

Distress and coping with in vitro fertilisation (IVF): the role of self-compassion, parenthood motivation and attachment

Abstract

Background: The experience of infertility and assisted reproductive technology (ART) are emotionally distressing for both partners, but particularly for women.

Aims: The current study explored the relationship between self-compassion, motivation for parenthood, relationship attachment and psychological distress in women undergoing in vitro fertilisation (IVF).

Method: A sample of 363 women undergoing IVF responded to a questionnaire based survey. Results: Negative mental health effects seem to be buffered by self-compassion, secure attachment, social support, problem focused and emotion focused coping.

Conclusion: Women who are less likely to blame themselves for failure and are more forgiving of perceived shortcomings, who are more secure in their relationship, who feel supported and are able to use both problem-focused and emotion-focused coping strategies have better mental health. The findings point to potential psychological interventions in terms of stress management, couple counselling, and mindfulness therapy in reducing the psychological distress of IVF.

Keywords: mindfulness, motivation for parenthood, distress, coping, in vitro fertilization

Volume 6 Issue 4 - 2016

Tony Cassidy, Marian McLaughlin

Psychology Research Institute, Ulster University, Ireland

Correspondence: Tony Cassidy, Psychology Research Institute, Ulster University, Ireland, Email t.cassidy@ulster.ac.uk

Received: June 22, 2016 | **Published:** August 05, 2016

Introduction

Infertility is a major source of distress for both women and men, with 10-15% of couples world-wide who are trying to conceive being affected.^{1,2} In extreme cases it has been linked to psychiatric disorder,³ and even suicide.⁴ It is generally invisible to the wider society and couples may feel isolated and unsupported.^{5,6} In addition where it is recognised in a community there is potential for couples to be stigmatised.⁷ Infertility also affects relationships in that it puts a strain on both partners and leads to choices about taking up assisted reproductive technologies (e.g. in vitro fertilisation – IVF) or adoption.^{8,9} Relationships also provide both the source of support which is important in moderating the impact of infertility,^{10,11} and the source and context for pressures that lead to stress.¹² It has been estimated that at least one-in-seven heterosexual couples in the United Kingdom (UK) experience fertility problems and 1 in 6 seek medical advice often leading to IVF.¹³

The decision to seek ART is a major life event and the procedure itself is stressful.¹⁴ Most commonly couples choose in vitro fertilisation (IVF). The evidence suggests that stress levels associated with IVF may impair the intervention and it has been argued that IVF cycles should start with a stress reduction intervention.¹⁵ Research suggests that levels of distress fluctuate across the IVF cycle and tend to peak towards the end in anticipation of the pregnancy test.¹⁶⁻²⁰ Failure of IVF has a negative impact on emotions and expectations of success and stress levels in future cycles of IVF.²¹⁻²³ Emotional distress is also predicted by pre-IVF cognitions of helplessness and acceptance²³ with women who start with low expectations of success experiencing less distress when treatment fails. The review authors go on to recommend “psychological support should be specifically targeted to help the woman adjust to the possibility of treatment failure and eventual childlessness rather than to help her to cope with the impact of the treatment itself” (p. 34). While it is important to establish realistic expectations, there is arguably very good ground for providing support

during treatment.^{16,17} Findings in regard to elevated stress levels early in the IVF cycle, particularly at the start, are equivocal²³ and there is some research to suggest that this may be explained via psychological processes.²⁴ Since IVF offers hope for infertile women, to be finally starting treatment could be argued to provide a respite from the stress or distress of infertility. The latter authors conclude that “active and passive coping, personality characteristics, dependency and self-criticism and intrusiveness, are more important in predicting the variability in psychological distress than infertility-specific concerns” (p. 1471). To be more specific their path model shows that the negative pathway leading to increased distress involves self-criticism and dependency (on others for support) which lead to passive coping strategies. This is interesting in the context of a growing literature on the role of self-compassion in relation to negative events, stress, and distress,²⁵⁻²⁸ and the link between self-compassion and mindfulness based interventions.²⁹⁻³¹ Mindfulness interventions have been demonstrated to be effective in stress reduction and management.³²

There seems to be ample evidence that infertility causes distress and that distress levels are increased during IVF at some point. The end of cycle fear of failure is one cause for elevated distress levels but there are arguably other sources. IVF procedures are invasive, time consuming and disruptive.^{5,14,33} The process puts additional demands on relationships thereby reducing the support that is necessary to cope with the procedure³⁴ often leading to the break-up of the relationship.⁴ The latter perhaps somewhat explained by gender differences in coping with fertility stress in which men tend to use distancing strategies while women tend to prefer confrontative approaches and support seeking.¹² Furthermore there is some evidence that distress levels associated with IVF may have negative consequences for the success of treatment,^{35,36} adding fuel to the need to understand the factors which cause distress, particularly those which may inform interventions. Cassidy and Sintrovani⁵ suggest that the motives for having a child may be influential and proposed a 6 factor model of parental motivation including, *Continuity* (motivation to carry on

the family line), *Nurturance* (intrinsic maternal desire for a child), *Relationship* (motivation to maintain or protect a relationship), *Identity* (motivation to complete the female identity as mother), *Social Pressure* (motivated to meet the demands of relative / friends), and *Materialism* (motivation based on what a child can provide in future such as support). They found that social pressure correlated directly, while nurturance and identity correlated inversely, with distress. The suggestion is that if a woman is more intrinsically motivated (maternal desire for a child) the better she will cope with the stress of IVF and the more she is extrinsically motivated (pressure from family) the less able she will be to cope.

Van den Broeck et al.,²⁴ also identify self-criticism and intrusiveness, a lack of self-compassion, as negatively indicated in relation to distress in IVF. There is also a growing literature on the positive impact of self-compassion in reducing distress,^{25–29} and an emerging link with successful mindfulness based interventions to reduce stress.^{30–32} Peterson, et al.,¹² explored gender differences in coping among couples undergoing IVF and found that “women proportionately engaged in a greater degree of confrontative coping, accepting responsibility, seeking social support and escape/avoidance” while men “cope by distancing themselves from the infertility, keeping their feelings to themselves through self-controlling strategies and emphasizing plans to solve the problem of infertility” (p. 2447). The fact that women are more likely to confront the problem and seek social support while men tend to distance themselves and keep their feelings to themselves, risks the breakdown of a supportive relationship which is one of the core variables in coping with stress,¹⁰ and may ultimately lead to relationship break down.³⁷ While there is a wealth of anecdotal evidence that many relationships do not survive the stress of IVF there is limited empirical evidence. However, it is clear that lack of social support between partners is a risk factor for distress during IVF and begs the question if the strength of the relationship could be a protective factor. There is some evidence that anxious and avoidant attachment is associated with increased distress in IVF couples³⁸ and attachment style is recognised as a measure of relationship quality.^{39,40} The latter authors show secure attachment to be an important protective factor in relationship stability.

From the literature reviewed it would seem that distress levels are important for the process and outcome of IVF and there is an urgent need to understand and try to alleviate stress. Factors related to distress in IVF include; motivation for parenthood, lack of self-compassion, lack of social support, passive coping style and anxious and avoidant attachment. The literature has tended to focus on the factors that generate stress and distress (a deficit approach) and provides strong evidence that it plays a significant role in IVF. The recent growth in positive health psychology allows us to apply a resource-based approach.^{38,39} This has not previously been done and we would suggest that it is important to ask if distress has a negative impact on IVF, could the development of psychological resources have a positive effect. In other words we have asked what causes distress and how might it be prevented, rather than what causes positive mental health and how might we build it. In this study the aim was to explore the role of motivation for parenthood, self-compassion, social support, coping style, and attachment in relation to both positive and negative mental health in women undergoing IVF.

Methods

Design

A cross-sectional survey design with questionnaire data collection was used to assess the relationship between motivation

for parenthood, self-compassion, social support, coping style, and attachment in relation to both positive and negative mental health in women undergoing IVF.

Participants and Procedure

Following ethical approval participants in an online support area were invited to take part in the study by a member of the group. They were provided with the e-mail address of the researcher and asked to e-mail their agreement if they were willing to take part. The inclusion / exclusion criterion was that they were currently undergoing an IVF cycle. In return they were e-mailed a questionnaire which they could download and complete and return via e-mail. Of the 381 who initially sent e-mail consent, 363 replied with completed questionnaires. Some of the informal comments made in the e-mails support the conclusion that the women were pleased that someone recognised the stressfulness of their situation and supported the need for research.

Measures

Personal details were requested on age, cycle of IVF (i.e. 1st, 2nd), and stage within the cycle (1 = egg production, 2 = egg collection and fertilisation, or 3 = embryo transfer to pregnancy test). This was followed by the following standardised measures.^{40–42}

The General Health Questionnaire:^{43,44} is a widely used measure of psychological distress and is comprised of 12 questions each of which is rated on a four-point scale. At the time of completing the GHQ-12 the participants were asked to consider how they had been feeling over the past month. In terms of scoring the GHQ-12, there are two methods. Likert scoring assigns a score (0-1-2-3) in response to each of the 12 questions, which makes for a maximum total score of thirty-six. The GHQ method or clinical method, which was used in this study, involves allocating scores of 0 and 1. The first two responses indicate the absence of a symptom and are allocated a 0, while the second two answers indicate the presence of a symptom and are allocated a 1, which makes for a maximum total score of twelve. A reliability coefficient of .78 was calculated in this study. There have been numerous psychometric studies of the GHQ-12 which show that it measures a number of factors but can equally be used as a unified measure.^{45–47} There have also been numerous studies demonstrating the reliability and validity of the GHQ12 in a range of social surveys with different ages and cultural groups and all support the construct, discriminant and predictive validity of the measure. For example Makowska, Merecz, Moćcicka, and Kolasa, (2002) compared the GHQ-12 and the GHQ-28 on five validity indicators, sensitivity, specificity, overall misclassification rate, and positive and negative predictive values. Both versions of the GHQ performed well but the GHQ-12 performed better on all measures.

The Perceived Social Support Scales (PSS-Fr and PSS-Fa Scales):⁴⁸ are two 20-item scales designed to measure perceived levels of social support received from friends and family. Most statements appear on both subscales, but one scale is concerned with family and the other with friends (e.g. ‘I rely on my family for emotional support’ vs. ‘I rely on my friends for emotional support’). The items are rated across a three-point scale ‘yes’, ‘no’ and ‘don’t know’. The measure is comprehensive and designed to reflect a number of forms of support including, emotional, feedback, informational and reciprocity (i.e. provision of support by the individual). In the current study the reliability coefficient values were friends support ($\alpha = .81$), and support from family ($\alpha = .83$).

Self-compassion. Self-compassion was measured using the Self-compassion Scale (Neff, 2003). The Self-compassion Scale is a

26-item self-report inventory and consists of six sub-scales: self-kindness, self-judgment, awareness of common humanity, isolation, mindfulness, and over-identification. Each item was rated on a 5-point scale (1=*strongly disagree* to 5=*strongly agree*). Cronbach Alphas were .94, .94, .87, .89, .92, and .94 for six subscales, respectively.

Coping: We used the Brief COPE⁴⁹ which is a widely used 28-item questionnaire and is a short version of the full 60-item version of the COPE.⁵⁰ The 28 items assess 14 coping strategies each with two items. Research supports the reliability and validity of the Brief COPE.⁴⁹ Participants respond to each item on a 4-point scale with the categories I did not do this at all I did not do this at all (0), I did this a little (1), I did this a medium amount (2), and I did this a lot (3).

Different studies have produced differing numbers of second order factors.^{51,52} It is recommended that researchers use their own data to test factor solutions and in this study we produced a 3 factor solution which fits the widely recognised model of problem-focused, emotion-focused and avoidance coping.

Attachment: This was measured using the revised Hazan & Shaver 3-Category Measure^{53,54} which measures secure attachment, anxious / ambivalent attachment, and avoidant attachment. Secure attachment has been described as a protective factor in relationship stability.³⁷ This single item measure allows participants to rate each dimension on a 7 point scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree and has been shown to be reliable.⁵⁵

Motivation for Parenthood: This was measured using the Parenthood Motivation Scale (PMS).⁵ This 24 item scale measures 6 factors related to motivation to have a child, *Continuity* (motivation to carry on the family line - $\alpha = .87$), *Nurturance* (intrinsic maternal desire for a child - $\alpha = .76$), *Relationship* (motivation to maintain or protect a relationship - $\alpha = .89$), *Identity* (motivation to complete the female identity as mother - $\alpha = .86$), *Social Pressure* (motivated to meet the demands of relative / friends - $\alpha = .84$), and *Materialism* (motivation based on what a child can provide in future such as support - $\alpha = .69$).

Results

The first stage in analysis focused on distress levels as measured by the GHQ-12 across the stages of IVF (egg production, egg collection and fertilisation, and embryo transfer to pregnancy test) and the cycles (in this case we just had the first and second cycles). The relevant descriptive statistics are in Table 1. The first stage in the analysis was to explore bivariate correlations between the variables with a particular focus on the correlates of positive and negative mental health as shown in Table 1. There is evidence to support the study aims in the pattern of correlations produced. Secure attachment is significantly inversely related to negative mental health and directly related to positive mental health, while both avoidant and anxious attachment have smaller but significant reverse relationships. From the motivation for parenthood variable, social pressure is significantly directly related to negative mental health and inversely related to positive mental health while nurturance has the reverse relationship with both. Self-compassion, problem focused coping and social support are inversely related to negative mental health and directly related to positive mental health. In essence, the pattern of relations suggests that those with secure attachment, who are more motivated by nurturance than social pressure, who are more self-compassionate, use problem focused coping, and have more social support, have more positive mental health. On the other hand those who have less secure attachment and are more motivated by social pressure than nurturance, who are less self-compassionate, less likely to use problem focused coping, and have less social support, have more negative mental health.

Table 2 Predictors of Positive Mental Health from HMRA

Model 1	B	SE B	b	DR2
age	0.015	0.025	0.03	
Stage of Cycle	-0.008	0.005	-0.102	
IVF cycle	-0.609	0.145	-.250***	.08***
Model 2 Friend and Family support added				
age	-0.021	0.022	-0.043	
duration/months	0	0.004	-0.003	
IVFcycle	-0.662	0.127	-.272***	
Family support	0.099	0.043	.103*	
Friend support	0.406	0.04	.461***	.11***
Model 3 Motivation for Parenthood added				
age	-0.028	0.016	-0.057	
duration/months	-0.002	0.003	-0.029	
IVFcycle	-0.238	0.098	-.098*	
Family support	0.15	0.036	.156***	
Friend support	0.156	0.032	.177***	
Continuity	-0.225	0.049	-.208***	
Materialism	-0.123	0.035	-.125***	
Relationship	-0.01	0.047	-0.008	
Identity	0.007	0.042	0.007	
Social pressure	-0.259	0.039	-.288***	
Nurturance	0.366	0.034	.422***	.13***
Model 4 Self-compassion added				
age	-0.007	0.014	-0.014	
duration/months	-0.003	0.003	-0.04	
IVFcycle	-0.096	0.084	-0.039	
Family support	0.092	0.031	.096**	
Friend support	0.105	0.029	.119***	
Continuity	-0.188	0.043	-.173***	
Materialism	-0.177	0.03	-.180***	
Relationship	-0.068	0.042	-0.052	
Identity	0.031	0.039	0.031	
Social pressure	-0.147	0.034	-.163***	
Nurturance	0.298	0.032	.343***	
Self kindness	0.133	0.066	.108*	
Self judgement	0.045	0.047	0.041	
Common humanity	0.126	0.043	.122**	
Isolation	0.081	0.039	.063*	
Mindfulness	0.195	0.04	.215***	
Over identified	-0.151	0.033	-.130***	.09***
Model 5 Attachment Style added				
age	-0.003	0.013	-0.005	
duration/months	-0.003	0.003	-0.039	
IVFcycle	-0.086	0.079	-0.035	
Family support	0.066	0.029	.069*	
Friend support	0.083	0.028	.094**	
Continuity	-0.136	0.041	-.125***	
Materialism	-0.139	0.029	-.141***	
Relationship	-0.074	0.039	-0.057	
Identity	0.001	0.036	0.001	
Social pressure	-0.116	0.032	-.129***	
Nurturance	0.288	0.03	.332***	
Self kindness	0.13	0.062	.105*	
Self judgement	0.058	0.044	0.053	
Common humanity	0.082	0.041	.079*	
Isolation	0.065	0.037	0.051	
Mindfulness	0.161	0.038	.178***	
Over identified	-0.129	0.031	-.111***	
Avoidant attachment	-0.049	0.024	-.057*	

Table Continued...

Model 1	B	SE B	b	DR2
Secure attachment	0.178	0.035	.168***	
Anxious attachment	-0.049	0.024	-.056*	.08***
Model 6 Coping Style added				
age	0.005	0.014	0.01	
duration/months	-0.003	0.003	-0.043	
IVFcycle	0.024	0.083	0.01	
Family support	0.072	0.028	.076**	
Friend support	0.11	0.027	.125***	
Continuity	-0.105	0.04	-.096**	
Materialism	-0.146	0.027	-.149***	
Relationship	-0.067	0.045	-0.052	
Identity	-0.022	0.037	-0.022	
Social pressure	-0.043	0.033	-0.047	
Nurturance	0.24	0.03	.277***	
Self kindness	0.126	0.06	.103*	
Self judgement	0.023	0.043	0.021	
Common humanity	0.048	0.039	0.046	
Isolation	0.065	0.035	0.051	
Mindfulness	0.12	0.037	.132***	
Over identified	-0.086	0.031	-.075**	
Avoidant attachment	-0.065	0.023	-.075**	
Secure attachment	0.133	0.034	.126***	
Anxious attachment	-0.058	0.023	-.066**	
Problem focused	0.267	0.045	.227***	
Emotion focused	0.076	0.04	0.058	
Avoidance coping	-0.082	0.04	-.066*	.06***
Total R2				.55***
* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001				

To clarify this and consider combined effects hierarchical multiple regressions (HMRA) was used to identify the predictors of positive mental health as per Table 2. Age, stage of current IVF cycle and which IVF cycle, were entered on step 1 and accounted for 8% of the variance in positive mental health. All participants were either in their first (n=168) or second (n=195) cycle of IVF and this produced the only significant beta ($\alpha = -.25$, $p < .001$). A one-way Anova shows that those in the second cycle scored significantly higher on negative mental health ($f(1,361) = 27.008$, $p < .001$) and significantly lower on positive mental health ($f(1,361) = 34.527$, $p < .001$) than those in the first cycle. On step 2 friend and family support were added and an additional 11% of variance was explained. The motivation for parenthood dimensions on step 3 added a further 13% of explanatory variance with nurturance contributing significant positive variance and social pressure, materialism and continuity contributing negatively. The dimensions of self-compassion on step 4 added a further 9% of variance with mindfulness, common humanity and self-kindness adding positive variance and over identified adding negatively.

Step 6 added the dimensions of attachment and accounted for a further 8% of variance with secure attachment contributing positively and avoidant and anxious attachment making a negative contribution. The final step added the dimensions of coping contributing a further 6% with problem focused coping making a significant positive contribution.

Discussion

The data from this study show that women undergoing IVF do experience more negative and less positive mental health. This effect

is even more pronounced in the second cycle probably reflecting the depressing effect of having failed in the first cycle. The pattern of correlations between motivation for parenthood and mental health corresponds with previous findings⁵ indicating that those who are more intrinsically motivated (in terms of nurturance motivation) experience more positive and less negative mental health. However, women whose motivation is externally driven (e.g. via social pressure) experience the reverse in terms of mental health. The negative mental health effects seem to be buffered by self-compassion, secure attachment, social support, problem focused and emotion focused coping. These same variables seem to bolster positive mental health. What this means is that women who are less likely to blame themselves for failure and are more forgiving of perceived shortcomings, who are more secure in their relationship, who feel supported and are able to use both problem-focused and emotion-focused coping strategies have better mental health. This is of special importance in the context of IVF, since it is a stressful and invasive process, which has a high prevalence of failure, which is potentially damaging to relationships, and carries with it a sense of potential blame for one or other partner because of the initial infertility.

Clearly this is a cross-sectional study with all its inherent limitations. However the relatively large sample and the range of measures provide useful information in terms of potential interventions. Based on this research and other previous research⁵ the first recommendation is that some initial counselling should be undertaken to identify the true motivation for wanting a child. Opening up such discourse between couples could serve to be protective in enhancing interpersonal understanding and support. In addition the early counselling might help to identify potential relationship difficulties and prevent later break down. In fact, part of such a process could empower partners to be more open about their emotions so that they can share the emotional load inevitably involved. Finally, it is widely recognised in the literature that only a small part of the failure of IVF can be explained by biological or medical causes, and that psychosocial stress must play a major part.⁵ It therefore follows that reducing or managing stress should impact on success rates. The identification of self-compassion and mindfulness as potential factors points to a potential intervention which must be considered, that is Mindfulness Based Stress Reduction (MBSR) which has been shown to be effective in a range of conditions.³² There is also some evidence that psychological interventions can increase pregnancy rates in IVF⁵⁶ though MBSR has not been tested.

Acknowledgments

None.

Conflicts of interest

Author declares there are no conflicts of interest.

Funding

None.

References

1. Bonde JP, Olsen J. Interpreting trends in fecundity over time. *BMJ*. 2008;336(7640):339–340.
2. Evers JL. Female subfertility. *Lancet*. 2002;360(9327):151–159.
3. Felskov BB, Kjaer SK, Albieri V, et al. Psychiatric disorders in women with fertility problems: results from a large Danish register-based cohort study. *Hum Reprod*. 2013;28(3):683–690.

4. Kjaer T, Albieri V, Jensen A, et al. Divorce or end of cohabitation among Danish women evaluated for fertility problems. *Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand*. 2014;93(3):269–276.
5. Cassidy T, Sintrovani P. Motives for parenthood, psychosocial factors and health in women undergoing IVF. *Journal of Reproductive and Infant Psychology*. 2008;26(1):4–17.
6. Whiteford LM, Gonzalez L. Stigma: The Hidden Burden of Infertility. *Soc Sci Med*. 1995;40(1):27–36.
7. Donkor ES, Sandall J. The impact of perceived stigma and mediating social factors on infertility-related stress among women seeking infertility treatment in Southern Ghana. *Soc Sci Med*. 2007;65(8):1683–1694.
8. Hahn CS, DiPietro JA. *In Vitro* Fertilization and the Family: Quality of parenting, family functioning, and child psychosocial adjustment. *Dev Psychol*. 2001;37(1):37–48.
9. Luk BH, Loke AY. The impact of infertility on the psychological well-being, marital relationships, sexual relationships, and quality of life of couples: a systematic review. *J Sex Marital Ther*. 2015;41(6):610–625.
10. Martins MV, Peterson BD, Almeida VM, et al. Direct and indirect effects of perceived social support on women's infertility-related stress. *Hum Reprod*. 2011;26(8):2113–2121.
11. Verhaak CM, Smeenk MJ, Evers AWM, et al. Predicting emotional response to unsuccessful fertility treatment: A prospective study. *J Behav Med*. 2005;28(2):181–190.
12. Peterson BD, Newton CR, Rosen KH, et al. Gender differences in how men and women who are referred for IVF cope with infertility stress. *Hum Reprod*. 2006;21(9):2443–2449.
13. Human Fertilisation & Embryology Authority. Fertility treatment in 2013: Trends and Figures. 2014.
14. Eugster A, Vingerhoets AJ. Psychological aspects of *in vitro* fertilization: a review. *Soc Sci Med*. 1999;48(5):575–589.
15. Campagne DM. Should fertilization treatment start with reducing stress? *Hum Reprod*. 2006;21(7):1651–1658.
16. Ardeni R, Campari C, Agazzi L, et al. Anxiety and perceptive functioning of infertile women during *in-vitro* fertilization: exploratory survey of an Italian sample. *Hum Reprod*. 1999;14(12):3126–3132.
17. Boivin J, Takefman JE. Stress level across stages of *in vitro* fertilization in subsequently pregnant and non-pregnant women. *Fertil Steril*. 1995;64(4):802–810.
18. Klonoff Cohen H, Chu E, Natarajan L, et al. A prospective study of stress among women undergoing *in vitro* fertilization or gamete intrafallopian transfer. *Fertil Steril*. 2001;76(4):675–687.
19. Merari D, Feldberg D, Elizur A, et al. Psychological and hormonal changes in the course of *in vitro* fertilization. *J Assist Reprod Genet*. 1992;9(2):161–169.
20. Yong P, Martin C, Thong J. A comparison of psychological functioning in women at different stages of *in vitro* fertilization treatment using the mean affect adjective checklist. *J Assist Reprod Genet*. 2000;17(10):553–556.
21. Merari D, Chetrit A, Modan B. Emotional reactions and attitudes prior to *in vitro* fertilization: An inter-spouse study. *Psychology and Health*. 2002;17(5):629–640.
22. Rockliff HE, Lightman SL, Rhidian E, et al. A systematic review of psychosocial factors associated with emotional adjustment in *in vitro* fertilization patients. *Hum Reprod Update*. 2014;20(4):594–613.
23. Verhaak CM, Smeenk MJ, Evers AWM, et al. Women's emotional adjustment to IVF: a systematic review of 25 years of research. *Hum Reprod Update*. 2007;13(1):27–36.
24. Van den BU, D'Hooghe T, Enzlin P, et al. Predictors of psychological distress in patients starting IVF treatment: infertility-specific versus general psychological characteristics. *Hum Reprod*. 2010;25(6):1471–1480.
25. Leary MR, Tate EB, Adams CE, et al. Self-compassion and reactions to unpleasant self-relevant events: The implications of treating oneself kindly. *J Pers Soc Psychol*. 2007;92(5):887–904.
26. Neff KD, Kirkpatrick KL, Rude S. Self-compassion and adaptive psychological functioning. *Journal of Research in Personality*. 2007;41(1):139–154.
27. Neff KD, Rude SS, Kirkpatrick KL. An examination of self-compassion in relation to positive psychological functioning and personality traits. *Journal of Research in Personality*. 2007;41:908–916.
28. Van Dam NT, Sheppard SC, Forsyth JP, et al. Self-compassion is a better predictor than mindfulness of symptom severity and quality of life in mixed anxiety and depression. *J Anxiety Disord*. 2011;25(1):123–130.
29. Baer R, Lykins ELB, Peters JR. Mindfulness and self compassion as predictors of psychological wellbeing in long-term meditators and matched non meditators. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*. 2012;7(3):230–238.
30. Birnie K, Specia M, Carlson LE. Exploring Self-compassion and Empathy in the Context of Mindfulness-based Stress Reduction (MBSR). *Stress and Health*. 2009;26(5):359–371.
31. Walker HL, Colosimo K. Mindfulness, self-compassion, and happiness in non-meditators: A theoretical and empirical examination. *Personality and Individual Differences*. 2011;50:222–227.
32. Grossman P, Niemann L, Schmidt S, et al. Mindfulness-based stress reduction and health benefits. A meta-analysis. *J Psychosom Res*. 2004;57(1):35–43.
33. Bouwmans CA, Lintsen BA, Al M, et al. Absence from work and emotional stress in women undergoing IVF or ICSI: an analysis of IVF-related absence from work in women and the contribution of general and emotional factors. *Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand*. 2008;87(11):1169–1175.
34. Mindes EJ, Ingram KM, Covington SN. The influence of spousal support and unsupportive social interactions on emotional responses during *in vitro* fertilization. *Fertility & Sterility*. 2005;84(1): S232–S233.
35. Ebbesen SM, Zachariae R, Mehlsen MY, et al. Stressful life events are associated with a poor *in vitro* fertilization (IVF) outcome: a prospective study. *Hum Reprod*. 2009;24(9):2173–2182.
36. Turner K, May RM, Zitek EM, et al. Stress and Anxiety Scores in First and Repeat IVF Cycles: A Pilot Study. *PLoS One*. 2013;8(5):e63743.
37. Kagami M, Maruyama T, Koizumi T, et al. Psychological adjustment and psychosocial stress among Japanese couples with a history of recurrent pregnancy loss. *Hum Reprod*. 2012;27(3):787–794.
38. Donarelli Z, Lo Coco G, Gullo S, et al. Are attachment dimensions associated with infertility-related stress in couples undergoing their first IVF treatment? A study on the individual and cross-partner effect. *Hum Reprod*. 2012;27(11):3215–3225.
39. Feeney JA. Adult romantic attachment and couple relationships. In: Cassidy J & Shaver PR (Eds.), *Handbook of Attachment: Theory, Research, and Clinical Implications*, Guilford Press, London, UK. 1999. p.355–377.
40. Treboux D, Crowell JA, Waters E. When 'New' Meets 'Old': Configurations of Adult Attachment Representations and Their Implications for Marital Functioning. *Dev Psychol*. 2004;40(2):295–314.
41. Cassidy T. Stress, coping, resilience, and health. In: Devonport TJ (Ed), *Managing Stress: From Theory to Application*. Nova Science Publishers, New York, USA. 2011.

42. Cassidy T, McLaughlin M, Giles M. Benefit finding in response to general life stress: measurement and correlates. *Health Psychol Behav Med* . 2014;2(1):268–282.
43. Goldberg D. Manual of the General Health Questionnaire. NFER Publishing Company, Windsor, UK. 1978.
44. Goldberg D. The detection of psychiatric illness by questionnaire. Oxford University Press, London, UK. 1972.
45. Campbell A, Walker J, Farrell G. Confirmatory factor analysis of the GHQ-12: can I see that again? *Aust NZ J Psychiatry*. 2003;37(4):475–483.
46. Kalliath TJ, O Driscoll MP, Brough P. A confirmatory factor analysis of the General Health Questionnaire-12. *Stress and Health*. 2004;20(1):11–20.
47. Shevlin M, Adamson G. Alternative factor models and factorial invariance of the GHQ-12: a large sample analysis using confirmatory factor analysis. *Psychol Assess*. 2005; 17(2):231–236.
48. Procidano ME, Heller K. Measures of Perceived Social support from friend and from family: Three validation studies. *Am J Community Psychol*. 1983;11(1):1–23.
49. Carver CS. You want to measure coping but your protocol's too long: Consider the Brief COPE. *Int J Behav Med*. 1997;4(1):92–100.
50. Carver CS, Scheier MF, Weintraub JK. Assessing coping strategies: A theoretically based approach. *J Pers Soc Psychol*. 1989;56(2):267–283.
51. Kimemia M, Asner Self KK, Daire AP. An exploratory factor analysis of the brief COPE with a sample of kenyan caregivers. *international journal of advances in counselling*. 2011;33(3):149–160.
52. Muller L, Spitz E. Multidimensional assessment of coping: validation of the Brief COPE among a French population. *Encephale*. 2003;29(6):507–518.
53. Hazan C, Shaver P. Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *J Pers Soc Psychol*. 1987;52(3):511–524.
54. Hazan C, Shaver PR. Love and work: An attachment theoretical perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1990;59(2):270–280.
55. Brennan KA, Shaver PR. Dimensions of adult attachment, affect regulation, and romantic relationship functioning. *Pers Soc Psychol Bull*. 1995;21(3):267–283.
56. Domar AD, Rooney KL, Wiegand B, et al. Impact of a group mind/body intervention on pregnancy rates in IVF patients. *Fertil Steril* . 2011;95(7):2269–2273.