TABLE 1. Selected characteristics of participants in a mixed-methods study of pregnancy-related attitudes and behaviors of homeless youth, by study arm, Los Angeles, 2008–2011

Characteristic	Qualitative (N=37)	Quantitative (N=277)
Percentages		
Male	46	60
Race/ethnicity		
Black	16	21
Hispanic	27	18
White	46	40
Other	11	21
High school graduate/GED	51	52
Currently employed	3	15
Means		
Current age	19.78	20.30
No. of years since first left home	3.68	4.67

TABLE 2. Percentage of youth in quantitative sample reporting selected attitudes and behaviors, by gender

Attitude/behavior	Males (N=164)	Females (N=113)
Pregnant/tried to become pregnant in past 3 mos.	na	28
Used prescription contraceptive in past 3 mos.	na	19
Used prescription contraceptive at last sex	na	16
Used condom in past 3 mos.	66	55
Used condom at last sex	52	33
Used withdrawal at last sex	39	43
Importance of avoiding pregnancy		
Very	75	71
Somewhat	10	11
A little	3	4
Not at all	12	15
Feeling if pregnancy occurred		
Very upset	25	45
A little upset	32	30
A little pleased	20	15
Very pleased	23	10

Note: na=not applicable.

TABLE 3. Percentage of youth, by contraceptive method used at last sex, according to gender and level of motivation to avoid pregnancy

Method	Total (N=277)	Males		Females	
		High motivation (N=84)	Low motivation (N=80)	High motivation (N=69)	Low motivation (N=44)
Prescription method only	12	7	16	14	8
Condom only	37	51	33	36	17
Prescription method and condom*,†	8	10	10	6	1
Withdrawal only	19	21	9	30	13
None*,†	25	11	31	14	62

*Differences by gender are significant at p<.05. †Differences by motivation level are significant at p<.05. *Notes:* Youth were classified as having a high motivation to avoid pregnancy if they thought it was very important to avoid pregnancy and would be upset by a pregnancy; they were classified as having a low motivation to avoid pregnancy if they thought it was less than very important to avoid a pregnancy or would be pleased by a pregnancy. Comparisons by gender and level of motivation were assessed in separate logistic regression analyses for each type of method.

TABLE 4. Odds ratios (and 95% confidence intervals) from bivariate and multivariate logistic regression analyses assessing associations between selected characteristics and pregnancy-related attitudes and behavior

Characteristic	Positive pregnancy attitudes		Nonuse of effective method at last sex	
	Bivariate	Multivariate	Bivariate	Multivariate
Male‡	2.31 (1.29–4.13)*	4.81 (2.29–10.13)*	0.46 (0.26–0.82)*	0.77 (0.34–1.78)
Race/ethnicity				
White (ref)	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Black	1.45 (0.75–2.81)	na	0.50 (0.26–0.99)*	0.53 (0.25–1.14)
Hispanic	1.26 (0.61–2.59)	na	0.98 (0.47–1.97)	1.16 (0.53–2.55)
High school graduate/GED‡	1.23 (0.70–2.14)	na	0.85 (0.49–1.48)	na
No. in network who attend school	0.92 (0.85–0.99)†	0.82 (0.74–0.92)*	0.92 (0.85–0.99)*	1.00 (0.88–1.14)
No. in network who attend school x gender	na	na	na	0.86 (0.72–1.02)
No. of years since first left home§	1.40 (1.06–1.83)*	1.55 (1.15–2.09)*	1.09 (0.83–1.43)	na
Slept outdoors in past month‡	1.11 (0.62–1.98)	na	1.70 (0.95–3.04)†	1.30 (0.64–2.63)
Had lived in ≥2 states since leaving home‡	0.85 (0.47–1.53)	na	0.75 (0.42–1.34)	na
Frequency of depressive symptoms	1.01 (0.72–1.42)	na	0.85 (0.60–1.19)	na
Alcohol use	0.95 (0.93–0.98)*	0.94 (0.91–0.98)*	1.01 (0.99–1.04)	na
Commitment to recent partner	1.47 (1.05–2.06)*	1.79 (1.23–2.61)*	1.62 (0.17–2.25)*	1.54 (1.08–2.20)*
No. in network who are relatives	1.10 (1.01–1.19)*	1.11 (1.00–1.24)*	0.97 (0.89–1.06)	na
No. in network who have risky sex				
0 (ref)	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
1–2	0.29 (0.13–0.65)*	0.42 (0.16–1.06)†	0.68 (0.31–1.51)	na
≥3	0.33 (0.17–0.72)*	0.52 (0.23–1.20)	0.73 (0.35–1.54)	na
Would be pleased by pregnancy‡	na	na	1.64 (0.93–2.88)†	1.48 (0.77–2.84)

*p<.05. †p<.10. ‡Dichotomous measure. All other characteristics for which no reference category is shown are continuous or scaled. §Divided by age and standardized. *Notes:* Gender interactions with each independent variable were tested; none of the interaction terms was associated with positive pregnancy attitudes. For nonuse of effective method, gender had a significant interaction with Hispanic ethnicity (p=.03) and a marginally significant interaction with number of network members who attend school (p=.07). The interaction between gender and Hispanic ethnicity was not included because the associations were not significant in the full sample or for either gender. ref=reference group. na=not applicable, because item was not included in the analysis.