

EXHIBIT #1

Quotation Errors in the AAP's Technical Report Are Replicated in a Subsequent Publication in *Pediatrics*

The following discussion demonstrates perpetuation of quotation errors in the scientific literature. In 2002, *Pediatrics* published a policy statement by the American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP) on coparent or second-parent adoption by same-sex parents.¹ This policy statement was supported by a technical report (TR),² published simultaneously in *Pediatrics*. In the July 2006 issue of *Pediatrics*, a special article, "The effects of marriage, civil union, and domestic partnership laws on the health and well-being of children" (SA),³ copies major sections from the TR² without direct attribution. All but six sentences on page 359 and several sentences on page 360 of the SA are duplicated exactly, or nearly so, from the TR. The TR is listed as a resource near the end of the SA (page 361); one assumes the purpose of this listing is additional information for the reader, not a source of quotes for the authors. The TR is not a good resource for readers or authors as it has quotation errors extensive enough to invalidate the document. Replicated statements in the SA have footnotes that are the same, different, absent, or additions compared to the TR. On brief perusal, ten of the quotation errors from the TR are repeated in the SA.

Using criteria similar to that employed by Evans et al⁴ to identify major errors in quotation of references, footnoted statements in the TR were examined for such errors. There are 31 references which are cited 46 times in the text. Three of these references were excluded: an unclear citation, a book which was not original research and had no page numbers cited,⁵ and a meta-analysis⁶ (excluded for technical reasons). 43 footnotes to 28 references remained for examination. In 22 out of 43 footnotes (51 percent) the reference is misquoted. Fifteen references are cited once with eight total misquotations. Eleven references are cited twice, and misquoted a total of eleven times. Two references are cited three times each with a total of three misquotations. Of the 28 references examined, 16 (57 percent) were misquoted at least once. The ratio of total errors (22) to references examined (28) is 0.79. See Table A, attached and incorporated by reference.

The TR contains the following categories of errors:

- Misrepresentation of data: citing a reference that has findings in direct opposition to the statement (number 8 in Table B, attached and incorporated by reference)
- Unsubstantiated:
 - a. citing a study on children aged three to nine to support a statement about outcomes of now adult children (number 12 in Table B)
 - b. assertions are not addressed by the reference(s) cited (numbers 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 15, 16, and 17 in Table B)
- Conflicting data:
 - a. One cited reference contains case reports that conflict with the TR statement although one unreferenced assertion could support it (number 7 in Table B)
 - b. TR states that "no difference" exists between study and control groups, yet the cited studies actually note some differences between the groups, in addition to the similarities (numbers 4, 6, 13 in Table B)

- Partial accuracy: Statements are partially supported by the citation, but are misleading because they do not report all pertinent results (numbers 13 and 14 in Table B)
- Misleads: TR states that “no difference” exists between study and control groups, yet the cited studies do not use a control group for comparison (numbers 3, 9, 11, 13, and 16 in Table B).

In addition to comparing statements in the TR to the original references cited, four instances were noted when a reference cited elsewhere in the TR had findings conflicting with a particular assertion (numbers 1, 10, 11, 13 in Table B); these observations are not included in the quantitative results.

The extent of major quotation errors in the TR, irrespective of the quality of the studies cited, violates the AAP’s standard for evidence-based medicine⁷ by the extent of the misrepresentation of data, unsupported or misleading statements, and failure to disclose conflicting evidence contained within the report’s own references. These errors have been perpetuated due to replication in a subsequent publication (SA).³

TABLE A: References and corresponding errors in the TR*

Reference number in TR	Study	No. times cited	No. errors
3	Bigner & Bozett ⁸	1	1
4	Patterson & Chan ⁹	1	0
5	Turner et al ¹⁰	1	1
6	Harris & Turner ¹¹	2	2
7	Bigner & Jacobsen ¹²	1	1
8	Flaks et al ¹³	2	1
9	Green et al ¹⁴	2	2
10	Golombok et al ¹⁵	2	1
11	Golombok et al ¹⁶	2	2
12	Kirkpatrick ¹⁷	1	1
13	Miller et al ¹⁸	1	0
14	Kirkpatrick et al ¹⁹	2	0
15	Patterson ²⁰	3	3
16	Patterson ²¹	2	2
17	Bailey et al ²²	1	1
18	Gottman ²³	1	0
19	Patterson ²⁴	1	0
20	Tasker & Golombok ²⁵	2	1
22	Huggins ²⁶	3	0
23	Tasker & Golombok ²⁷	1	1
24	Patterson ²⁸	2	0
25	Steckel ²⁹	2	0
26	Stacey & Biblarz ³⁰	1	0
27	Tasker ³¹	1	1
28	Patterson ³²	2	0
29	Chan et al ³³	1	0
30	Patterson et al ³⁴	1	0
31	Emery ³⁵	1	1
TOTAL	28	43	22

*The 3 excluded references each had 1 citation in the text, and these 3 citations are not in Table A.

Table B: Quotation Errors in the Technical Report (TR) and Special Article (SA)*

No.	Text in TR/SA (page in TR/SA)†‡	Discrepancies between text and reference(s)
1	<i>L and G adults choose to become parents for many of the same reasons H adults do.</i> (341) No reference cited.	Bigner & Bozett ⁸ cited elsewhere in the TR suggest that G men may have different reasons for becoming fathers compared to H men.
2	<i>A growing number of G men have chosen to become fathers through the assistance of a surrogate mother who bears their child. Others have made agreements to be coparents with a single woman (L or H) or a L couple.</i> (341) Barret & Robinson, ⁵ Bigner & Bozett ⁸ (E), Patterson & Chan cited in the TR. ⁹	Bigner & Bozett ⁸ is a review chapter. No mention of changing incidence of fatherhood, surrogate mothers, or coparents.
3	<i>Empirical evidence reveals <u>in contrast</u> that G fathers have substantial evidence of nurturance and investment in their paternal role and no differences from H fathers in providing appropriate recreation, {or} encouraging autonomy....</i> (342/359) Turner et al ¹⁰ (E) cited in TR; no ref in SA.	No H control group, so there is no basis for claim of “no difference” between groups. This study assessed fathers’ time away from children, encouragement of sex-typed toys, and parents’ reports of children’s reactions to their homosexuality and presence of SSSB in their children. Outcome measures in TR text are not found in the reference.
4	...[G fathers have no difference from H fathers in] [§] <i>dealing with general problems of parenting.</i> (342) Harris et al ¹¹ (E) cited.	The parenting issues reviewed include problems with child care, visits with the other parent, encouragement of sex-typed toys or same-sex friends, and provision of an opposite sex role model for their child. <u>Differences</u> were noted between HO vs. H groups for all of these issues except the parents’ encouragement of same-sex friends or sex-typed toys.
5	<i>Compared with H fathers, G fathers have been described to adhere to <u>stricter</u> {strict} disciplinary guidelines, to place <u>greater</u> {an} emphasis on guidance and the development of cognitive skills, and to be <u>more</u> involved in their children’s activities.</i> (342/359) Bigner et al ¹²	Specific results described in the text are not found in the study referenced in the TR. Bigner et al ¹² noted differences in Adult Responses to Child Behavior (ARC-B) between G and H fathers in 2/15 items proposed to differentiate between task-, child-, and adult-oriented responses of father to child. 7/36 items of Attitudes Toward Fathering (ATF) differed between the groups of fathers. SA: Patterson & Chan’s chapter ⁹ reviewing studies on G fathers only has very weak partial support of the text that

No.	Text in TR/SA (page in TR/SA)†‡	Discrepancies between text and reference(s)
	(E) cited in TR; Patterson & Chan ⁹ and Barret & Tasker ³⁶ cited in SA. (The latter was not obtainable, as it is in a British professional society journal that is not accessible through PubMed, journal website, or the university library.)	refers to disciplinary guidelines through a secondary reference to a study by Bigner & Jacobsen. The latter reportedly found that G fathers reported more limit-setting with their children than H fathers. The review warns that caution must be exercised in interpretation of these results which stem entirely from paternal reports about their own behavior. The text “emphasis on guidance and development of cognitive skills, and to be involved in their children’s activities” is not supported by Patterson & Chan. ⁹ Patterson & Chan’s chapter also mentions studies by Bigner & Jacobsen in which G fathers’ motivation for parenthood differed from H fathers in that G fathers’ desire for children was more often self-serving—they perceived a higher status accorded to parents (p378); yet this finding is not included in the SA.
6	<i>few differences have been found in the research from the last 2 {research conducted over the last 3} decades comparing L and H mothers’ self-esteem, psychological adjustment, and attitudes toward child rearing.</i> (342/359) Flaks et al ¹³ (E) and Green et al ¹⁴ (E) cited in TR and SA.	Flaks et al ¹³ compared L and H couples on parenting skills and relationship quality. The specific issues in the text were not studied. Green et al ¹⁴ compared children with L vs. H mothers. The mothers had <u>differences</u> in cohabitation, plans for remarriage and more children, feminist and religious activity, psychosexual development, part of the psychological testing, and time holding their infants. Mothers’ self-esteem was not studied.
7	<i>L mothers strongly endorse child-centered attitudes and commitment to their maternal roles,...</i> (342/359) Golombok et al ¹⁶ (E), Kirkpatrick ¹⁷ (E), Miller et al ¹⁸ cited in TR; Golombok et al ¹⁶ cited in SA.	Neither Golombok et al ¹⁶ nor Kirkpatrick’s 4 case reports with discussion ¹⁷ specifically study L mothers’ attitudes toward children or commitment to their maternal role. Kirkpatrick ¹⁷ states (without reference) that lesbian mother studies note that motherhood was the salient identity. However, 2 of her case reports conflict with that conclusion and the TR statement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A L mom ridiculed her partner’s son’s masculinity, labeling him as a “macho creep.” • A L mom’s partner was unprepared for parenthood and became jealous of the child.
8	<i>...and [L mothers]⁸ have been shown to be more concerned with providing male role models for their children than are divorced H mothers.</i> (342) Harris et al ¹¹ (E) and Kirkpatrick et al ¹⁹ cited in TR; Kirkpatrick et al ¹⁹ in SA.	Harris et al: ¹¹ had the opposite finding: H parents made more effort to provide a role model of the opposite sex from themselves for their children than did G/L parents. Kirkpatrick et al ¹⁹ supports the text.

No.	Text in TR/SA (page in TR/SA)†‡	Discrepancies between text and reference(s)
9	<p><i>They report similar role conflicts, social support networks, and coping strategies.</i> (342/359) Patterson²⁰ (E) and Patterson²¹ (E) cited in TR and SA. Note: “They” refers to L and H mothers.</p>	<p>Neither study has a H control group. Patterson²⁰ compares L mothers to their partners on various measures. Patterson²¹ studies children of L mothers, not mothers themselves.</p>
10	<p><i>No differences have been found in the toy, game, activity, dress, or friendship preferences of boys or girls who had L mothers, compared with those who had H mothers.</i> (342/360) None cited in TR; Patterson,²¹ Tasker,³⁷ Bailey et al,²² Gottman,²³ and Patterson²⁴ cited in SA.</p>	<p>Green et al¹⁴ (a reference in the TR) has contradictory findings. Groups of daughters differed in “cross-dressing,” choice of adult occupation, perception of fathers’ roles, choice of toys and activities, and type of neighborhood and school activities. Groups of sons differed in one perception of fathers’ roles and preference for same-sex activities outside of school.</p> <p>Patterson²¹ did not compare the children of L mothers with a matched group of children of H mothers. Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL) scores were compared to norms from heterogeneous normal samples of children and children from clinical populations; it is not stated whether the family style of the comparative groups was assumed or assessed. Children’s Self-View Questionnaire (CSVQ) results for the sample group of children aged 4-9 years was compared to a sample of 5.5-year-old children growing up in middle-class “heterosexual” families. The sample group of L mothers’ children may not match the middle-class norms used, as 92% of the L mothers were white or non-Hispanic Caucasian, 74% had college degrees, 48% had graduate degrees, and 62% of the women were in professional occupations.</p> <p>Bailey et al²² is a study of adult sons of G fathers, not children of L mothers, and the specific findings in the text are not discussed.</p>
11	<p><i>No differences have been found in the gender identity, social roles, or sexual orientation of adults who had a divorced HO parent (or parents) compared with those who had divorced H parents.</i> (342) Bailey et al²² (E), Gottman,²³ and Patterson²⁴ cited in TR.</p>	<p>Bailey et al:²² No H comparison group in this study. 9% of children were “non-H.” This percentage is higher than rates found in large-scale surveys. ¶</p> <p>2 studies cited in the TR provide conflicting results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stacey and Biblarz³⁰ note differences in sexual behavior and sexual preferences between children of HO vs. H parents in some studies. • Tasker & Golombok:²⁵ Longitudinal study of L and single H mothers and their children. Young adults with L moms are significantly more likely to think that their mother preferred them to be HO (daughters primarily), and to have considered or actually experienced a same-

No.	Text in TR/SA (page in TR/SA)†‡	Discrepancies between text and reference(s)
		gender sexual relationship. L moms willing to accept their child’s development of a “non-H” orientation in the original study tended to have more children reporting same-gender sexual interest at follow-up.
12	<i>Compared with young adults who had H mothers, men and women who had L mothers were slightly more likely to consider the possibility of having a same-sex partner, [Tasker & Golombok²⁵ cited in SA] and more of them had been involved in at least a brief relationship with someone of the same sex, [Golombok et al¹⁵ (E) cited in TR] (342/360)</i>	The children in this study by Golombok et al ¹⁵ are aged 3-9, not adult children, and same-sex relationships of children are not assessed. Correct reference is Tasker & Golombok. ²⁵
13	<i>Several studies comparing children who have a L mother with children who have a H mother have failed to document any differences between such groups on personality measures, measures of peer group relationships, self-esteem, behavioral difficulties, academic success, or warmth and quality of family relationships. (342/359) Green et al (E),¹⁴ Golombok et al¹⁶ (E), Patterson²⁰ (E), Patterson²¹ (E), Tasker & Golombok²⁵ (E), Allen et al⁶ cited in TR . SA cites the same references with the exceptions that Patterson²¹ is missing and Tasker³¹ is added.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green et al:¹⁴ Differences between the two groups of children in length of time held by mothers when in infancy. Groups of daughters differed in “cross-dressing,” choice of adult occupation, perception of fathers’ roles, choice of toys and activities, and type of neighborhood and school activities. Groups of sons differed in one perception of fathers’ roles and preference for same-sex activities outside of school. • Golombok et al:¹⁶ Differences between children of L and H mothers in psychiatric problems and occurrence of psychiatric referral. • Patterson:²⁰ Information from introductory review is supportive of parts of the TR statement. However, the original research section summarizes results of the Bay Area Families Study, in which there is no H control group. Differences are noted between children of L mothers and norms in reaction to stress and sense of well-being. Information about contact with extended family has no control group for comparison. • Patterson:²¹ A part of the Bay Area Families Study which has no H control group; same differences between children and norms as noted for Patterson²⁰ • Tasker et al:²⁵ Differences noted between the groups of young adult sons in the amount of teasing about their own sexuality, attitude towards women’s rights if the mother sympathizes with feminist causes, attitude towards those identifying as G or L, willingness to talk to their mother about their sexual development, and in thinking that their mother preferred them to be HO (daughters primarily).

No.	Text in TR/SA (page in TR/SA)†‡	Discrepancies between text and reference(s)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tasker’s review³¹ reports differences between children of L mothers and children of H families in that children of L mothers were found to have a better relationship with their step-parent, greater pride in mother’s sexual identity, more teasing of sons about their own sexuality, and greater possibility of considering and actually having a same-sex relationship. One reviewed study found children in father-absent families were less confident about their physical skills and cognitive or academic abilities compared with children in father-present families, although no differences were observable between children in L households and single heterosexual-mother families. <p>Stacey and Biblarz³⁰ (cited elsewhere) have findings that conflict with the TR in their review of 21 studies looking at children and parents in HO vs. H households. Differences or mixed evidence exist between groups on measures including gender behavior/preferences, sexual behavior/sexual preferences, self-esteem and psychological well-being, parental behavior toward children’s gender and sexual development, parenting practices, parent/child relationships, and parent’s self-esteem and psychological well-being.</p>
14	<p><i>Adult children of divorced L mothers have recalled more teasing by peers during childhood than have adult children of divorced H parents. (343/359)</i> Tasker²⁷ (E) cited in TR and SA.</p>	<p>Actually no significant difference noted between groups of children in general teasing or bullying, but those from L group (particularly boys) more likely to recall teasing about their sexuality.</p>
15	<p><i>In <u>1</u> {one} study, children of H parents saw themselves as being somewhat more aggressive than did children of <u>Ls</u> {L parents}, and they were seen by parents and teachers as more bossy, negative, and domineering. Children of L parents saw themselves as more lovable and were seen by parents and teachers as more affectionate, responsive, and protective of younger children, compared with children of H parents. (343/359)</i> TR cites Steckel²⁹ and Tasker³¹ (E). SA cites Patterson²⁰</p>	<p>Text findings are found in Steckel.²⁹ Tasker³¹ does not address these specific issues. SA: Patterson²⁰ reports Steckel’s findings in her introduction, but her original research findings differ from the text in that children of L mothers did not see themselves as either more or less aggressive, sociable, or likely to enjoy being the center of attention than did children of presumed H mothers in a normal sample.²⁰</p>
16	<p><i>Children of L parents reported</i></p>	<p>Patterson²⁰ and Patterson²¹ both report results of the same</p>

No.	Text in TR/SA (page in TR/SA)†‡	Discrepancies between text and reference(s)
	<i>their self-esteem to be similar to that of children of H parents and saw themselves as similar in aggressiveness and sociability.</i> (343/359) Patterson ²⁰ (E) cited in TR. Patterson ²¹ cited in SA.	Bay Area Families Study of 37 L mothers with or without partners (total of 66 women in study); no H control group is employed. Self-esteem of L mothers was assessed in Patterson, ²⁰ but that specific term was not used in either paper in connection with children’s testing. Both papers report results of the CBCL and CSVQ. The CBCL, which assesses internalizing and externalizing problems and social competence, was completed by L mothers; it does not involve children’s reports. The scores of children (aged 4-9 years) of L mothers on the CSVQ, which assesses psychological concepts of self, were compared to a sample norm of 5.5-year-old children growing up in middle-class “heterosexual” families (not stated whether family structure of norm group was assumed or assessed). Children of L mothers differed from norms on 2 of 5 sub-scales, reporting greater stress reactions than did children of normative sample, but also a greater overall sense of well-being. The sample group of L mothers’ children may not match the middle-class norms used, as 92% of the L mothers were white or non-Hispanic Caucasian, 74% had college degrees, 48% had graduate degrees, and 62% of the women were in professional occupations.
17	<i>Children whose parents divorce (regardless of sexual orientation) are better adjusted when their parents have high self-esteem, maintain a responsible and amicable relationship, and are currently living with a partner.</i> (343) Huggins ²⁶ and Emery ³⁵ (E) cited in TR.	Neither of these references discusses the self-esteem of parents. Emery’s review does not mention the sexual orientation of parents or the partner status of the divorced custodial parent.

*Abbreviations:

Abbreviations for designated groups: “lesbian” = L, “heterosexual” = H
“gay” = G, “bisexual” = B, “homosexual” = HO; same-sex sexual behavior = SSSB; not applicable = NA; Child Behavior Checklist = CBCL; Eder’s (1990) Children’s Self-View Questionnaire = CSVQ.

†Text differences between the Technical Report (TR)² and Special Article (SA)³ are underlined in the TR and placed in brackets { } in the SA.

‡A reference that is misquoted, and is counted as an error in the quantitative analysis of quotation errors in the Technical Report, is followed by (E)

§Text in brackets is implied; the quotation is continued from the text in the previous listing.

|| This number is higher than those obtained in recent large-scale surveys using probability sampling which have examined rates of same-sex behavior (SSSB) in the general population. See Table 1 in Declaration.

EXHIBIT 1 REFERENCES - SHARON QUICK DECLARATION

1. American Academy of Pediatrics, Committee on Psychosocial Aspects of Child and Family Health. Coparent or second-parent adoption by same-sex parents. *Pediatrics*. 2002 Feb;109(2):339-340.
2. American Academy of Pediatrics, Perrin EC, Committee on Psychosocial Aspects of Child and Family Health. Technical report: coparent or second-parent adoption by same-sex parents. *Pediatrics*. 2002 Feb;109(2):341-344.
3. Pawelski JG, Perrin EC, Foy JM, et al. The effects of marriage, civil union, and domestic partnership laws on the health and well-being of children. *Pediatrics*. 2006 Jul;118(1):349-364.
4. Evans JT, Nadjari HI, Burchell SA. Quotational and reference accuracy in surgical journals. A continuing peer review problem. *JAMA*. 1990 Mar 9;263(10):1353-1354.
5. Barret RL, Robinson BE. *Gay Fathers*. Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books; 1990.
6. Allen M, Burrell N. Comparing the impact of homosexual and heterosexual parents on children: meta-analysis of existing research. *J Homosex*. 1996 32(2):19-35.
7. Koriath T. Academy changes procedure for development of policy statements. *AAP News*. 2002 March 1, 2002;20(3):113-a-.
8. Bigner JJ, Bozett FW. Parenting by gay fathers. In: Bozett FW, Sussman MB, eds. *Homosexuality and family relations*. New York, NY: Harrington Park Press; 1990:155-175.
9. Patterson CJ, Chan RW. Gay fathers and their children. In: Cabaj RP, Stein TS, eds. *Textbook of homosexuality and mental health*. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Press; 1996:371-393.
10. Turner PH, Scadden L, Harris MB. Parenting in gay and lesbian families. *J Gay Lesbian Psychother*. 1990 1(3):55-66.
11. Harris MB, Turner PH. Gay and lesbian parents. *J Homosex*. 1985 Winter;12(2):101-113.
12. Bigner JJ, Jacobsen RB. Adult responses to child behavior and attitudes toward fathering: gay and nongay fathers. *J Homosex*. 1992 23(3):99-112.
13. Flaks DK, Ficher I, Masterpasqua F, Joseph G. Lesbians choosing motherhood: a comparative study of lesbian and heterosexual parents and their children. *Dev Psychol*. 1995 31(1):105-114.
14. Green R, Mandel JB, Hotvedt ME, Gray J, Smith L. Lesbian mothers and their children: a comparison with solo parent heterosexual mothers and their children. *Arch Sex Behav*. 1986 Apr;15(2):167-184.
15. Golombok S, Tasker F, Murray C. Children raised in fatherless families from infancy: family relationships and the socioemotional development of children of lesbian and single heterosexual mothers. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry*. 1997 Oct;38(7):783-791.

16. Golombok S, Spencer A, Rutter M. Children in lesbian and single-parent households: psychosexual and psychiatric appraisal. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry*. 1983 Oct;24(4):551-572.
17. Kirkpatrick M. Clinical implications of lesbian mother studies. *J Homosex*. 1987 14:201-211.
18. Miller JA, Jacobsen RB, Bigner JJ. The child's home environment for lesbian vs. heterosexual mothers: a neglected area of research. *J Homosex*. 1981 7(1):49-56.
19. Kirkpatrick M, Smith C, Roy R. Lesbian mothers and their children: a comparative survey. *Am J Orthopsychiatry*. 1981 51(3):545-551.
20. Patterson CJ. Children of lesbian and gay parents. *Adv Clin Child Psychol*. 1997 19:235-282.
21. Patterson CJ. Children of the lesbian baby boom: behavioral adjustment, self-concepts, and sex-role identity. In: Greene B, Herek GM, eds. *Lesbian and Gay Psychology: Theory, Research, and Clinical Applications*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications; 1994:156-175.
22. Bailey JM, Bobrow D, Wolfe M, Mikach S. Sexual orientation of adult sons of gay fathers. *Dev Psychol*. 1995 31:124-129.
23. Gottman JS. Children of gay and lesbian parents. In: Bozett FW, Sussman MB, eds. *Homosexuality and family relations*. New York: Harrington Park; 1990:177-196.
24. Patterson CJ. Children of lesbian and gay parents. *Child Dev*. 1992 Oct;63(5):1025-1042.
25. Tasker F, Golombok S. *Growing up in a lesbian family: effects on child development*. New York: Guilford Press; 1997.
26. Huggins SL. A comparative study of self-esteem of adolescent children of divorced lesbian mothers and divorced heterosexual mothers. *J Homosex*. 1989 18:123-135.
27. Tasker F, Golombok S. Adults raised as children in lesbian families. *Am J Orthopsychiatry*. 1995 Apr;65(2):203-215.
28. Patterson CJ. The family lives of children born to lesbian mothers. In: Patterson CJ, D'Augelli AR, eds. *Lesbian, gay, and bisexual identities in families: psychological perspectives*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press; 1998:154-176.
29. Steckel A. Psychosocial development of children of lesbian mothers. In: Bozett FW, ed. *Gay and Lesbian Parents*. New York, NY: Praeger Publishers; 1987:75-85.
30. Stacey J, Biblarz TJ. (How) does the sexual orientation of parents matter? *American Sociological Review*. 2001 April;66(2):159-183.
31. Tasker F. Children in lesbian-led families: a review. *Clin Child Psychol Psychiatry*. 1999 4(2):153-166.
32. Patterson CJ. Families of the lesbian baby boom: parents' division of labor and children's adjustment. *Dev Psychol*. 1995 31:115-123.
33. Chan RW, Brooks RC, Raboy B, Patterson CJ. Division of labor among lesbian and heterosexual parents: associations with children's adjustment. *J Fam Psychol*. 1998 12(3):402-419.

34. Patterson CJ, Hurt S, Mason CD. Families of the lesbian baby boom: children's contact with grandparents and other adults. *Am J Orthopsychiatry*. 1998 July;68(3):390-399.
35. Emery RE. Interparental conflict and the children of discord and divorce. *Psychol Bull*. 1982 92(2):310-330.
36. Barrett H, Tasker F. Growing up with a gay parent: views of 101 gay fathers on their sons' and daughters' experiences. *Educ Child Psychol*. 2001 18(1):62-77.
37. Tasker F. Lesbian mothers, gay fathers, and their children: a review. *J Dev Behav Pediatr*. 2005 Jun;26(3):224-240.