Title: Risk of unintended pregnancy among adolescent and young adult women: The roles of social discrimination and mental health

Authors:

1. Kelli Stidham Hall (corresponding)
   Research Investigator and "BIRCWH" NIH K-12 Scholar
   Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology; Institute for Social Research, Population Studies Center, University of Michigan
   L4000 Women's Hospital, 1500 East Medical Center Dr., Ann Arbor, MI 48109
   (t) 734-232-1818 (e) hkelli@umich.edu (f) 734-647-9727
2. Yasamin Kusunoki, Institute for Social Research, Population Studies and Survey Research Centers, University of Michigan
3. Heather Gatny, Institute for Social Research, Population Studies and Survey Research Centers, University of Michigan
4. Jennifer Barber, Department of Sociology; Institute for Social Research Population Studies and Survey Research Centers, University of Michigan

Acknowledgements/Funding: This work was supported by an NICHD Building Interdisciplinary Research Careers in Women's Health "BIRCWH" K-12 Career Development Award #K12HD001438 (Hall, PI Johnson), by NICHD grant #R01-HDHD050329 (Barber), by NICHD grant #R24HD041028 (Smock) and by NICHD grant # R21-DA024186 (Axinn).

Key words: social discrimination; unintended pregnancy; stress; mental health; adolescents; social epidemiology

Short Abstract

We investigated relationships between social discrimination, mental health and unintended pregnancy. Data were drawn from 794 women 18-20 years in a longitudinal cohort study. Baseline and weekly surveys assessed information on social context including discrimination (EDS), stress (PSS), depression (CES-D), and reproductive outcomes. Multi-level, mixed-effects regression and discrete-time hazard models estimated associations between discrimination, mental health and pregnancy. Baron and Kenny's method was used to test mediation effects of mental health on discrimination and pregnancy. The mean discrimination score was 19/45 points; 20% reported moderate/high discrimination. Discrimination scores were higher among women with stress and depression versus those without (21 versus 18 points for both, p's<0.001). Pregnancy rates (14% overall) were higher among women with moderate/high (23%) versus low (11%) discrimination (p<0.001). Discrimination predicted stress (aOR 2.2, 95%CI 1.4,3.4), depression (aOR 2.4, CI 1.5,3.7), and pregnancy (aOR 1.8, CI 1.1,3.0). Stress and depression did not mediate discrimination's effect on pregnancy. In conclusion, discrimination increased women's risks of mental health symptoms and unintended pregnancy. The interactive biosocial influences on reproductive outcomes during adolescence and young adulthood warrant further study.

INTRODUCTION

Unintended pregnancy during adolescence and young adulthood has significant health and social consequences for young women, their families, and society [1-3]. Increased risk of maternal and infant morbidity and mortality, antenatal and postpartum depression, domestic violence, rapid repeat unintended pregnancy, interrupted education, reduced employment opportunities, and substantial health care costs are among the many adverse outcomes for pregnant young women, their offspring, and health systems worldwide [1-3]. In the United States, unintended pregnancy and its sequelae are disproportionately high among poor and minority young women [4,5].

While disparities in unintended pregnancy point to the role of sociodemographic factors such as race/ethnicity and socioeconomic status (SES) [4-7], the mechanisms through which these distal determinants influence reproductive outcomes are not fully clear. Research on the interrelationships between social context and health (i.e. biosocial), including Geronimous' "Weathering Hypothesis," suggests that chronic social stressors differentially experienced by socially disadvantaged women, and specifically discrimination and marginalization, can lead to ongoing psychological (e.g. mental distress) and physiological (e.g., immune/inflammatory dysfunction, higher allostatic load, and accelerated cellular aging) stress burden to influence health outcomes (e.g., depression, chronic disease, and mortality) and shape health disparities [8-12]. Social discrimination and its biosocial processes, however, have been given relatively little attention in reproductive health research [13]. Racial and socioeconomic disparities in adverse perinatal outcomes, such as miscarriage and stillbirth, are believed to at least

partially stem from the biological and psychological "wear and tear" that chronic exposure to discrimination triggers [14-18].

Discrimination and its biosocial processes (i.e., mental and physical weathering) may also help explain disparities *unintended* and *early* pregnancy among socially disadvantaged women, though this has not been widely studied. Our prior research highlighted the influence of young women's mental health on the proximate determinants of unintended pregnancy – sex and contraceptive behaviors [19-21]. Using data from a representative longitudinal study of nearly 1,000 women aged 18-20, we described the effects of stress and depression symptoms on women's contraceptive nonuse, misuse, less effective method use, increased sexual activity and rates of pregnancy over one year [19-21]. While this work and that of others has identified links between mental health and unintended pregnancy [22-24], young women's adverse social circumstances, and notably experiences with discrimination, have not been considered but may concurrently contribute to negative mental *and* reproductive health outcomes, especially for poor and minority young women [13].

We investigated relationships between social discrimination, mental health, and pregnancy among a population-based cohort of adolescent and young adult women not desiring pregnancy. We hypothesized that women who perceived discrimination would experience higher rates of stress and depression symptoms and pregnancy and that mental health would mediate relationships between discrimination and pregnancy. We further hypothesized that rates of discrimination, mental health symptoms, and pregnancy would be higher among poor and minority women than among their socially advantaged counterparts.

METHODS

Sample and design

Data were drawn from a longitudinal population-based cohort study of women aged 18-20 [19-21]. Young women were sampled from a racial/ethnically and socioeconomically diverse county in the Midwestern U.S. between March 2008 and March 2009. Names and contact information were randomly selected from state driver's license and personal identification card registries to identify eligible women (ages 18-20 and a county resident). Of the women contacted by mail or in-person and asked to participate, 84% enrolled at baseline and 99% of those agreed to participate in the longitudinal study, resulting in a final sample of 992 women. The Institutional Review Board of the University of Michigan approved this study.

Following informed consent, women completed a 60-minute in-person baseline survey interview on sociodemographics, relationship characteristics, reproductive and contraceptive histories, and mental health. Nearly all participants (98%) stated at baseline that they had no intentions but rather strong desires to avoid pregnancy. Women then participated in a 2.5-year study of weekly surveys (online or by phone) that collected information on relationship dynamics, sexual and contraceptive behaviors, and pregnancy outcomes; 75% of the sample completed 18 months or more of surveys. We also administered a series of quarterly surveys assessing additional psychosocial characteristics, including social discrimination.

For our analysis, we included women who were not pregnant and not desiring pregnancy at baseline, completed more than one weekly survey, and completed at least

one quarterly survey with a discrimination scale measurement. The analytic sample includes 794 women who completed 36,809 weekly surveys, including 2,417 quarterly discrimination surveys, over the first 18 months of study.

Measures

Social discrimination. In quarterly journals, we administered the Everyday Discrimination Scale, the most commonly used measure of perceived social discrimination in studies of health and wellbeing [25,26]. On a 5-point Likert response scale (5=almost everyday, 4=at least once a week, 3=a few times a month, 2=a few times a year, or 1=less than once a year), women responded to nine items assessing how often they experienced discrimination in their day-to-day lives: "You are treated with less courtesy than other people;" You are treated with less respect than other people;" "You receive poorer service than other people at restaurants or stores;" "People act as if they think you are not smart;" "People act as if they think you are dishonest;" "You are called names or insulted;" "People act as if they are better than you are;" "You are threatened or harassed;" and "You are followed around in stores." Responses are summed for a total score (range 5-45 points), with higher scores denoting greater perceived discrimination.

On average, women completed 4 quarterly discrimination scales (SD 1.6, range 1-7). We examined time-variant journal-level discrimination scores (intra-class correlation and reliability coefficients 0.7 and 0.9 respectively, suggesting little variance across woman's journal-level scores). We then created a summary indicator, a woman-level average discrimination score.

To assess different "levels" of discrimination (i.e. low, moderate, and high scores), we created sets of bivariate and categorical indicators using score cut-offs based upon the sample distribution. We applied a cut-off of 24.5 points (≥1 SD above the sample mean, the top 20th percentile) to create a bivariate discrimination indicator denoting women with moderate/high versus low discrimination scores. We conducted sensitivity analyses to test different discrimination score cut-offs. Results were sensitive to a 25.5-point cut-off (15th percentile). Discrimination score means and proportions with moderate/high scores were the same for the journal-level and woman-level discrimination indicators. We present results from the latter.

Mental health symptoms. We administered The Center for Epidemiologic Studies – Depression Scale (CES-D) and The Perceived Stress Scale (PSS) at baseline. The abbreviated CES-D assesses how often, on a 4-point Likert scale, women experienced five depressive symptoms over the previous week [27]. The PSS assesses the degree to which one appraises their life situations as stressful, unpredictable, uncontrollable, and overloading over the previous month via four items on a 5-point Likert scale [28]. For both scales, responses are summed for depression or stress scores, with higher scores indicating greater symptoms. We used standard score cut-offs to denote moderate/severe mental health symptoms (≥4 points on the CES-D-5 to denote moderate/severe depression symptoms; ≥9 points on the PSS-4 to denote moderate/severe stress symptoms).

Unintended pregnancy. Each woman was asked each week whether it was possible she was pregnant and whether a pregnancy test had indicated so. We operationalized a pregnancy as a newly reported positive pregnancy test. Given that 98%

of women explicitly stated at baseline that they had no intentions but rather strong desires to avoid pregnancy, we refer to pregnancy here as "unintended."

Background characteristics. Sociodemographic, relationship, and reproductive characteristics were assessed at baseline and each week and included: age, race/ethnicity, educational attainment, employment status, public assistance recipient, childhood household/family structure, mother's age at first birth, frequency of religious service attendance, relationship status, cohabitation with marital or non-marital partner, sexual intercourse experience, age at coitarche, lifetime number of sexual partners, and histories of pregnancy, contraceptive use and unprotected sex.

Statistical analysis

We described women's background characteristics, discrimination scores, and rates of moderate/high discrimination and pregnancy using means with standard deviations (SD) and frequencies with percentages (%). We conducted unadjusted bivariate analysis (t-tests, X^2, ANOVA, and nonparametric equivalents) to identify differences in discrimination scores and proportions with moderate/high discrimination by: 1) background characteristics, 2) mental health symptoms, and 3) pregnancy.

Using multi-level, mixed effects logistic regression models, we examined relationships between background characteristics, discrimination, mental health, and pregnancy, controlling for covariate fixed effects, random and cluster effects where appropriate, and the numbers of weekly journals completed, discrimination scales completed, pregnancy months, and pregnancy months squared. We used discrete-time proportional hazard models to estimate associations between discrimination and the

hazard of pregnancy. Person-weeks of exposure are the unit of analysis. A woman was considered to be at risk of pregnancy during all weeks that she reported not being already pregnant. We estimated associations between discrimination and pregnancy in full models first, then in reduced models controlling only for significant covariates. We also tested a series of interaction terms for discrimination by mental health symptoms and discrimination by covariates (e.g. race); none were significant and are not presented.

Finally, we used Baron and Kenny's formal mediation criteria to test whether mental health symptoms mediate the effects of discrimination on pregnancy [29]. The method requires the following criteria:

1) Independent variable affects the mediator (Path A, discrimination is related to mental health). We tested these models with depression and stress regressed on discrimination. Given that mental health was only measured at baseline and discrimination was measured quarterly intervals and because we hypothesized that bidirectional relationships between mental health and discrimination may exist, we also tested models with discrimination regressed on depression and stress.

2) Mediator affects the outcome (Path B, mental health is related to pregnancy). This step replicates our prior work on the relationships between depression and stress and pregnancy rates [19], here using 18 months of data among this smaller sub-sample of women.

3) When Paths A and B are simultaneously controlled, a previously present effect of the independent variable on the outcome (Path C, discrimination is related to pregnancy) becomes insignificant or reduced. We tested separate mediation models with pregnancy regressed on discrimination, controlling for depression and stress.

We present results with discrimination modeled as the bivariate woman-level summary indicator of the proportion with moderate/high discrimination (24.5 point cut-off). Covariate selection was based upon our previous work and variables were considered for inclusion in regression models if their p-value in bivariate models was 0.25 or less [19-21]. We examined time-varying sociodemographic characteristics and their effects were similar to baseline characteristics, so we present baseline models. We present exponentiated coefficients from regression models as adjusted relative risk ratios (aRR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI), with two-tailed alphas of $P<0.05$*, $P<0.01$**, and $P<0.001$*** considered significant. We analyzed data with Stata 12.0 (StataCorp LP, College Station, TX).

RESULTS

Sample characteristics

Sociodemographic, reproductive, and mental health characteristics of the sample are presented in Table 1. Women identified as Non-Black (68%) or Black (32%) race/ethnicity. Over half of women were enrolled in a 2- or 4-year college (59%). A quarter of women were receiving public assistance (24%) and 51% were unemployed. Most women were in a relationship (71%); 16% were cohabiting. Three-quarters of women had a history of sexual intercourse (75%), with 51% experiencing coitarche at 16 years or younger; 20% had a history of pregnancy. Mental health symptoms were moderate/severe for quarter of women (24% for depression and 23% for stress).

Social discrimination

The mean response on the Everyday Discrimination Scale was 2 out of 5 (SD 1), translating to perceived social discrimination "a few times a year." The mean discrimination score (both journal-level and woman-level) was 19 (SD 6) out of 45 points (range 9 to 40.5). Twenty percent of women (n=155) scored 1 SD above the mean or higher, denoting moderate/high discrimination.

Discrimination scores differed by nearly all of women's background characteristics (Table 1). Compared to their counterparts, mean discrimination scores and proportions of moderate/high discrimination were higher among women with low educational attainment, women who were unemployed or receiving public assistance, women with a childhood family structure of other than 2 parents present or with a mother who had given birth as a teen, women with infrequent or no religious service attendance, women who were engaged or cohabitating, and women with histories of more sexual partners, early coitarche, unprotected sex, and prior pregnancy.

In multivariable models of social discrimination (Table 1), women with a pregnancy history had a higher risk of perceiving moderate/high levels of discrimination than those without a prior pregnancy (aRR 1.7, CI 1.0, 2.8, P =0.03). Women who were employed (aRR 0.6, CI 0.4, 1.0, P =0.04) or enrolled in a 2-year (aRR 0.6, CI 0.3, 1.0, P =0.04) or 4-year (aRR 0.3, CI 0.2, 0.5, P <0.001) college had lower risks of moderate/high discrimination, compared to their counterparts (Table 1).

Mental health and discrimination

Discrimination scores were three points higher for women with depression and stress symptoms compared to those without symptoms (21 versus 18 points, *P*-

values<0.001 for both) (Table 1). Proportions with moderate/high discrimination were also higher among women with depression and stress than those without symptoms (31% versus 16% and 34% versus 15%, respectively, *P*'s<0.001).

In multivariable models, relationships between social discrimination and mental health symptoms were similarly significant when we treated depression and stress as predictors of discrimination (Table 1) and vice versa (Mediation Path A); women with moderate/high levels of discrimination had over twice the risk of having both depression (aRR 2.4, CI 1.5, 3.7, *P* <0.001) and stress (aRR 2.2, CI 1.4, 3.4, *P* =0.001) symptoms compared to women with low discrimination.

Unintended pregnancy, mental health, and discrimination

The pregnancy rate during the 18-month study period was 14%. Pregnancy rates were higher among women with depression and stress symptoms than among those without depression (18% versus 12%, *P* =0.01) and stress (17% versus 12%, *P* =0.05). In adjusted models of pregnancy regressed on mental health symptoms (Mediation Path B, not shown in tables), stress was marginally associated with pregnancy (aRR 1.5, CI 1.0, 2.4, *P* =0.09). The similar point estimate for depression was non-significant (aRR 1.3, CI 0.8, 2.0, *P* =0.33).

Pregnancy rates were also higher among women with moderate/high discrimination levels compared to those with low discrimination (23% versus 11%, *P* <0.001). In hazard models controlling for significant covariates (Table 2), the risk of pregnancy was 80% higher among women who perceived moderate/high discrimination compared to those who did not (aRR 1.8, CI 1.1, 3.0, *P* =0.01) (Mediation Path C).

Point estimates for discrimination remained stable and significant across all models testing the mediation effects of depression and stress on the relationship between discrimination and pregnancy, providing no evidence of mediation (Table 2).

DISCUSSION

Perceived social discrimination was not uncommon among young women in our study, with discrimination experienced "a few times a year," on average. The strongest predictor of moderate/high discrimination was a history of adolescent pregnancy. A few studies have pointed to the social stigmatization of adolescent pregnancy in the U.S. and abroad [30-32]. Young women, especially adolescents, who become pregnancy may suffer marginalization and discrimination, as well as more severe social and health consequences, including lost employment and educational opportunities, parental and intimate partner violence, and mental health morbidity, all which may be further stigmatizing [30-33]. A dearth of research exists on stigma and family planning among young women, and we did not have explicit measures of stigma here. Our ongoing research focuses on the role of stigma in women's reproductive and mental health outcomes across adolescence and young adulthood, in domestic and global contexts.

These young women not desiring pregnancy who perceived moderate/high social discrimination had nearly two-fold risk of *subsequent* pregnancy over 18 months compared to women with low discrimination. They also experienced two-fold higher risk of depression and stress symptoms, though mental health symptoms did not appear to fully mediate relationships between discrimination and pregnancy. These results, coupled with our previous work, contribute to emerging biosocial research on the biological and

psychological consequences of social stressors and their impact on reproductive outcomes. Most studies on discrimination and "weathering" in reproductive health have focused on maternal-infant outcomes in the perinatal and postpartum period [14-18]. Our findings offer new insights into adverse social circumstances and mental health in shaping risk of unintended pregnancy, accounting for different dimensions of women's health, wellbeing and social disadvantage that are understudied in family planning. Building upon Bird and Bongart's research [34-36], future studies can elucidate mechanisms by which discrimination influences unintended pregnancy, especially contraceptive access and family planning service utilization.

Relationships between discrimination and pregnancy appeared to be similar across socially advantaged and disadvantaged women, with non-significant interaction terms by race, SES, and education. Race and SES were also not predictive of discrimination. Perhaps discrimination does not contribute to pregnancy risk above and beyond the contributions of other adverse life events for socially disadvantaged women. It may also be that disadvantaged women are "better equipped" to manage the effects of discrimination due to adaptive coping, social support, and resiliency, which can result from "weathering" [8,14,37,38].

Other social class indicators, including college enrollment and employment, were protective against discrimination (though not associated with pregnancy). Researchers have documented the positive effects of upward mobility (i.e. opportunities and activities that compete with childbearing during adolescence and young adulthood) in improving the health and wellbeing of disadvantaged young women, including the protective effects of educational attainment and employment on reproductive outcomes [6,7]. Ultimately,

factors associated with discrimination require further study to better understand links between discrimination, mental health, and unintended pregnancy.

Several limitations are noteworthy. The larger study only measured mental health at baseline and discrimination quarterly, so we were unable to account for temporal ordering, which limited our ability to test causal pathways linking discrimination and mental health to pregnancy. The data did not include time-variant mental health indicators or biological health assessments, which are required to model the interactive biosocial trajectories health and unintended pregnancy [10,11]. We did not account for microdynamic pregnancy intentions here, which limits our ability to draw conclusions about the effects of discrimination and mental health on "unintended" pregnancy. Nor did we examine measures of social support, coping and resilience, or thoroughly consider religiosity or relationship microdynamics and violence, all of which likely have an impact on mental health and social wellbeing [30-32,37-40]. Finally, our results may not be generalizable to all young women.

Nonetheless, findings beg further consideration of traditional conceptualizations of discrimination and the diversity of experiences that contribute to social wellbeing and mental and reproductive health during adolescence and young adulthood.

References

1. Finer LB. Unintended pregnancy among U.S. adolescents: accounting for sexual activity. J Adolesc Health. 2010;47:312-4.
2. Gipson JD, Koenig MA, Hindin MJ. The effects of unintended pregnancy on infant, child and parental health: A review of the literature. Stud Fam Plann. 2008;39:18-38.
3. Sonfield A, Kost K, Gold RB, et al. The public costs of births resulting from unintended pregnancies: National and state-level estimates. Persp Sex Reprod Health. 2011;43:94-102.
4. Dehlendorf C, Rodriguez MI, Levy K, Borrero S, Steinauer J. Disparities in family planning. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2010;202:214-220.
5. Finer LB, Henshaw SK. Disparities in rates of unintended pregnancy in the United States, 1994 and 2001. Persp Sex Reprod Health. 2006;38:90-6.
6. Hoffman SD, Maynard RA. Kids having kids: Economic and social consequences of teen pregnancy (2nd ed). Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press, 2008.
7. Harris KM, Gordon-Larsen P, Chantala K, Udry JR. Longitudinal trends in race and ethnic disparities in leading health indicators from adolescence to young adulthood. Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med. 2006;160:74-81.
8. Geronimus AT. Understanding and eliminating racial inequalities in women's health in the United States: The role of the Weathering conceptual framework. JAMWA. 2001;56:133-136.
9. Williams DR. Race, socioeconomic status, and health: The added effects of racism and discrimination. Ann New York Acad Sci. 1999;896:173-188.

10. Boardman JD, Alexander KB. Stress trajectories, health behaviors and the mental health of black and white young adults. Soc Sci Med. 2011;72(10):1659-1666.
11. Adkins D, Wang V, Dupre M, van den Ord E, Elder G. Structure and stress: trajectories of depressive symptoms across adolescence and young adulthood. Social Forc. 2009;88:31–60.
12. Lewis TT, Everson-Rose SA, Powell LH, et al. Chronic exposure to everyday discrimination and coronary calcification in African American women: The SWAN Heart Study. Psychosom Med. 2006;68:362-368.
13. Wachter KW, Bulatao RA (Eds). Offspring: Human fertility behavior in biodemographic perspective. Panel for the workshop on the biodemography of fertility and family behavior. National Research Council of the National Academiesc, National Academies Press: Washington, D.C., 2003.
14. Hogue CJR, Bremner D. Stress model for research into preterm delivery among black women. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2005;192:S47-55.
15. Hogue CJR, Parker CB, Willinger M, et al. A Population-based Case-Control Study of Stillbirth: The Relationship of Significant Life Events to the Racial Disparity for African Americans. Am J Epidemiol. 2013. Published online ahead of print. DOI: 10.1093/aje/kws381
16. De Marco M, Thorburn S, Zhao W. Perceived discrimination during prenatal care, labor, and delivery: An examination of data from the Oregon Pregnancy Risk Assessment Monitoring System, 1998-1999, 2000, and 2001. Am J Public Health. 2008;98:1818-1821.
17. Khashan AS, McNamee R, Abel KM, et al. Rates of preterm birth following

antenatal maternal exposure to severe life events: a population-based cohort study. Hum Reprod. 2009;24:429–437.

18. Wilsborg K, Barklin A, Hedegaard M, et al. Psychological stress during pregnancy and stillbirth: prospective study. BJOG. 2008;115:882–885.
19. Hall KS, Kusunoki Y, Gatny H, Barber J. Unintended pregnancy risk among young women with psychological stress and depression symptoms. Soc Sci Med. 2014;100:62-71.
20. Hall K, Moreau C, Trussell J, Barber J. Role of young women's depression and stress symptoms in their weekly use and nonuse of contraceptive methods. J Adolesc Health. 2013;53:241-248.
21. Hall K, Moreau C, Trussell J, Barber J. Young women's consistency of contraceptive use – do depression and stress matter? Contraception. 2013;88:641-9.
22. Hall K, Reame N, O'Connell K, Rickert V, Weshoff C. Influence of depressed mood and psychological stress symptoms on perceived oral contraceptive side effects and discontinuation in young minority women. Contraception. 2012;86:518-25.
23. Garbers S, Correa N, Tobier N, Blust S, Chiasson MA. Associations between symptoms of depression and contraceptive method choices among low-income women at urban reproductive health centers. Mat Child Health. 2010;14:102-109.
24. Steinberg JR, Tschann JM, Henderson JT, et al. Psychological distress and post-abortion contraceptive choice at an urban clinic. Contraception. 2013;88:717-24.

25. Williams DR, Yu Y, Jackson JS, Anderson NB. Racial differences in physical and mental health: Socioeconomic status, stress, and discrimination. J Health Psychol. 1997;2:335-351.

26. Krieger N, Smith K, Naishadham D, Hartman C, Barbeau EM. Experiences of discrimination: validity and reliability of a self-report measure for population health research on racism and health. Soc Sci Med. 2005;61(7):1576-1596.

27. Radloff LS. The CES-D scale: A self-report depression scale for research in the general population. Applied Psych Meas. 1977;1:385- 401.

28. Cohen S, Kamarck T, Mermelstein R. A global measure of perceived stress. J Health Soc Behav. 1993;24:385-96.

29. Baron R, Kenny D. The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. J Persp Soc Psychol. 1986;51:1173-1182.

30. Wienmann CM, Rickert VI, Berenson AB, Volk RJ. Are pregnant adolescents stigmatized by pregnancy. J Adolesc Health. 2005;36:1-7.

31. Kelly DM. Stigma stories: Four discourses about teen mothers, welfare, and poverty. Youth Soc. 1996;27:421-49

32. Levandowski BA, Kalilani-Phiri L, Kachale F, et al. Investigating social consequences of unwanted pregnancy and unsafe abortion in Malawi: The role of stigma. Int J Gynecol Obstet. 2012;118:167-71

33. Sartorius N. Iatrogenic stigma of mental illness. BMJ. 2002;324:1470-71.

34. Bird ST, Bogart LM. Birth control, conspiracy beliefs, perceived discrimination, and contraception among African Americans: an exploratory study. J Health Psychol. 2003;8:263–276.

35. Bird ST, Bogart LM. Conspiracy beliefs about birth control: Barriers to pregnancy prevention among African Americans of reproductive age. Health Educ Behav. 2005;32:474-487.

36. Thorburn S, Bogart LM. African American women and family planning services: perceptions of discrimination. Women's Health. 2005;42:23–39.

37. Ajrouch KJ, Reisine S, Lim S, Sohn W, Ismail A. Perceived everyday discrimination and psychological distress: does social support matter? Ethn Health. 2010;15:417-34.

38. Schulz AJ, Israel BA, Zenk SN, et al. Psychological stress and social support as mediators of relationships between income, length of residence and depressive symptoms among African American women on Detroit's eastside. Soc Sci Med. 2006;62:510-22.

39. Bearman PS, Moody J, Stovel K. Chains of affection: The structure of adolescent romantic and sexual networks. Am J Soc. 2004;110: 44-91.

40. Whitehead BD, Wilcox BL, Rostosky SS, eds. Keeping the Faith: The Role of Religion and Faith Communities in Preventing Teen Pregnancy. Washington, DC: National Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy, 2001.

Table 1. Social Discrimination, by Mean Scores, Proportions with Moderate/High Scores, and Adjusted Odds, According to Women's Background Characteristics and Mental Health Symptoms

		Mean discrimination scores[b]			Proportion with moderate/high discrimination[c]		Adjusted odds of moderate/high discrimination[h]			
							Model 1 (Full)		Model 2 (Reduced)	
	%	M	SD	*P*[g]	%	*P*[g]	aRR	CI	aRR	CI
Total sample (N=794)[a]	100	19	6		20					
Sociodemographic and reproductive characteristics[d]										
Age				0.14		0.69				
18 years	42	19	6		19		1			
19 years	50	19	6		21		1.4	0.9,2.2		
20 years	8	18	7		16		0.8	0.3,1.8		
Race/ethnicity										
Black	32	19	6	0.60	21	0.54	1.1	0.6,1.9		
Non-Black	68	19	6		19		1			
Educational enrollment				<0.001		<0.001				
Not enrolled (graduated HS)	19	20	7		27		1		1	
Enrolled in high school	13	20	6		24		0.8	0.4,1.6	0.8	0.4,1.4
Enrolled in 2 year college	29	19	6		18		0.6^	0.3,1.0	0.6*	0.3,1.0
Enrolled in 4 year college	30	17	6		10		0.3***	0.1,0.6	0.3***	0.1,0.5
High school drop-out	8	21	7		33		0.7	0.3,1.7	0.9	0.4,2.1
Employment status				0.01		0.001				
Employed	49	19	6		15		0.6*	0.4,1.0	0.7*	0.4,1.0
Unemployed	51	20	7		24		1		1	
Receiving public assistance				0.004		0.002				
Yes	24	20	7		27		1.0	0.6,1.8		
No	76	19	6		17		1			
Childhood family structure				0.02		0.09				
2 parents (biological/step)	54	18	6		17		1			
1 parent only	38	20	6		23		1.0	0.6,1.6		
Other	8	20	7		24		0.8	0.4,1.9		
Mother's age at first birth				0.02		0.10				
<20 years old	34	20	7		23		0.9	0.6,1.5		
≥20 years old	66	19	6		18		1			
Religious service attendance				0.01		0.57				
Never	22	20	7		22		1			
< weekly	52	19	6		20		0.9	0.5,1.5		
≥ weekly	26	18	6		18		0.9	0.5,1.8		
Relationship status				<0.001		0.003				
Married	1	18	9		20		1			
Engaged	7	22	7		39		5.4	0.8,36.4		
Romantic relationship	47	19	6		19		2.0	0.3,11.4		
Physical/emotional	16	19	6		19		2.5	0.4,15.1		
None	29	18	6		16		2.1	0.4,12.3		
Cohabitation status				0.001		0.006				
Cohabiting	16	21	7		28		1.1	0.6,2.1		
Not cohabiting	84	19	6		18		1			
Lifetime # sexual partners				<0.001		0.01				
0	25	18	6		15					
1	17	18	5		15					
2	13	19	6		18					
≥3	44	20	6		25					

Age at coitarche				<0.001		<0.001				
≤ 16 years	51	20	6		25		1.2	0.7,2.0		
> 16 years	49	18	6		15		1			
Ever had sex without using birth control				<0.001		<0.001				
Yes	44	20	7		26		1.4	0.8,2.4		
No	56	18	6		15		1			
History of pregnancy				<0.001		<0.001				
Yes	20	21	7		30		1.4	0.8,2.6	1.8*	1.0,3.0
No	80	19	6		17		1		1	
Number of pregnancies				<0.001		<0.001				
0	80	18	6		17					
1	13	20	6		24					
≥2	6	23	7		44					
Mental health symptoms[d]										
Moderate/severe depression[e]				<0.001		<0.001				
Yes (≥4pts CESD)	24	21	7		31		2.4***	1.5,3.7	2.5***	1.6,3.9
No (<4pts CESD)	76	18	6		16		1		1	
Moderate/severe stress[f]				<0.001		<0.001				
Yes (≥9pts PSS-4)	23	21	6		34		2.1***	1.3,3.4	2.2***	1.4,3.5
No (<9pts PSS-4)	77	18	6		15		1		1	

Abbreviations: Adjusted relative risk ratios (aRR); Center for Epidemiologic Studies – Depression Scale (CES-D-5); confidence intervals (CI); Mean (M); Perceived Stress Scale - 4 (PSS-4); *P*-values (*P)*; Standard deviation (SD)

[a]N=794 women (36,809 total weekly journals, 2,417 quarterly discrimination scores).

[b]Social Discrimination based upon woman-level average social discrimination score (summary measure of individual journal-level discrimination scores averaged over study period for each woman).

[c]Bivariate results presented as discrimination score means with standard deviations and proportions (%) of women meeting criteria for moderate/high discrimination scores on the Everyday Discrimination Scale using cut-off of 24.5 points (top 20% percentile, 1SD above mean).

[d]Depression, stress and covariates were measured at baseline.

[e]Center for Epidemiologic Studies – Depression Scale (CES-D-5) – 4 point cut-off for moderate/severe depression symptoms.

[f]Perceived Stress Scale - 4 (PSS-4) - 9-point cut-off for moderate/severe stress symptoms.

[g]*P*-values are from unadjusted bivariate tests (student's t, anova or Chi-square where appropriate) comparing score means or proportions across sociodemographic and reproductive characteristics. *P* -values significant for two-tailed alpha at <0.05*, <0.01**, and <0.001***; ^ marginally significant at *P* <0.10.

[h]Multivariable results are aRR and 95% CIs from full multi-level, mixed-effects logistic regression models with a cluster effect for the woman and controlling for number of discrimination scores and number of journals completed. Outcome in models is bivariate woman-level average moderate/high discrimination score on the Everyday Discrimination Scale using cut-off of 24.5 points (top 20% percentile, 1SD above mean). Results are sensitive to a 15% cut-off score of 25.5 points on the discrimination scale. Depression and stress variables entered separately in individual models with point estimates of other covariates stable across models; those shown from stress models. Significant predictors were same in models with continuous Discrimination score outcome (not shown).

Table 2. Relationships Between Social Discrimination and the Hazard of Pregnancy[a]

	Model 1 (Sociodemographics)[e]		Model 2 (Reduced)		Model 3 Depression mediation (Reduced)[b]		Model 4 Stress mediation (Reduced)[b]	
	aRR	CI	aRR	CI	aRR	CI	aRR	CI
Social discrimination								
<Moderate/high discrimination	1		1		1		1	
Moderate/high discrimination	1.5^	1.0,2.5	1.8*	1.1,3.0	2.0**	1.2,3.3	1.9*	1.2,3.1
Depression symptoms[c]								
No (<4pts CESD)					1			
Yes (≥4pts CESD)					0.9	0.5,1.5		
Stress symptoms[d]								
No (<9pts PSS)							1	
Yes (≥9pts PSS)							1.0	0.6,1.7
Age								
18 years	1		1		1		1	
19 years	0.9	0.6,1.5	0.8	0.5,1.3	0.8	0.5,1.3	0.8	0.5,1.3
20 years	0.2*	0.1,0.9	0.2*	0.1,0.7	0.2*	0.1,0.7	0.2*	0.1,0.7
Race/ethnicity								
Non-Black	1							
Black	1.3	0.7,2.3						
Educational enrollment								
Not enrolled	1							
High school	1.0	0.5,2.1						
2 year college	0.7	0.4,1.3						
4 year college	0.8	0.4,1.5						
High school drop-out	0.5	0.2,1.2						
Employment status								
Unemployed	1							
Employed	0.8	0.5,1.3						
Receiving public assistance								
No	1							
Yes	1.3	0.7,2.1						
Childhood family structure								
2 parents (biological/step)	1							
1 parent only	1.3	0.8,2.2						
Other	1.1	0.5,2.4						
Mother's age at first birth								
≥20 years old	1							
<20 years old	1.4	0.8,2.1						
Religious service attendance								
Never	1							
< weekly	1.4	0.7,2.6						
≥ weekly	1.4	0.6,3.0						
Relationship status								
Married	1							
Engaged	3.5	0.4,35.1						
Romantic relationship	1.8	0.2,16.9						
Physical/emotional	1.5	0.2,14.9						
None	1.0	0.1,10.2						
Cohabitation status								
Not cohabitating	1		1					
Cohabitating	1.3	0.7,2.3	1.7^	1.0,2.8				
Age at coitarche								
> 16 years	1		1		1		1	

≤ 16 years	2.4**	1.3,4.4	3.3***	1.9,5.7	3.7***	2.1,6.6	3.5***	2.0,6.1
History of pregnancy								
No	1		1		1		1	
Yes	1.8*	1.0,3.1	2.3**	1.4,3.8	2.3**	1.4,3.8	2.4**	1.5,4.0
Ever had unprotected sex								
No	1							
Yes	1.2	0.7,2.0						

Abbreviations: Adjusted relative risk ratios (aRR); Center for Epidemiologic Studies – Depression Scale (CES-D-5); confidence intervals (CI); Mean (M); Perceived Stress Scale - 4 (PSS-4); *P*-values (*P)*; Socioeconomic status (SES); Standard deviation (SD)

[a]Results are aRR and 95% CI from full and reduced multi-level, mixed-effects, discrete-time, proportional hazard models using multivariable logistic regression with a random effect for the woman and controlling for number of pregnancy months, pregnancy months squared, number of discrimination scores and number of journals completed. *P*-values (*P*) significant for two-tailed alpha at <0.05*, <0.01**, and <0.001***. Outcome is time-variant measure of a new pregnancy during the first 18months of study based on self-reported pregnancy status each week. Primary predictor is bivariate woman-level average moderate/high social discrimination score on the Everyday Discrimination Scale using cut-off of 24.5 points (top 20% percentile, 1SD above mean). Results are sensitive to a 15% cut-off score of 25.5 points on the discrimination scale. Interaction terms for stress, depression, race, SES, and previous pregnancy not significant (not shown).

[b]Mediation effects of depression and stress on relationship between discrimination and pregnancy were same in full models as in reduced models presented.

[c]Center for Epidemiologic Studies – Depression Scale (CES-D-5) – 4 point cut-off for moderate/severe depression symptoms.

[d]Perceived Stress Scale - 4 (PSS-4) - 9-point cut-off for moderate/severe stress symptoms.

[e]Depression, stress and background covariates were measured at baseline.