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## Sex Selection and Technology In the Untied States: Is It Playing GOD?

Dr. Roberta Steinbacher, Audrianna Rodriguez McNairs Scholars Program, Cleveland State University

## ABSTRACT

Preferences for male iirstorn chilidren have been well estabisished through research in
countries such as India, China, and the Middle East. The effects of this phenomenon have been devastating to these populations'sex ratios and have led to a number of
violent crimes against women. Early studies conducted in the United States have violent crimes against women. Early studies conducted in the United States have
indicated that firstborn son preference exists; however, more recent studies indicate indicated that firistoon son preference exists, ho
slight trend toward firstbon girl preferencec.
Tight t tent owarr firisioon exir preference.
The current study examines firstborn preference and attitudes toward using technology to achieve the desired sex of firstbom orfspring. A sample drawn from the
Cleveland State University sudent body was given a survey to determine male and Cleveland State University suddent body was given a survey to determine male and
female firstborn preferences and willingness to use sex selection technology. our
 indings revealed an overail preference for firstorn sons. Our rindings also showe
trend towards "no preference" for sex of offspring, especially among females. The
number of praticinants who indienter willingess to use sex selection tectnology number of participants who indicated a willingness to use sex selection tecchology
$(8 \%)$ was so smal to calculate any relationship between potential luers and firstbo $(8 \%)$ was to smal
sex preference. sex preferencec

## INTRODUCTION

Sex selection is defined as attempting to control the sex of offspring through technological advances to ensure the desired sex is achieved by pre- or postimplantation methods.

Sex Selection Technology
e-implantation Genetic Diagnosis (PGD) -PGD was originally used to test for sex linked
disorders but now is used for sex selection for nonmedical reasons
-The sex can be determined by DNA amplification or Florescent In Situ Hybridization (FISH) techniques". "The efficacy of this technique to determine embryo's sex is near 100\%".

## Micro Sort

Uses a machine (Flow Cytometer) to separate the $X$ and $Y$ sperm sample for artificial insemination or in vitro fertilization.
"The efficacy of this technique is to sort sperm to a purity of $80 \%-90 \%$ for X bearing sperm and $60 \%$ 70\% purity for Y bearing sperm".
Post-implantation Technology
Selective abortions
Motivations for Using in Sex Selection conomic Bias Favoring Sons
-Higher wage earnings for males

- Males tend to be the recipients of a family's inheritance
ultural or Religious Reasons for sex preference -Births of sons elevates the family standing -Security for parents/ take care of elderly -Woman takes on name and customs of in-laws

LITERATURE REVIEW
Examples of Sex Selection Studies Indicating Percent Preference

| Preference for Sex of offspring |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Authors | Sex of Subject | Boy | Girl | No Preference |
| Dinitz, Dynes \& Clark,1954 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Male } \\ \text { Female } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5929 \\ 59 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\frac{46 \%}{46 \%}$ | $\underset{\substack{33 \% \\ 33 \% \%}}{\substack{\text {. } \\ \hline}}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Markle \& Nam, } \\ 1971 \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{\substack{\text { Male } \\ \text { Female }}}{\text {. }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 80 \% \\ & 79 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{4 \%}{42 \%}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 166 \% \\ & 98 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Lageg, 1972 | Combined | $63 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $30 \%$ |
| Rosenzweig \& | Combined | $39 \%$ | $13 \%$ | ${ }_{52 \%}$ |
| Rent \& Rent | Combined | $51 \%$ | $6 \%$ | ${ }_{43 \%}$ |
|  | Combined | 73.2\% | 26.7\% | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Foread } \\ & \text { Conoce } \end{aligned}$ |
| Steinbacher \& Gilroy, 1980 <br> Gilroy, 1980 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Male } \\ \text { Fonde } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 46.2 \% \% \\ & 38.559 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.4 \% \% \% \% \\ & 15.5 \% \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 43.296 \\ & 45.5 \% \\ & 460 \end{aligned}$ |
| Steinbacher \& Gilroy, 1983 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Male } \\ \text { Femile } \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{\substack{46 \% \% \\ 38 \% \%}}{ }$ | $\begin{gathered} 7 \% \\ 16 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 47 \% \sigma \\ & 46 \% \% \end{aligned}$ |
|  <br> Gilroy, 1990 |  | $\begin{gathered} 58 \% \\ 398 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 88 \% \\ & 244 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 34 \% \% \\ & 3727 \% \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Steinbacher, } \\ & \text { Gilroy \& Swetkis } \\ & 2002 \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\substack{\text { Male } \\ \text { Female }}}{\substack{\text { and }}}$ | $\begin{gathered} 58 \% \% \\ \hline 40 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 856 \\ & 2006 \\ & 206 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 346 \% \\ & 40 \% \\ & 40 \% \end{aligned}$ |
| Dail at El 2006 | Combined | 39\% | $19 \%$ | $42 \% \%$ |

The Current Study
-Our study examined current attitudes toward Sex
Selection, that is, are firstborn boys preferred over
firstborn girls as in previous studies in the United
States?
-We investigated whether or not there is a correlation
between sex preference and technology utilization.

## METHOD

Participants
113 students participated in the study
78 participants were able to qualify for the study 23 were males
55 were females
35 questionnaires were eliminated from analyses Exclusionary Criteria
Already have children
Less then 18 years of age
Materials
Personal Preference And Attitude Scale
Consisted of 16 questions
The relevant questions for the study
"Do you prefer your first child to be a girl or boy".
"I would use sex selection technology to select the sex of my children".
Demographic questions
Procedure
Approval was granted from CSU's Institutional Review Board
Letters of inquiry were sent to professors so that the surveys could be administered during class time Consent forms were signed by participants and questionnaires were then administered

RESULTS
Firstborn Preferences

Males Preferences


RESULTS cont.

Female Preferences


Participants Willingness to use Sex Selection Technology
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