



## Article

# Assessing Triadic Interactions and the Family Alliance among Belgian Lesbian Mothers and Their Donor-Conceived Children

Salvatore D'Amore <sup>1</sup>, Nicolas Favez <sup>2</sup> and Nicola Carone <sup>3,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Faculty of Psychological Sciences and Education, Université Libre de Bruxelles, Avenue F.D. Roosevelt 50, CP 122, 1050 Brussels, Belgium

<sup>2</sup> Unit of Interpersonal Relationship Clinical Psychology, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, University of Geneva, Boulevard du Pont-d'Arve 40, 1205 Geneva, Switzerland

<sup>3</sup> Department of Brain and Behavioral Sciences, University of Pavia, Piazza Botta 11, 27100 Pavia, Italy

\* Correspondence: nicola.carone@unipv.it

**Abstract:** Both empirical and clinical evidence with heterosexual parents and their biological children has shown the significant influence of early family interactions on children's socioemotional and cognitive development during their first years. Yet, very little research has applied family-level assessment to families who are diverse with respect to parents' gender and sexual orientation, and child's method of conception. The present cross-sectional study compared 24 lesbian mother families with donor-conceived children and 24 heterosexual parent families with spontaneously conceived children with respect to triadic interaction quality and the family alliance (i.e., emotional and interactional coordination during family activities), as observed during the Lausanne Trilogue Play procedure. All parents were first-time parents, White, cisgender, residing in Belgium, had an upper-middle socioeconomic status, and a child aged 3–74 months ( $M = 21.00$ ,  $SD = 17.72$ ). Across family types, triadic interactions demonstrated similar scores in each family alliance dimension, characterized by appropriate levels of participation, organization, focalization, and affect sharing. The results have clinical implications for the use of the LTP as both a clinical assessment and a tool to reinforce and intervene with lesbian coparents. Family psychologists may find the results particularly informative when working to support coparenting relationships among diverse families.

**Keywords:** coparenting; family alliance; triadic interactions; lesbian mothers; assisted reproduction



**Citation:** D'Amore, Salvatore, Nicolas Favez, and Nicola Carone. 2022. Assessing Triadic Interactions and the Family Alliance among Belgian Lesbian Mothers and Their Donor-Conceived Children. *Social Sciences* 11: 519. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci11110519>

Academic Editors: Monica Pivetti and Silvia Di Battista

Received: 6 September 2022

Accepted: 10 November 2022

Published: 15 November 2022

**Publisher's Note:** MDPI stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



**Copyright:** © 2022 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

## 1. Introduction

The “family alliance” captures the degree of early family engagement and cooperation in everyday interactions in the child–parent triad (Fivaz-Depeursinge and Corboz-Warnery 1999). Although both empirical and clinical evidence with heterosexual parents and their biological children has shown the significant influence of early family interactions (implying more than two persons) on children's social, emotional, and cognitive development throughout the years (e.g., Favez et al. 2012, 2017; Jacobvitz et al. 2004; Hébert et al. 2021; McHale 2007; Tissot et al. 2022), very few attempts have been made to apply family-level assessment to families who are diverse with respect to parents' gender and sexual orientation, and child's method of conception (for exceptions, see Carone 2022; Farr et al. 2019), such as lesbian mother families through donor insemination.

Most studies involving lesbian mother families formed through adoption or donor insemination have been limited to the coparenting family subsystem (Carone et al. 2017; Farr and Patterson 2013), which encompasses the ways in which parents cooperate, support, and or undermine each other in their reciprocal presence or absence, and their management of triadic processes (Feinberg 2003; McHale 1995; Van Egeren and Hawkins 2004). While coparenting quality is foundational for both the family alliance and child development (McHale 2007; Minuchin 1974; Teubert and Pinquart 2010), it overlooks children's own

contribution to family interactions, such as self-regulation and involvement, which may, in turn, exert an influence on coparenting and, overall, on family alliance (Cole 2003).

The family alliance model was developed to define the quality of family dynamics within early triadic interactions (Favez et al. 2011, 2017). The model is derived from the symbolic interactionism approach (Blumer 1969) and the ecosystemic model (Keeney 1979), as both consider space (i.e., the transactional space defined by the interaction partners through their body position, at a distance that allows verbal or emotional exchanges) and time (i.e., the sequence of behaviors and the synchrony of interactive signals) the two main contextual characteristics of interaction. A further characteristic accounted by the family alliance model is specific to parent–child interactions and pertains to the hierarchy of interaction. That is, the parents provide the child with a framework by being more stable across time and by supplying stimulation of appropriate intensity. In return, the child “informs” the parents of their state, which allows them to adjust the setting (e.g., increasing or decreasing the stimulation); these reciprocal influences guarantee the mutual adjustment of systems of different hierarchical levels (for details, see Favez et al. 2011).

Based on these premises, the family alliance model outlines four components of interactive family coordination, which cannot be examined separately as they altogether define the quality of family alliance: (a) participation of all family members (involvement degree of each partner in the game), (b) role organization (adequacy degree to game structure and tasks), (c) focalization on a common interactive focus (to be attentive to other interactive behaviors and goals), and (d) affect sharing and empathy (feel each other and attune on the basis of the other emotional state) (Favez et al. 2011; Fivaz-Depeursinge and Corboz-Warnery 1999). A family alliance may be categorized as “cooperative (to work as a team),” “conflicted (to disagree with others),” or “disordered (to show confusing and unexpected behaviors),” depending on the relative levels of cooperation, competition and conflict, and exclusion and chaotic interactions, respectively, within the triad.

A body of studies suggested that the family alliance in heterosexual parent families is fairly stable from pregnancy to children’s toddler years, and influential for child development. While “cooperative” families have been found to report better child outcomes at the ages of 18 months and 5 years, particularly with respect to social skills, theory of mind, and understanding of inner states (Favez et al. 2006a, 2006b, 2012), conflicted and disordered family alliances are predictive of maladaptive or even psychopathological socio-emotional development, given the predominant negative affect and harsh and distant parenting within the interactive family practices (Cummings et al. 2000; McHale 2007). Specifically, in “conflicted” families, the interactions are characterized by competitive behaviors between the parents to acquire the attention of the child. This competition can be cheerful, with overcompensating emotions hiding the tension, or openly hostile. In “disordered” families, one of the family members excludes themselves from the interactions or is excluded by others, or the interactions are unstructured and globally chaotic, without any play or any positive effects (Favez et al. 2011).

The present study utilized the Lausanne Trilogue Play (LTP; Corboz-Warnery et al. 1993) to investigate the family alliance and coparenting during triadic interactions among lesbian mother families through donor insemination, in comparison to heterosexual parent families through spontaneous conception in Belgium.

## 2. Lesbian Mother Coparenting

Studies have revealed many similarities between heterosexual and lesbian mothers in their management of coparenting. Yet they have also emphasized some unique ways in which lesbian mothers approach decisions about parenting roles and responsibilities. Research comparing lesbian mother families with heterosexual parent families has found that lesbian mothers tend to share household duties more equally than do heterosexual parents (Bos et al. 2007; Farr and Patterson 2013), and perhaps even prefer an equitable division (Brewster 2017; Farr and Patterson 2013; Goldberg et al. 2012; Patterson et al. 2004). Similar results have also been found in gay father families. A possible reason for this is that

parents in these diverse family forms may be less likely to reproduce traditional gendered divisions of family work (Carone and Lingardi 2022).

Furthermore, observational studies have indicated that heterosexual couples are more undermining as coparents than are lesbian couples (Farr and Patterson 2013). That lesbian mothers show good levels of family functionality has been further suggested by a recent questionnaire-based study, in which they reported high coparental cooperation and affectivity, and low conflict and coparental triangulation (Mosmann and Pasinato 2021).

A further recent cross-cultural study with first-time lesbian, gay, and heterosexual parents through assisted reproduction found that parents' paid work outside the home was the most important determinant of the division of non-paid tasks during the first year of parenthood (van Rijn-van Gelderen et al. 2020). Across all family types, parents who were not working (or were working part-time) performed more childcare tasks when infants were 4 months old; this pattern remained stable when infants were 12 months old. In parallel, other studies have identified parents' perceived social support (particularly from their family of origin; Sumontha et al. 2016), observed family conflict (Farr et al. 2019), and parents' self-reported internalized sexual stigma and biological relatedness (Carone et al. 2017) as important factors contributing to coparenting quality among lesbian couples.

To date, the family alliance in lesbian mother families has received insufficient attention. However, exploratory studies (D'Amore et al. 2010, 2013) have found a similar functional family alliance between lesbian mother and heterosexual parent families. In D'Amore et al. (2010), eight families showed a cooperative family alliance and three families showed a conflictive alliance. Additionally, in D'Amore et al. (2013), family alliances among ten lesbian mother families were compared to those of three family groups (i.e., families with heterosexual parents with spontaneously conceived child, a depressed mother within a heterosexual couple, and heterosexual parents through donor insemination, respectively), finding significantly higher family alliance scores among lesbian mother families relative to families with a depressed mother (D'Amore et al. 2013). Of note, compared to other studies on coparenting, in the studies by D'Amore et al. (2010, 2013) the child was included in the observational system.

In sum, although extensive comparison studies between lesbian and heterosexual parent families indicated that coparenting and child development quality do not relate to family structure or parental sexual orientation (Bos and Gartrell 2020; Patterson 2017), family processes and coparenting have been rarely investigated considering the triad (both parents and the child) during moment-to-moment interactions (for exceptions, see Carone 2022; Farr et al. 2019). This constitutes a missing opportunity to show that not only representations (assessed through self-reports of parenting/coparenting), but also interactional processes are similar in lesbian and heterosexual parent families, or, possibly, in which aspects they differ.

Such an examination would allow to improve knowledge on lesbian parent families' functioning, with a particular focus on systemic processes, which still remain understudied. In addition, it would inform the social debate around the suitability of lesbian women as parents, given that negative attitudes and concerns against sexual minority parent families persist (ILGA 2022), and that heterosexual parent families with children spontaneously conceived are still the baseline against which to compare, interpret, and understand all other families (Fish and Russell 2018). Since to date very few comparisons on family alliance and coparenting in lesbian and heterosexual parent families have been made, an in-depth examination of the ways in which lesbian mothers and their donor-conceived children coordinate during triadic interactions, and how their behaviors compare with those of their heterosexual counterparts, would cover the current knowledge gap.

### 3. The Present Study

The present cross-sectional study aimed at comparing lesbian mother and heterosexual parent families with respect to the family alliance and child-parent triadic behaviors. In particular, the study sought to:

- (1) Observe and describe the characteristics and specificities, if any, of the family alliance in lesbian mother families, in regard to their structure (i.e., participation, organization, focalization, affect sharing) and dynamics (i.e., mistakes during shared activities and transitions), as well as the coparenting subsystem and child contribution during a standardized triadic play situation;
- (2) Compare family alliance dimensions between lesbian mother and heterosexual parent families.

Based on the literature reviewed above, it was expected that lesbian mother families would demonstrate a functional (i.e., cooperative) family alliance, and neither the quality of the family alliance nor specific interactive behaviors would differ between family types.

## 4. Materials and Methods

### 4.1. Sample

The study sample comprised 48 child–parent triads living in Belgium, including 24 within lesbian parent families formed through donor insemination (i.e., FIVET, with an unknown sperm donor in the clinic or hospital) and 24 within heterosexual parent families formed through spontaneous conception, all with a child aged 3–74 months ( $M = 21.00$ ,  $SD = 17.72$ ). All parents were first-time parents, White, cisgender, had an upper-middle socioeconomic status (calculated asking parents to consider their education level, occupation, and income), and came from non-clinical families. Child gender distribution did not significantly differ between family types,  $\chi^2(1) = 1.394$ ,  $p = 0.238$  (with Yate's correction for continuity), and there were 19 (39.6%) girls (12 in lesbian mother families and 7 in heterosexual parent families); regarding age, children of lesbian mothers ( $M = 24.17$ ,  $SD = 20.24$ ) did not differ from children of heterosexual parents ( $M = 17.83$ ,  $SD = 14.52$ ),  $F(1,46) = 1.551$ ,  $p = 0.219$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = 0.033$ . Conversely, parents' age differed between family types, with lesbian mothers ( $M = 34.37$ ,  $SD = 5.45$ ) being older than heterosexual parents ( $M = 31.39$ ,  $SD = 4.52$ ),  $F(1,94) = 8.125$ ,  $p = 0.005$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = 0.083$ . Among the 24 lesbian mother families, gestational mothers were mean aged 33.42 years ( $SD = 4.05$ ) and non-gestational mothers were mean aged 35.42 years ( $SD = 6.88$ ); the 12 female children were mean aged 21.75 months ( $SD = 15.95$ ) and the 12 male children were mean aged 26.58 months ( $SD = 24.25$ ). Among the 24 heterosexual parent families, mothers were mean aged 31.80 years ( $SD = 4.53$ ) and fathers were mean aged 33.4 years ( $SD = 5.14$ ); the 7 female children were mean aged 18 months ( $SD = 18.41$ ) and the 17 male children were mean aged 17.76 months ( $SD = 13.27$ ).

### 4.2. Procedure

Families were recruited through parental associations and announcements posted on the websites of Belgian parenting associations (i.e., Ligue des Familles, Homoparentalités). Parents received a flyer with an invitation to participate to the study on “family communication among contemporary families”, which had the main aim of studying family communication in lesbian and heterosexual parent families. In the flyer, inclusion criteria, research social implications, and contact of the researchers were also mentioned. Each parent provided informed consent to be contacted via email by the main researcher and to participate. The main researcher invited those who agreed to participate to the faculty laboratory, which was equipped for the Lausanne Trilogue Play (details below). An initial interview was administered to collect participants' sociodemographic details. The Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Psychological Sciences and Education, Université Libre de Bruxelles approved the study.

### 4.3. Observation Situation

The LTP (Fivaz-Depeursinge and Corboz-Warnery 1999) was used to observe the family alliance and specific behaviors during triadic interactions. The LTP is a standardized play situation involving two parents and their child. It is structured in four parts: (a) one parent plays with the infant while the other is excluded, (b) the parents reverse roles,

(c) both parents play together with the infant, and (d) the parents talk to each other while the infant is excluded.

Parents are told that the entire session generally takes 10–15 min, depending on their child's age and behavior. In the framework of this interval, they have to perform the same tasks in the same order, though the duration of each LTP part is up to the parents as they are expected to respect the four parts within the given timeframe (organization function). The technical equipment includes two cameras: one that films the parents and the other that films the infant. Both tapes are synchronized with a stopwatch. The final video is comprised of two shots (one of the child and the other of the parents).

In the present study, each video was analyzed using the Family Alliance Assessment Scale (FAAS), version 6.3 (Favez et al. 2011; Lavanchy Scaiola et al. 2008), which has been shown to have good inter-rater reliability and good validity (Favez et al. 2011, 2019). The FAAS includes 15 scales (i.e., *Postures, Gazes, Role Implication, Structure, Co-construction, Parental Scaffolding, Family Emotional Warmth, Validation, Authenticity, Interactive Mistakes during Activities, Interactive Mistakes during Transitions, Coparental Support, Coparental Conflict, Child Involvement, Child Self-Regulation*), which measure seven principal interaction dimensions (i.e., *participation, organization, focalization, affect sharing, timing/synchronization, coparenting subsystem, child subsystem*).

Each scale assesses triadic interaction according to a 3-point scoring system, as follows: 0 (*inappropriate*), 1 (*moderate*), and 2 (*appropriate*). For example, *Gazes* are rated as appropriate when each partner orients their gaze toward the other partners or toward shared activities; *Structure* is rated as moderate when at one or two occasions during the LTP the scenario becomes a little confused, but the four parts are carried out; *Family warmth* is rated as inappropriate when the emotional climate is neutral or even negative. The LTP was originally developed with parents who were in heterosexual relationships and has not been validated with same-gender couples but with other diverse samples such as clinical, interracial, and heterosexual couples who have used FIVET. Based on current research on same-gender parenting and family processes showing similarities with heterosexual counterparts, there is no counter-indication to use LTP with same-gender parenting.

#### 4.4. Coding Strategy

A trained and certified coder coded all videos. To test inter-rater reliability, two additional trained and certified coders coded half of the videos, each; these were randomly assigned. Thus, all videos were double-coded, resulting in moderate overall reliability for the 15 scales ( $ICC = 0.65$ ).

#### 4.5. Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations) were computed for each family alliance dimension and the total family alliance score (constituting the sum of the first 11 FAAS scales), in both family types. Subsequently, given the small sample size, the nonparametric Mann–Whitney U test was conducted to compare family types on these factors. Given that family groups differed on parent age, the analyses were conducted with and without parent age as a covariate. In case no significant effect was detected, to retain more power, the analyses presented in the article did not control for parent age. Then, to calculate the power achieved and the minimal detectable difference that would lead to the rejection of the null hypothesis, a post-hoc power analysis was performed using the G\*Power software. In all analyses, statistical significance was set at  $p < 0.05$ .

## 5. Results

### *Family Alliance Dimensions during the LTP, by Family Type*

Table 1 displays the means, standard deviations, and mean ranks for FAAS scores by family type. On a descriptive level, both family types fulfilled, on average, the participation, focalization, and affect sharing functions, and moderately fulfilled the organization function. With respect to family subsystems, on average, parents showed appropriate levels of

support and conflict as coparents, and children were involved and able to appropriately self-regulate. Then, the Mann–Whitney U test used mean ranks to examine potential differences in family alliance dimensions between family types, indicating that, during the LTP, lesbian mothers and heterosexual parent families did not differ on any FAAS dimension or the total family alliance score. Given the non-significant effect of parent age, the analysis did not control for it. The mean power achieved by the Mann–Whitney U test analysis was 0.166 (range: 0.050–0.468). In addition, the minimal detectable difference that would lead to the rejection of the null hypothesis ranged from 0 to 1.703, indicating that a minimum sample size of 73 and 80 would be required for detecting potential differences on role implication and child involvement scales, respectively, between the two family groups at 95% confidence level. For all other FAAS scales, the minimum required number was higher than 246.

**Table 1.** Comparison of Family Alliance Assessment Scale scores between family groups (N = 48).

Theoretical Concepts	Scales	Lesbian Mother Families (n = 24)			Heterosexual Parent Families (n = 24)			Mann-Whitney U	p
		M	SD	Mean Rank	M	SD	Mean Rank		
Participation	Posture	1.79	0.42	25.50	1.71	0.46	23.50	264.00	0.509
	Gaze	1.46	0.72	24.52	1.50	0.59	24.48	287.50	0.991
Organization	Role implication	0.92	0.58	21.96	1.17	0.48	27.04	227.00	0.115
	Structure	1.08	0.58	24.81	1.04	0.75	24.19	285.50	0.863
Focalization	Co-construction	1.58	0.65	25.25	1.54	0.59	23.75	270.00	0.663
	Parental scaffolding	1.46	0.59	25.48	1.33	0.70	23.52	264.50	0.589
Affect sharing	Family warmth	1.67	0.48	26.00	1.54	0.51	23.00	252.00	0.381
	Validation	1.67	0.48	23.50	1.75	0.44	25.50	264.00	0.530
	Authenticity	1.83	0.38	25.50	1.75	0.44	23.50	264.00	0.482
Timing/ Synchronization	Mistakes during activities	1.50	0.59	24.50	1.50	0.59	24.50	288.00	1.000
	Mistakes during transitions	1.38	0.50	25.31	1.29	0.55	23.69	268.50	0.634
Coparenting	Support	1.67	0.48	26.00	1.54	0.51	23.00	252.00	0.381
	Conflict	1.83	0.38	25.08	1.75	0.53	23.92	274.00	0.670
Child contribution	Involvement	1.75	0.44	26.75	1.50	0.66	22.25	234.00	0.177
	Self-regulation	1.67	0.48	24.50	1.67	0.48	24.50	288.00	1.000
Family alliance score		16.33	3.46	26.08	16.13	2.72	22.92	250.00	0.430

Note: The Family Alliance Assessment Score was calculated summing the first 11 scales. Mean ranks were used to calculate Mann–Whitney U test.

## 6. Discussion

The present study was the first to compare lesbian mother families through donor insemination and heterosexual parent families through spontaneous conception with respect to the family alliance in child–parent triads. The results demonstrate similar family alliance quality and coparenting across the family types. Following the first research aim, lesbian-parented triads displayed appropriate verbal and non-verbal play and inclusion with their partner during the LTP. In addition, they followed the LTP instructions by adhering to their assigned roles. Finally, they demonstrated focused co-construction and parental scaffolding, by respecting turn-taking, sharing play, and adapting their stimulation to their infant’s rhythms.

On an affective level, lesbian mothers displayed positive, warm, and supportive interactions, and seemed to recognize and adjust to their partner’s emotional states. They

also helped their child self-regulate, when necessary. Parents' emotional display seemed mainly authentic and congruent with the emotional states of their partner and child. These results suggest that lesbian coparents may be emotionally and interactively coordinated, in line with previous studies indicating that lesbian mothers' sexual orientation is not associated with coparental support or conflict during shared activities, or with overall emotional involvement with children (Bos and Gartrell 2020; Bos et al. 2007; Carone et al. 2017, 2018; Farr et al. 2019; Farr and Patterson 2013).

With respect to the second research aim, family alliance quality did not significantly differ between family types. Rather, lesbian mothers and heterosexual parents showed similar appropriate interactions in terms of both the family alliance and coparenting. These results support the two previous exploratory LTP studies involving Belgian lesbian mothers (D'Amore et al. 2010, 2013), indicating that, on average, lesbian-parented triads show functional family alliances, similar to heterosexual parent families. To a wider extent, they further align with the high coparental cooperation and affectivity, and low conflict and coparental triangulation found by Mosmann and Pasinato (2021) in their sample of 31 Brazilian lesbian mothers. Overall, these results do not provide empirical confirmation to those who build their policies upon the idea that lesbian mothers are not suitable parents.

While previous research in this area has examined coparenting quality and family interactions (Carone et al. 2017; Chan et al. 1998; Goldberg et al. 2012; Mosmann and Pasinato 2021; Patterson et al. 2004; van Rijn-van Gelderen et al. 2020), the present study was one of the first to apply a fine-grained observation (i.e., LTP) of triadic interactions. Furthermore, most prior studies have been based on self-report (for exceptions, see Farr and Patterson 2013; Farr et al. 2019). Another important strength of the present study was that the two family groups did not significantly differ on parents' socioeconomic status and children's gender and age; this allowed to control the analysis of family alliance quality for the potential effect of these sociodemographic variables.

However, some limitations should be acknowledged. First, the relatively small sample size and the subsequent small power achieved by the analyses, the snowball recruitment technique, and the sample characteristics (i.e., all participants were White and of the same socio-economic group), including the sample convenience nature, may have affected our results and prevent generalization to all Belgian lesbian mother families. Therefore, future studies with larger, ethnically and socio-economically diverse groups are needed. Regarding statistical power, a further note is that, although the minimal detectable difference test indicated that a sample size of 73 would have been necessary to likely detect some differences between lesbian and heterosexual parents, high-powered studies with large and nationally representative samples (e.g., US Census data, administrative data from the Netherlands) showed that lesbian parent families fare as well as their heterosexual counterparts (Rosenfeld 2010; Kabátek and Perales 2021). When differences were detected, these indicated that children of lesbian parents outperformed children of heterosexual parents on multiple indicators (e.g., academic performance) (Kabátek and Perales 2021). Second, children's wide age range did not allow the specificities of children's developmental period to be considered. This is particularly important to be kept in mind, since children exert an impact on parenting behaviors, which is more and more strategic and goal-oriented as they grow (Cole 2003). In addition, although the LTP coding manual provides specifications about codes regarding the different ages covered, it cannot be ruled out that the wide age ranges have influenced the low ICC.

Third, because of the gender composition of the two family groups, it was not possible to mask the family type to the coders. Whether this aspect may have influenced the coding process cannot be excluded, given that research represents a shared space, shaped by both researcher and participants, and, as such, the identities of both researcher and participants have the potential to impact the research process (England 1994). Finally, both family types employed different paths to parenthood. Although previous research has shown that lesbian mother families through donor insemination generally present similar outcomes as heterosexual parent families through spontaneous conception (Bos and Gartrell 2020),

different results may have emerged from the inclusion of heterosexual parent families through assisted reproduction. In this vein, research has shown that a child-centered parenting style (characterized by overprotection and a failure to set appropriate limits; [Hahn and DiPietro 2001](#)) may result from the struggle to conceive. Such a child-centered attitude might impede the fluidity and coordination of triadic interactions, thereby reducing family alliance quality.

The present study contributes novel and important insights into family alliance quality and coparenting among lesbian mother families with donor-conceived children. Aligning with previous research involving sexual minority parent families on the relevance of family processes over family structure for family functioning and child adjustment (e.g., [Bos and Gartrell 2020](#); [Patterson 2017](#)), the results showed that coparenting dynamics are likely universal and that the quality of interactional and affective processes between coparents and their child (i.e., participation, organization, focalization, affect sharing) is not related to parents' gender, sexual orientation, and conception method.

Future research should replicate and extend the LTP methodology to further samples of diverse families, including gay father families, heterosexual parent families with primary caregiver fathers, and transgender parent families. This would facilitate a deeper investigation of the main and interactive effect of parent gender, sexual orientation, and the caregiving role on family alliance quality. From a clinical perspective, longitudinal research may be important to trace family alliance development and stability from the pre- to the post-natal period, as well as across child development stages (e.g., from the school years through to middle childhood and adolescence). Such research could inform preventive interventions for families with an at-risk or low pre-natal family alliance quality.

The findings have clinical implications for improving coparenting relationships. In this vein, the LTP may be used as both a clinical assessment and a tool to reinforce and intervene with lesbian coparents, insofar as the observation of dyadic and triadic interactional patterns may allow family psychologists to examine the quality of family and coparenting alliances and patterns. In this vein, the recognition of lesbian coparents as competent in their structural organization and emotional support may promote their sense of efficacy. Additionally, video feedback may facilitate an exploration of parents' resources and limitations, while promoting their sense of validation and family inclusion. In sum, family psychologists may find the results particularly informative when working to support coparenting relationships among diverse families.

**Author Contributions:** Conceptualization, S.D.; Data curation, S.D.; Formal analysis, N.F. and N.C.; Investigation, S.D.; Methodology, S.D. and N.F.; Supervision, N.C.; Writing—original draft, S.D., N.F. and N.C.; Writing—review & editing, S.D., N.F. and N.C. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

**Funding:** This research received no external funding.

**Institutional Review Board Statement:** The study was conducted according to the guidelines of the Declaration of Helsinki, and approved by the Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Psychological Sciences and Education, Université Libre de Bruxelles.

**Informed Consent Statement:** Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

**Data Availability Statement:** The datasets generated for this study are not publicly available because they contain information (i.e., videos) that could compromise the privacy of research participants, but are available from the first or corresponding author on reasonable request.

**Acknowledgments:** The authors thank all families who participated in the study. The authors also thank Aurélie Lepot, Marina Miscioscia, Giada Padula, Lidia Scariotta, and Karin Gresse for their help with the recruitment, LTP administration, and coding.

**Conflicts of Interest:** The author declares no conflict of interest.



## References

- Blumer, Herbert. 1969. *Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method*. Hoboken: Prentice-Hall.
- Bos, Henny M. W., and Nanette K. Gartrell. 2020. Lesbian-mother families formed through donor insemination. In *LGBTQ-Parent Families: Innovations in Research and Implications for Practice*, 2nd ed. Edited by Abbie E. Goldberg and Katherine R. Allen. Cham: Springer, pp. 25–44.
- Bos, Henny M. W., Frank van Balen, and Dymphna C. van den Boom. 2007. Child adjustment and parenting in planned lesbian parent families. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 77: 38–48. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Brewster, Melanie E. 2017. Lesbian women and household labor division: A systematic review of scholarly research from 2000 to 2015. *Journal of Lesbian Studies* 21: 47–69. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
- Carone, Nicola. 2022. Family alliance and intergenerational transmission of coparenting in gay and heterosexual single-father families through surrogacy: Associations with child attachment security. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 19: 7713. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
- Carone, Nicola, and Vittorio Lingiardi. 2022. Untangling caregiving role from parent gender in coparenting research: Insights from gay two-father families. *Frontiers in Psychology* 13: 863050. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
- Carone, Nicola, Roberto Baiocco, Salvatore Ioverno, Antonio Chirumbolo, and Vittorio Lingiardi. 2017. Same-sex parent families in Italy: Validation of the Coparenting Scale–Revised for lesbian mothers and gay fathers. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology* 14: 367–79. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Carone, Nicola, Vittorio Lingiardi, Antonio Chirumbolo, and Roberto Baiocco. 2018. Italian gay father families formed by surrogacy: Parenting, stigmatization, and children’s psychological adjustment. *Developmental Psychology* 54: 1904–16. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Chan, Raymond W., Risa C. Brooks, Barbara Raboy, and Charlotte J. Patterson. 1998. Division of labor among lesbian and heterosexual parents: Associations with children’s adjustment. *Journal of Family Psychology* 12: 402–19. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Cole, Pamela. 2003. The developmental course from child effects to child effectiveness. In *Children’s Influence on Family Dynamics*. Edited by Ann Crouter and Alan Booth. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum, pp. 109–18.
- Corboz-Warnery, Antoinette, Elisabeth Fivaz-Depeursinge, Christine Gertsch-Bettens, and Nicolas Favez. 1993. Systemic analysis of father-mother-baby interactions: The Lausanne Triadic Play. *Infant Mental Health Journal* 14: 298–316. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Cummings, Mark E., Patrick Davies, and Susan Campbell. 2000. *Developmental Psychopathology and Family Process*. New York: Guilford.
- D’Amore, Salvatore, Lidia Scarcioffa, and Karin Gresse. 2010. Les alliances familiales dans le contexte de l’homoparentalité: Une recherche exploratoire à travers le modèle du Jeu Trilogique de Lausanne. *Thérapie Familiale* 31: 465–72. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- D’Amore, Salvatore, Alessandra Simonelli, and Marina Miscioscia. 2013. La qualità delle interazioni triadiche nelle famiglie lesbogenitoriali: Uno studio pilota con la procedura del Lausanne Trilogue Play. *Infanzia e adolescenza* 12: 113–27.
- England, Kim V. L. 1994. Getting personal: Reflexivity, positionality, and feminist research. *The Professional Geographer* 46: 80–89. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Farr, Rachel H., and Charlotte J. Patterson. 2013. Coparenting among lesbian, gay, and heterosexual couples: Associations with adopted children’s outcomes. *Child Development* 84: 1226–40. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
- Farr, Rachel H., Simon T. Bruun, and Kay A. Simon. 2019. Family conflict observations and outcomes among adopted school-age children with lesbian, gay, and heterosexual parents. *Journal of Family Psychology* 33: 965–74. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
- Favez, Nicolas, France Frascarolo, Claudio Carneiro, Vivienne Montfort, Antoinette Corboz-Warnery, and Elisabeth Fivaz-Depeursinge. 2006a. The development of the family alliance from pregnancy to toddlerhood and children outcomes at 18 months. *Infant and Child Development* 15: 59–73. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Favez, Nicolas, France Frascarolo, and Elisabeth Fivaz-Depeursinge. 2006b. Family alliance stability and change from pregnancy to toddlerhood and marital correlates. *Swiss Journal of Psychology* 65: 213–20. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Favez, Nicolas, Chloé Scaiola, Hervé Tissot, Joëlle Darwiche, and Frances Frascarolo. 2011. The Family Alliance Assessment Scales: Steps toward validity and reliability of an observational assessment tool for early family interactions. *Journal of Child and Family Studies* 20: 23–37. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Favez, Nicolas, Francesco Lopes, Mathieu Bernard, France Frascarolo, Chloé Scaiola, Antoinette Corboz-Warnery, and Elisabeth Fivaz-Depeursinge. 2012. The development of family alliance from pregnancy to toddlerhood and child outcomes at 5 years. *Family Process* 51: 542–56. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Favez, Nicolas, France Frascarolo, and Hervé Tissot. 2017. The family alliance model: A way to study and characterize early family interactions. *Frontiers in Psychology* 8: 1441. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Favez, Nicolas, Hervé Tissot, and France Frascarolo. 2019. Is it typical? The ecological validity of the observation of mother-father-infant interactions in the Lausanne Trilogue Play. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology* 16: 113–21. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Feinberg, Mark E. 2003. The internal structure and ecological context of coparenting: A framework for research and intervention. *Parenting: Science and Practice* 3: 95–131. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Fish, Jessica N., and Stephen T. Russell. 2018. Queering methodologies to understand queer families. *Family Relations* 67: 12–25. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
- Fivaz-Depeursinge, Elisabeth, and Antoinette Corboz-Warnery. 1999. *The Primary Triangle. A Developmental Systems View of Mothers, Fathers and Infants*. New York: Basic Books.
- Goldberg, Abbie E., JuliAnna Z. Smith, and Maureen Perry-Jenkins. 2012. The division of labor in lesbian, gay, and heterosexual new adoptive parents. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 74: 812–28. [\[CrossRef\]](#)

- Hahn, Chun-Shin, and Janet DiPietro. 2001. In vitro fertilization and the family: Quality of parenting, family functioning, and child psychosocial adjustment. *Developmental Psychology* 37: 37–48. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
- Hébert, Élizabeth, Sophie Regueiro, and Annie Bernier. 2021. Investigating the associations between family alliance and executive functioning in middle childhood. *Journal of Cognition and Development* 22: 789–805. [[CrossRef](#)]
- ILGA. 2022. *Annual Review of the Human Rights Situation of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans and Intersex People in Europe and Central Asia 2022*. Brussels: ILGA-Europe.
- Jacobvitz, Deborah, Nancy Hazen, Melissa Curran, and Kristen Hitchens. 2004. Observations of early triadic family interactions: Boundary disturbances in the family predict symptoms of depression, anxiety, and attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder in middle childhood. *Development and Psychopathology* 16: 577–92. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Kabátek, Jan, and Francisco Perales. 2021. Academic achievement of children in same-and different-sex-parented families: A population-level analysis of linked administrative data from the Netherlands. *Demography* 58: 393–418. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Keeney, Bradford. 1979. Ecosystemic epistemology: An alternative paradigm for diagnosis. *Family Process* 18: 117–29. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Lavanchy Scaiola, Chloé, Nicolas Favez, Hervé Tissot, and France Frascarolo. 2008. *The Family Alliance Assessment Scales*. Unpublished coding manual. Lausanne: Center for Family Studies, University of Lausanne.
- McHale, James P. 2007. When infants grow up in multiperson relationship systems. *Infant Mental Health Journal* 28: 370–92. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
- McHale, James P. 1995. Coparenting and triadic interactions during infancy: The roles of marital distress and child gender. *Developmental Psychology* 31: 985–96. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Minuchin, Salvador. 1974. *Families and Family Therapy*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Mosmann, Clarisse, and Liana Pasinato. 2021. Coparenting, parenting, affectivity, and conflict in homoparental families. In *Parenting and Couple Relationships among LGBTQ+ People in Diverse Contexts*. Edited by Normanda A. Morais, Fabio Scorsolini-Comin and Elder Cerqueira-Santos. Cham: Springer. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Patterson, Charlotte J. 2017. Parents' sexual orientation and children's development. *Child Development Perspectives* 11: 45–49. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Patterson, Charlotte J., Erin L. Sutfin, and Megan Fulcher. 2004. Division of labor among lesbian and heterosexual parenting couples: Correlates of specialized versus shared patterns. *Journal of Adult Development* 11: 179–89. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Rosenfeld, Michael J. 2010. Nontraditional families and childhood progress through school. *Demography* 47: 755–75. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Sumontha, Jason, Rachel H. Farr, and Charlotte J. Patterson. 2016. Social support and coparenting among lesbian, gay, and heterosexual adoptive parents. *Journal of Family Psychology* 30: 987–96. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
- Teubert, Daniela, and Martin Pinquart. 2010. The association between coparenting and child adjustment: A meta-analysis. *Parenting: Science and Practice* 10: 286–307. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Tissot, Hervé, Noémie Lapalus, France Frascarolo, Jean-Nicolas Despland, and Nicolas Favez. 2022. Family alliance in infancy and toddlerhood predicts social cognition in adolescence. *Journal of Child and Family Studies* 31: 1338–49. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Van Egeren, Laurie A., and Dyane P. Hawkins. 2004. Coming to terms with coparenting: Implications of definition and measurement. *Journal of Adult Development* 11: 165–78. [[CrossRef](#)]
- van Rijn-van Gelderen, Loes, Kate Ellis-Davies, Marijke Huijzer-Engbrenghof, Terrence D. Jorgensen, Martine Gross, Alice Winstanley, Bérangère Rubio, Olivier Vecho, Michael E. Lamb, and Henny M. W. Bos. 2020. Determinants of non-paid task division in gay-, lesbian-, and heterosexual-parent families with infants conceived using artificial reproductive techniques. *Frontiers in Psychology* 11: 914. [[CrossRef](#)]