TABLE 2. Percentage distribution of women whose childbearing behavior during the intersurvey period did not follow their stated intention in the NFHS, by reason, according to intention and behavior

Intention, behavior and reason	%	
Intended not to have children, but did	(N=89)	
Woman wanted more children	32.5	
Birth of children up to God	14.6	
Husband/in-laws wanted more children	13.4	
Contraception not effective	6.7	
Fear of side effects	6.7	
No contraceptive knowledge	4.5	
Sterilization failure	6.8	
Do not know	5.6	
Death of child	4.5	
Changed mind	3.4	
Other	1.1	
Intended to have children, but did not	(N=84)	
Health problem	40.4	
Changed mind	23.8	
Did not give serious answer	7.1	
Do not know	4.8	
Death of husband	8.3	
Migration of husband	2.4	
Menopause/subfecundity	3.6	
Convinced to adopt contraception	3.6	
NFHS response guided by husband/in-laws	3.6	
Worsened finances	2.4	
Total	100.0	

TABLE 3. Percentage distribution of women whose contraceptive behavior during the intersurvey period did not follow their stated intentions in the NFHS, by reason, according to intention and behavior

Intended to use method, but did not	(N=59)
Woman wanted more children	35.6
Do not know	11.9
Changed mind	5.1
Fear of side effects	13.6
No contraceptive knowledge	5.1
Health problem	11.9
Opposition from family	10.2
Menopause	1.7
Death of husband	1.7
Other	3.2
Intended not to use method, but did	(N=93)†
Reached desired family size	72.0
Husband wanted to use method	8.6
Changed mind/did not give serious answer	6.5
Newly married/no contraceptive knowledge	3.3
Convinced to use method by health care worker/	
friend/relative/neighbor	2.2
Other	7.5
Total	100.0

TABLE 4. Odds ratios from logistic regression analyses examining the effect of selected characteristics on the likelihood of inconsistency between childbearing and contraceptive intentions and behavior

Characteristic	Childbearing intention		Contraceptive intention	
	To have children (N=287)	Not to have children (N=145)	To use method (N=124)†	Not to use method (N=294)
Age				
<30 (ref)	1.00 0.25**	1.00 0.08**	1.00 6.22**	1.00 5.89**
≥30	0.25^^	0.08^^	6.22**	5.89**
No. of child deaths, 1992–1999)			
0 (ref)	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
≥1	0.27**	2.66**	2.56*	0.19**
No. of living children				
<4 (ref)	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
≥4	0.79	0.20**	0.39	1.39
No. of surviving sons				
≥1 (ref)	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
0	0.18**	1.97	1.42	0.83
Ideal vs. actual family size				
ldeal≤actual (ref)	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Ideal>actual	1.17	0.99	0.99*	1.16
Residence‡				
Kachcha (ref)	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Pucca/semi-pucca	2.39	0.71	0.30*	0.32
Caste/tribe				
Scheduled§ (ref)	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Other	1.30	0.72	1.04	0.49*
Literate				
No (ref)	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Yes	1.89	1.41	1.58	2.33*
Constant	0.216	15.635	2.969	0.437

*p<.05. **p<.01.†Among respondents who intended to use a contraceptive method, three had already reached menopause at the time of NFHS. ±On the basis of construction materials, a house is classified as kachcha (made with mud, thatch or other low-quality materials), pucca (made with high-quality materials) or semi-pucca (made with low- and high-quality materials). §Scheduled castes and tribes are officially recognized by the government of India as socioeconomically disadvantaged and in need of special protection from injustice and exploitation. Note: ref=reference group.