September 2013

Unintended Pregnancy Rates at the State Level: Estimates for 2002, 2004, 2006 and 2008

Kathryn Kost

September 2013

Unintended Pregnancy Rates at the State Level: Estimates for 2002, 2004, 2006 and 2008

Kathryn Kost

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This report was prepared by Kathryn Kost of the Guttmacher Institute. Lawrence Finer and Adam Sonfield provided comments on drafts. It was edited by Haley Ball. The Guttmacher Institute gratefully acknowledges the general support it receives from individuals and foundations, including major grants from The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, the David and Lucile Packard Foundation and the Ford Foundation, which undergirds all of the Institute's work.

We rely greatly on the work of staff from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, who collected, compiled and published much of the surveillance data we use in this report. We also gratefully acknowledge staff at state health departments throughout the United States, who provided tabulations of state-level data upon request. Without their cooperation, expertise and dedicated work, the estimates provided in this report would not be possible.

Suggested citation: Kost K, *Unintended Pregnancy Rates at the State Level: Estimates for 2002, 2004, 2006 and 2008,* New York: Guttmacher Institute, 2013, <http://www.guttmacher.org/pubs/StateUP08.pdf>

www.guttmacher.org

Report Summary

This report provides estimates for 2008 of the number of unintended pregnancies, rates of unintended and intended pregnancies, and the proportionate distribution of unintended pregnancies by wantedness and pregnancy outcome among resident women aged 15–44 for each U.S. state and the District of Columbia. Estimates for 2002, 2004 and 2006 were first published in Finer and Kost (2011).[1] Since that time, final population estimates following the 2010 national census have been released from the United States Census Bureau,[2] allowing us to calculate updated estimates for these intercensal years. The revised numbers, which differ only slightly from those published in 2011, supersede the previously published estimates (Appendix Table 1, page 11). The final, revised population counts are used for the 2008 estimates; therefore, the 2008 figures will not need to be revised in the future.

Key Findings

TABLE 1

- In 31 of the 50 states, more than half of pregnancies in 2008 were unintended.
- In 2008, the median state unintended pregnancy rate was 50 per 1,000 women aged 15–44. Most states fell within a range of 40 to 65.
- The state with the highest unintended pregnancy rate was Delaware (70); the lowest rate was in New Hampshire (31).
- Rates were generally higher in the South and Southwest, and in states with large urban populations.
- For states with data available, more unintended pregnancies were mistimed than unwanted; about one-quarter to one-third of unintended pregnancies were unwanted in each state.
- In 38 states, more than half of unintended pregnancies resulted in a birth.

TABLE 2

- Of the 32 states with an estimate of unintended pregnancy in 2002 and 2008, 18 showed increases of 5% or more between 2002 and 2008. Most of the remaining 14 states experienced very little change in the rate, though four states had decreases of 5% or more (Colorado, Illinois, Maryland and Michigan).
- Four states had increases of 5% or more in the unintended pregnancy rate between 2006 and 2008 (Delaware, Louisiana, Rhode Island and West Virginia). Thirteen other states saw rates decrease by 5% or more between 2006 and 2008. For the remaining states with estimates of unintended pregnancy for both years, there was very little change in the unintended pregnancy rate between 2006 and 2008 (25 states).

TABLE 1. Number of unintended pregnancies, percentage of all pregnancies that were unintended, unintended and intended pregnancy rates, and proportions of unintended pregnancies by wantedness and pregnancy outcome, all by state, 2008

State	Unintended pregnancies		Pregnancies per 1,000 women 15–44		% distribution of unintended pregnancies						
					by wantedness			by outcome			
	Number	As % of all pregnancies	Unintended	Intended	Mistimed	Unwanted	Total	Birth	Abortion	Fetal loss	Total
Alabama	46,000	52	48	45	70	30	100	63	23	15	100
Alaska	7,000	47	53	60	68	32	100	61	25	15	100
Arizona*	72,000	51	57	57	na	na	na	59	26	15	100
Arkansas	31,000	57	55	42	69	31	100	68	17	15	100
California	516,000	53	66	59	54	30	100	48	39	13	100
Colorado	47,000	46	46	53	72	28	100	56	30	14	100
Connecticut	35,000	51	50	47	71	29	100	40	47	13	100
Delaware	13,000	61	70	45	64	36	100	45	42	13	100
Dist. of Columbia*	12,000	70	80	45	na	na	na	41	45	14	100
Florida	221,000	59	62	42	68	32	100	50	37	14	100
Georgia	124,000	57	60	46	68	32	100	56	30	14	100
Hawaii	16,000	54	61	52	69	31	100	53	33	14	100
Idaho	13,000	40	43	65	75	25	100	66	19	15	100
Illinois	141,000	53	53	48	69	31	100	52	35	14	100
Indiana*	57,000	48	44	48	na	na	na	64	20	16	100
Iowa	24,000	44	42	53	na	na	na	61	24	15	100
Kansas*	26,000	47	48	52	na	na	na	64	20	16	100
Kentucky	35,000	46	41	49	64	36	100	68	17	15	100
Louisiana	58,000	62	63	38	72	28	100	62	23	15	100
Maine	9,000	46	36	42	69	31	100	55	31	14	100
Maryland	69,000	56	58	46	68	32	100	48	39	13	100
Massachusetts	58,000	48	43	46	67	33	100	45	42	13	100
Michigan	100,000	54	51	43	66	34	100	52	34	14	100
Minnesota	45,000	45	43	53	73	27	100	59	26	14	100
Mississippi	40,000	63	66	38	66	34	100	66	19	15	100
Missouri	60,000	52	50	46	70	29	100	61	24	15	100
Montana*	9,000	50	48	48	na	na	na	62	22	16	100
Nebraska	16,000	46	46	55	75	25	100	68	17	15	100
Nevada*	31,000	50	57	57	na	na	na	45	40	15	100
New Hampshire*	8,000	40	31	43	na	na	na	50	34	15	100
New Jersey	106,000	54	60	51	64	36	100	39	49	13	100
New Mexico	22,000	51	56	54	71	29	100	57	28	14	100
New York	252,000	54	62	52	63	37	100	32	56	12	100
North Carolina	99,000	52	51	46	67	33	100	58	28	14	100
North Dakota*	6,000	48	45	43	na	na	na	67	17	16	100
Ohio	119,000	55	52	42	68	32	100	60	26	15	100
Oklahoma	41,000	55	56	45	74	26	100	67	17	15	100
Oregon	36,000	50	48	48	73	27	100	55	31	14	100
Pennsylvania	120,000	52	49	45	68	32	100	50	37	14	100
Rhode Island	10,000	55	48	40	65	35	100	48	39	13	100
South Carolina	50,000	56	54	43	71	29	100	61	25	15	100
South Dakota*	7,000	47	48	54	na	na	na	71	13	16	100
Tennessee	68,000	56	53	41	68	32	100	63	23	15	100
Texas	301,000	52	58	53	72	28	100	60	26	15	100
Utah	26,000	37	44	77	79	21	100	70	14	15	100
Vermont	4,000	47	37	42	69	31	100	50	37	14	100
Virginia	87,000	53	53	46	71	29	100	52	34	14	100
Washington	65,000	48	49	52	69	31	100	51	36	14	100
West Virginia	15,000	51	43	41	68	32	100	68	17	15	100
Wisconsin	39,000	40	35	52	70	30	100	62	23	15	100
Wyoming	5,000	46	48	56	71	29	100	65	20	15	100

*Unintended and intended pregnancy rates predicted from multivariate linear regression. *Notes:* The number of unintended pregnancies is obtained as the sum of births, abortions and fetal losses. Numbers are rounded to the nearest thousand. All estimates are based on the populations of births and abortions in 2008. na=not available.

TABLE 2. Unintended pregnancy rates and trends in rates, by state, 2002, 2004, 2006 and 2008

State	Unintended pregnancy rate				% change 2002–2008	% change 2006–2008
	2002	2004	2006	2008		
Alabama	48	50	51	48	0	-5
Alaska	54	55	55	53	-1	-4
Arizona	na	na	na	na	na	na
Arkansas	51	53	54	55	8	2
California	68	na	66	66	-3	0
Colorado	50	48	48	46	-8	-5
Connecticut	47	48	52	50	6	-5
Delaware	na	na	65	70	na	8
District of Columbia	na	na	na	na	na	na
Florida	63	62	63	62	-1	-1
Georgia	na	57	60	60	na	-1
Hawaii	59	59	64	61	3	-4
Idaho	43	42	43	43	0	0
Illinois	56	53	54	53	-5	-1
Indiana	na	na	na	na	na	na
Iowa	40	41	44	42	6	-5
Kansas	na	na	na	na	na	na
Kentucky	na	na	40	41	na	1
Louisiana	53	53	54	63	19	17
Maine	31	35	37	36	17	-3
Maryland	64	59	62	58	-11	-8
Massachusetts	na	na	43	43	na	-1
Michigan	55	51	51	51	-9	-1
Minnesota	38	41	44	43	11	-2
Mississippi	59	60	69	66	11	-4
Missouri	na	na	52	50	na	-2
Montana	44	na	48	na	na	na
Nebraska	46	49	44	46	-1	4
Nevada	na	na	na	na	na	na
New Hampshire	na	na	na	na	na	na
New Jersey	63	63	63	60	-4	-4
New Mexico	54	55	59	56	4	-5
New York	na	68	65	62	na	-5
North Carolina	49	53	57	51	5	-10
North Dakota	33	na	36	na	na	na
Ohio	48	48	51	52	9	2
Oklahoma	53	55	54	56	5	3
Oregon	49	46	47	48	-2	3
Pennsylvania	na	na	49	49	na	0
Rhode Island	45	48	45	48	7	7
South Carolina	50	51	57	54	9	-5
South Dakota	na	na	na	na	na	na
Tennessee	na	na	55	53	na	-3
Texas	60	59	61	58	-4	-5
Utah	42	42	46	44	5	-3
Vermont	34	35	38	37	8	-5
Virginia	na	na	52	53	na	1
Washington	49	45	48	49	-1	2
West Virginia	37	39	39	43	16	9
Wisconsin	na	na	40	35	na	-11
Wyoming	47	43	53	48	2	-10

Note: na=data not available on intention status of births for the indicated year or any nearby years for that state.

Data Sources and Methods

The total number of pregnancies in each state is the sum of all births, abortions and fetal losses. Similarly, the total number of unintended pregnancies is the sum of all births from unintended pregnancies, all abortions from unintended pregnancies and all fetal losses from unintended pregnancies. We follow the methodology developed and detailed in Finer and Kost (2011), with one exception: for states without available data, we used predicted rates for 2006 and 2008 to examine trends in unintended pregnancy rates.

Births: Counts and Intentions

The annual number of births occurring to resident women in each state was obtained from the U.S. vital statistics system for each of the years included in this report (2002,[3] 2004,[4] 2006[5] and 2008[6]).

For most states, the proportion of births in each state that were intended, mistimed or unwanted was obtained from the Pregnancy Risk Assessment Monitoring System (PRAMS).[7] PRAMS consists of annual surveys of resident mothers who have delivered a recent live birth. The sample is drawn from the birth certificate file, and the data can be weighted to represent all births in the state for the year of the survey. PRAMS surveys were conducted in 31 states in 2002, 29 states in 2004, 28 states in 2006 and 37 states in 2008. In addition, PRAMS has been conducted in New York City since 2001.

Several states that do not participate in PRAMS administer survey programs that are based on or similar to PRAMS and include questions on pregnancy intention. The Pregnancy Risk Assessment Tracking System (PRATS) has been administered annually in Idaho since 2001[8] and was administered in Connecticut in 2002 and 2003.[9] The Maternal Outcomes Measurement System (MOMS) is based on PRAMS and was conducted in in Wyoming in 2003, 2004 and 2005. California's Maternal and Infant Health Assessment (MIHA) has collected similar data annually since 2000. The ongoing Barriers to Prenatal Care survey has included questions on the intention status of Iowa births since 1991. And in South Dakota, the Perinatal Risk Assessment survey was conducted in 2003, 2005 and 2007.* Finally, Kentucky administered a PRAMS-based pilot survey in 2007.

As a result, we were able to directly estimate 2008 rates for the 42 states that carried out PRAMS or a similar survey in 2008 (or, for states without a survey in 2008, we used the distribution of intention status of births from a 2007, 2009 or 2010 survey). For each state with available data, we obtained tabulations of the proportion of births that were unintended (and the proportions mistimed and unwanted).† These proportions were applied to the state's total number of births reported in U.S. vital statistics for 2008. A detailed description of methods used for the calculation of the 2006 rates is available in Finer and Kost (2011).

States Without PRAMS or PRAMS-Like Surveys

For the nine jurisdictions where PRAMS (or similar) data were not available to provide the distribution of births by intention status (Arizona, Indiana, Kansas, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Dakota and South Dakota, as well as the District of Columbia), we predicted the unintended and intended pregnancy rates using a multivariate linear regression model. In the model, each of the 42 states with data represented an observation. The dependent variable was the state unintended pregnancy rate; in a second analysis, the dependent variable was the intended pregnancy rate. We included several independent variables, based on demographic characteristics that have been shown to be associated with unintended pregnancy rates.[10,11] These included age, race/ethnicity, poverty status and marital status. The model included state-level, rather than individual-level, data, so, for example, race/ethnicity was entered as three separate variables: percentage of the state popula-

*The surveys in South Dakota were designed to be representative of births at the state level, but in our previous analyses of births from these surveys, but respondents in the sample had higher levels of education than the state's population of women. For this reason, we did not use estimates of the intention status of births from these surveys (see reference 1).

†Tabulations of the proportion of births resulting from unintended pregnancies were obtained from the CDC's CPONDER interactive data analysis system (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, CPONDER—CDC's PRAMS on-line data for epidemiologic research, 2013, <http://www.cdc.gov/prams/cponder.htm>, accessed June 13, 2013), through requests made directly to state health departments or from the states' online reports.

tion of women aged 15–44 who were non-Hispanic white in 2008, percentage who were non-Hispanic black in 2008 and percentage who were Hispanic in 2008 (non-Hispanic other was omitted to prevent overspecification). Finally, we included the state's overall pregnancy rate as a key independent variable. After removing marital status, which did not contribute significantly to the model, the R^2 of the final model was .88. We used the same independent variables to predict the intended pregnancy rates for these states; the R^2 for that model was .86.

To test the accuracy of the model, we used the resulting regression coefficients to calculate predicted rates for the states for which we had already an actual rate estimated using PRAMS or similar data. We then compared the model's predictions to these actual rates. Twenty-three of 42 predicted rates were within two points of the actual rate, and another eleven were within 3.5 points. The largest difference between a predicted value and an actual value was 5.8 rate points in New York, where the predicted rate was higher than the actual rate; the difference was 5.1 rate points in Delaware, where the predicted rate was lower than the actual rate. There was no clear geographic pattern to the size of these residuals. Those states with predicted rates are indicated as such in the tables.

Abortions: Counts and Intention Status

For abortion counts, most (but not all) states conduct annual surveillance of abortions provided in the state and the number of abortions obtained by residents.[12–15] However, abortions are almost always underreported to the state surveillance systems.[16] We therefore used counts for 2002, 2004, 2006 and 2008 from a periodic national census of abortion providers conducted by the Guttmacher Institute.[17,18]

While a majority of abortions result from unintended conceptions, some women do obtain abortions following a conception that was intended. There are currently no state-level data on the intendedness of pregnancies resulting in induced abortion (PRAMS is limited to births). However, we do have national-level estimates of the intendedness of pregnancies ending in induced abortion, from a nationally representative sample interviewed in the Guttmacher Institute's 2008 National Survey of Abortion Patients (APS).[19] Data on the intendedness of pregnancies ending in abortion are also available from the National Survey of Family Growth, but abortions are substantially underreported in that survey, raising questions about the representativeness of the abortions that are reported.[20] Because the proportion of abortions following intended pregnancies in the APS is quite small (approximately 5%), we are comfortable applying the national distribution by intention to the number of abortions that occurred among residents of each state in order to obtain the number of unintended pregnancies ending in abortion in that state.

Fetal Losses: Counts and Intention Status

Fetal losses are often included in vital statistics reports, but are even more seriously undercounted than induced abortions because, for most states, only fetal deaths occurring at 20 weeks' gestation or later are required to be reported to the vital statistics system. Fetal loss also is underreported in surveys of pregnancy histories[20] because many spontaneous abortions occur at very early gestations and are not detected by women. A reasonable approximation of the total number of fetal losses is the sum of 20% of all births and 10% of all induced abortions.*[21] We applied this approximation separately for intended and unintended pregnancies. That is, we calculated unintended pregnancies ending in fetal loss for each state as the sum of 20% of unintended pregnancies ending in births and 10% of unintended pregnancies ending in abortion to obtain the number of unintended pregnancies ending in fetal loss in each state. Similarly, the number of fetal losses from intended pregnancies was calculated as 20% of intended births and 10% of intended abortions.

Numbers of Pregnancies and Percentage Unintended

For the proportion of all pregnancies that were unintended, we simply divided the number of unintended pregnancies by the total number of pregnancies. For those states with unintended pregnancy rates predicted from the regression model, we applied each predicted rate to the state's population count of women aged 15–44 in 2008 to calculate the number of unintended pregnancies and the percentage of pregnancies that were unintended.

For states with data on the proportions of births that were mistimed and unwanted, we were also able to calculate the proportion of all unintended pregnancies that were mistimed or unwanted. Again, the proportion of abortions resulting from a mistimed or unwanted pregnancy was obtained from the 2008 APS, and we assumed the same distribution for every state.

Finally, for states with unintended pregnancy rates predicted from multivariate regression, we calculated the number of unintended pregnancies ending in birth by subtracting unintended pregnancies ending in abortion and

*In our analysis, this approximation yields estimates of fetal loss ranging from 14.0% to 16.2% of all pregnancies, which is within the ranges previously estimated using national data corrected for abortion underreporting.[20]

fetal loss from the calculated total of unintended pregnancies. Unintended pregnancies ending in fetal loss were estimated for these states by assuming the proportion of all fetal losses that were unintended was the same as the proportion of all pregnancies that were unintended.

Population of Resident Women Aged 15–44

All demographic rates depend on accurate counts of the population. The most accurate counts for the U.S. population are obtained decennially (in census years), and these counts are used to create improved estimates of the population in the years between censuses (known as the intercensal populations). All rates in this report are calculated as events per 1,000 women aged 15–44 residing in the state. These numbers of women are from the U.S. Census Bureau's intercensal counts.[22]

Our prior publication containing the 2002, 2004 and 2006 rates used the most recent population counts available at that time, the vintage 2008 population estimates.[1] Because we now have revised estimates for those years based on the 2010 census, we recalculated rates for those intercensal years in this report. The unintended pregnancy rate changed by one rate point in 17 states (14 states had lower revised rates; three states had higher rates). States most affected by the change in the population estimate for 2006 were Arizona (increased by three rate points), Hawaii (decreased by two rate points), Iowa (increased by two rate points) and Nevada (decreased by three rate points). Our estimate for the District of Columbia increased the most, from 67 to 72 unintended pregnancies per 1,000 women aged 15–44. Relatively large discrepancies between the estimates of the population prior to the decennial census in 2010 and revised population counts following the census are likely responsible in large part to these changes in rate estimates.

The estimates in this report for years through 2008 can now be considered final, because once population counts are updated using new census numbers, they are not updated again.

Appendix: Additional Notes on Data

Issues with Specific State Surveys

The PRATS survey in Idaho is limited to mothers aged 18 and older, so the estimates of the proportion of pregnancies that were unintended among women younger than 20 in Idaho could be too low if teenagers younger than 18 were more likely to have an unplanned birth than teenagers aged 18 and 19. For both 2006 and 2008, we compared the distribution of intention status among 18- and 19-year-old women in Idaho to the distribution obtained by an average of women younger than 20 in surrounding states (Oregon, Utah, Washington and Wyoming). The proportions were within a comparable range, indicating that the distribution among 18- and 19-year-olds in Idaho was reasonably accurate for all teenagers younger than 20.*

Estimates of the proportion of births from unintended pregnancies from the Iowa Barriers to Prenatal Care surveys are weighted, but the proportions mistimed and unwanted from weighted data were not available at the time of this report.

There was no single data source for pregnancy intention for New York State as a whole. However, New York City and the rest of the state of New York conducted PRAMS surveys independently. We calculated rates and numbers for New York by adding together the numbers of unintended pregnancies (and births, abortions and fetal losses) estimated separately for these two areas.

For states without data from 2008, we first sought estimates of the proportion of births resulting from unintended pregnancies from surveys in adjacent years. Three states fell into this group: California, Connecticut and Kentucky. A Maternal and Infant Health Assessment (MIHA) survey was carried out in California in 2008, but it did not include a comparable question on pregnancy intention status in that year. We therefore used the proportions intended and unintended from the 2007 MIHA, applied to the number of births in 2008. The question on pregnancy intention status in the MIHA survey also includes "not sure" as a possible response. We included these births with all unintended births, following the convention used in MIHA publications and tabulations provided on unintended pregnancy in California.†

Connecticut conducted a PRATS survey in 2010–2011, and we applied the proportions of births intended and unintended from that survey to the numbers of births in 2008 in our calculation of the state's unintended pregnancy rate.

Estimates of the pregnancy intention status of births from a 2007 pilot survey Kentucky were used to calculate the 2008 rates.

For our estimates of the 2006 unintended pregnancy rates, there were several states for which we applied the proportion unintended in the closest available year to the actual number of births in the state in 2006. We used estimates from a 2002 PRAMS survey in Montana and North Dakota (the most recent year available), from a 2005 survey in Florida, and from a 2007 survey in Delaware, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Missouri, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Virginia, Wisconsin and Wyoming. For the 2006 estimate in Connecticut, we used tabulations from a 2003 PRATS survey.

We used this same strategy for rates in 2002 and 2004. We used the proportion of births intended and unintended from the 2002 PRATS survey to calculate the unintended pregnancy rate in Connecticut for 2002, and we used the proportions from a 2003 PRATS survey for calculation of the 2004 unintended pregnancy rate. For the 2002 estimate of unintended pregnancy in Wyoming, we used data from the 2003 MOMS survey. Further detail on estimates for 2002, 2004 and 2006 is available in Finer and Kost (2011).

*In 2008, the proportion of births from unintended pregnancies among 18–19-year-olds was 69% in Idaho; the proportions among all teenagers younger than 20 in surrounding states were 77% in Oregon, 67% in Utah, 62% in Washington and 81% in Wyoming.

†Twelve percent of mothers reported they had been "unsure" of their pregnancy intention. If we exclude births whose mothers had been "unsure" from the total number of births from unintended pregnancies, the resulting unintended pregnancy rate in California in 2008 would be 55 per 1,000 women aged 15–44.

Survey Response Rates

Prior to the 2007 round of data collection, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) did not recommend the use of or publish data from PRAMS surveys that did not reach a response rate of 70%. For surveys from 2007 on, they lowered the threshold to 65%. Estimates from surveys with lower-than-optimal response rates can be greatly affected by slight variations in the composition of the sample, and the confidence intervals surrounding estimates from the survey are often quite large, even in states that did meet the optimal response rate threshold. In some states, the only data available on intention status of births came from a single survey with a response rate below the CDC thresholds; in others, annual surveys consistently fell below the threshold; and in others response rates varied from year to year. We used estimates of the intention status of births from surveys falling below these thresholds when there were no other data available. We carefully examined tabulations from surveys with lower-than-optimal response rates and rejected any that appeared to have been affected by skewed samples (this occurred for only one state, South Dakota in 2006[1]).

Estimates used in this report from states with weighted survey response rates less than 70% in 2002 were Connecticut (50%), Idaho (55%), Mississippi (61%), Montana (54%), Oregon (69%) and Texas (56%). Surveys with less than a 70% response rate in 2004 were Alabama (64%), Connecticut (44%)*, Idaho (56%), Ohio (67%) and Texas (64%). Surveys with less than a 70% response rate in 2006 were Alabama (60%), Idaho (64%), New Mexico (64%), North Carolina (59%), South Carolina (67%) and Texas (54%). For states without data for 2006, we used surveys from 2007. Surveys with less than a 65% response rate in 2007 were Kentucky (62%), Louisiana (56%), Tennessee (63%) and Virginia (57%). Surveys with less than a 65% response rate in 2008 were Alabama (60%), Florida (57%), Idaho (56%), Louisiana (52%), Missouri (63%), New Mexico (61%), New York City (62%), South Carolina (59%), Texas (64%) and Virginia (52%).

*Response rate is for the 2003 survey, which was used for the 2004 estimate.

APPENDIX TABLE 1. Number of unintended pregnancies, percentage of all pregnancies that were unintended, unintended and intended pregnancy rates, and proportions of unintended pregnancies by wantedness and pregnancy outcome, all by state, 2006

State	Unintended pregnancies		Pregnancies per 1,000 women 15–44		% distribution of unintended pregnancies						
					by wantedness			by outcome			
	Number	As % of all pregnancies	Unintended	Intended	Mistimed	Unwanted	Total	Birth	Abortion	Fetal loss	Total
Alabama	48,000	55	51	42	na	na	na	63	22	15	100
Alaska	8,000	51	55	53	67	33	100	61	25	15	100
Arizona*	75,000	52	61	58	na	na	na	59	25	16	100
Arkansas	31,000	55	54	43	72	28	100	68	17	15	100
California	513,000	56	66	51	na	na	na	47	39	13	100
Colorado	48,000	48	48	52	71	30	100	58	27	14	100
Connecticut	37,000	51	52	50	64	36	100	37	51	12	100
Delaware	12,000	60	65	44	66	34	100	49	38	14	100
Dist. of Columbia*	11,000	62	72	51	na	na	na	30	56	14	100
Florida	223,000	59	63	44	67	33	100	49	37	14	100
Georgia	122,000	58	60	45	68	32	100	61	24	15	100
Hawaii	17,000	57	64	49	63	37	100	52	34	14	100
Idaho	13,000	40	43	65	74	26	100	65	20	15	100
Illinois	143,000	53	54	49	70	30	100	53	34	14	100
Indiana*	58,000	48	45	48	na	na	na	63	21	16	100
Iowa	26,000	46	44	52	na	na	na	62	24	15	100
Kansas*	26,000	48	48	51	na	na	na	63	21	16	100
Kentucky	35,000	46	40	48	64	36	100	68	17	15	100
Louisiana	49,000	59	54	38	72	28	100	71	14	16	100
Maine	10,000	47	37	41	71	29	100	57	29	14	100
Maryland	75,000	57	62	48	66	34	100	41	46	13	100
Massachusetts	59,000	47	43	48	65	35	100	41	46	13	100
Michigan	105,000	53	51	45	65	35	100	50	37	14	100
Minnesota	46,000	45	44	54	72	28	100	57	29	14	100
Mississippi	42,000	65	69	37	68	32	100	66	19	15	100
Missouri	61,000	53	52	45	68	32	100	61	24	15	100
Montana	9,000	50	48	47	68	32	100	64	22	15	100
Nebraska	16,000	45	44	55	72	28	100	68	17	15	100
Nevada*	33,000	52	63	59	na	na	na	45	40	15	100
New Hampshire*	9,000	45	35	42	na	na	na	52	32	15	100
New Jersey	112,000	55	63	52	63	37	100	36	51	12	100
New Mexico	24,000	54	59	50	71	29	100	58	27	14	100
New York	266,000	56	65	50	65	35	100	33	55	12	100
North Carolina	106,000	56	57	44	68	32	100	57	28	14	100
North Dakota	5,000	41	36	52	77	24	100	67	18	15	100
Ohio	118,000	55	51	42	66	34	100	59	26	14	100
Oklahoma	39,000	54	54	47	73	27	100	66	18	15	100
Oregon	35,000	48	47	50	71	29	100	53	33	14	100
Pennsylvania	121,000	54	49	41	70	30	100	55	31	14	100
Rhode Island	10,000	51	45	42	67	33	100	46	41	13	100
South Carolina	52,000	58	57	42	71	29	100	60	25	15	100
South Dakota*	7,000	48	48	52	na	na	na	72	12	16	100
Tennessee	70,000	58	55	40	69	31	100	62	23	15	100
Texas	309,000	53	61	53	67	33	100	58	28	14	100
Utah	26,000	38	46	75	76	23	100	71	14	16	100
Vermont	5,000	49	38	41	67	33	100	50	36	14	100
Virginia	85,000	52	52	48	65	35	100	51	35	14	100
Washington	64,000	49	48	51	68	32	100	50	36	14	100
West Virginia	14,000	49	39	41	67	33	100	66	19	15	100
Wisconsin	45,000	45	40	48	70	30	100	62	23	15	100
Wyoming	5,000	51	53	51	74	26	100	63	22	15	100

*Unintended and intended pregnancy rates predicted from multivariate linear regression. *Notes:* The number of unintended pregnancies is the sum of births, abortions and fetal losses. Numbers are rounded to the nearest thousand. All estimates are based on the populations of births and abortions in 2008. na=not available.

References

1. Finer LB and Kost K, Unintended pregnancy rates at the state level, *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health,* 2011, 43(2):78–87.

2. National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS), Intercensal estimates of the July 1, 2000–July 1, 2009 United States resident population by year, county, age, sex, bridged race, and Hispanic origin, file icen_state2000_2009.sas7bdat, Oct. 26, 2012, <http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nvss/bridged_race.htm>, accessed Nov. 11, 2012.

3. Martin J et al., Births: final data for 2002, *National Vital Statistics Reports*, 2003, Vol. 52, No. 10.

4. Martin J et al., Births: final data for 2004, *National Vital Statistics Reports,* 2006, Vol. 55, No. 1.

5. Martin J et al. Births: final data for 2006, *National Vital Statistics Reports,* 2009, Vol. 57, No. 7.

6. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), VitalStats—births, <http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data_access/vitalstats/VitalStats_Births.htm>, Nov. 11, 2012.

7. CDC, PRAMS, 2013, <http://www.cdc.gov/prams>, accessed June 13, 2013.

8. Department of Health and Welfare, Division of Public Health, Bureau of Vital Records and Health Statistics, *Results From the 2008 Pregnancy Risk Assessment Tracking System (PRATS) Annual Report,* 2012, <http://www.healthandwelfare.idaho.gov/Health/VitalRecordsandHealthStatistics/HealthStatistics/PregnancyRiskAssessmentTrackingSystem/tabid/915/Default.aspx>, accessed May 29, 2013.

9. Morin J, Connecticut Department of Public Health, personal communication, Aug. 11, 2009.

10. Finer L and Henshaw SK, Disparities in rates of unintended pregnancy in the United States, 1994 and 2001, *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health,* 2006, 38(2):90–96.

11. Finer LB and Zolna MR, Unintended pregnancy in the United States: incidence and disparities, 2006, *Contraception,* 2011, 84(5):478–485.

12. Pazol K et al., Abortion surveillance—United States, 2006, *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report,* 2009, Vol. 58, No. SS08.

13. Strauss L et al., Abortion surveillance—United States, 2002, *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report,* 2005, Vol. 54, No. SS07.

14. Strauss L et al., Abortion surveillance—United States, 2004, *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, 2007, Vol. 56, No. SS09.

15. Pazol K et al., Abortion surveillance—United States, 2008, *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report,* 2009, Vol. 60, No. SS15.

16. Henshaw SK and Kost K, *Trends in the Characteristics of Women Obtaining Abortions, 1974 to 2004*, New York: Guttmacher Institute, 2010, <http://www.guttmacher.org/pubs/2008/09/18/Report_Trends_Women_Obtaining_Abortions.pdf>, accessed June 13, 2010.

17. Jones RK et al., Abortion in the United States: incidence and access to services, 2005, *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health,* 2008, 40(1):6–16.

18. Jones RK and Kooistra K, Abortion incidence and access to services in the United States, 2008 *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health*, 2011, 43(1):41–50.

19. Jones RK, Finer LB and Singh S, *Characteristics of U.S. Abortion Patients, 2008,* New York: Guttmacher Institute, 2010, <http://www.guttmacher.org/pubs/US-Abortion-Patients.pdf>, accessed June 13, 2010.

20. Jones RK and Kost K, Underreporting of induced and spontaneous abortion in the United States: an analysis of the 2002 National Survey of Family Growth, *Studies in Family Planning,* 2007, 38(3):187–197.

21. Leridon H, *Human Fertility: The Basic Components*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977.

22. NCHS, Intercensal estimates of the July 1, 2000–July 1, 2009 United States resident population by year, county, age, sex, bridged race, and Hispanic origin, file icen_state2000_2009.sas7bdat, Oct. 26, 2012, <http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nvss/bridged_race.htm>, accessed Nov. 11, 2012.

Advancing sexual and reproductive health worldwide through research, policy analysis and public education

125 Maiden Lane
New York, NY 10038
(212) 248-1111; fax (212) 248-1951
info@guttmacher.org

1301 Connecticut Avenue NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036
policyinfo@guttmacher.org

www.guttmacher.org