Regional Comparative Analysis of Status and Impact factors of Sexual Reproductive Health Treatment Services for Unmarried Youth in China

Zhang Lei¹, Guo Chao¹, Zheng Xiaoying^{1,*} Institute of Population Research, Peking University, 100871 Corresponding author: Zheng Xiaoying, Email: <u>xzheng@pku.edu.cn</u>

Introduction

According to the data of Survey of Youth Access to Reproductive Health in China (YARHC), there were 0.196 billion unmarried youth aged 15-24 in 2009, and accounted for 14.96 of the total population.^[1]The 1994 International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD) Programme of Action speaks specifically of the right of adolescents to reproductive health education, information and care.^[2]This was further strengthened by UNFPA that "making 1 billion count: investing in adolescents' health and rights" in 2003^[3]. With the international concept of" youth friendly services" proposed by WHO^[4] public and private SRH services, SRH outpatient clinic, versatile center provide SRH services, and youth-friendly drug store, which especially for youth people were successively developed around the world. Presently, there were lots of researches focuses on youths' SRH knowledge, attitude and status of needs,^{[5][6][7][8]} and a some of them addressed the SRH treatment needs^{[9][10]}, but few literature paid attention on the utilization of SRH medical services and its impact factors, especially treatment services. For the data limitation, there were no previous studies on this topic by using regional comparison analysis. This study will explore the status and impact factors of SRH treatment services for unmarried youth in different regions of China.

Data and method

This study used data from 2009 Survey of Youth Access to Reproductive Health in China (YARHC), the first nationally representative survey of unmarried youth on this topic. The target population were unmarried youth aged 15 to 24 living in 30 provinces/autonomous regions/municipalities of mainland China (excluding Tibet) and divided into three subpopulations: school youth, household youth, and youth living in collective households. The survey employed mixed sampling methods that combined stratified, multi-stage, and probability proportional to size sampling in the three subpopulations. The general refusal rate was 24.9%. There were 22288 respondents, with 50.3% being male.

SPSS16.0 software was used for statistical analysis. Descriptive analysis on frequency, percentage to describe unmarried youths general information and reproductive health treatment services was used. And comparison of the different characteristics of young people on sexual and reproductive health treatment services utilization by χ^2 test (Chi-square test). Logistic regression analysis was used for impact factors analysis.

Table 1 Variables definition									
Variables	Definition								
Gender	male=0, female=1								
Age	"15-19"=1, "10-24"=2。								
Residence place	Urban=0, Rural=1								

Measurement

EDU level	Middle school and below: yes =1, no=0; high school: yes=1,no=0; college and							
	above: yes=1, no=0.							
Have religious beliefs or not	yes=1, no=0							
Only child in family	yes=1, no=0							
Living with parents	yes=1, no=0							
Migration	At school: yes=1, no=0; family household: yes=1, no=0; migrants of collective							
	household: yes=1, no=0.							
Disposable income	"<2000": yes=1, no=0; "2000-5000": yes=1, no=0; "5000-10000": yes=1, no=0;							
	">10000": yes=1, no=0							
Mother's EDU	Middle school and below: yes =1, no=0; high school: yes=1, no=0; college and							
	above: yes=1, no=0.							
Father's EDU	Middle school and below: yes =1, no=0; high school: yes=1, no=0; college and							
	above: yes=1, no=0.							
Sexual behavior	vog=1 no=0							
experience	yes-1, 110-0							

Results

For the total sample size, the proportion of "at least one sexual and reproductive health problems require to get treatment" was 16.26%, the proportion of "at least once on a sexual and reproductive health of made use of treatment services" accounted for 9.3%, the achieve rate of requirement (ARR)was only 57.4%. ARR in Western China was the lowest compared with the Eastern and Middle China. Regression analysis showed that for total youth, unmarried youth with the characteristics of female, older age, non-religious beliefs, not only-child in family, and sexual experience were much easier to utilize SRH services. In Eastern China, unmarried youth with the characteristics of female, older age, non-religious beliefs and treatment of sexually experienced were much easier to utilize SRH services; in Middle China, unmarried youth with the characteristics of female, older age, sexually experience, youth not at school were much easier to utilize SRH services; on the characteristics of female, older age, non-religious beliefs of the characteristics of female, older age, sexually experience, youth not at school were much easier to utilize SRH services; on the characteristics of female, older age, non-religious beliefs.

region	A	t leas	t one ne	ed	At least	utilized	one type o	Achieve rate of treatment nee		
	N	%	χ2	р	Ν	%	χ2	р	(%)	
Eastern China	1241	12.2	226.23	< 0.01	709	7.00	123.63	< 0.01	57.13	
Middle China	979	14.0	38.91	< 0.01	593	8.50	9.08	< 0.01	60.57	
Western China	1405	27.4	610.27	< 0.01	779	15.2	272.12	< 0.01	55.48	
China	3625	16.26	_		2081	9.30	_	_	57.42	

Table 2 Comparison analysis of utilization of SRH treatment services of unmarried youths

Items	Easte	rn Chir	ia			Middle China						Western China							
		Utiliz	zed	Not ut	ilized	χ2	p		Utilized		ilized	χ2	р	Utilized		Not utilized		χ2	р
		Ν	%	Ν	%			Ν	%	Ν	%			Ν	%	Ν	%		
Gender	male	210	4	5014	96	144.276	< 0.01	142	4	3431	96	191.042	< 0.01	183	7.3	2338	92.7	244.39	< 0.01
	female	499	10.1	4447	89.9			452	13.2	2977	86.8			596	23	1999	77		
Age	15-19	244	4.7	493	95.3	89.012	< 0.01	217	5.4	3838	94.6	120.784	< 0.01	381	12.2	2734	87.8	55.366	< 0.01
	20-24	465	9.4	4468	90.6			376	12.8	2571	87.2			398	19.9	1603	80.1		
Residence	urban	395	7.1	5161	92.9	0.359	0.549	290	8.7	3025	91.3	0.672	0.428	296	14.5	1751	85.5	1.553	0.213
place	rural	314	6.8	4300	93.2			303	8.2	3383	91.8			483	15.7	2586	84.3		
EDU level	Middle school and below	273	5.4	4739	94.6	35.416	< 0.01	295	6.7	4140	93.3	52.202	< 0.01	378	11.9	2803	88.1	72.212	< 0.01
	high school	158	8.4	1722	91.6	7.300	0.04	139	12	1022	88	22.037	< 0.01	219	22.6	750	77.4	50.355	< 0.01
	college and above	278	8.5	3000	91.5	16.990	< 0.01	160	11.4	1247	88.6	18.940	< 0.01	181	18.8	784	81.2	11.598	< 0.01
Have	yes	502	6.2	7592	93.8	36.189	< 0.01	511	8.3	5629	91.7	1.406	0.239	558	12.9	3756	87.1	111.984	< 0.01
religious	no	207	10	1869	90			82	9.5	779	90.5			221	27.6	581	72.4		
beliefs or																			
Only child	yes	359	6.8	4945	93.2	0.704	0.401	247	8	2826	92	1.314	0.252	207	12.1	1506	87.9	19.704	< 0.01
in family	no	350	7.2	4516	92.8			346	8.8	3583	91.2			572	16.8	2831	83.2		
Living	yes	669	7	8930	93	0.000	0.983	551	8.4	3583	91.6	0.674	0.426	747	15.4	4101	84.6	2.366	0.137
with	no	40	7	532	93			42	9.5	6009	90.5			32	11.9	236	88.1		
parents Migration	At school	279	6	4406	94	13 604	< 0.01	186	6	2910	94	43 413	< 0.01	343	139	2133	86 1	7 015	< 0.01
Brwnon	family household	280	77	3357	92.3	4 614	0.018	292	10.8	2419	89.2	30 239	< 0.01	353	16.2	1831	83.8	2.683	0.055
	migrants of collective household	150	8.1	1698	91.9	4.568	0.018	115	9.6	1080	90.4	2.477	0.066	82	18	373	82	3.062	0.048
Disposable	<2000	74	5.3	1311	94.7	6.552	< 0.01	97	5.1	1791	94.9	37.007	< 0.01	146	12.1	1063	87.9	12.174	< 0.01
income	2000-5000	131	5.4	2276	94.6	11 358	< 0.01	109	62	1658	93.8	16 134	< 0.01	229	16.5	1158	83.5	2 495	0.063
	5000-10000	187	67	2589	93 3	0 301	0.307	154	10.6	1304	89.4	10.397	< 0.01	171	14.6	1001	85.4	0 477	0.261
	>10000	317	8.8	3286	91.2	28 732	< 0.01	233	12.3	1655	87.7	49 554	< 0.01	232	17.2	1115	82.8	5 747	0.010
Mother's	Middle school and below	451	74	5632	92.6	5 014	0.014	406	89	4139	91.1	2 760	0.052	533	14 3	3185	85.7	8 072	< 0.01
EDU	high school	195	6.4	2872	93.6	2.978	0.046	148	7.4	1845	92.6	3.288	0.038	183	18.3	815	81.7	9.398	< 0.01

Table3 Comparison analysis of SRH treatment services utilization of unmarried youths by region

	yes	23	12.2	100	07.0			21	17.5	12)	02.7			21	12.5	10)	07.5		
experience	VAS	25	122	180	878			27	173	120	827			27	12.5	180	875		
Sexual	no	684	6.9	9281	93.1	8.802	0.003	567	8.3	6279	91.7	16.004	< 0.01	752	15.3	4148	84.7	1.299	0.254
	college and above	118	7	1557	93	0.017	0.470	61	7.8	717	92.2	0.446	0.278	90	15.3	499	84.7	0.003	0.500
Father's EDU	high school	249	6.8	3412	93.2	0.227	0.332	188	7.6	2288	92.4	3.793	0.028	291	18.2	1312	81.8	15.491	< 0.01
	Middle school and below	341	7.1	4493	92.9	0.099	0.392	344	9.2	3403	90.8	5.249	0.012	397	13.6	2526	86.4	14.292	< 0.01
	college and above	63	6.2	957	93.8	1.103	0.162	39	8.4	424	91.6	0.001	0.528	62	15.5	337	84.5	0.033	0.451

	Chi	ina	Eastern	China	Middle	e China	Western China		
Impact factors									
	В	OR	В	OR	В	OR	В	OR	
Gender (male)	1.268	3.554	1.053	2.868	1.432	4.188	1.401	4.058	
Age	0.176	1.193	0.194	1.214	0.177	1.196	0.183	1.200	
Have religious beliefs or not (yes)	0.520	1.681	0.566	1.760	—	—	0.756	2.129	
Sexual experience (yes)	0.518	1.679	0.673	1.691	0.935	2.546	—	—	
Only child in family (yes)	0.110	1.116	_	_	_	—	0.219	1.245	
Migration (At school)									
family household	0.369	1.447	0.214	1.239	0.331	1.392	0.151	1.163	
migrants of collective household	0.250	1.283	0.068	1.070	0.363	1.483	-0.055	0.947	
EDU (Middle school and below)									
high school	0.084	1.088	0.057	1.059	0.083	1.087	-0.035	0.965	
college and above	0.333	1.395	0.150	1.162	0.147	1.158	0.237	1.267	
Disposable income (<2000)									
2000-5000	-0.096	0.908	-0.053	0.948	-0.439	0.645	-0.117	0.889	
5000-10000	0.015	1.015	-0.120	0.887	-0.334	0.715	0.246	1.279	
>10000	-0.035	0.966	-0.016	0.984	-0.064	0.938	-0.080	0.923	
Mother's EDU (Middle school and below)									
high school	-0.053	0.948	_	—	—	—	—	—	
college and above	-0.077	0.926	_	—	—	—	—	—	
Father's EDU (Middle school and below)									
high school			_	—	—	—	-0.547	0.579	
college and above			_	_	—	—	-0.217	0.805	
constant	-8.356	0.000	-8.424	0.000	-8.41	0.000	-7.749	0.000	

Table 4 Impact factors of SRH treatment services utilization by region

p<0.05

References:

[1] China Statistical Year Book, 2010. http://www.stats.gov.cn/tjsj/ndsj/2010/indexch.htm [2]UNFPA (1995): International Conference on Population and Development - ICPD - Programme of Action, New York. (A/CONF.171/13/Rev.1 -- Report of the International Conference on Population and Development)

[3] UNFPA (2003) . State of World Population, Beijing.

[4]WHO (2002). Adolescent Friendly Health Services an Agenda for Change, Geneva, Switzerland.

[5]Chen Xianjun (2005): Adolescent reproductive health survey and analysis [J]. China Youth Study, 9:47-52

[6]Xu Li, Gong Luxia, Zhang Shuping (2006): Demand and influencing factors in adolescent reproductive health services [J]. Maternal & Child Health Care of China, 21:93-98

[7]Wu Yuqin, Cao Qingli, Feng Jinping (2003): Reproductive health needs of youth in urban floating population investigation [J]. Chinese Journal of Health Education, 19(2): 102-107.

[8] Chen Hua, Zheng Xiaoying (2011): Study on service needs of reproductive health in unmarried female youths [J]. Chinese Journal of Family Planning, 19(5):280-286.

[9] Yu Xiaoming, Wang Jia, and Mi Yanli (2002): 1012 urban adolescents' health service needs analysis in Beijing [J]. Maternal & Child Health Care of China ,6(17):372-278

[10] Ma Yating, Yu Xiaoming, Wei Wei(2008): Male adolescents to reproductive health services utilization and impact factors [J]. Chinese Journal of Child Health Care,2(16): 152-156