

1 **Determinants of sexual and reproductive empowerment: a cross-national analysis in five Sub-**
2 **Saharan African countries**

3
4 Short title: **Sexual and reproductive empowerment in five African countries**

5
6 **Authors:** Caroline Moreau ^{1,2}, Celia Karp ¹, Shannon N. Wood ¹, Georges Guiella ³, Peter Gichangi ⁴,
7 Frederick Makumbi,⁵ Rosine Mosso⁶, Sani Oumarou ⁷, Linnea Zimmerman¹

8
9 **Corresponding Author**

10 Caroline Moreau, MD, PhD

11 Department of Population, Family and Reproductive Health

12 Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health

13 cmoreau2@jhu.edu (CM)

14
15 **Affiliations:**

16 ¹Department of Population, Family and Reproductive Health, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of
17 Public Health.

18 ² Soins et Santé Primaire, CESP Centre for Research in Epidemiology and Population Health U1018,
19 Inserm, F-94805 Villejuif, France

20 ³ Institut Supérieur des Sciences de la Population (ISSP/University Joseph Ki-Zerbo), Ouagadougou,
21 Burkina Faso

22 ⁴ International Centre for Reproductive Health-Kenya, Nairobi, Kenya,

23 ⁵Department of Community Health and Behavioral Sciences, School of Public Health, Makerere
24 University College of Health Sciences,

25 ⁶ École Nationale Supérieure de Statistique et d'Economie Appliquée (ENSEA) of Abidjan, Côte
26 d'Ivoire

27 ⁷Institut National de la Statistique (INS), Niamey, Niger

28
29

30 CM, CK, SW designed the study and, CM conducted the analysis, and wrote the first draft of the paper. GG,
31 PG, FM, RM,SO are country principal investigators, contributing to instrument development, survey
32 implementation, and interpretation of results. LM Contributed to instrument development and analysis. All
33 authors revised the manuscript.

34

35

36

37

38

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

39 **Abstract**

40 Research has shown inconsistent associations between women's empowerment and sexual and
41 reproductive health (SRH) in sub-Saharan Africa (SSA), pointing to a lack of salient measures in this
42 context. A novel measure provides an opportunity to explore different facets of SRH empowerment in
43 SSA.

44 **Methods**

45 We used five national surveys among women 15-49 years conducted between 2019-2020 in Kenya
46 (n=5,504), Uganda (n=2,273), Cote d'Ivoire (n=2,329), Burkina Faso (n=4,135), and Niger (n=2,228).
47 Two measures of contraceptive and sexual empowerment were combined into a four-category SRH
48 empowerment measure to identify the opportunity structures associated with SRH empowerment using
49 multinomial logistic regression modeling.

50 **Results**

51 SRH empowerment was lowest in Niger and highest in Kenya. Between 15.0% and 21.7% of
52 participants had more sexual but less contraceptive empowerment than their peers, while the opposite
53 was true for 15.4% to 20.4% of participants. Education increased overall SRH empowerment or sexual
54 empowerment alone in all sites and contraceptive empowerment alone in Kenya. Wealth increased
55 overall SRH empowerment or sexual empowerment alone in three sites. Parity increased overall
56 empowerment or contraceptive empowerment alone in all sites but decreased sexual empowerment
57 alone in Uganda. Finally, healthcare provider contact increased overall and contraceptive empowerment
58 in four sites while family planning media messages increased overall empowerment in two sites.

59 **Conclusion**

60 This study confirms the multidimensional nature of SRH empowerment, which varies by country,
61 domain, and by women's parity and social capital. Longitudinal research is needed to comprehend how
62 women gain or lose SRH empowerment and how empowerment predicts SRH outcomes.

63

64

65

66 **Introduction**

67 Women's and girls' empowerment, generally understood as a process by which individuals
68 exert control over their own destinies by actively challenging gender and power inequities, has gained
69 prominence in policy and programmatic arenas to promote human rights and improve health(1). A
70 growing body of research has shown linkages between women's empowerment and sexual and
71 reproductive health (SRH)(2–5). Inconsistent evidence, however, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa,
72 has led to calls for greater conceptual development(6) and consideration for contextual variations in the
73 expression of empowerment(7,8). Empowerment results from the interface between *agency* - the
74 'ability to make effective choices and to transform these choices into desired outcomes' - and
75 *opportunity structures* - the sociocultural and economic resources and the political and legal
76 environment that shape women's choices(9,10). The interplay between these two dimensions is rarely
77 reflected in current research, which either focuses on women's opportunity structures (e.g., access to
78 education, wealth, or health information and proximity to health services) or agency, such as their
79 freedom of movement or household decision-making(8,11,12). While relevant for understanding
80 specific aspects of empowerment, these proxy measures lack a clear conceptual linkage to SRH
81 behaviors and outcomes(13).

82 Promising new measures of SRH agency, including those reflecting negotiation skills,
83 autonomy, decision-making, and control over sexual intercourse and contraceptive use, facilitate a
84 broader investigation of the full spectrum of women's SRH agency and its contribution to health
85 (11,12,14–17). In particular, the recent development and validation of a women and girls' SRH
86 empowerment index, grounded in the voices of women living in diverse communities across the African
87 continent (Ethiopia, Nigeria, Uganda) (11,12) provides an opportunity to better understand African
88 women's ability to set and achieve their SRH goals (17). The SRH empowerment measure, which in
89 fact, solely focuses on SRH agency, is not only salient to the sub-Saharan context, but addresses several
90 conceptual limitations of prior empowerment research, by considering SRH agency as a dynamic and
91 multidimensional process that interacts with opportunity structures to inform SRH outcomes. The
92 structure and content of the SRH empowerment measure offers an opportunity to understand how levels
93 of agency vary according to the domain of decisions (e.g., sexual versus contraceptive decisions) and

94 to the nature of decisions (e.g., setting goals versus acting on these goals), Specifically, the measure
95 aligns with the World Bank’s empowerment framework (10), which considers agency as a process
96 moving from existence of choice (i.e., setting goals aligned with one’s values) to exercise of choice
97 (i.e., translation of goals into action), ultimately informing the achievement of choice (i.e., realization
98 of one’s goals). The psychometric properties of the SRH empowerment multidimensional measure were
99 initially validated in a pilot study conducted in three Sub-Saharan countries(17). The measure offers an
100 opportunity to fully explore the empowerment framework, by identifying the opportunity structures that
101 support or constrain each component of SRH empowerment (contraceptive and sexual) as well as the
102 conditions favoring overall SRH empowerment, to inform programmatic efforts.

103 Using the newly developed SRH empowerment measure, we seek to (1) empirically test the distinction
104 between sexual and contraceptive empowerment, (2) understand the opportunity structures that enable
105 each component, and (3) identify the conditions informing the intersection of sexual and contraceptive
106 empowerment across a diversity of sociocultural settings in sub-Saharan Africa.

107 **Materials and Methods**

108 *Setting and study samples*

109 This study draws from five population-based surveys conducted in 2019-2020, as part of the
110 Performance Monitoring for Action (PMA) study in Kenya, Uganda, Cote d’Ivoire, Burkina Faso, and
111 Niger, which are the five PMA countries including national samples. These countries cover different
112 geographies in Sub-Saharan Africa (East and West Africa), and represent a diversity of socioeconomic,
113 and cultural backgrounds. According to the United Nation’s human development composite measures,
114 Kenya and Cote d’Ivoire show medium levels of human development, ranking 152nd and 159th
115 respectively on the human development index, while Uganda, Burkina Faso, and Niger show low levels
116 of human development, ranking 166th, 184th and 189th respectively(20). These countries also vary
117 according to their gender inequality index, lower in East Africa (Kenya and Uganda rank 128th and
118 131st, respectively), than in West Africa (Niger, Cote d’Ivoire and Burkina Faso rank 153th, 155th and
119 157th respectively(21).

120 PMA surveys follow a common protocol, including sampling, survey instruments and data
121 collection procedures are described by Zimmerman et al. (22) and further detailed at padata.org.

122 Briefly, in each site, a multistage cluster sampling design was used to select a representative sample of
123 the female population aged 15-49 years, who were screened for eligibility and who consented to
124 participate. All participants provided oral consent, and unmarried minors provided parental consent and
125 ascent to participate. Women responded to a face-to-face survey, administered by trained local
126 interviewers, which solicited information on their sociodemographic background, reproductive history,
127 fertility preferences, contraceptive knowledge, and practices, and included a series of questions related
128 to SRH empowerment.

129 Altogether 3,633 to 9,477 women across geographies completed the survey with participation
130 rates ranging from 95.4% in Niger to 98.7% in Kenya (Table 1). For this analysis, we selected women
131 who were partnered at the time of the survey and ever had sexual intercourse and further restricted to
132 participants who had no missing information about the SRH empowerment measure. Participants were
133 considered to have missing information about SRH empowerment if they were missing half of the items
134 or more on any of the four subscales comprising SRH empowerment, described further below. (Table
135 1). Our final analytic samples ranged from 2,273 women in Uganda to 5,504 women in Kenya.

136 **Table 1: Study samples**

| | Total female samples | Samples of partnered women who ever had sex. | Analytic samples (partnered women who ever had sex and data on SRH empowerment measures) |
|----------------------|----------------------|--|--|
| Burkina Faso (2019) | 6,590 | 4,297 | 4,135 |
| Cote d'Ivoire (2020) | 4,135 | 2,499 | 2,329 |
| Niger (2020) | 3,633 | 2,526 | 2,288 |
| Kenya (2019) | 9,477 | 5,541 | 5,504 |
| Uganda (2020) | 3,938 | 2,291 | 2,273 |

137

138 This study was approved by ethical review committees at Johns Hopkins School of Public
139 Health (IRB14702; MOD18860; MOD3903; MOD4748), Comité d'Ethique pour la recherche en santé
140 and the Ministère de la Santé et Ministère de l'Enseignement Supérieur, de la Recherche Scientifique et
141 de l'Innovation in Burkina Faso, Comité d'Ethique de la Recherche Institut Pasteur de la Côte d'Ivoire,
142 Kenya Medical Research Institute (KEMRI) Ethics Review Committee in Kenya, Comité Consultatif
143 National d'Ethique in Niger, and Makerere University School of Public Health Higher Degrees,
144 Research and Ethics Committee in Uganda.

145 *Measures*

146 SRH empowerment is a two-dimensional measure, evaluating the degree to which women make
 147 decisions related to sex and contraception and act on these decisions (17). This cross-cultural measure
 148 is structured according to the World Bank’s framework, which describes agency as the movement from
 149 existence of choice to exercise of choice, ultimately leading to achievement of choice (10). The
 150 measure, which centers on existence and exercise of choice as predictors of achievement of choice was
 151 developed and tested using a mixed-methods study conducted in Ethiopia, Uganda, and Nigeria (17–
 152 19). The 15-item multidimensional construct distinguishing the dimensions of existence and exercise
 153 of choice within broader domains of sexual and contraceptive empowerment (17). The measure was
 154 restricted to 13 items as one item of contraceptive exercise of choice subscale was accidentally skipped
 155 and one item from the one item of sexual exercise of choice subscale was dropped after assessing its
 156 psychometric properties in eight PMA geographies (Table 2). Internal reliability testing yielded
 157 Cronbach alphas ranging from 0.68 to 0.73 for contraceptive empowerment and from 0.67 to 0.77 for
 158 sexual empowerment.

159
 160 **Table 2: SRH empowerment items by domain and**

| Sexual empowerment (6 items) | |
|--|--|
| Existence of choice | If I refuse sex with my husband/partner, he may physically hurt me If I refuse sex with my husband/partner, he may force me to have sex If I refuse sex with my husband/partner, he may stop supporting me I am confident I can tell my husband/partner when I want to have sex |
| Exercise of choice | I am able to decide when to have sex If I do not want to have sex, I can tell my husband |
| Contraceptive empowerment (7 items) | |
| Existence of choice | If I use family planning, my husband/partner may seek another sexual partner If I use family planning, I may have trouble getting pregnant the next time I want to If I use family planning, it may cause conflict in my relationship If I use family planning, my body may experience side effects that will disrupt relations If I use family planning, my children may not be born normal |
| Exercise of choice | I can decide to switch from one family planning method to another if I want to I feel confident telling my provider what is important when selecting a method |

161
 162 We first created two measures reflecting sexual empowerment (six items) and contraceptive
 163 empowerment (seven items). Each domain-specific empowerment score was calculated based on
 164 women’s responses to each item, with item responses defined on a five-point Likert scale (ranging from

165 strongly agree to strongly disagree). The sexual empowerment scale included three items representing
166 existence of choice and three items representing exercise of choice, while the contraceptive
167 empowerment scale comprised five items reflecting existence of choice and three reflecting exercise of
168 choice (Table 2). For each measure, item responses were averaged separately for each dimension (i.e.,
169 existence of choice and exercise of choice), and subsequently averaged across the two dimensions.
170 Missing items ranged from 6%-12% for contraceptive existence of choice, 0.5%- 6.2% for
171 contraceptive exercise of choice and fell below 2.5% for sexual existence and exercise of choice.
172 Missing items were replaced by the average score of their respective dimension for the calculation of
173 each of the four subscales. Final scores ranged from 1-5 for each domain, with higher scores indicating
174 greater empowerment in that domain (i.e., sex, contraception) (17).

175 Next, we created a relative measure of SRH empowerment reflecting 1) the intersection of the
176 sexual and contraceptive empowerment measures and 2) comparing individuals to their peers. The
177 continuous domain-specific measures of sexual and contraceptive empowerment were dichotomized at
178 the median in each site to create a four-category relative measure of SRH empowerment (lower SRH
179 empowerment, higher sexual empowerment only, higher contraceptive empowerment, and higher SRH
180 empowerment). Respondents who scored below the median on the contraceptive empowerment
181 measure and above the median on the sexual empowerment measure compared to their peers, were
182 considered to have higher than average sexual empowerment only, while those who scored above the
183 median on contraceptive empowerment and below the median on sexual empowerment compared to
184 their peers, were considered to have higher than average contraceptive empowerment only.
185 Respondents who, compared to their peers, consistently fell below or above the median for both
186 measures of sexual and contraceptive empowerment were classified as having lower than average SRH
187 empowerment or higher than average SRH empowerment, respectively. For simplicity we refer to these
188 categories as “lower SRH empowerment”, “higher sexual empowerment only”, “higher contraceptive
189 empowerment only” and “higher SRH empowerment”.

190 We considered sociodemographic characteristics (age, marital status, education, employment,
191 household wealth), life course experiences (parity), and other resources (recent access to FP messages,
192 cell phone ownership, recent contact with the health system and area of residence (rural/urban)) as the

193 opportunity structures that could enable and enhance sexual and contraceptive empowerment. Recent
194 access to FP messages included any exposure to FP messages via the radio, TV, magazines, or social
195 media in the last 12 months, while recent contact with the health system was defined as having been to
196 a health facility or having been visited by a healthcare worker in the last 12 months.

197

198 *Analysis*

199 We first conducted a descriptive analysis, calculating mean and median scores of sexual
200 empowerment and contraceptive empowerment by site. We also examined correlations between
201 domains (sexual empowerment and contraceptive empowerment), between dimensions domains
202 (existence and exercise of choice) across domains and within each domain. Next, we conducted
203 bivariate and multivariate analysis in the form of linear regression models to identify sociodemographic
204 characteristics, life course experiences, and other resources associated with sexual empowerment and
205 contraceptive empowerment. We further examined how women's combined SRH empowerment
206 (operationalized by the four-categorical relative measure), varied according to women's opportunity
207 structures (sociodemographic characteristics, life experiences and other resources) using bivariate and
208 multivariate multinomial regression models. Analyses were stratified by site. They were also weighted
209 and accounted for clustering to reflect the complex survey design. All analyses were conducted using
210 Stata 17.

211 **Results**

212 The characteristics of the women in our sample, by site, are displayed in Table 3. The mean
213 age of respondents varied from 29.0 years in Niger to 32.3 years in Kenya (data not shown). Marital
214 status and parity varied widely across countries, with a higher proportion of non-married, partnered
215 women in Uganda and Cote d'Ivoire, and higher proportion of low-parity women in Kenya and Cote
216 d'Ivoire. Likewise, while most women had no education in the three West African countries, a majority
217 attended at least primary education in Uganda and Kenya and 31% and 42.6%, respectively, had a
218 secondary education. Women in Cote d'Ivoire and Niger were least likely to work outside of the home,
219 while employment reached 64% in Uganda. Between 63% to 82% of women had contact with the
220 healthcare system in the last 12 months (through facilities or community health workers) and between

221 49.7% of women in Cote d'Ivoire and 86.2% in Kenya had heard or viewed family planning messages
222 on the radio, TV, social media, or magazines in the last 12 months.

223 **Table 3: Distribution of women's opportunity structures by site.**

| | | Burkina Faso | Cote d'Ivoire | Niger | Kenya | Uganda |
|--|--------------------------|--------------|---------------|-------|-------|--------|
| Age | 15-24 | 26.0% | 20.7% | 30.5% | 19.2% | 27.7% |
| | 25-34 | 37.6% | 41.6% | 41.5% | 43.1% | 40.3% |
| | 35-49 | 36.5% | 37.7% | 28.0% | 37.7% | 32.0% |
| Marital status | Not married/cohabitating | 9.7% | 38.4% | 0.7% | 9.8% | 56.0% |
| | Married | 90.3% | 61.6% | 99.3% | 90.2% | 44.0% |
| Parity | 0-2 children | 36.0% | 43.7% | 34.0% | 41.0% | 38.5% |
| | 3-4 children | 27.0% | 28.7% | 27.6% | 32.8% | 25.9% |
| | 5+ children | 37.0% | 27.5% | 38.4% | 26.1% | 35.6% |
| Education | None | 70.7% | 52.4% | 75.2% | 6.1% | 8.2% |
| | Primary | 17.1% | 27.1% | 14.3% | 51.3% | 60.7% |
| | Secondary | 12.1% | 20.5% | 10.5% | 42.6% | 31.1% |
| Employment in the last 12 months | No | 45.2% | 68.5% | 78.3% | 37.5% | 35.9% |
| | Yes | 54.8% | 31.5% | 21.8% | 62.5% | 64.1% |
| Has a mobile phone | No | 6.9% | 7.3% | 35.5% | 12.5% | 19.6% |
| | Yes | 90.1% | 92.7% | 64.5% | 87.5% | 80.4% |
| Residence | Rural | 82.6% | 47.1% | 85.2% | 71.1% | 71.2% |
| | Urban | 17.4% | 52.9% | 14.8% | 28.9% | 28.8% |
| Contact with health services | No | 18.0% | 26.2% | 36.8% | 26.9% | 26.2% |
| | Yes | 82.0% | 73.8% | 63.2% | 73.1% | 73.8% |
| Media exposure to FP message in the last 12 months | No | 34.9% | 50.3% | 53.6% | 13.8% | 49.7% |
| | Yes | 65.1% | 49.7% | 46.4% | 86.2% | 50.3% |


224

225

226 *Sexual and contraceptive empowerment scores*

227 Figure 1 presents mean sexual, contraceptive, and overall SRH empowerment scores by site.
228 Mean empowerment scores for both domains were lowest in Niger and highest in Kenya, with sexual
229 empowerment ranging from 3.35 to 3.98 and contraceptive empowerment scores varying from 3.68 to
230 4.24. In all sites, mean contraceptive empowerment scores were higher than mean sexual empowerment
231 scores, with the greatest difference observed in Burkina Faso (0.55 points) and the lowest difference in
232 Côte d'Ivoire (0.18 points).


233 Figure 1: Mean sexual and contraceptive empowerment and overall SRH- empowerment
234 scores by site.



235

236

237 Figure 2: Correlation between sexual and contraceptive empowerment mean scores by site.



238

239 While differences in sexual and contraceptive empowerment scores were small, the measures

240 were moderately correlated in all countries but Kenya, with correlation coefficients ranging from 0.25

241 to 0.29 (Figure 2). Contraceptive and sexual empowerment scores were more strongly correlated in
242 Kenya (correlation=0.42) (Figure 2). A more detailed comparison of domain and dimension-specific
243 measures indicates low correlations between sexual and contraceptive existence of choice (ranging from
244 a correlation coefficient of 0.28 in Uganda to 0.42 in Niger) and between sexual and contraceptive
245 exercise of choice (from 0.18 in Uganda to 0.30 in Niger) (Appendix 1). Additionally, within each
246 domain, existence and exercise of choice were poorly correlated ranging from -0.17 in Niger to 0.22 in
247 Kenya for existence and exercise of sexual choice and from 0.07 in Uganda to 0.18 in Kenya for
248 existence and exercise of contraceptive choice (Appendix 1).

249 Bivariate analysis of the opportunity structures that could enhance sexual and contraceptive
250 empowerment, respectively, show these factors vary by country and by empowerment domain (Table
251 4). Across sites, education and wealth were generally associated with increased sexual empowerment
252 and, to a lesser extent, with contraceptive empowerment. Parity was associated with increased
253 contraceptive empowerment in two Western African sites (Burkina Faso and Cote d'Ivoire) but
254 correlated with decreased sexual empowerment in all sites except Niger. In all sites, women who had
255 been in recent contact with a provider/community health worker or had heard FP messages in the media
256 exerted higher contraceptive empowerment, and to a lesser degree, higher sexual empowerment.
257 Likewise, cell phone owners reported greater sexual and contraceptive empowerment in three of the
258 five sites. Other factors varied more across sites. For instance, urban residence was associated with
259 higher sexual empowerment in three sites but with contraceptive empowerment in only one site.
260 Likewise, sexual empowerment increased with age in Cote d'Ivoire, but decreased with age in Uganda,
261 while age was unrelated to contraceptive empowerment in all sites.

262

263

264

265

266

267

268

269

270 **Table 4: Factors associated with sexual empowerment and contraceptive empowerment (FP):**
271 **bivariate analysis.**

| | | Burkina Faso | | Cote d'Ivoire | | Niger | | Kenya | | Uganda | |
|---|----------------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | Sex power | FP power | Sex power | FP power | Sex power | FP power | Sex power | FP power | Sex power | FP power |
| Age | 15-24 | 3.56 | 4.06 | 3.66 | 3.92 | 3.35 | 3.68 | 4.03 | 4.27 | 3.51 | 3.65 |
| | 25-34 | 3.62 | 4.16 | 3.83 | 4.03 | 3.36 | 3.72 | 3.99 | 4.26 | 3.41 | 3.69 |
| | 35-49 | 3.56 | 4.15 | 3.83 | 3.96 | 3.33 | 3.61 | 3.95 | 4.22 | 3.22 | 3.70 |
| Marital status | Not married | 3.44 | 4.07 | 3.97 | 4.00 | | | 4.11 | 4.24 | 3.39 | 3.69 |
| | Married/cohabitating | 3.60 | 4.14 | 3.69 | 3.97 | | | 3.97 | 4.28 | 3.35 | 3.67 |
| Parity | 0-2 children | 3.61 | 4.05 | 3.86 | 3.93 | 3.35 | 3.62 | 4.11 | 4.31 | 3.53 | 3.63 |
| | 3-4 children | 3.63 | 4.17 | 3.85 | 4.07 | 3.38 | 3.74 | 3.97 | 4.29 | 3.37 | 3.76 |
| | 5+ children | 3.52 | 4.18 | 3.62 | 3.95 | 3.32 | 3.68 | 3.8 | 4.09 | 3.21 | 3.67 |
| Education | No education | 3.54 | 4.13 | 3.57 | 3.91 | 3.29 | 3.64 | 3.63 | 3.75 | 3.11 | 3.51 |
| | Primary | 3.52 | 4.11 | 3.92 | 3.98 | 3.45 | 3.73 | 4.86 | 4.20 | 3.27 | 3.65 |
| | Secondary | 3.89 | 4.19 | 4.20 | 4.16 | 3.60 | 3.84 | 4.18 | 4.37 | 3.65 | 3.79 |
| Wealth tertile | Lowest | 3.61 | 4.13 | 3.48 | 3.78 | 3.21 | 3.55 | 3.76 | 4.08 | 3.22 | 3.60 |
| | | | | 3.75 | 3.95 | | | 3.93 | 4.23 | 3.30 | 3.65 |
| | Middle | 3.53 | 4.16 | 3.89 | 4.08 | 3.32 | 3.68 | 3.97 | 4.27 | 3.25 | 3.70 |
| | Highest | 3.62 | 4.10 | 4.05 | 4.07 | 3.51 | 3.8 | 4.27 | 4.35 | 3.68 | 3.79 |
| Phone ownership | Yes | 3.42 | 4.01 | 3.81 | 3.98 | 3.39 | 3.76 | 4.02 | 4.27 | 3.40 | 3.70 |
| | No | 3.60 | 4.14 | 3.66 | 3.92 | 3.28 | 3.52 | 3.70 | 4.03 | 3.27 | 3.58 |
| Employment | Yes | 3.49 | 4.14 | 3.76 | 3.97 | 3.40 | 3.74 | 4.01 | 4.29 | 3.38 | 3.71 |
| | No | 3.70 | 4.12 | 3.88 | 4.01 | 3.33 | 3.66 | 3.93 | 4.16 | 3.37 | 3.63 |
| Residence | Rural | 3.65 | 4.06 | 3.72 | 3.93 | 3.30 | 3.63 | 3.93 | 4.22 | 3.28 | 3.67 |
| | Urban | 3.82 | 4.01 | 3.86 | 4.02 | 3.60 | 4.00 | 4.11 | 4.30 | 3.63 | 3.72 |
| Contact with health provider | Yes | 3.57 | 4.16 | 3.83 | 4.03 | 3.44 | 3.79 | 4.00 | 4.30 | 3.40 | 3.71 |
| | No | 3.62 | 4.01 | 3.71 | 3.84 | 3.19 | 3.48 | 3.92 | 4.10 | 3.29 | 3.56 |
| Media exposure to FP message in the last 12 | yes | 3.64 | 4.18 | 3.94 | 4.05 | 3.4 | 3.76 | 4.03 | 4.28 | 3.41 | 3.7 |
| | no | 3.48 | 4.05 | 3.66 | 3.91 | 3.30 | 3.61 | 3.70 | 3.99 | 3.20 | 3.58 |

272

273 **bold numbers are indicative of significant associations $p < 0.05$.**

274 In multivariate analysis (Table 5), associations with education were mostly maintained, while those
275 between wealth and sexual empowerment and contraceptive empowerment remained significant in
276 three sites (Cote d'Ivoire, Niger, and Kenya) and two sites (Burkina Faso and Cote d'Ivoire),
277 respectively. Parity was still positively associated with contraceptive empowerment in two sites
278 (Burkina Faso and Uganda) and decreased sexual empowerment in one site (Kenya). Finally recent
279 contact with the health care system was associated with increased contraceptive empowerment in all
280 sites but Uganda, and sexual empowerment in one site (Niger), while FP media exposure was associated
281 with increased sexual empowerment and contraceptive empowerment in two different sites.


282

283 **Table 5: Factors associated with sexual empowerment and contraceptive empowerment (FP):**
284 **results from multivariate linear regression analysis.**

| | | Burkina Faso | | Cote d'Ivoire | | Niger | | Kenya | | Uganda | |
|------------------------------------|--------------|-----------------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|
| | | Sex power | FP power | Sex power | FP power | Sex power | FP power | Sex power | FP power | Sex power | FP power |
| | | Adjusted coefficients | | | | | | | | | |
| Parity | 0-2 children | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref |
| | 3-4 children | 0.07 | 0.12 | 0.08 | 0.17 | 0.02 | 0.09 | -0.08 | 0.01 | -0.13 | 0.14 |
| | 5+ children | -0.03 | 0.15 | -0.04 | 0.11 | 0.01 | 0.08 | -0.16 | -0.12 | -0.20 | 0.10 |
| Education | None | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref |
| | Primary | -0.01 | 0.01 | 0.30 | 0.06 | 0.09 | 0.04 | 0.07 | 0.29 | 0.10 | 0.12 |
| | Secondary | 0.33 | 0.12 | 0.50 | 0.22 | 0.16 | 0.08 | 0.25 | 0.40 | 0.31 | 0.25 |
| Wealth | Low | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref |
| | Intermediate | -0.08 | 0.23 | 0.31 | 0.26 | 0.09 | 0.10 | 0.06 | 0.03 | -0.02 | 0.05 |
| | High | -0.06 | 0.26 | 0.29 | 0.17 | 0.20 | 0.12 | 0.23 | 0.03 | 0.26 | 0.08 |
| Phone ownership | No | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref |
| | yes | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.05 | 0.02 | 0.04 | 0.20 | 0.18 | 0.11 | -0.02 | 0.05 |
| Employed | No | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref |
| | Yes | -0.20 | 0.02 | -0.10 | -0.05 | 0.07 | 0.05 | 0.03 | 0.08 | -0.01 | 0.06 |
| Contact with healthcare provider | No | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref |
| | Yes | -0.03 | 0.14 | 0.07 | 0.16 | 0.23 | 0.28 | 0.01 | 0.14 | 0.07 | 0.11 |
| FP media message in last 12 months | No | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref |
| | Yes | 0.15 | 0.11 | 0.08 | 0.04 | 0.06 | 0.12 | 0.18 | 0.14 | 0.11 | 0.06 |

285 **bold numbers** are indicative of significant associations $p < 0.05$.
286

287 The intersection of sexual and contraceptive empowerment, depicted in Figure 3, shows that high SRH
288 empowerment, where women are in the highest median for both sexual and contraceptive
289 empowerment, ranges from 23.3% of women in Niger to 33.9% in Kenya. In contrast, 30.7% of women
290 in Uganda to 42.3% of women in Niger had consistently lower SRH empowerment, scoring below the
291 median for both empowerment subscales, compared to their peers. Between 31.9% of women in Kenya
292 and 41.9% of women in Uganda scored above the median in one domain of empowerment and below
293 the median in the other domain, compared to their peers. Specifically, 15.0% of women in Kenya to
294 21.7% in Uganda had more sexual empowerment but less contraceptive empowerment than their peers,
295 while the opposite was true among 15.4% of women in Niger and up to 20.4% of women in Côte
296 d'Ivoire. Differences in mean scores between sexual and contraceptive empowerment measures
297 averaged 0.83 and 1.61 points (on a scale from 1-5) among respondents who had only sexual
298 empowerment or only contraceptive empowerment, while the difference was reduced to 0.40 and 0.17
299 points among respondents who had consistently low or high empowerment across the two dimensions.



300

301 Patterns of relative SRH empowerment, as a combination of sexual and contraceptive
 302 empowerment, varied according to women’s reproductive life cycle, in addition to their social resources
 303 (Table 6). In three sites (Burkina Faso, Cote d’Ivoire, and Uganda), increasing parity was associated
 304 with a greater percentage of women with higher contraceptive empowerment alone but a lower
 305 percentage of women with higher sexual empowerment alone. In West African countries, these
 306 opposing effects resulted in little variation in the percentages of women with overall higher or lower
 307 SRH empowerment by parity, while in the two Eastern African sites, increasing parity correlated with
 308 a rise in the percentages of women with lower overall SRH empowerment and a decline in the
 309 percentages of women with higher overall SRH empowerment. In all sites, as education increased, the
 310 percentage of women who had higher SRH empowerment increased, while the percentage who had
 311 lower SRH empowerment decreased (although non-significant in Uganda, $p=0.11$). In addition, the
 312 percentage of women with higher sexual empowerment alone increased while the percentage of women
 313 with higher contraceptive empowerment alone dropped with education in all sites but Kenya (and Niger
 314 in the case of contraceptive empowerment). While other factors varied by site, notable associations
 315 included increasing percentages of women with higher SRH empowerment and decreasing percentages
 316 of women with high lower SRH empowerment with wealth and cell phone ownership in Niger and
 317 Kenya. Similar patterns of overall SRH empowerment variations were also observed among women
 318 with recent contact with the healthcare system in Cote d’Ivoire, Niger, and Kenya as well as among
 319 women exposed to FP messages in Cote d’Ivoire and Kenya.

320 In multivariate analysis, the role of parity and education remained consistent in most sites,
321 while wealth remained associated with increases in the relative risk ratio of higher SRH empowerment
322 or sexual empowerment alone in three sites (Cote d’Ivoire, Kenya, Uganda). Recent contact with the
323 healthcare system was related to increased relative risk ratio of higher overall SRH empowerment or
324 higher contraceptive empowerment in four sites, while exposure to FP messages through the media was
325 associated with higher overall SRH empowerment in two sites (Cote d’Ivoire and Kenya) (Table 7).

Table 6: Distribution of opportunity structures according to the relative measure of SRH empowerment, by site

| | | Burkina Faso | | | | Cote d'Ivoire | | | | Niger | | | | Kenya | | | | Uganda | | | |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | | % Lower SRH power | % Higher Sex power alone | % Higher FP power alone | % Higher SRH power | % Lower SRH power | % Higher Sex power alone | % Higher FP power alone | % Higher SRH power | % Lower SRH power | % Higher Sex power alone | % Higher FP power alone | % Higher SRH power | % Lower SRH power | % Higher Sex power alone | % Higher FP power alone | % Higher SRH power | % Lower SRH power | % Higher Sex power alone | % Higher FP power alone | % Higher SRH power |
| Age | 15-24 | 33.6 | 17.2 | 20.2 | 29.0 | 32.8 | 20.4 | 20.1 | 26.6 | 42.3 | 15.4 | 19.1 | 23.2 | 34.7 | 16.9 | 15.0 | 33.9 | 30.7 | 20.2 | 21.7 | 27.4 |
| | 25-34 | 36.2 | 18.6 | 17.7 | 27.6 | 37.0 | 19.5 | 19.6 | 23.9 | 45.5 | 15.1 | 16.9 | 22.6 | 34.5 | 16.7 | 13.9 | 34.8 | 26.9 | 26.1 | 17.7 | 29.3 |
| | 35-49 | 33.0 | 16.8 | 20.5 | 29.7 | 29.7 | 22.0 | 20.5 | 27.8 | 39.0 | 16.1 | 21.0 | 23.9 | 34.2 | 17.0 | 14.5 | 34.4 | 30.7 | 19.7 | 20.7 | 29.1 |
| Marital status | Not married | 32.4 | 16.7 | 21.7 | 29.7 | 34.0 | 19.2 | 19.9 | 26.9 | 43.8 | 14.5 | 18.8 | 23.0 | 35.4 | 17.1 | 14.6 | 32.9 | 34.0 | 15.9 | 26.4 | 23.7 |
| | Married/cohabitating | 33.2 | 17.6 | 19.8 | 29.4 | 27.5 | 25.6 | 15.0 | 32.0 | | | | | 33.1 | 17.0 | 10.5 | 39.4 | 30.3 | 20.8 | 21.1 | 27.9 |
| Parity | 0-2 children | 37.1 | 13.8 | 23.9 | 25.1 | 36.2 | 17.2 | 23.3 | 23.3 | | | | | 34.9 | 17.0 | 14.8 | 33.3 | 31.2 | 19.6 | 22.5 | 26.8 |
| | 3 or 4 children | 36.2 | 19.1 | 16.6 | 28.2 | 32.2 | 25.1 | 15.0 | 27.8 | 45.5 | 16.6 | 15.5 | 22.4 | 33.2 | 16.0 | 12.4 | 38.4 | 27.5 | 26.4 | 16.1 | 30.0 |
| | 5+ children | 29.8 | 18.6 | 21.4 | 30.2 | 30.0 | 19.4 | 19.6 | 31.0 | 38.5 | 2.1 | 21.5 | 24.3 | 32.4 | 17.5 | 17.1 | 33.0 | 28.3 | 18.1 | 23.0 | 30.5 |
| Education | No education | 33.9 | 14.5 | 22.9 | 28.8 | 36.9 | 14.1 | 28.8 | 20.2 | 42.2 | 14.0 | 20.6 | 23.2 | 40.0 | 17.7 | 14.3 | 28.0 | 35.8 | 15.1 | 26.6 | 22.4 |
| | Primary | 34.8 | 15.8 | 21.7 | 27.7 | 39.4 | 16.0 | 25.5 | 19.1 | 44.3 | 15.3 | 19.6 | 20.8 | 49.6 | 19.9 | 10.1 | 20.4 | 43.6 | 16.2 | 24.7 | 15.6 |
| | Secondary | 35.4 | 17.2 | 20.1 | 27.4 | 29.2 | 24.6 | 16.9 | 29.3 | 39.3 | 14.2 | 17.2 | 29.3 | 37.7 | 16.6 | 16.5 | 29.3 | 33.7 | 18.9 | 23.9 | 23.5 |
| Wealth tertile | Lowest | 24.4 | 25.7 | 11.8 | 38.2 | 20.9 | 26.3 | 10.5 | 42.3 | 32.5 | 17.1 | 18.1 | 32.2 | 29.0 | 17.0 | 12.6 | 41.5 | 21.5 | 23.9 | 16.5 | 38.2 |
| | | 34.4 | 18.1 | 18.5 | 29.0 | 43.0 | 15.5 | 23.9 | 17.6 | 47.8 | 16.7 | 19.3 | 16.2 | 41.7 | 15.0 | 15.3 | 28.0 | 38.3 | 17.9 | 22.5 | 21.3 |
| | Middle | 32.4 | 19.4 | 19.0 | 29.1 | 32.4 | 19.4 | 19.0 | 29.1 | | | | | 34.9 | 18.2 | 15.5 | 31.5 | 34.0 | 16.8 | 24.6 | 24.7 |
| | | 33.5 | 14.3 | 23.4 | 28.8 | 25.6 | 18.5 | 19.7 | 36.3 | 44.1 | 15.0 | 19.4 | 21.5 | 33.1 | 16.8 | 16.2 | 33.9 | 33.1 | 17.6 | 23.4 | 25.0 |
| Highest | 33.3 | 20.6 | 23.2 | 22.9 | 28.7 | 28.9 | 14.2 | 28.3 | 34.9 | 14.4 | 18.6 | 32.2 | 30.2 | 18.5 | 9.6 | 41.7 | 19.2 | 23.5 | 16.9 | 40.4 | |
| | 32.7 | 19.8 | 18.4 | 29.1 | 28.7 | 28.9 | 14.2 | 28.3 | 34.9 | 14.4 | 18.6 | 32.2 | 30.2 | 18.5 | 9.6 | 41.7 | 19.2 | 23.5 | 16.9 | 40.4 | |
| Has a mobile phone | Yes | 32.6 | 17.6 | 20.4 | 29.4 | 32.2 | 20.7 | 20.1 | 27.0 | 39.0 | 15.0 | 20.9 | 25.2 | 33.7 | 17.0 | 14.1 | 35.1 | 29.3 | 19.8 | 22.0 | 28.9 |
| | No | 46.8 | 12.2 | 18.2 | 22.8 | 41.0 | 17.2 | 20.2 | 21.6 | 48.4 | 16.1 | 15.9 | 19.6 | 41.6 | 16.4 | 16.5 | 25.5 | 36.4 | 21.9 | 20.4 | 21.3 |
| Employment | Yes | 34.2 | 15.7 | 22.4 | 27.7 | 34.4 | 20.0 | 21.8 | 23.9 | 41.7 | 12.7 | 17.2 | 28.4 | 32.9 | 17.0 | 15.0 | 35.2 | 29.8 | 19.4 | 22.9 | 28.0 |
| | No | 32.9 | 19.1 | 17.5 | 30.5 | 29.5 | 21.6 | 16.4 | 32.6 | 42.5 | 16.1 | 19.6 | 21.8 | 37.8 | 16.9 | 13.5 | 31.8 | 32.3 | 21.7 | 19.5 | 26.4 |
| Residence | Rural | 34.2 | 15.7 | 21.3 | 29.0 | 34.2 | 19.8 | 20.0 | 26.0 | 44.6 | 15.5 | 19.3 | 20.6 | 34.8 | 17.1 | 15.3 | 32.8 | 33.8 | 17.9 | 15.2 | 36.1 |
| | Urban | 30.6 | 24.5 | 15.0 | 29.9 | 31.7 | 21.0 | 20.2 | 27.2 | 29.1 | 14.5 | 18.0 | 38.4 | 34.4 | 16.6 | 12.4 | 36.7 | 21.7 | 27.1 | 15.2 | 36.1 |
| Contact with health services | Yes | 32.7 | 16.6 | 21.4 | 29.3 | 30.4 | 20.2 | 20.8 | 28.6 | 36.8 | 15.6 | 19.6 | 28.0 | 32.6 | 16.7 | 15.3 | 35.4 | 29.1 | 20.0 | 22.4 | 28.5 |
| | No | 37.7 | 20.3 | 14.9 | 27.2 | 39.7 | 21.1 | 18.0 | 21.2 | 51.8 | 14.9 | 18.2 | 15.0 | 40.4 | 17.7 | 11.9 | 30.0 | 36.3 | 21.1 | 19.2 | 23.5 |
| Media exposure to FP message in | Yes | 31.0 | 17.2 | 20.3 | 31.5 | 28.1 | 21.8 | 18.2 | 31.9 | 40.6 | 13.9 | 19.1 | 26.4 | 33.1 | 16.9 | 14.3 | 35.7 | 29.7 | 20.7 | 20.8 | 28.9 |
| | No | 38.4 | 17.4 | 20.0 | 24.2 | 37.4 | 19.1 | 22.1 | 21.4 | 43.8 | 17.0 | 19.2 | 20.5 | 45.1 | 16.7 | 15.1 | 23.1 | 35.5 | 18.1 | 26.2 | 20.3 |

FP = contraceptive empowerment

bold numbers are indicative of significant associations p<0.05.

Table 7: Opportunity structures associated with the relative measure SRH empowerment by site: results from multivariate multinomial regression models.

| | | Burkina | | | Cote d'Ivoire | | | Niger <i>reference group, lower SRH agency</i> | | | Kenya | | | Uganda | | |
|---|-----------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| | | RRR Higher Sex power | RRR Higher FP power | RRR Higher SRH power | RRR Higher Sex power | RRR Higher FP power | RRR Higher SRH power | RRR Higher Sex power | RRR Higher FP power | RRR Higher SRH power | RRR Higher Sex power | RRR Higher FP power | RRR Higher SRH power | RRR Higher Sex power | RRR Higher FP power | RRR Higher SRH power |
| Parity | 0-2 children | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref |
| | 3-4 children | 1.33 | 1.49 | 1.43 | 0.95 | 1.32 | 1.50 | 1.14 | 1.62 | 1.23 | 1.18 | 1.4 | 0.99 | 0.71 | 1.36 | 1.09 |
| | 5+ children | 0.98 | 1.47 | 1.28 | 0.66 | 1.63 | 0.98 | 0.96 | 1.51 | 1.23 | 1.06 | 0.99 | 0.80 | 0.53 | 1.33 | 0.80 |
| Education | None-primary | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref |
| | secondary cycle | 1.07 | 0.93 | 1.01 | 1.86 | 0.92 | 1.89 | 1.01 | 0.98 | 1.30 | 0.91 | 1.82 | 1.38 | 1.32 | 1.18 | 1.65 |
| | secondary cycle | 2.29 | 0.88 | 2.20 | 2.28 | 0.87 | 4.04 | 1.50 | 1.22 | 2.92 | 1.12 | 1.91 | 2.17 | 1.70 | 1.23 | 2.93 |
| Wealth | low | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref |
| | intermediate | 0.77 | 1.28 | 0.99 | 1.75 | 1.44 | 2.64 | 0.88 | 1.00 | 1.38 | 1.36 | 1.1 | 1.07 | 1.05 | 1.2 | 1.18 |
| | high | 0.88 | 1.03 | 0.84 | 1.76 | 0.90 | 1.10 | 0.98 | 1.09 | 2.14 | 1.42 | 0.71 | 1.13 | 2.15 | 1.40 | 2.24 |
| Employed | No | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref |
| | Yes | 0.80 | 1.18 | 0.87 | 0.82 | 1.1 | 0.67 | 0.79 | 0.81 | 1.33 | 1.08 | 1.20 | 1.14 | 1.00 | 1.25 | 1.09 |
| | No | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref |
| Phone ownership | Yes | 1.93 | 1.67 | 1.84 | 1.31 | 1.31 | 1.41 | 1.14 | 1.63 | 1.28 | 1.04 | 0.89 | 1.27 | 0.77 | 1.09 | 1.09 |
| Recent contact with healthcare provider | No | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref |
| | Yes | 0.94 | 1.57 | 1.23 | 1.21 | 1.51 | 1.68 | 1.46 | 1.45 | 2.40 | 1.09 | 1.50 | 1.28 | 1.12 | 1.41 | 1.34 |
| Received FP message through media in last 12 months | No | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref | ref |
| | Yes | 1.16 | 1.23 | 1.53 | 1.07 | 1.08 | 1.35 | 0.87 | 1.03 | 1.21 | 1.21 | 1.11 | 1.55 | 1.14 | 0.85 | 1.27 |

RRR= adjusted relative risk ratios compared to reference group of lower sexual empowerment
bold numbers are indicative of significant associations p<0.05.

Discussion

This cross-national exploration of women's SRH empowerment in five sub-Saharan countries provides empirical evidence supporting the multidimensional nature of women's SRH empowerment, which lies at the intersection of agency and opportunity structures and varies according to the nature of decisions considered (sex versus contraception). Using a newly validated measure of SRH empowerment, we found empowerment varied by country and domain, and according to women's reproductive life cycle and social resources.

Across domains of sex and contraception, empowerment was consistently lowest in Niger and Uganda and highest in Kenya. These differences align with some global indicators of development, such as the United Nation's human development index(20), offering empirical support for the UN's agenda of promoting women's empowerment to accelerate sustainable human development, although directionality of associations still need to be established. However, patterns of sexual and contraceptive empowerment are less aligned with country level indicators of gender equality and SRH, as the gender inequality index is more favorable in Uganda than any our Western African countries(23) while SRH empowerment was more favorable in Cote d'Ivoire and Burkina Faso than Uganda. While the gender inequality index includes dimensions of reproductive health and empowerment along with labor market, these dimensions focus on different aspects of empowerment (education and parliament representation) or reproductive health (maternal mortality and adolescent birth rates)(23), which likely explains differences in the patterns observed. As such, our measure of SRH empowerment may provide complementary information towards monitoring progress towards achieving SDG 5 and SG3 goals.

The study also confirms theoretical perspectives on empowerment, which lies at the intersection of agency and opportunity structures and is multidimensional, varying according to the nature of life decisions. In our study, the low correlation between sexual and contraceptive empowerment scores suggests that women who have power over sexual decisions do not necessarily control contraceptive decisions, and vice versa. These results have both research and programmatic implications, highlighting the need to align empowerment indicators with the SRH outcomes of interest. For example, efforts to promote contraceptive empowerment and informed choice to use contraception may bear little impact on women's sexual empowerment within their partnerships. Similarly, programs aimed at increasing

sexual empowerment and/or reducing sexual violence, may not advance outcomes related to contraceptive use. To simultaneously empower women and girls in achieving their SRH outcomes more holistically, programs must include components promoting both sexual and contraceptive empowerment. As such, contextually validated measures, such as our SRH empowerment index, or other indicators of contraceptive or sexual autonomy, should be prioritized over more traditional measures, such as household decision-making or mobility, that are loosely and inconsistently associated with SRH outcomes in sub-Saharan Africa (6).

The higher levels of contraceptive empowerment compared to sexual empowerment in all countries, could reflect the division of gender roles and power, promoting men's sexual prowess, while stigmatizing women's sexuality and instead assigning women the responsibility of regulating their fertility (24). These divisions amplify over the reproductive life course, as we found women who had more children gained contraceptive empowerment in some sites but lost sexual empowerment in the two East African settings. While the directionality of associations cannot be established with cross-sectional data, we hypothesize the observed patterns could be reinforced by the health system, which seems to be associated with increased contraceptive empowerment, but not sexual empowerment, calling for greater programmatic efforts to address women's SRH needs more holistically. However, these efforts are unlikely to succeed unless they also engage men to challenge gender-specific norms and attitudes surrounding sex, and improve their competencies in preventing sexual risks related to STIs and unintended pregnancy(25).

Our study also explores the theoretical distinction between agency and opportunity structures, showing how different forms of social capital enable different forms of empowerment. We found women's education and wealth were consistently related to sexual empowerment and to a lesser extent contraceptive empowerment, while employment was not related to either. Education was specifically correlated with contraceptive empowerment in settings where women accessed higher education but not in countries where 70% of the population or more had little to no education. These results confirm the role of education in promoting women's sexual and contraceptive empowerment (26), while calling for greater understanding of the relationship between women's economic empowerment and SRH

empowerment. Prior studies have raised the alarm on the potential backlash of women's economic autonomy on their social safety, including exposure to intimate partner violence(27). The intersection of economic and SRH empowerment was beyond the scope of the present study, but merits further exploration given the lack of cross-sectional association between women's employment and their level of SRH empowerment.

While the current study uses cross-sectional data that prevent the exploration of SRH empowerment as a dynamic process that unfolds from existence to exercise of choices leading to desired outcomes, our results provide support for future longitudinal investigation of this process, given the distinct constructs of existence and exercise of sexual or contraceptive choices described in this study. Specifically, longitudinal studies should examine how SRH empowerment develops from existence to exercise of choice and how each component contributes to future desired SRH outcomes. Our current multidimensional SRH empowerment measure allows such an exploration using repeated measures over time.

Beyond the cross-sectional nature of the study that prevents any causal inferences, our study should be interpreted with several limitations in mind. The SRH empowerment index was missing one item related to exercise of contraceptive choices which likely affects the quality measure. The item was reintroduced in Phase 2, but we could not use Phase 2 data as sexual empowerment was only collected in Phases 1 and 3 of the PMA surveys to reduce survey burden. Additionally, while the measure captures different components of SRH empowerment, some domains are missing, including pregnancy-related empowerment or the ability to determine the timing and outcome of a pregnancy. This domain was initially included in the formative measurement work, but no consistent indicator of pregnancy empowerment emerged across settings (17). Further measurement advances are needed to integrate women's motivations for childbearing and their ability to act on them, which is distinct from contraceptive empowerment, given the significant gap between pregnancy intentions and contraceptive intentions (28). Another study limitation is the lack of partner perspective, providing little context in which women make SRH decisions, despite the dyadic nature of sexual and reproductive behaviors (29) and the power dynamics informing these decisions (30).

Despite, these limitations, we believe our results contribute important empirical evidence of the multidimensional nature of SRH empowerment and its connection to opportunity structures, pointing to the evolving nature of empowerment over the reproductive life course and the importance of social capital (education) in strengthening women's ability to set and act on their sexual desires and contraceptive decisions. Longitudinal research is needed to further understand how women gain or lose power over these decisions and how the intersection of agency and opportunity structures, which together constitute empowerment, predict future sexual and contraceptive behaviors.

Acknowledgements: The authors would like to thank the women who graciously agreed to share their experiences and perspectives by responding the PMA survey. We also thank Performance Monitoring for Action (PMA) teams, including data collectors, field supervisors, and research staff and for their invaluable work in fielding the PMA surveys. Their involvement made a critical contribution to the quality of the research presented.

References

1. UN General Assembly. Transforming our world : the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, [Internet]. 2015 Oct [cited 2023 Jul 22]. Report No.: A/RES/70/1. Available from: <https://www.refworld.org/docid/57b6e3e44.html>
2. Prata N, Fraser A, Huchko MJ, Gipson JD, Withers M, Lewis S, et al. WOMEN'S EMPOWERMENT AND FAMILY PLANNING: A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE. *J Biosoc Sci.* 2017 Nov;49(06):713–43.
3. Nkhoma DE, Lin CP, Katengeza HL, Soko CJ, Estinfort W, Wang YC, et al. Girls' Empowerment and Adolescent Pregnancy: A Systematic Review. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2020 Mar 4;17(5):1664.
4. Pratley P. Associations between quantitative measures of women's empowerment and access to care and health status for mothers and their children: A systematic review of evidence from the developing world. *Soc Sci Med.* 2016 Nov;169:119–31.
5. Upadhyay UD, Upadhyay UD. Women's empowerment and fertility: A review of the literature. *Soc Sci Med.* 2014;115:111–20.
6. Heckert J, Fabic MS. Improving Data Concerning Women's Empowerment in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Stud Fam Plann.* 2013;44(3):319–44.
7. Malhotra A, Schuler SR, Boender C. Measuring Women's Empowerment. 2002;59.

8. Richardson RA. Measuring Women's Empowerment: A Critical Review of Current Practices and Recommendations for Researchers. *Soc Indic Res.* 2018 Jun;137(2):539–57.
9. Kabeer N. Reflections on the measurement of women's empowerment. In Stockholm: AB NG, ed. *Sida Studies*; 2001. (Discussing Women's Empowerment--Theory and Practice; vol. 3).
10. Alsop R, Bertelsen M, Holland J. Empowerment in Practice: From Analysis to Implementation [Internet]. The World Bank; 2005 [cited 2018 Aug 31]. Available from: <http://elibrary.worldbank.org/doi/book/10.1596/978-0-8213-6450-5>
11. Vizheh M, Muhidin S, Behboodi Moghadam Z, Zareiyani A. Women empowerment in reproductive health: a systematic review of measurement properties. *BMC Womens Health.* 2021 Dec;21(1):424.
12. Desai S, Chen F, Reddy S, McLaughlin A. Measuring Women's Empowerment in the Global South. *Annu Rev Sociol.* 2022 Jul 29;48(1):507–27.
13. James-Hawkins L, Peters C, VanderEnde K, Bardin L, Yount KM. Women's agency and its relationship to current contraceptive use in lower- and middle-income countries: A systematic review of the literature. *Glob Public Health.* 2018 Jul 3;13(7):843–58.
14. Mandal, M, Treves-Kagan, S, Mejia, C. Validating Measures of Reproductive Empowerment in Kenya. Chapel Hill, NC, USA. Chapel Hill, NC, USA: MEASURE Evaluation, University of North Carolina; 2020.
15. Mandal, M., Albert, L. M. Reproductive Empowerment Scale: Psychometric Validation in Nigeria. Chapel Hill, NC, USA: MEASURE Evaluation, University of North Carolina. Chapel Hill, NC, USA: MEASURE Evaluation, University of North Carolina.; 2020.
16. Senderowicz L. Contraceptive Autonomy: Conceptions and Measurement of a Novel Family Planning Indicator. *Stud Fam Plann.* 2020 Jun;51(2):161–76.
17. Moreau, Karp, Wood, Galadanci, Kibira, Makumbi, et al. Reconceptualizing Women's and Girls' Empowerment: A Cross-Cultural Index for Measuring Progress Toward Improved Sexual and Reproductive Health. *Int Perspect Sex Reprod Health.* 2020;46:187.
18. Karp C, Wood SN, Galadanci H, Sebina Kibira SP, Makumbi F, Omoluabi E, et al. 'I am the master key that opens and locks': Presentation and application of a conceptual framework for women's and girls' empowerment in reproductive health. *Soc Sci Med.* 2020 Aug;258:113086.
19. Wood SN, Karp C, Tsui A, Kibira SPS, Desta S, Galadanci H, et al. A sexual and reproductive empowerment framework to explore volitional sex in sub-Saharan Africa. *Cult Health Sex.* 2020 Apr 3;1–18.
20. Nations U. Human Development Index [Internet]. Human Development Reports. United Nations; [cited 2024 Jul 10]. Available from: <https://hdr.undp.org/data-center/human-development-index>
21. United Nations. Gender Inequality Index [Internet]. Human Development Reports. United Nations; [cited 2024 Jul 10]. Available from: <https://hdr.undp.org/data-center/thematic-composite-indices/gender-inequality-index>
22. Zimmerman L, Olson H, Tsui A, Radloff S. PMA2020: Rapid Turn-Around Survey Data to Monitor Family Planning Service and Practice in Ten Countries. *Stud Fam Plann.* 2017 Sep 1;48(3):293–303.

23. Nations U. Gender Inequality Index [Internet]. Human Development Reports. United Nations; [cited 2024 Jul 10]. Available from: <https://hdr.undp.org/data-center/thematic-composite-indices/gender-inequality-index>
24. Connell R. Gender, health and theory: Conceptualizing the issue, in local and world perspective. *Soc Sci Med*. 2012 Jun;74(11):1675–83.
25. Shand T, Marcell AV. Engaging Men in Sexual and Reproductive Health. In: Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Global Public Health [Internet]. Oxford University Press; 2021 [cited 2023 Sep 22]. Available from: <https://oxfordre.com/publichealth/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190632366.001.0001/acrefore-9780190632366-e-215>
26. Psaki SR, Chuang EK, Melnikas AJ, Wilson DB, Mensch BS. Causal effects of education on sexual and reproductive health in low and middle-income countries: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *SSM - Popul Health*. 2019 Aug;8:100386.
27. Vyas S, Watts C. How does economic empowerment affect women’s risk of intimate partner violence in low and middle income countries? A systematic review of published evidence. *J Int Dev*. 2009;21(5):577–602.
28. Moreau C, Shankar M, Helleringer S, Becker S. Measuring unmet need for contraception as a point prevalence. *BMJ Glob Health*. 2019 Aug;4(4):e001581.
29. Miller WB, Severy LJ, Pasta DJ. A Framework for Modelling Fertility Motivation in Couples. *Popul Stud*. 2004;58(2):193–205.
30. Dodoo FNA, Frost AE. Gender in African Population Research: The Fertility/Reproductive Health Example. *Annu Rev Sociol*. 2008;34(1):431–52.

Appendix 1: Correlations between different domains and dimensions of SRH empowerment

| | sexual existence of choice | sexual exercise of choice | Contraceptive existence of choice | Contraceptive exercise of choice |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|
| Burkina Faso | | | | |
| sexual existence of choice | 1 | | | |
| sexual exercise of choice | 0.15 | 1 | | |
| Contraceptive existence of choice | 0.33 | 0.08 | 1 | |
| Contraceptive exercise of choice | 0.04 | 0.19 | 0.15 | 1 |
| Cote d'Ivoire | | | | |
| sexual existence of choice | 1 | | | |
| sexual exercise of choice | 0.18 | 1 | | |
| Contraceptive existence of choice | 0.31 | 0.12 | 1 | |
| Contraceptive exercise of choice | 0.02 | 0.22 | 0.16 | 1 |
| Niger | | | | |
| sexual existence of choice | 1 | | | |
| sexual exercise of choice | -0.17 | 1 | | |
| Contraceptive existence of choice | 0.42 | -0.11 | 1 | |
| Contraceptive exercise of choice | -0.02 | 0.30 | 0.13 | 1 |
| Kenya | | | | |
| sexual existence of choice | 1 | | | |
| sexual exercise of choice | 0.22 | 1 | | |
| Contraceptive existence of choice | 0.39 | 0.22 | 1 | |
| Contraceptive exercise of choice | 0.13 | 0.28 | 0.18 | 1 |
| Uganda | | | | |
| sexual existence of choice | 1 | | | |
| sexual exercise of choice | 0.18 | 1 | | |
| Contraceptive existence of choice | 0.28 | 0.10 | 1 | |
| FP exercise of choice | -0.02 | 0.18 | 0.07 | 1 |