Reproductive Coercion

Identification & Intervention in the Clinical Setting: Current Practice and Future

Directions

Lindsay Clark, MD Rebecca H. Allen, MD, MPH Amy S. Gottlieb, MD Reproductive coercion and co-occurring intimate partner violence in obstetrics and gynecology patients

American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology 2014

Definitions Reproductive Coercion

Male behavior to control pregnancy & pregnancy-related outcomes

Miller et al. Contraception 2010

Definitions Reproductive Coercion

- Pregnancy Coercion (PC)
 - Intimidation
 - Violence
 - Threats to leave the relationship
- Birth Control Sabotage (BCS)
 Flushing OCPs down the toilet
 Breaking or removing condoms
 - Inhibiting the partner's ability to obtain contraception

Miller et al. Contraception 2010; Moore et al. Social Science and Medicine 2010; Thiel de Bocanegra et al. Violence Against Women 2010

Prevalence Reproductive Coercion

- Centers for Disease Control 2010
 - > 9000 women
 - Telephone interviews with trained staff
 - 8.6% reported partners' trying to get them pregnant when they didn't want to be or refusing to use a condom
- Miller et al. 2010
- Family planning clinics
- > 1200 women
- 19% reported h/o pregnancy coercion
- 15% reported h/o birth control sabotage
 - National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey. CDC/National Center for Injury Prevention and Control. 2011. Miller et al. *Contraception* 2010

Reproductive Coercion

Goal = Fertility Control

Goal ≠ Particular Reproductive Outcome

(May also involve pressure to terminate pregnancy)



Unwanted births/terminations

- Contraceptive "non-compliance" = RC?
- Offer long-acting, "hidden" birth control

Reproductive Coercion: A Prevalence Study

- Early research focused on high risk populations
- Limited data on how RC impacts more general clinical population of women
- Limited understanding relationship between RC and IPV



- · Primary Objective:
 - Estimate prevalence of RC in a general, hospital-based obstetrics & gynecology clinic
- Secondary Objective:
 - Estimate prevalence of IPV in relationships where reproductive coercion has occurred

Study Population

- Women presenting to a university-based clinic for general obstetrics or gynecology care
- · Inclusion criteria:
 - Ages 18-44
 - Able to read English





R	eproductive	Coercio	Prevalenc n, Pregna rol Sabot	ancy Coerc	ion
	Variable	N/Total	%	95% CI	
	Reproductive coercion	103/641	<u>16.1%</u>	13.0-18.7%	
	Pregnancy coercion	74/641	11.5%	9.1-14.0%	
	Birth control sabotage	58/641	9.0%	6.8-11.3%	

Results:					
Comparison of women who screen					
+ for RC vs - RC					
Variable	Adjusted OR (95% CI)	P			
Relationship					
Single/Dating	2.16 (1.26-3.70)	0.005			
Committed	1.00	Ref.			
Married	1.46 (0.75-2.85)	0.3			
Other/Don't know	5.57 (1.86-16.67)	0.002			
Currently pregnant	0.60 (0.37-0.97)	0.04			
Race/ethnicity					
Latina	1.00	Ref.			
Black	1.37 (0.72-2.59)	0.3			
White	0.67 (0.36-1.33)	0.2			
Other	1.50 (0.67-3.34)	0.3			
More than one	2.50 (1.04-5.99)	0.04			
Insurance					
Private	1.01 (0.50-2.01)	1.0			
Medicaid	1.00	Ref.			
WIH Charity	2.27 (0.96-5.38)	0.06			
Other/None/Don't know	1.66 (0.66-4.25)	0.3			

Results: IPV Prevalence

Results: Provider Role

"It would have been helpful if a provider had":

- asked whether partner messed with birth control (3%)
- asked whether partner pressured patient to become pregnant (14%)
- <u>discussed hidden forms of birth control (20%)</u>

Lessons learned

- · RC is prevalent and often accompanied by IPV
- Women's health providers uniquely positioned to screen and offer interventions for RC
- · Patients feel screening would be helpful
- Patients want providers to talk with them about hidden birth control

Clark et al. Am J Obstet Gynecol 2014

Reproductive Coercion Guideline: American Congress of Obstetricians & Gynecologists

- 1. Be familiar with RC
- 2. Routinely screen women for RC
- 3. Consider RC as a reason for contraception "non-compliance"
- 4. Offer hidden forms of contraception
- 5. Discuss safety plans

ACOG Committee Opinion No. 554. Obsetet Gynecol 2013







Intrauterine Device (IUD)

- Placed inside the uterus by provider
- Strings can be trimmed so device is undetectable
- Copper IUD
 - Highly effective: 0.8% annual failure rate
 - Can use for 10 years
 - No effects on menstruation
- Levonorgestrel Intrauterine System
 - Highly effective: 0.2% annual failure rate
 - Can use for 5 years

Amenorrhea

Trussell. Contraception, 2011

Contraceptive Implant

- · Etonogestrel rod placed in arm by provider
- Highly effective: 0.05% annual failure rate
- · Effective for 3 years
- · Alters menstrual cycle
- Rod may be easily felt

Trussell. Contraception, 2011

Conclusions

- Reproductive coercion is common and often associated with intimate partner violence
- Ask about reproductive coercion and partner abuse at routine health care visits, especially when discussing family planning
- If patient heterosexually active and not using contraception, ask WHY?
- Offer hidden forms of birth control

Acknowledgements

Vinita Goyal, MD, MSc Christina Raker, ScD Staff of the Women's Primary Care Center at Women and Infants Hospital of Rhode Island