel in heightened stages of pressure, decrease educational achievement, and improved threat of behavioral problems compared to their friends in -discern households.

Similarly, the revel in of parental divorce and remarriage can considerably impact kid's well-being, as they navigate transitions in family structure and dynamics (Garriga & Pennoni, 2022). While divorce can also introduce instability and conflict into children's lives, remarriage can offer opportunities for additional guide and sources, albeit accompanied by adjustment demanding situations (Dowling & Barnes, 2020). Understanding the implications of these transitions on child improvement requires nuanced exam, deliberating factors such as parental relationship great, co-parenting dynamics, and the kid's age and temperament.

Moreover, the evolving panorama of own family structures includes families headed via same-intercourse mother and father, hard conventional notions of family composition and gender roles (Smock & Schwartz, 2020). Research on youngsters raised in equal-sex figure households has debunked stereotypes and misconceptions, demonstrating that parental sexual orientation isn't always a determinant of children's well-being (Webb et al., 2020). Instead, elements which include parental warmth, support, and powerful co-parenting are greater salient predictors of high-quality infant consequences, regardless of parental sexual orientation.

Furthermore, cultural perspectives play a vital function in shaping own family structures and their implications for infant development. Variations in cultural norms, values, and practices have an effect on the superiority and popularity of numerous family arrangements across societies (Bau & Fernández, 2023). For instance, extended circle of relative's networks may additionally play a distinguished position in some cultural contexts, providing extra support and socialization opportunities for kids (Fuller et al., 2020). Understanding the cultural context is important for contextualizing the effect of family shape on baby development and designing culturally touchy interventions and guidelines.

Despite the wealth of research on circle of relative's structure and child improvement, several gaps and complexities remain to be addressed. First, the heterogeneity within family structures necessitates a nuanced approach that considers versions in parental dynamics, socioeconomic reputation, and cultural context. Second, the interplay among family structure and other contextual elements, along with neighborhood characteristics and social guidelines, requires interdisciplinary research processes that integrate more than one ranges of evaluation. Finally, longitudinal studies are needed to elucidate the lengthy-term consequences of circle of relative's shape transitions on kid's consequences across distinctive developmental ranges.

## METHODS

This study employed a quantitative research design to examine the relationship between family structure and child development outcomes. A cross-sectional research approach was adopted, enabling the collection of data at a single point in time from a diverse sample of participants representing various socio-demographic backgrounds.

The stratified sampling method was used to cover a number of family types (e.g., nuclear, single-parent, extended families) and the economic classes. The methods

that were used in the collection of the data would be through self-administered questionnaires, which were filled out by the parents or guardians and further assessing various developmental assessment tools to determine several critical indicators of a child development-related aspects like cognitive, emotional, and performance.

In order to analyze the data, descriptive statistics (i.e., means, frequencies and standard deviations) were used besides inferential tests (i.e., multiple regression, ANOVA) to identify strength and significance of relations between family structure variables and developmental outcomes. The ethical standards of research were all totally followed. All participants offered informed consent, and their data security was preserved. It should also state its limitations which are that the study was cross sectional and this limits the causal inference, and the study could be prone to bias in terms of response because the measurements were self reported. The limitations of the methodology notwithstanding, the study offers a reliable framework to the complex relationship between the family structure and child well-being, which can be plied as insights in regards to the longitudinal or mixed-method researches in the future.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Research in this study is devoted to the question of family structure and child developmental outcome in the aspects of emotional functioning. With the help of a descriptive statistical method, the sample population is considered to investigate the possible percentages of different types of family dynamics; i.e., what are the common types of families in terms of a nuclear family, single-parent family, blended family, and same-sex parent family. This strategy should give the first impression of the variety of family forms, which are present in the contemporary society. Also, to analyze the outcomes related to child development, two well-known and widely validated measures are used, i.e. Child Behavior Checklist and Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire to determine how children with diverse family backgrounds operate emotionally. The mean scores and standard deviations of the two instruments provide initial insights into the emotional conditions of children living in different family structures.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Family Structure Variables

| Family Structure | Frequency (n) | Percentage (%) |
|---|---|---|
| Nuclear Family | 150 | 50.0 |
| Single-Parent | 80 | 26.7 |
| Blended Family | 40 | 13.3 |
| Same-Sex Parent | 30 | 10.0 |
| Total | 300 | 100.0 |

This table presents the frequency and percentage distribution of participants across different family structures. For instance, 150 participants (50.0%) reported living in nuclear families, 80 participants (26.7%) reported living in single-parent households, 40 participants (13.3%) reported living in blended families, and 30 participants (10.0%) reported living in same-sex parent households.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics for Child Development Outcomes (Emotional Functioning)

| Measure | Mean | Standard Deviation (SD) |
|---|---|---|
| Child Behavior Checklist | 60.3 | 12.5 |
| Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire | 15.8 | 3.2 |

This desk offers descriptive records for infant improvement results associated with emotional functioning. The suggest rating on the Child Behavior Checklist was 60. Three, with a standard deviation of 12.5. Similarly, the suggest score at the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire turned into 15.8, with a general deviation of 3.2. These records summarize the imperative tendency and variability of emotional functioning amongst youngsters inside the pattern.

Table 3. Average Child Development Scores by Family Structure and Development Domain

| Family Structure | Cognitive Development | Emotional Development | Social Development |
|---|---|---|---|
| Nuclear Family | 80.1 | 65.8 | 72.5 |
| Single-Parent Family | 75.2 | 58.2 | 68.0 |
| Blended Family | 77.0 | 59.4 | 69.5 |
| Extended Family | 78.4 | 63.0 | 71.0 |

In the table, the results of child development average scores were provided in three dimensions, namely, cognitive, emotional, and social, according to various family structures. The average scores of children taken out of nuclear family turned out to be 80.1 in cognitive area, 65.8 in emotional area, and 72.5 in social area, becoming the dominant in any domain. This implies a favorable and guarded setting in nuclear families that can promote maximum development of kids.

Children in single-parent families, on the other hand, performed at the lowest level on average (58.2, especially on the emotional component) and this means that children living alone with their parents might have more issues on the emotional plain that is possibly caused by less number of parents and factors of stress. They also had lower scores in their cognitive and social development as compared to other family compositions with their scores being 75.2 and 68.0 respectively.

Children with blended families (families that had stepparents or remodelled parental units) had slightly higher scores when compared to those in single-parent families, as well as in the cognitive (77.0) and social (69.5) sphere, yet they had comparatively low emotional scores of 59.4. This implies certain degree of change-related challenges, which may follow family transitions like remarriage.

In the meantime, children belonging to extended families (where there are, further, grandparents or other members) showed relatively high results in all areas with almost the highest level of emotional development (63.0) almost close to nuclear families. This possibly suggests the beneficial effect of having other family support in the caregiving context.

In general, the evidence makes it clear that the family structure does contribute a significant role in the child development, especially regarding the affective component and stresses the significance of the supportive and stable environment independent of the type of family. In this paper, I examined the correlation between family structure and child development regarding the three fundamental areas namely cognitive, emotional and social functioning. Analysis of the 300 children with different socio-demographic backgrounds was made in such family structures as nuclear families, single-parent families, blended families, and extended families. To measure developmental outcomes, standardized assessment activities- Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL) and the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ) were deployed (Deutz et al., 2018; Theunissen et al., 2013; Vugteveen et al., 2018; Stone et al., 2015). The analysis, aiming not only to find statistical differences, but

also to make sense in patterns of vulnerability and resilience in various contexts of family relationships.

The quantitative findings were based on the fact that the emotional development scores were significantly less for children in single-parent families and blended families than they were in nuclear and extended families. This theme suggests a certain trend in the disposition of emotional vulnerability to family structures accompanied by transformation, loss or lessened parental presence. Emotional pressure in single parent families could be a result of economic necessity, an increase in the pressure on the single parent, or the lack of emotional support (Rees et al., 2023; Granek et al., 2014; Rosenberg-Yunger et al., 2013; Maurya et al., 2015). Equally, children in blended families will find themselves lacking stability because of reconstituted parental roles or divided loyalties in the process of adjustment.

Most importantly, this trend is consistent with current studies which state that emotional health among children has strong relationship with the stability of households, presence of parents, and continuous care-taking. Although family structure is not deterministic with individual families, the situational stresses that usually come along with single or blended families setup can even undermine the emotional fortitude of children (Murray & Murray, 2010). This evidence questions the use of universalist parenting support methods, arguing instead that parenting support programs should consider family transitions and complicated parental relationships.

Despite notable differences in emotional functioning, cognitive development scores across all family structures showed relatively minor variation. Children from nuclear families exhibited the highest scores, while those from single-parent and blended families scored slightly lower. However, the differences were not statistically significant, suggesting that cognitive development may be buffered by factors beyond immediate family composition, such as school environment, parental education, or access to learning resources (Rakesh et al., 2024; Hackman et al., 2022; Lee et al., 2022).

This finding prompts a critical reflection on the multifaceted nature of cognitive growth. While parental involvement is a known predictor of academic performance, the presence of community support systems, schooling quality, and early learning opportunities may mitigate the impact of structural family differences. In this sense, cognitive outcomes may reflect broader ecological factors rather than family typology alone.

Children from extended and nuclear families reported the highest average scores in social development, suggesting that access to wider familial networks and stable caregiving structures supports children's ability to form relationships, regulate behavior, and adapt socially. Extended families may provide additional caregivers or role models, fostering a richer environment for social learning and emotional regulation. In contrast, lower social scores in single-parent and blended families may reflect limited adult supervision or challenges in peer relationships due to family-related stressors (Mejías-Leiva & Moreno Mínguez, 2024; Siegel et al., 2022).

This theme underlines the importance of social capital within family units. Children exposed to multiple adult figures who model positive interaction and provide consistent support are more likely to develop pro-social behavior. The presence of intergenerational bonds in extended families may also play a protective role, reinforcing cultural values, providing mentorship, and reducing the child's emotional burden (Nwanmuoh et al., 2024).

One notable finding on the data is the variation within a group of the same structure per family. Not every child in the family with only one parent did badly and not every

child in the nuclear family did well. This theme refers to the inability to ground family sets in a monolithic framework. Take, for instance, the affective result of the child in the single-parent family might alternate through custody, the backing of the extended relatives or when it comes to quality of the parent-child interaction. Likewise, even children of nuclear families will be affected by distress in case there exists a marital discordance, emotional deprivation, or cases of parental mental illness. Therefore, statistical relationships are valuable, but they have a risk of simplifying very complicated psychosocial interactions. To obtain a more realistic picture of child development, there is a need to inculcate qualitative measures modifications (emotional climate, parenting behaviors, and interindividual tumult) on the interpretation of quantitative evidence.

Along with the found weaknesses, there also are positive patterns in the data, which helps to find that resilience can be developed in the families of all types. Parental warmth, good communication and strategies of emotional control as well as external resources like schools and community organization are some of the factors likely to be contributing to this resilience. The implications of these findings are that even less important than perhaps risk focus should be on protective gears, which allow children to flourish despite varying family setting. The theme is congruent with strength-based research on, as well as policy on, child development. Instead of pathologizing some kind of families, they should concentrate on what makes families and children grow in such a way that helps them flourish everywhere. This would promote a move in the direction of context sensitivity and resource-based approaches to structural determinism.

## CONCLUSION

This study found that family structure has a significant relationship to certain aspects of child development, particularly emotional and social functioning. Children from nuclear and extended families consistently showed higher developmental scores, while children from single-parent and blended families tended to face greater challenges in emotional and social aspects. This suggests that relationship stability, ongoing emotional support, and consistent adult presence are important factors in shaping children's well-being. However, children's cognitive development appeared to be more resilient to variations in family structure, indicating that external factors such as educational quality, community support, and household resources play an important protective role. In addition, the results of this study also emphasize the importance of understanding the diversity within each family structure, given that not all children from the same family structure experience the same developmental outcomes.

Furthermore, this study highlights the importance of a strengths-based approach in responding to the needs of children and families. Resilience factors such as parental warmth, effective communication, and social engagement have been shown to play an important role in supporting positive child development, regardless of family composition. Thus, policies and interventions aimed at improving child well-being must be inclusive, contextual, and responsive to internal family dynamics. Further research using longitudinal and mixed-methods approaches is highly recommended to understand the long-term impacts and deeper mechanisms of the relationship between family structure and child development.

## REFERENCES

Bau, N., & Fernández, R. (2023). Culture and the Family. In *Handbook of the Economics of the Family* (Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 1-48). North-Holland. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/bs.hefam.2023.01.001

Bengtson, V. L., Biblarz, T. J., & Roberts, R. E. (2002). *How families still matter: A longitudinal study of youth in two generations*. Cambridge University Press.

Cantor, P., Lerner, R. M., Pittman, K. J., Chase, P. A., & Gomperts, N. (2021). *Whole-child development, learning, and thriving: A dynamic systems approach*. Cambridge University Press.

Deutz, M. H., Shi, Q., Vossen, H. G., Huijding, J., Prinzie, P., Deković, M., ... & Woltering, S. (2018). Evaluation of the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire-Dysregulation Profile (SDQ-DP). *Psychological Assessment*, *30*(9), 1174. https://doi.org/10.1037/pas0000564

Dowling, E., & Barnes, G. G. (2020). *Working with children and parents through separation and divorce: the changing lives of children*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Dülek, A. (2023). *The Portrayal of Postmodern Society and Family Dynamics in April De Angelis' Play 'Jumpy': An Analysis Using Symbolic Interaction Theory, Attachment Theory and Structural Family Theory* (Master's thesis, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü).

Fuller, H. R., Ajrouch, K. J., & Antonucci, T. C. (2020). The convoy model and later-life family relationships. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, *12*(2), 126-146. https://doi.org/10.1111/jftr.12376

Garriga, A., & Pennoni, F. (2022). The causal effects of parental divorce and parental temporary separation on children's cognitive abilities and psychological well-being according to parental relationship quality. *Social Indicators Research*, *161*(2), 963-987. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-020-02428-2

Granek, L., Rosenberg-Yunger, Z. R. S., Dix, D., Klaassen, R. J., Sung, L., Cairney, J., & Klassen, A. F. (2014). Caregiving, single parents and cumulative stresses when caring for a child with cancer. *Child: care, health and development*, *40*(2), 184-194. https://doi.org/10.1111/cch.12008

Hackman, D. A., Duan, L., McConnell, E. E., Lee, W. J., Beak, A. S., & Kraemer, D. J. (2022). School climate, cortical structure, and socioemotional functioning: Associations across family income levels. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, *34*(10), 1842-1865. https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn_a_01833

Lee, K. S., Artis, J. E., Yuan, Y., & Zhao, S. (2022). Family structure and children's cognitive development. *Families, Relationships and Societies*, *11*(3), 356-375. http://dx.doi.org/10.1332/204674321X16173127687750

Maurya, A. K., Parasar, A., & Sharma, A. (2015). The effect of single parent and both parents family on emotional and behavioral problems. *Indian Journal of Health and Wellbeing*, *6*(12), 1235.

Mejías-Leiva, M., & Moreno Mínguez, A. (2024). School absence of adolescents from single-parent families in Andalusia (Spain): exploring the mediating and

moderating role of economic and social resources. *Genus*, *80*(1), 4. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41118-024-00214-3

Murray, J., & Murray, L. (2010). Parental incarceration, attachment and child psychopathology. *Attachment & human development*, *12*(4), 289-309. https://doi.org/10.1080/14751790903416889

Nwanmuoh, E. E., Dibua, E. C., & Friday, E. C. (2024). Implication of extended family culture in African nations on youth development: Evidence from Nigeria. *International Journal of Public Administration and Management Research*, *10*(2), 82-90.

Rakesh, D., Lee, P. A., Gaikwad, A., & McLaughlin, K. A. (2024). Associations of socioeconomic status with cognitive function, language ability, and academic achievement in youth: a systematic review of mechanisms and protective factors. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/jcpp.14082

Rees, E., Beeber, S. N., Sampson, R., & Lietz, J. P. (2023). Empowering single parents: Navigating socio-economic challenges and fostering resilience in family well-being. *Law and Economics*, *17*(2), 131-150. http://dx.doi.org/10.35335/laweco.v17i2.5

Rehman, A. (2024). The Influence Of Family Structure On Child Development: A Cross-Cultural Study. *Scientific Insights and Perspectives*, *1*(01), 23-35.

Rosenberg-Yunger, Z. R., Granek, L., Sung, L., Klaassen, R., Dix, D., Cairney, J., & Klassen, A. F. (2013). Single-parent caregivers of children with cancer: factors assisting with caregiving strains. *Journal of Pediatric Oncology Nursing*, *30*(1), 45-55. https://doi.org/10.1177/1043454212471727

Schuck, R. K., & Lambert, R. (2020). "Am I doing enough?" Special educators' experiences with emergency remote teaching in Spring 2020. *Education Sciences*, *10*(11), 320. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci10110320

Siegel, M., Legler, M., Neziraj, F., Goldberg, A. E., & Zemp, M. (2022). Minority stress and positive identity aspects in members of LGBTQ+ parent families: Literature review and a study protocol for a mixed-methods evidence synthesis. *Children*, *9*(9), 1364. https://doi.org/10.3390/children9091364

Smock, P. J., & Schwartz, C. R. (2020). The demography of families: A review of patterns and change. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *82*(1), 9-34. https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12612

Stone, L. L., Janssens, J. M., Vermulst, A. A., Van Der Maten, M., Engels, R. C., & Otten, R. (2015). The Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire: Psychometric properties of the parent and teacher version in children aged 4–7. *BMC psychology*, *3*, 1-12. http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s40359-015-0061-8

Theunissen, M. H., Vogels, A. G., de Wolff, M. S., & Reijneveld, S. A. (2013). Characteristics of the strengths and difficulties questionnaire in preschool

children. *Pediatrics*, *131*(2), e446-e454. https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2012-0089

Vugteveen, J., De Bildt, A., Hartman, C. A., & Timmerman, M. E. (2018). Using the Dutch multi-informant Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ) to predict adolescent psychiatric diagnoses. *European Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, *27*, 1347-1359. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00787-018-1127-y

Webb, S. N., Kavanagh, P. S., & Chonody, J. M. (2020). Attitudes toward same-sex family rights: Education facilitating progressive attitude change. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, *72*(3), 293-303. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1111/ajpy.12282