Same-sex couples ‘make good parents’: researchers

Children raised by gay parents do as well as kids raised by straight parents, according to a comprehensive research analysis published in the Medical Journal of Australia today.

The analysis was done by professor Frank Oberklaid and colleagues from Murdoch Children’s Research Institute, the University of Melbourne, the Royal Children’s Hospital, Victorian Clinical Genetics Services, the Children’s Hospital at Westmead, and the Liggins Institute at the University of Auckland.

Correcting what they described as “misinformation” circulating in the same-sex marriage debate, the researchers cited a 2017 review of 79 studies, a 2014 review of more than 80 studies, a 2013 review in Australia and a 2010 meta-analysis of 53 studies in their analysis.

“They argued that because of homophobia, prejudice, and social isolation, including a mental health risk for same-sex couples, their children, and young people who identify as LGBTIQ+, they wrote in the journal. “The consensus of the peer-reviewed research is that children raised in same-sex parented families do as well emotionally, socially and educationally as children raised by heterosexual-couple parents. These findings have been replicated across independent studies in Australia and internationally.”

“The research tells us that children and adolescents with same-sex parents are doing well, despite the discrimination that their families endure. This will not continue for long in the face of hostile debate.”

All major health groups in Australia have made policy statements in support of marriage equality — prompting some members to make their opposition known — and Health Minister Greg Hunt has championed the Yes campaign.

The researchers noted that although some studies suggested children with same-sex parents did better than other children, that may reflect high-quality parenting, socioeconomic status and family stability within the same-sex parented studies.

“The findings of these reviews reflect a broader consensus within the field of family studies and psychology,” they wrote. “It is family processes (parenting quality, parental wellbeing, the quality of and satisfaction with relationships within the family), rather than family structures (the number, gender, sexuality or cohabitation arrangements of parents), that make a more meaningful difference to children’s wellbeing and positive development.”

Messages from the No campaign include that children of gay parents are neglected or put at risk, and allowing gay marriage would see children sexualised at school or in the community.

Q&A CRACKING A COLD CASE

Download our latest podcast ‘The Teacher’s Pet’ with award-winning journalist Helty Thomas. On behind-the-scenes and hear about his investigation, the twists and turns of the case and get exclusive insights.

BOOK NOW
Whatever. I've seen it first hand. Kids who don't have both biological parents at home are at a disadvantage in every way.

Promoting a lifestyle that robs children of their right to know both parents is wrong.

Hey look. Actual researched evidence.

When have Abbott, Abetz or Andrews ever done any actual scientific evidence in their lives?

Never.

Hey look, they set the parameters for their own research.

Hey look, a desperate attempt at invalidation.

They have 'cherry picked' the research that suits them. David van Gend's book "Swallowing From a Child" proves the complete opposite. All one needs to do is look at the overall wellssss of children who go through divorces, death of one biological parent, etc to see that living with both biological parents is overall the best outcome. We don't need to be bombarded by research and data. We just need to have common sense, which unfortunately is lacking in the world today.

That's funny, thinking someone other than David van Gend has been cherry picking. What you claim in children losing a parent bears no correlation to same sex parenting.

David, I have to disagree with you. Children being brought up in same sex relationships are in effect losing one of their biological parents. If it wasn't such a big deal, why do we have television programs dedicated to adults (who have been brought up by loving adoptive parents) who are desperate to find their birth mother or biological father. It is because, whether we understand it or not, people have an innate longing to know where they came from. No scientific study I'm sure can refute that.

None of what you claim negate the findings of the experts.

Ultimately what the so-called experts say. They only say what is favourable for their back pocket or their preferred biased points of view. Ordinary people need to become the 'real experts' and think for themselves. If we trusted every 'expert' we would all need to be admitted to psychiatric hospitals or we would already be ten foot underground. Use your own brain and think!

Good luck with becoming an informed, educated expert in everything. Do your own dentistry do you?

It seems that we require a panel of experts to inform us or dictate to us on a daily basis. I wonder how we could possibly live without them. How humanity managed over the years without so-called 'educated experts' to help it survive is beyond me.

We didn't have so much expertise available in so many fields, knowledge has expanded exponentially. Not as many people did survive in the past.
Tina

How come in Canada suicide rates keep increasing exponentially and same sex marriage has been legal for many years. Has knowledge really expanded exponentially?

Koula

What ‘educated expert’ has given you that piece of information. Source please.

Descant

@Koula I think this research must be a bit biased. In the quadrant article which linked at all the research it shows that homosexuals marriages are very unstable. This is what has more of an impact. I will enjoy looking further into the research. Not convinced.

Paul

Sorry, but I'm going with millennia of human experience over a “peer reviewed” article published yesterday.

David

@Paul

Of course you are. When an uninformed, unscientific claim suits your predetermined view over decades of research by the relevant experts counts for nothing right.

Tim

A millennia of human experience?

Have you been alive for a thousand years or are you just going on your ignorant bases and got feel again?

Ashley

A politically-motivated ‘study’ based on extremely small sample sizes. Now that’s what I call scientific!

David

@Ashley

Not politically motivated, that’s for the likes of Shelton. Meta-analyses on a number of studies from various precincts. So no, not extremely small sample sizes. Your wish hasn’t come true.

Paul

The AMA have already declared their position on SSM. How can you say politics has no influence?

David

@Paul

When the science supports their position.

Daniel

@David @Paul David, you’re on fire this morning!

Ashley

@David @Paul Science requires meaningful sample sizes. Your argument is invalid.

David

@Ashley @David @Paul Repeating your error won’t alter the outcome.