

1 Contraceptive congruence: acknowledging pregnancy ambivalence in a novel measure of
2 contraceptive use

3 Hallie N. Nelson, MD^a; Erik Lehman, MS^b; Sarah Horvath, MD, MSHP^c, Cynthia H. Chuang,
4 MD, MSc^{d,b,c}

5 ^aDepartment of Obstetrics, Gynecology and Women's Health, Albert Einstein College of
6 Medicine/Montefiore Medical Center, Bronx, NY; USA

7 ^bDepartment of Public Health Sciences, Penn State College of Medicine; Hershey, PA; USA

8 ^cDepartment of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Penn State College of Medicine; Hershey, PA; USA

9 ^dDivision of General Internal Medicine, Penn State College of Medicine; Hershey, PA; USA

10 Present Address Author:

11 Hallie N. Nelson, MD

12 Department of Obstetrics, Gynecology and Women's Health, Albert Einstein College of

13 Medicine/Montefiore Medical Center

14 1300 Morris Park Avenue, Block Building 631

15 Bronx, New York 10461

16 Hanelson@montefiore.org

17 **Word count:** Abstract 237, Manuscript 2497

18 **Funding Statement**

19 This work was supported by the Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute (PCORI)
20 Program Award (CD-1304-6117). All statements in this report, including its findings and
21 conclusions, are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of PCORI,
22 its Board of Governors or its Methodology Committee. Study data were collected and managed
23 using REDCap electronic data capture tools hosted at the Penn State Milton S. Hershey Medical
24 Center and College of Medicine. REDCap is supported by the Penn State Clinical &
25 Translational Science Institute, Pennsylvania State University CTSI, NIH/NCATS Grant
26 Number UL1 TR000127. The contents are solely the responsibility of the authors and do not
27 necessarily represent the official views of NIH/NCATS.

28

29 **Acknowledgement**

30 The authors thank Highmark Health for their assistance with participant recruitment. The
31 findings and conclusions presented are solely those of the authors and do not represent the views
32 of Highmark Health.

33 **Abstract**

34 *Background:* The historical view that pregnancy intention is dichotomous (i.e., intending or not
35 intending pregnancy), and the notion that all individuals not intending pregnancy should be using
36 highly effective contraceptive methods, oversimplifies how we view contraceptive decision-
37 making. To better understand this, we studied contraceptive congruence as an alternative, 3-level
38 measure describing methods as very congruent, somewhat congruent, or incongruent with one's
39 individual attitudes about becoming pregnant.

40 *Methods:* Secondary data analysis included 982 MyNewOptions study participants who were not
41 intending pregnancy within the next year. The cross-sectional survey assessed attitudes about how
42 important it is to avoid pregnancy, how pleased/upset one would be if pregnant, and current
43 contraceptive method use. Participant answers to attitudinal questions and effectiveness of current
44 contraceptive method were used to determine congruence categories.

45 *Results:* Contraceptive methods included LARC (8%), other prescription methods (50%), non-
46 prescription methods (30%), and no method (12%). Methods for 23% of participants were very
47 congruent, 48% somewhat congruent, and 29% incongruent with attitudes about becoming
48 pregnant. Contraceptive congruence was significantly associated with contraceptive satisfaction
49 in bivariate analysis. Predictors of contraceptive congruence included being married or living
50 with partner, full-time employment, and intending future pregnancy in the next 1-5 years.

51 *Conclusion:* Contraceptive congruence is a novel measure that acknowledges pregnancy
52 ambivalence and is associated with higher contraceptive satisfaction scores. Future contraception
53 research should strive for robust, patient-centered measures of contraceptive use that acknowledge
54 the complex attitudes affecting individual contraceptive behavior and satisfaction.

55 **What is already known on this topic:** Pregnancy intention is historically seen as a dichotomous
56 outcome (“intended” vs “unintended”), does not capture the full breadth of pregnancy
57 ambivalence, and may be an oversimplification of an individual’s reality.

58 **What this study adds:** To better understand this complex interaction of pregnancy intention with
59 contraceptive use, we propose contraceptive congruence as an alternative, 3-level measure that
60 describes methods as very congruent, somewhat congruent, or incongruent with one’s individual
61 attitudes about becoming pregnant. Contraceptive congruence is a novel patient centered measure
62 that acknowledges pregnancy ambivalence, is associated with higher contraceptive satisfaction
63 scores, and with further research could change contraceptive counseling in the future.

64 **How this study might affect research, practice or policy:** The differences observed in
65 contraceptive congruence and contraceptive effectiveness suggests that better strategies are
66 needed to measure patient-centered contraceptive method use. Clinical practice and policy must
67 advance how we use reproductive life planning, shared decision making, motivational
68 interviewing, and patient autonomy to help patients find contraceptive methods that are aligned
69 with their pregnancy intentions, ambivalence, and individual preferences.

70

71 **1. Introduction**

72 With effectiveness of over 99%, long-acting reversible contraception (LARC), which
73 include the intrauterine device (IUD) and the contraceptive implant, are often touted as the
74 preferred methods for reducing unintended pregnancies.¹⁻³ However, indiscriminate promotion
75 of LARCs is problematic for several reasons, including the inaccurate assumption that pregnancy
76 intention is dichotomous – i.e., either intending pregnancy or not intending pregnancy. On the
77 contrary, many individuals feel some degree of ambivalence even when stating they are or are
78 not intending pregnancy.

79 Commonly used measures of pregnancy intention have generally assessed whether
80 participants want/intend to have a baby in the future.⁴ Although a “not sure” category is often
81 offered and used by researchers to define ambivalence, we suspect that these “not sure”
82 responses are not capturing the full breadth of pregnancy ambivalence. In contraceptive behavior
83 studies, individuals who self-report not intending pregnancy are often expected or encouraged to
84 use a LARC or other highly effective form of contraception. While efficacy is a convenient and
85 easy outcome measure, it is also flawed.

86 Misunderstanding pregnancy ambivalence and its role in contraceptive decision making
87 is not only an issue for research methodology, but a critically important concept that needs to be
88 better understood to provide patient-centered clinical care. Gubrium and colleagues state that no
89 one contraceptive method should be first line for everyone and furthermore endorsing LARC
90 methods for everyone may be perpetuated by the Healthy People 2020 goal of reducing method
91 failure from 12.4% to 9.9%.^{5 6} In a recent study that supports individualizing contraceptive
92 counseling, participants desiring to avoid pregnancy had higher odds of any and more consistent
93 contraceptive use, but not use of a more effective method.⁷ To acknowledge these complexities

94 in contraceptive decision-making, we need to include patient-centered perspectives in how we
95 define whether contraceptive choices are congruent with individual situations, instead of always
96 advocating for highest efficacy methods for all.

97 Our objective is to propose an alternative 3-level measure, contraceptive congruence, that
98 categorizes the contraceptive method an individual is using as being very congruent, somewhat
99 congruent, or incongruent with their attitudes toward future pregnancy. We aim to define this
100 new research measure and describe its association with contraceptive method satisfaction, as
101 well as the traditional hierarchy of contraceptive method effectiveness using data from the
102 MyNewOptions study. We hypothesize that contraceptive congruence will yield different results
103 than method effectiveness alone.

104

105 **2. Methods**

106 *2.1. Study sample*

107 Data for these cross-sectional analyses are from the baseline survey (prior to study
108 interventions) of the MyNewOptions randomized controlled trial. The parent study tested the
109 effectiveness of web-based interventions to assist insured self-identified women in making
110 individualized contraceptive choices (ClinicalTrials.gov identifier: [REDACTED]).⁸ Study
111 participants were members of Highmark Health plans in Pennsylvania and sampled from the
112 Highmark enrollee database. Eligible self-identified women were aged 18-40, not intending
113 pregnancy in the next 12 months, not surgically sterile (or current partner with vasectomy),
114 sexually active with reported male partner(s), and had Internet access. The baseline survey,
115 completed in 2014, assessed pregnancy and contraceptive history, current contraceptive use and

116 behaviors, and sociodemographic factors. Further details regarding the MyNewOptions study
117 protocol are previously published.⁹

118 There were 987 participants in the MyNewOptions study; the analytic sample for the
119 current analysis was limited to the 982 participants who provided complete survey responses for
120 the main independent and dependent variables of interest, as described below (2.2 Measures).

121 The MyNewOptions study was approved by the [REDACTED] Institutional
122 Review Board.

123

124 2.2. Measures

125 2.2.1. Outcome Variable: Contraceptive Congruence with Pregnancy Attitudes

126 Contraceptive congruence is a 3-level variable describing whether an individual's
127 contraceptive method is very congruent (VC), somewhat congruent (SC), or incongruent (IC)
128 with one's attitudes about getting pregnant. The research metric variable was constructed based
129 on the participant's responses to three questions—current primary contraceptive method,
130 importance of avoiding pregnancy, and pleased/upset if became pregnant. Contraceptive methods
131 were categorized into four groups representing highest to lowest effectiveness: 1) long-acting
132 reversible contraceptive (LARC) including intrauterine devices (IUDs) and contraceptive
133 implants, which have a failure rate of <1%, 2) other prescription methods (i.e., oral
134 contraceptives, injectable, patch, vaginal ring), which have a typical failure rate of 6-9%, 3) non-
135 prescription methods (i.e., barrier methods, spermicide, withdrawal, fertility-awareness based
136 methods (FABM)), with a typical failure rate of 12-24%, and 4) no method. Importance of
137 avoiding pregnancy was assessed with the question, "Thinking about your life right now, how
138 important is it to you to avoid becoming pregnant?"—the response choices were very important,

139 somewhat important, a little important, and not at all important. How pleased/upset one would be
140 if pregnant was assessed with the item, “Now, imagine that you have just found out today that
141 you are pregnant. How would you feel?”—the response choices were very upset, somewhat
142 upset, unsure, somewhat pleased, and very pleased.

143 The definitions for very congruent, somewhat congruent, or incongruent are shown in
144 Figure 1. Whether a participant’s contraception is VC, SC, or IC is dependent on individual
145 responses to the pregnancy attitude questions. The strictest definition for congruence applies to
146 participants for whom it is very important to avoid getting pregnant or would be very upset if
147 pregnant, in which case only contraceptive methods with highest effectiveness (i.e., LARC) are
148 defined as very congruent. In this same scenario, other prescription methods would be somewhat
149 congruent, and non-prescription or no method would be incongruent. In cases where it is
150 somewhat/a little important to avoid pregnancy or would only be a little upset/not sure/or a little
151 pleased if pregnant, a more moderate definition for congruence applies, where any prescription
152 method is very congruent, any non-prescription method is somewhat congruent, and no method
153 is incongruent. Finally, for participants stating it is not at all important to avoid pregnancy or
154 would be very pleased if pregnant within the next year, LARCs are considered somewhat
155 congruent, given dependence on clinicians for insertion/removal, and all other methods (or no
156 method) are considered very congruent.

157

Figure 1: Defining Contraception Congruence

PREGNANCY ATTITUDE QUESTIONS	CURRENT CONTRACEPTIVE METHOD			
1. Thinking about your life right now, how important is it to avoid becoming pregnant? 2. Imagine that you have just found out today that you are pregnant. How would you feel?	LARC	Non-LARC prescription method	Non-prescription method	No method
VERY IMPORTANT or VERY UPSET If YES →	Very Congruent	Somewhat Congruent	Incongruent	
If NO → SOMEWHAT/A LITTLE IMPORTANT or LITTLE UPSET/NOT SURE/A LITTLE PLEASED If YES →	Very Congruent		Somewhat Congruent	Incongruent
If NO → NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT or VERY PLEASED If YES →	Somewhat Congruent	Very Congruent		

158

159 *2.2.2. Independent variables*

160 Independent variables were included that were expected to be associated with contraceptive use,
 161 including intended timing of future pregnancy, pregnancy history, and sociodemographic
 162 variables. Intended timing of future pregnancy was a 5-level variable that captured when
 163 individuals intended a future pregnancy (in 1-2 years, 2-5 years, 5 or more years, never, or not
 164 sure); only participants not intending pregnancy in the next year were eligible for the parent
 165 study. Pregnancy history variables included number of previous live births and any prior
 166 unintended pregnancy or abortion. Sociodemographic characteristics included age group,
 167 relationship status, self-reported race/ethnicity, prior education, employment status, annual
 168 household income, and religion.

169 The MyNewOptions baseline survey also included a single-item measure of contraceptive
 170 satisfaction: “My overall satisfaction with my birth control method(s) is...” The response options

171 were very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, somewhat dissatisfied,
172 and strongly dissatisfied.” For analysis, contraceptive satisfaction was dichotomized as very
173 satisfied vs. all other categories.¹⁰ We included contraceptive satisfaction to evaluate whether it
174 correlated with contraceptive congruence. However, we did not include contraceptive
175 satisfaction in the adjusted analysis, as we did not hypothesize that contraceptive congruence
176 would be independent of contraceptive satisfaction.

177

178 *2.2.3. Statistical analysis*

179 Prior to any analysis, frequencies and percentages were used to summarize all
180 independent and outcome variables. A series of Chi-square tests were performed to assess
181 bivariate associations between the contraceptive congruence variable and the demographic
182 variables (Table 1). All associations with a p-value less than 0.05 were considered significant. A
183 multivariable logistic regression was performed including the significant variables from the
184 bivariate analysis (Table 2), except satisfaction as outlined above (2.2.2. Independent variables).
185 We attempted to use ordinal logistic regression, but the model failed the assumption of
186 proportional odds. Therefore, we collapsed “Somewhat Congruent” and “Incongruent”
187 categories into one category taken as a reference group against “Very Congruent” and applied
188 binomial logistic regression. Prior to any multivariable modeling, we checked for
189 multicollinearity between factors using variance inflation factor (VIF) statistics. Any factors with
190 VIF statistics >5 would be excluded from the model, but no multicollinearity was found. Odds
191 ratios were used to quantify the magnitude and direction of any significant associations. The
192 Hosmer and Lemeshow goodness-of-fit test was used to assess the fit of the model which was

193 good ($p=0.551$). The statistical analysis software SAS version 9.4 was used to perform all
194 analyses (SAS Institute, Cary, NC, USA).

195

196 **3. Results**

197 The majority of the 982 participants in the analytic sample was between 18 and 25 years
198 old, in a relationship, white, a college graduate, employed, and had an annual household income
199 of greater than \$50,000 (Table 1). Most individuals had no prior live births and were intending to
200 have a baby sometime in the future, with the intended timing of future pregnancy well
201 distributed. Individuals were most likely to report they would be very upset if found out they
202 were pregnant today (36.9%) and considered avoiding pregnancy right now to be very important
203 (65.1%). Current contraceptive methods included LARCs (8.4%), other prescription methods
204 (49.8%), non-prescription methods (30.4%), and no method (11.5%). The main outcome
205 variable, contraceptive congruence, was distributed as follows: 23.3% very congruent ($n=229$),
206 48.0% somewhat congruent ($n=471$), and 28.7% incongruent ($n=282$).

207 Contraceptive congruence varied by participant characteristics (Table 1). Age was
208 significantly associated with congruence, with participants aged 26-33 and 34-40 years old more
209 likely to be very congruent (33.3% and 26.7%, respectively) compared with only 13.9% of 18-
210 25-year-old individuals ($p<0.001$). Being married or cohabiting, a college graduate, employed
211 full-time, intending pregnancy within the next 5 years, prior live birth, higher income, and prior
212 unintended pregnancy or abortion were associated with higher contraceptive congruence.

213 Although the multi-level race/ethnicity and religion variables were significant in chi-square
214 analyses ($p=0.001$ and $p=0.022$, respectively), there was not a clear trend of higher/lower
215 congruence with any specific race/ethnicity or religious group. Congruence was associated with

216 contraceptive satisfaction – 63% of very congruent participants had high method satisfaction,
 217 compared with 58% of somewhat congruent and 28% of incongruent participants.

218 **Table 1: Baseline characteristics of total study sample, and by contraceptive congruence**
 219 **groups, n=982.**

Participant Characteristics	Total - (n, column %)	Very congruent - (n, row %)	Somewhat congruent - (n, row %)	Incongruent - (n, row %)	p value*
Age					
18-25	447 (45.5)	62 (13.9)	246 (55.0)	139 (31.1)	<0.001
26-33	363 (37.0)	121 (33.3)	155 (42.7)	87 (24.0)	
34-40	172 (17.5)	46 (26.7)	70 (40.7)	56 (32.6)	
Relationship Status					
Married	367 (37.5)	112 (30.5)	156 (42.5)	99 (27.0)	<0.001
Cohabiting	165 (16.9)	51 (30.9)	83 (50.3)	31 (18.8)	
Dating	293 (29.9)	47 (16.0)	162 (55.3)	84 (28.7)	
Not in relationship	154 (15.7)	18 (11.7)	70 (45.5)	66 (42.9)	
Race/ethnicity					
Non-Hispanic white	916 (94.0)	219 (23.9)	450 (49.1)	247 (27.0)	0.001
Non-Hispanic Black	18 (1.9)	3 (16.7)	5 (27.8)	10 (55.6)	
Hispanic	12 (1.2)	3 (25.0)	3 (25.0)	6 (50.0)	
Non-Hispanic other	29 (3.0)	2 (6.9)	11 (37.9)	16 (55.2)	
Education					
Some college or less	385 (39.4)	69 (17.9)	180 (46.8)	136 (35.3)	<0.001
College graduate	593 (60.6)	159 (26.8)	289 (48.7)	145 (24.5)	
Employment status					
Employed full time	577 (58.9)	176 (30.5)	267 (46.3)	134 (23.2)	<0.001
Employed part time	136 (13.9)	26 (19.1)	66 (48.5)	44 (32.4)	
Not employed	266 (27.2)	26 (9.8)	137 (51.5)	103 (38.7)	
Household Income					
<\$25,000	132 (13.9)	18 (13.6)	72 (54.6)	42 (31.8)	0.003
\$25,000-\$49,999	241 (25.3)	56 (23.2)	100 (41.5)	85 (35.3)	
\$50,000-\$74,999	232 (24.4)	65 (28.0)	116 (50.0)	51 (22.0)	
≥\$75,000	346 (36.4)	84 (24.3)	170 (49.1)	92 (26.6)	
Religion					
Catholic	303 (31.1)	57 (18.8)	154 (50.8)	92 (30.4)	0.022
Protestant	262 (26.9)	65 (24.8)	133 (50.8)	64 (24.4)	
Other	186 (19.1)	42 (22.6)	76 (40.9)	68 (36.6)	
No religion	223 (22.9)	62 (27.8)	105 (47.1)	56 (25.1)	
Number of live births					
0	662 (67.5)	133 (20.1)	352 (53.2)	177 (26.7)	<0.001
1	146 (14.9)	43 (29.5)	51 (34.9)	52 (35.6)	
2 or more	173 (17.6)	52 (30.1)	68 (39.3)	53 (30.6)	

Any prior unintended pregnancy or abortion					
No	810 (82.6)	173 (21.4)	404 (49.9)	233 (28.8)	0.005
Yes	171 (17.4)	55 (32.2)	67 (39.2)	49 (28.7)	
Future pregnancy intentions (at baseline)					
1 to 2 years	132 (13.5)	54 (40.9)	53 (40.2)	25 (18.9)	<0.001
2 to 5 years	246 (25.1)	66 (26.8)	115 (46.8)	65 (26.4)	
5 or more years	223 (22.7)	17 (7.6)	128 (57.4)	78 (35.0)	
Never	152 (15.5)	35 (23.0)	67 (44.1)	50 (32.9)	
Not sure	228 (23.2)	56 (24.6)	108 (47.4)	64 (28.1)	
High contraceptive method satisfaction					
Yes	464 (53.5)	141 (30.4)	274 (59.1)	49 (10.6)	<0.001
No	404 (46.5)	82 (20.3)	197 (48.8)	125 (30.9)	
Primary contraceptive method					
LARC	82 (8.4)	82 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	<0.001
Prescription	489 (49.8)	137 (28.0)	352 (72.0)	0 (0.0)	
Non-prescription	298 (30.4)	4 (1.3)	119 (39.9)	175 (58.7)	
No method	113 (11.5)	6 (5.3)	0 (0.0)	107 (94.7)	
Upset if found out pregnant today					
Very upset	362 (36.9)				
A little upset	218 (22.2)				
Not sure	215 (21.9)				
A little pleased	127 (12.9)				
Very pleased	60 (6.1)				
Important to avoid becoming pregnant right now					
Very important	639 (65.1)				
Somewhat important	241 (24.5)				
A little important	64 (6.5)				
Not at all important	38 (3.9)				
Contraceptive congruence					
Very congruent	229 (23.3)				
Somewhat congruent	471 (48.0)				
Incongruent	282 (28.7)				

220 *p-values from Chi-square tests comparing contraceptive congruence by participant
 221 characteristic.

222 Multivariable logistic regression model results are shown in Table 2, modeling very
 223 congruent contraceptive use. Compared to those who were not partnered, individuals who were
 224 living with their partner or married had greater odds of using a contraceptive method that was
 225 very congruent with their pregnancy attitudes. Likewise, full-time employment was associated
 226 with higher congruence. Finally, individuals who intend pregnancy in 1-2 or 2-5 years were more
 227 likely to be congruent than participants who never intend to get pregnant.

228 **Table 2: Logistic regression modeling very congruent contraceptive method use, n=934.**

Participant Characteristics	Adjusted Odds Ratio (95% Confidence Interval)
Age	
18-25	Reference
26-33	1.19 (0.79, 1.79)
34-40	1.40 (0.82, 2.40)
Relationship status	
Not partnered	Reference
Partnered not living with partner	1.17 (0.73, 1.87)
Living with partner	1.70 (1.01, 2.86)
Married	1.83 (1.06, 3.17)
Race/ethnicity	
Non-Hispanic white	Reference
Non-Hispanic Black	0.64 (0.21, 1.91)
Hispanic	1.09 (0.33, 3.57)
Non-Hispanic other	0.46 (0.18, 1.81)
Education	
Some college or less	Reference
College graduate	0.94 (0.68, 1.30)
Employment status	
Employed full time	1.81 (1.23, 2.66)
Employed part time	1.54 (0.95, 2.49)
Not employed	Reference
Household Income	
<\$25,000	Reference
\$25,000-\$49,999	1.57 (0.96, 2.57)
\$50,000-\$74,999	1.62 (0.98, 2.70)
≥\$75,000	1.25 (0.75, 2.07)
Religion	

Catholic	0.88 (0.59, 1.29)
Protestant	1.02 (0.69, 1.52)
Other	1.05 (0.68, 1.63)
No religion	Reference
Number of live births	
0	Reference
1	0.62 (0.39, 1.00)
2 or more	0.89 (0.52, 1.53)
Future pregnancy intentions (at baseline)	
1 to 2 years	1.94 (1.11, 3.38)
2 to 5 years	1.70 (1.02, 2.81)
5 or more years	0.79 (0.44, 1.45)
Never	Reference
Not sure	1.20 (0.76, 1.90)
Unintended pregnancy	
Yes	1.36 (0.89, 2.08)
No	Reference

229

230 **4. Discussion**

231 In this paper, we propose a new variable, contraceptive congruence, to describe whether
232 an individual's primary contraceptive method is aligned with one's attitudes toward future
233 pregnancy to illustrate the pitfalls of using pregnancy intention alone in making assumptions
234 about the "correctness" of one's contraceptive method use. In this cohort of insured
235 reproductive-age participants not intending pregnancy in the next year, only a minority (8.4%)
236 was using a highly effective LARC, but a higher proportion (23.3%) were using a method that
237 was very congruent with their pregnancy attitudes. While we would hope to see more individuals
238 with high contraceptive congruence, our novel research metric suggests that measuring
239 congruence is very different than just evaluating LARC use alone.

240 While we acknowledged the importance of future pregnancy ambivalence by using this
241 novel contraceptive congruence variable, we also recognize that our methods are flawed since

242 measurement of ambivalence has not been standardized nor validated. As described in previous
243 qualitative studies and perspectives, pregnancy intention is not binary (“unintended” vs
244 “intended”). Intention is much more nuanced and better described along a continuum, as
245 suggested by many participants responding with ambivalence over pregnancy intention.^{17 11-17}
246 Individuals who have strong intentions to avoid pregnancy are more likely to choose a LARC
247 method over individuals with some ambivalence towards pregnancy, who may view a LARC as
248 too permanent.¹⁴ By incorporating pregnancy ambivalence, the contraceptive congruence
249 measure recognizes that the most effective methods are not always the most patient-centered for
250 all individuals seeking contraception.

251 Measures of pregnancy intention, which can be assessed with a singular question or
252 batteries of questions,^{16 18-23} have not been found to be durable over time. More abstract
253 questions (e.g., lifetime intention) are less reliable, but if asked on a shorter timeframe (e.g., one
254 year) with more specific examples, participants have a better ability to predict their intentions.¹⁸
255 ²¹ Our data showed similar results, with individuals intending to become pregnant in the next 1-5
256 years being more likely to be very congruent with their method than those who never intend
257 pregnancy. The literature also suggests that intention can be unstable when asked prospectively
258 and retrospectively, and likely not durable over time.²⁴⁻²⁶ Our findings are consistent with this
259 fluidity in intention, as participants who do not intend pregnancy ever or for at least 5 years, are
260 half as likely to be very congruent between attitudinal questions and contraceptive method.
261 These results suggest that an individual’s contraceptive preferences may be better understood
262 when their future intention is supplemented with the two additional pregnancy attitude questions,
263 which suggests that more work needs to be done to develop a better metric. This measure can be

264 used to describe whether contraceptive methods are aligned with individual needs, and this
265 metric can then be used for both research measurement and clinical assessment.

266 Our study has several limitations. By design, our study population only included privately
267 insured self-reported women from a single state, yielding a demographically and
268 socioeconomically homogeneous sample. Thus, our study results are not generalizable to more
269 racially and economically diverse populations in other parts of the U.S. However, LARC use in
270 our study was similar to that reported in the National Survey of Family Growth, suggesting that
271 the contraceptive use patterns may not be dissimilar from a U.S. population-based sample.²⁷ Of
272 note, this was a secondary analysis from a randomized trial testing the comparative effectiveness
273 of web-based reproductive life planning interventions on contraceptive decision making.⁹
274 Because this analysis used survey data from the baseline measurement prior to randomization,
275 the study interventions would not have interfered with the baseline participant responses. We
276 also acknowledge the limitations of the congruence variable, which may not account for all
277 factors that would be necessary for a robust, patient-centered measure.

278 Although our primary focus was to understand the implications of contraceptive use
279 measurement for research purposes, there are implications for clinical practice and policy.
280 Clinicians and public health agencies may encourage LARC methods to satisfy population-based
281 goals of reducing unintended pregnancies, without acknowledging that individuals are making
282 contraceptive choices that are influenced by many factors beyond effectiveness alone and may be
283 driven by ambivalence over pregnancy intention and planning.^{14 16 28} Clinical practice and policy
284 must also advance how we use reproductive life planning, shared decision making, motivational
285 interviewing, and patient autonomy to help patients find contraceptive methods that are aligned
286 with their individual pregnancy intentions, ambivalence, and preferences.^{1 5 14 18 19 29}

287 By incorporating two attitudinal questions, we acknowledge pregnancy ambivalence
288 using a measure that describes how congruent a contraceptive method is with an individual's
289 desire to avoid pregnancy. The differences observed in contraceptive congruence and
290 contraceptive effectiveness suggests that better strategies are needed to measure patient-centered
291 contraceptive method use.

292

293 5. Bibliography

- 294 1. Morse JE, Moos MK. Reproductive Life Planning: Raising the Questions. *Maternal and*
295 *Child Health Journal* 2018;22(4):439-44. doi: 10.1007/s10995-018-2516-z
- 296 2. Peipert JF, Madden T, Allsworth JE, et al. Preventing Unintended Pregnancies by
297 Providing No-Cost Contraception. *Obstetrics & Gynecology* 2012;120(6):1291-97.
- 298 3. Ricketts S, Klingler G, Schwalberg R. Game Change in Colorado: Widespread Use Of
299 Long-Acting Reversible Contraceptives and Rapid Decline in Births Among
300 Young, Low-Income Women. *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health*
301 2014;46(3):125-32. doi: 10.1363/46e1714
- 302 4. NSFG - 2015-2017 NSFG - Public-Use Data Files, Codebooks and Documentation.
- 303 5. Gubrium AC, Mann ES, Borrero S, et al. Realizing Reproductive Health Equity Needs
304 More Than Long-Acting Reversible Contraception (LARC). *American Journal of*
305 *Public Health Perspectives* 2016;106(1):18-19.
- 306 6. Sundaram A, Vaughan B, Kost K, et al. Contraceptive Failure in the United States:
307 Estimates from the 2006-2010 National Survey of Family Growth. *Perspectives on*
308 *sexual and reproductive health* 2017;49(1):7-16. doi: 10.1363/psrh.12017
- 309 7. Samari G, Foster DG, Ralph LJ, et al. Pregnancy preferences and contraceptive use
310 among US women. *Contraception* 2020;101(2):79-85. doi:
311 10.1016/j.contraception.2019.10.007
- 312 8. Chuang CH, Weisman CS, Velott DL, et al. Reproductive Life Planning and
313 Contraceptive Action Planning for Privately Insured Women : The
314 MyNewOptions Study. *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health*
315 2019;51(4):219-27. doi: 10.1363/psrh.12123
- 316 9. Chuang CH, Velott DL, Weisman CS, et al. Reducing Unintended Pregnancies Through
317 Web-Based Reproductive Life Planning and Contraceptive Action Planning among
318 Privately Insured Women: Study Protocol for the MyNewOptions Randomized,
319 Controlled Trial. *Women's Health Issues* 2015;25(6):641-48. doi:
320 10.1016/j.whi.2015.06.010
- 321 10. Sittig KR, Weisman CS, Lehman E, et al. What Women Want: Factors Impacting
322 Contraceptive Satisfaction in Privately Insured Women. *Women's Health Issues*
323 2020;30(2):93-97. doi: 10.1016/j.whi.2019.11.003

- 324 11. Aiken ARA, Borrero S, Callegari LS, et al. Rethinking the Pregnancy Planning
325 Paradigm: Unintended Conceptions or Unrepresentative Concepts? *Perspectives*
326 *on Sexual and Reproductive Health* 2016;48(3):147-51. doi: 10.1363/48e10316
- 327 12. Bachrach CA. Intended Pregnancies and Unintended Pregnancies: Distinct Categories
328 or Opposite Ends of a Continuum?:251-52.
- 329 13. Coombe J, Harris ML, Loxton D. Accidentally-on-purpose: findings from a qualitative
330 study exploring pregnancy intention and long-acting reversible contraceptive use.
331 *BMJ Sexual & Reproductive Health* 2018;44(3):bmjsrh-200112. doi:
332 10.1136/bmjsrh-2018-200112
- 333 14. Higgins JA. Pregnancy Ambivalence and Long-Acting Reversible Contraceptive
334 (LARC) Use Among Young Adult Women: A Qualitative Study. *Perspectives on*
335 *Sexual and Reproductive Health* 2017;49(3):149-56. doi: 10.1363/psrh.12025
- 336 15. Nelson AL, Shabaik S, Xandre P, et al. Reproductive Life Planning and Preconception
337 Care 2015: Attitudes of English-Speaking Family Planning Patients. *Journal of*
338 *Women's Health* 2016;25(8):832-39. doi: 10.1089/jwh.2015.5323
- 339 16. Nettleman MD, Chung H, Brewer J, et al. Reasons for unprotected intercourse:
340 analysis of the PRAMS survey. *Contraception* 2007;75:361-66. doi:
341 10.1016/j.contraception.2007.01.011
- 342 17. Zabin LS. Ambivalent feelings about parenthood may lead to inconsistent
343 contraceptive use - and pregnancy. *Family Planning Perspectives* 1999;31(5):250-
344 51. doi: 10.2307/2991576
- 345 18. Callegari LS, Aiken ARA, Dehlendorf C, et al. Addressing potential pitfalls of
346 reproductive life planning with patient-centered counseling. *American Journal of*
347 *Obstetrics and Gynecology* 2017;216(2):129-34. doi: 10.1016/j.ajog.2016.10.004
- 348 19. Dunlop AL, Logue KM, Miranda MC, et al. Integrating reproductive planning with
349 primary health care: An exploration among low-income, minority women and
350 men. *Sexual & Reproductive Healthcare* 2010;1:37-43. doi:
351 10.1016/j.srhc.2010.01.001
- 352 20. Hatcher RA. Contraceptives must fit in reproductive life plan. *Contraceptive*
353 *technology update* 1980;1(9):131-2.
- 354 21. Kavanaugh ML, Schwarz EB. Prospective Assessment of Pregnancy Intentions Using
355 a Single- Versus a Multi-Item Measure. *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive*
356 *Health* 2009;41(4):238-43. doi: 10.1363/4123809
- 357 22. Nelson AL, Shabaik S, Xandre P, et al. Providing Quality Family Planning Services.
358 Recommenda- tions of CDC and the U.S. Office of Populations Affairs. *Journal of*
359 *women's health (2002)* 2016;00(00):1-8. doi: 10.1089/jwh.2015.5323
- 360 23. Preconception Health & Reproductive Life Plan | HHS.gov.
- 361 24. Jones RK, Tapales A, Lindberg LD, et al. Using Longitudinal Data to Understand
362 Changes In Consistent Contraceptive Use. *Perspectives on Sexual and*
363 *Reproductive Health* 2015;47(3):131-39. doi: 10.1363/47e4615
- 364 25. Santelli J, Rochat R, Hatfield-Timajchy K, et al. The measurement and meaning of
365 unintended pregnancy. *Perspectives on sexual and reproductive health*
366 1999;35(2):94-101. doi: 10.1363/3509403
- 367 26. Sedgh G, Singh S, Hussain R. Intended and Unintended Pregnancies Worldwide in
368 2012 and Recent Trends. *Studies in Family Planning* 2014;45(3):301-14.

- 369 27. Kavanaugh ML, Jerman J. Contraceptive method use in the United States: trends and
370 characteristics-NC-ND license ([http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-](http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/)
371 [nd/4.0/](http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/)). 2017 doi: 10.1016/j.contraception.2017.10.003
- 372 28. Dehlendorf C, Fox E, Sobel L, et al. Patient-centered contraceptive counseling:
373 Evidence to inform practice. *Current Obstetrics and Gynecology Reports*
374 2016;5(1):55-63. doi: 10.1007/s13669-016-0139-1
- 375 29. Barry MJ, Edgman-levitan S, Billingham V. Shared Decision Making — The Pinnacle
376 of Patient-Centered Care. 2016:780-81.
377