

PO-100-100 99
100-100-100
3/10/86

EVALUATION OF THE VOLUNTARY
STERILIZATION PROGRAM

Tables on Bangladesh Government(BDG)
Clinics
for
April-June 1986 quarter

M. A. Quasem and Co.
7/16 Lalmatia, Block-B
Dhaka-7, Bangladesh

December 15, 1986

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the agreement between the Bangladesh Government (BDG) and the USAID, a protocol was signed stipulating the reimbursement by the latter of the selected costs of BDG Voluntary Sterilization (VS) Program. The protocol also provides for an independent audit/evaluation of the VS program. Accordingly, in March 1983, USAID, Dhaka, appointed M/s. M.A. Quasem & co. - a Bangladeshi Chartered Accountants firm to conduct quarterly audit of the voluntary sterilization of BDG clinics. The contract expired in December, 1984. However, another agreement signed between USAID and M.A. Quasem & Co. provided scope for conducting eight quarterly evaluation of the VS program covering both BDG and NGO¹ clinics beginning from January-March 1985 quarter. Under the given objectives and approved methodology, the present report, the sixth of its kind, is the evaluation of the April-June 1986 quarter of the VS program of both BDG and NGO done through a nationally representative sample survey. The report has already been submitted to the USAID, Dhaka.

The field survey of the sixth quarterly evaluation was carried out in June and July 1986. It was conducted in 50 selected upazilas of the country of which 38 upazilas were selected for evaluation of BDG clinics and the rest 12 upazilas were selected for NGO clinics only. From these selected upazilas, 1520 BDG clients and 480 NGO clients were selected for field survey. Data were collected for those clients from both the clinic records and from the clients directly through personal interview.

¹ Non-Government Organisation

The detailed methodology and the objectives of the evaluation are contained in the report of the evaluation of the VS program for April-June 1986 quarter and hence are not repeated here.

According to the contract, this report, containing selected tables based on weighted client sample, has been prepared separately on the findings of BDG clinics only as 'parallel tables' of the report of the sixth quarter of the evaluation of the VS program and are shown in the annexure.

ANNEXURE
BDG TABLES

Table 1: Percentage distribution of all clients by status of locating the clients

Status of locating the clients	Categories of clients		
	Tubectomy	Vasectomy	All
<u>Client located</u>	<u>90.7</u>	<u>91.1</u>	<u>90.9</u>
Interviewed	84.1	77.0	79.5
Not interviewed	6.6	14.1	11.4
<u>Client not located</u>	<u>9.3</u>	<u>8.9</u>	<u>9.1</u>
Client permanently left the address	3.6	3.2	3.4
Client was only temporarily visiting there	4.8	2.5	3.4
Address not found	0.5	2.8	2.0
Client died before the reference quarter	-	0.2	0.1
Client died within the reference quarter	0.2	0.2	0.1
Not attempted	0.2	0.1	0.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	535	985	1520

Table 2: Percentage distribution of the interviewed clients by reported clinics

Reported clinic	Categories of clients		
	Tubectomy	Vasectomy	All
Recorded clinic	99.6	98.0	98.5
Other than the recorded clinic	0.4	1.3	1.0
<u>Sterilized twice</u>			
Recorded clinic and other than the recorded clinic	-	0.1	0.1
<u>Never sterilized</u>			
Never visited the recorded clinic	-	0.5	0.3
Visited the recorded clinic for other purpose	-	0.1	0.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	450	758	1208

Table 3: Percentage distribution of the interviewed clients
by status of reported date of operation

Status of date of operation	Categories of clients		
	Tubectomy	Vasectomy	All
Within the quarter	94.2	95.0	94.7
<u>Before the quarter</u>			
Upto 6 months	0.2	0.4	0.3
Before 6 months to 12 months	-	1.2	0.8
" 13 " to 2 years	0.5	1.2	0.9
" 2 years and above	4.9	1.3	2.6
<u>Sterilized twice</u>			
1st operation before the quarter and 2nd operation within the quarter	-	0.3	0.2
<u>Never sterilized</u>			
Never visited the recorded clinic	0.2	0.5	0.4
Visited the recorded clinic for other purpose	-	0.1	0.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	450	758	1208

Table 4: Percentage distribution of the interviewed clients by status of reported date of operation and by status of reported clinics

Status of reported clinic	Status of reported date of operation	Tubectomy				Vasectomy					A l l				
		Within the quarter	Before the quarter	Never sterilized	A l l	Within the quarter	Before the quarter	Within the quarter and before the quarter	Never sterilized	A l l	Within the quarter	Before the quarter	Within the quarter and before the quarter	Never sterilized	A l l
Sterilized in the recorded clinic		94.2	5.1	-	99.3	95.0	2.9	-	-	99.9	94.7	3.7	-	-	98.4
Sterilized in other than the recorded clinic		-	0.5	-	0.5	-	1.2	-	-	1.2	-	0.9	-	-	0.9
Sterilized twice (sterilized in the recorded clinic and other than the recorded clinic)		-	-	-	-	-	-	0.3	-	0.3	-	-	0.2	-	0.2
Never sterilized		-	-	0.2	0.2	-	-	-	0.6	0.6	-	-	-	0.5	0.5
Total Weighted N		94.2	5.6	0.2	100.0 450	95.0	4.1	0.3	0.6	100.0 758	94.7	4.6	0.2	0.5	100.0 1208

Table 5: Percentage distribution of the SELECTED CLIENTS by
results of interviews

Results of interviews	Categories of clients		
	Tubectomy	Vasectomy	All
A. INTERVIEWED			
Sterilized within the quarter in the recorded clinic	79.2	73.1	75.3
Sterilized before the quarter in the recorded clinic	4.3	2.2	3.0
Sterilized before the quarter in other than the recorded clinic	0.4	1.0	0.7
Sterilized twice (1st operation before the quarter in other than the recorded clinic and 2nd operation within the quarter in the recorded clinic)	-	0.2	0.1
Never sterilized	0.2	0.5	0.4
B. NOT INTERVIEWED			
Client not available	6.6	14.1	11.4
Client has permanently left the address	3.6	3.2	3.4
Client was only temporarily visiting the address	4.8	2.5	3.4
Address not found	0.5	2.8	2.0
Client died before the reference quarter	-	0.2	0.1
Client died within the reference quarter	0.2	0.1	0.1
Not attempted	0.2	0.1	0.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	535	985	1520

Estimated false* cases for tubectomy : 5.4 percent
 Estimated false cases for vasectomy : 6.9 percent

*False cases means those clients who fall under the category,
 'address not found', 'never sterilized clients', 'operations not
 done in the quarter', 'operations not done in the recorded clinic',
 'double operations', and 'client died before the reference quarter'.

Table 6: Percentage distribution of all the SELECTED CLIENTS by type and status of informed consent forms

Status of informed consent form	Type of operation		Total
	Tubectomy	Vasectomy	
<u>USAID-approved</u>			
Signed by clients	99.6	99.1	99.3
Not signed by clients	0.4	0.3	0.3
<u>Not USAID-approved</u>			
Signed by clients	-	0.6	0.4
Not signed by clients	-	-	-
<u>No informed consent form</u>	-	-	-
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	535	985	1520

Table 7: Percentage distribution of the ACTUALLY STERILIZED CLIENTS by types of informed consent forms and status of signing

Types of consent forms and status of signing	Categories of clients		
	Tubectomy	Vasectomy	All
<u>USAID-approved</u>			
Signed by clients	99.5	99.2	99.3
Not signed by clients	0.5	-	0.2
<u>Not USAID-approved</u>			
Signed by clients	-	0.8	0.5
Not signed by clients	-	-	-
<u>No informed consent form</u>	-	-	-
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	424	719	1143

Table 8: Percentage distribution of the actually sterilized clients by status of informed consent forms and status of receipt of surgical apparel

Status of informed consent form	Status of receipt of surgical apparel	Categories of clients			
		Tubectomy	Vasectomy	All	
USAID-approved informed consent forms signed by clients	Received	99.5	97.8	98.4	
	Did not receive	-	1.4	0.9	
Sub-total		99.5	99.2	99.3	
Informed consent form not USAID-approved/ informed consent form USAID-approved but not signed by clients/ no consent form	Received	0.5	0.8	0.7	
	Did not receive	-	-	-	
Sub-total		0.5	0.8	0.7	
All		Received	100.0	98.6	99.1
		Did not receive	-	1.4	0.9
Total		100.0	100.0	100.0	
Weighted N		424	719	1143	

Table 9: Percentage distribution of the actually sterilized tubectomy clients by amount reportedly received

Amount reportedly received in Taka	All clients	Status of facilities received	
		Received any facility	Received no facility
175.00	90.8	NA	NA
170.00	0.5	0.3	0.2
165.00	0.2	0.2	-
160.00	5.9	5.2	0.7
150.00	2.0	1.7	0.3
140.00	0.2	0.2	-
130.00	0.2	0.2	-
125.00	0.2	0.2	-
Total	100.0	8.0	1.2
Weighted N	424		

Reported average amount: Tk.173.29

Estimated average amount considering the 'received any facility' category received the approved amount: Tk.174.82

Note: NA in the table stands for not applicable cases

Table 10: Percentage distribution of the actually sterilized vasectomy clients by amount reportedly received

Amount reportedly received in Taka	All clients	Status of facilities received	
		Received any facility	Received no facility
175.00	96.8	NA	NA
170.00	1.0	0.3	0.7
165.00	0.1	-	0.1
160.00	0.4	-	0.4
150.00	0.1	-	0.1
140.00	0.1	0.1	-
120.00	0.1	-	0.1
100.00	0.4	0.1	0.3
80.00	0.3	-	0.3
75.00	0.3	-	0.3
60.00	0.1	-	0.1
40.00	0.3	0.2	0.1
Total	100.0	0.7	2.5
Weighted N	719		

Reported average amount: Tk.173.34

Estimated average amount considering the 'received any facility' category received the approved amount: Tk.173.70

Note: NA in the table stands for not applicable cases

Table 11: Percentage distribution of actually sterilized clients by status of promise for unapproved items

Status of promise for unapproved items	Categories of clients		
	Tubectomy	Vasectomy	All
Promised for unapproved items	-	-	-
Not promised for unapproved items	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	424	719	1143

Table 12: Percentage distribution of the actually sterilized clients by whether they knew before sterilization that they could not have any child after accepting sterilization

Status of knowledge	Categories of clients		
	Tubectomy	Vasectomy	All
Knew	100.0	100.0	100.0
Did not know	-	-	-
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	424	719	1143

Table 13: Percentage distribution of the actually sterilized clients by the length of time they had seriously thought about having the sterilization method

P e r i o d	Categories of clients		
	Tubectomy	Vasectomy	All
1 day to 7 days	0.9	3.2	2.4
8 days to 15 days	0.9	5.0	3.5
16 days to 29 days	-	0.8	0.5
1 month to 2 months	8.7	18.8	15.1
More than 2 months to 4 months	8.5	11.3	10.2
More than 4 months to 6 months	20.1	14.3	16.4
More than 6 months to 12 months	34.0	25.5	28.6
More than 1 year	26.9	21.1	23.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	424	719	1143

Table 14: Percentage distribution of the actually sterilized clients by categories whether they had talked to anyone who had already had a sterilization before their operation

Whether talked to anyone or not	Categories of clients		
	Tubectomy	Vasectomy	All
Talked	87.3	72.5	78.0
Did not talk	12.7	27.5	22.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	424	719	1143

Table 15: Percentage distribution of the actually sterilized clients by the length of time they had seriously thought about having the sterilization method and whether they had talked to anyone who had already had a sterilization before their operation

Period of thinking before sterilization	Type of operation					
	Tubectomy			Vasectomy		
	Talked	Did not talk	Total	Talked	Did not talk	Total
Less than 30 days	1.2	0.7	1.9	3.9	5.0	8.9
1 month to 6 months	29.0	8.0	37.0	29.3	15.2	44.5
More than 6 months to 12 months	31.9	2.1	34.0	20.4	5.2	25.6
More than 1 year	25.2	1.9	27.1	18.8	2.2	21.0
T o t a l	87.3	12.7	100.0	72.4	27.6	100.0
Weighted N			424			719

Table 16: Percentage distribution of the actually sterilized clients by categories whether they had suggested anyone for sterilization after accepting sterilization method or whether they would suggest to anyone in the future

Suggestion by clients	Categories of clients		
	Tubectomy	Vasectomy	All
Gave suggestion	66.3	62.9	64.1
Would suggest in future	32.3	33.4	33.0
Would not suggest in future	1.4	3.7	2.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	424	719	1143

Table 17: Percentage distribtuion of the actually sterilized tubectomy clients by recorded and reported helpers

Recorded helper	Reported helper								
	BDG fieldworker	Other NGO fieldworker	BDG registered agent	BVS registered agent	Registered Dai	Unspecified category ¹	Does not know	Went alone	All
BDG fieldworker	50.9	-	2.8	0.7	4.0	4.3	-	1.9	64.6
Other NGO fieldworker	0.7	6.4	0.7	-	1.2	-	-	0.2	9.2
BDG registered agent	-	-	12.0	-	-	0.5	0.5	1.2	14.2
Registered Dai	-	-	-	-	10.4	-	0.7	0.9	12.0
Total	51.6	6.4	15.5	0.7	15.6	4.8	1.2	4.2	100.0
Weighted N = 424									

¹The clients could not specify the categories of their helpers whether they were FP workers or registered agents.

Table 18: Percentage distribution of the actually sterilized vasectomy clients by recorded and reported helpers

Recorded helper	Reported helper								
	BDG field-worker	BAVS salaried field-worker	Other NGO fieldworker	BDG registered agent	Registered Dai	Unspecified category ¹	Went alone	Does not know	All
BDG fieldworker	32.1	0.3	0.1	5.2	0.8	2.1	2.8	-	43.4
BAVS Salaried field-worker	-	2.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.0
Other NGO field-worker	-	-	4.2	1.1	-	-	0.3	0.3	5.9
BDG registered agent	0.1	-	0.1	37.8	0.3	1.8	2.0	2.4	44.5
Registered Dai	-	-	-	-	4.2	-	-	-	4.2
Total	32.2	2.3	4.4	44.1	5.3	3.9	5.1	2.7	100.0
Weighted N = 719									

¹The clients could not specify the categories of their helpers whether they were FP workers or registered agents.

Table 19: Percentage distribution of the actually sterilized tubectomy clients by reported age of client and husband

Age group of clients (in years)	Age group of husband (in years)									Total
	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	70-74	
15 - 19	0.2	0.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.4
20 - 24	1.0	3.8	2.4	0.7	0.2	0.2	-	-	-	8.3
25 - 29	0.2	10.9	27.6	7.8	1.4	0.5	0.2	-	-	48.6
30 - 34	-	0.5	14.2	11.1	7.3	1.4	2.4	-	-	36.9
35 - 39	-	-	-	1.4	2.4	0.5	0.2	-	-	4.5
40 - 44	-	-	-	-	0.2	0.5	0.2	0.2	-	1.1
45 - 49	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.2	0.2
Total	1.4	15.4	44.2	21.0	11.5	3.1	3.0	0.2	0.2	100.0
Weighted N = 424										
Mean age (in years) : Clients : 29.6										
: Husband : 40.0										

Table 21: Percentage distribution of the actually sterilized clients by reported number of living children

Reported number of living children	Categories of clients		
	Tubectomy	Vasectomy	All
0	0.5	0.1	0.3
1	2.1	2.1	2.1
2	19.6	24.1	22.4
3	31.8	31.7	31.8
4	25.0	19.8	21.7
5	13.0	12.1	12.4
6	4.9	3.5	4.0
7	1.7	2.8	2.4
8	1.2	2.7	2.0
9	-	0.8	0.5
10	0.2	0.1	0.2
11	-	0.1	0.1
14	-	0.1	0.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	424	719	1143
Mean number of living children	3.5	3.6	3.6

Table 22: Percentage distribution of the actually sterilized clients by employment status of women

Employment status of wife/client	Categories of clients		
	Tubectomy	Vasectomy	A l l
Employed with cash earning	8.0	8.2	8.1
Employed without cash earning	1.9	1.4	1.6
Not employed	90.1	90.4	90.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	424	719	1143

Table 23: Percentage distribution of the actually sterilized clients by occupation of husband/wife

Occupation of husband/wife	Categories of clients		
	Tubectomy	Vasectomy	A l l
Agriculture	27.6	23.5	25.0
Day labour	50.0	64.7	59.2
Business	15.1	9.0	11.3
Service	6.4	2.4	3.9
Not employed	0.9	0.1	0.5
Others	-	0.3	0.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	424	719	1143

Table 24: Percentage distribution of the actually sterilized clients by their educational level

Educational level	Categories of clients		
	Tubectomy	Vasectomy	All
No schooling	87.5	72.3	78.0
No class passed	1.2	0.6	0.8
Class I-IV	5.4	12.9	10.2
Class V	2.4	6.0	4.6
Class VI-IX	3.5	6.8	5.6
SSC and HSC	-	1.4	0.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	424	719	1143

Table 25: Percentage distribution of the actually sterilized clients by religion

Religion	Categories of clients		
	Tubectomy	Vasectomy	All
Muslim	72.2	90.0	83.4
Hindu	27.6	9.5	16.2
Christian	0.2	0.5	0.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	424	719	1143

Table 26: Percentage distribution of the actually sterilized clients by ownership of land

Status of land ownership	Categories of clients		
	Tubectomy	Vasectomy	All
Owned land	37.7	33.8	35.3
Did not own land	62.3	66.2	64.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	424	719	1143

Table 27: Percentage distribution of the service providers/helpers by status of interview

Interview status	Categories of service providers/ helpers		
	Physicians	Clinic staff	Helpers
Interviewed	72.6	85.4	86.3
Not interviewed	27.4	14.6	13.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	95	96	263

Table 28: Percentage distribution of the clients whose helpers were interviewed by status of receipt of helper fee

Status of receipt of helper fee reported by helpers	Number of clients whose helpers were interviewed		
	Tubectomy	Vasectomy	All
Received	97.6	98.0	97.9
Did not receive	2.4	2.0	2.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	127	201	328

Table 29: Estimated proportions of clients actually sterilized by selected upazila

District/Upazila	Selected sample size			Proportion of actually sterilized cases for the sample		
	Vas.	Tub.	All	Vas.	Tub.	All
<u>DINAJPUR</u>						
Nawabgonj	33	7	40	0.97	1.00	0.98
Parbotipur	17	23	40	1.00	0.83	0.90
Birgonj	22	18	40	0.95	1.00	0.98
Dinajpur	37	3	40	1.00	1.00	1.00
Bochagonj	38	2	40	0.87	1.00	0.88
Khanshama	17	23	40	0.59	0.70	0.65
<u>PANCHAGAR</u>						
Boda	25	15	40	1.00	1.00	1.00
<u>NILPHAMARI</u>						
Nilphamari	29	11	40	1.00	0.91	0.98
Jaldhaka	3	37	40	1.00	1.00	1.00
Kishoregonj	22	18	40	1.00	1.00	1.00
<u>THAKURGAON</u>						
Thakurgaon	34	6	40	0.97	0.83	0.95
Pirgonj	35	5	40	0.91	1.00	0.93
<u>RANGPUR</u>						
Kaunia	33	7	40	1.00	1.00	1.00
Pirgonj	28	12	40	0.86	1.00	0.90
Gangachara	40	-	40	0.95	-	0.95
Mithapukur	21	19	40	1.00	1.00	1.00
Rangpur	25	15	40	0.84	1.00	0.90
<u>LALMONIRHAT</u>						
Patgram	30	10	40	0.97	1.00	0.98
Aditmari	8	32	40	0.88	1.00	0.98
Lalmonirhat	3	37	40	1.00	0.97	0.98

Table 29: contd.

District/Upazila	Selected sample size			Proportion of actually sterilized cases for the sample 1,2		
	Vas.	Tub.	All	Vas.	Tub.	All
<u>GAIBANDHA</u>						
Palashbari	20	20	40	0.85	1.00	0.93
<u>BARISAL</u>						
Bakergonj	33	7	40	1.00	1.00	1.00
<u>JHALAKATI</u>						
Rajapur	38	2	40	1.00	1.00	1.00
<u>MAGURA</u>						
Magura	35	5	40	1.00	1.00	1.00
<u>JHINAIDAHA</u>						
Sailakupa	1	39	40	1.00	1.00	1.00
<u>JESSORE</u>						
Monirampur	34	6	40	1.00	1.00	1.00
<u>KHULNA</u>						
Rupsha	30	10	40	0.90	1.00	0.93
<u>BAGERHAT</u>						
Chitalmari	33	7	40	0.91	1.00	0.93
<u>RAJBARI</u>						
Pangsha	40	-	40	0.63	-	0.63
<u>BOGRA</u>						
Sherpur	14	26	40	0.93	1.00	0.98
Dhunat	39	1	40	0.64	1.00	0.65
<u>MYMENSINGH</u>						
Bhaluka	14	26	40	0.93	0.88	0.90
Iswargonj	18	22	40	0.72	1.00	0.88
<u>NETROKONA</u>						
Kendua	7	33	40	0.86	1.00	0.98
<u>MANIKGONJ</u>						
Singair	-	40	40	-	1.00	1.00

Table 29: contd.

District/Upazila	Selected sample size			Proportion of actually sterilized cases for the sample 1,2		
	Vas.	Tub.	All	Vas.	Tub.	All
<u>GAZIPUR</u>						
Sreepur	29	11	40	0.79	0.82	0.80
<u>MOULAVIBAZAR</u>						
Srimongal	20	20	40	0.95	1.00	0.98
<u>SUNAMGONJ</u>						
Chhatak	31	9	40	0.94	1.00	0.95
T o t a l	936	584	1520	0.90	0.97	0.93