

Table 2. Percentage of visits exhibiting quality care, by measurement instrument; percentage agreement between instruments; kappa coefficients indicating strength of agreement; and assessment of bias—for all three countries combined, by quality of care indicator

Indicator	Observations	Interviews	Agreement	Kappa	Evidence of bias*
Provider actions with client (objective)					
Provider discusses with client which method she would prefer†	88	93	85	0.71	No
Provider gives instructions on when to return	89	86	83	0.66	Yes
Provider asks client if she has any concerns or problems‡	86	86	79	0.57	No
Provider discusses client's fertility intentions§	51	49	65	0.30	No
Information given to client (objective)					
Provider tells client how to use the method**	87	90	85	0.69	No
Provider mentions STDs or HIV/AIDS	15	23	78	0.56	Yes
Provider gives information on side effects**	74	73	74	0.48	No
Provider encourages dual method use††	32	48	74	0.47	Yes
Provider explains that method does not protect against HIV/AIDS††	21	48	63	0.26	Yes
Provider gives accurate information on the method accepted**	87	91	84	0.67	Yes
Interpersonal relations (subjective)					
Provider treats client with respect/courtesy	99	99	99	0.98	No
Client receives her method of choice†	83	84	90	0.80	No
Provider sees client in private for counseling	95	91	88	0.75	Yes
Facility offers privacy for pelvic examination/IUD insertion‡‡	99	94	93	0.86	Yes

*Based on McNemar's test for bias, $p < .05$. †New clients with a method preference (N=347). ‡Returning clients (N=653). §New clients only (N=512). **New clients who received a method in Ecuador (N=447). ††New clients who received a nonbarrier method (N=408). ‡‡Clients receiving a pelvic examination or having an IUD inserted (N=575). Note: Kappa coefficients, which correct for the proportion of responses that would agree because of chance alone, are adjusted for prevalence and bias.