

Levels of Person Centered Antenatal Care among Pregnant Women in Public and Private Health Facilities in Western Hararghe Zone, Ethiopia: An Institution Based Comparative Mixed Method Study Design

Habtamu Solomon Demeke^{1*}, Girmatsion Fisseha², Kidanu Gebremariam³

Affiliations

1. Department of Public Health, College of Medical and Health Sciences, Samara University, P.O. Box. 132, Samara, Afar Region, Ethiopia.
2. Department of Reproductive Health, School of Public Health, College of Health Sciences, Mekelle University, P.O. Box. 231, Mekelle, Tigray Region, Ethiopia.
3. Department of Epidemiology, School of Public Health, College of Health Sciences, Mekelle University, P.O. Box. 231, Mekelle, Tigray Region, Ethiopia

* For correspondence author

Email address of authors:

HS: habtamusolomon108@gmail.com

GF: girmaf4@gmail.com

KG: kidanumeles2008@gmail.com

Abstract

Background

Person-centered Antenatal Care (PCANC) is a component of quality care that is essential to enable maximize health outcomes. It is believed to be one of the reasons why private health facilities have higher quality than public health facilities. However, in Ethiopia, there is a little study that assesses and compares the level of person-centered antenatal care among pregnant women in public and private health facilities.

Objectives: To assess and compare the level of person-centered antenatal care among pregnant women attending antenatal care in public and private health facilities in the Western Hararghe zone, Oromia region, Ethiopia, 2020.

Methods: -An Institution Based Comparative Mixed Method Study Design was conducted among pregnant women in the Western Hararghe zone, Ethiopia from September 01-October 02, 2020. A multistage stage sampling technique was used to obtain 340 pregnant women (170 from public facilities and 170 from private facilities). The data were entered into Epi-data version 4.4 and analyzed using SPSS version 27. A comparison of categorical and continuous variables was done using an independent t-test and Chi-square test respectively. All comparisons were considered to be significant at a p-value of ≤ 0.05 . Qualitative data was analyzed by manually.

Results: The overall PCANC percentage mean score was significantly higher in private health facilities (73.7%; 95% CI: 70.5–77.1%) compared to public facilities (59.7%; 95% CI: 56.05–63.5%) ($P < 0.001$). Private facilities had higher percentage mean score than public ones in effective communication (71.4% vs. 56.3%), respect and dignity (85.2% vs. 71.2%), and supportive care (70.1% vs. 59.2%). Qualitative findings further highlighted better interpersonal communication in private facilities.

Conclusion: This study highlights significant disparities in the PCANC between private and public health facilities, with private facilities better in effective communication, respect, dignity, and supportive care. Qualitative findings further underscore better interpersonal communication in private settings. Addressing the disparities in person-centered antenatal care between private and public health facilities is crucial to achieve equity and quality of antenatal care.

Keywords: Person centered care, antenatal care, pregnant women, private health facilities, public health facilities, Ethiopia

Key messages of the article

What is already known on this topic:

Person Centered Antenatal Care (PCANC) is critical for ensuring the quality maternal health services. However, disparities in the quality of care contribute to inequities in maternal health outcomes.

What this study adds:

This is the first study to assess and compare the level of PCANC in private and public health facilities in Ethiopia using the WHO Quality Framework on Maternal and Newborn Care. The study reveals significant inequities in PCANC with private facilities scoring substantially higher in effective communication, respect and dignity, and supportive care compared to public facilities.

How this study might affect research, practice, or policy:

The findings emphasize the urgent need to address inequities in antenatal care by strengthening Person-Centered care in public health facilities. The findings highlight the need for targeted strategies that enhance communication, respect, and supportive care to ensure equitable and quality antenatal care. Policymakers and health system planners should leverage the WHO framework to implement targeted interventions aimed at improving equity and quality in maternal care services.

Introduction

Person-centered care (PCC) is care that is respectful and responsive to individual patient preferences, needs, and values, and ensures that patient values guide all clinical decisions¹. Even though the term person-centered care has been frequently used in the literature and lacks universal consensus in its definition, this term is used interchangeably with woman-centered care (WCC), respectful maternity care (RMC), patient-centered care (PCC), and client-centered care²⁻⁷. The term person-centered care (PCC) is described as the most inclusive term and the most frequently used term in the literature^{3 8-10}. The concepts of person-centered maternity care (PCMC) apply to person-centered antenatal care (PCAC) since antenatal care is one of the key elements of maternity care^{11 12}.

Adapted from the definition by the Person-Centered Care Framework, Person-centered antenatal care (PCANC) refers to providing antenatal care that is respectful of and responsive to individual women and their families' preferences, needs, and values, and ensuring that their values guide all clinical decisions. It is human rights and is a key domain of quality of care that captures women's experience of care¹³. Domains of PCANC include dignity and respect, communication and autonomy, and supportive care, which capture the experience-of-care dimensions in the WHO quality of care framework for maternal and newborn health, and in WHO recommendations for a positive pregnancy experience^{14 15}. These experience dimensions assess person-centered antenatal care (PCANC). A Positive experience during pregnancy is paramount to person-centered care and the human rights of every childbearing woman. In the era of sustainable development goal (SDG), the person-centered antenatal care that brought positive pregnancy experience is so central to achieving the vision to reduce maternal deaths to less than 70 per 100 000 live births by 2030¹⁶.

Person-centered antenatal care is a critical component of quality care to enable treatment adherence and maximize health outcomes¹⁷. PCANC has been flagged as a potential strategy for reducing preventable maternal mortality and morbidity to accelerate progress towards meeting the SDG targets for improving maternal and newborn health and a critical component in the continuum of care^{14 18}. PCANC is associated with higher patient satisfaction, earlier presentation for care, improved adherence to post-care treatment, lower healthcare costs having an effective transition to positive labor and birth, and achieving positive motherhood¹⁹⁻²¹. Poor person-centered care is a driving factor for high maternal mortality, newborn complications, and low rates of facility-based deliveries^{14 22}.

The vast majority of the maternal deaths (94%) occurred in low- and middle-income countries whereby most of these maternal deaths could have been prevented if the women or adolescent girls had been able to obtain person-centered care during pregnancy. Sixty per cent of the stillbirths (1.46 million) occurred during the antepartum period and were mainly attributed to untreated maternal infection, hypertension, and poor fetal growth^{19 23}. If person-centered antenatal care is poor, the women will not attend ANC, irrespective of the number of recommended contacts in the ANC model.

Improving disparities in person-centered antenatal care in public and private health facilities is critical in attaining health equity and the SDG commitment that “no woman is left behind”^{12 24}. Person-centered care is believed to be one of the key reasons why private facilities have higher person-centered maternity scores than public health facilities¹⁷. A study conducted in Kenya revealed that the quality of ANC is suboptimal in a dimension of the experience of care whereby those who received care in private facilities had higher experience scores than those who received care in public hospitals PCMC is higher in lower-level and private facilities¹². A study conducted in Ethiopia showed that those who received maternity care at private health institutions had significantly higher person-centered maternity care scores when compared with respondents who gave birth in public health institutions^{25 26}.

Despite a paradigm shift at the global level toward person-centered maternity care, assessing person-centered antenatal care has received far less attention^{23 27}. However, some of the studies have focused on person-centered maternity care during childbirth^{25 28}. Very few studies have sought to assess person-centered antenatal care during pregnancy. Moreover, most prior studies on antenatal care have emphasized the service provision dimensions of quality of care by neglecting person-centered antenatal care which captures women’s experience of care during pregnancy²⁹⁻³³. However, little has been said about person-centered antenatal care in public and private health facilities in Ethiopia in general and in West Hararghe. Therefore, the objective of this study was to assess and compare the level of person-centered antenatal care in public and private health facilities in the western Hararghe zone of Ethiopia, 2020.

Methods

Study area and period

The study was conducted in the West Hararghe Zone, which lies in the South East part of Ethiopia sharing boundaries with Somali and Afar Regional State to the North, with Bale Zone to the South, East Hararghe Zone to the East, and Arsi Zone and East Showa Zone to the west. West Hararghe Zone is one of the 12 zones in Oromia Regional State. It covers an area of 17,779.4 Km². Available information from the zonal health office shows that the total population of the zone is estimated to be 2,435,350 of which, 2,175,785 (90%) is rural and the remaining 259,565 (10%) is urban. West Hararghe Zone is subdivided into 17 districts whereby there are 11 rural districts of agricultural, 4 rural districts of pastoralist, and 2 urban towns. According to the 2020 zonal health office, the health system of the zone consists of two general hospitals, three primary hospitals, eighty-five health centers, four hundred eighty-two health post facilities, and 25 private clinics. The study was conducted from September 01–October 02, 2020.

Study Design

An institution-based comparative cross-sectional study triangulated with a qualitative study was used to compare the level of Person-Centered Antenatal care among pregnant women attending antenatal care in public and private health facilities from September 01 –October 02, 2020.

Study population

Quantitative part: - All pregnant women who were attending antenatal care in each of the selected public and private health facilities from September 01–October 02, 2020.

For qualitative part

Purposively selected antenatal care providers and antenatal care service users among randomly selected women for exit interviews in public and private health facilities of West Hararghe Zone to assess interpersonal communication attributes of person-centered antenatal care from September 01 –October 02, 2020

Inclusion criteria

Pregnant women attending antenatal care in the current facility

Exclusion criteria

Women who had lived less than six months in Kebele were severely ill and unable to speak, and those with psychiatric problems, and women who transferred from another health facility to continue their ANC contact were excluded.

Sample size determination and procedure

The sample size was calculated by using the following double population proportion formula and the Epi Info version TM 7 software. Using the magnitude of respectful maternity care (P1= 58.1% and P2= 58.1%) from a similar study conducted in Harar, Eastern Ethiopia, with the assumption of 95% Confidence interval, 80% power, design effect of 2 and by adding a 5% non-response rate ²⁶. The final sample size estimated was 340, where n1=170 & n2=170.

A multi-stage sampling technique was used; first, seven districts were selected among seventeen districts in the Zone by simple random sampling technique of balloting. The selected districts were Chiro, Hirna, Mieso, Bedessa, Asabot, Mechara, and Gelemso town. Seven health facilities were selected from 14 public health facilities and 7 health facilities from 12 private health facilities were selected using the simple random method from seven districts after identifying public and private health facilities rendering maternity services in seven selected districts. Finally, proportionally allocated sample sizes were made for each selected health facility based on the total number monthly of ANC users in the most recent quarterly report in the selected facility. Individual subjects were selected by systematic random sampling. The K value was calculated by dividing the average monthly ANC attendees by the total sample size of private and public health facilities. That was $K=567/170$ or 3 for public health facilities and $K= 447/170=3$ for private health facilities. This interval was used in private and public health facilities separately to select study subjects by systematic random sampling until the required sample size at each health facility based on the order of ANC clients coming to the health facilities. The starting point was a number between 1 and 3 that was selected randomly, which were 2 for both private and public health facilities.

Qualitative part

Interpersonal communication attributes of quality of ANC

One out of three study respondents eligible for client exit interviews was observed by purposive random sampling.

Measurements

Study Variables: Person-Centered Antenatal Care

The PCANC was measured using the PCANC scale which has three domains: effective communication, dignity and respect, autonomy, and supportive care with 6 items of binary response (Yes/No) and 26 items that have a four-point response scale. i.e. 0 (“no, never”), 1 (“yes, a few times”), 2 (“yes, most of the time”) and 3 (“yes, all the time”), and with negative

items reverse coded (i.e. questions that were framed negatively, such as the physical, verbal abuse, waiting time, unofficial cost, etc. had to be recorded so that high numbers represent good care. Responses that were recorded as “not applicable” were considered as a missing value. To be consistent with variables with binary responses, we recorded the PCANC variables from a four-point frequency responses scale to binary responses, coding “no, never and a few times” together and “yes, most of the time and all the time” together. As a result, the scale score ranges from **0 to 32**³⁴.

Effective Communication scale

Measured using nineteen items with each item has a binary point response scale; i.e. after recoding the PCANC variables from a four-point frequency responses scale to binary responses, 0 (“never or a few times”), 1 (“most of the time or all of the time), so, the total score ranges from 0 to 19³⁴.

Dignity and respect scale

Measured using Six items with a binary point scale; i.e., 0 (“never or a few times”), 1 (“most of the time or all of the time), was used to measure dignity and respect. So, the total score ranges from 0 to 6³⁴.

Supportive care scale

Measured using seven items with each item has a binary point scale; i.e. 0 (“never or a few times”), 1 (“most of the time or all of the time), so, the total score ranges from 0 to 7³⁴.

Socio-demographic variables

Socio-demographic variables of the women include age, residency, educational status, partner’s level of education, religion, marital status, occupation, monthly income, ethnicity, level of participation in household decision-making, domestic violence, self or household member in the facility.

Qualitative Part

Interpersonal communication attributes of Person-Centered Antenatal Care

It includes items related to effective communication with women about the care provided, their; care with respect and preservation of dignity; and access to support care^{18 35}.

Data collection tool and procedures

Quantitative Data were collected through client exit interviews by using a pre-tested structured Local Afan Oromo version questionnaire. The study used a standard validated tool adapted from a person-centered maternity care scale developed in Kenya with Cronbach’s

alpha of 0.86³⁴. The other included questions in the questionnaire were prepared by reviewing different works of literature¹². The questionnaire in the English and local Afan Oromo versions is available in [Supplementary File 1](#) and [Supplementary File 2](#) respectively.

Qualitative data were collected using a semi-structured observation checklist to assess interpersonal attributes of antenatal care as per the WHO quality framework and after reviewing the literature^{18 35}. The questionnaire was first developed in English and translated into the local language Afan Oromo and re-translated back into English by blind translators to ensure its consistency. Data collectors were ten health science University students residing where the study takes place. The training was given to collectors for two days before the normal data collection time, a pretest was conducted using a 5% (17) sample size on a non-selected health facility (Micheta Health Center) and the necessary correction was made accordingly.

All respondents were informed about the purpose of the study, and their written consent was obtained. The respondents' right to refuse or withdraw from participating in the interview was fully maintained and the information provided by each respondent was kept strictly confidential. For the qualitative part, the investigator who did not participate in the caregiving process observed the provider interaction to assess interpersonal communication attributes of the person-centered antenatal care. Qualitative data was collected and analyzed by the primary investigator. For the observation part of the qualitative study, client-provider interactions on the first three observations were not considered for analysis before actual data collection to minimize the Hawthorne effect. Finally, qualitative findings were categorized to triangulate the quantitative findings.

Internal reliability for this study was checked by calculating Cronbach's alpha for each of the domains. The PCANC scale used in this study had a maximum possible score of 32. These items were grouped into three domains per WHO's latest quality framework, comprising effective communication, respect and dignity, and supportive care domains. These subscales have maximum possible scores of 19, 6, and 7 respectively. The Cronbach alpha for the overall PCANC scale was 0.931. For the sub-scale, the reliability test conducted shows that the effective communication scale, respect and dignity scale, and supportive care scale had Cronbach alpha values of 0.889, 0.662 and 0.754 respectively.

Data processing and analysis

Data were checked for completeness and consistency, and then coded and entered into Epi. Info version TM 7 software and exported to SPSS version 27 software package for analysis. A comparison of independent categorical variables was done using the Chi-square test while an independent t-test was used for continuous variables. All comparisons were considered to be significant at a p-value of ≤ 0.05 . The descriptive data were analyzed using frequency distribution, percentages, and cross-tabulation. For qualitative data, descriptive qualitative analysis was made manually. Finally, the findings were compiled and presented using tables, graphs, figures, and texts.

Patient and public involvement

Patients and /or the public were not involved in the design, conduct, reporting and dissemination of this study.

Results

Socio-Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

In this study, a total of 340 women were involved for the study, one hundred seventy from each facility with a response rate of 100%. The details are shown in **Table 1** below.

Table 1 Socio-demographic characteristics of respondents in private and public health facilities in West Hararge zone, Oromia, Eastern Ethiopia, 2020 (n = 340)

Variables	Category	Private	Public	X ² (P -value)
Age	Below 19	11(6.5%)	10 (5.9%)	1.93 (0.75)
	20-24	37 (21.8%)	42 (24.7%)	
	25-29	78 (45.9%)	84 (49.4%)	
	30-34	38 (22.4%)	30 (17.6%)	
	above 35	6 (3.5%)	4 (2.4%)	
Religion	Orthodox	52 (30.6%)	57 (33.5%)	1.1 (0.9)
	Muslim	86 (50.6%)	84 (49.4%)	
	Protestant	23 (13.5%)	18 (10.6%)	
	Catholic	8 (4.7%)	10 (5.9%)	
	Other	1 (0.6%)	1 (0.6%)	
Place of residence	Urban	111 (65.3%)	66 (38.8%)	22.8 (0.00 [*])
	Rural	59 (34.7%)	104 (61.2%)	
Level of education	Illiterate	12 (7.1%)	25 (14.7%)	5.1 (0.02 [*])
	Literate	158 (92.9%)	145 (85.3%)	
Partner level of education	Illiterate	9 (5.3%)	33 (19.4%)	15.6 (0.00 [*])
	Literate	161 (94.7%)	137 (80.6%)	
Occupation	House wife	62 (36.5%)	75 (44.1%)	32.7(0.00 [*])
	Merchant	41 (24.1%)	35 (20.6%)	
	Government	41 (24.1%)	8 (4.7%)	
	Farmer	16 (9.4%)	34 (20.0%)	
	Other	10 (5.9%)	18 (10.6%)	
Marital status	Married	169 (99.4%)	170 (100.0%)	1.000
	Other	1 (0.6%)	0 (0.0%)	
Ethnicity	Oromo	124 (72.9%)	139 (81.8%)	5.94 (0.11)
	Amhara	30 (17.1%)	16 (9.4%)	
	Somale	4 (2.9%)	6 (3.5%)	
	Gurage	12 (7.1%)	9 (5.3%)	
Monthly income	≤3000	69 (40.6%)	106 (62.4%)	15.3 (0.00 [*])
	>3000	101 (59.4%)	64 (37.6%)	
Self or household member	Yes	11 (6.5%)	13 (7.6%)	0.04 (0.83)
	No	159 (93.5%)	157 (92.4%)	
Domestic Violence	Yes	49 (28.8%)	76 (44.7%)	8.55(0.03 [*])
	No	121 (71.2%)	94 (55.3%)	
Participation in household	Low	59 (34.7%)	92 (54.1%)	12.2(0.00 [*])
	High	111 (65.3%)	78 (45.9%)	

Level of Person-Centered Antenatal Care

The mean PCANC scale of the respondents in both private and public health facilities was 21.34. In particular, the mean of overall PCANC scale of respondents in private health facilities was 23.58 compared to 19.11 for the respondents at public health facilities (P=0.001, t-test=5.38). Regarding the mean of PCANC subscales, the mean of effective communication subscale of the respondents in both private and public health facilities was 12.13. The mean of effective communication subscale of the respondents in private health facilities was 13.56 while those who had ANC contact at public health facilities had a mean score of 10.7 (P=0.000, t-test=5.52). The mean of respect and dignity subscale of the respondents in both private and public health facilities was 4.69. Specifically, the mean of respect and dignity subscale of the respondents in private health facilities was 5.11 while it was 4.27 for respondents at public health facilities (P=0.000, t-test=5.85). Furthermore, the mean of supportive scale of the respondents in both private and public health facilities was 4.53. The mean of supportive care subscale of the private clients was 4.91 while that of public clients was 4.15 (P=0.001, t-test=3.48).

Percentage Mean Score of overall Person-Centered Antenatal Care and its Domains score

The following formula was used to standardize the mean score;

$$\text{Percentage mean score} = \frac{\text{Actual score} - \text{potential minimum score}}{\text{Potential maximum score} - \text{potential minimum score}} \times 100\%$$

Based on this formula, the percentage mean score of overall PCANC and its domain score is presented in **Supplementary Figure 1**.

Distribution of Individual Person Centered Antenatal Care items among women in private and public health facilities.

Effective communication

Most of the respondents 124 (72.9%) who had antenatal contact at public health facilities reported that providers introduce themselves a few times or never while nearly half 84 (49.4%) of the respondents experienced the same at private health facilities (P=0.00). The majority of the respondents 156 (91.8%) at private health facilities were told about the signs of pregnancy complications compared to 123 (72.4%) of the respondents at public health facilities (P=0.000). About 96 (56.5%) of the women respondents at private health facilities understood the purposes of tests performed most or all of the time whereas at public health facilities, 103 (60.6%) of women understood the purposes of tests performed a few times or

never (P=0.002). The details of the distribution of effective communications domain are shown in [Table 2](#)

[Table 2 Distribution](#) of effective communications domain among women in private and public health facilities (n = 340), West Hararghe Zone, Ethiopia, 2020

Table 2 Distribution of effective communications domain among women in private and public health facilities (n = 340), West Hararghe Zone, Ethiopia, 2020

Effective communication sub-scale	Category			X ² (P value)
		Private	Public	
Introduce themselves	A few times or never	84 (49.4%)	124 (72.9%)	18.8 (0.00*)
	Most or all the time	86 (50.6%)	46 (27.1%)	
Healthcare providers call you by your name	A few times or never	50 (46.3%)	58 (53.7%)	0.66 (0.4)
	Most or all the time	120 (51.7%)	112 (48.3%)	
A language you could understand	A few times or never	0 (0.0%)	8 (4.7%)	11.3 (0.007)
	Most or all the time	170 (100 %)	162 (95.3%)	
Told the results after weighing	A few times or never	43 (25.3%)	68 (40.0%)	7.7 (0.006)
	Most or all the time	127 (74.7%)	102 (60.0%)	
Told results after blood pressure measurements	A few times or never	58 (34.1%)	90 (52.9%)	11.5 (.001*)
	Most or all the time	112 (65.9%)	90 (47.1%)	
Told results after urine test	A few times or never	66 (38.8%)	111 (65.3%)	22.8 (0.00*)
	Most or all the time	104 (61.2%)	59 (34.7%)	
Told results after the blood test	A few times or never	59 (34.7%)	112 (65.9%)	31.8 (0.00*)
	Most or all the time	111 (65.3%)	58 (34.1%)	
Signs of pregnancy complications	No	14 (8.2%)	47 (27.6%)	20.5 (0.00*)
	Yes	156 (91.8%)	123 (72.4%)	
Told where to go in case of complications	No	22 (12.9%)	27 (15.9%)	0.38 (0.54)
	Yes	148 (87.1%)	143 (84.1%)	
Told what to expect during pregnancy and delivery	No	22 (12.9%)	42 (24.7%)	6.95 (0.008)
	Yes	148 (87.1%)	128 (75.3%)	
Birth preparedness	No	32 (18.8%)	62 (36.5%)	12.4 (0.00*)
	Yes	138 (81.2%)	108 (63.5%)	
Nutrition education	No	49 (28.8%)	66 (38.8%)	3.36 (0.07)
	Yes	121 (71.2%)	104 (61.2%)	
Breastfeeding education	No	55 (32.4%)	62 (36.5%)	0.47 (0.493)
	Yes	115 (67.6%)	108 (63.5%)	
Understood the purpose of tests	A few times or never	74 (43.5%)	103 (60.6%)	9.2 (0.002*)
	Most or all the time	96 (56.5%)	67 (39.4%)	
Understood the purpose of the medication	A few times or never	53 (31.2%)	79 (46.5%)	7.7 (0.005*)
	Most or all the time	117 (68.8%)	91 (53.5%)	
Felt able to ask any questions	A few times or never	67 (39.4%)	108 (63.5%)	18.8 (0.00*)
	Most or all the time	103 (60.6%)	62 (36.5%)	
Asked if she had any	A few times or never	94 (55.3%)	110 (64.7%)	2.76 (0.097)

questions	Most or all the time	76 (44.7%)	60 (35.3%)	
Explain examinations or procedures	A few times or never	73 (42.9%)	88 (51.8%)	2.3 (0.13)
	Most or all the time	97 (57.1%)	82 (48.2%)	
Position of choice for examination	A few times or never	16 (9.4%)	46 (27.1%)	16.6 (0.00*)
	Most or all the time	154 (90.6%)	124 (72.9%)	

Respect and dignity

About more than nine in ten (91.8%) of the respondents at private health facilities felt they were treated with respect most or all of the time while over two-thirds (67.6%) did experience the same for the women at public health facilities (P=0.00). One hundred forty (82.4%) of private clients reported they did not feel exposed most or all the time compared to more than two-thirds of public health facility clients 114 (67.1%) who didn't feel similar most or all the time (P=0.002). About 7 in 10 of the study subjects 120 (70.6%) at private health facilities felt that they could discuss issues in a private most or all of the time on the other hand more than half of the respondents 88 (51.8%) at private health facilities felt that they could discuss issues in a private a few times or never (P=0.000). The details are shown in **Table 3** below.

Table 3 Distribution of respect and dignity domain among women in private and public health facilities (n = 340), West Hararghe Zone, Oromia Region, Eastern Ethiopia, 2020

Respect and dignity sub-scale	Category	Private	Public	X ² (P value)
Treat you with respect	A few times or never	14 (8.2%)	55 (32.4%)	29.1 (0.00*)
	Most or all the time	156 (91.8%)	115 (67.6%)	
Treated friendly	A few times or never	50 (29.4%)	93 (54.7%)	21.2 (0.00*)
	Most or all the time	120 (70.6%)	77 (45.3%)	
Health providers shouted scolded, insulted, and threatened at you	Most or all the time	2 (1.2%)	0 (0.0%)	2.8 (0.5)
	A few times or never	168 (98.8%)	170 (100%)	
Treated roughly like pushed, beaten etc.	Most or all the time	5 (2.9%)	3 (1.8%)	0.52 (0.72)
	A few times or never	165 (97.1%)	167 (98.2%)	
Privacy	A few times or never	30 (17.6%)	56(32.9%)	9.73 (0.002*)
	Most or all the time	140 (82.4%)	114 (67.1%)	
Confidentiality	A few times or never	50 (29.4%)	88 (51.8%)	16.7 (0.00*)
	Most or all the time	120 (70.6%)	82(48.2%)	

Supportive care

About 110 (64.7%) of the respondents at private health facilities reported that providers talked to them about their feelings most or all of the time, whereas just half of the respondents 85 (50.0%) at public health facilities reported that providers talked to them about their feelings a few times or never (P=0.008). Nearly half of the private clients 83 (48.8%) reported that they were paid unofficial (additional cost) a few times or many times compared to only 14 (8.2%) of public clients reported that they paid similar a few times or many times (P= 0.00). About 127 (74.7%) of the respondents at private health facilities felt that the waiting time was somewhat short or somewhat short, in contrast to 100 (58.8%) of women who felt the waiting time was somewhat long or very long for the respondents at public health facilities (P= 0.00). The details are shown in [Table 4](#) below.

Table 4 Distribution of supportive care domain among women in private and public health facilities (n = 340), West Hararghe Zone, Oromia Region, Eastern Ethiopia, 2020

Supportive sub scale	Category	Private	Public	X ² (P value)
Feeling	A few times or never	60 (35.3%)	110 (50.0%)	6.93 (0.008)
	Most or all the time	110 (64.7%)	85 (50.0%)	
Encourage male involvement	A few times or never	72 (42.4%)	91 (53.5%)	3.82 (0.05[*])
	Most or all the time	98 (57.6%)	79(46.5%)	
Unofficial cost	A few times or many times	83 (48.8%)	14 (8.2%)	66.7 (0.00[*])
	Never or yes, once	87 (51.2%)	156 (91.8%)	
Treated differently because of any personal attribute	A few times or many times	5 (2.9%)	8 (4.7%)	0.32 (0.57)
	Never or yes, once	165 (97.1%)	162 (95.3%)	
Felt the health facility was clean	A few times or never	46 (27.1%)	93 (54.7%)	25.75 (0.00[*])
	Most or all the time	124 (72.9%)	77 (45.3%)	
Waiting time	Somewhat long or very long	43 (25.3%)	100 (58.8%)	37.85 (0.00[*])
	Short or somewhat short	127 (74.7%)	70 (41.2%)	
Felt safe	A few times or never	48 (28.2%)	93 (54.7%)	23.4 (0.00[*])
	Most or all the time	122 (71.8%)	77(45.3%)	

Qualitative findings

Interpersonal Communications Attributes of Person-Centered Antenatal Care

The finding of direct non-participant observation for ten women attending ANC at private health facilities suggested that most of the women were comfortable being provided a seat and greeted by health providers. Apart from this, there was no interruption of speech by the provider and clients were treated respectfully in most of the observations taking place at private facilities. During observation private health facilities, explaining procedures or medical information to the women, allocating sufficient time to clients and examining women in the private room were offered for most of the women from ten observations by observer. Meanwhile, the concerns of women were also asked for some of the clients during observation of private health facilities.

On the other hand, the observation of twenty clients at public health facilities demonstrated that welcoming the patient, providing seats and greeting women to be comfortable were offered for only a few women. Additionally, there was interruption of speech by health providers, clients weren't treated respectfully for the majority of clients during the time of observation in this study. Explaining procedures or medical information to the women, allocating sufficient time to clients and examining women in private rooms or privacy was offered for a few of the women. Moreover, concerns of women were asked about for few clients attending public health facilities.

Discussion

This study is the first study that assesses and compares the level of Person-Centered Antenatal Care among pregnant women in public and private health facilities in Western Hararghe zone, Oromia, Ethiopia, 2020. The Percentage Mean score of the overall PCANC scale in both private and public health facilities was 66.7% [95% CI: 64.2, 69.4%]. The domains of effective communication had relatively low Percentage Mean scores followed by supportive care then respect, and dignity. This study revealed significant differences in the level of PCANC between private and public health facilities, with private facilities performing better across domains of effective communication, respect and dignity, and supportive care ($p < 0.001$). Meanwhile, the qualitative study findings reported the interpersonal communication attributes of PCANC at private health facilities were better than the public ones.

The Percentage Mean score of overall PCANC in both private and public health facilities was 66.7% [95% CI: 64.2, 69.4%]. This is in studies consistent with the percentage mean score of the Person-centered Maternity Care (PCMC) scale conducted in Northeastern, Ethiopia (64.5%), urban Kenya (66.9 %) but higher than study conducted in rural Ghana 51.6 %^{25 28}. This implies the form of antenatal care that was rendered to the pregnant mother in these settings was not taking into account women's preferences, needs, and aspirations. The consequences of this kind of care which is not person-centered care not only deprives or violates human rights it has also a devastating impact on maternal and newborn outcomes^{19 36}
37.

In the domains of PCNC, the Percentage Mean score at both private and public health facilities was 78.2% [95% CI: 75.8-80.5%] for respect and dignity, 63.8 [95% CI: 61.1, 66.8%] for effective communication, and 64.7% [95% CI: 61.8- 67.7%] for supportive care. This indicates domains of effective communication had relatively low scores followed by supportive care then respect, and dignity. This finding is consistent with the studies than the study conducted in Northeastern Ethiopia, Enugu Nigeria, and low and middle-income countries^{25 38 39}.

The percentage means score of the overall PCANC scale at private health facilities was 73.7% [95% CI: 70.5, 77.1%] while it was 59.7% [95% CI: 56.05, 63.5%] for respondents at public health facilities (P<0.001). This variation was supplemented by qualitative findings which suggested the interpersonal communication attributes of PCANC at private health facilities were better than the public one. This is consistent with a study reported that women who delivered in private facilities reported a higher PCMC score than those who delivered in public hospitals²⁸. This implied that there are inequities of PCANC in private and public health facilities. This eventually results in divergence within groups, and societies that hampered universal health coverage to achieve SDG goals with the slogan of “NO ONE IS LEFT BEHIND”^{14 16 40}.

In the domain of effective communication, the percentage mean score of PCANC at private health facilities was 71.4% [95% CI: 68.1, 75.01%] compared to public health facilities 56.3% [95% CI: 52.5, 60.4%] (P<0.001). This is supplemented by This was also supplemented by the qualitative study by observation suggesting that most of the women were more effectively communicated by health providers in private facilities than those at public facilities. This implies there is a poor rapport between healthcare providers and

women, who attended ANC which affects women's adherence to treatments and recommendations, willingness to seek care in the future in the facility, and user satisfaction and improve maternal and newborn outcomes^{19,21}.

In the domain of respect and dignity, the percentage mean score of PCANC at private health facilities was 85.2% [95% CI: 82.5, 87.8%] compared to public health facilities 71.2% [95% CI: 67.3, 74.9%] (P<0.001). This finding is supplemented by the qualitative study by the observation that clients were treated respectfully in most of the observations that took place at private facilities while in public health facilities, only a few women were respected. This implies that in about 6 in 10 women, violation of article 4 which protects Women's right to be treated with dignity and respect is violated⁴¹.

In the domain of supportive care, the percentage mean score of PCANC at private health facilities was 70.1% [95% CI: 65.7, 74.6%] compared to public health facilities 59.2% [95% CI: 55.05-63.6%] (P<0.001). This finding is also supplemented by a qualitative study whereby explaining procedures or medical information to the women, allocating sufficient time to clients, and examining women in private rooms or privacy was offered and concerns of women were asked for a few of the women attending public health facilities compared to private one. This indicates the lack of continuous support during pregnancy that can result in low rates of facility-based deliveries thereby increasing the vulnerability of mothers to develop maternal and newborn complications^{14,16}.

Strengths and limitations

This is the first study that contributes to the growing body of evidence on PCANC providing critical insights into facility-level disparities. The study also employed a comparative mixed-method study design that combined qualitative study to triangulate quantitative findings. The data were collected using systematic random sampling and thereby findings can be more generalized to the target population. Comparing the counts of PCANC domains using the WHO quality framework captures the diversity of person-centered antenatal care that would not have been possible by simple prevalence measures.

Despite these strengths, this study could suffer from social desirability bias as women may not want to report negative experiences when interviewed at the facility due to fear of retaliation. Another potential limitation is the risk of a potential Hawthorne effect despite strong efforts to minimize the bias. This study didn't identify factors affecting Person Centered Antenatal Care. Future researchers should conduct a study on person-centered

Antenatal Care and provisions of care dimensions and underlying factors with structural attributes of care as cross-cutting issues.

Conclusion

The findings of this study highlight significant disparities in the PCANC between private and public health facilities. Across the three domains, effective communication, respect and dignity, and supportive care, private health facilities consistently achieved higher percentage mean scores compared to their public counterparts. Meanwhile, the qualitative finding suggested that interpersonal communication attributes of PCANC at private health facilities were better than the public ones. Addressing the disparities in person-centered antenatal care between private and public health facilities is critical to attaining health equity and SDG commitment, particularly in resource-limited settings. Prioritizing the allocation of resources to reduce patient-provider ratios, enhance training programs focusing on communication and interpersonal skills, and implement accountability mechanisms to ensure adherence to standards of person-centered care. Additionally, promoting public-private partnerships could facilitate the exchange of best practices and innovations to achieve equity and quality of antenatal care.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to the study participants. We are also grateful for Mekelle University and Samara University, Ethiopia.

Authors' contributions

HS, GF and KG had made substantial contributions to the conception and design of the survey. HS has designed the study, participated in data collection, analysis, interpretation, and write-up, drafted the manuscript and critically revised it. GF has participated in study design, analysis, interpretation, and critically revised the manuscript. MK has participated in the study design, analysis, and interpretation drafted the manuscript and critically revised the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Ethical approval and consent to participate

The study protocol was reviewed and approved by the ethical review committee of Mekelle University, College of Health Sciences. The expedited approval of this study was received from the ethical review of committee Mekelle University, College of Health Sciences with code **1504/2020**. All the study participants were informed about the purpose of the study and

finally, verbal consent was obtained before the interview. Respondents were informed about the purpose of the study, and their oral consent was obtained. The respondent's right to refuse or withdraw from participating in the interview was fully maintained. Confidentiality and anonymity were ensured.

Consent for publication

Informed consent was obtained from each subject so that the study would be published and presented at different workshops without the anonymity of the participants.

Availability of data

The datasets used for this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request. All supplementary information files are included in this manuscript.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Funding and Disclaimer The study was financially supported by Samara University, the Department of Public Health, and the College of Medical and Health Science. Its contents are solely the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official views of the supporting offices. The funders had no role in the study design, data collection, and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

Provenance and peer review Not commissioned; externally peer-reviewed.

Supplemental material This content has been supplied by the author(s). It has not been vetted by BMJ Publishing Group Limited (BMJ) and may not have been peer-reviewed. Any opinions or recommendations discussed are solely those of the author(s) and are not endorsed by BMJ. BMJ disclaims all liability and responsibility arising from any reliance placed on the content.

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

Habtamu Solomon Demeke: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8427-3396>

Girmatsion Fisseha: <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-2918-5910>

Kidanu Gebremariam: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-7880-6907>

References

1. Baker, A. Crossing the quality chasm: a new health system for the 21st century. *BMJ* 2001;323(7322):1192.
2. De Labrusse C, Ramelet A-S, Humphrey T, et al. Patient-centered care in maternity services: a critical appraisal and synthesis of the literature. *Women's health issues* 2016;26(1):100-09.
3. Stephanie MS, Yoder L. A Concept Analysis of Person-Centered Care. *Research gate* 2011;XX Number X doi: 10.1177/0898010111412189
4. Hajizadeh K, Vaezi M, Meedya S, et al. Respectful maternity care and its related factors in maternal units of public and private hospitals in Tabriz: a sequential explanatory mixed method study protocol. *Reproductive health* 2020;17(1):1-7.
5. Sheferaw ED, Mengesha TZ, Wase SB. Development of a tool to measure women's perception of respectful maternity care in public health facilities. *BMC pregnancy and childbirth* 2016;16(1):1-8.
6. Bohren MA, Tunçalp Ö, Miller S. Transforming intrapartum care: Respectful maternity care. *Best Practice & Research Clinical Obstetrics & Gynaecology* 2020
7. Entwistle VA, Watt IS. Treating patients as persons: a capabilities approach to support delivery of person-centered care. *The American Journal of Bioethics* 2013;13(8):29-39.
8. Snowden JM, Guise J-M, Kozhimannil KB. Promoting inclusive and person-centered care: Starting with birth *Birth* 2018 doi: 10.1111/birt.12351
9. Zhao J, Gao Sg, Wang J, et al. Differentiation between two healthcare concepts: Person-centered and patient-centered care. *International Journal of nursing sciences* 2016(3):398-402.
10. Ekman I, Swedberg K, Taft C, et al. Person-centered care—ready for prime time. *European journal of cardiovascular nursing* 2011;10(4):248-51.
11. Sudhinaraset M, Afulani P, Diamond-Smith N, et al. Advancing a conceptual model to improve maternal health quality: The Person-Centered Care Framework for Reproductive Health Equity. *Gates open research* 2017;1
12. Afulani PA, Buback L, Essandoh F, et al. Quality of antenatal care and associated factors in a rural county in Kenya: an assessment of service provision and experience dimensions. *BMC health services research* 2019;19(1):1-16.
13. Miller P, Afulani PA, Musange S, et al. Person-centered antenatal care and associated factors in Rwanda: a secondary analysis of program data. *BMC pregnancy and childbirth* 2021;21(1):1-11.
14. Tunçalp Ö, Were W, MacLennan C, et al. Quality of care for pregnant women and newborns—the WHO vision. *BJOG: An International Journal of Obstetrics & Gynaecology* 2015;122(8):1045-49.
15. Tunçalp Ö, Pena Rosas JP, Lawrie T, et al. WHO recommendations on antenatal care for a positive pregnancy experience—going beyond survival. *BJOG: An International Journal of Obstetrics & Gynaecology* 2017;124(6):860-62.
16. Koblinsky M, Moyer CA, Calvert C, et al. Quality maternity care for every woman, everywhere: a call to action. *The Lancet* 2016;388(10057):2307-20.
17. Srivastava A, Singh D, Montagu D, et al. Putting women at the center: a review of Indian policy to address person-centered care in maternal and newborn health, family planning and abortion. *BMC public health* 2018;18(1):1-10.
18. Organization WH. Standards for improving quality of maternal and newborn care in health facilities. 2016
19. WHO. WHO recommendations on antenatal care for a positive pregnancy experience: World Health Organization 2016.
20. Sudhinaraset M, Landrian A, Golub GM, et al. Person-centered maternity care and postnatal health: associations with maternal and newborn health outcomes. *AJOG Global Reports* 2021;1(1):100005.
21. Sudhinaraset M, Landrian A, Afulani PA, et al. Association between person-centered maternity care and newborn complications in Kenya. *International Journal of Gynecology & Obstetrics* 2020;148(1):27-34.

22. Sudhinaraset M, Treleaven E, Melo J SK, et al. Women's status and experiences of mistreatment during childbirth in Uttar Pradesh: a mixed methods study using cultural health capital theory. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth* 2016 16(1):332.
23. Lattof SR, Moran AC, Kidula N, et al. Implementation of the new WHO antenatal care model for a positive pregnancy experience: a monitoring framework. *BMJ Global Health* 2020;5(6):e002605.
24. Afulani PA, Sayi TS, Montagu D. Predictors of person-centered maternity care: the role of socioeconomic status, empowerment, and facility type. *BMC health services research* 2018;18(1):1-16.
25. Dagnaw FT, Tiruneh SA, Azanaw MM, et al. Determinants of person-centered maternity care at the selected health facilities of Dessie town, Northeastern, Ethiopia: community-based cross-sectional study. *BMC pregnancy and childbirth* 2020;20(1):1-10.
26. Bante A, Teji K, Seyoum B, et al. Respectful maternity care and associated factors among women who delivered at Harar hospitals, eastern Ethiopia: a cross-sectional study. *BMC pregnancy and childbirth* 2020;20(1):86.
27. Lattof SR, Tunçalp Ö, Moran AC, et al. Developing measures for WHO recommendations on antenatal care for a positive pregnancy experience: a conceptual framework and scoping review. *BMJ open* 2020;9(4):e024130.
28. Afulani PA, Phillips B, Aborigo RA, et al. Person-centred maternity care in low-income and middle-income countries: analysis of data from Kenya, Ghana, and India. *The Lancet Global Health* 2019;7(1):e96-e109.
29. Ejigu T, Woldie M, Kifle Y. Quality of antenatal care services at public health facilities of Bahir-Dar special zone, Northwest Ethiopia. *BMC health services research* 2013;13(1):1-8.
30. Yakob B, Gage A, Nigatu TG, et al. Low effective coverage of family planning and antenatal care services in Ethiopia. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care* 2019;31(10):725-32.
31. Asefa F, Fikadu G, Taye A. Quality of Antenatal Care among Mothers Attending Antenatal Care and associated factors at Jimma Medical Center south west Ethiopia. *Ethiopian Journal of Reproductive Health* 2020;12(1):10-10.
32. Desalegn DM, Abay S, Abebe A, et al. Quality of focused antenatal care laboratory services provided at public health facilities in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. *Qual Prim Care* 2017;26(3):81-89.
33. Sheffel AL. Quality of Antenatal Care Services in Low-Income Countries: Investigating Its Meaning and Measurement. Johns Hopkins University, 2019.
34. Afulani PA, Diamond-Smith N, Golub G, et al. Development of a tool to measure person-centered maternity care in developing settings: validation in a rural and urban Kenyan population. *Reproductive health* 2017;14(1):1-18.
35. Sheffel A, Heidkamp R, Mpembeni R, et al. Understanding client and provider perspectives of antenatal care service quality: a qualitative multi-method study from Tanzania. *Journal of global health* 2019;9(1)
36. Midwives ICo, Alliance WR, Association IP, et al. Mother– baby friendly birthing facilities. *International Journal of Gynecology & Obstetrics* 2015;128(2):95-99.
37. de Masi S, Bucagu M, Tunçalp Ö, et al. Integrated person-centered health care for all women during pregnancy: implementing World Health Organization recommendations on antenatal care for a positive pregnancy experience. *Global Health: Science and Practice* 2017;5(2):197-201.
38. Ogbuabor DC, Nwankwor C. Person-Centred Maternity Care in a Poor-Resource Setting: Evidence from a Cross-Sectional Study in Enugu State, Nigeria. 2020
39. Umar N, Wickremasinghe D, Hill Z, et al. Understanding mistreatment during institutional delivery in northeast Nigeria: a mixed-method study. *Reproductive health* 2019;16(1):1-14.
40. Chou D, Daelmans B, Jolivet RR, et al. Ending preventable maternal and newborn mortality and stillbirths. *Bmj* 2015;351
41. Alliance WR. Respectful maternity care. The white ribbon alliance Washington DC: The Universal Rights of Childbearing Women Washington 2011

Supplementary Figure 1




Figure 1 Percentage mean score of PCANC and its domains from the total expected score among pregnant women of Western Hararghe Zone, Oromia, Ethiopia, 2020