

Glimpses of Institutional Maternity Care – some food for thought

A civil society study 2008- 2009

22nd April 2009, IIC, New Delhi

Background & Context of Study

In 2007, growing concern among civil society actors on:

- Staggering maternal mortality
- Government's increasing emphasis on institutional delivery (ID) as the best option and the incentivization of ID through the JSY program
- Lack of staff, capacity, supplies & equipment in health institutions and inability to deal with normal or complicated deliveries
- Lack of monitoring by state health systems of adverse outcomes
- Lack of attention to home births
- Lack of attention to other determinants of maternal mortality
- Lack of accessibility /good referral transport systems, also corruption within health institutions
- Proportion of ID still not that high as per NFHS- necessitating a more thorough review of experiences of women trying to get IDs

Objectives of Study

- To understand the experiences of women who delivered or attempted to deliver in institutions
- To examine the need for changes/ improvements in the India government's current policy on maternal health
- To build capacities of groups on using evidence for advocacy

Study Partners

- ASHA (West Bengal)
- Belaku Trust (Karnataka)
- Centre for Health and Social Justice (New Delhi), worked with Mahila Bal Jyoti Kendra and Shaktivardhini in Bihar
- EKJUT (Jharkhand)
- SAHAYOG (Lucknow) working with SPS & GPNS in UP and
- SAHAYOG working with MKS in Uttarakhand
- 1 study partner adopted different methodology complete the process

Research advisors (joined at different times)

- Abhijit Das (CHSJ)
- Asha George (CommonHealth)
- Imrana Qadeer
- Leila Caleb Varkey (CommonHealth, WRAI)
- Patricia Jeffery (University of Edinburgh)
- Priya Nanda (ICRW)

Methodology

- Mainly qualitative with an initial screening questionnaire
- Study started in 8 states (1 dropped later as methodology differed); Study sites are blocks (10 blocks)
- Common methodology adopted across all sites. Questionnaire for screening survey and interview guide for in-depth case studies emerged as methods from consultative process
- Household survey from approximately 10,000 population was conducted – to screen cases of all IDs in 3 months study period (Jan to Mar 2008)
- Consent of women was obtained
- Convenience sample chosen due to resource constraints
- Qualitative in-depth interview to obtain approx. 10 retrospective narratives of women who attempted IDs & family member who accompanied them in each site, not all sites reported exactly 10 cases studies each
- Total approx.80 indepth case studies across all sites was analysed

- **Methods of Analysis – Development of common data coding system, collation of data and site specific analysis**
- **Quantitative data from the screening questionnaires was collated from all sites and analysed by one study partner**
- **Qualitative data was analysed by different organizations involved in the study in different states using common methodology**
- **A group of advisors were involved (at different times) who gave feedback from time to time**
- **Duration of the study nearly 18 months**

STUDY ACTIVITIES (All held in Delhi)	DATES
Initial meeting organized by Healthwatch Forum	August 2007
Tools Development	Nov-Dec 07-08
Bilingual Research Method Training Workshop Data collection	February 2008 March to June
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Data Analysis process and Advocacy Plan Meetings •Review by advisors 	April, July, September 2008, February 2009
Sharing of Findings	September 2008, April 2009

Limitations

- Population based samples of 10,000 and window period of 3 months meant that samples were not large enough to throw up large no. of adverse outcome, eg., maternal deaths and in 1 site not adequate no. of IDs
- In some sites, number of births were not reconfirmed by other sources
- Selection of indepth interviews differed and small - small sample size due to lack of funds and other resources
- Generalizations are not recommended
- Differing criteria for selection of cases for indepth-interviews across sites.
- Voluntary effort leading to challenges in keeping up the tempo

Strength

- **Work was done mostly by field practitioners who are working on advocacy and service delivery issues**
- **This data is necessary as women's perspectives are completely missing from current policy context & current review processes**
- **Is a reality check – how policy translates into lived experiences of poor rural women**
- **The work was done in stated time**
- **Garnered interest among policy influencers/makers**
- **This study was a non funded and voluntary effort.**
- **Partnership based research – partnership among researchers, support organizations and grassroots groups working**
- **Built capacities of grassroots groups**
- **Findings are already being used at few sites for advocacy**

Thank You

Jayeeta Chowdhury

(On behalf of all study partners)