A Study on the Social Mechanism of Multi-family Environment on the Early Development Differences of Infants and Young Children

Yunxia Xue[1]

[1]*Shandong Vocational College of Industry, Zibo 256414, China*
[1]*Email: 664636775@qq.com*

ABSTRACT
Based on the social reality of the continuous diversification of family structure, this article discusses the social mechanism behind the differences in early infant development. The study abandons the usual path of individual attribution and starts from the perspective of institutional structure and social process, systematically analyzing how family patterns affect the development environment of infants through resource allocation, interactive scripts and institutional feedback. Through theoretical deduction and mechanism modeling, this article reveals how the nuclear family presupposition implied in the current parenting support system systematically excludes non-mainstream families and leads to structural inequality in development opportunities. The study further puts forward a theoretical framework that "care structure" replaces "legal identity" as the benchmark of policy design, and emphasizes that the system should have the ability to recognize, tolerate and empower family diversity. The article finally points to an early development policy paradigm with more structural sensitivity. Its core is to regard family diversity as the starting point of system design rather than an exception, thus providing a new path for building a fair, accessible and culturally adapted family support system in theory.

Keywords: *Pluralistic family, Early infant development, Institutional logic, Social transmission path, Support system reconstruction.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Under the background of rapid social transformation, the early development of infants is no longer regarded as a biological growth process, but a multidimensional construction phenomenon embedded in complex social structure [1]. As the initial social field of children's life, family's internal structure, interaction mode and resource endowment directly shape the cognitive, emotional and social development track of infants [2]. In recent years, with the diversification of marriage and childbearing concepts, the popularization of non-traditional family forms and the reconstruction of intergenerational care models, the family environment has shown unprecedented diversity. Single-parent families, families raised by generations, reorganized families, dink families and even same-sex couples have gradually become the social norm [3]. This structural change not only challenges the traditional development theory based on the nuclear family, but also urges the academic circles to re-examine the deep social mechanism behind the early development differences [4]. The developmental difference is not only determined by individual heredity or micro-parenting behavior, but also systematically influenced by the social position of the family, the accessibility of institutional support and the logic of cultural capital reproduction [5].

Most of the existing studies are from the perspective of developmental psychology or pedagogy. They emphasize the predictive function of variables such as parental rearing patterns, language stimulation frequency or parent-child attachment quality on infant development. However, these studies relatively ignore the influence of family form itself as a social institutional arrangement. Family form indirectly but continuously affects early development through intermediary paths such as resource allocation, time allocation and emotional structure [6]. Although

some sociological studies pay attention to the influence of family structure on children's studies or behaviors, they often simplify the infant stage into a "pre-socialization" blank period, underestimating the cumulative effect of social experience in the first 1000 days of life [7]. Policy discourse often regards the family as a homogeneous responsibility unit, which fails to fully respond to the structural differences in the needs of different types of families for childcare support, resulting in the disconnection between intervention measures and the actual situation.

This article attempts to jump out of the analysis inertia of individual attribution, put the multi-family environment in the dual context of social stratification and institutional change, and explore how it can weave the social generation mechanism of early development differences through three paths: institutional logic, cultural scripts and daily practice. The significance of this theoretical analysis lies in that it not only provides a structural explanation beyond individual ability for understanding the differences in early development, but also lays a conceptual foundation for building a more inclusive family support policy. When "diversity" is no longer just a descriptive word, but a realistic premise that system design must respond to, infant development research can truly get rid of the idealized presupposition of middle-class nuclear families and realize respect and response to diversity at the theoretical and practical levels. This article tries to reveal the hidden social logic behind the early development differences without relying on empirical data.

2. INSTITUTIONAL LOGIC OF FAMILY STRUCTURE CHANGE AND ALLOCATION OF PARENTING RESOURCES

The contemporary change of family structure is not an isolated demographic phenomenon, but a structural process embedded in multiple institutional logics such as labor system, welfare system and gender role norms. The decline of traditional nuclear family and the rise of multiple family forms essentially reflect the historical redrawing of the responsibility boundary among the state, market and family [8]. In this context, the allocation of child-rearing resources is no longer determined only by the wishes within the family, but is shaped by the normative definitions of "qualified family" and "proper child-rearing" in the external institutional environment.

Institutional logic affects the allocation of resources in three aspects. The first is qualification: to define which families can legally enter the support system. The second is resource allocation: it determines the convenience and cost of obtaining services for different families. The third is cultural recognition: that is, whether institutional discourse gives its parenting practice legitimacy. Take the current 0-3-year-old nursery policy in China as an example. Although the policy text emphasizes "inclusiveness" and "diversity", it still relies heavily on the affiliated or market-oriented nursery institutions in practice. Ancestor care, neighborhood mutual assistance and other informal care models have not been included in the subsidy system, and there is no quality guidance mechanism. This institutional preference invisibly strengthens the value judgment that "professional institutions are superior to family care", which makes the families raised by generations in a structural disadvantage in the competition for resources.

Table 1 combs the barriers to resource acquisition faced by four typical family forms under the current institutional framework, and its classification basis integrates three dimensions: household registration status, marriage form and main caregiver identity.

Table 1. Institutional Interface Barriers in Diverse Family Types

Family Type	Primary Caregiver	Typical Examples of Institutional Barriers	Resource Conversion Efficiency
Single-Parent Families with Separated Household Registration	Mother (non-local household registration)	Inability to access local inclusive childcare subsidies; annual re-certification required for children's medical insurance	Low
Grandparent-Led Families	Grandparents	Childcare services do not accept registrations from non-parents; community parenting activities are limited to parents only	Medium-Low
Blended Families	Biological father +	Court guardianship ruling required for childcare	Medium

Family Type	Primary Caregiver	Typical Examples of Institutional Barriers	Resource Conversion Efficiency
	Stepmother	slot applications; early education courses reject non-biological relationship registrations	
Unmarried Cohabiting Parenting Families	Both partners jointly	Inability to apply for housing or education subsidies under the name of "family" in some regions	Low

The above-mentioned institutional logic not only limits the accessibility of resources, but also transforms family structure differences into inequality in development opportunities through the "hidden screening" mechanism. When the system only designs the support path based on the single family model, multiple families are forced to build their own alternative resource networks outside the formal system. This extra institutional cost is finally passed on to the daily experience of infants, which constitutes the social root of early development differences.

3. SOCIAL TRANSMISSION PATH OF MULTI-FAMILY ENVIRONMENT AFFECTING EARLY DEVELOPMENT

The influence of multi-family environment on the early development of infants is not realized through direct causal chain, but through a series of conduction paths nested in social structure. These paths include not only the distribution logic of material and time resources, but also the cultural coding of emotional interaction mode, and also the reverse shaping of family internal practice by external social evaluation. Traditional research often simplifies the family as a "black box" of educational investment, ignoring the systematic differences of different family forms in social network embeddedness, institutional trust and cultural script callability. These differences precisely determine the density of language stimuli that infants can contact, the frequency of responsive care and the safe boundary of exploring the environment.

First of all, the resource transformation path constitutes the most basic transmission mechanism. The differences in economic capital, time availability and social support network of different family structures directly affect their ability to turn external resources into development opportunities. Secondly, the interactive script path is embodied as the "default setting" of daily practice in the family. Mainstream parenting discourse often presupposes parents' cooperation, high language input and structured games as ideal models. Reorganized families or unmarried families may be overcompensated because of the anxiety of identity legitimacy, or reduce the sensitivity of interaction because of vague roles, thus affecting the establishment of infant's security attachment. Thirdly, the institutional feedback path emphasizes the role of external environment in disciplining family practice. When families frequently encounter institutional exclusion, their parenting confidence and efficacy will be weakened. This psychological state will be indirectly transmitted to the quality of care, forming a negative cycle of "institutional pressure-family anxiety-decline in the quality of interaction".

The above three paths do not operate in isolation, but are intertwined and resonate in daily practice. Table 2 shows the typical characteristics of four types of families at key conduction nodes. The table is based on the comprehensive deduction of the implicit assumptions in the policy text, the logic of community service allocation and the communication structure of mainstream parenting knowledge. The listed indicators focus on mechanism description rather than value evaluation.

Table 2. Characteristics of Social Transmission Pathways in Family Environments

Family Type	Resource Conversion Efficiency	Main Interactive Script Characteristics	Institutional Trust Level	External Support Accessibility
Urban Dual-Income Nuclear Families	High	High-frequency language input, structured play, alternating parental care	High	High
Rural Grandparent-Led Families	Medium-Low	Low language stimulation, high physical care, low encouragement	Low	Low

Family Type	Resource Conversion Efficiency	Main Interactive Script Characteristics	Institutional Trust Level	External Support Accessibility
		for exploration		
Migrant Single-Parent Families	Low	Time-scarce interactions, high emotional volatility, low regularity	Extremely Low	Extremely Low
Highly Educated Blended Families	Medium-High	High cognitive investment, frequent role negotiation, cautious emotional expression	Medium	Medium

4. THEORETICAL RECONSTRUCTION OF POLICY IMPLICATION AND SUPPORT SYSTEM

At present, the mainstream paradigm of early infant development policy is still deeply rooted in the institutional imagination with stable marriage, co-education of parents and middle-class lifestyle as the default premise. This "family normative presupposition" leads to the lack of structural response ability to multi-family environment in policy design in terms of target group identification, service supply model and evaluation standard. When the policy only takes "improving the quality of parenting" as a single goal, but ignores the institutional burden and cultural tension carried by the family form itself, its intervention effect may not only decrease marginally, but may even inadvertently strengthen the existing inequality. Therefore, the theoretical reconstruction of the support system urgently needs to shift from "family neutrality" to "family sensitivity", that is, to admit that family diversity is a social reality rather than a deviated state, and to adjust the underlying assumptions of institutional logic accordingly.

The core of theoretical reconstruction lies in redefining "family ability" as the product of the interaction between system and family, rather than the inherent attribute of family. This means that the policy should not only focus on changing family behavior, but should give priority to eliminating the systematic exclusion of non-mainstream families from the institutional structure. The blind area of system design makes policy intervention presuppose that some families are "unworthy of support" or "incapable of cooperation" at the starting point, thus replicating social stratification. To achieve real inclusiveness, the policy system needs to be theoretically updated in three dimensions. First, the qualification should be changed from "identity compliance" to "functional needs", that is, based on the actual care arrangements for infants, rather than the form of family law. Secondly, the service supply should shift from "standardization" to "situational adaptation", allowing different families to call differentiated support components according to their own structures. Third, the evaluation framework should shift from "development results" to "opportunity fairness", and pay attention to whether the system provides accessible, affordable and culturally recognized support paths for all families. It changes the policy from "correcting family defects" to "empowering family diversity", making the system an amplifier rather than a filter of family ability.

5. CONCLUSION

Through theoretical analysis, this article reveals that the deep root of the early development difference between infants and young children does not stem from the natural differences in parenting ability within the family, but from the structural mismatch between the multi-family form and the current institutional logic. When the policy system continues to take the nuclear family as the only legal template, single-parent, generation-separated, reorganized and unmarried families will encounter systematic obstacles in qualification identification, service access and cultural recognition. This institutional exclusion is finally internalized into the dilemma of resource transformation within the family, and it is transmitted to the development experience of infants through daily interaction.

The problem of the current support system lies not only in the insufficient coverage, but also in the blind spot of its underlying presupposition of family diversity-treating non-traditional families as "problem families" rather than "different families". Structural contradictions are thus transferred to individual responsibility. In order to break through this dilemma, this article proposes that the theoretical reconstruction of the support system must complete three shifts: from identity compliance to functional requirements, from standardized supply to situational adaptation, and from result-oriented to opportunity fairness. The

policy adaptation framework based on care structure aims to make all kinds of families find recognized and supported positions in the system through the flexibility of system interface, the differentiation of service content and the decontamination of cultural narrative. This reconstruction is not to deny the family responsibility, but to redefine the cooperation boundary between the state and the family-the system should not try to shape the "ideal family" but empower the "real family". In this way, the early development policy can truly transcend formal equality and move towards substantive inclusion, so that every infant can get a starting point for growth with dignity and possibility, no matter what family structure he is born in.

REFERENCES

[1] Li Jia, Wang Xuena, Du Wenwen, et al. Research Progress on the Impact of Family Parenting Environment on Early Childhood Development[J]. Chinese Journal of Child Health Care, 2021, 29(10): 1096-1099+1104.

[2] Liu Yanqiong. The Influence of Different Feeding Methods on Infant Development Behavior, Nutritional Status, and Obesity Incidence[J]. Heilongjiang Medicine Journal, 2020, 33(04): 945-947. DOI: 10.14035/j.cnki.hljyy.2020.04.097.

[3] Bai Yu, Xuan Zhichong, Liu Chengfang. The Impact of Rural Parental Migration on Early Childhood Development: Evidence from 891 Families in Yunnan Province[J]. Chinese Rural Economy, 2023, (08): 148-167+185-190. DOI: 10.20077/j.cnki.11-1262/f.2023.08.007.

[4] Gao Xuemin, Tang Yinxia. Current Situation and Optimization Pathways of Childcare Services for Children Aged 0–3 in Tongling City[J]. Journal of Tongling Vocational & Technical College, 2025, 24(03): 73-78. DOI: 10.16789/j.cnki.1671-752x.2025.03.014.

[5] Yang Yingyi, Li Hainian. Current Status and Development Strategies of Childcare Service Demand for Children Aged 0–3[J]. Vocational Education, 2025, 24(08): 75-80.

[6] Gong Rujing. Development Pathways for Community-Based Childcare Services for Children Aged 0–3[J]. New Class Teacher, 2023, (29): 53-54.

[7] Kang Chuankun, Zhao Shuchen, Li Xintong. Childcare Services for Children Aged 0–3: Current Status, Utilization, and Effects[J]. Journal of Shandong University of Finance and Economics, 2023, 35(03): 75-85.

[8] Zhao Dan. Current Status and Influencing Factors of Family Childcare Service Demand for Children Aged 0–3[J]. Education Observation, 2023, 12(06): 4-7. DOI: 10.16070/j.cnki.cn45-1388/g4s.2023.06.006.