

Ethnic Disparities in Contraceptive Use and Its Impact on Family Planning Program in Nepal

Mukesh Kumar Mishra, M.Phil.

Department of Social Science, NIMS College, Lalitpur, Nepal

Received February 2010; Revised and accepted June 2010

Abstract

Objective: Regardless of three decades of implementation of family planning program in Nepal, need of family planning services is largely unmet. Systematic studies, evaluating the impact of family program on several ethnic groups of Nepal has not been carried out in large scale. This study sheds light on the investigation of, whether the use of contraceptives varies among different ethnic groups in Nepal and what are the predictors of contraceptive variance in ethnic groups in Nepal.

Materials and methods: The study is based on data collected from Nepal Demographic Health Survey (NDHS) 2006. Multilevel logistic regression analyses of 10793 married women of reproductive age nested within 264 clusters from the surveys were considered as the sample size. Individual, household, and program variables were set and a multilevel logistic regression model was fitted to analyze the variables, using GLLAMM command in STATA-9.

Results: Multilevel logistic regression analysis indicated that Muslims, Dalits and Terai madheshi women were significantly less likely to use modern contraceptives compared to the Brahmins and Chhetries (Higher Castes). Women who were exposed to family planning information in radio were more likely to use modern contraceptives than women not exposed to radio information (OR=1.22, $P > 0.01$). An odd of using contraceptives by Newar was (OR 1.09, $P > 0.05$), the highest among all ethnic groups. Exposure of women to family planning messages through health facilities, family planning workers, and means of communication, increased the odds of using modern contraceptives. However, impact of the family planning information on contraceptive use varied among ethnicity.

Conclusion: Special attention need to be paid, in particular to the ethnicity, while formulating family planning policies in Nepal, for better success rate of family planning intervention programs.

Keywords: Modern contraceptives, Family planning, Nepal, Ethnic groups, DHS, Odd ratio

Introduction

Family planning activities were initiated first in 1958 by Nepal Family Planning Association in Nepal. Family Planning Policy was adopted in 1965 and limited family planning services were made available in Kath-

mandu valley in 1968. Services were expanded all over the country only in the early 1990s (1). Various interventions were implemented through the static and mobile services, door-to-door campaigns and mass media to increase knowledge, acceptability and use of contraceptive over the last two decades. As a result, Total Fertility Rate has been declined from 5.1 in 1991 to 3.1 in 2006 and the knowledge of family planning is almost universal in Nepal (2). It is evident that the need for family planning is largely unmet

Correspondence:

Mukesh Kumar Mishra, NIMS College, Lalitpur-6, Bagmati, Nepal
E-mail: Mr.callmishra@gmail.com

(25%) (3). Unmet need of contraceptive is considerably higher among poor than wealthier women (4). Regional and ethnic disparities also exist in the utilization of family planning services. A report on the further analysis of NDHS 2007 indicates that, despite impressive progress on meeting the Millennium Development Goal (MDG), Dalit and Janjati (Low castes), and Terai/Madheshi-origin groups are still facing many barriers to access the family planning services because of their illiteracy, poverty and low social status (5).

Existing studies on contraceptive use focused more on individual and household level determinants and ignored the importance of community and health care program factors (6, 7). Previous studies have also shown that contraceptive use pattern vary among ethnic groups (8–10).

Exposure to message broadcast through a variety of channels is currently considered the most effective way change knowledge, attitudes and behaviour (11). Conceptual framework developed by Bertrand et al. (1996) provides the basis to evaluate the impact of family planning program. The framework recognizes that fertility and other behavior are consequences of both the demand for and supply of family planning services. Demand for family planning services are affected by a number of political, socioeconomic, cultural and individual factors. Thus an increase in the availability of family planning services is more likely to translate into higher levels of use in a country where these other factors exert a positive influence on demand.

So far, systematic studies using this framework for evaluating the impact of family planning program on the utilization contraceptive services among different ethnic groups have not been conducted in Nepal. This analysis intends to fill this gap by examining the differences of the impact of exposure to family planning services on the modern contraceptive use among different ethnic groups.

Overall objective of this study is to examine whether observed differences in the levels of modern contraceptive use among different ethnic groups over the last ten years in Nepal is associated with the exposure to family planning information. More specifically, this study intends to examine:

- a) Whether the impact of exposure to family information on contraceptive use varies among different ethnic groups controlling for individual, household and program level characteristics.
- b) What are the predictors of ethnic variance in con-

traceptive use in Nepal?

- c) To what extent, do they impact on family planning services in Nepal?

Materials and Methods

Individual, household, and program-level data for this analysis come from Nepal Demographic and Health Surveys 2006. All together 10793 married women of reproductive age nested with 264 clusters from the survey was considered as sample size. Proportionate to population size (PPS) equal weighting cluster approach was followed to determine the number of clusters. The 95% two-sided t-value with 10–1 degrees of freedom was 2.2621. A multilevel logistic regression model was fitted to analyze the use of modern contraceptive by six ethnic groups of Nepal based on individual, household and program level variable, using GLLAMM command in STATA-9.

The individual variables are chosen to represent socio-demographic factors that previous research has shown to be associated with contraceptive use: age, education, place of residence. In the absence of information on household income, a wealth index is used to represent the socioeconomic status of the household. The index includes the ownership of household amenities and goods: telephone, electricity, radio, television, bicycle, floor (vinyl or Asphalt Strips, carpet, tile, concrete, wood), piped water, and flush toilet. The family planning program related variables include, whether or not a woman: visited by family planning worker in the last 12 months, visited health facility in the last 12 months, heard family planning on radio.

The analysis used a cumulative approach to model building. Model 1 is null model which was run without including any variables. Model 2 includes only the year of survey. Model 1 and 2 are not significant to this study thus these are ignored. Model 3 includes individual factors. Model 4 includes individual and household factors and Model 5 includes individual, household and Program level factors. This approach allows the identification of the relative impact of each set of factors in explaining community variation in the contraceptive use. All models include cluster-level random effects terms.

Result

Sample characteristics

Among married women of reproductive age used in this study, 36 % were using modern contraceptives and 55.4 % were in 20–34 years age group. Seventy-two percent of Women had no education, whereas 14%

Table 1: Percentage distribution of married women aged 15–49 used in the analysis by selected characteristics, 2006

Characteristic		(%)
Modern Contraceptive Use	—	36.0
Age	Below 20	9.9
	20–34	55.4
	35 and over	34.7
Education	No	71.7
	Primary	14.1
	Secondary and above	14.2
Ethnicity	Brahmin / Chhetri	31.6
	Terai Madhesi other cast	15.4
	Dalit	13.4
	Newar	5.0
	Janjatis	30.0
	Muslim	4.6
Residence	Rural	89.2
	Urban	10.8
Household socio-economic status	Poorest	30.4
	Poorer	14.4
	Middle	17.5
	Richer	20.0
	Richest	17.7
Visited by health worker	—	9.8
Visited health facility	—	48.1
Heard family planning on radio	—	57.6

had a secondary or higher level of education. The largest ethnic groups were upper caste Brahmin and Chhetries (32%), Janjatis (30%), Terai Madhesi caste (15%), Dalits (13%), Newars (5%) and Muslims (5%) (Table 1).

Contraceptive Use

Among the 23381 currently married women of reproductive age, 36% reported to use modern contraceptive (Table 1). Among the 36% women who were currently using contraceptive, 9.0% were below the age 20, 35% were illiterate and 53 % were urban residences.

The variation in use of modern contraceptives is seen among ethnic groups, 39% Brahmin / Chhetries, 34% Terai Madheshi, 29% Dalits, 52% Newars, 38% janjati and 13% Muslim women used modern contraceptives (Table 2).

Multilevel Analysis

Multilevel logistic regression modeling was employed to determine impact of program variables on contraceptive use and to examine ethnic differences in contraceptive use. Individual and household variables

were also included in the model as confounders. Three variables on exposure to family planning information from health worker and mass media sources were used as program variables. Three groups of variables were entered into the model in sequence. Table 3 and Table 4 show the result of the multilevel modeling of the contraceptive use.

Model 1 is null model which was run without including any variables. Model 2 includes only the year of survey. Model 1 and 2 were not significant to explain the cluster level variance so they are excluded from Table. Individual socio-demographic factors included in Model 3 explained 17% of the cluster-level variation of modern contraceptive use remained unexplained in Model 2. Similarly, household wealth index added in Model 4 explained 19% of the cluster-level variation of contraceptive use seen in Model 3. Cluster-level variables obtained by aggregating individual characteristics within the cluster were added in Model 4, which were able to explain 11% of the cluster-level variation of contraceptive use remained unexplained in Model 5. Finally, the program variables were added in the Model 5.

Table 2: Percentage distribution of married women aged 15–49, using modern contraceptive method by selected characteristics, 2006

Characteristics	Ethnic groups in %						
	All	B*	T*	D*	N*	J*	M*
Age							
Below 20	9.0	9.0	4.9	5.9	20.9	13.6	6.3
20–34	44.4	36.1	31.7	26.2	49.4	38.0	12.4
35 and over	46.2	50.1	47.9	44.4	61.5	43.8	16.2
Ethnic groups using modern contraceptives	–	38.8	34.0	28.8	52.2	38.0	13.0
Education							
No	34.5	36.8	33.4	28.3	51.8	38.7	11.1
Primary	38.1	40.7	33.0	33.3	52.7	37.4	16.6
Secondary and above	41.1	42.3	43.1	34.3	52.2	33.1	43.2
Residence							
Rural	33.8	36.1	32.5	27.4	44.7	37.2	11.0
Urban	53.7	56.1	50.8	45.7	65.7	48.5	32.2
Household socio-economic status							
Poorest	24.5	23.6	26.2	22.3	23.2	28.4	7.3
Poorer	32.3	31.7	34.1	28.0	33.8	35.7	12.0
Middle	36.8	40.8	37.6	35.1	28.0	41.0	11.2
Richer	40.4	42.7	38.1	35.6	47.1	43.8	14.7
Richest	52.9	55.6	45.1	49.3	65.7	46.4	32.3
Visited by health worker	49.1	50.0	43.4	40.2	70.8	53.3	35.3
Visited health facility	39.6	41.4	34.0	29.9	56.3	43.5	19.7
Heard family planning on radio	40.7	41.6	44.7	31.3	52.0	41.0	22.7

* B= Brahmin / Chhetri, T= Terai madhesi other cast, D= Dalit, N= Newar, J= Janjatis, M= Muslim

The program variables, exposure of family planning message from health worker and media sources added in Model 5 were able to explain 5% of the cluster-level variance on contraceptive use remained unexplained in Model 4. Even after controlling for individual, household, cluster and year of survey in Model 5, significant cluster-level variance in contraceptive use remained unexplained.

Controlling for individual, household and cluster-level factors, all program variables were significantly associated with the modern contraceptive use (Table 3). Currently married women of reproductive age who visited health facility or who were visited by health worker in the last 12 month were more likely to use modern contraceptive use (OR=1.23 and 1.60 respectively $P>0.05$) than women who were not in contact with health worker or health facility. Likewise, women who were exposed to family planning information in radio in the last few months were more likely to use modern contraceptive use than women not exposed to family planning in these media (OR=1.22, $P>0.01$).

With household (Model 3), cluster (Model 4) and program variables (Model 5) sequentially added, place

of residence and ethnicity (Newar and Terai Medhesi) emerged as non-significant predictors of contraceptive use. Model 5 further shows that, all ethnic groups except Newars were significantly less likely to use modern contraceptive than the Brahmin and Chhetries (OR1.09, $P>0.05$).

Place of residence, which was significant predictor of modern contraceptive use in Model 3 also emerged as non-significant when cluster and program factors were added in Model 4 and Model 5. The odd ratio for urban area has decreased in Model 4 and 5 as the cluster and program variables added to model. (OR of Urban area in model 3, 4, and 5 is 2.02, 1.23, and 0.95 respectively with $P>0.05$).

Table 4 shows the result of the multilevel logistic regression models of the modern contraceptive use among the 6 ethnic groups separately. None of the program variables proved to be significantly associated with the contraceptive use in all 6 ethnic groups. The health worker's visit showed a significant association with contraceptive use in all ethnic groups except in Newars. Women belonging to Brahmin and Chhetries, Newars, Janjatis and Muslims, who visited

Table 3: Odds ratios (and 95% confidence intervals) from multilevel models examining the odds of using modern contraceptive methods by selected characteristics

Characteristics		Model 3 (OR)	Model 4 (OR)	Model 5 (OR)
Age	Below 20 (ref)	1	1	1
	20-34	5.02 (4.31–5.85)	4.94 (4.24–5.76)	4.88 (4.18–5.68)
	35 and over	8.73 (7.45–10.24)	8.37 (7.14–9.81)	8.18 (6.98–9.59)
Education	No (ref)	1	1	1
	Primary	1.07 (0.97–1.17)	0.99 (0.90–1.10)	0.9 (0.90–1.07)
	Secondary and above	1.00 (0.90–1.11)	0.86 (0.77–0.96)	0.85 (0.76–0.94)
Ethnicity	Brahmin/Chhetri (ref)	1	1	1
	Terai Madhesi	0.85 (0.74–0.97)	0.90 (0.79–1.03)	0.85 (0.74–0.98)
	Dalit	0.72 (0.64–0.80)	0.81 (0.72–0.91)	0.79 (0.71–0.89)
	Newar	1.21 (1.03–1.43)	1.18 (1.00–1.39)	1.09* (0.92–1.29)
	Janjatis	0.86 (0.78–0.94)	0.88 (0.81–0.97)	0.86 (0.78–0.94)
	Muslim	0.27 (0.20–0.35)	0.28 (0.21–0.37)	0.25 (0.19–0.33)
Residence	Rural (ref)	1	1	1
	Urban	2.02* (1.71–2.39)	1.53* (1.30–1.80)	0.95* (0.79–1.15)
Household socio-economic status	Poorest (ref)	—	1	1
	Poorer	—	1.26 (1.14–1.40)	1.25 (1.13–1.39)
	Middle	—	1.66 (1.50–1.84)	1.60 (1.45–1.77)
	Richer	—	1.78 (1.61–1.97)	1.67 (1.50–1.84)
	Richest	—	2.50 (2.21–2.84)	2.08 (1.82–2.38)
Visited by health worker	No (ref)	—	—	1
	Yes	—	—	1.6* (1.44–1.76)
Visited health facility	No (ref)	—	—	1
	Yes	—	—	1.23* (1.15–1.32)
Heard family planning on radio	No (ref)	—	—	1
	Yes	—	—	1.22** (1.12–1.32)

* Significant at 0.05 ** Significant at 0.01

Table 4: Odds ratios (and 95% confidence intervals) from multilevel models examining the odds of using modern contraceptive methods by ethnic groups and selected variables, 2006

Characteristics	Final Multilevel Model by Ethnicity					
	B#	T#	D#	N#	J#	M#
Age						
Below 20 (ref)	1	1	1	1	1	1
20–34	4.83 (3.66–6.38)	10.46 (5.88–18.61)	5.60 (3.65–8.57)	2.79 (1.49–5.25)	3.98 (3.05–5.19)	2.14 (0.84–5.41)
35 and over	9.11 (6.83–12.15)	21.07 (11.70–37.95)	14.2 (9.14–22.18)	4.63 (2.38–9.01)	5.88 (4.45–7.78)	2.89 (1.10–7.61)
Education						
No (ref)	1	1	1	1	1	1
Primary	0.90 (0.77–1.05)	0.84 (0.61–1.17)	0.95* (0.70–1.29)	0.70 (0.48–1.01)	0.93 (0.78–1.11)	1.13 (0.42–3.04)
Secondary and above	0.73 (0.61–0.87)	0.90 (0.59–1.36)	0.82** (0.49–1.35)	0.45 (0.29–0.69)	0.73 (0.57–0.93)	1.22 (0.44–3.38)
Residence						
Rural (ref)	1	1	1	1	1	1
Urban	0.86 (0.67–1.12)	0.76 (0.43–1.31)	0.88 (0.60–1.30)	0.78 (0.49–1.27)	1.11* (0.80–1.53)	1.24* (0.39–3.95)
Household socio-economic status						
Poorest (ref)	1	1	1	1	1	1
Poorer	1.27 (1.07–1.51)	1.26 (0.88–1.78)	1.30 (0.98–1.71)	1.45 (0.72–2.93)	0.93 (0.77–1.12)	1.34 (0.45–3.96)
Middle	1.66 (1.37–2.00)	1.87 (1.45–2.41)	1.74 (1.32–2.29)	1.41 (0.74–2.69)	1.23 (1.02–1.48)	1.20 (0.61–2.38)
Richer	1.59 (1.32–1.91)	1.48 (1.12–1.97)	1.61 (1.19–2.20)	2.51 (1.37–4.60)	1.39 (1.15–1.67)	1.33 (0.65–2.70)
Richest	2.03 (1.60–2.58)	1.83 (1.21–2.76)	1.88 (1.17–3.01)	3.28 (1.64–6.58)	1.47 (1.15–1.88)	2.48 (0.97–6.36)
Visited by health worker						
No (ref)	1	1	1	1	1	1
Yes	1.59 (1.34–1.89)	1.47* (1.10–1.97)	1.82 (1.35–2.47)	1.58 (0.91–2.72)	1.58 (1.33–1.89)	4.00* (2.07–7.75)
Visited health facility						
No (ref)	1	1	1	1	1	1
Yes	1.13 (1.01–1.26)	0.86 (0.71–1.04)	0.99 (0.81–1.20)	1.64 (1.23–2.17)	1.57 (1.39–1.77)	2.18 (1.33–3.59)
Heard family planning on radio						
No (ref)	1	1	1	1	1	1
Yes	1.29 (1.12–1.48)	1.53 (1.20–1.95)	1.06 (0.85–1.31)	0.86 (0.61–1.22)	1.23 (1.07–1.42)	1.29 (0.73–2.29)

B# = Brahmin / Chhetri, T# = Terai madhesi other cast, D# = Dalit, N# = Newar, J# = Janjatis, M# = Muslim

* Significant at 0.05 ** significant at 0.01

health facility in the last 12 months, were more likely to receive modern contraceptive use than the women who did not visit health facility in the same period. Relative to women who did not heard family planning information from radio, all women (except Newars, Janjatis and Muslims) who heard family planning message from radio were more likely to use contracep-

tive.

There was also ethnic variation in the association of place of residence, Janjati and Muslim women living in urban sectors were more likely to use modern contraception (OR 1.11 and 1.24 respectively with $P > 0.05$) than their rural counterpart. Level of education does not fit significant to modern contraception use

among Dalit women, women with primary education had better odd ratio than women with secondary or above education(OR 0.95 and 0.82 respectively with $P>0.5$ and 0.01).

There was also ethnic variation in the association of household wealth with the contraceptive use; household wealth was not associated with contraceptive use in Muslims. The visit by health workers was found very high among Muslims (OR 4.0 with $P>0.05$) and very low among Terai Madhesi women (OR 1.47 with $P>0.05$). Similarly, Ethnic groups except Newars were found significantly associated with information on family planning through radio.

Discussion

Findings from this analysis indicate that age and ethnicity were the important individual-level factors contributing to the contraceptive use. All the program variables used in the analysis were associated with increased contraceptive use. Exposure to family planning information on radio and contact of women with the health worker were the important program variables contributing to contraceptive adoption.

Impact of the program variables on contraceptive use differed by ethnicity. For example, health worker's visit was not associated with contraceptive use among Newars. Similarly there was no association between health facility visit and contraceptive use among Dalits and Terai Madhesi ethnic groups. While, exposure of family planning information in Radio was not associated with contraceptive use among Newars, Janjatis and Muslim.

This analysis also indicated that the household economic status was strong predictor of contraceptive use behavior, though its impact of on contraceptive use varies by the ethnicity. Large scale studies conducted in Sweden, Turkey, Poland and Iran showed strong association between ethnicity and poor self reported health which was mediated by socioeconomic status, cultural change, and discrimination (12, 13). It is also found that large percentages of Muslim women failed to use modern contraceptive and the trend is not so encouraging in the last decade. The question why so large proportion of Muslims are not using contraceptive should be the issue of further exploration. However, we can speculate that this may be due to the language, cultural barrier and their feeling of discrimination, which need to be address by family planning program.

It is also evident that despite geographical and cultural difficulties, ethnic minority groups can be open

to adopt family planning when services are accessible and provided in a culturally acceptable manner (14). Therefore, future family planning program intervention in Nepal, should be planned to make it context specific so as to make it acceptable in different culture. Different approaches should be applied to expand the family planning program in Mountain, Hill and Terai regions and among different ethnic groups. It is also speculated that the ethnic variation in contraceptive use is due to the cultural or knowledge barriers affecting women's access to health care in Nepal. Therefore, Ethnic minorities should be made more aware with the importance of the family planning programs. Special program attention should be made to the Muslim, Dalit and Madhesi women.

Finally, the interventions to be designed in the future in Nepal to attain MDG should be based on socio-cultural conditions of different ethnic groups. The community health workers including FCHVs should be encouraged to disseminate health information in local language. They should also be motivated to serve Dalits, Muslims and other ethnic minorities without violating the local cultural norms. Members of the local ethnic groups should be integrated in the working team to deliver the family planning message among Muslim, Terai Madhesi and Dalits.

Acknowledgement

There is no conflict of interest to declare.

References

1. Aryal RH, Pathak RS, Dattel BR, Pant PD. A comparative analysis of unmet need in Nepal: further analysis of the 2006 Nepal Demographic and Health Survey. *Calverton, Maryland, USA: Macro International Inc; 2008.*
2. Ministry of Health and Population (MoHP) [Nepal], New Era, and Macro International Inc; 2007
3. Karki YB, Krishna R. Factors responsible for the rapid decline of fertility in Nepal—an interpretation: *Analysis of the 2006 Nepal Demographic and Health Survey.* Calverton, Maryland, USA: Macro International Inc; 2008.
4. Hixson M, Christ T, Bradley-Johnson S. Best practices in the analysis of progress monitoring and decision making. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.). *Best practices in school psychology-V*, Silver Springs, MD: National Association of School Psychologists; 2008.
5. Bennett L, Dahal DR, Govindasamy P. Caste, ethnic

- and regional identity dimensions in Nepal : *Further Analysis of the 2006 Nepal Demographic and Health Survey*, Calverton, Maryland, USA: Macro International Inc; 2008.
6. Dahal GP, Padmadas SS, Hinde PR. Fertility-limiting behavior and contraceptive choice among men in Nepal. *International Family Planning Perspective* 2008; 34: 6–14.
 7. Emens A. Perceived fertility regulation costs and contraceptive use in Nepal. *Population Studies Center Research Report*, Michigan University; 2008.
 8. Christman SK, Zawacki T. Understanding ethnic disparities in Contraceptive Use: The mediating role of attitudes. *Under Graduate Research Journal for the Human Science* 2009; 8.
 9. Raine T, Harper C, Paukku M, Darney P. Race, adolescent contraceptive choice, and pregnancy at presentation to a family Planning clinic. *Obstetrics and Gynecology* 2002; 99: 241–7.
 10. Addai I. Ethnicity and contraceptive use in sub-Saharan Africa: the case of Ghana. *Journal of Biosocial Science* 1999; 31:105–20.
 11. Gupta N, Katende C, Bessinger R. Association of mass media exposure with family planning attitudes and practices in Uganda. *Studies in Family Planning* 2003, 34: 19–31.
 12. Wiking E, Joshansson S, Sundquist J. Ethnicity, acculturation, and self reported health. A population based study among immigrants from Poland, Turkey, and Iran in Sweden. *Journal of Epidemiol Community Health* 2004; 58: 574–82.
 13. Lindstrom M, Sundquist J, Ostergren PO. Ethnic differences in self-reported health in Malmo in Southern Sweden. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2001; 55: 97–103.
 14. Bertrand JT, Seiber E Escudero G. Contraceptive dynamics in Guatemala: 1978–1998. *International Family Planning Perspectives* 2001, 27: 112–8.