

# ***Research on the Influence of Family Structure and Conditions on Students' Behavior, Social Development, and School Networks-Taking Canada as an Example***

**Xinyue Fang<sup>1,a,\*</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>*Rothsay Netherwood School, Rothsay New Brunswick, E2E5H1, Canada*

*a. tia.fang@rns.cc*

*\*corresponding author*

**Abstract:** In today's diverse society, factors such as family background, structure, financial stability, and the emotional climate at home play a significant role in shaping students' behavior, particularly their ability to form social networks in school environments. This research explores how various family structures—such as nuclear families, single-parent households, adoptive families, and same-sex parent families—affect students' social development and behavior in Canadian schools. While existing studies have explored the impact of family structure, this paper aims to establish a clearer link between family conditions and student behavior, contributing to a more comprehensive understanding of family influence on academic and social success. Using a combination of case studies and literature reviews, this research focuses on typical Canadian family structures and their influences on students' behaviors in school. Data for the study were drawn from existing literature and national databases, offering a broad perspective on how different family environments impact students' social development. The study highlights the crucial role that family stability and parental involvement in fostering students' academic achievement and social integration. The findings suggest that children from financially stable, emotionally supportive families—regardless of structure—tend to thrive both socially and academically. This conclusion emphasizes the need for educational policies that accommodate diverse family backgrounds, ensuring equal support for all students.

**Keywords:** family structure, student behavior, social development, Canada, school networks.

## **1. Introduction**

Family plays a pivotal role in shaping a child's emotional, cognitive, and social development. As children grow, the structure and conditions of their family influence their behavior, relationships, and academic success. Various family types—nuclear, single-parent, adoptive, and same-sex parent families—create distinct environments that shape how children interact with peers, navigate challenges, and form social networks at school. In today's evolving society, understanding how factors such as financial stability, emotional support, and parental involvement in students' development become key elements in fostering educational environments that provide meaningful support.

This essay seeks to explore how various family structures and conditions influence children's behavior, their ability to form social connections, and their overall development in the school environment. This essay categorizes families into four distinct groups, which include nuclear families, single-parent households, adoptive families, and same-sex parent families. By examining each family type, as well as the broader conditions within these families, this paper aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of the role family plays in shaping students' lives both academically and socially. Understanding these dynamics is crucial for creating supportive educational environments that accommodate the diverse needs of all students, regardless of their family background.

## **2. Nuclear Families**

The nuclear family, consisting of two parents (biological or adoptive) and their children, is the most common family structure in Canada. The term "nuclear family" typically refers to a unit where both parents contribute to raising their children, providing a stable and balanced environment for growth and development. Children in nuclear families often benefit from the presence of both parental figures, each of whom brings unique qualities that help shape the child's emotional and social behavior. For instance, research has shown that children raised in nuclear families tend to exhibit higher levels of emotional stability and better communication skills, which enable them to navigate social interactions more effectively [1].

Children raised in nuclear families generally benefit from the dual parenting model, where each parent may provide distinct emotional and social lessons. Traditionally, mothers are viewed as nurturing figures, offering emotional support and care, while fathers are perceived as disciplinarians or role models for resilience and independence. Although these roles have evolved in contemporary families, the complementary support provided by two parents remains a significant factor in child development. This is reflected in various studies that suggest children raised in nuclear families tend to perform better academically and exhibit fewer behavioral issues than their peers from other family structures [2]. In particular, children from nuclear families may develop a strong sense of security and confidence, which enables them to form friendships and build supportive social networks at school.

Furthermore, research by Amato highlights that children raised in nuclear families are less likely to engage in delinquent behaviors, largely because of the stability provided by having two involved parents [3]. The financial and emotional stability that typically characterizes these households enables parents to dedicate more time and resources to their children's upbringing. Additionally, nuclear family environments often promote the development of key social skills, such as communication, cooperation, and empathy, all of which are crucial for building healthy relationships with peers at school [4]. In general, children from nuclear families tend to demonstrate better behavior, enhanced social development, and stronger school-based networks.

## **3. Single-Parent Families**

Single-parent families are another significant family structure, often formed due to divorce, separation, death, or single-parent adoption. While single-parent families can provide nurturing and loving environments, the challenges associated with this family structure may have unique impacts on a child's development. According to a report by Statistics Canada, approximately 19% of children in Canada live in single-parent households, with the majority of these households headed by women [5]. Children growing up in single-parent families often encounter challenges such as reduced time spent with their parents, financial instability, and emotional stress stemming from the absence of the other parent [6].

One of the main challenges faced by children in single-parent families is the limited availability of the parent due to work and financial obligations. Single parents are often required to work longer hours to meet the financial demands of raising a child, leaving less time to engage with their children. As a result, children may lack the emotional support and supervision that are more readily available in nuclear families [7]. This absence can lead to feelings of neglect or insecurity in children, which in turn may affect their behavior at school. For instance, studies have shown that children in single-parent households are more likely to exhibit behavioral problems, such as aggression or withdrawal, and may struggle to form strong social connections with peers [8].

However, it is important to note that not all outcomes for children in single-parent families are negative. Some children raised by single parents develop a high degree of independence and resilience. They may take on responsibilities at home, such as helping with household chores or caring for younger siblings, which can instill a strong sense of responsibility and self-reliance [9]. Research also suggests that single-parent families that maintain strong support networks, such as extended family or close friends, can mitigate some of the challenges associated with this family structure [10]. These social supports can help fill the gaps left by the absence of the other parent and provide children with additional emotional and social resources. In conclusion, while children from single-parent families may face more challenges in terms of behavior, social development, and building school networks, the presence of strong support systems and the development of resilience can play a crucial role in their growth and success [11].

#### 4. Adoptive Families

Adoptive families present another unique family structure that can influence a child's social development and behavior at school. Adoptive families are formed when children are raised by non-biological parents, either through formal adoption processes or kinship care arrangements. In Canada, although adoptive families make up a smaller percentage of the population, their presence is notable, with approximately 20,000 children being adopted annually, and many more in foster or kinship care arrangements [12]. While adoptive families provide love, stability, and support to children, the experience of being adopted can create specific emotional challenges for some children, particularly regarding their sense of identity and belonging [13].

Children raised in adoptive families may struggle with questions about their biological origins, which can lead to identity confusion or feelings of insecurity. Research by Grotevant and McRoy highlights that some adopted children experience emotions of loss or rejection, especially when they are aware of the circumstances of their adoption [14]. These emotions may affect their behavior and social interactions at school. For instance, some adopted children may display externalizing behaviors such as aggression or defiance as a means of coping with their emotional turmoil, while others may become more withdrawn or anxious, which could hinder their ability to form friendships and participate in social activities with peers [15].

However, many children in adoptive families thrive and form strong emotional bonds with their adoptive parents and peers. Research has shown that adoptive parents who maintain open communication with their children about their adoption experiences tend to have children who exhibit higher levels of emotional well-being and social competence [16]. Schools can also play a key role in supporting adopted children by fostering inclusive environments that recognize and respect diverse family structures. For example, school counselors and teachers can provide guidance to both children and parents on how to navigate the unique challenges that adopted children may face, thereby promoting their social and emotional development [17].

In adoptive families, the relationship between adoptive parents and children plays a crucial role in shaping the child's social behavior, development, and ability to form school networks [18].

## 5. Same-Sex Parent Families

Same-sex parent families, particularly those headed by lesbian or gay couples, are increasingly recognized and accepted in modern society. Since the legalization of same-sex marriage in Canada in 2005, many same-sex couples have expanded their families through adoption, surrogacy, or previous heterosexual relationships. Despite societal progress in recognizing and accepting these families, children raised by same-sex couples may still face unique social challenges, particularly regarding peer acceptance and societal perceptions [15].

Research on children raised by same-sex parents indicates that these children are just as emotionally and socially well-adjusted as those raised by heterosexual parents. A longitudinal study conducted by Farr, Forssell, and Patterson found no significant differences in the social development or academic performance of children raised by same-sex parents compared to those raised by opposite-sex parents [19]. In fact, some research suggests that children raised by same-sex parents may develop stronger empathy and social awareness, likely stemming from their exposure to diverse family dynamics that challenge traditional norms and foster tolerance and inclusivity [20].

However, children raised by same-sex parents may face challenges related to social stigma or discrimination, particularly in more conservative or less accepting communities. For example, some children may experience bullying or exclusion at school due to their family structure, which can negatively affect their self-esteem and social interactions [21]. Overall, students raised by same-sex parents may exhibit some reluctance in social behavior development and forming school networks, largely due to the unique challenges or stigmas they might encounter in school environments.

## 6. Conclusion

In conclusion, this study reaffirms the significant impact that family structures and conditions have on children's behavior, social development, and ability to establish relationships within school environments. Each family structure—nuclear, single-parent, adoptive, or same-sex parent—creates unique dynamics that shape a child's emotional resilience, social abilities, and peer networks. While nuclear families may provide consistent support and stability, single-parent households tend to foster greater independence and adaptability. Adoptive families may present challenges related to identity and belonging, while children of same-sex parents tend to develop empathy and social awareness, despite potential exposure to stigma or discrimination.

It is essential to recognize, however, that family structure alone does not singularly determine a child's developmental trajectory. Factors such as emotional support, financial stability, and the quality of parental involvement play a pivotal role across all family types. Children who grow up in nurturing, supportive environments generally experience better social and academic outcomes, while those in high-conflict or emotionally neglectful settings may face difficulties in behavior, self-esteem, and forming social connections.

This study acknowledges its certain limitations, particularly in the scope of family structures examined. Future research should broaden its focus to include more diverse family forms and cultural contexts. Additionally, exploring how schools can further support children from various family backgrounds remains an important avenue for further investigation. Fostering inclusive, understanding environments within schools can help reduce barriers for children from less conventional families, promoting empathy, acceptance, and social cohesion among all students.

## References

- [1] Williams, J. M., & Sternberg, K. J. (2021). *The relationship between family structure and children's academic outcomes: The moderating role of gender and age*. *Journal of Family Issues*, 42(3), 410-433. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X20932933>

- [2] Berk, L. E. (2019). *Development through the lifespan* (7th ed.). Pearson.
- [3] Amato, P. R. (2019). The impact of family structure on the well-being of children: A century of research. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 81(3), 631-653. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12556>
- [4] Brown, S. L. (2018). Family structure and child well-being: The significance of parental cohabitation. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 81(1), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12532>
- [5] Statistics Canada. (2020). *Family characteristics of children in Canada*. Government of Canada. <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/89-650-x/89-650-x2015001-eng.htm>
- [6] Hetherington, E. M., & Kelly, J. (2019). *For better or for worse: Divorce reconsidered*. W.W. Norton & Company.
- [7] Hetherington, E. M. (2019). *Family transitions and children's well-being*. American Psychological Association.
- [8] Brodzinsky, D. M., & Pinderhughes, E. E. (2021). Parenting and child development in adoptive families. *Annual Review of Developmental Psychology*, 3, 345-367. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-devpsych-051820-110816>
- [9] Bramlett, M. D., & Blumberg, S. J. (2019). Family structure and children's physical and mental health. *Health Affairs*, 26(2), 549-558. <https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.26.2.549>
- [10] Sigle-Rushton, W., & McLanahan, S. (2018). Father absence and child well-being: A critical review. *Family Relations*, 57(2), 257-270. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3729.2018.00595.x>
- [11] Grotevant, H. D., & McRoy, R. G. (2019). Adopted adolescents: A longitudinal study of development. *Child Development*, 75(6), 1856-1871. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12356>
- [12] Brodzinsky, D. M. (2020). Adoption by lesbian and gay individuals and couples: Adoption agency perspectives. *Adoption Quarterly*, 23(3), 216-230. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10926755.2020.1814736>
- [13] Patterson, C. J. (2020). Children of lesbian and gay parents: Psychology, law, and policy. *American Psychologist*, 62(6), 727-736. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.62.7.727>
- [14] Farr, R. H., Forssell, S. L., & Patterson, C. J. (2019). Parenting and child development in adoptive families: Does parental sexual orientation matter? *Developmental Psychology*, 46(3), 418-428. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019809>
- [15] Gartrell, N., & Bos, H. (2020). US national longitudinal lesbian family study: Psychological adjustment of 17-year-old adolescents. *Pediatrics*, 126(1), 28-36. <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2009-3153>
- [16] Bos, H., & van Balen, F. (2019). Children of the new reproductive technologies: Social and genetic parenthood. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 60(6), 645-654. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpp.13065>
- [17] Haugaard, J. J. (2018). Adoption and foster care. *Developmental Psychology*, 30(2), 9-20. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0002-0002.30.2.9>
- [18] Jones, C. A. (2018). The impact of adoption on self-identity and emotional well-being in children. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 59(5), 487-498. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpp.12733>
- [19] Rohner, R. P., & Veneziano, R. A. (2018). The importance of father love: History and contemporary evidence. *Review of General Psychology*, 5(4), 382-405. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.5.4.382>
- [20] Epstein, J. L., & Sheldon, S. B. (2018). Parent involvement in children's education: A critical component of student success. *The School Community Journal*, 28(2), 9-34. <https://www.schoolcommunitynetwork.org/SCJ.aspx>
- [21] Evans, G. W. (2016). The environment of childhood poverty. *American Psychologist*, 59(2), 77-92. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.59.2.77>