



FACT SHEET

April 9, 2012

**SCIP – Ogumaniha:
Antenatal Services**

Alfredo E. Vergara PhD¹
Lara M.E. Vaz PhD^{1,2}
Lázaro Gonzales Calvo PhD²
Jeff Weiser MS²
Meridith Blevins MS¹



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

This publication was made possible through support provided by the Agency for International Development Mozambique, under the terms of Award No. 656-A-00-09-00141-6 to World Vision Inc. and by Vanderbilt University through the endowment of the Amos Christie Chair in Global Health. The opinions expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the U.S. Agency for International Development or World Vision.

¹Vanderbilt University Institute for Global Health. ²Friends in Global Health.

The Ogumaniha baseline survey asked questions about antenatal services accessed and received during last pregnancy, among the female heads of household who participated in the survey who had at least one child. The tables that follow compare characteristics of women who visited a health facility at last pregnancy to those who did not (Table 1), received the full package of antenatal services at last pregnancy to those who received some of the package (Table 2), and delivered at a health facility versus those who did not deliver at the facility (Table 3).

Of the 3749 who participated in the survey, 3259 had been pregnant at least once.

Table 1 presents characteristics of women, by whether or not they visited a health facility for antenatal care during their last pregnancy (columns “Yes” and “No”). For categorical responses, the values in each column represent the percentage of those who have a particular characteristic along with a 95% confidence interval, which indicates the precision of this estimate. For those responses that were continuous values and not categories, the median and interquartile range are reported. The median value is the 50th percentile of that continuous response for which 50% of the group fall below and 50% fall above. The interquartile range represents the 25th and 75th percentiles.

There were nearly equal numbers of women who went to the health facility during their last pregnancy, as compared to women who did not go to the health facility (1551 attended, 1708 did not). Looking at the distribution of characteristics across the columns, and based on the variation of these estimates between the columns, visiting a health facility during their last pregnancy is potentially related to:

- Being younger;
- Living in urban areas;
- Being of Evangelical / Pentecostal or Muslim religion;
- Having attended school longer;
- Understanding Portuguese;
- Living in a household:
 - Where Nyanja or Portuguese is spoken;
 - Closer to a health facility;
 - Where some income is received;
 - A household member owns a bicycle;
 - Where household members use a latrine

It is important to note that these are only associations and cannot be assumed to be causal – meaning that we cannot attribute these characteristics as for the reason why a woman went to a health facility for her pregnancy or not. These characteristics may also be associated with other factors, either measured or not measured in this survey. For example, if being of a particular religion appears to be associated to more access to antenatal services it may be because those religions are more prevalent in areas close to health facilities, and being closer to a health facility is also associated with having gone to the health facility during pregnancy, and therefore living close to health services may be the real reason for having attended the health facility.

Table 1: Visited a health facility for antenatal care during last pregnancy

	No (n=1708)	Yes (n=1551)
Household size ^a (n=3259)	4 (3 – 6)	5 (4 – 6)
Children under 5 (n=3259)	1 (0 – 2)	1 (1 – 2)
Age of respondent (n=2783)	30 (23 – 39)	26 (23 – 33)
Marital Status ^b (n=3258)		
Single	18.1% (13.6, 22.6)	15.9% (11.6, 20.2)
Married/Common Law	73.9% (68.4, 79.3)	75.4% (70.3, 80.4)
Widowed	4.2% (1.8, 6.6)	4.6% (1.5, 7.7)
Divorced/Separated	3.8% (2.2, 5.4)	4.1% (0.9, 7.3)
Length of residency (years) (n=3170)	5 (3 – 13)	5 (3 – 10)
Urban/rural (n=3259)		
Rural	90.0% (81.8, 98.3)	74.8% (55.3, 94.4)
Urban	10.0% (1.7, 18.2)	25.2% (5.6, 44.7)
Religion (n=2981)		
Catholic	45.0% (36.3, 53.7)	43.3% (36.4, 50.2)
Protestant	16.3% (7.3, 25.4)	14.2% (9.6, 18.7)
Evangelical and Pentecostal	15.7% (9.9, 21.6)	18.7% (12.5, 24.9)
Other Christian ^c	2.0% (0.8, 3.1)	5.7% (2.5, 8.8)
Muslim	7.0% (3.7, 10.2)	9.3% (4.6, 14.0)
Non Christian Eastern	4.1% (2.1, 6.1)	1.7% (0.4, 3.0)
Other ^c	9.9% (6.8, 13.1)	7.2% (3.0, 11.3)
Education (n=3259)	0 (0 – 3)	2 (0 – 5)
Primary language of household (n=3250)		
Cinyanja	12.8% (4.2, 21.5)	18.1% (6.9, 29.3)
Cisena	19.4% (10.7, 28.2)	7.9% (2.5, 13.4)
Echuabo	23.7% (13.7, 33.7)	22.8% (12.5, 33.1)
Elomwe	40.9% (29.0, 52.9)	39.0% (24.8, 53.2)
Emakhuwa	0.5% (0.0, 1.3)	0.3% (0.0, 1.0)
Portuguese	2.6% (0.5, 4.8)	11.8% (2.0, 21.6)
Respondent understands Portuguese (n=3256)	26.8% (21.3, 32.3)	46.7% (39.4, 54.0)
Distance of EA from health facility (km) ^a (n=3235)	8.9 (5.4 – 11.6)	5.6 (2.6 – 9.6)
Monthly household income ^b (n=2992)		
No income	44.6% (36.4, 52.8)	24.6% (19.2, 29.9)
Up to Mts 200	17.9% (14.0, 21.8)	19.6% (15.1, 24.2)
Mts 200–400	13.4% (8.7, 18.0)	12.5% (8.1, 16.9)
Mts 400–600	9.2% (6.2, 12.2)	9.5% (6.8, 12.2)
Mts 600–800	3.5% (1.7, 5.2)	4.9% (2.6, 7.2)
Mts 800–1000	5.2% (1.3, 9.0)	6.5% (3.3, 9.6)
Mts 1000–1500	2.4% (0.8, 4.1)	9.2% (4.6, 13.7)
Mts 1500–4000	3.2% (1.3, 5.1)	11.1% (5.9, 16.3)
More than Mts 4000	0.7% (0.1, 1.3)	2.2% (0.7, 3.6)
Household member has a farm (n=3206)	93.8% (91.5, 96.1)	90.5% (86.1, 94.9)
Sometimes sell crops (n=2864)	60.2% (54.8, 65.6)	58.3% (48.5, 68.0)
Ever sold livestock (n=3255)	16.0% (11.1, 20.9)	20.8% (16.5, 25.1)
Household member owns bicycle (n=3244)	37.9% (31.4, 44.5)	48.7% (43.7, 53.8)
Owens chicken(s) (n=3259)	44.8% (37.0, 52.7)	46.3% (36.6, 55.9)
Household uses latrine (n=3208)	26.6% (19.8, 33.3)	42.1% (30.2, 54.0)
Empowerment (score) (n=3174)	41.7 (25 – 50)	50 (33.3 – 58.3)
Gender equality (score) (n=3249)	77.8 (63.3 – 93.3)	80 (66.7 – 93.3)

^a Continuous variables are reported as weighted estimates of median (interquartile range), with each observation being weighted by the inverse of the household sampling probability.

^b Categorical variables are reported as weighted percentages, with each observation being weighted by the inverse of the household sampling probability. The 95% confidence intervals include precision estimates that incorporate the effects of stratification and clustering.

^c ‘Other Christian’ includes LDS Mormon and Jehovah’s Witness. ‘Other’ includes Spiritual, Traditional Religions, and Agnostic or Atheist.

Table 2: Received full package of antenatal services^d

	No (n=3077)	Yes (n=182)
Household size ^a (n=3259)	5 (4 – 6)	6 (4 – 7)
Children under 5 (n=3259)	1 (1 – 2)	1 (1 – 2)
Age of respondent (n=2783)	29 (23 – 36)	25 (23 – 31)
Marital Status ^b (n=3258)		
Single	17.2% (13.9, 20.4)	13.1% (0.2, 26.0)
Married/Common Law	74.8% (70.8, 78.8)	74.4% (61.8, 87.0)
Widowed	4.4% (2.3, 6.6)	4.7% (0.0, 10.9)
Divorced/Separated	3.6% (2.0, 5.3)	7.8% (2.1, 13.4)
Length of residency (years) (n=3170)	5 (3 – 11)	5 (3 – 10)
Urban/rural (n=3259)		
Rural	83.4% (72.3, 94.5)	54.7% (17.4, 92.1)
Urban	16.6% (5.5, 27.7)	45.3% (7.9, 82.6)
Religion (n=2981)		
Catholic	44.5% (38.1, 51.0)	38.2% (20.6, 55.8)
Protestant	14.2% (8.8, 19.6)	23.4% (9.6, 37.1)
Evangelical and Pentecostal	17.6% (12.4, 22.8)	16.7% (1.9, 31.6)
Other Christian ^c	3.6% (2.3, 4.9)	10.1% (0.0, 22.3)
Muslim	8.9% (5.4, 12.5)	2.3% (0.0, 6.1)
Non Christian Eastern	2.3% (1.2, 3.5)	6.2% (0.3, 12.0)
Other ^c	8.8% (5.7, 11.8)	3.2% (0.0, 7.8)
Education (n=3259)	1 (0 – 4)	4 (0.8 – 8)
Primary language of household (n=3250)		
Cinyanja	14.0% (5.7, 22.2)	37.8% (20.7, 54.9)
Cisena	13.5% (7.0, 20.0)	2.8% (0.6, 5.1)
Echuabo	24.5% (15.2, 33.9)	8.8% (0.8, 16.7)
Elomwe	41.0% (29.8, 52.2)	26.9% (6.4, 47.4)
Emakhuwa	0.4% (0.0, 1.0)	0.0% (0.0, 0.0)
Portuguese	6.7% (1.6, 11.8)	23.7% (8.4, 39.0)
Respondent understands Portuguese (n=3256)	38.2% (31.6, 44.7)	44.3% (33.1, 55.5)
Distance of EA from health facility (km) ^a (n=3235)	7.2 (3.9 – 10.4)	3 (0.6 – 8.3)
Monthly household income ^b (n=2992)		
No income	34.1% (27.5, 40.7)	18.8% (9.6, 28.0)
Up to Mts 200	18.5% (14.9, 22.2)	23.1% (13.8, 32.3)
Mts 200–400	13.5% (10.5, 16.5)	6.4% (0.0, 13.3)
Mts 400–600	9.9% (7.4, 12.4)	3.3% (0.0, 8.1)
Mts 600–800	4.1% (2.7, 5.4)	7.0% (0.0, 14.1)
Mts 800–1000	6.1% (3.4, 8.8)	4.0% (0.0, 8.6)
Mts 1000–1500	5.1% (2.8, 7.4)	20.1% (12.5, 27.8)
Mts 1500–4000	7.3% (3.5, 11.0)	14.2% (4.8, 23.6)
More than Mts 4000	1.4% (0.4, 2.4)	3.1% (0.0, 7.2)
Household member has a farm (n=3206)	92.6% (90.1, 95.2)	83.3% (73.6, 93.0)
Sometimes sell crops (n=2864)	59.0% (52.8, 65.2)	59.2% (34.1, 84.2)
Ever sold livestock (n=3255)	18.3% (14.5, 22.1)	25.1% (11.7, 38.6)
Household member owns bicycle (n=3244)	43.8% (38.8, 48.9)	50.6% (36.2, 65.1)
Owens chicken(s) (n=3259)	46.2% (39.8, 52.5)	40.5% (19.1, 61.9)
Household uses latrine (n=3208)	33.1% (25.1, 41.1)	64.6% (56.4, 72.8)
Empowerment (score) (n=3174)	50 (33.3 – 50)	50 (33.3 – 58.3)
Gender equality (score) (n=3249)	77.8 (66.7 – 93.3)	81.5 (65.3 – 90)

^a Continuous variables are reported as weighted estimates of median (interquartile range), with each observation being weighted by the inverse of the household sampling probability.

^b Categorical variables are reported as weighted percentages, with each observation being weighted by the inverse of the household sampling probability. The 95% confidence intervals include precision estimates that incorporate the effects of stratification and clustering.

^c ‘Other Christian’ includes LDS Mormon and Jehovah’s Witness. ‘Other’ includes Spiritual, Traditional Religions, and Agnostic or Atheist.

^d Among women with children. Full package defined as receipt of fansidar, tetanus vaccine, vitamin A, iron supplements, bed net, and offered VCT.

Table 2 shows the characteristics of participants by whether or not they received a full package of antenatal services during their last pregnancy. The full package is defined here as: Fansidar for treatment of malaria, distribution of bednets, provision of HIV counseling and testing, tetanus vaccine, iron supplements and post-partum vitamin A supplementation.

Because only 182 of the total 3259 respondents received a full package of antenatal services the estimates of the confidence intervals are wider, consequently making interpretation of the results more difficult. Nonetheless, in general, the characteristics that seem to be associated with having received the full package of antenatal services are similar to those associated with having attended the health facility during last pregnancy. Receiving full package of ANC services is potentially related to:

- Being younger;
- Being divorced/separated;
- Living in urban areas;
- Being of Protestant religion;
- Having attended school longer;
- Understanding Portuguese;
- Living in a household:
 - Where Nyanja or Portuguese is spoken;
 - Closer to a health facility;
 - Where some income is received;
 - A household member has a farm;
 - Where household members use a latrine

Table 3 presents characteristics of women by whether or not they delivered their last child at a health facility during their last pregnancy. The distribution of characteristics for delivery at health facility shows a very similar pattern to previous tables. Delivering their baby at health facilities is potentially associated with:

- Being younger;
- Living in urban areas;
- Being of ‘other Christian’ religion;
- Being more educated;
- Understanding Portuguese;
- Living in a household:
 - Where Nyanja or Portuguese is spoken;
 - Closer to a health facility;
 - Where some income is received;
 - A household member owns a bicycle;
 - Where household members use a latrine

In general it seems that as expected, younger, more educated, affluent mothers living closer to health facilities, specially in urban areas are more likely to utilize antenatal care. This is what is expected. However, ANC service utilization also seems to be associated with household primary language, and with being of certain religions. These associations may be confounded, meaning that perhaps certain religions or Nyanja speakers are more concentrated in urban centers closer to health facilities and therefore are a proxy (a substitute) measure for living in urban, more affluent places.

Table 3: Delivery performed at health facility

	No (n=1782)	Yes (n=1477)
Household size ^a (n=3259)	4 (3 – 6)	5 (4 – 6)
Children under 5 (n=3259)	1 (1 – 2)	1 (1 – 2)
Age of respondent (n=2783)	30 (23 – 39)	26 (23 – 33)
Marital Status ^b (n=3258)		
Single	17.0% (12.8, 21.1)	16.7% (12.1, 21.2)
Married/Common Law	74.6% (69.0, 80.1)	74.9% (69.5, 80.3)
Widowed	4.6% (1.5, 7.7)	4.4% (1.0, 7.7)
Divorced/Separated	3.9% (2.3, 5.4)	4.1% (0.6, 7.5)
Length of residency (years) (n=3170)	5 (3 – 14)	5 (3 – 10)
Urban/rural (n=3259)		
Rural	90.3% (82.2, 98.4)	73.4% (52.7, 94.0)
Urban	9.7% (1.6, 17.8)	26.6% (6.0, 47.3)
Religion (n=2981)		
Catholic	44.4% (36.1, 52.6)	43.7% (36.5, 50.8)
Protestant	16.9% (7.9, 25.9)	13.5% (8.9, 18.2)
Evangelical and Pentecostal	16.3% (10.5, 22.1)	18.5% (12.0, 25.0)
Other Christian ^c	1.8% (0.8, 2.8)	6.1% (2.8, 9.4)
Muslim	6.9% (3.6, 10.2)	9.5% (4.7, 14.3)
Non Christian Eastern	3.7% (1.9, 5.6)	1.8% (0.4, 3.2)
Other ^c	10.1% (6.9, 13.2)	6.9% (2.8, 11.0)
Education (n=3259)	1 (0 – 3)	2 (0 – 5)
Primary language of household (n=3250)		
Cinyanja	11.8% (3.8, 19.8)	19.4% (7.7, 31.1)
Cisena	18.7% (10.2, 27.3)	7.6% (2.2, 13.0)
Echuabo	24.4% (13.8, 35.1)	22.1% (11.8, 32.4)
Elomwe	42.0% (29.9, 54.2)	38.0% (23.8, 52.2)
Emakhuwa	0.4% (0.0, 1.2)	0.4% (0.0, 1.0)
Portuguese	2.6% (0.5, 4.7)	12.5% (2.2, 22.9)
Respondent understands Portuguese (n=3256)	29.6% (23.8, 35.5)	46.0% (38.5, 53.6)
Distance of EA from health facility (km) ^a (n=3235)	8.9 (5 – 11.6)	5.4 (2.2 – 9.4)
Monthly household income ^b (n=2992)		
No income	41.9% (33.4, 50.4)	25.3% (20.1, 30.4)
Up to Mts 200	18.7% (14.7, 22.7)	19.1% (14.8, 23.5)
Mts 200–400	14.1% (10.0, 18.2)	11.8% (7.2, 16.5)
Mts 400–600	10.0% (7.0, 13.1)	8.8% (5.9, 11.6)
Mts 600–800	3.2% (1.6, 4.7)	5.3% (2.8, 7.7)
Mts 800–1000	5.3% (1.5, 9.2)	6.4% (3.4, 9.4)
Mts 1000–1500	2.2% (0.7, 3.7)	9.9% (5.2, 14.6)
Mts 1500–4000	3.9% (1.8, 6.0)	11.1% (5.6, 16.6)
More than Mts 4000	0.7% (0.1, 1.2)	2.3% (0.8, 3.8)
Household member has a farm (n=3206)	94.4% (92.3, 96.4)	89.8% (85.1, 94.4)
Sometimes sell crops (n=2864)	58.4% (52.5, 64.3)	59.6% (49.2, 69.9)
Ever sold livestock (n=3255)	17.2% (12.3, 22.0)	20.3% (15.9, 24.6)
Household member owns bicycle (n=3244)	37.9% (31.4, 44.4)	49.6% (44.9, 54.4)
Owens chicken(s) (n=3259)	46.1% (38.3, 54.0)	45.3% (35.8, 54.8)
Household uses latrine (n=3208)	26.4% (19.4, 33.3)	43.5% (31.3, 55.7)
Empowerment (score) (n=3174)	41.7 (25 – 50)	50 (33.3 – 58.3)
Gender equality (score) (n=3249)	77.8 (66.7 – 93.3)	79.2 (66.7 – 93.3)

^a Continuous variables are reported as weighted estimates of median (interquartile range), with each observation being weighted by the inverse of the household sampling probability.

^b Categorical variables are reported as weighted percentages, with each observation being weighted by the inverse of the household sampling probability. The 95% confidence intervals include precision estimates that incorporate the effects of stratification and clustering.

^c ‘Other Christian’ includes LDS Mormon and Jehovah’s Witness. ‘Other’ includes Spiritual, Traditional Religions, and Agnostic or Atheist.