Family Policy Brief

Outcomes According to Family Structure

Many people assert that alternative family forms—such as single parents, cohabiting couples, and families broken by divorce—are equal to the natural family as far as their effects on individuals and society. However, research demonstrates conclusively that alternative family forms provide different outcomes to individuals.

Social science research has conclusively proven that a strong family based on marriage between a man and a woman is the best environment to protect, nourish and develop individuals. This family structure provides significantly better outcomes than any alternative structure.

There are specific social benefits from man/woman marriage called “social goods,” which flow to both individuals and the larger society. These social goods are derived from the complementary physical, emotional, and spiritual union of a man and a woman.

The research findings summarized in the next section show that these “social goods” that come from man/woman marriage begin to disappear when individuals live outside of the married man/woman family structure. The research shows that any deviation from man/woman marriage generally results in serious negative outcomes for individuals and families. The findings come from a multitude of social scientists and other scholars and are remarkably consistent and compelling.

In the following section, studies gathered by the Family Watch International staff have been cited to support each key finding. The one or two representative studies cited barely scratch the surface of the available research. Many more references are available.

When compared to single adults, married adults:

- have significantly higher average household income.¹
- generally have better physical health.²
- generally have better emotional health.³
- are happier.⁴

– are more likely to be productive and engaged citizens.\textsuperscript{5}

– drink and smoke less.\textsuperscript{6}

– live longer.\textsuperscript{7}

– have lower rates of domestic violence.\textsuperscript{8}

– report they find more meaning and purpose in life.\textsuperscript{9}

– experience more satisfying sex lives.\textsuperscript{10}

\vspace{1em} **When compared to children of non-married parents, children of married parents:**

– are less likely to be aborted, abused, or neglected.\textsuperscript{11}

– spend more time with, and receive more affection from, their fathers.\textsuperscript{12}

– are less likely to have a premarital birth in high school.\textsuperscript{13}

\vspace{1em}


\textsuperscript{6} Schoenborn, supra note 2.

\textsuperscript{7} Kaplan, RM; Kronick, RG. "Marital status and longevity in the United States population." Journal Of Epidemiology And Community Health 60: 760, 2006.


– have higher grade point averages and lower dropout rates.\textsuperscript{14}
– do better economically.\textsuperscript{15}
– have better physical health and increased life expectancy.\textsuperscript{16}
– are less likely to have emotional or behavioral problems.\textsuperscript{17}
– engage in fewer risky behaviors (e.g., premarital sex and substance abuse).\textsuperscript{18}
– are less likely to divorce as adults.\textsuperscript{19}
– experience a lower rate of sexually transmitted diseases (STDs).\textsuperscript{20}

\textbf{When compared to married couples, cohabiting couples:}

– have worse physical and mental health.\textsuperscript{21}
– earn less and possess fewer assets.\textsuperscript{22}
– are much more likely to separate.\textsuperscript{23}

\textsuperscript{20} Family Socioeconomic Status and Self-Reported Sexually Transmitted Diseases Among Black and White American Adolescents, Sexually Transmitted Diseases, Vol. 31, No. 9 (2004): 533-541.
– experience more conflict and violence.24
– receive less social support from friends and family.25

**When compared to married women, cohabiting women:**

– have more depression and three times the alcohol problems.26
– are three times as likely to experience physical aggression.27
– experience at least three times the amount of violence.28
– are more likely to suffer sexual abuse.29

**When compared to children in married households, children in cohabiting households:**

– will receive a smaller share of their parents’ income for education.30
– are more likely to cheat in, or be suspended from, school.31
– are more likely to engage in delinquent behavior.32
– face dramatically higher rates of physical and sexual abuse.33

---


28 Ibid.


31 W. Bradford Wilcox et al., supra note 9

32 Ibid.

– show poorer emotional development.\(^{34}\)

**When compared to married adults, separated or divorced adults:**

– are more than twice as likely to commit suicide.\(^{35}\)

– experience noticeably higher rates of violence by spouses, ex-spouses, and/or boyfriends.\(^{36}\)

– suffer greater economic hardships (especially women).\(^{37}\)

– experience greater depression, substance abuse, and poor health.\(^{38}\)

**When compared to children of married couples, children whose parents divorced:**

– are less likely to attend and graduate from college.\(^{39}\)

– are more likely to experience economic hardship and deep poverty.\(^{40}\)

– are more likely to experience depression or anxiety in their 20s or 30s.\(^{41}\)


\(^{41}\) Catherine E. Ross & John Mirowsky, “Parental Divorce, Life-Course Disruption, and Adult Depression (1999).

; Andrew J. Cherlin et al., “Effects of Parental Divorce on Mental Health Throughout the Life Course,” American Sociological
– have twice the risk of experiencing serious psychological problems.\(^42\)
– are more likely to get involved in early sexual activity.\(^43\)
– are more likely to use drugs and alcohol.\(^44\)
– are more likely to cohabitate or divorce.\(^45\)

**When compared to heterosexual men, men who engage in homosexual behavior:**

– experience a significantly higher rate of domestic violence with their partners.\(^46\)
– are up to seven times more likely to attempt suicide.\(^47\)
– have a lower life expectancy by 20 to 30 years.\(^48\)
– have an incidence of HIV/AIDS that is up to 430 times higher.\(^49\)
– have three times the number of drug and alcohol dependencies.\(^50\)

---

\(^42\) W. Bradford Wilcox, Linda Waite and Aldex Roberts, supra note 9


\(^45\) Amato & DeBoer, supra note 19.


– are significantly more promiscuous, with very few maintaining fidelity.  
51
– are more than twice as likely to have an STD.  
52
– are significantly more likely to engage in pedophilia.  
53
– are much more likely to have mental and emotional disorders/illnesses.  
54
– are at higher risk of deliberate self-harm.  
55

When compared to heterosexual youth, youth who engage in homosexual behavior:

– are at increased risk of suffering major depression and generalized anxiety disorder.  
56
– are associated with more school and runaway problems.  
57
– are more likely to attempt suicide.  
58
– experience a much higher rate of alcoholism.  
59
– are more likely to engage in substance abuse.  
60


– are more likely to engage in high-risk sexual behavior.\textsuperscript{61}

**When compared to heterosexual women, lesbian women:**

– are significantly more likely to be victims of domestic violence.\textsuperscript{62}

– experience a much higher rate of sexual coercion by their partner.\textsuperscript{63}

– are more likely to use drugs and alcohol.\textsuperscript{64}

– have a significantly higher risk of developing general anxiety disorder.\textsuperscript{65}

– are twice as likely to attempt suicide.\textsuperscript{66}

– are at higher risk for breast cancer.\textsuperscript{67}

– are at higher risk of deliberate self-harm.\textsuperscript{68}

**Statistics for Children of Same-Sex Couples**

A misleading claim that has been perpetuated is that there are “no differences” in the social and psychological outcomes for children raised by same-sex partners when compared to those raised by heterosexual parents. Some of the studies cited above clearly refute this, but this false claim is so widespread that it bears further examination.


\textsuperscript{61} Ibid.


Although exclusive homosexual parenting is a relatively new phenomenon, and more studies are needed in order to form definitive conclusions, the current body of research is fairly conclusive in showing that differences indeed exist for children raised in alternative situations. Moreover, according to experts who have examined this body of research, some pro-homosexual researchers seeking to prove there are no differences failed to report on the differences they did find.

Indeed, after examining available studies in this area, researcher Dr. Trayce Hansen found that children raised by homosexual parents have a four to ten times greater likelihood of engaging in homosexual behavior than other children. Specifically, her analysis of the studies conducted thus far indicates that between 8 percent and 21 percent of the children of homosexual parents consider themselves as non-heterosexual as compared to two percent in the general population. Dr. Hansen also cites the conclusions of researchers Judith Stacey and Timothy Biblarz, who, after reviewing 21 different studies, concluded that children parented by homosexuals are, in fact, different from children parented by heterosexuals in terms of sexual behavior and preference.\(^69\)

Dr. Hansen points out that the percentage of children identifying themselves as homosexual may have been even greater had more of the children studied been raised from birth by openly homosexual parents. Many had been born into heterosexual families that broke up later when one of the parents “came out” as homosexual. Dr. Hansen concludes that it should not be surprising that available studies suggest homosexual parents are rearing disproportionate numbers of non-heterosexual children. After all, parents pass on their values, viewpoints, priorities, etc., to their children.\(^70\)

Regarding the studies that claim to show no differences, independent evaluations of these studies have concluded that such research did not meet minimum scientific standards. Nevertheless, these flawed studies are cited as proof that same-sex parenting is equal to (or in some cases may be even better than) heterosexual parenting.

Some of the problems associated with those studies include:

1. Very small size samples.
2. Reliance on “self-reporting” by the same-sex parents themselves of the traits and characteristics of their children. (The parents may have a vested interest in representing their children to be as normal as possible.)

---

\(^69\) For a review of a number of the studies conducted, see Trayce Hansen, Ph. D., "A Review and Analysis of Studies Which Assessed Sexual Preference of Children Raised by Homosexuals"; available: [http://www.drtraycehansen.com/Pages/writings_sexpref.html](http://www.drtraycehansen.com/Pages/writings_sexpref.html).

\(^70\) Trayce Hansen, Ph. D., Pro-Homosexual Researchers Concel Finding: Children Raised by Openly Homosexual Parents More Likely to Engage in Homosexuality (citations omitted); available: [http://www.drtraycehansen.com/Pages/writings_prohomo.html](http://www.drtraycehansen.com/Pages/writings_prohomo.html).
(3) Self-selection of some of the subjects through homosexual advocacy magazines.

(4) Comparison of children being raised by two lesbians to children being raised by single mothers, rather than to children being raised by heterosexual parents.

(5) Even though female and male homosexuals parent very differently, research outcomes from children raised by two lesbian partners was applied to children raised by two male homosexual partners.

(6) Failure of the researchers to control for children originally raised by heterosexual parents who broke up after the children’s formative years and found subsequent same-sex partners.  

Any conclusions derived from flawed research should not be considered credible or relied upon as the basis for taking policy actions such as expanding adoption privileges to include same-sex couples, legalizing same-sex marriage, or promoting technologically assisted childbearing for same-sex couples.

---

71 In an exhaustive scientific review of the same-sex parenting studies, Dr. George Rekers – who is a Professor of Neuropsychiatry and Behavioral Science, Research Director for Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, and Chairman of Faculty in Psychology at the University of South Carolina School of Medicine -- characterized those studies as follows: “…the few studies available are biased with regard to subject selection in that they generally report on a small group of research subjects which are not randomly selected and which do not constitute a scientifically representative sample of homosexual parents and their children. Furthermore, although the research designs of the available studies are replete with numerous other methodological deficiencies, many of the authors make illegitimate generalizations or unwarranted conclusions from their flawed research studies.” George Rekers & Mark Kilgus, “Studies of Homosexual Parenting: A Critical Review,” Regent University Law Review, Vol. 14, No. 2 (2001/02): 343-382. Our Family Watch Policy Brief entitled “Same-Sex Parenting and Junk Science,” which can be found on our website (www.familywatchinternational.org), summarizes the expert critiques of the studies to date on same-sex parenting.