



### **CLI Fact Sheet Responding to the Turnaway Study:**

The “Turnaway” study is biased research intended to prove negative outcomes for women when abortions are not funded by taxpayers. It is being used to advocate for the elimination of long-standing federal policies against taxpayer funding for abortion. These life-affirming policies are commonly referred to as the Hyde Amendment, but also include riders with other names such as Smith, Dornan, Helms, and more.

- **The Turnaway Study is not objective science. It is an advocacy-driven whitewash, based on a non-random, self-censoring sample of a small number of paid participants.**

Supporting facts:

- It’s non-random since abortion counselors selectively decided whom to invite.
- It’s self-censoring because 69% of women invited to participate refused, even when promised up to \$500 (\$50 per interview).
- Of those who did participate in the first interview, over half dropped out before the last interview.
- Other studies show that the women most likely to refuse (or drop out) are those who anticipate strong, negative feelings after their abortions.

- **The Turnaway Study simply cannot tell us anything about what the majority of women experience. It is a gross overreach to claim that interviews with a non-random, self-selected panel of paid participants accurately reflects the vast majority of women.**

Supporting facts:

- Of 30 participating clinics, 2/3<sup>rd</sup> of the data came from just three clinics.
- Only 31% participated at the first interview which dropped to 17% at the last interview.
- More reputable research with over double the participation rate (66%, Soderberg)<sup>1</sup> found that one year after abortion 60% of women had emotional distress, with 30% so severe it interfered with daily life, and 76% said they would never abort again.

- **The authors of the Turnaway Study have refused to comply with data sharing requirements. They will not allow anyone else to verify or dispute their findings and their weakly supported conclusions.**

Supporting facts:

- The authors work for Advancing New Standards in Reproductive Health (ANSIRH), an organization seeking to promote abortions.
- The authors have refused to comply with the American Psychological Association’s ethics rules on data sharing to allow others to examine and verify their findings.
- They refuse to respond to queries requesting details regarding their published findings.
- The authors’ conclusions and news releases routinely make exaggerated claims while concealing the weaknesses of their dataset and unpublished survey instruments.

- **The Turnaway Study authors’ conclusions are inconsistent with their own actual data.**

Supporting facts:

- They characterize the finding that 95% agreed with the statement “*Given your situation, was the decision to have an abortion the right decision for you?*” as proof of “decision satisfaction” and evidence that very few women have regrets or psychological distress after abortion.
- Yet in a single, unheralded report, they have also revealed that the vast majority of their non-random, self-censored sample also reported regret (44-66%), sadness (64%-74%), guilt (53-63%) and anger (31-43%).
- They claim that their small sample of women suffered psychologically and economically when turned away from late-term abortions because they were past the gestational age allowed by law. Yet, their own data actually revealed that there were no lasting significant differences. Instead, though never headlined, 60% of the Turnaway group were happy about their pregnancies and 43% were happy they were turned away. They also experienced less guilt and sadness than those who aborted.

---

<sup>1</sup> Söderberg H, Andersson C, Janzon L, et al. Selection bias in a study on how women experienced induced abortion. *Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol.* 1998;77(1):67-70. doi:10.1016/s0301-2115(97)00223-6