Journal of Community Medicine and Primary Health Care. 31 (1) 48-56



# JOURNAL OF COMMUNITY MEDICINE AND PRIMARY HEALTH CARE

**ORIGINAL ARTICLE** 

## Determinants of Desire for Child spacing among Women attending a Family Planning Clinic in Kaduna, North Western Nigeria

Oyefabi A<sup>1</sup>, Adelekan B<sup>2</sup>, Nmadu AG<sup>1</sup>, Abdullahi KM<sup>3</sup>

- <sup>1</sup>Department of Community Medicine, College of Medicine, Kaduna State University, Nigeria
- <sup>2</sup>Academy for Health Development, Ife, Osun State; Ipas, Abuja. Nigeria.
- <sup>3</sup>Nigeria Urban and Reproductive Health Initiative, Kaduna

### **Keywords:**

Family planning, Child spacing, Child limiting, Nigeria

#### **ABSTRACT**

**Background:** Family planning (FP) refers to a conscious effort by a couple to limit or space the number of children they want using contraceptive methods. This study examined the determinants for child spacing among women of reproductive age at the family planning clinic of the Ungwan-Rimi Primary Health Care facility, Kaduna North LGA, North western, Nigeria.

**Methods:** The study was a retrospective cross-sectional review of the records of 1351 clients who accessed FP services at the facility between June 2010 and May 2017. A proforma was used to extract required information from the clients' records. Data was analyzed using the IBM SPSS Version 25.0 and STATA/SE 12. Statistical significance was set at p<0.05

**Results:** The median (IQR) age of the clients was 27 (8.0) years. Majority 883 (65.4%) completed at least secondary education. A greater proportion of the clients' 1119 (82.8%) desired child spacing compared to child limiting 232 (17.2%). Bivariate analysis showed that younger age (p<0.001), attainment of up to a secondary education (p=0.04), parity < 4, (p<0.001) and last child birth (LCB)  $\leq$ 1year, (p<0.001) were significantly associated with desire for child spacing. Multiple logistic regression analysis further revealed that the older age group  $\geq$  35 years (AOR=3.72, 95%CI=2.21-6.63) parity of  $\geq$  4 (AOR=2.35, 95%CI = 1.6-3.46) and use of long acting reversible contraceptive (LARC) (AOR=1.40, 95%CI=1.02-1.91) were significantly associated with increased odds of no desire for child spacing.

**Conclusion:** This study shows that clients' age group, parity and preference for LARC influenced behavioral attitudes for child spacing.

Correspondence to:

Dr. Adegboyega Oyefabi Department of Community Medicine, College of Medicine, Kaduna State University, Nigeria. E: mail: oyefabiadegboyega@yahoo.co.uk

#### INTRODUCTION

Family planning (FP) is one of the most costeffective interventions to improve maternal and child health outcomes especially in developing countries.<sup>1-2</sup> The World Health Organization defines FP as the ability of individuals and couples to anticipate and attain their desired number of children and the spacing and timing of their births. This is achieved through usage of modern contraceptive devices and the treatment of involuntary infertility.<sup>3-4</sup> FP enables women not only to plan the time for pregnancy, but also allows for child spacing; therefore, it helps to reduce unwanted pregnancies, unsafe abortions and maternal deaths from the high risk pregnancies.<sup>5</sup> The Nigeria maternal mortality ratio is currently the fourth highest

globally with an estimated 160 maternal deaths per day, the majority of which is from the northern Nigeria, where the contraceptive prevalence rate is also the lowest.<sup>6-7</sup> Previous studies had revealed that there could be a two-thirds reduction in the rate of maternal and neonatal deaths through the use of modern contraceptive devices.<sup>8, 9</sup> Strengthening family planning services therefore, is essential for improving health, promoting human rights and socio-economic development.<sup>10</sup>

The general fertility rate (GFR) of 190 births per 1,000 women reported in the 2013 Nigeria National Demographic and Health Survey (NDHS) was three times higher than that of USA (62/1000).<sup>11</sup> The Nigerian mean total fertility rate (TFR) of 6.2 was also about three times higher than those of Sweden (1.9), United Arab Emirate (UAE) (1.7) and South Africa (2.5).12 However, the gross domestic products (GDPs) for Sweden, South Africa and United Arab Emirate were twenty-five, fifteen and two times higher, respectively than the Nigeria's meager GDP of 2,178 USD in 2016.13 This may imply that uncontrolled birth is a trigger for poverty at the individual, community and national levels. The Nigeria Multiple Indicator Cluster survey (MICS) 2017 also revealed that the contraceptive prevalence rate (CPR), utilization of modern contraceptive devices and unmet need for FP in Nigeria were 15%, 10% and 16%, respectively.14 These maternal health indices have contributed to the increasing Nigeria population currently estimated at 198 million and an average annual urban population growth rate of 6.5%.15 This has negative impact on the national economy, environment, health and social infrastructures, with the consequent challenges of unemployment, poverty, crime and insecurity. Thus, a preventive check on child birth rate proposed by the Malthusian theory of population growth is inevitable in the Nigeria situation.16 The NDHS 2013

showed that Kaduna State had the lowest TFR (4.1) in the country and the highest CPR of 20.2 in northern Nigeria, but also had the highest proportion (21%) of women of reproductive age group (WRAG) who were currently pregnant in the country. This implies that the discontinuation rate of the modern contraceptive utilization may also be high among these women.

This study therefore examined the socioreproductive demographic and health determinants of the desire for child spacing among the clients at the Family planning clinic in Kaduna State University's Urban Primary Health Care Centre (PHC) at Ungwan-Rimi, Kaduna. Majority of women and children get essential health care services at the PHCs in Nigeria which is the first point of contact with the national health system of the country.<sup>18</sup> Understanding the factors influencing contraceptive uptake at this level of health care service delivery can therefore help to understand the appropriate programme interventions to improve both the quality and uptake of FP services, which would in turn improve maternal and child health and consequently foster socio-economic development in line with the Sustainable Development Goal 3.

#### **METHODOLOGY**

This study was a retrospective, cross-sectional review of the records of 1351 clients who accessed FP services at the Kaduna State University's Urban Primary Health Care (PHC) centre in Ungwan-Rimi Kaduna North LGA between June 2010 and May 2017. The centre serves 13 contiguous communities with an estimated population of 27,000. The study population were women of reproductive age group (15-49 years) who accessed FP services at the facility. The inclusion criteria were the clients whose FP information such as the sociodemographic profile, desire for FP or child

spacing, child limiting, parity, type of contraceptives and sources of FP information could be obtained from the available records. The study excluded those with incomplete or no record.

A proforma was used to extract the required information of the clients from the clients' file which was collated into an excel file and transferred into computer using a SPSS format. Data of 1351 WRAG were used for the study. The data entry was done with the IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 25.0. (Armonk, NY: IBM Corp) while the StataCorp STATA/SE 12 (StataCorp.2011; Stata Statistical Software: Release 12, College Station, TX; StataCorp LP) was used for both descriptive and inferential analyses. The frequencies and the percentages of the sociodemographic and clinical profiles of the patients were computed. For the bivariate analysis, chi-square was used to determine the factors associated with the uptake of the FP methods. The level of statistical significance was set at p < 0.05.

The primary outcome variable was the desire for child spacing. The predictor variables identified from the patients' records were age, the parity, educational status, religion, source of FP information, outcome of last pregnancy, and contraceptive method used. Multivariate analysis was carried out through logistic regression against these sets of independent variables to determine the predictors of desire for child spacing. Ethical clearance for the study was obtained from the Kaduna State Ministry of Health and Human Resources. The permission of the Matron-in-charge of the health facility was also obtained before data collection.

#### **RESULTS**

The median (IQR) age of the 1351 clients was 27 (30.75) years with the highest proportion of the WRAG 698 (51.7%) being between 25-34 years.

Majority had completed at least a secondary education 883 (65.4%). More than three-quarters of clients 1102 (81.6%) received information about FP from clinic personnel compared to other sources. More clients 780 (57.7%) utilized the short acting (SARC) compared to the long acting reversible contraceptives (LARC). Majority 783 (54.4%) had less than 4 children and 1308 (96.8%) had no complication in their last delivery. A greater proportion of the clients, 1119 (82.8%) came to the clinic for child spacing rather than child limiting 232 (17.2%) **Table 1** 

Bivariate analysis showed a significant relationship between younger age group (p<0.001), at least a secondary level of education (p=0.04), parity < 4 (p<0.001), year of last child birth (LCB)  $\leq$  1year (p<0.001), and increased desire for child spacing. **Table 2** 

The multiple logistic regression analysis further revealed that older age group  $\geq 35$  years (AOR = 3.72, 95%CI = 2.21-6.63), clients' parity of  $\geq 4$  (AOR = 2.35, 95%CI = 1.6-3.46) and use of long acting reversible contraceptives (AOR = 1.40, 95%CI = 1.02-1.91) were associated with the increased odds of no desire for child spacing. **Table 3** 

#### **DISCUSSION**

This study showed that most of the women who accessed the FP services came for child spacing rather than child limiting. This is typical of the many African communities where socio-cultural values favour the desire for many children. <sup>19-20</sup> Birth spacing techniques therefore remain the preferable method of contraception rather than permanent methods of family planning in these setting since many of the women still hope to have more children for socio-cultural reasons. <sup>20</sup> This also explains the reason for the preference for the SARC;

Table 1: Socio demographic and reproductive health profile of the clients

| health profile of               |                       |         |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------|---------|
| Variables                       | Frequency<br>(n=1351) | Percent |
| Age group                       | (11 1001)             |         |
| (years)                         |                       |         |
| 15-24                           | 439                   | 32.5    |
| 25-34                           | 698                   | 51.7    |
| ≥ 35                            | 214                   | 15. 8   |
| Median (IQR)                    |                       | 10.0    |
| age 27 (8.0)                    |                       |         |
| years                           |                       |         |
| Level of                        |                       |         |
| education                       |                       |         |
| No education                    | 202                   | 15.0    |
| Primary                         | 266                   | 19.7    |
| Secondary/Post                  | 883                   | 65.4    |
| -Secondary                      | 003                   | 05.4    |
| Religion                        |                       |         |
| Muslim                          | 1076                  | 70.6    |
| Christian                       | 1076                  | 79.6    |
| Christian                       | 275                   | 20.4    |
| Raproductiva                    |                       |         |
| Reproductive<br>health profile  |                       |         |
| Parity                          |                       |         |
| <4                              |                       |         |
| <4<br>≥4                        | 783                   | 54.4    |
| <del></del>                     | 568                   | 45.6    |
| Last pregnancy outcome          |                       |         |
|                                 |                       |         |
| Normal                          | 1308                  | 96.8    |
| Complicated                     | 43                    | 3.2     |
| Last child birth                |                       |         |
| (years)                         |                       |         |
| ≤1                              | 1009                  | 74.7    |
| >1                              | 342                   | 25.3    |
| Type of                         |                       |         |
| contraceptives                  |                       |         |
| used                            |                       |         |
| Short acting                    |                       |         |
| reversible                      |                       |         |
| (n=780)                         |                       |         |
| Combined oral                   | 139                   | 10.3    |
| Contraceptives                  |                       |         |
| Noristerat                      | 472                   | 34.9    |
| Depo-Provera                    | 162                   | 12.0    |
| Sayana press                    | 7                     | 0.5     |
| Long acting                     |                       |         |
| reversible                      |                       |         |
| (n=571)                         |                       |         |
| Hormonal                        | 559                   | 41.4    |
| implant                         |                       |         |
| IUCD                            | 12                    | 0.9     |
| Source of FP                    |                       |         |
| information                     |                       |         |
| Clinic personnel                | 1102                  | 81.6    |
| Friends/                        | 118                   | 8.7     |
| Relatives                       | 110                   | 0.7     |
| Community                       | 70                    | 5.2     |
| outreach                        | 70                    | 5.2     |
| Mass Media                      | <i>L</i> 1            | 4 -     |
| Reason for                      | 61                    | 4.5     |
| using FP service                |                       |         |
| -                               | 4440                  | 22.5    |
| Child spacing<br>Child limiting | 1119                  | 82.8    |
| Cima mining                     | 232                   | 17.2    |

the combined oral contraceptives and injections among participants in this study, compared to the utilization of the LARC such as the IUCDs and sub dermal implants, which is consistent with findings from previous studies.21-25 However, we observed in this study that when the FP methods were considered individually, the demand for the sub-dermal implants were the highest. This increased utilization of sub-dermal implants by these women will enhance adequate child spacing which in turn will improve maternal and child health outcomes.<sup>26</sup> Previous studies have also reported increasing demand for the hormonal implant contraceptive WRAG in developing nations.<sup>27-29</sup> It was also noted in this study that fewer women with high parity (>4) came to the health facility for FP services compared to the WRAG with parity < 4. This contrasts with previous reports which associated high parity with increase demand for FP services.30-31

The reasons for the lower patronage of the FP services by women with > 4 children could not be fully explored within the scope of this quantitative study, however further analysis of the data showed that the odds for desire for child limiting was 26% higher for the Christian women as compared to the Muslim women, although it was not significant, indicating the likely influence of socio-cultural and religious beliefs on the utilization of FP Previous studies have reported the sociocultural context as a major contributor to the low utilization of FP services in Nigeria and have proposed the use of religious leaders and significant others as champions of family planning at the community level.32-34

TABLE 2: Socio-demographic and reproductive health factors associated with desire for child spacing in clients

| Variables                | Child<br>Yes (n=1119) | Spacing<br>No (n=232) | χ2    | p-value |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------|---------|
|                          | n (%)                 | n (%)                 |       |         |
| Age (years)              |                       |                       |       |         |
| 15-24                    | 398 (90.7)            | 41 (9.3)              | 136.2 | < 0.001 |
| 25-34                    | 602 (86.2)            | 96 (13.8)             |       |         |
| ≥ 35                     | 119 (55.6)            | 95 (44.4)             |       |         |
| Level of education       | , ,                   | , ,                   |       |         |
| No education             | 159 (78.7)            | 43 (21.3)             | 6.44  | 0.04    |
| Primary                  | 212 (79.7)            | 54 (20.3)             |       |         |
| Secondary/Post-Secondary | 748 (84.7)            | 135 (15.3)            |       |         |
| Religion                 | ` ,                   | ` ,                   |       |         |
| Muslim                   | 899 (83.5)            | 177 (16.5)            | 1.94  | 0.16    |
| Christian                | 220 (80.0)            | 55 (20.0)             |       |         |
| Parity                   | ` /                   | ` ,                   |       |         |
| <4                       | 707 (90.3)            | 76 (9.7)              | 72.9  | < 0.001 |
| ≥4                       | 412 (72.5)            | 156 (27.5)            |       |         |
| Last pregnancy outcome   | ` /                   | ` ,                   |       |         |
| Normal                   | 1083 (82.8)           | 225 (17.2)            | 0.03  | 0.88    |
| Complicated              | 36 (83.7)             | 7 (16.3)              |       |         |
| Last child birth (years) | , ,                   | ` ,                   |       |         |
| ≤1                       | 861 (85.3)            | 148 (14.7)            | 17.6  | < 0.001 |
| >1                       | 258 (75.4)            | 84 (24.6)             |       |         |
| Type of contraceptives   | ` /                   | ,                     |       |         |
| Short acting reversible  | 659 (84.5)            | 121 (15.5)            | 3.57  | 0.059   |
| Long acting              | 460 (80.6)            | 111 (19.4)            |       |         |
| Source of FP information | ` /                   | ` '                   |       |         |
| Clinic personnel         | 905 (82.1)            | 197 (17.9)            | 2.08  | 0.149   |
| Others                   | 214 (85.9)            | 35 (14.1)             |       |         |

Table 3: Multivariate logistic regression for predictors of no desire for child spacing among the clients

| Variables                   | Crude OR[95%CI]  | p value | Adjusted OR[95%CI] | p value |
|-----------------------------|------------------|---------|--------------------|---------|
| Age group (years)           |                  |         |                    | _       |
| 15-24                       | 1 [Ref]          |         | 1 [Ref]            |         |
| 25-34                       | 1.55[1.05-2.28]  | 0.027   | 0.99[0.64-1.53]    | 0.96    |
| ≥ 35                        | 7.74[5.09-11.79] | < 0.001 | 3.72[2.21-6.63]    | < 0.001 |
| Level of Education          |                  |         |                    |         |
| No education                | 1 [Ref]          |         | 1 [Ref]            |         |
| Primary                     | 0.94 [0.6-1.48]  | 0.79    | 1.12[0.69-1.83]    | 0.64    |
| Secondary/Post-Secondary    | 0.67 [0.45-0.98] | 0.04    | 1.05[0.69-1.61]    | 0.82    |
| Religion                    |                  |         |                    |         |
| Muslim                      | 1[Ref]           |         | 1 [Ref]            |         |
| Christian                   | 1.26 [0.91-1.78] | 0.16    | 1.37 [0.94-2.0]    | 0.1     |
| Parity                      |                  |         |                    |         |
| <4                          | 1[Ref]           |         | 1[Ref]             |         |
| ≥4                          | 3.52 [2.61-4.75] | < 0.001 | 2.35[1.6-3.46]     |         |
| Last child birth (years)    |                  |         |                    | < 0.001 |
| ≤1                          | 1[Ref]           |         | 1[Ref]             |         |
| >1                          | 1.89[1.4-2.56]   | < 0.001 | 1.40[0.99-1.97]    | 0.05    |
| Type of contraceptives used |                  |         | -                  |         |
| Short acting reversible     | 1[Ref]           |         | 1 [Ref]            |         |
| Long acting reversible      | 1.31[0.98-1.74]  | 0.06    | 1.40 (1.02-1.91]   | 0.04    |
| Source of FP information    |                  |         | ,                  |         |
| Clinic personnel            | 1[Ref]           |         | 1 [Ref]            |         |
| Mass media                  | 0.59[0.27-1.33]  | .21     | 0.67[0.29-1.54]    | 0.35    |
| Community outreach          | 0.77[0.45-1.32]  | 0.35    | 0.58 [0.34-1.03]   | 0.06    |
| Friends/relatives           | 0.86[0.44-1.66]  | 0.65    | 0.69 [0.33-1.40]   | 0.30    |

This study also showed that family planning information was received more from clinic personnel in the facilities compared to other sources such as community outreaches, mass media and from family and friends. This shows the influence of health care providers in information providing quality with capabilities to encourage positive behavioral attitudes towards utilization of FP services. Community outreaches that targets WRAG and their spouses can also encourage spousal FP communication and increase spousal consent which is very crucial to the utilization of the FP services, since the male partners still dominate in taking crucial reproductive health decisions in this patriarchal setting.35-36 Creating demand for the FP services through information communication technology has also been reported by the Nigerian Urban Reproductive Health Initiative (NURHI) project in Nigeria.37

This study findings are limited in terms of overall generalizations since it is not all the WRAGs in the community who accessed FP services at this facility. We did not also know about the FP preferences of those whose records were missing during the period of the study. Despite these limitations, we believe that our data provides useful information for the utilization of FP services in the LGA and will also inform policy decisions by the relevant FP stakeholders in Kaduna State.

In conclusion, varied, specific and demand generating health programs with targeted FP messages that are sensitive to the different socio-demographic dimensions of WRAGs in this community are recommended. For instance, child spacing FP messages could be targeted at young, less educated women with less than four living children while child limiting messages could be targeted at the educated, women with more than four living children and the older women. More emphasis should be placed on community outreaches

and use of the electronic media to increase the reach of FP information especially for the grand multi parous women. Incentivized support for the clinic personnel as agents of FP social marketing is also crucial to sustaining the gains already made by the utilization of these services by these community women.

**Competing interest:** The authors declare that there is no competing interest.

Authors' contribution: AO is the principal investigator for the study; he contributed to the study design, data collection, and analysis as well as drafted the initial and revised manuscripts. BA contributed to the data analysis and BA, AGN and KMA made critical inputs into the revision and finalization of the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

#### **REFERENCES**

- 1. Amaral G, Foster DG, Biggs MA, Jasik CB, Judd S, Brindis CD. Public savings from the prevention of unintended pregnancy: a cost analysis of family planning services in California. Health Serv Res. 2007 October; 42(5): 1475-6773.
- 2. Starbird E, Norton M, Marcus R. Investing in family planning: key to achieving the Sustainable Development Goals. Glob Health Sci. Pract. 2016; 4(2): 191-120.
- World Health Organization, UNICEF, UNFPA and World Bank. Trends in maternal mortality: 1990 to estimates by WHO, UNICEF, UNFPA, United World Bank and **Nations** population division. Geneva Switzerland: World Health Organization; 2016.
- 4. Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia Ministry of Health (FMOH). National Guidelines for family planning services in Ethiopia.2011; 23

- Ahmed S, Li Q, Liu L, Tsui AO. Maternal deaths averted by contraceptive use; an analysis of 172 countries. Lancet. 2012; 80: 111-125.
- 6. Babalola S, Oyenubi O, Speizer I, Cobb L, Akiode A, Odeku M. Factors affecting the achievement of fertility intentions in urban Nigeria: Analysis of longitudinal data. BMC Public Health. 2017; 17: 942.
- Okonofua F, Imosemi D, Igboin B, Adeyemi A, Chibuko C, Idowu A et al. Maternal death review and outcomes: An assessment in Lagos State, Nigeria. PLoS ONE. 2017; 12(12): Available from https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0 188392
- 8. Singh S, Darroch JE, Ashford LS. Adding it up: the costs and benefits of investing in sexual and reproductive health. New York: Guttmacher Institute; 2014.
- 9. Achyut P, Mishra A, Montana L, Sengupta R, Calhoun LM, Nanda P. Integration of family planning with maternal health services: An opportunity to increase postpartum modern contraceptive use in urban Uttar Pradesh. Indian Journal of Family Planning and Reproductive Health Care. 2016; 42(2): 107-115.
- 10. Dulli LS, Eichleav M, Rademacher K, Sortijas S, Nsengiyumva T. Meeting postpartum women's family planning needs through integrated family planning and immunization services: Results of a cluster-randomized controlled trial in Rwanda. Global Health Science Practice. 2016; 4(1): 73-86. Available at https://doi.org/10.9745 /GHSP-D-15-00291.
- 11. Gretchen L. Is U.S. fertility at an all-time low? It depends. Factank. Pew Research Centre. 2018
- 12. United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. Population and Vital Statistics Report .2018; [Cited January 1,

- 2017]. Available at https://unstats.un.org/unsd/demographic-social/products/vitstats/sets/Series\_A\_2018.pdf.
- 13. Population Division. World Population Prospects: The 2017 Revision [Cited June 21, 2017]. Available at https://www.un.org/development/desa/publication s/world-population-prospects-the-2017-revision.htmldate.
- National Bureau of Statistics (NBS), United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF). Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey 2016-17, Survey Findings Report. Published February 2018.
- 15. National Population Commission. Abuja, Nigeria. 2018 Report. population.gov.ng/nigerias-populationhit-198m-people-npopc-chairman/ [Cited April 11, 2018]
- 16. Reniers GM. The 18<sup>th</sup> century European explorers and the principle of population in Africa. African Population Studies. 2011; 25(2): 181-193.
- 17. National Population Commission (NPC), Nigeria, ICF International. Nigeria Demographic and Health Survey 2013. Abuja, Nigeria, and Rockville, Maryland, USA: NPC and ICF International; 2014
- 18. National Primary Health Care Development Agency. Integrating Primary Health Care governance – Primary Health Care under One Roof – implementation manual. Abuja, Nigeria: NPHCDA. 2013.
- 19. Kaida A, Kipp W, Hessel P, Konde-Lule J. Male participation in family planning: Results from a qualitative study in Mpigi District, Uganda. J Biosoc Sci. 2005; 37(03): 269-286.
- 20. Capurchande R, Coene G, Roelens K, Meulemans H. "If I have only two children and they die... who will take care of me?" A qualitative study exploring knowledge, attitudes and

- practices about family planning among Mozambican female and male adults. BMC Women's Health. 2017; 17(1): 66.
- 21. Samuel M, Fetters T, Desta D. Strengthening post-abortion family planning services in Ethiopia: Expanding contraceptive choice and improving access to long-acting reversible contraception. Glob Health Sci Pract. 2016; 4(Suppl2): S60-72.
- 22. Family Health International. Addressing unmet need for family planning in Africa: long-acting and permanent methods. North Carolina, USA: Family Health International-FHI: Research Triangle Park; 2008
- 23. WHO. From evidence to policy: expanding access to family planning. Geneva: WHO Department of Reproductive Health and Research; Strategies to increase use of long-acting and permanent contraception. 2012.
- 24. Secura GM, Allsworth JE, Madden T, Mullersman JL, Peipert JF. The Contraceptive CHOICE Project: Reducing barriers to long-acting reversible contraception. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2010; 203(2): 115
- 25. TibaijukaL, Odongo R, Welikhe E, Mukisa, W, KugonzaL, Busingye I et al. Factors influencing use of long-acting versus short-acting contraceptive methods among reproductive-age women in a resource-limited setting. BMC Women's Health. 2017; 17 (1): 25.
- 26. Adding It Up: Investing in Contraception and Maternal and Newborn Health. [Internet]. New York, NY; Guttmacher Institute; 2017 [Cited December 6, 2017]. Available from https://www.guttmacher.org/fact-sheet/adding-it-up-contraception-mnh
- 27. Eliason S, Awoonor W, Eliason C, Novignon J, Nonvignon J, Aikins M. Determinants of modern family

- planning use among women of reproductive age in the Nkwanta district of Ghana: A case-control study. Reproductive Health. 2014; 11: 65.
- 28. Keiss K, Penfold S, Alabi O. Safety, quality and acceptability of subdermal contraceptive implant provision by community health extension workers versus nurses and midwives in Nigeria: Protocol for a quasi-experimental, non-inferiority study. JMIR Res Protoc. 2018; 7(3): e67.
- 29. Tang JH, Kopp DM, Stuart GS. Association between contraceptive implant knowledge and intent with implant uptake among postpartum Malawian women: a prospective cohort study. Contracept Reprod Med. 2016; 1: 13.
- 30. Jabeen M, Gul F, Wazil F, Javed N. Knowledge, attitudes and practices of contraception in women of reproductive age. Gomal Journal of Medical Sciences. 2011; 9: 2.
- 31. Sharma V, Mohan U, Das V, Awasthi S. Socio demographic determinants and knowledge, attitude, practice: Survey of family planning. Journal of Family Medicine and Primary Care. 2012; 1: 43-47.
- 32. Aransiola JO, Akinyemi AI, Fatusi AO. Women's perceptions and reflections of male partners and couple dynamics in family planning adoption in selected urban slums in Nigeria: a qualitative exploration. BMC Public Health. 2014; 14: 869.
- 33. Mitchell PM. Case Study: Hope Clinic in Uganda, in Multi-faith Cooperation for Family Planning and Health Services. Christian Connections for International Health, 2013.

- 34. Barot S. A common cause: Faith-based organizations and promoting access to family planning in the developing world. Guttmacher Policy Rev. 2013; 16: 18-23.
- 35. Omideyi AK, Akinyemi AI, Aina OI, Adeyemi AB, Fadeyibi OA, Bamiwuye SO et al Contraceptive practice, unwanted pregnancies and induced abortion in Southwest Nigeria. Global Public Health. 2011; 6(Supp1): S52-S72.
- 36. Derose LF, Ezeh AC. Men's influence on the onset and progress of fertility decline in Ghana, 1988–98. Population Studies. 2005; 59(2): 197-210.
- 37. Krenn S, Cobb L, Babalola S, Odeku M, Kusemiju B. Using behavior change communication to lead a comprehensive family planning programme: The Nigerian Urban Reproductive Health Initiative. Global Health: Science and Practice. 2014; 2(4): 427-443