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

Merel Sprenger[1]*†, Wieke Y. Beumer[2-5]†, Dr. Jenneke M. 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: 4663

Number of figures: 1

Number of tables: 4

Manuscript formatted in British English

Abstract

Background. It is often unclear what constitutes an unintended pregnancy, and pregnancy intentions may be multidimensional, dynamic as well as context specific. The primary aim of this study is to establish a reliable Survey on Pregnancy Intentions in the Netherlands (SPIN).

Methods. The development of the SPIN was based on the London Measure of Unplanned Pregnancy, but substantial differences were made, resulting in a version for people who were pregnant and one for partners. We conducted a psychometric evaluation of the SPIN using observational data from two studies on pregnancy intentions 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 and Mokken scaling was applied.

Results. The SPIN 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). Subsequently, people who were younger, single, and nulliparous reported lower pregnancy intentions. People who had an abortion reported lower pregnancy intentions compared to people continuing their pregnancy to term. Lastly, results showed a high correlation of pregnancy intentions in couples (n = 257 couples).

Conclusions. The SPIN is evaluated as reliable for the Dutch context. It offers Dutch researchers and policy makers an instrument suitable to measure pregnancy intentions in a multidimensional manner, constituting a closer reflection of the actual experience of pregnancy intentions. Pregnancy intentions are context-specific and often consistent between partners.

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). However, previous studies indicated that defining pregnancy intentions in this categorical manner leads to oversimplification of a complex construct (2-5). People often experience ambivalent attitudes towards (the prospect of) pregnancy (6). For instance, some people feel happy at the prospect of a pregnancy, while simultaneously trying to actively prevent conception with their behaviours (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 the actual experience of people with an unintended pregnancy in research, calls have been made for using a multidimensional measurement on a continuous scale (9). The London Measure of Unplanned Pregnancy (LMUP) is an instrument that can be used for this purpose (10). The LMUP was developed as a short, self-administered measure in the United Kingdom (UK), and has been translated and validated in several other languages and cultural contexts across all continents (11). The measure considers three key dimensions when measuring pregnancy intentions: (1) context (timing and partner discussion), (2) stance (desire for pregnancy/parenthood and expressed intentions) and (3) behaviour (contraceptive use and pre-conceptual preparations). This multidimensional conceptualization enables measuring pregnancy intentions in a more comprehensive way compared to dichotomous measures and it does not rely on people having fully formed family building plans (10). The original version of the LMUP was assessed as easy to understand, valid and reliable in the UK (10).

Previous studies showed various important associated factors with people's pregnancy intentions. As might be expected, studies showed that unintended pregnancies are more common in people having abortions compared to people continuing their pregnancies to term (12, 13). It was also found that people with unintended pregnancies were more likely to be single, non-cohabiting or unmarried (14-16). Further, people with unintended pregnancies are often under 20 years old (12, 16-19), or over 40 (12). Lastly, people who already have children, are more likely to report unintended pregnancies (14-16, 18), although other studies found no differences between pregnancy intentions of nulli- or multiparous people (17). Up to now, evidence into associated factors with unintended pregnancy as a continuous and multidimensional construct is limited, especially in a context with quite accessible abortion care like the Netherlands.

Furthermore, there is growing recognition of the importance of incorporating partners' perspectives in research on reproductive health (20). 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. Thus, this might be someone's husband or wife, their (non-)cohabiting partner, a friend-with-benefits or someone they had sex with once. Previous research into associated factors with unintended pregnancy primarily focused on pregnant people's perspectives. Research on factors associated with the partner's pregnancy intentions is limited, and only focused on partners of people continuing their pregnancies to term, mostly with quite intended pregnancies (21, 22). Moreover, research indicated that there is a high consistency of pregnancy intentions within couples, i.e.

pregnant people's partners often report similar pregnancy intentions compared to their pregnant partner (23, 24), but recent evidence is lacking.

In the current study, we developed the Survey of Pregnancy Intention in the Netherlands (SPIN), inspired by the structure of the LMUP (10). Like the LMUP, SPIN is grounded in a multidimensional, continuous conceptualization of pregnancy intention. However, we introduced substantial modifications to tailor the instrument to the Dutch context, making it unsuitable for direct comparison with the LMUP. Modifications included rewording items for clarity, adding and adjusting response options, and incorporating gender-neutral and partner-inclusive language where appropriate. Although a validated Flemish-Dutch version of the LMUP exists (14), we considered it essential to develop a Dutch language measure for pregnancy intentions, as Flemish and Dutch are distinct language varieties (25). Moreover, societal norms and perceptions surrounding unintended pregnancy can differ significantly across political, cultural, and healthcare systems (26, 27). SPIN was therefore designed to be applicable to both pregnant people and their partners within the Dutch setting. Our aim is not to compare SPIN to the LMUP, but to evaluate an instrument that reflects the linguistic, cultural, and healthcare context of the Netherlands. In sum, the results of this study may offer an instrument that captures the complexity of pregnancy intentions and supports more nuanced research in the Dutch context.

2 Methods

2.1 Developing the questionnaire

To develop the Survey on Pregnancy Intentions in the Netherlands (SPIN) that is suitable for use in the Netherlands and acceptable for anyone who can get pregnant and their partners, we based our first version on the Flemish LMUP and the UK 2020 update, incorporating linguistic changes from Flemish to Dutch (14, 28). 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 input from all these experts, 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 (in English). No adjustments had to be made. In our third step, the surveys were evaluated in individual think-aloud interviews with five women and two men who experienced an unintended pregnancy. Think-aloud interviewing is a cognitive interviewing technique in which participants are asked to think aloud as they perform a task, e.g., completing a survey (29, 30). Participants took the interviewer through the cognitive process of completing the survey and expressed any thoughts or feelings that came up. Based on the think-aloud interviews, we slightly adjusted the questionnaire. This adjusted version was discussed with the other researchers, linguists and professionals and consensus was reached, resulting in the final version. The final version of SPIN was reviewed in consultation with the developers of the LMUP, who provided guidance on next steps. They specifically recommended that we clearly document the adaptations made, emphasizing that while SPIN was inspired by the LMUP, it has been substantially modified to align with the Dutch context. As such, we do not present SPIN as a direct translation or Dutch equivalent of the LMUP, but rather as a distinct instrument tailored to local linguistic and cultural considerations.All adjustments are presented in Table 1. Complete versions of the SPIN for people who were pregnant and partners are available in the supplementary material.

2.2 Data collection

2.2.1 Design

The current study combines data from two Dutch prospective population-based cohort studies: the BluePrInt study and the RISE UP study. The two studies are both part of a Dutch consortium around unintended pregnancy funded by ZonMw. The researchers decided to join forces in the creation and evaluation of the SPIN.

The BluePrInt study collected data about unintended pregnancies, including terminated pregnancies, across the Netherlands. The RISE UP study collected data about all pregnancies in The Hague, the Netherlands. Data collection took place from May 2022 to October 2024. Both studies were reviewed by the ethical committee and received a waiver from the Medical Research Involved Human subjects Act (WMO): for the RISE UP study by the Medical Research Ethics Committee of Leiden Den Haag Delft under reference number N21.127, and for the BluePrInt study by the Medical Research Ethics Committee of the Amsterdam Medical Center under reference number W21_407. All participants provided consent before completing the survey.

2.2.2 Participants

The BluePrInt study included people who carried an unintended pregnancy to term or terminated an unintended pregnancy, 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 did not explicitly target unintended pregnancy, but people could take part if they were or if their partner was pregnant, and if they lived 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.

2.2.3 Procedure

For both studies, interested people could scan a QR-code that directed them to the information letter, video, and consent form. After receiving their consent, the survey was sent to them. Upon completing the survey (about 20 minutes), they received a gift card worth €10. In both studies, other sections in the survey asked questions on psychosocial health, social support, adverse life events, experience with abuse, worries, wellbeing, and resilience. To enable test-retest analysis, a separate selection of 110 pregnant people in the RISE UP study was invited to complete the SPIN a second time after 7 days. They were part of a test sample who had the possibility of leaving SPIN questions unanswered, without additional answer options 'I don't know' or 'I'd rather not say'.

2.2.4 Measures

In the online surveys, participants were required to answer all items of the SPIN. Further, participants indicated whether they intended to carry their pregnancy to term or recently had an abortion, their age, and whether they currently had a romantic relationship (yes/no). People

who were (recently) pregnant were asked to indicate whether they were pregnant for the first time (yes/no).

2.3 Analyses

Analyses were inspired by evaluations of the LMUP, hence both classical and modern test theory were applied for the evaluation of the SPIN (10, 14, 31, 32). As we have data from both people who were pregnant and partners, and as we developed two slightly different versions for both groups (Table 1), we performed separate analyses for these versions. All analyses were performed by MS & WB using R version 4.2.1. In the analyses, 'I don't know' or 'I'd rather not say' were coded as missing. SPIN data could be used if participants answered three or more questions. Mean imputation for the remaining missing values was applied, in line with LMUP guidelines (33).

2.3.1 Acceptability

To assess acceptability, we examined missing data rates with rates lower than 5% indicating higher acceptability (34). Item discrimination was assessed by looking at item category endorsement values and checking if there were no item categories with greater endorsement (selection) than 80%. We also looked at targeting by investigating if the distribution of our data covered the full range of the SPIN, from 0 to 12. We investigated readability with the Flesch Reading Ease Score (FRES) and the Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level (FKGL) (35).

2.3.2 Reliability

To assess reliability, we used the Cronbach's alpha statistic with a score higher than 0.7 indicating acceptable reliability (36). We also looked at corrected item-rest correlations (with a score lower than 0.2 indicating that the item contributed little to the homogeneity of the scale) and inter-item correlations were examined to check that all items had a positive direction. Additionally, we performed test-retest stability analyses in a separate sample using the weighted kappa and Pearson's correlation. For both statistics, results above 0.60 were acceptable (31, 37, 38). We also analysed the median and mean number of days between test and retest, and at the median and mean difference in the total SPIN 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)(39). Additionally, we tested the following hypotheses: 1) people report a higher SPIN score if they are continuing their pregnancy to term, compared to if people who terminated their pregnancy 2) people who are in a relationship have higher SPIN scores than people who are not in a relationship, with even higher scores for people who are cohabiting and/or married, 3) people younger than 20 years old and people older than 39 years old have lower SPIN scores than those in between, and 4) people who were pregnant for the first time have higher SPIN scores than people who have been pregnant before. These hypotheses are based on previous studies into associated factors with pregnancy intentions in contexts with quite similar abortion care accessibility and laws (12-14, 19). We looked at the distribution of the scores in a histogram and performed a Shapiro-Wilk test to test for normality which provided no evidence for normality ($p<0.001$ for

both survey versions). Hence, we carried out non-parametric Mann-Whitney U tests to test our hypotheses. For age, we performed a Kruskal-Wallis test, followed by a Dunn's post-hoc test with a Bonferroni adjustment of the *p* values.

2.3.4 Convergent validity

Furthermore, we analysed SPIN difference scores of couples. Data from couples were linked during recruitment, thus scores could be compared. First, we tested the normal distribution of the difference scores by visually inspecting a histogram representing difference scores. As this was the case, a paired samples t-test was performed. Further, the correlation between scores of partners was assessed. Although we expected a significant correlation between the scores, we did not expect perfect agreement, as a partner may have different pregnancy intentions compared to the pregnant person (21).

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, and with H<0.4 indicating a weak scale, 0.4<H<0.49 a medium scale, and ≥0.5 a strong scale, meaning that the full score may be used.

3 Results

3.1 Sample

Of the 1201 participants, 1172 people (97.6%) answered 3 or more LMUP items, and were therefore eligible to calculate a total SPIN score. Out of these 1172 people, 910 were participants of the BluePrInt study and 262 were participants of the RISE UP study. 590 people (50.3%) in the total sample were pregnant people continuing their pregnancies to term, and 242 (20.6%) were people who recently had an abortion. Further, we included 216 (18.4%) partners of people continuing their pregnancies to term and 124 (10.6%) partners of people who recently had an abortion. Participants were between 16 and 55 years old (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. The BluePrInt study and RISE UP study included quite similar populations, with the RISE UP study participants consisting of a somewhat bigger proportion of religious people, a smaller proportion of people born in the Netherlands, and people that were not in a relationship. Most pregnancies occurred within a relationship and had a gestational age between 13-16 weeks when filling out the questionnaire. 53.2% of the pregnancies were first pregnancies (Table 2). Further, participants reported a broad range of pregnancy planning (Figure 1). Characteristics of the test-retest sample can be found 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. Further, missing data per item ranged from 1.2%

(item 2; timing) to 23.5% (item 3; intention) for partners. In both respondent groups, the missing data rates of items 1, 2 and 6 were acceptable. However, the missing data rates of items 3, 4 and 5 were >5%, because of a high number of participants choosing the 'I don't know' option for these items. 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 relatively more common in the BluePrInt study compared to the RISE UP study.

For the total sample, as well as for the two subgroups of people who were pregnant and partners, SPIN 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. The FRES was 80, both for people who were pregnant and partners, with an FKGL of 4.3 for both versions.

3.3 Reliability

The Cronbach's alpha for the six items of both versions indicated good internal consistency for people who were pregnant (alpha = 0.88) and for partners (alpha = 0.87). Further, results indicated that in the total sample, the item-rest correlations were above 0.2 for all items, and all inter-item correlations were positive (Table 3).

As for the test-retest analyses (n = 101), the mean days between test and retest was 9.3 (range 6-23 days) and the median difference between the two scores 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, both with scores ranging between 0.66, both for item 5, and 0.91, both 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, including PCA component loadings and CFA factor loadings. PCA showed that all items loaded onto one dimension with an Eigenvalue of 3.76 both for people who were pregnant and partners. CFA assessing model fit 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 when looking at CFI (0.976), SRMR (0.035), and RMSEA (0.098 (0.059-0.139)).

All our hypothesis tests were confirmed (Table 4). People who terminated their pregnancy and their partners reported lower pregnancy intentions compared to people with pregnancies that were continued to term and their partners. Further, single people reported on average lower pregnancy intentions compared to people who are in a relationship. The difference was even larger for people who were cohabiting with a partner compared to single people and people who were in a relationship, but not cohabiting. As for age, for partners the total LMUP score increases as they get older. People who were pregnant, however, reported lower pregnancy intentions for both the younger age group (<20) and the older age group (≥40). Due to data availability, the fourth hypothesis was tested for people who were pregnant only, showing that people who were pregnant for the first time (primigravida) reported on average higher pregnancy intentions than people who had been pregnant before (multigravida).

3.5 Convergent validity

Data were available for 257 couples. SPIN scores of people who were pregnant were highly correlated to their partner's scores (r = 0.800). The paired t-test indicated that on average, people who were pregnant reported lower pregnancy intentions compared to their linked partners ($M_{\text{people who were pregnant}}$ = 4.48, M_{partners} = 4.94, t_{256} = -3.36, p <0.001). When comparing SPIN scores based on pregnancy outcome, 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). SPIN scores did significantly differ in couples who decided to carry 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).

To test whether reported pregnancy intentions of the participants who had a linked partner in the data set differed from participants without a linked partner in the data set, another t-test was performed. Participants who did not have a linked partner in the data set either did not have a partner or had a partner who did not participate in one of our studies. Results indicated that participants with a linked partner in the data set had reported significantly lower pregnancy intentions compared to participants without a linked partner (M_{linked} = 4.74, $M_{\text{not linked}}$ = 6.10, t_{1169} = -6.38, p <0.001).

3.6 Scaling

Results from the Mokken Scale Analysis showed that items correspond to a basic Guttman structure with Loevinger's H coefficients greater than 0.45 for all items, both in the survey for people who were pregnant and for partners (Table 3). Hence, 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. For the entire scale with all six items, the Loevinger's H coefficient was 0.68 for both versions, indicating a strong scale.

4 Discussion

Pregnancy intention is a complex concept that asks for a multidimensional and continuous measurement to capture the actual experiences of people's pregnancy intentions in research (9). In this study, we developed an acceptable and reliable Survey on Pregnancy Intentions in the Netherlands (SPIN). The SPIN was primarily based on the structure of the London Measure of Unplanned Pregnancy (LMUP) (10), but we introduced 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-inclusive language where relevant.

Overall, the SPIN performed well according to various criteria for the performance of psychometric measures, both for people who were pregnant and their partners. Specifically, the SPIN appeared to be acceptable, readable (on an elementary school level), and reliable. Further, construct validity analyses demonstrated that all items loaded onto one dimension and moderately supported a single factor model. 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. Previous research has highlighted discrepancies between reported pregnancy intentions and actual contraceptive practices (40, 41). In the Dutch context, this disconnect may be further explained by differing interpretations of the term 'contraception.' For instance, in a recent study into unintended pregnancy in the Netherlands, some participants reported not using contraception in an online questionnaire yet described in follow-up interviews that they relied on condoms and fertility tracking apps: methods they did not personally classify as 'contraception' (42). Similarly, although healthy preconception behaviours are widely promoted in Dutch policy and practice (43), research has shown that even individuals who consciously plan their pregnancies often do not adhere to these recommendations (18). Comparable findings have been reported among men (44). These examples illustrate how behavioural indicators may not fully align with individuals' intentions, which could explain the lower contributions of these items to the SPIN and the results from CFA, despite all items loading onto one factor in the PCA.

Additionally, results highlighted several important factors that were associated with pregnancy intentions in the Netherlands, of both people continuing their pregnancy to term as people who recently had an abortion. First of all, as expected and in line with previous studies (12, 13), results indicated that people having an abortion reported lower pregnancy intentions compared to people continuing their pregnancy to term. This study shows that this is also true for partners. Second, also in line with previous studies (14-16), people who were in a stable relationship reported more pregnancy intentions. Third, results showed that pregnant people who were younger than 20 years old and older than 39 years old reported lower pregnancy intentions than those in between. This aligns with a UK study (12), but contrasts with a Dutch study (18), which found higher pregnancy intentions in those over 39 years old. The inconsistency might be due to different study populations, as Maas et al. (18) focused on low-risk pregnancies continued to term. In addition, with regard to pregnant people's partners, we found that a higher age was associated with more pregnancy intentions. Fourth, we found that people who were pregnant for the first time reported higher pregnancy intentions compared to those who already were pregnant before, which is in line with previous studies (14-16, 18).

Moreover, current study results showed a high correlation of pregnancy intentions among couples. However, we also found a small, but significant pregnancy intention difference in couples who continued the pregnancy to term, with slightly higher pregnancy intentions for partners. This is contrary to what was found in other studies measuring partner's pregnancy intentions as a continuous and multidimensional construct (21). We expect that this difference was found as a consequence of selection bias, as we expect that partners with more positive feelings towards pregnancy might have been more likely to participate in our studies. This idea is supported by the fact that there was a significant difference in pregnancy intentions for people that were linked to their partner in our dataset compared to people that did not have a linked partner. There was no significant difference for couples in the abortion group. This is in line with previous studies on abortion and partners, showing that couples' pregnancy intentions are highly associated (23, 24).

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). But to appreciate the results, some limitations need to be acknowledged. First, although it was not the aim of this study, the adjustments we made to the measure prevent direct comparison between SPIN and the LMUP. While these modifications were carefully considered and intended to better reflect the

Dutch context, they inevitably altered the structure and content of the LMUP. As a result, SPIN should be viewed as a distinct instrument rather than a variant of the LMUP. 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). Third, some participants within the complete dataset were hesitant with answering specific SPIN items, and therefore chose '*I don't know*' or '*I'd rather not say*' as their answer. Nonetheless, these were substantive response options and might be informative on their own. For example, some people may feel uncomfortable sharing their thoughts about pregnancy, and for others the '*I don't know*'-option is the best reflection of their actual experiences. It was outside the scope of the current study, but future research could investigate these missing values more closely. Finally, some statistics (CFI for pregnant people and RMSEA for both versions) were inadequate in the construct validity analyses. The CFI was just below the threshold for people who were pregnant.

4.2 Conclusion

The current study evaluated the SPIN as reliable for the Dutch context and showed that pregnancy decision, relationship status, age, and gravidity are associated with pregnancy intention. Pregnancy intentions are often consistent between partners. Future studies are advised to study this complexity in groups that are underrepresented in studies into pregnancy intentions, such as pregnant people's partners (47, 48). Nevertheless, future research into Dutch speaking populations is advised to use the SPIN to measure pregnancy intentions in a way that reflects actual experiences more closely, providing Dutch policy makers with a framework that encompasses the broad array of context and experiences surrounding people's pregnancy intentions.

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

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

JvD – 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. 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.
13. Bexhell H, Guthrie K, Cleland K, Trussell J. Unplanned pregnancy and contraceptive use in Hull and East Yorkshire. Contraception. 2016;93(3):233-5.
14. 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.
15. 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.
16. Maxson P, Miranda ML. Pregnancy intention, demographic differences, and psychosocial health. Journal of Women's Health. 2011;20(8):1215-23.
17. Carlander A, Hultstrand JN, Reuterwall I, Jonsson M, Tydén T, Kullinger M. Unplanned pregnancy and the association with maternal health and pregnancy outcomes: A Swedish cohort study. PLOS ONE. 2023;18(5):e0286052.
18. 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.
19. 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.
20. 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.
21. 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.
22. Yeatman S, Smith-Greenaway E. Birth planning and women's and men's health in Malawi. Stud Fam Plann. 2018;49(3):213-35.
23. 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.
24. 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.
25. 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.
26. 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.
27. 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.
28. 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.

29. Collins D. Pretesting survey instruments: An overview of cognitive methods. Qual Life Res. 2003;12(3):229-38.
30. Drennan J. Cognitive interviewing: Verbal data in the design and pretesting of questionnaires. J Adv Nurs. 2003;42(1):57-63.
31. 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.
32. 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.
33. Barrett G. Scoring the LMUP [Available from: https://www.lmup.org.uk/score.htm.
34. Loewenthal KM, Lewis CA. An introduction to psychological tests and scales: Routledge; 2020.
35. 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.
36. Cronbach LJ. Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. Psychometrika. 1951;16:297-334.
37. Landis JR, Koch GG. The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. Biometrics. 1977;33:159-74.
38. 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.
39. 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.
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. Bodin M, Käll L, Tydén T, Stern J, Drevin J, Larsson M. Exploring men's pregnancy-planning behaviour and fertility knowledge:a survey among fathers in Sweden. Ups J Med Sci. 2017;122(2):127-35.
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.
47. Guadagno M, Mackert M, Rochlen A. Improving prenatal health: Setting the agenda for increased male involvement. Am J Mens Health. 2013;7(6):523-6.
48. Bond MJ. The missing link in MCH: Paternal involvement in pregnancy outcomes. Am J Mens Health. 2010;4(4):285-6.

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 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.

576 **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 SPIN 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 SPIN scores by SPIN version and pregnancy decision.



(A) Pregnant people - Carry to term



(B) Partners - Carry to term



(C) Pregnant people - Abortion



(D) Partners - Abortion