

TABLE 4. Percentage of low-income women reporting selected perceptions of service quality, by race, ethnicity and language spoken, and odds ratios from logistic regression analyses assessing associations between service quality perceptions and these characteristics

Perception and characteristic	%	Crude estimate	Model 1‡	Model 2§	Model 3††
Optimal rating of structure and facility at last visit					
	(N=1,687)	(N=1,687)	(N=1,677)	(N=1,656)	(N=1,633)
Black	20	0.51***	0.61*	0.70	0.69
English-speaking Latina	16	0.40***	0.43***	0.47***	0.51*
Spanish-speaking Latina	10	0.22***	0.25***	0.31***	0.38**
White (ref)	33	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Optimal rating of client-staff interaction at last visit					
	(N=1,716)	(N=1,716)	(N=1,705)	(N=1,679)	(N=1,655)
Black	64	0.62*	0.63*	0.72	0.84
English-speaking Latina	64	0.61**	0.62*	0.68*	0.89
Spanish-speaking Latina	70	0.80	0.73	0.85	1.24
White (ref)	74	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Optimal rating of patient-centeredness at last visit					
	(N=1,709)	(N=1,709)	(N=1,698)	(N=1,673)	(N=1,648)
Black	64	0.58**	0.59*	0.59*	0.67†
English-speaking Latina	53	0.36***	0.35***	0.36***	0.41***
Spanish-speaking Latina	38	0.20***	0.20***	0.21***	0.25***
White (ref)	76	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Informed about different contraceptives at last visit‡‡					
	(N=1,024)	(N=1,024)	(N=1,017)	(N=1,008)	(N=1,001)
Black	82	1.56	1.36	1.05	1.10
English-speaking Latina	84	1.80*	1.61	1.47	1.54
Spanish-speaking Latina	84	1.72†	1.29	1.28	1.38
White (ref)	75	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Was pressured by a doctor/clinic staff to adopt a contraceptive					
	(N=1,738)	(N=1,738)	(N=1,727)		
Black	11	2.62**	2.30*	na	na
English-speaking Latina	5	1.20	0.99	na	na
Spanish-speaking Latina	3	0.75	0.55	na	na
White (ref)	5	1.00	1.00	na	na

*p<.05. **p<.01. ***p<.001. †p<.10. ‡Adjusted for age, marital status, education and parity. §Adjusted for all Model 1 covariates plus type of insurance coverage and site where care was received. ††Adjusted for all Model 2 covariates plus purpose of visit, whether care site provides general health care, clinician continuity, whether clinician was preferred gender and whether client perceived she was race-concordant with clinician. ‡‡Based on 1,032 women who received a method at visit. Notes: ref=reference group. na=not applicable. Percentages and odds ratios are weighted; sample sizes are unweighted.