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INTRODUCTION
Prenatal genetic screening and selective abortion have become ubiquitous in obstetrics care in the United States. Emerging alongside these technologies are ethical entanglements between disability activists, researchers, and practitioners regarding who decides—and by what measure—who should and should not inhabit the world (Hubbard, 2013, p. 81).

The nature of disability itself serves as a central tension, with the language deployed to endorse or critique screenings, their use in clinical settings, and design of the technologies themselves revealing conflicting orientations toward disability.

BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION

Prenatal Genetic Screening as a Site of Controversy
- Genetic technology development and deployment may be guided by a “curative imaginary” (Kafer, 2013), and contribute to the production of a “genetic underclass” (Jasanoff, 2011).

Problem-Framing
- Prenatal screening is leveraged to reinforce the stark biological line between ability and disability. The attribution of disability to purely detectable and quantifiable biological characteristics “misrecognizes and thus masks the effects of social practices and hierarchy” (Carrier, 1983) as quoted in Conrad, 1992, p. 224).

Medicalization as Social Control
- The medicalization of certain characteristics, particularly with the aid of technologies whose measurements are trusted as objective, provides a powerful foundation for legitimizing forms of social control based on those characteristics (Conrad, 1992).

OBJECTIVES
This project sought to determine:
- The roles prescribed to clinicians, fetuses, and parents at both the institutional and the individual level.
- The rhetoric included and excluded in professional and personal discussions about congenital disability and prenatal genetic testing.
- The extent to which guidance and practice support or suppress opportunities for choice and autonomy in lay patients.
- The relationship between professional guidance and individual perception and practice.

FINDINGS

Documents emphasize parental right to knowledge for autonomous decision-making
- Respondents report little to no interaction with guidance documents
- Genetic counselors value experiential learning and ad hoc knowledge transmission
- Counselors have almost no experience with people living with congenital disabilities

Social dimensions of disability obscured, making fully-informed decision-making impossible
- Genetic counselors favor biomedical definitions of disability. Social dimensions deemed too unpredictable.

Genetic counselors rely on anecdotal evidence, largely in hospital settings, to understand lived experience of disability

CONCLUSION
- Genetic counselors view prenatal genetic screening as integral to empowering “potential parents...to make fully informed and autonomous decisions about reproductive options and pregnancy management” (Hercher et al., 2016), but reliance on purely biomedical conceptualizations of disability obscure the social dimensions of disability which may impact decision-making.
- It is necessary to provide genetic counselors insight into a holistic view of disability that does not rely on a medicalized model. However, there is a question around implementation, as it is clear that guidance documents are not a sufficient means of knowledge transmission.
- Genetic counselors are not the only clinicians entrenched in the prenatal genetic testing apparatus, and it is not immediately clear how many alternative pathways to genetic testing exist and who acts as gatekeepers and educators on these pathways.
- As prenatal genetic testing becomes less invasive and more ubiquitous, the context in which it is executed will become increasingly important to shaping biological, social, and political conceptualizations of disability.

METHODS

Phase 1:
Inductive content analysis of nine relevant professional guidance documents endorsed by the National Board of Genetic Counselors or the American Board of Genetic Counselors

Phase 2:
Recruitment and semi-structured interviews with seven practicing prenatal genetic counselors in the United States.

Phase 3:
Iterative, inductive analysis of interviews and critical comparison of emergent categories in interviews and documents
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