

The International Electronic Journal of Rural and Remote Health Research, Education, Practice and Policy

ORIGINAL RESEARCH

Relationship between income generating activities of rural women and their reproductive health behavior in Bangladesh

SM Shariful Islam, AKM Mainuddin

International Center for Diarrhoeal Diseases, Shaheed Tajuddin Ahmed Sarani, Mohakhali, Dhaka, Bangladesh

Submitted: 26 July 2014; Revised: 8 March 2015; Accepted: 19 March 2015; Published: 26 November 2015

Shariful Islam SM, Mainuddin AKM

Relationship between income generating activities of rural women and their reproductive health behavior in Bangladesh

Rural and Remote Health 15: 3216. (Online) 2015

Available: http://www.rrh.org.au

ABSTRACT

Introduction: The objective of the study was to find out the effects of income generating activities of rural women and their reproductive health behavior (contraceptive use) in Bangladesh.

Methods: A cross-sectional study using a multi-stage sampling technique was carried out among 200 married rural women in Cox's Bazar, Bangladesh. Data were collected using a structured questionnaire on socioeconomic factors, income generating activities, women's empowerment in mobility, decision making and reproductive health behavior in terms of contraceptive use, number of children and desire for more children. Logistic regression analysis was used to determine the relationship between income generating activities and contraceptive use.

Results: Almost half (45.5%) of the participants were involved in income generating activities. A great majority (63.9%) worked year-round, two-thirds (75.0%) earned cash for their family and 21.3% were engaged in poultry farms. Women aged 26–35 years, members of any non-governmental organization and from a poor family were more likely to be engaged in income generating activities ($p \le 0.001$). Highly educated women worked more than their less educated counterparts and the opposite was true for their husbands ($p \le 0.001$). Almost half of the women (45.0%) did not use any contraceptive. Contraceptive use was significantly higher among working women (73.4%) than with non-working women (33.0%). Women engaged in income generating activities were more likely to use contraceptives compared to non-working women (odds ratio 5.6, 95% confidence interval 3.1–7.0, $p \le 0.001$).



The International Electronic Journal of Rural and Remote Health Research, Education Practice and Policy

Conclusions: Income generating activities seem to empower women, increase their likelihood of using contraception and are one of the key issues for changing the life of rural women in Bangladesh.

Key words: Bangladesh, contraceptive use, income generating activities, reproductive behavior, rural women, women's empowerment.

Introduction

Over the past few decades Bangladesh has made unprecedented and rapid progress in several health indicators and outcomes despite spending less on health¹. Bangladesh now has the longest life expectancy, lowest total fertility rate and the lowest infant and under-5 mortality rates in south Asia^{1,2}. Bangladesh is one of the most densely populated countries in the world, and in terms of human development it ranks at 129 out of 169 countries³. Almost 40% of people in Bangladesh continue to live below the poverty line⁴. Most women (90%) live in rural areas and constitute the majority of the poor, experiencing greater deprivation and vulnerability to poverty and socioeconomic adversity due to their low status in society according to reports by UNFPA Bangladesh⁵. The Government of Bangladesh has achieved success in reducing the total population growth from 2.3% in 1981 to 1.34% in 2011⁶. However, population is still one of the major public health problems of Bangladesh, underpinning the need for better family planning services and understanding the complex reproductive health behavior of its population.

Most rural women in Bangladesh actively contribute to the household activities. However, a great deal of women's activities does not generate direct income. Women's participation in income is usually a function of their poverty⁷. Income may enhance a woman's position in the family and may increase her autonomy in decision making. Once she earns status and autonomy in family decisions, she will have control over her desired fertility⁸. There is a need for women's participation in income generating activities in Bangladesh to meet basic needs and improve quality of life in

terms of education, health and social improvement beyond simple survival⁹. Contraceptive use rates among income generating women were 56.1% compared to 40.1% among the non-participant¹⁰.

Women's working hours in economic activities were found to be low due to their substantial involvement in noneconomic household work. A study in Bangladesh showed 37% of women did not participate at all in economic activities, 38% worked only for up to 2 hours a day and only 6% of women worked for more than 6 hours a day in economic activities, which may be considered as full-time employment¹⁰. Women's involvement in livestock rearing and homestead gardening and cottage industries is significantly higher than that of men. Those residing in dispersed rural areas are less likely to find employment other than agricultural wage labor¹¹.

Women's empowerment has been defined as 'the capacity of the women to be economically self sufficient and self reliant with control over decisions affecting their life options and freedom from violence'12. Women's empowerment in Bangladesh is strongly associated with women's working status and financial services¹³⁻¹⁵. In recent years the rapid influx of women in income generating activities in Bangladesh has become a key factor in the growing independence of women economically, socially and legally and in improving women's empowerment. However, to the best of the authors' knowledge there are no studies showing the relationship between income generating activities of women and reproductive health behavior in Bangladesh. The objective of the study was to find out the association between income generating activities of women and their reproductive health behavior in Bangladesh. The results of the study will

The International Electronic Journal of Rural and Remote Health Research, Education Practice and Policy

help to understand the reasons for involvement in income generating activities of rural women, relationship between work and empowerment, relationship between work, empowerment and fertility and to develop policies for the integrated development of Bangladesh.

Methods

Study design and populations

A cross-sectional study was carried out among 200 married rural women from June to December 2010 in Cox's Bazar district of Bangladesh using a multistage sampling technique (Fig1). At the first stage, one district was selected randomly out of the 64 districts in Bangladesh (Cox's Bazar district). At the second stage, one sub-district (Sadar) was selected out of the seven sub-districts and at the third stage one village (Kalampur) was selected randomly out of 163 villages. Cox's Bazar consists of 7 upazilas, 3 municipalities, 27 wards, 58 mahallas, 67 union parishads, 199 mouzas and 975 villages. Cox's Bazar Sadar had a population of 253 788, of whom 117 509 were aged ≥18 years. Males constituted 53.9% of the population, and females 46.1%. Cox's Bazar Sadar had an average literacy rate of 28.3% (≥7 years), against the national average of 32.4%. A total of 220 married women aged ≥16 years were approached for the interview in the selected villages with a 90.9% response rate. Participants were selected by convenience sampling from the village.

Data collection tools and procedure

The study was conducted using a structured questionnaire. The questionnaire was pre-tested in a separate village among 30 married female participants and modified for the study. Eight local graduate female interviewers were recruited and trained to interview the participants with necessary conceptual and contextual understanding. The interviewers carried out a one-to-one interview at each participant's house and maintaining proper confidentiality. The interviewers cross-checked the questionnaire for missing data and inconsistency after the interview. To provide necessary conceptual and systematic support, two supervisors monitored the interview and cross-checked the process regularly.

Variables and definitions

Data were collected following variables: on the sociodemographic characteristics, working status of respondents, empowerment of women in terms of mobility and decision making authority and reproductive behaviour in terms of contraceptive use, discussion of family planning with husband and desire for more children by women and their husbands. In the present study, income generating activities have been defined as those activities that generate income for the household or save household expenditure for the goods from the market¹¹. Mobility is one of the indicators for measuring empowerment of women. It refers to the propensity of a woman to move freely in society. To determine mobility frequency, each respondent was asked if she had ever gone to the market, outside the village and to the hospital/health center. Those who said they travelled outside of their homes were asked if they were accompanied by someone else. Each participant was given one point for each place visited with someone and an additional one point if she reported to have travelled alone. Women having scores of 0-2, 3-4 and 5-6 were considered as weakly, normally and strongly mobile, respectively.

Decision making authority represents women's participation in family decision making such as household purchases, daily food menu, permission to visit relatives, decisions on seeking personal and child healthcare and control over money earned. For all six cases, a woman scored 2 if she made a decision alone, 1 for decision making jointly and 0 for no authority. Women who scored 0–4, 5–8 and 9–12 were considered to have weak, normal and strong decision making authority, respectively.



Rural and Remote Health-

The International Electronic Journal of Rural and Remote Health Research, Education Practice and Policy



Figure 1: Administrative structure of Bangladesh used in study sampling.

Data analysis

Data analysis was carried out with the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences v16 (IBM; http://www.spss.com). Univariate analysis was used to illustrate the working pattern of women. Bivariate analysis using χ^2 tests was applied to find out the relationship between variables. Multivariate logistic regression analysis was carried out to show the effect of different factors on work, empowerment and reproductive behavior by developing models using maximum likelihood methods. The authors used only those variables in multivariate analysis that were statistically significant in the binary logistic model. The following independent variables were used as covariates in the multivariate analysis: 'age', 'belongs to NGO', 'wealth index', 'education', 'husband's education' and 'age at first marriage'.

Ethics approval

Data collection took place after obtaining written informed consent from each participant. Objectivity of the study and confidentiality were explained to participants. Principles of the Helsinki Declaration were adhered to for data collection. The study was approved by the ethical review board of the Department of Health Economics, University of Dhaka, Bangladesh (IRBDHE 0907128).

Results

In this study, the majority of the participants were first married at the age of 18 years or more (81%), were from poor to middle class (88%) according to wealth index and had some years of formal education (95%). More than half of the women (55%) discussed family planning with their husband and were involved in income generating activities (54.5%). Among working women, 23.1% were involved in business; 21.3% in poultry raising, cattle raising and trading; and 20.4% in agriculture. A great majority of women (63.9%) worked year-round, 34.3% seasonally and 1.9% occasionally. Among the participants, 75% earned cash only for work, 3.7% earned in-kind and 21.3% were not paid. Only one-third of women were members of any non-governmental organization (NGO) in their area (34.4%; Table 1).



The International Electronic Journal of Rural and Remote Health Research, Education Practice and Policy

Variable	Working status of women			p value
	Working	Working Non-working		
	n (%)	n (%)		
Age group (years)	• • • •			0.8880
16-25	23 (51.1%)	22 (48.9%)	45	
26-35	36 (58.1%)	26 (41.9%)	62	
36-45	29 (53.7%)	25 (46.3%)	54	
46-55	14 (50.0%)	14 (50.0%)	28	
56-65	7 (63.6%)	4 (36.4%)	11	
Membership of NGO	•			0.0375
Yes	40 (65.6%)	21 (34.4%)	61	
No	68 (49.6%)	69 (50.4%)	137	
Wealth index				0.0001
Poor	45 (42.9%)	60 (57.1%)	105	
Middle	52 (62.7%)	31 (37.3%)	83	
Rich	12 (100%)	0 (0%)	12	
Education level				0.0000
Illiterate	1 (10%)	9 (90%)	10	
Primary	37 (35.2%)	68 (64.8%)	105	
Secondary	51 (78.5%)	14 (21.5%)	65	
Higher secondary	14 (100%)	0 (0%)	14	
Graduate and above	6 (100%)	0 (0%)	6	
Husband's education				0.0000
Illiterate	1 (7.1%)	13 (92.9%)	14	
Primary	12 (20.3%)	47 (79.7%)	59	
Secondary	59 (67%)	29 (33%)	88	
Higher secondary	17 (100%)	0 (0%)	17	
Graduate and above	20 (90.9%)	2 (9.1%)	22	7
Age at first marriage (years)	•			0.5804
<18	22 (57.9%)	16 (42.1%)	38	7
≥18	86 (53.4%)	75 (46.6%)	161	7

Table 1: Sociodemographic characteristics of respondents

NGO, non-governmental organization

Women aged 26–35 years were more (58.1%) involved in income generating activities. NGO members and women from poor families were 1.2 times more likely to be engaged in income generating activities than non-NGO members and those from rich families. Among the working women, most (83.3%) made decisions normally, 15% strongly and 15.7% weakly. Among the non-working women, 84.3% weakly made their decisions. Interspousal communication was strong (76.5%) among working women. Working women were three times more empowered than non-working women.

More than half of the participants (55.0%) were using contraceptives. Contraceptive use was significantly higher

among working women (73.4%) than non-working women (33.0%) ($p \le 0.001$). The women who discussed family planning more often (91.4%) and sometimes (60.3%) with their husband were more likely to beusing more contraceptives than those who never discussed it (5.1%). Contraceptive use was higher among women aged 36–45 years (77.8%) and women aged 26–35 years (56.5%) than among age groups 16–25 years (44.4%), 46–55 years (39.3%) and 56–65 years (18.2%). Contraceptive use among women who were strongly mobile (78%) was more than double compared to weakly mobile women (31%). More than half of the women who had normal and strong decision making authority were using contraceptives (Table 2).



The International Electronic Journal of Rural and Remote Health Research, Education Practice and Policy

$(?6)$ No Working status 0.000 Working 73.4% 26.6% 109 Non-working 33% 67% 91 Discusses family planning with husband 0.000 More often 91.4% 8.6% 35 Sometimes 60.3% 39.7% 126 Never 5.1% 94.9% 39 Husband's desire for children 0.000 Husband wants fewer 93.1% 6.9% 29 Both want same 62.1% 37.9% 116 Want more/don't know 20% 80% 55 Number of living children 0.000 ≥ 7 0% 100% 2 5 or 6 29.4% 70.6% 55 26-35 56.5% 43.3% 62 3 or 4 61.6% 38.4% 86 0-22 68.9% 31.1% 61 Age group (years) (0.00	Variable	Contraceptive use		Total	p value
YesNo \sim Working status73.4%26.6%109Non-working33%67%91Discusses family planning with husband \sim \sim More often91.4%8.6%35Sometimes60.3%39.7%126Never5.1%94.9%39Husband's desire for children \sim \sim Husband want fewer93.1%6.9%29Both want same62.1%37.9%116Want more/don't know20%80%55Number of living children \sim \sim \geq 0.000100%2 \leq or 629.4%70.6%51 3 or 461.6%38.4%86 $O-2$ 68.9%22.2%54 d_{16-25} 44.4%55.6%55 $26-35$ 56.5%43.5%62 $36-45$ 77.8%22.2%54 $46-55$ 39.3%60.7%28 $56-65$ 18.2%81.8%11Mohlity \sim \sim Morall69.8%30.2%63Weak31%69%87Decision making authority \sim \sim Normal68.8%31.3%96Weak73.3%26.7%15Education \sim \sim Ilterate10%90%10Primary45.7%54.3%105Secondary85.7%14.3%14Graduate and above33.3%			(%)		
Working status $ -$		Yes	No		
Working73.4%26.6%109Non-working33%67%91Discusses family planning with husband \sim 0.000More often91.4%8.6%35Sometimes60.3%39.7%126Never5.1%94.9%39Husband's desire for children \sim \sim Husband wants fewer93.1%6.9%29Both want same62.1%37.9%116Want more/don't know20%80%55Number of living children \sim \sim \geq 70%100%25 or 629.4%70.6%513 or 461.6%38.4%86 $O-2$ 68.9%31.1%61More of living children \sim \sim $2 - 5$ or 629.4%70.6%513 or 461.6%38.4%86 $O-2$ 68.9%31.1%61More of living children \sim \sim $2 - 5 $ 56.5%43.5%6236-4577.8%22.2%5446-5539.3%60.7%2856-6518.2%81.8%11Mobility \sim \sim Moreal69%87Decision making authority \sim \sim Weak71.%62.9%89Normal68.8%31.3%96Weak73.3%26.7%15Education \sim \sim Iliterate10%100% <tr< td=""><td>Working status</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>0.000</td></tr<>	Working status				0.000
Non-working 33% 67% 91 Discusses family planning with husband	Working	73.4%	26.6%	109	
Discusses family planning with husband 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Non-working	33%	67%	91	
More often91.4%8.6%35Sometimes 60.3% 39.7% 126Never 5.1% 94.9% 39 Husband's desire for children 1000 1000 Husband wants fewer 93.1% 6.9% 29 Both want same 62.1% 37.9% 116 Want more/don't know 20% 80% 55 Number of living children 100% 2 ≥ 7 0% 100% 2 $5 or 6$ 29.4% 70.6% 51 $3 or 4$ 61.6% 38.4% 86 $0-2$ 68.9% 31.1% 61 Age group (years) 100% 100% $16-25$ 44.4% 55.6% 55 $26-35$ 56.5% 43.5% 62 $36-45$ 77.8% 22.2% 54 $46-55$ 39.3% 60.7% 28 $56-65$ 18.2% 81.8% 11 Mobility 1000 100 Strong 77.3% 62.9% 89 Normal 69.8% 31.3% 96 Weak 31% 69% 87 Decision making authority 100% 100% Iliterate 10% 90% 100 Primary 45.7% 54.3% 105 Secondary 72.3% 27.7% 65 Higher secondary 87.7% 11.4% 14 Graduate and above 33.3% 66.7% 59 Secondary 62.7% 59 $55.$	Discusses family planning with husband				0.000
Sometimes 60.3% 39.7% 126 Never 5.1% 94.9% 39 Husband's desire for children 0.000 Husband stame 62.1% 37.9% 116 Want more/don't know 20% 80% 55 Number of living children 0.000 22 $5 \text{ or } 6$ 29.4% 70.6% 51 $3 \text{ or } 4$ 61.6% 38.4% 86 $0-2$ 68.9% 31.1% 61 Age group (years) 0.000 0.000 $16-25$ 44.4% 55.6% 55 $26-35$ 56.5% 43.5% 62 $36-45$ 77.8% 22.2% 54 $46-55$ 39.3% 60.7% 28 $56-65$ 18.2% 81.8% 11 Mobility 0.000 50 50 63 Weak 31% 69% 87 Decision making authority 0.000 <td>More often</td> <td>91.4%</td> <td>8.6%</td> <td>35</td> <td></td>	More often	91.4%	8.6%	35	
Never 5.1% 94.9% 39 Husband's desire for children (6.9%) 29 Both want same 62.1% 37.9% 116 Want more/don't know 20% 80% 55 Number of living children (0.00%) 22 5 or 6 29.4% 70.6% 51 3 or 4 61.6% 38.4% 86 $0-2$ 68.9% 31.1% 61 Age group (years) (2.2%) 54 (3.5%) $16-25$ 44.4% 55.6% 55 $26-35$ 56.5% 43.5% 62 $36-45$ 77.8% 22.2% 54 $46-55$ 39.3% 60.7% 28 $56-65$ 18.2% 81.8% 11 Mobility (0.000) (0.000) Strong 78% 22% 50 Normal 69.8% 30.2% 63 Weak 73.3% 26.7% 15 Education (10%) 90% 100 Primary 45.7% 54.3% 105 Secondary 72.3% 27.7% 65 Higher secondary 83.2% 11.8% 11 Primary 37.3% 66.7% 65 Higher secondary 88.2% 11.8% 17 Primary 37.3% 62.7% 59 Secondary 64.8% 35.2% 88 Higher secondary 72.7% $73.\%$ 22	Sometimes	60.3%	39.7%	126	
Husband's desire for children000Husband wants fewer93.1% 6.9% 29Both want same 62.1% 37.9% 116Want more/don't know 20% 80% 55 Number of living children $$	Never	5.1%	94.9%	39	
Husband wants fewer93.1% 6.9% 29Both want same 62.1% 37.9% 116Want more/don't know 20% 80% 55 Number of living children $0.000\geq 70\%100\%25 \text{ or } 629.4\%70.6\%513 \text{ or } 461.6\%38.4\%860-268.9\%31.1\%61Age group (years)68.9\%31.1\%16-2544.4\%55.6\%5526-3556.5\%43.5\%6236-4577.8\%22.2\%5446-5539.3\%60.7\%2856-6518.2\%81.8\%11Mobility0.000Strong78\%22\%50Normal69.8\%30.2\%63Weak31\%69\%87Decision making authority$	Husband's desire for children				0.000
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c } \hline Both want same & 62.1\% & 37.9\% & 116 \\ \hline Want more/don't know & 20\% & 80\% & 55 \\ \hline Number of living children & & & & & \\ \hline \hline & & & & & & & \\ \hline \hline & & & &$	Husband wants fewer	93.1%	6.9%	29	
Want more / don't know20%80%55Number of living children0.0002 ≥ 7 0%100%25 or 629.4%70.6%513 or 461.6%38.4%860-268.9%31.1%61Age group (years)16-2544.4%55.6%5526-3556.5%43.5%6236-4577.8%22.2%5446-5539.3%60.7%2856-6518.2%81.8%11MobilityMobility-0.000Strong78%22%50Normal69.8%30.2%63Weak31%69%87Decision making authorityStrong37.1%62.9%89Normal68.8%31.3%96Weak73.3%26.7%15EducationIlliterate10%90%10Primary45.7%54.3%105Secondary72.3%27.7%65Higher secondary85.7%14.3%14Graduate and above33.3%66.7%6Husband's educationIlliterate0%100%14Primary37.3%62.7%59Secondary64.8%35.2%88Higher secondary88.2%11.8%17Graduate and above77.7%7	Both want same	62.1%	37.9%	116	
Number of living children 0% 100% 2 ≥ 7 0% 100% 2 $5 \text{ or } 6$ 29.4% 70.6% 51 $3 \text{ or } 4$ 61.6% 38.4% 86 $0-2$ 68.9% 31.1% 61 Age group (years) - - 6 $16-25$ 44.4% 55.6% 55 $26-35$ 56.5% 43.5% 62 $36-45$ 77.8% 22.2% 54 $46-55$ 39.3% 60.7% 28 $56-65$ 18.2% 81.8% 11 Mobility - - 0.000 Strong 78% 22% 50 Normal 69.8% 30.2% 63 Weak 31% 69% 87 Decision making authority - - - Strong 37.1% 62.9% 89 Normal 68.8% 31.3% 96 Weak 73.3% 26.7% 15 Education - - - <	Want more/don't know	20%	80%	55	
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Number of living children				0.000
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	≥7	0%	100%	2	
3 or 4 $61.6%$ $38.4%$ 86 $0-2$ $68.9%$ $31.1%$ 61 Age group (years) 0.000 $16-25$ $44.4%$ $55.6%$ 55 $26-35$ $56.5%$ $43.5%$ 62 $36-45$ $77.8%$ $22.2%$ 54 $46-55$ $39.3%$ $60.7%$ 28 $56-65$ $18.2%$ $81.8%$ 11 Mobility 0.000 Strong $78%$ $22%$ 50 Normal $69.8%$ $30.2%$ 63 Weak $31%$ $69%$ 87 Decision making authority 0.000 Strong $37.1%$ $62.9%$ 89 Normal $68.8%$ $31.3%$ 96 Weak $73.3%$ $26.7%$ 15 Education 0.000 100 Illiterate $10%$ $90%$ 10 Primary $45.7%$ $54.3%$ 105 Secondary $72.3%$ $27.7%$ 65 Higher secondary $88.2%$ $11.8%$ 14 Primary $37.3%$ $62.7%$ 59 Secondary $63.7%$ $62.7%$ 59 Secondary $64.8%$ $35.2%$ 88 Higher secondary $68.8%$ $31.8%$ 17 Graduate and above $72.7%$ 22	5 or 6	29.4%	70.6%	51	
0-2 $68.9%$ $31.1%$ 61 Age group (years)	3 or 4	61.6%	38.4%	86	
Age group (years) $16-25$ 44.4% 55.6% 55 $26-35$ 56.5% 43.5% 62 $36-45$ 77.8% 22.2% 54 $46-55$ 39.3% 60.7% 28 $56-65$ 18.2% 81.8% 11 MobilityMobilityStrong 78% 22% 50 Normal 69.8% 30.2% 63 Weak 31% 69% 87 Decision making authorityStrong 37.1% 62.9% 89 Normal 68.8% 31.3% 96 Weak 73.3% 26.7% 15 EducationIlliterate 10% 90% 10 Primary 45.7% 54.3% 105 Secondary 72.3% 27.7% 65 Higher secondary 85.7% 14.3% 14 Graduate and above 33.3% 66.7% 6 Husband's educationIlliterate 0% 100% 14 Primary 37.3% 62.7% 59 Secondary 64.8% 35.2% 88 Higher secondary 88.2% 11.8% 17 Graduate and above 72.7% 27.5% 22	0-2	68.9%	31.1%	61	
16-25 $44.4%$ $55.6%$ 55 $26-35$ $56.5%$ $43.5%$ 62 $36-45$ $77.8%$ $22.2%$ 54 $46-55$ $39.3%$ $60.7%$ 28 $56-65$ $18.2%$ $81.8%$ 11 Mobility 0.000 Strong $78%$ $22%$ 50 Normal $69.8%$ $30.2%$ 63 Weak $31%$ $69%$ 87 Decision making authority 0.000 Strong $37.1%$ $62.9%$ 89 Normal $68.8%$ $31.3%$ 96 Weak $73.3%$ $26.7%$ 15 Education 0.000 Illiterate $10%$ $90%$ 10 Primary $45.7%$ $54.3%$ 105 Secondary $72.3%$ $27.7%$ 65 Higher secondary $33.3%$ $66.7%$ 6 Husband's education 0.000	Age group (years)				0.000
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	16-25	44.4%	55.6%	55	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	26-35	56.5%	43.5%	62	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	36-45	77.8%	22.2%	54	
56-65 $18.2%$ $81.8%$ 11 Mobility $78%$ $22%$ 50 Normal $69.8%$ $30.2%$ 63 Weak $31%$ $69%$ 87 Decision making authority 0.000 Strong $37.1%$ $62.9%$ 89 Normal $68.8%$ $31.3%$ 96 Weak $73.3%$ $26.7%$ 15 Education $10%$ $90%$ 10 Illiterate $10%$ $90%$ 10 Primary $45.7%$ $54.3%$ 105 Secondary $72.3%$ $27.7%$ 65 Higher secondary $33.3%$ $66.7%$ 6 Husband's education 0.000 14 Primary $37.3%$ $62.7%$ 59 Secondary $64.8%$ $35.2%$ 88 Higher secondary $88.2%$ $11.8%$ 17 Graduate and above $72.7%$ $27.3%$ 22	46-55	39.3%	60.7%	28	
Mobility 0.000 Strong 78% 22% 50 Normal 69.8% 30.2% 63 Weak 31% 69% 87 Decision making authority 0.000 Strong 37.1% 62.9% 89 Normal 68.8% 31.3% 96 Weak 73.3% 26.7% 15 Education 0.000 Illiterate 10% 90% 10 Primary 45.7% 54.3% 105 Secondary 72.3% 27.7% 65 Higher secondary 85.7% 14.3% 14 Graduate and above 33.3% 66.7% 6 Husband's education 0.000 0.000 Illiterate 0% 100% 14 Primary 37.3% 62.7% 59 Secondary 64.8% 35.2% 88 Higher secondary 88.2% 11.8% 17 Graduate and above <td>56-65</td> <td>18.2%</td> <td>81.8%</td> <td>11</td> <td></td>	56-65	18.2%	81.8%	11	
Strong 78% 22% 50 Normal 69.8% 30.2% 63 Weak 31% 69% 87 Decision making authority 0.000 Strong 37.1% 62.9% 89 Normal 68.8% 31.3% 96 Weak 73.3% 26.7% 15 Education 0.000 Illiterate 10% 90% 10 Primary 45.7% 54.3% 105 Secondary 72.3% 27.7% 65 Higher secondary 85.7% 14.3% 14 Graduate and above 33.3% 66.7% 6 Husband's education 0.000 111 Illiterate 0% 100% 14 Primary 37.3% 62.7% 59 Secondary 64.8% 35.2% 88 Higher secondary 88.2% 11.8% 17 Graduate and above 72.7% 22 22	Mobility				0.000
Normal 69.8% 30.2% 63 Weak 31% 69% 87 Decision making authority 0.000 Strong 37.1% 62.9% 89 Normal 68.8% 31.3% 96 Weak 73.3% 26.7% 15 Education 0.000 Illiterate 10% 90% 10 Primary 45.7% 54.3% 105 Secondary 72.3% 27.7% 65 Higher secondary 85.7% 14.3% 14 Graduate and above 33.3% 66.7% 6 Husband's education 0.000 Illiterate 0% 100% 14 Primary 37.3% 62.7% 59 Secondary 64.8% 35.2% 88 Higher secondary 88.2% 11.8% 17 Graduate and above 72.7% 27.3% 22	Strong	78%	22%	50	
Weak 31% 69% 87 Decision making authority 37.1% 62.9% 89 Strong 37.1% 62.9% 89 Normal 68.8% 31.3% 96 Weak 73.3% 26.7% 15 Education 10% 90% 10 Primary 45.7% 54.3% 105 Secondary 72.3% 27.7% 65 Higher secondary 85.7% 14.3% 14 Graduate and above 33.3% 66.7% 6 Husband's education 0% 100% 14 Primary 37.3% 62.7% 59 Secondary 64.8% 35.2% 88 Higher secondary 64.8% 35.2% 88 Higher secondary 88.2% 11.8% 17 Graduate and above 72.7% 27.3% 22	Normal	69.8%	30.2%	63	
Decision making authority0.000Strong 37.1% 62.9% 89 Normal 68.8% 31.3% 96 Weak 73.3% 26.7% 15 Education 0.000 00% 00% Illiterate 10% 90% 10 Primary 45.7% 54.3% 105 Secondary 72.3% 27.7% 65 Higher secondary 85.7% 14.3% 14 Graduate and above 33.3% 66.7% 6 Husband's education 0.000% 14 Primary 37.3% 62.7% 59 Secondary 64.8% 35.2% 88 Higher secondary 88.2% 11.8% 17 Graduate and above 72.7% 27.3% 22	Weak	31%	69%	87	
Strong 37.1% 62.9% 89 Normal 68.8% 31.3% 96 Weak 73.3% 26.7% 15 Education 0.000 Illiterate 10% 90% 10 Primary 45.7% 54.3% 105 Secondary 72.3% 27.7% 65 Higher secondary 85.7% 14.3% 14 Graduate and above 33.3% 66.7% 6 Husband's education 0.000 Illiterate 0% 100% 14 Primary 37.3% 62.7% 59 Secondary 64.8% 35.2% 88 Higher secondary 88.2% 11.8% 17 Graduate and above 72.7% 27 3% 22	Decision making authority				0.000
Normal 68.8% 31.3% 96 Weak 73.3% 26.7% 15 Education 0.000 Illiterate 10% 90% 10 Primary 45.7% 54.3% 105 Secondary 72.3% 27.7% 65 Higher secondary 85.7% 14.3% 14 Graduate and above 33.3% 66.7% 6 Husband's education 0.000 Illiterate 0% 100% 14 Primary 37.3% 62.7% 59 Secondary 64.8% 35.2% 88 Higher secondary 88.2% 11.8% 17 Graduate and above 72.7% 27.3% 22	Strong	37.1%	62.9%	89	
Weak 73.3% 26.7% 15 Education	Normal	68.8%	31.3%	96	
Education 0.000 Illiterate 10% 90% 10 Primary 45.7% 54.3% 105 Secondary 72.3% 27.7% 65 Higher secondary 85.7% 14.3% 14 Graduate and above 33.3% 66.7% 6 Husband's education 0% 100% 14 Primary 37.3% 62.7% 59 Secondary 64.8% 35.2% 88 Higher secondary 88.2% 11.8% 17 Graduate and above 72.7% 27.3% 22	Weak	73.3%	26.7%	15	
Illiterate 10% 90% 10 Primary 45.7% 54.3% 105 Secondary 72.3% 27.7% 65 Higher secondary 85.7% 14.3% 14 Graduate and above 33.3% 66.7% 6 Husband's education 0% 100% 14 Primary 37.3% 62.7% 59 Secondary 64.8% 35.2% 88 Higher secondary 88.2% 11.8% 17 Graduate and above 72.7% 27.3% 22	Education				0.000
Primary 45.7% 54.3% 105 Secondary 72.3% 27.7% 65 Higher secondary 85.7% 14.3% 14 Graduate and above 33.3% 66.7% 6 Husband's education 0% 100% 14 Primary 37.3% 62.7% 59 Secondary 64.8% 35.2% 88 Higher secondary 88.2% 11.8% 17 Graduate and above 72.7% 27.3% 22	Illiterate	10%	90%	10	
Secondary 72.3% 27.7% 65 Higher secondary 85.7% 14.3% 14 Graduate and above 33.3% 66.7% 6 Husband's education 0% 100% 14 Primary 37.3% 62.7% 59 Secondary 64.8% 35.2% 88 Higher secondary 88.2% 11.8% 17 Graduate and above 72.7% 27.3% 22	Primary	45.7%	54.3%	105	
Higher secondary 85.7% 14.3% 14 Graduate and above 33.3% 66.7% 6 Husband's education 0% 100% 14 Primary 37.3% 62.7% 59 Secondary 64.8% 35.2% 88 Higher secondary 88.2% 11.8% 17 Graduate and above 72.7% 27.3% 22	Secondary	72.3%	27.7%	65	
Graduate and above 33.3% 66.7% 6 Husband's education 0% 100% 14 Primary 37.3% 62.7% 59 Secondary 64.8% 35.2% 88 Higher secondary 88.2% 11.8% 17 Graduate and above 72.7% 27.3% 22	Higher secondary	85.7%	14.3%	14	
Husband's education 0% 00% 14 Illiterate 0% 100% 14 Primary 37.3% 62.7% 59 Secondary 64.8% 35.2% 88 Higher secondary 88.2% 11.8% 17 Graduate and above 72.7% 27.3% 22	Graduate and above	33.3%	66.7%	6	
Illiterate 0% 100% 14 Primary 37.3% 62.7% 59 Secondary 64.8% 35.2% 88 Higher secondary 88.2% 11.8% 17 Graduate and above 72.7% 27.3% 22	Husband's education		-	-	0.000
Primary 37.3% 62.7% 59 Secondary 64.8% 35.2% 88 Higher secondary 88.2% 11.8% 17 Graduate and above 72.7% 27.3% 22	Illiterate	0%	100%	14	
Secondary 64.8% 35.2% 88 Higher secondary 88.2% 11.8% 17 Graduate and above 72.7% 27.3% 22	Primary	37.3%	62.7%	59	
Higher secondary 88.2% 11.8% 17 Graduate and above 72.7% 27.3% 22	Secondary	64.8%	35.2%	88	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Higher secondary	88.2%	11.8%	17	
Giudaute and above 12.170 21.370 22	Graduate and above	72.7%	27.3%	22	

Table 2: Distribution of respondents by reproductive health behaviour



The International Electronic Journal of Rural and Remote Health Research, Education Practice and Policy

behaviour (use of contraceptive) Odds ratio Odds ratio Respondent's age 0.327*** 1.187*** $46-55$ 0.44**** 1.023*** $36-45$ 0.630*** 1.073*** $26-35$ 1.047*** 1.172*** $16-25$ (RC) 1.00 1.00 Belongs to NGO Yes 1.238*** Yes 1.236*** N/U No (RC) 1.00 N/U Wealth index - - Poor 1.236*** N/U Middle 0.000*** 0.482 Higher secondary 0.000*** 0.482 Higher secondary 0.000*** 0.482 Higher secondary 0.000*** 0.895 Illiterate (RC) 1.000 1.000 Education of respondent - - Graduate or above 0.263*** N/U Higher secondary 4.5188*** N/U Secondary 9.517*** N/U Primary 9.57*** N/U <th>Variable</th> <th>Working status</th> <th colspan="2">Reproductive health</th>	Variable	Working status	Reproductive health	
Contraceptive) Odds ratio Odds ratio Respondent's age $0.327***$ $1.187***$ $46-55$ $0.327***$ $1.187***$ $46-55$ $0.448***$ $1.023***$ $36-45$ $0.630***$ $1.073***$ $26-35$ $1.047***$ $1.72***$ $16-25$ (RC) 1.00 1.00 Belongs to NGO $1.238***$ N/U No (RC) 1.00 N/U Weath index $1.236***$ N/U Poor $1.236***$ N/U Middle $0.000***$ 0.482 Higher secondary $0.000***$ 0.949 Secondary $0.000***$ 0.984 Primary $0.000***$ 0.895 Illiterate (RC) 1.00 1.000 Eduction of respondent 0.738 N/U Graduate or above $0.263***$ N/U Higher secondary $4.5188***$ N/U Primary $9.517***$ N/U			behaviour (use of	
Odds ratio Odds ratio Respondent's age 0.327*** 1.187*** 56-65 0.327*** 1.023*** 36-45 0.630*** 1.023*** 26-35 1.047*** 1.172*** 16-25 (RC) 1.00 1.00 Belongs to NGO Yes N/U Yes 1.238*** N/U No (RC) 1.00 N/U Wealth index Poor 1.236*** N/U Middle 0.000*** N/U Rich (RC) 1.00 N/U Husband's education 0.000*** 0.482 Higher secondary 0.000*** 0.984 Primary 0.000*** 0.895 Illiterate (RC) 1.00 1.000 Education of respondent Graduate or above 0.263*** Graduate or above 0.263*** N/U Higher secondary 9.517*** N/U Primary 0.000*** 0.895 Illiterate (RC) 1.00 N/U <			contraceptive)	
Respondent's age 0.327*** 1.187*** $46-55$ 0.448*** 1.023*** $36-45$ 0.630*** 1.073*** $26-35$ 1.047*** 1.172*** $16-25$ (RC) 1.00 1.00 Belongs to NGO Yes N/U Yes 1.238*** N/U Wolk (RC) 1.00 N/U Wealth index - - Poor 1.236*** N/U Middle 0.000*** N/U Rich (RC) 1.00 N/U Huber secondary 0.000*** 0.482 Higher secondary 0.000*** 0.984 Primary 0.000 0.000 Education of respondent - - Graduate or above 0.263*** N/U Higher secondary 4.518*** N/U Secondary 9.517*** N/U Higher secondary 4.518*** N/U Secondary 9.517*** N/U Higher secondary		Odds ratio	Odds ratio	
56-65 0.327*** 1.187*** $46-55$ 0.448*** 1.023*** $36-45$ 0.630*** 1.073*** $26-35$ 1.047*** 1.172*** $16-25$ (RC) 1.00 1.00 Belongs to NGO * * Yes 1.238*** N/U No (RC) 1.00 N/U Wealth index * * Poor 1.236*** N/U Middle 0.000*** N/U Middle 0.000*** 0.482 Higher scondary 0.000*** 0.949 Secondary 0.000*** 0.895 Illiterate (RC) 1.000 1.000 Education of respondent * N/U Graduate or above 0.263*** N/U Higher secondary 4.518*** N/U Secondary 9.517*** N/U Graduate or above 0.263** N/U Secondary 1.060*** N/U Secondary 1.000	Respondent's age			
$46-55$ 0.448^{***} 1.023^{***} $36-45$ 0.630^{***} 1.073^{***} $26-35$ 1.047^{***} 1.172^{***} $16-25$ (RC) 1.00 1.00 Belongs to NGO 1.238^{***} N/U No (RC) 1.00 N/U Wealth index 1.236^{***} N/U Poor 1.236^{***} N/U Middle 0.000^{***} 0.482 Higher secondary 0.000^{***} 0.482 Higher secondary 0.000^{***} 0.984 Primary 0.000^{***} 0.985 Illiterate (RC) 1.000 1.000 Education of respondent 0.263^{***} N/U Graduate or above 0.263^{***} N/U Higher secondary 4.5188^{***} N/U Secondary 1.069^{***} N/U Primary 9.517^{***} N/U Secondary 1.00 N/U Vorking status V_U 1.00 Working status $More$ often N/U 1.000 <	56-65	0.327***	1.187***	
$36-45$ 0.630^{***} 1.073^{***} $26-35$ 1.047^{***} 1.172^{***} $16-25$ (RC) 1.00 1.00 Belongs to NGO Yes 1.238^{***} N/U No (RC) 1.00 N/U Wealth index Poor 1.236^{***} N/U Middle 0.000^{***} N/U Middle 0.000^{***} N/U Hushand's education Graduate or higher 0.000^{***} 0.482 Higher secondary 0.000^{***} 0.949 Sccondary 0.994 Sccondary 0.000^{***} 0.984 Primary 0.000^{***} 0.984 Primary 0.000^{***} 0.984 N/U Higher secondary 4.5188^{***} N/U Graduate or above 0.263^{***} N/U 0.000^{***} 0.895 Illiterate (RC) 1.00 N/U 0.000^{***} 0.100^{***} Graduate or above 0.263^{***} N/U 0.00^{***} Graduate or above	46-55	0.448***	1.023***	
$26-35$ 1.047^{***} 1.172^{***} $16-25$ (RC) 1.00 1.00 Belongs to NGO	36-45	0.630***	1.073***	
16-25 (RC) 1.00 1.00 Belongs to NGO Yes N/U No (RC) 1.00 N/U Wealth index 1.00 N/U Poor 1.236*** N/U Middle 0.000*** N/U Rich (RC) 1.00 N/U Husband's education 0.000*** 0.482 Higher secondary 0.000*** 0.949 Secondary 0.000*** 0.895 Illiterate (RC) 1.000 1.000 Education of respondent 0.263*** N/U Graduate or above 0.263*** N/U Higher secondary 4.5188*** N/U Higher secondary 4.5188*** N/U Secondary 1.06 N/U Primary 9.517*** N/U Illiterate (RC) 1.00 N/U Secondary 1.00 N/U Secondary 0.738 N/U Secondary 0.738 N/U Secondary 1.00	26–35	1.047***	1.172***	
Belongs to NGO N/U Yes 1.238*** N/U No (RC) 1.00 N/U Wealth index - - Poor 1.236*** N/U Middle 0.000*** N/U Middle 0.000*** N/U Higher secondary 0.000*** 0.482 Higher secondary 0.000*** 0.984 Primary 0.000*** 0.895 Illiterate (RC) 1.00 1.000 Education of respondent - - Graduate or above 0.263*** N/U Higher secondary 4.5188*** N/U Primary 9.517*** N/U Becondary 1.069*** N/U Primary 9.517*** N/U Nega at first marriage (years) - <18	16–25 (RC)	1.00	1.00	
Yes 1.238*** N/U No (RC) 1.00 N/U Wealth index 1.236*** N/U Poor 1.236*** N/U Middle 0.000*** N/U Rich (RC) 1.00 N/U Husband's education 0.000*** 0.482 Higher secondary 0.000*** 0.949 Secondary 0.000*** 0.895 Illiterate (RC) 1.000 1.000 Education of respondent 0.263*** N/U Graduate or above 0.263*** N/U Higher secondary 4.5188*** N/U Secondary 1.069*** N/U Primary 9.517*** N/U Illiterate (RC) 1.00 N/U Age at first marriage (years) <18	Belongs to NGO			
No (RC) 1.00 N/U Wealth index 1.236*** N/U Poor 1.236*** N/U Middle 0.000*** N/U Rich (RC) 1.00 N/U Husband's education 0.000*** 0.482 Higher secondary 0.000*** 0.949 Secondary 0.000*** 0.984 Primary 0.000*** 0.895 Illiterate (RC) 1.000 1.000 Education of respondent 0.263*** N/U Graduate or above 0.263*** N/U Higher secondary 4.5188*** N/U Primary 9.517*** N/U Illiterate (RC) 1.00 N/U Age at first marriage (years) <18	Yes	1.238***	N/U	
Wealth index Poor1.236***N/UMiddle0.000***N/URich (RC)1.00N/UHusband's education0.000***0.482Higher secondary0.000***0.949Secondary0.000***0.984Primary0.000***0.895Illiterate (RC)1.0001.000Education of respondent0.263***N/UGraduate or above0.263***N/UHigher secondary9.517***N/UPrimary9.517***N/UPrimary9.517***N/UIlliterate (RC)1.00N/UAge at first marriage (years)<100	No (RC)	1.00	N/U	
Poor 1.236*** N/U Middle 0.000*** N/U Rich (RC) 1.00 N/U Husband's education 0.000*** 0.482 Higher secondary 0.000*** 0.949 Secondary 0.000*** 0.984 Primary 0.000*** 0.895 Illiterate (RC) 1.000 1.000 Education of respondent 0.263*** N/U Graduate or above 0.263*** N/U Higher secondary 4.5188** N/U Primary 1.069*** N/U Higher secondary 4.5188*** N/U Primary 9.517*** N/U Illiterate (RC) 1.00 N/U Age at first marriage (years) <18	Wealth index			
Middle 0.000*** N/U Rich (RC) 1.00 N/U Husband's education 0.000*** 0.482 Higher secondary 0.000*** 0.949 Secondary 0.000*** 0.984 Primary 0.000*** 0.895 Illiterate (RC) 1.000 1.000 Education of respondent 0.263*** N/U Graduate or above 0.263*** N/U Higher secondary 4.5188*** N/U Primary 9.517*** N/U Primary 9.517*** N/U Illiterate (RC) 1.00 N/U Age at first marriage (years) <18	Poor	1.236***	N/U	
Rich (RC) 1.00 N/U Husband's education 0.000*** 0.482 Higher secondary 0.000*** 0.949 Secondary 0.000*** 0.984 Primary 0.000*** 0.985 Illiterate (RC) 1.000 1.000 Education of respondent 0.263*** N/U Graduate or above 0.263*** N/U Higher secondary 4.5188*** N/U Secondary 1.069*** N/U Primary 9.517*** N/U Illiterate (RC) 1.00 N/U Age at first marriage (years) <18	Middle	0.000***	N/U	
Husband's education Graduate or higher Higher secondary Secondary 0.000^{***} 0.000^{***} 0.949 Secondary Primary 0.000^{***} 0.000^{***} 0.984 Primary Graduate or above Higher secondary Graduate or above 4.5188^{***} N/U Higher secondary Primary 1.069^{***} 1.000 N/U N/U N/U N/U N/U N/U N/U N/U Secondary 1.069^{***} 1.000 N/U N/U N/U N/U N/U N/U N/UAge at first marriage (years) <18 Working status Working (RC) 0.738 N/U 1.000 N/U 1.000 Working status Working is family planning with husband More often Husband wants fewer Both want fewer N/U 0.720^{***} $N/U0.300^{***}0.720^{***}0.000^{***}Wumber of living children275 or 63 or 40.700N/U0.000^{***}0.000^{***}0.000^{***}$	Rich (RC)	1.00	N/U	
Graduate or higher 0.000*** 0.482 Higher secondary 0.000*** 0.949 Secondary 0.000*** 0.984 Primary 0.000*** 0.895 Illiterate (RC) 1.000 1.000 Education of respondent 0.263*** N/U Graduate or above 0.263*** N/U Higher secondary 4.5188*** N/U Secondary 1.069*** N/U Primary 9.517*** N/U Illiterate (RC) 1.00 N/U Age at first marriage (years) <18	Husband's education			
Higher secondary 0.000*** 0.949 Secondary 0.000*** 0.984 Primary 0.000*** 0.895 Illiterate (RC) 1.000 1.000 Education of respondent 0.263*** N/U Graduate or above 0.263*** N/U Higher secondary 4.5188*** N/U Secondary 1.069*** N/U Primary 9.517*** N/U Illiterate (RC) 1.00 N/U Age at first marriage (years) <18	Graduate or higher	0.000***	0.482	
Secondary 0.000^{***} 0.984 Primary 0.000^{***} 0.895 Illiterate (RC) 1.000 1.000 Education of respondent 0.263^{***} N/U Graduate or above 0.263^{***} N/U Higher secondary 4.5188^{***} N/U Secondary 1.069^{***} N/U Primary 9.517^{***} N/U Illiterate (RC) 1.00 N/U Age at first marriage (years) <18 0.738 <18 0.738 N/U ≥ 18 (RC) 1.00 N/U Working status N/U 5.59^{***} Non-working (RC) N/U 1.00 Discusses family planning with husband N/U 21.21^{***} Never (RC) N/U 1.000 Husband's desire for children Husband wants fewer N/U 9.460^{***} Wants more (RC) N/U 1.000 Number of living children ≥ 7 N/U 0.000^{***} ≥ 7 N/U 0.000^{***} ≤ 0.6 N/U 0.000^{***} ≤ 0.73 N/U 0.000^{***} <td>Higher secondary</td> <td>0.000***</td> <td>0.949</td>	Higher secondary	0.000***	0.949	
Primary 0.000^{***} 0.895 Illiterate (RC) 1.000 1.000 Education of respondent 0.263^{***} N/U Graduate or above 0.263^{***} N/U Higher secondary 4.5188^{***} N/U Secondary 1.069^{***} N/U Primary 9.517^{***} N/U Illiterate (RC) 1.00 N/U Age at first marriage (years) <18 0.738 <18 0.738 N/U Working status 0.738 N/U Working more status N/U 1.00 More often N/U 1.00 Discusses family planning with 1.00 husband $More often$ N/U More often N/U 1.000 Husband vants fewer N/U 0.720^{***} Both want fewer N/U 0.200^{**} Wants more (RC) N/U 1.000 Number of living children 27 N/U ≥ 7 N/U 0.000^{**} ≥ 0.400 N/U 0.000^{***} ≥ 0.400 N/U 0.000^{***}	Secondary	0.000***	0.984	
Illiterate (RC)1.0001.000Education of respondent Graduate or above0.263***N/UHigher secondary4.5188***N/USecondary1.069***N/UPrimary9.517***N/UIlliterate (RC)1.00N/UAge at first marriage (years) <18 (RC)	Primary	0.000***	0.895	
Education of respondent0.263***N/UGraduate or above0.263***N/UHigher secondary4.5188***N/USecondary1.069***N/UPrimary9.517***N/UIlliterate (RC)1.00N/UAge at first marriage (years) < 18 0.738 < 18 0.738N/UWorking status0.738N/UWorking statusN/U5.59***Non-working (RC)N/U1.00Discusses family planning with13.05***husbandN/U22.121***Never (RC)N/U1.000Husband vants fewerN/U9.460***Wants more (RC)N/U1.000Number of living children ~ 7 ≥ 7 N/U0.000*** ≤ 0.60 N/U0.000*** ≤ 0.76 N/U0.000***	Illiterate (RC)	1.000	1.000	
Graduate or above $0.263***$ N/UHigher secondary $4.5188***$ N/USecondary $1.069***$ N/UPrimary $9.517***$ N/UIlliterate (RC) 1.00 N/UAge at first marriage (years) < 18 0.738 < 18 0.738 N/UWorking status 0.738 N/UWorking marking (RC) 1.00 N/UDiscusses family planning with 1.00 1.00 husband 0.738 0.738 0.738 More often 0.740 0.738 More often 0.740 0.000 Husband s desire for children $0.2.121***$ Never (RC) 0.700 $0.720***$ Both want fewer 0.700 $0.000***$ Warts more (RC) 0.700 $0.000***$ Number of living children 27 $0.000***$ 27 $0.700***$ $0.000***$ $3 \text{ or } 4$ $0.700***$ $0.2000***$ $0.000***$	Education of respondent			
Higher secondary4.5188***N/USecondary 1.069^{***} N/UPrimary 9.517^{***} N/UIlliterate (RC) 1.00 N/UAge at first marriage (years) < 18 0.738 < 18 0.738 N/UWorking status 0.738 N/UWorking status N/U 5.59^{***} Non-working (RC)N/U 1.00 Discusses family planning with N/U 1.00 husband N/U 22.121^{***} Never (RC)N/U 1.000 Husband's desire for children N/U 6.720^{***} Husband wants fewer N/U 9.460^{***} Warts more (RC) N/U 1.000 Number of living children 27 N/U ≥ 7 N/U 0.000^{***} $\leq 0.600^{***}$ N/U 0.000^{****} $\leq 0.600^{***}$ N/U 0.000^{****}	Graduate or above	0.263***	N/U	
Secondary 1.069^{***} N/UPrimary 9.517^{***} N/UIlliterate (RC) 1.00 N/UAge at first marriage (years) <18 0.738 N/U ≤ 18 0.738 N/U ≥ 18 (RC) 1.00 N/UWorking statusN/U 5.59^{***} Non-working (RC)N/U 1.00 Discusses family planning with N/U 1.00 husbandN/U 22.121^{***} Never (RC)N/U 1.000 Husband vants fewerN/U 2.121^{***} Never (RC)N/U 1.000 Husband wants fewerN/U 0.000^{***} Both want fewerN/U 0.000^{***} Wants more (RC)N/U 0.000^{***} Number of living children 27 N/U ≥ 7 N/U 0.000^{***} δ or 4N/U 0.000^{****}	Higher secondary	4.5188***	N/U	
Primary Illiterate (RC)9.517*** N/U 1.00N/UAge at first marriage (years) <18	Secondary	1.069***	N/U	
Illiterate (RC)1.00N/UAge at first marriage (years) <18 0.738N/U ≥ 18 (RC)1.00N/UWorking statusN/U $5.59***$ Working (RC)N/U1.00Discusses family planning with husband N/U 1.00 More oftenN/U 1.00 Discusses family planning with husband N/U $13.05***$ SometimesN/U $22.121***$ Never (RC)N/U 1.000 Husband's desire for children Husband wants fewer N/U $6.720***$ Both want fewerN/U $9.460***$ Wants more (RC)N/U 1.000 Number of living children 27 N/U ≥ 7 N/U $0.000**$ ≤ 0.66 N/U $0.000***$ ≤ 0.76 N/U $0.000***$	Primary	9.517***	N/U	
Age at first marriage (years)0.738N/U<18	Illiterate (RC)	1.00	N/U	
<18 0.738 N/U ≥18 (RC) 1.00 N/U Working status N/U Working (RC) N/U $Non-working (RC)$ N/U $Discusses family planning with1.00husbandN/UMore oftenN/USometimesN/UN/U22.121***Never (RC)N/UHusband's desire for childrenN/UHusband wants fewerN/UMore oftenN/UN/U2.600***More oftenN/UN/U0.000Musband's desire for children0.000Husband wants fewerN/UN/U0.000Mumber of living children0.000**≥7N/U5 or 6N/U3 or 4N/U0.000**3 or 4N/U0.000**$	Age at first marriage (years)			
≥18 (RC)1.00N/UWorking status WorkingN/U $5.59***$ Non-working (RC)N/U 1.00 Discusses family planning with husband More oftenN/U 1.00 Discusses family planning with husband More oftenN/U $13.05***$ Noneworking (RC)N/U $13.05***$ SometimesN/U $22.121***$ Never (RC)N/U 1.000 Husband's desire for children Husband wants fewerN/U $6.720***$ Both want fewerN/U $9.460***$ Wants more (RC)N/U 1.000 Number of living children 27 N/U $5 \text{ or } 6$ N/U $0.000***$ $3 \text{ or } 4$ N/U $0.000***$ 4.020 N/U 1.000	<18	0.738	N/U	
Working status Working status Working (RC)N/U $5.59***$ N/UNon-working (RC)N/U 1.00 Discusses family planning with husband More oftenN/U $13.05***$ SometimesSometimesN/U $22.121***$ N/UNever (RC)N/U 1.000 Husband's desire for children Husband wants fewerN/U $6.720***$ N/UBoth want fewerN/U $9.460***$ UWants more (RC)N/U $0.000***$ ONumber of living children ≥ 7 N/U $0.000***$ O3 or 4N/U $0.000***$ U0.000***N/U $0.000***$	≥18 (RC)	1.00	N/U	
Working Working Non-working (RC)N/U $5.59***$ 1.00Discusses family planning with husband More oftenN/U 1.00 Discusses family planning with husband More oftenN/U $13.05***$ 2.121*** Never (RC)Never (RC)N/U $12.121***$ N/UHusband's desire for children Husband wants fewerN/U $6.720***$ 9.460*** N/UBoth want fewerN/U $9.460***$ UWants more (RC)N/U 1.000 Number of living children ≥ 7 N/U $0.000*$ N/U $5 \text{ or } 6$ $3 \text{ or } 4$ N/U $0.000***$ 1.000	Working status			
Non-working (RC)N/U 1.00 Discusses family planning with husband 1.00 More oftenN/USometimesN/USometimesN/UNever (RC)N/UHusband's desire for children Husband wants fewer N/U Husband wants fewerN/UBoth want fewerN/UWants more (RC)N/UNumber of living children ≥ 7 N/U 5 or 6N/U 3 or 4N/U $0.000**$ $0.000**$ $0.000**$	Working	N/II	5 59***	
Discusses family planning with husbandN/U13.05***More oftenN/U13.05***SometimesN/U22.121***Never (RC)N/U1.000Husband's desire for children Husband wants fewerN/U6.720***Both want fewerN/U9.460***Wants more (RC)N/U1.000Number of living children ≥ 7 N/U0.000*5 or 6N/U0.000***3 or 4N/U0.000***0.000***N/U0.000***	Non-working (RC)	N/U	1.00	
busbases laming main husbandN/U $13.05***$ Nore oftenN/U $22.121***$ Never (RC)N/U 1.000 Husband's desire for children $0.720***$ Husband wants fewerN/U $6.720***$ Both want fewerN/U $9.460***$ Wants more (RC)N/U 1.000 Number of living children $0.000*$ ≥ 7 N/U $0.000**$ 5 or 6N/U $0.000***$ 3 or 4N/U $0.000***$	Discusses family planning with			
More oftenN/U 13.05^{***} SometimesN/U 22.121^{***} Never (RC)N/U 1.000 Husband's desire for children 1.000 Husband wants fewerN/U 6.720^{***} Both want fewerN/U 9.460^{***} Wants more (RC)N/U 1.000 Number of living children 27 $5 \text{ or } 6$ N/U 0.000^{**} $3 \text{ or } 4$ N/U 0.000^{***}	husband			
SometimesN/U $22.121***$ Never (RC)N/U 1.000 Husband's desire for children 1.000 Husband wants fewerN/UBoth want fewerN/UBoth want fewerN/U9.460***Wants more (RC)N/UNumber of living children ≥ 7 N/U5 or 6N/U3 or 4N/U0.000***0.000***1.000	More often	N/U	13.05***	
Never (RC)N/U1.000Husband's desire for children $(6.720***)$ Husband wants fewerN/UBoth want fewerN/U9.460***Wants more (RC)N/U1.000Number of living children ≥ 7 N/U5 or 6N/U3 or 4N/U0.200**0.200**1.000	Sometimes	N/U	22 121***	
Husband's desire for children Husband wants fewerN/U 6.720^{***} Both want fewerWants more (RC)N/U 9.460^{***} 1.000Number of living children ≥ 7 N/U 0.000^{*} 0.000***5 or 6N/U 0.000^{***} 0.000***3 or 4N/U 0.000^{***} 1.000	Never (RC)	N/U	1.000	
Husband solutionN/U 6.720^{***} Both want fewerN/U 9.460^{***} Wants more (RC)N/U 1.000 Number of living children ≥ 7 N/U $5 \text{ or } 6$ N/U 0.000^{**} $3 \text{ or } 4$ N/U 0.000^{***}	Husband's desire for children	1., 6		
NoteNote 0.120 Both want fewerN/U $9.460***$ Wants more (RC)N/U 1.000 Number of living children ≥ 7 N/U ≥ 7 N/U $0.000**$ 5 or 6N/U $0.000***$ 3 or 4N/U $0.000***$ $0.2 000***$ N/U $0.000***$	Husband wants fewer	N/H	6 720***	
Both Wall FellerN/U 1.000 Wants more (RC)N/U 1.000 Number of living children ≥ 7 N/U ≥ 7 N/U $0.000*$ 5 or 6N/U $0.000***$ 3 or 4N/U $0.000***$ 0.2 (BC)N/U 1.000	Both want fewer	N/II	9 460***	
Number of living children N/U $0.000*$ ≥ 7 N/U $0.000*$ 5 or 6 N/U $0.000***$ 3 or 4 N/U $0.000***$	Wants more (BC)	N/II	1 000	
≥ 7 N/U 0.000* 5 or 6 N/U 0.000*** 3 or 4 N/U 0.000***	Number of living children		1.000	
5 or 6 N/U 0.000** 3 or 4 N/U 0.000*** 0.2 (PG) N/U 0.000**	>7	N/II	0.000*	
3 or 4 N/U 0.000** 0.000** N/U 0.000**	5 or 6	N/H	0.000***	
	3 or 4	N/U	0.000***	
1 0 = 2 (KC) $1 N/U 1 0 = 0$	0-2 (BC)	N/U	1.000	

Table 3: Logistic regression analysis for working status and reproductive behavior



The International Electronic Journal of Rural and Remote Health Research, Education Practice and Policy

Table 3: cont'd

Variable	Working status	Reproductive health behaviour (use of contraceptive)
	Odds ratio	Odds ratio
Mobility		
Strong	N/U	1.840***
Normal	N/U	16.444***
Weak (RC)	N/U	1.000

*p<10%**p<5%, ***p<1%

Covariates: age, belongs to NGO, wealth index, education, husband's education and age at first marriage. NGO, non-governmental organization. NU, not analyzed. RC, reference category

There was no significant association between husband's education and contraceptive use in most cases. Contraceptive use was 22 times and 5.6 times higher among women who discuss family planning with their husbands sometimes and more often, respectively, compared to women who never discussed it. The women whose husbands wanted fewer children and those who wanted the same number of children were 6.7 and 9.5 times more likely to use contraceptive respectively than those whose husbands had a desire for more children. Working women were 5.6 times more likely to use a contraceptive method compared to non-working women ($p \le 0.001$). Women who are in the older age group and had more children were more likely to use contraceptives compared to women in the 16-25 years age group and have 0-2 children. Women who were strongly mobile and normally mobile were 1.8 and 16.4 times more likely, respectively, to use contraceptive than those who were weakly mobile (Table 3).

Discussion

In this study, working women were more empowered than non-working women. Income and empowerment were positively associated with contraceptive use and negatively associated with desire for additional children. So, engagement in income generating activities of rural women is an essential issue for fertility reduction. During the past few decades, changes have taken place in rural areas of Bangladesh that touch women's lives and options most profoundly. These changes have been encouraged by a number of critical economic, demographic and social factors as well as by the government and the $NGOs^{16,17}$.

In this study, income generating activities are defined as activities that generate income for the household in terms of cash income only. This includes employment in the agricultural and non-agricultural labor market, and also work for the household in crop cultivation, homestead gardening, livestock, and poultry raising, fishing, cottage industry, construction, business, and personal services¹¹. Reproductive behavior can include sexual activity, knowledge about human sexual behavior and so on. In this study, 'reproductive behavior' refers to use of contraceptives, discussing family planning with husband, and childbirth by rural women. Only three indicators to measure women's empowerment were used.

The present study showed that women aged 26-35 years and worked (58.1%) poor women more to earn money. Women's education and that of their husbands are important factors for working¹⁸. In this study, highly educated women were working more than others, and the opposite was true for husband's education. Several studies in Bangladesh have also reported the positive response of education for income generating activities for both men and women¹⁹. Increased opportunities for people to obtain an education will produce a beneficial impact on the

The International Electronic Journal of Rural and Remote Health Research, Education Practice and Policy

sociodemographic condition of individual households in societies as well as the population at large. Women with longer duration of marriage seem to work more than others. Husband's occupation and age at first marriage and its influence on working status of rural women was insignificant. This may be because a husband's earnings are not sufficient and as a result women have to work whether their husbands are employed or not. Also, in rural areas women usually have less knowledge about reproductive health²⁰ and get married earlier because they have to follow their customs, traditional rules and patriarchal decisions²¹.

Empowerment is a composite variable and in this study three indicators - mobility, decision making authority and interspousal communication - have been considered for measuring empowerment. Working women are the predominant group in this study, are more mobile, have strong decision making authority and higher interspousal communication. In this study, 16% of working women are strongly empowered compared to no non-working women. Working women contributing to their family welfare increases their decision making power, importance to their husband and ultimately empowerment. Women's involvement in income generating activities reduces economic dependence on men and undermines the risk insurance value of children, leading to desire for lower fertility. Further, income generating activities makes women empowered, and empowered women are better able to cross different socioeconomic barriers^{22,23}.

Work directly and indirectly influences women's reproductive behavior. Fertility is a micro- as well as macrolevel phenomenon. Working women are expected to be more concerned with their own reproductive health needs and know more about family planning²⁴⁻²⁶. In the present study, strongly mobile women are the predominant group who use more contraceptives and desire smaller family sizes. Competing roles give women greater access to extra familiar sources of information and resources, increasing their potential autonomy in reproductive decision making and use of contraceptives. Demand for children was generally negatively associated with women's status²⁷. In this study, decision making authority shows insignificant association with reproductive behavior. This may be because women have no authority to make decisions on family planning issues in Bangladeshi society. Also, education was found to have no influence on contraceptive and desire for additional children, which might be related to strong local customs as found in a recent study²⁸. The relationship between women's fertility level and employment is complex but there are certain aspects of the relationship that can be understood and subjected to programs and policies that may enable women to fulfil their multiple roles in a less strained and more equitable environment.

The government of Bangladesh and its development partners have achieved success in reducing the total fertility rate from 5 in the 1980s to 2.3 in 2011 and total population growth from 2.3% in 1981 to 1.3% in 2011. However, the contraceptive prevalence rate for use of modern contraceptives has increased only slightly between 2004 and 2007 (from 47.3% to 47.5%, with 52.5% of married women not currently using any form of contraception). At the same time the unmet need for family planning has increased from 11% to 17%, underpinning the need for better family planning services²⁹.

One limitation of the present study is that responses by women may be affected by social desirability bias. Thus responses on women's empowerment may not reflect the facts. This study collected information from women only and not their husbands and family members (which could provide further information). Reproductive health behavior was limited to questions on contraceptive use, family planning and childbirth only, and the authors deliberately excluded questions on sexual activities, desire, performance and satisfaction.

Conclusions

This study shows that women's involvement in income generating activities increases empowerment and reduces fertility. This might be one of the key issues for changing the

The International Electronic Journal of Rural and Remote Health Research, Education Practice and Policy

life of rural women in Bangladesh and ensuring gender equity. National policies should increase scope for income generating activities of rural women, which will help to improve their reproductive health behavior, fertility control and contribute to the economic development of the country.

Acknowledgement

The authors acknowledge the support by the Faculty of Health Economics, University of Dhaka to support this study; and the editor and reviewers of this article for their valuable comments and suggestions.

References

1. Das P, Horton R. Bangladesh: innovating for health. The Lancet 2013; 382(9906): 1681-1682.

2. Chowdhury AMR, Bhuiya A, Chowdhury ME, Rasheed S, Hussain Z, Chen LC. The Bangladesh paradox: exceptional health achievement despite economic poverty. The Lancet 2013; 382(9906): 1734-45.

3. Rende S, Donduran M. Neighborhoods in development: human development index and self-organizing maps. Social Indicators Research 2013; 110(2): 721-734.

4. Khan MMH, Zanuzdana A, Kraemer A. Levels, trends and disparities in public-health-related indicators among reproductiveage women in Bangladesh by urban-rural and richest-poorest groups, 1993-2011. PloS One 2013; 8(9): e75261.

5. Hadi A. Women's productive role and marital violence in Bangladesh. Journal of Family Violence 2005; 20(3): 181-189.

6. Akhtaruzzaman M, Khan MNI, Islam SN. Nutrition, health and demographic survey of Bangladesh - 2011. Dhaka: Institute of Nutrition and Food Science, University of Dhaka, 2013.

7. Rahman HZ, Hossain M, Sen B. 1987-1994: Dynamics of rural poverty in Bangladesh. Analysis of Poverty Trends Project. 1996.

8. Schuler SR, Hashemi SM, Riley AP. The influence of women's changing roles and status in Bangladesh's fertility transition: evidence from a study of credit programs and contraceptive use. World Development 1997; 25(4): 563-575.

9. Amin R, Ahmed A, Chowdhury J, Ahmed M. Poor women's participation in income-generating projects and their fertility regulation in rural Bangladesh: evidence from a recent survey. World Development 1994; 22(4): 555-565.

10. Goetz AM, Gupta RS. Who takes the credit? Gender, power, and control over loan use in rural credit programs in Bangladesh. World Development 1996; 24(1): 45-63.

11. Hossain M, Bose ML, Ahmad A. Nature and impact of women's participation in economic activities in rural Bangladesh: insights from household surveys. Working papers. Sweden: Lund University, 2004.

12. Rao A, Kelleher D. Engendering organizational change: the BRAC case. IDS Bulletin 1995; 26(3): 69-78.

13. Hashemi SM, Schuler SR, Riley AP. Rural credit programs and women's empowerment in Bangladesh. World Development 1996; 24(4): 635-653.

14. Kabeer N. Resources, agency, achievements: reflections on the measurement of women's empowerment. Sida Studies No. 3. Stockholm: Swedish International Development Agency, 2001.

15. Mahmud S, Razzaque A, Nahar L. Women's empowerment and reproductive change in rural Bangladesh. Dhaka: Bangladesh Institute of Development Studies, 2001.

16. Sinha S, Matin I. Informal credit transactions of micro credit borrowers in rural Bangladesh. IDS Bulletin 1998; 29(4): 66-80.

17. Steele F, Amin S, Naved RT. The impact of an integrated microcredit program on women's empowerment and fertility behavior in rural Bangladesh. Population Council, Policy Research Division, 1998.

18. Kumskova NH. Strengthening income-generating opportunities for rural women in Kyrgyzstan. 1999.



The International Electronic Journal of Rural and Remote Health Research, Education Practice and Policy

19. Khan SR, Chowdhury AMR, Ahmed SM, Bhuiya A. Women's education and employment: Matlab experience. *Asia Pacific Population Journal* 1996; **11**: 45-58.

20. Mou SZ, Bhuiya FA, Islam SMS. Knowledge and perceptions of sexually transmitted diseases, HIV/AIDS, and reproductive health among female students in Dhaka, Bangladesh. *International Journal of Advanced Medical and Health Research* 2015; **2(1)**: 9.

21. Amin S. The poverty's purdah trap in rural Bangladesh: implications for women's roles in the family. *Development and Change* 1997; **28(2)**: 213-233.

22. Naved RT. Empowerment of women: listening to the voices of women. *The Bangladesh Development Studies* 1994: 155-78.

23. Mainuddin A, Begum HA, Rawal LB, Islam A, Islam SS. Women empowerment and its relation with health seeking behavior in Bangladesh. *Journal of Family & Reproductive Health* 2015; **9(2):** 65.

24. Stycos JM, Weller RH. Female working roles and fertility. *Demography* 1967; 4(1): 210-217.

25. Chaudhury RH. The influence of female education, labor force participation, and age at marriage on fertility behavior in Bangladesh. *Biodemography and Social Biology* 1984; **31(1-2)**: 59-74.

26. Zheng Z, Zhou Y, Zheng L, Yang Y, Zhao D, Lou C, et al. Sexual behaviour and contraceptive use among unmarried, young women migrant workers in five cities in China. *Reproductive Health Matters* 2001; **9(17):** 118-127.

27. Bongaarts J. A framework for analyzing the proximate determinants of fertility. *Population and Development Review* 1978: 105-132.

28. Bilkis S. Women's education, employment and empowerment: analysis of interrelationships. *Empowerment: A Journal of Women for Women* 2004; 11: 45.

29. United Nations Population Fund Bangladesh. *About Bangladesh*. (Online) 2014. Available: http://unfpabgd.org/index.php? option=page&id=49&Itemid=4 (Accessed 29 December 2014).

