9

1

provided by Apoll

L	Parent psychological adjustment, donor conception and disclosure: a follow-up
2	over ten years
3	
1	Blake, L.,*Jadva, V., Golombok, S.
5	Centre for Family Research, University of Cambridge
5	
7	*Correspondence address. Centre for Family Research, Free School Lane, Cambridge,
3	CB2 3RQ. E-mail: Lucy Blake, lb377@cam.ac.uk,

ABSTRACT

11

33

10

12 Study question: What is the relationship between parent psychological adjustment, 13 type of gamete donation (donor insemination, egg donation), and parents' disclosure 14 of their use of donated gametes to their children. 15 Summary answer: Disclosure of donor origins to the child was not always associated 16 with optimal levels of psychological adjustment, especially for fathers in donor 17 insemination families. 18 What is known already: Cross-sectional analyses have found mothers and fathers 19 who conceived a child using donated sperm or eggs to be psychologically well 20 adjusted, with few differences emerging between parents in gamete donation 21 families and parents in families in which parents conceived naturally. The 22 relationship between mothers' and fathers' psychological well-being, type of gamete 23 donation (donor insemination, egg donation) and parents' disclosure decisions has 24 not yet been examined. 25 **Study design, size, duration:** In this follow-up study, data were obtained from 26 mothers and fathers in donor insemination and egg donation families at five-points, 27 when the children in the families were aged 1, 2, 3, 7 and 10. In the first phase of the 28 study, 50 donor insemination families and 51 egg donation families with a 1-year-old 29 child participated. By age 10, the study included 34 families with a child conceived by 30 donor insemination and 30 families with a child conceived by egg donation, 31 representing 68% and 58% of the original sample respectively. 32 Participants/materials, setting, methods: Families were recruited through nine

fertility clinics in the United Kingdom. Standardised questionnaires assessing

34 depression, stress and anxiety were administered to mothers and fathers in donor 35 insemination and egg donation families. 36 Main results and the role of chance: Mothers and fathers in both donor 37 insemination and egg donation families were found to be psychologically well-38 adjusted: for the vast majority of parents levels of depression, anxiety and parenting 39 stress were found to be within the normal range at all five time points. Disclosure of 40 the child's donor origins to the child was not always associated with optimal levels of 41 parental psychological adjustment. For example, disclosure was associated with 42 lower levels of psychological well-being for certain groups in particular (such as 43 fathers in donor insemination families), at certain times (when children are in middle 44 childhood and have a more sophisticated understanding of their donor origins). 45 **Limitations, reasons for caution:** Due to small sample sizes, the value of this study 46 lies not in its generalisability, but in its potential to point future research in new 47 directions. 48 Wider implications of the findings: Donor insemination and egg donation families 49 are a heterogenous group, and future research should endeavour to obtain data 50 from fathers as well as mothers. Support and guidance in terms of disclosure and 51 family functioning might be most beneficial for parents (and especially fathers) in 52 donor insemination families, particularly as the child grows older. The more that is 53 known about the process of disclosure over time, from the perspective of the 54 different members of the family, the better supported parents and their children can 55 be. 56 Study funding/competing interest(s): The project described was supported by grant

number RO1HD051621 from the National Institute of Child Health and Human

Development. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not represent the official views of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development or the National Institutes of Health. The authors have no conflict of

Key words: donor insemination, egg donation, psychological well-being, disclosure, gamete donation

interest to declare.

INTRODUCTION

Parental psychological adjustment is an important aspect of family functioning. The psychological adjustment of both mothers and fathers has been found to be associated with children's psychological development. For example, children living with a mother who is depressed are at increased risk for behavioural difficulties and a variety of psychiatric problems, including depression (Lovejoy, Graczyk, O'Hare, & Neuman, 2000). Likewise, anxiety disorders have been found to cluster within families (Turner, 2003), with children of anxious parents being seven times more likely to develop an anxiety disorder themselves than the children of non-anxious parents (Turner, Beidel, & Epstein, 1991). Similarly, high levels of parenting stress (i.e. stress that is caused by day-to-day parenting) has been shown to be an important factor in the development of child psychopathology (Deater-Deckard, 1998) and, in particular, behavioural problems (Barry, Dunlap, Cotten, Lochman, & Wells, 2005).

Mothers' and fathers' mental health problems influence their children's development in a number of different ways (Goodman & Gotlib, 1999). Firstly, children with a depressed or anxious parent may have a genetic predisposition to psychopathology. Secondly, mothers with psychopathology may expose their children to negative cognitions, behaviours, and affect, which then place the child at an elevated risk for developing psychopathology themselves. For example, depressed mothers have been found to be more disengaged, hostile, manipulative, and inconsistent in their discipline than non-depressed mothers (Dix & Meunier, 2009). Likewise, anxious mothers have been found to be less warm and less positive in their interactions with their children, granting less autonomy to, and being more critical of, their child in general when compared to non-anxious mothers (Whaley, Pinto, & Sigman, 1999). It is also important to consider that mental health problems do not exist in isolation, but within a social and familial context (Cicchetti, Rogosch, & Toth, 1998). Therefore, children growing up in households in which one or both parents are experiencing mental health problems may experience increased levels of marital discord and family conflict, factors that have been identified as having a detrimental effect on children's psychological adjustment.

98

99

100

101

102

103

104

81

82

83

84

85

86

87

88

89

90

91

92

93

94

95

96

97

The influence of fathers' psychological adjustment on family functioning and child outcomes has received less attention by researchers than that of mothers (Phares & Compas, 1992). A recent meta-analytic review of 28 studies concluded that paternal depression has a significant, though small, effect on parenting, with depressed fathers demonstrating fewer positive parenting behaviours and more negative parenting behaviours (Wilson & Durbin, 2010). The effect size for the relationship

between paternal depression and parenting behaviours was found to be comparable to those found for mothers, indicating that psychological adjustment affects fathers' parenting behaviours to the same extent as it does for mothers.

108

109

110

111

112

113

114

115

116

117

118

119

120

121

122

123

124

125

126

127

105

106

107

Parents' psychological adjustment may differ between families created by gamete donation and families in which parents conceived naturally for a number of reasons. The parenting experience may be different for heterosexual couples who conceive using donated sperm or eggs compared to those who conceived naturally, as one parent lacks a genetic relationship with the child (the father in donor insemination families, and the mother in egg donation families). Parents who conceive using donated sperm or eggs have also experienced a different route to parenthood, typically having experienced infertility and undergone fertility treatment, which may have lasted for many years. These parents have had to accept that they are unable to experience the pregnancy and birth of a child who is their shared genetic offspring, which may have involved feelings of grief and loss (Hammer, Burns & Covington, 2006). Although the stress of infertility has traditionally been thought of as being more pronounced for women (Greil, 1997), research in the past decade indicates that men likewise experience feelings of sadness and anxiety and may feel unable to talk to their friends or family about this experience (Dooley, Nolan, & Sarma, 2011; Fisher & Hammarberg, 2012). It has been questioned whether parents who have experienced infertility and conceived using assisted reproductive technologies will be able to parent effectively having endured a long period of infertility (van Balen, 1998).

Another reason why parental psychological well-being may differ in families created by gamete donation is the issue of disclosure. Parents who have conceived using donated sperm or eggs have a choice as to whether to tell their child about their donor origins and if so, how and when to do so. In the UK, parents are generally encouraged to tell their child that they were conceived using the egg or sperm of a donor at a young age, with the hope that there will never be a time when this information is new or shocking (HFEA, 2004; Nuffield Council on Bioethics, 2013). An increasing number of parents in both donor insemination and egg donation families are choosing to tell their children about their donor origins, although most twoparent heterosexual parent families in the UK appear not to do so (Readings et al., 2011). Keeping a secret within the family may cause high levels of anxiety and has been described as being psychologically "hard work" (Lane & Wegner, 1995), as individuals or couples may become preoccupied with the secret, and feel anxious and uncomfortable when topics related to the secret are raised in conversation (Karpel, 1980). On the other hand, it has been recognised that the disclosure of secrets may not always be an easy option (Vrij et al., 2003) and may result in a reaction that is psychologically damaging (Caughlin et al., 2009).

146

147

148

149

150

151

152

129

130

131

132

133

134

135

136

137

138

139

140

141

142

143

144

145

Despite concerns about the experience of infertility and the issue of disclosure, mothers and fathers who have conceived a child using donated sperm or eggs have been found to be psychologically well adjusted, with few differences emerging between parents in gamete donation families and comparison groups of parents who conceived naturally (Golombok *et al.*, 1996; Golombok *et al.*, 2002; Murray *et al.*, 2006). Of the small number of cross-sectional studies that have compared family

functioning in disclosing and non-disclosing gamete donation families, no differences have been found in mothers' or fathers' psychological well-being (Golombok *et al.*, 2002; Lycett *et al.*, 2004; Nachtigall *et al.*, 1997).

The analysis presented in the paper aims to build upon what we know about parent psychological well-being in donor conception families in relation to disclosure. Due to the highly sensitive nature of research in this area, the recruitment of families is challenging and sample sizes are typically small, therefore donor insemination and egg donation families are often treated as homogenous group. In the exploratory analysis presented in this paper, mothers' and fathers' psychological adjustment in relation to disclosure is examined in donor insemination families and egg donation families over a ten-year period. The more that is known about parent psychological adjustment in donor insemination and egg donation families over time, in relation to the disclosure of the child's donor origins, from the perspective of both mothers and fathers, the better supported parents and their children can be.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

<u>Participants</u>

Data were collected as part of larger study of heterosexual, two-parent families created by assisted reproduction in the UK. This larger study aimed to examine family functioning in families created by donor insemination, egg donation,

surrogacy and a control group of families in which children were naturally conceived. Data have obtained from parents at five time-points, when the children were aged one (Golombok *et al.*, 2004), two (Golombok *et al.*, 2005), three (Golombok *et al.*, 2006), seven (Golombok *et al.*, 2011; Readings *et al.*, 2011) and 10 years (Golombok *et al.*, 2012).

The donor insemination and egg donation families were recruited through nine fertility clinics in the United Kingdom. All two-parent heterosexual families with a child aged between nine months and one year old were asked to take part in the research. The exclusion criteria were severe congenital abnormalities and multiple births (Golombok $et\ al.$, 2004). At this initial stage, 50% of donor insemination families (n = 50) and 75% of egg donation families (n = 51) agreed to take part. No information is available on those families that declined.

By age 10, the study included 34 families with a child conceived by donor insemination and 30 families with a child conceived by egg donation, representing 68% and 58% of the original sample respectively (response rates for each phase of the study are presented in Table I). Rather than having actively withdrawn, the majority of those families from whom data was not obtained had moved home and could not be traced. The response rate has been calculated per family rather than for mothers and fathers separately. At some phases of the study, fathers completed questionnaire booklets but were unavailable for interview (mostly due to work commitments). The number of mothers and fathers in each family type from whom we obtained questionnaire data are presented in Tables II and III.

Those families who participated when the children were aged 10 (responders) were compared with those who did not (non-responders). There was no association between whether families participated at age 10, and mothers' or fathers' intentions regarding whether to tell their child about the nature of their conception reported at age one. Likewise, there was no association between maternal or paternal psychological well-being (levels of depression, anxiety and stress) at age one, and whether families participated at age 10.

Procedure

Ethical approval for the earlier phases of the study (when children were aged one, two or three) was obtained from the City University Ethics Committee, and ethical approval for the latter phases (when children were aged seven and 10) was granted by the Cambridge Psychology Research Ethics Committee.

When children were aged one, two, three, seven and 10, a research psychologist trained in the study techniques visited the families at home. Standardised questionnaires relating to parents' psychological adjustment were administered to mothers and fathers individually. Standardised interviews were also conducted with mothers and fathers, a section of which dealt with disclosure (for more information see Blake *et al.*, 2010).

Measures

Disclosure status (age one, two, three, seven and 10 years)

227

228

229

230

231

232

233

234

235

236

237

238

239

240

241

242

243

244

245

246

226

Parents' disclosure status was rated using data obtained during interviews with mothers. When children were aged one, two and three, parents' disclosure status was categorised according to parents' intentions, given the young age of their children and their children's inability to understand. At age one, 46% of donor insemination (n=23) and 56% of egg donation parents (n = 29) reported that they intended to disclose in the future. When children were aged seven, 29% of mothers in donor insemination families (n = 10) and 47% of mothers in egg donation families (n = 14) reported that they had started the process of disclosure. At the latter phases of the study, we defined disclosure status according to actual behaviour (rather than intentions) as most parents who disclose do so by the time their child is 7 year old (Blake et al., 2010; Mac Dougall et al., 2007a). To clarify, disclosure status was categorised as follows: Age one, two and three: "disclosing" families refers to those in which mothers planned to tell the child about their donor origins in the future or had already started doing so; "non-disclosing" refers to those who did not plan to do so or were uncertain as to how to proceed. Age seven and 10: "disclosing" refers to those families in which mothers reported

that they had started the process of telling their children about their donor origins;

all other families were categorised as "non-disclosing".

To assess parents' level of depression, the Edinburgh Depression Scale [EDS]
(Thorpe, 1993) was administered to both mothers and fathers. This 10-item measure
produces a total score ranging from 0 to 30, with higher scores indicating higher
levels of depression. Scores of 13 or above are indicative of the presence of a
depressive illness for women (Cox, Holden, & Sagovsky, 1987) and scores above 10
have been shown to be indicative of a depressive illness in men (Matthey, Barnett,
Kavanagh, & Howie, 2001). The questionnaire has been found to have satisfactory
validity, split-half reliability and to be sensitive to changes in depression over time
(Cox et al., 1987). Although it was originally devised for use with women in the
postpartum period, the scale has been shown to be applicable to mothers outside of
the postpartum period and to fathers (Matthey et al., 2001).
Trait Anxiety Inventory (age one, two, three, seven and 10 years)
The Trait-Anxiety Inventory (Spielberger, 1983), a 20-item questionnaire measuring
the individual's general level of anxiety, was also administered to mothers and
fathers. Scores on this questionnaire range from 20 to 80, with higher scores

indicating greater anxiety. This questionnaire is one of the most well-established

measures of anxiety, used in over 3000 studies (Spielberger, 1989). It has been

shown to have good reliability and to discriminate well between clinical and non-

Edinburgh Depression Scale (age one, two, three, seven and 10 years)

Parenting Stress Index (age one, two, three and seven years only)

clinical samples (Spielberger, 1983).

The short form of the Parenting Stress Index [PSI] (Abidin, 1990) is a standardised assessment of stress associated with parenting, was completed by mothers and fathers. This 36-item questionnaire comprises three subscales (Parental Distress, Parent-Child Dysfunctional Interaction, and Difficult Child) which are summed to produce a total stress score, with higher scores representing greater levels of stress experienced in the role of parent. A total stress score above 90 indicates clinically significant levels of stress. Test-retest reliability for the total score was reported to be 0.96 over a 1 to 3-month interval and .65 over a year. Concurrent and predictive validity have been demonstrated for the full-length questionnaire, and the short form has been reported to correlate very highly with the full-length version (Abidin, 1990). The PSI was not administered at age 10; the battery of tests given to parents changed at each time-point and some questionnaires were eliminated so that others, which were more pertinent to families in which children were aged 10, could be included.

Analytical approach

A cross-sectional factorial ANOVA design was utilised, which allowed differences between family type (donor insemination versus egg donation families), disclosure (disclosing versus non-disclosing) and the interaction between family type and disclosure status to be examined at each time-point. An ANOVA approach was taken as opposed to the more complex MANOVA approach in order to avoid any further loss of data and to aid the interpretation of findings. Due to relatively small sample sizes at the latter time-points of the study (especially for data obtained from

fathers), a longitudinal analytical approach was not taken, as it would have involved a considerable loss of data.

Demographic variables were compared between the different family types at each phase of the study. Mothers in egg donation families were significantly older than mothers in donor insemination families at age one, two, seven and 10. In addition, there was a statistically significant difference in family size at age 1 and 3, with children in egg donation families being more likely to be only children. There was no difference between groups in socioeconomic status, as measured by the parent with the highest ranking occupation according to a modified version of the Registrar General's Classification (The Population and Census Statistics [OCPS] and Employment Department Group, 1991). At each time-point, the relationship between demographic variables that differed between groups and the outcome variables were examined. No significant relationships were found.

The statistic eta-squared (η^2) was calculated and the square root of this value (the effect size r) has been reported. Effect sizes are classified as small (r = 0.1 - 0.23), medium (r = 0.24 - 0.36) and large (r > 0.37) (Cohen, 1992). Eta-squared has been criticised for providing an overestimation of the effect size (Field, 2009), but was considered appropriate due to the unequal sample sizes in each group.

RESULTS

318 Age one

3	19
32	20

Mothers' scores on questionnaires assessing depression, stress and anxiety were entered into factorial ANOVAs (see Table II). The effect of family type (donor insemination versus egg donation) was non-significant for all three measures of psychological well-being. The interaction effect between family type and disclosure was non-significant for all three measures of psychological well-being.

The effect of disclosure (disclosing versus non-disclosing) approached statistical significance for mothers' levels of depression (F(1) = 3.45, p = .07, r = .19) and was statistically significant for mothers' levels of parenting stress (F(1) = 4.97, p = .03, r = .23). For mothers in both donor insemination and egg donation families, levels of depression and stress were lowest for mothers who planned to tell their child about their donor origins.

Fathers' scores from the Edinburgh Depression Scale, Parenting Stress Index and
Trait Anxiety Inventory were entered into factorial ANOVAs (as shown in Table III).
For all three measures of psychological well-being, the effects of family type,
disclosure status, and interaction effects were not statistically significant.

341 Age two

343	Mothers
344	
345	At age 2, mothers' scores for depression, parenting stress and anxiety were entered
346	into a factorial ANOVA. For all three measures of psychological well-being, the
347	effects of family type, disclosure status, and interaction effects were not statistically
348	significant.
349	
350	Likewise, when fathers' scores on the Edinburgh Depression Scale and Parenting
351	Stress Index were entered into an ANOVA, the main effects of family type, disclosure
352	status and interaction effects were not statistically significant.
353	
354	However, for fathers' scores on the Trait Anxiety Inventory the effect of disclosure
355	was statistically significant (F (1) = 6.31, p = .02, r = .31). For fathers in both donor
356	insemination and egg donation families, levels of anxiety were lowest in non-
357	disclosing families.
358	
359	Age three
360	
361	At age 3, the effects of family type, disclosure status, and interaction effects were
362	not statistically significant on any of the measures of psychological well-being for
363	mothers or for fathers.
364	
365	Age seven
366	

When children were aged seven, mothers' scores from the Edinburgh Depression Scale, Parenting Stress Index and Trait Anxiety Inventory were entered into factorial ANOVAs. The effect of family type was non-significant for all three measures of psychological well-being. The interaction effect between family type and disclosure was non-significant for all three measures of psychological well-being. The effect of disclosure was statistically significant for mothers' levels of depression (F(1) = 7.45, p = .01, r = .34). For mothers in both donor insemination and egg donation families, levels of depression were lowest for mothers in families in which parents had started the process of disclosure. For fathers' scores on the Edinburgh Depression Scale, Trait State Anxiety questionnaire and Parenting Stress Index, the effect of family type was nonsignificant for all three measures of psychological well-being. The main effect of disclosure was statistically significant for fathers' levels of anxiety (F = 5.38, p = .03, r = .33). Levels of anxiety were lowest for fathers in families in which parents had not disclosed. The main effect of disclosure was non-significant for fathers' levels of depression and parenting stress.

386

387

388

389

367

368

369

370

371

372

373

374

375

376

377

378

379

380

381

382

383

384

385

The interaction effect between family type and disclosure for fathers' levels of anxiety approached statistical significance (F(1) = 2.90, p = .1, r = .25), as shown in Table III. For fathers in donor insemination families, levels of anxiety were lowest for

fathers in non-disclosing families. For fathers in egg donation families, levels of anxiety were more similar between disclosing and non-disclosing families.

There was also a significant interaction effect for fathers' levels of parenting stress (F = 5.47, p < .02, r = .34) as shown in Table III. For fathers in donor insemination families, levels of stress were lowest for fathers who had not disclosed, whereas for fathers in egg donation families, levels of parenting stress were lowest for fathers in families who had started the process of disclosure.

402 Age 10

Mothers' scores on the Edinburgh Depression Scale and Trait Anxiety Inventory at age 10 were entered into factorial ANOVAs (see Table II). The effect of family type and disclosure status were non-significant for both measures of psychological wellbeing.

The interaction effect between family type and disclosure was statistically significant for mothers' anxiety scores (F(1) = 6.77, p < .01, r = .33) as shown in Table II. For mothers in donor insemination families, anxiety levels were lowest for those mothers who had not disclosed. Conversely, for mothers in egg donation families,

413	levels of anxiety were lowest for those mothers who had started the process of
414	disclosure.
415	
416	Fathers' scores on the Edinburgh Depression Scale and Trait Anxiety Inventory at age
417	10 were entered into factorial ANOVAs. The effect of family type was non-significant
418	for both measures of psychological adjustment.
419	
420	The effect of disclosure was marginally significant for anxiety (F (1) = 2.90, p = .1, r =
421	.28), with levels of anxiety being lowest for fathers in non-disclosing families.
422	
423	The interaction effect for fathers' levels of depression was statistically significant (F
424	(1) = 4.23, p = .05, r = .33) as shown in Table III. For fathers in donor insemination
425	families, levels of depression were lowest for those fathers who had not told.
426	Conversely, for fathers in the egg donation group, levels of depression were lowest
427	for fathers in families who had disclosed.
428	
429	<u>DISCUSSION</u>
430	
431	This study examined the relationship between mothers' and fathers' psychological
432	adjustment, type of donation (donor insemination, egg donation), and disclosure of
433	donor origins to the child at ages 1, 2, 3, 7 and 10. Two main findings emerged.
434	Firstly, mothers and fathers in both donor insemination and egg donation families
435	were found to be psychologically well-adjusted: for the vast majority of parents

levels of depression, anxiety and parenting stress were found to be within the

normal range at all five time points. Secondly, disclosure of the child's donor origins to the child was not always associated with optimal levels of parental psychological adjustment. For example, for fathers in donor insemination families, it was non-disclosure that was associated with higher levels of psychological functioning at age two, seven and 10.

The majority of mothers and fathers in both donor insemination and egg donation families were found to be psychologically well-adjusted at all five time-points. These findings add to the body of literature that has found high levels of parent psychological well-being in families created using assisted reproductive technologies (e.g. Golombok, MacCallum, Goodman, & Rutter, 2002; Golombok *et al.*, 1996; Golombok, Brewaeys, *et al.*, 2002; Murray, MacCallum, & Golombok, 2006). Low levels of parental psychological disorder have been found to be beneficial to children's psychological development. In this respect, gamete donation families therefore appear to provide children with a positive family environment in which to grow.

However, in terms of the relationship between disclosure of donor origins to children and psychological adjustment, different patterns were found for mothers and fathers. For example, greater levels of psychological adjustment were found for mothers who planned to tell their child about the nature of their origins from age one compared to those who did not. Whereas fathers in non-disclosing families at age two had greater levels of psychological well-being than fathers in disclosing families. Similarly, at age 7, higher levels of psychological well-being were found for

those mothers who had started the process of disclosure, whereas for fathers, higher levels of psychological well-being were found in non-disclosing families. Also of note is that interaction effects (examining the relationship between family type and disclosure) were more prominent for fathers than they were for mothers. For those families in which parents had disclosed more positive findings emerged for egg donation families (where fathers have a genetic link with the child) compared to donor insemination families (where fathers do not).

Due to its design and analytical approach, this study cannot speak to causation. Fathers have been found to have little involvement in the process of disclosure, particularly in egg donation families (Blake *et al.*, 2010). It is possible that disclosure is less challenging in egg donation families because both parents have a biological relationship to the child (mothers have a gestational link and fathers have a genetic link), or it may the case that infertility holds less stigma for women than for men, and that disclosure is therefore a less threatening and difficult task (Appleby *et al.*, 2012; Raoul-Duval *et al.*, 1992). Research of an in-depth qualitative nature may be better suited to unpacking the differences and similarities between men and women in the disclosure process in both donor insemination and egg donation families.

It is also important to note that the dichotomy between disclosure and non-disclosure is not always simple, with some parents engaging in "layers" of disclosure, telling their family members and children about some aspects of their origins, but not others (Daniels, 1995; Readings *et al.*, 2011). It is also important to note that although families in this analysis were categorised as "disclosing", the children in

these families may not have an understanding of what it means to be donor conceived, and families may have only discussed this topic once or twice (*Blake et al.*, 2010).

488

489

490

491

492

493

494

495

496

497

498

499

500

501

502

503

504

505

506

507

508

485

486

487

The analyses presented in this paper are limited by small sample sizes (as indicated in Tables II and III), particularly in terms of data obtained from fathers in the latter phases of the study. Sample sizes smaller than 30 are often considered to be acceptable in psychology, yet Rosnow et al., (2000) emphasise that it would be difficult for significant small or medium effects to be found at the .05 level when the smaller of the two samples is less than 30. Underpowered analyses have a substantial risk of missing significant results. As emphasised throughout the paper, the analyses in this study are exploratory and any generalisations from this dataset made from this analysis should be made with great caution. However, the data presented in this analysis are valuable, as they have been obtained from donor insemination and (lesser-studied) egg donation families over a ten-year span. Therefore, the value of the findings of this analysis lies in its potential to point researchers in new directions. Fathers are often neglected in research on families created by assisted reproductive technologies, and in family research at large, therefore we echo the call for the greater inclusion of fathers in research in this field (e.g. Culley et al., 2013), as assuming that the experiences and perceptions of mothers and fathers are equivalent may be misleading. The findings of this study also suggest that the process of disclosure may be different in donor insemination and egg donation families and that they should not be treated as a homogenous group. Although we are beginning to understand more about the early phases of

disclosure when children are young (e.g. Blake et al., 2010; Mac Dougall et al., 2007), it is now crucial to understand what happens next in the disclosure process, in adolescence and beyond.

512

513

514

515

516

517

518

519

520

521

522

523

524

525

526

527

528

529

530

509

510

511

Although early disclosure is generally recommended and encouraged (Nuffield Council on Bioethics, 2013), the difficulty of carrying out this task has been recognised by many (Blyth et al., 2010; Golombok, 1997; Grace & Daniels, 2007; Salter-Ling et al., 2001). The findings of this exploratory analysis suggest that disclosure might be difficult for certain groups in particular (such as fathers in donor insemination families), at certain times (when children are in middle childhood). The reasons for these patterns are unclear, and the cross-sectional analyses presented in this paper do not allow us to infer causation. Research that begins to explore which aspects of disclosure are particularly challenging and why, and what kind of information or support parents and offspring in these families would find helpful, would be of great value. Factors that would be worthy of further investigation might be how parents' disclosure decisions change over time and why, and how this is dealt with by mothers and fathers. Ultimately, the more that is known about the process of disclosure over time, from the perspective of the different members of the family, the better supported parents and their children can be.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to all the participants who took part in this research.

Authors' roles

531	All authors contributed to the acquisition and interpretation of data for this study.
532	L.B drafted this manuscript and all authors have contributed to its revision and
533	approved the final version for publication.
534	Funding
535	The first three phases of this study were supported by funding from the Wellcome
536	Trust. The final two phases of this study were sup- ported by grant number
537	RO1HD051621 from the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.
538	The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not represent the
539	official views of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development or
540	the National Institutes of Health.
541	Conflict of interest
542	None declared.
543	References
544 545	Abidin, R. R. (1990). <i>Parenting stress index. Professional manual.</i> (Third Edit.). Odessa, USA: Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc.
546 547 548	Appleby, J., Blake, L., & Freeman, T. (2012). Is disclosure in the best interests of children conceived by donation? In <i>Reproductive Donation: Practice, Policy and Bioethics</i> (pp. 231–249). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
549 550 551	Barry, T. D., Dunlap, S. T., Cotten, S. J., Lochman, J. E., & Wells, K. C. (2005). The influence of maternal stress and distress on disruptive behavior problems in boys. <i>J AM ACAD CHILD PSY</i> , <i>44</i> (3), 265–73.
552 553 554	Blake, L., Casey, P., Readings, J., Jadva, V., & Golombok, S. (2010a). "Daddy ran out of tadpoles": how parents tell their children that they are donor conceived, and what their 7-year-olds understand. HUM REPROD, 1 –8.
555 556	Blake, L., Casey, P., Readings, J., Jadva, V., & Golombok, S. (2010b). "Daddy ran out of

559 560	Caughlin, J. P., Scott, A. M., Miller, L. E., & Hefner, V. (2009). Putative secrets: When information is supposedly a secret. <i>J SOC PERS RELAT</i> , 26(5), 713–743.
561 562 563	Cicchetti, D., Rogosch, F., & Toth, S. L. (1998). Maternal depressive disorder and contextual risk: contributions to the development of attachment insecurity and behavior problems in toddlerhood. <i>CHILD Y PSY</i> , 10(2), 283–300.
564 565	Cohen, J. (1992). Statistical power analysis. <i>Current Directions in Psychological Science</i> , 1(3), 98–101.
566 567 568	Cox, J. L., Holden, J. M., & Sagovsky, R. (1987). Detection of postnatal depression. Development of the 10-item Edinburgh Postnatal Depression Scale. <i>BRIT J PSYCHIAT</i> , 150(6), 782–786.
569 570 571	Culley, L., Hudson, N., & Lohan, M. (2013). Where are all the men? The marginalization of men in social scientific research on infertility. <i>REPROD BIOMED ONLINE</i> , (July). doi:10.1016/j.rbmo.2013.06.009
572 573 574 575	Daniels, K. (1995). Information sharing in donor insemination: a conflict of rights and needs. <i>CAMB Q HEALTHC ETHIC</i> , 4, 217–224. Retrieved from http://journals.cambridge.org/production/action/cjoGetFulltext?fulltextid=527 0172
576 577	Deater-Deckard, K. (1998). Parenting stress and child adjustment: Some old hypotheses and new questions. <i>CLIN PSYCHOL-SCI PR</i> , <i>5</i> (3), 314–332.
578 579 580	Dix, T., & Meunier, L. N. (2009). Depressive symptoms and parenting competence: An analysis of 13 regulatory processes. <i>DEV REV</i> , <i>29</i> (1), 45–68. doi:10.1016/j.dr.2008.11.002
581 582 583	Dooley, M., Nolan, A., & Sarma, K. M. (2011). The psychological impact of male factor infertility and fertility treatment on men: a qualitative study. <i>IRISH J PSYCHOL</i> , 32(1-2), 37–41.
584 585	Field, A. (2009). <i>Discovering statistics using SPSS</i> . London, England: Sage Publications, Inc.
586 587 588 589	Fisher, J. R. W., & Hammarberg, K. (2012). Psychological and social aspects of infertility in men: an overview of the evidence and implications for psychologically informed clinical care and future research. <i>ASIAN J ANDROL</i> , 14(1), 121–9. doi:10.1038/aja.2011.72
590 591 592	Golombok, S., Blake, L., Casey, P., Roman, G., & Jadva, V. (2012). Children born through reproductive donation: A longitudinal study of psychological adjustment. <i>Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry</i> .

593 594 595	Golombok, S., Brewaeys, A., Cook, R., Giavazzi, M. T., Guerra, D., Mantovani, A., Dexeus, S. (1996). The European study of assisted reproduction families: Family functioning and child development. <i>HUM REPROD</i> , 11(10), 2324–2331.
596 597 598	Golombok, S., Brewaeys, A., Giavazzi, M. T., Guerra, D., MacCallum, F., & Rust, J. (2002). The European study of assisted reproduction families: the transition to adolescence. <i>HUM REPROD</i> , <i>17</i> (3), 830–840.
599 500	Golombok, S., Jadva, V., Lycett, E., Murray, C., & MacCallum, F. (2005). Families created by gamete donation: follow-up at age 2. <i>HUM REPROD</i> , <i>20</i> (1), 286–293
501 502 503	Golombok, S., Lycett, E., MacCallum, F., Jadva, V., Murray, C., Rust, J., Margara, R. (2004). Parenting infants conceived by gamete donation. <i>J FAM PSYCHOL</i> , 18, 443–452.
504 505 506	Golombok, S., MacCallum, F., Goodman, E., & Rutter, M. (2002). Families with children conceived by donor insemination: a follow-up at age twelve. <i>CHILD DEV</i> , 73(3), 952–968.
507 508 509 510	Golombok, S., Murray, C., Jadva, V., Lycett, E., MacCallum, F., & Rust, J. (2006). Non-genetic and non-gestational parenthood: consequences for parent-child relationships and the psychological well-being of mothers, fathers and children at age 3. <i>HUM REPROD</i> , 21(7), 1918–1924.
511 512 513 514	Golombok, S., Readings, J., Blake, L., Casey, P., Mellish, L., Marks, A., & Jadva, V. (2011). Children conceived by gamete donation: psychological adjustment and mother-child relationships at age 7. <i>J FAM PSYCHOL</i> , <i>25</i> (2), 230–239. doi:10.1037/a0022769
515 516 517 518	Goodman, S. H., & Gotlib, I. H. (1999). Risk for psychopathology in the children of depressed mothers: a developmental model for understanding mechanisms of transmission. <i>PSYCHOL REV</i> , 106(3), 458–90. Retrieved from http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10467895
519 520	Greil, A (1997). Infertility and psychological distress: a critical review of the literature. SOC SCI MED, 45(11), 1679–1704.
621 622 623	Hammer Burns, L., & Covington, S. N. (2006). Psychology of Infertility. In S. N. Covington & L. Hammer Burns (Eds.), <i>Infertility Couselling. A Comprehensive Handbook for Clinicians.</i> (Second Edi.). New York: Cambridge University press.
624 625 626	HFEA. Human Fertilisation and Embryology Authority (Disclosure of Donor Insemination Regulations) (2004). Retrieved from http://www.opsi.gov.uk/SI/si2004/20041511.htm
527 528 529	Karpel, M. A. (1980). Family secrets: I. Conceptual and ethical issues in the relational context. II. Ethical and practical considerations in therapeutic management. <i>FAM PROCESS</i> , 19(3), 295–306.

530 531 532	insemination recipients: secrecy, privacy, and disclosure. <i>FERTIL STERIL</i> , <i>62</i> (3), 477 – 484.
633 634	Lane, J. D., & Wegner, D. M. (1995). The cognitive consequences of secrecy. <i>J PERS SOC PSYCHOL</i> , 69(2), 237–253.
635 636 637	Lovejoy, M. C., Graczyk, P. A., O'Hare, E., & Neuman, G. (2000). Maternal depression and parenting behavior: a meta-analytic review. <i>CLIN PSYCHOL REV</i> , <i>20</i> (5), 561–592.
638 639 640	Lycett, E., Daniels, K., Curson, R., Chir, B., & Golombok, S. (2004). Offspring created as a result of donor insemaintion: a study of family relationships, child adjustment, and disclosure. <i>FERTIL STERIL</i> , 82(1), 172–179.
541 542 543	Mac Dougall, K., Becker, G., Scheib, J. E., & Nachtigall, R. D. (2007a). Strategies for disclosure: how parents approach telling their children that they were conceived with donor gametes. <i>FERTIL STERIL</i> , <i>87</i> (3), 524–33.
544 545 546	Mac Dougall, K., Becker, G., Scheib, J. E., & Nachtigall, R. D. (2007b). Strategies for disclosure: how parents approach telling their children that they were conceived with donor gametes. <i>FERTIL STERIL</i> , <i>87</i> (3), 524–533.
647 648 649 650	Matthey, S., Barnett, B., Kavanagh, D. J., & Howie, P. (2001). Validation of the Edinburgh Postnatal Depression Scale for men, and comparison of item endorsement with their partners. <i>Journal of Affective Disorders</i> , 64(2-3), 175–84.
651 652	Murray, C., MacCallum, F., & Golombok, S. (2006). Egg donation parents and their children: follow-up at age 12 years. <i>FERTIL STERIL</i> , <i>85</i> (3), 610–618.
653 654 655	Nachtigall, R. D., Tschann, J. M., Szkupinski Quiroga, S., Pitcher, L., & Becker, G. (1997). Stigma, disclosure, and family functioning among parents of children conceived through donor insemination. <i>FERTIL STERIL</i> , <i>68</i> (1), 83–89.
656 657	Nuffield Council on Bioethics. (2013). Donor conception: ethical aspects of information sharing. London.
658 659	Phares, V., & Compas, B. E. (1992). The role of fathers in child and adolescent psychopathology: make room for daddy. <i>PSYCHOL BULL</i> , 111(3), 387–412.
560 561 562	Raoul-Duval, A., Letur-Konirsch, H., & Frydman, R. (1992). Anonymous oocyte donation: a psychological study of recipients, donors and children. <i>HUM REPROD</i> , 7(1), 51–54.
563 564	Readings, J., Blake, L., Casey, P., Jadva, V., & Golombok, S. (2011). Secrecy, disclosure and everything in-between: decisions of parents of children conceived by donor

565 566	insemination, egg donation and surrogacy. <i>REPROD BIOMED ONLINE</i> , 22, 485–495. doi:10.1016/j.rbmo.2011.01.014
567 568	Rosnow, R. L., Rosenthal, R., & Rubin, D. B. (2000). Contrasts and correlations in effect-size estimation. <i>PSYCHOL SCI</i> , 11(6), 446.
569 570	Spielberger, C. D. (1983). The handbook of the state-trait anxiety inventory. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting University Press.
571 572	Spielberger, C. D. (1989). State-trait anxiety inventory: A comprehensive bibliography. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
573 574 575	The Population and Census Statistics [OCPS] and Employment Department Group. (1991). Standard classification of occupations. London, England: Her Majesty's Stationary Office.
676 677 678	Thorpe, K. (1993). A study of the use of the Edinburgh Postnatal Depression Scale with parent groups outside the postpartum period. <i>J REPROD INFANT PSYC</i> , 11(2), 119–125.
579 580	Turner, S. (2003). Parenting behaviors in parents with anxiety disorders. <i>Behaviour and Research Therapy</i> , 41(5), 541–554.
581 582	Turner, S. M., Beidel, D. C., & Epstein, L. H. (1991). Vulnerability And Risk For Anxiety Disorders. <i>Journal of Anxiety Disorders</i> , <i>5</i> , 151–166.
583	Van Balen, F. (1998). Development of IVF children. DEV REV, 18, 30–46.
684 685 686	Vrij, A., Paterson, B., Nunkoosing, K., Soukara, S., & Oosterwegel, A. (2003). Perceived advantages and disadvantages of secrets disclosure. <i>PERS INDIV DIFFER</i> , 35(3), 593–602.
587 588	Whaley, S. E., Pinto, A., & Sigman, M. (1999). Characterizing interactions between anxious mothers and their children. <i>J CONSULT CLIN PSYCH</i> , <i>67</i> (6), 826–836.
689 690 691	Wilson, S., & Durbin, C. E. (2010). Effects of paternal depression on fathers' parenting behaviors: a meta-analytic review. <i>CLIN PSYCHOL REV</i> , <i>30</i> (2), 167–80. doi:10.1016/j.cpr.2009.10.007
692 693 694	

Table I: Response Rates for all Family Types at each Phase of the Study

Child's age (y)	Donor insemination	Egg donation
1	50	51
2	46	48
% original	92%	94%
sample		
3	41	41
% original	82%	80%
sample		
7	36	32
% original	72%	67%
sample		
10	34	30
% original	68%	59%
sample		

N.B. Sample sizes need not not always decrease over time, as in some cases families

were unable to participate during one phase of the study (e.g. a family event, moving

house) but were then able to participate at a later phase.

Table II: Mothers' Psychological Wellbeing

Family	Disclosure	N	Mean	SD	Statistically significant effects*		
	Age 1						
Parenting Stress				Disclosure <i>F</i> =4.97, <i>p</i> =.03			
DI	Non- disclosing	26	62.88	15.16			
	Disclosing	21	58.38	11.83			
ED	Non- disclosing	19	65.84	11.68			
	Disclosing	26	57.23	15.73			
Depression				Disclosure <i>F</i> =3.45, <i>p</i> =.07			
DI	Non- disclosing	26	6.42	3.35			

	Disclosing	21	4.67	4.47	
ED	Non-	19	6.58	4.71	
	disclosing				
	Disclosing	27	5.11	4.15	
Anxiet	y		ı	•	None
DI	Non-	26	35.50	8.42	
	disclosing				
	Disclosing	21	36.52	9.88	
ED	Non-	19	37.68	8.59	
	disclosing				
	Disclosing	27	37.22	10.11	
		1	Age	2	
Paren	ting Stress				None
DI	Non-	21	65.81	20.48	
	disclosing				
	Disclosing	21	65.43	15.50	
ED	Non-	15	71.07	11.96	
	disclosing				
	Disclosing	21	66.05	19.33	
Depre		None			
DI	Non-	21	6.14	3.72	
	disclosing				
	Disclosing	21	4.19	3.47	
ED	Non-	15	6.07	3.20	
	disclosing				
	Disclosing	21	5.62	4.73	
Anxie					None
DI	Non-	21	37.38	8.63	
	disclosing				
	Disclosing	21	34.76	8.13	
ED	Non-	15	36.80	8.36	
	disclosing				
	Disclosing	21	36.05	9.51	
	<u>.</u>	•	Age	3	
Daron	ting Stress				None
DI	Non-	20	64.05	16.24	None
וט	disclosing				
	Disclosing	18	63.83	17.25	-
ED	Non-	8	61.75	9.45	
LU	disclosing				
	Disclosing	25	64.96	17.95	
Depre		1	None		
DI	Non-	20	6.25	4.04	
וט	disclosing				
	Disclosing	18	4.83	4.85	
	Disclusing			L	

ED	Non	8	5.63	4.78	
ED	Non-		0.00	1.70	
	disclosing	25	5.44	4.38	
Amin	Disclosing		0.11	1.00	None
Anxie	1	19	34.58	7.86	None
DI	Non-	19	34.30	7.00	
	disclosing	18	34.11	10.47	
	Disclosing	7	34.86	8.19	
ED	Non-	_ ′	34.86	8.19	
	disclosing	0.5	05.00	0.70	
	Disclosing	25	35.60	9.76	
			Age	7	T
Paren	ting Stress		T		None
DI	Non-	23	57.83	12.40	
	disclosing				
	Disclosing	10	60.20	13.03	
ED	Non-	19	61.95	12.70	
	disclosing				
	Disclosing	12	61.58	15.64	
Depres	ssion				Disclosure <i>F</i> =7.45, <i>p</i> =.01
DI	Not	25	4.88	3.03	
	disclosed				
	Disclosed	9	3.78	3.19	
ED	Not	17	7.18	4.33	
	disclosed				
	Disclosed	11	3.27	2.15	
Anxie	1	00	00.40	0.04	None
DI	Not	23	28.13	9.24	
	disclosed		0.4.70	40.00	
	Disclosed	9	24.78	10.90	
ED	Not	19	26.47	12.59	
	disclosed		00.55	10 :-	
	Disclosed	11	29.27	18.47	
			Age	10	
Depre		1	T		None
DI	Not	24	5.08	3.92	
	disclosed				
	Disclosed	9	5.67	4.18	
ED	Not	16	7.25	4.04	
	disclosed				
	Disclosed	13	4.92	3.64	
Anxie	ty				Interaction F=6.77,p=.01
DI	Not	23	33.57	7.51	
	disclosed				
	Disclosed	9	35.67	9.63	
ED	Not	16	39.81	7.31	1

disclosed			
Disclosed	13	31.08	6.95

*Factorial ANOVA for differences between family type, disclosure status and

interaction between them.

Table III: Fathers' Psychological Wellbeing

Family	Disclosure	N	Mean	SD	Family	Disclosure	Interaction
		•		Age 1			
Parenting	Stress						
DI	Non-disclosing	23	57.35	10.53			
	Disclosing	18	61.89	17.68			
ED	Non-disclosing	17	61.88	11.67			
	Disclosing	23	63.00	14.06			
Depressio	n						
DI	Non-disclosing	24	3.25	3.23			
	Disclosing	18	5.22	4.60			
ED	Non-disclosing	17	3.53	2.65			
	Disclosing	23	4.09	3.26			
Anxiety		•					
DI	Non-disclosing	24	32.79	7.74			
	Disclosing	17	33.41	9.84			
ED	Non-disclosing	17	32.18	6.47			
	Disclosing	23	37.22	7.19			
				Age 2			•
Parenting	Stress						
DI	Non-disclosing	20	59.25	12.09			
	Disclosing	14	67.93	19.49			
ED	Non-disclosing	13	64.85	13.23			
	Disclosing	16	62.25	11.10			
Depressio	n						
DI	Non-disclosing	20	3.40	2.96			
	Disclosing	14	5.21	5.51			

ED	Non-disclosing	13	4.46	3.78		
	Disclosing	16	6.13	4.11		
Anxiety					F=6.31, p = .02	
DI	Non-disclosing	20	30.45	7.40	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
D1	Disclosing	14	36.14	9.83		
ED	Non-disclosing	13	32.77	7.41		
LD	Disclosing	16	37.25	7.10		
	Disclosing			Age 3		
Darenti	ing Stress			Age 3		
DI	Non-disclosing	15	65.93	18.17		
Di	Disclosing	14	63.14	14.41		
ED	Non-disclosing	6	67.83	17.22		
LU	Disclosing	20	68.35	12.53		
Depres			00.00			
Depres	Non-disclosing	17	4.94	4.78		
וט	Disclosing	13	5.08	4.82		
		6	4.67	4.63		
ED	Non-disclosing	20	4.15	2.85		
Amint	Disclosing .	20	4.10	2.00		
Anxiety	1	17	44.82	5.56		
DI	Non-disclosing	13	43.46	3.18		
ED	Disclosing	6	45.17	4.26		
ED	Non-disclosing	20	42.70	2.89		
	Disclosing	20	42.70			
				Age 7	T T	T 5 5 47 02
	ing Stress	15	50.53	11.24		F=5.47,p=.02
DI	Non-disclosing					
	Disclosing	7	63.71	8.98 17.25		
ED	Non-disclosing	14	65.14			
	Disclosing	9	59.67	8.20		
Depress			0.74	0.70		
DI	Not disclosed	17	3.71	2.73		
	Disclosed	5	4.40	2.07		
ED	Not disclosed	14	3.64	3.23		
	Disclosed	8	2.00	1.31		
Anxiety		ı			F=5.38,p=.03	F=2.90,p=.1
DI	Not disclosed	17	30.12	6.37		
	Disclosed	7	38.43	9.03		
ED	Not disclosed	14	34.50	6.35		
	Disclosed	9	35.78	5.59		
				Age 10		
Depres	sion					F=4.23,p=.05
DI	Not disclosed	14	3.57	2.62		
	Disclosed	7	5.86	2.97		
ED	Not disclosed	9	4.67	2.78		
	Disclosed	9	3.33	2.35		
Anxiety					F=2.90,p=.1	

DI	Not disclosed	14	29.50	6.78		
	Disclosed	7	36.57	7.72		
ED	Not disclosed	9	32.33	5.52		
	Disclosed	8	32.63	5.48		