#### **ORIGINAL ARTICLE**

# INFLUENCE OF MEDIA ON CONTRACEPTIVE USE: A CROSS-SECTIONAL STUDY IN FOUR ASIAN COUNTRIES

Muhammad Bedar Bakht, Zaeema Arif, Shamsa Zafar, Muhammad Asif Nawaz\*
Health Services Academy, Islamabad, \*Ayub Medical College, Abbottabad, Pakistan

**Background:** The most important factors contributing to poor state of maternal health continue to be early marriages, under-nutrition and high fertility rates in the context of low rates of contraceptive use. The aim of this study was to emphasize the influence of television on the contraceptive use in Asia. **Methods:** Publicly available cross-sectional survey data from Survey of Status of Women and Fertility (SWAF) was used. Logistic regression was used to estimate the odds ratios and to adjust for covariates, i.e., age, education and income. SAS-9.2 was used for statistical analyses. **Results:** Television watching is associated with increased contraceptive use, both in men and women. In India, the adjusted odds ratios for condom use in males and females were 1.9 (95% CI 1.2–2.9, p=0.003) and 1.8 (95% CI 1.1–2.9, p=0.019) respectively. In Pakistan the adjusted odds ratios were significant in females for condom with odds ratios of 1.9 (95% CI 1.1–3.3, p=0.02). In the Philippines the adjusted odds ratios for condom use were 1.6 (95% CI 1.01–2.46, p=0.05) in females and 2.5 (95% CI 1.66–3.79, p<0.0001) in males. In Thailand the adjusted odds ratios for condom use were 19.3 (95% CI 12.3–30.3, p<0.0001) in males and 1.5 (95% CI 1.32–1.83, p<0.0001) in females. **Conclusion:** Along with other factors affecting human behaviour, media is a very useful tool to influence health behaviours like family planning, on a large scale.

Keywords: Contraception, Media, Television, Condom, Reproductive Health

J Ayub Med Coll Abbottabad 2013;25(3-4):3-8

#### INTRODUCTION

The state of maternal health worldwide, though difficult to measure objectively, can be well-indicated by the Maternal Mortality Ratio (MMR). According to the latest statistics, in Pakistan, the MMR is 276 per 100,000 births annually. The most important factors contributing to this gloomy state of maternal health continue to be early marriages, under nutrition and high fertility rates in the context of low rates of contraceptive use. <sup>2</sup>

Family planning is an important issue in all developing countries especially in South Asia.<sup>3</sup> In India and Bangladesh, fertility rates have dropped, with Sri Lanka already at a low rate. However, Pakistan and Nepal do not follow the trend of fertility decline in South Asia. Population trends indicate that girls are married off young, and start bearing children immediately. Fertility rate in Pakistan, for example, continues to remain high (4.1) even after the introduction of a government program endorsing family planning, and other improvements. Contraception is not used effectively in these two countries.<sup>4</sup> Notably, in Pakistan, where awareness of contraception stands at about 95%, the prevalence of contraceptive use remains relatively low (29.6%) in the country. There is a huge knowledge-practice gap. This gap may be recognised as one of the major reasons of oral contraceptive pill (OCP) failure and unwanted pregnancies.<sup>5</sup>

A team of American researchers in the 1970s demonstrated that television could influence the public's contraceptive use. Contraceptive awareness was directly proportional to the level of investment done in

advertisements.<sup>6</sup> Since then, a number of public health campaigns have addressed contraception effectively. Some researchers believe that the low rates of unwanted pregnancies and abortions in the Netherlands are directly related to effective media resources spreading awareness amongst the public.<sup>7</sup>

In conservative societies within developing countries as well, various forms of mass media campaigns have had a positive and strong influence on the knowledge, practice and attitudes regarding contraception. Research has shown that both TV and radio, via their family planning programming, influence the use of family planning methods. Pakistan, Bangladesh and India have influenced their populations' reproductive attitudes through family planning media programming. According to analyses of national survey data, women of these countries who had exposure to the media's family-planning campaigns were more likely to opt for a contraceptive technique than the women without any exposure.

In addition, a particular respondent's place of settlement, literacy level, financial status, geographical region and the size of the family are among the crucial variables determining mass media contact with family planning and thus the current use and continuation of contraception as well. The importance of media in this regard cannot be ruled out, especially the TV. Education through media is yet another contributing factor. Though previous studies, as mentioned in lines above, have looked at the association between media and contraception use, our study is unique because of

diversity of our study population, which embraces different cultures, traditions, religions including Muslims, Hindus, Budhists etc. established in different South Asian geographical locations. The sample size is also substantial.

#### MATERIAL AND METHODS

The study used publicly available data from the Survey of Status of Women and Fertility (SWAF) a crosssectional survey (http://swaf.sas.upenn.edu). The SWAF data was collected through interviews with married women ages 15-39 and their husbands in a total of 56 communities in India, Pakistan, Malaysia, Philippines and Thailand. In all countries except Thailand, the sample population was selected to attain desired variability on factors as religion, geographical location, economic status etc., and probability sampling was used at lower levels. In Thailand, national level random sampling was done. The method was described in detail elsewhere. 13 The exposure was measured by the question 'does anyone in the house hold own TV'. The outcome was measured by the question 'Have you/your husband ever used condom', and 'have you ever used pills' by women and their husbands. In our final sample study population the missing values for exposure or outcome were not included.

Data was stratified by contraceptive use into two groups, users and non-users. In both groups of contraceptive users and non-users, age was compared as a continuous variable, and education was categorised three levels, i.e., primary [grade five], matriculation/high secondary (grade 10), more than matriculation, and its frequency was calculated. Income was divided into tertiles and frequency was compared between contraceptive users and non-users. Independent samples t-test and Chi-square tests were used to compute the p-values for continuous and categorical outcome variables respectively, and p<0.05 was considered significant. Binary logistic regression was used to estimate odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals. We used two approaches for analysing the data. First, we computed the association of interest, and then we did modelling to adjust for covariates, i.e., age, education and income. Separate analyses were conducted for men and women. Analyses were done for every country separately. SAS 9.2 was used for statistical analyses.

## **RESULTS**

The subjects who own TV are more likely to use contraceptives compared with those who do not have TV at their home. The education and income contribute significantly towards increased contraceptive use, but even after adjustment of these, association between TV watching and contraceptive remain substantially strong.

In India, individuals with TV in their home were 80 to 90% more likely to use condoms and OCP, compared to those who did not have TV in their home (Table-1). The adjusted odds ratios for condom use (Table-2) in males and females were 1.9 (95% CI 1.2–2.9, p=0.003) and 1.8 (95% CI 1.1–2.9, p=0.019) respectively. The adjusted odds ratio for OCP use in women was 1.8 (95% CI 1.04–3.05, p=0.036). In Malaysia the analyses were not done because of the inadequate sample size.

In Pakistan women who had TV in their home were 90% more likely to use condoms (95% CI 1.1–3.3, p=0.02), and 2.6 times more likely to use OCP (95% CI 1.4–4.8, p=0.003) compared with their counterparts who did not have TV in their homes, after adjustment of covariates, e.g., education, income and age (Table-3). In men, when adjusted for age, income and education the relationship between media exposure and contraception use was not found significant with an odds ratio of 1.3 (95% CI 0.7–2.4, p=0.49).

In Philippines, (Table-4) women that had TV in their home were 1.6 times (95% CI 1.01-2.46, p=0.05) more likely to use condoms, and 1.73 times (95% CI 1.26–2.37, *p*=0.0007) more likely to use OCP, compared to those who did not have TV in their homes. Men who had TV in their home were 2.5 times (95% CI 1.66-3.79, p<0.0001) more likely to use condoms, compared to men who did not have TV in their home (Table-2). In Thailand, (Table-5) women with TV in their home were 1.5 times (95% CI 1.32-1.83, p<0.0001) more likely to use condoms and 1.81 times (95% CI 1.65–1.98, p<0.0001) more likely to use OCPs, compared with women who did not have TV in their homes. Men with TV in their homes were 20 times (95% CI 12.3–30.3, p<0.0001) more likely to use condoms compared to those who did not have TV at their homes.

# **DISCUSSION**

Our findings, consistent with previous studies, demonstrated very strong associations between television exposure and use of contraceptives in all countries. Education and income 14 also influenced contraception use, but the association between TV exposure and contraception use often remained strong after controlling for these variables. A study in Pakistan demonstrated that main source of information affecting the common people is TV, followed by the friends and relatives. 15 The mean age of contraceptive use is usually higher in contraceptive user compared with non-user. Younger respondents were more likely to use condoms as compared with pills. We did our analyses only for condom and pills because these two are the most commonly used contraceptives. 16,17

Table-1: Age distribution, education and income in contraceptive users vs non-users in India

Age N Mean±SD 95% CI Education N (%) No Education Less than Grade 5 Grade 5–10 Above Grade 10 Income N (%) 0–9,600 19,601–18,000 >18,000 Age N Mean±SD 95% CI Education N (%)	87 30.1±5.0 29.0–31.1 20 (3) 38 (8.4) 25 (10.1) 4 (9.8) 14 (3.6) 2 (5) 41 (8.2) 117 28.07±6.0 27.0–29.2	1320 28.3±6.2 28.0-28.6 644 (97) 416 (91.6) 223 (89.9) 37 (90.2) 379 (96.4) 38 (95) 460 (91.8) 1134	0.008
95% CI  Education N (%)  No Education Less than Grade 5 Grade 5–10 Above Grade 10  Income N (%) 0–9,600 19,601–18,000 >18,000  Age N  Mean±SD 95% CI	29.0-31.1 20 (3) 38 (8.4) 25 (10.1) 4 (9.8) 14 (3.6) 2 (5) 41 (8.2) 117 28.07±6.0	28.0–28.6 644 (97) 416 (91.6) 223 (89.9) 37 (90.2) 379 (96.4) 38 (95) 460 (91.8) 1134	0.000
Education N (%) No Education Less than Grade 5 Grade 5–10 Above Grade 10 Income N (%) 0–9,600 19,601–18,000 >18,000 Age N Mean±SD 95% CI	20 (3) 38 (8.4) 25 (10.1) 4 (9.8) 14 (3.6) 2 (5) 41 (8.2) 117 28.07±6.0	644 (97) 416 (91.6) 223 (89.9) 37 (90.2) 379 (96.4) 38 (95) 460 (91.8)	
No Education Less than Grade 5 Grade 5–10 Above Grade 10 Income N (%) 0–9,600 19,601–18,000 >18,000 Age N Mean±SD 95% CI	38 (8.4) 25 (10.1) 4 (9.8) 14 (3.6) 2 (5) 41 (8.2) 117 28.07±6.0	416 (91.6) 223 (89.9) 37 (90.2) 379 (96.4) 38 (95) 460 (91.8) 1134	
Less than Grade 5 Grade 5–10 Above Grade 10 Income N (%) 0–9,600 19,601–18,000 >18,000 Age N Mean±SD 95% CI	38 (8.4) 25 (10.1) 4 (9.8) 14 (3.6) 2 (5) 41 (8.2) 117 28.07±6.0	416 (91.6) 223 (89.9) 37 (90.2) 379 (96.4) 38 (95) 460 (91.8) 1134	
Grade 5–10 Above Grade 10 Income N (%) 0–9,600 19,601–18,000 >18,000 Age N Mean±SD 95% CI	25 (10.1) 4 (9.8) 14 (3.6) 2 (5) 41 (8.2) 117 28.07±6.0	223 (89.9) 37 (90.2) 379 (96.4) 38 (95) 460 (91.8) 1134	
Above Grade 10  Income N (%) 0-9,600 19,601-18,000 >18,000  Age N Mean±SD 95% CI	4 (9.8) 14 (3.6) 2 (5) 41 (8.2) 117 28.07±6.0	37 (90.2) 379 (96.4) 38 (95) 460 (91.8) 1134	0.007
Income N (%) 0-9,600 19,601-18,000 >18,000 Age N Mean±SD 95% CI	14 (3.6) 2 (5) 41 (8.2) 117 28.07±6.0	379 (96.4) 38 (95) 460 (91.8) 1134	0.007
0-9,600 19,601-18,000 >18,000 Age N Mean±SD 95% CI	2 (5) 41 (8.2) 117 28.07±6.0	38 (95) 460 (91.8) 1134	0.007
19,601–18,000 >18,000 Age N Mean±SD 95% CI	2 (5) 41 (8.2) 117 28.07±6.0	38 (95) 460 (91.8) 1134	0.007
>18,000 Age N Mean±SD 95% CI	41 (8.2) 117 28.07±6.0	460 (91.8) 1134	0.007
Age N Mean±SD 95% CI	117 28.07±6.0	1134	
Mean±SD 95% CI	28.07±6.0	-	
95% CI			
	27.0_29.2	$28.2\pm6.2$	0.836
Education N (%)		27.8–28.6	
Euucauon 11 ( /0)			
No Education	47 (7.6)	572 (92.4)	
Less than Grade 5	30 (8.5)	324 (91.5)	0.008
Grade 5–10	36 (15.1)	203 (84.9)	
Above Grade 10	4 (10.3)	35 (89.7)	
Income N (%)	· · ·	` ,	
0-15,600	24 (7.0)	317 (93.0)	0.121
15,601-28,500	4 (11.8)	30 (88.2)	0.131
>28,500	52 (11.1)	415 (88.9)	
Age N	154	1472	
Mean±SD	33.8±7.2	33.9±7.7	0.8
95% CI	32.6-34.9	33.5-34.3	
Education N (%)			
No Education	15 (3.6)	401 (96.4)	
Less than Grade 5			0.000
Grade 5–10		` /	
Above Grade 10	50 (19.8)	203 (80.2)	
Income N (%)			
` /	36 (6.8)	492 (93.2)	
,	` /	` /	0.002
9.601-18.000	` /	` ,	0.002
	No Education Less than Grade 5 Grade 5–10 Above Grade 10 Income N (%) 0–9,600 9,601–18,000	No Education 15 (3.6) Less than Grade 5 32 (6.9) Grade 5–10 57 (11.6) Above Grade 10 50 (19.8)  Income N (%) 0–9,600 36 (6.8)	No Education 15 (3.6) 401 (96.4) Less than Grade 5 32 (6.9) 434 (93.1) Grade 5–10 57 (11.6) 434 (88.4) Above Grade 10 50 (19.8) 203 (80.2)  Income N (%) 0–9,600 36 (6.8) 492 (93.2) 9,601–18,000 4 (9.1) 40 (90.9)

<sup>\*</sup>Income was calculated in Indian Rupees

Table-2: Odds Ratios of contraceptive use with exposure of Television

India	Gender	Contraceptive	•	OR	95% CI	p
	Female	Pills	Model 1	2.8	1.76 -4.44	< 0.0001
		N=1407	Model 2	1.8	1.04 -3.05	0.037
		Condom	Model 1	2.1	1.35 -3.14	0.0008
		N=1251	Model 2	1.8	1.10 -2.90	0.019
	Male	Condom	Model 1	3.0	2.08 -4.39	< 0.0001
		N=1626	Model 2	1.9	1.24 -2.86	0.0030
Pakistan	Female	Pills	Model 1	2.9	1.61 -5.07	0.0003
		N=1033	Model 2	2.6	1.37 -4.76	0.0032
		Condom	Model 1	2.7	1.60 -4.34	0.0001
		N=1034	Model 2	1.9	1.11 -3.31	0.0205
	Male	Condom	Model 1	1.8	1.02 -3.34	0.044
		N=469	Model 2	1.3	0.65 -2.44	0.489
Philippines	Female	Pills	Model 1	2.0	1.55 -2.69	< 0.0001
		N=950	Model 2	1.7	1.26 -2.37	0.0007
		Condom	Model 1	2.0	1.35 -2.92	0.0005
		N=890	Model 2	1.6	1.01-2.46	0.0456
	Male	Condom	Model 1	2.8	1.97 -4.05	< 0.0001
		N=1000	Model 2	2.5	1.66 -3.79	< 0.0001
Thailand	Female	Pills	Model 1	1.5	1.39-1.64	< 0.0001
		N=16485	Model 2	1.8	1.65-1.98	< 0.0001
		Condoms	Model 1	6.8	5.38-7.98	< 0.0001
		N=15736	Model 2	1.6	1.32-1.83	< 0.0001
	Male	Condom	Model 1	20.8	13.50-31.90	< 0.0001
		N=3902	Model 2	19.3	12.27-30.32	< 0.0001

Model 1: Unadjusted Model 2: Adjusted for Age, Education and Income

Table-3: Distribution of Age, Education and Income contraceptive in users vs. non-users, Pakistan

Contraceptive	Gender	Covariate	Contraceptive User	Contraceptive Non-User	P-value
Pills Fe	Females	AGE N	50	983	
		Mean±SD	31.2±4.9	28.4±6.3	0.002
		95% CI	29.8–32.6	28.0-28.8	
		Education N (%)			
		No Education	34 (4.1)	796 (95.9)	
		Less than Grade 5	13 (8.9)	133 (91.9)	0.07
		Grade 5–10	3 (6.4)	44 (93.6)	
		Above Grade 10	0 (0)	9 (100)	
		Income N (%)	, ,	` /	
		0-15600	15 (4.5)	322 (95.6)	0.57
		15601-28500	0 (0)	1 (100)	0.57
		More then 28500	21 (6.2)	316 (93.8)	
Condom	Female	AGE N	68	966	
		Mean [SD]	29.2 [5.7]	28.5±6.3	0.39
		95% CI	27.8-30.5	28.1-28.9	
		Education N (%)			
		No Education	40 (4.8)	791 (95.2)	
		Less than Grade 5	24 (16.4)	122 (83.6)	0.000
		Grade 5–10	2 (4.3)	45 (95.7)	
		Above Grade 10	1 (11.1)	8 (88.9)	
		Income N (%)	` '		
		0-15600	10 (3.0)	372 (97.0)	0.0004
		15601-28500	0 (0)	1 (100)	0.0004
		More then 28500	36 (10.7)	302 (89.3)	
Condom	Males	AGE N	52	421	
Condon	1,24125	Mean [SD]	38.0 [7.1]	34.3±8.1	0.002
		95% CI	36.0-40.0	33.5–35.1	*****
		Education N (%)			
		No Education	9 (5.7)	150 (94.3)	
		Less than Grade 5	10 (8.3)	110 (91.7)	0.005
		Grade 5- 10	29 (16.8)	144 (83.2)	0.000
		Above Grade 10	4 (19)	17 (81)	
		Income N (%)	. (/	()	
		0–15600	13 (8.3)	144 (91.7)	
		15601-28500	0(0)	0 (0)	0.052
		More then 28500	23 (15.4)	126 (84.6)	
			acurad in Pakietan Punas	120 (0 1.0)	

\*Income was measured in Pakistan Rupee

Table-4: Distribution of Age, Education and Income in contraceptive users vs. non-users, Philippines

Pills	Contraceptive	Gender	Covariate	Contraceptive User	Contraceptive Non-User	P-value
Page	Pills	Female				
Education N (%)   No Education   11 (35.5)   20(64.5)   113 (73.9)   0.003						0.000
No Education   11 (35.5)   20(64.5)   13 (73.9)   0.003     Less than Grade 5   40 (26.1)   113 (73.9)   0.003     Grade 5-10   64 (27.8)   166 (72.2)     Above Grade 10   209 (39)   327 (61)     Income N (%)   0-9,600   87 (28.3)   220(71.7)   0.0006     More then 18,000   1 (25)   3 (75)   0.0006     More then 18,000   139 (42.9)   185(57.1)     Condom   Female   AGE N   121   769			95% CI	29.9-31.0	28.6–9.5	
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			Education N (%)			
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			No Education	11 (35.5)	20(64.5)	
Above Grade 10   209 (39)   327 (61)     Income N (%)   0-9,600   87 (28.3)   220(71.7)   0.0006     19,601-18,000   1 (25)   3(75)   185(57.1)     More then 18,000   139 (42.9)   185(57.1)     AGE N			Less than Grade 5	40 (26.1)	113 (73.9)	0.003
Income N (%) 0-9,600			Grade 5–10	64 (27.8)	166 (72.2)	
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			Above Grade 10	209 (39)	327 (61)	
19,601-18,000   1 (25)   3(75)   0.0006     More then 18,000   139 (42.9)   185(57.1)     Mean [SD]   31.9 (5.1)   29.3[5.5]   0.000     95% CI   30.9-32.8   28.9-29.7     Education N (%)   No Education   0 (0)   18 (100)     Less than Grade 5   12 (9.1)   120 (90.9)   0.063     Grade 5-10   27 (12.4)   190 (87.6)     Above Grade 10   82 (15.7)   441 (84.3)     Income N (%)   0-15,600   26 (9.1)   261(90.9)   0.0048     Males   AGE N   149   732     Mean [SD]   33.7 (6.5)   32.1 [7.0]   0.014     95% CI   32.6-34.7   31.6-32.6     Education N (%)   No Education   0 (0)   4 (100)     Less than Grade 5   11 (6.1)   168 (93.9)   0.028     Grade 5-10   25 (12.5)   175 (87.5)     Above Grade 10   113 (22.7)   385 (77.3)     Income N (%)   0-9,600   27 (9.2)   268(90.9)   0.001     9,601-18,000   0 (0)   4 (100)   0.001			Income N (%)			
19,601-18,000			0-9,600	87 (28.3)	220(71.7)	0.0006
Condom   Female			19,601–18,000	1 (25)	3(75)	0.0006
Mean [SD]   31.9 (5.1)   29.3[5.5]   0.000     95% CI   30.9-32.8   28.9-29.7     Education N (%)   No Education   0 (0)   18 (100)     Less than Grade 5   12 (9.1)   120 (90.9)   0.063     Grade 5-10   27 (12.4)   190 (87.6)     Above Grade 10   82 (15.7)   441 (84.3)     Income N (%)   0-15,600   26 (9.1)   261(90.9)   0.0048     15,601-28,500   0 (0)   2(100)   0.0048     Males   AGE N   149   732     Mean [SD]   33.7 (6.5)   32.1 [7.0]   0.014     95% CI   32.6-34.7   31.6-32.6     Education N (%)   No Education   0 (0)   4 (100)     Less than Grade 5   11 (6.1)   168 (93.9)   0.028     Grade 5-10   25 (12.5)   175 (87.5)     Above Grade 10   113 (22.7)   385 (77.3)     Income N (%)   0-9,600   27 (9.2)   268(90.9)   0.001     9,601-18,000   0 (0)   4 (100)   0.001			More then 18,000	139 (42.9)	185(57.1)	
Males   Male	Condom	Female	AGE N	121	769	
Education N (%)   No Education   0 (0)   18 (100)   Less than Grade 5   12 (9.1)   120 (90.9)   0.063   Grade 5-10   27 (12.4)   190 (87.6)   Above Grade 10   82 (15.7)   441 (84.3)   Income N (%)   0-15,600   26 (9.1)   261(90.9)   0.0048			Mean [SD]	31.9 (5.1)	29.3[5.5]	0.000
No Education   0 (0)   18 (100)   18 (100)   1			95% CI	30.9–32.8	28.9-29.7	
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			Education N (%)			
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			No Education	0 (0)	18 (100)	
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			Less than Grade 5	12 (9.1)	120 (90.9)	0.063
Income N (%)   0-15,600   26 (9.1)   261(90.9)   0.0048			Grade 5–10	27 (12.4)	190 (87.6)	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			Above Grade 10	82 (15.7)	441 (84.3)	
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			Income N (%)			
Condom   Males   AGE N   149   732     Mean [SD]   33.7 (6.5)   32.1 [7.0]   0.014			0-15,600	26 (9.1)	261(90.9)	0.0049
Condom         Males         AGE N Mean [SD]			15,601–28,500	0 (0)	2(100)	0.0048
Mean [SD]     33.7 (6.5)     32.1 [7.0]     0.014       95% CI     32.6-34.7     31.6-32.6     0.014       Education N (%)     0 (0)     4 (100)     4 (100)       Less than Grade 5     11 (6.1)     168 (93.9)     0.028       Grade 5-10     25 (12.5)     175 (87.5)     175 (87.5)       Above Grade 10     113 (22.7)     385 (77.3)       Income N (%)     0-9,600     27 (9.2)     268(90.9)     0.001       9,601-18,000     0 (0)     4(100)     0.001			More then 28,500	57 (18.1)	258(81.9)	
95% CI     32.6–34.7     31.6-32.6       Education N (%)     0 (0)     4 (100)       No Education     0 (0)     4 (100)       Less than Grade 5     11 (6.1)     168 (93.9)     0.028       Grade 5–10     25 (12.5)     175 (87.5)       Above Grade 10     113 (22.7)     385 (77.3)       Income N (%)     27 (9.2)     268(90.9)       9,601–18,000     0 (0)     4(100)     0.001	Condom	Males	AGE N	149	732	
Education N (%)     0 (0)     4 (100)       No Education     0 (0)     4 (100)       Less than Grade 5     11 (6.1)     168 (93.9)     0.028       Grade 5-10     25 (12.5)     175 (87.5)       Above Grade 10     113 (22.7)     385 (77.3)       Income N (%)     27 (9.2)     268(90.9)       9,601-18,000     0 (0)     4(100)     0.001				33.7 (6.5)	32.1 [7.0]	0.014
No Education 0 (0) 4 (100) Less than Grade 5 11 (6.1) 168 (93.9) 0.028 Grade 5-10 25 (12.5) 175 (87.5) Above Grade 10 113 (22.7) 385 (77.3)  Income N (%) 0-9,600 27 (9.2) 268(90.9) 9,601-18,000 0 (0) 4(100) 0.001			95% CI	32.6–34.7	31.6-32.6	
Less than Grade 5			Education N (%)			
Grade 5–10 25 (12.5) 175 (87.5) Above Grade 10 113 (22.7) 385 (77.3)  Income N (%) 0–9,600 27 (9.2) 268(90.9) 9,601–18,000 0 (0) 4(100) 0.001			No Education	0 (0)	4 (100)	
Above Grade 10 113 (22.7) 385 (77.3)  Income N (%) 0-9,600 27 (9.2) 268(90.9) 9,601-18,000 0 (0) 4(100) 0.001			Less than Grade 5	11 (6.1)	168 (93.9)	0.028
Income N (%) 0-9,600 27 (9.2) 268(90.9) 9,601-18,000 0 (0) 4(100) 0.001			Grade 5–10	25 (12.5)	175 (87.5)	
$ \begin{vmatrix} 0-9,600 & 27 (9.2) & 268(90.9) \\ 9,601-18,000 & 0 (0) & 4(100) \end{vmatrix} 0.001 $			Above Grade 10	113 (22.7)	385 (77.3)	
9,601–18,000 0 (0) 4(100) 0.001			Income N (%)			
9,601–18,000 0 (0) 4(100) 0.001				27 (9.2)	268(90.9)	0.001
			9,601–18,000			0.001
	Ì					

\*Income was measured in Philippine Peso.

Table-5: Distribution of Age, Education and Income in contraceptive users vs. non-users, Thailand

Female	AGE N	1005		
	HOL II	1925	782	-
	Mean [SD]	35.6[11.88]	37.3 [12.4]	.001
	95% CI	35.1-36.2	36.5-38.2	
	Education N (%)			
	No Education	0(0)	0(0)	
	Less than Grade 5	1045(71.6)	412(28.2)	.000
	Grade 5–10	602(75.3)	197(24.7)	
	Above Grade 10	266(63.2)	153(36.3	
	Income N (%)		,	
	0-40,000	4732(79.9)	1192(20.1)	. 0001
	40,000-1,25,000	1807(75.0)	603(25.0)	<.0001
	More than 1,25,000	3068(67.6)	1472(32.4)	
Female	AGE N	599	2013	
	Mean [SD]	36.1[11.8]	36.1 [12.1]	.883
	95% CI	35.1-37.0	35.6-36.7	
	Education N (%)			
	No Education	0(0)	0(0)	
	Less than Grade 5	245(17.5)	1147(82)	.000
	Grade 5–10	172(22)	607(77.6)	
	Above Grade 10	188(44.7)	229(54.4)	
	Income N (%)			
	0-15600	820(14.7)	4755(85.3)	<.0001
	15601-28500	498(22.0)	1763(78.0)	<.0001
	More then 28500	1744(40.8)	2536(59.2)	
Males	AGE N	459	960	
	Mean [SD]	35.4 [7.4]	35.4 [8.8]	.933
	95% CI	34.7-36.1	34.9-36.0	
	Education N (%)			
	No Education	0(0)	0(0)	
	Less than Grade 5	153(21)	574(78.7)	.000
	Grade 5- 10	116(30.1)	268(69.4)	
	Above Grade 10	191(63)	106(35)	
	Income N (%)	` ′	) , ,	
	0-40,000	1789(30.8)	4022(69.2)	
	40,000-1,25,000	1039(42.4)	1410(57.6)	<.0001
	More than 1,25,000	1713(39.0)	2675(61.0)	
		No Education   Less than Grade 5   Grade 5-10   Above Grade 10   Income N (%)   0-40,000   40,000-1,25,000   More than 1,25,000   More than 1,25,000   Female   AGE N   Mean [SD]   95% CI   Education N (%)   No Education Less than Grade 5   Grade 5-10   Above Grade 10   Income N (%)   0-15600   15601-28500   More then 28500   More then 28500   More then 28500   More then 28500   Less than Grade 5   Grade 5-10   Above Grade 10   Less than Grade 5   Grade 5-10   Above Grade 10   Income N (%)   No Education Less than Grade 5   Grade 5-10   Above Grade 10   Income N (%)   0-40,000   40,000-1,25,000   More than 1,25,000   More than 1,25,000	No Education	No Education

\*Income was measured in Thailand Baht

A drawback of cross-sectional design is that it cannot establish causality because of lack of temporality but owing to the large and randomly collected sample, results can be generalized to the South Asian population, a substantial part of the world. Electronic media, most importantly the television, is a valuable tool to effectively influence family planning trends in developing countries. 18,19 Television can clarify the importance of family planning and demystify and publicize the various methods, and serve as a tool to broadcast important health information in an effective manner. 14,20 to television's However, realize potential, should programming engage thorough demonstrations of family planning, and guide viewers to these services. The programming shouldn't be preachy and dull, but interesting and adapted to a particular place's cultural sensitivities. The program should be vigilantly prepared, evaluated, and revised so as to make it more reliable and effective. However, television has its fair share of flaws as well. TV sets are not very common in rural and remote areas - they are expensive and inaccessible. Moreover, to conduct such program, people with ample know-how of both broadcasting and familyplanning are required, but there is a shortage of these professionals in the region. And TV then, is a one-

way communication. It is exclusive, and the audience participation is not possible. <sup>21</sup>

# **CONCLUSION**

Our study highlighted the importance of contraception programs and advertisements on television with the aim of enhancing the use of contraceptive methods. The use of media for health promotion is a strong way to influence health status of a population. The use of other modern media computer/internet and text messages on cell phones is also recommended.

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank Dr. Maryam Ashraf, Research Associate, Centre of Excellence for Maternal and Child Health, Health Services Academy, for her constant help, advice and critique during the course of drafting this manuscript. We acknowledge the assistance of Ms. Kathryn Taylor, Public Health Professional, Johns Hopkins, Baltimore, Maryland, USA in editing the language of this article.

#### REFERENCES

 National Institute of Population Studies and Macro International. Pakistan Demographic and Health Survey 2006-0. Islamabad: 2008.

- Khan YP, Bhutta SZ, Munim S, Bhutta ZA. Maternal health and survival in Pakistan: issues and options. J Obstet Gynaecol Can 2009;31:920–9.
- Population growth and its implications Islamabad, National Institute of Population Studies; 2004.
- Sathar ZA, Raza B. Safe motherhood in South Asia: current status and strategies for change. Pak Dev Rev 1994;33(4 Pt 2):1123–37
- Little P, Griffin S, Kelly, Dickson N, Sadler C. Effect of educational leaflets and questions on knowledge of contraception in women taking the combined contraceptive pill: randomized controlled trial. BMJ 1998;316:1948–52.
- Udry JR, Clark LT, Chase CL, Levy M. Can mass media advertising increase contraceptive use? Fam Plann Perspect 1972;4:37–44.
- Van Lunsen RHW, Arnolds HT, van Maris GM. Choices and changes in contraceptive behavior, the role of information sources. Patient Educ Couns 1994;23:197–202.
- Kane TK, Gueye M, Speizer I, Pacque-Margolis S, Baron D. The impact of a family planning multimedia campaign in Bamako, Mali. Stud Fam Plann 1988;29:309–23.
- Women's Exposure to Mass Media Is Linked to Attitudes Toward Contraception in Pakistan, India and Bangladesh. Int Fam Plann Perspect 2000;26(1):48–50.
- Islam MM, Hasan AH. Mass media exposure and its impact on family planning in Bangladesh. J Biosoc Sci 2000;32(4):513-26.
- Goni A, Rahman M. The impact of education and media on contraceptive use in Bangladesh: A multivariate analysis. Int J Nurs Pract 2012:18:565–73

- 12. Jejeebhoy SJ, Sathar ZA. Women's Autonomy in India and Pakistan: The Influence of Religion and Region. Popul Dev Rev 2001;27:687–712.
- Mason KO, Smith HL, Chayovan N, Jejeebhoy SJ, Nagaraj S, Raymundo CM, Sathar ZA, Ghuman S, Lee H. Female autonomy and fertility in five Asian countries, March 9,1999. Available at: http://swaf.pop.upenn.edu/publications-and-papers
- Mungai P. Men's knowledge, attitudes and practices with regard to family planning. Afr Link 1996 Apr:5–7.
- Khawaja NP, Tayyeb R, Malik N. Awareness and practices of contraception among Pakistani women attending a tertiary care hospital. J Obstet Gynaecol 2004;24:564

  –7.
- Santelli JS, Warren CW, Lowry R, Sogolow E, Collins J, Kann L, et al. The use of condoms with other contraceptive methods among young men and women. Fam Plann Perspect 1997;29(6):261–7.
- Siziya S. Determinants of contraceptive knowledge among teenagers in Zimbabwe. Afr J Health Sci 2000;7(3–4):88–90.
- Keating J, Meekers D, Adewuyi A. Assessing effects of a media campaign on HIV/AIDS awareness and prevention in Nigeria: results from the VISION Project. BMC Public Health 2006;6:123.
- Yee L, Simon M. The role of the social network in contraceptive decision-making among young, African American and Latina women. J Adolesc Health 2010;47:374

  –80.
- 20. El-bakly S. TV spots' impact. Integration. 1994;41:24–7.
- Munyanziza B. Television could be effective in the family planning program in Rwanda. Imbonezamuryango 1993;26:31–4.

# **Address for Correspondence:**

Muhammad Bedar Bakht, Research Associate, Health Services Academy. Islamabad. Pakistan.

Email: muhammadbedarbakht@gmail.com