

1 **TITLE:** Physician attitudes about abortion at a Midwestern academic medical center

2

3 Nicholas B. SCHMUHL, PhD¹, Laurel W. RICE, MD¹, Cynthia K. WAUTLET, MD¹, Jenny A. HIGGINS

4 PhD, MPH²

5 1. Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, University of Wisconsin-Madison,

6 Madison, WI

7 2. Department of Gender and Women's Studies and Department of Obstetrics and

8 Gynecology, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI

9

10 **Conflicts of interests:** The authors report no conflict of interest.

11

12 **Funding source:** University of Wisconsin-Madison Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research

13 and Graduate Education (\$31,768)

14

15 **Role of the funding source:** The funding source had no role in study design; in the collection,

16 analysis and interpretation of data; in the writing of the report; or in the decision to submit the

17 article for publication.

18

19 **Paper Presentation:** These findings have been submitted to the Society of Family Planning 2020

20 Annual Meeting in Baltimore, Maryland, October 10 – 12, 2020.

21

22 **Corresponding Author:**

23 Laurel W. Rice, MD

24 lwrice@wisc.edu

25 University of Wisconsin-Madison, School of Medicine and Public Health

26 McConnell Hall, 4th Floor

27 1010 Mound Street

28 Madison, WI 53715

29 Telephone: 608-417-4213

30 Fax: 608-417-4270

31

32 **Abstract Word Count: 499**

33

34 **Main Text Word Count: 2,990**

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45 **ABSTRACT**

46 **Background:** Almost every medical professional organization supports abortion access.
47 Meanwhile, federal and state-level policies continue to erode abortion-related healthcare.
48 Physicians are instrumental to abortion access, and their evidence-based attitudes could
49 significantly influence public understanding. However, most studies of physician attitudes about
50 abortion focus on specific subgroups. A study of abortion attitudes among a broader population
51 of clinicians is important for at least three reasons. First, results could provide insights and
52 strategies to improve access and reduce stigma at academic medical centers and beyond.
53 Second, findings could explain discrepancies between expressions of support for abortion by
54 the medical community and the inability or unwillingness of the same community to provide
55 sufficient access to abortion services. Third, gauging the climate of opinion among physicians in
56 a politically contested state is likely to be informative given that most abortion-related judicial
57 decisions will occur in state- versus federal-level courts, and physician attitudes could
58 potentially influence public policy.

59 **Objective:** To use leading survey methodologies to assess abortion-related attitudes among all
60 physicians at the largest academic medical center in a politically contested Midwestern state.

61 **Study Design:** Investigators developed a cross-sectional survey to gauge abortion-related
62 knowledge, attitudes, and practices. The university's survey research center disseminated the
63 survey to all 1,357 physician faculty members of the school of medicine and public health using
64 a web and mail mixed-mode methodology (67% response rate). Analyses included chi-squared
65 tests and binary logistic regression models of support for abortion procedures and willingness
66 to consult in abortion care.

67 **Results:** Across more than 20 specialties and all sociodemographic categories, physicians
68 reported strong support for abortion. Majorities expressed support for medication (81%) and
69 surgical abortion (80%), that abortion should be legal in all or most cases (88%), and that a state
70 law banning abortion would make women’s health worse (91%). While nearly all physicians
71 (94%) care for women of reproductive age, most (69%) reported no opportunity to participate
72 in abortion care and fewer than half (44%) knew whom to contact to refer a patient for
73 abortion care. Female physicians and those who considered their expertise relevant to abortion
74 were more supportive, while physicians of color and highly religious physicians were less
75 supportive. Few physicians reported participating in any aspect of abortion care (14%), though
76 nearly two-thirds were willing to consult in such care (65%). Those with relevant expertise were
77 more willing to consult, while physicians of color and highly religious physicians were less
78 willing. While most physicians said they support unrestricted access to abortion (63%) and the
79 efforts of abortion providers (70%) “a lot,” a majority perceived relatively less support among
80 their professional peers, revealing a climate of pluralistic ignorance.

81 **Conclusions:** Despite overwhelming support for abortion among this population, participation
82 in any aspect of abortion care is remarkably low. Physicians across all disciplines need clear
83 training and guidelines on how to refer patients for abortion care, and abortion should be
84 normalized and integrated into mainstream medicine. Given professional organizations’
85 support of abortion and physicians’ cultural influence, these results can be used to inform
86 public policy regarding abortion access.

87

88 **Keywords:** Abortion; abortion providers; abortion referral; physician attitudes; pluralistic

89 ignorance; stigma

90

91 **Introduction**

92 Forty-two percent of unintended pregnancies end in abortion,¹ which is safe^{2,3} and has
93 no known negative impacts on women’s physical or mental health beyond those of any surgical
94 procedure.⁴ Access to abortion is associated with improved socioeconomic outcomes and
95 relationship quality for women, as well as benefits to their current children.^{5–8} Almost every
96 medical professional organization supports abortion access.^{9–11} However, federal and state-level
97 policies continue to erode abortion-related healthcare^{12,13}—including in Wisconsin.^{14,15} Indeed,
98 without protections enacted after *Roe v. Wade*, Wisconsin’s pre-Civil War (1849) statute, which
99 criminalizes abortion without exceptions for rape or incest, would become enforceable.¹⁶

100 Physicians are instrumental to abortion care and access.¹² Doctors are more trusted
101 cultural figures than politicians, lawyers, or even clergy members,¹⁷ and their evidence-based
102 attitudes about abortion could significantly influence public understandings and policy. However,
103 most studies of physician attitudes about abortion focus only on specific subgroups. Research
104 suggests that most women’s health specialists¹⁸ and primary care providers¹⁹ support abortion
105 access, though far fewer participate in any aspect of abortion care^{20–22}—including referrals.^{23,24}
106 Abortion providers frequently report feeling stigmatized at work,^{25–27} potentially contributing to
107 the decline in access. Policies tend to protect physicians who conscientiously object to abortion,²⁸
108 while rarely addressing the role of conscience in abortion provision.²⁹

109 A study of abortion attitudes among a broader population of clinicians is important for at
110 least three reasons. First, results could provide insights and strategies to improve access and
111 reduce stigma at academic medical centers and beyond. Second, findings could help explain
112 discrepancies between expressions of support for abortion by the medical community and the

113 inability or unwillingness of the same community to provide sufficient access. Third and finally,
114 gauging the climate of opinion among physicians in a politically contested state is likely to be
115 informative given that most abortion-related judicial decisions will occur in state- versus federal-
116 level courts.

117 **Materials and Methods**

118 Investigators developed a cross-sectional survey of 45 questions gauging physicians'
119 knowledge, attitudes, and practices regarding abortion. Several of these items were
120 replicated^{26,30} or adapted²⁶ from previous studies. The intent was to field the survey to every
121 currently-practicing physician faculty member at the University of Wisconsin-Madison School of
122 Medicine and Public Health (UW SMPH), the largest medical school in the state of Wisconsin.

123 The UW SMPH Human Resources Department provided an up-to-date list of 1,357
124 practicing physician faculty members and their contact information, by permission of the Dean.
125 The University of Wisconsin Survey Center (UWSC) consulted on survey methodology, assisted
126 with formatting and production, and disseminated the survey using evidence-based web/mail
127 mixed-mode methodology.³¹ First, they mailed individualized introductory letters outlining the
128 purpose of the study containing \$5 cash incentives and a unique URL and passcode for each
129 participant to access the online questionnaire. One week later, those who had not responded
130 received an email containing their unique URL and passcode, followed by up to three weekly
131 reminder emails to non-responders. Finally, a paper questionnaire was mailed along with a
132 stamped, self-addressed return envelope to those who had not responded after six weeks. The
133 UWSC collected responses over three months in early 2019 and delivered a de-identified dataset
134 to the study team.

135 An initial filter question asked participants to confirm that they were currently practicing
136 faculty physicians at UW SMPH. Others were directed to the sociodemographics section at the
137 end of the survey and excluded from all phases of analysis.

138 The University of Wisconsin-Madison Health Science Minimal Risk Institutional Review
139 Board (IRB) deemed this study exempt from full review because the research is not federally
140 supported, does not fall under Veterans Affairs regulations, and is not Food and Drug
141 Administration-regulated. Nonetheless, the study underwent minimal IRB review to ensure
142 adequate provisions were in place to protect privacy and maintain confidentiality.

143 ***Measures***

144 In order to facilitate statistical analyses and/or simplify interpretation of results, we
145 combined or collapsed responses to several survey items into composite measures. The original
146 response formats and their combined categories appear in Tables 1 through 3. Here, we present
147 an overview of our reasoning behind some groupings and provide information about our primary
148 attitude variables.

149 Physicians were asked to choose their area of practice from 13 predetermined choices, or
150 “Something else – please tell us,” which included a space for text entry. Of the 20 specialties
151 listed or typed in, we created three collapsed categories to account for differences in training,
152 practices, patient populations, and exposure to abortion across disciplines while protecting the
153 confidentiality of physicians who practice less common specialties. These three practice
154 categories included “office-based” practices (internal medicine, geriatrics, pediatrics, family
155 medicine, neurology, psychiatry, dermatology, ophthalmology, speech pathology, rehabilitation
156 medicine, palliative care, and medical oncology; 62%), “surgical” practices (surgery, obstetrics

157 and gynecology, urology, and otolaryngology; 16%), and “other” practices (emergency medicine,
158 radiology, anesthesiology, pathology, genetics, radiation oncology, and hospital medicine; 22%).

159 Separate items gauged participants’ support for medication abortion and surgical
160 abortion on five-point scales ranging from “strongly support” to “strongly oppose,” with “in
161 between” as a midpoint. Levels of support for both abortion procedures were highly positively
162 correlated, $r(882)=0.96$, $p<0.001$. For the purposes of further analyses, the variables were
163 combined to create a binary variable consisting of those who registered any opposition or
164 neutrality (no support, 20%), and those who “somewhat” or “strongly support” abortion (any
165 support, 80%).

166 A single item queried participants about the perceived relevance of their medical
167 expertise to the issue of abortion on a five-point Likert-type scale, ranging from “not at all” to
168 “extremely.” These responses were collapsed in order to create a binary variable consisting of
169 those who felt that their expertise was “not at all” to “somewhat” relevant (low relevance, 80%)
170 and those who felt that their expertise was “very” or “extremely” relevant (high relevance, 20%).

171 The questionnaire measured willingness to consult in the care of any patient seeking
172 abortion via a single item with a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from “not at all” to
173 “extremely.” We dichotomized responses into a binary variable consisting of those who were
174 “not at all” to “somewhat” willing (low willingness, 35%) or “very” or “extremely” willing (high
175 willingness, 65%).

176 The survey queried participants about their own support for “unrestricted access to
177 abortion” and “the efforts of UW SMPH faculty who provide abortion services,” and also asked
178 them to estimate support for the same concepts among “your peers on the UW SMPH clinical

179 faculty.” The seven-point Likert-type response scales for these items ranged from “oppose a lot”
180 to “support a lot,” with “neither oppose nor support” as a midpoint. We created perceived self-
181 peer difference scores for these items by subtracting estimated peer support from participants’
182 self-reported support. Those with negative difference scores perceived themselves as less
183 supportive than professional peers. Those with positive difference scores perceived themselves
184 as more supportive than professional peers. The remainder perceived no difference in support.

185 Three survey items focused on participants’ religiosity, including measures of religious
186 identification, religious influence on daily life, and attendance at religious services or meetings.
187 We combined these items into a binary religiosity variable: 1) those who indicated no religious
188 identification or religious identifiers who fell below the midpoint of the combined religiosity scale
189 (low religiosity; 74%); and 2) religious identifiers who fell in the upper half of the scale (high
190 religiosity; 26%).

191 Participants reported whether they currently had children or other dependents, and
192 whether they or a partner was currently pregnant.

193 ***Analyses***

194 Investigators used IBM SPSS Statistics 26 to perform analyses. At a bivariate level, when
195 comparing responses to various survey items by sociodemographic or professional
196 characteristics, we used chi-square tests of independence to confirm that observed differences
197 were statistically significant.

198 At the multivariate level, we used binary logistic regression to model two outcomes of
199 interest: 1) support for abortion care procedures; and 2) willingness to consult in abortion care.
200 Socio-demographic control variables included age, gender, race/ethnicity, and parenting status.

201 Covariates, selected based on both previous literature²⁶ and significant bivariate chi-square
202 associations, included exposure to abortion during training and perceived relevance of medical
203 expertise to the issue of abortion. Because interdisciplinarity is a unique feature of the study
204 sample, we stratified models by practice type in order to elucidate potential differences between
205 physicians of different backgrounds and expertise.

206 **Results**

207 Nine hundred and thirteen of 1,357 distributed surveys were returned, for an adjusted
208 response rate of 67%. Nearly all participants (N=893; 98%) confirmed that they were currently
209 practicing physicians; others were excluded from further analysis.

210 ***Socio-demographic and professional characteristics***

211 As shown on Table 1, a slight majority of physicians identified as male (54%). Respondents
212 tended to be middle-aged (M=47.7 years; SD=10.7) and white (83%). Most had children and/or
213 reported that they or a partner were currently pregnant (86%). Slightly more than half (52%) said
214 they identified with a religion, and religious identifiers tended to report a moderate influence of
215 religious beliefs on their daily lives and occasional attendance at religious meetings.

216 Participants represented more than 20 medical specialties. Nearly all (94%) said they see
217 women of reproductive age in their practices. Over half (56%) reported some exposure to
218 abortion at any point during their medical training.

219 ***Attitudes and perceptions about abortion and abortion providers***

220 Table 2 includes responses to survey items regarding attitudes about abortion care,
221 access, providers, and policy; Figure 1 visually illustrates a subset of items contained in Table 2.
222 As indicated in both, we found strong support for abortion among UW SMPH faculty physicians

223 across various measures, ranging from 80% who support surgical abortion to 91% who said that
224 women's health care in Wisconsin would be worse if *Roe v. Wade* were overturned and the state
225 law took effect (91%).

226 In terms of participants' self-reported support for unrestricted access to abortion and the
227 efforts of UW SMPH faculty who provide abortions, majorities placed their own attitudes on the
228 supportive end of the response spectrum for both unrestricted access to abortion (80%) and the
229 efforts of abortion providers (84%). However, they underestimated support among their
230 professional peers. While most participants said they support access (63%) and providers (70%)
231 "a lot," they most commonly estimated that their peers only "somewhat" supported access (44%)
232 and providers (40%). Notably, while few participants claimed neutrality ("neither oppose nor
233 support") regarding access (3%) or providers (9%), they perceived greater neutrality among their
234 peers (16% for both access and providers). Chi-square tests of independence revealed statistically
235 significant differences between self-appraisals and perceptions of peer support for abortion
236 access ($\chi^2(36, N=861) = 363.19, p<0.001$) and the efforts of abortion providers ($\chi^2(36, N=861) =$
237 $363.19, p<0.001$).

238 Figure 2 presents comparisons (i.e., difference scores) between self-reported attitudes
239 about abortion and estimates of peers' attitudes. More than half of physicians in our sample
240 perceived themselves as more supportive of abortion than their professional peers (51% for both
241 access and providers), indicating a split between actual climate of opinion and perceived climate
242 of opinion (i.e., pluralistic ignorance).

243 ***Involvement in abortion care***

244 As indicated in Table 3, few physicians said they participate in abortion care in any way in
245 their current role (14%), though a majority (72%) reported that their medical expertise was
246 relevant to abortion to some extent, and nearly two thirds said they were either “very” or
247 “extremely” willing to consult in the care of any patient seeking abortion (65%). Meanwhile,
248 fewer than half said that they would know whom to contact if they had to refer a patient for
249 abortion care (44%).

250 Majorities were at least “a little” concerned that if they were to take a public stand either
251 for or against abortion, they would alienate some patients (79%), alienate some co-workers
252 (75%), or be harassed or harmed by protestors of opposing views (83%).

253 ***Factors associated with support for abortion***

254 Table 4 presents results from binary logistic regression models with support for abortion
255 as the outcome. Female physicians were more likely than male physicians to be supportive of
256 abortion in the overall population (OR 1.87, 95% CI 1.25-2.80) and among those with surgical (OR
257 6.07, 95% CI 1.46-25.18) practices. Physicians identifying as persons of color or mixed race were
258 significantly less likely than those identifying as white to support abortion, both in the overall
259 population (OR 0.51, 95% CI 0.32-0.81) and among those with office-based practices (OR 0.43,
260 95% CI 0.24-0.76). Highly-religious physicians were also significantly less likely to than non- or
261 less-religious physicians to support abortion, both in the overall population (OR 0.16, 95% CI 0.10-
262 0.24) and among those with office-based (OR 0.20, 95% CI 0.12-0.34), surgical (OR 0.11, 95% CI
263 0.03-0.35), and other types of practices (OR 0.01, 95% CI 0.04-0.25). Those who considered their
264 expertise moderately-to-highly relevant to the issue of abortion were significantly more likely

265 than their counterparts to support abortion in the overall population (OR 2.10, 95% CI 1.23-3.61),
266 as well as those with office-based practices (OR 2.02, 95% CI 1.04-3.91).

267 ***Factors associated with willingness to consult in abortion care***

268 Table 5 presents results from multivariate logistic regression models with willingness to
269 consult in abortion care as the outcome. In general, physicians with practices categorized as
270 “other” were significantly less likely to be willing to consult in abortion care than those with
271 office-based practices (OR 0.64, 95% CI 0.44-0.93). The difference between surgical and office-
272 based practices was not statistically significant.

273 Compared to white physicians, physicians who identified as persons of color were less
274 likely to be willing to consult in abortion care in the overall population (OR 0.40, 95% CI 0.29-
275 0.54), and also among those with office-based (OR 0.54, 95% CI 0.36-0.80), surgical (OR 0.40, 95%
276 CI 0.18-0.91), and other types of practices (OR 0.40, 95% CI 0.17-0.97). More religious physicians
277 were less willing to consult in abortion care in the overall population (OR 0.40, 95% CI 0.29-0.54),
278 and among those with office-based (OR 0.54, 95% CI 0.36-0.78), surgical (OR 0.40, 95% CI 0.18-
279 0.91), and other types of practices (OR 0.15, 95% CI 0.07-0.32). Physicians who felt their medical
280 expertise was relevant to the issue of abortion were more likely to be willing to consult in
281 abortion care in the overall population (OR 5.26, 95% CI 3.18-8.70), and among those with office-
282 based (OR 5.89, 95% CI 3.08-11.29), surgical (OR 3.44, 95% CI 1.06-11.15), and other types of
283 practices (OR 7.18, 95% CI 2.04-25.31).

284 **Comment**

285 ***Principle Findings***

286 Across all sociodemographic factors and types of medical practices, physicians in this
287 population overwhelmingly support abortion care, abortion providers, and pro-choice policies.
288 Notably, the most commonly shared sentiment was that women’s health care would be worse in
289 Wisconsin if the *Roe v. Wade* decision gave way to the restrictive state law that has remained
290 unchanged for 170 years (91%).

291 **Results**

292 Despite predominant support across all subgroups, some physicians were more likely to
293 support abortion access than others. Women were generally more likely to support abortion than
294 men—particularly women with surgical practices, who were six times as likely to support
295 abortion as their male colleagues with surgical practices. Highly religious physicians were less
296 likely to support abortion, as might be expected in any population. Physicians of color, who were
297 underrepresented in this sample, were less likely than white physicians to support abortion,
298 which may reflect concerns about reproductive autonomy grounded in a history of reproductive
299 coercion among populations of color in the United States.

300 Given the level of stated support for abortion, direct participation in any aspect of
301 abortion care is remarkably low (14%). While it is encouraging that nearly two-thirds (65%) are
302 willing to consult in abortion cases, roughly the same proportion perceive that they have no
303 opportunity to participate in abortion care (69%). The fact that fewer than half of physicians
304 would know whom to contact if they had to refer a patient for abortion care (44%) is difficult to
305 reconcile—especially given that almost every physician in our sample said they care for women
306 of reproductive age (94%).

307 **Implications**

308 We argue as others have that physicians across all specialties need clear training and
309 guidelines on how and where to refer patients for abortion care³²—in direct opposition to the
310 recent federal Title X “gag rule” that prohibits healthcare providers at funded clinics from
311 counseling or referring clients for abortion care.³³ We also maintain that abortion care must
312 become fully integrated into mainstream medicine, particularly given the widespread ability of
313 physicians from various specialties to learn to prescribe and manage medication abortion.

314 In a population highly supportive of abortion, and one in which abortion opponents
315 acknowledge that they are in the minority, the gap between stated support and participation (or
316 willingness to participate by referring or consulting according to one’s professional skillset) bears
317 consideration. It is illuminating that many physicians in this population underestimate support
318 for abortion and overestimate neutrality among their colleagues, suggesting pluralistic ignorance
319 and stigma. It is well established that abortion providers feel stigmatized by their colleagues²⁵. In
320 a climate where perceptions undercut actual support for abortion, or where abortion care is
321 isolated to the extent that many physicians assume their colleagues have no opinion at all,
322 supportive physicians may be less inclined to convert their attitudes into actions.

323 ***Strengths and Limitations***

324 This study expands the existing literature regarding healthcare provider attitudes about
325 abortion by gauging the climate of opinion among physicians in all academic specialties at the
326 largest medical training center in a state where abortion rights are threatened. While our sample
327 is limited to a single academic medical center, this study can and should be replicated at similar
328 institutions across the country. Our unusually strong response rate for a physician survey
329 suggests that physicians are willing—perhaps eager—to express their attitudes about abortion.

330 **Conclusions**

331 Strategies to reduce pluralistic ignorance and stigma include challenging inaccurate
332 perceptions, promoting dialogue, and normalizing the accurate beliefs and experiences of group
333 members.³⁴ To that end, a next step toward reducing pluralistic ignorance and stigma
334 surrounding abortion at UW SMPH, which can be replicated at every academic medical center, is
335 to collect and broadly disseminate accurate information about the climate of opinion. Training
336 and other interventions may be required to activate physician support, so that every physician
337 who cares for women of reproductive age feels prepared to assist or refer any patient seeking
338 abortion.

339

340

341

342

343

344

345

346

347

348

349

350

351

352 **Acknowledgments**

353 The authors would like to thank Lisa Harris, Lisa Martin, and Meghan Seewald at the University
354 of Michigan for consulting on the content of our survey instrument. We are also grateful to the
355 University of Wisconsin Survey Center for their invaluable methodological expertise and multiple
356 reviews of the survey instrument. Finally, we would like to acknowledge early contributions to
357 this work by Helen Zukin (literature review) and Kelsey Wright (data analysis) at the University of
358 Wisconsin-Madison.

359

360

361

362

363

364

365

366

367

368

369

370

371

372

373

374

375 **References**

- 376 1. Finer LB, Zolna MR. Declines in Unintended Pregnancy in the United States, 2008–2011. *N*
377 *Engl J Med*. 2016;374(9):843-852.
- 378 2. National Academies of Sciences E. *The Safety and Quality of Abortion Care in the United*
379 *States*. National Academies Press; 2018.
- 380 3. Raymond EG, Grimes DA. The Comparative Safety of Legal Induced Abortion and Childbirth
381 in the United States. *Obstet Gynecol*. 2012;119(2):215.
- 382 4. Brown SS, Eisenberg L. *The Best Intentions: Unintended Pregnancy and the Well-Being of*
383 *Children and Families*. National Academies Press; 1995.
- 384 5. Upadhyay UD, Aztlan-James EA, Rocca CH, Foster DG. Intended pregnancy after receiving
385 vs. being denied a wanted abortion. *Contraception*. 2019;99(1):42-47.
- 386 6. Foster DG, Biggs MA, Ralph L, Gerdtts C, Roberts S, Glymour MM. Socioeconomic Outcomes
387 of Women Who Receive and Women Who Are Denied Wanted Abortions in the United
388 States. *Am J Public Health*. 2018;108(3):407-413.
- 389 7. Foster DG, Biggs MA, Raifman S, Gipson J, Kimport K, Rocca CH. Comparison of Health,
390 Development, Maternal Bonding, and Poverty Among Children Born After Denial of
391 Abortion vs After Pregnancies Subsequent to an Abortion. *JAMA Pediatr*.
392 2018;172(11):1053-1060.
- 393 8. Foster DG, Raifman SE, Gipson JD, Rocca CH, Biggs MA. Effects of Carrying an Unwanted
394 Pregnancy to Term on Women’s Existing Children. *J Pediatr*. 2019;205:183-189.e1.
- 395 9. American Academy of Family Physicians. Frontline Physicians Call on Politicians to End
396 Political Interference in the Delivery of Evidence Based Medicine. *aafp.org*.
- 397 10. AMA lawsuit to protect patient-physician relationship in North Dakota. *Am Med Assoc*.
- 398 11. AMA opposes proposed rule on Title X family planning program. *Am Med Assoc*.
- 399 12. Nash E. Abortion Rights in Peril — What Clinicians Need to Know. *N Engl J Med*.
400 2019;381(6):497-499.
- 401 13. Jones RK, Jerman J. Abortion Incidence and Service Availability In the United States, 2014.
402 *Perspect Sex Reprod Health*. 2017;49(1):17-27.
- 403 14. *State Facts About Abortion Wisconsin*. Guttmacher Institute; 2019:2.

- 404 15. *Bad Medicine: How a Political Agenda Is Undermining Abortion Care and Access (3rd Ed.)*.
405 National Partnership for Women & Families; 2018.
- 406 16. Wis. Stats. § 940.04. Abortion.
- 407 17. Gallup, Inc. Nurses Again Outpace Other Professions for Honesty, Ethics. *Gallup.com*.
408 December 2018.
- 409 18. Dodge LE, Haider S, Hacker MR. Attitudes toward Abortion among Providers of
410 Reproductive Health Care. *Womens Health Issues*. 2016;26(5):511-516.
- 411 19. Chuang CH, Martenis ME, Parisi SM, et al. Contraception and abortion coverage: what do
412 primary care physicians think? *Contraception*. 2012;86(2):153-156.
- 413 20. Desai S, Jones RK, Castle K. Estimating abortion provision and abortion referrals among
414 United States obstetrician-gynecologists in private practice. *Contraception*.
415 2018;97(4):297-302.
- 416 21. Stulberg DB, Dude AM, Dahlquist I, Curlin FA. Abortion Provision Among Practicing
417 Obstetrician–Gynecologists: *Obstet Gynecol*. 2011;118(3):609-614.
- 418 22. Myran DT, Carew CL, Tang J, Whyte H, Fisher WA. Medical Students’ Intentions to Seek
419 Abortion Training and to Provide Abortion Services in Future Practice. *J Obstet Gynaecol*
420 *Can*. 2015;37(3):236-244.
- 421 23. Homaifar N, Freedman L, French V. “She’s on her own”: a thematic analysis of clinicians’
422 comments on abortion referral. *Contraception*. 2017;95(5):470-476.
- 423 24. Holt K, Janiak E, McCormick MC, et al. Pregnancy Options Counseling and Abortion
424 Referrals Among US Primary Care Physicians: *Fam Med*. 2017:10.
- 425 25. Martin LA, Debbink M, Hassinger J, Youatt E, Harris LH. Abortion providers, stigma and
426 professional quality of life. *Contraception*. 2014;90(6):581-587.
- 427 26. Martin LA, Seewald M, Johnson TRB, Harris LH. Trusted Colleagues or Incompetent Hacks?
428 Development of the Attitudes About Abortion-Providing Physicians Scale. *Womens Health*
429 *Issues*. October 2019.
- 430 27. Britton LE, Mercier RJ, Buchbinder M, Bryant AG. Abortion providers, professional identity,
431 and restrictive laws: A qualitative study. *Health Care Women Int*. 2017;38(3):222-237.
- 432 28. Morrell KM, Chavkin W. Conscientious objection to abortion and reproductive healthcare:
433 a review of recent literature and implications for adolescents. *Curr Opin Obstet Gynecol*.
434 2015;27(5):333.

- 435 29. Harris LH. Recognizing Conscience in Abortion Provision. *N Engl J Med*. 2012;367(11):981-
436 983.
- 437 30. Harris LH, Cooper A, Rasinski KA, Curlin FA, Lyerly AD. Obstetrician–Gynecologists’
438 Objections to and Willingness to Help Patients Obtain an Abortion. *Obstet Gynecol*.
439 2011;118(4):905-912.
- 440 31. Dykema J, Jones NR, Piché T, Stevenson J. Surveying Clinicians by Web: Current Issues in
441 Design and Administration. *Eval Health Prof*. 2013;36(3):352-381.
- 442 32. Zurek M, O’Donnell J, Hart R, Rogow D. Referral-making in the current landscape of
443 abortion access. *Contraception*. 2015;91(1):1-5.
- 444 33. Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health, Office of the Secretary, U.S. Department of
445 Health and Human Services (HHS). Compliance With Statutory Program Integrity
446 Requirements. *Fed Regist*. 2019;84(42):7714–7791.
- 447 34. Karaffa KM, Koch JM. Stigma, Pluralistic Ignorance, and Attitudes Toward Seeking Mental
448 Health Services Among Police Officers. *Crim Justice Behav*. 2016;43(6):759-777.
- 449

Table 1: Sociodemographic and Professional Characteristics of Faculty Physicians at the University of Wisconsin School of Medicine and Public Health, 2019 (N=893)

	N	%
Gender		
Female	398	45.4
Male	476	54.3
Other	2	0.2
Age		
≤39	235	27.3
40 - 49	288	33.5
50 - 59	196	22.8
60 - 69	123	14.3
≥70	19	2.2
Race and/or ethnicity		
Arab or Middle Eastern	8	0.9
Asian	91	10.5
Black or African American	11	1.3
Hispanic or Latino/a	18	2.1
Native American or Alaskan Native	3	0.3
Pacific Islander	2	0.2
White	723	83.2
Mixed or Other	13	1.5
Parenting status		
Does not have children	126	14.2
Has children or participant/partner currently pregnant	759	85.8
How much do you incorporate your religious beliefs into all your dealings in life?		
No religious identification	425	48.3
A little or not at all	154	17.5
Somewhat	127	14.4
Quite a bit or a great deal	174	19.8
How often do you attend a church, temple, mosque, or other religious meetings?		
No religious identification	425	48.4
Once a year or less	98	10.9
At least a few times a year	249	28.3
Once a week or more	109	12.4
Did you get any exposure to abortion care during your medical education, such as in medical school, residency or fellowship, even if you did not participate?		
Yes	494	55.5
No	396	44.5
Do you see women of reproductive age in your practice?		
Yes	838	94.3

No	51	5.7
Medical specialty		
Internal Medicine	233	26.4
Pediatrics	118	13.3
Family Medicine	111	12.6
Surgery	99	11.2
Radiology	61	6.9
Anesthesiology	56	6.3
Obstetrics and Gynecology	39	4.4
Emergency Medicine	32	3.6
Pathology	27	3.1
Neurology	24	2.7
Psychiatry	19	2.1
Dermatology	15	1.7
Ophthalmology	13	1.5
Radiation Oncology	7	0.8
Rehabilitation Medicine	7	0.8
Geriatrics	6	0.7
Urology	5	0.6
Genetics	4	0.5
Hospital Medicine	4	0.5
Medical Oncology	2	0.2
Otolaryngology	2	0.2

Table 2: Attitudes and perceptions about abortion care, access, providers, and policy among faculty physicians at the University of Wisconsin School of Medicine and Public Health, 2019 (N=893)

	N	%
How much do you support or oppose:		
<i>Medication abortion</i>		
Oppose (somewhat or strongly)	88	9.9
Neither oppose nor support	82	9.3
Support (somewhat or strongly)	714	80.7
<i>Surgical abortion</i>		
Oppose (somewhat or strongly)	98	11.1
Neither oppose nor support	80	9.0
Support (somewhat or strongly)	706	79.8
Please tell us if the following groups of people oppose or support unrestricted access to abortion?		
<i>Yourself</i>		
Oppose a lot	59	6.6
Oppose somewhat	59	6.6
Oppose a little	29	3.3
Neither oppose nor support	29	3.3
Support a little	29	3.3
Support somewhat	127	14.3
Support a lot	556	62.6
<i>Your peers on the University of Wisconsin School of Medicine and Public Health clinical faculty</i>		
Oppose a lot	4	0.5
Oppose somewhat	28	3.3
Oppose a little	23	2.7
Neither oppose nor support	139	16.1
Support a little	103	12.0
Support somewhat	381	44.3
Support a lot	183	21.3
How much do the following groups of people oppose or support the efforts of University of Wisconsin School of Medicine and Public Health faculty who provide abortion services?		
<i>Yourself</i>		
Oppose a lot	26	3.0
Oppose somewhat	24	2.7
Oppose a little	14	1.6
Neither oppose nor support	77	8.7
Support a little	23	2.6
Support somewhat	102	11.6

Support a lot	615	69.8
<i>Your peers on the University of Wisconsin School of Medicine and Public Health clinical faculty</i>		
Oppose a lot	1	0.1
Oppose somewhat	16	1.9
Oppose a little	22	2.6
Neither oppose nor support	140	16.3
Support a little	107	12.5
Support somewhat	344	40.1
Support a lot	227	26.5
Do you believe that abortion should be:		
Illegal in all circumstances	13	1.5
Illegal in most circumstances except, for example, rape, incest, or when there is a danger to the mother's life	93	10.5
Legal in most circumstances except, for example, certain gestational limits	567	63.8
Legal in all circumstances	216	24.3
How much better or worse would women's health care be...if Wisconsin's state abortion law took effect?		
Better (a lot or somewhat)	36	4.1
Neither better nor worse	41	4.6
Worse (a lot or somewhat)	805	91.3

Table 3: Participation in abortion-related care, consultancy, and advocacy among faculty physicians at the University of Wisconsin School of Medicine and Public Health, 2019 (N=893)

	N	%
In your current role, do you participate in abortion care in any way?		
Yes	119	14.1
No - no opportunity	578	68.7
No - choose not to participate	144	17.1
How relevant is your medical expertise to the issue of abortion?		
Not at all	252	28.4
A little or somewhat	454	51.1
Very or extremely	182	20.5
How willing would you be to be a consultant in the care of any patient seeking abortion?		
Not at all	76	8.7
A little or somewhat	231	26.4
Very or extremely	568	64.9
If you had to refer a patient for abortion care, would you know whom to contact?		
Yes	367	43.9
No	469	56.1
How concerned are you that if you take a strong public stance either in support of or against abortion you will:		
<i>Alienate some patients</i>		
Not at all	175	21.4
A little or somewhat	487	59.5
Very or extremely	156	19.1
<i>Alienate some co-workers</i>		
Not at all	208	25.2
A little or somewhat	488	59
Very or extremely	131	15.8
<i>Be harassed or harmed by protestors of opposing views</i>		
Not at all	138	17.4
A little or somewhat	488	61.7
Very or extremely	165	20.9

Table 4. Factors associated with support for medical and surgical abortion among faculty physicians, University of Wisconsin School of Medicine and Public Health, 2019 (N=841)

	Overall (N=841)		Office practice (N=526)		Surgical practice (N=134)		Other practice (N=181)	
	OR	95%CI	OR	95%CI	OR	95%CI	OR	95%CI
	1.00							0.98-
Age		0.99-1.02	1.01	0.98-1.03	0.97	0.92-1.02	1.03	1.07
Gender								
Male	ref		ref		ref		ref	
Female	1.87	1.25-2.80	1.46	0.90-2.37	6.07	1.46-25.18	2.24	0.84-6.03
Race								
White	ref		ref		ref		ref	
Person of color	0.51	0.32-0.81	0.43	0.24-0.76	0.44	0.13-1.58	0.73	0.25-2.13
Religiosity								
None or low	ref		ref		ref		ref	
High	0.16	0.10-0.24	0.20	0.12-0.34	0.11	0.03-0.35	0.01	0.04-0.25
Current or expecting parent								
No	ref		ref		ref		ref	
Yes	1.04	0.60-1.82	0.69	0.32-1.48	3.77	0.97-14.73	1.83	0.54-6.26
Exposure to abortion during training								
No	ref		ref		ref		ref	
Yes	1.01	0.69-1.49	1.06	0.65-1.71	0.49	0.16-1.47	1.17	0.48-2.81
Relevance of expertise to abortion								
None or low	ref		ref		ref		ref	
High	2.10	1.23-3.61	2.02	1.04-3.91	4.48	0.76-26.44	1.10	0.33-3.68
Practice type								
Office-based	ref							
Surgical	0.79	0.48-1.32						
Other	0.95	0.59-1.54						

Support = At least "somewhat" support medication *and* surgical abortion.

Bold values represent statistical significance at the 0.05 level.


Table 5. Factors associated with willingness to consult in the care of any patient seeking abortion, faculty physicians at the University of Wisconsin School of Medicine and Public Health, 2019 (N=835)

	Overall (N=835)		Office practice (N=523)		Surgical practice (N=133)		Other practice (N=179)	
	<u>OR</u>	<u>95%CI</u>	<u>OR</u>	<u>95%CI</u>	<u>OR</u>	<u>95%CI</u>	<u>OR</u>	<u>95%CI</u>
Age	0.98	0.97-0.998	0.97	0.95-0.99	1.01	0.97-1.05	1.00	0.97-1.03
Gender								
Male	ref		ref		ref		ref	
Female	0.87	0.63-1.20	0.72	0.48-1.08	2.54	0.99-6.54	0.74	0.36-1.55
Race								
White	ref		ref		ref		ref	
Person of color	0.48	0.32-0.71	0.50	0.30-0.83	0.33	0.11-0.96	0.40	0.17-0.97
Religiosity								
None or low	ref		ref		ref		ref	
High	0.40	0.29-0.54	0.54	0.36-0.80	0.40	0.18-0.91	0.15	0.07-0.32
Parent or pregnant								
No	ref		ref		ref		ref	
Yes	1.04	0.66-1.64	0.88	0.48-1.60	1.82	0.65-5.08	1.02	0.36-2.85
Exposure to abortion during training								
No	ref		ref		ref		ref	
Yes	1.25	0.91-1.70	1.15	0.77-1.71	1.27	0.54-2.98	1.66	0.82-3.36
Relevance of expertise to abortion								
None or low	ref		ref		ref		ref	
High	5.26	3.18-8.70	5.89	3.08-11.29	3.44	1.06-11.15	7.18	2.04-25.31
Practice type								
Office-based	ref		ref		ref		ref	
Surgical	0.76	0.49-1.17						
Other	0.64	0.44-0.93						

Willingness to consult = "Very" or "extremely" willing to consult.

Bold values represent statistical significance at the 0.05 level.

Figure 1: Multiple measures of physician support for abortion; University of Wisconsin School of Medicine and Public Health, 2019



451
452

Figure 2: Physician abortion attitudes compared to perceived attitudes of professional peers;
University of Wisconsin School of Medicine and Public Health, 2019

