

**TABLE 2. Odds ratios from multivariate logistic regressions assessing the association of local service environment and women's characteristics with current contraceptive use, by area of residence, DISH districts, 1999**

Characteristic	Rural (N=1,053)	Urban (N=650)
<b>LOCAL SERVICE ENVIRONMENT</b>		
<b>No. and type of facilities offering family planning services</b>		
≥2 government	1.25	0.97
≥1 private	0.84	2.08*
≥1 NGO	1.18	0.96
<b>No. of facilities and contraceptive choice</b>		
≥2 facilities offering all 3 supply methods†	1.70	1.22
≥1 facility offering ≥1 long-term method‡	0.95	0.59*
<b>No. of facilities with family planning signposts/posters/flipcharts</b>		
≥1	0.77	0.54
0	1.00	1.00
<b>No. of DISH-trained staff in local facilities</b>		
≥3	0.78	1.68*
<3	1.00	1.00
<b>INDIVIDUAL</b>		
<b>Age-group</b>		
15-19	1.00	1.00
20-29	1.53	3.54***
30-39	2.86*	2.44*
40-49	2.02	3.21*
<b>Marital status</b>		
Never-married	1.00	1.00
Currently in union	0.57	1.09
Formerly in union	0.30*	0.68
<b>Parity</b>		
0	1.00	1.00
1-3	2.57*	2.18*
≥4	3.37*	3.37*
<b>Ethnicity</b>		
Luganda	0.71	1.41*
Runyankole	0.54*	0.98
Other	1.00	1.00
<b>Education</b>		
None	1.00	1.00
Primary	4.64***	1.37
≥secondary	9.91***	2.85*

\*p<.05.\*\*\*p<.001. †The pill, injectable and male condom. ‡The IUD, the implant, tubal ligation and vasectomy. Note: For the dichotomous variables measuring the number and type of local facilities offering family planning in general, and of supply and long-term methods in particular, the respective reference categories are fewer such facilities, and thus more limited access. Sixty-one women were dropped from the analysis because data were missing on one or more variables.