

# Emotional Reality and Related Factors of Japanese Midwives in Mid-Term Abortion Care

Miki Saito

Department of Nursing, Saitama Prefectural University, 820 Sannomiya, Koshigaya-Shi, Saitama, 343-8540, Japan

## Abstract

**Aim:** To understand the emotions experienced by midwives in mid-term abortion care in Japan and to identify the related factors.

**Background:** Japanese midwives provide mid-term abortion care with conflicted and negative emotions, but the extent of the emotions and related factors are unknown.

**Design:** A cross-sectional design was used.

**Methods:** An online questionnaire survey was administered to 385 midwives with experience in mid-term abortion care in 2022. Bivariate and multiple regression analyses were performed.

**Results:** The Midwives' Emotion Scale in Second-Trimester Abortion Care (MES-SAC) score was highest for "negative perception of care", followed by "self-evaluation of care skills." The MES-SAC score was positively associated with care for the woman (unsympathetic attitude) and fetus (live delivery), midwifery services, self-confidence, and improved technology. Furthermore, it was negatively associated with length of engagement in mid-term abortion care, positive feedback experiences from women, challenges faced when working with physicians, and views on abortion.

**Conclusion:** Education for midwives to gain a correct understanding of women undergoing abortion is important to reduce negative emotions in mid-term abortion care. Furthermore, debriefing to understand the participants' own care and emotions, and case conferences, in which they can feel comfortable expressing their emotions, are also important.

## Publication History:

Received: November 25, 2025

Accepted: December 24, 2025

Published: January 16, 2026

## Keywords:

Abortion, Pregnancy termination, Emotions, Negative perceptions, Negative emotions

## Introduction

In Japan, abortion is legal under the Maternal Protection Law (formerly the Eugenic Protection Law) promulgated in 1948; however, it was stipulated as illegal under the Penal Code in 1907, which remains in effect. Only "designated doctors," that is, those designated by the Maternal Protection Law, are allowed to perform abortions. Additionally, the reason for the abortion must be either: (1) physical or economic, whereby the continuation of pregnancy or delivery will likely cause serious harm to the mother's health, or (2) the pregnancy resulted from assault, threat, or adultery, wherein the woman was unable to resist or refuse.

In the 1950s, Japan was one of the first countries worldwide to legalize abortion; it was called the "abortion heaven" because of the high number of abortions performed there. In the 1970s, memorial services for aborted fetuses, known as "mizuko kuyo," became a common practice in the country, reaching the peak of popularity in the mid-1980s. The practice continues in many religious institutions to date [1]. Considering this background, it can be discerned that abortion is a taboo in Japan and is considered a sin, a value that is upheld by the nursing profession [2-3]. It is estimated that 122,725 abortions are performed annually in Japan, of which 7,045 are mid-term abortions occurring between 12 and 22 weeks' gestation [4]. Mid-term abortions are performed by artificially inducing labor and delivery, with uterine contractions after cervical ripening. Midwives are mainly responsible for the care of women undergoing abortion until delivery.

The World Health Organization (WHO) places women's values and preferences at the center of its conceptual structure for abortion care [5]. Conversely, abortion care in Japan is characterized by a dichotomy in nurses' care attitudes: one is a proactive, positive attitude, with a view to alleviate suffering, and the other is a passive, negative attitude, without being deeply involved with the woman undergoing abortion

[6-8]. According to the WHO, care provided with a negative attitude cannot be centered on women's values and intentions. Japanese nursing professionals are conflicted regarding abortion care [9-11], which prevents them from providing care with a positive attitude. Saito et al. [12] revealed the phenomenon in which midwives who provide mid-term abortion care with a positive attitude deal with the conflicts they experience in their care; that is, the phenomenon of "respecting the women's decision to have an abortion." This reveals that by processing their own negative emotions toward abortion, abortion care, and women undergoing abortion, midwives may develop a positive care attitude.

By understanding the emotions (negative and positive) experienced by midwives in mid-term abortion care and identifying related factors, measures to reduce the midwives' negative emotions can be examined. Hence, this study aimed to understand the actual situation of midwives' emotions in mid-term abortion care in Japan and identify the related factors.

## Methods

### Study design

This study used a cross-sectional survey with a self-administered, anonymous questionnaire (online).

**Corresponding Author:** Dr. Miki Saito, Department of Nursing, Saitama Prefectural University, 820 Sannomiya, Koshigaya-Shi, Saitama, 343-8540, Japan

**Citation:** Saito M (2025) Emotional Reality and Related Factors of Japanese Midwives in Mid-Term Abortion Care. Int J Nurs Clin Pract 12: 434. doi: <https://doi.org/10.15344/2394-4978/2025/434>

**Copyright:** © 2025 Saito et al. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

## Research participants

Midwives with experience in mid-term abortion care were the target participants. There was no restriction on the number of times they had provided mid-term abortion care, nor a limit on the length of their experience.

Logistic and proportional hazards regression analyses required a sample size of explanatory variables  $x \geq 10$  [13-14]. As the developed questionnaire comprised 41 items, we assumed a facility consent rate of 15% and a collection rate of 50%; therefore, 600 facilities were selected for the study to ensure that at least 410 midwives were included.

Mid-term abortions in Japan are performed at in-patient obstetric facilities. Therefore, we used "Perinatal Medical Plaza", a website operated by the Japan Society of Obstetrics and Gynecology, to search for delivery facilities and to recruit participants. We randomly selected 600 facilities in the top eight prefectures (Tokyo, Osaka, Kanagawa, Aichi, Fukuoka, Hokkaido, Chiba, and Saitama) in terms of the number of abortions in 2020 [15]. Furthermore, stratified sampling was used to select the facilities.

## Survey contents

### Demographic characteristics

The following information was obtained: participants' age, years of experience (nurse or midwife), midwifery school, whether advanced midwife, number of assisted vaginal births, children, and whether religious.

### Midwife emotions in mid-term abortion

The Midwives' Emotion Scale in Second-Trimester Abortion Care (MES-SAC) developed by Saito et al. [16] was used to measure midwives' emotions in mid-term abortion. Developed to measure midwives' emotions in second-trimester abortion care, it comprises 25 items across six subscales ("factors"): Factor 1 ("positive perception of care") 6 items; Factor 2 ("negative feelings toward fetus") 4 items; Factor 3 ("anger toward women") 4 items; Factor 4 ("negative perception of care") 5 items; Factor 5 ("self-evaluation of care techniques") 4 items; and Factor 6 ("frustration with women's surroundings") 2 items. The possible scores range from 25 to 125 points, with responses rated on a 5-point scale ranging from 5 (Yes) to 1 (No). Higher scores indicate greater negative emotions in care.

### Factors assumed to be related to midwives' emotions in mid-term abortion care

Factors assumed to be related to midwives' emotions in mid-term abortion care were extracted from previous studies [17-24] and an earlier literature review [25], and were examined. After the items were developed, pretests were administered to three researchers and five midwives. Finally, 33 items were established: four, ten, nine, five, and five items for personal background, abortion care experience, mid-term abortion care scene, attitudes in mid-term abortion care, and thoughts on mid-term abortion care, respectively ([Supplementary File](#)).

## Analysis method

The statistical software SPSS Statistics Ver. 28 was used for the analysis. The significance level was set at less than 5%.

Descriptive statistics were calculated for all the variables. Furthermore, the total MES-SAC scale scores, means for each subscale, and item means for the subscales were calculated to determine the actual emotional state of midwives in mid-term abortion care.

Bivariate analyses (Spearman's rank correlation coefficient, Mann-Whitney U test, and Kruskal-Wallis test) were performed to examine differences in the total MES-SAC scores based on basic attributes and factors assumed to be related. Cronbach's alpha coefficient was calculated to assess the internal consistency of the MES-SAC. Spearman's rank correlation coefficients were calculated to confirm the correlations between the items.

A multiple regression analysis using the forced entry method was conducted with the MES-SAC as the dependent variable and basic attributes and factors with assumed associations as independent variables. We selected variables with a p-value of less than 0.2 in the bivariate analysis. If the correlation coefficient between the selected independent variables was greater than 0.6, one variable was excluded to avoid multicollinearity.

In the analysis, four- and five-count method variables among the independent variables were treated as interval measures, and qualitative variables generated multiple categorical variables. A Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) of less than 10 confirmed multicollinearity among the independent variables. Residual analysis was performed to confirm the normality of the residuals.

## Ethical Considerations

This study was approved by the Juntendo University Graduate School Research Ethics Committee (Junkan Rin No. 2021-117). The study's purpose, significance, and methods were explained to the participants in writing, as was the fact that participation was voluntary. Explanations regarding privacy considerations, benefits, and disadvantages of participation, and that the results of the study would be presented at relevant academic conferences were also provided. All items were required to be answered, and this was stated at the beginning of the survey.

## Results

### Demographic characteristics

Table 1 presents the demographic characteristics. The largest number of subjects were between 40-49 years of age, and all were women, as there are no male midwives in Japan.

### The emotional reality of midwives in mid-term abortion care

The MES-SAC scores ranged from 34 to 118 points, with a mean of 75.93 (SD = 15.9). The Shapiro-Wilk test showed  $p=0.279$ , and the total scores followed a normal distribution.

Means for each subscale were: Factor I: mean 17.27 points (SD = 4.43), Factor II: 11.41 points (SD = 4.34), Factor III: 10.87 points (SD = 3.88), Factor IV: 17.07 points (SD = 4.94), Factor V: 13.52 points (SD = 3.18), and Factor VI: 5.79 points (SD = 1.90). Item means were 2.88, 2.85, 2.72, 3.41, 3.38, and 2.90 for Factors I, II, III, IV, V, and VI, respectively, with Factor IV being the highest, followed by Factors V and VI.

Table 1: Demographic characteristics n=385

|   | n   | %    |
|---|-----|------|
| <b>Age (year)</b>                           |     |      |
| 20–29                                       | 74  | 19.2 |
| 30–39                                       | 108 | 28.1 |
| 40–49                                       | 120 | 31.2 |
| 50–59                                       | 76  | 19.7 |
| ≥60   | 7   | 1.8  |
| <b>Years of experience (midwife) (year)</b> |     |      |
| 1 >   | 5   | 1.3  |
| 1–5 >                                       | 67  | 17.4 |
| 5–10 >                                      | 83  | 21.6 |
| 10–15 >                                     | 72  | 18.7 |
| 15–20 >                                     | 49  | 12.7 |
| ≥20   | 109 | 28.3 |
| <b>Midwifery school</b>                     |     |      |
| Graduate school                             | 27  | 7.0  |
| University Major                            | 49  | 12.7 |
| University                                  | 54  | 14.0 |
| University special course                   | 8   | 2.1  |
| Junior college                              | 34  | 8.8  |
| Vocational school                           | 206 | 53.5 |
| Other                                       | 7   | 1.8  |
| <b>Advanced Midwife*</b>                    |     |      |
| Yes   | 145 | 37.7 |
| No  | 240 | 62.3 |
| <b>Number of births assisted</b>            |     |      |
| 50 >  | 37  | 9.6  |
| 50–100 >                                    | 46  | 11.9 |
| 100–300 >                                   | 114 | 29.6 |
| 300–1000 >                                  | 143 | 37.1 |
| ≥1000                                       | 45  | 11.7 |
| <b>Child</b>                                |     |      |
| No  | 168 | 43.6 |
| Yes (one)                                   | 59  | 15.3 |
| Yes (two)                                   | 90  | 23.4 |
| Yes (3 or more)                             | 65  | 16.9 |
| No answer                                   | 3   | 0.8  |
| <b>Religion</b>                             |     |      |
| No  | 317 | 82.3 |
| Buddhist                                    | 49  | 12.7 |
| Shinto                                      | 5   | 1.3  |
| Christianity (Catholicism)                  | 3   | 0.8  |
| Christianity (Protestant)                   | 4   | 1.0  |
| Christianity (Orthodox Church)              | 0   | 0.0  |
| Other                                       | 3   | 0.8  |
| No answer                                   | 4   | 1.0  |

\*Advanced Midwife...Midwives certified at Level III of the Proficiency Stage of Midwifery Practice (CLOCMiP).

### Comparison of MES-SAC scores by each variable

Table 2 presents the results of the bivariate analysis. The MES-SAC scores were significantly higher for midwives who were not advanced; were not currently engaged in mid-term abortion care; had no experience in perinatal loss care, participating in study groups or self-study, with positive feedback from women, with positive feedback from the woman's partner/family; and were unable to refuse care.

In mid-term abortion care situations, significant positive correlations were found between the MES-SAC scores and involvement in the decision-making process, care for the woman (regardless of the reason for abortion/unsympathetic reasons for abortion/unsympathetic attitude), care for the fetus (with abnormalities/with or without abnormality/live delivery), support from colleagues and supervisors, midwifery tasks, helping the woman remain positive, confidence, and improving skills. Conversely, a significant negative correlation was found between the MES-SAC scores and challenges in working with doctors.

### Investigation of MES-SAC reliability

Cronbach's alpha coefficients for the MES-SAC were .905 for the overall scale and, for the subscales, .817, .838, .852, .864, .716, and .732 for Factors I, II, III, IV, V, and VI, respectively.

### Multiple regression analysis with MES-SAC scores as dependent variable

In the bivariate analysis of the total MES-SAC scale scores, 33 variables had p-values less than 0.2. Spearman's rank correlation coefficients between these 33 items were calculated, and six combinations had correlation coefficients greater than 0.6. Therefore, four of these variables were excluded: years of experience (midwife), experience of positive feedback from partner/family, care for the woman (unsympathetic reasons for abortion), and care for the fetus (with or without abnormality). The remaining 29 items were used as independent variables. All variables had a VIF of less than 10. The Durbin-Watson test (2.24) for the total MES-SAC scale score and Shapiro-Wilk test confirmed the normality of the residuals ( $p = 0.809$ ).

Multiple regression analysis using the forced entry method was performed with MES-SAC scores as the dependent variable (Table 3). MES-SAC scores were significantly associated with length of engagement in mid-term abortion care (<3–10 years) ( $\beta = -.135$ ,  $p < .01$ ), positive feedback experiences from women ( $\beta = -.132$ ,  $p < .001$ ), care for women (unsympathetic attitude) ( $\beta = -.274$ ,  $p < .001$ ), care for the fetus (live delivery) ( $\beta = -.154$ ,  $p < .001$ ), challenges in working with physicians ( $\beta = -.111$ ,  $p < .01$ ), midwifery services ( $\beta = -.157$ ,  $p < .001$ ), self-confidence ( $\beta = -.214$ ,  $p < .001$ ), improvement of technology ( $\beta = -.147$ ,  $p < .001$ ), and views on abortion (abortion is an option) ( $\beta = -.11$ ,  $p < .01$ ). The degree-of-freedom adjusted coefficient of determination was .626 ( $p < .001$ ), and because the model fit and residuals followed a normal distribution, an interaction term was deemed unnecessary.

### Discussions

#### The emotional reality of midwives in mid-term abortion care

The mean MES-SAC scores in this study and a previous study were similar at 75.93 (SD = 15.9) and 75.79 (SD = 14.6; Saito et al., 2022), respectively. Therefore, the average MES-SAC score of Japanese midwives was inferred as approximately 75 points.

Table 2: Bivariate analysis of the MES-SAC scores and each variable.

n=385

|   | n   | Correlation analysis <sup>†</sup> with the MES-SAC |         | Test for differences in the MES-SAC scores <sup>‡§</sup> |                    |                            |
|---|-----|--|---------|--|--------------------|----------------------------|
|   |     | Spearman's ρ                                       | p-value | Mean ± SD  | p-value            | Multiple comparisons       |
| <b>Basic attribute</b>                                  |     |  |         |  |                    |                            |
| Age   |     |  |         |  | 0.131 <sup>§</sup> |                            |
| Years of experience (nurse)                             |     |  |         |  | 0.601 <sup>§</sup> |                            |
| Years of experience (midwife)                           |     |  |         |  | 0.066 <sup>§</sup> |                            |
| Midwifery school  |     |  |         |  | 0.203 <sup>§</sup> |                            |
| Advanced Midwife  |     |  |         |  | 0.019 <sup>‡</sup> |                            |
| Number of births assisted                               |     |  |         |  | 0.986 <sup>§</sup> |                            |
| Child   |     |  |         |  | 0.023 <sup>§</sup> | N.S.                       |
| Religion  |     |  |         |  | 0.579 <sup>§</sup> |                            |
| <b>Personal Background</b>                              |     |  |         |  |                    |                            |
| Perinatal Loss of Care Experience                       |     |  |         |  | 0.012 <sup>‡</sup> |                            |
| Yes   | 376 |  |         | 75.6±15.9  |                    |                            |
| No  | 9   |  |         | 88.0±10.9  |                    |                            |
| Relation to infertile women                             |     |  |         |  | 0.512 <sup>‡</sup> |                            |
| Yes   | 226 |  |         | 75.5±16.2  |                    |                            |
| No  | 159 |  |         | 76.6±15.5  |                    |                            |
| Family and friends who have experienced Perinatal Loss  |     |  |         |  | 0.177 <sup>§</sup> |                            |
| Yes   | 237 |  |         | 74.7±15.9  |                    |                            |
| No  | 143 |  |         | 77.9±16.0  |                    |                            |
| No answer   | 5   |  |         | 77.2±9.0   |                    |                            |
| Family and friends who have experienced an abortion     |     |  |         |  | 0.17 <sup>§</sup>  |                            |
| Yes   | 186 |  |         | 75.0±16.1  |                    |                            |
| No  | 189 |  |         | 76.5±16.0  |                    |                            |
| No answer   | 10  |  |         | 82.6±9.7   |                    |                            |
| <b>Abortion Care Experience</b>                         |     |  |         |  |                    |                            |
| Number of assisted early-term abortions                 |     |  |         |  | 0.017 <sup>§</sup> | "300-1000 >" > "100-300 >" |
| 0   | 46  |  |         | 78.8±16.9  |                    |                            |
| 1-50 >  | 212 |  |         | 76.1±14.8  |                    |                            |
| 50-100 >  | 76  |  |         | 73.8±15.7  |                    |                            |
| 100-300 >   | 36  |  |         | 70.8±17.7  |                    |                            |
| 300-1000 >  | 13  |  |         | 88.5±20.2  |                    |                            |
| ≥1000   | 2   |  |         | 87.5±2.1   |                    |                            |
| Number of assisted mid-term abortions                   |     |  |         |  | 0.027 <sup>§</sup> | "1-5 >" > "5-10 >"         |
| 1-5 >   | 111 |  |         | 79.8±15.3  |                    |                            |
| 5-10 >  | 120 |  |         | 74.0±13.3  |                    |                            |
| 10-20 >   | 76  |  |         | 75.0±16.3  |                    |                            |
| 20-30 >   | 33  |  |         | 74.0±13.8  |                    |                            |
| ≥30   | 45  |  |         | 74.6±22.3  |                    |                            |
| Status of engagement in mid-term abortion care          |     |  |         |  | 0.031 <sup>‡</sup> |                            |
| present   | 306 |  |         | 74.9±15.9  |                    |                            |
| the past  | 79  |  |         | 79.9±15.4  |                    |                            |
| Duration of engagement in mid-term abortion care (year) |     |  |         |  | 0.004 <sup>§</sup> | "1-3 >" > "≥10"            |
| 1 >   | 42  |  |         | 79.8±13.8  |                    |                            |
| 1-3 >   | 43  |  |         | 82.4±15.1  |                    |                            |
| 3-5 >   | 52  |  |         | 74.9±15.7  |                    |                            |
| 5-10 >  | 96  |  |         | 76.4±14.3  |                    |                            |
| ≥10   | 152 |  |         | 73.1±17.1  |                    |                            |

Continuing...

|  | n   | Correlation analysis <sup>†</sup> with the MES-SAC |         | Test for differences in the MES-SAC scores <sup>§§</sup> |                    |                      |
|--|-----|--|---------|--|--------------------|----------------------|
|  |     | Spearman's ρ                                       | p-value | Mean ± SD  | p-value            | Multiple comparisons |
| Frequency of Mid-term abortion care responsibilities               |     |  |         |  | 0.299 <sup>§</sup> |                      |
| More than 4 years interval   | 25  |  |         | 77.4±16.0  |                    |                      |
| Once every 2 to 3 years  | 61  |  |         | 78.1±12.4  |                    |                      |
| Once a year  | 92  |  |         | 77.3±16.1  |                    |                      |
| Once every six months  | 81  |  |         | 74.9±16.3  |                    |                      |
| At least once every six months                                     | 87  |  |         | 72.7±17.7  |                    |                      |
| Only one experience in charge                                      | 14  |  |         | 80.7±12.0  |                    |                      |
| Not currently engaged  | 25  |  |         | 76.0±16.2  |                    |                      |
| Participation in workshops and self-study on abortion care         |     |  |         |  | <.001 <sup>‡</sup> |                      |
| Yes  | 231 |  |         | 72.8±15.3  |                    |                      |
| No   | 154 |  |         | 80.7±15.6  |                    |                      |
| Experience in caring for teenage women undergoing abortion         |     |  |         |  | 0.518 <sup>‡</sup> |                      |
| Yes  | 249 |  |         | 75.5±16.9  |                    |                      |
| No   | 136 |  |         | 76.6±13.9  |                    |                      |
| Experience in caring for women who have undergone repeat abortions |     |  |         |  | 0.193 <sup>‡</sup> |                      |
| Yes  | 202 |  |         | 74.9±16.0  |                    |                      |
| No   | 183 |  |         | 77.1±15.7  |                    |                      |
| Positive feedback experience from women                            |     |  |         |  | <.001 <sup>‡</sup> |                      |
| Yes  | 227 |  |         | 71.7±15.6  |                    |                      |
| No   | 158 |  |         | 82.0±14.4  |                    |                      |
| Positive feedback experience from partner/family                   |     |  |         |  | <.001 <sup>‡</sup> |                      |
| Yes  | 147 |  |         | 71.4±15.5  |                    |                      |
| No   | 238 |  |         | 78.8±15.6  |                    |                      |
| <b>Mid-term abortion care scene</b>                                |     |  |         |  |                    |                      |
| Refusal of care  |     |  |         |  | <.001 <sup>‡</sup> |                      |
| possible   | 119 |  |         | 70.3±14.7  |                    |                      |
| impossible   | 266 |  |         | 78.5±15.8  |                    |                      |
| Care of the facility where you work (Multiple answers)             |     |  |         |  |                    |                      |
| care for the close to women  | 127 |  |         | 75.7±14.9  | 0.634 <sup>‡</sup> |                      |
| care for the close fetus   | 85  |  |         | 73.7±13.1  | 0.154 <sup>‡</sup> |                      |
| care for the close to woman and her fetus                          | 323 |  |         | 75.2±15.9  | 0.059 <sup>‡</sup> |                      |
| administrative care  | 106 |  |         | 75.9±14.4  | 0.893 <sup>‡</sup> |                      |
| care that "never happened" abortion                                | 3   |  |         | 74.0±6.9   | 0.78 <sup>‡</sup>  |                      |
| other  | 8   |  |         | 68.9±18.8  |                    |                      |
| do not know  | 14  |  |         | 87.7±13.7  | 0.004 <sup>‡</sup> |                      |
| Involvement in the decision-making process                         |     | 0.189  | <.001   |  |                    |                      |
| closely involved   | 44  |  |         | 70.8±18.0  |                    |                      |
| somewhat involved  | 131 |  |         | 74.1±15.4  |                    |                      |
| mostly not involved  | 145 |  |         | 76.6±15.3  |                    |                      |
| not at all involved  | 65  |  |         | 81.6±15.2  |                    |                      |
| Care for women (regardless of reason for abortion)                 |     | 0.48   | <.001   |  |                    |                      |
| not at all resistant   | 34  |  |         | 58.2±15.2  |                    |                      |
| mostly resistant   | 102 |  |         | 69.3±12.7  |                    |                      |
| undecided  | 42  |  |         | 77.0±13.3  |                    |                      |

Continuing...

|   | n   | Correlation analysis <sup>†</sup> with the MES-SAC |         | Test for differences in the MES-SAC scores <sup>‡§</sup> |         |                      |
|---|-----|--|---------|--|---------|----------------------|
|   |     | Spearman's ρ                                       | p-value | Mean ± SD  | p-value | Multiple comparisons |
| somewhat resistant                                  | 162 |  |         | 80.2±13.7  |         |                      |
| very resistant                                      | 45  |  |         | 88.0±15.9  |         |                      |
| Care for women (unsympathetic reasons for abortion) |     | 0.505  | <.001   |  |         |                      |
| not at all resistant                                | 25  |  |         | 58.5±16.6  |         |                      |
| mostly resistant                                    | 87  |  |         | 66.6±13.3  |         |                      |
| undecided   | 39  |  |         | 76.4±14.1  |         |                      |
| somewhat resistant                                  | 157 |  |         | 77.9±13.2  |         |                      |
| very resistant                                      | 77  |  |         | 88.0±13.3  |         |                      |
| Care for women (unsympathetic attitude)             |     | 0.534  | <.001   |  |         |                      |
| not at all resistant                                | 16  |  |         | 55.4±16.5  |         |                      |
| mostly resistant                                    | 74  |  |         | 65.7±14.4  |         |                      |
| undecided   | 39  |  |         | 75.0±10.9  |         |                      |
| somewhat resistant                                  | 178 |  |         | 75.7±12.9  |         |                      |
| very resistant                                      | 78  |  |         | 90.9±12.6  |         |                      |
| Care for the fetus (with abnormalities)             |     | 0.367  | <.001   |  |         |                      |
| not at all resistant                                | 91  |  |         | 65.6±15.8  |         |                      |
| mostly resistant                                    | 139 |  |         | 76.2±14.4  |         |                      |
| undecided   | 36  |  |         | 81.8±14.3  |         |                      |
| somewhat resistant                                  | 96  |  |         | 79.2±13.0  |         |                      |
| very resistant                                      | 23  |  |         | 92.1±14.8  |         |                      |
| Care for the fetus (with or without abnormality)    |     | 0.375  | <.001   |  |         |                      |
| not at all resistant                                | 87  |  |         | 65.5±16.0  |         |                      |
| mostly resistant                                    | 128 |  |         | 75.8±14.5  |         |                      |
| undecided   | 33  |  |         | 79.2±13.0  |         |                      |
| somewhat resistant                                  | 110 |  |         | 79.7±13.0  |         |                      |
| very resistant                                      | 27  |  |         | 91.0±16.6  |         |                      |
| Care for the fetus (live delivery)                  |     | 0.462  | <.001   |  |         |                      |
| not at all resistant                                | 15  |  |         | 59.3±15.7  |         |                      |
| mostly resistant                                    | 32  |  |         | 61.4±14.3  |         |                      |
| undecided   | 35  |  |         | 73.9±13.7  |         |                      |
| somewhat resistant                                  | 130 |  |         | 71.6±12.5  |         |                      |
| very resistant                                      | 173 |  |         | 83.7±14.6  |         |                      |
| <b>Attitudes in Mid-Term Abortion Care</b>          |     |  |         |  |         |                      |
| Support from colleagues and supervisors             |     | 0.196  | <.001   |  |         |                      |
| feel very much                                      | 79  |  |         | 71.5±17.1  |         |                      |
| feel somewhat                                       | 188 |  |         | 75.5±15.3  |         |                      |
| feel little   | 94  |  |         | 79.2±15.0  |         |                      |
| do not feel it at all                               | 24  |  |         | 80.8±16.9  |         |                      |
| Support from friends and family                     |     | 0.044  | 0.39    |  |         |                      |
| feel very much                                      | 18  |  |         | 69.1±18.0  |         |                      |
| feel somewhat                                       | 89  |  |         | 75.5±15.0  |         |                      |
| feel little   | 129 |  |         | 76.7±14.7  |         |                      |
| do not feel it at all                               | 149 |  |         | 76.3±17.1  |         |                      |
| Staffing Challenges                                 |     | -0.049   | 0.34    |  |         |                      |
| feel very much                                      | 66  |  |         | 77.0±15.7  |         |                      |
| feel somewhat                                       | 192 |  |         | 76.2±15.5  |         |                      |
| feel little   | 109 |  |         | 75.5±15.5  |         |                      |

Continuing...

|  | n   | Correlation analysis <sup>†</sup> with the MES-SAC |         | Test for differences in the MES-SAC scores <sup>‡§</sup> |                    |   |
|--|-----|--|---------|--|--------------------|---|
|  |     | Spearman's ρ                                       | p-value | Mean ± SD  | p-value            | Multiple comparisons  |
| do not feel it at all                            | 18  |  |         | 72.1±22.6  |                    |   |
| Challenges in working with physicians            |     | -0.183   | <.001   |  |                    |   |
| feel very much                                   | 52  |  |         | 79.9±15.0  |                    |   |
| feel somewhat                                    | 177 |  |         | 78.1±15.1  |                    |   |
| feel little                                      | 140 |  |         | 72.0±16.1  |                    |   |
| do not feel it at all                            | 16  |  |         | 73.3±19.2  |                    |   |
| Restrictions on involvement due to work schedule |     | -0.108   | 0.03    |  |                    |   |
| feel very much                                   | 76  |  |         | 80.1±16.8  |                    |   |
| feel somewhat                                    | 201 |  |         | 75.2±15.2  |                    |   |
| feel little                                      | 100 |  |         | 74.3±15.6  |                    |   |
| do not feel it at all                            | 8   |  |         | 74.6±23.7  |                    |   |
| <b>Thoughts on Mid-Term Abortion Care</b>        |     |  |         |  |                    |   |
| Midwifery services                               |     | 0.409  | <.001   |  |                    |   |
| agree  | 222 |  |         | 70.9±14.3  |                    |   |
| somewhat agree                                   | 114 |  |         | 79.5±14.7  |                    |   |
| neither agree nor disagree                       | 13  |  |         | 81.8±10.9  |                    |   |
| not so much agree                                | 26  |  |         | 93.4±14.2  |                    |   |
| disagree   | 10  |  |         | 94.0±16.7  |                    |   |
| Making Women Positive                            |     | 0.321  | <.001   |  |                    |   |
| agree  | 57  |  |         | 69.0±18.0  |                    |   |
| somewhat agree                                   | 145 |  |         | 72.4±13.0  |                    |   |
| neither agree nor disagree                       | 53  |  |         | 78.6±16.4  |                    |   |
| not so much agree                                | 97  |  |         | 79.9±15.3  |                    |   |
| disagree   | 33  |  |         | 87.5±15.3  |                    |   |
| Self-confidence                                  |     | 0.428  | <.001   |  |                    |   |
| agree  | 7   |  |         | 51.9±15.5  |                    |   |
| somewhat agree                                   | 50  |  |         | 63.0±15.8  |                    |   |
| neither agree nor disagree                       | 46  |  |         | 71.3±14.9  |                    |   |
| not so much agree                                | 132 |  |         | 75.6±13.0  |                    |   |
| disagree   | 150 |  |         | 83.1±14.3  |                    |   |
| Improvement of Technology                        |     | 0.376  | <.001   |  |                    |   |
| agree  | 109 |  |         | 68.9±15.3  |                    |   |
| somewhat agree                                   | 128 |  |         | 74.5±12.3  |                    |   |
| neither agree nor disagree                       | 48  |  |         | 75.4±14.3  |                    |   |
| not so much agree                                | 60  |  |         | 82.2±18.0  |                    |   |
| disagree   | 40  |  |         | 91.1±13.1  |                    |   |
| Views on abortion                                |     |  |         |  | <.001 <sup>§</sup> |   |
| Abortion is a bad idea                           | 14  |  |         | 86.6±17.5  |                    | "Abortion is not a bad idea", "If anything, abortion is a bad idea", "Neither"> "Abortion is an option" "Abortion is not a bad idea", "If anything, abortion is a bad idea" >"If anything, abortion is an option" |
| If anything, abortion is a bad idea              | 73  |  |         | 84.0±14.7  |                    |   |
| Neither  | 82  |  |         | 77.6±16.1  |                    |   |
| If anything, abortion is an option               | 140 |  |         | 73.8±13.7  |                    |   |
| Abortion is an option                            | 76  |  |         | 68.3±15.9  |                    |   |

<sup>†</sup>Spearman's rank correlation coefficient.

<sup>‡</sup>Mann-Whitney's U test.

<sup>§</sup>Kruskal-Wallis test; multiple comparisons are made using the Dunn-Bonferroni method when there is a significant difference at p<.05.

Table 3: Multiple regression analysis with MES-SAC as dependent variable.

n=385

| Independent variable   | MES - S A C            |          | VIF    |       |
|--|------------------------|----------|--------|-------|
|  | $\beta$                | p        |        |       |
| Age <sup>a</sup>   | .018                   | .721     | 2.502  |       |
| Advanced Midwife <sup>b</sup>  | -.025                  | .505     | 1.486  |       |
| Child <sup>c</sup>   | one or two             | .064     | .103   | 1.551 |
|  | 3 or more              | .027     | .476   | 1.489 |
| Perinatal Loss of Care Experience <sup>d</sup>   | -.041                  | .238     | 1.241  |       |
| Family and friends who have experienced Perinatal Loss <sup>e</sup>                          | -.045                  | .192     | 1.222  |       |
| Family and friends who have experienced an abortion <sup>e</sup>                             | -.010                  | .771     | 1.203  |       |
| Number of assisted early-term abortions <sup>f</sup>   | 1-300 >                | -.066    | .083   | 1.487 |
|  | ≥ 300                  | .041     | .287   | 1.546 |
| Number of assisted mid-term abortions <sup>g</sup>   | 5-10 >                 | .014     | .739   | 1.862 |
|  | ≥10                    | .026     | .605   | 2.548 |
| Status of engagement in mid-term abortion care <sup>h</sup>                                  | .016                   | .669     | 1.509  |       |
| Duration of engagement in mid-term abortion care <sup>i</sup>                                | 3-10 >                 | -.135    | .007** | 2.539 |
|  | ≥10                    | -.120    | .052   | 3.854 |
| Participation in workshops and self-study on abortion care <sup>d</sup>                      | -.041                  | .256     | 1.352  |       |
| Experience in caring for women who have undergone repeat abortions <sup>d</sup>              | .045                   | .195     | 1.209  |       |
| Positive feedback experience from women <sup>d</sup>   | -.132                  | <.001*** | 1.462  |       |
| Refusal of care <sup>j</sup>   | -.073                  | .034     | 1.202  |       |
| Care of the facility where you work : Care for the close fetus <sup>d</sup>                  | .024                   | .473     | 1.128  |       |
| Care of the facility where you work : Care for the close to woman and her fetus <sup>d</sup> | .047                   | .182     | 1.292  |       |
| Involvement in the decision-making process <sup>k</sup>                                      | .030                   | .393     | 1.272  |       |
| Care for women (regardless of reason for abortion) <sup>l</sup>                              | .027                   | .514     | 1.792  |       |
| Care for women (unsympathetic attitude) <sup>l</sup>   | .274                   | <.001*** | 1.592  |       |
| Care for the fetus (with abnormalities) <sup>l</sup>   | .073                   | .052     | 1.421  |       |
| Care for the fetus (live delivery) <sup>l</sup>  | .154                   | <.001*** | 1.505  |       |
| Support from colleagues and supervisors <sup>m</sup>   | -.034                  | .339     | 1.298  |       |
| Challenges in working with physicians <sup>m</sup>   | -.111                  | .004**   | 1.472  |       |
| Restrictions on involvement due to work schedule <sup>m</sup>                                | -.013                  | .738     | 1.543  |       |
| Midwifery services <sup>n</sup>  | .157                   | <.001*** | 1.553  |       |
| Making Women Positive <sup>n</sup>   | .008                   | .828     | 1.499  |       |
| Self-confidence <sup>n</sup>   | .214                   | <.001*** | 1.506  |       |
| Improvement of Technology <sup>n</sup>   | .147                   | <.001*** | 1.719  |       |
| Views on abortion <sup>o</sup>   | Abortion is a bad idea | .058     | .168   | 1.792 |
|  | Abortion is an option  | -.110    | .008** | 1.723 |
|  | R2                     | .659***  |        |       |
|  | Adjusted R2            | .626***  |        |       |

forced entry method  $\beta$  = standard partial regression coefficient, VIF = Variance Inflation Factor

\*p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.001 Durbin-Watson = 2.243

<sup>a</sup>: 20-29 years old = 1, 30-39 years old = 2, 40-49 years old = 3, 50-59 years old = 4, 60 years old and older = 5

<sup>b</sup>: No = 0, Yes = 1 <sup>c</sup>: No or do not respond = 0 (reference category), Yes (1 person) or Yes (2 persons) = 1, Yes (3 or more persons) = 2

<sup>d</sup>: None = 0, Yes = 1 <sup>e</sup>: not present or not responding = 0, present = 1

<sup>f</sup>: 0 cases = 0 (reference category), 1-50 cases, 50-100 cases, 100-300 cases = 1, 30-1000 cases, more than 1000 cases = 2

<sup>g</sup>: 1 to less than 5 = 0 (reference category), 5 to less than 10 = 1, 10 to less than 20, 20 to less than 30, 30 or more = 2

<sup>h</sup>: No (had been done in the past) = 0, Yes = 1

<sup>i</sup>: less than 1 year and 1-3 years = 0 (reference category), 3-5 years and 5-10 years = 1, more than 10 years = 2 <sup>j</sup>: Cannot = 0, Can = 1

<sup>k</sup>: closely involved = 1, somewhat involved = 2, little involved = 3, not involved at all = 4

<sup>l</sup>: No resistance at all = 0, little resistance = 1, undecided = 3, somewhat resistant = 4, very resistant = 5

<sup>m</sup>: very much = 1, somewhat = 2, little = 3, not at all = 4 <sup>n</sup>: agree = 1, somewhat agree = 2, undecided = 3, not so much agree = 4, disagree = 5

<sup>o</sup>: Abortion is not good because it is an act that takes the life of the fetus; If anything, abortion is not good because it takes the life of the fetus = 0;

neither = 1 (reference category); If anything, a woman has the right not to give birth and abortion is an option; women have the right not to give birth and abortion is an option = 2"

Factor IV (“negative perception of care”) had the highest item mean, followed by Factor V (“self-evaluation of care techniques”). Previous studies have demonstrated that many Japanese midwives find abortion care painful [26], some do not accept abortion care as a job [22], and some view it as being complicit in taking a life [27]. Furthermore, in Japan, the tendency to view abortion as evil persists, and midwives may have internalized these values, leading them to negatively perceive their provision of care. In addition, inadequate basic nursing education regarding abortion care [7,28] and the fact that care is practiced in an undeveloped state without the accumulation of knowledge/techniques through experience [6] were believed to be related to low self-evaluation of care skills. Conversely, the lowest item mean was Factor III (“anger toward women”). Indeed, descriptions of anger toward women were less common in Japan than internationally, with four descriptions in foreign literature and one in domestic literature [25]. This suggests that Japanese midwives’ anger toward women was less impactful than other factors.

### Factors associated with midwives' emotions in mid-term abortion care

#### Abortion care experience

Regarding abortion care experience, a significant association was observed between the duration of engagement in mid-term abortion care (<3–10 years) and positive feedback experience from women.

Compared to those who had been engaged in mid-term abortion care for <3 years, those who had been engaged for 3–10 years showed reduced negative affect. However, negative feelings were not necessarily inversely related to length of engagement, as no significant association was observed for those who had been engaged for more than 10 years.

The experience of receiving positive feedback from women has been shown to reduce negative emotions. Several studies have reported the influence of positive feedback from patients/families on job satisfaction and as confirmation of having done a good job [29–30]. Similarly, in this study, receiving positive feedback from women and their families reduced participants’ negative feelings generated by mid-term abortion care and led to rewards and role recognition.

#### Mid-term abortion care scene

In mid-term abortion care situations, a significant association was observed between care for the woman (unsympathetic attitude) and fetus (live delivery).

Care for women with unsympathetic attitudes had the strongest impact on midwives’ emotions. It was shown that the more resistance to care for a woman who exhibits unsympathetic attitudes, the more negative emotions increase, which is consistent with previous research [7,12]. It was found that empathy becomes difficult when the patient’s behavior conflicts with the nurse’s own values [31], which is also true in mid-term abortion situations. Consistent with previous studies, attitudes of women who underwent mid-term abortion were found to affect the midwives’ emotions. Literature has reported that abortion causes women to have complex emotions, mainly negative ones [32–34]. Furthermore, midwives predict the expression of attitudes based on these feelings. Conversely, more than 85% of women who have experienced an abortion experience both negative emotions, such as sadness, guilt, regret, disappointment, and grief, and positive emotions, such as relief, happiness, satisfaction, and feeling better

after an abortion [35–36]. Therefore, if nurses are unaware that women who undergo abortion have both positive and negative feelings, they may perceive the women’s expression of positive feelings as an unsympathetic attitude.

Negative emotions were shown to increase with resistance to care for a fetus delivered alive. In support of this study’s results, previous studies have reported that contact with a fetus delivered alive during a mid-term abortion caused negative emotions, such as distress [10,37], anger [38–39], and sadness [7], suggesting that care for a fetus delivered alive is closely related to negative emotions.

#### Attitudes in mid-term abortion care

A significant association was observed between challenges in working with physicians and attitudes in mid-term abortion care, indicating that the lesser the challenges of working with physicians, the greater the negative feelings were reduced. Negative feelings associated with lack of collaboration with physicians in necessary abortion care situations were only evident in the international literature [40]. The present study’s results suggest that, even in Japan, inadequate collaboration with physicians increases negative emotions. Hence, clarifying the nature of the issues experienced by midwives in Japan and considering countermeasures are crucial. Furthermore, strategies, such as knowing the doctor in charge at the start of work and making contact early on when pain begins [40], are necessary to facilitate cooperation with physicians.

#### Thoughts on mid-term abortion care

There was a significant association between midwifery services, self-confidence, improvements in technology, and views on abortion (abortion is a choice) in terms of thoughts on mid-term abortion care.

The less the mid-term abortion care was considered a midwifery service, the more negative were the feelings. The International Confederation of Midwives specifies abortion care in its competencies specific to preconception and pregnancy care [41]. Conversely, this was not explicitly stated in the Core Competencies for Midwifery Practice 2021, presented by the Japan Midwifery Association [42]. Hence, clarifying the position of abortion care in midwifery education in Japan could reduce negative feelings.

The less the midwives’ self-confidence in mid-term abortion care, the more negative their feelings. Lack of confidence among Japanese nurses in abortion care has been reported [10,43]; only 57 (14.8%) midwives in this study were confident. Parajuli et al. [44] report that years of experience is significantly associated with nurses’ confidence in providing care, and experience has a significant impact on confidence. Among this study’s participants, 60% were midwives who had assisted in fewer than 10 mid-term abortions, suggesting that their lack of experience could have influenced their confidence.

The results indicate that the more one perceived abortion as a choice, the more the negative feelings were reduced. “Views on abortion” was an item that asked about values toward abortion. In the U.S., opposition to abortion is referred to as being pro-life (the life of the fetus is paramount) and pro-abortionists are referred to as being pro-choice (insisting on a woman’s right to choose); consequently, debates and conflicts have developed. However, values and attitudes do not necessarily coincide, as pro-life supporters are reported to

often have ambivalent attitudes toward medically necessary abortion, and pro-choice supporters tend to have ambivalent attitudes toward elective abortion [45]. Individual values toward abortion were found to be closely and intricately related to emotions experienced in mid-term abortion care.

### Implications for nursing

Midwives' feelings regarding mid-term abortion care were most strongly influenced by their care for women (unsympathetic attitude). Women who undergo abortion sometimes lie and the attitudes expressed are not always based on a woman's true feelings. Therefore, rather than becoming angry at, or questioning, "cheerful or unconcerned women who undergo abortion," it is necessary for midwives to consider the possibility that the women's appearance is not based on their true feelings, and to attempt to understand the true intentions behind their words and actions. Conversely, as many women who undergo abortion experience both negative and positive emotions [35-36], accepting women's emotional reactions of relief and happiness as normal responses is desirable. Therefore, education to ensure midwives correct perceptions of women undergoing abortions may be effective.

Confidence and improved skills also influenced midwives' feelings regarding mid-term abortion care. Although experience has a significant impact on confidence [44], 60% of midwives had assisted in fewer than 10 mid-term abortion deliveries, suggesting that lack of experience also had an impact. According to Kuginaka et al. [46], despite experience in providing nursing care (to patients), if there is insufficient reflection and evaluation of the care provided, the nurses might develop fear and lose confidence in engaging with the patient. Furthermore, Koyama et al. [47] pointed out that a lack of positive dialogue regarding care among nurses leads to a sense of burden and lack of confidence in care. Therefore, debriefing [48] can be useful in understanding one's feelings and experiences and gaining knowledge that could be used in subsequent situations. In this context, the MES-SAC can be useful. Additionally, conducting case conferences in an atmosphere where participants feel comfortable expressing their feelings and discussing the meaning of negative and positive emotions could reduce the burden of mid-term abortion care and help participants gain confidence. Furthermore, more than half of the midwives (61.5%) wanted to improve their mid-term abortion care skills. To this end, appropriate educational programs are required to respond to midwives' motivations.

### Limitations

Many midwives interested in the research topic may have participated in the survey. As all items in the questionnaire required answers, it is assumed that those who were averse to mid-term abortion care were not included. Additionally, because this was a cross-sectional study, causal relationships between emotions and related factors could not be determined. Future empirical research on changes in emotions and the causal relationship between emotions and related factors should be conducted through longitudinal studies.

### Conclusion

The MES-SAC was used to identify midwives' emotional reality and the factors related to mid-term abortion care. In mid-term abortion care, midwives had strong negative perception about their care and felt that their own care skills were inadequate. The MES-SAC score was positively associated with care for the woman (unsympathetic

attitude), care for the fetus (live delivery), midwifery services, self-confidence, and improved technology. Conversely, it was negatively associated with length of engagement in mid-term abortion care (<3-10 years), positive feedback experiences from women, challenges in working with physicians, and views on abortion (abortion is an option). Education for midwives to gain a correct understanding of women undergoing abortion, debriefing to understand their own care and feelings, and participation in case conferences in which participants feel comfortable expressing their feelings are important for reducing negative emotions in mid-term abortion care.

### Acknowledgement

We thank the hospital administrators and midwives for their cooperation.

We thank Professor Eliko Otsuki of Juntendo University Graduate School for her guidance in conducting this study.

### Competing Interests

The authors declare no competing interests relevant to this article.

### References

1. Suzuki Y (2017) A study of the changes in the view of fetal life seen in memorial services for aborted babies. *Bulletin of the National Museum of Japanese History* 205: 157-209.
2. Atsuta K (2017) Problem of abortion medical care as support for "mother": From interviews with Japanese women who experienced abortion treatment. *Proceedings of Health & Medical Sociology* 28: 34-43.
3. Kinefuchi E, Yoshida Y (2020) Stigma of nurses against the termination of pregnancy. *Japanese Journal of Maternal Health* 61: 272-279.
4. e-Stat (2023) Examples of health administration reports in Fiscal 2022 statistical table annual report. [Cited 25 Nov 2025.] Available from: [https://www.e-stat.go.jp/stat-search/files?stat\\_infid=000040112033](https://www.e-stat.go.jp/stat-search/files?stat_infid=000040112033).
5. World Health Organization (2022) Abortion care guideline. [Cited 25 Nov 2025.]. Available from: <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/Supplementary10665/349316>.
6. Okubo M (2002) Care of women who have had abortions: a survey of nursing and midwifery professionals. In: Saito Y (Ed) *The maternal protection act and us: Abortion, multiple births, and sterilization in society and institutions*, Akashishoten, Japa, pp. 123-139.
7. Okubo M (2003) How do nurses relate to abortion care? A survey of attitudes toward abortion nursing. *The Japanese Journal for Midwives* 57: 200-206.
8. Katsumata S, Matsuoka M, Misumi J, Shimizu K (2005) Nurse's experiences in and views about caring for women undergoing abortion. *Japanese Society of Psychosomatic Obstetrics and Gynecology* 10: 85-93.
9. Shimoyama H (2010) Experiences of midwifery staff in caring for women and their families dealing with pregnancy termination for fetal abnormality. *Japanese Journal of Maternal Health* 50: 602-610.
10. Takagi S, Kobayashi Y (2010) Medical termination of pregnancies: Difficulties among midwives. *Journal of Japan Academy of Midwifery* 24: 227-237.
11. Mizuno M (2011) Confusion and ethical issues surrounding the role of Japanese midwives in childbirth and abortion: A qualitative study. *Nurs Health Sci* 13: 502-506.
12. Saito M, Otsuki E, Kanemune M (2021) Emotional conflict and compromise experienced by midwives caring for women who have undergone an induced second-trimester abortion. *Journal of Japan Society of Maternity Nursing* 21: 9-17.
13. Peduzzi P, Concato J, Feinstein AR, Holford TR (1995) Importance of events per independent variable in proportional hazards regression analysis II. Accuracy and precision of regression estimates. *J Clin Epidemiol* 48: 1503-1510.

14. Peduzzi P, Concato J, Kemper E, Holford TR, Feinstein AR (1996) A simulation study of the number of events per variable in logistic regression analysis. *J Clin Epidemiol* 49: 1373–1379.
15. e-Stat (2022) Example of health administration report in Fiscal 2020 statistical table annual report. [Cited 25 Nov 2025.] Available from: [https://www.e-stat.go.jp/stat-search/files?stat\\_infid=000032155852](https://www.e-stat.go.jp/stat-search/files?stat_infid=000032155852).
16. Saito M, Otsuki E (2022) Development of a midwives' emotion scale in second trimester abortion care: Verification of reliability and validity. *Japan Academy of Midwifery* 36: 247–257.
17. Gallagher K, Porock D, Edgley A (2010) The concept of 'nursing' in the abortion services. *J Adv Nurs* 66: 849–857.
18. Lipp A, Fothergill A (2009) Nurses in abortion care: Identifying and managing stress. *Contemp Nurse* 31: 108–120.
19. Lipp A (2011) Stigma in abortion care: Application to a grounded theory study. *Contemp Nurse* 37: 115–123.
20. Marek MJ (2004) Nurses' attitudes toward pregnancy termination in the labor and delivery setting. *J Obstet Gynecol Neonatal Nurs* 33: 472–479.
21. McLemore MR, Kools S, Levi AJ (2015) Calculus formation: Nurses' decision-making in abortion-related care. *Res Nurs Health* 38: 222–231.
22. Mizuno M (2016) Psychosocial stress among Japanese nurses and midwives providing abortion care. *Japanese Society of Psychosomatic Obstetrics and Gynecology* 20: 294–301.
23. Mizuno M, Kinefuchi E, Kimura R, Tsuda A (2013) Professional quality of life of Japanese nurses/midwives providing abortion/childbirth care. *Nursing Ethics* 20: 539–550.
24. Simmonds K, Schwartz-Barcott D, Erickson-Owens D (2021) Nurse practitioners' and certified nurse midwives' experiences providing comprehensive early abortion care in New England, USA. *Health Care Women Int* 45: 24–46.
25. Saito M, Otsuki E (2021) Literature review on negative emotions and factors that occur in nurses involved with abortion care. *Journal of Health Care and Nursing* 18: 96–106.
26. Tokutake C, Saito M, Kawauchi H, Kinefuchi E, Ohira M, et al. (2025) A study on midwives' attitudes and perceptions regarding induced abortion and pain experienced during care. *Journal of Japan Academy of Midwifery* 39: 67–78.
27. Shida J (2014) Midwives' feelings about stillbirths: A comparison of feelings between spontaneous and artificial stillbirths. *Proceedings of the Japanese Nursing Association: Maternal Nursing Care* 44: 46–49.
28. Mizuno M (2014) Abortion-care education in Japanese nurse practitioner and midwifery programs: A national survey. *Nurse Educ Today* 34: 11–14.
29. Christiansen B (2008) Good work: How is it recognized by the nurse? *J Clin Nurs* 17: 1645–1651.
30. Khowaja K, Merchant RJ, Hirani D (2005) Registered nurses perception of work satisfaction at a tertiary care university hospital. *J Nurs Manag* 13: 32–39.
31. Baillie L (1996) A phenomenological study of the nature of empathy. *J Adv Nurs* 24: 1300–1308.
32. Aléx L, Hammarström A (2004) Women's experiences in connection with induced abortion: A feminist perspective. *Scand J Caring Sci* 18: 160–168.
33. Kinefuchi E, Takahashi M (2004) Psychological process of women who have undergone induced abortion. *Ishikawa Journal of Nursing* 1: 39–47.
34. Lie MLS, Robson SC, May CR (2008) Experiences of abortion: A narrative review of qualitative studies. *BMC Health Serv Res* 17: 150.
35. Fergusson DM, Horwood LJ, Boden JM (2009) Reactions to abortion and subsequent mental health. *Br J Psychiatry* 195: 420–426.
36. Sokabe M, Ohi K, Kishi E, Hayakawa Y, Takamura H (2000) The process and psychological change for decision making on an induced abortion. *Japanese Society of Psychosomatic Obstetrics and Gynecology* 5: 190–196.
37. Christensen AV, Christiansen AH, Petersson B (2013) Faced with a dilemma: Danish midwives' experiences with and attitudes towards late termination of pregnancy. *Scandinavian Journal of Caring Sciences* 27: 913–920.
38. Andersson IM, Gemzell-Danielsson K, Christensson K (2014) Caring for women undergoing second-trimester medical termination of pregnancy. *Contraception* 89: 460–465.
39. Mauri AP, Ceriotti E, Soldi M, Contini NNG (2015) Italian midwives' experiences of late termination of pregnancy: A phenomenological-hermeneutic study. *Nurs Health Sci* 17: 243–249.
40. Parker A, Swanson H, Frunchak V (2014) Needs of labor and delivery nurses caring for women undergoing pregnancy termination. *J Obstet Gynecol Neonatal Nurs* 43: 478–487.
41. ICM (2019) Essential competencies for midwifery practice. International Confederation of Midwives. [Cited 25 Nov 2025.] Available from: <https://www.internationalmidwives.org/our-work/policy-and-practice/essential-competencies-for-midwifery-practice.html>.
42. Japan Midwives Association (2022) Core competencies for midwives 2022. [Cited 25 Nov 2025.] Available from: <https://www.midwife.or.jp/midwife/competency.html>.
43. Tsuru Y, Sasaki M, Obata Y (2019) Thoughts of a nurse in charge of a patient undergoing a mid-term miscarriage procedure. *Proceedings of the Japanese Nursing Association: Nursing Management* 49: 35–38.
44. Parajuli J, Hupcey JE, Kitko L, Birriel B (2021) Palliative care: Oncology nurses' confidence in provision to patients with cancer. *Clini J Oncol Nurs* 25: 449–455.
45. Craig SC, Kane JG, Martinez MD (2002) Sometimes you feel like a nut, sometimes you don't: Citizens' ambivalence about abortion. *Political Psychology* 23: 285–301.
46. Kukinaka C, Nakagomi S, Susaka H (2018) Subject of continuing educational program about genetic nursing for certified nurses, certified nurses specialist and intractable illness certified nurses in neurological intractable illness area. *Japanese Society of Genetic Nursing* 16: 56–67.
47. Koyama T, Watanabe Y, Sasuga Y (2021) Current status of and issues affecting the creation of organizations to improve the quality of dementia care in an acute hospital: A questionnaire survey of mid-career nurses and middle nursing managers. *Research Journal, School of Nursing and Graduate School of Nursing, Yamanashi Prefectural University* 7: 15–24.
48. Schmidt M, Haglund K (2017) Debrief in emergency departments to improve compassion fatigue and promote resiliency. *Journal of Trauma Nursing: The Official Journal of the Society of Trauma Nurses* 24: 317–322.