

EVALUATION OF THE VOLUNTARY  
STERILIZATION PROGRAM

TABLES ON BANGLADESH GOVERNMENT (BDG)  
CLINICS

F O R

JULY - SEPTEMBER 1986 QUARTER

i1. A. QUASEM AND Co.  
7/16 LALMATIA, BLOCK-B  
DHAKA - 7. BANGLADESH

MARCH 05, 1987

## 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 NGO<sup>1</sup> clinics beginning from January-March 1985 quarter. Under the given objectives and approved methodology, the present report, the seventh of its kind, is the evaluation of the July-September 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 seventh quarterly evaluation was carried out in September and October 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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 July-September 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 seventh quarter of the evaluation of the VS program and are shown in the annexure.

- 1 -

**ANNEXURE  
BDG TABLES**

Table 1: Percentage distribution of the SELECTED CLIENTS by  
results of clients survey

Results of clients' survey	Categories of clients		
	Tubectomy	Vasectomy	All
A. INTERVIEWED	<u>81.9</u>	<u>63.4</u>	<u>69.5</u>
Sterilized within the reference quarter in the recorded clinic	81.1	58.1	65.7
Sterilized in the recorded clinic but before the reference quarter	0.8	1.7	1.4
Sterilized within the reference quarter in other than the recor- ded clinic	-	0.8	0.5
Sterilized before the reference quar- ter in other than the recorded clinic	-	0.7	0.5
Sterilized twice (1st operation before the quarter in other than the recorded clinic and 2nd operation within the quarter in the recorded clinic)	-	0.6	0.4
Never sterilized	-	1.5	1.0
B. NOT INTERVIEWED	<u>15.5</u>	<u>26.5</u>	<u>22.8</u>
Clients not available	7.4	21.2	16.7
Client has permanently left the recorded address	3.0	2.2	2.4
Client was only temporarily visi- ting the recorded address	5.1	2.8	3.6
Client died before the reference quarter	-	0.2	0.1
Client died within the reference quarter	-	0.1	0.0
C. ADDRESS NOT LOCATED	<u>2.1</u>	<u>10.1</u>	<u>7.7</u>
Address does not exist/not found	2.2	9.6	7.2
Not attempted	0.4	0.1	0.2
Incomplete address	-	0.4	0.3
T o t a l	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	498	1022	1520

Estimated false \* cases for tubectomy : 3.0 percent

Estimated false \* cases for vasectomy : 15.1 percent

\* False cases means those clients who fall under the category, 'sterilized in the recorded clinic but before the reference quarter', 'sterilized within the reference quarter in other than the recorded clinic', 'sterilized before the reference quarter in other than the recorded clinic', 'sterilized twice', 'never sterilized', 'client died before the reference quarter', and 'address does not exist/not found'.

Table 2: 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	98.4	99.2	98.9
Not signed by clients	1.4	0.8	1.0
<u>Not USAID-approved</u>			
Signed by clients	0.2	-	0.1
Not signed by clients	-	-	-
<u>No informed consent form</u>	-	-	-
<hr/>			
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	498	1022	1520

Table 3: 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	98.8	99.7	99.3
Not signed by clients	1.0	0.3	0.6
<u>Not USAID-approved</u>			
Signed by clients	0.2	-	0.1
Not signed by clients	-	-	-
<u>No informed consent form</u>	-	-	-
<hr/>			
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	404	592 <sup>a</sup>	996

<sup>a</sup> Excludes one vasectomy client who reported that he was tempted by the helper but found to have been sterilized in the recorded clinic within the reference quarter. The subsequent tables also excludes this client.

Table 4: 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	98.8	95.6	96.9
	Did not receive	-	4.1	2.4
Sub-total		98.8	99.7	99.3
Informed consent form not USAID-approved/ informed consent form USAID-approved but not signed by clients/ no consent form	Received	1.2	0.3	0.7
	Did not receive	-	-	-
Sub-total		1.2	0.3	0.7
All	Received	100.0	95.9	97.6
	Did not receive	-	4.1	2.4
Total		100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N		404	592	996

Table 5: 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	88.6	NA	NA
172.00	0.5	-	0.5
171.00	0.3	0.3	-
170.00	2.0	2.0	-
165.00	0.2	0.2	-
164.00	3.7	3.2	0.5
160.00	2.7	2.5	0.2
150.00	1.5	1.0	0.5
142.00	0.3	0.3	-
100.00	0.2	0.2	-
Total	100.0	9.7	1.7
Weighted N	404		

Reported average amount: Tk.173.40

Estimated average amount considering the 'received any facility' category received the approved amount: Tk.174.77

Note: NA in the table stands for not applicable cases

Table 6 : 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	86.3	NA	NA
170.00	4.1	0.4	3.7
160.00	1.4	-	1.4
155.00	0.4	0.4	-
150.00	0.8	-	0.8
140.00	0.4	0.3	0.1
120.00	0.3	0.2	0.1
110.00	0.5	-	0.5
100.00	3.9	0.7	3.2
90.00	0.3	-	0.3
80.00	0.5	-	0.5
70.00	0.3	-	0.3
65.00	0.2	0.2	-
60.00	0.3	-	0.3
50.00	0.3	-	0.3
Total	100.0	2.2	11.5
Weighted N	592		

Reported average amount: Tk.168.65

Estimated average amount considering the 'received any facility' category received the approved amount: Tk.169.58

Note: NA in the table stands for not applicable cases

Table 7 : 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	404	592	996

Table 8: 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	A l l
Knew	100.0	100.0	100.0
Did not know	-	-	-
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	404	592	996

Table 9: 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	5.5	15.5	11.5
8 days to 15 days	4.0	13.9	9.8
16 days to 29 days	0.2	2.0	1.3
1 month to 2 months	22.5	27.7	25.6
More than 2 months to 4 months	6.7	5.4	5.9
More than 4 months to 6 months	12.4	12.0	12.1
More than 6 months to 12 months	27.7	10.3	17.4
More than 1 year	21.0	13.2	16.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	404	592	996

Table 10: 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	75.0	58.1	65.0
Did not talk	25.0	41.9	35.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	404	592	996

Table 11: 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	3.0	6.4	9.4	14.8	16.4	31.2
1 month to 6 months	30.7	10.9	41.6	26.2	19.1	45.3
More than 6 months to 12 months	24.3	3.7	28.0	7.8	2.5	10.3
More than 1 year	17.0	4.0	21.0	9.3	3.9	13.2
Total	75.0	25.0	100.0	58.1	41.9	100.0
Weighted N			404			592

Table 12: 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	54.4	46.5	49.7
Would suggest in future	33.2	40.7	37.7
Would not suggest in future	12.4	12.8	12.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	404	592	996

Table 13: Percentage distribution of the actually sterilized tubectomy clients by recorded and reported helpers

Recorded helper	Reported helper								
	BDG fieldworker	Other NGO fieldworker	BDG registered agent	Other NGO registered agent	Registered Dai	Unspecified category <sup>1</sup>	Does not know	Went alone	All
BDG fieldworker	48.3	1.7	7.4	-	1.5	3.5	0.5	0.5	63.4
Other NGO fieldworker	-	7.2	1.2	-	0.3	-	-	0.9	9.6
BDG registered agent	-	-	17.3	-	1.0	0.5	-	1.2	20.0
Other NGO registered agent	-	-	-	0.3	-	-	-	-	0.3
Registered Dai	-	-	0.3	-	5.9	0.5	-	-	6.7
Total	48.3	8.9	26.2	0.3	8.7	4.5	0.5	2.6	100.0
Weighted N = 404									

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

Table 14: Percentage distribution of the actually sterilized vasectomy clients by recorded and reported helpers

Recorded helper	Reported helper								
	BDG fieldworker	Other NGO fieldworker	BDG registered agent	BAVS registered agent	Registered Dai	Unspecified category	Went alone	Does not know	Total
BDG fieldworker	23.1	-	5.1	-	0.5	3.7	2.7	0.5	35.6
Other NGO fieldworker	0.3	3.7	-	-	-	0.3	-	0.5	4.8
BDG registered agent	1.5	-	49.5	-	-	1.9	2.4	2.5	57.8
BAVS registered agent	-	-	-	0.2	-	-	-	0.2	0.4
Registered Dai	-	-	0.2	-	1.2	-	-	-	1.4
Total	24.9	3.7	54.8	0.2	1.7	5.9	5.1	3.7	100.0
Weighted N = 592									

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

Table 15: 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	0.7	0.7	0.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.7
20 - 24	1.7	6.9	2.5	-	-	0.3	0.3	-	-	11.7
25 - 29	0.7	15.1	16.3	6.4	1.5	1.0	1.2	-	-	42.2
30 - 34	-	0.7	8.2	9.9	5.2	3.2	-	0.5	0.5	28.2
35 - 39	-	-	-	5.2	5.0	2.0	0.7	-	-	12.9
40 - 44	-	-	-	-	0.3	2.2	0.5	-	-	3.0
45 - 49	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.3	-	0.3
Total	3.1	23.4	27.3	21.5	12.0	8.7	2.7	0.8	0.5	100.0
Weighted N = 404										
Mean age (in years) : Clients : 29.9										
: Husband : 40.5										

Table 16: 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 +	
20 - 24	-	0.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.2
25 - 29	1.4	13.2	0.2	-	-	-	-	-	14.8
30 - 34	0.3	6.4	11.7	-	-	-	-	-	18.4
35 - 39	-	2.0	12.7	5.6	-	-	-	-	20.3
40 - 44	-	-	3.9	10.0	2.0	-	-	-	15.9
45 - 49	-	0.2	1.0	4.4	7.8	1.0	-	-	14.4
50 - 54	-	-	-	1.4	3.9	2.0	-	-	7.3
55 - 59	-	-	0.2	0.3	1.7	1.5	0.7	0.2	4.6
60 - 64	-	-	-	-	-	0.6	0.8	0.1	1.5
65 - 69	-	-	-	-	0.2	-	0.3	0.3	0.8
70 - 74	-	-	-	0.7	0.1	-	-	0.7	1.5
95 - 99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.3	0.3
Total	1.7	22.0	29.7	22.4	15.7	5.1	1.8	1.6	100.0
Weighted N = 592									

Mean age (in years): Client : 40.7  
Wife : 30.6

Table 17: Percentage distribution of the actually sterilized clients by reported number of living children

Reported number of living children	Categories of clients		
	Tubectomy	Vasectomy	A l l
0	-	0.5	0.3
1	3.5	3.7	3.6
2	30.7	22.3	25.7
3	23.3	30.8	27.7
4	20.0	16.2	17.8
5	12.6	11.2	11.8
6	5.4	9.1	7.6
7	2.5	3.2	2.9
8	2.0	2.0	2.0
9	-	0.7	0.4
10	-	0.3	0.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	404	592	996
Mean number of living children	3.4	3.6	3.6

Table 18: 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	7.4	16.6	12.9
Employed without cash earning	5.2	1.9	3.2
Not employed	87.4	81.5	83.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	404	592	996

Table 19: Percentage distribution of the actually sterilized clients by occupation of husband/wife

Occupation of husband/wife	Categories of clients		
	Tubectomy	Vasectomy	All
Agriculture	24.0	22.1	22.9
Day labour	55.2	69.4	63.7
Business	14.3	5.9	9.3
Service	5.0	2.2	3.3
Not employed	1.5	0.2	0.7
Others	-	0.2	0.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	404	592	996

Table 20 Percentage distribution of the actually sterilized clients by their educational level

Educational level	Categories of clients		
	Tubectomy	Vasectomy	All
No schooling	84.4	73.1	77.7
No class passed	0.7	-	0.3
Class I-IV	7.7	18.1	13.9
Class V	2.5	2.9	2.7
Class VI-IX	4.5	5.2	4.9
SSC and HSC	0.2	0.7	0.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	404	592	996

Table 21: Percentage distribution of the actually sterilized clients by religion

R e l i g i o n	Categories of clients		
	Tubectomy	Vasectomy	A l l
Muslim	73.5	79.9	77.3
Hindu	26.5	15.6	20.0
Christian	-	2.0	1.2
Others	-	2.5	1.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	404	592	996

Table 22: Percentage distribution of the actually sterilized clients by ownership of land

Status of land ownership	Categories of clients		
	Tubectomy	Vasectomy	A l l
Owned land	32.7	27.0	29.3
Did not own land	67.3	73.0	70.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	404	592	996

Table 23: Percentage distribution of the service providers/helpers by status of interview

Interview status	Categories of service providers/ helpers		
	Physicians	Clinic staff	Helpers
Interviewed	83.5	86.0	83.2
Not interviewed	16.5	14.0	16.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	91	107	250

Table 24: 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	98.8	99.3
Did not receive	-	1.2	0.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	133	173	306

Table 25: 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>						
Parbotipur	11	29	40	1.00	0.97	0.98
<u>NILPHAMARI</u>						
Sadar	39	1	40	0.79	1.00	0.80
Kishoregonj	7	33	40	0.57	0.91	0.85
<u>RANGPUR</u>						
Pirgonj	38	2	40	0.92	1.00	0.93
Gangachara	38	2	40	0.74	1.00	0.75
Mithapukur	31	9	40	0.97	1.00	0.98
Kaunia	30	10	40	0.90	1.00	0.93
Sadar	15	25	40	0.80	0.96	0.90
Badar gonj	25	15	40	0.72	0.87	0.78
<u>GAIBANDA</u>						
Palashbari	37	3	40	0.68	1.00	0.70
Sundargonj	11	29	40	1.00	0.97	0.98
Gobindagonj	36	4	40	0.94	1.00	0.95
<u>LALMONIRHAT</u>						
Hatibanda	25	15	40	0.80	0.93	0.85
Lalmonirhat Sadar	18	22	40	1.00	1.00	1.00
Aditmari	3	37	40	1.00	1.00	1.00
<u>KUSHTIA</u>						
Mirpur	1	39	40	1.00	1.00	1.00
<u>MEHERPUR</u>						
Sadar	2	38	40	1.00	1.00	1.00
<u>Jhenaidaha</u>						
Sailakupa	1	39	40	1.00	1.00	1.00
<u>MAGURA</u>						
Sadar	31	9	40	0.65	1.00	0.73
<u>KHULNA</u>						
Rupsha	34	6	40	1.00	1.00	1.00
Fultala	37	3	40	0.89	1.00	0.90

Table 25: Contd.

District/Upazila	Selected sample size			Proportion of actually sterilized cases for the samle		
	Vas.	Tub.	All	Vas.	Tub.	A l l
<u>BAGERHAT</u>						
Rampal	25	15	40	0.88	1.00	0.93
Sadar	35	5	40	0.89	1.00	0.90
Kachua	38	2	40	0.89	1.00	0.90
Morrelgonj	24	16	40	0.75	1.00	0.85
<u>BORGUNA</u>						
Sadar	39	1	40	0.95	1.00	0.95
Amtali	39	1	40	0.95	1.00	0.95
<u>PATUAKHALI</u>						
Sadar	26	14	40	1.00	1.00	1.00
Mirzagonj	32	8	40	0.91	1.00	0.93
<u>BARISAL</u>						
Bakergonj	33	7	40	0.15	0.43	0.20
<u>RAJBARI</u>						
Pangsha	40	-	40	0.48	-	0.48
<u>MANIKGONJ</u>						
Singair	-	40	40	-	1.00	1.00
Shivaloya	-	40	40	-	1.00	1.00
Gheor	-	40	40	-	1.00	1.00
<u>TANGAIL</u>						
Sakhipur	23	17	40	0.96	1.00	0.98
<u>MYMENSINGH</u>						
Gouripur	5	35	40	1.00	0.94	0.95
Iswargonj	29	11	40	0.97	1.00	0.98
<u>COMILLA</u>						
Sadar	1	39	40	1.00	1.00	1.00
<b>T o t a l</b>	<b>859</b>	<b>661</b>	<b>1520</b>	<b>0.829</b>	<b>0.977</b>	<b>0.893</b>