

PO 10/11/86  
100 42557  
022200

EVALUATION OF THE VOLUNTARY  
STERILIZATION PROGRAM

Tables on Non-Government Organisations(NGOs)  
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 Government of Bangladesh (BDG) and the USAID, a protocol was signed stipulating the reimbursement by the latter of the selected costs of the BDG Voluntary Sterilization (VS) Program. Accordingly, in March 1983, USAID, Dhaka, appointed M/s. M.A. Quasem & Co. - a Bangladeshi Chartered Accountants firm to conduct quarterly audits 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 evaluations of the VS program covering both BDG and NGO<sup>1</sup> 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 12 upazilas were selected for evaluation of NGO clinics and the rest 38 upazilas were selected for BDG clinics only. The selected NGO clinics by upazilas are given below:

---

<sup>1</sup> Non-Government Organisation

<u>District/upazila</u>	<u>BAVS</u>	<u>FPAB</u>	<u>Others</u>
<u>Dinajpur</u> Sadar	x	x	
<u>Rangpur</u> Sadar	x	x	x
<u>Nilphamari</u> Sadar	x		
<u>Pabna</u> Sadar	x	x	
<u>Jessore</u> Sadar	x	x	
<u>Barisal</u> Sadar	x	x	
<u>Patuakhali</u> Sadar		x	
<u>Pirojpur</u> Sadar	x		
<u>Comilla</u> Sadar	x	x	
<u>Sylhet</u> Sadar	x	x	
<u>Chittagong</u> Sadar	x	x	

---

Note: BAVS - Bangladesh Association for Voluntary Sterilization  
 FPAB - Family Planning Association of Bangladesh

*From those selected upazilas, 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.*

*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 NGO 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.*

11

ANNEXURE  
NGO TABLES

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

Status of locating the clients	Categories of clients		
	Tubectomy	Vasectomy	A l l
<u>Client located</u>	<u>89.8</u>	<u>91.3</u>	<u>90.6</u>
Interviewed	84.5	79.9	82.1
Not interviewed	5.3	11.4	8.5
<u>Client not located</u>	<u>10.2</u>	<u>8.7</u>	<u>9.4</u>
Client permanently left the address	4.0	4.7	4.4
Client was only temporarily visiting there	6.2	2.0	4.0
Address not found	-	1.2	0.6
Client died within the reference quarter	-	0.4	0.2
Not attempted	-	0.4	0.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	226	254	480

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

Reported clinic	Categories of clients		
	Tubectomy	Vasectomy	A l l
Recorded clinic	100.0	100.0	100.0
Other than the recorded clinic	-	-	-
Sterilized twice	-	-	-
Naver sterilized	-	-	-
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	191	203	394

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	A l l
Within the quarter	100.0	99.5	99.7
Before the quarter	-	-	-
Sterilized twice	-	0.5	0.3
Never sterilized	-	-	-
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	191	203	394

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

Status of reported date of operation	Tubectomy					Vasectomy					A l l				
	Within the quarter	Within quarter and Before quarter	Never sterilized	A l l		Within the quarter	Within quarter and Before quarter	Never sterilized	A l l		Within the quarter	Within quarter and Before quarter	Never sterilized	A l l	
Sterilized in the recorded clinic	100.0	-	-	100.0	99.5	-	-	99.5	99.7	-	-	-	-	99.7	
Sterilized in other than the recorded clinic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Sterilized twice	-	-	-	-	-	0.5	-	0.5	-	0.3	-	-	0.3	-	
Never sterilized	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Total	100.0			100.0	99.5	0.5	-	100.0	99.7	0.3	-	-	100.0		
Weighted N				191				203					394		

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

Results of interviews	Categories of clients		
	Tubectomy	Vasectomy	All
<b>A. INTERVIEWED</b>			
Sterilized within the quarter in the recorded clinic	84.5	79.5	81.9
Sterilized twice	-	0.4	0.2
<b>B. NOT INTERVIEWED</b>			
Client not available	5.3	11.4	8.5
Client has permanently left the address	4.0	4.7	4.4
Client was only temporarily visiting the address	6.2	2.0	4.0
Address not found	-	1.2	0.6
Client died within the reference quarter	-	0.4	0.2
Not attempted	-	0.4	0.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	226	254	480

Estimated false\* cases for tubectomy : Nil  
Estimated false cases for vasectomy : 1.6 percent

\* False cases means those clients who fall under the category,  
'address not found' and 'sterilized twice'.

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

Status of informed consent form	Categories of clients		
	Tubectomy	Vasectomy	All
<u>USAID-approved</u>			
Signed by clients	100.0	100.0	100.0
Not signed by clients	-	-	-
<u>Not USAID-approved</u>	-	-	-
<u>No informed consent form</u>	-	-	-
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	226	254	480

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

Type of consent forms and status of signing	Categories of clients		
	Tubectomy	Vasectomy	All
<u>USAID-approved</u>			
Signed by clients	100.0	100.0	100.0
Not signed by clients	-	-	-
<u>Not USAID-approved</u>	-	-	-
<u>No informed consent form</u>	-	-	-
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	191	202	393

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	100.0	96.5	98.2	
	Did not receive	-	3.5	1.8	
Sub total		100.0	100.0	100.0	
Informed consent form not USAID-approved/ informed consent form USAID-approved but not signed by clients/ no consent form	Received	-	-	-	
	Did not receive	-	-	-	
Sub-total		-	-	-	
		Received	100.0	96.5	98.2
A l l		Did not receive	-	3.5	1.8
Total		100.0	100.0	100.0	
Weighted N		191	202	393	

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
175.0	84.8	NA	NA
170.0	4.2	3.1	1.1
165.0	2.1	2.1	-
160.0	4.2	4.2	-
128.0	0.5	0.5	-
127.0	3.1	3.1	-
120.0	1.1	1.1	-
Total	100.0	14.1	1.1
Weighted N	191		

Reported average amount: Tk.171.62

Estimated average amount considering the 'received any facility' category received the approved amount: Tk.174.95

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
175.0	95.0	NA	NA
170.0	1.0	-	1.0
160.0	0.5	0.5	-
130.0	1.5	1.0	0.5
100.0	1.0	-	1.0
90.0	1.0	-	1.0
Total	100.0	1.5	3.5
Weighted N	202		

Reported average amount: Tk.172.62

Reported average amount considering the 'received any facility' category received the approved amount: Tk.173.14

Note: NA in the table stands for not applicable cases.

Table 11: Percentage distribution of the 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	191	202	393

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	191	202	393

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	A l l
1 day to 7 days	1.6	7.4	4.6
8 days to 15 days	2.1	5.4	3.8
16 days to 29 days	-	0.5	0.3
1 month to 2 months	7.3	29.2	18.6
More than 2 months to 4 months	11.0	4.0	7.4
More than 4 months to 6 months	14.7	22.8	18.8
More than 6 months to 12 months	35.0	22.3	28.5
More than 1 year	28.3	8.4	18.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	191	202	393

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	A l l
Talked	92.1	67.8	79.6
Did not talk	7.9	32.2	20.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	191	202	393

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	3.1	0.5	3.6	5.5	7.4	12.9
1 month to 6 months	32.5	1.1	33.6	36.6	19.3	55.9
More than 6 months to 12 months	31.4	3.7	35.1	18.3	4.5	22.8
More than 1 year	25.1	2.6	27.7	7.4	1.0	8.4
Total	92.1	7.9	100.0	67.8	32.2	100.0
Weighted N			191			202

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	67.5	47.5	57.3
Would suggest in future	31.4	50.5	41.2
Would not suggest in future	1.1	2.0	1.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	191	202	393

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

Recorded helper	Reported helper									
	BDG fieldworker	BAVS salaried fieldworker	Other NGO fieldworker	BAVS registered agent	Other NGO registered agent	Registered Dai	Unspecified Category <sup>1</sup>	Went alone	Does not know	A 1 1
BDG fieldworker	3.7	-	-	-	-	0.5	-	-	0.5	4.7
BAVS salaried fieldworker	-	15.7	-	1.6	-	0.5	-	0.5	-	18.3
Other NGO fieldworker	-	-	52.9	-	1.6	-	2.1	5.8	-	62.4
BAVS registered agent	-	-	0.5	5.2	-	-	-	-	-	5.7
Other NGO registered agent	-	-	-	-	3.7	-	-	4.2	-	7.9
Registered Dai	-	-	-	-	-	1.0	-	-	-	1.0
Total	3.7	15.7	53.4	6.8	5.3	2.0	2.1	10.5	0.5	100.0
Weighted N = 191										

<sup>1</sup>The 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 fieldworker	BAVS salaried fieldworker	Other NGO fieldworker	BDG registered agent	BAVS registered agent	Other NGO registered agent	Registered Dai	Unspecified category	Went alone	Does not know	All
BDG fieldworker	1.5	-	0.5	1.5	-	-	-	0.5	0.5	1.9	6.4
BAVS salaried fieldworker	-	13.9	-	-	-	1.0	0.5	3.0	4.0	1.9	24.3
Other NGO fieldworker	-	-	24.3	-	-	5.4	-	1.5	2.0	4.9	38.1
BDG registered agent	-	-	-	1.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.0
BAVS registered agent	-	-	-	-	1.0	-	-	-	0.5	-	1.5
Other NGO registered agent	-	-	-	-	-	23.3	-	0.5	3.5	1.4	28.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>13.9</b>	<b>24.8</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>29.7</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>10.5</b>	<b>10.1</b>	<b>100.0</b>
Weighted N = 202											

<sup>1</sup>The 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)							T o t a l
	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	
15 - 19	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.5	0.5
20 - 24	0.5	7.3	3.2	0.5	1.1	-	-	12.6
25 - 29	0.5	12.0	27.7	4.7	1.6	0.5	-	47.0
30 - 34	-	-	14.7	13.6	4.2	-	-	32.5
35 - 39	-	-	-	2.1	2.6	1.1	-	5.8
40 - 44	-	-	-	-	1.1	-	-	1.1
45 - 49	-	-	-	-	-	0.5	-	0.5
Total	1.0	19.3	45.6	20.9	10.6	2.1	0.5	100.0
Weighted N = 191								

Mean age of the tubectomy client : 29.3 years

Mean age of the husband : 38.8 years

Table 20 : Percentage distribution of the actually sterilized  
vasectomy clients by reported age of client and wife

Age group of clients (in years)	Age group of wife (in years)								T o t a l
	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50 +	
25 - 29	0.9	6.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	7.8
30 - 34	-	8.4	5.9	-	-	-	-	-	14.3
35 - 39	-	1.4	14.9	0.9	0.9	-	-	-	18.1
40 - 44	-	-	6.9	6.4	1.9	-	-	-	15.2
45 - 49	-	-	2.5	8.4	3.9	1.9	-	-	16.7
50 - 54	-	0.9	0.5	2.5	6.9	2.9	-	-	13.7
55 - 59	-	-	-	-	2.5	4.5	1.9	-	8.9
60 - above	-	-	-	-	1.4	-	1.4	2.5	5.3
Total	0.9	17.6	30.7	18.2	17.5	9.3	3.3	2.5	100.0
Weighted N = 202									

Mean age of the vasectomy client : 42.5 years

Mean age of the wife : 31.9 years

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

Reported number of living children	Categories of clients		
	Tubectomy	Vasectomy	All
1	0.5	1.0	0.8
2	15.7	19.8	17.8
3	30.4	20.3	25.2
4	22.5	19.3	20.9
5	18.8	12.4	15.5
6	4.2	9.9	7.1
7	4.2	5.4	4.8
8	3.7	8.4	6.1
9	-	2.0	1.0
10	-	1.5	0.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	191	202	393
Mean number of living children	3.9	4.4	4.2

Table 22: Percentage distributio of the actually steri-  
lized clients by employment status of women

Employment status of wife/client	Categories of clients		
	Tubectomy	Vasectomy	A l l
Employed with cash earning	15.7	5.0	10.2
Employed without cash earning	1.6	1.0	1.3
Not employed	82.7	94.0	88.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	191	202	393

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

Occupation of husband/client	Categories of clients		
	Tubectomy	Vasectomy	A l l
Agriculture	5.8	31.7	19.1
Day labour	34.1	50.5	42.5
Business	29.8	6.4	17.8
Service	29.8	9.9	19.6
Not employed	-	1.5	0.8
Others	0.5	-	0.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	191	202	393

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

Educational level	Categories of clients		
	Tubectomy	Vasectomy	All
No schooling	72.3	52.0	61.8
No class passed	0.5	1.5	1.0
Class <u>I</u> - <u>IV</u>	9.9	28.7	19.6
Class <u>V</u>	4.7	4.4	4.6
Class <u>V</u> - <u>IX</u>	10.0	11.4	10.7
SSC and above	2.6	2.0	2.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	191	202	393

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

Religion	Categories of clients		
	Tubectomy	Vasectomy	All
Muslim	78.5	87.1	83.0
Hindu	21.0	11.9	16.3
Christian	0.5	1.0	0.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	191	202	393

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	23.6	45.5	34.9
Did not own land	76.4	54.5	65.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	191	202	393

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	75.0	86.0	73.7
Not interviewed	25.0	14.0	26.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	36	43	99

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	A 1 1
Received	100.0	100.0	100.0
Did not receive	-	-	-
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	39	46	85

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

District/Upazila	Selected sample size			Proportion of actually sterilized cases for the sample		
	Tub.	Vas.	A l l	Tub.	Vas.	A l l
<u>NILPHAMARI</u>						
Nilphamari	10	30	40	1.00	1.00	1.00
<u>DINAJPUR</u>						
Dinajpur	23	17	40	1.00	1.00	1.00
<u>RANGPUR</u>						
Rangpur	25	15	40	1.00	1.00	1.00
<u>COMILLA</u>						
Comilla	15	25	40	1.00	1.00	1.00
<u>CHITTAGONG</u>						
Chittagong	29	11	40	1.00	1.00	1.00
<u>PATUAKHALI</u>						
Patuakhali	3	37	40	1.00	1.00	1.00
<u>BARISAL</u>						
Barisal	24	16	40	1.00	0.94	0.98
<u>JESSORE</u>						
Jessore	9	31	40	1.00	1.00	1.00
<u>PIROJPUR</u>						
Pirojpur	13	27	40	1.00	1.00	1.00
<u>SYLHET</u>						
Sylhet	23	17	40	1.00	1.00	1.00
<u>PABNA</u>						
Pabna	9	31	40	1.00	0.90	0.93
<u>GAZIPUR</u>						
Tongi	31	9	40	0.97	0.89	0.95
NGO T o t a l	214	266	480	0.99	0.98	0.99