

Psychometric properties of the Dutch London Measure of Unplanned Pregnancy for pregnant people and their partners

First authors: Merel Sprenger¹, & Wieke Y. Beumer^{2,3,4,5}

Supporting authors: Dr. Jenneke van Ditzhuijzen^{2,3,6} & Prof. Dr. Jessica C. Kiefte-de Jong¹

Affiliations:

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

²Amsterdam UMC location University of Amsterdam, Epidemiology and Data Science, Meibergdreef 9, Amsterdam, Netherlands;

³Amsterdam UMC location University of Amsterdam, Obstetrics and Gynecology, Meibergdreef 9, Amsterdam, Netherlands;

⁴Amsterdam Reproduction and Development, Amsterdam, the Netherlands;

⁵Amsterdam Public Health, Mental Health, Amsterdam, the Netherlands;

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

Acknowledgements

Studies in this project were funded by ZonMw, project numbers 554002012 and 554002006.

1 **Abstract**

2 **Context.** It is often unclear what constitutes an unplanned or unintended pregnancy, and pregnancy
3 intentions may be multidimensional dynamic. The London Measure of Unplanned Pregnancy (LMUP)
4 measures pregnancy intentions in a manner close to the actual experience. The aim of this study is to
5 establish a Dutch version of the LMUP (LMUP-NL) and to evaluate the reliability and validity of this
6 version for both people who were pregnant and their partners, whatever the pregnancy outcome.

7 **Methods.** A psychometric evaluation of the LMUP using observational data from the BluePrint study
8 and the RISE UP study was conducted with 1201 people (839 people who were pregnant and 362
9 partners), aged between 16-55 years. The LMUP-NL was translated based using the Flemish LMUP
10 and the UK 2020 update, resulting in a version for people who were pregnant and one for partners.
11 Next, the acceptability, readability, reliability, construct and convergent validity were analyzed,
12 combining Principal Component analysis, Confirmatory Factor analysis and Mokken scale analyses.

13 **Results.** The LMUP-NL demonstrated to be readable and reliable (Cronbach's alpha >0.80 for both
14 versions). Construct validity of both versions was acceptable (CFI>0.93) and Mokken scale analyses
15 indicated a strong scale (H-coefficient:0.68).

16 **Conclusions.** The LMUP-NL is reliable and valid for people who were pregnant and their partners,
17 regardless of the pregnancy outcome. It offers researchers and policy makers an instrument suitable to
18 measure pregnancy intention in a multidimensional manner, constituting a closer reflection of the actual
19 experience of pregnancy intentions.

1 Introduction

2 A positive pregnancy test elicits a wide variety of emotional responses. In most research and policy, a
3 pregnancy is defined as either wanted, mistimed (unplanned, but wanted) or unwanted.^{1,2} However,
4 previous studies indicated that defining pregnancy intentions in this dichotomous manner leads to
5 oversimplification of a complex construct.^{1,3-5} Dichotomous measures of unintended pregnancy assume
6 that pregnancy intentions are the product of a conscious process or choice. According to this view,
7 people experience clear attitudes towards a pregnancy, and their behaviors are often consistent with
8 their intentions. However, previous studies showed a more complex view of pregnancy intentions.
9 People often experience ambivalent attitudes towards (the prospect of) a pregnancy.⁶ For instance,
10 some people feel happy at the prospect of a pregnancy, while simultaneously trying to actively prevent
11 conception with their behaviors.⁷ Moreover, often people don't have fully formed family building plans
12 (yet).⁸

13 To address pregnancy intentions in a manner closer to the actual experience of people with an
14 unintended pregnancy in research, calls have been made for using a multidimensional, measurement
15 on a continuous scale.⁹ The London Measure of Unplanned Pregnancy (LMUP) is an instrument that
16 can be used for this purpose.¹⁰ The LMUP was developed as a short, self-administered measure in the
17 UK, based on lay views. The measure considers three key dimensions when measuring pregnancy
18 intentions: (1) context (timing and partner discussion), (2) attitudes towards the pregnancy (desire for
19 pregnancy/parenthood and expressed intentions) and (3) behavior (contraceptive use and pre-
20 conceptual preparations). The multidimensional conceptualization enables measuring pregnancy
21 intentions in a more comprehensive way compared to dichotomous measures.¹⁰ The LMUP does not
22 assume congruency between the aspects, and it does not rely on people having fully formed family
23 building plans. In 2004, the original version of the LMUP has been assessed as easy to understand,
24 valid and reliable.¹⁰

25 The LMUP has been translated and validated in several other languages and cultural contexts
26 across all continents (for example, see Hall et al., 2013; Lang et al., 2019; Morof et al., 2012; Olani et
27 al., 2022; Rocca et al., 2010; Ranatunga & Jayaratne 2020; Roshanaei et al., 2015).¹¹⁻¹⁷ However, the
28 LMUP is not yet validated in the Netherlands. There is a validated version of the LMUP available in
29 Flemish-Dutch, but Flemish is a clearly different variety of the Dutch language.¹⁸ Furthermore, norms
30 and perceptions regarding unintended pregnancies can vary due different political and cultural contexts.

1 Therefore, the Flemish LMUP cannot simply be administered in the context of the Netherlands, and
2 validation is needed for use in the Dutch context.

3 The LMUP has been found valid for measuring pregnancy intentions of anyone who can get
4 pregnant, regardless of their pregnancy circumstances and outcome. For instance, the LMUP is tested
5 in samples with people who were currently pregnant, people who just gave birth and people who had
6 an abortion.^{12,13,15,19} In contrast, there is much less research on the validity of the LMUP for pregnant
7 people's partners. We define 'partners' as the people who are involved in the pregnancy either as a
8 romantic partner (regardless of their gender and/or sex), or a non-romantic, but sexually/biologically
9 involved partner. Thus, this might be someone's husband or wife, their (non-)cohabiting partner, a
10 friend-with-benefits or someone they had sex with once. There is growing recognition of the importance
11 of incorporating the partner's perspectives in research on reproductive health.²⁰ Up to now, the LMUP
12 has been adapted several times for the purpose of measuring pregnancy intentions of pregnant people's
13 partners, and this has been validated in samples from the UK and Malawi.^{21,22} Both studies showed
14 promising results with regard to reliability and validity. However, previous studies were done in partners
15 of people who chose to carry the pregnancy to term, mostly with quite intended pregnancies. Research
16 on the pregnancy intentions of partners of people who had an abortion, or a less intended pregnancy,
17 is missing. Further, the LMUP is not yet validated for Dutch speaking partners.

18 The aim of the current study is threefold: (1) to establish acceptable Dutch versions for people
19 who were pregnant and partners of the LMUP for use in the Netherlands, (2) to test the reliability and
20 validity of the LMUP-NL in a population-based sample of people who were pregnant with a variety of
21 pregnancy intentions in the Netherlands, and (3) to also validate the LMUP-NL for pregnant people's
22 partners. Results of the current study may provide future researchers and policy makers with an
23 instrument that is suitable to cover the complexity of pregnancy intentions, thereby providing a more
24 realistic understanding than existing measures. Furthermore, it will offer more accurate understanding
25 of pregnancy intentions in the Netherlands.

1 **Methodology**

2 **Adaptation of the questionnaire**

3 To create a Dutch LMUP that is suitable for use in the Netherlands and acceptable for anyone who can
4 get pregnant and their partners, we based the Dutch versions on the Flemish LMUP and the UK 2020
5 update.^{19,23}

6 According to the translational guidelines of Sousa and Rojjanasrirat,²⁴ we firstly created a draft
7 version with linguistic changes from Flemish to Dutch. Second, this version was evaluated in
8 discussions with five other researchers, professionals from the field (e.g., an abortion doctor, sexologist,
9 and midwife) and with linguists. After adaptation based on expert input, a blind back-translation into
10 English was performed by two independent translators with English as their native language. This
11 version was then compared to the LMUP in English. No adjustments had to be made. In our third step,
12 the surveys were evaluated in individual think-aloud interviews with seven people who experienced an
13 unintended pregnancy: five women and two men. Think-aloud interviewing is a cognitive interviewing
14 technique in which participants are asked to think aloud as they perform a task, e.g., completing a
15 survey.^{25,26} Participants took the interviewer through the cognitive process of completing the survey and
16 expressed any thoughts or feelings that came up. Based on the think-aloud interviews, we slightly
17 adjusted the questionnaire (see Table 1). This adjusted version was discussed with the other
18 researchers, linguists and professionals again and consensus was reached, resulting in the final
19 version. Complete versions of the Dutch questionnaire (LMUP-NL) for people who were pregnant and
20 partners are available on request or via OSF.

21 22 **Data collection for validation**

23 The current study combines data from two prospective population-based cohort studies: the BluePrInt
24 study in the Netherlands by Amsterdam University Medical Center (ZonMw project number 554002012)
25 and the RISE UP study in The Hague (ZonMw project number 554002006), the Netherlands by the
26 Leiden University Medical Center. The two studies are both part of a consortium funded by ZonMw
27 around unintended pregnancy and the researchers decided to join forces in the adaptation and
28 validation of the Dutch LMUP, as the RISE UP study collected data about all pregnancies and the
29 BluePrInt study collected data about unintended pregnancies, including terminated pregnancies. Both
30 studies were reviewed by the ethical committee and received a waiver from the Medical Research

1 Involved Human subjects Act (WMO): for the RISE UP study by the Medical Research Ethics Committee
2 of Leiden Den Haag Delft under reference number N21.127, and for the BluePrint study by the Medical
3 Research Ethics Committee of the Amsterdam Medical Center under reference number W21_407.

4 The BluePrint study included people who carried an unintended pregnancy to term or
5 terminated an unintended pregnancy, and their partners. Participants were informed about the study at
6 first consultation with their midwife, in the abortion clinic or via an online mailing directed at pregnant
7 people. Because we did not want to interfere within the decision process, people could take part in the
8 study after the abortion or when they decided to carry the pregnancy to term.

9 The RISE UP study did not explicitly target unintended pregnancy, but people could take part
10 if they were or their partner was pregnant (gestational age ≤ 28 weeks), or terminated their pregnancy
11 less than three months ago, and if they lived in The Hague. Potential participants were informed about
12 the study at their midwife, at Youth and Family Centers, via direct emails from an online pregnancy
13 platform, and through social media advertisements.

14 For both studies, interested people could scan a QR code that directed them to the information
15 letter, video, and consent form. After receiving their consent, we sent them the survey. Participants
16 were required to answer all survey items, with the option to answer 'I don't know' or 'I'd rather not say'
17 to any item. Upon completing the survey (about 20 minutes), they received a gift card worth €10. In
18 both studies, other sections in the survey asked questions on psychosocial health, social support,
19 adverse life events, experience with abuse, worries, wellbeing, and resilience.

20

21 **Analysis of psychometric properties**

22 In the development of the original LMUP and in later validation studies, classical test theory was
23 used.^{10,21} For the current validation, we applied this theory as well, and additionally, we used elements
24 from modern test theory like several other validation studies have done.^{11,13,19,27,28} As we have data from
25 both people who were pregnant and partners, and as we have two slightly different versions for both
26 groups (Table 1), we carried out the following analyses for these versions separately. Data were
27 cleaned and prepared for merge by researchers (MS & WB). All analyses were performed using R
28 version 4.2.1. In the analyses, 'I don't know' or 'I'd rather not say' were coded as missing.

29

30

1 • *Acceptability*

2 To assess acceptability, we examined missing data rates with rates lower than 5% indicating higher
3 acceptability, in line with Lang et al.¹² Item discrimination was assessed by looking at item category
4 endorsement values and checking if there were no item categories with greater endorsement (selection)
5 than 80%. We also looked at targeting by investigating if the distribution of our data covered the full
6 range of the LMUP, from 0 to 12.

7
8 • *Readability*

9 We investigated the readability with the Flesch Reading Ease Score (FRES) and the Flesch-Kincaid
10 Grade Level (FKGL), like Goossens et al. did for the Flemish version of the LMUP.²⁹

11
12 • *Reliability*

13 To assess reliability, we used the Cronbach's alpha statistic with a score higher than 0.7 indicating
14 acceptable reliability.³⁰ We also looked at corrected item-total correlations (with a score lower than 0.2
15 indicating that the item contributed little to the homogeneity of the scale) and inter-item correlations
16 were examined to check that all items had a positive direction.

17
18 • *Construct validity*

19 We assessed construct validity through a principal component analysis (PCA) to examine if all items
20 were related to one construct, i.e., loading onto one component with an Eigenvalue of >1. With this PCA
21 we compared the current psychometric properties with those of the original LMUP scale.³ In line with
22 recent validations,^{21,28,31,32} we performed a Confirmatory Factor Analysis to investigate model fit,
23 assessed by the comparative fit index (CFI) (acceptable if > 0.95) and the standardized root mean
24 squared residual (SRMR) (acceptable if <0.08) and root mean squared error of approximation (RMSEA)
25 (acceptable if <0.06).³³ Additionally, we tested the following hypotheses for construct validity: 1) people
26 who are in a relationship have higher LMUP scores than people who are not in a relationship, with even
27 higher scores for people who are cohabiting and/or married, 2) people younger than 20 years old and
28 people older than 39 years old have lower LMUP scores than those in between (age limits are chosen
29 based on recent reports of Statistics Netherlands on the average age of mothers),³⁴ 3) people who
30 decide to carry the pregnancy to term have higher scores than people who choose to terminate the

1 pregnancy, 4) people who were pregnant for the first time have lower LMUP scores than people who
2 have been pregnant before, and 5) people with a higher gestational age at survey/abortion have higher
3 LMUP scores than those who have a lower gestational age at survey/abortion.^{14,19,27} We looked at the
4 distribution of the scores in a histogram and performed a Shapiro-Wilk test to test for normality which
5 provided no evidence for normality ($p < 0.001$ for both survey versions). Hence, we carried out non-
6 parametric Mann-Whitney U tests to test our hypotheses. For age, we performed a Kruskal-Wallis test,
7 followed by a Dunn's post-hoc test with a Bonferroni adjustment of the p values.

8 Furthermore, we assessed convergent validity by analyzing linked LMUP difference scores of
9 couples. Data from couples were linked during recruitment, thus scores could be compared. First, we
10 tested normal distribution of the difference scores by visually inspecting a histogram representing
11 difference scores. As this was the case, a paired samples t-test was performed. Further, the correlation
12 between couple's scores was assessed. Although we expected a significant correlation between the
13 scores, we did not expect perfect agreement, as a partner may have different pregnancy intentions
14 compared to the pregnant person.²¹

15

16 • *Mokken scale analysis*

17 Then, in line with other validations of the LMUP, we have performed analysis as established by modern
18 test theory.^{13,19,27,28,32} Thus, we carried out a Mokken scale analysis which tells us whether the separate
19 items have different levels of difficulty. Participants should show as much agreement with items as is in
20 line with the true extent of their pregnancy intention. The scalability of the Mokken scale was assessed
21 by the Loevinger H coefficient, with only items of > 0.3 eligible for scaling, and with $H < 0.4$ indicating a
22 weak scale, $0.4 < H < 0.49$ a medium scale, and ≥ 0.5 a strong scale. If this analysis suggests that the
23 LMUP is a strong scale, it means that the full score may be used.³⁵

24

1 Results

2 Sample

3 1201 people completed the questionnaires. Of the 1201 participants, 1172 people (97.6%) answered 3
4 or more LMUP items, and were therefore eligible for the analyses.¹⁰ Out of these 1172 people, 910
5 were participants of the BluePrint study and 262 were participants of the RISE UP study. 597 (49.7%)
6 in the total sample were pregnant people intending to carry the pregnancy to term, and 242 (20.1%)
7 were people who recently had an abortion. Further, we included 238 (19.8%) partners of people
8 intending to carry the pregnancy to term and 124 (10.3%) partners of people who recently had an
9 abortion. Participants were between 16 and 55 years old (people who were pregnant: median = 29, IQR
10 = 25-33, range = 16-44 years; partners: median = 30, IQR = 25-33, range: 16-55 years). As shown in
11 Table 2, most participants were born in the Netherlands, were not religious, and were cohabiting with a
12 partner. The BluePrint study and RISE UP study included quite similar populations, with the RISE UP
13 study participants consisting of a somewhat bigger proportion of religious people, a smaller proportion
14 of people born in the Netherlands, and people that were not in a relationship. Most pregnancies
15 occurred within a relationship and had a gestational age between 13-16 weeks when filling out the
16 questionnaire. 53.2% of the pregnancies were first pregnancies (Table 2).

17

18 Acceptability

19 The number of missing responses per item ranged from 1.3% (item 1; contraception) to 16.7% (item 5;
20 partner discussion) for people who were pregnant (Table 3). Further, missings per item ranged from
21 1.2% (item 2; timing) to 23.5% (item 3; intention) for partners (Table 3). In both respondent groups, the
22 missing data rates of items 1, 2 and 6 are acceptable. However, the missing data rates of items 3, 4
23 and 5 are >5%, because of a high number of participants choosing the '*I don't know*' option for these
24 items (Table 3). Partners had more missings than people who were pregnant for item 1 and 3.
25 Participants did not have any missings on item 6. Missing data was relatively more common in the
26 BluePrint study compared to the RISE UP study.

27 For the total sample, as well as for subsamples of people who were pregnant and partners,
28 total LMUP scores ranged from 0 to 12 with a median of 5 and IQR from 2 to 8 (Figure 1), indicating a
29 distribution of scores along the total LMUP scale. No question response had more than 80%
30 endorsement on either version (Table 3).

1 **Readability**

2 The Flesch-Kincaid Reading Ease Score was 80, both for people who were pregnant and partners,
3 translating to 4th grade level (4.3 for both versions).

4

5 **Reliability**

6 The Cronbach's alpha for the six LMUP items of both versions of the LMUP (for people who were
7 pregnant and for partners) indicated good internal consistency (Table 4).³⁰ Further, results indicated
8 that in the total sample, the item-rest correlations were above 0.2 for all items, and all inter-item
9 correlations were positive.

10

11 **Construct validity**

12 PCA showed that all items loaded onto one dimension with an Eigenvalue of 3.76 both for people who
13 were pregnant and partners. CFA assessing model fit largely supported a single factor model for people
14 who were pregnant with regards to CFI (0.930), SRMR (0.041), and RMSEA (0.160 (0.139-0.183)). A
15 better fit was found for partners when looking at CFI (0.976), SRMR (0.035), and RMSEA (0.098 (0.059-
16 0.139)). PCA component loadings and CFA factor loadings can be found in Table 4 for both the people
17 who were pregnant and partner survey.

18 All our hypothesis tests were confirmed (Table 5). They showed that single people have on
19 average a lower total LMUP score (i.e., lower pregnancy intent) compared to people who are in a
20 relationship. The difference was even larger for people who were cohabiting with a partner compared
21 to single people and people who were in a relationship, but not cohabiting. We also found lower total
22 LMUP scores for pregnancies that were terminated compared to pregnancies that were carried to term.
23 As for age, for partners the total LMUP score increases as they get older. People who were pregnant,
24 however, have lower LMUP scores for both the younger age group (<20) and the older age group (≥40).
25 The final two hypotheses were tested for people who were pregnant only, showing that people who
26 were pregnant for the first time (primigravida) had on average lower total LMUP scores than people
27 who had been pregnant before (multigravida). And people who filled out the survey at a lower
28 gestational age (in the first 12 weeks) had a lower total LMUP score on average compared to people
29 who had a higher gestational age while filling out the survey. This hypothesis also held when looking
30 only at people who carried their pregnancy to term.

1 **Convergent validity**

2 LMUP scores for both people who were pregnant and their partners were available for 257 couples.

3 LMUP scores of people who were pregnant were highly correlated to their partners scores ($r = 0.800$).

4 The paired t-test indicated that on average, people who were pregnant reported a lower LMUP score

5 compared to their linked partners ($M_{\text{people who were pregnant}} = 4.48$, $M_{\text{partners}} = 4.94$, $t_{256} = -3.36$, $p < .001$).

6 When comparing LMUP scores based on pregnancy outcome, results indicated that couple's scores

7 did not significantly differ in the abortion group ($M_{\text{people who were pregnant, abortion}} = 1.70$, $M_{\text{partners, abortion}} = 1.94$,

8 $t_{95} = -1.39$, $p = .167$). LMUP scores did however significantly differ in couples who decided to carry the

9 pregnancy to term ($M_{\text{pregnant people, carry to term}} = 6.41$, $M_{\text{partners, carry to term}} = 6.73$, $t_{256} = -3.08$, $p = 0.002$).

10 Besides, to test whether the LMUP scores of the participants who had a linked partner in the

11 data set differed from participants without a linked partner in the data set, another t-test was performed.

12 Participants who did not have a linked partner in the data set either did not have a partner or had a

13 partner who did not participate in one of our studies. Results indicated that participants with a linked

14 partner in the data set ($M_{\text{linked}} = 4.74$) had a significantly lower LMUP score compared to participants

15 without a linked partner ($M_{\text{not linked}} = 6.10$, $t_{1169} = -6.38$, $p < .001$).

16

17 **Scaling**

18 Results from the Mokken Scale Analysis showed that items correspond to a basic Guttman structure

19 with Loevinger H coefficients greater than 0.45 for all items, both in the survey for people who were

20 pregnant and for partners (Table 4). Hence, all items were eligible for scaling. For people who were

21 pregnant, item 3 was easiest to endorse, followed by item 4, 2, 5, 6, and 1. For partners, item 4 was

22 easiest to endorse, followed by 5, 3, 2, 6, and 1. For the entire scale with all six items, the Loevinger's

23 H coefficient was 0.68 for both versions, indicating a strong scale.

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 established acceptable Dutch versions for people who were pregnant and partners of the London Measure of Unplanned Pregnancy (LMUP-NL) for use in the Netherlands. The LMUP-NL was found both reliable and valid in a population-based sample of people who were pregnant with a variety of pregnancy intentions in the Netherlands. Lastly, the version for pregnant people's partners was also valid. The current study therefore contributes to a more realistic measurement of pregnancy intentions in the Dutch context.

Overall, the LMUP-NL performed well according to various criteria for the performance of psychometric measures, both for people who were pregnant and their partners. The LMUP-NL appeared to be reliable and more readable than the original version of the LMUP (4.3 compared to 6.7).¹⁰ Further, construct validity analyses demonstrated that all items loaded onto one dimension and largely supported a single factor model. All hypotheses were confirmed related to relationship status, age, pregnancy decision, gravidity, gestational age, in line with previous studies.^{11-13,19,27,36} Additionally, results of the current study confirmed the hypothesis that people who were pregnant filling out the LMUP later in their pregnancy (gestational age > 12 weeks) reported more retrospective pregnancy planning compared to people filling out the LMUP earlier in their pregnancy (gestational age 0-12 weeks), also when looking only at the group that chose to carry to term. This result suggests that the reflection on pregnancy intention may change to become more intended as the pregnancy continues.¹⁴ Lastly, our Mokken Scale analyses indicated a strong scale and showed that items correspond to a basic Guttman structure.^{21,31} In line with previous validations, we found that item 1 (contraception) and item 6 (preparation) have the lowest contributions to the scale.

With regard to the comparison of the LMUP-NL versions for people who were pregnant and their partners, we found a high correlation of LMUP scores between couple's scores. However, we also found a small, but significant difference in linked LMUP scores in couples who chose to carry to term, with slightly higher scores for partners. This is contrary to what was found in other validations of the LMUP for partners.²¹ We expect that this difference was found as a consequence of selection bias, as we expect that partners with more positive feelings towards the pregnancy may be more likely to participate in our studies. This idea is supported by the fact that there was a significant difference in

1 pregnancy intention for people that were linked to their partner in our dataset compared to people that
2 did not have a linked partner. There was no significant difference for couples in the abortion group. This
3 is in line with previous studies on abortion and partners, showing that couple's pregnancy intentions are
4 highly associated.^{37,38}

5

6 **Strengths and limitations**

7 This study has several strengths. First, a thorough translation of the LMUP from both English and
8 Flemish to Dutch took place, consulting diverse experience experts and colleagues in the field. Second,
9 the current study is the first to validate the Dutch LMUP for both people who were pregnant and their
10 partners and applied methods in line with previous validations. We had a relatively large and diverse
11 sample with a broad range of pregnancy intentions pregnancy outcomes, in comparison to previous
12 studies validating the LMUP.^{12,16,19,28,36}

13 To appreciate the results, some limitations need to be acknowledged. First, people who were
14 born outside the Netherlands, or with a parent born outside the Netherlands, and people with a religious
15 background, were underrepresented in our sample.^{39,40} Second, some questions had a relatively high
16 missing value rate, explained by participants choosing 'I don't know' or 'I'd rather not say' as their
17 answer. Nonetheless, these answers might be informative on their own. For example, some people
18 may feel uncomfortable sharing their thoughts about the pregnancy, and for others the 'I don't know'-
19 option is the best reflection of their actual experiences. Although we do not expect that this will influence
20 the underlying factor structure of LMUP-NL, it may influence the overall LMUP score. It was outside the
21 scope of the current study, but future research could investigate these missing values more closely.
22 Finally, some statistics (CFI for people who were pregnant and RMSEA for both versions) were
23 inadequate in the construct validity analyses. The CFI for people who were pregnant was just below the
24 threshold. As for the RMSEA, there are only few other versions that report on RMSEA analyses, hence
25 we cannot properly compare our psychometric evaluation with validations of other translations of the
26 LMUP.

27

28 **Conclusion**

29 The current study supports the reliability and validity of the LMUP-NL, for both people who were
30 pregnant and their partners, regardless of the pregnancy outcome. We believe more qualitative work

1 could shed light on the dimensionality and the dynamics of pregnancy intentions, to truly understand
2 the complexity of this concept. Especially, future studies are advised to study this complexity in groups
3 that are underrepresented in studies into pregnancy intentions, such as pregnant people's partners.^{41,42}
4 Nevertheless, future research into Dutch speaking populations is advised to use the LMUP-NL to
5 measure pregnancy intentions in a way that reflects actual experiences more closely. At the same time,
6 it also provides policy makers with a framework that encompasses the broad array of experiences
7 surrounding unintended pregnancy.

References

1. 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. doi:10.1111/j.1728-4465.2009.00192.x
2. UNFPA. *Seeing the unseen: The case for action in the neglected crisis of unintended pregnancy*. 2022. <https://esaro.unfpa.org/en/publications/seeing-unseen>
3. Barrett G, Wellings K. What is a 'planned' pregnancy? Empirical data from a British study. *Soc Sci Med*. 2002;55(4):545-557. doi:10.1016/s0277-9536(01)00187-3
4. Klerman LV. The intendedness of pregnancy: A concept in transition. *Matern Child Health J*. 2000;4(3):155-162. doi:10.1023/a:1009534612388
5. 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):170-178. doi:10.1111/jmwh.13457
6. Schwarz EB, Lohr PA, Gold MA, Gerbert B. Prevalence and correlates of ambivalence towards pregnancy among nonpregnant women. *Contraception*. 2007;75(4):305-310. doi:10.1016/j.contraception.2006.12.002
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;132:149-155. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2015.03.038
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):150-156. doi:10.1016/j.contraception.2014.09.014
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. doi:10.1016/j.pmedr.2019.100869
10. Barrett G, Smith SC, Wellings K. Conceptualisation, development, and evaluation of a measure of unplanned pregnancy. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 2004;58(5):426-433. doi:10.1136/jech.2003.014787
11. 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

- 1 Pregnancy in Malawi. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. 2013;13(1):200. doi:10.1186/1471-2393-13-
2 200
- 3 12. Lang AY, Hall JA, Boyle JA, Harrison CL, Teede H, Moran LJ, et al. Validation of the London
4 Measure of Unplanned Pregnancy among pregnant Australian women. *PLoS One*.
5 2019;14(8):e0220774. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0220774
- 6 13. Morof D, Steinauer J, Haider S, Liu S, Darney P, Barrett G. Evaluation of the London Measure
7 of Unplanned Pregnancy in a United States population of women. *PLoS ONE*.
8 2012;7(4):e35381. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0035381
- 9 14. Rocca CH, Wilson MR, Jeon M, Foster DG. Stability of retrospective pregnancy intention
10 reporting among women with unwanted pregnancies in the United States. *Matern Child Health*
11 *J*. 2019;23(11):1547-1555. doi:10.1007/s10995-019-02782-9
- 12 15. Ranatunga IDJC, Jayaratne K. Proportion of unplanned pregnancies, their determinants and
13 health outcomes of women delivering at a teaching hospital in Sri Lanka. *BMC Pregnancy*
14 *Childbirth*. 2020;20:667. doi:10.1186/s12884-020-03259-2
- 15 16. Roshanaei S, Shaghghi A, Jafarabadi MA, Kousha A. Measuring unintended pregnancies in
16 postpartum Iranian women: Validation of the London Measure of Unplanned Pregnancy. *East*
17 *Mediterr Health J*. 2015;21(8):572-578. doi:10.26719/2015.21.8.572
- 18 17. Olani AB, Bekelcho T, Woldemeskel A, Tefera K, Eyob D. Evaluation of the Amharic version of
19 the London Measure of Unplanned Pregnancy in Ethiopia. *PLoS One*. 2022;17(6):e0269781.
20 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0269781
- 21 18. Louw Rd. Is Dutch a pluricentric language with two centres of standardization? An overview of
22 the differences between Netherlandic and Belgian Dutch from a Flemish perspective.
23 *Werkwinkel*. 2016;11(1):113-135. doi:10.1515/werk-2016-0006
- 24 19. Goossens J, Verhaeghe S, Van Hecke A, Barrett G, Delbaere I, Beeckman D. Psychometric
25 properties of the Dutch version of the London Measure of Unplanned Pregnancy in women with
26 pregnancies ending in birth. *PLoS One*. 2018;13(4):e0194033.
27 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0194033
- 28 20. Roudsari RL, sharifi F, Goudarzi F. Barriers to the participation of men in reproductive health
29 care: A systematic review and meta-synthesis. *BMC Public Health*. 2023;23(1):818.
30 doi:10.1186/s12889-023-15692-x

- 1 21. Barrett G, Hall JA, Howden B, Patel D, Shawe J, Stephenson J. Evaluation of the psychometric
2 properties of a version of the London Measure of Unplanned Pregnancy for women's partners.
3 *Int J Men's Soc Community Health*. 2020;3(1):e65-e77. doi:10.22374/ijmsch.v3i1.20
- 4 22. Yeatman S, Smith-Greenaway E. Birth planning and women's and men's health in Malawi. *Stud*
5 *Fam Plann*. 2018;49(3):213-235. doi:10.1111/sifp.12060
- 6 23. Barrett G, Nolan EM, Grtin ZB, Stephenson J, Hall JA. London Measure of Unplanned
7 Pregnancy and newer family forms: An update. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 2020:765.
8 doi:10.1136/jech-2020-214419
- 9 24. Sousa VD, Rojjanasirat W. Translation, adaptation and validation of instruments or scales for
10 use in cross-cultural health care research: A clear and user-friendly guideline. *J Eval Clin Pract*.
11 2011;17(2):268-274. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2753.2010.01434.x
- 12 25. Collins D. Pretesting survey instruments: An overview of cognitive methods. *Qual Life Res*.
13 2003;12(3):229-238. doi:10.1023/a:1023254226592
- 14 26. Drennan J. Cognitive interviewing: Verbal data in the design and pretesting of questionnaires.
15 *J Adv Nurs*. 2003;42(1):57-63. doi:10.1046/j.1365-2648.2003.02579.x
- 16 27. Borges ALV, Barrett G, Dos Santos OA, Nascimento NDC, Cavalhieri FB, Fujimori E.
17 Evaluation of the psychometric properties of the London Measure of Unplanned Pregnancy in
18 Brazilian Portuguese. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. 2016;16. doi:10.1186/s12884-016-1037-2
- 19 28. Muleva BR, Borges ALV, Hall JA, Barret G. Evaluation of the Portuguese version of the London
20 Measure of Unplanned Pregnancy in Mozambique: A psychometric measurement study. *Afr J*
21 *Reprod Health*. 2022;26(2):47-57. doi:10.29063/ajrh2022/v26i2.5
- 22 29. Kincaid JP, Fishburne Jr RP, Rogers RL, Chissom BS. *Derivation of new readability formulas*
23 *(Automated Readability Index, Fog Count and Flesch Reading Ease Formula) for navy enlisted*
24 *personnel*. Institute for Simulation and Training; 1975. <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/istlibrary/56/>
- 25 30. Cronbach LJ. Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*. 1951;16:297-
26 334.
- 27 31. Drevin J, Kristiansson P, Stern J, Rosenblad A. Measuring pregnancy planning: A psychometric
28 evaluation and comparison of two scales. *J Adv Nurs*. 2017;73(11):2765-2775.
29 doi:10.1111/jan.13364

- 1 32. Hall JA, Stephenson J, Barrett G. Evaluating the Chichewa version of the London Measure of
2 Unplanned Pregnancy in Malawi: a validation update. *BMC Res Notes*. 2021;14:231.
3 doi:10.1186/s13104-021-05645-1
- 4 33. Hu L-t, Bentler PM. Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional
5 criteria versus new alternatives. *Struct Equ Modeling*. 1999;6(1):1-55.
6 doi:10.1080/10705519909540118
- 7 34. Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek. Kinderen krijgen. [https://www.cbs.nl/nl-](https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/visualisaties/dashboard-bevolking/levensloop/kinderen-krijgen)
8 [nl/visualisaties/dashboard-bevolking/levensloop/kinderen-krijgen](https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/visualisaties/dashboard-bevolking/levensloop/kinderen-krijgen).
- 9 35. Mokken RJ. *A Theory and Procedure of Scale Analysis: With Applications in Political Research*.
10 Berlin, New York: De Gruyter Mouton; 1971.
- 11 36. Bukenya JN, Nalwadda CK, Neema S, Kyambadde P, Wanyenze RK, Barrett G. Pregnancy
12 Planning among Female Sex Workers in Uganda: Evaluation of the Psychometric Properties of
13 the London Measure of Unplanned Pregnancy. *Afr J Reprod Health*. 2019;23(3):79-95.
14 doi:10.29063/ajrh2019/v23i3.8
- 15 37. Waller MR, Bitler MP. The link between couples' pregnancy intentions and behavior: Does it
16 matter who is asked. *Perspect Sex Reprod Health*. 2008;40(4):194-201. doi:10.1363/4019408
- 17 38. Cha S, Chapman DA, Wan W, Burton CW, Woolf SH, Masho SW. Couple pregnancy intentions
18 and induced abortions in the United States. *Int J Women's Health Reprod Sci*. 2016;4(4):157-
19 163. doi:10.15296/ijwhr.2016.36
- 20 39. Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek. CBS introduceert nieuwe indeling bevolking naar herkomst.
21 2022 Feb 16. [https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/nieuws/2022/07/cbs-introduceert-nieuwe-indeling-](https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/nieuws/2022/07/cbs-introduceert-nieuwe-indeling-bevolking-naar-herkomst#:~:text=Op%20januari%202021%20telde,%C3%A9%C3%A9n%20in%20Ned)
22 [bevolking-naar-](https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/nieuws/2022/07/cbs-introduceert-nieuwe-indeling-bevolking-naar-herkomst#:~:text=Op%20januari%202021%20telde,%C3%A9%C3%A9n%20in%20Ned)
23 [herkomst#:~:text=Op%20januari%202021%20telde,%C3%A9%C3%A9n%20in%20Ned](https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/nieuws/2022/07/cbs-introduceert-nieuwe-indeling-bevolking-naar-herkomst#:~:text=Op%20januari%202021%20telde,%C3%A9%C3%A9n%20in%20Ned)
24 [erland%20geboren%20ouder](https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/nieuws/2022/07/cbs-introduceert-nieuwe-indeling-bevolking-naar-herkomst#:~:text=Op%20januari%202021%20telde,%C3%A9%C3%A9n%20in%20Ned).
- 25 40. Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek. Bijna 6 op de 10 Nederlanders behoren niet tot religieuze
26 groep. 2022 Dec 22. [https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/nieuws/2022/51/bijna-6-op-de-10-nederlanders-](https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/nieuws/2022/51/bijna-6-op-de-10-nederlanders-behoren-niet-tot-religieuze-groep)
27 [behoren-niet-tot-religieuze-groep](https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/nieuws/2022/51/bijna-6-op-de-10-nederlanders-behoren-niet-tot-religieuze-groep).
- 28 41. Guadagno M, Mackert M, Rochlen A. Improving prenatal health: Setting the agenda for
29 increased male involvement. *Am J Mens Health*. 2013;7(6):523-526.
30 doi:10.1177/1557988313490785

- 1 42. Bond MJ. The missing link in MCH: Paternal involvement in pregnancy outcomes. *Am J Mens*
2 *Health*. 2010;4(4):285-286. doi:10.1177/1557988310384842
3

1 **Tables and Figures**

2 **Table 1. Adjustments made compared to the Flemish and UK 2020 version.** Note: for question
3 numbers followed by a 'P', changes were made in the version for partners only.

4

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

5

6

1 **Table 2. Socio-demographic characteristics of the study participants (n = 1172).**

2

Characteristic	People who were pregnant			Partner		
	Total	RISE UP	BluePrint	Total	RISE UP	BluePrint
	(n = 832)	(n = 219)	(n = 613)	(n = 340)	(n = 43)	(n = 297)
	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	657 (79.0)	142 (64.8)	515 (84.0)	296 (87.1)	28 (65.1)	268 (90.2)
One or 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)
<i>Missing</i>	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)
<i>Missing</i>	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)
<i>Missing</i>	10 (1.3)	1 (0.5)	9 (1.5)	8 (2.2)	-	8 (2.6)

Pregnancy within relationship

No	86 (10.3)	11 (5.0)	75 (12.2)	29 (8.5)	3 (7.0)	26 (8.8)
Yes	741 (89.1)	208 (95.0)	533 (86.9)	311 (91.5)	40 (93.0)	271 (91.2)
<i>Missing</i>	5 (0.6)	-	5 (0.8)	-	-	-

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)
<i>Missing</i>	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)
<i>Missing</i>	10 (1.2)	-	10 (1.7)

1 **Table 3. Endorsement frequencies of LMUP items and response options.**

Item	People who were pregnant			Partners		
	All N (%)	Decision: Carry to term N (%)	Decision: abortion N (%)	All partners N (%)	Decision: Carry to term N (%)	Decision: abortion N (%)
1 – Contraception						
Always using contraception	161 (19.4)	77 (13.1)	84 (34.7)	90 (26.5)	31 (14.4)	59 (47.6)
Using sometimes or failed at least once	281 (33.8)	184 (31.2)	97 (40.1)	124 (36.5)	77 (35.7)	47 (37.9)
Not using contraception	379 (45.6)	318 (53.9)	61 (25.2)	114 (33.5)	96 (44.4)	18 (14.5)
<i>Missing: Don't know</i>	4 (0.5)	4 (0.7)	0 (0)	0 (0)	12 (5.6)	0 (0)
<i>Missing: Rather not say</i>	7 (0.8)	7 (1.2)	0 (0)	12 (3.6)	0 (0)	0 (0)
2 – Timing						
Wrong time	257 (30.9)	68 (11.5)	189 (78.1)	97 (28.5)	15 (6.9)	82 (66.1)
OK time	314 (37.7)	274 (46.4)	40 (16.5)	142 (41.8)	109 (50.5)	33 (26.6)
Right time	246 (29.6)	241 (40.8)	5 (2.1)	97 (28.5)	91 (42.1)	6 (4.8)
<i>Missing: Don't know</i>	11 (1.3)	5 (0.9)	6 (2.5)	4 (1.2)	1 (0.5)	3 (2.4)
<i>Missing: Rather not say</i>	4 (0.5)	2 (0.3)	2 (0.8)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
3 – Intention						


Did not intend pregnancy	481 (57.8)	261 (44.2)	220 (90.9)	143 (42.1)	45 (20.8)	98 (79.0)
Intentions kept changing	98 (11.8)	84 (14.2)	14 (5.8)	46 (13.5)	30 (13.9)	16 (12.9)
Intended pregnancy	199 (23.9)	196 (33.2)	3 (1.2)	71 (20.9)	68 (31.5)	3 (2.4)
<i>Missing: Don't know</i>	42 (5)	38 (6.4)	4 (1.7)	64 (18.8)	57 (26.4)	7 (5.6)
<i>Missing: Rather not say</i>	12 (1.4)	11 (1.9)	1 (0.4)	16 (4.7)	16 (7.4)	0 (0)
4 – Desire						
Did not want a baby	242 (29.1)	62 (10.5)	180 (74.4)	99 (29.1)	14 (6.5)	85 (68.6)
Mixed feelings about having a baby	168 (20.2)	131 (22.2)	37 (15.3)	94 (27.7)	66 (30.6)	28 (22.6)
Wanted baby	199 (23.9)	291 (49.3)	20 (8.3)	97 (28.5)	89 (41.2)	8 (6.4)
<i>Missing: Don't know</i>	89 (10.7)	84 (14.3)	5 (2.1)	40 (11.8)	37 (17.1)	3 (2.4)
<i>Missing: Rather not say</i>	22 (2.6)	22 (3.7)	0 (0)	10 (2.9)	10 (4.6)	0 (0)
5 – Partner discussion						
Never discussed getting pregnant with partner, or agreed to not get pregnant	242 (29.1)	80 (13.6)	162 (66.9)	109 (32.1)	25 (11.6)	84 (67.7)
Discussed, but did not agree about getting pregnant	78 (9.4)	47 (8.0)	31 (12.8)	36 (10.6)	15 (6.9)	21 (16.9)
Agreed to get pregnant	372 (44.8)	342 (58.1)	30 (12.4)	103 (30.3)	90 (41.7)	13 (10.5)
<i>Missing: Don't know</i>	105 (12.6)	89 (15.1)	16 (6.6)	65 (19.1)	59 (27.3)	6 (4.8)

<i>Missing: Rather not say</i>	34 (4.1)	31 (5.3)	3 (1.2)	27 (7.9)	27 (12.5)	0 (0)
6 – Preparation						
No preparatory lifestyle changes	532 (63.9)	314 (53.2)	218 (90.1)	266 (78.2)	150 (69.4)	116 (93.6)
Did 1 preparatory lifestyle change	144 (17.3)	129 (21.9)	15 (6.2)	43 (12.7)	38 (17.6)	5 (4.0)
Did 2 or more preparatory lifestyle changes	156 (18.8)	147 (24.9)	9 (3.7)	31 (9.1)	28 (13.0)	3 (2.4)
<i>Missing: Don't know</i>	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
<i>Missing: Rather not say</i>	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

1

1 **Figure 1. Distribution of the total LMUP scores of people who were pregnant and their**
2 **partners.**

3



4

1 **Table 4. Results of reliability, construct validity, and Mokken scale analyses for LMUP survey for people who were pregnant and partners.**

Item	N	Item-rest correlation coefficient	PCA component loading	CFA factor loadings	Loevinger 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

1

1 **Table 5. Results from hypothesis testing. W values are presented for all tests except for age,**
 2 **there the values are a Kruskal-Wallis chi-squared statistic.**

Hypothesis	People who were pregnant		Partners	
	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		
0-12 weeks vs >12 weeks	35,050.0	<0.001		
Carry to term group	24,636.0	<0.001		

3