a number of ways from those who did not (see appendix, page 23). The findings may be somewhat influenced by these biases. However, the study design largely depended on the use of panel data.

Measures
Five spousal communication questionnaire items were included in all three waves of the survey: whether couples had ever discussed family planning, whether they had discussed it in the past 12 months and whether they intended to discuss it; whether women believed their spouse approved of family planning; and whether they were aware of the number of children their spouse wanted.

The spousal communication items were treated individually and combined into an index, because factor analysis showed that they covaried on one factor. The index was calculated as follows: for each item, a positive response was given a score of one, and a negative response was scored zero. The scores for the five items were added together, and the sum was divided by five to obtain the index value, which thus may range from zero to one. Reliability coefficients (Cronbach’s alpha) for the index were within acceptable limits: 0.75 (wave one), 0.73 (wave two) and 0.64 (wave three).

Exposure to the campaign was measured by a questionnaire item that asked respondents whether they had ever listened to Cut Your Coat According to Your Cloth. Family planning use was measured by a question asking women if they were currently using any contraceptive method (traditional or modern).

Hypotheses were tested by bivariate analyses of the relationship between spousal communication and campaign exposure, demographic factors and psychosocial factors. Psychosocial factors reflect the implicit power structure within a couple’s relationship and are measured by an item that asked the respondent who makes decisions about family planning—her husband, she herself or the two jointly.

We used multivariate models to determine if spousal communication was associated with campaign exposure after demographic variables (age, education, occupation and number of children) were controlled for. Logistic regression models were computed separately for each spousal communication item. Spousal communication items at wave three were modeled as the dependent variables, and lagged variables for those items from the previous two waves were included as independent variables.

Similarly, both bivariate and multivariate analyses were conducted to identify determinants of family planning use. We used bivariate analyses to assess the relationship between family planning use and psychosocial variables. We employed multivariate techniques to determine whether family planning use was associated with exposure to the drama serial, once we had controlled for spousal communication, family planning use at previous time periods, desire to stop childbearing prior to radio program exposure and demographic variables.

Finally, to clarify the association of family planning use with spousal communication and radio drama exposure across the three waves, we used structural equation modeling, a statistical technique that identifies the simultaneous influences of multiple independent and dependent variables. These analyses assess how exposure to the radio drama serial and previously held attitudes influenced spousal communication about family planning and suggest pathways through which contraceptive use may have been affected.

RESULTS
Sample Characteristics
Overall, only 22% of women in the sample had ever attended school (Table 1). About three-quarters of women reported agriculture as their occupation. Twenty-five percent reported either not being employed or working in nonagricultural activities, such as in small industries and service-related occupations. Eight in 10 reported a monthly household expenditure of 3,000 rupees (US $40) or less. About 30% of respondents were 25 or younger, and 25% were aged 26–30. On average, respondents had had 3.8 children (SD=2.11; not shown). The sample was ethnically diverse.

Spousal Communication
At their first interview, 80% of women said that they had ever discussed family planning with their spouse, 54% had done so within the past year and 52% intended to do so (Table 2). The vast majority reported that their husband approved of family planning (81%) and that they knew how many children he wanted (83%). In the subsequent surveys, the proportion reporting having had a family planning discussion in the past year were lower, while all other indicators of communication were higher, by 1999, nearly all women said that they knew their husband’s desired number of children.

In bivariate analyses, respondents who were exposed to the drama serial showed a significantly greater increase in the spousal communication index from baseline to the 1997 follow-up interview than those not exposed (0.15 vs. 0.09; p<.001). No significant differences were evident between 1997 and 1999, however. This pattern may have methodological and programmatic explanations: First, when the level of communication is already high, the potential for further gains is limited. Second, the radio spots were aired in a number of ways from those who did not (see appendix, page 23). The findings may be somewhat influenced by these biases. However, the study design largely depended on the use of panel data.