Original research Open access

# BMJ Open Association between male involvement during antenatal care and use of maternal health services in Mwanza City, Northwestern Tanzania: a crosssectional study

Clara C Natai, <sup>1</sup> Neema Gervas, <sup>1</sup> Frybert M Sikira, <sup>1</sup> Beatrice J Leyaro <sup>0</sup>, <sup>2</sup> Juma Mfanga, <sup>3</sup> Mashavu H. Yussuf <sup>0</sup>, <sup>1</sup> Sia E Msuya<sup>2,4</sup>

To cite: Natai CC. Gervas N. Sikira FM. et al. Association between male involvement during antenatal care and use of maternal health services in Mwanza City. Northwestern Tanzania: a crosssectional study. BMJ Open 2020;10:e036211. doi:10.1136/ bmjopen-2019-036211

Prepublication history for this paper is available online. To view these files, please visit the journal online (http://dx.doi. org/10.1136/bmjopen-2019-036211).

Received 06 December 2019 Revised 05 June 2020 Accepted 07 August 2020



@ Author(s) (or their employer(s)) 2020. Re-use permitted under CC BY-NC. No commercial re-use. See rights and permissions. Published by

For numbered affiliations see end of article.

#### **Correspondence to**

Dr Mashavu H. Yussuf; mashay55@gmail.com

## **ABSTRACT**

Background Male involvement in antenatal care (ANC) is among interventions to improve maternal health. Globally male involvement in ANC is low and varies in low-income and middle-income countries including Tanzania where most maternal deaths occur. In Sub-Sahara, men are chief decision makers and highly influence maternal health. In Tanzania information is limited regarding influence of male involvement during ANC on utilisation of maternal health services.

**Objectives** To determine the effect of male involvement during ANC on use of maternal health services in Mwanza, Tanzania.

**Design** A cross-sectional study conducted from June to July 2019.

**Setting** This study was conducted at seven randomly selected health facilities providing reproductive, maternal and child health (RCH) services in Mwanza City.

Participants Included 430 postpartum women who delivered 1 year prior to the study and attending for RCH services (growth monitoring, vaccination, postpartum care).

Outcome measures 4 or more ANC visits, skilled birth attendant (SBA) use during childbirth and postnatal care (PNC) utilisation 48 hours after delivery.

Methods Interviews and observation of the women's ANC card were used to collect data. Data was entered, cleaned and analysed by SPSS.

**Results** The mean age of participants was 25.7 years. Of 430 women, 54,4% reported their partners attended ANC at least once, 69.7% reported they attended for four or more ANC visits during last pregnancy, 95% used SBAs during childbirth and 9.2% attended PNC within 48 hours after delivery. Male involvement during ANC was significantly associated with four or more ANC visits (Crude Odds Ratio (COR): 1.90; 95% CI: 1.08-3.35) but not with SBA use or PNC utilisation.

Conclusion Male involvement in ANC is still low in Mwanza, as 46% of the partners had not attended with partners at ANC. Alternative strategies are needed to improve participation. Studies among men are required to explore the barriers of participation in overall RCH services.

# Strengths and limitations of this study

The study had some strengths and limitations that have to be considered when interpreting the results.

- One of the strengths of this study was record review of women's antenatal care (ANC) card. This helped with the information on ANC care use; frequency and delivery and postnatal care information. We recruited women who were attending for postnatal care services and who delivered in past 1 year to assess the association of male participation and use of maternal health services. The coverage of vaccination service in Mwanza region is at 70%. We might have therefore missed a proportion of those who do not bring children for vaccination and/or for growth monitoring and therefore overestimated the use of maternal health services.
- Men with partners who delivered in past 1 year in the community would have been a better population to answer questions of participation and challenges. Time and difficulty in getting them limited our ability to use this population.
- Due to the cross-sectional nature of our study, we were unable to infer causal inferences.

#### INTRODUCTION

Male involvement in maternal, newborn and child health as well as other sexual and reproductive health programmes in Africa has been associated with improved maternal and child health outcomes. In many Sub-Saharan African countries where maternal and newborn deaths are high, women are not the main decision makers. Traditionally men are the heads of families and have a strong influence in decision making in matters pertaining to the use of women and children health services.<sup>2</sup> Their participation as partners in antenatal care (ANC), delivery and child services has shown considerable benefits to women and children.<sup>3</sup>





Studies have shown an association between male involvement during pregnancy and positive uptake of reproductive and maternal health services as well as positive pregnancy outcomes. In family planning, male involvement improved uptake and continuation with the methods,<sup>4</sup> while in prevention of mother-to-child HIV transmission programmes, male involvement during pregnancy is associated with increased HIV testing at ANC, uptake of prophylaxis to exposed child as well as increased adherence to infant-feeding options.<sup>5–7</sup> Male support has also shown to decrease delay in seeking care when women have obstetric and newborn complications.<sup>6</sup> Others have shown male involvement and support during pregnancy to increase counselling of danger signs and birth preparedness, increase frequency of ANC visits, use of health facility and skilled birth attendants (SBAs) during childbirth.<sup>8 9</sup> UNICEF reports that when men are involved in pregnancy and given nutrition counselling, this can reduce the number of children born with low birth weight.9

Despite of its advantages, proportion of male involvement in ANC is low in low-income and middle-income countries including Tanzania where maternal and newborn deaths are high. <sup>10 11</sup> In Tanzania, few studies that evaluated male involvement in ANC show it was still low, ranging from 34.6% to 63%. <sup>1 12</sup> Different strategies to improve male participation have been implemented such as first track services to pregnant women who attended with their partners as shown in southern Tanzania and in other places opening services after work hours or in the weekends to accommodate men's busy schedules. Some of the interventions showed positive outcomes while others the opposite effect. <sup>10</sup>

In Tanzania, while 96% of pregnant women attend at least one for ANC, only 51% attend the recommended four or more ANC visits, 64% use SBAs during childbirth and 34% attend for postnatal care (PNC) within 48 hours after birth. 12 The national targets are set for 90% women to reach the recommended four or more ANC visits and 80% deliver with SBAs by 2020. 12 WHO now recommends that a pregnant woman without complication should have at least eight contacts with the healthcare system and that first contact occurs before 12 weeks. 13 The Tanzanian Lake zone (Mwanza region) where the study was conducted has poor maternal and newborn health indicators compared with national level where: 47.6% of pregnant women attend for four or more ANC visits, 53.3% use skilled birth attendants during childbirth and 20.7% use PNC with 48 hours, respectively; while that of national level is 50.7%, 64%, 34.1%, respectively. 12

As stated in other settings, studies have shown an association between male involvement during ANC with increased ANC frequency, use of SBAs during childbirth and PNC utilisation. In Tanzania, there is limited information on the association of male involvement during ANC on the utilisation of reproductive health services along the continuum of care. This study aimed to assess the association of male involvement during ANC on

frequency of ANC visits (attend four or more visits), use of SBAs during childbirth and PNC utilisation within 48 hours after delivery. SBA use during childbirth and immediate postpartum period is assessed because it is a key period in reducing maternal and newborn deaths.<sup>14</sup>

#### **METHODS**

# Study design and setting

This was a cross-sectional study conducted in Mwanza City Council, Tanzania from June to July 2019. Mwanza City Council is one of the seven districts of Mwanza region in the Lake zone. The district is bordered to the south by Misungwi District, North by Ilemela District, west by Mwanza Bay of Lake Victoria, east by Magu District. The population of Mwanza region was approximately 2.8 million and of Mwanza City Council was 363 452 according to the 2012 Census. The major economic activities in Mwanza City Council are business and fishing.

Mwanza City Council has a total of 63 health facilities: 11 hospitals, 12 health centres and 40 dispensaries. Of the 63 facilities, 46 (8 hospitals, 10 health centres and 28 dispensaries) offer reproductive and child health (RCH) services.

In Mwanza region the use of maternal and child health services is low compared with that of national level according to Tanzania Demographic and Health Survey (TDHS) (2015–2016) that is; four or more ANC visits is at 47.6%, use of SBAs during delivery at 54%, PNC within 2 days after delivery for women is at 20.7%, vaccination coverage for children at 70% and modern contraceptive use at 18%; while that of national level is 51%, 64%, 34.1%, 75% and 32%, respectively.<sup>12</sup>

# **Study population**

The study included consenting postpartum women who had delivered within 1 year prior to the study and were attending the selected health facilities for routine RCH services. The RCH services included women bringing children for growth monitoring and children for vaccinations. Recruitment was conducted beyond the postpartum visit of 48 hours in order to ensure the generalisability of findings and avoid potential bias.

While attendance for PNC within 48 hours is a challenge in Tanzania, majority of women attend the facilities for vaccination and growth monitoring of their children. PNC care attendance at 6 weeks that coincides with the first vaccination is very high in Tanzania (99%). This was done in order to ensure the study sample fairly represents the population of women of reproductive age at Mwanza City. Women who were not residents of Mwanza City Council were excluded from the study.

# Sample size and sampling

The formula for precision was used for sample size calculation.

$$N = \frac{Z^2 p (1-p)}{E^2}$$



Where: N=estimated sample size; Z=standard normal deviation corresponding to 5% level of estimated significance, which is 1.96; p=53.3% as the prevalence of SBA utilisation during delivery in Mwanza City. 12

Substituting the numbers in the formula, the minimum sample size was 382. Adding 10% for non-response, the minimum sample size required for the study was 420 women.

Each level of health facility was sampled purposively based on the large number of attendees. One hospital (Nyamagana), two health centres (Makongoro and Igoma) and four dispensaries (Buhongwa, Mkoalani, Tambuka reli and Mahina) were selected to participate. At the health facility level, women meeting the inclusion criteria during the study period were invited to participate.

## Data collection methods, tools and procedures

Data collection was conducted by four trained medical students over a period of 4 weeks. On average, each researcher was interviewing five women per day. The duration of the interview lasted from 35 to 40 min to complete. The researchers were from Kilimanjaro Christian Medical University College and they were not involved in offering routine care at facilities in Mwanza City. Face-to-face interviews were done to collect information from the participants. We opted for face-to-face interviews instead of self-filling because most women have low literacy level and prefer this method of data collection as documented also by TDHS. Record review of women's ANC card was done to get the exact number of ANC visits the women attended and delivery information if delivered at health facility.

Questionnaire was the tool used for data collection. It had both closed and opened ended questions. The questionnaire had five sections. The first part of the questionnaire collected sociodemographic and economic information. The second part collected information on reproductive characteristics as well as information on ANC attendance, frequency of ANC attendance and use of skilled providers during childbirth. The third part collected information on male involvement during ANC, at what gestation age, frequency they attended together and if they were HIV-couple counselled. The fourth part assessed the use of services after deliveries, PNC attendance and the last part assessed challenges women face when inviting partners to attend RCH care with them.

# **Data analysis**

Data was entered and cleaned using SPSS V.20. Categorical variables were summarised using frequency and percentages while the continuous variables were summarised using measures of central tendency with their respective measures of dispersion.

The association between male involvement and each of outcome variables (four or more ANC visits, SBA use and PNC use) was assessed by using ORs with their respective 95% CIs. Logistic regression analysis was used to control

confounders. All associations were considered statistically significant at p<0.05.

# **Explanation and categorisation of variables**

The primary predictor of interest in this study was male involvement in ANC. In this study male participation was defined by attendance to ANC of the male partner for two or more times. This arose because during designing of the study and pretesting, it was found that women are expected to bring their partners for HIV-testing during pregnancy<sup>11</sup> and therefore, participation was defined beyond the expected one visit. Therefore, male participation was assessed by asking women if they were accompanied by their partners to ANC and frequency. Those who attended for at least two visits or more and received services together during their last pregnancy (coded 1) and those who attended ANC with their partners less than two visits as well as those who did not attend ANC with their partners at all (coded 0).

There were three main outcome variables for this study namely: use of four or more ANC visits; SBA use during childbirth and PNC utilisation within 48 hours after delivery.

Attendance of four or more ANC visits was recorded by asking the number of visits a woman attended during pregnancy and verified from RCH card 1. This variable was categorised at 0 (less than four ANC visits) and 1 (four or more ANC visits). SBA use was categorised as 1 (Yes) if a woman reported she was assisted by trained personnel and 0 (No) if she reported to have delivered at home and/or not assisted by trained personnel. PNC use categorised as 1 (Yes) if a woman was attended by skilled health personnel within 48 hours after birth and 0 (No) if she was not attended by skilled health personnel within 48 hours after birth.

# Patient and public involvement

Patients or the public were not involved in the design, or conduct, or reporting, or dissemination plans of our research.

#### **RESULTS**

# **Background characteristics of the participants**

A total of 430 participants were enrolled in the study. Out of 430 enrolled participants, 423 (98.3%) attended for ANC in their last pregnancy and these are the ones included in the analysis of male participation during antenatal period.

The mean age of the 423 women was 25.7 years (SD 5.7). Most of the 423 participants, 83.9% were married or cohabiting, 58.4% had primary education, 90.8% were not formally employed and 68.3% had a minimum income of 45 000 Tanzanian Shillings or less (~US\$20) per month. Table 1 shows other sociodemographic characteristics of the participants.

# Reproductive and obstetric characteristics

Reproductive characteristics of the participants are presented in table 2. Of the 423 participants, 69.7%



**Table 1** Sociodemographic characteristics of the participants (N=423)

Variables         N         %           Age (years)         -18         3         0.7           18–24         210         49.7           25–34         171         40.4           35–49         39         9.2           Highest level of education         25         5.9           Primary education         247         58.4           Secondary education         127         30.0           Higher education         24         5.7           Marital status	participants (N=423)		
<18       3       0.7         18-24       210       49.7         25-34       171       40.4         35-49       39       9.2         Highest level of education       25       5.9         No formal education       24       58.4         Secondary education       127       30.0         Higher education       24       5.7         Marital status       355       83.9         Married/cohabiting       355       83.9         Single       56       13.3         Divorced/separated/widowed       12       2.8         Formal employment       No       384       90.8         Yes       39       9.2         Source of income (N=384)       5.5       9.2         Farmer       21       5.5         Peasants       34       8.9         Business       123       32.0         Other*       206       53.6         Average income per month (TZS)       46000       289       68.3         46000—99 999       61       14.4         10000-200000       34       8.1         Polygamous relationship       No       401       94.8 <th>Variables</th> <th>N</th> <th>%</th>	Variables	N	%
18–24       210       49.7         25–34       171       40.4         35–49       39       9.2         Highest level of education       25       5.9         No formal education       24       58.4         Secondary education       127       30.0         Higher education       24       5.7         Marital status       355       83.9         Married/cohabiting       355       83.9         Single       56       13.3         Divorced/separated/widowed       12       2.8         Formal employment       No       384       90.8         Yes       39       9.2         Source of income (N=384)       Farmer       21       5.5         Peasants       34       8.9         Business       123       32.0         Other*       206       53.6         Average income per month (TZS)       <46000	Age (years)		
25-34       171       40.4         35-49       39       9.2         Highest level of education       25       5.9         No formal education       24       58.4         Secondary education       127       30.0         Higher education       24       5.7         Marital status       355       83.9         Married/cohabiting       355       83.9         Single       56       13.3         Divorced/separated/widowed       12       2.8         Formal employment       No       384       90.8         Yes       39       9.2         Source of income (N=384)       Farmer       21       5.5         Peasants       34       8.9         Business       123       32.0         Other*       206       53.6         Average income per month (TZS)       <46000	<18	3	0.7
Highest level of education   No formal education   25   5.9     Primary education   247   58.4     Secondary education   127   30.0     Higher education   24   5.7     Marital status   Married/cohabiting   355   83.9     Single   56   13.3     Divorced/separated/widowed   12   2.8     Formal employment   No   384   90.8     Yes   39   9.2     Source of income (N=384)     Farmer   21   5.5     Peasants   34   8.9     Business   123   32.0     Other*   206   53.6     Average income per month (TZS)     <46 000   289   68.3     46 000–99 999   61   14.4     100 000–200 000   34   8.1     Polygamous relationship     No   401   94.8     Yes   22   5.2     Partner's age (years) (N=355)     18-24   47   13.2     25-34   186   52.4     >35   122   34.4     Partners education level (N=355)     Primary education   163   45.9	18–24	210	49.7
Highest level of education   No formal education   25   5.9     Primary education   247   58.4     Secondary education   127   30.0     Higher education   24   5.7     Marital status   Married/cohabiting   355   83.9     Single   56   13.3     Divorced/separated/widowed   12   2.8     Formal employment   No   384   90.8     Yes   39   9.2     Source of income (N=384)     Farmer   21   5.5     Peasants   34   8.9     Business   123   32.0     Other*   206   53.6     Average income per month (TZS)     <46 000   289   68.3     46 000–99 999   61   14.4     100 000–200 000   39   9.2     >200 000   34   8.1     Polygamous relationship     No   401   94.8     Yes   22   5.2     Partner's age (years) (N=355)     18-24   47   13.2     25-34   186   52.4     >35   122   34.4     Partners education level (N=355)     Primary education   163   45.9	25–34	171	40.4
No formal education         25         5.9           Primary education         247         58.4           Secondary education         127         30.0           Higher education         24         5.7           Marital status         355         83.9           Married/cohabiting         355         83.9           Single         56         13.3           Divorced/separated/widowed         12         2.8           Formal employment         No         384         90.8           Yes         39         9.2           Source of income (N=384)         Secure of income (N=384)           Farmer         21         5.5           Peasants         34         8.9           Business         123         32.0           Other*         206         53.6           Average income per month (TZS)         <46000	35–49	39	9.2
Primary education       247       58.4         Secondary education       127       30.0         Higher education       24       5.7         Marital status       Married/cohabiting       355       83.9         Single       56       13.3         Divorced/separated/widowed       12       2.8         Formal employment       No       384       90.8         Yes       39       9.2         Source of income (N=384)       Farmer       21       5.5         Peasants       34       8.9         Business       123       32.0         Other*       206       53.6         Average income per month (TZS)       <46 000	Highest level of education		
Secondary education       127       30.0         Higher education       24       5.7         Marital status       355       83.9         Single       56       13.3         Divorced/separated/widowed       12       2.8         Formal employment       384       90.8         No       384       90.8         Yes       39       9.2         Source of income (N=384)       5.5         Farmer       21       5.5         Peasants       34       8.9         Business       123       32.0         Other*       206       53.6         Average income per month (TZS)       46000       289       68.3         46000	No formal education	25	5.9
Higher education       24       5.7         Marital status       355       83.9         Single       56       13.3         Divorced/separated/widowed       12       2.8         Formal employment       384       90.8         No       384       90.8         Yes       39       9.2         Source of income (N=384)       8.9         Farmer       21       5.5         Peasants       34       8.9         Business       123       32.0         Other*       206       53.6         Average income per month (TZS)       46000       289       68.3         46000 - 99 999       61       14.4       100000-200000       39       9.2         >200 000       34       8.1       Polygamous relationship         No       401       94.8       94.8         Yes       22       5.2         Partner's age (years) (N=355)       18-24       47       13.2         25-34       186       52.4         >35       122       34.4         Partners education level (N=355)       122       34.4         Partnery education       163       45.9 </td <td>Primary education</td> <td>247</td> <td>58.4</td>	Primary education	247	58.4
Marital status       Married/cohabiting       355       83.9         Single       56       13.3         Divorced/separated/widowed       12       2.8         Formal employment           No       384       90.8         Yes       39       9.2         Source of income (N=384)           Farmer       21       5.5         Peasants       34       8.9         Business       123       32.0         Other*       206       53.6         Average income per month (TZS)          <46000	Secondary education	127	30.0
Married/cohabiting       355       83.9         Single       56       13.3         Divorced/separated/widowed       12       2.8         Formal employment       384       90.8         No       384       90.8         Yes       39       9.2         Source of income (N=384)       8.9       9.2         Farmer       21       5.5         Peasants       34       8.9         Business       123       32.0         Other*       206       53.6         Average income per month (TZS)       246 000       289       68.3         46 000 - 99 999       61       14.4       100 000 - 200 000       39       9.2         >200 000       34       8.1       Polygamous relationship         No       401       94.8       94.8         Yes       22       5.2         Partner's age (years) (N=355)       47       13.2         25-34       186       52.4         >35       122       34.4         Partners education level (N=355)       122       34.4         Partners education       163       45.9	Higher education	24	5.7
Single       56       13.3         Divorced/separated/widowed       12       2.8         Formal employment       384       90.8         No       384       90.8         Yes       39       9.2         Source of income (N=384)       21       5.5         Peasants       34       8.9         Business       123       32.0         Other*       206       53.6         Average income per month (TZS)       289       68.3         46 000       289       68.3         46 000-99 999       61       14.4         100 000-200 000       39       9.2         >200 000       34       8.1         Polygamous relationship       No       401       94.8         Yes       22       5.2         Partner's age (years) (N=355)       18-24       47       13.2         25-34       186       52.4         >35       122       34.4         Partners education level (N=355)       122       34.4         Partners education       163       45.9	Marital status		
Divorced/separated/widowed         12         2.8           Formal employment         No         384         90.8           Yes         39         9.2           Source of income (N=384)         Farmer         21         5.5           Peasants         34         8.9           Business         123         32.0           Other*         206         53.6           Average income per month (TZS)         289         68.3           46 000         289         68.3           46 000-99 999         61         14.4           100 000-200 000         39         9.2           >200 000         34         8.1           Polygamous relationship         No         401         94.8           Yes         22         5.2           Partner's age (years) (N=355)         18-24         47         13.2           25-34         186         52.4         >35         122         34.4           Partners education level (N=355)         Primary education         163         45.9	Married/cohabiting	355	83.9
Formal employment  No 384 90.8  Yes 39 9.2  Source of income (N=384)  Farmer 21 5.5  Peasants 34 8.9  Business 123 32.0  Other* 206 53.6  Average income per month (TZS)  <46 000 289 68.3  46 000–99 999 61 14.4  100 000–200 000 39 9.2  >200 000 34 8.1  Polygamous relationship  No 401 94.8  Yes 22 5.2  Partner's age (years) (N=355)  18–24 47 13.2  25–34 186 52.4  >35 122 34.4  Partners education level (N=355)  Primary education 163 45.9	Single	56	13.3
No       384       90.8         Yes       39       9.2         Source of income (N=384)         Farmer       21       5.5         Peasants       34       8.9         Business       123       32.0         Other*       206       53.6         Average income per month (TZS)       289       68.3         46 000       289       68.3         46 000-99 999       61       14.4         100 000-200 000       39       9.2         >200 000       34       8.1         Polygamous relationship         No       401       94.8         Yes       22       5.2         Partner's age (years) (N=355)       18-24       47       13.2         25-34       186       52.4         >35       122       34.4         Partners education level (N=355)       122       34.4         Partnery education       163       45.9	Divorced/separated/widowed	12	2.8
Yes       39       9.2         Source of income (N=384)       21       5.5         Farmer       21       5.5         Peasants       34       8.9         Business       123       32.0         Other*       206       53.6         Average income per month (TZS)       289       68.3         46 000       289       68.3         46 000-99 999       61       14.4         100 000-200 000       39       9.2         >200 000       34       8.1         Polygamous relationship       401       94.8         Yes       22       5.2         Partner's age (years) (N=355)       47       13.2         25-34       186       52.4         >35       122       34.4         Partners education level (N=355)       122       34.4         Primary education       163       45.9	Formal employment		
Source of income (N=384)         Farmer       21       5.5         Peasants       34       8.9         Business       123       32.0         Other*       206       53.6         Average income per month (TZS)       289       68.3         46 000       289       68.3         46 000-99 999       61       14.4         100 000-200 000       39       9.2         >200 000       34       8.1         Polygamous relationship         No       401       94.8         Yes       22       5.2         Partner's age (years) (N=355)       47       13.2         25-34       186       52.4         >35       122       34.4         Partners education level (N=355)       163       45.9	No	384	90.8
Farmer       21       5.5         Peasants       34       8.9         Business       123       32.0         Other*       206       53.6         Average income per month (TZS)       -206       53.6         46 000       289       68.3         46 000-99 999       61       14.4         100 000-200 000       39       9.2         >200 000       34       8.1         Polygamous relationship       401       94.8         Yes       22       5.2         Partner's age (years) (N=355)       47       13.2         25-34       186       52.4         >35       122       34.4         Partners education level (N=355)       122       34.4         Primary education       163       45.9	Yes	39	9.2
Peasants       34       8.9         Business       123       32.0         Other*       206       53.6         Average income per month (TZS)	Source of income (N=384)		
Business       123       32.0         Other*       206       53.6         Average income per month (TZS)       289       68.3         46 000	Farmer	21	5.5
Other*       206       53.6         Average income per month (TZS)       289       68.3         46 000–99 999       61       14.4         100 000–200 000       39       9.2         >200 000       34       8.1         Polygamous relationship         No       401       94.8         Yes       22       5.2         Partner's age (years) (N=355)       47       13.2         25–34       186       52.4         >35       122       34.4         Partners education level (N=355)         Primary education       163       45.9	Peasants	34	8.9
Average income per month (TZS)  <46 000	Business	123	32.0
<46 000	Other*	206	53.6
46 000-99 999       61       14.4         100 000-200 000       39       9.2         >200 000       34       8.1         Polygamous relationship       401       94.8         Yes       22       5.2         Partner's age (years) (N=355)       47       13.2         25-34       186       52.4         >35       122       34.4         Partners education level (N=355)         Primary education       163       45.9	Average income per month (TZS)		
100 000-200 000       39       9.2         >200 000       34       8.1         Polygamous relationship         No       401       94.8         Yes       22       5.2         Partner's age (years) (N=355)         18-24       47       13.2         25-34       186       52.4         >35       122       34.4         Partners education level (N=355)         Primary education       163       45.9	<46 000	289	68.3
>200 000       34       8.1         Polygamous relationship       401       94.8         No       401       94.8         Yes       22       5.2         Partner's age (years) (N=355)       47       13.2         25-34       186       52.4         >35       122       34.4         Partners education level (N=355)         Primary education       163       45.9	46 000–99 999	61	14.4
Polygamous relationship         No       401       94.8         Yes       22       5.2         Partner's age (years) (N=355)         18-24       47       13.2         25-34       186       52.4         >35       122       34.4         Partners education level (N=355)         Primary education       163       45.9	100 000-200 000	39	9.2
No       401       94.8         Yes       22       5.2         Partner's age (years) (N=355)       47       13.2         18-24       47       13.2         25-34       186       52.4         >35       122       34.4         Partners education level (N=355)         Primary education       163       45.9	>200 000	34	8.1
Yes     22     5.2       Partner's age (years) (N=355)     47     13.2       18-24     47     13.2       25-34     186     52.4       >35     122     34.4       Partners education level (N=355)       Primary education     163     45.9	Polygamous relationship		
Partner's age (years) (N=355)  18–24 25–34 186 52.4 >35 122 34.4  Partners education level (N=355)  Primary education 163 45.9	No	401	94.8
18–24       47       13.2         25–34       186       52.4         >35       122       34.4         Partners education level (N=355)         Primary education       163       45.9	Yes	22	5.2
25–34       186       52.4         >35       122       34.4         Partners education level (N=355)         Primary education       163       45.9	Partner's age (years) (N=355)		
>35 122 34.4  Partners education level (N=355)  Primary education 163 45.9	18–24	47	13.2
Partners education level (N=355)  Primary education 163 45.9	25–34	186	52.4
Primary education 163 45.9	>35	122	34.4
	Partners education level (N=355)		
Secondary education 154 43.4	Primary education	163	45.9
	Secondary education	154	43.4
Higher education 38 10.7	Higher education	38	10.7

US\$=2280 Tanzanian Shillings (TZS) during data collection.

attended ANC for four or more times, but only 39.5% started ANC during the first trimester of pregnancy. Majority of the participants (95%) used SBAs during childbirth and 30.1% attended for PNC within 40 days

**Table 2** Reproductive and obstetric characteristics of the study participants (N=423)

Variables	N	%
Number of living children		
1	171	40.4
2	114	27.0
≥3	138	32.6
Gestational age in weeks at first visit dur	ing last	pregnancy
≤12	167	39.5
13–27	234	55.3
28 +	22	5.2
Number of ANC visits		
<4	128	30.3
4+	295	69.7
Place of delivery (last pregnancy)		
Home	7	5.0
Health facility	133	95.0
Person assisted during delivery		
Skilled birth attendant	402	95.0
Tradition birth attendant	4	1.0
Others (specify)	17	4.0
Mode of delivery		
By SVD	380	89.8
By caesarean section	43	10.2
Time discharged after delivery (hours)		
<6	9	2.2
7–24	314	77.2
25–48	27	6.6
>48	57	14.0
Attendance for PNC (N=366)		
No	256	69.9
Yes	110	30.1
Time for first PNC after delivery (N=110)		
Within 2 days	10	9.2
After 2 days	99	90.8

ANC, antenatal care; PNC, postnatal care; SVD, spontaneous vaginal delivery.

after delivery. Of the 110 women who attended for PNC, only 9.2% did so within 48 hours after delivery.

# **Proportion of male involvement during ANC**

Table 3 shows the proportion of male involvement during ANC. Of the 423 women, 54% (230) reported that their partners attended ANC with them at least once. Of the 230 women whose partners attended, 142 (61.7%) attended once; while 52 (22.6%) attended for two times and 36 (8.3%) attended for three or more times. Majority

<sup>\*</sup>Other sources of income include shop keeping, food handling.



Table 3Proportion of male involvement during antenatal<br/>care (ANC) (N=423)VariablesN%

Variables	N	%
Accompanied by partner during ANC		
No	193	45.6
Yes	230	54.4
Frequency of ANC visit with partner		
None	193	45.6
1	142	33.6
2	52	12.3
3+	36	8.5
ANC visit accompanied by partner (N-	=230)	
First	221	96.1
Second	4	1.7
Third or more	5	2.2
Gestational age accompanied by part	ner (N=23	0)
1st trimester	103	44.8
2nd trimester	112	48.7
3rd trimester	15	6.5
Received health education together w	ith partne	r (N=230)
No	3	1.3
Yes	227	98.7
Tested for HIV during ANC (N=230)		
No	5	2.2
Yes	225	97.8

of the 230 partners (96%) attended ANC with the women at their first visit and were tested for HIV (97.8%).

# Association between male involvement in ANC and use of reproductive and maternal health services

Women who attended for ANC with partners had significantly higher frequency of attending for four or more ANC visits than others (79.5% vs 67.2%; p=0.024). They did not have higher SBA use during childbirth (94.3% vs 95.2%; p=0.728) or higher attendance for PNC within 48 hours after delivery (3.4% vs 2.1%; p=0.468). The prevalence of ANC attendance, SBA use and PNC utilisation by other sociodemographic characteristics are presented in table 4.

Table 5 presents the results of logistic regression analysis of the association between male involvement during ANC and four or more ANC visits, SBA use during delivery and PNC utilisation within 48 hours taking into account other variables. In the crude analysis, women who were accompanied with their partner to ANC had 1.9 times higher odds of attending four or more ANC visits compared with women who were not accompanied with their partners to ANC. After adjusting for other variables, women who were accompanied with their partner had 1.7 times higher odds of attending four or more ANC visits compared with those who were not. This association, however, was not

statistically significant. Age, level of education, employment status and polygamous relationship had no association with attending four or more ANC visits.

During crude and adjusted analysis, male participation during ANC was not associated with SBA use during childbirth. In adjusted analysis, formal education was the only factor significantly associated with SBA use during childbirth (p=0.013). Male involvement during ANC, age, marital status, level of education, employment status, polygamous relationship and number of children of the participants had no association with PNC use within 48 hours after delivery.

## DISCUSSION

The results of this study show that nearly half (45.6%) of the men do not participate in the antenatal care with their partners. It was also noted 70% of the women attended four or more ANC visits in their last pregnancy, 95% used SBAs during childbirth and 9% had PNC utilisation within 48 hours after delivery. Male involvement in ANC was associated with attendance for four or more ANC visits but not with SBA use during childbirth or PNC utilisation within 48 hours after delivery.

From this study, male involvement in ANC was significantly associated with attendance of four or more ANC visits. This finding was similar to those reported in Ethiopia and Nepal where women who received ANC education with their partners were more likely to attend four or more ANC visits than those who did not. <sup>8 9</sup> This result could possibly be explained by the fact that almost all women who went with their partners (96%) received health education together with their partners. Based on these findings it implies that educating husbands/male partners about the importance of healthcare for the family could potentially increase the promotion of some health-seeking behaviour such as ANC.

In the present study we found no significant association between male involvement and SBA use during childbirth. Our finding was in contrast to previous studies from India and Zambia which reported that when pregnant women are accompanied and received education together with their partners at ANC, they were more likely to deliver at health facilities. This could be explained by the fact that the majority of women in our sample used SBAs (95%) and implies that most women in Mwanza despite of the presence of their husband during ANC have knowledge on the importance of SBA utilisation during delivery.

This study showed that there was no association between male involvement and PNC utilisation within 48 hours after delivery. This finding was also different from other studies which were done in Nepal, Zambia and Burkina Faso which showed that women who received education with their partners were more likely to return for PNC compared with those who were not. This difference could be explained due to different timing of postnatal check-up assessment in Nepal which assessed PNC check-up after 1 week while in Zambia and Burkina Faso



	<b>ANC</b> attendance	ance		SBA			PNC		
	<4 visits	>4 visits		No	Yes		No	Yes	
Variables	(%) N	(%) N	P value	(%) N	(%) N	P value	(%) N	(%) N	P value
Male involvement									
No	110 (32.8)	225 (67.2)	0.024	16 (4.8)	319 (95.2)	0.728	328 (97.9)	7 (2.1)	0.468
Yes	18 (20.5)	70 (79.5)		5 (5.7)	83 (94.3)		85 (96.6)	3 (3.4)	
Woman's age (years)									
<25	69 (32.4)	144 (67.6)	0.336	12 (5.6)	201 (94.4)	0.523	210 (98.6)	3 (1.4)	0.193
>25	59 (28.1)	151 (71.9)		9 (4.3)	201 (95.7)		203 (96.7)	7 (3.3)	
Highest level of education									
No formal education	10 (40.0)	15 (60)	0.274	5 (20.0)	20 (80.0)	<0.001	25 (100.0)	0.0) 0	0.423
Formal education	118 (29.6)	280 (70.4)		16 (4.0)	382 (96.0)		388 (97.5)	10 (2.5)	
Marital status									
Single	30 (44.1)	38 (55.9)	0.007	6 (8.8)	62 (91.2)	0.110	(92) (92)	3 (4.4)	0.225
Married	98 (27.6)	257 (72.4)		15 (4.2)	340 (95.8)		348 (98)	7 (2.0)	
Number of children									
1	47 (27.5)	124 (72.5)	908.0	7 (4.1)	164 (95.9)	0.497	167 (97.7)	4 (2.3)	0.978
2+	81 (32.1)	171 (67.9)		14 (5.6)	238 (94.4)		246 (97.6)	6 (2.4)	
Formal employment									
No	118 (30.7)	266 (69.3)	0.510	21 (5.5)	363 (94.5)	0.134	376 (97.9)	8 (2.1)	0.233
Yes	10 (25.6)	29 (74.4)		0.0) 0	39 (100.0)		37 (94.9)	2 (5.1)	
Polygamous relationship									
No	122 (30.4)	279 (69.6)	0.754	19 (4.7)	382 (95.3)	0.360	392 (97.8)	9 (2.2)	0.489
Yes	6 (27.3)	16 (72.7)		0 (0 1)	(0 00) 00		21 (95.5)	1 (4.5)	

ANC, antenatal care; PNC, postnatal care; SBA, skilled birth attendant.

Table 5 Logistic regress	sion analysis of factors a	ssociated with ANC 4+ v	isits, SBA use during c	Logistic regression analysis of factors associated with ANC 4+ visits, SBA use during childbirth and PNC use (N=423)	423)	
	ANC 4+ visits		SBA		PNC within 48 hours	Ś
Variable	COR (95% CI)	AOR (95% CI)	COR (95% CI)	AOR (95% CI)	COR (95% CI)	AOR (95% CI)
Male involvement						
No	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Yes	1.90 (1.08-3.35)*	1.71 (0.95–3.07)	0.83 (0.30–2.34)	0.70 (0.23–2.13)	1.65 (0.42–6.53)	2.12 (0.46–9.73)
Age (years)						
<25		1.0		1.0		1.0
25+		1.46 (0.89–2.39)		1.76 (0.61–5.04)		2.31 (0.47–11.28)
Educational level						
No formal education		1.0		1.0		
Formal education		1.39 (0.59–3.30)		4.37 (1.37–13.92)*		1
Marital status						
Single		1.0		1.0		1.0
Married		2.03 (1.15–3.59)*		2.40 (0.77–7.50)		0.29 (0.06–1.35)
Number of children						
-		1.0		1.0		1.0
2+		0.58 (0.35-0.97)*		0.52 (0.16–1.66)		0.81 (0.18–3.64)
Formal employment						
No		1.0				1.0
Yes		1.06 (0.42–2.98)		I		1.79 (0.33–9.84)
Polygamous relationship						
No		1.0		1.0		1.0
Yes		1.11 (0.42–2.98)		0.44 (0.08–2.29)		3.17 (0.33–30.49)

 $^*\chi^2$  <0.05. ANC, antenatal care; AOR, Adjusted Odds Ratio; COR, Crude Odds Ratio; PNC, postnatal care; SBA, skilled birth attendant.



only PNC check-up was assessed regardless of time when the women returned. WHO recommends that all women and their neonates to have the first postnatal visit within 48 hours after delivery. Most of the interviewed women in Mwanza City regardless of their husbands' presence during ANC did not return for postnatal check-up (70%), but rather returned after 6 weeks for child vaccination. There is a need to assess further if there are cultural practices that influence PNC attendance.

## CONCLUSION

A substantial proportion of women (46%) do not attend for ANC with their partners in Mwanza City. Most of those who attend (61.7%), attend once. Male attendance influenced frequency of ANC attendance (four or more times) among women, but not SBA or PNC use.

There is a need to further understand specific barriers for male participation in this setting so that alternative strategies to reach male partners in maternal, newborn and child health services can be designed. Furthermore, there is a need for local health teams to assess low PNC use in general and within 48 hours at the setting as this is an important period to improve maternal and newborn survival.

#### **Author affiliations**

<sup>1</sup>Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Kilimanjaro Christian Medical University College, Moshi, Tanzania

<sup>2</sup>Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Institute of Public Health, Kilimanjaro Christian Medical University College, Moshi, Tanzania

<sup>3</sup>Office of City Medical Officer, Mwanza, Tanzania

<sup>4</sup>Department of Community Health, Institute of Public Health, Kilimanjaro Christian Medical University College, Moshi, Tanzania

**Acknowledgements** We would like to thank the city medical officer, district RCH coordinator, health facility in charge of Mwanza City Council for their help during the study period. We would also like to thank the women who participated in the study for their time and cooperation.

Contributors CCN, NG, FMS, BJL, JM, MY and SEM designed the study, interpreted the results and read for intellectual content. CCN, NG, FMS and MY participated in the data analysis. CCN, NG and FMS prepared the manuscript and all the other authors reviewed the manuscript before submission. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

**Funding** BJL and SEM were THRiVE-2 faculty and were partially supported by the DELTAS Africa Initiative grant # DEL-15-011 to THRiVE-2.

Competing interests None declared.

Patient and public involvement Patients and/or the public were not involved in the design, or conduct, or reporting, or dissemination plans of this research.

Patient consent for publication Not required.

Ethics approval Ethical approval to conduct the study was obtained from the Kilimanjaro Christian Medical University College Ethical Committee (Ethical approval number UG 001). Permission to carry out the study was obtained from Mwanza City Council Medical officer of health and in-charge of selected health facilities. Verbal consent was requested from each participant. Confidentiality with regards to the information of the participants was highly maintained as no names appeared in the questionnaires. Participants who did not want to participate were not denied access to services at the health facilities.

Provenance and peer review Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.

**Data availability statement** Data are available upon reasonable request. Data and material will be available upon request from the corresponding author.

Open access This is an open access article distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution Non Commercial (CC BY-NC 4.0) license, which permits others to distribute, remix, adapt, build upon this work non-commercially, and license their derivative works on different terms, provided the original work is properly cited, appropriate credit is given, any changes made indicated, and the use is non-commercial. See: http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/.

#### **ORCID iDs**

Beatrice J Leyaro http://orcid.org/0000-0002-8525-0281 Mashavu H. Yussuf http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5080-2437

## **REFERENCES**

- 1 Chibwae A, Kapesa A, Jahanpour OLA, et al. Attendance of male partners to different reproductive health services in Shinyanga District, North western Tanzania. Tanzan J Health Res 2018;20:1–11.
- 2 Yargawa J, Leonardi-Bee J, et al. Male involvement and maternal health outcomes: systematic review and meta-analysis. J Epidemiol Community Health 2015;69:604–12.
- 3 Tokhi M, Comrie-thomson L, Davis J, et al. Involving men to improve maternal and newborn health: A systematic review of the effectiveness of interventions 2018:1–16.
- 4 Farquhar C, Kiarie JN, Richardson BA, et al. Antenatal couple counseling increases uptake of interventions to prevent HIV-1 transmission. J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr 2004;37:1620–6.
- 5 Msuya SE, Mbizvo EM, Hussain A, et al. Low male partner participation in antenatal HIV counselling and testing in northern Tanzania: implications for preventive programs. AIDS Care 2008;20:700–9.
- 6 Bhatta DN. Involvement of males in antenatal care, birth preparedness, exclusive breast feeding and immunizations for children in Kathmandu, Nepal. BMC Pregnancy Childbirth 2013;13:1.
- 7 Mullany BC, Becker S, Hindin MJ. The impact of including husbands in antenatal health education services on maternal health practices in urban Nepal: results from a randomized controlled trial 2007;22:166–76.
- 8 Forbes F, Wynter K, Wade C, et al. Male partner attendance at antenatal care and adherence to antenatal care guidelines: secondary analysis of 2011 Ethiopian demographic and health survey data. BMC Pregnancy Childbirth 2018;18:145.
- 9 UNICEF. The State of the World's Children 2009.
- 10 Peneza AK, Maluka SO. 'Unless you come with your partner you will be sent back home': strategies used to promote male involvement in antenatal care in Southern Tanzania. Glob Health Action 2018:11:1449724
- 11 Vermeulen E, Solnes Miltenburg A, Barras J, et al. Opportunities for male involvement during pregnancy in Magu district, rural Tanzania. BMC Pregnancy Childbirth 2016;16:1–9.
- MoHCDGEC, MoH, NBS, OCGS, ICF. Tanzania Demographic and Health Survey and Malaria Indicator Survey (TDHS-MIS) 2015-16 2016
- 13 WHO. WHO Recommendations on Antenatal Care for a Positive Pregnancy Experience: Summary Highlights and Key Messages from the World Health Organization's 2016 Global Recommendations for Routine Antenatal Care 2018;10:1–10.
- 14 WHO. World Health Organization Maternal mortality fact sheet. *World Heal Organ Genever, Swizerl* 2015.
- 15 Chattopadhyay A. Men in maternal care: Evidence from India. *J Biosoc Sci* 2014;00:1–26.
- 16 Kashitala J, Nyambe N, Mwalo S, et al. Is Male Involvement in ANC and PMTCT Associated with Increased Facility-Based Obstetric Delivery in Pregnant Women? Zambia has made great strides in implementing Methods Design and instruments. Afr J Reprod Health 2015;19:116–23.
- 17 Daniele MAS, Ganaba R, Sarrassat S, et al. Involving male partners in maternity care in Burkina Faso: a randomized controlled trial. Bull World Health Organ 2018;96:450–61.