

Expectations and experiences of gamete donors and donor-conceived adults searching for genetic relatives using DNA linking through a voluntary register

O.B.A. van den Akker^{1,*}, M.A. Crawshaw², E.D. Blyth³, and L.J. Frith⁴

¹Department of Psychology, Middlesex University, London NW4 4BT, UK ²Department of Social Policy & Social Work, University of York, York, UK ³School of Human and Health Sciences, University of Huddersfield, Huddersfield, UK ⁴Department of Health Services Research, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK

*Correspondence address. Tel: +44-208-411-6953; E-mail: o.vandenakker@mdx.ac.uk

Submitted on April 12, 2014; resubmitted on September 6, 2014; accepted on October 6, 2014

STUDY QUESTION: What are the experiences of donor-conceived adults and donors who are searching for a genetic link through the use of a DNA-based voluntary register service?

SUMMARY ANSWER: Donor-conceived adults and donors held positive beliefs about their search and although some concerns in relation to finding a genetically linked relative were reported, these were not a barrier to searching.

WHAT IS KNOWN ALREADY: Research with donor-conceived people has consistently identified their interest in learning about—and in some cases making contact with—their donor and other genetic relatives. However, donor-conceived individuals or donors rarely have the opportunity to act on these desires.

STUDY DESIGN, SIZE, AND DURATION: A questionnaire was administered for online completion using Bristol Online Surveys. The survey was live for 3 months and responses were collected anonymously.

PARTICIPANTS/MATERIALS, SETTING, AND METHODS: The survey was completed by 65 donor-conceived adults, 21 sperm donors and 5 oocyte donors who had registered with a DNA-based voluntary contact register in the UK. The questionnaire included socio-demographic questions, questions specifically developed for the purposes of this study and the standardized Aspects of Identity Questionnaire (AIQ).

MAIN RESULTS AND THE ROLE OF CHANCE: Motivations for searching for genetic relatives were varied, with the most common reasons being curiosity and passing on information. Overall, participants who were already linked and those awaiting a link were positive about being linked and valued access to a DNA-based register. Collective identity (reflecting self-defining feelings of continuity and uniqueness), as assessed by the AIQ, was significantly lower for donor-conceived adults when compared with the donor groups ($P < 0.05$), but not significantly different between linked/not linked or length of time since disclosure of donor conception (all P s > 0.05) for donor-conceived adults.

LIMITATIONS, REASONS FOR CAUTION: Participants were members of a UK DNA-based registry which is unique. It was therefore not possible to determine how representative participants were of those who did not register for the service, those in other countries or of those who do not seek information exchange or contact.

WIDER IMPLICATIONS OF THE FINDINGS: This is the first survey exploring the experiences of donor-conceived adults and donors using a DNA-based voluntary register to seek information about and contact with genetic relatives and the first to measure aspects of identity using standardized measures. Findings provide valuable information about patterns of expectations and experiences of searching through DNA linking, identity and of having contact in the context of donor conception that will inform future research, practice and policy development.

STUDY FUNDING/COMPETING INTERESTS: No funding was obtained for this study. The authors have no competing interests to declare except for M.C. who was national adviser to UKDL from 2003–2013.

TRIAL REGISTRATION NUMBER: Not applicable.

Key words: gamete donation / donor searching / UK donor link / identity / donor register

Introduction

UK donor link (UKDL), launched in 2004, was the first register in the world to use DNA as the primary basis for enabling donor-conceived adults, donor-conceived and non-donor-conceived siblings and donors to identify each other voluntarily and, if mutually agreed, to share information and have direct contact (Crawshaw et al., 2013). There is one further DNA-based register service, *Fiom*, in The Netherlands which is also government funded. This study examines the shared and comparative experiences of donor-conceived adults and donors of searching for a genetic link through a DNA register. It also considers how personal, social and collective components of identity (Cheek, 1989) are related to the experiences of being a donor or donor-conceived adult, and (for donor-conceived adults) the role of age at the time of disclosure of donor conception, drawing on a survey of registrants of UKDL.

The ability of gamete and embryo donors, donor-conceived people and others who are genetically connected by virtue of gamete or embryo donation to find out about, and make contact with, each other is a recent development. While there has been some research on both donors' and donor-conceived people's attitudes and views about such information and contact, little is currently known about those who take positive action either through a voluntary contact register or using their own resources. Existing research is limited because it has included only small numbers of participants, has been conducted in few geographical locations, in different time periods, under different disclosure regimes, has focused largely on sperm donation and has examined intentions rather than actual behaviour. Moreover, these studies are restricted to providing merely a snapshot of participants' experiences at a single point in their lives (Van den Broeck et al., 2013).

Background to research on donors and donor-conceived people

The majority of studies with sperm and oocyte donors have indicated donors' desire to learn the outcome of their donation, although fewer have expressed interest in knowing the identity of, or disclosing their identity to, or making contact with, their donor offspring (van den Akker, 2006; Purewal and van den Akker, 2009; Van den Broeck et al., 2013). Findings from these studies are likely to be influenced by the regimes under which donors were recruited (i.e. mostly anonymous) and the unlimited and largely unknown number of offspring who may have been born using the gametes from the same donor.

Two recent online surveys have reported on gamete donors, primarily in the USA, who were recruited as anonymous donors but subsequently took active steps to share information about themselves with their offspring, by registering with the Donor Sibling Registry (Jadva et al., 2011; Daniels et al., 2012). Half (37) of the 63 sperm donors and 11 oocyte donors surveyed by Jadva et al. (2011) wanted identifying

information about their donor offspring and almost one-third (24) reported that they viewed their relationship with their donor offspring as 'special [...], like a good friend', while a comparable number (20) viewed it as a 'genetic relationship only'. Some expressed concerns about the impact of any contact on their own families or those of the offspring. Twenty-two sperm donors (35%) and one oocyte donor had made contact with at least one donor offspring—or with their parents where the offspring were too young for direct contact—and all reported this to be a positive experience. The majority of sperm donors noticing similarities in appearance (21), personal interests (17), personality (16) and behaviour/mannerisms (11). In Daniels et al's (2012) survey of 164 sperm donors, 147 (97%) reported thinking about their offspring and 150 (94%) were agreeable to some form of contact, including in a smaller number of cases (46; 28%) a parent–child relationship if that was desired. Among those who had established contact with offspring (33), reports were positive although some indicated it had prompted challenges within their existing relationships, especially with spouses. Studies in Australia (Kirkman et al., 2014) and the UK (Daniels et al., 2005) of men recruited initially as anonymous sperm donors indicate that they continue to think about potential offspring and some would be interested in or willing to meet them.

Previous research has shown negative outcomes for adjustment in donor-conceived adults told of their donor origins beyond early childhood (Blyth et al., 2012). Findings from research regarding donor-conceived individuals also show that they are often interested in knowing about their donor and any other genetic relatives (especially donor siblings) they may have a result of the donation. Those who do not have the option of identifying their donor generally want more information than they possess or are likely to acquire (Blyth et al., 2012). Few studies have explicitly investigated the experiences of actual exchange of information or communication. Although some negative experiences of donor-conceived individuals' contact—or attempted contact—with donors has been reported (e.g. Turner and Coyle, 2000; Cushing, 2010), most of the limited number of studies where this has been investigated have reported largely positive outcomes (Cushing, 2010; Jadva et al., 2010; Beeson et al., 2011; Daniels et al., 2012). Positive outcomes have also been reported in the few studies that have investigated contact between donor-conceived half-siblings (Kirkman, 2004; Scheib and Ruby, 2008; Jadva et al., 2010; Blyth, 2012a,b). However, unsuccessful efforts to locate donor siblings are accompanied by frustration and disappointment (Cushing, 2010).

A number of studies have highlighted the contribution of support networks in facilitating and providing assistance for searches (Turner and Coyle, 2000; Paul and Berger, 2007; Berger and Paul, 2008; Cushing, 2010; Jadva et al., 2010; Mahlstedt et al., 2010) and for mediating contact with donors and/or other genetic relatives (Scheib et al., 2005; Rodino et al., 2011; Blyth, 2012a,b). For the most part, even when the search had not been successful, such support was reported favourably. Cushing (2010), Jadva et al. (2010) and Beeson et al. (2011) also considered the impact of searching for donors and/or donor siblings

on participants' relationships with their parents. While for the most part, participants' searches appear not to have adversely impacted these relationships, some donor-conceived individuals have reported negative experiences and strained relationships. Two participants in Cushing's (2010) study thought that their mothers 'felt hurt and unloved' because of their daughters' search for 'another parent'. A small number of participants in the study conducted by Beeson *et al.* (2011) reported parents feeling 'angry' and/or 'fearful' about the participant's 'curiosity about the[ir] donor'. Few 'negative' (not further elaborated) responses were reported by participants who searched for their donor and/or donor siblings in Jadva *et al.*'s (2010) study. One father was reported as 'not especially comfortable' and one mother as feeling 'excluded' in Blyth's (2012a,b) study of participants' search for and discovery of donor siblings. In the same study, reported responses of adoptive or donor siblings with whom participants had been raised as children, but who were not themselves donor-conceived, ranged from indifference to feelings of exclusion.

Previous research has conceptualized negative aspects of donor-conceived individuals' identity that result from lack of adequate information about their genetic parenthood and inheritance (Stevens-Botsford, 2000; Turner and Coyle, 2000; Stock, 2002). In research and theory on identity orientations, reference is made to the relative importance of various identity attributes in the construction of self-definitions. Cheek (1989) developed a questionnaire to assess theoretically distinct aspects of personal, collective and social identity orientations (Hogan and Cheek, 1983). According to this theoretical framework, collective identity (reflecting self-defining issues such as pride in being a citizen or belonging to a family) is an identity shared with others who are believed to have some characteristics in common and give the individual 'a place in the social world' (Simon and Klandermans, 2001). This shared position does not require direct contact with others who share category membership (Sedikides and Brewer, 2001). Instead, it is psychological. Collective identity is therefore explicitly connected to a group of people outside the self. Personal identity (reflecting one's emotions and feelings), on the other hand, typically refers to characteristics of the self that one believes, in isolation or combination, to be unique to the self (Sedikides and Brewer, 2001). Social identity (reflecting reputational issues, such as 'what others think of me'), which are important to the development of a sense of who one is includes the in-group versus out-group comparison process which is fundamental to Social Identity Theory (Tajfel, 1978), involving external perceptions of image attributed through social roles. The standardized Aspects of Identity Questionnaire (AIQ) (Cheek, 1989) items reflect these differences in personal (My personal values and moral standards; My dreams and imagination), social (My popularity with other people; The ways in which other people react to what I say and do) and collective identity orientations (Being a part of the many generations of my family; my race or ethnic background) confirming these theoretical distinctions. Alpha coefficients of 0.84 (personal) 0.86 (social) and 0.68 (collective) have been reported (Cheek and Briggs, 1982; Cheek, 1989). The objectives of this study were to examine the shared and comparative experiences of donor-conceived adults and donors of searching for a genetic link through a DNA register. Finally, we sought to determine the extent to which the personal, social and collective components of identity are affected by the experiences of being a donor or donor-conceived adult, and (for donor-conceived adults) the role of age at the time of disclosure.

Materials and Methods

Design

An online questionnaire-based study design was used to obtain qualitative and quantitative responses from donor-conceived adults and donors. Where appropriate, statistical analysis comparing the needs, experiences and identity scores between the donor-conceived adults and donors was undertaken.

Participants

All registrants of the UKDL ($n = 244$) were approached to participate in the study, excluding four non-donor-conceived offspring of donors. Registrants included $n = 172$ donor-conceived adults; $n = 65$ sperm donors; and $n = 7$ oocyte donors. A total of 91 participants responded to the questionnaire survey, representing 37.3% of those sent the request for participation [$n = 65$ (37.8% of all registered) donor-conceived adults; $n = 21$ (32.3% of all registered) sperm donors and $n = 5$ (71.4% of all registered) egg donors]. Fifty donor-conceived adults were women and 14 were men (one did not provide details). Most questionnaire surveys (81) were completed online and 10 via paper copies. However, the research team subsequently learnt from UKDL that during transfer of the register to a new provider in early 2013, UKDL had become aware that a number of registrants had changed their contact details without notifying the registry. Consequently, some registrants would not have received the survey, although the research team was not provided with the actual number of such registrants. Hence the actual response rate of requests received will have been higher than the 37% response rate reported.

Materials

The questionnaire was developed specifically for this study by the researchers in consultation with UKDL and combined both open and closed questions with some dedicated sections for completion either by donor-conceived adults or donors as well as sections common to both groups. In addition, the 35 item standardized Aspects of Identity Questionnaire (AIQ-IIIx; Cheek, 1989) was modified to obtain information on identity in our population. Specifically, 10 questions were classified by Cheek (1989) as 'Special items' and were not relevant to our study and thus were omitted. An example of a non-relevant, omitted item from the original questionnaire is 'My role of being a student in college'. Thus, the final version of the AIQ in our study was comprised of 25 items. The three AIQ subscales used contained questions on personal identity orientation (PIO; reflecting internal, individualistic identity), social identity orientation (SIO; reflecting social aspects of identity, e.g. reputational, physical attractiveness, impressions created on others) and collective identity orientation (CIO; an outgrowth of social identity personally acknowledged as self-defining in some respect such as one's ethnicity or gender or family membership). Questions were rated on a five-point scale ranging from 1 = 'Not important to my sense of who I am' to 5 = 'Extremely important to my sense of who I am'. The SIO subscale consisted of seven items (e.g. 'My popularity with other people'), the CIO subscale consisted of eight questions (e.g. 'Being a part of the many generations of my family') and the PIO consisted of 10 items (e.g. 'My personal values and moral standards'). The personal, social and collective orientation scales have been shown to have distinct patterns of correlations with other measures of identity and self-concept in subsequent research (Cheek *et al.*, 2013).

Procedures

An online survey was administered using the Bristol Online Surveys (BOS) with hard copy questionnaires sent to those without email contact or who otherwise requested one. Participants were provided with an information sheet and informed that their consent was implied from completion of the

questionnaire. A debrief sheet was provided for participants at the end of the online questionnaire or on a separate page of the hard copy. The invitation to participate and the link to the survey (or hard copy) were sent out via the UKDL Head Office (with two reminders) to all those who were registered; the survey was open from mid-October 2012 to mid-January 2013.

Statistical analysis

Data were converted from BOS into SPSS inc. (2012) and descriptive analyses were carried out on all variables. Open ended responses were listed separately by group. Analysis of categorical data was carried out using χ^2 statistics and the AIQ was analysed using analysis of variance (ANOVA) (three groups) and *t*-tests (two groups).

Ethics

Ethical approval was obtained from Middlesex and Huddersfield Universities and approval for the study was given by UKDL.

Results

Demographic variables

Ages were significantly different between the groups [$F(2,87) = 25.22$, $P < 0.0001$] with donor-conceived adults significantly younger (mean = 35.68, SD = 12.64) than either the sperm donors (mean = 55.0, SD = 8.95) or oocyte donors (mean = 55.8, SD = 4.14). There were no significant differences on any other socio-demographic variables between groups (see Table I). All donor-conceived adults and donors were white except for one Asian male donor-conceived adult.

There were significant differences in current family makeup, possibly reflecting the differing age profiles of the donor-conceived adults and the donors. The donor group reported children living with them more often than did the donor-conceived adults group ($\chi^2 = 4.22$, $df = 1$, $P < 0.034$), and the donor-conceived adults were more likely than the donors to report that their mother and father ($\chi^2 = 6.37$, $df = 1$, $P <$

0.01) were still alive, though the latter did not reach significance levels. There was no significant difference between groups as to whether their parents (if alive) were still living together.

Characteristics of donor-conceived adults

Four donor-conceived adults were raised within families with siblings from the same donor, 23 with siblings from a different donor and nine with non-donor siblings; the remainder did not report being raised with siblings. Eleven donor-conceived adults had siblings who were also registered with UKDL. Knowledge of the nature of their conception began at different ages, ranging from 'as long as I can remember' through to older adulthood. Some found out in an unplanned way, such as following parental death or separation, discovery of blood group incompatibility or of paperwork relating to gamete donation and during a row. Ages at which donor-conceived adults were informed were re-categorized into four age groups for further analysis: 0–10 years (10, 15%); 11–20 years (24, 37%); 21–30 years (22, 34%) and 31+ years (9, 14%).

Reasons for searching

All participants were asked about their reasons for searching, so participants will have been answering according, where relevant, to whoever they perceive to be their children and family. Participants were invited to endorse reasons from a list as well as to provide additional reasons. Reasons for searching varied between groups (Table II). For donor-conceived adults, the most frequently cited reasons were 'to satisfy my curiosity' (84.6%), 'to see whether we have anything in common' (75.4%), 'to access medical information' (70.8%) and 'to make me feel more complete in my identity' (69.2%). For sperm donors they were 'to satisfy my curiosity' (66.7%), 'to find out what happened in their lives since conception' (66.7%), 'to be able to pass on information to my children/family' (47.6%) and 'to make me feel more complete in my identity' (28.6%) whereas for oocyte donors, they were 'to be able

Table I Socio-demographic features of the donor-conceived adults and donor groups.

Feature	Donor-conceived adult group	Combined donor group	Chi square (χ^2), degrees of freedom (df), significance (P)
Sex			
Female	50 (77)	5 (19)	$\chi^2 = 27.56$, $df = 1$, $P < 0.0001$
Male	14 (22) ^a	21 (81)	
Marital status			
Single/widowed/divorced	25 (39)	10 (39)	$\chi^2 = 0.000$, $df = 1$, $P > 0.99$
Married/living with partner	40 (61)	16 (61)	
Education			
School level	11 (17)	7 (27)	$\chi^2 = 2.195$, $df = 2$, $P = 0.167$
Degree level	33 (51)	9 (35)	
Post graduate	21 (32)	10 (39)	
Religion			
Practices	21 (32)	8 (31)	$\chi^2 = 0.887$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.272$
Does not practice	44 (68)	18 (69)	

Data are n(%).

^aOne person did not specify their gender.

Table II Sperm and oocyte donors' and donor-conceived adults' reasons for searching.

	Sperm donors (n = 21)	Oocyte donors (n = 5)	Donor-conceived adults (n = 65)
To satisfy my curiosity	14 (67)	3 (60)	55 (85)
To see whether we have anything in common	5 (24)	2 (40)	49 (75)
To access medical information	2 (10)	2 (40)	46 (71)
To make me feel more complete in my identity	6 (29)	2 (40)	45 (69)
To find out what has happened in their lives since donation/conception	14 (67)	4 (80)	28 (43)
To be able to pass on information to my children/family	10 (48)	5 (100)	32 (49)
Other	7 (33)	1 (20)	13 (20)
Answered as N/A	1 (1.5)		

Data are n(%).

Participants were able to tick more than one answer.

to pass on information to my children/family' (100%), 'to find out what has happened in their lives since conception' (80%) and then evenly spread among the remaining reasons.

There were also open comments (that are classified as 'other' in Table II). For sperm donors, these related primarily to meeting the needs of donor-conceived adults: 'to provide context for them about me, if they wished to know more'; 'to help resolve the issue for any donor conceived offspring' and 'I think any children should know about me so they can understand themselves better'. This was summed up by one participant who said: 'the absence of access to knowledge of their donor parents in my opinion constitutes a possible "harm" to my offspring'. And another said, 'it is a personal life principle "to do no harm" and this is the best way I could act in accordance'. Others talked about meeting their own needs by searching: 'to find out if any people exist'; 'if they are in need of support or help, Guilt'. One oocyte donor commented; 'As I was aware of the recipient's identity albeit through chance I knew that twins were conceived from my egg donation 5 weeks after donating, hence I always hoped to meet them and be in contact with them, which I now am. It was very important to me that my son got the chance to meet his half-sister and brother as he is donor conceived and I hoped it would give him an extra sense of family/identity'.

Donor-conceived adults also made open comments, many of which expressed deep sentiments related to their own needs such as: 'Curiosity' doesn't go anywhere near the HUNGER (*emphasis original*) to find someone I was connected to'. 'To see whether we have anything in common' sounds so casual. It is a case of looking for CONNECTION (*emphasis original*). For me, that was not anything in the zone of curiosity or idle research; it was visceral. Another donor-conceived adult stated; 'It is a fundamental quest to find family and get to know them and feel a part of a new family and be accepted by them', and; 'This is my only chance to find blood relatives'.

Expectations and experiences of using a DNA-based primary route to locate genetic relatives

Most donor-conceived adults, who chose to participate in UKDL, (62; 95.3%), and all sperm and oocyte donors valued access to a DNA-based

register to identify possible genetic relationships even though DNA often cannot provide absolute certainty of a relationship. Decision time from first thoughts to actually registering took a few days (5); weeks (33); months (12); a year or more (12) for donor-conceived adults (three participants said they 'could not remember' or did not answer the question). Two sperm donors made the decision in days; six in weeks; six in months and five over a year or longer (two could not remember). Four oocyte donors took weeks and one a few months to register.

Donor-conceived adults' estimations as to how many [more] siblings they thought they might find ranged from zero to 1000 and included statements such as 'hopefully not more than one', 'absolutely no idea'; 'Only God knows'. The maximum number of siblings with whom they would feel comfortable about being linked ranged from fewer than five (eight); 5–10 (ten); 10–20 (four); 20 or more (two) to 'No limit' (thirty-nine) (two donor-conceived adults did not answer the question). The number of offspring that donors believed they might find ranged from zero to 110 (sperm donors) and from zero to three (oocyte donors). The maximum number of adult offspring with whom oocyte donors would feel comfortable having future contact was four (one did not answer this question), whereas among sperm donors, most (thirteen) imposed no limit, one would feel comfortable with '20+', four with between 5 and 10, and one with fewer than 5 (two sperm donors did not answer the question).

Experiences of being linked to a genetic relative through the UKDL register

Twenty-six participants (23 donor-conceived adults, 2 sperm donors and 1 oocyte donor) had been linked. Of the donor-conceived adults with a link, six were linked to their donor and 18 had been linked with between one and 14 'siblings'.

For the donor-conceived adults, questions about the consequences of being linked, and positive or negative effects upon themselves and their existing relatives and links are reported in Table III. Since few donors were linked, their responses are not reported. Most donor-conceived adults reported direct, regular and continuing contact and perceived this to be mutually positive; however, just over one-fifth (five, 22%) did not have regular contact and around one quarter (six, 26%) reported some negative consequences for themselves. Almost two-thirds

Table III Consequences of being linked and effects on donor-conceived adults and their relationships.

	No	Not applicable	Not sure	Yes	Total
When you were linked did you and the other person(s) have direct contact?	2 (9)	0	0	21 (91)	23
Do you now have regular contact with the linked relative(s)?	5 (22)	1 (4)	1 (4)	16 (70)	23
Do you expect to maintain regular contact with those with whom you are linked?	3 (15)	1 (4)	1 (4)	17 (77)	22 [§]
Does the contact bring some negative consequences for you?	15 (66)	1 (4)	1 (4)	6 (26)	23
Did this contact affect you positively?	1 (4)	1 (4)	4 (18)	17 (74)	23
Did this affect your linked relative(s) positively?	1 (4)	3 (13)	4 (18)	15 (65)	23
Did it affect your existing relative(s)/personal relationships positively?	3 (14)	3 (14)	7 (34)	8 (38)	21 ^{§§}
Does the contact bring some negative consequences for your linked relative(s)?	12 (52)	1 (4)	7 (31)	3 (13)	23
Did your sense of family change?	6 (26)	0	2 (9)	15 (65)	23
Did your sense of self change?	6 (26)	0	2 (9)	15 (65)	23

Data are n(%).

[§]One did not respond; ^{§§}two did not respond.

(fifteen, 65%) of donor-conceived adults who were linked believed their sense of family and self had changed, but there was little evidence of the contact adversely affecting their existing relationships. Almost half (eleven, 48%) believed that more links would be found for them with the remainder (twelve, 52%) being not sure.

Feelings/beliefs about being linked among those 'not yet linked'

Questions were asked of those not yet linked about their expectations should a link be made and the consequences they anticipated for themselves and their relatives/links (Tables IV and V). Although the majority of participants wanted to make contact as well as exchange information, they were not sure whether these would become regular occurrences. They were positive about contact for themselves and any relatives to whom they might be linked through donor conception but were less certain than those already linked about the impact this might have on their existing family and uncertain about any possible negative consequences for themselves, their linked and their existing relatives.

Although most not-yet-linked participants were realistically uncertain whether they would ever be linked through the register, about half of donor-conceived adults and sperm donors and all oocyte donors believed their sense of 'family' would change if a genetic link was found (Table V).

Anticipated and actual difficulties of being on a voluntary register among linked and not-yet-linked donor-conceived adults and donors

All participants were asked about their experiences and thoughts about being on the UKDL register with responses grouped according to whether they had been linked or not (Table VI). Participants either experienced or anticipated few difficulties, confirming the positive beliefs among those not yet linked and actual experiences among those already linked, as reported above. Although there was consistency in responses between the two groups, levels of uncertainty were expressed more frequently by the 'not-yet-linked' group, as might be

expected. The only aspect where the majority of participants (in both groups) anticipated possible difficulties was in the event of 'getting false-positive results' (76% linked; 61% not linked).

Group differences on the AIQ

ANOVA comparing the donor-conceived adults, sperm and oocyte donors on the three AIQ-IIIx subscales (PIO; SIO; CIO) showed the three groups differed significantly on CIO [$F(2, 82) = 3.60, P < 0.03$], with donor-conceived adults scoring significantly lower (mean = 20.5, SD = 5.58) than either donor (sperm donors mean = 23.9, SD = 5.59 or oocyte donors mean = 24.8, SD = 3.30) group. The groups did not differ significantly on either the PIO (donor-conceived adults mean = 39.0, SD = 6.50; sperm donors mean = 38.1, SD = 6.46; oocyte donors mean = 37.8, SD = 4.65) or SIO (donor-conceived adults mean = 22.8, SD = 5.41; sperm donors mean = 23.8, SD = 4.56; oocyte donors mean = 24.0, SD = 5.22) subscales. Since the few oocyte donors were similar in age to sperm donors and did not differ from them on the AIQ-IIIx subscales, a Combined Donor group (26) was created for further analysis. The same CIO subscale for the combined group differed significantly from the donor-conceived adults group [$F(1, 83) = 7.20, P < 0.01$; see Fig. 1].

Based on a sample of European Americans not conceived in the context of IVF, the donor-conceived adults' CIO subscale was also lower [(means CIO = 22.9; SD = 5.55; SIO = 23.8, SD = 4.67; PIO = 42.2, SD = 5.62)—Cheek et al., 2013], indicating they may have less emotional connection to a particular community or institution, such as their family, when compared with peers who were conceived in traditional ways. There were no significant differences between donor-conceived adults who found out about their status at different ages on the identity subscales; PIO [$F(3, 54) = 0.834, P > 0.05$]; SIO [$F(3, 58) = 0.705, P > 0.05$] or CIO [$F(3, 57) = 0.470, P > 0.05$]. Lastly, a series of *t*-tests were carried out between those already linked (26) and those not linked (65) and the identity subscales. No significant differences on any of the three identity scales were found (all P s > 0.05), suggesting identity orientation is not different between individuals linked or those still searching for a link.

Table IV Anticipated consequences of being linked and effects on donor-conceived adults and their relationships among those not yet linked.

	No	Not applicable	Not sure	Yes	Total
Do you think, if a link is made, you and the other person(s) should have direct contact as well as exchanging information?					
Donor-conceived adults	0	0	10 (24)	31 (76)	41 [§]
Sperm donors	2 (11)	0	4 (21)	13 (68)	19
Oocyte donors	0	0	1 (25)	3 (75)	4
Do you think you will have regular contact with those with whom you are linked?					
Donor-conceived adults	4 (10)	2 (5)	22 (55)	12 (30)	40 ^{§§}
Sperm donors	1 (10)	0	14 (70)	4 (20)	19
Oocyte donors	0	0	2 (50)	2 (50)	4
Do you think contact will affect you positively?					
Donor-conceived adults	0	1 (2)	12 (30)	27 (68)	40 ^{§§}
Sperm donors	0	0	9 (47)	10 (53)	19
Oocyte donors	0	0	1 (25)	3 (75)	4
Do you think contact will affect your linked relative(s) positively?					
Donor-conceived adults	1 (2)	3 (8)	18 (45)	18 (45)	40 ^{§§}
Sperm donors	0	1 (5)	8 (42)	10 (53)	19
Oocyte donors	0	0	2 (50)	2 (50)	4
Will it affect existing relative(s)/personal relationship(s) positively?					
Donor-conceived adults	4 (10)	1 (3)	26 (65)	9 (22)	40 ^{§§}
Sperm donors	2 (11)	0	9 (47)	8 (42)	19
Oocyte donors	0	0	2 (50)	2 (50)	4
Do you think contact will bring some negative consequences for you?					
Donor-conceived adults	11 (26)		25 (60)	6 (14)	42
Sperm donors	7 (37)		8 (42)	4 (21)	19
Oocyte donors	0		3 (75)	1 (25)	4
Do you think contact will bring some negative consequences for your linked relative(s)?					
Donor-conceived adults	11 (28)	2 (5)	23 (59)	3 (8)	39 ^{§§§}
Sperm donors	7 (37)	1 (5)	10 (53)	1 (5)	19
Oocyte donors	0	0	2 (50)	2 (50)	4
Do you think contact will bring some negative consequences for your existing relatives/personal relationships?					
Donor-conceived adults	10 (26)	2 (5)	20 (51)	7 (18)	39 ^{§§§}
Sperm donors	6 (34)	0	10 (55)	2 (11)	18 [§]
Oocyte donors	0	0	2 (50)	2 (50)	4

Data are n(%).

[§]One did not respond; ^{§§}two did not respond; ^{§§§}three did not respond.

Discussion

Our online study provides the first research evidence of the experiences of donor-conceived adults and donors using a DNA-based service to search for genetic relatives. It suggests that this group of searchers have similar motivations and experiences to those using other searching routes (e.g. [Jadva et al., 2010](#); [Daniels et al., 2012](#)). Curiosity was a key driver, as was, variously, the desire to see if they had anything in common with linked relatives, to access medical information, to be able to pass on information to their children/family and to find out what had happened in their lives since conception. In addition, while understandably apprehensive about the uncertainty attached to the fact that DNA testing provides less stringent evidence of a genetic link

than a robust paper-trail, based on accurate documented records, a fact that many will have been unaware of until being informed at registration—the use of DNA did not appear to dampen positive beliefs about the value of being linked for themselves and, albeit less so, for their existing relationships. This held true for those already linked and not yet linked, and across all three groups of donor-conceived adults, sperm and oocyte donors, there was strong support for the value of a DNA-based register. Contrary to popular representations, DNA testing to identify genetic relationships can produce complex results that require scientific and statistical interpretation ([Crawshaw and Marshall, 2008](#); [Adams and Lorbach, 2012](#)). More robust results may be secured where the DNA from the biological parent of a donor-conceived person is available and any supporting evidence such as date and place

Table V Thoughts and feelings about becoming linked. Data are n (%).

	No	Not sure	Yes	Total
Do you think a link will be found?				
Donor-conceived adults	13 (33)	25 (64)	1 (3)	39 ^{§§§}
Sperm donors	1 (5)	11 (58)	7 (37)	19
Oocyte donors	1 (25)	3 (75)	0	4
Will it change your sense of family if a link is found?				
Donor-conceived adults	6 (15)	13 (33)	21 (52)	40 ^{§§}
Sperm donors	3 (16)	7 (37)	9 (47)	19
Oocyte donors	0	0	4 (100)	4

^{§§}Two missing; ^{§§§}three missing responses.

Table VI Linked and not yet linked participants' anticipated and actual difficulties of being on a voluntary register.

	No problem	Not sure	Possibly difficult	Total
Agreeing on type and levels of contact				
Linked	24 (92)	1 (4)	1 (4)	26
Not linked	41 (65)	14 (22)	8 (13)	63 ^{§§}
Getting along with anyone you get linked with				
Linked	17 (68)	5(20)	3 (12)	25 [§]
Not linked	29 (47)	24 (39)	9 (14)	62 ^{§§§}
Regretting starting the process				
Linked	21 (84)	3(12)	1 (4)	25 [§]
Not linked	43 (68)	11 (17)	9 (15)	63 ^{§§}
Finding out more than you anticipated				
Linked	21 (84)	3 (12)	1 (4)	25 [§]
Not linked	31 (50)	18 (29)	13 (21)	62 ^{§§§}
Finding out less than you anticipated				
Linked	13 (52)	3 (12)	9 (36)	25 [§]
Not linked	21 (34)	17 (28)	23 (38)	61 ^{§§§§}
Coping with the fact that DNA results are not 100% accurate				
Linked	12 (48)	1 (4)	12 (48)	25 [§]
Not linked	35 (55)	15(23)	14 (22)	64 [§]
Coping with never being linked				
Linked	10 (48)	1 (4)	10 (48)	21 ^{§§§§§}
Not linked	18 (28)	13 (20)	33 (52)	64 [§]
Getting false-positive results				
Linked	5 (20)	1 (4)	19 (76)	25 [§]
Not linked	10 (16)	15 (23)	39 (61)	64 [§]
Not being able to cope emotionally				
Linked	15 (62)	5 (21)	4 (17)	24 ^{§§}
Not linked	34 (55)	16 (26)	12 (19)	62 ^{§§§}

Data are n(%).

[§] ^{§§} ^{§§§} ^{§§§§} ^{§§§§§} Indicate one to five missing responses, respectively.




Figure 1 Donor-conceived (DC) adults and combined donor (CD) groups' mean scores on the Three AIQ-IIIx subscales (of PIO, SIO and CIO. Subscale items measured the importance of each orientation to a person's sense of who they are).

of donation. For laboratories such as that used by UKDL which use CODIS markers that are considered more reliable for identifying putative links, results for half sibling relationships are even more complex to interpret and generally carry a higher risk of false positives or negatives. As DNA science has advanced, new supplementary tests have been developed for same sex pairs (the X- and Y-tests) but there are as yet no such tests available for opposite sex pairs. All results are expressed as a numerical probability of a genetic relationship existing with the proviso that this may alter with the addition of new DNA into the database. The current state of DNA science leaves services such as UKDL with the decision as to whether to release all results to all registrants, regardless of the risk of false positives and false negatives, and has implications for the availability of comprehensive information and support services to enable registrants to cope with associated uncertainty and decision-making about progressing with information exchange or contact. Given that DNA testing will be the only route through which the majority of those affected by donor conception internationally will be able to identify genetic relatives, these are important findings.

Interestingly, although participants in all three groups considered that their sense of self and of family might or did change, negative impacts on themselves or on existing relationships that might or did arise from being linked were generally rated to be low. Those who were linked reported, on the whole, direct, regular and continuing contact which was mutually positive. This is not to say that contacts were wholly positive but that the risk of adverse or troubling reactions appeared to be low. This extends previous research findings (Turner and Coyle, 2000; Cushing, 2010; Jadva et al., 2010; Beeson et al., 2011; Blyth, 2012a,b; Daniels et al., 2012). However, a sizeable minority (six, 26%) of linked donor-conceived adults reported some negative consequences for themselves and 'not yet linked' registrants across all three groups were somewhat more likely than those already linked to express uncertainty about potential impact on themselves and their existing relationships. Here again, quantitative research does not allow us to look beyond the figures, suggesting the need for qualitative research to provide better indications of what helps and what hinders such experiences—including any service-related needs [such as the in-depth qualitative study of a small group of donor-conceived registrants with UKDL undertaken by Blyth (2012a,b)].

The actual and anticipated effect of being linked on existing relationships, whether donor-conceived adult or donor, also marks an interesting shift in

terms of whose needs are being met through donor conception. Previously, the perceived needs of donors and their families for privacy through anonymity (Meirow and Schenker, 1997; Novaes, 1998) were prioritized over those of donor-conceived adults (Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists, 1987). Our findings suggest that a DNA register may prioritize the needs of both donor-conceived adults and donors who appear willing to seek information and contact even if they are uncertain as to whether any links may have negative consequences for their family members and existing relationships. In fact, the only areas where more than a third of participants anticipated or experienced difficulties in coping as a result of being on the register were focused on personal coping in the event of 'finding out less than anticipated', with 'the fact that DNA results are not 100% positive' and that they may 'get false-positive results'. In other words, although historically concern has been about parties sharing too much information, our data suggest there may be negative impacts of having too little information.

We are not aware of any research that looks at the length of time taken by donor-conceived adults and donors from first contemplation of joining a register to moving ahead with registration. Our study suggests that this might range from a few days to more than a year. When reviewing details of the 64 people who had started but not completed registration with UKDL during 2012, one of the authors (M.C.) found that 12 donor-conceived adults (29%) and two donors (14%) had also started and stopped the process at least once prior to the start of 2012, with a few having made several approaches over many years. This hitherto unreported aspect of searching carries implications for service delivery and for the support needs of potential registrants and warrants further investigation.

This study is also the first to measure aspects of identity for searchers, using standardized measures. More than two-thirds of donor-conceived adults were motivated to search by a desire to feel more complete in their identity, as were six sperm donors and two oocyte donors. While qualitative studies have previously reported such a motivation in relation to donor-conceived adults, this has not been asked previously of donors, nor has it been assessed using a specifically designed standardized questionnaire. The age of donor-conceived adults at disclosure of their donor-conceived status varied, similar to that reported in previous research (Blyth *et al.*, 2012). However, the data did not show a significant relationship between AIQ and age of disclosure; this was a surprising finding given data on negative outcomes for adjustment in donor-conceived adults told of their donor origins beyond early childhood, and is a phenomenon worthy of further study.

Collective identity is a multidimensional concept referring to a belief that one shares characteristics with a group of others and includes a set of cognitive beliefs associated with that category (stereotypic traits thought to be shared by category members or ideological positions that define the group's goals). Collective identity also involves 'value and emotional significance'. This affective aspect of collective identification can include how we evaluate a category and the perceived value placed on the category by others (Tajfel, 1991). Collective identity is therefore described as referring to the individual rather than to a group (social identity) because it is a psychological concept and only becomes a collective identity when it is personally acknowledged as self-defining in some way. Collective identity can include people one has not yet met but with whom common attributes, such as gender, nationality, occupation, (or DNA) is shared. Furthermore, CIO is connected to a group of people outside the self (Sedikides and Brewer, 2001).

The significantly lower CIO scores of donor-conceived adults when compared with donors therefore suggest their perceived collective (or family) identity, as distinct from their personal or social identity, was low. This is somewhat further supported by the findings that donor-conceived adults also rated 'to feel more complete in my identity' as one of the prominent reasons for searching for genetic relatives. They also believed their 'sense of family' would change if they were to find a link, and those who were already linked reported their 'sense of self' had changed as a result. Since aspects of identity subscales were also analysed by whether participants had been 'linked' or 'not yet linked' to genetic 'relatives' and these analyses were not significant, the data indicate this low collective identity is important to donor-conceived adults regardless of their linked status, and warrants further qualitative research to improve understanding.

Limitations

At the time of this study, UKDL had 244 registrants, of whom ~37% agreed to participate. At the time donor participants donated or donor-conceived adult participants were conceived, it was common practice for donors to be advised not to expect to receive any information about their donation and for recipients to be advised not to tell their donor-conceived children about the nature of their conception. It is not possible, therefore, to compare participants in this study (donors who were sufficiently interested in knowing about the outcome of their donation to register with UKDL and donor-conceived adults who not only knew about their donor origins but were sufficiently interested in obtaining more information to register with UKDL) with any other population of donors or donor-conceived individuals. Although the response rate to the study was low, it is likely to be a conservative estimate as it is known that contact details for a number of those sent the survey were out of date and hence would not have received it. Looking more closely at the profile of participants, their age and gender profile reflected the profile of the three groups of registrants on UKDL—donor-conceived people, sperm donors and oocyte donors (Crawshaw *et al.*, 2013)—and further reflects the gendered participation rates in research involving donor-conceived people more generally (Blyth *et al.*, 2012). No socio-demographic differences existed across the three groups beyond the donor group being older, more likely to have children living with them and less likely to still have living parents.

Conclusion

This study has shown that donor-conceived adults and gamete donors registering on a voluntary DNA-based Register appeared to have thought carefully about searching and were undeterred by the uncertainties attached to DNA as a basis for linking. The experiences of those linked and expectations of those not yet linked were similar and generally positive, and in the case of donor-conceived adults, potentially a necessity in relation to their low subjective feelings of continuity and uniqueness (CIO). The findings of this study are likely to have policy and practice implications for donor registers in other countries that rely on DNA testing. The study also provides the first data on actual measures of identity among gamete donors and donor-conceived people. The finding of lowered collective identity for donor-conceived people when compared with donors and samples in the general population provides empirical support for theoretical arguments that a sense of

belongingness is critical to identity and has important implications for understanding the development of identity in donor-conceived people. Further research, policy and practice should focus on preparation of donor conception parents for meeting the needs of their donor-conceived children to seek information about their genetic relatives with potential altered sense of self and sense of family. Preparation of donors for their own future information and contact needs, impact on their family members, improved understanding of the services required to assist those searching for genetic relatives and making contact when those affected do not have access to a records-based Register and instead use DNA testing needs more research.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank UKDL for distributing the questionnaires to its membership, and all those participating in the research.

Authors' roles

OA was responsible for the data analysis and all authors contributed equally to the study design and writing of the paper.

Funding

No funding was obtained for this study.

Conflict of interest

The authors have no competing interests to declare except for M.C. who was national adviser to UKDL from 2003–2013.

References

- Adams D, Lorbach C. Accessing donor conception information in Australia: a call for retrospective access. *J Law Med* 2012; **19**:707–721.
- Beeson D, Jennings P, Kramer W. Offspring searching for their sperm donors: how family type shapes the process. *Hum Reprod* 2011; **26**:2415–2424.
- Berger R, Paul M. Family secrets and family functioning: the case of donor assistance. *Fam Proc* 2008; **47**:553–566.
- Blyth E. Genes R Us? Making sense of genetic and non-genetic kinship relationships following anonymous sperm donation. *Reprod Biomed Online* 2012a; **24**:719–726.
- Blyth E. Discovering the 'facts of life' following anonymous donor insemination. *IJ Law, Policy Fam* 2012b; **26**:143–161.
- Blyth E, Crawshaw M, Frith L, Jones C. Donor-conceived people's views and experiences of their genetic origins: a critical analysis of the research evidence. *J Law Med* 2012; **19**:769–789.
- Cheek JM. Identity orientations and self-interpretation. In Buss DM, Cantor N (eds). *Personality Psychology: Recent Trends and Emerging Directions*. New York: Springer, 1989, 275–285.
- Cheek JM, Briggs SR. Self-consciousness and aspects of identity. *J Res Pers* 1982; **16**:401–408.
- Cheek JM, Tropp LR, Underwood MK, Cheek NN. The distinction between social and collective identity orientations in the Aspects of Identity Questionnaire. *Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology*, 2013, New Orleans.
- Crawshaw M, Marshall L. Practice experiences of running UK DonorLink, a voluntary information exchange and contact register for adults related through donor conception. *Hum Fertil* 2008; **11**:231–237.
- Crawshaw M, Gunter C, Tidy C, Atherton F. Working with previously anonymous gamete donors and donor-conceived adults: recent practice experiences of running the DNA-based voluntary information exchange and contact register, UK DonorLink. *Hum Fertil* 2013; **16**:26–30.
- Cushing A. 'I just want more information about who I am': The search experience of sperm-donor offspring, searching for information about their donors and genetic heritage. *Inf Res* 2010; **15**. <http://www.informationr.net/ir/15-2/paper428.html> (9 April 2014, date last accessed).
- Daniels KR, Blyth E, Crawshaw M, Curson R. Short communication: previous semen donors and their views regarding the sharing of information with offspring. *Hum Reprod* 2005; **20**:1670–1675.
- Daniels KR, Kramer W, Perez-y-Perez MV. Semen donors who are open to contact with their offspring: issues and implications for them and for their families. *Reprod Biomed Online* 2012; **25**:670–677.
- FIOM. http://www.fiom.nl/biologische_familie_zoeken/f4029003/9/kidregister_en_dna_databank.aspx (9 April 2014, date last accessed).
- Hogan R, Cheek JM. Identity, authenticity, and maturity. In Sarbin TR, Scheibe KE (eds). *Studies in Social Identity*. New York: Praeger, 1983, 339–357.
- Jadva V, Freeman T, Kramer W, Golombok S. Experiences of donor offspring searching for and contacting their donor siblings and donor. *Reprod BioMed Online* 2010; **20**:523–532.
- Jadva V, Freeman T, Kramer W, Golombok S. Sperm and oocyte donors' experiences of anonymous donation and subsequent contact with their donor offspring. *Hum Reprod* 2011; **26**:638–645.
- Kirkman M. Genetic connection and relationships in narratives of donor assisted conception. *Aust J Emerging Technol Soc* 2004; **2**:1–20. <http://www.swinburne.edu.au/hosting/ijets/journal/V2N1/pdf/V2N1-1-Kirkman.pdf> (9 April 2014, date last accessed).
- Kirkman M, Bourne K, Fisher J, Johnson L, Hammarberg K. Gamete donors' expectations and experiences with their donor offspring. *Hum Reprod* 2014; **29**:731–738.
- Mahlstedt P, LaBounty K, Kennedy T. The views of adult offspring of sperm donation: essential feedback for the development of ethical guidelines within the practice of assisted reproductive technology in the United States. *Fertil Steril* 2010; **93**:2236–2246.
- Meirow D, Schenker J. Reproductive health care policies around the world: the current status of sperm donation in assisted reproduction technology: ethical and legal considerations. *J Ass Reprod Gen* 1997; **14**:133–138.
- Novaes S. The medical management of donorinsemination. In Daniels K, Haines E (eds). *Donor Insemination: International Social Science Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998, 105–130.
- Paul MS, Berger R. Topic avoidance and family functioning in families conceived with donor insemination. *Hum Reprod* 2007; **22**:2566–2571.
- Purewal S, van den Akker OBA. Systematic review of oocyte donation: investigating attitudes, motivations and experiences. *Hum Reprod Update* 2009; **15**:499–515.
- Rodino IS, Burton PJ, Sanders KA. Donor information considered important to donors, recipients and offspring: an Australian perspective. *Reprod Biomed Online* 2011; **22**:303–311.
- Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists. *Donor Insemination (Leaflet)*. London: RCOG, 1987.
- Scheib J, Ruby A. Contact among families who share the same sperm donor. *Fertil Steril* 2008; **9**:33–43.
- Scheib J, Riordan M, Rubin R. Adolescents with open identity sperm donors: reports from 12–17 year olds. *Hum Reprod* 2005; **20**:239–252.
- Sedikides C, Brewer MB (eds). *Individual Self, Relational Self, Collective Self*. Philadelphia: Psychology Press, 2001.

- Simon B, Klandermans B. Politicized collective identity: a social psychological analysis. *Am Psychol* 2001;**56**:319–331.
- SPSS inc. *IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows Version 21*. Armonk, New York, USA, 2012.
- Stevens-Botsford J. Offspring reflections—a personal story of blood and belonging 2000. Available from <http://www.dcnetwork.org>.
- Stock V. The issue of donor insemination—a donor offspring writes. *Donor Conception Network News* 2002;**20**:20.
- Tajfel H. Social categorization, social identity, and social comparison. In Tajfel H (ed.), *Differentiation Between Social Groups: Studies in the Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations*. London: Academic Press, 1978,61–76.
- Tajfel H. *Human Groups and Social Categories: Studies in Social Psychology*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Turner AJ, Coyle A. What does it mean to be a donor offspring? The identity experiences of adults conceived by donor insemination and the implications for counselling and therapy. *Hum Reprod* 2000;**15**:2041–2051.
- van den Akker OBA. A review of family donor constructs: current research and future directions. *Hum Reprod Update* 2006;**12**:91–101.
- Van den Broeck U, Vandermeeren M, Vanderschueren D, Enzlin P, Demyttenaere K, D'Hooghe T. A systematic review of sperm donors: demographic characteristics, attitudes, motives and experiences of the process of sperm donation. *Hum Reprod Update* 2013;**19**:37–51.