



U.S. Women's Use of Sexual and Reproductive Health Services: Trends, Sources of Care and Factors Associated with Use, 1995–2010

Jennifer J. Frost

HIGHLIGHTS

- Seven in 10 U.S. women of reproductive age, some 43–45 million women, make at least one medical visit to obtain sexual and reproductive health (SRH) services each year. Uninsured women are significantly less likely than either privately or Medicaid-insured women to receive SRH services. Approximately 25 million women receive contraceptive services annually.
- The number of women having either a Pap test or pelvic exam each year fell from 41 million in 2002 to 39 million in 2006–2010, consistent with recent changes in cervical cancer screening recommendations.
- The number of women receiving STD testing, treatment or counseling each year doubled from 4.6 million in 1995 to 9.8 million in 2006–2010, reflecting both an increase in routine chlamydia screening now recommended for all sexually active women younger than age 25, as well as an increase in the reported incidence of chlamydia.
- The number of women receiving any SRH service who went to a publicly funded clinic for that care rose from 7.3 million (17% of those receiving care) in 1995 to 10.2 million (23%) in 2006–2010, mirroring concurrent increases in the number of women in poverty and in need of publicly funded contraceptive services. Compared with women receiving services from private doctors, women going to publicly funded clinics received a wider range of SRH services and were more likely to have conversations about contraception during annual gynecologic visits.
- Title X-funded clinics continue to play an important role in providing SRH care to poor and low-income women—14% of all women who receive any contraceptive service obtain that care from these clinics, as do 25% of poor women and 36% of uninsured women receiving care. In fact, six in 10 women (61%) visiting Title X-funded clinics for contraceptive and related services report that the clinic is their usual source for medical care.
- Between 1995 and 2006–2010, there was a significant rise in the use of private insurance to pay for contraceptive visits—from 48% to 63%. Going forward, the Affordable Care Act is likely to accelerate this trend.



May 2013

U.S. Women’s Use of Sexual and Reproductive Health Services: Trends, Sources of Care and Factors Associated with Use, 1995–2010

Jennifer J. Frost

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This report was written by Jennifer J. Frost, of the Guttmacher Institute. It was edited by Susan London, independent consultant.

The authors thank Guttmacher colleagues Rachel Gold, Laura Lindberg and Lawrence Finer for guidance during analysis and manuscript review. Additional thanks go to William Mosher and Gladys Martinez, of the National Center for Health Statistics, and Sue Moskosky and Christina LaChance, of the Office of Population Affairs, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, for reviewing the draft manuscript.

The research on which this report is based was funded by the Office of Population Affairs, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, under grant FPRPA006050. The conclusions presented are those of the author.

The Guttmacher Institute gratefully acknowledges the general support it receives from individuals and foundations—including major grants from the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, the David and Lucile Packard Foundation and the Ford Foundation—which undergirds all of the Institute’s work.

CONTENTS

- Background and Significance 3**
- Methodology 5**
 - Data Sources 5
 - Key Measures..... 5
 - Receipt of Services..... 5
 - Mix of Services..... 7
 - Source of Care..... 7
 - Usual Source for Medical Care 8
 - Statistical Analysis 8
- SRH Services Received 9**
 - Trends in Service Use 9
 - Trends in Contraceptive Service Use by Women’s Characteristics 10
 - Factors Associated with Use of SRH Services 10
- Source of SRH Services Received 15**
 - Variation in Source of Care over Time..... 15
 - Variation in Source of Care According To Type of Service 16
 - Factors Associated with Use of Publicly Funded Clinics .. 17
 - Characteristics of Women Receiving SRH Care..... 18
- Variation in the Mix of SRH Services Received 26**
 - Receipt of Specific Services by Provider Type..... 26
 - Mix of SRH Services Received 27
 - Mix of SRH Services Received by Clinic Type 28
 - Factors Associated with Type of SRH Services Received..... 29
 - Conversations with Providers During SRH Visits 31
 - Usual Source of Care 32
- Discussion..... 42**
 - Use of Services 42
 - The Importance of Safety Net Providers 43
 - SRH Service Use Under the ACA 44
- Appendix 46**
- Appendix Tables 48**
- References 60**

© Guttmacher Institute, 2013

Suggested citation: Frost JJ, *U.S. Women’s Use of Sexual and Reproductive Health Services: Trends, Sources of Care and Factors Associated with Use, 1995–2010*, New York: Guttmacher Institute, 2013, <<http://www.guttmacher.org/pubs/sources-of-care-2013.pdf>>.

www.guttmacher.org

Background and Significance

A core component of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA) of 2010 is its focus on preventive services and the role that these services play in promoting optimal health and well-being. For women, many critical preventive care services are provided within the context of sexual and reproductive health (SRH) visits. A recent Institute of Medicine study identified a number of specific preventive services and screenings that support women's overall health and that should be provided by health insurance plans without cost sharing.¹ The recommended services include contraceptive counseling and provision of the full range of Food and Drug Administration–approved contraceptive methods, as well as several related screening and counseling services that address broader SRH conditions such as cervical cancer, STIs and HIV, interpersonal and domestic violence, and maternity services such as screening for gestational diabetes. Taken together, the services identified by the Institute of Medicine comprise a large portion of the broad package of SRH services received by U.S. women every year. Moving forward, as the ACA is implemented and more women gain health care coverage, one challenge will be ensuring that all women have access to these important preventive services and that there is a network of providers capable of meeting women's SRH care needs.

In order to meet this challenge, policymakers and program planners need information and evidence about the current state of SRH care service provision in the United States. Understanding what SRH services women currently receive and where they go to obtain that care, and identifying gaps in the services provided or in the care received by subgroups of the population are important steps necessary for designing programs and service delivery options that will best meet the SRH care needs of women. This report aims to lay out a comprehensive picture of trends and current provision and use of key SRH services nationally over the last decade.

In the United States, women rely on a mix of private and public providers for their SRH care. Such care is offered by some 16,000 private practice obstetrician-gynecologists, many of the more than 68,000 office-based family practice doctors,² and more than 8,000 publicly funded clinics.³ Researchers have paid particular attention to examining services provided by publicly funded

clinics, distinguishing between clinics that receive funding through the federal Title X family planning program and those that receive other, non–Title X sources of public funding. This focus is important because Title X–funded clinics are often the only source of SRH care for poor and low-income women. In addition, Title X provides the only federal funding dedicated solely to family planning and requires its grantees to adhere to program regulations and guidelines that set a high standard of care and direct both how and what SRH services should be provided.

Several studies have investigated the practices and services provided by the network of publicly funded clinics that provide SRH services to poor and low-income Americans.^{4–7} Over the last two decades, a few studies, using nationally representative data from the 1980s, 1990s and 2002, have examined the SRH services received by all U.S. women at both public and private providers.^{8–12} These latter analyses are the precursors to the current report and use data from the National Survey of Family Growth (NSFG), an ongoing survey of nationally representative samples of U.S. women and men aged 15–44, to examine trends in use of SRH services and variation in the types of services received by women from different types of providers. Analyses using data from the 1995 and 2002 NSFGs found that the range and type of SRH services received by women visiting publicly funded clinics differed from those received by women visiting private doctors.^{8,9} Some, but not all, of these differences could be attributed to differences in the characteristics of women using each type of provider—with young, unmarried, minority, less-educated and low-income women most likely to depend on public providers for their care. More recently, researchers have examined the use of SRH services by adolescent and young adult women (aged 15–24) using the 2006–2010 NSFG, finding an upward trend in overall use of services by this group, but variation in access to care with disadvantaged women less likely to use SRH services.^{13,14} These studies did not look at variation in service use according to type of provider and focused solely on women younger than age 25.

The analysis reported here uses the women's data from the 2006–2010 NSFG to update many of the analyses published in earlier reports using the 1995 and 2002 NSFGs, and to more completely examine both the patterns and trends in SRH service use, as well as the factors associated with use of services and with use of specific provider types among women receiving services in the prior year.

The NSFG is the only national data source that identifies women who have received care from Title X–funded clinics and collects data on specific services received, allowing for comparisons in service delivery patterns among these clinics, other clinics and private doctors. A secondary focus of this report is to look at differences in service provision among publicly funded clinics according to their type, distinguishing between community health clinics (which include federally qualified health centers [FQHCs]), independent family planning clinics and public health department clinics. Given the increased funding of and expectations for FQHCs to serve many of the newly insured women under the ACA, it is important to assess the current role that they and the other types of clinics have in providing SRH services. Finally, we also update earlier analyses^{10,15} looking at whether women who receive family planning services from clinics report that the clinic is their usual source for medical care.

By assessing trends in the mix of SRH services received from different types of providers, controlling for women's sociodemographic characteristics, we expect these findings to inform the work of policymakers and program planners when developing recommendations for improving the delivery and financing of SRH services in the United States.

Methodology

Data Sources

This study is based on data from the three most recent releases of the NSFG—those conducted in 1995,¹⁶ in 2002¹⁷ and in 2006–2010.¹⁸ These nationally representative, in-home, cross-sectional surveys collect retrospective data from women aged 15–44 and are conducted by the U.S. National Center for Health Statistics. In 2006–2010, the sample size was 12,279 female respondents and the response rate was 77%; in 2002, the sample size was 7,643 female respondents and the response rate was 80%; and in 1995, the sample size was 10,847 female respondents and the response rate was 79%.

Key Measures

We focus on several key measures related to the use of SRH services by U.S. women. An overview regarding how these measures were operationalized is given below, with further detail in the Appendix.

- *Receipt of services* measures whether women reported receiving any of 15 specific SRH services in the prior year. In addition, four summary variables measure receipt of any contraceptive service, any preventive gynecologic service (either a Pap test or pelvic exam), any STD/HIV service and any of the remaining other services.
- *Mix of services* measures the combinations of types of SRH services received by women each year, classified into six service mix groupings; for example, contraceptive services plus other different types of services, and other different types of services without contraceptive care.
- *Source of care* indicates the type of provider visited for each individual SRH service received, classified as private doctor or HMO, publicly funded clinic or other. Clinics are further divided according to whether they receive federal Title X funding and according to their type (community clinic, independent family planning clinic, public health department clinic, and hospital outpatient or school-based clinic). Other providers include hospital inpatient services, emergency rooms, urgent care centers and other, nonspecified providers.

- *Usual source for medical care* measures whether women who visited publicly funded clinics reported that the clinic visited was their usual source for medical care.
- *Women's characteristics* measure a variety of demographic and socioeconomic variables. The items used in these analyses include age (15–19, 20–24, 25–29, 30–34, 35–39, ≥40 years); marital status (married, not married but cohabiting, formerly married, never married); parity (zero children, one or more children); race/ethnicity (non-Hispanic white, non-Hispanic black, Hispanic, other); nativity (U.S. born, foreign born); education (less than high school, high school/GED, some college, college complete); poverty status based on income as a percentage of federal poverty level (FPL)* (0–99% FPL=poor, 100–249% FPL=low-income, ≥250% FPL=better-off); health insurance status (has private insurance, has Medicaid or other public insurance, has no insurance); any uninsured period in the past year (yes, no); metropolitan location (yes, no); sexually active in the past year (yes, no), defined as having had heterosexual intercourse at least once in the past year; at risk for unintended pregnancy (yes, no), defined as being sexually active, able to become pregnant and not currently pregnant or seeking pregnancy; and number of sex partners in the past year (zero or one, two or more).

Receipt of Services

Female respondents of the NSFG are asked whether they received any of 15 specific contraceptive and related reproductive health care services from a doctor or other medical care provider in the prior 12 months. In all three survey cycles, 11 of the services asked about—five of the contraceptive services and six of the related SRH services—were identical (see table below). Starting in 2002, two additional contraceptive services were included: emergency contraception counseling and emergency contraception pills or prescription. All three surveys had an item on STD testing and treatment, but the wording of the question changed between 1995 and 2002 when the term *counsel-*

*The federal poverty level for a family of four in 2010 was \$20,050.

| In the past 12 months have you received: | 1995 | 2002 | 2006–2010 |
|---|-------------|-------------|------------------|
| Contraceptive services | | | |
| Counseling or information about birth control? | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| A check-up or medical test related to using a birth control method? | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| A method of birth control or a prescription for a method? | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Counseling or information about getting sterilized? | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| A sterilizing operation? | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Counseling or information about emergency contraception, also known as “Plan B” or “Preven,” or the “morning-after pill”? | na | ✓* | ✓* |
| Emergency contraception, also known as “Plan B” or “Preven,” or the “morning-after pill,” or a prescription for it? | na | ✓* | ✓* |
| Preventive gynecologic services | | | |
| A Pap smear? | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| A pelvic exam? | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| STD/HIV services | | | |
| Counseling for, or been tested or treated for a sexually transmitted disease? | ✓* | ✓* | ✓* |
| An HIV test (outside of blood donation)? | ✓ | ✓– | ✓ |
| Other SRH services | | | |
| A pregnancy test? | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Prenatal care? | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Postpregnancy care? | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| An abortion? | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| <i>Notes:</i> SRH=sexual and reproductive health. ✓=item asked. ✓*=item wording changed slightly across survey years. na=item not asked. ✓–=item asked, but detail on clinic providers missing. | | | |

ing was added to STD testing and treatment. And, in all three surveys, a question about receipt of HIV testing was included, but some of the detail on the type of provider visited was not collected in 2002 for women going to clinics.

Data are presented on each service separately, and several summary measures examine women’s receipt of any contraceptive or reproductive health care services, altogether and for subgroups of services. For the 1995 overall summary measure of any SRH service, we include the 13 similar service items (five contraceptive services, two gynecologic services, two STD/HIV services and four other SRH services). For 2002 and 2006–2010, we include the 13 similar service items and also include both emergency contraception questions, even though they were not asked in 1995. (Only 22 respondents, representing 160,000 women, reported receiving one of these services but no other family planning service in 2002, and only 14 respondents, representing 57,000 women, did so in 2006–2010, so the lack of data on emergency contraception for 1995 should not skew the results.)

We created additional summary measures for receipt of any contraceptive service, any preventive gynecologic

service, any STD/HIV service and any of the remaining other services. Receipt of any contraceptive service includes the five contraceptive service items asked in all years plus the two emergency contraception items asked in the later surveys. For 1995, one other adjustment was made: Women using reversible contraception who reported having obtained their method from a medical source, but who did not report having received any of the five specific contraceptive services, were coded as having received a contraceptive service. This adjustment has been described previously.⁸ In 2002 and 2006–2010, this adjustment was not necessary because a follow-up question was added to the NSFG to check for this inconsistency, and many fewer women reported being current contraceptive users with no contraceptive visit.

Receipt of any preventive gynecologic service includes having received a Pap test or pelvic exam and, in most instances, it is this combined variable that is presented because these services are typically provided together and most women who report receiving one also report the other. Receipt of any STD/HIV service includes receiving counseling, testing or treatment for an STD or having

received an HIV test. Finally, receipt of other SRH services includes having received a pregnancy test, prenatal care, postpregnancy care or an abortion. Although we include abortion as one of the SRH services that women may have received in the prior year in summary measures, because this service is estimated to be underreported by about 50% in the NSFG,¹⁹ we do not show abortion separately in any of the tables or figures. All of the respondents who reported undergoing an abortion in the prior year also reported receiving at least one of the other 14 SRH services.

Mix of Services

We combined the information on the specific SRH services that each woman reported receiving to classify women according to the mix of services received during the prior year using the following six categories, also shown in the table below: (1) contraceptive services with STD/HIV services (with or without preventive gynecologic or other services); (2) contraceptive services with other services (with or without preventive gynecologic services); (3) contraceptive services alone (with or without preventive gynecologic services); (4) STD/HIV services without contraceptive services (with or without preventive gynecologic services or other services); (5) other services without contraceptive care (with or without preventive gynecologic services); and (6) only preventive gynecologic services.

Source of Care

For each SRH service received, women were asked a series of questions about the type of provider visited to obtain that service and the method of payment used. Respondents were shown a card with 11 provider types to choose from: private doctor's office, HMO, four types of po-

tentially publicly funded clinics (community or public health clinic, family planning or Planned Parenthood clinic, school/school-based clinic, hospital outpatient clinic), employer or company clinic, hospital emergency room, hospital regular room, urgent care center and some other place.

Women reporting services from any of the four clinic types were asked for a specific provider name and address that was then compared with a database of family planning clinics. This database is updated regularly and contains all known publicly funded clinics providing contraceptive services; each clinic is classified according to its type and whether it receives federal Title X program funding. Information on Title X funding status and whether the clinic was a public health department was then attached to each respondent's record for all clinics found in the database. Clinics reported by women that could not be found in the database were coded as being unknown, and the name and address were "written in" if women could provide that information. In each survey year, extensive effort was put into classifying these unknown clinics (see the Appendix for details on methods used in each year).

After all adjustments, the recoded categories for source of care used in this analysis are private doctor/HMO, publicly funded clinic (divided into Title X-funded clinics and non-Title X-funded clinics) and other. These categories are used for comparisons across all three survey periods. In addition to these categories, for the 2006–2010 analysis, a second variable was created to classify clinics using the original four clinic categories reported by women, along with the information on whether a clinic was a public health department. This variable classifies clinics as community clinics, independent family planning clinics, public health department clinics and other clinics (which include both hospital outpatient and school-based clinics).

| Mix of services received | Contraceptive services | Preventive gynecologic services | STD/HIV services | Other services |
|--|------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| (1) Contraceptive services with STD/HIV services | Yes | Possibly | Yes | Possibly |
| (2) Contraceptive services with other services | Yes | Possibly | No | Yes |
| (3) Contraceptive services alone | Yes | Possibly | No | No |
| (4) STD/HIV services without contraceptive care | No | Possibly | Yes | Possibly |
| (5) Other services without contraceptive care | No | Possibly | No | Yes |
| (6) Only preventive gynecologic services | No | Yes | No | No |

- *Community clinics* likely include all or most FQHCs that women visited as well as other community clinics that do not receive this funding, but provide a range of primary care services. In 2006–2010, 27% of women going to community clinics for SRH services went to sites that received Title X funding (data not shown).
- *Independent family planning clinics* include Planned Parenthood clinics, as well as many other freestanding publicly funded clinics that specialize in the provision of contraceptive services. Fifty-eight percent of women going to independent family planning clinics went to sites that received Title X funding (data not shown).
- *Public health department clinics* often specialize in the provision of family planning services and sometimes provide related STD services; many also provide immunizations and infectious disease services, typically separate from family planning care. Ninety-one percent of women going to public health departments for SRH services went to sites that receive Title X funding (data not shown).
- Among the *other clinics*, hospital outpatient clinics were split between those that focus on family planning and those that provide a broader range of primary or maternity care services. Twenty percent of women going to hospital outpatient clinics or school-based clinics for SRH services went to sites that receive Title X funding (data not shown).

In each year, about 7% of women receiving any contraceptive service and 15% of women receiving any SRH care service visited more than one provider type for their services in the past 12 months (data not shown). In these cases, we assigned women to a single provider type using the following hierarchy of services and order of provider types. First, we coded the provider type for contraceptive services received from a Title X–funded clinic, non–Title X–funded clinic, private doctor or HMO, hospital, other, or employer clinic; if no contraceptive services were received, we coded the provider type for Pap test or pelvic exam, using the same order of providers; and finally, if no contraceptive services or Pap test or pelvic exam were received, we coded the provider type for STD/HIV services or other SRH services, again using the same order of providers. Thus, for example, a woman who visited both a publicly funded clinic and a private doctor for contraceptive services during the year would be coded as a clinic client; a woman who received STD/HIV services from a clinic, but contraceptive services or an annual gynecologic visit from a private doctor would be coded as a private doctor client.

Usual Source for Medical Care

For the subset of women visiting clinics for contraceptive and related services, we examined information about whether respondents considered these clinics to be their usual source for medical care. All female respondents who reported visiting a clinic were asked: “Is this clinic your *regular* place for medical care, or do you *usually* go somewhere else for medical care?” Women were asked this question separately for each clinic that they reported visiting in the prior 12 months for any of the SRH services received. Response options were as follows: clinic is regular place; clinic is regular place, but I have more than one regular place; usually go somewhere else; or don’t have a usual place for medical care.

For this analysis, we examined the percentage of women reporting that the clinic visited for family planning care was their only regular or usual source of medical care (excluding those with more than one usual source of care). We defined family planning care broadly to include all contraceptive services, as well as standard preventive gynecologic services typically provided in a family planning visit. These services included birth control method/prescription; birth control check-up; birth control counseling; sterilization counseling; emergency contraception counseling; emergency contraception; sterilization procedure; Pap test; pelvic exam; pregnancy test; and STD counseling, testing or treatment. To keep the focus on women who reported that their source for family planning care was their usual source of care, we excluded from analysis those who visited a publicly funded clinic in the past 12 months but received only prenatal care, postpartum care or abortion services, and none of the other family planning services.

Statistical Analysis

All analyses were performed using SPSS, version 18. In comparing proportions between surveys, we used the SPSS complex sample module, which produces standard errors and confidence intervals that account for the complex sample design used by the NSFG. In addition to the bivariate comparisons, for 2006–2010, we examined the predictors of receipt of specific types of services, provider choice and reliance on the clinic as a usual source of care using multivariate logistic regression analysis. Again, the significance levels for the odds ratios (ORs) in each model were obtained using the complex samples module of SPSS.


SRH Services Received

Trends in Service Use

The number and proportion of all U.S. women receiving any SRH service in the prior year has remained relatively stable over the past decade (Figure 1, Table 1). Some small, but significant, changes have occurred for individual services and for specific subgroups of women.

- A total of 44 million women reported receiving at least one SRH service in the 12 months before the 2006–2010 NSFG interview, representing 71% of all reproductive-age women. This proportion is not statistically significantly different from the 74% of women in 2002 and the 72% in 1995 who reported receiving similar services.
- Nearly 25 million women, or 40%, reported receiving at least one contraceptive service in the prior year in 2006–2010. This proportion is statistically unchanged from 2002, but it is significantly higher than the 36% observed in 1995.
- The number and proportion of women receiving preventive gynecologic care (either a Pap test or pelvic exam) fell between 2002 and 2006–2010 from 41 million women (67%) to 39 million women (63%).
- The receipt of STD/HIV services increased significantly from 21% in 1995 to 23% in 2002 and to 26% in 2006–2010. This increase was due exclusively to an increase in receipt of counseling, testing or treatment

FIGURE 1. Percentage of U.S. women 15–44 receiving each type of service in the prior year, 1995–2010.



for STDs (as opposed to HIV testing), which rose from 8% of all women to 13% and then to 16%. Some of the initial rise in STD care between 1995 and 2002 may have been related to the change in wording of this item, but the rise between 2002 and 2006–2010 is not affected by this issue. There were no significant changes in receipt of HIV testing over the period.

- Among the individual SRH services, receipt of several increased between the first two survey cycles and then remained at the higher level in the third. For example, the proportion of all women reporting that they had received a birth control method or prescription rose from 28% in 1995 to 34% in 2002 and then leveled off at 33% in 2006–2010. Similar patterns were found for increases in the percentages of women receiving birth control counseling and receiving pregnancy tests.

Trends in Contraceptive Service Use by Women's Characteristics

Increases in the percentage of women receiving any contraceptive service between 1995 and 2006–2010 occurred among some subpopulations of women, but not all (Table 2, page 13).

- The most consistent increases in contraceptive service use occurred among older women, women with family incomes of at least 250% of the FPL and non-Hispanic white women. For each of these subpopulations, the percentage receiving services rose significantly between 1995 and 2002, and remained significantly higher in 2006–2010 than in 1995.
- Among women in their 20s, poor and low-income women, and minority women, there was virtually no change in the proportion reporting receipt of contraceptive services across survey years.

Factors Associated with Use of SRH Services


To assess patterns or gaps in service provision among subgroups of women, we examined variation in receipt of SRH services according to women's characteristics, limiting our samples to women for whom the service was appropriate (Table 3 and Figure 2). For receipt of any SRH service or any STD/HIV service, we included only women who were sexually active in the prior year, and for receipt of contraceptive services, we included only women who were at risk for unintended pregnancy (sexually active in the prior year, able to get pregnant, not currently pregnant with an intended pregnancy and not trying to become pregnant).

Generally, young and unmarried women had the highest levels of receipt of SRH services in the prior year, patterns that likely reflect life course variation in SRH care

needs rather than gaps in access. On the other hand, disadvantaged women, particularly those without health insurance, and women with little education had the lowest levels of receipt, patterns that may indicate population subgroups for whom improved service access is needed.

- Compared with women in their 40s, younger women were significantly more likely to receive any SRH service, any contraceptive service and any STD/HIV service (ORs=1.5–4.3).
- Relative to their married peers, cohabiting women were more likely to receive each type of service measured (1.5–1.7), and formerly married women and never-married women had higher odds of receiving STD/HIV services (1.7).
- Non-Hispanic black women were more likely to receive any SRH service or any STD/HIV service compared with non-Hispanic white women (1.7–2.2), but they were less likely to receive any contraceptive service (0.7). Women of other races were also less likely than non-Hispanic white women to receive contraceptive services in the prior year (0.5).
- Relative to college-educated women, those with a high school education or less had lower odds of receiving any SRH care service, and the least educated had lower odds of receiving contraceptive services (0.5–0.6).
- Compared with women having private insurance, those having Medicaid coverage were more likely to receive any SRH service or any STD/HIV service (1.3–1.8). However, women who were uninsured all year had lower odds of receiving any SRH service, any contraceptive service and any STD/HIV service (0.4–0.7).
- Nonmetropolitan residents were less likely to receive STD/HIV services compared with metropolitan peers (0.8), while women with two or more sexual partners during the year had higher odds of receiving these services compared with peers having a single partner (1.8).

FIGURE 2 . Percentage of women at risk for unintended pregnancy who received any contraceptive service in the prior year by selected characteristics, 2006–2010



Note: FPL=federal poverty level.

TABLE 1. Number and percentage of women aged 15–44 who received any SRH service in the prior year, and the percentage receiving each specific service, United States, 1995, 2002, 2006–2010

| Type of service | 1995 | | 2002 | | 2006–2010 | |
|---|---------------|-----------|---------------|-------------|---------------|--------------|
| | No. (in 000s) | % | No. (in 000s) | % | No. (in 000s) | % |
| No. of women aged 15–44 | 59,958 | – | 61,561 | – | 61,755 | – |
| No. and % receiving any SRH service | 43,204 | 72 | 45,414 | 74 | 44,050 | 71 |
| No. and % receiving specific services | | | | | | |
| Birth control counseling | 8,694 | 15 | 11,432 | 19 * | 10,304 | 17 * |
| Birth control check-up | 13,370 | 22 | 14,510 | 24 | 13,793 | 22 |
| Birth control method or prescription | 16,480 | 28 | 20,864 | 34 * | 20,610 | 33 * |
| Sterilization counseling | 2,011 | 3 | 2,697 | 4 * | 1,943 | 3 † |
| Sterilization operation | 1,158 | 2 | 1,139 | 2 | 1,131 | 2 |
| Emergency contraception counseling | na | na | 1,986 | 3 | 2,007 | 3 |
| Emergency contraception pills or prescription | na | na | 568 | 1 | 1,345 | 2 |
| Any contraceptive service | 21,428 | 36 | 25,659 | 42 * | 24,665 | 40 * |
| Pap test | 37,162 | 62 | 39,629 | 64 | 37,305 | 60 † |
| Pelvic exam | 36,804 | 61 | 36,667 | 60 | 34,053 | 55 *† |
| Either Pap test or pelvic exam | 38,916 | 65 | 41,034 | 67 | 38,835 | 63 † |
| Test/treatment for STD | 4,562 | 8 | 7,732 | 13 * | 9,847 | 16 *† |
| Test for HIV | 10,387 | 17 | 10,329 | 17 | 11,752 | 19 |
| Any STD/HIV service | 12,370 | 21 | 14,106 | 23 * | 16,045 | 26 *† |
| Pregnancy test | 9,622 | 16 | 12,125 | 20 * | 11,481 | 19 * |
| Prenatal care | 5,700 | 10 | 4,555 | 7 * | 4,218 | 7 * |
| Postpregnancy care | 3,534 | 6 | 3,804 | 6 | 3,498 | 6 |
| Other SRH services | 11,773 | 20 | 13,668 | 22 * | 13,240 | 21 |

*Proportion is significantly different from 1995 at $p < .05$.

†Proportion is significantly different from 2002 at $p < .05$.

Note: SRH=sexual and reproductive health. na=not available.

TABLE 2. Percentage of women aged 15–44 who received any contraceptive service in the prior year according to women’s characteristics, United States, 1995, 2002, 2006–2010

| Characteristic | 1995 | 2002 | 2006–2010 |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| No. of women (in 000s) | 59,958 | 61,561 | 61,755 |
| % receiving any contraceptive service | 36 | 42 * | 40 * |
| Age-group | | | |
| 15–19 years | 32 | 40 * | 36 |
| 20–24 years | 60 | 63 | 58 |
| 25–29 years | 52 | 55 | 52 |
| 30–34 years | 39 | 47 * | 43 |
| 35–39 years | 23 | 31 * | 31 * |
| 40–44 years | 14 | 20 * | 21 * |
| Marital status | | | |
| Currently married | 33 | 39 * | 37 |
| Cohabiting | 50 | 50 | 54 |
| Formerly married | 31 | 34 | 35 |
| Never married | 38 | 44 * | 41 |
| Race/ethnicity | | | |
| Non-Hispanic white | 36 | 43 * | 42 * |
| Non-Hispanic black | 38 | 40 | 37 |
| Hispanic | 37 | 40 | 36 |
| Other | 24 | 35 * | 33 |
| Poverty status, % of FPL | | | |
| 0–99 | 37 | 41 | 40 |
| 100–249 | 35 | 38 | 37 |
| ≥250 | 36 | 45 * | 42 * |

* Proportion is significantly different from 1995 at $p < .05$.

Note: FPL=federal poverty level.

TABLE 3. Percentage of women receiving various services in the prior year among subgroups of women for whom the service is relevant, according to their characteristics, and multivariate odds ratios predicting receipt of services, United States, 2006–2010

| Characteristic | Received any SRH service [†] | | | Received any contraceptive service [‡] | | | Received any STD/HIV service [†] | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|----|------------|---|----|------------|---|----|------------|
| | No. (in 000s) | % | Odds ratio | No. (in 000s) | % | Odds ratio | No. (in 000s) | % | Odds ratio |
| No. of women (in 000s) | 49,414 | 80 | – | 30,841 | 63 | – | 49,414 | 31 | – |
| Age-group | | | | | | | | | |
| 15–19 | 4,183 | 80 | 1.67 * | 3,895 | 66 | 3.05 * | 4,183 | 43 | 2.55 * |
| 20–24 | 8,399 | 89 | 3.30 * | 7,226 | 70 | 3.27 * | 8,399 | 49 | 4.31 * |
| 25–29 | 9,523 | 85 | 2.13 * | 6,799 | 67 | 2.63 * | 9,523 | 38 | 3.30 * |
| 30–34 | 8,441 | 81 | 1.52 * | 4,880 | 63 | 1.94 * | 8,441 | 28 | 2.32 * |
| 35–39 | 9,605 | 73 | 1.00 | 4,674 | 56 | 1.54 * | 9,605 | 20 | 1.51 * |
| 40–44 (ref) | 9,262 | 74 | 1.00 | 3,367 | 47 | 1.00 | 9,262 | 14 | 1.00 |
| Marital status | | | | | | | | | |
| Currently married (ref) | 25,388 | 78 | 1.00 | 12,839 | 60 | 1.00 | 25,388 | 19 | 1.00 |
| Cohabiting | 6,828 | 85 | 1.54 * | 4,589 | 72 | 1.61 * | 6,828 | 40 | 1.72 * |
| Formerly married | 4,194 | 78 | 1.29 | 2,208 | 61 | 1.35 | 4,194 | 34 | 1.74 * |
| Never married | 13,004 | 83 | 1.00 | 11,204 | 64 | 1.00 | 13,004 | 46 | 1.68 * |
| Any children | | | | | | | | | |
| No (ref) | 17,266 | 84 | 1.00 | 13,820 | 66 | 1.00 | 17,266 | 36 | 1.00 |
| Yes | 32,148 | 78 | 1.08 | 17,021 | 61 | 1.22 | 32,148 | 27 | 1.08 |
| Race/ethnicity | | | | | | | | | |
| Non-Hispanic white (ref) | 30,741 | 81 | 1.00 | 18,927 | 67 | 1.00 | 30,741 | 26 | 1.00 |
| Non-Hispanic black | 7,067 | 87 | 1.74 * | 4,395 | 58 | 0.67 * | 7,067 | 51 | 2.23 * |
| Hispanic | 8,457 | 74 | 1.00 | 5,308 | 59 | 0.91 | 8,457 | 33 | 1.18 |
| Other | 3,149 | 75 | 0.77 | 2,212 | 50 | 0.55 * | 3,149 | 25 | 0.98 |
| Nativity | | | | | | | | | |
| U.S. born (ref) | 41,810 | 81 | 1.00 | 25,863 | 65 | 1.00 | 41,810 | 31 | 1.00 |
| Foreign born | 7,569 | 74 | 1.11 | 4,946 | 52 | 0.87 | 7,569 | 30 | 1.17 |
| Education | | | | | | | | | |
| <high school complete | 9,357 | 74 | 0.54 * | 5,663 | 58 | 0.59 * | 9,357 | 39 | 1.12 |
| High school complete | 12,557 | 77 | 0.65 * | 7,112 | 62 | 0.76 | 12,557 | 31 | 1.01 |
| Some college | 14,267 | 82 | 0.84 | 9,470 | 65 | 0.87 | 14,267 | 32 | 1.05 |
| College graduate (ref) | 13,233 | 84 | 1.00 | 8,597 | 65 | 1.00 | 13,233 | 23 | 1.00 |
| Poverty status, % of FPL | | | | | | | | | |
| 0–99 (ref) | 10,393 | 79 | 1.00 | 6,404 | 64 | 1.00 | 10,393 | 41 | 1.00 |
| 100–249 | 15,871 | 75 | 0.80 | 9,905 | 60 | 0.81 * | 15,871 | 31 | 0.92 |
| ≥250 | 23,150 | 83 | 1.20 | 14,532 | 65 | 0.94 | 23,150 | 25 | 1.00 |
| Health insurance | | | | | | | | | |
| Private (ref) | 31,834 | 82 | 1.00 | 19,877 | 66 | 1.00 | 31,834 | 25 | 1.00 |
| Medicaid | 10,029 | 86 | 1.32 * | 6,547 | 67 | 1.05 | 10,029 | 49 | 1.76 * |
| None all year | 7,551 | 63 | 0.45 * | 4,417 | 47 | 0.56 * | 7,551 | 27 | 0.73 * |
| Any uninsured period in past year | | | | | | | | | |
| No (ref) | 34,734 | 83 | 1.00 | 21,742 | 66 | 1.00 | 34,734 | 29 | 1.00 |
| Yes | 14,680 | 73 | 0.84 | 9,100 | 57 | 0.82 | 14,680 | 33 | 1.10 |
| Metropolitan location | | | | | | | | | |
| Yes (ref) | 39,247 | 80 | 1.00 | 25,192 | 62 | 1.00 | 39,247 | 32 | 1.00 |
| No | 10,167 | 80 | 1.21 | 5,649 | 68 | 1.26 | 10,167 | 25 | 0.76 * |
| No. of partners in past year | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 (ref) | 42,896 | 79 | 1.00 | 25,877 | 63 | 1.00 | 42,896 | 27 | 1.00 |
| ≥2 | 6,518 | 84 | 1.10 | 4,964 | 65 | 1.02 | 6,518 | 52 | 1.80 * |

*Significant at p<.05. †Among sexually active women (see page 10 for definition). ‡Among women at risk for unintended pregnancy (see page 10 for definition). Notes: ref=reference group. FPL=federal poverty level.

Source of SRH Services Received

Variation in Source of Care over Time


Over the past decade, the number and percentage of women relying on certain types of providers for their SRH care has shifted, with a greater share of women relying on publicly funded clinics in 2006–2010 (Table 4, Figure 3). However, even with this change, the large majority of women who receive these services still rely on the private sector—in each survey year, more than seven in 10 women receiving SRH care reported a private doctor or HMO as the source for this care.

- Between 1995 and 2006–2010, the proportion of women receiving any SRH service whose source was a private doctor or HMO fell from 77% to 72%. Meanwhile, the

proportion whose source was a publicly funded clinic rose from 17% to 23%, mainly because the share of women using non–Title X clinics increased (from 7% to 12%).

- Over time, for women receiving contraceptive services specifically, there were no significant changes in the proportion receiving care from private doctors versus clinics. Among women receiving STD/HIV services, although similar proportions relied on private doctors each year, the proportion going to clinics did increase significantly because fewer women relied on “other” provider types, which include hospital emergency rooms, urgent care centers, blood banks and other places, for this care.

FIGURE 3. Among women receiving any SRH service, distribution according to source of care, 1995–2010



Note : SRH=sexual and reproductive health.

- Among women receiving preventive gynecologic care or other SRH services, a smaller share relied on private doctors and a larger share relied on publicly funded clinics in 2006–2010 versus 1995.

Variation in Source of Care According to Type of Service


Comparing different types of SRH services, there is wide variation in where women go to receive that care, with greater percentages relying on private doctors for maternity and preventive gynecologic care than do so for contraceptive or STD/HIV services (Tables 4 and 5, Figure 4).

- In 2006–2010, for maternity care (prenatal or postpregnancy care) and preventive gynecologic care (Pap test or pelvic exam), more than three-quarters of women

(76–77%) received each service from a private doctor or HMO and about 20% from a publicly funded clinic, split fairly evenly between those that were and were not funded by Title X (8–10% vs. 11%, respectively).

- For basic contraceptive services (receipt of a birth control method or a check-up related to birth control), one in four women (25–27%) received care from a publicly funded clinic, as did one-third of those who said they received birth control counseling in the past year.
- More than one in three women (35%) who reported receiving STD testing, treatment or counseling did so from a publicly funded clinic, as did 29% of those who reported receiving an HIV test in the prior year. Fewer than 60% of women reporting STD or HIV services received that care from private doctors. One in five women who reported receipt of an HIV test did so from an “other”

FIGURE 4. Percent distribution of women receiving each service according to the source of care, 2006–2010.



Note: EC=emergency contraception.

type of provider—a group that includes not only hospital inpatient services, emergency rooms and urgent care centers, but also the respondents' home or work site, and labs or blood banks.

- Among the small percentage of women who reported receiving emergency contraception services—counseling, pills or a prescription—more than half (52–59%) received the service from a publicly funded clinic, with Title X–funded clinics providing these services to one-third (31–34%) of all women receiving the service. Only about one-quarter (23%) of women who obtained emergency contraception pills or a prescription in the past year went to a private doctor, while a similar proportion (25%) used “other” provider types.

Among women who received SRH services from publicly funded clinics, Table 5 presents additional detail on the source of care according to clinic type—classifying clinics into four types that typically rely on different funding sources and have different missions and focus in delivering care. Community clinics include FQHCs that receive federal funding from the Bureau of Primary Care and focus on provision of a broad range of primary care services. Independent family planning clinics include Planned Parenthood clinics and other freestanding clinics that focus on provision of contraceptive services; many receive funding from Title X and from state or local sources. Public health department clinics often focus on the provision of contraceptive and STD services, and typically rely on Title X funding for contraceptive care and state or county funding for their other services. Finally, other clinics include both hospital outpatient clinics and school-based clinics—sites that vary widely in terms of their service focus (some are reproductive health focused, whereas others have a broader service focus).

- The 23% of women receiving any SRH service from a publicly funded clinic included 8% who did so from a community clinic, 6% from an independent family planning clinic, 5% from a public health department clinic and 4% from a hospital outpatient or school-based clinic.
- Among the 28% of women receiving contraceptive services from publicly funded clinics, the distribution differed slightly, with the largest group, 9%, receiving care from independent family planning clinics, 8% from community clinics, 6% from public health department clinics and 5% from hospital outpatient or school-based clinics.
- With respect to specific individual services, community clinics provided care to the largest shares of women visiting publicly funded clinics for Pap tests and pelvic exams, and prenatal or postpregnancy care. More than one-third of women getting either a Pap test or pelvic

exam from publicly funded clinics did so from a community clinic (7–8% of all women receiving these services), and about half of those getting prenatal or postpregnancy care from clinics did so from community clinics (9–10% of women receiving these services).


- In contrast, independent family planning clinics provided care to the largest shares of women visiting publicly funded clinics for specific contraceptive services, particularly emergency contraception services. About one in three women visiting publicly funded clinics for birth control counseling or a birth control check-up or to get a method or prescription went to an independent family planning clinic (9–10% of women receiving these services), as did half of those going to clinics for emergency contraception (30–37% of women receiving emergency contraception services).

Factors Associated with Use of Publicly Funded Clinics

Women's demographic and socioeconomic characteristics were strongly associated with the type of provider they visited for SRH care (Table 6 and Figure 5, page 18).

- Compared with older, married, white and more affluent women, those who were in their 20s, unmarried, non-white, and poor or low income had a greater likelihood (ORs=1.4–1.9) of getting both any SRH service and any contraceptive service from a publicly funded clinic as opposed to private doctors or other providers. Women with children had lower odds of visiting clinics for either type of service relative to their childless peers (0.5–0.6).
- Women without a high school education were significantly more likely to visit clinics for both categories of services compared with college-educated women (1.8–1.9).
- Foreign-born women had greater odds of visiting clinics for any SRH service compared with their U.S.-born counterparts (1.4), and marginally significantly greater odds for receipt of any contraceptive service (1.4, *p* significant at .10). The proportion of foreign-born women visiting clinics for contraceptive services was significantly higher than that for U.S.-born women (41% vs. 25%).
- Relative to women with private health insurance, those on Medicaid were more than twice as likely to visit clinics (2.5 for any SRH service and 2.7 for any contraceptive service), and those who were uninsured all year had a more than four times the odds of getting care from clinics (4.5 and 5.2).
- Compared with their metropolitan peers, nonmetropolitan residents had greater odds of getting care from clinics (1.7–1.8).

FIGURE 5. Percentage of women receiving contraceptive services in the prior year who went to a publicly funded clinic, by selected characteristics, 2006–2010.



Note: FPL=federal poverty level.

Characteristics of Women Receiving SRH Care

Focusing on only the women who received SRH services in the prior year, we examined variation in their characteristics over time and compared women who went to private providers with those who went to publicly funded clinics. Table 7 provides information for women receiving any SRH care, and Table 8 provides similar data for women who received contraceptive services. (Further detail for 2006–2010 by type of clinic, including both row and column percentage distributions, can be found in Appendix Tables 1–6.)

In general, the distributions of women receiving SRH services according to key sociodemographic characteristics varied somewhat over time, typically mirroring national demographic and economic change between 1995

and 2006–2010. Moreover, the distributions of women receiving care from private doctors by these characteristics differed widely from those of women going to clinics in all survey years. Generally similar patterns were observed for the larger group of women receiving any SRH care service (Table 7) and the subset who received contraceptive services (Table 8). To simplify the presentation of results, we focus on the latter.

- Overall, in all survey periods, about six in 10 women receiving contraceptive services were younger than age 30. Some 55–56% of women who received such services from private physicians fell in this age-group, while 74–79% of the women receiving them from clinics did. Over time, fewer women who received care from clinics


were teenagers—24% in 1995 and 19% in 2006–2010—while the teenager share among women going to private doctors rose—from 9% to 14%.

- The share of women receiving contraceptive services who were married fell from 46% in 1995 to 38% in 2006–2010, and the percentage in cohabiting relationships increased. Union status also varied widely according to provider type—women receiving care from private doctors were more likely to be married, while those going to clinics were more likely to have never married.
- Reflecting demographic and economic trends, the distributions of women by race/ethnicity and poverty status changed over time—the percentage of women receiving contraceptive services who were non-Hispanic white fell from 71% in 1995 to 66% in 2006–2010, accompanied by increases in the percentage who were Hispanic; the percentage who had a family income below 100% of

the FPL increased from 14% to 22% over that period. Comparing provider types, larger shares of minority and poor women were served at clinics in all survey periods.

- Significant and opposing changes are seen in women’s receipt of contraceptive care according to health insurance status and in how they reported paying for that care (Figure 6). On the one hand, slightly fewer women reported having private health insurance in 2006–2010 compared with 1995 (67% vs. 70%), while the share of women covered by Medicaid rose from 19% to 23%. On the other hand, use of private insurance to pay for contraceptive care increased substantially—in 1995, 48% of women receiving this care paid for their visits with private insurance; in 2006–2010, 63% did so. Meanwhile the percentage of women reporting that they paid for their contraceptive care using self-pay only fell from 27% in 1995 to 9% in 2006–2010.

FIGURE 6. Percent distribution of women receiving contraceptive services according to their health insurance status and visit payment type, 1995 and 2006–2010.



- This change is most dramatic among women receiving contraceptive services from private doctors/HMOs. Although about 8 in 10 women who received contraceptive care from private doctors reported having private health insurance in each survey period (78–84%), in 1995, only 61% of private doctor clients used insurance to pay for this care; in contrast, in 2006–2010, 79% of private doctor clients did so—virtually all of this group of clients who reported having health insurance during the year.
- Among the 2006–2010 subset of women who received contraceptive services and reported being covered by private health insurance for the entire prior year, the vast majority (89%) reported that they used their insurance to pay for their contraceptive visit. However, this varied by women’s age and poverty status. Teens (83%) and women in their 20s (85%) were less likely than women in their 30s (95%) to have used their insurance to pay for the visit. Similarly, poor women below 100% of the FPL (81%) and low-income women between 100% and 249% of this level (85%) were less likely than their more affluent peers at 250% or more of the FPL (91%) to have used their insurance to pay for the visit (data not shown).

TABLE 4. Number and distribution of women receiving contraceptive or other reproductive health care services in the prior year according to the source of that care, United States, 1995, 2002, 2006–2010

| Type of service | No. receiving service (in 000s) | | Source of care [‡] | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------|-----|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------|-------------|--------------------|
| | | | Private doctor/HMO | Publicly funded clinic | | | Other [§] |
| | | | | Total | Title X | Non-Title X | |
| 1995 | | | | | | | |
| Any SRH service | 43,204 | 100 | 77 | 17 | 10 | 7 | 6 |
| Any contraceptive service | 21,428 | 100 | 70 | 24 | 15 | 9 | 6 |
| Either Pap test or pelvic exam | 38,916 | 100 | 81 | 16 | 9 | 6 | 4 |
| Any STD/HIV service | 12,370 | 100 | 57 | 26 | 15 | 11 | 16 |
| Other SRH services | 11,773 | 100 | 70 | 22 | 12 | 10 | 8 |
| 2002 | | | | | | | |
| Any SRH service | 45,414 | 100 | 76 | 20 * | 10 | 10 * | 4 * |
| Any contraceptive service | 25,659 | 100 | 72 | 25 | 13 | 12 | 3 * |
| Either Pap test or pelvic exam | 41,034 | 100 | 81 | 17 | 8 | 9 | 2 |
| Any STD/HIV service | 14,106 | 100 | 54 | 33 | 14 | 19 | 13 |
| Other SRH services | 13,668 | 100 | 68 | 25 | 12 | 12 | 8 |
| 2006–2010 | | | | | | | |
| Any SRH service | 44,050 | 100 | 72 *† | 23 * | 11 | 12 * | 5 |
| Any contraceptive service | 24,665 | 100 | 69 | 28 | 14 | 13 * | 4 * |
| Either Pap test or pelvic exam | 38,835 | 100 | 75 * | 21 * | 10 | 11 * | 3 |
| Any STD/HIV service | 16,045 | 100 | 55 | 33 * | 16 | 16 * | 13 |
| Other SRH services | 13,240 | 100 | 61 *† | 29 * | 14 | 15 * | 9 |
| 2006–2010, specific services | | | | | | | |
| Birth control counseling | 10,304 | 100 | 63 | 33 | 18 | 15 | 3 |
| Birth control check-up | 13,793 | 100 | 71 | 27 | 15 | 12 | 2 |
| Birth control method or prescription | 20,610 | 100 | 71 | 26 | 13 | 12 | 3 |
| Sterilization counseling | 1,943 | 100 | 72 | 19 | 9 | 10 | 9 |
| Sterilization operation | 1,131 | 100 | 6 | 13 | 4 | 9 | 81 |
| Emergency contraception counseling | 2,007 | 100 | 32 | 59 | 34 | 25 | 10 |
| Emergency contraception pills or prescription | 1,345 | 100 | 23 | 52 | 31 | 21 | 25 |
| Pap test | 37,305 | 100 | 76 | 21 | 10 | 11 | 3 |
| Pelvic exam | 34,053 | 100 | 77 | 19 | 9 | 10 | 4 |
| Testing/treatment/counseling for STD | 9,847 | 100 | 59 | 35 | 18 | 17 | 6 |
| Test for HIV | 11,731 | 100 | 50 | 29 | 14 | 15 | 21 |
| Pregnancy test | 11,481 | 100 | 59 | 29 | 15 | 14 | 12 |
| Prenatal care | 4,218 | 100 | 77 | 20 | 9 | 11 | 3 |
| Postpregnancy care | 3,498 | 100 | 76 | 18 | 8 | 11 | 6 |

*Significantly different from 1995 at p<.05.

†Significantly different from 2002 at p<.05.

‡For women with more than one source type we have assigned one type coded hierarchically first for contraceptive service source (Title X clinic, other clinic, private doctor, hospital/other), then for source of Pap or pelvic (according to same order) and finally for the source of pregnancy care or STD care if that was all they received.

§Other providers include hospital inpatient care, emergency room, urgent care center and some other place.

Note: SRH=sexual and reproductive health.

TABLE 5. Number and distribution of women receiving contraceptive or other reproductive health care services in the prior year from publicly funded clinics according to the type of clinic visited, United States, 2006–2010

| Type of service received | No. receiving service (in 000) | Source of care* | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|---|
| | | Publicly funded clinics by type† | | | | |
| | | Total clinics | Community clinics | Independent FP clinics | Health department clinics | Hospital outpatient or school-based clinics |
| 2006–2010 | | | | | | |
| Any SRH service | 44,050 | 23 | 8 | 6 | 5 | 4 |
| Any contraceptive service | 24,665 | 28 | 8 | 9 | 6 | 5 |
| Either Pap test or pelvic exam | 38,835 | 21 | 8 | 5 | 5 | 3 |
| Any STD/HIV care | 16,045 | 33 | 11 | 8 | 8 | 6 |
| Other SRH services | 13,240 | 29 | 10 | 8 | 7 | 4 |
| 2006–2010, specific services | | | | | | |
| Birth control counseling | 10,304 | 33 | 8 | 10 | 9 | 6 |
| Birth control check-up | 13,793 | 27 | 7 | 9 | 7 | 4 |
| Birth control method or prescription | 20,610 | 26 | 7 | 9 | 6 | 4 |
| Sterilization counseling | 1,943 | 19 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 4 |
| Sterilization operation | 1,131 | 13 | 2 | | 2 | 9 |
| Emergency contraception counseling | 2,007 | 59 | 14 | 30 | 10 | 5 |
| Emergency contraception pills or prescription | 1,345 | 52 | 4 | 37 | 7 | 4 |
| Pap test | 37,305 | 21 | 8 | 5 | 5 | 3 |
| Pelvic exam | 34,053 | 19 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 3 |
| Testing/treatment/counseling for STD | 9,847 | 35 | 11 | 10 | 8 | 6 |
| Test for HIV | 11,731 | 29 | 10 | 5 | 8 | 5 |
| Pregnancy test | 11,481 | 29 | 10 | 8 | 7 | 3 |
| Prenatal care | 4,218 | 20 | 10 | 2 | 4 | 3 |
| Postpregnancy care | 3,498 | 18 | 9 | 1 | 4 | 4 |

*For women with more than one source type we have assigned one type coded hierarchically first for contraceptive service source (Title X clinic, other clinic, private doctor, hospital/other), then for source of Pap or pelvic (according to same order) and finally for the source of pregnancy care or STD care if that was all they received.

†See methods section, page 8 for description of clinic types.

Notes: FP=family planning. SRH=sexual and reproductive health.

TABLE 6. Percentage of women receiving various services who obtained those services from a publicly funded clinic, according to their characteristics, and multivariate odds ratios predicting receipt of services from publicly funded clinics as opposed to private doctors or other providers, United States, 2006–2010

| Characteristic | Women who received services from a clinic, among those receiving: | | | | | |
|--|---|----|------------|---------------------------|----|------------|
| | Any SRH service | | | Any contraceptive service | | |
| | No. (in 000s) | % | Odds ratio | No. (in 000s) | % | Odds ratio |
| No. of women (in 000s) | 44,050 | 23 | – | 24,665 | 27 | – |
| Age-group | | | | | | |
| 15–19 | 4,677 | 33 | 0.89 | 3,770 | 34 | 0.87 |
| 20–24 | 8,208 | 35 | 1.42 * | 5,976 | 36 | 1.49 |
| 25–29 | 8,677 | 28 | 1.42 * | 5,485 | 33 | 1.74 * |
| 30–34 | 7,301 | 17 | 0.96 | 3,937 | 19 | 1.06 |
| 35–39 | 7,586 | 15 | 0.94 | 3,276 | 16 | 0.89 |
| 40–44 (ref) | 7,601 | 13 | 1.00 | 2,223 | 13 | 1.00 |
| Marital status | | | | | | |
| Currently married (ref) | 19,846 | 13 | 1.00 | 9,416 | 16 | 1.00 |
| Cohabiting | 5,856 | 34 | 1.67 * | 3,699 | 38 | 1.61 * |
| Formerly married | 4,223 | 23 | 1.31 | 1,959 | 27 | 1.37 |
| Never married | 14,124 | 32 | 1.82 * | 9,591 | 34 | 1.73 * |
| Any children | | | | | | |
| No (ref) | 17,594 | 26 | 1.00 | 11,866 | 30 | 1.00 |
| Yes | 26,455 | 21 | 0.59 * | 12,799 | 25 | 0.51 * |
| Race/ethnicity | | | | | | |
| Non-Hispanic white (ref) | 27,470 | 17 | 1.00 | 16,170 | 22 | 1.00 |
| Non-Hispanic black | 6,904 | 30 | 1.45 * | 3,284 | 34 | 1.49 * |
| Hispanic | 6,905 | 38 | 1.74 * | 3,804 | 43 | 1.68 * |
| Other | 2,770 | 33 | 1.94 * | 1,407 | 35 | 1.51 |
| Nativity | | | | | | |
| U.S. born (ref) | 37,738 | 21 | 1.00 | 21,530 | 25 | 1.00 |
| Foreign born | 6,277 | 34 | 1.40 * | 3,135 | 41 | 1.42 |
| Education | | | | | | |
| <high school complete | 8,206 | 42 | 1.90 * | 4,623 | 44 | 1.78 * |
| High school complete | 10,659 | 26 | 1.27 | 5,581 | 31 | 1.20 |
| Some college | 12,963 | 21 | 1.11 | 7,548 | 25 | 1.07 |
| College graduate (ref) | 12,221 | 12 | 1.00 | 6,914 | 16 | 1.00 |
| Poverty status, % of FPL | | | | | | |
| 0–99 | 9,489 | 39 | 1.68 * | 5,494 | 44 | 1.67 * |
| 100–249 | 13,320 | 30 | 1.67 * | 7,372 | 34 | 1.55 * |
| ≥250 (ref) | 21,241 | 12 | 1.00 | 11,799 | 16 | 1.00 |
| Health insurance | | | | | | |
| Private (ref) | 29,180 | 12 | 1.00 | 16,429 | 16 | 1.00 |
| Medicaid | 9,680 | 38 | 2.49 * | 5,682 | 43 | 2.66 * |
| None all year | 5,189 | 56 | 4.47 * | 2,555 | 64 | 5.18 * |
| Any uninsured period in past year | | | | | | |
| No (ref) | 32,468 | 17 | 1.00 | 18,410 | 21 | 1.00 |
| Yes | 11,582 | 42 | 1.36 * | 6,256 | 48 | 1.49 * |
| Metropolitan location | | | | | | |
| Yes (ref) | 35,083 | 21 | 1.00 | 19,631 | 26 | 1.00 |
| No | 8,967 | 30 | 1.83 * | 5,034 | 34 | 1.71 * |
| No. of partners in past year | | | | | | |
| 0–1 (ref) | 38,598 | 22 | 1.00 | 21,068 | 25 | 1.00 |
| ≥2 | 5,451 | 35 | 1.22 | 3,597 | 39 | 1.28 |
| At risk for unintended pregnancy | | | | | | |
| No | 17,786 | 18 | 0.65 * | 5,176 | 23 | 0.68 * |
| Yes (ref) | 26,264 | 26 | 1.00 | 19,489 | 29 | 1.00 |

*Significant at $p < .05$. Notes: SRH=sexual and reproductive health. ref=reference group. FPL=federal poverty level. Odds ratios are relative odds that women received services from clinics as opposed to private providers or other providers after controlling for all the variables listed.

TABLE 7. Distribution of women who received any SRH service in the prior year according to their characteristics and the source of care, United States, 1995, 2002, 2006–2010

| Characteristic | 1995 | | | 2002 | | | 2006–2010 | | |
|--|---------------|--------------------|------------------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------------|
| | Total | Source of care* | | Total | Source of care* | | Total | Source of care* | |
| | | Private doctor/HMO | Publicly funded clinic | | Private doctor/HMO | Publicly funded clinic | | Private doctor/HMO | Publicly funded clinic |
| Total no. of women obtaining any care (in 000s) | 43,204 | 33,223 | 7,345 | 45,414 | 34,529 | 7,398 | 44,050 | 31,571 | 10,231 |
| | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Age-group | | | | | | | | | |
| 15–19 | 10 | 7 | 20 | 11 | 8 | 22 | 11 | 9 | 15 |
| 20–24 | 17 | 14 | 29 | 18 | 16 | 25 | 19 | 16 | 28 |
| 25–29 | 19 | 18 | 20 | 17 | 16 | 17 | 20 | 19 | 24 |
| 30–34 | 20 | 22 | 14 | 19 | 20 | 14 | 17 | 18 | 12 |
| 35–39 | 19 | 21 | 11 | 18 | 19 | 12 | 17 | 19 | 11 |
| 40–44 | 16 | 18 | 7 | 19 | 21 | 10 | 17 | 20 | 10 |
| Marital status | | | | | | | | | |
| Currently married | 53 | 59 | 31 | 50 | 56 | 29 | 45 | 52 | 26 |
| Cohabiting | 8 | 7 | 13 | 10 | 8 | 17 | 13 | 11 | 20 |
| Formerly married | 11 | 11 | 12 | 10 | 10 | 11 | 10 | 9 | 10 |
| Never married | 28 | 23 | 44 | 30 | 26 | 44 | 32 | 28 | 45 |
| Any children | | | | | | | | | |
| No | 38 | 36 | 45 | 37 | 36 | 43 | 40 | 38 | 45 |
| Yes | 62 | 64 | 55 | 63 | 64 | 57 | 60 | 62 | 55 |
| Race/ethnicity | | | | | | | | | |
| Non-Hispanic white | 70 | 75 | 53 | 66 | 72 | 44 | 62 | 69 | 45 |
| Non-Hispanic black | 15 | 13 | 23 | 15 | 13 | 21 | 16 | 14 | 20 |
| Hispanic | 11 | 9 | 20 | 14 | 10 | 28 | 16 | 12 | 26 |
| Other | 4 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 9 |
| Nativity | | | | | | | | | |
| U.S. born | 90 | 92 | 86 | 86 | 89 | 78 | 86 | 88 | 79 |
| Foreign born | 10 | 8 | 14 | 14 | 11 | 22 | 14 | 12 | 21 |
| Education | | | | | | | | | |
| <high school complete | 16 | 12 | 31 | 16 | 10 | 36 | 19 | 13 | 33 |
| High school complete | 36 | 36 | 37 | 28 | 27 | 31 | 24 | 23 | 27 |
| Some college | 25 | 26 | 21 | 31 | 33 | 26 | 29 | 31 | 26 |
| College complete | 23 | 26 | 11 | 25 | 30 | 7 | 28 | 33 | 14 |
| Poverty status, % of FPL | | | | | | | | | |
| 0–99 | 13 | 9 | 29 | 18 | 12 | 40 | 22 | 16 | 36 |
| 100–249 | 28 | 25 | 37 | 29 | 28 | 35 | 30 | 27 | 39 |
| ≥250 | 59 | 66 | 34 | 53 | 60 | 26 | 48 | 57 | 25 |
| Health insurance | | | | | | | | | |
| Private | 73 | 81 | 40 | 73 | 83 | 39 | 66 | 78 | 35 |
| Medicaid | 17 | 12 | 38 | 18 | 12 | 41 | 22 | 17 | 36 |
| None | 10 | 7 | 21 | 8 | 5 | 20 | 12 | 5 | 29 |
| Payment type | | | | | | | | | |
| Insurance | 54 | 64 | 15 | 67 | 80 | 19 | 64 | 79 | 24 |
| Medicaid | 12 | 8 | 30 | 12 | 7 | 29 | 16 | 12 | 27 |
| Public/free/sliding scale | 7 | 1 | 34 | 9 | 1 | 39 | 10 | 1 | 36 |
| Self-pay only/other | 26 | 27 | 20 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 10 | 8 | 13 |
| Metropolitan location | | | | | | | | | |
| Yes | 80 | 81 | 77 | 83 | 85 | 77 | 80 | 82 | 73 |
| No | 20 | 19 | 23 | 17 | 15 | 23 | 20 | 18 | 27 |

*For women with more than one source type we have assigned one type coded hierarchically first for contraceptive service source (Title X clinic, other clinic, private doctor, hospital/other), then for source of Pap or pelvic (according to same order) and finally for the source of pregnancy care or STD care if that was all they received. *Notes:* SRH=sexual and reproductive health. FPL=federal poverty level.

TABLE 8. Distribution of women who received any contraceptive service in the prior year according to their characteristics and the source of care, United States, 1995, 2002, 2006–2010

| Characteristic | 1995 | | | 2002 | | | 2006–2010 | | |
|--|---------------|--------------------|------------------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------------|
| | Total | Source of care* | | Total | Source of care* | | Total | Source of care* | |
| | | Private doctor/HMO | Publicly funded clinic | | Private doctor/HMO | Publicly funded clinic | | Private doctor/HMO | Publicly funded clinic |
| Total no. of women obtaining any care (in 000s) | 21,428 | 14,973 | 5,100 | 25,669 | 18,411 | 6,368 | 24,665 | 17,004 | 6,754 |
| | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Age-group | | | | | | | | | |
| 15–19 | 13 | 9 | 24 | 15 | 11 | 27 | 15 | 14 | 19 |
| 20–24 | 25 | 22 | 34 | 24 | 23 | 29 | 24 | 21 | 32 |
| 25–29 | 24 | 25 | 22 | 20 | 21 | 18 | 22 | 21 | 27 |
| 30–34 | 20 | 23 | 11 | 19 | 21 | 13 | 16 | 18 | 11 |
| 35–39 | 12 | 14 | 7 | 13 | 14 | 9 | 13 | 15 | 8 |
| 40–44 | 6 | 8 | 3 | 9 | 10 | 5 | 9 | 11 | 4 |
| Marital status | | | | | | | | | |
| Currently married | 46 | 53 | 29 | 44 | 49 | 26 | 38 | 44 | 23 |
| Cohabiting | 10 | 8 | 15 | 11 | 9 | 16 | 15 | 13 | 21 |
| Formerly married | 9 | 10 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| Never married | 35 | 30 | 48 | 37 | 33 | 50 | 39 | 35 | 49 |
| Any children | | | | | | | | | |
| No | 46 | 44 | 50 | 45 | 45 | 50 | 48 | 47 | 52 |
| Yes | 54 | 56 | 50 | 55 | 55 | 50 | 52 | 53 | 48 |
| Race/ethnicity | | | | | | | | | |
| Non-Hispanic white | 71 | 77 | 56 | 68 | 75 | 49 | 66 | 72 | 52 |
| Non-Hispanic black | 14 | 12 | 22 | 13 | 11 | 18 | 13 | 12 | 17 |
| Hispanic | 11 | 9 | 19 | 14 | 9 | 26 | 15 | 12 | 24 |
| Other | 3 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 7 |
| Nativity | | | | | | | | | |
| U.S. born | 91 | 93 | 87 | 87 | 90 | 80 | 87 | 90 | 81 |
| Foreign born | 9 | 7 | 13 | 13 | 10 | 20 | 13 | 10 | 19 |
| Education | | | | | | | | | |
| <high school complete | 17 | 12 | 28 | 17 | 11 | 34 | 19 | 13 | 30 |
| High school complete | 34 | 33 | 36 | 25 | 23 | 29 | 23 | 22 | 26 |
| Some college | 26 | 26 | 24 | 33 | 34 | 29 | 31 | 31 | 28 |
| College complete | 24 | 29 | 12 | 26 | 32 | 8 | 28 | 34 | 16 |
| Poverty status, % of FPL | | | | | | | | | |
| 0–99 | 14 | 10 | 26 | 19 | 12 | 37 | 22 | 17 | 36 |
| 100–249 | 29 | 24 | 38 | 28 | 26 | 33 | 30 | 27 | 37 |
| ≥250 | 57 | 66 | 36 | 53 | 62 | 29 | 48 | 57 | 28 |
| Health insurance | | | | | | | | | |
| Private | 70 | 80 | 44 | 73 | 84 | 43 | 67 | 78 | 39 |
| Medicaid | 19 | 13 | 35 | 20 | 12 | 40 | 23 | 17 | 37 |
| None | 11 | 7 | 21 | 8 | 4 | 18 | 10 | 4 | 24 |
| Payment type | | | | | | | | | |
| Insurance | 48 | 61 | 14 | 63 | 78 | 19 | 63 | 79 | 24 |
| Medicaid | 14 | 9 | 27 | 12 | 7 | 27 | 17 | 13 | 27 |
| Public/free/sliding scale | 10 | 1 | 38 | 12 | 2 | 42 | 11 | 1 | 36 |
| Self-pay only/other | 27 | 28 | 22 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 9 | 7 | 13 |
| Metropolitan location | | | | | | | | | |
| Yes | 80 | 81 | 75 | 83 | 86 | 75 | 80 | 82 | 74 |
| No | 20 | 19 | 25 | 17 | 14 | 25 | 20 | 18 | 26 |

*For women with more than one source type we have assigned one type coded hierarchically first for contraceptive service source (Title X clinic, other clinic, private doctor, hospital/other), then for source of Pap or pelvic (according to same order) and finally for the source of pregnancy care or STD care if that was all they received.

Note: FPL=federal poverty level.

Variation in the Mix of SRH Services Received

Receipt of Specific Services by Provider Type


Among women who received any SRH service during the year, we examined which specific services they received along with the mix of combined services received. This analysis is important to understanding the scope of individual women's SRH care needs (e.g., how many women need and obtain a combination of contraceptive and STD services each year?) and how these needs are being met by different types of providers (e.g., do all providers offer the same mix of services to the clients who receive care from them each year?).

- In all years, about half of women (50–57%) receiving any SRH care received at least one contraceptive service and nine in 10 (88–90%) received preventive gynecologic care (Table 9). About one in three (29–36%) received

STD/HIV services, and similar proportions received other SRH care (27–30%). These patterns varied according to the type of provider visited, as did the mix of services that individual women report receiving over the course of a year.


- In 2006–2010, 54% of women who relied on private doctors/HMOs for SRH care reported receiving contraceptive services (Table 9 and Figure 7). This is significantly higher than the 44% of women going to private doctors for SRH care in 1995 who received a contraceptive service, although it is virtually unchanged from 2002.
- Women who relied on publicly funded clinics for their SRH care were significantly more likely than those who relied on private doctors to report receipt of contraceptive services in all survey years. In 2006–2010, 73% of

FIGURE 7. Percentages of women receiving specific types of services in the prior year, according to their source of care, 2006–2010.



Note: SRH=sexual and reproductive health.

FIGURE 8. Percent distribution of women according to the mix of SRH services received in the prior year, 1995–2010, and by provider type, 2006–2010.



*With or without preventive gynecologic care. †May include other SRH care. *Note:* SRH=sexual and reproductive health.

women who relied on Title X clinics and 60% of those visiting non-Title X clinics for SRH care received contraceptive services during the year. These percentages were not significantly different from earlier years.

- Similar patterns are found for receipt of STD/HIV care. Between 1995 and 2006–2010, the proportion of women receiving SRH care from private doctors/HMOs who received STD/HIV services rose from 23% to 32%. And in all years, women going to clinics were more likely to report receipt of this care compared with those going to private doctors. In 2006–2010, more than half (52%) of all women relying on Title X clinics for SRH care received STD/HIV services; nearly half (46%) of those going to non-Title X clinics did so.
- Among women receiving any care, receipt of preventive gynecologic care remained fairly stable over time (a slight increase among women going to private providers between 1995 and 2002 was followed by a drop back to the prior level in 2006–2010). In all years, women going to publicly funded clinics or other providers were somewhat less likely to have received preventive gynecologic care compared with peers going to private doctors/HMOs.

Mix of SRH Services Received

Comparing the mix of all SRH services received by women during the prior year reveals both changes over time, consistent with the patterns already observed, and variation by provider type (Table 10 and Figure 8). In general, women who received SRH care from private doctors received a more limited mix of preventive gynecologic and contraceptive services, whereas women who received care from clinics received a broader mix of services that more often included STD/HIV care.

- Over time, the proportion of women who reported receiving a combination of contraceptive and STD care rose from 15% in 1995 to 21% in 2006–2010, while the proportion who reported receiving only preventive gynecologic care in the prior year fell from 30% to 24%.
- In 2006–2010, a higher percentage of women receiving SRH care from Title X clinics reported receiving contraceptive services in combination with STD care (38%) compared with women relying on either private doctors (18%) or non-Title X clinics (27%).
- More than one-quarter (28%) of women relying on private doctors reported receipt of only preventive gynecologic care.

gynecologic care during the prior year, compared with 9% of women going to Title X clinics and 17% of those going to non-Title X clinics.

- Finally, although the proportion of private doctor clients reporting a combination of contraceptive and STD/HIV services increased significantly between 1995 and 2006–2010 (from 12% to 18%) and the proportion receiving only preventive gynecologic care declined (from 36% to 28%), the differences between private providers and clinics in the mix of services received by clients remained significant and striking.

Mix of SRH Services Received by Clinic Type

For the most recent survey period (2006–2010), we further analyzed the mix of services women received according to the type of clinic visited (community clinics, independent family planning clinics, public health department clinics, and hospital outpatient or school-based clinics). Again, we found variation in the proportion of women receiving specific SRH services and in the mix of services received, according to the type of clinic providing care (Table 11 and Figures 9 and 10).

FIGURE 9. Percentages of women receiving specific types of services in the prior year, according to their source of care, 2006–2010.





FIGURE 10. Percent distribution of women according to the mix of SRH services received in the prior year, by source of care, 2006–2010.



*With or without preventive gynecologic care. †May include other SRH care. Note: SRH=sexual and reproductive health.

- Similar to women going to private providers for SRH care, about half (51%) of those going to community clinics reported receipt of contraceptive services in the prior year. In contrast, 83% of women who received any SRH care from an independent family planning clinic received contraceptive care, as did 69% of those going to health department or hospital outpatient/other clinics.
- There were no significant differences in the provision of preventive gynecologic care or STD care among different publicly funded clinic types, although clinics of all types were more likely than private doctors to provide STD care.
- Perhaps not surprisingly, women who received their SRH care from independent family planning clinics were much more likely to receive contraceptive services than women going to other types of clinics; in particular, such women were the most likely to receive a mix of contraceptive and STD services (43% vs. 24–36% of peers going to other types of clinics).
- Women receiving SRH care from community clinics—although similar to peers receiving this care from other clinics in their overall receipt of STD services—were more likely to receive such care alone or with preventive


gynecologic care and not in the context of a contraceptive visit (23% of women going to community clinics vs. 11% of women going to independent family planning clinics).

- Finally, one in five women (21%) receiving SRH care from community clinics reported receiving only preventive gynecologic care and no other SRH care service. Among women receiving care from either an independent family planning clinic or a public health department clinic, the percentages receiving only preventive gynecologic care were significantly lower—4% and 11%, respectively.

Factors Associated with Type of SRH Services Received

Some of the variation in the mix of SRH services received from different types of providers is likely associated with variation in the characteristics of clients seeking care from each provider type. As described earlier, women who receive these services from publicly funded clinics are more likely to be younger, unmarried and from racial or ethnic minorities, and to have less education compared with women who receive these services from private doctors

FIGURE 11. Among women receiving preventive gynecologic services in the prior year, percentage who reported that their provider talked to them about birth control during the visit, according to source of care and clinic type, 2006–2010.



(Table 6). Thus, the greater provision of contraceptive and STD services by clinics may reflect, in part, the greater need for these services by their clients. Alternatively, it may reflect the fact that women choose providers that they expect will have the specific types of services they are seeking. To examine these possibilities, we conducted multivariate logistic regression analyses measuring the association between provider type and women’s receipt of either contraceptive services or STD/HIV services, controlling for women’s characteristics and limiting the sample to women who received any SRH care service (Table 12).

As expected, many of women’s characteristics, as well as their level of risk for unintended pregnancy and STDs, were strongly associated with having received a contraceptive or STD/HIV service in the prior year. However, even after controlling for these characteristics and risk factors, the type of provider visited for care remained strongly associated with women’s receipt of specific SRH services.

- Overall, 56% of women receiving any SRH service reported receipt of one or more contraceptive services, and 36% reported receipt of STD/HIV services.
- After controlling for women’s characteristics and risk factors, women going to Title X clinics were about twice as likely as those going to private doctors to receive contraceptive services (OR=2.2) and also to receive STD/HIV services (1.9). Women going to other (non-Title X) publicly funded clinics or to other provider types also had comparatively higher odds of receiving STD/HIV services (1.7 and 4.1, respectively).
- Comparing women according to the type of clinic visited, there were significant differences for receipt of contraceptive services, but not for receipt of STD/HIV services. Relative to counterparts who received SRH services from community clinics, those going to independent family planning clinics were more than three times as likely to receive contraceptive services (3.4), and those going to health department clinics or

to hospital outpatient or school clinics were about two times as likely (1.8–2.4).


- Relative to 40–44-year-olds receiving any SRH services, younger women were more likely—often much more so—to receive both contraceptive services and STD/HIV services (1.6–9.7), as were most unmarried women compared with currently married peers (1.3–1.9). Cohabiting women were similar to married women in their use of contraceptive services, but similar to other unmarried women in their use of STD/HIV services.
- Non-Hispanic black women were only about half as likely as white women to receive a contraceptive service (0.5), but twice as likely to receive an STD/HIV service (2.0).
- Women with a high school education or less had lower odds of receiving contraceptive services compared with college-educated women (0.6–0.7), as did uninsured women compared with those privately insured (0.6). Women covered by Medicaid had higher odds of receiving STD/HIV services (1.6).
- Women who had had two or more sexual partners in the past year were significantly more likely to receive

STD/HIV services relative to peers having only a single partner (1.9) but were less likely to receive any contraceptive service (0.7).

Conversations with Providers During SRH Visits

Some women in the NSFG were asked about their interaction with the provider during their visit for SRH services in the past year. Specifically, those who made a visit for preventive gynecologic care (Pap test or pelvic exam) were asked if the doctor talked to them about birth control or about emergency contraception; in addition, those who made a visit for STD testing, treatment or counseling were asked if a doctor talked to them about use of condoms. We examined the percentages of women reporting that these conversations had occurred, making comparisons according to women’s characteristics and the type of provider visited (Table 13, Figures 11 and 12). Results from multivariate logistic regression analyses indicated that clinic clients were more likely to have these types of conversations with their doctors than private doctor clients, even after controlling for their characteristics.

FIGURE 12. Among women receiving STD services in the prior year, percentage who reported that their provider talked to them about condom use during the visit, according to source of care and clinic type, 2006–2010



- Overall, nearly half (49%) of women who received a Pap test or pelvic exam during the year reported that the clinician talked to them about birth control at that visit, and 9% of similar women reported having a conversation about emergency contraception.
- Women receiving preventive gynecologic care from publicly funded clinics were significantly more likely to report having conversations about birth control during the visit, even after controlling for their characteristics. Compared with women visiting private doctors for such care, those going to Title X clinics were nearly twice as likely to talk to the clinician about birth control (OR=1.9) and those going to non-Title X clinics were nearly one and a half times as likely to do so (1.4).
- In terms of clinic type, women receiving preventive gynecologic care from independent family planning clinics or health department clinics were more likely to report conversations about birth control than those going to community clinics (1.7).
- Relative to private doctor clients, women going to Title X clinics were more than three times as likely to report that their doctor talked about emergency contraception, and women going to non-Title X clinics were nearly twice as likely to report such discussion (3.2 and 1.9, respectively). Similarly, women going to independent family planning clinics were more than twice as likely to talk about this topic, compared women going to community clinics (2.3).
- The odds of conversations about birth control during preventive gynecologic exams were higher among younger women and among unmarried and noncohabiting women compared with older women and married women (1.3–4.1).
- There were few differences in the likelihood of providers having conversations about birth control according to women's socioeconomic characteristics—women of all races and poverty statuses were equally likely to report having had these conversations with their doctors. However, uninsured women were less likely than insured women to have talked about birth control during the visit (0.7).
- Conversations about emergency contraception were more likely to occur among 15–29-year-olds, as well as among minority women and those with less than a high school education, compared with older, white or college-educated women (1.5–2.7).
- Slightly more than half (53%) of all women receiving STD/HIV services reported that a clinician talked to them about condoms at that visit. Teenagers, unmarried women and women with less than a college education all had greater odds of reporting such conversations, compared with respective reference categories.

- Clients of Title X clinics were more than twice as likely to report talking to their clinician about condoms during STD visits relative to private doctor clients (2.1).


Usual Source of Care

Many women who receive family planning services from publicly funded clinics report that the clinic is their usual source for medical care. Using the 2002 NSFG, we found that 61% of women going to clinics for family planning and related services reported this to be true.¹⁰ Here, we update that analysis. Women who reported visiting a publicly funded clinic for any SRH service were asked whether that clinic was their regular or usual source for medical care. In examining whether women considered the provider where they received family planning and related services to be their usual medical source, we excluded responses given regarding providers visited for prenatal or postpregnancy care only.

In 2006–2010, a majority (63%) of women who visited a publicly funded clinic for one or more family planning services in the prior year reported that the clinic was their usual source for medical care (Table 14 and Figure 13). These percentages varied according the type of service that the woman had received and the type of clinic visited.

- Among women who received any family planning service from a publicly funded clinic, 61% of those visiting Title X clinics and 66% of those attending non-Title X clinics reported that the clinic was their usual source for care. In multivariate analyses, the difference was not significant.
- For specific types of clinics, these differences were much wider: 76% of women going to a community clinic reported it to be their usual source for medical care, compared with 47% of those going to independent family planning clinics and 60–64% of those going to health department and hospital outpatient or school clinics. In the multivariate analysis, these differences were significant, with independent family planning clinics one-third as likely and health department clinics less than half as likely to be considered women's usual source of care, compared with community clinics (ORs=0.4–0.5).
- Adult women, non-Hispanic black women, uninsured women, Medicaid recipients and low-income women who relied on clinics for their family planning care were more likely to report that that clinic was their usual source for medical care compared with teenagers, white women, privately insured women or more affluent women who also visited publicly funded clinics for contraception or gynecologic care.

FIGURE 13. Among women receiving family planning services from publicly funded clinics, percentage who rely on the clinic as their usual source for medical care, 2006–2010.



Note: FPL=federal poverty level.

- Overall, among all women visiting publicly funded family planning clinics for one or more of these services, 70% of poor women, 67% of uninsured women, 68% of Hispanic women and 72% of black women reported that the clinic was their usual source for medical care. In comparison, this was true for only about half of women who were more affluent (52%), had private insurance (52%) or were white (54%).
- The characteristics of women that were associated with calling a clinic their medical home were primarily related to socioeconomic status—with uninsured or publicly insured women, poor women and minority women most likely to rely on clinics as their usual source of care.

Among women who considered the clinic to be their usual source for care, we did not know whether they were reporting this because they received other types of medical care at the same clinic or whether the only type of usual medical care they received during the year was the SRH care that they got at the clinic. The fact that more than three-quarters of the women receiving family planning services from community clinics reported the clinic as their usual source of care was not surprising and suggests that for them, these services were being provided along with other types of medical care. However, even among the women who received family planning services from independent family planning clinics, nearly half reported the clinic to be their usual source for medical care. For these women, it is likely that they considered their SRH care to be the only type of usual care they received.

TABLE 9. Among women receiving any SRH service, the percentage who received each type of service during the prior year according to their source of reproductive health care, United States, 1995, 2002, 2006–2010

| Type of service received | All women receiving care | Source of care [§] | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | | Private doctor/HMO | Publicly funded clinic | | | Other** |
| | | | Total | Title X | Non–Title X | |
| 1995 | | | | | | |
| No. receiving any care (in 000s) | 43,204 | 33,223 | 7,345 | 4,190 | 3,155 | 2,572 |
| % reporting receipt of: | | | | | | |
| Any contraceptive service | 50 | 44 | 69* | 75* | 61* | 48 |
| Either Pap test or pelvic exam | 90 | 92 | 83* | 87* | 79* | 64* |
| Any STD/HIV care | 29 | 23 | 44* | 46* | 42* | 43* |
| Other SRH services | 27 | 25 | 35* | 36* | 33* | 31* |
| 2002 | | | | | | |
| No. receiving any care (in 000s) | 45,414 | 34,529 | 9,107 | 4,380 | 4,726 | 1,779 |
| % reporting receipt of: | | | | | | |
| Any contraceptive service | 57† | 53† | 70* | 75* | 65* | 50 |
| Either Pap test or pelvic exam | 90 | 94† | 84* | 85* | 83* | 60* |
| Any STD/HIV care | 31 | 27† | 45* | 48* | 43* | 44* |
| Other SRH services | 30† | 28† | 38* | 40* | 35* | 37* |
| 2006–2010 | | | | | | |
| No. receiving any care (in 000s) | 44,050 | 31,571 | 10,231 | 4,902 | 5,329 | 2,248 |
| % reporting receipt of: | | | | | | |
| Any contraceptive service | 56† | 54† | 66* | 73* | 60* | 40 |
| Either pap test or pelvic exam | 88 | 92‡ | 83* | 84* | 83* | 63* |
| Any STD/HIV care | 36†‡ | 32†‡ | 49* | 52* | 46* | 48* |
| Other SRH services | 30† | 28 | 37* | 37* | 37* | 33 |

*Significantly different from private doctor/HMO at $p < .05$.

†Significantly different from 1995 at $p < .05$.

‡Significantly different from 2002 at $p < .05$.

§For women with more than one source type we have assigned one type coded hierarchically first for contraceptive service source (Title X clinic, other clinic, private doctor, hospital/other), then for source of Pap or pelvic (according to same order) and finally for the source of pregnancy care or STD care if that was all they received.

**Other providers include hospital inpatient care, emergency room, urgent care center and some other place.

Note: SRH=sexual and reproductive health.

TABLE 10. Distribution of women according to the mix of contraceptive or other reproductive health care services received during the prior year by their source of reproductive health care, United States, 1995, 2002, 2006–2010

| Mix of services received | All women receiving care (in 000s) | Source of care [§] | | | | |
|---|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | | Private doctor/HMO | Publicly funded clinic | | | Other** |
| | | | Total | Title X | Non–Title X | |
| 1995 | | | | | | |
| No. receiving any care (in 000s) | 43,204 | 33,223 | 7,345 | 4,190 | 3,155 | 2,572 |
| Distribution by mix of services | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Any contraceptive service | | | | | | |
| Plus STD/HIV care | 15 | 12 | 24* | 33* | 29* | 16* |
| Plus other SRH | 9 | 9 | 9 | 12* | 11 | 10 |
| Alone or with pap/pelvic | 26 | 25 | 29* | 31* | 30 | 24 |
| No contraceptive service | | | | | | |
| Any STD/HIV care | 14 | 12 | 19* | 13 | 15* | 29* |
| Other SRH care only | 6 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 7 |
| Pap/pelvic only | 30 | 36 | 15* | 7* | 11* | 14* |
| 2002 | | | | | | |
| No. receiving any care (in 000s) | 45,414 | 34,529 | 9,107 | 4,380 | 4,726 | 1,779 |
| Distribution by mix of services | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Any contraceptive service | | | | | | |
| Plus STD/HIV care | 20† | 16† | 29* | 39* | 33* | 19 |
| Plus other SRH care | 9 | 9 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 6 |
| Alone or with pap/pelvic | 28 | 28† | 27 | 27 | 27 | 25 |
| No contraceptive service | | | | | | |
| Any STD/HIV care | 11† | 10 | 14 | 9 | 12 | 25* |
| Other SRH care only | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 15* |
| Pap/pelvic only | 27† | 31† | 16* | 11* | 14* | 11* |
| 2006–2010 | | | | | | |
| No. receiving any care (in 000s) | 44,050 | 31,571 | 10,231 | 4,902 | 5,329 | 2,248 |
| Distribution by mix of services | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Any contraceptive service | | | | | | |
| Plus STD/HIV care | 21† | 18† | 32* | 38* | 27* | 17 |
| Plus other SRH care | 8 | 8 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 6 |
| Alone or with Pap/pelvic | 27 | 28† | 24 | 26 | 22* | 17* |
| No contraceptive service | | | | | | |
| Any STD/HIV care | 15‡ | 14‡ | 17‡ | 15‡ | 19* | 31* |
| Other SRH care only | 5† | 5† | 4 | 3 | 4 | 11* |
| Pap/pelvic only | 24† | 28† | 13* | 9* | 17* | 18* |

*Significantly different from private doctor/HMO at p<.05.

†Significantly different from 1995 at p<.05.

‡Significantly different from 2002 at p<.05.

§For women with more than one source type we have assigned one type coded hierarchically first for contraceptive service source (Title X clinic, other clinic, private doctor, hospital/other), then for source of Pap or pelvic (according to same order) and finally for the source of pregnancy care or STD care if that was all they received.

**Other providers include hospital inpatient care, emergency room, urgent care center and some other place.

Note: SRH=sexual and reproductive health.

TABLE 11. Among women receiving any SRH service, the percentage who received each type of service during the prior year according to their primary source of reproductive health care, United States, 2006–2010

| Type of service received | All women receiving care | Source of care [‡] | | | | | Other |
|---|--------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------|
| | | Private doctor/HMO | Publicly funded clinic [§] | | | Hospital outpatient or school clinic | |
| | | | Community clinic | Independent FP clinic | Health department clinic | | |
| 2006–2010 | | | | | | | |
| No. receiving any care (in 000s) | 44,050 | 31,571 | 3,643 | 2,646 | 2,279 | 1,663 | 2,248 |
| % reporting receipt of: | | | | | | | |
| Any contraceptive service | 56 | 54 | 51 | 83*† | 69*† | 69*† | 40* |
| Either Pap test or pelvic exam | 88 | 91 | 85 | 84 | 84 | 78 | 63*† |
| Any STD care | 36 | 31 | 48* | 55* | 53* | 41* | 48* |
| Other SRH care | 30 | 27 | 38* | 39* | 38* | 33 | 33 |
| No. receiving any care (in 000s) | 44,050 | 31,571 | 3,643 | 2,646 | 2,279 | 1,663 | 2,248 |
| Distribution by mix of services received | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Any contraceptive service | | | | | | | |
| Plus STD care | 21 | 18 | 24* | 43*† | 36*† | 27* | 17 |
| Plus other SRH care | 8 | 8 | 8 | 11 | 9 | 11 | 6 |
| Alone or with pap/pelvic | 27 | 28 | 19* | 29† | 24 | 30† | 17* |
| No contraceptive service | | | | | | | |
| Any STD/HIV care | 15 | 14 | 23* | 11† | 16 | 14 | 31* |
| Other SRH care only | 5 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 11*† |
| Pap/pelvic only | 24 | 28 | 21* | 4*† | 11*† | 13* | 18* |

*Significantly different from private doctor/HMO at p<.05.

†Significantly different from community clinic at p<.05.

‡For women with more than one source type we have assigned one type coded hierarchically first for contraceptive service source (Title X clinic, other clinic, private doctor, hospital/other), then for source of Pap or pelvic (according to same order) and finally for the source of pregnancy care or STD care if that was all they received.

§See methods section, page 8 for description of clinic types.

Notes: FP=family planning. SRH=sexual and reproductive health.

TABLE 12. Percentage of women receiving various services among all women who received any SRH service in the prior year, according to their characteristics, and multivariate odds ratios predicting receipt of either contraceptive or STD/HIV services, United States, 2006–2010

| Characteristic | Among women receiving any SRH service, women who received: | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--|----|------------|---------------------|----|------------|
| | Any contraceptive service | | | Any STD/HIV service | | |
| | No. (in 000s) | % | Odds ratio | No. (in 000s) | % | Odds ratio |
| No. of women (in 000s) | 44,052 | 56 | – | 44,052 | 36 | – |
| Provider type[†] | | | | | | |
| Private doctor (ref) | 31,571 | 54 | 1.00 | 30,414 | 29 | 1.00 |
| Title X clinic | 4,902 | 73 | 2.21 * | 4,954 | 53 | 1.89 * |
| Non–Title X clinic | 5,329 | 60 | 1.14 | 5,490 | 48 | 1.74 * |
| Other | 2,248 | 40 | 0.54 | 3,191 | 63 | 4.14 * |
| Clinic type[†] | | | | | | |
| Community clinic (ref) | 3,643 | 51 | 1.00 | 3,635 | 47 | 1.00 |
| Independent family planning clinic | 2,646 | 83 | 3.45 * | 2,493 | 51 | 0.93 |
| Health department clinic | 2,279 | 69 | 2.43 * | 2,396 | 55 | 1.17 |
| Hospital/school clinic | 1,663 | 69 | 1.82 * | 1,920 | 49 | 1.16 |
| Not a clinic | 33,819 | 53 | 1.05 | 33,605 | 32 | 1.16 |
| Age-group | | | | | | |
| 15–19 | 4,679 | 81 | 9.73 * | 4,679 | 43 | 2.25 * |
| 20–24 | 8,208 | 73 | 3.91 * | 8,208 | 52 | 3.41 * |
| 25–29 | 8,677 | 63 | 2.89 * | 8,677 | 44 | 2.97 * |
| 30–34 | 7,301 | 54 | 2.21 * | 7,301 | 34 | 2.12 * |
| 35–39 | 7,586 | 43 | 1.56 * | 7,586 | 27 | 1.59 * |
| 40–44 (ref) | 7,601 | 29 | 1.00 | 7,601 | 19 | 1.00 |
| Marital status | | | | | | |
| Currently married (ref) | 19,846 | 47 | 1.00 | 19,846 | 25 | 1.00 |
| Cohabiting | 5,856 | 63 | 1.21 | 5,856 | 47 | 1.65 * |
| Formerly married | 4,223 | 46 | 1.61 * | 4,223 | 40 | 1.92 * |
| Never married | 14,127 | 68 | 1.31 * | 14,127 | 47 | 1.74 * |
| Any children | | | | | | |
| No (ref) | 17,597 | 67 | 1.00 | 17,597 | 39 | 1.00 |
| Yes | 26,455 | 48 | 0.99 | 26,455 | 35 | 1.11 |
| Race/ethnicity | | | | | | |
| Non-Hispanic white (ref) | 27,473 | 59 | 1.00 | 27,473 | 30 | 1.00 |
| Non-Hispanic black | 6,904 | 48 | 0.53 * | 6,904 | 56 | 1.97 * |
| Hispanic | 6,905 | 55 | 0.89 | 6,905 | 43 | 1.20 |
| Other | 2,770 | 51 | 0.74 * | 2,770 | 31 | 1.04 |
| Nativity | | | | | | |
| U.S. born (ref) | 37,740 | 57 | 1.00 | 37,740 | 36 | 1.00 |
| Foreign born | 6,277 | 50 | 0.88 | 6,277 | 38 | 1.05 |
| Education | | | | | | |
| <high school complete | 8,206 | 56 | 0.63 * | 8,206 | 47 | 1.20 |
| High school complete | 10,659 | 52 | 0.73 * | 10,659 | 39 | 1.12 |
| Some college | 12,966 | 58 | 0.90 | 12,966 | 37 | 1.06 |
| College graduate (ref) | 12,221 | 57 | 1.00 | 12,221 | 26 | 1.00 |
| Poverty status, % of FPL | | | | | | |
| 0–99 (ref) | 9,489 | 58 | 1.00 | 9,489 | 49 | 1.00 |
| 100–249 | 13,322 | 55 | 0.79 * | 13,322 | 40 | 0.97 |
| ≥250 | 21,241 | 56 | 0.86 | 21,241 | 29 | 0.97 |
| Health Insurance | | | | | | |
| Private (ref) | 29,183 | 56 | 1.00 | 29,183 | 30 | 1.00 |
| Medicaid | 9,680 | 59 | 0.84 | 9,680 | 55 | 1.57 * |
| None all year | 5,189 | 49 | 0.64 * | 5,189 | 41 | 0.93 |

TABLE 12 (continued)

| Characteristic | Among women receiving any SRH service, women who received: | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|----|------------|---------------------|----|------------|
| | Any contraceptive service | | | Any STD/HIV service | | |
| | No. (in 000s) | % | Odds ratio | No. (in 000s) | % | Odds ratio |
| Metropolitan location | | | | | | |
| Yes (ref) | 35,085 | 56 | 1.00 | 35,085 | 38 | 1.00 |
| No | 8,967 | 56 | 1.08 | 8,967 | 30 | 0.65 * |
| No. of partners in past year | | | | | | |
| 1 (ref) | 38,601 | 55 | 1.00 | 38,601 | 33 | 1.00 |
| ≥2 | 5,451 | 66 | 0.71 * | 5,451 | 63 | 1.94 * |
| At risk[‡] | | | | | | |
| Yes (ref) | 26,264 | 74 | 1.00 | 39,535 | 38 | 1.00 |
| No | 17,788 | 29 | 0.16 * | 4,517 | 21 | 0.33 * |

*Significant at $p < .05$.

[†]Provider type and clinic type are added separately in two separate regression analyses, controlling for all other variables.

[‡]At risk=at risk for unintended pregnancy (in contraceptive service model) or at risk for STDs/HIV because of being sexually active (in STD/HIV model). See page 5 for definitions.

Notes: ref=reference group. SRH=sexual and reproductive health. FPL=federal poverty level.

TABLE 13. Percentage of women reporting that a doctor talked to them about birth control or emergency contraception during a preventive gynecologic exam, or about condoms during an STD visit, and multivariate odds ratios predicting such conversations, United States, 2006–2010

| Characteristic | During preventive gynecologic exam doctor talked about: | | | | | During STD visit, doctor talked about using condoms | | |
|------------------------------------|---|---------------|------------|-------------------------|------------|---|----|------------|
| | No. (in 000s) | Birth control | | Emergency contraception | | No. (in 000s) | % | Odds ratio |
| | | % | Odds ratio | % | Odds ratio | | | |
| No. of women (in 000s) | 38,835 | 49 | – | 9 | – | 16,045 | 53 | – |
| Source of care[†] | | | | | | | | |
| Private doctor (ref) | 29,296 | 46 | 1.00 | 6 | 1.00 | 8,761 | 46 | 1.00 |
| Title X clinic | 3,936 | 64 | 1.94 * | 24 | 3.21 * | 2,614 | 72 | 2.12 * |
| Non–Title X clinic | 4,314 | 55 | 1.39 * | 17 | 1.91 * | 2,635 | 60 | 1.28 |
| Other | 1,289 | 39 | 0.72 | 6 | 0.67 | 2,015 | 36 | 0.44 * |
| Clinic type[†] | | | | | | | | |
| Community clinic (ref) | 3,168 | 49 | 1.00 | 16 | 1.00 | 1,726 | 59 | 1.00 |
| Independent family planning clinic | 1,922 | 69 | 1.65 * | 32 | 2.27 * | 1,275 | 78 | 2.22 * |
| Health department clinic | 1,897 | 63 | 1.75 * | 21 | 1.41 | 1,307 | 73 | 2.02 * |
| Hospital/school clinic | 1,262 | 63 | 1.46 | 10 | 0.60 | 941 | 53 | 0.85 |
| Not a clinic | 30,585 | 46 | 0.81 | 6 | 0.50 * | 10,776 | 45 | 0.76 |
| Age-group | | | | | | | | |
| 15–19 | 2,973 | 70 | 4.06 * | 18 | 2.43 * | 2,019 | 74 | 2.01 * |
| 20–24 | 7,195 | 64 | 2.84 * | 15 | 2.74 * | 4,254 | 62 | 1.83 |
| 25–29 | 7,770 | 55 | 2.25 * | 9 | 1.83 * | 3,854 | 46 | 1.44 |
| 30–34 | 6,758 | 46 | 1.70 * | 7 | 1.72 | 2,453 | 40 | 1.39 |
| 35–39 | 7,024 | 39 | 1.38 * | 5 | 1.23 | 2,025 | 41 | 1.26 |
| 40–44 (ref) | 7,115 | 29 | 1.00 | 3 | 1.00 | 1,441 | 34 | 1.00 |
| Marital status | | | | | | | | |
| Currently married (ref) | 18,452 | 41 | 1.00 | 5 | 1.00 | 4,926 | 28 | 1.00 |
| Cohabiting | 5,265 | 52 | 1.10 | 11 | 1.06 | 2,763 | 54 | 1.80 * |
| Formerly married | 3,753 | 41 | 1.34 * | 7 | 1.27 | 1,691 | 51 | 2.49 * |
| Never married | 11,364 | 61 | 1.46 * | 14 | 1.38 | 6,665 | 67 | 2.90 * |
| Any children | | | | | | | | |
| No (ref) | 14,733 | 58 | 1.00 | 11 | 1.00 | 6,847 | 60 | 1.00 |
| Yes | 24,102 | 43 | 1.10 | 7 | 0.74 | 9,198 | 48 | 0.77 |
| Race/ethnicity | | | | | | | | |
| Non-Hispanic white (ref) | 24,472 | 49 | 1.00 | 6 | 1.00 | 8,369 | 50 | 1.00 |
| Non-Hispanic black | 6,106 | 47 | 0.81 | 12 | 1.53 * | 3,835 | 59 | 1.28 |
| Hispanic | 5,919 | 49 | 1.02 | 18 | 2.36 * | 2,985 | 59 | 1.23 |
| Other | 2,339 | 45 | 0.85 | 8 | 1.41 | 857 | 49 | 0.91 |
| Nativity | | | | | | | | |
| U.S. born (ref) | 33,398 | 49 | 1.00 | 8 | 1.00 | 13,646 | 54 | 1.00 |
| Foreign born | 5,405 | 46 | 0.95 | 13 | 1.03 | 2,395 | 51 | 1.10 |
| Education | | | | | | | | |
| <high school complete | 6,232 | 51 | 0.81 | 17 | 1.80 * | 3,882 | 63 | 2.60 * |
| High school complete | 9,233 | 43 | 0.69 * | 9 | 1.29 | 4,189 | 60 | 2.65 * |
| Some college | 11,863 | 51 | 0.91 | 8 | 1.15 | 4,770 | 54 | 2.07 * |
| College graduate (ref) | 11,507 | 49 | 1.00 | 5 | 1.00 | 3,205 | 32 | 1.00 |
| Poverty status, % of FPL | | | | | | | | |
| 0–99 (ref) | 7,963 | 49 | 1.00 | 13 | 1.00 | 4,615 | 60 | 1.00 |
| 100–249 | 11,521 | 50 | 1.08 | 11 | 1.20 | 5,295 | 59 | 1.12 |
| ≥250 | 19,351 | 48 | 1.12 | 5 | 0.92 | 6,135 | 44 | 0.98 |
| Health insurance | | | | | | | | |
| Private (ref) | 26,610 | 48 | 1.00 | 6 | 1.00 | 8,631 | 48 | 1.00 |
| Medicaid | 8,181 | 51 | 0.85 | 14 | 1.12 | 5,279 | 58 | 0.99 |
| None all year | 4,044 | 45 | 0.74 * | 16 | 1.25 | 2,135 | 63 | 1.12 |

TABLE 13 (continued)

| Characteristic | During preventive gynecologic exam doctor talked about: | | | | During STD visit, doctor talked about using condoms | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|---------------|------------|-------------------------|---|---------------|----|------------|
| | No. (in 000s) | Birth control | | Emergency contraception | | No. (in 000s) | % | Odds ratio |
| | | % | Odds ratio | % | Odds ratio | | | |
| Metropolitan location | | | | | | | | |
| Yes (ref) | 30,924 | 49 | 1.00 | 9 | 1.00 | 13,388 | 53 | 1.00 |
| No | 7,911 | 45 | 0.86 | 6 | 0.57 * | 2,658 | 55 | 1.06 |
| No. of partners in past year | | | | | | | | |
| 1 (ref) | 34,148 | 47 | 1.00 | 8 | 1.00 | 12,629 | 50 | 1.00 |
| ≥2 | 4,687 | 58 | 0.86 | 15 | 1.17 | 3,416 | 64 | 1.12 |
| At risk[‡] | | | | | | | | |
| Yes (ref) | 23,329 | 60 | 1.00 | 11 | 1.00 | 10,350 | 58 | 1.00 |
| No | 15,506 | 31 | 0.38 * | 5 | 0.62 * | 5,696 | 44 | 0.67 * |

*Significant at p<.05.

[†]Provider type and clinic type are added separately in two separate regression analyses, controlling for all other variables.

[‡]At risk=at risk for unintended pregnancy (in contraceptive service model) or at risk for STDs/HIV because of being sexually active (in STD/HIV model). See page 5 for definitions.

Notes: ref=reference group. SRH=sexual and reproductive health. FPL=federal poverty level.

TABLE 14. Among women who received at least one family planning or related service[†] in the prior year from a publicly funded clinic, the percentage who reported that the clinic was their usual source for medical care, by clinic and women's characteristics, and multivariate odds ratios predicting that a clinic is their usual source for care, United States, 2006–2010

| Characteristic | Clinic is usual source for care (among women receiving family planning services from clinics) | | |
|------------------------------------|---|----|------------|
| | No. (in 000s) | % | Odds ratio |
| No. of women (in 000s) | 9,929 | 63 | – |
| Provider type | | | |
| Title X clinic (ref) | 5,056 | 61 | 1.00 |
| Non–Title X clinic | 4,873 | 66 | 0.86 |
| Clinic type | | | |
| Community clinic (ref) | 3,529 | 76 | 1.00 |
| Independent family planning clinic | 2,597 | 47 | 0.36 * |
| Health department clinic | 2,243 | 60 | 0.46 * |
| Hospital/school clinic | 1,560 | 64 | 0.79 * |
| Age-group | | | |
| 15–19 (ref) | 1,522 | 52 | 1.00 |
| 20–24 | 2,784 | 60 | 1.71 * |
| 25–29 | 2,327 | 67 | 2.06 * |
| 30–34 | 1,252 | 66 | 1.68 * |
| 35–39 | 1,076 | 71 | 1.98 * |
| 40–44 | 967 | 70 | 1.86 * |
| Marital status | | | |
| Currently married (ref) | 2,563 | 74 | 1.00 |
| Cohabiting | 1,998 | 62 | 0.57 * |
| Formerly married | 927 | 59 | 0.46 * |
| Never married | 4,441 | 58 | 0.61 * |
| Any children | | | |
| No | 4,537 | 53 | ns |
| Yes | 5,392 | 72 | |
| Race/ethnicity | | | |
| Non-Hispanic white (ref) | 4,471 | 54 | 1.00 |
| Non-Hispanic black | 1,973 | 72 | 1.61 * |
| Hispanic | 2,600 | 68 | 1.24 |
| Other | 885 | 77 | 1.99 * |
| Nativity | | | |
| U.S. born (ref) | 7,827 | 61 | 1.00 |
| Foreign born | 2,099 | 70 | 0.98 |
| Education | | | |
| < high school complete | 3,300 | 64 | |
| High school complete | 2,682 | 68 | ns |
| Some college | 2,585 | 61 | |
| College graduate | 1,363 | 56 | |
| Poverty status, % of FPL | | | |
| 0–99 | 3,619 | 70 | 1.46 * |
| 100–249 | 3,837 | 64 | 1.34 |
| ≥250 (ref) | 2,473 | 52 | 1.00 |
| Health insurance | | | |
| Private (ref) | 3,507 | 52 | 1.00 |
| Medicaid | 3,649 | 71 | 2.02 * |
| None all year | 2,773 | 67 | 1.55 * |

*Significant at $p < .05$. [†]Family planning or related services include all contraceptive services, preventive gynecologic services, STD services and pregnancy testing (we exclude women who only reported receiving prenatal care, postpregnancy care or abortion). Notes: ns=not significant (these variables were excluded from the final logistic regression models as they were not significant in preliminary models). ref=reference group. FPL=federal poverty level.

Discussion

Use of Services

Seven in 10 U.S. women of reproductive age, some 44 million women in 2006–2010, make at least one medical visit to obtain SRH services each year, and this number has remained constant over the past decade. However, use of specific SRH services has varied over the same period.

Fewer women are receiving preventive gynecologic care. The number of women receiving preventive gynecologic care (either a Pap test or pelvic exam) each year fell between 2002 and 2006–2010 from 41 million women to 39 million women. This trend is not unexpected and follows recent changes in cervical cancer screening guidelines that now recommend that many women be screened every two or three years rather than annually, and that screening not begin before age 21, regardless of age of sexual initiation.^{20,21}

More women are receiving STD services. The annual number of women receiving STD testing, treatment or counseling doubled between 1995 and 2006–2010 from 4.6 million to 9.8 million. Although a small part of this trend may be related to a change in question wording, most of the rise is likely due to an actual increase in the reported incidence of STDs, particularly chlamydia, among women, and to the concomitant increase in routine chlamydia screening among women aged 25 and younger. Between 1996 and 2009, the reported chlamydia rate among women rose from 369 per 100,000 to 716 per 100,000²²; the estimated percentage of sexually active young women aged 15–25 in participating health plans who were screened rose from 25% in 2000 to 48% in 2010.²³

More older women are using contraceptive services. Over the past decade, the percentage of all women of reproductive age receiving contraceptive services each year increased significantly, from 36% in 1995 to 40% in 2006–2010, and this trend was found primarily among older women (as well as non-Hispanic white women and more affluent women). One likely explanation relates to changes in the types of contraceptive methods available and used by women, especially older women, during this period. In the past, older women relied primarily on sterilization and condoms, methods that do not need ongoing provider support, and few relied on oral contraceptives, other hormonal

methods or IUDs—methods that do require ongoing provider contact to obtain refills or to discuss method-related issues or side effects. Current formulations of many oral contraceptives and other types of hormonal contraception have lower doses of estrogen than in the past or are progestin-only and are now recommended as safe to use by many older women, as are currently available IUDs.²⁴ As a result, the types of methods used by older women have changed—in 1995, only 14% of contraceptive-using women aged 35–39 and 8% of those aged 40–44 relied on hormonal contraception or IUDs. In 2006–2010, those percentages had nearly doubled to 26% of contraceptive-using women aged 35–39 and 15% of those aged 40–44.²⁵

Persistent disparities in service use remain. Although the availability of publicly funded clinics provides many women with access to SRH services that they might otherwise forgo, disparities persist in the receipt of SRH services among certain groups of women, including those at high risk for unintended pregnancy. In particular, uninsured women were significantly less likely than either privately insured or Medicaid-covered women to have received any type of SRH service in the prior year, and among women receiving any SRH service, uninsured women were less likely to receive a contraceptive service and were less likely to talk to their doctor about birth control during preventive gynecologic visits. Disparities in receipt of SRH services were also found according to women's race and educational status. Non-Hispanic black women at risk for unintended pregnancy were less likely than white women to have received a contraceptive service in the prior year, even though they were more likely to have received an STD service. And the least educated women were significantly less likely to receive SRH services compared with their more educated counterparts. It is not clear exactly how or why these factors influence receipt of SRH services, although possibilities include a variety of patient barriers—for example, women not knowing where to go to obtain affordable or free services, or women choosing nonprescription methods because they don't have insurance or they think they can't afford other methods, as well as provider assumptions that may affect care once women seek services.

The Importance of Safety Net Providers

More women depend on clinics for SRH care. Although the majority of women receiving SRH services each year do so from private doctors, publicly funded clinics play an important role in equalizing service access for poor and low-income women. Over time, both the number and share of women receiving any SRH service who went to a publicly funded clinic rose—from 7.3 million (17%) in 1995 to 10.2 million (23%) in 2006–2010. The increase in women’s dependence on publicly funded clinics for SRH care mirrors both an increase in the number of women who were estimated to be in need of publicly funded contraceptive services—from 16.5 million in 1995²⁶ to 17.4 million in 2008²⁷—as well as an overall rise in the numbers of U.S. women living in poverty in recent years. Between 2000 and 2010, the numbers of women living in poverty increased from 18 million to 25 million,²⁸ while the numbers of women who were poor or low income (up to 200% of the FPL) increased from 44 million²⁹ to 56 million.³⁰

Much of the increased use of clinics occurred because more women reported receiving care from non–Title X–funded clinics (an increase from 7% in 1995 to 12% in 2006–2010). A number of factors may have contributed to this trend, including a nearly 200% increase in federal funding for and expanded service provision by FQHCs (publicly funded clinics that typically do not receive Title X funding) over the period.³¹

Disadvantaged women are most likely to depend on clinics. Publicly funded family planning clinics, including clinics that receive Title X funding, as well as clinics that receive other federal, state or local funds, such as FQHC funding, play a critical role in providing SRH services to the increasing numbers of poor and low-income women who need affordable care. These clinics are especially important in the provision of specific types of SRH care—28% of all women receiving any contraceptive service obtain care from publicly funded clinics, as do 35% of women receiving STD testing, treatment or counseling, and more than half of women who seek emergency contraception services. Women are also increasingly going to clinics for preventive gynecologic care and other SRH services, such as maternity care. For example, in 1995, only 16% of women receiving a Pap test or pelvic exam received the service from a clinic, but in 2006–2010, that proportion had risen to 21%. Moreover, specific subgroups of women—particularly those who are disadvantaged—are significantly more likely than other subgroups to depend on clinics for their care. Among uninsured women who received any SRH service, more than half went to a publicly funded clinic, and the odds of receiving care from clinics

were also high for minority women, foreign-born women, poor and low-income women, and women with less than a high school education.

Clinics are the usual source of medical care for many women. For many women, the publicly funded clinic that they visit for contraceptive and related services is their usual source for medical care—overall, six in 10 women (63%) visiting publicly funded clinics for such services consider this to be true. For many women from disadvantaged subgroups, dependence on clinics as their usual source is even higher. Among poor women, foreign-born women and non-Hispanic black women who visited a clinic for contraceptive or related care, seven in 10 reported that the clinic was their usual source for care. As expected, women who received family planning and related services from a community clinic were more likely to report the clinic as their usual source for care (76%) compared with women who received family planning care from an independent family planning clinic (47%).

Similar results were reported from a targeted study that examined service use over the prior year among a sample of clients visiting publicly funded family planning clinics. This study sampled only women attending reproductive health–focused clinics that were located in relatively urban areas and measured whether the clinic was the only medical provider that they had visited in the prior year—41% reported this to be true.³² Although the measures used and the samples of respondents interviewed are very different across these studies, both support the conclusion that many women visiting clinics for SRH care depend on these clinics as their main source for medical care, and that this is even truer for disadvantaged women.

Title X clinics remain an important source of SRH care for many women. Fourteen percent of all women receiving any contraceptive service obtain care from Title X–funded clinics, as do 18% of women receiving STD testing, treatment or counseling, and more than one-third of women who seek emergency contraception services. Moreover, Title X–funded clinics provide clients with a broad mix of SRH services that is not always available from other types of providers. For example, women who receive SRH services from private doctors typically receive a more limited mix of mostly preventive gynecologic care and contraceptive services, whereas women who receive care from publicly funded clinics receive a broader mix of services that more often includes STD/HIV care. Women going to clinics funded by the federal Title X family planning program and to independent family planning clinics receive the broadest range of services, compared with other provider types.

Some of these differences are undoubtedly due to the characteristics of women who seek care from different types of providers, with younger, unmarried women who are at higher risk for STDs and unplanned pregnancy more likely to visit clinics. However, when we tested for this possibility by controlling for women's demographic and socioeconomic characteristics, as well as their risk for STDs and unplanned pregnancy, we found that the type of provider remained strongly associated with receipt of specific services—women going to Title X–funded clinics were twice as likely as women going to private doctors to receive a contraceptive service, and women going to any kind of clinic had higher odds of receiving STD care. This latter finding is especially troubling and suggests that private doctors may be lagging behind publicly funded clinics in their implementation of current STD screening protocols that recommend all sexually active women younger than age 25 be routinely screened for chlamydia, and that older women with certain risk factors be routinely screened.³³

Ongoing monitoring of measures of health care quality also reveal similar variation in the chlamydia screening rates for commercial health plans compared with Medicaid health plans, with Medicaid plans reporting higher screening rates among sexually active female enrollees younger than age 25 (58% in 2010) compared with commercial plans (40–43%).³⁴ Our results suggest that part of the discrepancy in screening rates between private and public health plans may be the fact that many Medicaid enrollees are served at publicly funded clinics. Additionally, they suggest that there are real differences between private doctors and publicly funded clinics in terms of the likelihood that clients will receive STD screening as part of a broad mix of SRH services. One explanation for the broader mix of services delivered by publicly funded clinics is the fact that many are funded by Title X and therefore adhere to comprehensive guidelines that set high standards for delivery of SRH care, including chlamydia screening protocols and requirements for provision of a broad range of contraceptive methods and services.

There are missed opportunities for client-provider conversations. Conversations that women have with their doctors around SRH issues are critical to their health. It is recommended that doctors talk to patients about their reproductive health plan at annual visits both to ensure timely receipt of preconception care among women desiring pregnancy, and to ensure effective contraceptive use among those who want to avoid pregnancy.³⁵ Regular conversations between providers and patients about birth control have the potential to identify and remedy issues around method satisfaction, side effects, appropriateness of method given current life situations, and adherence to

method protocols—all factors that can contribute to inconsistent method use or stopping use altogether.³⁶ Among women who received a preventive gynecologic visit in the past year, fewer than half (49%) reported that their doctor talked to them about birth control at that visit, suggesting many missed opportunities for conveying important information and assessing whether women's contraceptive needs were being met. Such conversations were more common among unmarried women, adolescents and women in their 20s. However, even after controlling for women's demographic and socioeconomic characteristics and risk factors for unintended pregnancy, women visiting publicly funded clinics for preventive gynecologic care were significantly more likely than those visiting private doctors to report that they spoke to the doctor about birth control at the visit. Women visiting Title X–funded clinics were nearly twice as likely as those going to private doctors to report such conversations.

We noted similar findings with respect to conversations about condom use during visits for STD testing, treatment or counseling. Women receiving STD care from Title X–funded clinics were more than twice as likely to report talking about condom use with their doctor compared with women visiting private doctors. Moreover, there were clear differences among publicly funded clinics on this measure. Women visiting clinics with a family planning focus, such as independent family planning clinics and public health department clinics, were more than twice as likely to report conversations about condom use during STD visits than women visiting community clinics that provide contraception and STD services within a broader primary care context.

SRH Service Use Under the ACA

Contraceptive coverage affects payment patterns.

Changes in state and federal regulations around private insurance coverage of contraceptive services and supplies have already affected women's payment patterns and service use. There has been an overall decline in the percentage of women aged 15–44 covered by private health insurance (from 70% in 1995 to 60% in 2010³⁷) and a similar, though not as dramatic, decline among those receiving contraceptive services (from 70% in 1995 to 67% in 2006–2010). However, over the same period, there was a significant rise in the use of private insurance to pay for contraceptive visits (from 48% to 63%).

These contrasting patterns suggest that during the earlier period, many women who reported having private insurance were not using that insurance to pay for their contraceptive and other SRH care visits (the difference between 70% and 48%), most likely because their insur-

ance did not cover the contraceptive method or service they were receiving. However, by 2006–2010, nearly all women who reported having private health insurance coverage during the year also reported that they used this insurance to pay for their contraceptive visit (the difference between 67% and 63%). The increased use of insurance to pay for contraceptive visits was especially pronounced among women obtaining care from private doctors and may help to explain some of the shifts in the mix of services received by private doctor clients between 1995 and 2006–2010, particularly the broader mix of services, including more contraceptive services received in the recent period. However, the reduced likelihood that teenagers and young adults will actually use their insurance to pay for contraceptive services compared with older women likely reflects continuing concerns about confidentiality among young women whose health insurance is through their parents' plan.

Changes in women's use of private insurance to pay for SRH care are consistent with the rise and impact of contraceptive coverage mandates, starting in the late 1990s, whereby many states enacted laws requiring private-sector insurers to cover prescription contraceptives and related services if they also covered other prescription drugs and devices. A 2004 study found that the percentage of employer-sponsored insurance plans that covered a full range of reversible contraceptive methods rose from 28% in 1993 to 86% in 2002 as a direct response to these mandates.³⁸ Insurance coverage of contraceptive methods and services has risen even further since that study was published and, under the ACA, contraceptive services are required to be covered by private health plans without out-of-pocket costs to patients.

There are several implications for implementation of the ACA. Moving forward, our findings clearly show that health insurance coverage—either private or public—reduces financial obstacles to receipt of critical SRH services and increases the likelihood that women will receive care. Under the ACA, the financial barriers faced by women who currently lack coverage will be greatly reduced, with the potential for more women seeking and receiving regular SRH services. Numerous benefits will accrue if and when more women are able to access regular preventive SRH care, such as screening for breast and cervical cancer and STDs, as well as contraceptive counseling and methods, including assistance choosing and using methods consistently and correctly. Lower morbidity and mortality from reproductive cancers, fewer complications from STDs and reduced rates of unintended pregnancy are only some of the benefits that may result as currently uninsured women gain coverage and access care.

However, benefits of coverage under the ACA will be realized only if there are providers available and willing to serve those women who are newly insured. Although some women may be able to obtain care from private doctors, it is likely that many newly insured women will seek services from publicly funded clinics, adding pressure to an already taxed network of safety net providers. Our findings reveal variation in the package of services provided by different kinds of providers, even between different types of clinics. Although some women may choose to seek care from community clinics such as FQHCs where they can obtain both SRH care and primary care services, others may want and need the broader mix of SRH services provided by those publicly funded clinics that focus on the provision of family planning services, such as independent family planning clinics and public health department clinics. Family planning-focused clinics have also been shown to provide patients with a much broader choice of contraceptive methods, including IUDs and other long-acting methods, compared with primary care-focused clinics and are more likely to have dispensing protocols that help clients initiate and continue using methods, such as providing oral contraceptive supplies and refills on site rather than requiring clients to make a separate visit to a pharmacy.⁴

Program planners and policymakers who are involved in designing programs and service delivery options under the ACA need to ensure that women continue to have access to a wide range of SRH care provider sources, as our analysis makes clear that one size or provider type does not fit all women's needs. It is also not possible to expect that primary care providers, especially as they are attempting to increase their capacity to serve more newly insured women, will also be able to broaden the SRH services they offer in a way that would match those services offered by providers specializing in reproductive health. One model for ensuring women have continued access to the care they need would be to encourage the formation of linkages between primary care providers and reproductive health-focused clinics. Under such a model, women would have the option of receiving SRH care, including routine screenings and a full range of contraceptive methods and services, from specialized providers in a seamless fashion, while still being able to establish an ongoing primary care relationship with a family doctor or primary care clinic.

Appendix

Methodology Used to Classify Some Clinics

In each survey, some women who reported visiting clinics for their SRH care were unable to provide information during the interview that allowed identification of the clinic in the clinic database provided to the NSFG by the Guttmacher Institute. When this happened, interviewers wrote in the name of the clinic, the address, whatever identifying information the respondent could provide or some combination thereof. These “unfound” or unknown clinics were dealt with slightly differently in each round of the NSFG.

Methodology by Year

1995

For the 1995 NSFG, unknown clinics were mostly left as a separate category in the public use data file, although the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS) contractor made some attempt to review the clinic database again and check the written-in information for possible identification. Some clinics were identified during this process, but still, when the NCHS released the 1995 NSFG public use data file, 1.6 million of the women receiving any of the five contraceptive services (about 8%) were coded as having obtained their service from an unknown clinic, and 3.7 million women receiving any of the contraceptive or other SRH services were coded with unknown clinic as the source of care (actual respondent counts were 294 and 698, respectively). Further detail has been published.⁸

To more accurately describe the source of care for NSFG respondents, in 1997, staff at the Guttmacher Institute reviewed a special file provided by NCHS containing the unknown clinic write-in information and reclassified these responses using the following procedures: (1) clinic write-ins were again compared with the clinic database by staff familiar with the database who were instructed to search for both definite and probable clinic matches; (2) clinics still not found were then searched for using online Yellow Pages directories; (3) clinics identified through the Yellow Pages were called to ascertain the type of clinic and whether it received public funding. Many sites located in this manner were found to be private physician groups and not clinics at all. Of the 698 respondents who obtained services from unknown clinics, two-thirds

(or 457) were identified through these procedures; of these, 13% were Title X clinics, 28% were public clinics not funded by Title X, 46% were private physician offices and 13% were other types of providers (schools, military clinics, etc.). Most of the remaining respondents who obtained care from unknown clinics had provided too little write-in information about the name or address of the clinic to locate it (many had provided little more than the name of the town in which the clinic was located). Each of these sites was randomly imputed a clinic or private physician type based on the distribution of those write-in clinics that had been identified.

2002

For the 2002 NSFG, unknown clinics were investigated by staff at NCHS during data cleaning, primarily to ensure that all Title X-funded sites had been correctly identified. This investigation included manual review of the clinic database, review of online Yellow Pages listings of clinics and review of the list of unfound clinics by Title X regional consultants, grantees and other individuals in the states where clinics were listed. NCHS staff did not call any potential sites found in the Yellow Pages to determine if the site was a publicly funded clinic.

After this investigation, the remaining unfound clinics were imputed, and most appeared as non–Title X–funded clinics in the 2002 public use data file. However, there were several problems with the way these cases were coded, and several additional steps were needed to classify these sites appropriately. First, women who reported going to a hospital emergency room, hospital regular room or urgent care center for a service had been classified as visiting a clinic. As most of these sites were not found in the database, they were later coded incorrectly as non–Title X–funded clinics. Some 305 respondents, representing more than 2 million women, were classified incorrectly because of this issue. In our recoding process, all cases wherein a woman originally reported receiving care from a hospital emergency room, hospital regular room or urgent care center were moved to a “hospital/other” category, and any clinic information found for these sites was ignored. Second, when NCHS imputed the type and funding information for clinics that could not be found in the

clinic database, some sites were imputed to be employer clinics. In our recoding process, cases wherein a woman originally reported receiving care from one of the four true clinic types (community clinic, family planning clinic, hospital outpatient clinic or school-based clinic) but that were later imputed to be employer clinics because the woman could give no information about the name or location of the site, were coded as non–Title X clinics.

Finally, even after making these corrections, some additional unknown clinics remained. In the 2002 public use data file, these were classified as “non–Title X, agency unknown.” Because we made no effort to confirm whether these were actually publicly funded clinics, keeping all of them classified as such overestimates the number of clinics providing SRH services. Therefore, we developed a methodology to reclassify some of the unknown clinics based on the method of payment used to pay for services received at each site. Women visiting unknown clinics who reported that payment for the service was based on a sliding fee scale or that the visit was paid for by Medicaid or that payment was not required were retained as having received the service from a clinic (coded as a non–Title X clinic). Women visiting unknown clinics who reported that their visit was paid for by private insurance or that they paid themselves (not based on a sliding scale) were classified as having visited a private doctor/HMO for that service. Overall, approximately 200 respondents, representing about 1.5 million women, were reclassified from unknown clinic to private doctor using this methodology. Further detail has been reported previously.³⁹

2006–2010

For the 2006–2010 NSFG, most of the problems with unknown clinics encountered in earlier cycles were corrected based on lessons learned, and a coordinated effort was made to identify as many clinics as possible before releasing the public use data file. Cases of unknown clinics that were not identified from the clinic database were flagged in the public use data file as either logical or multiple regression imputations. Logical imputations were based on both NCHS staff and Guttmacher staff reviewing all of the lists of unknown clinics and attempting to make definite or likely matches using the clinic database, online searches and Yellow Pages, and follow-up to confirm whether matched sites were publicly funded clinics or private doctors or group practices. Multiple regression imputations were done by NCHS staff using the same procedures as all other NSFG imputations (refer to their documentation¹⁸ for details), and unlike 2002, only the correct clinic codes were used during this process.

APPENDIX TABLE 1. Percentage distribution of women aged 15–44 who reported receiving any contraceptive or other reproductive health care in the prior year according to their source of care and characteristics, United States, 2006–2010 (row percents)

| Characteristic | TOTAL | | All sources | | | All clinics according to: | | | | | |
|--|---------------|-----|----------------|-------------|-------|---------------------------|-------------|------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| | No. (in 000s) | % | Private doctor | All clinics | Other | Funding | | Type | | | |
| | | | | | | Title X | Non-Title X | Community clinic | Independent FP clinic | Health department | Hospital or school |
| All women | 44,050 | 100 | 72 | 23 | 5 | 11 | 12 | 8 | 6 | 5 | 4 |
| Age-group | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15–19 | 4,679 | 100 | 60 | 33 | 7 | 15 | 18 | 11 | 9 | 7 | 6 |
| 20–24 | 8,208 | 100 | 60 | 35 | 6 | 17 | 18 | 10 | 12 | 7 | 6 |
| 25–29 | 8,677 | 100 | 67 | 28 | 5 | 14 | 14 | 9 | 8 | 6 | 5 |
| 30–34 | 7,301 | 100 | 79 | 17 | 4 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 3 | 6 | 2 |
| 35–39 | 7,586 | 100 | 80 | 15 | 5 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| 40–44 | 7,601 | 100 | 81 | 13 | 5 | 5 | 8 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| Marital status | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Currently married | 19,846 | 100 | 83 | 13 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| Cohabiting | 5,856 | 100 | 60 | 34 | 5 | 18 | 16 | 13 | 9 | 9 | 4 |
| Formerly married | 4,223 | 100 | 69 | 23 | 8 | 11 | 12 | 8 | 6 | 6 | 3 |
| Never married | 14,127 | 100 | 62 | 32 | 6 | 16 | 16 | 10 | 10 | 7 | 6 |
| Any children | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No | 17,597 | 100 | 69 | 26 | 5 | 13 | 14 | 7 | 9 | 4 | 5 |
| Yes | 26,455 | 100 | 74 | 21 | 5 | 10 | 11 | 9 | 4 | 6 | 3 |
| Race/ethnicity | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Non-Hispanic white | 27,473 | 100 | 79 | 17 | 4 | 9 | 8 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 3 |
| Non-Hispanic black | 6,904 | 100 | 63 | 30 | 8 | 16 | 14 | 11 | 4 | 10 | 5 |
| Hispanic | 6,905 | 100 | 56 | 38 | 6 | 18 | 20 | 16 | 10 | 9 | 3 |
| Other | 2,770 | 100 | 59 | 33 | 8 | 6 | 27 | 23 | 5 | 1 | 5 |
| Nativity | | | | | | | | | | | |
| U.S. born | 37,740 | 100 | 74 | 21 | 5 | 10 | 11 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 |
| Foreign born | 6,277 | 100 | 59 | 34 | 7 | 16 | 18 | 15 | 7 | 8 | 5 |
| Education | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <high school complete | 8,206 | 100 | 49 | 42 | 9 | 21 | 21 | 16 | 9 | 12 | 5 |
| High school complete | 10,659 | 100 | 69 | 26 | 5 | 13 | 13 | 11 | 6 | 6 | 3 |
| Some college | 12,966 | 100 | 74 | 21 | 5 | 9 | 11 | 7 | 6 | 4 | 4 |
| College graduate | 12,221 | 100 | 86 | 12 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 4 |
| Poverty status, % of FPL | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0–99 | 9,489 | 100 | 54 | 39 | 7 | 19 | 20 | 16 | 9 | 9 | 5 |
| 100–249 | 13,322 | 100 | 63 | 30 | 7 | 15 | 15 | 11 | 7 | 7 | 5 |
| ≥250 | 21,241 | 100 | 85 | 12 | 3 | 5 | 7 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| Health insurance | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Private | 29,183 | 100 | 84 | 12 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 |
| Medicaid | 9,680 | 100 | 55 | 38 | 7 | 19 | 19 | 16 | 8 | 10 | 5 |
| None all year | 5,189 | 100 | 32 | 56 | 12 | 27 | 30 | 22 | 15 | 15 | 4 |
| Any uninsured period in past year | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No | 32,470 | 100 | 79 | 17 | 4 | 8 | 9 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 4 |
| Yes | 11,582 | 100 | 50 | 42 | 8 | 21 | 20 | 15 | 11 | 11 | 4 |
| Payment type | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Private insurance | 27,752 | 100 | 89 | 9 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| Medicaid | 6,917 | 100 | 56 | 39 | 5 | 19 | 21 | 15 | 9 | 10 | 5 |
| Own income only | 3,357 | 100 | 63 | 29 | 8 | 11 | 18 | 11 | 8 | 6 | 5 |
| Free/sliding scale | 4,251 | 100 | 7 | 85 | 8 | 46 | 39 | 27 | 26 | 24 | 8 |
| School/other | 912 | 100 | 41 | 38 | 21 | 21 | 16 | 15 | 9 | 11 | 2 |

APPENDIX TABLE 1 (continued)

| Characteristic | TOTAL | | All sources | | | All clinics according to: | | | | | | |
|---|---------------|-----|----------------|-------------|-------|---------------------------|-------------|------------------|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------|--|
| | No. (in 000s) | % | Private doctor | All clinics | Other | Funding | | Type | | | | |
| | | | | | | Title X | Non-Title X | Community clinic | Independent FP clinic | Health dept-ment | Hospital or school | |
| Metropolitan location | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Yes | 35,085 | 100 | 74 | 21 | 5 | 10 | 12 | 7 | 7 | 4 | 4 | |
| No | 8,967 | 100 | 63 | 30 | 6 | 17 | 13 | 12 | 4 | 11 | 4 | |
| No. of partners in past year | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0-1 | 36,539 | 100 | 74 | 22 | 5 | 11 | 11 | 8 | 5 | 5 | 3 | |
| 2 | 3,341 | 100 | 59 | 35 | 5 | 19 | 16 | 6 | 13 | 9 | 7 | |
| ≥3 | 2,110 | 100 | 56 | 35 | 9 | 13 | 22 | 14 | 12 | 4 | 5 | |
| At risk for unintended pregnancy | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No | 17,788 | 100 | 76 | 18 | 5 | 8 | 10 | 8 | 3 | 4 | 3 | |
| Yes | 26,264 | 100 | 69 | 26 | 5 | 13 | 13 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 4 | |
| Current contraceptive method | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sterilization | 9,506 | 100 | 77 | 16 | 7 | 7 | 9 | 7 | 2 | 4 | 3 | |
| Long-acting reversible contraceptives | 1,985 | 100 | 69 | 29 | 3 | 15 | 14 | 12 | 6 | 7 | 5 | |
| Hormonal | 12,954 | 100 | 72 | 26 | 2 | 15 | 11 | 7 | 9 | 6 | 4 | |
| Barrier/spermicide | 4,638 | 100 | 68 | 26 | 6 | 9 | 16 | 9 | 8 | 4 | 5 | |
| Rhythm/withdrawal | 1,722 | 100 | 72 | 20 | 8 | 8 | 12 | 8 | 6 | 2 | 3 | |
| No method—at risk | 3,485 | 100 | 70 | 24 | 6 | 13 | 11 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 2 | |
| Pregnant/seeking | 5,001 | 100 | 71 | 25 | 4 | 11 | 13 | 10 | 5 | 6 | 3 | |
| No recent sex | 3,821 | 100 | 65 | 26 | 8 | 9 | 17 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 7 | |
| Sterile | 940 | 100 | 71 | 19 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 7 | 6 | 3 | 3 | |

Notes: FP=family planning. FPL=federal poverty level.

APPENDIX TABLE 2. Percentage distribution of women aged 15–44 who reported receiving any contraceptive or other reproductive health care in the prior year according to their characteristics and their source of care, United States, 2006–2010 (column percents)

| Characteristic | TOTAL | | All sources | | | All clinics according to: | | | | | |
|--|---------------|-----|----------------|-------------|-------|---------------------------|-------------|------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| | No. (in 000s) | % | Private doctor | All clinics | Other | Funding | | Type | | | |
| | | | | | | Title X | Non-Title X | Community clinic | Independent FP clinic | Health department | Hospital or school |
| No. of women (in 000s) | 44,050 | | 31,571 | 10,231 | 2,248 | 4,902 | 5,329 | 3,643 | 2,646 | 2,279 | 1,663 |
| | | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Age-group | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15–19 | 4,679 | 11 | 9 | 15 | 14 | 15 | 15 | 14 | 16 | 14 | 17 |
| 20–24 | 8,208 | 19 | 16 | 28 | 21 | 28 | 27 | 23 | 37 | 25 | 28 |
| 25–29 | 8,677 | 20 | 19 | 24 | 18 | 25 | 23 | 22 | 25 | 23 | 25 |
| 30–34 | 7,301 | 17 | 18 | 12 | 13 | 13 | 11 | 13 | 9 | 18 | 7 |
| 35–39 | 7,586 | 17 | 19 | 11 | 16 | 11 | 12 | 15 | 9 | 9 | 10 |
| 40–44 | 7,601 | 17 | 20 | 10 | 18 | 8 | 11 | 13 | 4 | 11 | 13 |
| Marital status | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Currently married | 19,846 | 45 | 52 | 26 | 34 | 23 | 29 | 33 | 17 | 25 | 27 |
| Cohabiting | 5,856 | 13 | 11 | 20 | 14 | 22 | 18 | 20 | 20 | 23 | 14 |
| Formerly married | 4,223 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 15 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 9 | 11 | 8 |
| Never married | 14,127 | 32 | 28 | 45 | 37 | 46 | 44 | 37 | 53 | 42 | 52 |
| Any children | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No | 17,597 | 40 | 38 | 45 | 39 | 45 | 45 | 34 | 63 | 34 | 55 |
| Yes | 26,455 | 60 | 62 | 55 | 61 | 55 | 55 | 66 | 37 | 66 | 45 |
| Race/ethnicity | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Non-Hispanic white | 27,473 | 62 | 69 | 45 | 49 | 49 | 41 | 32 | 59 | 42 | 55 |
| Non-Hispanic black | 6,904 | 16 | 14 | 20 | 24 | 22 | 18 | 21 | 10 | 30 | 23 |
| Hispanic | 6,905 | 16 | 12 | 26 | 18 | 26 | 26 | 30 | 26 | 27 | 14 |
| Other | 2,770 | 6 | 5 | 9 | 10 | 3 | 14 | 17 | 5 | 1 | 8 |
| Nativity | | | | | | | | | | | |
| U.S. born | 37,740 | 86 | 88 | 79 | 81 | 79 | 78 | 74 | 84 | 78 | 81 |
| Foreign born | 6,277 | 14 | 12 | 21 | 19 | 21 | 22 | 26 | 16 | 22 | 19 |
| Education | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <high school complete | 8,206 | 19 | 13 | 33 | 34 | 35 | 32 | 35 | 28 | 42 | 26 |
| High school complete | 10,659 | 24 | 23 | 27 | 26 | 27 | 26 | 32 | 24 | 28 | 17 |
| Some college | 12,966 | 29 | 31 | 26 | 29 | 25 | 27 | 23 | 31 | 23 | 31 |
| College graduate | 12,221 | 28 | 33 | 14 | 11 | 13 | 15 | 9 | 17 | 8 | 26 |
| Poverty status, % of FPL | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0–99 | 9,489 | 22 | 16 | 36 | 30 | 38 | 35 | 41 | 31 | 39 | 31 |
| 100–249 | 13,322 | 30 | 27 | 39 | 40 | 40 | 38 | 39 | 35 | 43 | 39 |
| ≥250 | 21,241 | 48 | 57 | 25 | 30 | 23 | 27 | 20 | 34 | 18 | 31 |
| Health insurance | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Private | 29,183 | 66 | 78 | 35 | 44 | 34 | 36 | 26 | 42 | 25 | 56 |
| Medicaid | 9,680 | 22 | 17 | 36 | 29 | 38 | 35 | 42 | 28 | 41 | 32 |
| None all year | 5,189 | 12 | 5 | 29 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 32 | 30 | 34 | 13 |
| Any uninsured period in past year | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No | 32,470 | 74 | 82 | 53 | 59 | 50 | 56 | 52 | 50 | 43 | 72 |
| Yes | 11,582 | 26 | 18 | 47 | 41 | 50 | 44 | 48 | 50 | 57 | 28 |
| Payment type | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Private insurance | 27,752 | 64 | 79 | 24 | 40 | 21 | 26 | 25 | 20 | 11 | 46 |
| Medicaid | 6,917 | 16 | 12 | 27 | 19 | 27 | 27 | 29 | 24 | 31 | 22 |
| Own income only | 3,357 | 8 | 7 | 10 | 14 | 8 | 12 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 9 |
| Free/sliding scale | 4,251 | 10 | 1 | 36 | 17 | 40 | 32 | 32 | 42 | 45 | 22 |
| School/other | 912 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 10 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 1 |

APPENDIX TABLE 2 (continued)

| Characteristic | TOTAL | | All sources | | | All clinics according to: | | | | | | |
|---|---------------|----|----------------|-------------|-------|---------------------------|-------------|------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--|
| | No. (in 000s) | % | Private doctor | All clinics | Other | Funding | | Type | | | | |
| | | | | | | Title X | Non-Title X | Community clinic | Independent FP clinic | Health department | Hospital or school | |
| Metropolitan location | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Yes | 35,085 | 80 | 82 | 73 | 75 | 69 | 78 | 71 | 87 | 58 | 79 | |
| No | 8,967 | 20 | 18 | 27 | 25 | 31 | 22 | 29 | 13 | 42 | 21 | |
| No. of partners in past year | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0-1 | 36,539 | 87 | 89 | 81 | 82 | 81 | 80 | 86 | 73 | 82 | 78 | |
| 2 | 3,341 | 8 | 7 | 12 | 9 | 13 | 11 | 5 | 17 | 14 | 15 | |
| ≥3 | 2,110 | 5 | 4 | 7 | 9 | 6 | 9 | 8 | 10 | 4 | 7 | |
| At risk for unintended pregnancy | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No | 17,788 | 40 | 43 | 32 | 43 | 30 | 34 | 39 | 21 | 35 | 31 | |
| Yes | 26,264 | 60 | 57 | 68 | 57 | 70 | 66 | 61 | 79 | 65 | 69 | |
| Current contraceptive method | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sterilization | 9,506 | 22 | 23 | 15 | 31 | 14 | 15 | 19 | 6 | 16 | 17 | |
| Long-acting reversible contraceptives | 1,985 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 6 | 5 | |
| Hormonal | 12,954 | 29 | 30 | 33 | 11 | 38 | 28 | 25 | 45 | 36 | 29 | |
| Barrier/spermicide | 4,638 | 11 | 10 | 12 | 13 | 9 | 14 | 11 | 13 | 8 | 14 | |
| Rhythm/withdrawal | 1,722 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 4 | |
| No method—at risk | 3,485 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 9 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 4 | |
| Pregnant/seeking | 5,001 | 11 | 11 | 12 | 10 | 12 | 12 | 14 | 10 | 13 | 10 | |
| No recent sex | 3,821 | 9 | 8 | 10 | 14 | 7 | 12 | 11 | 7 | 8 | 16 | |
| Sterile | 940 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | |

Notes: FP=family planning. FPL=federal poverty level.

APPENDIX TABLE 3. Percentage distribution of women aged 15–44 who reported receiving any contraceptive care in the prior year according to their source of contraceptive care and characteristics, United States, 2006–2010 (row percents)

| Characteristic | TOTAL | | All sources | | | All clinics according to: | | | | | |
|--|---------------|-----|----------------|-------------|-------|---------------------------|-------------|------------------|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| | No. (in 000s) | % | Private doctor | All clinics | Other | Funding | | Type | | | |
| | | | | | | Title X | Non-Title X | Community clinic | Independent FP clinic | Health dept-ment | Hospital or school |
| All women | 24,665 | 100 | 69 | 27 | 4 | 14 | 13 | 8 | 9 | 6 | 5 |
| Age-group | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15–19 | 3,770 | 100 | 62 | 34 | 5 | 15 | 18 | 10 | 11 | 7 | 6 |
| 20–24 | 5,976 | 100 | 61 | 36 | 3 | 19 | 17 | 8 | 14 | 7 | 6 |
| 25–29 | 5,485 | 100 | 65 | 33 | 2 | 19 | 14 | 9 | 11 | 8 | 5 |
| 30–34 | 3,937 | 100 | 78 | 19 | 3 | 10 | 9 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 2 |
| 35–39 | 3,276 | 100 | 80 | 16 | 5 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 2 |
| 40–44 | 2,223 | 100 | 81 | 13 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 5 |
| Marital status | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Currently married | 9,416 | 100 | 80 | 16 | 3 | 8 | 8 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 3 |
| Cohabiting | 3,699 | 100 | 60 | 38 | 3 | 21 | 17 | 11 | 12 | 10 | 4 |
| Formerly married | 1,959 | 100 | 66 | 27 | 7 | 14 | 13 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 5 |
| Never married | 9,591 | 100 | 62 | 34 | 3 | 18 | 16 | 8 | 13 | 7 | 7 |
| Any children | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No | 11,866 | 100 | 68 | 30 | 3 | 15 | 15 | 7 | 13 | 5 | 6 |
| Yes | 12,799 | 100 | 70 | 25 | 4 | 14 | 11 | 8 | 5 | 8 | 4 |
| Race/ethnicity | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Non-Hispanic white | 16,170 | 100 | 76 | 22 | 3 | 12 | 10 | 4 | 9 | 4 | 4 |
| Non-Hispanic black | 3,284 | 100 | 60 | 34 | 6 | 20 | 14 | 9 | 5 | 13 | 7 |
| Hispanic | 3,804 | 100 | 52 | 43 | 4 | 22 | 21 | 15 | 13 | 11 | 4 |
| Other | 1,407 | 100 | 55 | 35 | 10 | 8 | 26 | 21 | 9 | 1 | 4 |
| Nativity | | | | | | | | | | | |
| U.S. born | 21,530 | 100 | 71 | 25 | 3 | 13 | 12 | 7 | 9 | 6 | 4 |
| Foreign born | 3,135 | 100 | 54 | 41 | 5 | 21 | 20 | 14 | 10 | 11 | 6 |
| Education | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <high school complete | 4,623 | 100 | 49 | 44 | 7 | 24 | 21 | 13 | 12 | 14 | 6 |
| High school complete | 5,581 | 100 | 66 | 31 | 3 | 17 | 14 | 11 | 9 | 8 | 4 |
| Some college | 7,548 | 100 | 71 | 25 | 4 | 12 | 12 | 6 | 9 | 4 | 5 |
| College graduate | 6,914 | 100 | 83 | 16 | 1 | 8 | 7 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 4 |
| Poverty status, % of FPL | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0–99 | 5,494 | 100 | 51 | 44 | 5 | 25 | 19 | 13 | 12 | 12 | 6 |
| 100–249 | 7,372 | 100 | 62 | 34 | 5 | 17 | 16 | 10 | 10 | 8 | 6 |
| ≥250 | 11,799 | 100 | 82 | 16 | 3 | 8 | 8 | 3 | 7 | 3 | 3 |
| Health insurance | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Private | 16,429 | 100 | 81 | 16 | 3 | 8 | 8 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 4 |
| Medicaid | 5,682 | 100 | 52 | 43 | 5 | 23 | 20 | 15 | 11 | 12 | 6 |
| None all year | 2,555 | 100 | 29 | 64 | 7 | 36 | 28 | 19 | 22 | 18 | 6 |
| Any uninsured period in past year | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No | 18,410 | 100 | 76 | 21 | 3 | 10 | 10 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 4 |
| Yes | 6,256 | 100 | 48 | 48 | 5 | 27 | 21 | 13 | 16 | 13 | 5 |
| Payment type | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Private insurance | 15,439 | 100 | 87 | 10 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| Medicaid | 4,219 | 100 | 52 | 44 | 4 | 22 | 22 | 14 | 12 | 12 | 6 |
| Own income only | 1,702 | 100 | 60 | 36 | 5 | 14 | 21 | 11 | 11 | 5 | 8 |
| Free/sliding scale | 2,747 | 100 | 7 | 89 | 4 | 52 | 37 | 20 | 34 | 25 | 11 |
| School/other | 486 | 100 | 28 | 51 | 21 | 29 | 22 | 15 | 17 | 17 | 3 |

APPENDIX TABLE 3 (continued)

| Characteristic | TOTAL | | All sources | | | All clinics according to: | | | | | | |
|---|---------------|-----|----------------|-------------|-------|---------------------------|-------------|------------------|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------|--|
| | No. (in 000s) | % | Private doctor | All clinics | Other | Funding | | Type | | | | |
| | | | | | | Title X | Non-Title X | Community clinic | Independent FP clinic | Health dept-ment | Hospital or school | |
| Metropolitan location | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Yes | 19,631 | 100 | 71 | 26 | 3 | 13 | 13 | 7 | 10 | 5 | 5 | |
| No | 5,034 | 100 | 60 | 34 | 6 | 22 | 13 | 10 | 6 | 13 | 5 | |
| No. of partners in past year | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0–1 | 19,661 | 100 | 71 | 25 | 4 | 14 | 12 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 4 | |
| 2 | 2,183 | 100 | 56 | 41 | 3 | 24 | 17 | 4 | 18 | 11 | 7 | |
| ≥3 | 1,414 | 100 | 58 | 36 | 6 | 14 | 22 | 12 | 15 | 3 | 5 | |
| At risk for unintended pregnancy | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No | 5,176 | 100 | 74 | 23 | 3 | 13 | 11 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 5 | |
| Yes | 19,489 | 100 | 68 | 29 | 4 | 15 | 14 | 8 | 10 | 6 | 4 | |
| Current contraceptive method | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sterilization | 2,063 | 100 | 66 | 18 | 15 | 9 | 9 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 7 | |
| Long-acting reversible contraceptives | 1,723 | 100 | 68 | 30 | 2 | 17 | 13 | 10 | 6 | 8 | 5 | |
| Hormonal | 12,823 | 100 | 72 | 26 | 2 | 15 | 12 | 7 | 9 | 6 | 4 | |
| Barrier/spermicide | 2,168 | 100 | 63 | 33 | 4 | 14 | 19 | 8 | 14 | 6 | 4 | |
| Rhythm/withdrawal | 714 | 100 | 68 | 26 | 5 | 13 | 13 | 10 | 12 | 1 | 3 | |
| No method—at risk | 1,560 | 100 | 67 | 29 | 4 | 16 | 13 | 7 | 12 | 8 | 3 | |
| Pregnant/seeking | 1,843 | 100 | 68 | 31 | 2 | 17 | 13 | 8 | 7 | 10 | 6 | |
| No recent sex | 1,388 | 100 | 57 | 38 | 5 | 14 | 24 | 12 | 9 | 5 | 12 | |
| Sterile | 382 | 100 | 71 | 19 | 10 | 14 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 6 | 1 | |

Notes: FP=family planning. FPL=federal poverty level.

APPENDIX TABLE 4. Percentage distribution of women aged 15–44 who reported receiving any contraceptive care in the prior year according to their source of contraceptive care and characteristics, United States, 2006–2010 (column percents)

| Characteristic | TOTAL | | All sources | | | All clinics according to: | | | | | |
|--|---------------|-----|----------------|-------------|-------|---------------------------|-------------|------------------|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| | No. (in 000s) | % | Private doctor | All clinics | Other | Funding | | Type | | | |
| | | | | | | Title X | Non-Title X | Community clinic | Independent FP clinic | Health dept-ment | Hospital or school |
| No. of women (in 000) | 24,665 | | 17,004 | 6,755 | 906 | 3,562 | 3,193 | 1,853 | 2,192 | 1,566 | 1,144 |
| | | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Age-group | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15–19 | 3,770 | 15 | 14 | 19 | 20 | 16 | 21 | 21 | 18 | 16 | 19 |
| 20–24 | 5,976 | 24 | 21 | 32 | 21 | 32 | 31 | 27 | 39 | 26 | 32 |
| 25–29 | 5,485 | 22 | 21 | 27 | 14 | 29 | 24 | 26 | 26 | 28 | 26 |
| 30–34 | 3,937 | 16 | 18 | 11 | 15 | 11 | 11 | 13 | 10 | 15 | 6 |
| 35–39 | 3,276 | 13 | 15 | 8 | 16 | 8 | 8 | 10 | 5 | 9 | 7 |
| 40–44 | 2,223 | 9 | 11 | 4 | 14 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 10 |
| Marital status | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Currently married | 9,416 | 38 | 44 | 23 | 36 | 22 | 24 | 26 | 17 | 25 | 24 |
| Cohabiting | 3,699 | 15 | 13 | 21 | 12 | 22 | 19 | 23 | 21 | 23 | 13 |
| Formerly married | 1,959 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 15 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 10 | 8 |
| Never married | 9,591 | 39 | 35 | 49 | 37 | 49 | 49 | 43 | 55 | 42 | 55 |
| Any children | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No | 11,866 | 48 | 47 | 52 | 37 | 50 | 54 | 42 | 68 | 34 | 61 |
| Yes | 12,799 | 52 | 53 | 48 | 63 | 50 | 46 | 58 | 32 | 66 | 39 |
| Race/ethnicity | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Non-Hispanic white | 16,170 | 66 | 72 | 52 | 45 | 54 | 49 | 38 | 63 | 44 | 63 |
| Non-Hispanic black | 3,284 | 13 | 12 | 17 | 21 | 19 | 14 | 16 | 8 | 28 | 19 |
| Hispanic | 3,804 | 15 | 12 | 24 | 18 | 24 | 25 | 31 | 23 | 27 | 13 |
| Other | 1,407 | 6 | 5 | 7 | 15 | 3 | 12 | 16 | 6 | 1 | 5 |
| Nativity | | | | | | | | | | | |
| U.S. born | 21,530 | 87 | 90 | 81 | 83 | 82 | 81 | 76 | 86 | 79 | 83 |
| Foreign born | 3,135 | 13 | 10 | 19 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 24 | 14 | 21 | 17 |
| Education | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <high school complete | 4,623 | 19 | 13 | 30 | 35 | 31 | 30 | 32 | 25 | 40 | 25 |
| High school complete | 5,581 | 23 | 22 | 26 | 19 | 27 | 25 | 32 | 24 | 27 | 18 |
| Some college | 7,548 | 31 | 31 | 28 | 36 | 26 | 29 | 26 | 32 | 21 | 31 |
| College graduate | 6,914 | 28 | 34 | 16 | 11 | 16 | 16 | 10 | 19 | 11 | 27 |
| Poverty status, % of FPL | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0–99 | 5,494 | 22 | 17 | 36 | 30 | 39 | 32 | 40 | 31 | 41 | 31 |
| 100–249 | 7,372 | 30 | 27 | 37 | 37 | 36 | 38 | 39 | 33 | 38 | 39 |
| ≥250 | 11,799 | 48 | 57 | 28 | 33 | 25 | 30 | 21 | 36 | 21 | 30 |
| Health insurance | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Private | 16,429 | 67 | 78 | 39 | 51 | 38 | 41 | 28 | 47 | 28 | 59 |
| Medicaid | 5,682 | 23 | 17 | 37 | 30 | 37 | 36 | 46 | 28 | 42 | 28 |
| None all year | 2,555 | 10 | 4 | 24 | 19 | 26 | 23 | 26 | 25 | 30 | 13 |
| Any uninsured period in past year | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No | 18,410 | 75 | 82 | 56 | 67 | 53 | 60 | 56 | 54 | 47 | 72 |
| Yes | 6,256 | 25 | 18 | 44 | 33 | 47 | 40 | 44 | 46 | 53 | 28 |
| Payment type | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Private insurance | 15,439 | 63 | 79 | 24 | 48 | 22 | 25 | 24 | 21 | 14 | 41 |
| Medicaid | 4,219 | 17 | 13 | 27 | 20 | 26 | 29 | 33 | 23 | 31 | 21 |
| Own income only | 1,702 | 7 | 6 | 9 | 10 | 7 | 11 | 10 | 9 | 5 | 11 |
| Free/sliding scale | 2,747 | 11 | 1 | 36 | 11 | 41 | 32 | 29 | 42 | 44 | 26 |
| School/other | 486 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 11 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 1 |

APPENDIX TABLE 4 (continued)

| Characteristic | TOTAL | | All sources | | | All clinics according to: | | | | | | |
|---|---------------|----|----------------|-------------|-------|---------------------------|-------------|------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--|
| | No. (in 000s) | % | Private doctor | All clinics | Other | Funding | | Type | | | | |
| | | | | | | Title X | Non-Title X | Community clinic | Independent FP clinic | Health department | Hospital or school | |
| Metropolitan location | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Yes | 19,631 | 80 | 82 | 74 | 69 | 69 | 80 | 72 | 86 | 57 | 78 | |
| No | 5,034 | 20 | 18 | 26 | 31 | 31 | 20 | 28 | 14 | 43 | 22 | |
| No. of partners in past year | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0–1 | 19,661 | 85 | 87 | 78 | 84 | 79 | 77 | 85 | 71 | 80 | 77 | |
| 2 | 2,183 | 9 | 8 | 14 | 7 | 15 | 13 | 6 | 19 | 17 | 16 | |
| ≥3 | 1,414 | 6 | 5 | 8 | 9 | 6 | 11 | 10 | 10 | 3 | 7 | |
| At risk for unintended pregnancy | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No | 5,176 | 21 | 22 | 18 | 17 | 18 | 17 | 18 | 12 | 21 | 25 | |
| Yes | 19,489 | 79 | 78 | 82 | 83 | 82 | 83 | 82 | 88 | 79 | 75 | |
| Current contraceptive method | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sterilization | 2,063 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 35 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 7 | 13 | |
| Long-acting reversible contraceptives | 1,723 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 4 | 8 | 7 | 10 | 5 | 8 | 8 | |
| Hormonal | 12,823 | 52 | 54 | 50 | 26 | 53 | 46 | 49 | 53 | 51 | 42 | |
| Barrier/spermicide | 2,168 | 9 | 8 | 11 | 9 | 9 | 13 | 10 | 14 | 9 | 8 | |
| Rhythm/withdrawal | 714 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 2 | |
| No method—at risk | 1,560 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 5 | 9 | 8 | 3 | |
| Pregnant/seeking | 1,843 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 3 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 11 | 9 | |
| No recent sex | 1,388 | 6 | 5 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 10 | 9 | 6 | 4 | 15 | |
| Sterile | 382 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |

Notes: FP=family planning. FPL=federal poverty level.

APPENDIX TABLE 5. Percentage distribution of women aged 15–44 who reported receiving any contraceptive or STD care in the prior year according to their source of care and characteristics, United States, 2006–2010 (row percents)

| Characteristic | TOTAL | | All sources | | | All clinics according to: | | | | | |
|--|---------------|-----|----------------|-------------|-------|---------------------------|-------------|------------------|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| | No. (in 000s) | % | Private doctor | All clinics | Other | Funding | | Type | | | |
| | | | | | | Title X | Non-Title X | Community clinic | Independent FP clinic | Health dept-ment | Hospital or school |
| All women | 31,464 | 100 | 68 | 27 | 5 | 14 | 13 | 9 | 8 | 6 | 4 |
| Age-group | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15–19 | 4,250 | 100 | 60 | 34 | 6 | 15 | 18 | 11 | 10 | 7 | 6 |
| 20–24 | 7,302 | 100 | 58 | 36 | 5 | 18 | 18 | 10 | 13 | 7 | 6 |
| 25–29 | 6,981 | 100 | 65 | 31 | 4 | 16 | 15 | 10 | 9 | 7 | 5 |
| 30–34 | 5,120 | 100 | 77 | 19 | 4 | 10 | 9 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 2 |
| 35–39 | 4,514 | 100 | 77 | 18 | 5 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 2 |
| 40–44 | 3,297 | 100 | 78 | 15 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 4 |
| Marital status | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Currently married | 11,924 | 100 | 81 | 16 | 4 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| Cohabiting | 4,751 | 100 | 58 | 37 | 5 | 20 | 17 | 14 | 11 | 9 | 4 |
| Formerly married | 2,890 | 100 | 66 | 26 | 8 | 13 | 13 | 9 | 6 | 7 | 4 |
| Never married | 11,899 | 100 | 60 | 34 | 6 | 17 | 17 | 9 | 12 | 7 | 6 |
| Any children | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No | 14,200 | 100 | 66 | 29 | 5 | 14 | 15 | 7 | 11 | 5 | 6 |
| Yes | 17,264 | 100 | 69 | 25 | 5 | 13 | 12 | 10 | 5 | 7 | 3 |
| Race/ethnicity | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Non-Hispanic white | 19,403 | 100 | 75 | 21 | 4 | 11 | 10 | 5 | 8 | 4 | 4 |
| Non-Hispanic black | 5,306 | 100 | 60 | 32 | 8 | 17 | 14 | 11 | 4 | 11 | 5 |
| Hispanic | 4,996 | 100 | 52 | 42 | 5 | 21 | 22 | 17 | 12 | 10 | 4 |
| Other | 1,759 | 100 | 56 | 34 | 10 | 7 | 27 | 21 | 7 | 1 | 5 |
| Nativity | | | | | | | | | | | |
| U.S. born | 27,245 | 100 | 70 | 25 | 5 | 13 | 12 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 4 |
| Foreign born | 4,214 | 100 | 55 | 38 | 7 | 18 | 20 | 14 | 9 | 9 | 6 |
| Education | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <high school complete | 6,378 | 100 | 48 | 44 | 9 | 23 | 21 | 15 | 11 | 13 | 6 |
| High school complete | 7,452 | 100 | 65 | 30 | 5 | 16 | 15 | 12 | 8 | 7 | 3 |
| Some college | 9,258 | 100 | 70 | 24 | 5 | 12 | 13 | 7 | 8 | 5 | 5 |
| College graduate | 8,377 | 100 | 83 | 15 | 2 | 7 | 8 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 4 |
| Poverty status, % of FPL | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0–99 | 7,476 | 100 | 52 | 42 | 7 | 22 | 19 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 6 |
| 100–249 | 9,623 | 100 | 61 | 32 | 7 | 17 | 16 | 11 | 9 | 8 | 5 |
| ≥250 | 14,365 | 100 | 81 | 16 | 3 | 7 | 9 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 3 |
| Health insurance | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Private | 19,954 | 100 | 81 | 16 | 3 | 7 | 8 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 4 |
| Medicaid | 7,876 | 100 | 53 | 41 | 6 | 21 | 20 | 16 | 9 | 10 | 6 |
| None all year | 3,633 | 100 | 29 | 60 | 11 | 32 | 28 | 19 | 20 | 17 | 5 |
| Any uninsured period in past year | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No | 22,947 | 100 | 76 | 20 | 4 | 9 | 11 | 7 | 6 | 4 | 4 |
| Yes | 8,517 | 100 | 47 | 45 | 8 | 25 | 20 | 14 | 14 | 12 | 4 |
| Payment type | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Private insurance | 18,641 | 100 | 87 | 11 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| Medicaid | 5,769 | 100 | 55 | 41 | 4 | 20 | 21 | 15 | 10 | 11 | 5 |
| Own income only | 2,175 | 100 | 60 | 32 | 8 | 13 | 20 | 11 | 10 | 5 | 6 |
| Free/sliding scale | 3,364 | 100 | 7 | 89 | 5 | 51 | 38 | 22 | 31 | 26 | 10 |
| School/other | 682 | 100 | 33 | 46 | 21 | 28 | 18 | 17 | 12 | 14 | 2 |

APPENDIX TABLE 5 (continued)

| Characteristic | TOTAL | | All sources | | | All clinics according to: | | | | | | |
|---|--------------|-----|----------------|-------------|-------|---------------------------|-------------|------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--|
| | No. (in 000) | % | Private doctor | All clinics | Other | Funding | | Type | | | | |
| | | | | | | Title X | Non-Title X | Community clinic | Independent FP clinic | Health department | Hospital or school | |
| Metropolitan location | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Yes | 25,325 | 100 | 70 | 25 | 5 | 12 | 13 | 8 | 9 | 5 | 4 | |
| No | 6,139 | 100 | 60 | 34 | 6 | 21 | 14 | 11 | 5 | 13 | 5 | |
| No. of partners in past year | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0–1 | 25,009 | 100 | 70 | 25 | 5 | 13 | 12 | 9 | 7 | 6 | 4 | |
| 2 | 2,927 | 100 | 56 | 39 | 5 | 21 | 17 | 6 | 15 | 10 | 7 | |
| ≥3 | 1,931 | 100 | 56 | 36 | 8 | 13 | 23 | 14 | 13 | 4 | 5 | |
| At risk for unintended pregnancy | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No | 9,234 | 100 | 70 | 24 | 6 | 12 | 12 | 9 | 5 | 6 | 4 | |
| Yes | 22,230 | 100 | 67 | 28 | 5 | 14 | 14 | 9 | 9 | 6 | 4 | |
| Current contraceptive method | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sterilization | 3,938 | 100 | 67 | 21 | 13 | 11 | 9 | 7 | 2 | 7 | 5 | |
| Long-acting reversible contraceptives | 1,770 | 100 | 68 | 29 | 3 | 17 | 13 | 10 | 6 | 8 | 5 | |
| Hormonal | 12,889 | 100 | 72 | 26 | 2 | 15 | 11 | 7 | 9 | 6 | 4 | |
| Barrier/spermicide | 3,017 | 100 | 62 | 32 | 6 | 13 | 19 | 10 | 11 | 6 | 5 | |
| Rhythm/withdrawal | 1,046 | 100 | 69 | 23 | 9 | 9 | 13 | 10 | 10 | 1 | 2 | |
| No method—at risk | 2,416 | 100 | 66 | 29 | 5 | 16 | 13 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 3 | |
| Pregnant/seeking | 3,646 | 100 | 68 | 28 | 5 | 13 | 15 | 12 | 6 | 7 | 3 | |
| No recent sex | 2,123 | 100 | 56 | 35 | 10 | 12 | 23 | 13 | 7 | 4 | 10 | |
| Sterile | 619 | 100 | 67 | 25 | 8 | 12 | 13 | 9 | 8 | 5 | 3 | |

Notes: FP=family planning. FPL=federal poverty level.

APPENDIX TABLE 6. Percentage distribution of women aged 15–44 who reported receiving any contraceptive or STD care in the prior year according to their source of care and characteristics, United States, 2006–2010 (column percents)

| Characteristic | TOTAL | | All sources | | | All clinics according to: | | | | | |
|--|----------------|-----|----------------|-------------|-------|---------------------------|-------------|------------------|-----------------------|--------------|--------------------|
| | No. (in '000s) | % | Private doctor | All clinics | Other | Funding | | Type | | | |
| | | | | | | Title X | Non–Title X | Community clinic | Independent FP clinic | Health dept- | Hospital or school |
| No. of women (in '000s) | 31,464 | | 21,370 | 8,497 | 1,594 | 4,285 | 4,212 | 2,706 | 2,472 | 1,939 | 1,380 |
| | | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Age-group | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15–19 | 4,250 | 14 | 12 | 17 | 17 | 15 | 18 | 17 | 17 | 15 | 17 |
| 20–24 | 7,302 | 23 | 20 | 31 | 25 | 31 | 31 | 26 | 39 | 27 | 32 |
| 25–29 | 6,981 | 22 | 21 | 26 | 17 | 26 | 25 | 25 | 26 | 25 | 26 |
| 30–34 | 5,120 | 16 | 19 | 11 | 13 | 12 | 11 | 11 | 9 | 17 | 7 |
| 35–39 | 4,514 | 14 | 16 | 10 | 13 | 10 | 9 | 14 | 7 | 9 | 7 |
| 40–44 | 3,297 | 10 | 12 | 6 | 15 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 7 | 10 |
| Marital status | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Currently married | 11,924 | 38 | 45 | 22 | 29 | 21 | 23 | 25 | 16 | 24 | 22 |
| Cohabiting | 4,751 | 15 | 13 | 21 | 15 | 22 | 20 | 24 | 21 | 22 | 14 |
| Formerly married | 2,890 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 15 | 9 | 9 | 10 | 7 | 10 | 9 |
| Never married | 11,899 | 38 | 33 | 48 | 42 | 48 | 48 | 41 | 56 | 44 | 55 |
| Any children | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No | 14,200 | 45 | 44 | 49 | 41 | 47 | 50 | 38 | 65 | 34 | 60 |
| Yes | 17,264 | 55 | 56 | 51 | 59 | 53 | 50 | 62 | 35 | 66 | 40 |
| Race/ethnicity | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Non-Hispanic white | 19,403 | 62 | 68 | 48 | 45 | 52 | 45 | 35 | 61 | 42 | 60 |
| Non-Hispanic black | 5,306 | 17 | 15 | 20 | 27 | 21 | 18 | 21 | 9 | 31 | 21 |
| Hispanic | 4,996 | 16 | 12 | 25 | 17 | 24 | 26 | 30 | 24 | 26 | 13 |
| Other | 1,759 | 6 | 5 | 7 | 11 | 3 | 11 | 14 | 5 | 1 | 6 |
| Nativity | | | | | | | | | | | |
| U.S. born | 27,245 | 87 | 89 | 81 | 81 | 82 | 80 | 78 | 85 | 79 | 83 |
| Foreign born | 4,214 | 13 | 11 | 19 | 19 | 18 | 20 | 22 | 15 | 21 | 17 |
| Education | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <high school complete | 6,378 | 20 | 14 | 33 | 35 | 34 | 31 | 34 | 28 | 42 | 25 |
| High school complete | 7,452 | 24 | 23 | 26 | 24 | 27 | 26 | 34 | 24 | 26 | 18 |
| Some college | 9,258 | 29 | 31 | 26 | 31 | 25 | 28 | 23 | 31 | 22 | 31 |
| College graduate | 8,377 | 27 | 33 | 14 | 11 | 14 | 15 | 9 | 18 | 9 | 25 |
| Poverty status, % of FPL | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0–99 | 7,476 | 24 | 18 | 37 | 32 | 39 | 34 | 41 | 31 | 40 | 33 |
| 100–249 | 9,623 | 31 | 27 | 37 | 40 | 38 | 36 | 37 | 34 | 40 | 35 |
| ≥250 | 14,365 | 46 | 55 | 27 | 28 | 23 | 30 | 22 | 35 | 20 | 32 |
| Health insurance | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Private | 19,954 | 63 | 76 | 37 | 43 | 34 | 39 | 28 | 44 | 26 | 56 |
| Medicaid | 7,876 | 25 | 20 | 38 | 32 | 38 | 37 | 47 | 27 | 43 | 32 |
| None all year | 3,633 | 12 | 5 | 26 | 26 | 28 | 24 | 26 | 29 | 31 | 12 |
| Any uninsured period in past year | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No | 22,947 | 73 | 81 | 55 | 58 | 51 | 60 | 57 | 52 | 45 | 72 |
| Yes | 8,517 | 27 | 19 | 45 | 42 | 49 | 40 | 43 | 48 | 55 | 28 |
| Payment type | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Private insurance | 18,641 | 61 | 77 | 24 | 42 | 21 | 27 | 26 | 21 | 12 | 43 |
| Medicaid | 5,769 | 19 | 15 | 28 | 20 | 27 | 29 | 33 | 24 | 32 | 22 |
| Own income only | 2,175 | 7 | 6 | 8 | 14 | 7 | 10 | 9 | 9 | 6 | 10 |
| Free/sliding scale | 3,364 | 11 | 1 | 36 | 13 | 41 | 31 | 28 | 43 | 45 | 24 |
| School/other | 682 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 12 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 1 |

APPENDIX TABLE 6 (continued)

| Characteristic | TOTAL | | All sources | | | All clinics according to: | | | | | |
|---|----------------|----|----------------|-------------|-------|---------------------------|-------------|------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| | No. (in '000s) | % | Private doctor | All clinics | Other | Funding | | Type | | | |
| | | | | | | Title X | Non-Title X | Community clinic | Independent FP clinic | Health department | Hospital or school |
| Metropolitan location | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Yes | 25,325 | 80 | 83 | 75 | 78 | 71 | 80 | 74 | 87 | 60 | 78 |
| No | 6,139 | 20 | 17 | 25 | 22 | 29 | 20 | 26 | 13 | 40 | 22 |
| No. of partners in past year | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0–1 | 25,009 | 84 | 87 | 78 | 79 | 79 | 76 | 83 | 71 | 80 | 75 |
| 2 | 2,927 | 10 | 8 | 14 | 10 | 15 | 13 | 7 | 18 | 16 | 17 |
| ≥3 | 1,931 | 6 | 5 | 9 | 11 | 6 | 11 | 11 | 10 | 4 | 8 |
| At risk for unintended pregnancy | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No | 9,234 | 29 | 30 | 26 | 37 | 26 | 26 | 30 | 18 | 29 | 28 |
| Yes | 22,230 | 71 | 70 | 74 | 63 | 74 | 74 | 70 | 82 | 71 | 72 |
| Current contraceptive method | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sterilization | 3,938 | 13 | 12 | 10 | 31 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 4 | 13 | 15 |
| Long-acting reversible | 1,770 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 3 | 7 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 7 | 6 |
| Hormonal | 12,889 | 41 | 43 | 40 | 15 | 44 | 35 | 33 | 48 | 41 | 34 |
| Barrier/spermicide | 3,017 | 10 | 9 | 11 | 11 | 9 | 14 | 11 | 14 | 9 | 12 |
| Rhythm/withdrawal | 1,046 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 2 |
| No method—at risk | 2,416 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 5 |
| Pregnant/seeking | 3,646 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 10 | 11 | 13 | 16 | 9 | 12 | 9 |
| No recent sex | 2,123 | 7 | 6 | 9 | 13 | 6 | 12 | 10 | 6 | 5 | 15 |
| Sterile | 619 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |

Notes: FP=family planning. FPL=federal poverty level.

References

1. Institute of Medicine, *Clinical Preventive Services for Women: Closing the Gaps*, Washington, DC: The National Academies Press, 2011, <http://iom.edu/~media/Files/Report%20Files/2011/Clinical-Preventive-Services-for-Women-Closing-the-Gaps/preventiveservicesforwomenreportbrief_updated2.pdf>, accessed Dec. 10, 2012.
2. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational employment and wages, 29-0000: healthcare practitioners and technical occupations, May 2011, <http://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes_stru.htm#29-0000>, accessed Dec. 10, 2012.
3. Guttmacher Institute, *Contraceptive Needs and Services, 2006*, 2009, <<http://www.guttmacher.org/pubs/win/index.html>>, accessed Mar. 20, 2012.
4. Frost JJ et al., *Variation in Service Delivery Practices Among Clinics Providing Publicly Funded Family Planning Services in 2010*, New York: Guttmacher Institute, 2012.
5. Frost JJ, Frohwirth L and Purcell A, The availability and use of publicly funded family planning clinics: U.S. trends, 1994–2001, *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health*, 2004, 36(5):206–215.
6. Frost JJ et al., Family planning clinic services in the United States: patterns and trends in the late 1990s, *Family Planning Perspectives*, 2001, 33(3):113–122.
7. Frost JJ, Family planning clinic services in the United States, 1994, *Family Planning Perspectives*, 1996, 28(3):92–100.
8. Frost JJ, Public or private providers? U.S. women's use of reproductive health services, *Family Planning Perspectives*, 2001, 33(1):4–12.
9. Frost JJ, Trends in US women's use of sexual and reproductive health care services, 1995–2002, *American Journal of Public Health*, 2008, 98(10):1814–1817.
10. Frost JJ, U.S. women's reliance on publicly funded family planning clinics as their usual source of medical care, paper presented at the 2008 Research Conference on the National Survey of Family Growth, Hyattsville, MD, Oct. 16 and 17, 2008.
11. Mosher WD et al., Use of contraception and use of family planning services in the United States: 1982–2002, *Advance Data from Vital and Health Statistics*, 2004, No. 350.
12. Mosher WD, Use of family planning services in the United States: 1982 and 1988, *Advance Data from Vital and Health Statistics*, 1990, No. 184.
13. Stidham-Hall K, Moreau C and Trussell J, Continuing social disparities despite upward trends in sexual and reproductive health service use among young women in the United States, *Contraception*, 2012, 86(6):681–686.
14. Stidham-Hall K, Moreau C and Trussell J, Determinants of and disparities in reproductive health service use among adolescent and young adult women in the United States, 2002–2008, *American Journal of Public Health*, 2012, 102(2):359–367.
15. Gold RB et al., *Next Steps for America's Family Planning Program: Leveraging the Potential of Medicaid and Title X in an Evolving Health Care System*, New York: Guttmacher Institute, 2009.
16. Abma JC et al., Fertility, family planning and women's health: new data from the 1995 National Survey of Family Growth, *Vital and Health Statistics*, 1997, Series 23, No. 19.
17. Chandra A et al., Fertility, family planning, and reproductive health of US women: data from the 2002 National Survey of Family Growth, *Vital and Health Statistics*, 2005, Series 23, No. 25.
18. Lepkowski JM et al., The 2006–2010 National Survey of Family Growth: sample design and analysis of a continuous survey, National Center for Health Statistics, *Vital and Health Statistics*, 2010, Series 2, No. 150.
19. Jones RK and Kost K, Underreporting of induced and spontaneous abortion in the United States: an analysis of the 2002 National Survey of Family Growth, *Studies in Family Planning*, 2007, 38(3):187–197.
20. ACOG Practice Bulletin No. 109: Cervical cytology screening. ACOG Committee on Practice Bulletins-Gynecology, *Obstetrics & Gynecology*, 2009, 114(6): 1409–1420.
21. U.S. Preventive Services Task Force, Screening for cervical cancer, U.S. Preventive Services Task Force Recommendation Statement, 2012, <<http://www.uspreventiveservicestaskforce.org/uspstf11/cervcancer/cervcancers.htm>>, accessed Dec. 19, 2012.
22. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for HIV, STD and TB Prevention (NCHSTP), Division of STD/HIV, Sexually transmitted diseases – interactive data 1996–2009: selected STDs by age, race/ethnicity, and

gender, 1996-2009, CDC WONDER On-line Database, June 2011, <<http://wonder.cdc.gov/std-std-race-age.html>>, accessed Jan. 21, 2013.

23. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, STD trends in the United States: 2010 national data for gonorrhea, chlamydia and syphilis, sexually transmitted diseases surveillance, 2010, <<http://www.cdc.gov/std/stats10/tables/trends-snapshot.htm>>, accessed Jan. 21, 2013.

24. Kaunitz AM, Hormonal contraception in women of older reproductive age, *New England Journal of Medicine*, 2008, 358(12):1262–1270.

25. Jones J, Mosher W and Daniels K, Current contraceptive use in the United States, 2006–2010, and changes in patterns of use since 1995, *National Health Statistics Reports*, No. 60, Hyattsville, MD: National Center for Health Statistics, 2012.

26. The Alan Guttmacher Institute, *Contraceptive Needs and Services, 1995*, New York: The Alan Guttmacher Institute, 1997.

27. Frost JJ, Henshaw SK and Sonfield A, *Contraceptive Needs and Services, 2008*, 2010, <<http://www.guttmacher.org/pubs/win/contraceptive-needs-2008.pdf>>, accessed Mar. 20, 2012.

28. U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Survey, Annual Social and Economic Supplements, Historical Poverty Tables, Table 7, <<http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/poverty/data/historical/people.html>>, accessed Jan. 27, 2013.

29. U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Survey, 2000 Annual Social and Economic Supplements, Detailed Poverty (P60 Package), Table 2, <<http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/cpstables/macro/032001/pov/toc.htm>>, accessed Jan. 25, 2013.

30. U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Survey, 2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplements, Detailed Poverty Tables, Table POV01, <http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/cpstables/032011/pov/POV01_200.htm>, accessed Jan. 27, 2013.

31. Shin P, Rosenbaum S and Paradise J, *Community Health Centers: The Challenge of Growing to Meet the Need for Primary Care in Medically Underserved Communities*, Washington, DC: Kaiser Commission on Medicaid and the Uninsured, 2012, <<http://www.kff.org/uninsured/upload/8098-02.pdf>>, accessed Jan. 25, 2012.

32. Frost JJ, Gold RG and Bucek A, Specialized family planning clinics in the United States: why women choose them and their role in meeting women's health care needs, *Women's Health Issues*, 2012, 22(6):e519–e525.

33. U.S. Preventive Services Task Force Recommendations, Screening for chlamydial infection, rec-

ommendation statement, 2007, <<http://www.uspreventiveservicestaskforce.org/uspstf07/chlamydia/chlamydiars.htm>>, accessed Jan. 25, 2013.

34. National Committee for Quality Assurance, *The State of Health Care Quality, 2011*, Washington, DC: National Committee for Quality Assurance, 2011, <http://www.ncqa.org/Portals/0/Publications/Resource%20Library/SOHC/SOHC_2011_FINALv3-1_3.16.12.pdf>, accessed Jan. 18, 2013.

35. American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, ACOG Committee Opinion, Number 313: the importance of preconception care in the continuum of women's health care, *Obstetrics & Gynecology*, 2005, 106(3):665–666.

36. Frost JJ, Darroch JE and Remez L, Improving contraceptive use in the United States, *In Brief*, New York: Guttmacher Institute, 2008, No. 1.

37. Sonfield A, Medicaid remains crucial for reproductive-aged women—and also a target for budget cuts, *Guttmacher Policy Review*, 2011, 14(4):27–28.

38. Sonfield A et al., U.S. insurance coverage of contraceptives and the impact of contraceptive coverage mandates, 2002, *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health*, 2004, 36(2):72–79.

39. Frost, JJ, Using the NSFG to examine the scope and source of contraceptive and preventative reproductive health services obtained by U.S. women, 1995-2002, paper presented at the 2006 Research Conference on the National Survey of Family Growth, Hyattsville, MD, Oct. 19 and 20, 2006.



*Advancing sexual and reproductive health worldwide
through research, policy analysis and public education*

125 Maiden Lane
New York, NY 10038
(212) 248-1111; fax (212) 248-1951
info@guttmacher.org

1301 Connecticut Avenue NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036
policyinfo@guttmacher.org

www.guttmacher.org