

**TABLE 4. Adjusted prevalence ratios (and 95% confidence intervals) from multivariate binomial regression models examining associations between quality of care measures and current use of modern contraceptives among urban Kenyan women aged 15–49**

Characteristic	Full sample‡	Restricted sample§
FACILITY AUDITS		
<b>Choice of methods</b>		
Composite variable for method choice	0.98 (0.91–1.05)	1.06 (0.96–1.18)
No. of methods provided and not out of stock in previous year	1.01 (0.98–1.03)	1.02 (0.99–1.05)
Mix of methods provided and not out of stock in previous year	1.10 (0.98–1.23)†	1.15 (0.99–1.34)†
<b>Family planning integration</b>		
With child health services	1.09 (0.93–1.28)	1.09 (0.90–1.32)
With postpartum services	1.02 (0.87–1.19)	0.99 (0.84–1.17)
With HIV services	1.05 (0.90–1.23)	1.02 (0.85–1.22)
<b>Facility infrastructure/readiness</b>		
Composite variable for basic items	0.96 (0.89–1.05)	0.99 (0.89–1.10)
Family planning guidelines	0.96 (0.86–1.07)	0.92 (0.79–1.06)
Quality assurance measures in place	1.05 (0.95–1.17)	1.04 (0.92–1.18)
PROVIDER INTERVIEWS		
<b>Choice of methods</b>		
Discusses different methods with clients	1.02 (0.91–1.14)	1.07 (0.92–1.23)
Asks client about their preferred method	1.03 (0.93–1.14)	1.14 (1.02–1.28)*
<b>Information given to clients</b>		
Helps clients select a method	1.03 (0.92–1.15)	1.11 (0.96–1.29)
Explains how to use the selected method	1.05 (0.94–1.18)	1.10 (0.97–1.26)
Explains side effects of selected method	1.12 (1.01–1.23)*	1.08 (0.95–1.23)
Discusses potential warning signs related to selected method	1.06 (0.96–1.18)	1.09 (0.95–1.24)
<b>Provider competence</b>		
Received in-service training in family planning provision	0.95 (0.85–1.06)	0.98 (0.84–1.14)
<b>Client-provider relations</b>		
Discusses reproductive goals with clients	0.99 (0.88–1.11)	1.02 (0.87–1.19)
<b>Family planning integration</b>		
With child health services	1.00 (0.87–1.14)	1.15 (0.92–1.43)
With postnatal care services	0.97 (0.85–1.10)	1.05 (0.88–1.26)
With HIV services	1.01 (0.88–1.16)	1.05 (0.85–1.28)
CLIENT EXIT INTERVIEWS		
<b>Choice of methods</b>		
Composite variable for method choice	na	1.01 (0.93–1.11)
<b>Information given to clients</b>		
Provider helped select a method	na	1.06 (1.01–1.11)*
Composite variable for information	na	0.96 (0.86–1.08)
<b>Client-provider relations</b>		
Provider asked about client's reproductive goals	na	1.05 (0.97–1.14)
Provider treated client “very well”	na	1.10 (1.01–1.19)*
Other facility staff treated client “very well”	na	1.06 (0.95–1.18)
Composite variable for bidirectional communication	na	1.00 (0.89–1.11)
<b>Follow-up mechanisms</b>		
Provider informed client when to return for resupply	na	0.97 (0.87–1.07)
<b>Client satisfaction</b>		
Believed other clients could not see them	na	0.92 (0.85–1.00)†
Believed other clients could not hear them	na	0.88 (0.73–1.05)
Believed provider would keep their information confidential	na	1.09 (0.95–1.26)
Believed she received the right amount of information	na	0.98 (0.82–1.17)
Felt waiting time was satisfactory	na	0.97 (0.89–1.06)
Felt satisfied overall with services	na	0.96 (0.82–1.14)
Composite variable for satisfaction	na	1.17 (1.02–1.35)*

\*p<.05. †p<.10. ‡Full weighted sample (N=2,949). §Sample restricted to observations linked to a higher volume facility where client exit interviews were conducted (N=1,887). Notes: na=not applicable. All models are adjusted for age, education, marital status, religion, wealth and slum residence.