Pregnancy intentions in the Netherlands: An evaluation of a multidimensional and continuous construct

Merel Sprenger[1]*†, Wieke Y. Beumer[2-5]†, Dr. Jenneke van Ditzhuijzen[3,4,6], Prof. Dr. Jessica C. Kiefte-de Jong[1]

Affiliations:

[1]Public Health and Primary Care/Health Campus The Hague, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, the Netherlands.

[2]Epidemiology and Data Science, Amsterdam UMC location University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, the Netherlands.

[3]Obstetrics and Gynecology, Amsterdam UMC location University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, the Netherlands.

[4]Amsterdam Reproduction and Development, Amsterdam, the Netherlands.

[5]Amsterdam Public Health, Mental Health, Amsterdam, the Netherlands.

[6]Interdisciplinary Social Sciences: Social Policy and Public Health, Utrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands.

† These authors contributed equally to this work and share first authorship.

Number of words: 2991

Number of figures: 1

Number of tables: 4

Manuscript formatted in British English

Abstract

Background. Pregnancy intention is a multidimensional, dynamic as well as context-specific construct. The primary aim of this study is to establish a reliable survey on pregnancy intention in the Netherlands based on the London Measure of Unplanned Pregnancy (LMUP).

Methodology. The development of the Dutch Adaptation of the London Measure of Unplanned Pregnancy (DA-LMUP) was based on the LMUP, but substantial differences were made, resulting in an adapted version both for people who were pregnant and one for partners. We conducted a psychometric evaluation of the DA-LMUP using observational data from two studies in the Netherlands, with 1172 participants (both pregnant people and their partners), aged between 16-55 years. Next, acceptability and reliability, including test-retest stability were assessed. Further, construct and convergent validity were analysed – including hypothesis testing – and Mokken scaling was applied.

Results. The DA-LMUP demonstrated to be acceptable and reliable (Cronbach's alpha >0.80 for both versions: pregnant people and partners). Construct validity was acceptable and Mokken scale analyses indicated a strong scale (H-coefficient: 0.68). All hypothesis tests were confirmed: people who were younger, single, and nulliparous reported lower pregnancy intent. People who had an abortion reported lower pregnancy intent compared to people continuing their pregnancy to term. Lastly, results showed a high correlation of pregnancy intent in couples (n = 257 couples).

Conclusions. The DA-LMUP is evaluated as reliable for the Dutch context. It offers researchers a suitable instrument to measure pregnancy intention in a multidimensional manner, constituting a closer reflection of people's actual experiences.

Key words: pregnancy intention, unintended pregnancy, unplanned pregnancy, evaluation, partners, fathers, abortion

1 Introduction

A positive pregnancy test elicits a wide variety of emotional responses. Although unintended pregnancy is a common phenomenon worldwide, it is often considered a public health issue (1). In most research and policy, a pregnancy is defined as either wanted, mistimed (unplanned, but wanted) or unwanted (1, 2). Defining pregnancy intentions in this categorical manner leads to oversimplification(2-5). People often experience ambivalent attitudes towards (the prospect of) pregnancy (6). Some people feel happy at the prospect of a pregnancy, while simultaneously wanting to prevent conception (7). Moreover, often people don't have fully formed family building plans (yet) (8).

To address pregnancy intentions in a manner that is closer to people´s actual experiences in research, calls have been made for using a multidimensional measurement on a continuous scale (9). The London Measure of Unplanned Pregnancy (LMUP) – assessed as easy to understand, valid and reliable – is a retrospective instrument that can be used for this purpose (10). The LMUP was developed as a short, self-administered measure and has been translated and validated in several other languages across all continents (11). It considers three key dimensions: 1) context (timing and partner discussion), 2) stance (desire for pregnancy/parenthood and expressed intentions), 3) behaviour (contraceptive use and pre-conceptual preparations).

In the current study, we developed the Dutch Adaptation of the London Measure of Unplanned Pregnancy (DA-LMUP), based on the LMUP (10). We introduced substantial modifications to tailor the instrument to the Dutch context, making it unsuitable for direct comparison with the LMUP. Although a validated Flemish-Dutch version of the LMUP exists (12), Flemish and Dutch are distinct language varieties, making the Flemish-Dutch version insufficiently accessible for use in the Netherlands (13). Moreover, societal norms and perceptions surrounding unintended pregnancy can differ significantly across political, cultural, and healthcare systems, including systems in the Netherlands and Belgium (14, 15).

Furthermore, there is growing recognition of the importance of incorporating partners' perspectives in research on reproductive health (16). Therefore, it is important to adapt and evaluate pregnancy intention measures tailored to partners. We define 'partners' as the people who are involved in the pregnancy either as a romantic partner (regardless of their gender and/or sex), or a non-romantic, but sexually or biologically involved partner. Up to now, the LMUP has been primarily tested in partners of people continuing their pregnancies to term, mostly with quite intended pregnancies (17, 18). Earlier research indicated that there is a high consistency of pregnancy intentions within couples, i.e., couples often report similar pregnancy intentions (19, 20), but recent evidence, and evidence in couples opting for abortion, is lacking.

This study aims to establish and evaluate two versions of DA-LMUP, applicable to pregnant people and their partners, for use in the Dutch context so that it might be used in Dutch monitor studies on sexual and reproductive health.

2 Methods

2.1 Developing the questionnaire

We based our first version of the DA-LMUP on the Dutch-Flemish LMUP and the UK 2020 update, incorporating linguistic changes from Flemish to Dutch (12, 21). Second, this version was evaluated in discussions with five other researchers, three professionals from the field (an abortion doctor, sexologist, and midwife), seven experience experts (of which five women) and with two linguists. After making adjustments based on their input, a blind back-translation into English was performed by two independent translators with English as their native language. This version was then compared to the original LMUP. No adjustments had to be made. Third, the surveys were evaluated in individual think-aloud interviews with five women and two partners who recently experienced an (unintended) pregnancy. Participants talked the interviewer through the cognitive process of completing the survey and expressed any thoughts or feelings that came up (22, 23). Based on these interviews, the questionnaire was slightly adjusted. Again, this version was discussed with the experts. Consensus was reached, resulting in the final version, which was reviewed in consultation with the developers of the LMUP, who provided guidance on next steps. They advised us to clearly document our adaptations, emphasising that the DA-LMUP, though based on the LMUP, has been substantially adapted to align with the Dutch context and should be regarded as a distinct instrument. All adjustments are presented in Table 1. The two DA-LMUP versions are available in the supplementary material.

2.2 Data collection

2.2.1 Design

We combined data from two Dutch prospective population-based cohort studies: the BluePrInt study and the RISE UP study. Both are part of a Dutch consortium around unintended pregnancy funded by ZonMw. Primary data collection took place from May 2022 to August 2023. Both studies were reviewed by the ethical committee and received a waiver from the Medical Research Involved Human subjects Act (WMO): the RISE UP study from the Medical Research Ethics Committee of Leiden Den Haag Delft under reference number N21.127, and the BluePrInt study from the Medical Research Ethics Committee of the Amsterdam Medical Center under reference number W21_407. All participants provided consent before participating.

2.2.2 Participants

The BluePrInt study (n = 910) included people who carried an unintended pregnancy to term or had an abortion, and their partners. Participants were informed about the study at first consultation with their midwife, in the abortion clinic or via an online mailing directed at pregnant people. Because we did not want to interfere with the decision process, people could take part in the study after the abortion or when they had completed decision making and had decided to carry the pregnancy to term.

The RISE UP study (n = 262) included any person who was pregnancy and their partners, living in The Hague. Potential participants were informed about the study at their midwife's practice, at Youth and Family Centres, via direct emails from an online pregnancy platform, and through social media advertisements. From April 2024 to October 2024, an additional test-retest sample of pregnant people in the RISE UP study (n = 110) was invited to complete the DA-LMUP again after 7 days.

2.2.3 Procedure

For both studies, people could scan a QR-code that directed them to the information letter, video, and consent form. After receiving consent, the survey was sent. Upon completing the survey (about 20 minutes), they received a gift card worth €10. All survey items were obligatory and included answer options ‘I don’t know’ or ‘I’d rather not say'. For the test-retest sample, DA-LMUP items were not obligatory and did not include these two additional answer options.

2.2.4 Measures

In addition to completing the DA-LMUP, participants reported on their age, and whether they currently had a romantic relationship. People who were (recently) pregnant were asked whether they were pregnant for the first time.

2.3 Analyses

Analyses were inspired by evaluations of the LMUP, hence both classical and modern test theory were applied (10, 12, 24, 25). As we developed two versions, for pregnant people and partners (Table 1), we performed analyses separately. All analyses were performed by MS & WB using R version 4.2.1. Answer options ‘I don’t know’ or ‘I’d rather not say’ were coded as missing. DA-LMUP data could be used if participants answered three or more questions. Mean imputation for remaining missing values was applied (26).

2.3.1 Acceptability

To assess acceptability, we examined missing data rates with rates <5% indicating higher acceptability (27). Item discrimination was assessed by looking at item category endorsement values and checking if there were no item categories with endorsement (selection) >80%. We also looked at targeting by investigating if the distribution of our data covered the full range of the DA-LMUP, from 0 to 12. We investigated readability with the Flesch Reading Ease Score (FRES) and the Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level (FKGL) (28).

2.3.2 Reliability

To assess reliability, we used the Cronbach’s alpha statistic with a score >0.7 indicating acceptable reliability (29). We also looked at corrected item-rest correlations (score <0.2 indicating limited contribution to homogeneity of the scale) and inter-item correlations (to check that all items had a positive direction). Additionally, we performed test-retest stability analyses using the weighted kappa and Pearson's correlation – both acceptable if >0.60 (24, 30, 31). We also analysed the median and mean number of days between test and retest, and median and mean difference in the total DA-LMUP score.

2.3.3 Construct validity

We assessed construct validity through a principal component analysis (PCA) to examine if all items were related to one construct, i.e., loading onto one component with an Eigenvalue of >1. Further, we performed a Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) to investigate model fit, assessed by the Comparative Fit Index (CFI) (acceptable if > 0.95) and the Standardised Root Mean squared Residual (SRMR) (acceptable if <0.08) and Root Mean Squared Error Of Approximation (RMSEA) (acceptable if <0.06) (32).

Additionally, based on findings of previous studies, we tested the following hypotheses to examine whether the DA-LMUP behaved as theoretically expected: 1) people report a higher DA-LMUP score (i.e., more pregnancy intent) if they are continuing their pregnancy to term, compared to if people had an abortion (33, 34); 2) people who are in a relationship have higher DA-LMUP scores than people who are not in a relationship, with even higher scores for people who are cohabiting and/or married (12, 35-37); 3) people younger than 20 years or older than 39 years have lower DA-LMUP scores than those in between (34); 4) people who were pregnant for the first time have higher DA-LMUP scores than people who had been pregnant before (12, 35, 36, 38). Distribution of DA-LMUP scores and Shapiro-Wilk tests provided no evidence for normality ($p<0.001$ for both DA-LMUP versions), thus non-parametric Mann-Whitney U tests were used to test our hypotheses. For age, a Kruskal-Wallis test was performed, followed by a Dunn's post-hoc test with a Bonferroni adjustment of the *p* values.

2.3.4 Convergent validity

Data from couples were linked during recruitment, thus DA-LMUP scores could be compared through a paired samples t-test on couples' difference scores. Further, the correlation between scores of partners was assessed. Although we expected a significant correlation between the scores, we did not expect perfect agreement (17). To test whether DA-LMUP scores differed between participants with and without a linked partner, a t-test was performed.

2.3.5 Scaling

Mokken scale analysis tells us whether the separate items have different levels of difficulty. Participants should show as much agreement with items in line with the true extent of their pregnancy intention. The scalability of the Mokken scale was assessed by the Loevinger's H coefficient, with only items of >0.3 eligible for scaling, while $H<0.4$ indicates a weak scale, $0.4<H<0.49$ a medium scale, and ≥ 0.5 a strong scale (39).

3 Results

3.1 Sample

Of the 1201 participants, 1172 people (97.6%) answered 3 or more DA-LMUP items, and were therefore eligible to calculate a total DA-LMUP score. Of the total sample, 50.3% (n=590) were continuing their pregnancies, 20.6% (n=242) had recently had an abortion, 18.4% (n=216) were partners of those continuing a pregnancy, and 10.6% (n=124) were partners of those who had an abortion. Participants' age ranged 16–55 years (people who were pregnant: median = 29, IQR = 25-33, range = 16-44 years; partners: median = 30, IQR = 25-33, range: 16-55 years). As shown in Table 2, most participants were born in the Netherlands, were not religious, and were cohabiting with a partner. Most pregnancies occurred within a relationship,53.2% of the pregnancies were first pregnancies (Table 2). Further, participants reported a broad range of pregnancy intent (Figure 1). Characteristics of the test-retest sample are reported in Supplementary Table 1.

3.2 Acceptability

Endorsement frequencies can be found in Supplementary Table 2. The number of missing responses per item ranged from 1.3% (item 1; contraception) to 16.7% (item 5; partner discussion) for people who were pregnant, and for partners from 1.2% (item 2; timing) to 23.5% (item 3; intention). Missing data rates of items 1, 2 and 6 were acceptable, while they

were >5% for items 3, 4 and 5. Partners had more missing data than people who were pregnant for item 1 and 3. Participants did not have any missing data on item 6. Missing data was more common in the BluePrInt study compared to the RISE UP study. DA-LMUP scores ranged from 0 to 12 with a median of 5 and IQR from 2 to 8 (Figure 1), indicating a distribution of scores along the total scale. No question response had more than 80% endorsement on either version. For both versions, the FRES was 80 and the FKGL was 4.3.

3.3 Reliability

The Cronbach's alpha indicated good internal consistency for people who were pregnant (0.88) and for partners (0.87). In the total sample, item-rest correlations were >0.2 for all items, and all inter-item correlations were positive (Table 3). As for the test-retest analyses (n = 101), mean time between test and retest was 9.3 (range 6-23 days) and the median difference was 0 (mean: 0.03). There were significant differences for ethnicity and gestational age between participants who did (n = 63) and who did not (n = 38) complete the retest. The weighted kappa and Pearson's correlation values for individual items demonstrated good stability, with both scores ranging between 0.66 for item 5, and 0.91 for item 4. For the total score, weighted kappa was 0.52 and Pearson's correlation coefficient was 0.97.

3.4 Construct validity

Table 3 presents results from PCA and CFA. PCA showed that all items loaded onto one dimension with an Eigenvalue of 3.76 both for people who were pregnant and partners. CFA moderately supported a single factor model for people who were pregnant with regards to CFI (0.930), SRMR (0.041), and RMSEA (0.160 (0.139-0.183)). A better fit was found for partners: CFI (0.976), SRMR (0.035), and RMSEA (0.098 (0.059-0.139)). All our hypothesis tests were confirmed (Table 4).

3.5 Convergent validity

Data were available for 257 couples. DA-LMUP scores of couples were highly correlated (r = 0.800). People who were pregnant reported lower pregnancy intentions compared to their partners ($M_{\text{people who were pregnant}} = 4.48$, $M_{\text{partners}} = 4.94$, $t_{256} = -3.36$, $p < 0.001$).Additional results indicated that couple's scores did not significantly differ in the abortion group ($M_{\text{people who were pregnant, abortion}} = 1.70$, $M_{\text{partners, abortion}} = 1.94$, $t_{95} = -1.39$, $p = 0.167$), though they did significantly differ in couples who continued the pregnancy to term ($M_{\text{pregnant people, carry to term}} = 6.41$, $M_{\text{partners, carry to term}} = 6.73$, $t_{160} = -3.08$, $p = 0.002$). Participants with a linked partner reported significantly lower pregnancy intentions than those without a linked partner ($M_{\text{linked}} = 4.74$, $M_{\text{not linked}} = 6.10$, $t_{1169} = -6.38$, $p < 0.001$). Participants without a linked partner either did not have a partner or had a partner who did not take part.

3.6 Scaling

The Mokken scale analysis showed that items correspond to a basic Guttman structure with H>0.45 for all items for both versions (Table 3), meaning all items were eligible for scaling. For people who were pregnant, item 3 was easiest to endorse, followed by item 4, 2, 5, 6, and 1. For partners, item 4 was easiest to endorse, followed by 5, 3, 2, 6, and 1. Loevinger's H was 0.68 for the entire scale for both versions, indicating a strong scale.

4 Discussion

In this study, we developed an acceptable and reliable Dutch Adaptation of the London Measure of Unplanned Pregnancy (DA-LMUP). The DA-LMUP was primarily based on the structure of the LMUP (10), with substantial linguistic and content-related modifications to enhance readability, acceptability, and cultural-linguistic appropriateness for the Dutch context. These included rewording items for clarity, adapting terminology, adding or modifying response options, and ensuring inclusivity by using gender-neutral or partner-specific language where relevant.

Overall, the DA-LMUP performed well according to various criteria for the performance of psychometric measures, both for people who were pregnant and their partners. The DA-LMUP appeared to be acceptable, readable and reliable. In construct validity analyses, all items loaded onto one dimension, moderately supporting a single factor model. Further, all hypotheses were confirmed. More specifically, this study shows that partners of people who have an abortion also report lower pregnancy intent. With regards to age, younger (<20 years) and older (>39 years) pregnant people reported lower pregnancy intent than those in between, aligning with a UK study (34), but contrasting with a Dutch study (38), which found higher pregnancy intentions in those over 39 years old. This inconsistency might be due to different study populations, as Maas et al. (38) focused on low-risk pregnancies continued to term. For partners, we found that a higher age was associated with higher pregnancy intent. Furthermore, results showed a high correlation of pregnancy intentions among couples, in line with previous studies.

Lastly, our Mokken Scale analyses indicated a strong scale. Notably, we found that item 1 (contraception) and item 6 (preparation behaviour) have the lowest contributions to the scale. This may reflect a broader disconnect between individuals' behaviours and their underlying intentions: prior studies have identified discrepancies between reported pregnancy intentions and actual contraceptive practices (40, 41) and reported that some contraceptive behaviours, such as condom use or fertility-based methods, are not always perceived as 'contraception' (42). Similarly, although healthy preconception behaviours are widely promoted (43), even individuals who consciously plan their pregnancies often do not adhere to these recommendations (38, 44).

4.1 Strengths and limitations

This study has several strengths: we had a relatively large and diverse sample, containing data of both pregnant people and their partners, with a broad range of pregnancy intentions and different pregnancy outcomes (i.e., carry to term or abortion). Some limitations need to be acknowledged. First, the adjustments we made to the measure prevent direct comparison between the DA-LMUP and the LMUP. While these modifications were carefully considered and intended to better reflect the Dutch context, they inevitably altered the instrument. Second, people who were born outside the Netherlands, or with a parent born outside the Netherlands, and people with a religious background, were underrepresented in our sample (45, 46). Finally, some statistics (CFI for pregnant people and RMSEA for both) were (slightly) inadequate in the construct validity analyses.

4.2 Conclusion

The current study presents the DA-LMUP as a reliable instrument for assessing pregnancy intentions in research within the Dutch context. Future studies on pregnancy intention in the

Netherlands are encouraged to apply the DA-LMUP to capture pregnancy intentions in a way that better reflects lived experiences compared to binary measures. This approach can provide policymakers with a better understanding of the diverse contexts and experiences surrounding pregnancy intentions in the Netherlands.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Author contributions

MS – Conceptualisation, Data curation, Formal analysis, Funding acquisition, Investigation, Methodology, Project administration, Writing – original draft

WB – Conceptualisation, Data curation, Formal analysis, Funding acquisition, Investigation, Methodology, Project administration, Writing – original draft

JvD – Conceptualisation, Funding acquisition, Methodology, Project administration, Supervision, Writing – review & editing

JKdJ – Conceptualisation, Funding acquisition, Methodology, Project administration, Supervision, Writing – review & editing

Funding

Both studies were funded by ZonMw. The BluePrInt study under project number 554002012 and the RISE UP study in The Hague under project number 554002006.

Acknowledgements

We would like to acknowledge all participants for responding to the survey and all people who have helped us to invite the population to participate in our studies. We want to thank the experienced experts and professional experts for their advice on the adaptations of the survey.

Ethics statement

The requirement of ethical approval was waived by the Medical Research Ethics Committee of Leiden Den Haag Delft and the Medical Research Ethics Committee of the Amsterdam Medical Center for the studies involving humans because the Medical Research Involved Human subjects Act (WMO) did not apply. The studies were conducted in accordance with the local legislation and institutional requirements. The participants provided their written informed consent to participate in this study.

Data availability statement

The datasets used and/or analysed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Generative AI Statement

During the preparation of this work, the authors used ChatGPT in order to improve flow and conciseness of the content. After using this tool, the authors reviewed and edited the content as needed and take full responsibility for the content of the publication.

5 References

1. UNFPA. Seeing the unseen: The case for action in the neglected crisis of unintended pregnancy. 2022.
2. Santelli JS, Lindberg LD, Orr MG, Finer LB, Speizer I. Toward a multidimensional measure of pregnancy intentions: Evidence from the United States. Stud Fam Plann. 2009;40(2):87–100.
3. Barrett G, Wellings K. What is a 'planned' pregnancy? Empirical data from a British study. Soc Sci Med. 2002;55(4):545–57.
4. Klerman LV. The intendedness of pregnancy: A concept in transition. Matern Child Health J. 2000;4(3):155–62.
5. Auerbach SL, Coleman-Minahan K, Alspaugh A, Aztlan EA, Stern L, Simmonds K. Critiquing the unintended pregnancy framework. Journal of Midwifery & Women's Health. 2023;68(2):170–8.
6. Schwarz EB, Lohr PA, Gold MA, Gerbert B. Prevalence and correlates of ambivalence towards pregnancy among nonpregnant women. Contraception. 2007;75(4):305–10.
7. Aiken AR, Dillaway C, Mevs-Korff N. A blessing I can't afford: Factors underlying the paradox of happiness about unintended pregnancy. Soc Sci Med. 2015;132:149–55.
8. Borrero S, Nikolajski C, Steinberg JR, Freedman L, Akers AY, Ibrahim S, et al. "It just happens": A qualitative study exploring low-income women's perspectives on pregnancy intention and planning. Contraception. 2015;91(2):150–6.
9. Hill B, Kothe EJ, Currie S, Danby M, Lang AY, Bailey C, et al. A systematic mapping review of the associations between pregnancy intentions and health-related lifestyle behaviours or psychological wellbeing. Prev Med Rep. 2019;14:100869.
10. Barrett G, Smith SC, Wellings K. Conceptualisation, development, and evaluation of a measure of unplanned pregnancy. J Epidemiol Community Health. 2004;58(5):426–33.
11. (LMUP) TLMoUP. LMUP versions [Available from: https://www.lmup.org.uk/versions.htm.
12. Goossens J, Verhaeghe S, Van Hecke A, Barrett G, Delbaere I, Beeckman D. Psychometric properties of the Dutch version of the London Measure of Unplanned Pregnancy in women with pregnancies ending in birth. PLoS One. 2018;13(4):e0194033.
13. Louw Rd. Is Dutch a pluricentric language with two centres of standardization? An overview of the differences between Netherlandic and Belgian Dutch from a Flemish perspective. Werkwinkel. 2016;11(1):113–35.
14. Auerbach SL, Coleman-Minahan K, Alspaugh A, Aztlan EA, Stern L, Simmonds K. Critiquing the unintended pregnancy framework. J Midwifery Wom Health. 2023;68(2):170–8.
15. Christiaens W, Verhaeghe M, Bracke P. Childbirth expectations and experiences in Belgian and Dutch models of maternity care. Journal of Reproductive and Infant Psychology. 2008;26(4):309–22.
16. Roudsari RL, sharifi F, Goudarzi F. Barriers to the participation of men in reproductive health care: A systematic review and meta-synthesis. BMC Public Health. 2023;23(1):818.
17. Barrett G, Hall JA, Howden B, Patel D, Shawe J, Stephenson J. Evaluation of the psychometric properties of a version of the London Measure of Unplanned Pregnancy for women's partners. Int J Men's Soc Community Health. 2020;3(1):e65–e77.
18. Yeatman S, Smith-Greenaway E. Birth planning and women's and men's health in Malawi. Stud Fam Plann. 2018;49(3):213–35.
19. Cha S, Chapman DA, Wan W, Burton CW, Woolf SH, Masho SW. Couple pregnancy intentions and induced abortions in the United States. Int J Women's Health Reprod Sci. 2016;4(4):157–63.
20. Waller MR, Bitler MP. The link between couples' pregnancy intentions and behavior: Does it matter who is asked. Perspect Sex Reprod Health. 2008;40(4):194–201.

21. Barrett G, Nolan EM, Gürtin ZB, Stephenson J, Hall JA. London Measure of Unplanned Pregnancy and newer family forms: An update. J Epidemiol Community Health. 2020:765.
22. Collins D. Pretesting survey instruments: An overview of cognitive methods. Qual Life Res. 2003;12(3):229–38.
23. Drennan J. Cognitive interviewing: Verbal data in the design and pretesting of questionnaires. J Adv Nurs. 2003;42(1):57–63.
24. Hall J, Barrett G, Mbwana N, Copas A, Malata A, Stephenson J. Understanding pregnancy planning in a low-income country setting: Validation of the London Measure of Unplanned Pregnancy in Malawi. BMC Pregnancy Childbirth. 2013;13(1):200.
25. Morof D, Steinauer J, Haider S, Liu S, Darney P, Barrett G. Evaluation of the London Measure of Unplanned Pregnancy in a United States population of women. PLoS ONE. 2012;7(4):e35381.
26. Barrett G. Scoring the LMUP [Available from: https://www.lmup.org.uk/score.htm.
27. Loewenthal KM, Lewis CA. An introduction to psychological tests and scales: Routledge; 2020.
28. Kincaid JP, Fishburne Jr RP, Rogers RL, Chissom BS. Derivation of new readability formulas (Automated Readability Index, Fog Count and Flesch Reading Ease Formula) for navy enlisted personnel. Institute for Simulation and Training; 1975.
29. Cronbach LJ. Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. Psychometrika. 1951;16:297–334.
30. Landis JR, Koch GG. The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. Biometrics. 1977;33:159–74.
31. Rocca CH, Krishnan S, Barrett G, Wilson M. Measuring pregnancy planning: An assessment of the London Measure of Unplanned Pregnancy among urban, south Indian women. Demographic Research. 2010;23:293–334.
32. Hu L-t, Bentler PM. Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. Struct Equ Modeling. 1999;6(1):1–55.
33. Bexhell H, Guthrie K, Cleland K, Trussell J. Unplanned pregnancy and contraceptive use in Hull and East Yorkshire. Contraception. 2016;93(3):233–5.
34. Hall JA, Barrett G, Copas A, Stephenson J. London Measure of Unplanned Pregnancy: guidance for its use as an outcome measure. Patient Relat Outcome Meas. 2017;8:43–56.
35. Karp C, Moreau C, Shiferaw S, Seme A, Yihdego M, Zimmerman LA. Evaluation of the London Measure of Unplanned Pregnancy (LMUP) among a nationally representative sample of pregnant and postpartum women Ethiopia. Contraception. 2023;5:100094.
36. Maxson P, Miranda ML. Pregnancy intention, demographic differences, and psychosocial health. Journal of Women's Health. 2011;20(8):1215–23.
37. Lang AY, Harrison CL, Barrett G, Hall JA, Moran LJ, Boyle JA. Opportunities for enhancing pregnancy planning and preconception health behaviours of Australian women. Women and Birth. 2021;34(2):e153–e61.
38. Maas VYF, Poels M, de Kievit MH, Hartog AP, Franx A, Koster MPH. Planning is not equivalent to preparing, how Dutch women perceive their pregnancy planning in relation to preconceptional lifestyle behaviour change - a cross-sectional study. BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth. 2022;22(1):577.
39. Mokken RJ. A theory and procedure of scale analysis: With applications in political research. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter Mouton; 1971.
40. Biggs MA, Karasek D, Foster DG. Unprotected intercourse among women wanting to avoid prgnancy: Attitudes, bhaviors, and bliefs. Women's Health Issues. 2012;22(3):e311–e8.
41. Jones RK, Tapales A, Lindberg LD, Frost J. Using longitudinal data to understand changes in consistent contraceptive use. Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health. 2015;47(3):131–9.
42. Beumer WY, Reilingh AYAM, van Zon A, Beukema L, Henrichs J, van Ditzhuijzen JM. What shaped contraceptive behavior prior to an unwanted pregnancy? Narrative insights from the BluePrInt study in the Netherlands. Under review. 2025.

43. Steegers EAP, Struijs JN, Uijtdewilligen AJM, Roseboom TJ. A good start for all children: Integrating early-life course medical and social care through Solid Start, the Netherlands' nationwide action programme. Health Policy. 2025;152:105219.
44. Maas VYF, Poels M, Stam AL, Lieftink N, Franx A, Koster MPH. Exploring male perceptions regarding the need to engage in preconception care – a mixed-method study amongst Dutch (prospective) fathers. The European Journal of Contraception & Reproductive Health Care. 2022;27(4):322–9.
45. Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek. CBS introduceert nieuwe indeling bevolking naar herkomst 2022 [updated 2022 Feb 16. Available from: https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/nieuws/2022/07/cbs-introduceert-nieuwe-indeling-bevolking-naar-herkomst#:~:text=Op%201%20januari%202021%20telde,%C3%A9%C3%A9n%20in%20Nederland%20geboren%20ouder.
46. Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek. Bijna 6 op de 10 Nederlanders behoren niet tot religieuze groep 2022 [updated 2022 Dec 22. Available from: https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/nieuws/2022/51/bijna-6-op-de-10-nederlanders-behoren-niet-tot-religieuze-groep.

6 Tables

Table 1. Adjustments made compared to the Flemish and UK 2020 LMUP versions.[a]

Question	Change	Reason
1	Move of 'I/we were using' from beginning of answer option to end of question	To improve readability
1	Clarification of answer option on always using contraception, but knowing method had failed	To improve readability, based on think aloud interviews
2	Addition of 'parent' next to 'mother'	To improve acceptability
2P	Use of 'father/parent' instead of 'mother/parent'	To improve acceptability
3P	Use of 'having a child' instead of 'becoming pregnant'	To improve acceptability and to better suit Dutch language, based on think aloud interviews
3P, 4P, 5P	Use of 'before the pregnancy' instead of 'before I got pregnant'	To improve acceptability and to better suit Dutch language, based on think aloud interviews
4	Use of word 'child' instead of 'baby'	To better suit Dutch language
5	Abbreviation of introductory text	To improve readability and acceptability
5	Addition of answer option in which participants agreed with their partner that they did not want any (more) children	To accommodate this group, based on think aloud interviews
6	Addition of answer option in which participants report exercising more	To prompt participants to think of this health behaviour
6P	Remove option of folic acid	To improve acceptability
All	Addition of answer options 'I don't know' or 'I'd rather not say'	Necessary for our data collection as for all items, answers were required

[a]Note: for question numbers followed by a 'P', changes were made in the version for partners only.

454 **Table 2. Socio-demographic characteristics of RISE UP and BluePrInt study participants (n = 1172).**

	People who were pregnant			Partner		
	Total (n = 832)	**RISE UP (n = 219)**	**BluePrInt (n = 613)**	**Total (n = 340)**	**RISE UP (n = 43)**	**BluePrInt (n = 297)**
Characteristic	**n (%)**	**n (%)**	**n (%)**	**n (%)**	**n (%)**	**n (%)**
Age groups						
<20	37 (4.5)	2 (0.9)	35 (5.7)	12 (3.5)	-	12 (4.0)
20-39	764 (91.8)	209 (95.4)	555 (90.5)	308 (90.6)	37 (86.0)	271 (91.2)
>39	31 (3.7)	8 (3.7)	23 (3.8)	20 (5.9)	6 (14.0)	14 (4.7)
Ethnicity						
Born in the Netherlands, both parents born in the Netherlands	657 (79.0)	142 (64.8)	515 (84.0)	296 (87.1)	28 (65.1)	268 (90.2)
Born in the Netherlands, one/both parents born outside the Netherlands	98 (11.8)	41 (18.7)	57 (9.3)	29 (8.5)	10 (23.3)	19 (6.4)
Born outside the Netherlands	73 (8.8)	36 (16.4)	37 (6.0)	15 (4.4)	5 (11.6)	10 (3.4)
Missing	4 (0.5)	-	4 (0.7)		-	-
Religion						
No religion	608 (73.1)	144 (65.7)	464 (75.7)	282 (82.9)	26 (60.5)	256 (86.2)
Buddhism	4 (0.5)	2 (0.9)	2 (0.3)	-	-	-
Christianity	120 (14.4)	31 (14.2)	89 (14.5)	31 (9.1)	6 (14.0)	25 (8.4)
Hinduism	11 (1.3)	7 (3.2)	4 (0.7)	1 (0.3)	1 (2.3)	-
Islam	47 (13.2)	24 (11.0)	23 (3.8)	11 (3.2)	5 (11.6)	6 (2.0)
Jewish	-	-	-	1 (0.3)	-	1 (0.3)
Other	18 (2.2)	3 (1.4)	15 (2.4)	5 (1.5)	2 (4.7)	3 (1.0)
Missing	24 (2.9)	8 (3.6)	16 (2.6)	9 (2.7)	3 (7.0)	6 (2.0)
Partnership status						
No relationship	72 (8.7)	9 (4.2)	63 (10.3)	17 (5.0)	-	17 (5.7)
Not cohabiting with partner	139 (16.7)	5 (2.3)	134 (21.9)	65 (19.1)	-	65 (21.9)
Cohabiting with partner	611 (73.4)	204 (93.2)	407 (66.4)	250 (73.5)	43 (100.0)	207 (69.7)
Missing	10 (1.3)	1 (0.5)	9 (1.5)	8 (2.2)	-	8 (2.6)
Gestational age at survey						
<4 weeks	13 (1.6)	-	13 (2.1)			
4-8 weeks	185 (22.1)	15 (6.8)	170 (27.8)			
9-12 weeks	190 (23.3)	19 (8.7)	171 (27.9)			
13-16 weeks	242 (29.0)	40 (18.3)	202 (33.0)			
17-24 weeks	102 (12.3)	70 (32.0)	32 (5.2)			
>24 weeks	92 (11.0)	75 (34.2)	17 (2.8)			
Missing	7 (0.8)	-	7 (1.1)			
Gravida						
First pregnancy	441 (53.1)	93 (42.5)	348 (56.9)			
Second or subsequent pregnancy	380 (45.7)	126 (57.5)	254 (41.5)			
Missing	10 (1.2)	-	10 (1.7)			

Table 3. Results of reliability, construct validity, and Mokken scale analyses of DA-LMUP for people who were pregnant and partners.

Item	N	Item-rest correlation coefficient	PCA component loading	CFA factor loadings	Loevinger's H coefficient
People who were pregnant					
Entire scale	645	Cronbach's alpha = 0.88	Eigenvalue = 3.76	CFI 0.930. SRMR 0.041. RMSEA 0.160 (0.139-0.183)	0.68
1 – Contraception	821	0.57	0.28	0.45	0.46
2 – Timing	817	0.78	0.44	0.82	0.69
3 – Intention	778	0.86	0.45	0.84	0.78
4 – Desire	721	0.85	0.45	0.86	0.72
5 – Partner discussion	692	0.81	0.43	0.80	0.71
6 – Preparation	832	0.67	0.38	0.65	0.68
Partners					
Entire scale	226	Cronbach's alpha = 0.87	Eigenvalue = 3.76	CFI 0.976. SRMR 0.035. RMSEA 0.098 (0.059-0.139)	0.68
1 – Contraception	328	0.64	0.34	0.56	0.54
2 – Timing	336	0.75	0.44	0.77	0.70
3 – Intention	260	0.86	0.45	0.83	0.73
4 – Desire	290	0.87	0.57	0.93	0.75
5 – Partner discussion	248	0.87	0.46	0.90	0.75
6 – Preparation	340	0.43	0.25	0.37	0.58

Table 4. Results from hypothesis testing. W values are presented for all tests except for age, there the values are a Kruskal-Wallis chi-squared statistic.

	People who were pregnant		Partners	
Hypothesis	**Test statistic**	**p-value**	**Test statistic**	**p-value**
Single vs Relationship	17,953.0	<0.001	1,670.0	0.009
Non-cohabiting/single vs cohabiting	32,328.0	<0.001	4,302.5	<0.001
Age				
20 to 39 vs >39	2,540.0	0.021	-2,320.0	0.030
20 to 39 vs <20	6,220.0	<0.001	4,300.0	<0.001
>39 vs <20	2,450.0	0.021	4,930.0	<0.001
Abortion vs carry to term	14,526.0	<0.001	2,947.5	<0.001
Primigravida vs multigravida	72,507.0	<0.001		

7 Figure legends

Figure 1. Distribution of the total DA-LMUP scores by DA-LMUP version and pregnancy decision.



(A) Pregnant people - Carry to term



(B) Partners - Carry to term



(C) Pregnant people - Abortion



(D) Partners - Abortion