

PD-AAX-037

ICA 53886

EVALUATION OF THE VOLUNTARY
STERILIZATION PROGRAM

TABLES ON BANGLADESH GOVERNMENT (BDG)
CLINICS
FOR
APRIL-JUNE 1987 QUARTER

M.A. QUASEM & CO.
7/16 LALMATIA, BLOCK-B
DHAKA-7, BANGLADESH

DECEMBER, 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 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 ten 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 tenth of its kind, is the evaluation of the April-June 1987 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 tenth quarterly evaluation was carried out in June and July 1987. 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. But 4 BDG selected upazilas could not be covered because of flood conditions prevailing there. From these selected upazilas, 1360 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 1987 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 tenth quarter of the evaluation of the VS program and are shown in the annexure.

A N N E X U R E
B D G T A B L E S

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>82.4</u>	<u>66.8</u>	<u>75.2</u>
Sterilized within the reference quarter in the recorded clinic	81.8	63.4	73.2
Sterilized in the recorded clinic but before the reference quarter	0.4	1.9	1.1
Sterilized before the reference quarter in other than the recorded clinic	-	0.3	0.1
Sterilized twice (1st operation before the quarter in other than the recorded clinic and 2nd operation within the quarter in the recorded clinic)	0.1	0.6	0.4
Never sterilized	0.1	0.6	0.4
B. NOT INTERVIEWED	<u>15.4</u>	<u>20.2</u>	<u>17.6</u>
Clients not available	8.1	16.2	11.8
Client has permanently left the recorded address	2.0	2.7	2.3
Client was only temporarily visiting the recorded address	5.3	1.3	3.5
C. ADDRESS NOT LOCATED	<u>2.2</u>	<u>13.0</u>	<u>7.2</u>
Address does not exist/ not found	1.2	11.4	6.0
Not attempted	1.0	1.3	1.1
Incomplete address	-	0.3	0.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	729	631	1360

Estimated false* cases for tubectomy : 1.8 percent
 Estimated false* cases for vasectomy : 14.8 percent

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

Table 2: Percentage distribution of all the sterilized 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	99.7	100.0	99.9
Not signed by clients	0.3	-	0.1
<u>Not USAID-approved</u>			
Signed by clients	-	-	-
Not signed by clients	-	-	-
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	729	631	1360

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	99.7	100.0	99.2
Not signed by clients	0.3	-	0.2
<u>Not USAID-approved</u>			
Signed by clients	-	-	-
Not signed by clients	-	-	-
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	596	400	996

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	99.7	99.3	99.5
	Did not receive	-	0.7	0.3
Sub-total		99.7	100.0	99.8
Informed consent form not USAID-approved/ informed consent form USAID-approved but not signed by clients/ no consent form	Received	0.3	-	0.2
	Did not receive	-	-	-
Sub-total		0.3	-	0.2
All	Received	100.0	99.3	99.7
	Did not receive	-	0.7	0.3
Total		100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N		596	400	996

Table 5: Percentage distribution of the actually sterilized tubectomy clients by recorded and reported helpers

Recorded helper \ Reported helper	BDG field-worker	Other NGO field-worker	BDG registered agent	Registered Dai	Does not know	Went alone	All
EDG field worker	40.9	0.2	9.1	2.7	0.3	0.5	53.7
BAVS salaried field worker	-	-	0.2	-	-	-	0.2
Other NGO field-worker	0.5	7.0	0.3	0.3	-	0.2	8.3
BDG registered agent	-	-	23.2	1.0	0.2	-	24.4
Other NGO registered agent	-	-	-	0.2	-	-	0.2
Registered Dai	0.2	-	0.5	12.4	0.1	-	13.2
Total Weighted N = 596	41.6	7.2	33.3	16.6	0.6	0.7	100.0

Table 6: Percentage distribution of the actually sterilized
vasectomy clients by recorded and reported helpers

Recorded helper \ Reported helper	BDG field-worker	Other NGO field-worker	BDG registered agent	Registered Dai	Wenc alone	Does not know	All
BDG field worker	27.5	-	5.0	0.2	2.3	1.3	36.3
Other NGO field worker	-	3.8	0.3	-	0.2	-	4.3
BDG registered agent	-	-	46.2	-	1.5	4.2	51.9
Registered Dai	0.2	0.5	2.3	3.5	-	1.0	7.5
Total Weighted N = 400	27.7	4.3	53.8	3.7	4.0	6.5	100.0

Table 7: 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	97.1	NA	NA
172.00	0.2	0.2	-
170.00	0.3	0.3	-
165.00	0.3	0.3	-
160.00	0.5	0.3	0.2
150.00	1.2	0.7	0.5
40.00	0.2	0.2	-
No payment	0.2	-	0.2
Total	100.0	2.0	0.9
Weighted N	596		

Reported average amount: Tk.174.06

Estimated average amount considering the 'received any facility' category received the approved amount: Tk.174.56

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

Table 8: 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	96.3	NA	NA
170.00	1.0	-	1.0
160.00	0.3	-	0.3
155.00	0.3	-	0.3
150.00	0.5	0.3	0.2
139.00	0.3	0.3	-
125.00	0.2	-	0.2
120.00	0.2	0.2	-
100.00	0.5	-	0.5
75.00	0.2	0.2	-
40.00	0.2	-	0.2
Total	100.0	1.0	2.7
Weighted N	400		

Reported average amount: Tk.173.40

Estimated average amount considering the 'received any facility' category received the approved amount: Tk.173.96

Note: NA in the table stands for not applicable cases

Table 9: 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	596	400	996

Table 10: Percentage distribution of the actually sterilized clients by how they spent the excess money

How excess was spent	Categories of clients		
	Tubectomy	Vasectomy	All
No excess money left	8.7	9.5	9.0
Spent on food	81.5	83.5	82.3
Purchased medicine	5.0	3.3	4.3
Purchased goat/chicken/goose	0.8	1.0	0.9
Purchased cloths	0.7	1.0	0.8
Purchased utensils	0.2	-	0.1
Purchased fishing net/yarn for making net	0.2	-	0.1
Repaired the house	0.2	0.2	0.2
Invested in business	0.3	-	0.2
Repaid the bank loan	0.2	-	0.1
Purchased fertilizer for land	-	0.5	0.2
Distributed to others	0.2	-	0.2
Purchased rice seedlings	0.2	-	0.1
Did not spent	1.8	0.7	1.4
Not stated	-	0.3	0.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	596	400	996

Table 11: Percentage distribution of the actually sterilized clients according to whether they would undergo sterilization operation if there were no compensation fees

Whether they would undergo sterilization operation	Tubectomy	Vasectomy	All
Would have done it at that time	86.8	79.3	83.8
Would wait	4.0	11.5	7.0
Never would have done	9.2	9.0	9.1
Not stated	-	0.2	0.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	596	400	996

Table 12: Percentage distribution of the actually sterilized clients according to their knowledge of family planning methods and knowledge of source of methods except sterilization

Methods	Tubectomy							Vasectomy						
	Unprompted knowledge	Prompted knowledge	No knowledge	Knowledge of source				Unprompted knowledge	Prompted knowledge	No knowledge	Knowledge of source			
				Knew at least one source	Did not know any source	Did not know the method	Not stated				Knew at least one source	Did not know any source	Did not know the method	Not stated
Pill	72.7	20.5	6.8	87.1	6.1	6.8	-	67.2	24.8	8.0	86.7	4.8	8.0	0.5
Condom	35.6	35.6	28.8	65.0	6.2	28.8	-	62.7	27.5	9.8	86.7	3.0	9.8	0.5
Injection	17.3	36.6	46.1	44.1	9.8	46.1	-	19.7	37.5	42.8	50.7	5.5	42.8	1.0
IUD	37.2	34.6	28.2	62.6	9.2	28.2	-	12.2	26.0	61.8	34.2	3.7	61.8	0.3
MR	5.0	26.4	68.6	25.3	5.9	68.6	0.2	0.5	12.7	86.8	11.2	1.7	86.8	0.3
Others	3.7	12.4	83.9	10.6	5.0	83.9	0.5	3.5	11.2	85.3	13.2	0.5	85.3	1.0
	Weighted N = 596							Weighted N = 400						

Table 13: 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	596	400	996

Table 14: Percentage distribution of the actually sterilized clients according to their view (reasons) for undergoing sterilization operation

Reasons for operation	Tubectomy		Vasectomy	
	Primary reason	Secondary reason	Primary reason	Secondary reason
To take care of children	11.3	32.0	22.8	39.0
To protect health/ avoid pain of birth	4.0	16.3	0.2	1.3
To protect children's health	1.4	9.9	1.8	6.5
To receive cash/ saree/lungi	6.0	13.3	10.5	24.0
Do not want children	76.3	10.9	63.7	18.5
Others	1.0	2.2	0.8	-
No reason	-	15.4	0.2	10.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	596	596	400	400

Table 15: Percentage distribution of the actually sterilized clients by the length of time they had seriously thought about having the sterilization method

Period	Categories of clients		
	Tubectomy	Vasectomy	All
1 day to 7 days	12.1	3.8	8.7
8 days to 15 days	2.0	3.5	2.6
16 " to 29 "	1.5	1.0	1.3
1 month to 2 months	16.4	14.8	15.8
More than 2 months to 4 months	8.1	11.5	9.4
More than 4 months to 6 months	11.9	24.2	16.9
More than 6 months to 12 months	26.0	23.0	24.8
More than 1 year	22.0	17.2	20.1
Not stated	-	1.0	0.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	596	400	996

Table 16: 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	82.7	78.8	81.1
Did not talk	17.3	21.0	18.8
Not stated	-	0.2	0.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	596	400	996

Table 17: 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	Not stated	Total
Less than 30 days	11.3	4.3	15.6	3.8	4.5	-	8.3
1 month to 6 months	30.0	6.4	36.4	39.0	11.5	-	50.5
More than 6 months to 12 months	22.1	3.9	26.0	20.8	2.3	-	23.1
More than 1 year	19.3	2.7	22.0	14.7	2.5	-	17.2
Not stated	-	-	-	0.5	0.2	0.2	0.9
Total	82.2	17.3	100.0	78.8	21.0	0.2	100.0
Weighted N			596				400

Table 18: Percentage distribution of the actually sterilized clients by their satisfaction with the operation

Satisfaction with operation	Tubectomy	Vasectomy	All
Satisfied	98.5	97.3	98.0
Not satisfied	1.5	2.5	1.9
Not stated	-	0.2	0.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	596	400	996

Table 19: Percentage distribution of the actually sterilized clients according to their recommendation to anyone for undergoing the sterilization operation

Recommendation	Tubectomy	Vasectomy	All
Already recommended	74.2	61.0	68.9
Would recommend in future	25.0	36.3	29.5
Neither recommended nor would recommend in future	0.8	2.5	1.5
Not stated	-	0.2	0.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	596	400	996

Table 20: Percentage distribution of the actually sterilized clients by status of their post operation conjugal life

Status	Tubectomy	Vasectomy	All
As before operation	69.6	56.2	64.3
Improved	25.2	36.8	29.8
Deteriorated	5.0	6.8	5.7
Not stated	0.2	0.2	0.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	596	400	996

Table 21: Percentage distribution of the actually sterilized clients by period after the operation normal work resumed

Period	Tubectomy	Vasectomy	All
Within 7 days	17.4	76.3	37.8
8 - 15 days	40.6	11.5	32.2
16 days and above	39.8	11.5	28.4
Others	2.2	0.5	1.5
Not stated	-	0.2	0.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	596	400	996

Table 22: 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	
	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	65-69	90-94	Not stated		
15 - 19	0.3	-	0.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.5
20 - 24	0.2	1.7	5.9	1.8	1.0	0.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10.9
25 - 29	-	0.2	17.6	25.3	4.7	1.2	0.7	0.5	0.2	-	0.1	-	-	50.5
30 - 34	-	-	1.5	12.6	11.4	2.3	1.2	0.3	0.5	-	-	-	-	29.8
35 - 39	-	-	-	0.7	3.9	1.0	1.0	0.2	0.7	-	-	0.1	-	7.6
40 - 44	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.2	-	-	0.1	-	-	-	0.3
45 - 49	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.2	-	-	-	-	-	0.2
50 - 54	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.2	-	-	-	-	0.2
Total	0.5	1.9	25.2	40.4	21.0	4.8	3.1	1.2	1.6	0.1	0.1	0.1	-	100.0
Weighted N = 596														

Mean age (in years): Clients : 29.3
 Husband : 38.7

Table 23: 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)								Total
	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	Not stated	
25 - 29	0.5	3.5	0.2	-	-	-	-	-	4.2
30 - 34	-	12.3	12.8	-	-	-	-	-	25.1
35 - 39	-	2.0	26.0	3.8	-	-	-	-	31.8
40 - 44	-	0.3	5.0	9.8	2.2	-	-	-	17.3
45 - 49	-	-	1.5	3.5	3.3	0.8	-	-	9.1
50 - 54	-	-	0.2	1.8	3.2	2.2	-	-	7.4
55 - 59	-	-	0.5	-	1.3	0.2	-	-	2.0
60 - 64	-	-	-	-	1.2	-	0.2	-	1.4
65 - 69	-	-	-	1.5	-	-	-	-	1.5
75 - 79	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.2	0.2
Total	0.5	18.1	46.2	20.4	11.2	3.2	0.2	0.2	100.0
Weighted N = 400									

Mean age (in years) : Client : 40.3
 Wife : 29.2

Table 24: 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	0.2	0.7	0.4
1	2.5	4.0	3.1
2	25.5	25.8	25.6
3	32.6	29.5	31.3
4	21.0	17.2	19.5
5	10.9	11.0	11.0
6	3.9	4.3	4.0
7	3.2	4.0	3.5
8	0.1	1.5	0.7
9	0.1	1.5	0.7
10+	-	0.5	0.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	596	400	996
Mean number of living children	3.4	3.5	3.4

Table 25: Percentage distribution of the actually sterilized clients by employment status of women

Employment status of wife/client	Categories of clients		
	Tubectomy	Vasectomy	All
Employed with cash earning	12.9	8.3	11.1
Employed without cash earning	2.2	0.3	1.4
Not employed	84.7	91.2	87.3
Not stated	0.2	0.2	0.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	596	400	996

Table 26: Percentage distribution of the actually sterilized clients by occupation of husband/wife

Occupation of husband/wife	Categories of clients		
	Tubectomy	Vasectomy	All
Agriculture	31.0	29.8	30.5
Day labour	55.0	59.5	56.8
Business	10.6	7.8	9.4
Service	1.9	2.5	2.1
Not employed	0.5	0.2	0.4
Others	0.2	0.2	0.3
Not stated	0.8	-	0.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	596	400	996

Table 27: Percentage distribution of the actually sterilized clients by their educational level

Educational level	Categories of clients		
	Tubectomy	Vasectomy	All
No schooling	86.9	58.5	75.5
Class I - <u>IV</u>	8.1	27.0	15.7
Class <u>V</u>	2.3	6.0	3.8
Class <u>VI</u> - <u>IX</u>	2.7	6.8	4.3
SSC and HSC	-	1.2	0.5
Degree and above	-	0.5	0.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	596	400	996

Table 28: Percentage distribution of the actually sterilized clients by religion

Religion	Categories of clients		
	Tubectomy	Vasectomy	All
Muslim	69.8	88.5	77.3
Hindu	29.4	11.3	22.1
Christian	0.8	0.2	0.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	596	400	996

Table 29: Percentage distribution of the actually sterilized clients by ownership of land

Status of land ownership	Categories of clients		
	Tubectomy	Vasectomy	All
Owned land	37.6	38.8	38.1
Did not own land	62.4	61.2	61.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	596	400	996

Table 30: Percentage distribution of the service providers/helpers by status of interview

Interview status	Categories of service providers/ helpers		
	Physician	Clinic staff	Helpers
Interviewed	68.6	79.4	69.5
Not interviewed	31.4	20.6	30.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	102	102	269

Table 31: 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	99.6	100.0	99.7
Did not receive	0.4	-	0.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Weighted N	149	102	251

Table 32: Estimated proportions of actually sterilized cases
by selected upazilas

District/upazila	Selected sample size			Proportion of actually sterilized cases for the sample		
	Tub.	Vas.	All	Tub.	Vas.	All
<u>Dinajpur</u>						
Khansama	20	20	40	0.85	0.80	0.83
Nawabgonj	4	36	40	1.00	1.00	1.00
<u>Thakurgaon</u>						
Pirgonj	7	33	40	0.86	0.91	0.90
Baliadanga	21	19	40	1.00	0.95	0.98
Horipur	22	18	40	1.00	1.00	1.00
Sadar	25	15	40	1.00	1.00	1.00
<u>Panchghar</u>						
Boda	19	21	40	1.00	0.95	0.98
Debigonj	8	32	40	1.00	0.94	0.95
<u>Nilphamari</u>						
Domar	39	1	40	1.00	1.00	1.00
Jaldhaka	36	4	40	1.00	1.00	1.00
Kishoregonj	31	9	40	1.00	0.89	0.98
<u>Rangpur</u>						
Pirgacha	9	31	40	0.89	0.87	0.88
Pirgonj	29	11	40	1.00	0.64	0.90
Badargonj	29	11	40	0.83	0.82	0.83
Mithapukur	33	7	40	1.00	1.00	1.00
Sadar	26	14	40	0.96	0.97	0.90
<u>Kurigram</u>						
Ulipur	37	3	40	0.97	1.00	0.98
Fulbari	40	-	40	1.00	-	1.00
<u>Gaibandha</u>						
Gobindagonj	23	17	40	1.00	0.82	0.93
<u>Bogra</u>						
Adamdighi	3	37	40	1.00	0.97	0.98
Sonatola	37	3	40	1.00	1.00	1.00
Dhunot	7	33	40	0.86	0.33	0.43
Sherpur	11	29	40	1.00	0.90	0.93
Shibgonj	28	12	40	1.00	1.00	1.00
<u>Naogaon</u>						
Mohadebpur	37	3	40	1.00	1.00	1.00
<u>Jhenaidah</u>						
Sailkupa	39	1	40	1.00	1.00	1.00

Table 32 contd.

District/upazila	Selected sample size			Proportion of actually sterilized cases for the sample		
	Tub.	Vas.	All	Tub.	Vas.	All
<u>Khulna</u>						
Fultala	3	37	40	1.00	0.49	0.53
<u>Barquna</u>						
Amtoli	13	22	40	1.00	1.00	1.00
Sadar	13	27	40	1.00	0.96	0.98
<u>Tangail</u>						
Gopalpur	35	4	40	1.00	1.00	1.00
Modhupur	31	9	40	0.94	0.67	0.88
<u>Mymensingh</u>						
Gouripur	25	14	40	0.96	0.93	0.95
Iswargonj	23	17	40	0.83	0.65	0.75
Haluaghat	31	9	40	0.97	0.44	0.85
Total	801	559	1360	0.97	0.84	0.92