



www.figo.org

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

## International Journal of Gynecology and Obstetrics

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/ijgo



## FAMILY PLANNING

## How conditional cash transfers to promote institutional delivery can also influence postpartum contra

View metadata, citation and similar papers at [core.ac.uk](http://core.ac.uk)

A.J. Francis Zavier\*, K.G. Santhya

Population Council, New Delhi, India

## ARTICLE INFO

## Keywords:

Conditional cash transfers  
India  
Janani Suraksha Yojana  
Postpartum contraception  
Rajasthan

## ABSTRACT

**Objective:** To examine the association between the receipt of benefits from a conditional cash transfer (CCT) scheme—Janani Suraksha Yojana (JSY)—and postpartum contraceptive use in Rajasthan, India. **Methods:** Data from 2920 women who had delivered in the year preceding the interview were used. Univariate and multivariate analyses were used. **Results:** Adoption of postpartum contraception was limited among study participants. Even so, women who had experienced the benefits of JSY were more likely than those who had not to have received postpartum contraceptive counseling (odds ratio [OR] 1.66; 95% confidence interval [CI], 1.38–2.00) and to have adopted contraception within 3 months of delivery (OR, 1.31; 95% CI, 1.02–1.68). **Conclusion:** The present findings make a case for special efforts to use the increased opportunity women experience to interact with the health system as a result of CCTs for promoting maternal and newborn health practices, including postpartum contraception.

© 2013 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ireland Ltd. on behalf of International Federation of Gynecology and Obstetrics.

Open access under [CC BY-NC-ND license](http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

## 1. Introduction

There is growing evidence from numerous countries that conditional cash transfers (CCTs) have leveraged sizeable gains in access to health services [1,2]. Janani Suraksha Yojana (JSY) is a CCT program in India intended to encourage institutional delivery and to provide access to care during pregnancy and in the postpartum period. Official statistics show that JSY has increased the number of institutional deliveries in India from 10.8 million in 2005–2006 to 17.6 million in 2012 [3]. Evaluations of JSY thus far have assessed its effects on the uptake of maternal health services and on improving newborn health [4–6]. Evidence, however, remains limited about its effects on postpartum contraceptive use.

Launched in 2005, JSY is currently implemented in all states of India, with a special focus on states that have performed poorly in health and demographic indicators. In the low-performing states—including Rajasthan, where the present study was located—all pregnant women who deliver in a government facility or an accredited private facility in rural areas are given Rs 1400 (approximately US \$23), and in urban areas Rs 1000 (approximately \$17) [7]. In the remaining states, the scheme is restricted to women having their first or second delivery, women aged 19 years or older, and women belonging to poor

households. Under the scheme, the potential beneficiaries are encouraged to register to receive at least 3 prenatal check-ups, opt for institutional delivery, and seek postpartum and newborn care, although JSY cash is disbursed to the women immediately after delivery.

Accredited Social Health Activists (ASHAs) have an important role in enabling women to benefit from JSY. Their responsibilities include identifying pregnant women and facilitating their registration for prenatal services; ensuring that pregnant women receive at least 3 prenatal check-ups; identifying functional government health facilities or accredited private health facilities for referral and delivery; counseling pregnant women to undergo institutional delivery; arranging transport for pregnant women to reach the health center for delivery or treatment of complications; escorting pregnant women to a health facility and staying with them until they are discharged; counseling women about breastfeeding their newborn; arranging immunization of newborns until the age of 14 weeks; making a postpartum visit within 7 days of delivery; and promoting family-planning services [7].

Evaluations of JSY have demonstrated that it has succeeded in increasing the uptake of maternal health services and improving newborn health. We hypothesized that JSY, in combination with the ASHAs who have a pivotal role in enabling women to access the program, can lead to increased interactions between women and healthcare providers, which in turn can lead to increased postpartum contraceptive counseling and contraceptive uptake.

The present paper examines differences between JSY beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries in receiving postpartum contraceptive counseling, in adopting contraception within 3 months of delivery, and in method choice made by contraceptive users. An assessment

\* Corresponding author at: Zone 5A, India Habitat Centre, Lodi Road, New Delhi 110003, India. Tel.: +91 11 2464 2901; fax: +91 11 2464 2903.

E-mail address: [fzavier@popcouncil.org](mailto:fzavier@popcouncil.org) (A.J.F. Zavier).

of the effects of JSY on postpartum contraception is timely in India. Although contraceptive use has increased over the decades (55%–60% of currently married women in India use some method of contraception), a substantial proportion of currently married women have an unmet need [8]. Routine postpartum check-ups offer an excellent opportunity for providing contraceptive counseling and services, thereby reducing the unmet need for contraception; however, efforts to promote postpartum contraceptive services continue to be limited.

## 2. Materials and methods

### 2.1. Study setting

The study was conducted in the state of Rajasthan, India. With a maternal mortality ratio of 318 per 100 000 live births, it has the third highest maternal mortality ratio among all states in India [9]. Moreover, the use of maternal health services is limited; in 2009–2010, 55% of women had 3 or more prenatal check-ups and 70% delivered in a health facility [6]. The coverage of programs such as JSY also remains far from universal. An evaluation conducted by the UNFPA reported that only half of women who had delivered in the year preceding the survey had received financial assistance under JSY [5].

Two districts, Alwar and Jodhpur, were purposively selected from among the 32 districts of the state for the study. The levels of sociodemographic and reproductive health indicators in these districts were close to the state averages. They also represent the eastern and western regions of the state. The study was fielded in both urban and rural areas. Sampling units were selected independently in rural and urban areas within each district via a 2-stage stratified systematic random-sampling procedure. At the first stage, blocks were selected; the 2001 census list of blocks served as the sampling frame for the selection of blocks. This list was first stratified using the percentage of the population belonging to scheduled castes and tribes; the next level of stratification was implicit for all strata, consisting of an ordering of blocks within each stratum by level of female literacy, ordered alternatively in increasing and decreasing levels of female literacy. The blocks were selected systematically from the stratified list, with selection probability proportional to size; thus, 3 rural blocks and 2 urban blocks were selected in each district. At the second stage, villages (rural areas)/census enumeration blocks (CEBs) (urban areas) were selected within each selected block, using a similar scheme. Thus, a total of 196 villages/CEBs were selected from rural and urban blocks of the 2 districts together. Within each selected village/CEB, all households were enumerated to identify eligible respondents. Villages/CEBs containing fewer than 200 households were linked to 1 or more adjoining villages/CEBs. Villages containing more than 300 households were divided into segments of 150–200 households and 1 segment was randomly selected. Approximately 44 530 households were enumerated.

In each district, the sample weight was calculated separately for rural and urban areas. The district weight was calculated taking into account differential non-response rates as well as design weights for rural and urban areas. For the combined sample of the 2 districts, the overall sample weights were calculated as the product of the design weight for each district (after adjusting for non-response) and the district weight.

### 2.2. Study design and participants

A cross-sectional study comprising a survey and in-depth interviews was conducted during September 2009–February 2010. Respondents included women younger than 35 years of age who had delivered in the year preceding the interview. The study was restricted to women aged below 35 years because childbearing at ages above 35 is rare in the study setting [8]. All eligible women identified were invited to participate in the study. In total, 5924 women were identified during the house-listing exercise; 4770 women were successfully interviewed, resulting in a response rate of 80%. While less than 2% of women refused

to participate, 17% were not interviewed as they were not at home after 3 visits; the majority of these women were daughters of the head of the household who had returned temporarily to their natal home at the time of the house-listing exercise but then returned to their marital home by the time of the survey.

A detailed questionnaire was administered to eligible respondents. It was translated into the local language—Hindi—pre-tested, and further modified. In addition to questions on socioeconomic characteristics, the questionnaire included detailed questions about maternal and newborn care-seeking practices, quality of services received, and postpartum contraceptive use. Trained female investigators conducted the interviews at respondents' homes.

Of the 4770 women interviewed, 46% experienced the benefits of JSY. The sociodemographic characteristics of JSY beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries differed significantly [2]. Therefore, the analysis presented here was restricted to a matched sample of JSY beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries, selected using the technique of propensity score matching (PSM) to enable controlling for potential self-selection bias by identifying those respondents from the non-beneficiary group who would be most likely to have experienced the benefits [10,11].

For calculating the propensity score, background characteristics such as women's age, education, parity, religion, caste, and household wealth status were considered. Once the score was calculated, the value was used to identify a respondent from the non-beneficiary group with the nearest possible value to that of the beneficiary, without replacement. The matching was done separately for rural and urban areas. *F* test for goodness of fit was significant at  $P \leq 0.0001$  for both urban and rural areas. The percentages of women who fell into the first–fifth quintiles were 26%, 21%, 18%, 18%, and 17%, respectively, among JSY beneficiaries; and 27%, 21%, 18%, 17%, and 17%, respectively, among JSY non-beneficiaries. A total of 3434 beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries were selected. Furthermore, given the focus of the paper on postpartum contraceptive use, the analysis was restricted to those who had delivered 4–12 months preceding the interview (2920 women). Percentages indicated in the tables are weighted but the number of respondents shown is unweighted.

### 2.3. Analysis

Two outcome indicators were used: receipt of postpartum contraceptive counseling and postpartum contraceptive use. The postpartum contraceptive counseling status measured whether health personnel, including ASHAs, advised the woman about the importance of postpartum contraceptive use during postpartum check-ups either at home or at the health facility. WHO guidelines indicate that when to start a contraceptive method after delivery will vary depending on whether a woman is breastfeeding [12]. For the purpose of the analysis presented here, postpartum contraceptive use was defined as contraceptive use within 3 months of delivery.

The receipt of JSY benefits measured whether the respondent had received cash assistance. Values of outcome variables obtained for beneficiary and non-beneficiary groups were first compared and  $\chi^2$  tests were used to test the significance of differences observed in the bivariate comparisons. Additionally, logistic regression analyses were used to account for potentially confounding effects that selected covariates might have had on the outcome measures. These covariates included rural–urban residence, husband's involvement in pregnancy-related care (i.e. whether the respondent's husband ever accompanied her to the health facility for prenatal, delivery, or postpartum services), steps taken by the provider during postpartum interactions to encourage the woman to continue using the service (i.e. whether the provider had reminded her about follow-up visits whenever she had a postpartum check-up), and study districts. For indicators related to postpartum contraceptive use, postpartum contraceptive counseling status was also controlled for. The background characteristics used to calculate the propensity score were not included in the regression model.

**Table 1**  
Sociodemographic profile and reproductive experiences of respondents by JSY beneficiary status.

Indicators	JSY beneficiaries (n = 1478)	JSY non-beneficiaries (n = 1442)	Combined (n = 2920)
Mean age, y	23.6 ± 3.9	23.5 ± 3.9	23.6 ± 3.9
Median years of school successfully completed	3.0	2.0	3.0
Religion, % <sup>a</sup>			
Hindu	82.6	83.2	82.9
Muslim	16.7	15.8	16.3
Caste, %			
Scheduled castes/tribes	34.4	33.9	34.2
Other backward castes	46.0	45.8	46.0
Others	19.5	20.1	19.8
Mean household wealth index (range, 0–58)	22.7 ± 9.8	22.1 ± 10.1	22.4 ± 10.0
Urban, %	26.5	24.4	25.5
Mean parity	2.5 ± 1.6	2.5 ± 1.5	2.5 ± 1.6
Husband was involved in pregnancy-related care, %	81.4	56.6 <sup>b</sup>	69.3
Interactions with any healthcare provider, excluding ASHAs, %			
Prenatal period	95.4	85.6 <sup>b</sup>	90.6
Postpartum period	80.7	37.1 <sup>b</sup>	59.4
Interactions with ASHAs, %			
Prenatal period	29.0	17.3 <sup>b</sup>	23.3
Delivery time	18.8	1.1 <sup>b</sup>	10.1
Postpartum period	21.2	6.6 <sup>b</sup>	14.1
Received postpartum check-up from healthcare personnel within 2 days of delivery, %	79.4	35.0 <sup>b</sup>	57.7
Provider always reminded about follow-up visit during postpartum check-ups, %	29.4	22.3 <sup>b</sup>	25.9
Received postpartum contraceptive counseling from, %			
ASHA	10.1	3.8 <sup>b</sup>	7.1
Auxiliary nurse midwife	16.6	6.6 <sup>b</sup>	11.7
Nurse or medical officer	16.7	12.5 <sup>b</sup>	14.7
Any of the above	32.8	19.3 <sup>b</sup>	26.2
Adopted postpartum contraception within 3 months, %	14.1	9.4 <sup>b</sup>	11.8
Among those who had adopted postpartum contraception, method used (n = 468), %			
Modern spacing methods	52.8	51.9	52.5
Permanent methods	38.1	43.8	40.3
Traditional methods	9.1	4.5	7.3

Abbreviations: ASHA, Accredited Social Health Activist; JSY, Janani Suraksha Yojana.

<sup>a</sup> Less than 1% of respondents belonged to religions other than Hindu or Muslim.<sup>b</sup>  $P \leq 0.001$ .

### 3. Results

Selected sociodemographic characteristics and reproductive experiences of women are summarized in Table 1. The majority of women were young (mean, 24 years), had limited schooling (median, 3 years), and belonged to the Hindu religion (83%). One-third of women belonged to socially excluded groups such as scheduled castes and tribes. A substantial proportion of women were from economically poor households (mean wealth index score of 22 on a scale ranging from 0 to 58). On average, they had 2.5 children ever born. Two-thirds of women reported that their husbands were involved in pregnancy-related care, with JSY beneficiaries more likely than non-beneficiaries to report such involvement.

A large proportion of women reported interactions with healthcare providers at least once during the prenatal and the postpartum periods (91% and 59%, respectively). However, contact with ASHAs was limited, with only 23%, 10%, and 14% of women reporting contact with ASHAs during the prenatal period, delivery, and the postpartum period, respectively. Almost two-thirds of women reported having received a postpartum check-up within 2 days of

delivery, and 26% reported that the provider always reminded them about follow-up visits. A larger proportion of JSY beneficiaries than non-beneficiaries reported interactions with healthcare providers during the prenatal and the postpartum periods (95% vs 86%, and 81% vs 37%, respectively). Beneficiaries were more likely than non-beneficiaries to report contact with ASHAs during the prenatal period, delivery, and the postpartum period (29% vs 17%, 19% vs 1%, and 21% vs 7%, respectively). They were also more likely to have received a postpartum check-up within 2 days of delivery (79% vs 35%) and to report that the provider always reminded them about follow-up visits whenever they had postpartum check-ups (29% vs 22%).

#### 3.1. Receipt of postpartum contraceptive counseling, adoption of postpartum contraception, and receipt of JSY benefits

Receipt of postpartum contraceptive counseling and adoption of postpartum contraception was limited among study participants (Table 1). Of the women who delivered 4–12 months preceding the interview, 26% had received postpartum contraceptive counseling; 7% from an ASHA; 12% from an auxiliary nurse midwife; and 15% from a nurse or medical officer. Beneficiaries were more likely than non-beneficiaries to have received counseling regarding postpartum contraception (33% vs 19%).

One in 8 (12%) women reported postpartum contraception within 3 months of delivery. Again, beneficiaries were more likely than non-beneficiaries to have adopted postpartum contraception within 3 months of delivery (14% vs 9%).

Among the women who reported contraceptive use within 3 months, 53% adopted a modern temporary method, 40% adopted a permanent method, and 7% used a traditional method. Differences by JSY status were narrow with respect to method choice: JSY beneficiaries were as likely as non-beneficiaries to have used a modern temporary method (53% vs 52%). However, they were slightly less likely to have used a permanent method (38% vs 44%) and more likely to have used a traditional method (9% vs 5%).

The bivariate associations were reiterated in the multivariate analyses (Table 2). The JSY beneficiaries were 1.7 times and 1.3 times more likely than non-beneficiaries to receive postpartum contraceptive counseling

**Table 2**Odds ratios from logistic regression analyses assessing the relationship between the receipt of JSY benefits and postpartum contraceptive counseling and use.<sup>a</sup>

Indicators	Received postpartum contraceptive counseling (n = 2920)	Adopted postpartum contraception within 3 months (n = 2920)
Received JSY benefits	1.66 <sup>b</sup> (1.38–2.00)	1.31 <sup>c</sup> (1.02–1.68)
Received postpartum contraceptive counseling (ref. = no)	–	2.06 <sup>b</sup> (1.59–2.65)
Provider always reminded about follow-up visit during postpartum care	3.52 <sup>b</sup> (2.89–4.27)	1.03 (0.79–1.35)
Husband was involved in pregnancy-related care	2.22 <sup>b</sup> (1.75–2.80)	1.68 <sup>d</sup> (1.21–2.32)
Urban residence (ref. = rural)	1.098 (0.89–1.36)	3.236 <sup>b</sup> (2.50–4.19)
Alwar district of residence (ref. = Jodhpur)	1.32 <sup>d</sup> (1.09–1.60)	1.16 (0.90–1.50)
Constant	0.084 <sup>b</sup>	0.037 <sup>b</sup>
–2LL	2924	1880
R <sup>2</sup>	0.162	0.114

Abbreviation: JSY, Janani Suraksha Yojana.

<sup>a</sup> Values are given as odds ratio (95% confidence interval) unless otherwise indicated.<sup>b</sup>  $P \leq 0.001$ .<sup>c</sup>  $P \leq 0.05$ .<sup>d</sup>  $P \leq 0.01$ .

and adopt postpartum contraception within 3 months of delivery, respectively, even after controlling for potentially confounding factors.

#### 4. Discussion

The present findings show that the receipt of postpartum contraceptive counseling and the adoption of postpartum contraception were limited in the study setting. However, JSY beneficiaries were more likely than non-beneficiaries to receive postpartum contraceptive counseling and to start using contraception soon after delivery. The increased opportunity for receiving information about pregnancy-related care and postpartum contraception, the enhanced interactions with healthcare providers, and the increased access to contraceptive supplies that are associated with exposure to JSY-related services may underlie the positive association between the receipt of JSY and the adoption of postpartum contraception.

The study had some limitations. First, indicators related to women's access to a health facility could also have predicted the probability of accessing JSY benefits that were not included in the calculation of the propensity score for lack of data. Therefore, there was potential for some selection bias. Second, 17% of women who were enumerated could not be interviewed. However, we believe that this was unlikely to have biased the findings because JSY is implemented in the entire state and a pregnant woman could access the benefits anywhere in the state provided she carried the maternal and child health card issued to her at the time of registering for prenatal check-up at the facility in which she delivered. Third, given that the study was located in just 2 districts of Rajasthan, the findings cannot be generalized.

Despite these limitations, the findings advance what is known about CCTs that are intended to promote institutional delivery in general and about JSY in particular. The present results make a case for special efforts to use the increased opportunity women receive to interact with the health system as a result of CCTs for promoting maternal and newborn health practices, including postpartum contraception.

#### Acknowledgments

Financial support for the present study was provided by the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation through a grant to the Population Council (No. 08-91861-000-GSS).

#### Conflict of interest

The authors have no conflicts of interest.

#### References

- [1] Bellows NM, Bellows BW, Warren C. The use of vouchers for reproductive health services in developing countries: systematic review. *Trop Med Int Health* 2011;16(1): 84–96.
- [2] Santhya KG, Jejeebhoy SJ, Acharya R, Zavier AJF. Effects of the Janani Suraksha Yojana on Maternal and newborn care practices: Women's experiences in Rajasthan. New Delhi: Population Council; 2011.
- [3] NRHM Facility Centre. National Rural Health Mission: State wise progress as on 31.03.2012. [http://mohfw.nic.in/NRHM/Documents/MIS/MIS\\_report\\_as\\_on\\_31-03-2012.xls](http://mohfw.nic.in/NRHM/Documents/MIS/MIS_report_as_on_31-03-2012.xls). Published 2012. Accessed 25 July 2012.
- [4] Lim SS, Dandona L, Hoisington JA, James SI, Hogan MC, Gakidou E. India's Janani Suraksha Yojana, a conditional cash transfer programme to increase births in health facilities: A impact evaluation. *Lancet* 2010;375(9730):1939–2050.
- [5] United Nations Population Fund. Concurrent Assessment of Janani Suraksha Yojana (JSY) Scheme in Selected States of India, 2008. New Delhi: UNFPA; 2009.
- [6] UNICEF. Coverage Evaluation Survey 2009. New Delhi: UNICEF; 2010.
- [7] MOHFW. National Rural Health Mission: Meeting People's Health Needs: Framework for Implementation 2005–2012. New Delhi: MOHFW; 2005.
- [8] IIPS, Macro International. National Family Health Survey (NFHS-3), 2005-06: India, vol. 1. Mumbai and Caverlton: International Institute for Population Sciences and Macro International; 2007.
- [9] ORGI (Office of the Registrar General of India). Special bulletin on maternal mortality in India 2004-06. Sample Registration System. New Delhi: RGI; 2011.
- [10] Rosenbaum PR, Rubin DB. Constructing a control group using multivariate matched sampling methods that incorporate the propensity score. *Am Stat* 1985;39(1): 33–8.
- [11] D'Agostino Jr Ralph B. Propensity score methods for bias reduction in the comparison of a treatment to a non-randomized control group. *Stat Med* 1998;17(19): 2265–81.
- [12] World Health Organization. Pregnancy, Childbirth, Postpartum and Newborn Care: A Guide for Essential Practice. Geneva: WHO; 2006.