



This is a peer-reviewed, final published version of the following in press document, © 2026 The Author(s). and is licensed under Creative Commons: Attribution 4.0 license:

Park-Morton, Lottie ORCID logoORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3864-7611>, Relja, Ruffin ORCID logoORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9569-6247> and Adkins, Victoria (2026) Public knowledge and attitudes towards non-conventional gestation in the United Kingdom: Results from a cross-sectional online survey experiment. Reproductive BioMedicine Online. doi:10.1016/j.rbmo.2026.105983 (In Press)

Official URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rbmo.2026.105983>

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.rbmo.2026.105983>

EPrint URI: <https://eprints.glos.ac.uk/id/eprint/16537>

Disclaimer

The University of Gloucestershire has obtained warranties from all depositors as to their title in the material deposited and as to their right to deposit such material.

The University of Gloucestershire makes no representation or warranties of commercial utility, title, or fitness for a particular purpose or any other warranty, express or implied in respect of any material deposited.

The University of Gloucestershire makes no representation that the use of the materials will not infringe any patent, copyright, trademark or other property or proprietary rights.

The University of Gloucestershire accepts no liability for any infringement of intellectual property rights in any material deposited but will remove such material from public view pending investigation in the event of an allegation of any such infringement.

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR TEXT.

Public knowledge and attitudes towards non-conventional gestation in the United Kingdom: Results from a cross-sectional online survey experiment



Lottie Park-Morton , Ruffin Relja , Victoria Adkins

PII: S1472-6483(26)00524-9
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rbmo.2026.105983>
Reference: RBMO 105983

To appear in: *Reproductive BioMedicine Online*

Received date: 16 February 2026
Revised date: 20 July 2026
Accepted date: 21 September 2026

Please cite this article as: Lottie Park-Morton , Ruffin Relja , Victoria Adkins , Public knowledge and attitudes towards non-conventional gestation in the United Kingdom: Results from a cross-sectional online survey experiment, *Reproductive BioMedicine Online* (2026), doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rbmo.2026.105983>

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo editing, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during this process changes will be made and errors may be discovered which could affect the content. Correspondence or other submissions concerning this article should await its publication online as a corrected proof or following inclusion in an issue of the journal.

© 2026 The Author(s). Published by Elsevier Ltd on behalf of Reproductive Healthcare Ltd.
This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

Public knowledge and attitudes towards non-conventional gestation in the United Kingdom: Results from a cross-sectional online survey experiment

Author names and affiliations

Dr Lottie Park-Morton, University of Gloucestershire
Oxstalls Campus
Longlevens
Gloucester
UK
GL2 9HW
cparkmorton@glos.ac.uk

Dr Ruffin Relja,* University of Gloucestershire
Oxstalls Campus
Longlevens
Gloucester
UK
GL2 9HW
rrelja1@glos.ac.uk

Dr Victoria Adkins, University of Greenwich

Old Royal Naval College
Park Row
London
UK
SE10 9LS
v.n.p.adkins@greenwich.ac.uk

*Corresponding author

Abstract

Research question: What does the British public know and think about three forms of non-conventional gestation (NCG)—surrogacy, uterus transplantation (UTx), and artificial placentas (AP)—and their variants: traditional surrogacy (TS), gestational surrogacy (GS), and UTx from living (LUTx) versus deceased donors (DUTx)?

Design: A quota-sampled cross-sectional online survey experiment in the United Kingdom recruited 1,646 adults (51% female) via a research panel. Respondents were randomly assigned to surrogacy (n=548), UTx (n=549), or AP (n=549) conditions. Within-subject ratings assessed TS versus GS and LUTx versus DUTx. Subjective knowledge and attitudes were measured before socio-demographic variables. Complete-case data were analysed using ANOVA, correlations, and linear regressions.

Results: The percentage of respondents with positive attitudes varied across surrogacy (85.9%; n=471/548), UTx (82.0%; n=450/549), and AP (64.8%; n=356/549). Variant-specific information reduced support for surrogacy and UTx, although attitudes remained favourable. Differences in support between surrogacy/UTx, TS/GS, and LUTx/DUTx were not significant. Most participants (74.3-82.7%) reported low knowledge of NCGs. Higher subjective knowledge predicted more positive attitudes towards UTx ($\beta=.11$), LUTx ($\beta=.13$), and AP ($\beta=.38$). Age negatively predicted attitudes towards UTx ($\beta=-.20$), LUTx ($\beta=-.14$), and AP ($\beta=-.22$), indicating that younger respondents were more supportive of these newer NCGs, while older age predicted greater support only for TS ($\beta=.11$). Religion predicted lower support for surrogacy ($\beta=-.15$), TS ($\beta=-.10$), and GS ($\beta=-.10$). Political orientation predicted higher support for UTx ($\beta=.15$), LUTx ($\beta=.10$), and DUTx ($\beta=.09$). Other demographics had minimal effects.

Conclusions: Public support for NCGs is shaped by the level of detail provided as well as subjective knowledge and socio-demographic factors, although associations vary across NCG forms and variants. Further research should examine information sources and other influences on attitudes.

Key words

Surrogacy

Uterus transplantation

Artificial placentas

Assisted reproduction

Non-conventional gestation

Public attitudes

Journal Pre-proof

Introduction

Assisted reproductive technologies (ARTs) seek to alleviate infertility for individuals and couples. These technologies often involve some form of clinical intervention, such as in vitro fertilisation (IVF), enabling conception outside the body. A new branch of “assisted gestative technologies” or “technologies enabling gestation” extends ARTs beyond conception to encompass practices involving technological intervention or the delegation of gestation to another person or device (Romanis, 2022; 2024).

Alongside the established practice of surrogacy, which is often enabled by ART and is therefore frequently considered part of the broader ART landscape (for example, Bulletti et al., 2023), more recent (and future) developments of uterus transplantation (UTx) and artificial placentas (AP), break the traditional link between intended parents and gestation. To delineate from a focus on technology or assistance, we use the term “non-conventional gestation” (NCG) to frame these processes. These innovations prompt important societal and regulatory considerations, as their implementation and use depend not only on clinical progress but also on public understanding and acceptance (for example, Krendel and Ryder, 2025).

Surrogacy, whereby gestation takes place in a body other than that of the intended parent, is currently the most established NCG practice in the United Kingdom (UK). Both traditional surrogacy (TS), where the surrogate is genetically related to the child, and gestational surrogacy (GS), where they are not, are lawful but unenforceable under the UK Surrogacy Arrangements Act 1985. While both forms are lawful in the UK, regulatory approaches to surrogacy vary considerably across jurisdictions and continue to evolve in response to shifting ethical, political, legal, and social debates (for example, Rodríguez-Jaume et al., 2021; Klotz, 2026).

UTx, an emerging technology that enables gestation in a transplanted uterus, remains in early clinical use but has recently resulted in the first UK birth (Womb Transplant UK, 2025). Uteruses may be sourced from living donors (LUTx) or deceased donors (DUTx), raising distinct questions about acceptability (for example, Williams, 2016).

APs seek to mimic the human placenta. Although currently being developed to improve outcomes for extremely premature infants (Hunter, 2024; Smajdor, 2007; Partridge et al., 2017), they have the potential to enable full artificial gestation in the future. For conceptual comparability with surrogacy and UTx, this study focuses on attitudes toward AP use for full gestation.

Each NCG has been subject to ethical scrutiny and cannot be regarded as ethically neutral (Writing Group on behalf of the ESHRE Ethics Committee, 2025; O'Donovan et al., 2019; Werner and Mercurio, 2022). Surrogacy, in particular, has become a focal point of international attention and critique (UN Human Rights Council, 2025), although many of the findings have been contested (for example, Horsey, 2025; Klotz, 2026). These debates have been influenced by cross-border arrangements and divergent national regulations (Deonandan, 2020; Horsey, 2024; Panerati et al., 2026; Petitfils et al., 2017; Rodríguez-Jaume, 2021). It is increasingly contextualised in relation to broader questions of human rights, autonomy, self-determination, and the protection of potentially vulnerable actors (for example, Bulletti et al., 2023; Horsey, 2025; Klotz, 2026). While surrogacy is often contested in national and international debates, it is also defended within a human rights framework, for example, as an expression of bodily autonomy and prosocial goals (for example, Martínez-López and Munuera-Gómez, 2024; Mullock et al., 2021). This internationalisation of, and international response to, surrogacy underscores the broader societal importance of how NCG forms are understood and regulated and may signal comparable patterns and trends in a global context in relation to UTx and APs. For example, Krendel and Ryder (2025) show how public discourse can frame emerging NCG forms, specifically AP, in ways that act as a barrier to their acceptance, thereby limiting their potential contributions to social justice and reproductive rights.

The Warnock Committee's emphasis on public consultation regarding embryo research and IVF illustrates how engagement with public views has historically shaped reproductive policy in the UK (Hammond-Browning, 2015), which has then influenced other jurisdictions (Franklin and Jackson, 2024). Public attitudes, therefore, both shape the social environment in which technological innovation occurs (Verweij et al., 2021) and contribute to regulatory legitimacy and policy development across borders. Understanding domestic attitudes to each NCG is therefore essential, as regulatory responses are often shaped by divergent social and ethical perspectives.

Although each NCG form has received attention in research and public debate, studies typically examine surrogacy (for example, Baron et al., 2024; Poote and van den Akker, 2009), UTx (for example, Rius et al., 2025; Vali et al., 2023), or AP (for example, Adkins, 2025; Romanis and Adkins, 2024) in isolation, with only few studies that consider multiple NCG forms together (for example, Mullock et al., 2021; Romanis, 2023). Rodríguez-Jaume et al. (2021) evidence that existing research also varies considerably in how attitudes are conceptualised and measured, limiting comparability across studies and indicating that public views differ depending on the specific technology, context, and dimension under consideration. As a result, evidence remains fragmented, leaving a limited understanding of how public attitudes compare across NCG forms or how attitudinal patterns vary within and between them.

To address the gaps in existing research, this study adopts a comparative and standardised approach to measuring public attitudes across multiple forms of NCG. By applying consistent evaluative items across NCG forms and their variants, the study enables systematic comparisons both between and within NCG types while capturing different dimensions of attitudinal responses. This design responds to prior calls for more coherent and multidimensional approaches to studying public opinion in this domain, where attitudes may vary depending on whether technologies are evaluated in normative, personal, or regulatory terms (Rodríguez-Jaume et al., 2021).

This study, therefore, provides the first UK-based comparative assessment of public attitudes toward multiple NCG types: surrogacy (unspecified, TS, GS), UTx (unspecified, LUTx, DUTx), and full-gestation AP. Along with attitudes, subjective knowledge of each principal NCG form was assessed. Prior research suggests that perceived knowledge can affect an individual's evaluations (Oh and Abraham, 2016) and that the public's understanding of ARTs in the UK is often limited (for example, Bracewell-Milnes et al., 2021; Vali et al., 2023). This study also examines whether a set of demographic variables—age, gender, previous pregnancies, sexual orientation, relationship status, ethnicity, religion, and political orientation—are associated with or predictive of attitudes, reflecting patterns in existing ART research (for example, Aurrekoetxea-Casas and Ronda, 2024; Baron et al., 2024; Constantinidis and Cook, 2012; Lasker and Murray, 2001; Lutkiewicz et al., 2026; Poote and van den Akker, 2009).

On this basis, we test the following hypotheses:

- H1: Attitudes differ significantly across surrogacy, UTx, and AP.
- H2: Attitudes differ significantly across surrogacy variants (unspecified, TS, GS).
- H3: Attitudes differ significantly across UTx variants (unspecified, LUTx, DUTx).
- H4: Subjective knowledge differs significantly across surrogacy, UTx, and AP.
- H5: Subjective knowledge is associated with attitudes toward each NCG form and variant.
- H6: Subjective knowledge predicts attitudes toward each NCG form and variant.
- H7: Demographic variables are associated with attitudes toward each NCG form and variant.
- H8: Demographic variables predict attitudes toward each NCG form and variant.

By analysing attitudes, knowledge, and demographic predictors together, this study provides an integrated understanding of how the UK public perceives current and emerging NCGs, offering evidence relevant to future public engagement and regulatory decision-making.

Materials and Methods

Sample recruitment

A priori power analyses were conducted using G*Power (Faul et al., 2009) to determine the sample sizes required to detect small effect sizes (Cohen, 1992) with $\alpha = .05$ and statistical power of .95. Calculations were performed for one-way ANOVAs (H1, H4), repeated mixed ANOVAs / General Linear Models (GLMs) (H2, H3), correlation analyses (H5, H7), and multiple linear regression models (H6, H8). These analyses indicated a minimum required sample size of $N = 1,548$.

Participants were recruited between 18 and 28 June 2025 via the online panel provider TGM Research. Comparable panel-based recruitment platforms (for example, Qualtrics, Prolific, Dynata, Amazon Mechanical Turk) have been widely used in prior research surveying public

attitudes on reproductive and bioethical issues (for example, Baron et al., 2024; Copp et al., 2024; Egan et al., 2022; Murali et al., 2025). Participants were compensated by the market research company in line with its standard reward procedures. The panel recruitment was funded through an internal research grant from the University of Gloucestershire (grant number 2024-25-172-2).

A quota sampling approach (Patton, 2015) was employed to achieve a gender distribution reflective of the UK population (Clark, 2025) and to minimise potential gender-related effects. Specifically, TGM Research broadly invited eligible UK residents aged 18 years or older, applying gender quotas of 51% women and 49% men. These quotas were met (see sample characteristics in the Results section). No post-stratification weighting was applied.

Several quality-control procedures were implemented by the market research company, including attention verification and bot detection. To enhance the robustness of the analyses, recruitment targets exceeded the minimum sample size determined by a priori power analyses. In total, 1,646 respondents successfully completed the survey. As participants were recruited through a dynamic online panel system rather than via direct invitations to a single survey, a conventional response rate could not be calculated. A total of 1715 respondents initiated the survey and 1,646 completed it, yielding a completion rate of 96%. Only fully completed questionnaires were retained for analysis. The recruitment approach and completion rate are comparable to those reported in prior public opinion research (for example, Miao, 2026).

Design

Participants were randomly assigned to one of three experimental conditions: surrogacy ($n = 548$), UTx ($n = 549$), and AP ($n = 549$). This design enabled both between- and within-subject comparisons while reducing cognitive load and survey fatigue. The three NCG forms were presented between subjects to avoid carryover effects and to ensure that participants evaluated different gestational arrangements independently (Lewis-Beck et al., 2004). In contrast, variants within the surrogacy and UTx groups were assessed within subjects to enable controlled comparisons of how specific features (for example, genetic relatedness, donor type) influence attitudes within a given NCG form (Constantinidis and Cook,

2012). These variants reflect substantively distinct configurations that differ in their legal treatment and ethical framing across jurisdictions (Writing Group on behalf of the ESHRE Ethics Committee, 2025; O'Donovan et al., 2019).

Procedure

Following established procedures in public-attitude research on ARTs (for example, Constantinidis and Cook, 2012), participants completed a brief online questionnaire with randomised items. After providing informed consent and confirming eligibility, respondents reported their subjective knowledge of the NCG form assigned to their group (surrogacy, UTx, or AP). They then rated their attitudes toward the same NCG form. In the next section, respondents in the surrogacy group received definitions of TS and GS, and respondents in the UTx group received definitions of LUTx and DUTx. No equivalent subtypes were presented for AP, given the exclusive focus on future application for full gestation. All respondents subsequently completed socio-demographic questions assessing age, gender, previous pregnancies, sexual orientation, relationship status, ethnicity, religion, and political orientation.

Ethics approval

The University of Gloucestershire's Research Ethics Committee approved the study [approval number, REC/25/LPM1; date of approval, 12 June 2025].

Measures

All constructs were measured using established scales (see Table 1). Attitudes toward each NCG form were measured using a validated three-item scale adapted from Shih and Fang (2004). Respondents indicated agreement with three statements: "X is an acceptable idea," "Using X is a good idea," and "X should be allowed," where "X" referred to the relevant NCG form or variant. These items capture evaluative ('good idea'), normative ('acceptable'), and regulatory ('should be allowed') dimensions of attitudes, enabling a multidimensional assessment of public opinion while maintaining conceptual distinction from related constructs such as attitudinal antecedents and beliefs about the outcomes of surrogacy arrangements. This approach addresses prior critiques of heterogeneous and inconsistent measurement in surrogacy research, which

limit comparability while indicating that attitudes vary across dimensions and contexts (Rodríguez-Jaume et al., 2021). Consistent application across NCG forms allows systematic comparison within and between technologies.

[insert Table 1 here]

Working definitions (see Table 2) were introduced using neutral wording following established practice (Constantinidis and Cook, 2012), with variant definitions presented as required. Responses were recorded on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly disagree; 5 = Strongly agree). Internal consistency was high across all NCG forms ($\alpha = .93-.96$), aligning closely with previous studies (for example, Shih and Fang, 2004). As items were strongly correlated, they were averaged to form a single attitude score, following standard practice (Umashankar et al., 2017).

[insert Table 2 here]

Subjective knowledge was measured to capture perceived familiarity, which shapes evaluations and is conceptually distinct from objective knowledge (Flynn and Goldsmith, 1999). In particular, subjective knowledge incorporates an individual's confidence in what they believe they know (for example, Dunning et al., 2003; Vörös et al., 2021), thereby helping to account for how people form judgments (for example, Slovic et al., 2002) when relying on perceived rather than factual knowledge (Brucks, 1985). This approach also enables more parsimonious and comparable measurement across NCG forms than objective knowledge testing does. Perceived knowledge has also been of interest in previous research (for example, Bitou et al., 2026), although its measurement remains unclear.

In this study, subjective knowledge was assessed using an established scale (Flynn and Goldsmith, 1999), adapted to each NCG context. Items (see Table 1) included both positively and negatively worded statements (for example, "I know pretty much about surrogacy"; "I do not feel very knowledgeable about UTx"), with negatively phrased items reverse-coded. Responses were recorded on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly disagree; 7 = Strongly agree). Reliability was satisfactory across forms ($\alpha = .84-.89$), consistent with previous findings (for example, $\alpha = .88$; Oh and Abraham, 2016).

Statistical analyses

Data were analysed in SPSS (version 30). Statistical significance was set at $p < .05$ (two-tailed). To test H1 and H4, one-way analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were performed using Welch's F (Welch, 1951) to account for potential violations of homogeneity of variance (Delacre et al., 2019). Games–Howell tests (Games and Howell, 1976) were used for post hoc comparisons when appropriate. To test H2 and H3, we conducted repeated-measures General Linear Models (GLMs). Greenhouse–Geisser corrections were applied when the assumption of sphericity was violated, and Bonferroni-corrected pairwise comparisons were used to assess within-subject differences among the surrogacy and UTx variants. To test H5 and H7, Pearson correlations were computed to examine associations between subjective knowledge or demographic variables (dummy-coded where required), and attitudes. Finally, to test H6 and H8, multiple linear regressions were conducted to identify predictors of attitudes, consistent with established practice in reproductive research (for example, Bitou et al., 2026; Chliaoutakis et al., 2002; Esmaeilvand et al., 2025; Lutkiewicz et al., 2023, 2026). Effect sizes are reported in line with established standards (Cohen, 1988).

To assess group balance following random assignment to the three NCG conditions, chi-square tests of independence were conducted for categorical demographic variables, and a one-way Welch ANOVA was conducted for age. Sensitivity analyses were subsequently performed using analyses of covariance (ANCOVAs) to compare subjective knowledge and attitudes across NCG conditions while controlling for all demographic variables (namely, age, gender, previous pregnancy, relationship status, sexual orientation, religion, political orientation, and ethnicity), with subjective knowledge additionally included as a covariate in the attitude models. Repeated-measures GLMs, including the same set of covariates, were also estimated to assess the robustness of the findings. Finally, chi-square goodness-of-fit tests were conducted to determine whether the observed distributions in the study sample differed significantly from the expected distributions based on available UK population data.

Results

Sample characteristics

Table 3 outlines the socio-demographic characteristics of the sample. Consistent with prior survey research (for example, Bitou et al., 2026; Constantinidis and Cook, 2012; Lutkiewicz et al., 2026; Rodríguez-Jaume, et al., 2024), several variables were dichotomised to facilitate analysis, including previous pregnancy (yes/no), relationship status (partnered vs not), sexual orientation (LGBTQ vs non-LGBTQ), religion (any vs none), and ethnicity (white vs non-white). We acknowledge that while analytically convenient, these classifications do not capture within-group heterogeneity.

Balance testing revealed small demographic differences between the three randomised groups. Chi-square tests indicated significant between-group differences for several demographic variables, including previous pregnancies ($\chi^2(2, N=1646) = 6.30, p = .043$, Cramer's $V = .06$), relationship status ($\chi^2(2, N=1646) = 8.78, p = .012$, Cramer's $V = .07$), and religion ($\chi^2(2, N=1646) = 29.66, p < .001$, Cramer's $V = .13$). A one-way Welch ANOVA indicated significant age differences across the three NCG groups, $F(2, 1095.08) = 14.76, p < .001, \eta^2 = .018$. Post hoc Games–Howell tests indicated no significant age difference between the (unspecified) surrogacy (mean (M) = 43.12 years, standard deviation (SD) = 16.61 years, 95% Confidence Interval (CI) [41.73, 44.52 years]) and UTx groups ($M = 41.03$ years, $SD = 16.50$ years, 95% CI [39.65, 42.42 years], $p = .092$). In contrast, respondents in the AP group were significantly older ($M = 46.51$ years, $SD = 17.11$ years, 95% CI [45.08, 47.95 years]) than those in both the (unspecified) surrogacy ($p = .003$) and UTx groups ($p < .001$). However, sensitivity analyses using ANCOVAs and repeated-measures GLMs controlling, where appropriate, for subjective knowledge, age, gender, previous pregnancy, relationship status, sexual orientation, religion, political orientation, and ethnicity yielded substantively identical patterns of results. These findings indicate that the pattern of differences in subjective knowledge and attitudes across NCG forms remained robust after controlling for all measured demographic variables and, where applicable, subjective knowledge.

Furthermore, in this section, we include comparisons with data from the UK Office for National Statistics (ONS) and YouGov for context, without claiming that the study is overall representative. To further gauge similarity, chi-square goodness-of-fit tests were performed to compare the sample distributions with available national benchmarks for specific binary variables. These tests serve to highlight general alignment or differences.

The full sample ($N = 1,646$) comprised 51% ($n = 835$) women and 49% ($n = 811$) men. This distribution aligns with UK population patterns reported for 2024 (ONS, 2025c) ($\chi^2(1, N=1646) = 1.97, p = .161$). Among female participants, 69% reported having experienced pregnancy (including live birth, stillbirth, ectopic pregnancy, miscarriage, or induced abortion).

[insert Table 3 here]

We compared the overall age distribution of the sample reported in Table 3 with that of the UK adult population in mid-2024 (ONS, 2025c). A chi-square goodness-of-fit test indicated a significant difference between the two distributions ($\chi^2(4, N = 1646) = 144.40, p < .001$, Cohen's $\omega = .30$). Examination of the residuals indicated that younger adults (18-44 years) were overrepresented and older adults (45 years and older) were underrepresented relative to their proportions in the UK adult population.

For relationship status, 63% of participants reported being married, in a civil partnership, or cohabiting. Based on chi-square testing, this proportion did not differ significantly from the national estimates (61%) for England and Wales in 2024 (ONS, 2025b) ($\chi^2(1, N = 1646) = 3.51, p = .061$).

Regarding sexual orientation, most of our sample self-identified as heterosexual or straight (92%), closely mirroring national estimates, which indicate that approximately 93% of the UK population identified as heterosexual in 2024 (ONS, 2025d) ($\chi^2(1, N = 1646) = .72, p = .396$).

Religious identification showed partial alignment with national distributions. In the 2021 Census, 38% of the population reported no religion and 47% identified as Christian (ONS, 2025a). In the present sample, 37% reported no religious affiliation and 53% identified as Christian, indicating a modest over-representation of Christian respondents. However, chi-square testing confirmed that our dichotomisation captures broad differences between religious and non-religious participants but does not necessarily reflect variation within the religious grouping ($\chi^2(1, N = 1646) = .85, p = .357$).

Political orientation was assessed by whether participants identified with a political position (namely, left-wing/liberal; moderate/centrist; right-wing/conservative) or none. Accordingly, the analytic variable reflects the presence versus the absence of political identification rather than ideological placement. Approximately 74% reported a political orientation, a pattern comparable to UK survey findings (YouGov, n.d.; Miao, 2026), although detailed ideological positioning was not modelled in this study ($\chi^2(1, N = 1646) = 1.36, p = .243$).

Finally, 78% of participants self-identified as White, compared with approximately 83% in the 2021 UK Census (ONS, 2025a), indicating a small but statistically significant difference ($\chi^2(1, N = 1646) = 26.99, p < .001$, Cohen's $\omega = .13$). For analysis, ethnicity was coded as 0 = non-white and 1 = white, acknowledging that this binary categorisation does not capture heterogeneity within ethnic groups.

Hypothesis 1: Attitudes differ significantly across surrogacy, UTx, and AP.

Most participants expressed positive attitudes—operationalised as selecting “agree” or “strongly agree” on the Likert scale—towards surrogacy (unspecified type), UTx (unspecified type), and AP, with 85.9% ($n=471/548$), 82.0% ($n=450/549$), and 64.8% ($n=356/549$), respectively. A one-way Welch ANOVA indicated significant mean differences across the three forms, $F(2, 1085.02) = 42.29, p < .001, \eta^2 = .056$. Post hoc Games–Howell tests showed similar support for surrogacy ($M = 3.88, SD = 0.91, 95\% \text{ CI } [3.80, 3.95]$) and UTx ($M = 3.78, SD = 0.88, 95\% \text{ CI } [3.71, 3.86], p = .185$), while both technologies were rated significantly higher than AP ($M = 3.33, SD = 1.11, 95\% \text{ CI } [3.24, 3.43], p < .001$ for both comparisons). These results confirm H1.

Hypothesis 2: Attitudes differ significantly across surrogacy variants (unspecified, TS, GS).

High levels of acceptance were also observed for surrogacy (unspecified type), TS, and GS, with 85.9% ($n=471/548$), 76.1% ($n=417/548$), and 69.7% ($n=382/548$) of participants selecting “agree” or “strongly agree,” respectively. A repeated-measures GLM with Greenhouse–Geisser correction identified a significant difference in attitudes across the three surrogacy types, $F(1.79, 976.36) = 21.71$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .038$. Bonferroni-adjusted comparisons showed that attitudes towards surrogacy (unspecified type) ($M = 3.88$, $SE = 0.04$, 95% CI [3.80, 3.95]) were significantly more positive than attitudes toward TS ($M = 3.68$, $SE = 0.04$, 95% CI [3.60, 3.76], $p < .001$) and GS ($M = 3.66$, $SE = 0.04$, 95% CI [3.58, 3.74], $p < .001$). Attitudes toward TS and GS did not differ ($p = 1.00$). H2 is supported.

Hypothesis 3: Attitudes differ significantly across UTx variants (unspecified, LUTx, DUTx).

A majority of participants expressed favourable views—indicated by responses of “agree” or “strongly agree”—towards UTx (unspecified type), LUTx and DUTx (82.0% [$n=450/549$], 71.2% [$n=391/549$], and 65.2% [$n=358/549$], respectively). A repeated-measures GLM with Greenhouse–Geisser correction showed significant differences in attitudes across the three UTx types, $F(1.65, 906.42) = 47.86$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .080$. Bonferroni-corrected comparisons indicated that UTx (unspecified type) ($M = 3.78$, $SE = 0.04$, 95% CI [3.71, 3.86]) was rated more positively than LUTx ($M = 3.50$, $SE = 0.04$, 95% CI [3.41, 3.58], $p < .001$) and DUTx ($M = 3.41$, $SE = 0.04$, 95% CI [3.32, 3.49], $p < .001$). Attitudes toward LUTx and DUTx did not differ ($p = .174$). These results confirm H3.

Hypothesis 4: Subjective knowledge differs significantly across surrogacy, UTx, and AP.

A one-way Welch ANOVA showed significant differences in subjective knowledge across groups, $F(2, 1082.04) = 25.36$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .025$. Post hoc Games–Howell tests showed higher knowledge in the surrogacy group ($M = 3.33$, $SD = 1.25$, 95% CI [3.23, 3.44]) compared with UTx ($M = 2.78$, $SD = 1.45$, 95% CI [2.66, 2.90], $p < .001$) and AP ($M = 2.91$, $SD = 1.64$, 95% CI [2.78, 3.05], $p < .001$). Subjective knowledge of UTx and AP did not differ ($p = .329$). These findings confirm H4. All means were below the midpoint of the scale (specifically, 4 on a 7-point Likert scale), indicating low perceived knowledge overall. This pattern is further reflected in the high proportion of respondents who expressed

disagreement on the subjective knowledge scale (“strongly disagree” to “somewhat disagree”): 74.3% (n=407/548) for surrogacy, 82.7% (n=454/549) for UTx, and 76.5% (n=420/549) for AP.

Hypotheses 5 and 7: Subjective knowledge and demographic variables are associated with attitudes toward each NCG form and variant.

Pearson correlations (Table 4) showed distinct patterns of association, providing partial support for H5 and H7. Attitudes toward TS ($r = .66$, 95% CI [.61, .71], $p < .001$) and GS ($r = .65$, 95% CI [.60, .70], $p < .001$) correlated strongly with attitudes toward surrogacy (unspecified type), suggesting that responses to a general surrogacy question are closely aligned with attitudes toward both forms of surrogacy. The near-identical correlation coefficients indicate that respondents did not systematically differentiate between TS and GS when evaluating surrogacy in the abstract, consistent with the findings for H2. Similarly, attitudes toward LUTx ($r = .68$, 95% CI [.63, .72], $p < .001$) and DUTx ($r = .56$, 95% CI [.50, .62], $p < .001$) correlated with attitudes toward UTx (unspecified type). Unlike surrogacy, however, the stronger association between attitudes toward UTx and LUTx suggests that respondents may have been somewhat more likely to envisage LUTx than DUTx when considering UTx in general. Given the outcomes of H3 testing, which did not find a significant difference in attitudes towards LUTx and DUTx, this pattern should be interpreted as indicative of a trend rather than a significant difference.

Subjective knowledge correlated significantly with attitudes towards UTx (unspecified type) ($r = .18$, 95% CI [.10, .26], $p < .001$), LUTx ($r = .17$, 95% CI [.09, .25], $p < .001$), and AP ($r = .48$, 95% CI [.42, .54], $p < .001$), but not with attitudes toward surrogacy. Associations were strongest for AP. Age correlated negatively with attitudes toward GS ($r = -.09$, 95% CI [-.17, -.01], $p = .032$), UTx (unspecified type) ($r = -.16$, 95% CI [-.24, -.07], $p < .001$), LUTx ($r = -.13$, 95% CI [-.21, -.05], $p = .002$), and strongest with AP ($r = -.38$, 95% CI [-.45, -.31], $p < .001$). A positive correlation emerged for TS ($r = .11$, 95% CI [.03, .19], $p = .011$). Gender correlated positively with attitudes towards GS ($r = .11$, 95% CI [.02, .19], $p = .014$), and negatively with attitudes towards LUTx ($r = -.10$, 95% CI [-.19, -.02], $p = .015$) and DUTx ($r = -.10$, 95% CI [-.18, -.01], $p = .025$). No other associations were observed. Previous pregnancies were not significantly associated with attitudes. Relationship status correlated positively with attitudes towards UTx (unspecified type) ($r = .14$, 95% CI [.05, .22], $p = .001$) and LUTx ($r = .09$, 95% CI [.01, .18], $p = .027$). Only attitudes towards surrogacy (unspecified type) showed a significant positive correlation ($r = .10$, 95% CI [.02, .18],

$p = .016$) with sexual orientation. Religion correlated negatively with attitudes toward surrogacy (unspecified type) ($r = -.19$, 95% CI $[-.27, -.10]$, $p < .001$), TS ($r = -.10$, 95% CI $[-.19, -.02]$, $p = .016$), and GS ($r = -.13$, 95% CI $[-.21, -.05]$, $p = .002$). In terms of political orientation, positive correlations emerged for attitudes towards UTx (unspecified type) ($r = .17$, 95% CI $[.08, .25]$, $p < .001$), LUTx ($r = .13$, 95% CI $[.05, .21]$, $p = .002$), DUTx ($r = .12$, 95% CI $[.03, .20]$, $p = .006$), and AP ($r = .09$, 95% CI $[.00, .17]$, $p = .039$). Finally, ethnicity was negatively associated with attitudes towards surrogacy (unspecified type) ($r = -.11$, 95% CI $[-.19, -.03]$, $p = .011$) and TS ($r = -.12$, 95% CI $[-.20, -.03]$, $p = .006$), and positively associated with attitudes towards AP ($r = .19$, 95% CI $[.10, .26]$, $p < .001$).

[insert Table 4 here]

Hypotheses 6 and 8: Subjective knowledge and demographic variables predict attitudes toward each NCG form and variant.

All multiple linear regression models were significant (see Table 5) and indicated no evidence of multicollinearity, with all variance inflation factors (VIFs) below 3.3 (see Supplementary Table 1). Significant predictors (standardised beta coefficients) are summarised below. For unstandardised beta coefficients and related 95% CIs, see Table 5.

Subjective knowledge predicted more positive attitudes toward UTx (unspecified type) ($\beta = .11$, $p = .018$), LUTx ($\beta = .13$, $p = .005$), and AP ($\beta = .38$, $p < .001$). No other effects were observed. Age negatively predicted attitudes toward UTx (unspecified type) ($\beta = -.20$, $p < .001$), LUTx ($\beta = -.14$, $p = .003$), and AP ($\beta = -.22$, $p < .001$). Age was a positive predictor of attitudes toward TS ($\beta = .11$, $p = .031$). No other effects emerged. Gender was a negative predictor of attitudes toward LUTx ($\beta = -.14$, $p = .028$). No other gender effects emerged. Previous pregnancies had no significant effect on attitudes towards any NCG form/variant. Relationship status predicted more positive attitudes towards UTx (unspecified type) ($\beta = .09$, $p = .030$). No other relationship effects emerged. Sexual orientation had no significant effect on attitudes toward any NCG form/variant. Religion negatively predicted attitudes toward surrogacy (unspecified type) ($\beta = -.15$, $p = .002$), TS ($\beta = -.10$, $p = .029$), and GS ($\beta = -.10$, $p = .032$). No other effects of religious beliefs emerged. Political orientation positively predicted attitudes toward UTx (unspecified type) ($\beta = .15$, $p < .001$), LUTx ($\beta = .10$, $p = .020$) and DUTx ($\beta = .09$, $p = .041$); no other effects of political orientation emerged.

Ethnicity was a significant negative predictor of attitudes toward UTx (unspecified type) ($\beta = -.09$, $p = .038$); no other effects of ethnicity emerged.

[insert Table 5 here]

Discussion

General

This study aimed to systematically compare public attitudes toward different forms of NCG in the UK and to assess how these attitudes vary across their variants and individual characteristics. In doing so, it provides the first comparative assessment across seven distinct NCG forms within a single, standardised design. This contribution addresses a key limitation in existing research, which has typically examined technologies in isolation or undertaken more limited comparisons. By integrating multiple NCG forms within a single analytical framework, the study moves beyond fragmented approaches and offers a more systematic understanding of how public attitudes are structured across NCG forms.

Results in this study show that support for AP was lower than for surrogacy and UTx in the present sample, although attitudes remained overall favourable (64.8% of respondents expressed positive attitudes toward AP). The study demonstrates that subjective knowledge is modest overall and only weakly predictive of attitudes (positively for UTx (unspecified), LUTx and AP; otherwise negligible). Across the NCG forms studied, a recurring pattern emerged: support diminishes when more specific procedural details are introduced (for example, distinguishing GS/TS; LUTx/DUTx). Further understanding of how information is received by the public and how this impacts attitudes will be necessary to shape future public consultation and regulation.

Although demographic characteristics predicted attitudes, the patterns and strengths of associations differed across NCG forms and variants, indicating that a substantial proportion of variation in public attitudes remains unexplained. This suggests that additional factors may influence

individuals' attitudes, such as the legislative and societal contexts within which these NCGs are practised and might be explored further in future research.

Attitudes and subjective knowledge

This study demonstrated similarly high positive attitudes towards surrogacy (85.9%) and UTx (82.0%), both of which were rated significantly more positively than AP (64.8%). In a UK context, the findings would suggest that approval of surrogacy has increased over time: a YouGov study found that 59% of British adults approved of (gestational) surrogacy in 2014 (Jordan, 2014), although such top-level statistics need to be interpreted cautiously given the measurement differences and variations in how attitudes are conceptualised.

Our study confirms previous findings indicating that public knowledge of NCG forms is generally limited (for example, Bitou et al., 2026, GS in Greece; Farkas et al., 2025, UTx in Hungary; Vali et al., 2023, UTx in the UK). Perceived knowledge is highest for surrogacy amongst the forms of NCG but remains modest ($M=3.33$), with insignificant mean differences in knowledge for UTx ($M=2.78$) and AP ($M=2.91$).

Surrogacy having the highest mean knowledge levels and percentage of respondents with positive attitudes may be attributed to the length of time that surrogacy has been practised, the public discourse, and its established legal regulation in the UK. Recent public consultations and reform proposals in England, Wales, and Scotland (Law Commissions, 2023) have increased its visibility at a domestic level. Its visibility is further enhanced by prominent media coverage and disclosures by celebrity figures, such as Khloe Kardashian and Tom Daly, allowing it to enter mainstream public discourse.

Comparative evidence also suggests that regulatory context may play an important role in determining public attitudes. For example, in jurisdictions where surrogacy is prohibited, such as Sweden and Japan, public attitudes tend to be less favourable (Wennberg et al., 2016; Nakazawa et al., 2019). However, in Spain, where surrogacy is also illegal, there is a high level of public support for the legalisation of the practice (Rius et al., 2025, Rodríguez-Jaume et al., 2024), suggesting that attitudes can differ from the legal positioning of the practice.

Turning to UTx, a relatively high proportion of respondents reported low knowledge (82.7%). While some evidence suggests that individuals considering uterine donation report higher awareness (Jones et al., 2021), population-level studies consistently find low familiarity (Vali et al., 2023; Pittman et al., 2025). This suggests that personal investment may increase familiarity, although this remains speculative as our study did not measure personal relevance.

In contrast to surrogacy, we expected a lower level of knowledge of UTx, particularly given Vali et al.'s (2023) finding that 71% of participants had never heard of it. It was also assumed that attitudes towards UTx would be less positive than surrogacy, given its novelty. The finding that attitudes towards surrogacy and UTx were similarly positive suggests that knowledge of a form of NCG alone does not shape public attitudes. Though still limited to clinical trials, UTx, like surrogacy, is a permitted form of NCG in the UK. It is therefore plausible that regulatory frameworks may exert greater influence on public exposure to and perceptions of reproductive options. This would also align with the relatively lower support observed for AP than for surrogacy or UTx, particularly for its use during full gestation, although the present study cannot determine whether this reflects AP's lack of clinical implementation, the absence of approved regulation, or other factors.

The absence of a significant difference in knowledge between UTx and AP was unexpected and may reflect first-exposure effects, whereby participants encountered both technologies for the first time in the study. Approval of these NCG forms may also be influenced by media representations. For example, there has been more prominent media coverage of UTx than of AP, given that APs are not yet at the stage of clinical trials. UK coverage of UTx has included positive, donor centric narratives: for example, "*A little miracle: First baby born in UK to woman with transplanted womb*" (Walsh, 2025), whereas AP coverage has often been cautious and interrogative: for example, "*This machine could keep a baby alive outside the womb. How will the world decide to use it?*" (Tu, 2025). Although media effects were not measured in this study, these contrasting tones illustrate how media framing may plausibly shape public attitudes.

Additional explanations for the AP findings are also plausible. Participants may have conflated partial and full ectogestation, overestimated their subjective knowledge, or relied on familiar cultural narratives when evaluating an unfamiliar technology. Science fiction and dystopian imagery,

for example, may provide accessible interpretive frames (Krendel and Ryder, 2025), meaning responses are guided more by analogy than by substantive understanding. As Krendel and Ryder (2025) argue, therefore, public engagement should focus on explaining the need and feasibility of emerging technologies, normalising their use and users, and demonstrating their societal and individual benefits. However, we acknowledge that the present study was not designed to identify the reasons for the lower support for one NCG form compared with other NCG forms, and that these explanations should therefore be regarded as speculative.

Overall, the findings of this study, when considered alongside existing evidence, suggest that external factors may play a distinct role in shaping knowledge and attitudes towards NCGs. Whilst comparisons with other studies suggest regulatory frameworks, media portrayals and broader public discourse may be key examples of such external factors, and more research on sources of knowledge are needed to substantiate this link.

Level of detail

Within the surrogacy group, respondents were more positive towards surrogacy (unspecified) than towards TS or GS, and did not significantly differentiate between TS and GS. The findings of our study would therefore indicate that the UK public does not necessarily equate surrogacy (unspecified type) with either GS or TS. Minai et al. (2007) reported a similar finding in Japan, although Constantinidis and Cook (2012) found that respondents equated 'surrogacy' without a definition with GS rather than TS. The difference between GS and TS is the existence (or non-existence) of a genetic link between the surrogate and the child. Several jurisdictions permit GS while prohibiting TS (for example, India, Portugal, various US states). Conversely, both forms of surrogacy are permitted in the UK and regulated in the same way, which may help explain our result. Given that no significant difference in attitudes towards GS and TS was evident within our study sample, the findings would indicate that the (sometimes) legal and academic distinction between GS and TS is not reflected as concerns amongst the UK population.

For UTx, the pattern is parallel: general UTx elicited higher support than either LUTx or DUTx, yet respondents did not significantly distinguish between donor types. However, correlation analyses indicate that attitudes toward UTx (unspecified type) were more strongly associated with attitudes towards LUTx ($r = .68$, 95% CI [.63, .72], $p < .001$) than with attitudes towards DUTx ($r = .56$, 95% CI [.50, .62], $p < .001$). This may

indicate that LUTx is more salient in public perception, potentially reflecting greater familiarity with living donor models in other medical contexts, or that gestation is not readily perceived as feasible using organs from deceased donors. However, both interpretations remain speculative. In contrast to previous research favouring DUTx over LUTx (Kisu et al., 2016; Hariton et al., 2018), our findings indicate a relative preference for LUTx (71.2%) over DUTx (65.2%); however, the mean differences were not statistically significant.

Taken together, these results indicate that increasing specificity reduces public support for NCG types relative to the abstract level. Detail is important, and qualitative research may better elucidate what drives attitudes and how these intersect with legal distinctions.

Demographics

As many commentators note, modern reproductive practices increasingly involve multiple actors and raise complex public, legal, and ethical questions, with regulatory approaches varying widely across jurisdictions and influenced by cultural and religious values (for example, Deonandan, 2020; Klotz, 2026; Rodríguez-Jaume et al., 2021). In this context, attitudes toward NCG types are not formed in isolation but are shaped by broader ideological and normative frameworks within and across national boundaries. This is reflected in research showing that religious values associated with traditional family models and related political orientations can negatively influence acceptance of reproductive technologies (for example, Aurrekoetxea-Casaus and Ronda, 2024).

Consequently, it is not surprising that religion (for all surrogacy forms) and political orientation (for all UTx forms) emerged as the most consistent predictors in our study. This finding aligns with evidence from Italy (Panerati et al., 2026), Poland (Lutkiewicz et al., 2023; 2026), Spain (Rodríguez-Jaume et al., 2024), and the UK (Baron et al., 2024), as well as broader cross-national patterns (Yıldız et al., 2023), reinforcing the argument that attitudes toward NCG forms are embedded within wider socio-cultural and ideological frameworks (Klotz, 2026). Given, for example, the Pope's condemnation of surrogacy (Hansen, 2024), the influence of religion on attitudes towards the practice may be anticipated. Religious emphases on lineage and procreation within marriage, which may be particularly salient where third parties are involved (Muaygil,

2017; Farid and Tasnim, 2023), may be the cause of this restrictive view. Again, such speculation needs to be interrogated further to understand where knowledge of NCGs derives.

However, it is notable that religion had no significant effect on attitudes towards UTx and AP, and that political beliefs did not significantly affect attitudes towards surrogacy or AP ratings. One explanation could be that binary coding, while analytically convenient, remains a coarse indicator for capturing variation within groups, as highlighted in more focused studies (for example, Deonandan, 2020; Yıldız et al., 2023), although it still provides a useful starting point for population-level analyses (see also Lutkiewicz, 2023; 2026).

Age also appeared to influence attitudes, with younger respondents expressing greater support for newer technologies (UTx, LUTx, AP). This pattern aligns with findings that younger cohorts are more optimistic about AP and that older respondents and those with prior parenting experience report greater concerns (Viviani, 2025). One possible explanation is that younger individuals, having grown up with a wider range of reproductive options, may be more open to novel or emerging technologies. In contrast, older participants were more positive toward TS, which may reflect its perceived alignment with more 'natural' or traditional forms of reproduction, as the surrogate is both the genetic and gestational parent. However, further qualitative research is needed to understand the rationale for the perspectives of different age groups. The inconsistent role of age across NCG forms reflects broader patterns in the literature, where findings vary across contexts, ARTs, and NCG forms (for example, Bitou et al., 2026; Farkas et al., 2025; Nakazawa et al., 2019; Esmailivand et al., 2025; Lutkiewicz et al., 2023, 2026). While some studies report similar age-related patterns, evidence overall remains mixed, suggesting that these associations are context-dependent rather than stable across settings.

Several socio-demographic variables showed limited or inconsistent associations with attitudes, including gender, ethnicity, relationship status, and prior pregnancy experience. This pattern is consistent with prior research, which frequently reports weak, non-significant, or context-dependent effects for these variables (for example, Bitou et al., 2026; Constantinidis and Cook, 2012; Esmailivand et al., 2025; Farkas et al., 2025; Lutkiewicz et al., 2023, 2026; Rodríguez-Jaume et al., 2024; Suzuki et al., 2006; Yıldız et al., 2023). Where associations do emerge, they

tend to be sensitive to contextual, cultural, and measurement-related factors. For example, sexual orientation was not a significant predictor for any NCG form in our study, although it has been found to be a statistically significant predictor in more religious contexts such as Italy (Panerati et al., 2026), Spain (Rodríguez-Jaume et al., 2024), and Poland (Lutkiewicz et al., 2026). Together, these findings suggest that demographic characteristics may help explain variation in attitudes, but their effects may be neither uniform nor sufficient on their own.

Overall, our findings suggest that attitudes towards NCG forms may be influenced by other extraneous considerations, which warrants further investigation. These findings also resonate with research on reproductive decision-making more broadly, which shows that attitudes toward pregnancy-related choices are shaped not only by demographic characteristics but also by ethical and biomedical considerations, perceived risks and costs, social norms, and the broader institutional and cultural contexts in which such decisions are made (for example, Azhar et al., 2015; Bracewell-Milnes et al., 2021; Chliaoutakis, 2002; Lasker and Murray, 2001; Murali, 2025; Petitfils et al., 2017; Purewal and van den Akker, 2006). The findings also align with Smietana et al.'s (2021) argument that ethical evaluations of reproductive practices are embedded within locally situated 'repro-regional moral frameworks', and that moral and regulatory positions may therefore vary across social and geographical contexts, highlighting the importance of considering such contextual differences in international policy and regulatory development.

Implications for future research, policy and regulation

It is important that regulation and policy align with public support. There is a need to reconsider how public opinion and regulation interact in emerging forms of NCG. Although this study suggests that knowledge and demographic factors can predict attitudes, relationship patterns and association strengths vary across NCG forms and variants, suggesting that other factors also influence public attitudes. For example, regulatory frameworks may themselves shape public views by signalling legitimacy, necessity, and acceptability. Policymakers should therefore engage closely with the evolving evidence base and draw on diverse methodological approaches to better understand public perspectives. In doing so, they must address key issues relating to human rights, reproductive autonomy, and cross-border legal variation across both established (for example, surrogacy) and emerging areas (for example, AP). Rather than instrumentalising knowledge, practitioners and stakeholders should

focus on providing nuanced, context-sensitive information that enables informed, rather than polarised, decision-making. Understanding where the public sources information about NCGs, and how different framings shape attitudes across jurisdictions, is a crucial next step for research.

Whilst knowledge alone does not determine public attitudes, the *type* and *amount* of information provided clearly have influence. As technologies such as UTx and AP move further into the public domain, it will be essential that information is accessible, responsive to ethical concerns, perceived risks, and broader social narratives alongside factual understanding. Further research is therefore needed to identify which aspects of information most strongly shape attitudes and how communication strategies can be tailored to meet public need.

Limitations

While the cross-sectional design provides a useful snapshot across NCG forms and variants within a single study, it does not capture how attitudes may evolve over time as technologies develop. Reliance on self-reported subjective knowledge is also a limitation, as participants may overestimate or underestimate their understanding of NCGs. In addition, the fact that some respondents may have been encountering certain technologies for the first time may have influenced their immediate responses. Furthermore, a large number of statistical tests introduces a potential risk of Type I error. Moreover, binary coding of demographic variables reduces nuance and masks within-group variation. Finally, the use of quota-sampled panel data and associated self-selection may limit generalisability.

Conclusion

This study enabled the collation and comparison of public attitudes towards NCG forms and types. Public support for different types of NCGs in the UK exhibits a consistent pattern of higher support for surrogacy and UTx than for AP (surrogacy $\approx$ UTx > AP) but declines when respondents receive more detailed information. Subjective knowledge is low and only weakly predictive of attitudes (positively for UTx (unspecified), LUTx and AP), while age (across most forms of NCG), religiosity (for surrogacy) and political orientation (for UTx) emerged as the most consistent demographic predictors. Other demographic characteristics showed less consistent and more context-dependent effects.

Legal frameworks and cultural narratives may be key determinants of attitudes, warranting further research into these broader influences. Regardless of the factors that influence attitudes, it is essential to increase public knowledge to enable meaningful public engagement with the current and future regulation of all forms of NCGs. Ultimately, it is imperative that societal views be considered as technologies develop and regulations are shaped, taking account of diverse and competing perspectives across both domestic and international contexts.

Funding

This work was supported by an internal research grant [grant number 2024-25-172-2] from the University of Gloucestershire, which had no involvement in the study design; in the collection, analysis and interpretation of data; in the writing of the report; and in the decision to submit the article for publication.

Declaration of generative AI and AI-assisted technologies in the manuscript preparation process

During the preparation of this work, the authors used Grammarly (Grammarly, Inc) and Microsoft Copilot (Microsoft) to improve language and readability. After using these tools, the authors reviewed and edited the content as needed and take full responsibility for the content of the published article.

References

Adkins, V. 2025. Partial ectogestation and threats to the fetus: How healthcare professionals' caution may reinforce the medicalization of pregnancy and childbirth. *Journal of Law and the Biosciences*. 12(2), 1-26. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jlb/lsaf023>.

- Aurrekoetxea-Casaus, M., Ronda, L. 2024. The nexus of fertility and politics: Exploring the influence of social tolerance, religiosity, and political conservatism on the acceptance of assisted reproduction in Spain. *Human Reproduction*. 39(9), 2043-2052. <https://doi.org/10.1093/humrep/deae169>.
- Azhar, E., Seifer, D. B., Melzer, K., Ahmed, A., Weedon, J., Minkoff, H. 2015. Knowledge of ovarian reserve and reproductive choices. *Journal of Assisted Reproduction and Genetics*. 32(3), 409-415. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10815-014-0415-9>.
- Baron, T., Svingen, E., Leyva, R. 2024. Surrogacy and adoption: An empirical investigation of public moral attitudes. *Journal of Bioethical Inquiry*. 21(4), 671-681. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11673-024-10343-1>.
- Bitou, A., Kouroutzis, I., Tzenetidis, V., Sarafis, P., Malliarou, M. 2026. Attitudes and perceptions of surrogacy in Greece. *Adv Exp Med Biol*, 1490, 15-23. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-032-03402-1_3.
- Bracewell-Milnes, T., Holland, J. C., Jones, B. P., Saso, S., Almeida, P., MacLaran, K., Norman-Taylor, J., Nikolaou, D., Shah, N. M., Johnson, M., Thum, M. Y. 2021. Exploring the knowledge and attitudes of women of reproductive age from the general public towards egg donation and egg sharing: A UK-based study. *Human Reproduction*. 36(8), 2189-2201. <https://doi.org/10.1093/humrep/deab157>.
- Brucks, M. 1985. The effects of product class knowledge on information search behavior. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 12(1), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1086/209031>.
- Bulletti, F. M., Sciorio, R., Palagiano, A., Guido, M., Bulletti, C. 2023. Transmission of human life with a gestational carrier. *Biomedical Journal of Scientific & Technical Research*, 52(2), 43569-43589. <https://doi.org/10.26717/BJSTR.2023.52.008227>.
- Chliaoutakis, J. E., Koukouli, S., Papadakaki, M. 2002. Using attitudinal indicators to explain the public's intention to have recourse to gamete donation and surrogacy. *Human Reproduction* 17(11), 2995-3002. <https://doi.org/10.1093/humrep/17.11.2995>.
- Clark, D. 2025. Population of the UK 1937-2024, by gender. Statista. Last Modified 28 Nov 2025. Accessed 27 May 2026. <https://www.statista.com/statistics/281240/population-of-the-united-kingdom-uk-by-gender/#statisticContainer>.
- Cohen, J. 1988. *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*, second ed. Hillsdale, NJ, United States.
- Cohen, J. 1992. A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*. 112(1), 155-159. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.112.1.155>.

- Constantinidis, D., Cook, R. 2012. Australian perspectives on surrogacy: The influence of cognitions, psychological and demographic characteristics. *Human Reproduction*. 27(4), 1080-1087. <https://doi.org/10.1093/humrep/der470>.
- Copp, T., van Nieuwenhoven, T., McCaffery, K. J., Hammarberg, K., Cvejic, E., Doust, J., Lensen, S., Peate, M., Augustine, L., van der Mee, F., Mol, B. W., Lieberman, D., Jansen, J. 2024. Women's interest, knowledge, and attitudes relating to anti-Mullerian hormone testing: A randomized controlled trial. *Human Reproduction*. 39(9), 2010-2020. <https://doi.org/10.1093/humrep/deae147>.
- Delacre, M., Leys, C., Mora, Y. L., Lakens, D. 2019. Taking parametric assumptions seriously: Arguments for the use of Welch's F-test instead of the classical F-test in one-way ANOVA. *International Review of Social Psychology*. 32(1), 13. <https://doi.org/10.5334/irsp.198>.
- Deonandan, R. 2020. Thoughts on the ethics of gestational surrogacy: Perspectives from religions, Western liberalism, and comparisons with adoption. *Journal of Assisted Reproduction and Genetics*. 37(2), 269-279. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10815-019-01647-y>.
- Dunning, D., Johnson, K., Ehrlinger, J., Kruger, J. 2003. Why people fail to recognize their own incompetence. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 12(3), 83-87. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8721.01235>.
- Egan, K., Summers, E., Limbers, C. 2022. Perceptions of child vulnerability in first-time mothers who conceived using assisted reproductive technology. *Journal of Reproductive and Infant Psychology*. 40(5), 489-499. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02646838.2021.1896689>.
- Esmailvand, M., Haseli, A., Karampour, A., Khatony, A., Rezaeian, S., Naghibzadeh, A., Mohammadi, M. M. 2025. A psychological analysis of Iranian infertile couples' attitudes toward gestational surrogacy: A cross-sectional study. *Health Science Reports*. 8(2), e70450. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hsr2.70450>.
- Farid, M. S., Tasnim, S. 2023. Assisted reproductive technologies: Comparing Abrahamic monotheistic religions. *Asian Bioethics Review*. 15(1), 53-67. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41649-022-00224-3>.
- Farkas, B., Papp, K. S., Kolumban, S., Kovacs, K., Bodis, J., Fazekas, G. 2025. Survey on the public opinion and attitudes toward uterus transplantation in Hungary. *Clinical Transplantation*. 39(11), e70356. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ctr.70356>.

- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Buchner, A., Lang, A.-G. 2009. Statistical power analyses using G*Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses. *Behavior Research Methods*, 41(4), 1149-1160. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BRM.41.4.1149>
- Flynn, L. R., Goldsmith R. E. 1999. A short, reliable measure of subjective knowledge. *Journal of Business Research*. 46(1), 57-66. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963\(98\)00057-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963(98)00057-5).
- Franklin, S., Jackson, E. 2024. *The 14 Day rule and human embryo research: A sociology of biological translation*. Routledge.
- Games, P. A., Howell, J. F. 1976. Pairwise multiple comparison procedures with unequal n's and/or variances: A Monte Carlo study. *Journal of Educational Statistics*. 1(2), 113-125. <https://doi.org/10.3102/10769986001002113>.
- Hammond-Browning, N. 2015. Ethics, embryos, and evidence: A look back at Warnock. *Medical Law Review*. 23(4), 588-619. <https://doi.org/10.1093/medlaw/fwv028>.
- Hansen, D. T. 2024. Pope Francis called surrogacy 'deplorable' – but the reasons why women and parents choose surrogacy are complex and defy simple labels. *The Conversation*. Last Modified 10 January 2024. Accessed 27 May 2026. <https://theconversation.com/pope-francis-called-surrogacy-deplorable-but-the-reasons-why-women-and-parents-choose-surrogacy-are-complex-and-defy-simple-labels-220761>.
- Hariton, E., Bortoletto, P., Goldman, R. H., Farland, L. V., Ginsburg, E. S., Gargiulo, A. R. 2018. A survey of public opinion in the United States regarding uterine transplantation. *Journal of Minimally Invasive Gynaecology*. 25(6), 980-985. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmig.2018.03.001>.
- Horsey, K. 2024. The future of surrogacy: a review of current global trends and national landscapes. *Reproductive BioMedicine Online*. 48(5), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rbmo.2023.103764>.
- Horsey, K. 2025. *The UN Special Rapporteur's Report: Biased from the outset*. Progress Educational Trust. Last Modified 15 September 2025. Accessed 27 May 2026. <https://www.progress.org.uk/the-un-special-rapporteurs-report-on-surrogacy-biased-from-the-outset/>
- Hunter, P. 2024. Exogestation for treating premature births and congenital diseases. *EMBO Rep*. 25, 17-20. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s44319-023-00022-4>.

- Jones, B. P., Rajamanoharan, A., Williams, N. J., Vali, S., Saso, S., Mantrali, I., Jalmbrant, M., Thum, M. Y., Diaz-Garcia, C., Ghaem-Maghami, S., Wilkinson, S., Quiroga, I., Friend, P., Yazbek, J., Smith, J. R. 2021. Uterine transplantation using living donation: A cross-sectional study assessing perceptions, acceptability, and suitability. *Transplantation Direct*. 7(3), e673. <https://doi.org/10.1097/TXD.0000000000001124>.
- Jordan, W. 2014. British public: legalise paid surrogacy. *Yougov.com*. Accessed 27 May 2026. <https://yougov.com/en-gb/articles/10059-british-public-legalise-commercial-surrogacies>
- Kisu, I., Banno, K., Soeda, E., Kurihara, Y., Okushima, M., Yamaguchi, A., Nakagawa, E., Umene, K., Aoki, D. 2016. Survey of attitudes towards uterus transplantation among Japanese women of reproductive age: A cross-sectional study. *PloS one*. 11(5), e0156179. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0156179>.
- Klotz, F. 2026. The science of surrogacy, thrust into the spotlight. *UNDARK*. Last modified 02 May 2026. Accessed 27 May 2026. <https://undark.org/2026/02/05/science-of-surrogacy>.
- Krendel, A., Ryder, M. 2025. Role of science fiction in conceptualising the reproductive future: A linguistic and literary perspective. *Medical Humanities*. 51(3), 306-315. <https://doi.org/10.1136/medhum-2024-013207>.
- Lasker, J. N., Murray, D. E. 2001. Attitudes towards technologies for conception: A 15-year follow-up. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*. 31(10), 2165-2183. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2001.tb00169.x>.
- Law Commission of England and Wales and Scottish Law Commission. 2023. Building families through surrogacy: A new law (Final report). <https://cdn.websitebuilder.service.justice.gov.uk/uploads/sites/54/2025/12/2.-Surrogacy-full-report.pdf>
- Lewis-Beck, M. S., Bryman, A., Liao, T. F. 2004. Carryover effects, in: M. S. Lewis-Beck, A. Bryman and T. F. Liao (Eds.), *The SAGE encyclopedia of social science research methods* (Vol. 3). Sage, pp. 89-90.
- Lutkiewicz, K., Bieleninik, Ł., Jurek, P., Bidzan, M. 2023. Development and validation of the attitude towards surrogacy scale in a Polish sample. *BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth*, 23(1), 413. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12884-023-05751-x>.

- Lutkiewicz, K., Bieleninik, Ł., Jurek, P., Bidzan, M. 2026. Attitudes towards surrogacy in the context of socio-demographic determinants: A cross-sectional study. *Journal of Reproductive and Infant Psychology*, 44(4), 1116-1131. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02646838.2025.2513662>.
- Martínez-López, J., Munuera-Gómez, P. 2024. Surrogacy in the United States: Analysis of sociodemographic profiles and motivations of surrogates. *Reproductive Biomedicine Online*. 49(4), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rbmo.2024.104302>.
- Miao, Y. 2026. Intersecting identities: Sociodemographic heterogeneity in right-wing climate attitudes in the UK. *Environmental Sociology*. 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23251042.2026.2648028>.
- Minai, J., Suzuki, K., Takeda, Y., Hoshi, K., Yamagata, Z. 2007. There are gender differences in attitudes towards surrogacy when information on this technique is provided. *European Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology and Reproductive Biology*. 132(2), 193-199. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejogrb.2006.08.016>.
- Muaygil R. A. 2017. Reexamining the prohibition of gestational surrogacy in Sunni Islam. *Developing World Bioethics*. 17(2), 112-120. <https://doi.org/10.1111/dewb.12133>.
- Mullock, A., Romanis, E. C., Begović, D. 2021. Surrogacy and uterus transplantation using live donors: Examining the options from the perspective of 'womb-givers'. *Bioethics*. 35(8), 820-828. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bioe.12921>.
- Murali, S., Suh, D., Sriram, S., Kirkland, A., Dupree, J. M. 2025. Willingness to pay for in vitro fertilization: Results from a national sample of reproductive-aged adults in the US. *Journal of Assisted Reproduction and Genetics*. 42(7), 2293-2303. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10815-025-03539-w>.
- Nakazawa, A., Hirata, T., Arakawa, T., Nagashima, N., Fukuda, S., Neriishi, K., Harada, M., Hirota, Y., Koga, K., Wada-Hiraike, O., Koizumi, Y., Fujii, T., Irahara, M., Osuga, Y. 2019. A survey of public attitudes towards uterus transplantation, surrogacy, and adoption in Japan. *PLOS ONE*. 14(10), e0223571. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0223571>.

O'Donovan, L., Williams, N. J., Wilkinson, S. 2019. Ethical and policy issues raised by uterus transplants. *British Medical Bulletin*. 131(1), 19-28. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bmb/ldz022>.

[dataset] Office for National Statistics. 2025a. Census-based statistics UK: 2021. Last modified 27 June 2025. Accessed 27 May 2026. <https://www.ons.gov.uk/file?uri=/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationestimates/datasets/censusbasedstatisticsuk2021/censusbasedstatisticsuk2021/censusbasedstatisticsuk2021.xlsx>

[dataset] Office for National Statistics. 2025b. Population estimates by marital status and living arrangements, England and Wales. Last modified 15 October 2025. Accessed 27 May 2026. <https://www.ons.gov.uk/file?uri=/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationestimates/datasets/populationestimatesbymaritalstatusandlivingarrangements/current/maritalstatuslivingarrangements2002to2024englandandwales.xlsx>

[dataset] Office for National Statistics. 2025c. Population estimates for the UK, England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland: mid-2024. Last modified 26 September 2025. Accessed 27 May 2026. <https://www.ons.gov.uk/visualisations/dvc3349/fig05/datadownload.xlsx?>

Office for National Statistics. 2025d. Sexual orientation, UK: 2024. 09 December 2025. Accessed 27 May 2026. <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/culturalidentity/sexuality/bulletins/sexualidentityuk/2024>

Oh, K., Abraham, L. 2016. Effect of knowledge on decision making in the context of organic cotton clothing. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*. 40(1), 66-74. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijcs.12214>.

Panerati, S., Cruciani, G., Carone, N., Salvati, M. 2026. The attitudes towards surrogacy scale: Preliminary validation and psychometric properties in the Italian context. *Journal of Reproductive and Infant Psychology*. 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02646838.2026.2649904>.

Partridge, E. A., Davey, M. G., Hornick, M. A., McGovern, P. E., Mejaddam, A. Y., Vrecenak, J. D., Mesas-Burgos, C., Olive, A., Caskey, R. C., Weiland, T. R., Han, J., Schupper, A. J., Connelly, J. T., Dysart, K. C., Rychik, J., Hedrick, H. L., Peranteau, W. H., Flake, A. W. 2017. An

- extra-uterine system to physiologically support the extreme premature lamb, *Nature Communications*. 8(1), 15112
<https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms15112>.
- Patton, M. Q. 2015. *Qualitative research and evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice*, fourth ed. Thousand Oaks, CA, United States.
- Petitfils, C., Munoz Sastre, M. T., Sorum, P. C., Mullet, E. 2017. Mapping people's views regarding the acceptability of surrogate motherhood. *Journal of Reproductive and Infant Psychology*, 35(1), 65-76. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02646838.2016.1222358>.
- Pittman, J., Gerstl, B., Cavazzoni, E., Rogers, N. M., Lotz, M., Deans, R. 2025. Deceased donor uterus transplantation: Religious perceptions. *Frontiers in Transplantation*. 4, 1536754. <https://doi.org/10.3389/frtra.2025.1536754>.
- Poote, A. E., van den Akker, O. B. A. 2009. British women's attitudes to surrogacy. *Human Reproduction*. 24(1), 139-145.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/humrep/den338>.
- Purewal, S., van den Akker, O. B. A. 2006. British women's attitudes towards oocyte donation: Ethnic differences and altruism. *Patient Education and Counseling*. 64(1), 43-49. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2005.11.007>.
- Rius, M., Camacho, M., Tomás, N., Díaz-Feijoo, B., Castelo-Branco, C., Borrás, A., Tort, J., Carmona, F. 2025. Attitudes towards uterus transplantation. An option for motherhood? *Acta Obstetrica et Gynecologica Scandinavica*. 104(3), 494-501.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/aogs.14849>.
- Rodríguez-Jaume, M. J., González-Río, M. J., Jareño-Ruiz, D. 2021. Cross-border reproductive care: Opinions and attitudes of society towards surrogate pregnancy. *Current Sociology*, 69(2), 266-285. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011392120964892>.
- Rodríguez-Jaume, M. J., González-Río, M. J., Pérez, P. C. 2024. Spanish society's opinion on surrogacy. *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas*, 182, 119-138. <https://doi.org/10.5477/cis/reis.182.119>.
- Romanis, E. C. 2022. Assisted gestative technologies. *Journal of Medical Ethics*. 48(7), 439-446. <https://doi.org/10.1136/medethics-2021-107769>.
- Romanis, E. C. 2023. Equality-enhancing potential of novel forms of assisted gestation: Perspectives of reproductive rights advocates. *Bioethics*, 37(7), 637-646. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bioe.13187>

- Romanis, E. C. 2024. *Biotechnology, Gestation, and the Law*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/9780191986574.001.0001>.
- Romanis, E. C., Adkins, V. 2024. Artificial placentas, pregnancy loss and loss-sensitive care. *Journal of Medical Ethics*. 50(5), 299-307. <https://doi.org/10.1136/jme-2023-109412>.
- Smietana, M., Rudrappa, S., Weis, C. 2021. Moral frameworks of commercial surrogacy within the US, India and Russia. *Sexual and Reproductive Health Matters*, 29(1), 377-393. <https://doi.org/10.1080/26410397.2021.1878674>.
- Slovic, P., Finucane, M., Peters, E., MacGregor, D. G. 2002. The affect heuristic, in: T. Gilovich, D. Griffin and D. Kahneman (Eds.), *Heuristics and biases: The psychology of intuitive judgment*. Cambridge University Press. pp. 397-420
- Smajdor, A. 2007. The Moral Imperative for Ectogenesis. *Cambridge Quarterly of Healthcare Ethics*. 16(3), 336–345. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963180107070405>.
- Shih, Y., Fang, K. 2004. The use of a decomposed theory of planned behavior to study Internet banking in Taiwan. *Internet Research*. 14(3), 213-223. <https://doi.org/10.1108/10662240410542643>.
- Surrogacy Arrangements Act 1985.
- Suzuki, K., Hoshi, K., Minai, J., Yanaihara, T., Takeda, Y., Yamagata, Z. 2006. Analysis of national representative opinion surveys concerning gestational surrogacy in Japan. *European Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology and Reproductive Biology*, 126(1), 39-47. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejogrb.2005.07.030>.
- Tu, L. 2025. This machine could keep a baby alive outside the womb. How will the world decide to use it?. *The Guardian*. Last Modified 5 November 2025. Accessed 27 May 2026. <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2025/nov/05/baby-alive-outside-womb>.
- United Nations Human Rights Council. 2025. Report of the Special Rapporteur on violence against women and girls, its causes and consequences: The different manifestations of violence against women and girls in the context of surrogacy (Reem Alsalem, Special Rapporteur). UN Doc. A/80/158.
- Umashankar, N., Ward, M. K., Dahl, D. W. 2017. The benefit of becoming friends: Complaining after service failures leads customers with strong ties to increase loyalty. *Journal of Marketing*. 81(6), 79-98. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jm.16.0125>.

- Vali, S., Jones, B. P., Sheikh, S., Saso, S., Quiroga, I., Smith, J. R. 2023. Attitudes, knowledge, and perceptions among women towards uterus transplantation and donation in the United Kingdom. *Frontiers in Medicine*. 10, 1223228. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmed.2023.1223228>.
- Verweij, E. J., De Proost, L., van Laar, J. O. E. H., Frank, L., Obermann-Borstn, S. A., Vermeulen, M. J., van Baalen, S., van der Hout-van der Jagt, M. B., Kingma, E. 2021. Ethical development of artificial amniotic sac and placenta technology: A roadmap. *Frontiers in Pediatrics*. 9, 793308. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fped.2021.793308>.
- Viviani, D. 2025. Ectogenesis. Beyond traditional parenthood, within the future scenarios of technology. *Italian Sociological Review*. 15(3), 579-599. <https://doi.org/10.13136/isr.v15i3.1000>.
- Vörös, Z., Szabó, Z., Kehl, D., Kovács, O. B., Papp, T., Schepp, Z. 2021. The forms of financial literacy overconfidence and their role in financial well-being. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 45(6), 1292-1308. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijcs.12734>.
- Walsh, F. 2025. 'A little miracle': First baby born in UK to woman with transplanted womb. BBC. Last Modified 7 April 2025. Accessed 27 May 2026. <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/articles/c78jd517z87o>.
- Welch, B. L. 1951. On the comparison of several mean values: An alternative approach. *Biometrika*. 38(3-4), 330-336. <https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/38.3-4.330>.
- Wennberg, A. L., Rodriguez-Wallberg, K. A., Milsom, I., Brännström, M. 2016. Attitudes towards new assisted reproductive technologies in Sweden: A survey in women 30-39 years of age. *Acta Obstetrica et Gynecologica Scandinavica*. 95(1), 38-44. <https://doi.org/10.1111/aogs.12781>.
- Werner, K. M., Mercurio, M. R. 2022. Ethical considerations in the use of artificial womb/placenta technology. *Seminars in Perinatology*. 46(3), 151521. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.semperi.2021.151521>.
- Williams, N. 2016. Should deceased donation be morally preferred in uterine transplantation trials? *Bioethics*. 30(6), 415-424. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bioe.12247>.

- Womb Transplant UK. 2025. First baby born in the UK to a woman with a transplanted womb. Womb Transplant UK. Last Modified 7 April 2025. Accessed 27 May 2026. <https://wombtransplantuk.org/first-baby-born-in-the-uk-to-a-woman-with-a-transplanted-womb>.
- Writing Group on behalf of the ESHRE Ethics Committee, Shenfield, F., Tarlatzis, B., Baccino, G., Bounartzi, T., Frith, L., Pennings, G., Provoost, V., Vermeulen, N. and Mertes, H. 2025. Ethical considerations on surrogacy. *Human Reproduction*. 40(3), 420-425. <https://doi.org/10.1093/humrep/deaf006>.
- Yıldız, M., Felix, E. O., Ademiju, O., Noibi, T. O., Gomes, R. F., Tanimowo, A., Tayyeb, M., Khadka, R. B., Rhino, A., Yıldız, R., Ramazanzadegan, K., Yildirim, M. S., Solmaz, E., Haylı, Ç. M. Şengan, A. 2023. Attitudes of different religions toward surrogacy: Analysis of 11 countries' situation using machine learning approach and artificial neural networks. *Journal of Religion and Health*, 62(5), 3230-3251. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10943-023-01782-y>.
- YouGov. n.d. What political alignment is the British public? Accessed 09 May 2026. <https://yougov.com/en-gb/trackers/what-political-alignment-is-the-british-public?>

Table 1: Measurement items and reliabilities

Construct	Items	Response scale	Reliabilities (α)	Adapted from
Attitudes	X is an acceptable idea.	1 = Strongly disagree; 5 = Strongly agree	.93-.96	Shih and Fang (2004)
	Using X is a good idea.			
	X should be allowed.			
Subjective knowledge	I know pretty much about X.		.84-.89	Flynn and Goldsmith (1999)

I do not feel very knowledgeable about X. (R)	1 = Strongly disagree;
Among my circle of friends, I'm one of the "experts" on X.	7 = Strongly agree
Compared to most other people, I know less about X. (R)	
When it comes to X, I really don't know a lot. (R)	

Note(s). α = Cronbach's alpha. X = the attitudinal object (namely, the specific non-conventional gestation form). R = reverse coded.

Table 2: NCG definitions provided in the online survey

NCG form or variant	Working definition
Surrogacy	Surrogacy is an arrangement in which a woman (the surrogate) carries and delivers a baby for someone else.
Traditional surrogacy (TS)	Surrogacy can be done through 'traditional' surrogacy. This is when the surrogate's own egg is used. Therefore, the surrogate is genetically related to the child.
Gestational surrogacy (GS)	Surrogacy can also be done through 'gestational' surrogacy. This is where the surrogate's own egg is not used. Therefore, the surrogate has no genetic link to the child.
Uterus transplantation (UTx)	A uterus transplant is a surgical procedure in which a healthy uterus is transplanted into an individual who does not have a functioning uterus. This can help them carry a pregnancy.
Living uterus transplantation (LUTx)	Uterus transplants can be done by using a living donor. This is where the donor of the uterus is a living person.
Deceased uterus transplantation (DUTx)	Uterus transplants can be done by using a deceased donor. This is where the donor is deceased before the transplant takes place.
Artificial placenta (AP)	Artificial placentas are being developed to mimic the human placenta. Imagine a future where artificial placentas could support the development of an embryo or foetus entirely outside of the human body.

Table 3: Socio-demographic characteristics of the participants

Variable	Total		Group 1 (surrogacy)		Group 2 (UTx)		Group 3 (AP)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Age, years (Mean=43.6 years, SD=16.88 years)	1,646		548		549		549	
18 to 24	209	13%	74	14%	89	16%	96	8%
25 to 44	723	44%	242	44%	261	48%	220	40%
45 to 64	475	29%	159	29%	135	25%	101	33%
65 to 74	169	10%	54	10%	40	7%	75	14%
≥75	70	4%	19	3%	24	4%	27	5%
Gender	1,646		548		549		549	
Female or identify female	835	51%	282	51%	275	50%	278	51%
Male or identify male	811	49%	266	49%	274	50%	271	49%
Previous pregnancies	835		282		275		278	
Yes (includes live birth, stillbirth, ectopic, miscarriage, or induced abortion)	576	69%	181	64%	180	65%	215	77%
No	251	30%	98	35%	90	33%	63	23%
Prefer not to say	8	1%	3	1%	5	2%	0	0%
Relationship status	1,646		548		549		549	
Single	470	29%	182	33%	169	31%	119	22%
Married, civil-partnered or cohabiting	1,033	63%	321	59%	343	62%	369	67%
Divorced, widowed or separated	140	9%	43	8%	37	7%	60	11%
Prefer not to say	3	0%	2	0%	0	0%	1	0%
Sexual orientation	1,646		548		549		549	
Heterosexual or straight	1,512	92%	505	92%	494	90%	513	93%
Gay or lesbian	42	3%	17	3%	13	2%	12	2%
Bisexual	68	4%	20	4%	30	5%	18	3%
Other	14	1%	2	0%	8	1%	4	1%
Prefer not to say	10	1%	4	1%	4	1%	2	0%
Ethnicity	1,646		548		549		549	
Asian or Asian British	103	6%	45	8%	31	6%	27	5%
Black, African, Black British or Caribbean	210	13%	65	12%	70	13%	75	14%
Mixed or multiple ethnic groups	34	2%	11	2%	14	3%	9	2%
White	1,287	78%	426	78%	428	78%	433	79%
Another ethnic group (for example, Arab)	7	0%	1	0%	4	1%	2	0%
Prefer not to say	5	0%	0	0%	2	0%	3	1%
Religion	1,646		548		549		549	
No religion	608	37%	222	41%	235	43%	151	28%
Christian	879	53%	266	49%	262	48%	351	64%
Any other religion (for example, Muslim)	130	8%	55	10%	40	7%	35	6%
Prefer not to say	29	2%	5	1%	12	2%	12	2%
Political orientation	1,646		548		549		549	
Left-wing/liberal	338	21%	100	18%	121	22%	117	21%
Moderate/centrist	464	28%	143	26%	147	27%	174	32%
Right-wing/conservative	412	25%	116	21%	126	23%	170	31%
No political view	377	23%	161	29%	141	26%	75	14%
Prefer not to say	55	3%	28	5%	14	3%	13	2%

Note(s): AP = Artificial placenta. SD = Standard deviation. UTx = Uterus transplants.

Table 4: Pearson's correlations between attitudes towards NCG forms/variants and subjective knowledge, demographic variables and attitudes toward other NCG forms/variants

Variable	Group 1 (N=548)			Group 2 (N=549)			Group 3 (N=549)
	Surrogacy (unspecified type) r [95% CI], p value	TS r [95% CI], p value	GS r [95% CI], p value	UTx (unspecified type) r [95% CI], p value	LUTx r [95% CI], p value	DUTx r [95% CI], p value	AP r [95% CI], p value
Attitudes							
Surrogacy (unspecified type)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TS	.66 [.61, .71], p<0.001	--	--	--	--	--	--
GS	.65 [.60, .70], p<0.001	.47 [.40, .53], p<0.001	--	--	--	--	--
UTx	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
LUTx	--	--	--	.68 [.63, .72], p<0.001	--	--	--
DUTx	--	--	--	.56 [.50, .62], p<0.001	.39 [.32, .46], p<0.001	--	--
AP	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Subjective knowledge towards NCG forms/variants	.05 [-.03, .14], p=0.225	-.01 [-.10, .07], p=0.754	.07 [-.01, .15], p=0.094	.18 [.10, .26], p<0.001	.17 [.09, .25], p<0.001	.08 [-.01, .16], p=0.067	.48 [.42, .54], p<0.001
Demographics ^a							
Age	-.06 [-.14, .03], p=0.179	.11 [.03, .19], p=0.011	-.09 [-.17, -.01], p=0.032	-.16 [-.24, -.07], p<0.001	-.13 [-.21, -.05], p=0.002	.01 [-.08, .09], p=0.843	-.38 [-.45, -.31], p<0.001
Gender	.07 [-.02, .15], p=0.114	-.06 [-.14, .03], p=0.195	.11 [.02, .19], p=0.014	-.04 [-.12, .05], p=0.399	-.10 [-.19, -.02], p=0.015	-.10 [-.18, -.01], p=0.025	-.02 [-.11, .06], p=0.603
Previous pregnancies	.05 [-.03, .13], p=0.243	-.03 [-.11, .06], p=0.529	.04 [-.04, .12], p=0.360	.03 [-.06, .11], p=0.514	-.06 [-.14, .03], p=0.193	-.06 [-.14, .03], p=0.184	-.01 [-.09, .07], p=0.807
Relationship status	.00 [-.08, .09], p=0.951	.00 [-.08, .09], p=0.911	-.01 [-.09, .07], p=0.823	.14 [.05, .22], p=0.001	.09 [.01, .18], p=0.027	.06 [-.02, .15], p=0.134	.07 [-.01, .15], p=0.096

	.10	.06	.07	.01	.04	-.01	.01
Sexual orientation	[.02, .18], p=0.016	[-.02, .15], p=0.143	[-.01, .15], p=0.098	[-.07, .09], p=0.808	[-.05, .12], p=0.368	[-.10, .07], p=0.778	[-.07, .09], p=0.835
Religion	-.19 [-.27, -.10], p<0.001	-.10 [-.19, -.02], p=0.016	-.13 [-.21, -.05], p=0.002	.00 [-.09, .08], p=0.907	-.02 [-.11, .06], p=0.578	-.05 [-.13, .04], p=0.284	.07 [-.01, .16], p=0.082
Political orientation	-.03 [-.12, .05], p=0.431	.07 [-.01, .16], p=0.080	.02 [-.07, .10], p=0.674	.17 [.08, .25], p<0.001	.13 [.05, .21], p=0.002	.12 [.03, .20], p=0.006	.09 [.00, .17], p=0.039
Ethnicity	-.11 [-.19, -.03], p=0.011	-.12 [-.20, -.03], p=0.006	-.06 [-.14, .02], p=0.166	-.03 [-.11, .06], p=0.504	-.01 [-.10, .07], p=0.744	-.03 [-.11, .05], p=0.489	.19 [.10, .26], p<0.001

Note(s). CI = Confidence Interval. TS = Traditional surrogacy. GS = Gestational surrogacy. UTx = Uterus transplants. LUTx = Uterus transplants from living donors. DUTx = Uterus transplants from deceased donors. AP = Artificial placentas. * Dummy variables were computed for Gender (0 = male, 1 = female); Previous pregnancies (0 = no, 1 = yes); Relationship status (0 = not partnered, 1 = partnered (married, civil-partnered, or cohabiting)); Sexual orientation (0 = non-LGBTQ, 1 = LGBTQ); Religion (0 = no religion, 1 = any religion); Political orientation (0 = none, 1 = any political orientation); Ethnicity (0 = non-White, 1 = White).

Table 5: Results of multiple linear regression models examining the relationships of multiple predictors with attitudes towards NCG forms/variants

Predictor	Surrogacy (unspecified type) β (B, [95% CI]), p value	TS β (B, [95% CI]), p value	GS β (B, [95% CI]), p value	UTx (unspecified type) β (B, [95% CI]), p value	LUTx β (B, [95% CI]), p value	DUTx β (B, [95% CI]), p value	AP β (B, [95% CI]), p value
Subjective knowledge towards NCG forms/variants	.07 (.05, [-.01, .12]), p=0.112	.04 (.03, [-.04, .10]), p=0.344	.07 (.05, [-.02, .12]), p=0.143	.11 (.06, [.01, .12]), p=0.018	.13 (.09, [.03, .15]), p=0.005	.08 (.06, [-.01, .12]), p=0.103	.38 (.26, [.20, .52]), p<0.001
Age	-.04 (.00, [-.01, .00]), p=0.451	.11 (.01, [.00, .01]), p=0.031	-.07 (.00, [-.01, .00]), p=0.196	-.20 (-.01, [-.02, .01]), p<0.001	-.14 (-.01, [-.01, .00]), p=0.003	.01 (.00, [-.01, .01]), p=0.906	-.22 (-.01, [-.02, .01]), p<0.001
Gender	.01 (.01, [-.21, .24]), p=0.922	-.04 (-.08, [-.32, .16]), p=0.522	.12 (.22, [-.02, .47]), p=0.069	-.11 (-.20, [-.41, .01]), p=0.060	-.14 (-.27, [-.50, .03]), p=0.028	-.09 (-.18, [-.44, .08]), p=0.175	-.02 (-.04, [-.33, .24]), p=0.764
Previous pregnancies	.04 (.07, [-.17, .31]), p=0.566	.00 (-.01, [-.26, .24]), p=0.938	-.04 (-.08, [-.33, .18]), p=0.557	.12 (.22, [.00, .45]), p=0.054	.05 (.10, [-.16, .35]), p=0.456	.00 (.00, [-.28, .28]), p=0.996	.00 (.01, [-.29, .31]), p=0.948
Relationship status	.03 (.05, [-.11, .22]), p=0.511	-.01 (-.02, [-.20, .15]), p=0.780	.03 (.06, [-.12, .23]), p=0.520	.09 (.17, [.02, .33]), p=0.030	.07 (.15, [-.03, .32]), p=0.103	.04 (.09, [-.10, .28]), p=0.359	.01 (.01, [-.18, .20]), p=0.889
Sexual orientation	.07 (.26, [-.05, .56]), p=0.100	.05 (.18, [-.15, .50]), p=0.288	.03 (.13, [-.20, .45]), p=0.451	.03 (.08, [-.17, .33]), p=0.553	.05 (.16, [-.12, .44]), p=0.266	.00 (.00, [-.31, .31]), p=0.994	.02 (.10, [-.24, .44]), p=0.562
Religion	-.15 (-.28, [-.44, .11]), p=0.002	-.10 (-.20, [-.38, .02]), p=0.029	-.10 (-.20, [-.38, .02]), p=0.032	-.02 (-.04, [-.19, .11]), p=0.615	-.05 (-.10, [-.27, .08]), p=0.278	-.07 (-.16, [-.35, .03]), p=0.107	-.05 (-.11, [-.30, .08]), p=0.242
Political orientation	-.02 (-.04, [-.20, .13]), p=0.675	.05 (.09, [-.09, .27]), p=0.311	.15 (.11, [-.07, .29]), p=0.214	.06 (.29, [.13, .45]), p<0.001	.09 (.22, [.03, .40]), p=0.020	.09 (.21, [.01, .41]), p=0.041	.05 (.16, [-.06, .39]), p=0.159
Ethnicity	-.08 (-.17, [-.39, .04]), p=0.113	-.05 (-.13, [-.35, .10]), p=0.275	-.05 (-.13, [-.36, .10]), p=0.274	-.09 (-.20, [-.39, .01]), p=0.038	-.07 (-.16, [-.38, .05]), p=0.131	-.02 (-.06, [-.30, .17]), p=0.603	.00 (-.01, [-.23, .21]), p=0.933
Adjusted R ² (p value)	.04 (p<0.001)	.02 (p=0.015)	.03 (p=0.006)	.08 (p<0.001)	.06 (p<0.001)	.02 (p=0.043)	.26 (p<0.001)

Note(s). N = 1,646. β = Standardised beta coefficients. B = Unstandardised beta coefficients. CI = Confidence Interval for B.

TS = Traditional surrogacy; GS = Gestational surrogacy; UTx = Uterus transplants; LUTx = Uterus transplants from living donors.

DUTx = Uterus transplants from deceased donors. AP = Artificial placenta. Dummy variables were computed for Gender (0 = male, 1 = female); Previous pregnancies (0 = no, 1 = yes); Relationship status (0 = not partnered, 1 = partnered (married, civil-partnered, or cohabiting)); Sexual orientation (0 = non-LGBTQ, 1 = LGBTQ); Religion (0 = no religion, 1 = any religion); Political orientation (0 = none, 1 = any political orientation); Ethnicity (0 = non-White, 1 = White).

Key message

In the United Kingdom, support for non-conventional gestations varies across approaches, with support highest for surrogacy and uterus transplantation and lower for artificial placentas, and declines as greater detail is provided. Knowledge and demographic characteristics shape attitudes, but their effects vary. Further research is needed to identify additional influences.

Vitae

Dr Lottie Park-Morton is a Senior Lecturer in Law at the University of Gloucestershire. She researches in family and medical law, with a particular interest in surrogacy and parenthood. Her PhD, obtained in 2025, is a doctrinal examination of domestic surrogacy laws from a child rights perspective.

Declaration of Interest Statement

The authors have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

