

Rural Residence, Motorcycle Access, and Contraception Use in South and Southeast Asia

Jonathan A. Muir^a, Scott R. Sanders^b, Hannah Hendricks^b, and Michale R. Cope^b

^aDepartment of Global Health, Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia

^bDepartment of Sociology, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah

ARTICLE HISTORY

Compiled May 22, 2023

ABSTRACT

Access to contraception is critical for limiting fertility. Yet, in South and Southeast Asia, access to these resources is often limited by spatial inequalities between rural and urban areas. Access to a motorcycle may empower women living in rural areas to attenuate these spatial inequalities, increase their educational attainment and participation in labor markets, and thereby facilitate a shift in fertility preferences. Concomitantly, motorcycle access may increase access to contraception for geographically isolated women who desire to limit fertility. We employ logistic regression models to examine associations with contraception use and unmet need for contraception for women living in rural vs. urban areas and for women with vs. without access to a motorcycle. Roughly 40 percent of women reported current use of contraception while another 21 percent indicated an unmet need for contraception. After adjusting for other variables, women with a motorcycle were more likely to report current contraception use (AOR = 1.55, 95% CI [1.50, 1.61]), modern contraception use (AOR = 1.60, 95% CI [1.54, 1.66]), and traditional contraception use (AOR = 1.49, 95% CI [1.41, 1.58]) compared to women who did not own a motorcycle. Women with a motorcycle were less likely to report an unmet need for contraception (AOR = 0.65, 95% CI [0.62, 0.68]) after adjusting for other variables. Our results are consistent with the premise that motorcycles facilitate contraception use among women living in resource-limited countries in South and Southeast Asia and thereby contribute to decreases in fertility. These relationships are contextualized by whether a woman lives in an urban or rural setting, and the number of children already present in their household; they are robust to controlling for household-level wealth and other factors that may mediate associations with contraception use.

KEYWORDS

Contraception, Fertility, Motorcycle, Rural-Urban Divide, Transportation

CONTACT Jonathan A. Muir Email: jamuir@emory.edu

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

Acknowledgement

Evaluating the economic, demographic, and social impacts of the mass influx of inexpensive motorcycles to limited-resource countries, especially in Southeast Asia, was the brainchild of the late Dr. Ralph B. Brown. Sadly, Dr. Brown is no longer with us. Former colleagues at Brigham Young University where he worked as Professor of Sociology have murmured against his continued listing as a co-author on manuscripts; even for manuscripts that he played a significant role in conceptualizing and contributing to their analysis and writing. To appease the murmuring voices, we have decided to no longer list Dr. Brown as last author on this and future manuscripts; however, we wish to express our deepest gratitude for his contributions, for the mentorship that he provided to many of us along our academic journeys, and for his unmitigated friendship. Ralph, you are dearly missed, hoser.

Conflict of Interest

These authors have no conflict of interest associated with this article or research.

1 Introduction

2 Synthesizing themes in demography, sociology, and geography we argue and present evidence
3 that in the resource-limited countries of South and Southeast Asia, access to motorcycles
4 facilitates transitions to lower fertility through increasing use of contraception. The first
5 of three core themes in this research is the transition to low fertility and the prevalent use
6 of contraception in resource-limited countries (Barber and Axinn 2004; Hirschman 1994;
7 Korinek et al. 2006; Morgan and Hagewen 2006). The second theme, spatial inequality, ad-
8 dresses the classic question of social stratification “who gets what?” by adding the context
9 of “where” (Lobao et al. 2007). Finally, the third theme considers the impact of physical
10 mobility in attenuating spatial inequalities (Cooley 1894; Leinbach 2000; Rigg 2002), specif-
11 ically investigating the impact of motorcycles as a “distance demolishing technology” (Scott
12 2009: 11).

13 Building from the widely held understanding that increases in educational attainment
14 and labor market participation are associated with increased demand for limited fertility
15 and that access to contraception is critical for limiting fertility (Axinn and Barber 2001;
16 Bongaarts 1978; Bongaarts and Casterline 2018; Easterlin 1975; Hirschman 1994; Moursund
17 and Kravdal 2003), we assert that access to education, labor markets, and contraception is
18 often limited in resource-limited countries across spatial divides between rural and urban
19 locations due to uneven development (Gottdiener and Hutchison 2010; Korinek et al. 2006;
20 Smith 2008). We further assert that “distance demolishing technologies” (Scott 2009: 11);
21 e.g., motorcycles in South and Southeast Asia, may help isolated individuals access resources
22 that are generally located in more urban or suburban regions of resource-limited countries.
23 Access to a motorcycle may help women living in rural areas attenuate disadvantages re-
24 sulting from spatial inequalities and increase their educational attainment and participation
25 in labor markets (Jayachandran 2021; Lobao et al. 2007); thereby facilitating a shift in fer-
26 tility preferences at the individual and family level. Concomitantly, access to a motorcycle
27 may also increase access to and use of contraception for spatially isolated women who de-

28 sire to limit fertility and thereby contribute to future declines in fertility (Bongaarts and
29 Casterline 2018). We anticipate that examining these associations through the lens of a life
30 course perspective for contraception use (Rindfuss et al. 1996) should enhance our overall
31 understanding.

32 To test these assertions, we examine the extent to which residence in an urban versus a
33 rural location is associated with the use of contraception for female respondents in Cambo-
34 dia, Indonesia, Nepal, the Philippines, and Timor-Leste. We further analyze the extent to
35 which motorcycle ownership is associated with contraception use and evaluate effect modi-
36 fication between motorcycle ownership, urban vs. rural residence, and the number of living
37 children. These relationships are evaluated while adjusting for a suite of factors commonly
38 associated with contraception use and/or fertility. Our results suggest that rural residence is
39 negatively associated with contraception use, motorcycle ownership is positively associated
40 with contraception use, and the association between motorcycle ownership and contraception
41 use is stronger in rural areas compared to urban.

42 **Background**

43 The demographic transition to low fertility and the prevalent use of birth control is one of
44 the most thoroughly researched subjects in demography (Axinn and Yabiku 2001). Given
45 the findings that fertility is a primary indicator of personal autonomy and social mobil-
46 ity (Dharmalingam and Morgan 1996; Docquier 2004; Ekert-Jaffe and Stier 2009; Korinek
47 et al. 2006; Kravdal 1994), the options and consequences of fertility are also central top-
48 ics in social and economic development studies (Docquier 2004; Ekert-Jaffe and Stier 2009),
49 with scholars endeavoring to create theoretical frameworks that explain changes in fertility in
50 resource-limited countries (Korinek et al. 2006). However, the pursuit of fertility frameworks,
51 particularly in resource-limited countries, is complex and debate continues. Extensive re-
52 views of the fertility literature are already available (Hirschman 1994; Morgan and Hagewen
53 2006; Upadhyay et al. 2014); thus, only a brief review and synthesis is provided below.

54 The original theoretical framework used to explain fertility transitions came from Demo-
55 graphic Transition Theory (DTT), which posited that changes in fertility occur as a result
56 of structural changes in society tied to modernization; e.g. urbanization, industrialization,
57 increased education, and reduced infant and child mortality (Davis 1963; Notestein 1945;
58 1953). However, DTT’s poor performance in anticipating fertility declines lead to substan-
59 tial revisions and elaborations (Morgan and Hagewen 2006), not to mention critiques (Coale
60 1973). Subsequent research, in particular that of the European Fertility Project, offered
61 an alternative explanation that focused on cultural settings, the diffusion of new ideas and
62 norms, and social interactions as key components leading to changes in fertility (Bongaarts
63 and Watkins 1996; Coale and Watkins 1986; Knodel and Walle 1979). Similar arguments are
64 posited in more recent research evaluating the impact of mass media in facilitating the rapid
65 diffusion of new norms and values concerning fertility (Barber and Axinn 2004). However,
66 structural explanations of fertility change were revisited with economic-based arguments as-
67 serting that economic development results in a tradeoff between “quantity” and “quality”
68 in raising children (Barro and Becker 1989; Becker 1960; Becker and Lewis 1973; Easterlin
69 1975). In essence, economic well-being shifts parents from seeking an increase in the number
70 of children for some immediate economic benefit to seeking to raise fewer but higher quality
71 children for future economic benefit. Such arguments are echoed to a degree in Caldwell’s
72 work regarding wealth flows (Caldwell 1982). More recently, studies reinvestigating struc-
73 tural explanations for fertility changes have highlighted the importance of social changes that
74 increase access to education and labor market participation and thereby increase the oppor-
75 tunity costs of fertility (Axinn and Barber 2001; Brewster and Rindfuss 2000; Ekert-Jaffé
76 1986; Ekert-Jaffe and Stier 2009; Hakim 2003; Knodel et al. 1984; Spain and Bianchi 1996).
77 Addressing the wide variety of theoretical frameworks, Hirschman (1994) and Morgan and
78 Hagewen (2006) concur that the various frameworks are not necessarily mutually exclusive
79 and that reality likely resembles a synthesis of these frameworks rather than a competition
80 (Hirschman 1994: 222).

81 Apart from the role of social and economic structures and cultural ideals and norms, more
82 proximal causes (e.g., contraception use) are important factors influencing changes in fertility
83 (Bongaarts 1978; Easterlin 1975; Feyisetan and Casterline 2000; Hirschman 1994; Morgan
84 and Hagewen 2006; Phillips et al. 1988; Rindfuss et al. 1996). While Hirschman (1994)
85 acknowledges that fertility limitation occurred prior to modern modes of contraception,
86 attributable in part to the use of traditional contraceptive methods, evidence exists that
87 recent family planning programs (Phillips et al. 1988) and access to modern contraception
88 (Bongaarts 1978; Moursund and Kravdal 2003; Townsend et al. 2011) help facilitate fertility
89 decline. Furthermore, while the diffusion of information concerning new fertility norms
90 and contraception options may increase demand for contraception, Feyisetan and Casterline
91 (2000) find evidence that the available supply of contraception does not always meet demand.
92 Indeed, the unmet need for contraception is continually reported by women globally, but
93 especially by those living in many low- and middle-income countries (Anik et al. 2022;
94 Bongaarts and Bruce 1995; Feyisetan and Casterline 2000; Sitruk-Ware 2006; Townsend
95 et al. 2011). A recent study using Demographic and Health survey data from 32 resource-
96 limited countries estimated that approximately 24 percent of women experience an unmet
97 need for contraception (Anik et al. 2022) and evidence suggests that unmet need is greatest
98 for those living in absolute poverty (Anik et al. 2022; Gakidou and Vayena 2007). This gap
99 in unmet need is concerning, as it exists despite progress in increasing access to a variety
100 of health products for individuals and families living in low- and middle-income countries
101 (Sitruk-Ware et al. 2013; Townsend et al. 2011). To help explain in part the continuing
102 gap in unmet need for contraception, we assert that spatial inequalities between and within
103 countries, especially resource-limited countries, lead to disparities in access to and use of
104 contraception.

105 **Spatial Inequality vs. Physical Mobility**

106 Throughout the different fertility frameworks is the notion that the transition to low fertility
107 and the prevalent use of birth control is mediated by differential access to scarce resources.
108 Whether these resources are structural (e.g., access to contraception, labor markets, and
109 educational opportunities) or ideational (e.g., access to mass media and broader, culturally
110 diverse social networks), the critical link is that access to scarce resources is often limited by
111 one's relative spatial proximity to them (Agyei and Migadde 1995; Barber 2004; Barber and
112 Axinn 2004; Jayachandran 2021; Leinbach 2000; Pebley and Sastry 2004; Townsend et al.
113 2011; Zakharenko 2010). Accordingly, inequality in the spatial distribution of resources is
114 likely to lead to inequalities in access to these resources.

115 In the resource-limited countries of Asia and Southeast Asia, a stark contrast in spatial
116 inequality (Lobao et al. 2007) remains between rural and urban locations in terms of social
117 and economic development (Korinek et al. 2006; Rigg 2002). In such settings, geographic
118 location vis-a-vis a developed labor market or school affects an individual's access to em-
119 ployment and education opportunities (Baschieri and Falkingham 2009; Korinek et al. 2006;
120 Leinbach 2000). Similarly, access to sources of mass media (Barber and Axinn 2004), and
121 outside cultural influences are mitigated by proximity to locations with these resources (Bar-
122 ber 2004). Consequently, women located in relatively isolated, rural areas as compared to
123 women located in more urban or suburban locations, will generally have less access to these
124 resources. They are also more likely to lack the resources needed to bridge the disadvantages
125 associated with physical isolation than their less isolated counterparts (Attané 2002; Korinek
126 et al. 2006; 2005; Leinbach 1983; Pebley and Sastry 2004; Rigg 2002).

127 Conversely, increased physical mobility empowers individuals and groups to transcend
128 spatial inequalities (Lobao et al. 2007) and increase access to scarce resources (Leinbach
129 2000; Rigg 2002). In urban and rural locations of resource-limited nations, physical mobility
130 has the potential to increase access to scarce resources such as education and occupational
131 opportunities (Jayachandran 2021; Leinbach 2000; Rigg 2002) as well as facilitate the dif-

132 fusion of new ideas and culture (Lawson and Borgerhoff Mulder 2016; Leinbach 2000; Rigg
133 2002); thereby acting as an agent of development (Cooley 1894; De Koninck 2000; Kun-
134 stadter 2000; Leinbach 2000; Owen 1987; Rigg 2002). This critical role is augmented by
135 access to owner-operated transportation or transportation services that are affordable and
136 reliable. Individuals with access to roads and vehicles to transport them are able to access
137 options that otherwise would not be possible (Leinbach 2000).

138 In as much as improved physical mobility may empower isolated individuals to access
139 options and opportunities that were previously unattainable, it is also possible that such
140 improvements facilitate the creation of opportunity costs to fertility through increasing an
141 individual's access to education and employment as well as improve access to contraception
142 to control fertility. Accordingly, a necessary next step in explaining changes in fertility in
143 resource-limited countries is to examine what types of interventions, technologies, and other
144 mechanisms may help more geographically and socially isolated rural women overcome their
145 disadvantaged position in accessing resources associated with declines in fertility that are
146 generally located in more urban or suburban regions of resource-limited countries. One
147 increasingly prevalent technology in the resource-limited countries of South and Southeast
148 Asia that has yet to be examined for its potential to decrease the isolation of rural women
149 is inexpensive motorcycles.

150 **Motorcycles as Distance Demolishing Technologies**

151 Sometimes even the simplest of technological shifts can become the “engines” of social and
152 economic change (Cooley 1894; Lenski 1984; Muir 2012; 2018; Sanders et al. 2018). Begin-
153 ning in the mid-1990s, many Southeast Asian countries experienced dramatic increases in the
154 number and availability of inexpensive motorcycles, thus transitioning their respective pop-
155 ulations from pedestrian economies with a limited range of physical mobility to economies
156 balanced on two motorized wheels and based on increased mobility. In Indonesia for ex-
157 ample, between 1987 and 2009, the number of motorcycles increased from 5.5 million to

158 approximately 52.4 million over this 22-year span with the most dramatic period of growth
159 occurring from 1990 to 2009 at which time the number of registered motorcycles increased
160 by approximately 893 percent (Badan Pusat Statistik 2011b; Badan Pusat Statistik 2011a).
161 During the same approximate period, the total amount of asphalted roads in Indonesia in-
162 creased by approximately 52,000 kilometers (Badan Pusat Statistik 2011b; Badan Pusat
163 Statistik 2011a). These changes took place while the Indonesian population increased by
164 only 15 percent. Similar trends occurred in Vietnam, where, since 1990 motorcycles have
165 increased by 1000 percent while the population increased by only 24 percent (Hsu et al. 2007:
166 15). In 2003, 95 percent of all registered vehicles in Vietnam were motorcycles (Hsu et al.
167 2007). Today, despite the increasing prevalence of automobile ownership, and with a few
168 exceptions (e.g., Malaysia, Brunei, and Singapore), motorcycles represent the primary means
169 of personal transportation for both rural and urban populations throughout Southeast Asia.

170 With access to one or more motorcycles in a household, members in that household be-
171 come more geographically mobile, which potentially increases access to jobs, mass media,
172 and educational opportunities. Furthermore, within the context of urban/rural dynamics,
173 increased access to transportation is associated with changes in household organization such
174 that “genders and generations renegotiate their respective roles” (Leinbach 2000: 5). Accord-
175 ingly, increased physical mobility should create significant shifts in social mobility, especially
176 for young women, by shifting their opportunity costs at the individual and household level
177 from money “savers” to income “producers” (Leinbach 2000).

178 Traditionally young women from rural regions in resource-limited countries are engaged
179 in “secondary” economic activities (e.g., planting and caring for a garden, watching livestock,
180 etc.) that save the household money versus making money (Cloud and Garrett 1996). Yet,
181 given the opportunity, rural households or resource-limited households prefer to have their
182 members make money (McMichael 2011; Morgan and Hagewen 2006) through engaging in
183 “primary” economic activities versus money-saving activities. This is true not only for
184 men, but also for women as rural families often propel female household members into

185 employment opportunities as such opportunities are viewed as a family duty or necessary
186 source of income (McMichael 2011: 92). Despite this preference, transportation costs and the
187 lack of transportation infrastructure have been, for many rural households in the resource-
188 limited world, a prohibiting factor (Jayachandran 2021; Leinbach 1983; Olsson 2009; Replogle
189 1991; Rigg 2002). Consequently, young women tend to stay at home while their male siblings
190 leave to pursue incomes (Cloud and Garrett 1996; Jayachandran 2021). When secondary
191 economic activities prevail in rural households, higher fertility is at worst inconsequential for
192 the households' economic strategies and may in fact be beneficial by providing more domestic
193 labor for localized money-saving activities (Knodel et al. 1984; Morgan and Hagewen 2006).
194 Furthermore, in resource-limited settings, children are often viewed as additional potential
195 laborers capable of increasing the flow of economic resources to the household head (Caldwell
196 1982; Morgan and Hagewen 2006). Under such conditions higher fertility is likely.

197 Access to relatively inexpensive motorcycles should alter the conditions favoring higher
198 fertility by influencing the economic strategies of individuals and households by decreasing
199 transportation costs, increasing access to labor markets, and thereby increasing opportunity
200 costs of fertility, a (Leinbach 2000). Under such a scenario, women and/or households may
201 revise their economic strategies to view women as potential money-generators in the short-
202 term, and even in the long-term if they can access additional educational opportunities as a
203 gateway to long-term career opportunities. Early and frequent pregnancies in these condi-
204 tions would constitute a major disruption to individual and household economic strategies
205 as the potential to earn an income is more feasible. Moreover, increased physical mobility
206 should empower women to reach broader economic markets and thereby increase their ac-
207 cess to contraception. Thus, access to motorcycles should be associated with increased use of
208 contraception as a means of addressing shifts in desired fertility. However, these mechanisms
209 likely function in tandem with more general life course events.

210 **Fertility and the Life Course**

211 The life course perspective asserts that individuals face different challenges and desires de-
212 pending upon where they are in their life's journey and that earlier decisions or life events
213 affect subsequent decisions and life events. As such, an individual's age is a key indica-
214 tor of a variety of life outcomes and fertility is a prime example (Rindfuss et al. 1996).
215 Young women typically enter menarche somewhere between ages 11 to 15 and transition
216 to menopause sometime around year 50, granted that there are variations across times and
217 locations (Zacharias and Wurtman 1969; Stanford et al. 1987). Within this time period,
218 fecundity has a curvilinear relationship with age, first increasing in an individual's late teens
219 and early twenties, typically peaking in their early 30s, and then gradually declining as they
220 approach menopause (Homan et al. 2007). By necessity, fertility decisions and experiences
221 occur within these limits. In addition, evidence suggests that women with high parity are
222 more likely to limit future fertility through the use of contraception (Amin et al. 1987). We
223 anticipate that interventions to help women increase their access to and use of contraception
224 will be strongly influenced by these underlying patterns—Rindfuss et al. (1996) find that
225 there are three stages in the reproductive life course relevant to contraception use; i.e., early
226 years, where contraception is used to delay first births and control the tempo of fertility;
227 mid-career, where decisions are made whether or not to seep sterilization; and a final stage in
228 which decisions revolve around when to stop using contraception if not previously sterilized.
229 With this in mind, we posit that the impact of access to a motorcycle on contraception use
230 is likely to change as a woman traverses her life course.

231 **Summary**

232 We have introduced fertility change, spatial inequality, and physical mobility as central
233 themes in this article. Arguing in agreement with the established understanding that access
234 to resources such as education, labor markets, and contraception is critical for transitions to
235 low fertility, we have further argued that access to these resources is often limited in resource-

236 limited countries due to spatial inequalities. However, we have proposed that motorcycles,
237 which constitute a primary “distance demolishing technology” (Scott 2009: 11) in South and
238 Southeast Asia, may help isolated individuals living in these regions increase their access to
239 these resources and thus facilitate transitions to low fertility across spatial divides through
240 increasing the use of contraception. We examine these propositions by examining the extent
241 to which access to a motorcycle juxtapose residence in a rural versus an urban location is
242 associated with the use of contraception for female respondents in Cambodia, Indonesia,
243 Nepal, the Philippines, and Timor-Leste.

244 **Research Questions**

245 With the extant literature in mind, we developed the following research questions to guide
246 our investigation:

- 247 1. To what extent is access to a motorcycle associated with an increased probability of
248 contraception use?
- 249 2. To what extent and in what direction is residence in a rural versus an urban location
250 associated with the probability of contraception use?
- 251 3. Does an interaction effect exist between motorcycle access and rural versus urban
252 residence, such that the impact of access to a motorcycle is more pronounced in rural
253 versus urban locations?

254 **Data and Methods**

255 To answer these questions, we use data from the Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS):
256 Cambodia (CDHS 2005, 2010, 2014, and 2021), Indonesia (IDHS 2007, 2012, and 2017),
257 Nepal (NDHS 2006, 2011, and 2016), the Philippines (PDHS 2008, 2013, and 2017), and
258 Timor-Leste (TLDHS 2009 and 2016). Data from Bangladesh and Myanmar were also

259 included in preliminary analyses, but did not include all of the desired variables for the
260 complete models (results that included these data were comparable across similar models).
261 DHS data are nationally representative samples of female respondents from each respective
262 country. Data were obtained through face-to-face survey interviews conducted with women
263 between the ages of 15 and 49 using a formal survey instrument by trained interviewers. The
264 DHS typically uses two-stage stratified cluster sampling to collect nationally representative
265 samples, which have been divided into sampling domains. In the first stage, clusters, or
266 enumeration areas (EAs), that represent the entire country are randomly selected from the
267 sampling frame using estimates of probability proportional to cluster size (PPS). The second
268 stage then involves the systematic sampling of households listed in each cluster or EA. Given
269 the focus of this study on current contraception use, we selected women from the original
270 sample who were not currently pregnant at the time of their interview and who were not
271 sterilized.

272 **Measures**

273 Analyses included in this research evaluate the relationships between key variables of interest
274 and control variables with the outcome variables contraception use, modern contraception
275 use, traditional contraception use, and unmet need. Contraception use was coded into a
276 dichotomous variable with 0 = no current use of contraception or current use of folklore
277 contraception (e.g., spiritual or mystical methods) and 1 = current use of traditional contra-
278 ception (e.g., withdrawal) or current use of modern contraception (e.g., a condom, pill, or
279 injection.). Two additional variables were created to isolate and distinguish between mod-
280 ern and traditional contraception use, with either category set to 1 and 0 = no current use
281 of contraception or current use of folklore contraception (an alternative coding that only
282 included no current use of contraception as the reference category was also analyzed; the
283 results were not substantively different from the results based on the combined reference
284 group). A final outcome variable was created to represent an unmet need for contraception,

285 which was coded as 0 = using contraception for birth spacing or limiting and 1 = unmet
286 need for birth spacing or limiting.

287 A key indicator of interest in this study is area of residence, as it often mediates access
288 to scarce resources. In order to analyze the impact of spatial inequality, analyses included
289 the variable residence, which was a dichotomous variable coded as 0 = rural, 1 = urban.
290 Juxtapose the potential impact of place on contraception use, access to a motorcycle was
291 measured based on household ownership of a motorcycle, which was measured as a dichoto-
292 mous variable coded as 0 = No, 1 = Yes. Additional right-hand-sided variables, representing
293 established indicators of fertility, were included as control variables in our models. Demo-
294 graphic variables included age, living children, and country of residence. Age was coded as
295 an ordinal variable with standard 5-year age categories from 15 to 49 years. Living children
296 was the respondent's total number of living children, coded as an ordinal variable with 0,
297 1, 2, and 3 plus children. Country was included as a categorical factor variable indicating a
298 respondent's country of residence (1 = Indonesia (reference), 2 = Cambodia, 3 = Nepal, 4
299 = Philippines, and 5 = Timor-Leste). Socioeconomic status was measured by respondent's
300 occupation, coded as a categorical factor variable (1 = none (reference), 2 = professional,
301 3 = agricultural, 4 = subsistence, and 5 = manual labor), and by the household's relative
302 wealth status as indicated by the DHS wealth index (coded as 1 = poorest (reference), 2 =
303 poorer, 3 = middle, 4 = richer, 5 = richest). Educational/ideational control variables include
304 education and TV use. Education was coded as an ordinal variable where 1 = no education
305 (reference), 2 = incomplete primary, 3 = complete primary, 4 = incomplete secondary, 5 =
306 complete secondary, and 6 = higher. TV use represented the frequency that a respondent
307 reported watching TV (coded as 0 = none, 1 = less than once a week, 2 = at least once
308 a week). Access variables included health clinic visit and family planning visit, each coded
309 as dichotomous variables (0 = no, 1 = yes) for whether a respondent had visited a clinic or
310 received a visit from a family planning professional within the past year. Also included were
311 variables representing whether or not money or distance represented substantial barriers to

312 accessing health care, each was coded as a dichotomous variable with 0 = No, 1 = Yes.

313 **Analytic Strategy**

314 Statistical analyses were performed using STATA version 15.1. We formally incorporated
315 the DHS's complex sample design using the "survey" package and by including the "svy"
316 command in our logistic regression analyses. We used a combination of unadjusted and
317 adjusted logistic regression models to explore the relationship between our outcome variables
318 and key independent variables. Preliminary models included a baseline model, that evaluated
319 unadjusted relationships between our outcome and key independent variables, as well as
320 pathway-specific models that adjusted for related control variables (results for pathway-
321 specific models are available upon request). A fully adjusted model was estimated to assess
322 associations between motorcycle ownership and residence with outcome variables, net the
323 effects of all control variables. A final model was estimated that included interaction terms
324 between motorcycle ownership, residence, and the number of living children. Results from
325 the interaction model are presented as predicted probabilities (see Figure 1).

326 **Results**

327 Roughly 60 percent of women reported living in rural areas and 47 percent reported house-
328 hold ownership of a motorcycle (see Tables 1-2). Women's age was distributed relatively
329 evenly with most age categories representing between 14 to 17 percent of respondents. Ap-
330 proximately 70 percent of women had at least one living child. About 13 percent of women
331 had no education, another 60 percent had less than a secondary education, and 28 percent
332 had a secondary education or higher. About half of the women reported working in a pro-
333 fessional occupation or in agriculture, and a little less than 40 percent reported not having
334 an occupation. Less than 15 percent of women reported having a recent visit from a family
335 planning professional, but almost 43 percent had visited a health clinic in the past year.

336 Money was reported as a substantial barrier to accessing health care by 40 percent of women
337 and distance was reported by 29 percent.

338 Almost 40 percent of women reported current use of traditional or modern contraception
339 while another 21 percent indicated an unmet need for contraception. Associations with con-
340 traception use are reported as adjusted odds ratios (AOR). After adjusting for other factors
341 commonly associated with contraception use, women with a motorcycle were more likely to
342 report current contraception use (AOR = 1.55, 95% CI [1.50, 1.61]), modern contraception
343 use (AOR = 1.60, 95% CI [1.54, 1.66]), and traditional contraception use (AOR = 1.49, 95%
344 CI [1.41, 1.58]) compared to women who did not own a motorcycle (see Table 3). Women
345 with a motorcycle were less likely to report an unmet need for contraception (AOR = 0.65,
346 95% CI [0.62, 0.68]) after adjusting for other variables. Women living in an urban area
347 were more likely to report current contraception use (AOR = 1.05, 95% CI [1.01, 1.09]) and
348 traditional contraception use (AOR = 1.34, 95% CI [1.26, 1.43]) compared to women living
349 in a rural area. Urban vs. rural residence was negatively associated with unmet need for
350 contraception (AOR = 0.90, 95% CI [0.85, 0.95]).

351 Womens' age presented a curvilinear association with contraception use, first increasing
352 in strength with a positive association with contraception use, modern contraception use,
353 and traditional contraception use that peaked in strength between ages 20 - 24 and declined
354 thereafter. A similar, but inverse association, was observed between age and unmet need
355 for contraption. Education was positively associated with contraception use; for example,
356 women who had completed secondary education were more likely to report contraception
357 use compared to women with no education (AOR = 1.60, 95% CI [1.50, 1.71]). Education
358 was inversely associated with an unmet need for contraception; for example, women who
359 had completed primary education were less likely to report an unmet need for contraception
360 compared to women with no education (AOR = 0.82, 95% CI [0.76, 0.88]). Women who had
361 visited a health clinic in the past year were more likely to report contraception use compared
362 to women who had not (AOR = 1.33, 95% CI [1.29, 1.37]); those who reported a visit from

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics by Outcome Indicator

| | Contraception Use | | | Modern Contraception | | | Traditional Contraception | | | Unmet Need | | |
|----------------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|----------------------|------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| | No | Yes | Total | No | Yes | Total | No | Yes | Total | No | Yes | Total |
| Motorcycle Ownership | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No | 54.79 (114446) | 49.85 (69598) | 52.81 (184044) | 54.79 (114446) | 49.72 (57556) | 52.98 (172002) | 54.79 (114446) | 50.48 (12042) | 54.35 (126488) | 49.96 (70103) | 64.81 (24169) | 53.08 (94272) |
| Yes | 45.21 (94417) | 50.15 (70017) | 47.19 (164434) | 45.21 (94417) | 50.28 (58206) | 47.02 (152623) | 45.21 (94417) | 49.52 (11811) | 45.65 (106228) | 50.04 (70204) | 35.19 (13124) | 46.92 (83328) |
| Residence | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rural | 59.97 (129534) | 59.99 (86168) | 59.98 (215702) | 59.97 (129534) | 61.24 (72991) | 60.42 (202525) | 59.97 (129534) | 53.87 (13177) | 59.35 (142711) | 60.02 (86641) | 66.35 (25811) | 61.36 (112452) |
| Urban | 40.03 (86469) | 40.01 (57479) | 40.02 (143948) | 40.03 (86469) | 38.76 (46193) | 39.58 (132662) | 40.03 (86469) | 46.13 (11286) | 40.65 (97755) | 39.98 (57710) | 33.65 (13093) | 38.64 (70803) |
| Age | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15-19 | 25.47 (55015) | 4.19 (6019) | 16.97 (61034) | 25.47 (55015) | 4.44 (5289) | 18.00 (60304) | 25.47 (55015) | 2.98 (730) | 23.19 (55745) | 4.17 (6024) | 6.52 (2534) | 4.67 (8558) |
| 20-24 | 17.15 (37047) | 14.14 (20303) | 15.95 (57350) | 17.15 (37047) | 14.98 (17853) | 16.38 (54900) | 17.15 (37047) | 10.02 (2450) | 16.43 (39497) | 14.10 (20343) | 16.38 (6370) | 14.58 (26713) |
| 25-29 | 12.67 (27369) | 20.17 (28968) | 15.67 (56337) | 12.67 (27369) | 21.09 (25128) | 15.67 (52497) | 12.67 (27369) | 15.70 (3840) | 12.98 (31209) | 20.13 (29056) | 19.09 (7422) | 19.91 (36478) |
| 30-34 | 10.42 (22511) | 21.11 (30309) | 14.69 (52820) | 10.42 (22511) | 21.51 (25632) | 14.37 (48143) | 10.42 (22511) | 19.12 (4677) | 11.31 (27188) | 21.09 (30440) | 17.25 (6706) | 20.28 (37146) |
| 35-39 | 9.94 (21473) | 19.08 (27406) | 13.59 (48879) | 9.94 (21473) | 18.87 (22485) | 13.12 (43958) | 9.94 (21473) | 20.12 (4921) | 10.98 (26394) | 19.09 (27555) | 16.09 (6257) | 18.46 (33812) |
| 40-44 | 11.05 (23857) | 14.05 (20171) | 12.24 (44028) | 11.05 (23857) | 12.99 (15483) | 11.74 (39340) | 11.05 (23857) | 19.17 (4688) | 11.87 (28545) | 14.10 (20344) | 14.66 (5702) | 14.22 (26046) |
| 45-49 | 13.28 (28689) | 7.26 (10432) | 10.88 (39121) | 13.28 (28689) | 6.11 (7278) | 10.73 (35967) | 13.28 (28689) | 12.89 (3154) | 13.24 (31843) | 7.31 (10549) | 10.01 (3894) | 7.88 (14443) |
| Living Children | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | 46.15 (99682) | 2.38 (3413) | 28.67 (103095) | 46.15 (99682) | 2.08 (2481) | 30.48 (102163) | 46.15 (99682) | 3.81 (932) | 41.84 (100614) | 2.37 (3421) | 5.76 (2240) | 3.09 (5661) |
| 1 | 15.07 (32554) | 22.42 (32212) | 18.01 (64766) | 15.07 (32554) | 23.06 (27479) | 17.91 (60033) | 15.07 (32554) | 19.35 (4733) | 15.51 (37287) | 22.37 (32290) | 21.54 (8380) | 22.19 (40670) |
| 2 | 13.54 (29245) | 34.81 (50002) | 22.03 (79247) | 13.54 (29245) | 35.61 (42447) | 21.39 (71692) | 13.54 (29245) | 30.88 (7555) | 15.30 (36800) | 34.74 (50150) | 24.79 (9646) | 32.63 (59796) |
| 3+ | 25.24 (54522) | 40.39 (58020) | 31.29 (112542) | 25.24 (54522) | 39.25 (46777) | 30.22 (101299) | 25.24 (54522) | 45.96 (11243) | 27.35 (65765) | 40.52 (58490) | 47.91 (18638) | 42.09 (77128) |
| Education | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No Education | 14.51 (31333) | 11.39 (16359) | 13.26 (47692) | 14.51 (31333) | 11.32 (13495) | 13.37 (44828) | 14.51 (31333) | 11.71 (2864) | 14.22 (34197) | 11.49 (16581) | 19.75 (7681) | 13.24 (24262) |
| Incomplete Primary | 16.86 (36425) | 18.58 (26686) | 17.55 (63111) | 16.86 (36425) | 18.31 (21821) | 17.38 (58246) | 16.86 (36425) | 19.89 (4865) | 17.17 (41290) | 18.61 (26863) | 20.44 (7950) | 19.00 (34813) |
| Complete Primary | 10.54 (22760) | 16.12 (23159) | 12.77 (45919) | 10.54 (22760) | 17.21 (20504) | 12.91 (43264) | 10.54 (22760) | 10.85 (2655) | 10.57 (25415) | 16.11 (23255) | 12.25 (4765) | 15.29 (28020) |
| Incomplete Secondary | 29.01 (62655) | 26.21 (37642) | 27.89 (100297) | 29.01 (62655) | 26.83 (31973) | 28.23 (94628) | 29.01 (62655) | 23.18 (5669) | 28.41 (68324) | 26.13 (37721) | 23.37 (9092) | 25.55 (46813) |
| Complete Secondary | 14.66 (31665) | 16.32 (23440) | 15.32 (55105) | 14.66 (31665) | 16.08 (19161) | 15.16 (50826) | 14.66 (31665) | 17.49 (4279) | 14.95 (35944) | 16.30 (23523) | 13.85 (5388) | 15.78 (28911) |
| Higher | 14.42 (31153) | 11.38 (16347) | 13.21 (47500) | 14.42 (31153) | 10.25 (12219) | 12.94 (43372) | 14.42 (31153) | 16.88 (4128) | 14.67 (35281) | 11.36 (16394) | 10.34 (4023) | 11.14 (20417) |
| Occupation | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| None | 39.34 (80293) | 36.06 (46559) | 38.07 (126852) | 39.34 (80293) | 37.19 (39816) | 38.60 (120109) | 39.34 (80293) | 30.57 (6743) | 38.49 (87036) | 36.03 (46734) | 37.36 (13307) | 36.32 (60041) |
| Professional | 25.87 (52805) | 27.22 (35142) | 26.40 (87947) | 25.87 (52805) | 25.78 (27601) | 25.84 (80406) | 25.87 (52805) | 34.19 (7541) | 26.69 (60346) | 27.21 (35288) | 21.54 (7674) | 25.99 (42962) |
| Agricultural | 24.07 (49118) | 25.63 (33096) | 24.67 (82214) | 24.07 (49118) | 26.20 (28053) | 24.80 (77171) | 24.07 (49118) | 22.86 (5043) | 23.95 (54161) | 25.68 (33310) | 31.44 (11200) | 26.92 (44510) |
| Subsistence | 2.39 (4875) | 1.53 (1980) | 2.06 (6855) | 2.39 (4875) | 1.32 (1415) | 2.02 (6290) | 2.39 (4875) | 2.56 (565) | 2.41 (5440) | 1.53 (1989) | 2.59 (923) | 1.76 (2912) |
| Manual Labor | 8.33 (16991) | 9.55 (12336) | 8.80 (29327) | 8.33 (16991) | 9.50 (10170) | 8.73 (27161) | 8.33 (16991) | 9.82 (2166) | 8.47 (19157) | 9.55 (12382) | 7.07 (2519) | 9.01 (14901) |

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics by Outcome Indicator (continued)

| | Contraception Use | | | Modern Contraception | | | Traditional Contraception | | | Unmet Need | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|----------------------|------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| | No | Yes | Total | No | Yes | Total | No | Yes | Total | No | Yes | Total |
| Wealth Index | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Poorest | 20.89 (45129) | 20.71 (29749) | 20.82 (74878) | 20.89 (45129) | 21.72 (25882) | 21.19 (71011) | 20.89 (45129) | 15.81 (3867) | 20.38 (48996) | 20.81 (30046) | 24.75 (9628) | 21.65 (39674) |
| Poorer | 18.66 (40305) | 19.98 (28705) | 19.19 (69010) | 18.66 (40305) | 20.60 (24551) | 19.35 (64856) | 18.66 (40305) | 16.98 (4154) | 18.49 (44459) | 19.98 (28844) | 19.78 (7697) | 19.94 (36541) |
| Middle | 18.79 (40586) | 19.25 (27645) | 18.97 (68231) | 18.79 (40586) | 19.46 (23194) | 19.03 (63780) | 18.79 (40586) | 18.19 (4451) | 18.73 (45037) | 19.21 (27736) | 18.79 (7312) | 19.13 (35048) |
| Richer | 19.88 (42937) | 19.58 (28130) | 19.76 (71067) | 19.88 (42937) | 19.30 (22999) | 19.67 (65936) | 19.88 (42937) | 20.97 (5131) | 19.99 (48068) | 19.56 (28234) | 18.82 (7322) | 19.40 (35556) |
| Richest | 21.78 (47046) | 20.48 (29418) | 21.26 (76464) | 21.78 (47046) | 18.93 (22558) | 20.77 (69604) | 21.78 (47046) | 28.04 (6860) | 22.42 (53906) | 20.43 (29491) | 17.85 (6945) | 19.88 (36436) |
| TV Use | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| None | 23.29 (50287) | 20.25 (29065) | 22.08 (79352) | 23.29 (50287) | 20.10 (23936) | 22.16 (74223) | 23.29 (50287) | 20.97 (5129) | 23.06 (55416) | 20.33 (29326) | 29.67 (11534) | 22.31 (40860) |
| Less than Once a Week | 16.02 (34582) | 13.47 (19337) | 15.00 (53919) | 16.02 (34582) | 13.35 (15904) | 15.07 (50486) | 16.02 (34582) | 14.04 (3433) | 15.82 (38015) | 13.47 (19430) | 16.46 (6398) | 14.10 (25828) |
| At Least Once a Week | 49.50 (106867) | 52.30 (75076) | 50.62 (181943) | 49.50 (106867) | 52.12 (62076) | 50.43 (168943) | 49.50 (106867) | 53.16 (13000) | 49.87 (119867) | 52.21 (75309) | 41.79 (16248) | 49.99 (91557) |
| Almost every Day | 11.19 (24148) | 13.98 (20076) | 12.30 (44224) | 11.19 (24148) | 14.43 (17184) | 12.34 (41332) | 11.19 (24148) | 11.83 (2892) | 11.25 (27040) | 14.00 (20191) | 12.08 (4697) | 13.59 (24888) |
| Family Planning Visit | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No | 87.87 (160503) | 84.38 (89365) | 86.59 (249868) | 87.87 (160503) | 84.68 (73747) | 86.84 (234250) | 87.87 (160503) | 82.98 (15618) | 87.42 (176121) | 84.40 (89827) | 80.85 (25099) | 83.60 (114926) |
| Yes | 12.13 (22150) | 15.62 (16546) | 13.41 (38696) | 12.13 (22150) | 15.32 (13342) | 13.16 (35492) | 12.13 (22150) | 17.02 (3204) | 12.58 (25354) | 15.60 (16598) | 19.15 (5945) | 16.40 (22543) |
| Health Clinic Visit | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No | 64.28 (122889) | 45.51 (49759) | 57.46 (172648) | 64.28 (122889) | 44.88 (40579) | 58.05 (163468) | 64.28 (122889) | 48.54 (9180) | 62.87 (132069) | 45.61 (50096) | 47.55 (15378) | 46.05 (65474) |
| Yes | 35.72 (68275) | 54.49 (59569) | 42.54 (127844) | 35.72 (68275) | 55.12 (49836) | 41.95 (118111) | 35.72 (68275) | 51.46 (9733) | 37.13 (78008) | 54.39 (59750) | 52.45 (16961) | 53.95 (76711) |
| Money Barrier | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Not a Big Problem | 56.90 (110618) | 64.11 (76055) | 59.64 (186673) | 56.90 (110618) | 65.56 (64282) | 59.81 (174900) | 56.90 (110618) | 57.19 (11773) | 56.93 (122391) | 64.07 (76369) | 52.91 (17434) | 61.66 (93803) |
| Big Problem | 43.10 (83773) | 35.89 (42577) | 40.36 (126350) | 43.10 (83773) | 34.44 (33765) | 40.19 (117538) | 43.10 (83773) | 42.81 (8812) | 43.07 (92585) | 35.93 (42822) | 47.09 (15515) | 38.34 (58337) |
| Distance Barrier | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Not a Big Problem | 68.83 (133890) | 75.81 (89959) | 71.47 (223849) | 68.83 (133890) | 75.98 (74515) | 71.23 (208405) | 68.83 (133890) | 74.98 (15444) | 69.42 (149334) | 75.75 (90310) | 62.91 (20781) | 72.96 (111091) |
| Big Problem | 31.17 (60632) | 24.19 (28709) | 28.53 (89341) | 31.17 (60632) | 24.02 (23556) | 28.77 (84188) | 31.17 (60632) | 31.17 (5153) | 30.58 (65785) | 24.25 (28917) | 37.09 (12252) | 27.04 (41169) |
| Country | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Indonesia | 34.76 (63506) | 52.33 (55430) | 41.21 (118936) | 34.76 (63506) | 58.07 (50580) | 42.28 (114086) | 34.76 (63506) | 25.77 (4850) | 33.92 (68356) | 52.43 (55809) | 26.24 (8148) | 46.52 (63957) |
| Cambodia | 24.15 (44124) | 22.10 (23411) | 23.40 (67535) | 24.15 (44124) | 18.99 (16538) | 22.48 (60662) | 24.15 (44124) | 36.51 (6873) | 25.30 (50997) | 22.02 (23435) | 22.46 (6975) | 22.12 (30410) |
| Nepal | 11.26 (20575) | 7.53 (7976) | 9.89 (28551) | 11.26 (20575) | 6.95 (6054) | 9.87 (26629) | 11.26 (20575) | 10.21 (1922) | 11.16 (22497) | 7.50 (7987) | 20.50 (6365) | 10.44 (14352) |
| Philippines | 18.63 (34038) | 14.66 (15534) | 17.17 (49572) | 18.63 (34038) | 12.08 (10520) | 16.51 (44558) | 18.63 (34038) | 26.64 (5014) | 19.38 (39052) | 14.66 (15608) | 18.27 (5673) | 15.48 (21281) |
| Timor Leste | 11.20 (20471) | 3.37 (3575) | 8.33 (24046) | 11.20 (20471) | 3.92 (3411) | 8.85 (23882) | 11.20 (20471) | 0.87 (164) | 10.24 (20635) | 3.38 (3601) | 12.54 (3895) | 5.45 (7496) |

363 a family planning professional in the past year were also more likely to report contraception
364 use compared to women who had not (AOR = 1.18, 95% CI [1.13, 1.23]). Having reported
365 money or distance as barriers to accessing health care were both negatively associated with
366 contraception use and positively associated with unmet need for contraception. Compared
367 to women living in Indonesia, women from other countries were less likely to report contra-
368 ception use and more likely to report an unmet need for contraception. For example, women
369 from Timor-Leste were less likely to report modern contraception use compared to women
370 from Indonesia (AOR = 0.20, 95% CI [0.18, 0.21.]). Finally, having a larger number of living
371 children was strongly associated with contraception use and inversely related to unmet need
372 for contraception.

373 Given the strength of the association between the number of living children and contra-
374 ception use, a three-way interaction model was estimated to evaluate associations between
375 motorcycle ownership in the context of rural vs. urban areas, but also evaluate how these in-
376 teractive associations may vary depending upon the number of living children that a woman
377 reported. Results from this interaction model (fully adjusted for other control variables)
378 were used to generate predicted probabilities of contraception use, modern contraception
379 use, traditional contraception use, and unmet need for contraception; these predicted proba-
380 bilities are visualized in Figure 1. The probability of contraception use, particularly modern
381 contraception use, was higher for women who had at least one living child and who also
382 owned a motorcycle. This pattern of association was strongest for women living in rural
383 areas. A moderate increase in probability of traditional contraception use was found for
384 women in both rural and urban areas if they had 2 or more living children. Finally, motor-
385 cycle ownership was consistently associated with a lower probability of reporting an unmet
386 need for contraception by women living in a rural area regardless of the number of living
387 children that they reported. The same association is only seen for women with 2 or more
388 children who lived in urban areas.

Table 3: Adjusted Odds Ratios Evaluating Factors Associated with Contraception Use

| | Contraception Use | | Modern Contraception | | Traditional Contraception | | Unmet Need | |
|------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|----------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| | AOR | 95% CI | AOR | 95% CI | AOR | 95% CI | AOR | 95% CI |
| Motorcycle Ownership | | | | | | | | |
| No | 1.00 | [1.00,1.00] | 1.00 | [1.00,1.00] | 1.00 | [1.00,1.00] | 1.00 | [1.00,1.00] |
| Yes | 1.55*** | [1.50,1.61] | 1.60*** | [1.54,1.66] | 1.49*** | [1.41,1.58] | 0.65*** | [0.62,0.68] |
| Residence | | | | | | | | |
| Rural | 1.00 | [1.00,1.00] | 1.00 | [1.00,1.00] | 1.00 | [1.00,1.00] | 1.00 | [1.00,1.00] |
| Urban | 1.05* | [1.01,1.09] | 0.99 | [0.95,1.04] | 1.34*** | [1.26,1.43] | 0.90*** | [0.85,0.95] |
| Age | | | | | | | | |
| 15-19 | 1.00 | [1.00,1.00] | 1.00 | [1.00,1.00] | 1.00 | [1.00,1.00] | 1.00 | [1.00,1.00] |
| 20-24 | 1.50*** | [1.37,1.63] | 1.28*** | [1.17,1.40] | 1.89*** | [1.58,2.26] | 0.85** | [0.76,0.94] |
| 25-29 | 1.28*** | [1.17,1.39] | 1.06 | [0.96,1.16] | 1.98*** | [1.65,2.38] | 0.75*** | [0.67,0.83] |
| 30-34 | 1.09* | [1.00,1.19] | 0.87** | [0.79,0.96] | 2.08*** | [1.73,2.50] | 0.64*** | [0.57,0.72] |
| 35-39 | 0.91* | [0.83,0.99] | 0.71*** | [0.64,0.78] | 1.91*** | [1.59,2.30] | 0.66*** | [0.59,0.75] |
| 40-44 | 0.59*** | [0.54,0.65] | 0.43*** | [0.39,0.48] | 1.56*** | [1.30,1.87] | 0.81** | [0.72,0.92] |
| 45-49 | 0.24*** | [0.22,0.27] | 0.16*** | [0.15,0.18] | 0.81* | [0.67,0.98] | 1.16* | [1.01,1.32] |
| Living Children | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | 1.00 | [1.00,1.00] | 1.00 | [1.00,1.00] | 1.00 | [1.00,1.00] | 1.00 | [1.00,1.00] |
| 1 | 45.87*** | [41.73,50.42] | 68.81*** | [61.54,76.92] | 17.52*** | [14.98,20.50] | 0.50*** | [0.44,0.57] |
| 2 | 111.34*** | [100.57,123.26] | 176.63*** | [156.95,198.78] | 36.37*** | [30.90,42.80] | 0.40*** | [0.35,0.45] |
| 3+ | 117.44*** | [105.80,130.37] | 182.77*** | [161.81,206.45] | 43.12*** | [36.59,50.81] | 0.53*** | [0.47,0.61] |
| Education | | | | | | | | |
| No Education | 1.00 | [1.00,1.00] | 1.00 | [1.00,1.00] | 1.00 | [1.00,1.00] | 1.00 | [1.00,1.00] |
| Incomplete Primary | 1.23*** | [1.17,1.30] | 1.14*** | [1.08,1.21] | 1.65*** | [1.50,1.81] | 0.96 | [0.89,1.02] |
| Complete Primary | 1.68*** | [1.58,1.79] | 1.53*** | [1.43,1.64] | 2.10*** | [1.88,2.34] | 0.78*** | [0.72,0.85] |
| Incomplete Secondary | 1.61*** | [1.52,1.71] | 1.43*** | [1.34,1.52] | 2.59*** | [2.34,2.86] | 0.82*** | [0.76,0.88] |
| Complete Secondary | 1.60*** | [1.50,1.71] | 1.36*** | [1.27,1.46] | 3.51*** | [3.13,3.92] | 0.89** | [0.82,0.97] |
| Higher | 1.53*** | [1.42,1.65] | 1.24*** | [1.14,1.34] | 3.59*** | [3.19,4.05] | 0.97 | [0.88,1.06] |
| Occupation | | | | | | | | |
| None | 1.00 | [1.00,1.00] | 1.00 | [1.00,1.00] | 1.00 | [1.00,1.00] | 1.00 | [1.00,1.00] |
| Professional | 0.98 | [0.95,1.02] | 0.95** | [0.91,0.98] | 1.16*** | [1.08,1.23] | 0.85*** | [0.81,0.90] |
| Agricultural | 1.09*** | [1.05,1.14] | 1.11*** | [1.06,1.16] | 1.03 | [0.96,1.11] | 0.88*** | [0.83,0.93] |
| Subsistence | 0.80*** | [0.72,0.88] | 0.72*** | [0.65,0.80] | 1.00 | [0.87,1.15] | 1.19** | [1.06,1.34] |
| Manual Labor | 1.22*** | [1.15,1.28] | 1.21*** | [1.14,1.28] | 1.24*** | [1.14,1.36] | 0.65*** | [0.60,0.70] |
| Household Wealth | | | | | | | | |
| Poorest | 1.00 | [1.00,1.00] | 1.00 | [1.00,1.00] | 1.00 | [1.00,1.00] | 1.00 | [1.00,1.00] |
| Poorer | 1.11*** | [1.07,1.16] | 1.14*** | [1.08,1.19] | 0.99 | [0.92,1.07] | 0.91** | [0.86,0.97] |
| Middle | 1.02 | [0.97,1.07] | 1.03 | [0.97,1.08] | 0.99 | [0.92,1.08] | 0.97 | [0.91,1.04] |
| Richer | 0.98 | [0.93,1.04] | 0.98 | [0.92,1.04] | 0.97 | [0.89,1.06] | 0.99 | [0.93,1.06] |
| Richest | 0.94* | [0.88,1.00] | 0.90** | [0.84,0.96] | 1.00 | [0.91,1.10] | 1.05 | [0.97,1.14] |
| TV Use | | | | | | | | |
| None | 1.00 | [1.00,1.00] | 1.00 | [1.00,1.00] | 1.00 | [1.00,1.00] | 1.00 | [1.00,1.00] |
| Less than Once a Week | 1.15*** | [1.09,1.21] | 1.14*** | [1.08,1.20] | 1.16*** | [1.07,1.26] | 0.87*** | [0.81,0.93] |
| At Least Once a Week | 1.29*** | [1.23,1.36] | 1.30*** | [1.24,1.37] | 1.21*** | [1.12,1.31] | 0.82*** | [0.78,0.87] |
| Family Planning Visit | | | | | | | | |
| No | 1.00 | [1.00,1.00] | 1.00 | [1.00,1.00] | 1.00 | [1.00,1.00] | 1.00 | [1.00,1.00] |
| Yes | 1.18*** | [1.13,1.23] | 1.23*** | [1.18,1.29] | 1.06 | [0.99,1.13] | 0.81*** | [0.77,0.85] |
| Health Clinic Visit | | | | | | | | |
| No | 1.00 | [1.00,1.00] | 1.00 | [1.00,1.00] | 1.00 | [1.00,1.00] | 1.00 | [1.00,1.00] |
| Yes | 1.33*** | [1.29,1.37] | 1.37*** | [1.33,1.42] | 1.18*** | [1.12,1.24] | 0.84*** | [0.80,0.87] |
| Money Barrier | | | | | | | | |
| Not a Big Problem | 1.00 | [1.00,1.00] | 1.00 | [1.00,1.00] | 1.00 | [1.00,1.00] | 1.00 | [1.00,1.00] |
| Big Problem | 0.88*** | [0.85,0.91] | 0.87*** | [0.84,0.90] | 0.94* | [0.89,0.99] | 1.08*** | [1.04,1.14] |
| Distance Barrier | | | | | | | | |
| Not a Big Problem | 1.00 | [1.00,1.00] | 1.00 | [1.00,1.00] | 1.00 | [1.00,1.00] | 1.00 | [1.00,1.00] |
| Big Problem | 0.90*** | [0.87,0.93] | 0.91*** | [0.88,0.95] | 0.87*** | [0.82,0.93] | 1.09*** | [1.04,1.14] |
| Country | | | | | | | | |
| Indonesia | 1.00 | [1.00,1.00] | 1.00 | [1.00,1.00] | 1.00 | [1.00,1.00] | 1.00 | [1.00,1.00] |
| Cambodia | 0.75*** | [0.71,0.79] | 0.51*** | [0.48,0.54] | 3.88*** | [3.58,4.20] | 1.88*** | [1.75,2.03] |
| Nepal | 0.52*** | [0.48,0.56] | 0.36*** | [0.32,0.39] | 2.55*** | [2.26,2.88] | 4.30*** | [3.92,4.71] |
| Philippines | 0.65*** | [0.62,0.68] | 0.45*** | [0.42,0.47] | 2.51*** | [2.32,2.72] | 2.17*** | [2.02,2.33] |
| Timor Leste | 0.21*** | [0.19,0.23] | 0.20*** | [0.18,0.21] | 0.19*** | [0.15,0.25] | 6.00*** | [5.41,6.64] |

Exponentiated coefficients; 95% confidence intervals in brackets

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$




Figure 1: Predicted Probability of Contraception Use, Modern Contraception Use, Traditional Contraception Use, and Unmet Need. Estimated by a three-way interaction between Motorcycle Ownership, Residence, and Number of Living Children. Figures were created in R with the ggplot2 package.

389 Discussion

390 Our results are consistent with the premise that motorcycles facilitate contraception use
391 among women living in resource-limited countries in South and Southeast Asia and thereby
392 contribute to decreases in fertility. This relationship is contextualized by whether a woman
393 lives in an urban or rural setting and the number of children already present in their house-
394 hold; i.e., the observed associations between motorcycle ownership and various indicators of
395 contraception use are strongest in rural locations and increase in magnitude with increases
396 in the number of living children. These relationships are generally robust to adjusting for
397 additional control variables; however, in urban areas, the degree to which motorcycles are
398 associated with contraception use diminishes after accounting for other factors. It's note-
399 worthy to highlight that contraception use appears to have a curvilinear relationship with
400 women's age as its use declines as women age regardless of residence location, access to a
401 motorcycle, or the number of children present in the household, supporting the premise that
402 a life course perspective adds clarity to patterns of contraception use over time.

403 In proposing that motorcycle access is associated with an increased probability of contra-
404 ception use and thereby negatively associated with fertility, we presented an argument that
405 motorcycles create opportunity costs to fertility through increasing an individual's ability
406 to access scarce resources such as education and labor market opportunities as well as fa-
407 cilitating the diffusion of new ideas and information—particularly in circumstances in which
408 such opportunities are located beyond an individual's local community. Our results are
409 consistent with these pathways functioning as potential mechanisms—including variables re-
410 lated to these pathways attenuated the strength of the association between motorcycles and
411 contraception, but did not eliminate it. Importantly, our results are robust to controlling
412 for household-level wealth. This suggests that motorcycle access functions beyond that of
413 a proxy for household- or individual-level economic privilege. We further predicted that
414 spatial inequalities associated with rural residence will negatively affect contraception use.
415 Results are consistent with this hypothesis—the relationship between rural residence and

416 contraception use was negative and generally robust to adjusting for additional variables.
417 However, the relationship between rural residence and contraception use does diminish after
418 controlling for indicators of socioeconomic status, education, and/or employment, suggesting
419 that differences in wealth, education, and employment account for part of this relationship.
420 This is consistent with the hypothesis that a distinguishing characteristic of rural vs. urban
421 residence is that of spatial inequality. It is of interest, however, that while the rural penalty
422 diminishes, motorcycle ownership remained a powerful indicator of increased probability of
423 contraception use even after adjusting for these control variables.

424 While the results support our premise concerning the relationship between contraception
425 use and access to a motorcycle, there are limitations. The largest limitation is the power of
426 our data. While DHS data is well adapted for cross-country comparison as it is collected in
427 different countries using comparable instruments, this data is cross-sectional at the individual
428 level and thus poses limitations for time-sensitive analyses of relationships between variables.
429 This limits the power of our models in testing causal mechanisms; thus, while we argue with
430 confidence that the models represent relationships of association, we are limited in our ability
431 to argue for relationships of causality. In addition, not all of the indicators included were ideal
432 for the concepts we wanted to control for, rather, they were the best approximation available.
433 Future research should further explore these relationships using longitudinal data with more
434 precise indicators to address these limitations, even if such data is available for only specific
435 countries. Despite these limitations, we believe that these analyses were conducted with
436 the best data available for cross-country analysis of trends in several of the resource-limited
437 countries of Southeast Asia.

438 The innovative contribution of the research presented in this article is the synthesis of
439 several premises in making the argument that motorcycles potentially facilitate fertility tran-
440 sitions in resource-limited countries through increasing access to knowledge, labor markets
441 and contraception. Individually, these core premises are not novel. What is novel, is the
442 synthesis of these ideas in arguing that a previously neglected technology, a motorcycle in

443 South or Southeast Asia, has the ability to help disadvantaged women living in rural regions
444 cross spatial divides and thereby increase their probability of using contraception and gain
445 increased control over their fertility. As such, it joins the list of other “Distance Demolishing
446 Technologies” (Scott 2009) such as cell phones and the internet that help individuals and
447 their communities to overcome social and economic isolation. We anticipate that these tech-
448 nologies help individuals overcome isolation beyond the rural/urban divide. Furthermore, in
449 as much as these technologies empower individuals to overcome social and geographic isola-
450 tion, they likely function as indicators of social mobility, individual autonomy, and may even
451 influence individuals’ experience of community. Research examining these would endeavor
452 to answer the call for research investigating “innovative and infrequently used measures” to
453 understand women’s empowerment (Upadhyay et al. 2014).

454 **Ethics Statement**

455 As a secondary analysis of de-identified data that are publicly available from the Demo-
456 graphic Health Surveys, this article was deemed exempt from human subjects review.

References

- 457
- 458 Agyei, W. K. and Migadde, M. (1995). Demographic and sociocultural factors influencing
459 contraceptive use in uganda. *Journal of Biosocial Science*, 27(01):47–60.
- 460 Amin, R., Mariam, A., and Faruquee, R. (1987). Trends and differentials in knowledge, ever
461 use, current use, and future intended use of contraceptives in rural bangladesh: Evidence
462 from three surveys. *The Pakistan Development Review*, pages 201–214.
- 463 Anik, A. I., Islam, M. R., and Rahman, M. S. (2022). Association between socioeconomic
464 factors and unmet need for modern contraception among the young married women: A
465 comparative study across the low-and lower-middle-income countries of asia and sub-
466 saharan africa. *PLOS Global Public Health*, 2(7):e0000731.
- 467 Attané, I. (2002). A Half Century of Chinese Socialism: The Changing Fortunes of Peasant
468 Families. *Journal of Family History*, 27(2):150–171.
- 469 Axinn, W. G. and Barber, J. S. (2001). Mass Education and Fertility Transition. *American*
470 *Sociological Review*, 66(4):481–505.
- 471 Axinn, W. G. and Yabiku, S. T. (2001). Social Change, the Social Organization of Families,
472 and Fertility Limitation. *American Journal of Sociology*, 106(5):1219–1261.
- 473 Barber, J. S. (2004). Community Social Context and Individualistic Attitudes Toward Mar-
474 riage. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 67(3):236–256.
- 475 Barber, J. S. and Axinn, W. G. (2004). New ideas and fertility limitation: The role of mass
476 media. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66(5):1180–1200.
- 477 Barro, R. J. and Becker, G. S. (1989). Fertility Choice in a Model of Economic Growth.
478 *Econometrica*, 57(2):481–501.

- 479 Baschieri, A. and Falkingham, J. (2009). Staying in school: assessing the role of access,
480 availability, and economic opportunities - the case of Tajikistan. *Population, Space and*
481 *Place*, 15(3):205–224.
- 482 Becker, G. S. (1960). An economic analysis of fertility. In *Demographic and economic change*
483 *in developed countries*, pages 209–240. Columbia University Press.
- 484 Becker, G. S. and Lewis, H. G. (1973). On the Interaction between the Quantity and Quality
485 of Children. *Journal of Political Economy*, 81(2):S279–S288.
- 486 Bongaarts, J. (1978). A Framework for Analyzing the Proximate Determinants of Fertility.
487 *Population and Development Review*, 4(1):105–132.
- 488 Bongaarts, J. and Bruce, J. (1995). The causes of unmet need for contraception and the
489 social content of services. *Studies in Family Planning*, 26(2):57–75.
- 490 Bongaarts, J. and Casterline, J. B. (2018). From fertility preferences to reproductive out-
491 comes in the developing world. *Population and development review*, pages 793–809.
- 492 Bongaarts, J. and Watkins, S. C. (1996). Social Interactions and Contemporary Fertility
493 Transitions. *Population and Development Review*, 22(4):639–682.
- 494 Brewster, K. L. and Rindfuss, R. R. (2000). Fertility and Women’s Employment in Indus-
495 trialized Nations. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26(1):271–296.
- 496 Caldwell, J. C. (1982). *Theory of fertility decline*. Academic Press.
- 497 Cloud, K. and Garrett, N. (1996). A modest proposal for inclusion of women’s household
498 human capital production in analysis of structural transformation. *Feminist Economics*,
499 2(3):93–119.
- 500 Coale, A. (1973). The demographic transition reconsidered. In *Proceedings of the Interna-*
501 *tional Population Conference*, volume 1.

- 502 Coale, A. J. and Watkins, S. C. (1986). *The decline of fertility in Europe*. Princeton
503 University Press.
- 504 Cooley, C. H. (1894). The Theory of Transportation. *Publications of the American Economic*
505 *Association*, 9(3):13–148.
- 506 Davis, K. (1963). The theory of change and response in modern demographic history. *Pop-*
507 *ulation index*, 29(4):345–366.
- 508 De Koninck, R. (2000). The theory and practice of frontier development: Vietnam’s contri-
509 bution. *Asia Pacific Viewpoint*, 41(1):7–21.
- 510 Dharmalingam, A. and Morgan, S. P. (1996). Women’s Work, Autonomy, and Birth Control:
511 Evidence From Two South India Villages. *Population Studies*, 50(2):187–201.
- 512 Docquier, F. (2004). Income Distribution, Non-convexities and the Fertility–Income Rela-
513 tionship. *Economica*, 71(282):261–273.
- 514 Easterlin, R. A. (1975). An Economic Framework for Fertility Analysis. *Studies in Family*
515 *Planning*, 6(3):54–63.
- 516 Ekert-Jaffé, O. (1986). Effets et limites des aides financières aux familles: Une expérience et
517 un modèle. *Population (French Edition)*, pages 327–348.
- 518 Ekert-Jaffe, O. and Stier, H. (2009). Normative or economic behavior? Fertility and women’s
519 employment in Israel. *Social Science Research*, 38(3):644–655.
- 520 Feyisetan, B. and Casterline, J. B. (2000). Fertility preferences and contraceptive change in
521 developing countries. *International Family Planning Perspectives*, pages 100–109.
- 522 Gakidou, E. and Vayena, E. (2007). Use of modern contraception by the poor is falling
523 behind. *PLoS medicine*, 4(2):e31.

- 524 Gottdiener, M. and Hutchison, R. (2010). *The New Urban Sociology: Fourth Edition*. West-
525 view Press, fourth edition edition.
- 526 Hakim, C. (2003). A new approach to explaining fertility patterns: Preference theory.
527 *Population and development review*, 29(3):349–374.
- 528 Hirschman, C. (1994). Why Fertility Changes. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 20:203–233.
- 529 Homan, G. F., Davies, M., and Norman, R. (2007). The impact of lifestyle factors on repro-
530 ductive performance in the general population and those undergoing infertility treatment:
531 a review. *Human Reproduction Update*, 13(3):209–223.
- 532 Hsu, T.-P., Tsai, C.-C., and Lin, Y.-J. (2007). Comparative analysis of household car and
533 motorcycle ownership characteristics. *Journal of the Eastern Asia Society for Transporta-
534 tion Studies*, 7:105–115.
- 535 Jayachandran, S. (2021). Social norms as a barrier to women’s employment in developing
536 countries. *IMF Economic Review*, 69(3):576–595.
- 537 Knodel, J., Havanon, N., and Pramualratana, A. (1984). Fertility transition in Thailand: A
538 qualitative analysis. *Population and Development Review*, pages 297–328.
- 539 Knodel, J. and Walle, E. v. d. (1979). Lessons from the Past: Policy Implications of Historical
540 Fertility Studies. *Population and Development Review*, 5(2):217–245.
- 541 Korinek, K., Chen, F., Alva, S., and Entwisle, B. (2006). Household Economic Transforma-
542 tion and Recent Fertility in Emerging Market Economies: China and Vietnam Compared.
543 *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 37:191–234.
- 544 Korinek, K., Entwisle, B., and Jampaklay, A. (2005). Through thick and thin: layers of
545 social ties and urban settlement among Thai migrants. *American Sociological Review*,
546 70(5):779–800.

- 547 Kravdal, Ø. (1994). The importance of economic activity, economic potential and economic
548 resources for the timing of first births in Norway. *Population Studies*, 48(2):249–267.
- 549 Kunstadter, P. (2000). Changing patterns of economics among Hmong in Northern Thailand
550 1960–1990. *Turbulent times and enduring peoples; Mountain minorities in the South-East
551 Asian Massif*, pages 167–92.
- 552 Lawson, D. W. and Borgerhoff Mulder, M. (2016). The offspring quantity–quality trade-off
553 and human fertility variation. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological
554 Sciences*, 371(1692):20150145.
- 555 Leinbach, T. R. (1983). Rural Transport and Population Mobility in Indonesia. *The Journal
556 of Developing Areas*, 17(3):349–364.
- 557 Leinbach, T. R. (2000). Mobility in development context: changing perspectives, new inter-
558 pretations, and the real issues. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 8(1):1–9.
- 559 Lenski, G. E. (1984). *Power and Privilege: A Theory of Social Stratification*. The University
560 of North Carolina Press.
- 561 Lobao, L. M., Hooks, G., and Tickamyer, A. R., editors (2007). *The Sociology of Spatial
562 Inequality*. State University of New York Press, 1 edition.
- 563 McMichael, P. (2011). *Development and Social Change: A Global Perspective*. SAGE Pub-
564 lications, Inc, fifth edition edition.
- 565 Morgan, S. P. and Hagewen, K. J. (2006). Fertility. In Poston, D. L. and Micklin, M., editors,
566 *Handbook of Population*, pages 229–249. Kluwer Academic Publishers-Plenum Publishers,
567 New York.
- 568 Moursund, A. and Kravdal, Ø. (2003). Individual and community effects of women’s educa-
569 tion and autonomy on contraceptive use in India. *Population Studies*, 57(3):285–301.

- 570 Muir, J. A. (2012). *Indicators of fertility change in a developing nation: examining the*
571 *impact of motorcycles as a distance demolishing technology on fertility change in rural*
572 *Indonesia*. Brigham Young University.
- 573 Muir, J. A. (2018). Another mhealth? examining motorcycles as a distance demolishing
574 determinant of health care access in south and southeast asia. *Journal of Transport &*
575 *Health*, 11:153–166.
- 576 Notestein, F. W. (1945). Population: the long view. *Schultz TW, ed. Food for the world*.
- 577 Notestein, F. W. (1953). *Economic problems of population change*. Oxford University Press.
- 578 Olsson, J. (2009). Improved road accessibility and indirect development effects: evidence
579 from rural Philippines. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 17(6):476–483.
- 580 Owen, W. (1987). *Transportation and World Development: Mobility and the Global Econ-*
581 *omy*. The Johns Hopkins University Press, first edition edition.
- 582 Pebley, A. R. and Sastry, N. (2004). Neighborhoods, poverty, and children’s well-being.
583 *Social inequality*, pages 119–145.
- 584 Phillips, J. F., Simmons, R., Koenig, M. A., and Chakraborty, J. (1988). Determinants of
585 reproductive change in a traditional society: evidence from Matlab, Bangladesh. *Studies*
586 *in Family Planning*, 19(6):313–334.
- 587 Replogle, M. A. (1991). *Sustainable transportation strategies for third-world development*.
588 Number 1294.
- 589 Rigg, J. (2002). Roads, marketization and social exclusion in Southeast Asia: What do roads
590 do to people? *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land-en Volkenkunde*, 158(4):619–636.
- 591 Rindfuss, R. R., Guilkey, D. K., Entwisle, B., Chamrathirong, A., and Sawangdee, Y.
592 (1996). The Family Building Life Course and Contraceptive Use: Nang Rong, Thailand.
593 *Population Research and Policy Review*, 15(4):341–368.

- 594 Sanders, S. R., Muir, J. A., and Brown, R. B. (2018). Overcoming geographic penalties
595 of inequality: The effects of distance-demolishing technologies on household well-being in
596 vietnam. *Asian Journal of Social Science*, 46(3):260–280.
- 597 Scott, J. C. (2009). *The Art of Not Being Governed: An Anarchist History of Upland*
598 *Southeast Asia*. Yale University Press.
- 599 Sitruk-Ware, R. (2006). Contraception: an international perspective. *Contraception*,
600 73(3):215–222.
- 601 Sitruk-Ware, R., Nath, A., and Mishell, D. R. (2013). Contraception technology: past,
602 present and future. *Contraception*, 87(3):319–330.
- 603 Smith, N. (2008). *Uneven Development: Nature, Capital, and the Production of Space*.
604 University of Georgia Press, 3rd edition.
- 605 Spain, D. and Bianchi, S. M. (1996). *Balancing act: Motherhood, marriage, and employment*
606 *among American women*. Russell Sage Foundation Publications.
- 607 Stanford, J. L., Hartge, P., Brinton, L. A., Hoover, R. N., and Brookmeyer, R. (1987). Factors
608 influencing the age at natural menopause. *Journal of chronic diseases*, 40(11):995–1002.
- 609 Townsend, J. W., Sitruk-Ware, R., Williams, K., Askew, I., and Brill, K. (2011). New
610 strategies for providing hormonal contraception in developing countries. *Contraception*,
611 83(5):405–409.
- 612 Upadhyay, U. D., Gipson, J. D., Withers, M., Lewis, S., Ciaraldi, E. J., Fraser, A., Huchko,
613 M. J., and Prata, N. (2014). Women’s empowerment and fertility: a review of the litera-
614 ture. *Social science & medicine*, 115:111–120.
- 615 Zacharias, L. and Wurtman, R. J. (1969). Age at menarche. *N Engl J Med*, 280((16)):868–75.
- 616 Zakharenko, R. (2010). Children Versus Ideas: An ‘Influential’ Theory of Demographic Tran-
617 sition. *Available at SSRN 1391753*.