

TABLE 6. Odds ratios (and 95% confidence intervals) from three logistic regression models of the determinants of whether women using methods other than the condom who were told about STI protection correctly received that message

Characteristic	Model 1 (N=1,067)	Model 2 (N=952)	Model 3 (N=952)
Client characteristics			
Age			
13–19	0.70 (0.45–1.10)	0.76 (0.47–1.24)	0.77 (0.47–1.26)
20–29 (ref)	1.00	1.00	1.00
30–39	1.16 (0.68–1.98)	1.09 (0.63–1.89)	1.08 (0.62–1.87)
40–49	0.45 (0.17–1.19)	0.51 (0.17–1.54)	0.49 (0.16–1.50)
Paid employee	1.19 (0.74–1.93)	1.18 (0.72–1.95)	1.12 (0.67–1.85)
Married	0.50 (0.20–1.29)	0.54 (0.21–1.39)	0.61 (0.24–1.59)
Wants no more children	1.24 (0.76–2.03)	1.20 (0.72–2.00)	1.24 (0.74–2.06)
Education			
None/primary (ref)	1.00	1.00	1.00
≥secondary	2.04 (1.36–3.05)**	1.82 (1.20–2.76)**	1.64 (1.08–2.50)*
Provider characteristics			
Years at clinic	na	0.99 (0.91–1.08)	1.02 (0.93–1.13)
Education			
Secondary (ref)	na	1.00	1.00
>secondary	na	0.62 (0.42–0.91)*	0.53 (0.35–0.81)**
Clinic characteristics			
Large clinic (A or B level)	na	na	0.40 (0.24–0.68)**
<i>–2 log likelihood</i>	<i>880.83</i>	<i>787.99</i>	<i>774.69</i>

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. Notes: Model 1 controls for the effects of client characteristics. Model 2 controls for the effects of client and provider characteristics. Model 3 controls for the characteristics of clients, providers and clinics. Of the 1,095 users of a method other than the condom who were observed being told that their method offered no STI protection, 28 cases are omitted from Model 1 because no data were available on knowledge about method protection for those women, and an additional 115 cases are omitted from Models 2 and 3 because the provider connected with those cases could not be interviewed.