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Motivation

- Family planning service provision is a **bidirectional** process, where:
  1. clients have a set of prior beliefs (fertility/spacing/method...)
  2. providers guide clients to realize their preferences and achieve desired outcomes (fertility-related or others)
- The contraceptive prevalence rate has been increasing in Malawi, from 46.1% (MDHS 2010) to 59.2% (DHS 2015-16)
- In spite of this increase in CPR, are women using the “right methods” that reflect their preferences?
  - Around 37% discontinued their contraceptive methods in less than 12 months, which suggests that frictions exist in women’s realization of their ideal method.
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Motivation

- Current family planning practice in Malawi may not be user-centered:
  - Counselors introduce all FP methods following the FP ‘Kulera’ counseling flipchart as specified by MOH.
  - Aim of this approach: to achieve “informed choice” - clients informed about all possible methods.

- How well does such a counseling approach do in helping women make informed decisions?
  - Informed decisions: update beliefs and preferences and act on these updated preferences.
  - Group counseling.
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- Current family planning practice in Malawi may not be user-centered:
  - Counselors introduce all FP methods following the FP ‘Kulera’ counseling flipchart as specified by MOH.
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Motivation

Current family planning practice in Malawi may not be user-centered:

- Counselors introduce all FP methods following the FP ‘Kulera’ counseling flipchart as specified by MOH.
- Aim of this approach: to achieve “informed choice” - clients informed about all possible methods.

How well does such a counseling approach do in helping women make informed decisions?

- Informed decisions: update beliefs and preferences and act on these updated preferences.
- Group counseling.
This Paper

- Tests a **user-centered counseling approach** aimed to help women **identify** and **realize** their true preferences for contraceptive methods
- Implements a RCT to examine the role of user-centered counseling on clients’ **concordance between stated and revealed preferences**
- Investigates two channels through which user-centered information provision affects concordance between stated and revealed preferences: **male involvement** and **tailored counseling**
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Preview of Results

- Women **who received the short counseling procedure** were:
  - **slightly more likely** to change their stated ideal method over time
  - **less likely** to have picked up their stated ideal method at follow-up
  - **more unsatisfied** with their currently used method at follow-up
Women who were encouraged to invite their husband to counseling were:

- less likely to change their ideal method from counseling to follow-up
- more likely to switch from their currently used method to another method from counseling to follow-up (marginally significant)
- more likely to pick up their stated ideal method at follow-up
- not more satisfied with their current method at follow-up
Experiment Design

Household Screening, Recruitment
Use DHS enumeration area maps, census listings, and community directories

1112 Households Selected

Baseline Survey

T1: First Arm
Detailed FP information package, private counseling, transportation, side effects counseling, reimbursement, 13 choices in counseling, husband invitations

782 Women Selected

Randomization

223 Participants

T0: Control
Detailed FP information package, private counseling, transportation, side effects counseling, reimbursement, 13 choices in counseling, no husband invitations

108 Participants

224 Participants

T2: Second Arm
Detailed FP information package, private counseling, transportation, side effects counseling, reimbursement, 5 choices in counseling, no husband invitations

T3: Third Arm
Detailed FP information package, private counseling, transportation, side effects counseling, reimbursement, 5 choices in counseling, husband invitations

227 Participants
Two Interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Husband</th>
<th>Husband</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long Counseling</td>
<td>T0: 108</td>
<td>T1: 223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Counseling</td>
<td>T2: 224</td>
<td>T3: 227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Husband Invitation option** to let the woman choose whether to invite her husband to the FP counseling session
  - differs from existing studies on male involvement
  - provides the “option” to invite husband rather than “inform them” they were assigned to receive couple counseling
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Tailored Short Counseling Procedure

1. elicits woman’s preferred method attribute and the rank of attributes if more than one attribute was chosen
2. counsels women on methods mapped to the most preferred attribute
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Tailored Short Counseling Procedure

1. **elicits woman’s preferred method attribute and the rank of attributes** if more than one attribute was chosen

2. counsels women on methods mapped to the most preferred attribute
Post Counseling Services

Following counseling, women receive a bundle of free FP services for one month starting from the counseling day.

Three Components:

1. Free transportation to the Good Health Kauma Clinic
2. Coverage of all FP-related expenditure incurred during the service period
3. Free mobile credit to women to make appointments by phone with field manager / taxi driver
### Summary Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary statistics</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of children</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desired Num. of Children</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently working</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First cohabitation age</td>
<td>18.04</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived w/ men once or more</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current/Ever Contraceptive usage</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Use</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 1 Attribute</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight to top 1 attribute</td>
<td>16.54</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to switch methods</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband Supportiveness towards Contraception</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Currently working refers to women’s working status at the baseline. First cohabitation age refers to the age at which women started to live with her (first) husband. Top attribute refers to whether the top method attribute is effectiveness or not. Weight to top attribute refers to the number of beans (out of 20 beans) the woman assigned to their top method attribute. Intention to switch methods is woman’s answer to the question, “if you had the choice to switch to another method, would you like to switch?” Husband approval towards contraception refers to the question, “on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being strongly supportive and 5 being strongly opposed, how do you believe your husband feels towards using family planning methods?”
Empirical Framework

\[ Y_i = \alpha + \beta_S \cdot \text{Short}_i + \mathbf{X}_i \gamma + \varepsilon_i \] (1)

\[ Y_i = \alpha + \beta_H \cdot \text{Husb}_i + \mathbf{X}_i \gamma + \varepsilon_i \] (2)

where:

- \( Y_i \): outcome variable of interest - stated ideal method, used method, uptake of ideal method, and concordance of current use and the ideal method
- \( \text{Short}_i \): short counseling treatment, i.e., tailored counseling
- \( \text{Husb}_i \): husband invitation treatment, i.e., the option to invite husband to receive counseling
- \( \mathbf{X}_i \): a vector of baseline control variables - women’s age, contraceptive use, chosen method attribute, total number of children, working status, ethnicity (Chewa or others)
- Area fixed effects are controlled and standard errors are heterogeneity-robust
Results - Short Counseling

- Women who received short counseling were:
  - Slightly but not significantly more likely to change their stated ideal method from counseling to follow-up by 7.8 percent
  - Less likely to have picked up their stated ideal method at follow-up by 16.8 percent
  - More unsatisfied with their currently used method at follow-up by 12.1 percent

  - Their relative inability to act on their change in preferences (in spite of increased access from FP package)
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  - **slightly but not significantly more likely** to change their stated ideal method from counseling to follow-up by 7.8 percent
  - **less likely** to have picked up their stated ideal method at follow-up by 16.8 percent
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Results - Husband Invitation

Women in the husband invitation group were:

- less likely to change their ideal method from counseling to follow-up by 15.0 percent (Husband Ideal Method Change)
- more likely to switch from their currently used method to another method from counseling to follow-up by 25.4 percent (marginally significant) (Husband Current Method Change)
- more likely to pick up their stated ideal method at follow-up by 17.0 percent, but were no more satisfied with their current method at follow-up (Husband Uptake of Stated Ideal Method) (Husband Switching Intention)
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Quotes:

- "I..."
Results - Husband Invitation

Women in the husband invitation group were:

- **less likely** to change their ideal method from counseling to follow-up by 15.0 percent.
- **more likely** to switch from their currently used method to another method from counseling to follow-up by 25.4 percent (marginally significant).
- **more likely** to pick up their stated ideal method at follow-up by 17.0 percent, but were **no more satisfied** with their current method at follow-up.
While both interventions seek to prioritize women’s preferences, and move closer towards the goal of “helping women make informed choices on FP”, neither approach likely gives strictly preferred outcomes.

While short counseling encouraged women to (slightly more) freely express and change contraceptive preferences over time, preferences were hardly realized.
Discussion

- While both interventions seek to **prioritize women’s preferences**, and move closer towards the goal of “helping women make informed choices on FP”, **neither approach likely gives strictly preferred outcomes**

- While short counseling encouraged women to (slightly more) freely express and change contraceptive preferences over time, **preferences were hardly realized**
While encouraging women to invite their husbands motivated them to realize their preferences, it discouraged women’s expression of true preferences. Women’s stated preferences, conditional on inviting their husbands, have internalized husband’s preferences. This may lead to a deviation of stated ideal method from their personal preferred contraceptive method.
Conclusions / Next Steps

- It would be necessary to further explore the trade-off women face between
  1. making independent decisions to reflect their individual preferences, and
  2. incorporating their husband’s / family’s preferences to make “jointly / socially better-off,” but not necessarily “individually better off”, decisions

- The current sample size is too small to allow for the examination of interaction effects

- Additional research is warranted to better understand women’s true preferences expressed without husband’s participation
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Related Literature

- **Family Planning Counseling**
  - Conducts a randomized controlled trial to understand factors that affect concordance of women’s preferences and choices

- **Cognitive overload, attribute salience, the Paradox of Choice**
  - Provides evidence on the role of attribute salience in choice-making in the family planning realm
Related Literature, Cont’d

**Male Involvement in Family Planning Counseling**

  
  » Leaves it up to the woman whether to invite husband to the counseling session rather than coerce couples to receive the counseling

**Choice range and switching intention**

  
  ⇒ Investigates two channels through which information provision affects concordance between stated and revealed preferences, i.e., male involvement and tailored counseling
Counseling Practice in Malawi

Note: Among 32 women who were counselled about family planning / birth spacing during last pregnancy
The Recommended FP Counseling Practice

- MOH, RHD
- Counselors introduce all 13 methods following the order in the flip chart
  - Male/Female Sterilization
  - IUD
  - Implants
  - Injectables
  - Pills/ECP
  - Male/Female Condoms
  - Standard Days Method
  - Two-Day Method
  - Rhythm Method
  - LAM
Survey Question for Eliciting Top Method Attribute

In choosing a contraceptive method, what feature(s) would be most important to you? CHOOSE ALL THAT APPLY.

- EFFECTIVE AT PREVENTING PREGNANCY
- CAN BE USED WITHOUT ANYONE ELSE KNOWING
- PROTECTS AGAINST STI/HIV
- DURATION OF EFFECT / LASTS LONG
- NO RISK OF HARMING HEALTH
- NO EFFECT ON REGULAR MONTHLY BLEEDING
- NO UNPLEASANT SIDE EFFECTS
- SHOULD NOT BE HORMONAL
- LOW COST
- EASILY AVAILABLE AT THE CLINIC
- CAN BE USED FOR A LONG TIME WITHOUT NEED TO VISIT CLINIC OR RE-SUPPLY
- WILL BE ABLE TO GET PREGNANT WHEN I WANT
- NO NEED TO GO TO A CLINIC TO OBTAIN THE METHOD
- NO RISK OF INFERTILITY
- NO NEED TO REMEMBER USING THE METHOD
- WANT TO TRY SOMETHING NEW / TIRED OF OLD METHOD
- MY DOCTOR RECOMMENDED IT TO ME
- MY HUSBAND WANTED ME TO USE THIS METHOD
- OTHER WOMEN IN MY FAMILY HAVE USED THIS METHOD
- FRIENDS HAVE USED THIS METHOD
- DOES NOT INTERRUPT SEX
- OTHER
- DON’T KNOW
- REFUSED
Eligibility Criteria for Recruitment

782 women in Lilongwe that:

1. were married
2. were between the ages of 18 and 35
3. lived in the city of Lilongwe (permanent residents)
4. were currently non-pregnant and did not give birth in the 6 months prior to the initial screening
5. had neither been sterilized nor have had a hysterectomy
6. had given birth to at least one child (one live birth) in their lifetime
7. lived with their husbands at the time of the screening
Eliciting Top Attribute

- Eliciting Women’s most valued attribute about contraceptive methods
  - 20 Counters to be allocated across at most 3 attributes
### Flip Charts - Attributes and Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flip Chart Colour</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Attributes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Blue              | 1. Sterilization  
2. IUD  
3. Implants  
4. Injectable 
5. Pill | Effective at preventing pregnancy  
Duration of effect/lasts long |
| Purple            | 1. LAM  
2. Two-day method  
3. Rhythm Method  
4. Standard Days Method  
5. Condoms | No risk of harming health  
No effect on monthly bleeding  
No unpleasant side effects  
Low-cost  
Non-risk of infertility  
Non-hormonal  
No need to go to the clinic to obtain |
| Pink              | 1. Condoms  
2. Two-day method  
3. Rhythm Method  
4. Standard Days Method  
5. IUD | Immediate return to fertility |
| Yellow            | Condoms | Protects against HIV/STI |
| Gray              | 1. IUD  
2. Implants  
3. Sterilization  
4. Pills  
5. Injectable | WANT TO TRY SOMETHING NEW / TIRED OF OLD M  
MY DOCTOR RECOMMENDED IT TO ME  
MY HUSBAND WANTED ME TO USE THIS METHOD  
OTHER WOMEN IN MY FAMILY HAVE USED THIS M  
FRIENDS HAVE USED THIS METHOD  
EASILY AVAILABLE AT CLINIC |
| Orange            | 1. Sterilization  
2. IUD  
3. Implants  
4. Injectable | No need to remember to use |
## Balance Table: Short Counseling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Short</th>
<th>Long</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>26.10</td>
<td>26.11</td>
<td>26.08</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total No. of Children at BL</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desired number of children</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently working</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First cohabitation age</td>
<td>18.04</td>
<td>18.05</td>
<td>18.01</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived w/ men once or more</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current/Ever use of FP</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current use of FP</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top attribute is effectiveness</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight to top attribute</td>
<td>16.54</td>
<td>16.59</td>
<td>16.46</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to switch methods</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband supports FP</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Observations**  
782  
451  
331  
782

*Note: Currently working refers to women's working status at the baseline. First cohabitation age refers to the age at which women started to live with her (first) husband. Top attribute refers to whether the top method attribute is effectiveness or not. Weight to top attribute refers to the number of beans (out of 20 beans) the woman assigned to their top method attribute. Intention to switch methods is woman's answer to the question, “if you had the choice to switch to another method, would you like to switch?” Husband approval towards contraception refers to the question, “on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being strongly supportive and 5 being strongly opposed, how do you believe your husband feels towards using family planning methods?”*
## Balance Table: Husband Invitation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Husband</th>
<th>No Husband</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>26.10</td>
<td>26.22</td>
<td>25.93</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total No. of Children at BL</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desired number of children</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently working</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First cohabitation age</td>
<td>18.04</td>
<td>18.05</td>
<td>18.02</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived w/ men once or more</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current/Ever use of FP</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current use of FP</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top attribute is effectiveness</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight to top attribute</td>
<td>16.54</td>
<td>16.61</td>
<td>16.44</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to switch methods</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband supports FP</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observations</strong></td>
<td><strong>782</strong></td>
<td><strong>450</strong></td>
<td><strong>332</strong></td>
<td><strong>782</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Short Counseling - Ten Flip charts

- All flipcharts corresponding to all “top attributes”
ID cards

Figure 1: Women’s ID cards for picking up services
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The Good Health Kauma Clinic
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# Short Counseling - Ideal Method Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unadjusted</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
<th>Controls</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
<th>More Controls</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short Counseling ($l = Yes$)</td>
<td>0.0320</td>
<td>0.0305</td>
<td>0.0349</td>
<td>0.0377</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.0470,0.111]</td>
<td>[-0.0492,0.110]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Counseling ($l = Yes$)</td>
<td>0.0438</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0392</td>
<td>0.0397</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.0350,0.123]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.0404,0.119]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>627</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Outcome in Control</td>
<td>0.438</td>
<td>0.431</td>
<td>0.438</td>
<td>0.431</td>
<td>0.431</td>
<td>0.431</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The dependent variable is a dummy taking the value of 1 if the follow-up ideal method differs from the pre-counseling ideal method. Area fixed effects are included, and heteroscedasticity-robust standard errors are presented.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$
## Table 3: End of Counseling Ideal Method and Follow-up Current Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unadjusted</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
<th>Controls</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
<th>More Controls</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short Counseling (1 = Yes)</strong></td>
<td>ITT</td>
<td>0.0898**</td>
<td>0.0813**</td>
<td>0.0709**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.0113,0.168]</td>
<td>[0.0053,0.158]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.0058,0.148]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short Counseling (1 = Yes)</strong></td>
<td>ITT</td>
<td>0.0949***</td>
<td>0.0856**</td>
<td>0.0760**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.0169,0.173]</td>
<td>[0.0095,0.162]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.0062,0.153]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observations</strong></td>
<td>639</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjusted R²</strong></td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean Outcome in Control</strong></td>
<td>0.423</td>
<td>0.420</td>
<td>0.423</td>
<td>0.420</td>
<td>0.420</td>
<td>0.420</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The dependent variable is a dummy taking the value of 1 if the follow-up current method differs from the end-of-counseling ideal method women wanted to pick up at the clinic. Area fixed effects are included, and heteroscedasticity-robust standard errors are presented.

* p < 0.1, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01

Go Back
### Short Counseling - Switching Intention

#### Table 2: Current Method and Ideal Method at the Follow-up Session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unadjusted ITT</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
<th>Controls ITT</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
<th>More Controls ITT</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short Counseling (1 = Yes)</td>
<td>0.0755**</td>
<td>[0.00201, 0.153]</td>
<td>0.0669**</td>
<td>[-0.00848, 0.142]</td>
<td>0.0674**</td>
<td>[-0.00898, 0.144]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Counseling (1 = Yes)</td>
<td>0.0841**</td>
<td>[0.00666, 0.161]</td>
<td>0.0727**</td>
<td>[-0.00256, 0.148]</td>
<td>0.0743**</td>
<td>[-0.00209, 0.151]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Outcome in Control</td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td>0.551</td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td>0.551</td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td>0.551</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The dependent variable is a dummy taking the value of 1 if the follow-up ideal method differs from the follow-up current method. Area fixed effects are included, and heteroscedasticity-robust standard errors are presented.

* p < 0.1, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01
### Table 4: Pre-Counseling and Follow-up Ideal Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unadjusted ITT</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
<th>Controls ITT</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
<th>More Controls ITT</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Husband</td>
<td>-0.0706***</td>
<td>[0.0149, 0.00822]</td>
<td>-0.0772**</td>
<td>[-0.157, 0.00225]</td>
<td>-0.0745**</td>
<td>[-0.155, 0.00581]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0116</td>
<td>[0.0940, 0.117]</td>
<td>0.0227</td>
<td>[0.0828, 0.128]</td>
<td>0.0164</td>
<td>[0.0911, 0.124]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Outcome in Control</td>
<td>0.496</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>0.496</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>0.496</td>
<td>0.454</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The dependent variable is a dummy taking the value of 1 if the follow-up ideal method differs from the pre-counseling ideal method. Area fixed effects are included, and heteroscedasticity-robust standard errors are presented.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$
### Table 5 Counseling and Follow-up Current Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unadjusted ITT</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
<th>Controls ITT</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
<th>More Controls ITT</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Husband</td>
<td>0.0443</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0430</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0386</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.0149,0.104]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.0160,0.102]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.0205,0.0977]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband</td>
<td>0.0788</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0837</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0917</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.0086,0.166]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.0036,0.171]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.0039,0.179]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>637</td>
<td></td>
<td>636</td>
<td></td>
<td>635</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Outcome in Control</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The dependent variable is a dummy taking the value of 1 if the follow-up current method differs from counseling used method. Area fixed effects are included, and heteroscedasticity-robust standard errors are presented.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$
Table 7: End-of-Counseling Ideal Method and Follow-up Current Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unadjusted ITT</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
<th>Controls IIT</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
<th>More Controls IIT</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Husband</td>
<td>-0.0865**</td>
<td>[-0.165,-0.00808]</td>
<td>-0.0882**</td>
<td>[-0.165,-0.0112]</td>
<td>-0.0889**</td>
<td>[-0.166,-0.0117]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.491</td>
<td>0.524</td>
<td>0.491</td>
<td>0.524</td>
<td>0.491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>0.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Outcome in Control</td>
<td>0.524</td>
<td>0.491</td>
<td>0.524</td>
<td>0.491</td>
<td>0.524</td>
<td>0.491</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The dependent variable is a dummy taking the value of 1 if the follow-up current method differs from the end-of-counseling ideal method women wanted to pick up at the clinic. Area fixed effects are included, and heteroscedasticity-robust standard errors are presented.

* p < 0.1, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01
### Table 6: Current Method and Ideal Method at the Follow-up Session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unadjusted ITT</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
<th>Controls ITT</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
<th>More Controls ITT</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Husband</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.0275</td>
<td>(0.104, 0.0495)</td>
<td>-0.0320</td>
<td>(0.107, 0.0429)</td>
<td>-0.0282</td>
<td>(0.104, 0.0475)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Husband</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.0334</td>
<td>(0.140, 0.0733)</td>
<td>-0.00616</td>
<td>(0.112, 0.0997)</td>
<td>-0.00209</td>
<td>(0.108, 0.104)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observations</strong></td>
<td>637</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjusted R²</strong></td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean Outcome in Control</strong></td>
<td>0.615</td>
<td>0.605</td>
<td>0.615</td>
<td>0.605</td>
<td>0.615</td>
<td>0.605</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The dependent variable is a dummy taking the value of 1 if the follow-up ideal method differs from the follow-up current method. Area fixed effects are included, and heteroscedasticity-robust standard errors are presented.

* p < 0.1, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01