

Barrett G. 2007 Letter to the Editor *Contraception* 75:79

The paper by Schunmann and Glasier¹ was interesting and informative, however there were fundamental flaws in their use of a new measure of pregnancy intention.^{2,3} A modified version of the measure was used in the study, where the mode of administration was changed and a question removed, despite the fact that the original scale has proven validity, reliability and acceptability with women undergoing abortion. Interpretations of the meaning of specific points of the new ten-point scale (e.g. score 3 or less = fairly unintended, score 2 or less = very unintended) were also made without justification. Any changes to the item content or wording or mode of administration of an existing measure must be formally evaluated against the original measure to ensure that the revised scale has commensurate psychometric properties.⁴ No such evaluation was carried out prior to, or as part of, this study, and therefore the data produced by the revised measure in this study may not be valid.

Geraldine Barrett, PhD

School of Health Sciences and Social Care,

Brunel University,

Uxbridge, Middlesex UB8 3PH, UK

Email address: geraldine.barrett@brunel.ac.uk

doi:10.1016/j.contraception.2006.07.010

References

- 1) Schunmann C, and Glasier A. Measuring pregnancy intention and its relationship with contraceptive use among women undergoing therapeutic abortion *Contraception* 2006 73:520-524.
- 2) Barrett G, Smith SC, Wellings K. Conceptualisation, development and evaluation of a measure of unplanned pregnancy *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2004 58:426-433 .
- 3) www.lmup.org.uk (accessed 31.07.06)
- 4) Nunally JC, Bernstein IH. *Psychometric Theory*. 3rd edition. London: McGraw-Hill, 1994, pp.92-94 and 250-254.