

TABLE 3. Unadjusted relative risk ratios (and 95% confidence intervals) from multinomial logistic regression analysis identifying associations between contraceptive method use and selected characteristics

Characteristic	Nonawareness method vs. no method	Awareness method vs. no method
RELATIONSHIP QUALITY		
Commitment score		
Women	1.00 (0.96–1.05)	1.02 (0.97–1.07)
Men	1.07 (0.95–1.22)	1.08 (1.03–1.12)***
Trust score		
Women	0.99 (0.95–1.04)	1.02 (0.94–1.10)
Men	1.05 (0.99–1.12)	1.04 (0.97–1.11)
Constructive communication score		
Women	1.00 (0.97–1.03)	1.05 (1.03–1.06)***
Men	1.05 (0.98–1.12)	1.16 (1.13–1.18)***
Destructive communication score		
Women	1.06 (0.98–1.15)	1.05 (0.99–1.12)
Men	0.93 (0.84–1.02)	0.97 (0.87–1.09)
Satisfaction score		
Women	0.96 (0.85–1.09)	1.17 (1.01–1.34)*
Men	1.35 (0.94–1.95)	1.31 (0.83–2.07)
WOMEN		
Age		
	0.94 (0.91–0.98)***	0.95 (0.90–1.00)
Education (yrs.)		
	1.07 (1.04–1.11)***	1.09 (0.91–1.31)
Religion		
Christian (ref)	1.00	1.00
Muslim	0.46 (0.26–0.83)**	0.68 (0.30–1.58)
HOUSEHOLD/COUPLE		
Household wealth quintile		
Lowest (ref)	1.00	1.00
Lower	1.17 (0.59–2.31)	1.24 (0.28–5.44)
Middle	0.86 (0.45–1.63)	1.22 (0.90–1.64)
Higher	0.59 (0.21–1.64)	1.29 (0.51–3.29)
Highest	0.75 (0.40–1.41)	1.80 (0.59–5.44)
Relationship type		
Monogamous (ref)	1.00	1.00
Polygynous	0.27 (0.15–0.48)***	0.12 (0.01–2.41)
Relationship status		
Married (ref)	1.00	1.00
Cohabiting	1.17 (0.31–4.45)	0.90 (0.21–3.80)
Relationship duration (yrs.)		
	0.98 (0.95–1.01)	0.97 (0.94–0.99)*
Difference in age (yrs.)		
	0.96 (0.92–1.01)	0.98 (0.95–1.02)
Difference in education (yrs.)		
	0.96 (0.94–0.98)***	1.03 (0.96–1.10)
No. of children		
	1.01 (0.87–1.17)	0.93 (0.74–1.16)

* $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$. *** $p \leq .001$. Notes: Nonawareness methods include the injectable, pill, IUD, implants and diaphragm. Awareness methods include periodic abstinence, withdrawal, condoms and spermicides. ref=reference group.