among women who chose to give birth (15% and 6%, respectively).

**Indirect Influence**

*Teenage births among significant others.* Among young women in the motherhood group, 54% reported that their mother had had her first child when she was 20 or younger (Table 4, page 227). A significantly smaller proportion (34%) of young women in the abortion group said that their mother was 20 or younger when she had her first child.

Compared with adolescent women who chose abortion, a significantly larger proportion of those who chose motherhood said they had a sister who had had her first child when she was 20 years old or younger (10% vs. 17%). Fifty-three percent of teenagers in both the abortion group and the motherhood group reported having a friend who had given birth as a teenager.

The difference between the two groups in their reports of their mothers’ and sisters’ experiences suggests a strong indirect influence of family members on the outcome of a teenager’s pregnancy. However, as the proportion of women in each group who had a friend who had had a teenage birth was the same, it appears that the experiences of friends do not necessarily influence teenagers’ pregnancy resolution decisions.

*Abortions among significant others.* Significantly larger proportions of teenagers in the abortion group than in the motherhood group reported that their mother had had an abortion and that they had discussed their mother’s abortion experience with her (Table 5, page 227). In addition, significantly larger proportions of young women in the abortion group than in the motherhood group whose sister had had an abortion said they had discussed their sister’s abortion experience with her. However, there was no significant difference between resolution groups in the proportion of women who had a friend who had had an abortion.

The main difference between the indirect influence of significant others who have had an abortion and significant others who have not is that a friend or family member’s abortion may not necessarily be known or discussed openly. Furthermore, it is likely that discussions of the experience of abortion have more of an impact on the resolution decision than simply knowledge of the decision. However, it is not possible to know from these data whether the discussions were negative or positive in nature. For example, discussions about negative consequences or regret could lead a teenager to choose motherhood rather than abortion. On the other hand, hearing about the positive experiences of others, such as the simplicity of the abortion procedure and the sense of relief felt by many women, could lead a teenager to choose abortion.

**Multivariate Analyses**

**Influence and Decisions**

To explore the association between the different types and sources of influence and teenagers’ decision about pregnancy resolution, multivariate logistic regression analyses were conducted. Several demographic characteristics of teenagers at the time of conception—age, marital status, ethnicity, religious affiliation and area of residence (urban, inner urban or rural)—were included to control for other factors that could influence teenagers’ pregnancy resolution decisions.*

---

*There are of course other characteristics not included here, including socioeconomic status, that could affect teenagers’ decisions to terminate or continue a pregnancy. Socioeconomic status was excluded because of the difficulty of measuring it or identifying a proxy for it in this sample. Still other factors could affect teenagers’ decisions leading to pregnancy, such as deciding to have sex or to use contraception. Sources: Evans A, Power and negotiation: young women’s choices about sex and contraception, Journal of Population Research, 2000, 17(2):235-260; and Miller B and Moore K, 1990 (see reference 4).

---

**Table 6. Multivariate coefficients and odds ratios (and standard errors) from two logistic regression models of the effects of type of influence and background characteristics on teenagers’ pregnancy resolution decision**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of influence and characteristics</th>
<th>Model I</th>
<th>Model II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>Odds ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of influence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct, toward abortion</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1.37** (0.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct, toward birth</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1.04 (0.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect, toward abortion</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>2.39** (0.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect, toward birth</td>
<td>-0.61</td>
<td>0.45** (0.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban (ref)</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural and remote</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner urban</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious affiliation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No affiliation (ref)</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Christian</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim/other non-Christian</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian/English-speaking (ref)</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-English-speaking</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at conception</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 (ref)</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status at conception</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not married (ref)</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction of area of residence and type of influence</td>
<td>Model I</td>
<td>Model II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct, toward abortion</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct, toward birth</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect, toward abortion</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect, toward birth</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural and remote</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct, toward abortion</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct, toward birth</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect, toward abortion</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect, toward birth</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner urban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct, toward abortion</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct, toward birth</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect, toward abortion</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect influence toward birth</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-1.72</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$-2 \log$ likelihood (df)</td>
<td>1070.182</td>
<td>4 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cox &amp; Snell pseudo $R^2$</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05. **p<.01. Notes: ref=reference group. Dependent variable coded as 1=abortion and 0=motherhood.