

Attitudes and Perceptions of Family Building Amongst All U.S. Trainees:

A Cross-Sectional Survey

Amanda Ryan¹, Krista Howard², Tess Chase³

¹Obstetrics and Gynecology, Orlando Health Bayfront Hospital, St Petersburg, FL, ²Texas State University, San Marcos, TX, ³Obstetrics and Gynecology, Johns Hopkins All Childrens Hospital, St Petersburg, FL.

INTRODUCTION

- Previous studies show many female surgical residents have concern about training affecting fertility, with half interested in oocyte cryopreservation (OC).¹ Similar trends were seen among OB/GYN compared to non-OB/GYN female residents.²
- These surveys did not specify other reproductive methods or compare sexes across surgical and non-surgical specialties.
- This study examines differences between males and females within surgical and non-surgical residencies on intentions for family building, reproductive services considered, and barriers to use.

METHODS

- A survey on demographics, residency factors, and family building was given to all US medical residents, with 278 participants (Female n=199; Male n=79) were included.
- Univariate comparisons by sex, stratified by residency type were analyzed using Independent t-tests and Chi-Square/Fisher Exact tests.
- All analyses are conducted with SPSS version 27 (IBM, Inc., Chicago) with a two-tailed alpha criterion of 0.05.

CONCLUSIONS

- Male non-surgical residents are more likely to have/plan to have children during residency without delaying family building.
- Female residents across specialties have concern about fertility, think more about family building, and find these thoughts distressing.
- Females have significantly more barriers to reproductive service use and feel less supported by their programs.
- Surgical female residents experience even more barriers and concerns.
- Discounted family-building programs should be accessible to all residents, regardless of sex or specialty.

REFERENCES

- Wang CN, Kurtzman JT, Ratan RB, Brady PC, Badalato GM. Oocyte cryopreservation during graduate medical training: A survey of trainees. *Am J Surg.* 2023;226(5):717-720. doi:10.1016/j.amjsurg.2023.05.026
- Tsai S, Truong T, Eaton JL. Fertility awareness and attitudes among resident physicians across different specialties. *J Assist Reprod Genet.* 2022;39(3):655-661. doi:10.1007/s10815-022-02425-z

RESULTS

	Surgical Residency		Non-Surgical Residency		Residency Comparison	Sex Comparison	
	Female N = 99	Male N = 19	Female N = 100	Male N = 60	p-value	p-value	
Had or are Planning to have Child(ren) during Residency	30.3% (30)	36.8% (7)	23.0% (23)*	41.7% (25)*	p = .895	p = .030	
Intentionally Delaying Children because of Residency	Yes	59.6% (59)	52.6% (10)	57.0% (57)**	p = .098	p < .001	
	No	34.3% (34)	36.8% (7)	34.0% (34)**			
Concern about Medical Training will Compromise Future Fertility	Yes	75.8% (75)**	21.1% (4)**	74.0% (74)**	p = .013	p < .001	
	No	18.2% (18)**	63.2% (12)**	14.0% (14)**			
Overall Likelihood Using Reproductive Services+	3.84 (1.2)*	3.00 (1.4)*	3.35 (1.6)*	2.75 (1.5)*	p = .001	p < .001	
Reproductive Services Considered During Residency	Oocyte Cryopreservation	63.6% (63)**	10.5% (2)**	46.0% (46)**	13.3% (8)**	p < .001	p < .001
	Intrauterine Insemination	19.2% (19)*	0.0% (0)*	14.0% (14)	13.3% (8)	p = .585	p = .171
	Gestational Carrier	2.0% (2)**	26.3% (5)**	5.0% (5)	6.7% (4)	p = .913	p = .019
	Semen Cryopreservation	4.0% (4)	5.3% (1)	2.0% (2)**	21.7% (13)**	p = .101	p < .001
	Unsure	28.3% (28)*	63.2% (12)*	48.0% (48)*	71.7% (43)*	p < .001	p < .001
	Barriers to Use of Reproductive Services (not mutually exclusive)						
Time	53.5% (53)*	26.3% (5)*	46.0% (46)*	23.3% (14)*	p = .052	p < .001	
Financial Costs	59.6% (59)	47.4% (9)	55.0% (55)*	30.0% (18)*	p = .048	p = .001	
Physical Impact	17.2% (17)	0.0% (0)	16.0% (16)*	3.3% (2)*	p = .433	p = .001	
Not Applicable	36.4% (36)*	63.2% (12)*	48.0% (48)*	75.0% (45)*	p = .004	p < .001	
Number of Barriers	1.67 (1.3)*	0.95 (1.0)*	1.50 (1.4)*	0.83 (1.3)*	p = .068	p < .001	
Aware of Discounted Programs for Family Building for Residents	35.4% (35)	26.3% (5)	8.0% (8)	5.0% (3)	p < .001	p = .026	
Desire Services Included in Discounted Programs for Residents	No	14.1% (14)	15.8% (3)	15.0% (15)	p = .001	p = .016	
	Yes	21.2% (21)	10.5% (2)	8.0% (8)			
	Unsure	64.6% (64)	73.7% (14)	77.0% (77)			
Supported by Training Program to pursue Family Building Goals+	3.83 (1.1)	4.16 (1.1)	3.60 (1.2)*	4.10 (1.1)*	p = .502	p = .009	
Would Ability to Pursue Reproductive Services Impact Timeline for Family Building?+	3.28 (1.3)	3.26 (1.2)	3.36 (1.3)*	2.85 (1.4)*	p = .489	p = .033	
Frequency of Family Planning Thoughts+	2.81 (0.8)	2.58 (0.7)	2.63 (0.8)*	2.33 (1.0)	p = .011	p = .006	
Thought of Family Building Causes Distress	58.6% (58)	47.4% (9)	61.0% (61)*	38.3% (23)*	p = .479	p = .004	
Ever Given Lecture about Family Building Options?	No	74.7% (74)	84.2% (16)	91.0% (91)	p = .025	p = .286	
	Yes	16.2% (16)	5.3% (1)	7.0% (7)			
Believe GME should offer more education and financial support?	No	5.1% (5)*	10.5% (2)*	5.0% (5)*	p = .361	p = .002	
	Yes	86.9% (86)*	63.2% (12)*	83.0% (83)*			

*indicates p-value <0.05, **indicates p-value <0.001, +indicates use of a likert-type scale (1-5 scale, 5 being 'Definitely Likely')