

Reithmayer, Corrina; Danne, Michael; Mußhoff, Oliver

Article — Published Version

Societal attitudes towards in ovo gender determination as an alternative to chick culling

Agribusiness

Provided in Cooperation with:

John Wiley & Sons

Suggested Citation: Reithmayer, Corrina; Danne, Michael; Mußhoff, Oliver (2021) : Societal attitudes towards in ovo gender determination as an alternative to chick culling, Agribusiness, ISSN 1520-6297, Wiley, Hoboken, NJ, Vol. 37, Iss. 2, pp. 306-323, <https://doi.org/10.1002/agr.21650>

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/230083>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.



<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

Societal attitudes towards in ovo gender determination as an alternative to chick culling

Corrina Reithmayer  | Michael Danne | Oliver Mußhoff

Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Development, Georg-August-Universität Göttingen, Göttingen, Germany

Correspondence

Corrina Reithmayer, Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Development, Georg-August-Universität Göttingen, Platz der Göttinger Sieben 5, 37073 Göttingen, Germany.
Email: corrina.reithmayer@agr.uni-goettingen.de

Funding information

Ministry for Science and Culture of Lower Saxony, Germany

Abstract

In ovo gender determination of incubated eggs can be a large-scale substitute to the culling of male chicks in layer hen production. However, the technology raises new ethical concerns which relate to the sensitivity of the embryo, as well as how the screened out eggs will be used afterward and the accuracy of gender determination. To comprehensively investigate consumer attitudes towards this new technology, a questionnaire including a choice experiment was distributed to a representative sample of 482 German consumers between December 2018 and March 2019. The data was analyzed by an explorative factor analysis and a latent class analysis. Results indicate that the sample can be divided into four segments, which differ in preferences for production attributes, attitudes, and price sensitivity. Attitudinal differences are found regarding respondents' approval of the technical advances in agricultural production, confidence in legal regulations, and the endorsement of enhanced livestock production conditions. Both a meaningful usage of by-products and a high rate of accuracy are crucial factors for the acceptance of in ovo gender determination for a majority of respondents. However, the response behavior of one segment, representing 11% of the sample,

This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited and is not used for commercial purposes.
© 2020 The Authors. *Agribusiness* Published by Wiley Periodicals LLC

indicates the disapproval of both chick culling and in ovo screening.[EconLit Citations: Q160, Q510].

KEYWORDS

choice experiment, culling, gender determination, in ovo, latent class

1 | INTRODUCTION

Approximately 330 million day-old male chicks are culled annually in the European Union (EC, 2008). Culling is a result of advanced specialization in poultry production with layer strains which are characterized by a slim physique and low fattening performance. These properties make them unprofitable for meat production, when competing with conventional broiler meat (Koenig, Hahn, Damme, & Schmutz, 2012). Also sperm sexing, as is performed for other species, is not feasible for poultry (Nanda et al., 2000; Vishwanath & Moreno, 2018). Therefore, superfluous chicks are eliminated either by asphyxiation with CO₂ gas or by maceration (EC, 2008). The economically motivated culling of male chicks without a later use for them in food production is currently being debated critically in a number of western societies, for example, the Netherlands or Germany (BMEL, 2017; Leenstra et al., 2011; Woelders, Brom, & Hopster, 2007).

An alternative to circumvent chick culling at a large scale is so-called “in ovo” (within the egg) gender determination. The technology allows the identification of male chicks already during incubation within the egg. Two technologies are expected to be ready for the market in the near future. They are executed at different stages of embryonic development. The first is a method determining the gender on Day 4 of incubation by a spectroscopic analysis of extraembryonic blood vessels (Galli et al., 2017). The second method analyzes the estradiol content of allantoic fluid on Day 9 of incubation (Weissmann, Reitemeier, Hahn, Gottschalk, & Einspanier, 2013). A third possibility is currently under discussion, which is aiming to analyze the gender through magnetic resonance. It might offer the possibility to sex eggs within the first day of incubation, but it is currently not clear on which level of precision or when it will reach market maturity (TUM Press statement, 2018).

The governments along with representatives of the industry (see Unilever, 2018; United Egg Producers, 2016) announce the approval of these in ovo technologies. In the Netherlands, the parliament has initiated research on potential alternatives to chick culling (see Leenstra et al., 2011). In Germany, the development of an in ovo technology is currently being funded by the government, its large-scale introduction is scheduled for 2020 (BMEL, 2017). In ovo gender determination is expected to be one of the major changes in poultry production over the next few years.

From an ethical point of view, one decisive factor for the evaluation of in ovo gender determination is the moral status given to chicken embryos or fetuses. A widely applied principle is that moral status depends on the ability to suffer (Bentham & Browning, 1843; Singer, 1975), which was considered to be more important than the ability to think (Bratanova, Loughnan, & Bastian, 2011; Loughnan, Haslam, & Bastian, 2010). Consciousness and sensation are preconditions for the ability to suffer, normally being applied soon after birth (Mellor & Gregory, 2003). Before birth, their determination is less straightforward (Mellor & Diesch, 2006). In chicken embryos, some uncertainty about the onset of sentience still remains. It is not possible before the 7th day of incubation, developing stepwise from Day 7 on (Aleksandrowicz & Herr, 2015). At Day 13, the brain is fully developed. Between days 7 and 13, pain perception can be possible, the degree to which it is actually experienced by the embryo is not certain yet (Bjørnstad, Austdal, Roald, Glover, & Paulsen, 2015; Eide & Glover, 1995). Mellor and Diesch (2007) argue that chicks are unconscious and in a sleep-like state until at least Day 17. In contrast the Guidelines of the American Veterinary Association (Leary, 2013) presume consciousness at 50% of incubation time, therefore, at Day 10.5.

Given this ethical background about in ovo gender determination, it is not surprising that its potential implementation raises ethical questions (Bruijnij, Blok, Stassen, & Gremmen, 2015) and is exposed to criticism by the

public, as has been shown in former studies: Leenstra et al. (2011) conducted a consumer study in the Netherlands and found ethical concerns among respondents towards the destruction of embryos. Sexing freshly laid eggs was considered acceptable (although this is currently not feasible) while destroying late embryos, in opposition, was not. A consumer study conducted in Switzerland by Gangnat et al. (2018) found a preference for in ovo sexing of fresh eggs over chick culling, but did not distinguish between the different technological alternatives. Gremmen, Bruijnij, Blok, and Stassen (2018) investigated Dutch respondents' approval of in ovo sexing at Days 9 and 11 of incubation. Sexing at Day 9 was described as "invasive" (taking a sample from the egg) and was found to be an acceptable option by 37.5% of respondents, whereas a further 33.5% found it unacceptable. Sexing at Day 11 was in contrast described as "noninvasive" and was rated as acceptable by 42.3% and unacceptable by 28.2% of respondents. Reithmayer and Mußhoff (2019) used a segmentation approach and found wide approval among German respondents for the in ovo technology, described as performed before the onset of pain perception. Almost three-quarters of respondents were in favor of in ovo screening; however, 27% preferred less specialized dual-use poultry as an alternative to chick culling.

Besides the day of gender determination, other crucial factors might raise or decrease the acceptance of the technology. A high error rate in gender determination or negative influence on hatchability might influence the acceptance for in ovo screening adversely. These factors would result in a higher number of animals needed and a higher input of resources as energy and fodder. Another crucial factor is the utilization of by-products, namely, screened out eggs or male chicks. A meaningful use of by-products could be shown to be a determinant of consent for the respective alternative (Leenstra et al., 2011). It is not intuitive that respondents consider this production characteristic to be important, as this feature has no discernible influence on animal welfare or on the main product (consumption eggs). However, in the related context of pro-environmental behavior, willingness to pay (WTP) a premium, for example, for environment-friendly production standards or recycling could be found in a number of studies (Aadland & Caplan, 2003; Royné, Levy, & Martínez, 2011). Furthermore, the implementation of in ovo screening will result in higher production costs for consumption eggs. In ovo screening is supposed to be implemented in hatcheries, once it is inexpensive and the extra costs per egg are kept marginal. However, certain consumer segments are very price-sensitive (Kontoleon & Yabe, 2006; Reithmayer & Mußhoff, 2019), thus this factor must be considered.

To the best of our knowledge, studies comparing consumer acceptance for in ovo gender determination at the specific Days 1, 4, and 9 of embryonic development as alternatives to the culling of male chicks are lacking. Furthermore, crucial factors that might influence the consumers' evaluation of in ovo gender determination as the utilization of screened out eggs, increasing production costs, and the error rate in gender determination have not been subjects of the investigation so far.

The aim of this study is, therefore, to identify and describe groups of consumers based on their attitudes towards in ovo gender determination. Specifically, there are two objectives: (a) identifying whether there are groups of consumers with different attitudes towards the characteristics of in ovo gender determination (using an explorative factor analysis and a latent class approach) and (b) determining, whether the membership in groups is associated with other characteristics; namely, attitudes towards technical advance and legislation associated with livestock production and WTP for enhanced animal welfare.

For this purpose, a questionnaire including a discrete choice experiment (DCE) and Likert Scale attitudinal questions was conducted with 482 German consumers between December 2018 and March 2019. The sample is almost representative of the German population regarding the distribution of age, education, residence (rural or urban), and occupational group. Insights from the study provide information for stakeholders in egg production, governments, and researchers. Findings should be understood as guidelines in the search and implementation of a publicly accepted and morally preferable substitute to the current practice of chick culling.

The paper is organized as follows. In the next section, the experimental design is described. Subsequently, the econometric model (the latent class model, LCM) of the study is presented. In Section 4, results from the factor analysis and the LCM are presented. Results are discussed subsequently and a conclusion ends the article.

2 | EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

2.1 | Data collection

The anonymous online survey was distributed to respondents via an online panel provider (respondi AG, Cologne, Germany) between December 2018 and March 2019. The company manages a pool of potential respondents and offers an expense allowance as an incentive for successful participation. The expense allowance amounted to about €3 for the presented survey. Quotas on the respondents' age and highest educational attainment were applied to the survey, to obtain a representative picture of the German population. Furthermore, the emphasis was taken to achieve a sample which is geographically well distributed over Germany by implementing quotas on participants' postcode (the quota was applied to the first number of the five-digit postcode; this corresponds in approximation to the distribution of the population in the different German federal states). The questionnaire consisted of four parts: first, respondents were asked to give information about their socioeconomic data. Second, two informational texts on the culling of day-old chicks and the *in ovo* technique were provided, which were essential for the understanding of the DCE. The texts focused on respondents' understanding of the current practice and of the attributes used in the DCE. Participants' understanding was verified through the inclusion of two multiple-choice control questions, which were placed immediately after the informational texts (The informational texts and the control questions are made available in the Appendix). If respondents answered wrongly, they were provided both the informational text and the control question a second time. If they gave a wrong answer a second time, they were screened out as careless response behavior has to be assumed here. The informational parts were then followed by the DCE (third part). An explanation of the used attributes remained available to respondents throughout the DCE by means of mouse-over buttons, which were included in each choice set. Fourth, important aspects of respondents' attitudes towards livestock farming, their WTP for enhanced livestock production conditions and their affinity towards technical solutions to improve animal welfare were measured by means of five-point Likert-scaled items. Here, too, a quality control was established: one of the Likert Scale questions read "please choose *rather disagree*" and participants who answered incorrectly were screened out.

2.2 | Discrete choice experiment

By employing a stated preferences approach, DCEs allow for conclusions to be drawn from previously non-articulated attitudes (Louviere, Hensher, Swait, & Adamowicz, 2010). Through an attribute-based measuring approach, respondents' preferences are investigated by a scenario of hypothetical decision-making situations (List, Sinha, & Taylor, 2006). Because there is no data available about the preferences of German consumers for the *in ovo* gender determination, using a DCE is advisable. Beforehand, an experimental design must be developed, imposing initial predictions on relevant characteristics of *in ovo* gender determination.

The attributes and their levels were chosen based on the premises of the relevance and complexity of the experiment. Both points were addressed by reviewing the literature and conducting a pilot study with a DCE with 38 respondents, as recommended by Lancsar and Louviere (2008). The attributes in the pilot study were identical to those of the final experiment. The following four attributes were considered pertinent for the sake of this study: (a) the *day* of gender determination, (b) the *usage* of screened out eggs or male chicks, (c) the *error rate*, including incorrect gender determination and lower hatchability and (d) the *cost increase* of *in ovo* sexing compared to the current practice, described as price increase per box of 10 fresh eggs (10 eggs is a common package size in Germany). All attributes of the DCE are described through different levels.

The day of *in ovo* gender determination, as derived from the literature and the current political discussion, is prospectively Day 4 of incubation (Galli et al., 2017) or Day 9 of incubation (Weissmann et al., 2013). A further approach attempts for gender determination at Day 1 (TUM Press statement, 2018). In the DCE, the *in ovo* gender determination is compared to the current practice of chick culling on the day of hatch (Day 21).

TABLE 1 Attributes and levels of the choice experiment

Attributes	Levels
Day	Day 1 Day 4 Day 9 Day 21 (chick)
Usage	Throwing away (no use) Chemical industry Pet food Fodder
Error rate	1% 5% 10% 15%
Cost increase	€0.00 €0.30 €1.00 €1.70

The later use of incubated eggs or chicks depends on the stage of embryonic development. Eggs can be used as pet feed, livestock fodder component, or in the chemical industry, whereas chicks are currently mainly used as pet feed (EC, 2009). Depending on the current market situation, it might occur that chicks or eggs would also be thrown away as waste.

The error rate in gender determination can lead to the unintentional destruction of eggs with female embryos. Furthermore, examination of eggs can result in lower hatchability. Galli et al. (2017) find a rate of accuracy in gender determination of >90% for the spectroscopic method performed on Day 4, with a hatching rate of >95% in comparison to the control group (Krautwald-Junghanns et al., 2018). For the endocrine method performed on Day 9 and presented by Weissmann et al. (2013) the hatching rate was reduced by 1.4–12.7 percent points, depending on the test group. The accuracy of determination was above 98%. Also, when sexing male chicks, a certain error rate applies (Biederman & Shiffrar, 1987). We set the error rates in the range between 1% and 15% for this DCE.

The current practice of chick culling is the most inexpensive alternative to handle superfluous male chicks. The introduction of in ovo gender determination will, therefore, result in a price increase of consumption eggs. Leenstra et al. (2011) found positive WTP for alternatives to chick culling for the majority of respondents, ranging from the statement to be willing to pay an additional “€0.05 to €0.10 per egg” to “double the price or more.”¹ The study derives the levels of the price attribute on the basis of these statements; they range from no increase in price to an increase of €1.70 per box of 10 eggs. A summary of attributes and levels is provided in Table 1 and an exemplary choice set is provided in Table 2.

For this study, an unlabeled experimental design with two generic alternatives and an opt-out alternative² was chosen. The opt-out alternative was included to avoid forced responses, which could lead to inaccuracy and inconsistency with demand theory (Hanley, Mourato, & Wright, 2001). With two generic alternatives, comprised of four attributes with four levels each, the full-factorial design consists of 65,536 possible decision situations (choice sets). However, for the sake of practicability, this design was determined to be too extensive. To minimize the loss of information when reducing the full-factorial design, a so-called “efficient design” was applied (Rose & Bliemer, 2009). Following the information received from the pretest, a D-efficient design with eight choice sets was found to be appropriate for our purposes (D-error: 1.82) and was computed using the software *ngene* (ChoiceMetrics, 2014).

3 | STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

3.1 | Factor analysis

The factor analysis summarizes the information of a number of observable variables to fewer latent factors (Yong & Pearce, 2013). Explorative factor analysis in particular is used to uncover complex relationships by identifying subgroups of interrelated variables and by defining the number of underlying factors which best describe the information received from

¹The cost of an egg ranges from a minimum of €0.11 for conventional barn eggs to around €0.50 for organic eggs.

²The opt-out option can be chosen by consumers if none of the given alternatives is assumed acceptable. This applies for instance if other alternatives for handling male chicks are preferred, or if the combination of levels does not meet their preferences.

TABLE 2 Example of a choice set

Attributes	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	I do not support any of the given alternatives
Day of gender determination	Day 9	Day 21	
Usage of screened out eggs or chicks	Throwing away (no use)	Pet food	
Wrongly sorted eggs or chicks	5%	10%	
Cost increase per 10 eggs	€1.70	€0	
Which alternative do you choose?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

the set of observed variables. More specifically, a set of observable variables is reduced to fewer unobservable factors that have a common variance. These unobservable factors build hypothetical constructs representing the observable variables. Exploratory factor analysis has been widely used in the literature to reduce complexity of the data (Hansson & Lagerkvist, 2012; Miles, Schwager, & Lenz, 1995; von Meyer-Höfer, Nitzko, & Spiller, 2015). Each observed variable is “loading” on each of the underlying factors. The size of the factor loadings has an implication on the variables' contribution to a factor, representing the strength of the correlation between factor and variable (Yong & Pearce, 2013). The larger the factor loading, the higher the contribution of the variable to the factor. For each sampled individual, as many factor scores are calculated as there are latent factors. Factor scores are individual-specific variables which represent how much one individual scores on a factor. In this study, the factor scores are finally used in the latent class analysis (LCA) for measuring the influence of the determined factors on consumer preferences.

3.2 | The latent class model

DCE have been widely applied to investigate consumer attitudes towards private and public goods (Risius & Hamm, 2018; van Wezemael, Caputo, Nayga, Chrysochoidis, & Verbeke, 2014) and are based on random utility theory (McFadden, 1986). It is assumed that utility gained from an alternative can be understood as a linear combination of utilities from the alternative's attributes, denoted V_{ij} , and a random term, ε_{ij} . Though the former is observable for the researcher, the latter remains unobservable and is assumed to follow a type I extreme value distribution (Train, 2009, p. 34). Assuming an individual i who chooses alternative j from a set of alternatives J_i , the utility can be written as $U_{ij} = V_{ij} + \varepsilon_{ij}$. The observable part of utility is described through the vector of attributes relating to alternative j , labeled x_{ij} and the corresponding parameter vector: $V_{ij} = \beta'x_{ij}$. The choice probability, as applied in the multinomial logit model (MNL), can be written as (Train, 2009):

$$P_{ij} = \frac{e^{V_{ij}}}{\sum_{j=1}^J e^{V_{ij}}} \quad (1)$$

The MNL model is based on the assumptions that preferences among surveyed individuals are homogeneous and utilities of different alternatives are uncorrelated (assumption of independence of irrelevant alternatives). In reality, these strong assumptions are often violated, leading to inconsistent model estimates (Hausman & McFadden, 1984).

Other econometric models relax these assumptions to allow for a more realistic approach. The LCM for example is more flexible. It accounts for heterogeneity in preferences (Greene & Hensher, 2003) by assuming that the population consists of a number of segments (so-called classes). Although preferences differ between classes, they are considered homogeneous for individuals within one class. In this way, a discrete distribution of preferences is assumed. The number of classes is defined by the researcher. It depends on the model fit but also on the research question and individual judgment (Swait, 1994). Segmentation of the sample is then performed endogenously based on respondents' choice behavior, and socioeconomic or attitudinal variables, if included in the model.

For the following explanations please refer to Greene and Hensher (2003). In a panel data setting, as applied to this study, an individual i faces a series of choice situations t . The choice probability for the LCM depends on class assignment q :

$$\text{Prob (choice } j \text{ made by } i \text{ in situation } t | \text{class } q) = P_{it|q}(j) = \frac{e^{V_{itj|q}}}{\sum_{j=1}^J e^{V_{itj|q}}} \quad (2)$$

The parameters in the observable part of utility are now class-specific, indicated by the suffix q . For the present study, this part consists of the attributes described in Table 1. The joint probability for the sequence of choices can be written as:

$$P_{i|q} = \prod_{t=1}^{T_i} P_{it|q} \quad (3)$$

The probability for a class assignment is unknown. We define the prior probability for class assignment H_{iq} as:

$$H_{iq} = \frac{e^{z_i' \theta_q}}{\sum_{q=1}^Q e^{z_i' \theta_q}} \quad q = 1, \dots, Q; \quad \theta_Q = 0. \quad (4)$$

The z_i represents observable characteristics which influence class membership. In the case of the present study, these consist of the factor scores obtained from factor analysis. θ_q are the corresponding parameter vectors. This vector is normalized to 0 for the Q th class to secure identification of the model. The choice probability for each individual i given the class membership q becomes:

$$P_i = \sum_{q=1}^Q H_{iq} P_{i|q} \quad (5)$$

Estimates for the structural parameter vectors β and the latent class parameter vectors θ are received using maximum likelihood estimation. The attributes, except *cost increase* and *error rate*, enter the model as effects-coded³ variables. The individual-specific characteristics enter the model as dummy-coded variables.

4 | RESULTS

4.1 | Sample characteristics

A total of 544 respondents completed the questionnaire. Respondents needed on average 26 min to complete the questionnaire with a median of 24 min. To ensure the quality of the data, participants who had always given the same answer in one or more sets of the Likert Scale attitudinal questions or who had always chosen the same of the two generic alternatives (e.g., always the first alternative) in the DCE were removed from the data set, as inaccurate answering behavior must be assumed in these cases. After the exclusion of these participants, 482 respondents remained in the data set. The sample was achieved to be almost representative for the German population regarding the variables age and education (highest educational attainment). The sample is furthermore representative regarding respondents' residence (rural or urban) and occupation group. This can be seen in Table 3.

³Effects and dummy coding differ in the handling of the attribute level which describes the base level. With dummy coding, all non-omitted levels are coded as 0 when the base level is present. With effects coding, all non-omitted levels are coded as -1 when the base level is present (Hauber et al., 2016). The latter avoids confounding with the opt-out option. For a discussion on effects coding in DCE, see Bech and Gyrd-Hansen (2005).

TABLE 3 Socioeconomic characteristics of the sample ($n = 482$)

Variable	Mean (SD)	Percentage %
Average age	49 [50] ^{a,b} (17.6)	
Gender male		44 [50] ^b
Education		
Apprenticeship		51 [56] ^b
University degree		19 [18] ^b
School leaving certificate or none		30 [26] ^b
Residence		
Rural residence (town of <20,000 inhabitants)		48 [41] ^c
Urban residence (town of >500,000 inhabitants)		19 [17] ^c
Occupation		
Students		4 [3] ^d
Employees		50 [50] ^d
Pensioners		35 [26] ^d
Other		11 [21]

Abbreviation: SD, standard deviation.

^aGerman average given in brackets [].

^bDestatis (2017).

^cDestatis (2018).

^dDestatis (2019).

4.2 | Results from the explorative factor analysis

The information about respondents' attitudes collected in the last part of the questionnaire was used to conduct an explorative factor analysis. The factor analysis is valuable to reduce the number of items and to identify the central dimension describing the respondents' attitudes. Subsequently, the extracted factor scores were included into the econometric model for the LCA.

In a first step, respondents' answers to 26 five-point Likert Scale questions on opinions about animal welfare in livestock production, WTP for enhanced production conditions and attitudes towards technological solutions in modern agriculture were used for an explorative factor analysis. Computations were performed using the package *psych* in R (Revelle, 2018). Bartlett test indicates that the data is suitable for factor analysis ($p < .00$). The overall Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin criteria is 0.88 and MSA values are >0.65 for all single variables. Velicer's MAP test (Velicer, 1976) indicates that three factors are most suitable to summarize information from the 26 variables. We run a maximum likelihood factor analysis with varimax rotation and keep variables with factor loadings ≥ 0.4 or ≤ -0.4 on one factor and a minimum difference to the second-highest factor loading of at least 0.2. Ultimately, 18 variables remain in the data set, loading on three factors. Cronbach's α indicates good to acceptable values of .89, .7 and .74 (Brace, Kemp, & Snelgar, 2018) for factors 1, 2 and 3. Factor loadings can be seen in Table 4.

Factor 1 can be summarized as “enhanced animal welfare,” as statements indicating a high affinity to improved animal welfare, a high WTP for enhanced production standards and a high demand for product information are loading on this factor. Factor 2 is named “technological advance,” as statements approving technological solutions in agriculture are loading high on this factor. Factor 3 is called “legal standards,” as it indicates trust in the legislation of livestock production in Germany.

4.3 | Results from the latent class model

The data from the choice experiment was analyzed through a LCA. Factor scores from the explorative factor analysis were included as individual-specific variables into the LCA. Models were tested with two and up to seven

TABLE 4 Factor loadings from the explorative factor analysis ($n = 482$)

	Mean (SD) ^a	Factor 1 Enhanced animal welfare	Factor 2 Technological advance	Factor 3 Legal standards
Animal welfare is very important to me. I express this through a willingness to pay.	3.77 (1.06)	0.77^b	-0.10	-0.08
Animal welfare is to be improved, even if this makes food more expensive.	3.95 (1.00)	0.75	-0.04	-0.21
When buying animal products, I pay attention to how the animals were kept.	3.52 (0.95)	0.75	-0.06	-0.02
I prefer products from housing systems that are above the legal standard.	3.87 (0.90)	0.70	0.03	-0.12
I would like to receive more information about the production conditions of food.	3.86 (1.02)	0.69	-0.02	-0.16
I am interested in livestock farming in Germany.	3.61 (0.96)	0.65	0.02	-0.10
The purchase of animal welfare products has an impact on animal welfare on farms.	3.73 (0.91)	0.52	0.16	-0.05
Animal welfare is a question of morality, not money.	4.02 (0.99)	0.51	-0.09	-0.08
Imported products from outside Germany should be produced according to the same animal welfare standards that apply in Germany.	4.28 (0.77)	0.42	0.11	-0.11
I am well aware of the conditions under which animals are kept.	2.98 (0.89)	0.41	-0.12	0.07
I do not check the information on food packaging.	2.31 (1.07)	-0.56	-0.13	0.05
To be honest, I don't think much about animal welfare in agriculture.	2.57 (1.15)	-0.73	0.14	0.07
Technical progress in agriculture is helpful in solving animal welfare problems.	3.57 (0.87)	0.09	0.60	0.08
The use of modern technology in animal production is part of the agriculture of the future.	3.81 (0.82)	0.01	0.59	0.06
Animal welfare and modern technologies are incompatible for me.	2.57 (1.04)	-0.02	-0.62	-0.01
The technical progress in agriculture is uncanny to me.	2.69 (1.12)	0.17	-0.63	-0.06
The welfare of the animals is ensured by the current statutory animal welfare standards.	2.46 (0.88)	-0.16	0.08	0.73
I have confidence in German animal husbandry.	2.63 (0.90)	-0.14	0.14	0.75
Cronbach's α		0.88	0.70	0.74

Abbreviation: SD, standard deviation.

^aSample mean of five-point Likert Scale questions. Value 1: "fully disagree" to 5: "fully agree."^bHighest factor loadings are marked bold.

TABLE 5 Bayesian information criteria (BIC)^a of models with a different number of classes ($n = 482$)

Number of classes (Q)	2	3	4	5	6	7
BIC	6,990	6,796	6,740	6,746	6,831	6,890

^a $\chi^2 = 2.3$, $df = 1$, $p[\chi^2] = .13$, with p as the number of free model parameters and n as the sample size.

classes. The Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC; Schwarz, 1978) was then used to identify the appropriate number of classes, as recommended by Roeder, Lynch, and Nagin (1999). BIC reaches a minimum at $Q = 4$, as can be seen in Table 5, indicating that heterogeneity in respondents' attitudes can best be described through four segments. McFadden R^2 for the model with four classes is 0.25, indicating a good explanatory power (Louviere et al., 2010, p. 54). The results of the four-class model subsequently are presented in Table 6.

The smallest class makes up 11% of the sample, whereas the largest class represents 41% of respondents. Statistically significant coefficients are found for all classes. For class 1 (11% of the sample), statistically significant negative coefficients are found for the ASC and the attribute *error rate*, whereas all other parameters are not statistically significant. That means that members of this group on average prefer to opt-out, and they disapprove inaccuracy in the gender determination process. Due to the tendency to opt-out, class 1 is named "the refusers." Members of class

TABLE 6 Estimation results of the LCM with four classes ($n = 482$)

	Class 1 <i>The refusers</i> 11%	Class 2 <i>The ethicists</i> 41%	Class 3 <i>The technology-savvy</i> 20%	Class 4 <i>The eager ones</i> 28%
ASC	-1.90 (0.43)*	0.85 (0.16)*	1.35 (0.22)*	4.00 (0.49)*
Day 1 ^a	0.03	1.97	-0.07	0.97
Day 4	0.03 (0.28)	1.19 (0.11)*	0.37 (0.14)**	0.95 (0.20)*
Day 9	0.04 (0.29)	-0.65 (0.22)**	0.48 (0.16)**	0.31 (0.13)***
Day 21 (chick)	-0.10 (0.42)	-2.51 (0.22)*	-0.78 (0.18)*	-2.23 (0.41)*
Waste ^a	0.04	-1.42	-0.71	-1.15
Chemical industry	-0.19 (0.34)	-0.35 (0.13)**	-0.67 (0.17)*	-0.32(0.12)***
Pet food	-0.10 (0.40)	1.02 (0.16)*	0.92 (0.17)*	0.84 (0.15)*
Fodder	0.25 (0.28)	0.75 (0.09)*	0.46 (0.17)**	0.63 (0.10)*
Error rate	-7.64 (3.44)***	-16.64 (2.01)*	-5.21 (1.55)*	-9.99 (0.98)*
Price	-0.22 (0.32)	-0.54 (0.13)*	-1.72 (0.23)*	-0.56 (0.13)*
Constant		1.30 (0.07)*	0.57 (0.08)*	0.92 (0.07)*
Factor 1		0.03 (0.06)	-0.08 (0.07)	-0.07 (0.06)
Factor 2		0.01 (0.07)	0.23 (0.08)**	0.10 (0.07)
Factor 3		0.34 (0.07)*	0.05 (0.08)	0.21 (0.07)**

Note: Standard errors are given in parantheses ().

Abbreviations: ASC, alternative specific constant; LCM, latent class model.

^aThe attributes *day* and *usage* are effects coded. The coefficient of the omitted attribute levels "Day 1" and "waste" can be obtained by calculating the negative of the sum of the other attribute levels' coefficients. By definition, no standard errors are obtained.

* $p \leq .001$.

** $p \leq .01$.

*** $p \leq .05$.

1 are widely indifferent about the remaining characteristics of the in ovo technique. This class seems to follow other criteria in their evaluation of in ovo gender determination or may have no clear opinion about the insignificant attributes. The results can be an indicator that class 1 approves neither chick culling nor in ovo gender determination but would be in favor of other solutions as, for example, dual-use poultry, which were not given as an alternative.

For classes 2, 3, and 4, statistically significant coefficients for all non-omitted attribute levels can be found. Class 2 (41% of the sample) is named "the ethicists." This class is price-sensitive and the preferences for the different levels of the attribute *day* indicate a discriminating view on the in ovo technique. Though in ovo gender determination at early stages of embryonic development, namely, Days 1 and 4, increases the choice probability, class 2 disapproves gender determination on Day 9. Also, chick culling is clearly disapproved by this class. The usage of by-products as pet food or fodder is significantly preferred to the use of screened out eggs in the chemical industry. Wald test reveals that members of this class are indifferent between the usage as pet food or fodder ($\chi^2 = 2.3$, $df = 1$, $p[>\chi^2] = .13$). Members of class 2 also reveal a very high negative parameter for the attribute *error rate*. The statistically significant positive coefficient for factor 3 indicates furthermore that class 2 has a higher trust in German livestock production and legal standards, in comparison to class 1.

Class 3 (20% of the sample), called "the technology-savvy" is more price-conscious than the other classes. Regarding the attitudes towards in ovo gender determination, all three in ovo alternatives increase choice probability, whereas the attribute level "chick culling" has the opposite effect. The use of by-products as pet food is approved as the best alternative by class 3, whereas respondents disapprove the usage in the chemical industry. The favor of in ovo screening as an alternative to chick culling is in line with the statistically significant coefficient for Factor 2: in comparison to class 1, class 3 is more favorable toward technological advance in agriculture and for animal welfare improvements.

Class 4 (28% of the sample), named "the eager ones," is less price-sensitive than class 3. Members of class 4 gain positive utility of all proposed in ovo technologies, chick culling is strongly disapproved. The preferences for the attribute *usage* are very similar to class 2, with the utilization of by-products as pet food and fodder preferred over the use in the chemical industry. As in class 2, members of class 4 are characterized by a higher trust in German livestock production and have more confidence in the legal requirements, compared to class 1. This is indicated by the statistically significant positive coefficient for Factor 3. It is worth noting that the ASC of class 4 is very high, indicating that members of this class gain a high utility from the alternatives per se and rarely opt-out. They would opt for one of the two alternatives, even if it was described by the least preferred combination of attribute levels. As for classes 2 and 3, also class 4 is significantly disapproving inaccuracy in the gender determination process.

As proven by the LCA, preferences for in ovo gender determination as an alternative to the current practice of chick culling are heterogeneous. A share of 41% of respondents has a differentiated view towards in ovo gender determination, approving it only if it can be carried out with certainty before the onset of pain perception. However, the share which approves in ovo screening independently of these concerns is with 48% similarly high. Also, disapproval of chick culling is heterogeneous. Though 69% of respondents (classes 2 and 4) disapprove it strongly, 20% of respondents (class 3) might accept chick culling under certain circumstances, as for example, a low error rate and a meaningful use of male chicks as pet food.

Preferences regarding the usage of by-products—incubated eggs or male chicks—are relatively homogeneous in classes 2–4. For all classes, the use as pet food is the preferred alternative, followed by the use as livestock fodder. A surprising result is that using screened out eggs in the chemical industry is disapproved in all classes. Class 3 equally rejects this, as well as if the eggs had to be thrown away. Classes 2 and 4 indicate that "no use" and, therefore, "waste" of by-products is the worst of the given attribute levels.

Findings allow the calculation of respondents' WTP for the implementation of in ovo screening (stated in a premium per box of 10 eggs) in comparison to the current practice of chick culling, for classes 2–4. For class 1, no statistically significant coefficients are obtained for the levels of the attributes *day* and *usage*; calculation of WTP is, therefore, meaningless. Marginal WTP for the attribute levels, calculated as the rate of substitution between the attribute levels' coefficients and the price coefficient, differs between the classes. This can be seen in Figure 1. Class 2 is only slightly price-sensitive. Marginal WTP to move from the current practice of chick culling to in ovo




FIGURE 1 Marginal willingness to pay (WTP) for the attribute levels of *day* (with respect to chick culling) and *usage* (with respect to waste)

gender determination is, therefore, very high, ranging from €8.26 for Day 1 to €3.43 for Day 9 per box of 10 eggs. Also, WTP for a meaningful use of by-products is high for this class: to use by-products in the chemical industry, as pet fodder or livestock feed instead of removing them as “waste,” members of class 2 are willing to pay on average €2.03, €4.55, and €4.05 per box of 10 eggs.

Members of the more price-sensitive class 3 are willing to pay on average a premium of €0.42, €0.67, and €0.74 per box of 10 eggs to switch from chick culling to in ovo gender determination on Days 1, 4, and 9, respectively. To find a solution where eggs or culled chicks can be used meaningfully as pet food, members of this class are willing to pay an additional €0.96 per box of 10 eggs. In contrast, the use in the chemical industry is not considered a viable option by this class.

Class 4 is less price-conscious and strongly disapproving of chick culling. On average WTP a surplus of €5.77, €5.76, and €4.61 per box of 10 eggs can be found for this class, to switch from the current practice to in ovo screening at Days 1, 4, and 9. The preferences of class 4 for the levels of the attribute *usage* are very similar to those of class 2, with marginal WTPs for the usages in the chemical industry, as pet food or fodder of €1.55, €3.65, and €3.27 per box of 10 eggs, respectively. Price increases of eggs seem to be no barrier for the implementation of the in ovo technology for a majority of respondents (69%). It can be assumed, that the probable price increases per box of 10 eggs will be accepted by this share of the population. However, 20% of the population is shown to be more price-sensitive, with WTP under €1.00 per box of 10 eggs to switch from chick culling to in ovo screening.

5 | DISCUSSION

The culling of layer-type male chicks is publicly criticized due to ethical concerns. Abandoning the practice comes with changes along the production chain. The most promising alternative to be applied on a large scale in the future is in ovo screening of incubated eggs. However, the implementation of in ovo screening may also cause ethical

concern and will potentially raise the costs of consumption eggs. To analyze consumer preferences for the implementation of in ovo gender determination, we conducted a survey including a choice experiment with German respondents. Germany is very suitable as a study area because chick culling and its potential alternatives are highly discussed. Findings from this study deliver a comprehensive understanding of societal attitudes towards this new technology, which have not been studied in this detail before.

A LCM is applied to data from a choice experiment conducted with a representative sample of 482 German respondents. This segmentation approach provides insights into the distribution of respondents' attitudes for different characteristics associated with chick culling and in ovo gender determination. Results of the LCM prove that heterogeneity towards the different in ovo technologies and the production characteristics exists. This heterogeneity becomes also apparent in respondents' WTP for certain characteristics of the in ovo technology. Furthermore, all factors received from attitudinal Likert Scale questions through an explorative factor analysis were shown to be meaningful predictors of class assignment and, therefore, explaining heterogeneity.

Findings show that chick culling is widely disapproved and that maintaining the current practice is considered the worst alternative for the majority of respondents (89%), whereas in ovo gender determination is preferred. However, choice behavior of 41% of respondents indicates ethical concern about the in ovo technology; it is approved if conducted at a stage of embryonic development when sentience can be excluded with certainty (Days 1 and 4). Although 20% of respondents are price-sensitive, the study finds a low price sensitivity and high WTP for in ovo screening alternatives for 69% of respondents. However, one class, representing 11% of the sample, indicates to disapprove both chick culling and in ovo screening.

Findings allow a number of implications. There seems to be no one solution for the abandoning of chick culling. In ovo screening is widely accepted, but results indicate that also other alternatives, including the current practice, might be demanded in the market, too. Furthermore, high WTP values indicate that the adoption of in ovo screening could be an interesting option for producers, also besides the current practice of chick culling. This could apply also for countries where chick culling will not be prohibited by law and where certain consumer segments are willing to pay for enhanced livestock production conditions. In this case, to market eggs labeled as coming from in ovo screened hens could be an attractive option for producers to differentiate from the market.

Interestingly, respondents in this sample were willing to pay considerable amounts for a production attribute, which did not render an apparent advantage: the later usage of by-products, male chicks or screened out eggs. WTPs for these factors are found to be comparably high, though less than for the attribute *day*. This WTP can be interpreted as a willingness for pro-environmental behavior and can be observed for all classes which support in ovo screening as an alternative to chick culling (89% of the sample). The high WTPs should furthermore be understood as an invitation to politicians to consider the legal foundations for a meaningful use of by-products of in ovo screening, as this appears to be a very important point in addition to the day of gender determination. The importance of this production characteristic should not be underestimated when searching for alternatives to chick culling, which are considered ethically superior. In practice, the usage of by-products as male chicks or incubated screened out eggs could be a decisive point when implementing in ovo screening on a large scale.

6 | CONCLUSION

The case of chick culling and in ovo gender determination provides the possibility to obtain profound insights into citizens' expectations towards ethically sound agricultural production standards in the context of technological advance. For this study, Germany was identified as very suitable study area because chick culling is currently highly discussed there. However, low implementation cost might allow the large-scale implementation of in ovo gender determination also in other markets in the near future. Attitudes towards chick culling alternatives were only studied in a few northern European countries so far. As cross-cultural differences in attitudes towards farm animal

welfare could be found in previous studies (Nocella, Hubbard, & Scarpa, 2010), future research should analyze consumer preferences for in ovo technologies in other European or non-European countries.

The presented study relies on a hypothetical choice experiment for the elicitation of preferences. This experimental approach was chosen, as the available data on purchases of eggs labeled as from rearing systems with in ovo gender determination was insufficient for this study. However, stated WTP estimates can be exposed to hypothetical bias. This could be a reason for the very high WTP estimates found. As the number of purchased “in ovo eggs” will increase in the future, the values obtained in this analysis should be validated by means of revealed preferences approaches.

This study focuses on consumer preferences for different in ovo technologies. Although the opt-out alternative of the DCE might reflect a refusal of in ovo screening and a preference for other alternatives to chick culling, as for example dual-use of chicken, such information is not directly measurable in our study. This research question has already been addressed by Reithmayer and Mußhoff (2019). Nevertheless, findings provide valuable insights into societal attitudes towards the implementation of in ovo gender determination; they give relevant implications for both marketers and political decision-makers when looking for an ethically more accepted alternative to chick culling.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study was supported by the “Ministry for Science and Culture” of Lower Saxony, Germany.

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

The authors declare that there are no conflict of interests.

ORCID

Corrina Reithmayer  <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-1624-669X>

REFERENCES

- Aadland, D., & Caplan, A. J. (2003). Willingness to pay for curbside recycling with detection and mitigation of hypothetical bias. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 85(2), 492–502.
- Aleksandrowicz, E., & Herr, I. (2015). Ethical euthanasia and short-term anesthesia of the chick embryo. *ALTEX: Alternativen zu Tierexperimenten*, 32(2), 143–147.
- Bech, M., & Gyrd-Hansen, D. (2005). Effects coding in discrete choice experiments. *Health Economics*, 14(10), 1079–1083.
- Bentham, J., & Browning, J. (1843). *The works of Jeremy Bentham*. London, UK: Simpkin, Marshall, & Co.
- Biederman, I., & Shiffrar, M. M. (1987). Sexing day-old chicks: A case study and expert systems analysis of a difficult perceptual-learning task. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 13(4), 640–645.
- Bjørnstad, S., Austdal, L. P. E., Roald, B., Glover, J. C., & Paulsen, R. E. (2015). Cracking the egg: Potential of the developing chicken as a model system for nonclinical safety studies of pharmaceuticals. *The Journal of Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics*, 355(3), 386–396.
- BMEL. (2017). *Alternativen zum Töten männlicher Küken*. Resource document. German Federal Ministry of Food and Agriculture. Retrieved from https://www.bmel.de/DE/Tier/Tierwohl/_texte/Tierwohl-Forschung-In-Ovo.html
- Brace, N., Kemp, R., & Snelgar, R. (2018). *SPSS for psychologists (and everybody else)* (6th ed.). London, UK: Palgrave, an imprint of Springer Nature Limited.
- Bratanova, B., Loughnan, S., & Bastian, B. (2011). The effect of categorization as food on the perceived moral standing of animals. *Appetite*, 57(1), 193–196.
- Brujinis, M. R. N., Blok, V., Stassen, E. N., & Gremmen, H. G. J. (2015). Moral “lock-in” in responsible innovation: The ethical and social aspects of killing day-old chicks and its alternatives. *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics*, 28(5), 939–960.
- ChoiceMetrics. (2014). *Ngene 1.1.2 User Manual & Reference Guide*, Australia: Author.
- Destatis. (2017). *Bevölkerung und Erwerbstätigkeit [Population and employment]*. Wiesbaden, Germany: German Federal Statistical Office.
- Destatis. (2018). *Alle politisch selbständigen Gemeinden mit ausgewählten Merkmalen am 30.09.2018 (3. Quartal 2018) [All politically independent municipalities with selected characteristics at 30 Sep. 2018 (3rd quarter 2018)]*. Resource document. German Federal Statistical Office. Retrieved from <https://www.destatis.de/DE/Themen/Laender-Regionen/Regionales/Gemeindeverzeichnis/Administrativ/Archiv/GVAuszugQ/AuszugGV3QAktuell.html>

- Destatis. (2019). *Bildung und Kultur—Sommersemester 2018 [Education and culture—Summer semester 2018]*. Resource document. German Federal Statistical Office. Retrieved from https://www.destatis.de/DE/Themen/Gesellschaft-Umwelt/Bildung-Forschung-Kultur/Hochschulen/Publikationen/Downloads-Hochschulen/studierende-hochschulen-ss-2110410187314.pdf?__blob=publicationFile&v=4
- EC. (2008). *Questions and Answers on the proposal for the protection of animals at the time of killing* (MEMO/08/574). Resource Document. European Commission. Retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/food/animals/welfare/practice/slaughter_en
- EC. (2009). Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 October 2009 laying down health rules as regards animal by-products and derived products not intended for human consumption and repealing Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002 (Animal by-products Regulation). *Official Journal of the European Union* L300, 52, 1–33.
- Eide, A. L., & Glover, J. C. (1995). Development of the longitudinal projection patterns of lumbar primary sensory afferents in the chicken embryo. *The Journal of Comparative Neurology*, 353(2), 247–259.
- Galli, R., Preusse, G., Uckermann, O., Bartels, T., Krautwald-Junghanns, M.-E., Koch, E., & Steiner, G. (2017). In ovo sexing of chicken eggs by fluorescence spectroscopy. *Analytical and Bioanalytical Chemistry*, 409(5), 1185–1194.
- Gangnat, I. D. M., Mueller, S., Kreuzer, M., Messikommer, R. E., Siegrist, M., & Visschers, V. H. M. (2018). Swiss consumers' willingness to pay and attitudes regarding dual-purpose poultry and eggs. *Poultry Science*, 97(3), 1089–1098.
- Greene, W. H., & Hensher, D. A. (2003). A latent class model for discrete choice analysis: Contrasts with mixed logit. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological*, 37(8), 681–698.
- Gremmen, B., Brujinis, M. R. N., Blok, V., & Stassen, E. N. (2018). A public survey on handling male chicks in the Dutch egg sector. *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics*, 31(1), 93–107.
- Hanley, N., Mourato, S., & Wright, R. E. (2001). Choice modelling approaches: A superior alternative for environmental valuation? *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 15(3), 435–462.
- Hansson, H., & Lagerkvist, C. J. (2012). Measuring farmers' attitudes to animal welfare and health. *British Food Journal*, 114(6), 840–852.
- Hauber, A. B., González, J. M., Groothuis-Oudshoorn, C. G. M., Prior, T., Marshall, D. A., Cunningham, C., ... Bridges, J. F. P. (2016). Statistical methods for the analysis of discrete choice experiments: A report of the ISPOR Conjoint Analysis Good Research Practices Task Force. *Value in Health: the Journal of the International Society for Pharmacoeconomics and Outcomes Research*, 19(4), 300–315.
- Hausman, J., & McFadden, D. (1984). Specification tests for the multinomial logit model. *Econometrica*, 52(5), 1219.
- Koenig, M., Hahn, G., Damme, K., & Schmutz, M. (2012). Untersuchungen zur Mastleistung und Schlachtkörperzusammensetzung von Stubenküken aus Masthybriden und verschiedenen Legehybridherkünften [Studies on fattening performance and carcass composition of poussins from fattening hybrids and various laying hybrid origins]. *Züchtungskunde*, 84(6), 511–522.
- Kontoleon, A., & Yabe, M. (2006). Market segmentation analysis of preferences for GM derived animal foods in the UK. *Journal of Agricultural & Food Industrial Organization*, 4(1), 1–36.
- Krautwald-Junghanns, M.-E., Cramer, K., Fischer, B., Förster, A., Galli, R., Kremer, F., ... Bartels, T. (2018). Current approaches to avoid the culling of day-old male chicks in the layer industry, with special reference to spectroscopic methods. *Poultry Science*, 97(3), 749–757.
- Lancsar, E., & Louviere, J. (2008). Conducting discrete choice experiments to inform healthcare decision making: A user's guide. *PharmacoEconomics*, 26(8), 661–677.
- Leary, S. L. (2013). *AVMA guidelines for the euthanasia of animals* (2013 ed.). Schaumburg, IL: American Veterinary Medical Association.
- Leenstra, F., Munnichs, G., Beekman, V., vanden Heuvel-Vromans, E., Aramyan, L., & Woelders, H. (2011). Killing day-old chicks? Public opinion regarding potential alternatives. *Animal Welfare*, 20(1), 37–45.
- List, J. A., Sinha, P., & Taylor, M. H. (2006). Using choice experiments to value non-market goods and services: Evidence from field experiments. *Advances in Economic Analysis & Policy*, 5(2), 1–37.
- Loughnan, S., Haslam, N., & Bastian, B. (2010). The role of meat consumption in the denial of moral status and mind to meat animals. *Appetite*, 55(1), 156–159.
- Louviere, J. J., Hensher, D. A., Swait, J., & Adamowicz, W. L. (2010). *Stated choice methods: Analysis and applications* (7th ed.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- McFadden, D. (1986). The choice theory approach to market research. *Marketing Science*, 5, 275–297.
- Mellor, D. J., & Diesch, T. J. (2006). Onset of sentience: The potential for suffering in fetal and newborn farm animals. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science*, 100(1–2), 48–57.
- Mellor, D. J., & Diesch, T. J. (2007). Birth and hatching: Key events in the onset of awareness in the lamb and chick. *New Zealand Veterinary Journal*, 55(2), 51–60.
- Mellor, D. J., & Gregory, N. G. (2003). Responsiveness, behavioural arousal and awareness in fetal and newborn lambs: Experimental, practical and therapeutic implications. *New Zealand Veterinary Journal*, 51(1), 2–13.

- Miles, H., Schwager, S. J., & Lenz, J. E. (1995). Perceptual dimensions that influence consumers' choices of milk type for beverage use. *Agribusiness*, 11(3), 263–272.
- Nanda, I., Zend-Ajusht, E., Shan, Z., Grützner, F., Schartl, M., Burt, D. W., ... Schmid, M. (2000). Conserved synteny between the chicken Z sex chromosome and human chromosome 9 includes the male regulatory gene DMRT1: A comparative (re)view on avian sex determination. *Cytogenetics and Cell Genetics*, 89(1-2), 67–78.
- Nocella, G., Hubbard, L., & Scarpa, R. (2010). Farm animal welfare, consumer willingness to pay, and trust: Results of a cross-national survey. *Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy*, 32(2), 275–297.
- Reithmayer, C., & Mußhoff, O. (2019). Consumer preferences for alternatives to chick culling in Germany. *Poultry Science*, 98(10), 4539–4548.
- Revelle, W. (2018). *psych: Procedures for Personality and Psychological Research*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University.
- Risius, A., & Hamm, U. (2018). Exploring influences of different communication approaches on consumer target groups for ethically produced beef. *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics*, 31(3), 325–340.
- Roeder, K., Lynch, K. G., & Nagin, D. S. (1999). Modeling uncertainty in latent class membership: A case study in criminology. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 94(447), 766–776.
- Rose, J. M., & Bliemer, M. C. J. (2009). Constructing efficient stated choice experimental designs. *Transport Reviews*, 29(5), 587–617.
- Royne, M. B., Levy, M., & Martinez, J. (2011). The public health implications of consumers' environmental concern and their willingness to pay for an eco-friendly product. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 45(2), 329–343.
- Schwarz, G. (1978). Estimating the dimension of a model. *The Annals of Statistics*, 6(2), 461–464.
- Singer, P. (1975). *Animal liberation: A new ethics for our treatment of animals*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Swait, J. (1994). A structural equation model of latent segmentation and product choice for cross-sectional revealed preference choice data. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 1(2), 77–89.
- Train, K. (2009). *Discrete choice methods with simulation* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- TUM Press statement. (2018). *Durchbruch bei Suche nach Alternative zum Kükentöten [Breakthrough in the search for an alternative to chick culling]*. Resource document. Technical University of Munich. Retrieved from <https://www.tum.de/die-tum/aktuelles/pressemitteilungen/detail/article/34775/>
- Unilever. (2018). *Farm animal welfare statement*. Resource document. Unilever. Retrieved from <https://www.unilever.com/sustainable-living/what-matters-to-you/farm-animal-welfare.html>
- United Egg Producers. (2016). *Statement on Eliminating Male Chick Culling*. Resource document. United Egg Producers & United Egg Association. Retrieved from <https://uepcertified.com/united-egg-producers-statement-eliminating-male-chick-culling/>
- Velicer, W. F. (1976). Determining the number of components from the matrix of partial correlations. *Psychometrika*, 41(3), 321–327.
- Vishwanath, R., & Moreno, J. F. (2018). Review: Semen sexing—current state of the art with emphasis on bovine species. *Animal: an international journal of animal bioscience*, 12(1), 85–96.
- vonMeyer-Höfer, M., Nitzko, S., & Spiller, A. (2015). Is there an expectation gap? Consumers' expectations towards organic. *British Food Journal*, 117(5), 1527–1546.
- Weissmann, A., Reitemeier, S., Hahn, A., Gottschalk, J., & Einspanier, A. (2013). Sexing domestic chicken before hatch: A new method for in ovo gender identification. *Theriogenology*, 80(3), 199–205.
- vanWezemael, L., Caputo, V., Nayga, R. M., Chrysochoidis, G., & Verbeke, W. (2014). European consumer preferences for beef with nutrition and health claims: A multi-country investigation using discrete choice experiments. *Food Policy*, 44, 167–176.
- Woelders, H., Brom, F., & Hopster, H. (2007). *Alternatieven voor doding van eendagskuikens: technologische perspectieven en ethische consequenties. [Alternatives to killing day-old chicks: technological perspectives and ethical consequences]*. Resource document. Animal Sciences Group. <http://edepot.wur.nl/45674>
- Yong, A. G., & Pearce, S. (2013). A beginner's guide to factor analysis: Focusing on exploratory factor analysis. *Tutorials in quantitative methods for psychology*, 9(2), 79–94.

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHIES

Corrina Reithmayer completed her doctorate at the University of Göttingen in the year 2020. She is currently doing research at the Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Development at the University of Göttingen. Her research focuses on consumers' decision-making in the context of farm animal welfare and societal expectations towards modern livestock farming. Email: corrina.reithmayer@agr.uni-goettingen.de.

Michael Danne completed his doctorate at the University of Göttingen in the year 2018. He is currently doing research at the Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Development at the University of Göttingen. His research focuses on farmers' and consumers' decision-making, farm management, and animal welfare out of the single-farm perspective. Email: michael.danne@agr.uni-goettingen.de.

Oliver Mußhoff is Professor of Agricultural Economics at the University of Göttingen. He has worked on a broad range of research questions in the field of farm management. Areas of application are modeling of entrepreneurial decisions, investment and finance, risk management, as well as experimental impact analysis of different agricultural policy measures. Email: oliver.musshoff@agr.uni-goettingen.de.

How to cite this article: Reithmayer C, Danne M, Mußhoff O. Societal attitudes towards in ovo gender determination as an alternative to chick culling. *Agribusiness*. 2021;37:306–323.

<https://doi.org/10.1002/agr.21650>

APPENDIX: INFORMATIONAL TEXTS AND CONTROL QUESTIONS USED IN THE ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE

Information about poultry production

In poultry production, egg and meat production are separated. For the production of chicken meat such as chicken fillets or chicken thighs, there are special breeds that grow very quickly, put on a lot of meat, and can be slaughtered after 5–6 weeks. For the production of eggs, specialized breeds are used which lay over 300 eggs per year. They are called layer breeds. The hens and cockerels of these breeds have a narrow, thin physique and put on very little meat, even when they are fully grown.

Only the females of these layer breeds can lay eggs. However, as male and female chicks hatch when breeding the laying hens, there is a problem: Cockerels do not lay eggs and they grow very slowly and put on very little meat. They are, therefore, neither useful for the production of eggs nor for the production of meat. Therefore, they are killed on the first day of life, shortly after they hatch. This happens in the EU mostly by suffocation with CO₂ gas. Slaughtered chicks can partly be used as feed for zoo animals or pets. This practice is very widespread, both in conventional and organic farming. In Germany, between 45 and 50 million male chicks are killed every year on the 1st day of life.

A technical solution to determine the gender in the egg (1)

Chicken eggs are usually incubated for 21 days. On the 21st day the chick hatches. In laying hen production, the chicks are sorted after hatching by hand into female and male chicks. The male chicks are then killed.

Currently, research is underway to develop a technique for determining the gender in the egg. This method is called “in ovo,” that is, “in the egg.” Eggs with male embryos would as a consequence be sorted out before hatching. Male chicks would, therefore, not have to be killed on the first day of life and eggs with female embryos would be incubated until hatching. The future laying hens hatch from these eggs.

Determining the gender of a chick before hatching is technically complex. Alternatives include the examination of the egg on days 1, 4, or 9 of incubation. On the 1st and 4th day of incubation, the pain sensation of the chick embryo is not yet developed. On the 9th day of incubation, the perception of pain might already be present to a certain degree.

Control question

Why should the ovo technique be introduced?

- The eggs can already be sorted into future broilers and laying hens during incubation.
- The health of the chicks can be determined before hatching, so that unhealthy embryos can be sorted out.

- Male chicks from layer hen production can be identified and sorted out during incubation. This prevents the killing of male chicks after hatching.

A technical solution to determine the gender in the egg (2)

Half of the fertilized eggs in the incubator contain male embryos, the other half is female. It is possible that the gender is not determined correctly in all eggs with the in ovo technique. It can happen that eggs with female embryos are destroyed by mistake.

Due to different errors, to obtain 100 healthy laying hens, more than 200 fertilized eggs must, therefore, be incubated.

Control question

Due to errors in gender determination, it is possible that eggs with female embryos are also unintentionally rejected.

- True
- False