Hindu-Muslim differentials in fertility and contraceptive use: A study in major Indian States

Introduction

Indian society has witnessed a paradigm shift about fertility behaviour, largely from unregulated fertility to fairly regulated fertility in the last few decades. Religious differentials in fertility behaviour have been the key concern in demography particularly in developing countries including India. The high fertility behaviours among Muslims compared to Hindu, and other religious communities has been reflected in several studies. In addition to directly influencing fertility through the proximate determinants, religion can also impact fertility indirectly through socioeconomic factors. The low economic status, low educational attainment, cultural and religious barriers were found for hindering the use of family planning method in Muslim community and which led to higher fertility (Bhat and Zavier, 2005; Bhagat and Praharaj, 2005).

Fertility decline is perhaps the most important social change that has occurred in India recent times. Fertility began to decline in the 1970s, and the pace of decline began to accelerate since the mid-1980s. India has witnessed an apparent decline in fertility after the 1980s (Visaria and Visaria, 1994). An enduring feature of this accelerated decline is that, in many parts of India, it has embraced nearly all sections of society- rich and poor, educated and illiterate, upper caste and lower caste, among women of different religion and so on.

According to NFHS-4, the total fertility rates by Religion are 2.61, 2.13 and 2.0 for Muslim, Hindu and Christians respectively for India as a whole. Due to various reasons, it is higher than average fertility among Muslims that attracts the attention. Doubts are often being raised about the relative decline in fertility among different religious groups particularly among Muslims in the decades of accelerated fertility transition in India (Bhat and Zavier, 2004; Jeffery and Jeffery, 2002; Joshi et al., 2003; Reddy, 2003). There has been a long and generous debate before and after the publication of the 2011 census data on religion.

However, analysis of the evidence from various data sources, including the NFHS shows clear evidence of differences in fertility by religion. But, religious-fertility differentials are not same across all the states in the country. Regional variations have been conspicuous, the southern and some western states have led the more and progressed at a rapid rate while the north-central belts have been late and slow (Alagarajan and Kulkarni, 2005). There are notable variations across social and economic classes as well and are well documented in previous studies. Differentials in fertility by religion need to be explored further, given the varying situation and patterns.

The differentials of population growth among Hindu-Muslim is one of the core issues in fertility. According to several researchers, fertility is the major factor in population growth differentials between Hindus and Muslims (Davis, 1951, Bhat, 2004). However, fertility itself is likely to be influenced by some socio-economic variables such as education, economic status of the household, occupation, caste/tribe status and religion. According to Bongaarts and Potter (1983), socio-economic factors must be the principal causes of fertility trends and differentials. While the role of socioeconomic factors influencing fertility cannot be denied, its relationship with religion and the influence on fertility is increasingly being debated (Jeffery and Jeffery 2000, 2002; Morgan et al. 2002: Bhat 2004; Dharmalingam and Morgan 2004). The present study attempts to understand how socio-economic variables influence fertility levels among Hindus and Muslims and the use of contraceptives among these two major religious group in India.

The population growth in any area is determined by the levels of births, deaths and migration in the specific geographical area. However, the controversy on Muslim population growth primarily revolves around fertility, as the impact of mortality and international migration has been rather negligible in the country in the recent years. The attempt so far has been to examine the effect of socioeconomic factors on fertility differentials across different religious groups. In case socio-economic factors fail to explain the fertility variation, it was mainly attributed to the ‘religious' effect (James and Nair, 2005).

Religion and Demographic Trends in India: An Overview

Religion in India is characterized by a diversity of religious beliefs and practices. India is a secular State by the 42nd amendment to the Constitution in 1976, meaning that all religions are treated equally by the State. The Indian subcontinent is the birthplace of four of the world's major religions; namely Hinduism, Buddhism, Jainism and Sikhism. Hindu population is 96.63 crore (79.8 percent); Muslim 17.22 crore (14.2 percent); Christian 2.78 crore (2.3 percent); Sikh 2.08 crore (1.7 percent); Buddhist 0.84 crore (0.7 percent); Jain 0.45 crore (0.4 percent), Other religions and persuasions (ORP) 0.79 crore (0.7 percent) and religion not stated 0.29 crore (0.2 percent).

The religious composition of India has been changing over the period of time. The proportion of Muslims in India's population has been steadily increasing somewhat during the past many decades. According to 1951 census, the share of the Muslim population was 9.9%. This increased to 12.1% in 1991, whereas the proportion of Hindus has declined from 84.9% to 82.0%

during the same period. As per the data of 2011 census figures, Hindu population now stands at 79.8 % and Muslim population at 14.23%. “The data on Population by Religious Communities of Census 2011 show that between 2001 and 2011, Hindu population grew by 16.76 per cent, while that of Muslims by 24.6 per cent. The population of both communities grew faster during the previous decade, at 19.92 per cent and 29.52 per cent, respectively. As a long-term trend, say demographers, the communities’ growth rates are converging.” This means that the decadal rates of growth of both communities is declining and converging closer to each other. The growth rate has always been higher for Muslims nearly in all censuses and higher fertility rates than the rest of the population even when adjusted to regional variations such as the North (with higher population growth rates) or south (with near replacement level growth rates). The Muslim Population growth rate is slightly higher than that of the other socio-religious groups in the above mentioned regions.

On the other side, Muslims have the most favourable child sex ratio among all socio-religious groups in the country. An average of 986 females to every 1000 males compared to 927/1000 for the general population.

Among all states in the country, Jammu and Kashmir has the highest Muslim population (68.3 percent), followed by Assam (34.2 percent) and West Bengal (27 percent), according to the census data on the population of religious groups. The State of West Bengal, which have experienced huge flux of illegal immigration from Bangladesh, has also seen a rise in Muslim population from 25.2 percent in 2001 to 27 percent in 2011. It is a growth of 1.8 percentage points, more than double the national average for Muslim population (.8 percent). Other state with a significant rise in the share of Muslims in the total population as per the 2011 census was Kerala (from 24.7 percent to 26.6 percent).

The higher level of Muslim fertility in India is fairly well known. This is true not only in recent years but even in the past. For instance, the Muslim population growth rate had been higher in the country. This perhaps leads to the larger question of whether natural fertility was higher among Muslim. Some cultural practices inhibiting fertility, like women spending long periods at homes of parent's spells of sexual abstinence etc. had been higher among the Hindu community. Thus, it is clear that when India began its fertility transition in the 1975 or even a decade earlier and with the accelerated decline in fertility in 1985, the different religious groups had stood from platforms at different levels, between Hindus and Muslims the former at a lower level of fertility. This is true not only of religious groups but across regions as well. However recent data indicates considerable variations in fertility among Muslim across states and socio-economic stratum. This suggests that fertility among Muslim is generally high but not necessarily high due to religion and religiosity coefficients. Given these emerging backgrounds, this study makes an effort to study the fertility and contraceptive use dynamics of different religious groups as well different regions in India.

Literature Review

The recent decline in fertility in developing countries created interest among researchers, policymakers and academicians. This is because such a dramatic change in fertility has occurred without a substantial improvement in socio-economic status, health conditions and outlier factors thought to be needed to bring about a fertility decline. Some argue that the decline in the fertility level was achieved mainly because of a successful family planning programmes (Visaria, 1974; Jeffery and Jeffery, 1997). Population development programmed have, no doubt, contributed to the fertility decline. However, several biological, behavioural and cultural factors are also involved.

Kingsley Davis (1951), a noted sociologist and a renowned demographer, was one of the first to comment upon the Hindu-Muslim fertility difference. In his monumental work on the population of India and Pakistan, he noted that child-woman ratios Muslims in undivided India were about 12-14 per cent higher than among Hindus.

Visaria (1974) examined the religious differentials in fertility based on different data sources of the Census, National Sample Surveys (NSS) and from small localized surveys conducted in different parts of India. Results from all sources found substantial higher marital fertility among Muslims compared to Hindus (Visaria, 1974; Rele, 1982).

Previous studies have suggested that there is a strong positive association between percentage of Muslims and total fertility rates in India, for example in Uttar Pradesh. Regarding the Muslim population growth in major states, the higher than average Muslim fertility has been the main contributing factor to the higher than average growth (Kapoor. 1993; Kulkarni, 1996). The differences in the intercensal growth rates of Hindus and Muslims have been used by the opponents of the family planning programmes to suggest that Muslim fertility is much higher than Hindu fertility (Visaria. 1974; Rele, 1982).

The effect of religion on fertility has been especially applied to Muslim fertility. While a number of countries where Muslims are the majority have experienced dramatic fertility decline (Obermeyer, 1992), Muslims tend to have more children than their non-Muslim counterparts (Dharmalingam and Morgan, 2004; Jeffery and Jeffery, 1997; Morgan et al., 2002; Westoff and Frejka, 2007). In addition to their high fertility levels, Muslims tend to desire more children and are less likely to use contraception (Morgan et al., 2002). Although this pattern is not context-specific (Dharmalingam and Morgan, 2004), there does not seem to be conclusive ‘grand' explanations for Muslim's higher fertility vis-a-vis non-Muslims. Some demographers advocated context-specific explanations (Jeffery and Jeffery, 1997; Obermeyer, 1992).

To begin with, it is obvious that differences in absolute levels of fertility across space and communities persist even after the onset of a pervasive demographic transition. These differences as seen now are not unique to the Hindu-Muslim case. For example, North India shows higher fertility than the south even after controlling for socio-economic factors (Bhat, 1996). Studies conducted in Kerala also showed that woman living in Malappuram district is likely to have more

children than her sisters in the other parts of the state, irrespective of her religion, caste and socio-economic background (Zachariah et al., 1994).

In the past three to four decades noticeable changes in reproductive behaviour have been documented. Literature confirmed that the bulk of fertility decline is now occurring in most of the regions of the developing world among women without education and this transition is being driven in a significant way by the increasing contraceptive prevalence rates among illiterate or less educated women (Bhat, 2002; Arokiasamy, 2009). Education continues to have a significant positive influence on contraceptive use, however; the differential by educational groups has become much smaller. This change reflects an increase in use rate among women with no education. Therefore, the change in the fertility level of uneducated women is the major factor, which, contributed to a decline in the overall fertility level (Dwivedi et al., 2007).

Analysis of Sabiha et al., (2011) on influence of religion on fertility and contraceptive use showed that with a largest holder of Muslim population, Muslims in Uttar Pradesh have high fertility rates compared to Kerala and Jammu & Kashmir. At the same time, the contraceptive prevalence among Muslims is lower in Uttar Pradesh compared with Jammu & Kashmir and Kerala. However, it has been seen that decline in fertility among Muslims has accelerated in the recent times and have experienced faster decline compared with Hindus. The socioeconomic background factors have stronger influence on contraceptive use among both Hindus and Muslims in Uttar Pradesh than Kerala. In the low fertility state of Kerala and Jammu & Kashmir, the background factors show significant influence on current use of contraception.

Moulasha et al., (1999) analysed the Hindu Muslim differentials in fertility showed that TFR of Muslim (4.1) was significantly higher than that of Hindus (2.7) in Maharashtra (IIPS, 1994). The study has brought out that the variations in the use of contraceptives and fertility between the Hindus and Muslims are higher not due to the differences in the socio-economic and demographic composition between them but religion or the religious affiliation of the women have much to do with it. Thus, the findings were not consistent with characteristics hypothesis rather than with particularized theology hypothesis.

In the demographic literature, several reasons have been put forth to explain the differentials in fertility by religion. For example, Goldscheider (1971) and Chamie (1977) suggest that one could observe fertility differentials by religion because of the theological content of religion, or from differences in socioeconomic characteristics among members of different religious groups, or from the insecurity associated with their minority status. The theological content of religious texts could differ concerning values or injunctions placed on monogamy, celibacy, virginity, divorce, remarriage, marriageable age, sexual abstinence, all of which could have intended or unintended effects on fertility. The codes of conduct prescribed by various religions could differ concerning their pronatalism slant and acceptability of contraception and abortion. Religious precepts could affect the autonomy of women, their access to economic resources and preference for children of the particular sex, and thus influence fertility levels. Some

religious doctrines could be more fatalistic than others, influence the content of education, resist individualism and rationalism, and thus inhibit economic progress and emergence of the small family norm. While some minority religious or ethnic groups might try to overcome their sense of insecurity through enhancing their chances of socio-economic mobility by reducing family sizes, others might try to conquer it through larger family sizes and by forging worldwide solidarity with members of their clan. It would be a daunting task to determine which of these pathways is most pertinent to the Hindu-Muslim fertility difference.

Rationale of the study

Previously several studies have been conducted to address the religious variation in fertility behavior and contraceptive use but recent studies are rare which present the current scenario of these association. The recent estimate shows a considerable change in fertility behaviour among the various religious groups in India witnessing an appreciable decline in TFR, 3.4 in 1992-93 (NFHS-1) to 2.2 in 2015-16 (NFHS-4). As far as the religion and fertility is concerned Muslim religion is observed to have a drastic decline in TFR, from 4.41 (NFHS1) to 2.61 (NFHS4) compared to the other communities. Though the Muslim fertility declined, it is still reached away from the below replacement level where the other religious groups have reached the below replacement level. Therefore, this study intends to understand whether this association follows previous trends in the Indian States or is there any variation exist concerning the religious affiliation. An attempt has also been made here to examine the underlying factors associated with fertility behaviour and contraceptive among various religious groups.

Research Questions

1. What are trends of differentials fertility among Hindus and Muslims in selected states in India?
2. What are the trends of contraceptive use by religion and background characteristics in selected states in India?
3. What are the influences of background factors and religion on fertility and contraceptive use?

Objectives

4. To examine the trends and differentials in fertility among the Hindus and Muslims in selected states in India.
5. To study the trends of contraceptive use by religion and background characteristics in selected states in India.
6. To study the influence of background factors and religion on fertility and contraceptive use.

Data Sources and Methodology

Data

The study used the publicly available data from the National Family Health Surveys (NFHS) of India.) NFHS are nationally representative, large-scale, stratified, multiple indicator cluster surveys comprising more than 99 percent of the country's population. To conduct fertility analysis, we estimated Total Fertility Rate (TFR) by using Women's file from NFHS-1 to NFHS-4 and for mean children ever born we used Women's file of NFHS-4. For showing the trend analysis of contraceptive use, we use women's file from NFHS-1 to NFHS-4. For Poisson analysis last five-year birth history file of NFHS-4 is used. The analysis of fertility and contraceptive use behaviour by religion is carried out for fourteen selected states: Assam, Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Jharkhand, Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, Gujarat, Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh, Jammu and Kashmir, Uttar Pradesh, Kerala, Maharashtra and West Bengal. The currently married women in age l5-49 are selected as a unit of analysis.

Selection of States

For the selection of states, we have considered only those States which above 40 lakh Muslim population (see table). With this inclusion criteria fourteen States have been selected for the present study. These States are Assam, Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Jharkhand, Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, Gujarat, Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh, Jammu and Kashmir, Uttar Pradesh, Kerala, Maharashtra and West Bengal.

Table-1.1 : Selected Indian States for the study

State	Total Population	Muslim Population	Share of Muslim Population(%)
J&K	12,541,302	8567485	68.31
Assam	31,205,576	10679345	34.2
West Bengal	91,276,115	24654825	27.01
Kerala	33,406,061	8873472	26.56
Uttar Pradesh	199,812,341	38483967	19.26
Bihar	104,099,452	12971152	11.54
Jharkhand	32,988,134	4793994	14.53
Karnataka	61,095,297	7893065	12.62
Maharashtra	112,374,333	12971152	11.54
Gujarat	60,439,692	5846761	9.67
Andhra Pradesh	84,580,777	8082412	9.56
Rajasthan	68,548,437	6215377	9.07
Madhya Pradesh	72,626,809	4774695	6.57
Tamil Nadu	72,147,030	4418331	6.12
India	**1,210,193,422**	**172245178**	**14.23**

The other States have been excluded from the study since these States have inadequate sample size due to less representation of Muslim population.

Statistical analysis

In the first part of the study, we have used bivariate analysis to see the trends and differentials in total fertility rate by religion for the fourteen selected states of Jammu and Kashmir, Kerala, Maharashtra, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal. In the second part of this study, the trends and differentials in contraceptive use by religion are examined for the fourteen selected states of India. Thirdly, multivariate Poisson regression models are employed to examine the effect of religion as well as socio-demographic determinants on recent fertility. Poisson regression is used to analyze non-negative whole number variables (count data), i.e. the number of births occurring to women over the course of a given period. It is a particular case of the generalized linear model, in which the conditional distribution of the dependent variable follows a Poisson law and the link function is logarithmic. The detailed description of the use of Poisson regression model to study recent fertility behaviour is published elsewhere (Arokiasamy, 2002; Winkelmann et al., 1994; Trussell and Rodriguez, I990) and multivariate logistic regression models are used to study the factors affecting contraceptive use by religion and background factors.

In Poisson regression analyses, the dependent variable is the count of births occurred to a woman in the last five years before the survey. In the regression models, only those women are selected who had given at least one birth in the last five years before the survey. The choice of selection of such regression models is because the dependent variable is a count variable ranging values from 1 to 6. Poisson regression is considered as an effective statistical tool for determining predictors of current fertility. The Poisson regression model provides estimates of incidence rate ratio which is easier to interpret.

Description of Variables

Earlier studies suggest that fertility behaviour and contraceptive use among women differs considerably by socioeconomic and demographic factors. The explanatory variables included in the multivariate regression model are age, religion, residence, women's education, mass media exposure, wealth index, work status, contraceptive use and sex preference. A description of the Dependent and Independent variables which are used in the models is provided below.

Dependent Variables:

Recent Fertility – Number of birth in the last five-years.

Current Use of Contraceptive

Independent Variables

Women's current age: 15-24. (reference category) 25-34, 35+.

Place of Residence: Urban. (reference category) and Rural.

Religion: Hindu, Muslim, and Others (reference category).

Women's education: No education (reference category), Primary. Secondary. Higher.

Partner's education: No education (reference category), Primary. Secondary. Higher

Women's work status: Not working-reference category) and Working.

Wealth Index: Poor (reference category), Middle and Rich

Contraceptive Use: Currently Using (reference category) and Currently Using

Mass Media Exposure: No Exposure (reference category) and Exposure

Sex Preference: Equal Preference (reference category), Daughter Preference and Son Preference.

The Software STATA 14.0 , Arc-GIS and MS Excel are used for all the statistical analyses in this study.

Trends in Fertility among Hindu and Muslim

The TFR can be interpreted as the number of children a woman would have throughout her lifetime, if she experiences the same level and pattern of fertility as measured at the time of the survey. The trends of fertility are presented in Table-1.1 which compares fertility rate by religion in fourteen (14) major selected states of Assam, Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Jharkhand, Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, Gujarat, Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh, Jammu and Kashmir, Uttar Pradesh, Kerala, Maharashtra and West Bengal. Overall trends in TFR indicated that, in the past couple of decades all the states had experienced fertility decline though the level varied.

This study shows the changes of TFR level from NFHS-1 (1992-1993) to NFHS-4 (2015-16). In NFHS-1, the TFR of both communities were above the replacement level that is 2.1 in all these selected states. But with the time it has been changed and showed the different level and pattern of fertility rate. In NFHS-4, the Hindus of nine states out of fourteen selected states achieved the fertility below replacement level. These states are Kerala (1.4), West Bengal (1.6), Karnataka (1.8), Tamil Nadu (1.7), Andhra Pradesh (1.8), Maharashtra (1.8), Assam (1.8), Jammu and Kashmir (1.9) and Gujarat (2.0). On the other hand, Muslims achieved the fertility below replacement level

only in six states. These states are Tamil Nadu (1.7), Kerala (1.9), Andhra Pradesh (2.0), West Bengal (2.1), Jammu and Kashmir (2.1) and Karnataka (2.1). Interestingly the TFR of Tamil Nadu is exactly the same (1.7) among both the communities.

Table 1.1 also depicts that the southern States have lower TFR than the other parts of India among both the religious group. The lowest TFR among Hindus in Southern region has been found in Kerala (1.4) followed by Tamil Nadu (1.7), Karnataka (1.8) and Andhra Pradesh (1.8); whereas the lowest TFR among the Muslim has been experienced by Tamil Nadu (1.7) followed by Kerala (1.9), Andhra Pradesh (2) and Karnataka (2.1). On the other hand, the highest TFR among Hindu in Northern States has been witnessed by Bihar (3.3) followed by Uttar Pradesh (2.7) and Jharkhand (2.5); whereas the highest TFR among Muslim in northern region has been experienced by Bihar (4.1) followed by Uttar Pradesh (3.1), Rajasthan (3.1) and Jharkhand (2.9).

Though Muslim fertility is higher than Hindu in all the fourteen selected states but it is quite evident from the figure that the Muslim fertility has declined faster than the Hindu in all the states except Gujarat, Rajasthan and Kerala. Uttar Pradesh and Bihar have the highest and Kerala and Tamil Nadu has the lowest fertility rates by both the religious groups among all the selected states. The TFR of Uttar Pradesh is 2.7 among Hindus and 3.1 among Muslims whereas the TFR in Bihar account for 3.3 among Hindus and 4.1 among Muslims. However, the highest relative change in TFR among Muslims has been witnessed by West Bengal (51.2 per cent) followed by Karnataka (48.9 per cent), Jammu & Kashmir (47.3 per cent) and Maharashtra (42.9 per cent); whereas the highest relative change in TFR among Hindus has been experienced by Assam (48.2 per cent) followed by Jammu & Kashmir (45.3 per cent), Kerala (41.3 per cent) and Uttar Pradesh (41.3 per cent). Interestingly the rate of relative change in TFR in Uttar Pradesh has remained same among both the Hindus and Muslims communities (41.3 percent and 41.4 percent respectively).

Level of fertility rates among Hindus and Muslims by Background Characteristics

In the study of fertility differentials, two measures of fertility, namely, total fertility rate (TFR) and children ever born (CEB) are generally used. CEB is a cohort measure of fertility; on the other hand, TFR represents a period measure of fertility and is suitable to study current fertility levels. The religious differentials in mean children ever born among currently married women by various background characteristics presented in Table-2.2. Results reveal that all the fourteen (14) states are at different stages of demographic transition, however, fertility itself is likely to be influenced by a number of socio-economic variables such as education, economic status of the household, occupation and religion in all these states: Assam, Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Jharkhand, Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, Gujarat, Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh, Jammu and Kashmir, Uttar Pradesh, Kerala, Maharashtra and West Bengal.

Fertility measured by mean number of children ever born among both the religion is higher in rural areas than urban in all these major states (see table 2.2). Rural fertility is highest in Uttar Pradesh

(3 for Hindus and 3.6 for Muslims) followed by Bihar (2.9 for Hindus and 3.3 for Muslims) and Madhya Pradesh (2.8 for Hindus and 3 for Muslims). Although the Hindu-Muslims gap in fertility level persists within each level of education, it is also true that fertility declines significantly with the rise of education level among Muslims. As a result, with increasing level of women's education, Muslim fertility becomes lower than the Hindu in Tamil Nadu. The analysis shows that women who have son preference reported the greater number of children ever born in her life compared with women who don't have son preference. The results reveal that the preference of having son is more in all the states except Kerala and Tamil Nadu irrespective of religion. In Jammu Kashmir son preference is less among Muslims than that of Hindus. Exposure to mass media indicates notable differences in fertility. Women who exposed to mass media reported a lesser number of children ever born compared with women who don't have any exposure to mass media. Working status of women have influenced the mean number of children ever born, but it varies with the states and religion respectively. Women with the high level of income have reported lower fertility irrespective of religious groups, but it is slightly higher among Muslims (Table-2.2).

Trends in Contraceptive Use among Hindus and Muslims

Of the four proximate determinants of fertility, contraceptive use is the one that is most commonly cited as the prime factor contributing to religious differentials in fertility. The particularized theology hypothesis operates primarily on this as the certain religious injunction may bar the use of contraception. It has often been said that Islam does not favor contraceptive use though there is no consensus on the actual position of the religion on this matter; many scholars have noted that there is no absolute bar on contraceptive use for Muslims (Omran 1992) and many Islamic countries like Indonesia, Malaysia and Egypt have public programmers' that provide contraception (Shaikh et al.,2012). To have a better understanding of religious differentials in fertility, one must have clear understanding of differential contraceptive use practices. Data on the contraceptive practice by religion have been available from a large number of surveys in India, and most of these surveys show that contraceptive prevalence is lower among Muslims than other religions.

In Table-3.1, we present the trends in contraceptive prevalence by religion in all fourteen selected states and the data pooled from the all round of NFHS (1992-93, 1998-99, 2005-06, and 2015-2016) for India. The contraceptive prevalence rate has been increasing with the time till NFHS-3 among currently married women of all religious categories in all the states. But NFHS 4 displayed that it tends to decline among Hindus from the last few years in all the States except Uttar Pradesh, Jharkhand and Rajasthan. The plausible reason for such decreasing trend is due to achievement of replacement level of fertility in these States except Bihar (3.3). However, change in contraceptive use rate among Muslims is variant in different States. Table 3 reflects that the prevalence of

contraceptive use among currently married Muslim women has increased in all the States till the time NFHS 3 but it has decreased in some States in NFHS 4. The States where contraceptive prevalence rate has been decreased are Madhya Pradesh, Gujarat, Kerala, Tamil Nadu, Karnataka, Andhra Pradesh and Bihar.

While looking at change in contraceptive prevalence rate, both the absolute and relative change is significantly higher among Muslims in all the states than their counterparts except in Jharkhand (11.3% for Hindus, 5.9% for Muslims), Madhya Pradesh (43.5% for Hindus, 17.2% for Muslims) and Andhra Pradesh (36.1% for Hindus, 24.9% for Muslims). The highest relative change in contraceptive prevalence among Muslims has been witnessed in Uttar Pradesh (269.6%) followed by Rajasthan (151.7%) and J&K (62.6%). From the table 3.1 it is clear that the contraceptive use in NFHS 4 has decreased more among Hindus in majority of the States while its use has decreased among Muslims in seven States.

Level of Contraceptive Use among Hindus and Muslims by Background Characteristics

Knowledge of contraceptive methods is almost universal in India, with 99 percent of currently married women and men age 15-49 knowing at least one method of contraception. The current use of contraception among currently married women by religion in all the fourteen selected states presented in the Table-3.2. The analysis clearly shows that Muslims have lowest contraceptive prevalence rate regarding most of the socio-economic background characteristics. The analysis also shows that women who have son preference reported a higher prevalence of contraception use among both the religious groups in all the States except Assam where daughters are preferred over sons. Notwithstanding the increase of contraceptive prevalence among Muslims the daughter preferences are higher than the sons in Maharashtra and Tamil Nadu. On the other hand, the States where daughter preference is higher among Hindu Women with higher contraceptive prevalence are Kerala and Andhra Pradesh. The contraceptive prevalence rate is higher among working women compared to those who are not working among both communities. The use of contraceptive, in both the communities, is increasing with the increasing level of wealth index in all States except Karnataka and Kerala which already have achieved replacement level of TFR. Interestingly the result shows that the illiterate women and illiterate husband/partner have higher contraceptive prevalence rate than the highly educated women as well as highly educated partner/husband in all the states. As expected the currently married women living in urban areas, irrespective of religion, have reported higher prevalence of contraceptive use than their counterparts in all selected States except West Bengal.

In a highly globalized world with rapid technological advancement it is established fact that the women who are exposed to it, have tendency of using more contraceptives than those women who do not have such exposures. In this study it has been found that the women who have media

exposure have reported higher contraceptive use among both the religious groups in all selected States except Andhra Pradesh. Similarly, the working currently married women have reported higher level of use of contraceptives among both the communities in all selected States. The reason is that the working women are more educated and aware about the family planning methods than their counterparts.

If we compare the contraceptive use by states, we find that Hindu and Muslim of Bihar has the lowest followed by Jharkhand and Uttar Pradesh. It shows that importance of region or state context when taking religion as a main factor.

Poisson Regression Analysis of Recent Fertility among Hindu and Muslim

Results of Poisson regression models on children ever born in the last five years are presented in Table 4.1. It estimates of incidence rate ratio (IRR) from Poisson analysis measuring the effect of socio-demographic factors on recent fertility in last five years. The effect of religion on fertility is not significant in all the selected states except Uttar Pradesh. As the older women (35+) used to complete their desired level of fertility, they are less likely to have the birth in the last five years in all the fourteen selected states. Women in Andhra Pradesh, Jammu and Kashmir, Jharkhand, Uttar Pradesh are significantly less likely to have children in the last five years among 35+ age group before the survey (31 percent, 32 percent, 32 percent and 31 percent respectively). The differences in recent fertility by residence, mass media exposure and work status are not seen clearly. With the increasing level of education and income, incidence rate ratio of fertility for last five years has declined. Women whose partners are educated have lower incidence rate ratio (IRR) in all selected States. Women using contraception have reported marginally lower incidence rate ratio(IRR) of births in last five years except Andhra Pradesh where there is 21 per cent more likely IRR.

Table 4.2 presents estimates of incidence rate ratio (IRR) from Poisson regression analysis measuring the effect of socio-demographic factors on recent fertility for each model and for each state by religion. The aim of this analysis is to see whether there is any significant difference in the direction of impact of socio-demographic factors to the recent fertility of five years by religion across the states. It has been found that the socio-demographic determinants of recent fertility have the different direction of impact on fertility. The results show that as the older women (35+) achieved their desired level of fertility, they are significantly less likely to have the birth in the last five years among both the religion in all the fourteen selected states. With the increasing level of education and income, incidence rate ratio of child birth for last five years are less likely, and the gap between Hindu and Muslim has narrowed down.

Logistic Regression Analysis of Current Use of Contraception among Hindus and Muslims

The characteristics hypothesis can be examined for contraceptive practice as well to see if the observed differences are attributable to religious differences in other socio-economic factors. In this case, since the dependent variable, contraceptive use, is dichotomous (user or not), the technique of logistic regression has been used. In the logistic regressions, religion is a categorized variable, with others as the reference group. The other variables used are the education of woman, partner's education, the standard of living index, work status of woman, and residence (rural-urban), sex preference and media exposure.

The results of the logistic regression analysis are given in Table 4.3 and 4.4 to understand the effect of religion on current use of contraception. First, separate models have been estimated for each state with background factors including religion as predictors. Second models have been estimated for each category of Hindu and Muslim women by different state, to understand the influence of background factors across religious categories.

Table 4.3 presents odds ratios for various socio-economic factors (explanatory variables) influencing the current use of contraception for each of the fourteen selected states. The odds ratio gives net effects of the particular category (states). An odds ratio of less than one indicates that the particular category has a lower propensity to use contraception than the reference group and vice versa. The logistic regression analysis results (table 4.3) demonstrate that the odds ratio of contraceptive use is higher among 35^{+} age group followed by 25-34 age group currently married women in all selected States. The state of Karnataka has the highest odds ratio [OR (95% CI) 11.9] of contraceptive use among 35^{+} age group followed by Andhra Pradesh [OR (95% CI) 11.52], Maharashtra [OR (95% CI) 9.72] and Bihar [OR (95% CI) 9.28]. The results also displayed that the odds of Hindu currently married women is higher than the Muslim currently married women in all selected States. Jharkhand has the highest odds ratio difference in contraceptive use among Hindu [OR (95% CI) 2.64] as compared to 'Others' followed by West Bengal [OR (95% CI) 2.41]. On the other hand, Muslim women have 83% less propensity of contraceptive use [OR (95% CI) .17] than 'Others' in Uttar Pradesh. In Andhra Pradesh and Rajasthan too Muslim women have less tendency of using contraceptives (55% and 50% respectively). The results also indicate that the odds ratios are significantly lower among the higher educated currently married women than illiterate and other less educated women in all selected States. In Kerala the higher educated women use 91 per cent less contraceptives than the illiterate currently married women; whereas in Uttar Pradesh the higher educated women use 22 per cent less contraceptives than the illiterate currently married women. The result of wealth index shows that the women belong to rich category have higher odds ratio than the poor category in all selected States. As expected the working women who are exposed to mass media have higher odds than the non-working and not exposed women in all states. The results clearly indicate that the odds of son preferences are higher than the daughter preferences in selected States.

Table 4.4 presents the odds ratios of explanatory variables on use of contraceptive for fourteen selected states by religion. There are variations in contraceptive use across religion and explanatory variables in different states. It shows that people are more likely to use contraception in age group 35+ in both the religious groups, Hindus as well as Muslims. This is because generally, women have completed their family size till the same age and they wanted to control their fertility. On the other hand, women who are working are more likely to use contraception than not working women. The influences of background factors like residence, wealth quintiles, exposure to mass media are stronger in Uttar Pradesh both among Muslims and Hindus. The results demonstrate that odds of contraceptive use among higher educated women in both the communities are lower than the illiterate women in all selected States. Interestingly the odds of contraceptive use among Hindu women is 92% lower whereas among Muslim women it is 84% higher in Kerala. The women who are involved in work participation are more likely to use contraceptives in all selected States irrespective of religion. There are huge variations in son preferences and its influence on contraceptive uses among these two communities, different States displayed different features. Hindu women in Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Rajasthan and Gujarat are more likely to use contraceptives while preferring son over daughters. In contrast the odds of Muslim women using contraceptives in Kerala are significantly higher [OR (95% CI) 2.1] than Hindu women [OR (95% CI) 0.62].

Summary, Discussion and Conclusion

The results of this study have revealed that there has been a gradual change in fertility behavior and contraceptive use among Hindus and Muslims. More specifically, our analysis of NFHS-4 survey has shown that the Hindu-Muslim differences in fertility and contraceptive use have declined. The use of contraception tends to decline among Hindus are more prevalent than the Muslims. The difference in fertility and use of contraception between the Hindu-Muslim becomes narrower with the time.

The Hindu-Muslim fertility differentials present in all socio-economic strata among all the fourteen selected states. However, the extent of religious differentials varies by background characteristics across states. Among all socio-economic factors, female education is considered to be one of the most important factors influencing fertility (Zachariah 1984; Dreze and Murthi, 2001). This is also true when we compare fertility levels within each level of education between Hindus and Muslims in all these fourteen selected states. Although the Hindu-Muslim gap in fertility level persists within each level of education, it is also true that fertility declines significantly with a rise in the level of education among Muslims. As a result, with the increasing of the level of women education, Muslim fertility becomes lower than the Hindu in Tamil Nadu and Kerala (Alagarajan et al., 2003). Women who are using any method of contraception have

reported higher mean children ever born compared with women not using any contraception among both the religion across all the states.

The contraceptive prevalence rate has been increasing with the time till NFHS-3 among currently married women of all religious categories in all the states. But NFHS 4 displayed that use of contraceptive tends to decline among Hindus from the last few years in all the States except Uttar Pradesh, Jharkhand and Rajasthan.

Poisson regression analysis of recent fertility shows that the influence of age group, higher level of education and work status on fertility remains significant even after controlling for other socio-economic variables. This result also conforms with the previous studies by (Sabiha et al., 2011). It shows that the influence of religion remains significant after controlling for socioeconomic variables in few states like Uttar Pradesh and Bihar. The independent effect of religion on fertility after controlling for several socio-economic variables on the one hand, and the autonomous influence of education on the other, affirm that education and religion have interactive mediating effects.

The logistic regression analysis results demonstrate that the odds ratio of contraceptive use is higher among above 35 years age group followed by 25-34 age group of currently married women in all selected States. The state of Karnataka has the highest odds ratio of contraceptive use among 35^{+} age group followed by Andhra Pradesh, Maharashtra and Bihar. The results also displayed that the odds ratio of Hindu currently married women is higher than the Muslim currently married women in all selected States.

The present study has made an effort to understand the effect of religion on contraceptive use and fertility in the context of recent fertility. Muslim fertility is found to be moderate compared with Hindu and other religion in fourteen selected states. With the largest holder of the Muslim population Uttar Pradesh, Bihar and Assam have high fertility rates compared to other states. At the same time, the contraceptive prevalence among Hindus and Muslims is lower in Bihar and Uttar Pradesh compared with other states. The relative change of contraceptive use is comparatively higher among Muslims than the Hindus. However, it has been seen that decline in fertility among Muslims has accelerated in the recent times and have experienced faster pace of decline compared with Hindus. This is a clear indication of fertility convergence across religions and socio-economic spectrum.

The results also suggest that the influence of socio-demographic factors such as age, place of residence, women's education, wealth index, exposure to mass media and working status on contraceptive use and fertility are operating in the similar direction for both Hindus and Muslims. However, the socioeconomic and background characteristics indicate the stronger influence on contraceptive use among both Hindus and Muslims in all the states except Bihar and Uttar Pradesh.

The findings of this study are fairly straightforward. While discussing religious differentials in India, one must also note that fertility for a religion varies substantially across states

and socio-economic spectrum. It is also found that there is significant gap in total fertility rate between the southern and northern states. Fertility among Hindus of Bihar and Uttar Pradesh is higher than that of Hindus of Kerala, Karnataka and Tamil Nadu and the same trend for Muslims fertility too. Significantly the results show that the TFR of Muslims of Southern states are comparatively lower than the TFR of Hindus of North Indian states. This suggests that there is no 'Hindu fertility' or 'Muslim fertility' as such rather fertility is more strongly rooted in socio-economic conditions regardless of religion. Besides, even in individual states, there is heterogeneity within a religion. The indicators that used for comparisons are averages for the communities in the states, and not the norms for the communities.

Finally, this study had no intention to enter into the ongoing controversy on the Hindu-Muslim fertility, rather it focuses especially on the relative importance of socio-economic factors and religious affiliation in determining fertility. The attempt is clearly to understand the performance and the strategy of fertility reduction among Hindus and Muslims during the periods of accelerated fertility decline. The message is clear. Fertility transition is well underway in both the communities in India and the fertility rate among Muslims have experienced faster decline compared with the fertility rate of Hindus.

References

Alagarajan, M. (2003). An analysis of fertility differentials by religion in Kerala state: a test of the interaction hypothesis. *Population Research and Policy Review*, *22*(5-6), 557-574.

Arokiasamy, P. (2002). Gender preference, contraceptive use and fertility in India: Regional and development influences. *Population, Space and Place*, *8*(1), 49-67.

Arokiasamy, P. (2009). Fertility decline in India: Contributions by uneducated women using contraception. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 55-64.

Balasubramaian, K. (1984). Hindu-Muslim Differentials in Fertility and Population Growth'. *Artha Vijnana*, *26*(3), 189-216.

Bhagat, R. B., & Praharaj, P. (2005). Hindu-Muslim fertility differentials. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 411-418.

Bhat, P. M. (1994). Levels and Trends in Indian Fertility: A Reassessment. *Economic and political weekly*, 3273-3280.

Bhat, P. M. (2002). Returning a favor: Reciprocity between female education and fertility in India. *World development*, *30*(10), 1791-1803.

Bhat, P N M and Francis Zavier (2004): 'Religion in Demographic Transition: The Case of Indian Muslims' in S Irudaya Rajan and K S James (eds), *Demographic Change, Health Inequality and Human Development in India*, Centre for Economic and Social Studies, Hyderabad and Manohar Publishers and Distributors, New Delhi

Bongaarts, J. (1984). Implications of future fertility trends for contraceptive practice. *Population and Development Review*, 341-352.

Bongaarts, J. (1978). A framework for analyzing the proximate determinants of fertility. *Population and development review*, 105-132.

Chamie, J. (1977). Religious differentials in fertility: Lebanon, 1971. *Population Studies*, *31*(2), 365-382.

Chaudhury, R. H. (1984). Hindu-Muslim differential fertility: how much religious and how much socio? *Social action*, *34*(3), 251-73.

Davis, Kingsley (1951): *The Population of India and Pakistan*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.

Dharmalingam, A., Navaneetham, K., & Morgan, S. P. (2005). Muslim-Hindu Fertility Differences: Evidence from National Family Health Survey-II. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 429-436.

Drèze, J., & Murthi, M. (2001). Fertility, education, and development: evidence from India. Population and development Review, 27(1), 33-63.

Dwivedi, L. K., Ram, F., & Reshmi, R. S. (2007). An approach to understanding change in contraceptive behaviour in India. *Genus*, 19-54.

Goldscheider, C., & Uhlenberg, P. R. (1969). Minority group status and fertility. *American Journal of Sociology*, *74*(4), 361-372.

Iyer, S (2002a): Demography and Religion in India, Oxford University Press, New Delhi.

Iyer, S -(2002b): 'Understanding Religion and the Economics of Fertility in India', Centre of South Asia Studies Occasional Paper 2, Centre of South Asia Studies, Cambridge.

James, K. S., & Nair, S. B. (2005). Accelerated decline in fertility in India since the 1980s: trends among Hindus and Muslims. *Economic and political weekly*, 375-383.

Jeffery, R., & Jeffery, P. (1997). Population, gender and politics: Demographic change in rural north India (Vol. 3). Cambridge University Press.

Jeffery, R., & Jeffery, P. (2000): 'Religion and Fertility in India', *Economic and Political Weekly* 35: pp 3253-59.

Jeffery, R., & Jeffery, P. (2002): 'A Population Out of Control: Myths about Muslim Fertility in Contemporary India', World Development 30, pp1805-22.

Jeffery, R., & Jeffery, P. (2005): 'Saffron Demography, The Common Wisdom, Aspirations and Uneven Governmentalities', *Economic and Political Weekly*, pp 145-157

Joshi A P, M D Srinivas and J K Bajaj (2003): Religious Demography of India, Centre for Policy Studies, Chennai

Kulkarni, P. M., & Alagarajan, M. (2005). Population growth, fertility, and religion in India. *Economic and Political weekly*, 403-410.

Mahboob, S., Arokiasamy, P., & Agarwal, G. (2011) Influence of religion on fertility and Contraceptive Use: A study in selected states of India. *Demography of India,* 40(1) , 17-37

Moulasha, K., & Rao, G. R. (1999). Religion-specific differentials in fertility and family planning. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 3047-3051.

Obermeyer, C. M. (1992). Islam, women, and politics: The demography of Arab countries. *Population and Development Review*, 33-60.

Omran, A. R. (Ed.). (1992). *Family planning in the legacy of Islam*. Routledge, London, New York

Rele, J. R. (1982). Trends and differentials in fertility. 91-108

Reddy, P. H. (2003). Religion, population growth, fertility and family planning practice in India. *Economic and political weekly*, 3500-3509.

Trussell, J., & Rodriguez, G. (1990). Heterogeneity in demographic research.

Visaria, L. (1974). 'Religious differentials in fertility' in Ashish Bose et al (eds), *Population in India's Development*, 1947-2000, Vikas Publishing House, New Delhi.

Winkelmann, R., & Zimmermann, K. F. (1994). Count data models for demographic data. *Mathematical Population Studies*, *4*(3), 205-221.

Westoff, C. F., & Frejka, T. (2007). Religiousness and fertility among European Muslims. *Population and Development Review*, *33*(4), 785-809.
Zachariah, K. C. (1984). The anomaly of the fertility declines in India's Kerala State: a field investigation.
IIPS and ORC Macro (1995): *National Family Health Survey (NFHS-1), India, 1992-93*, International Institute of Population Sciences, Mumbai.
IIPS and ORC Macro (2000): *National Family Health Survey (NFHS-2), India, 1998-99*, International Institute of Population Sciences, Mumbai.
IIPS and ORC Macro (2007): *National Family Health Survey (NFHS-3), India, 1998-99*, International Institute of Population Sciences, Mumbai.
IIPS and ORC Macro (2015): *National Family Health Survey (NFHS-4), India, 1998-99*, International Institute of Population Sciences, Mumbai.

Table:2.1 Trends in Total Fertility Rate(TFR) among Hindus and Muslims in fourteen selected states of India, NFHS-1, 2, 3 & 4 (1992-2015)												
STATE	**HINDU**						**MUSLIM**					
	NFHS1 (1992-93)	NFHS2 (1998-99)	NFHS3 (2005-06)	NFHS4 (2015-16)	Absolute Change	Relative Change	NFHS1 (1992-93)	NFHS2 (1998-99)	NFHS3 (2005-06)	NFHS4 (2015-16)	Absolute Change	Relative Change
Jammu & Kashmir	3.5	3.3	2.2	1.9	-1.6	-45.3	3.9	3.6	2.5	2.1	-1.9	-47.3
Uttar Pradesh	4.6	3.9	3.7	2.7	-1.9	-41.3	5.3	4.8	4.3	3.1	-2.2	-41.4
West Bengal	2.6	2.0	1.9	1.6	-1.0	-37.2	4.3	3.0	3.1	2.1	-2.2	-51.2
Maharashtra	2.7	2.4	2.0	1.8	-0.9	-32.8	4.1	3.6	2.9	2.3	-1.8	-42.9
Kerala	2.4	2.2	1.5	1.4	-1.0	-41.3	3.0	2.4	2.5	1.9	-1.1	-37.8
Andhra Pradesh	2.3	1.9	1.8	1.8	-0.5	-22.7	2.9	2.6	1.9	2.0	-0.9	-31.8
Assam	3.6	2.4	2.0	1.8	-1.7	-48.2	4.8	2.9	3.6	2.9	-1.9	-39.0
Bihar	3.5	3.3	3.9	3.3	-0.3	-7.1	5.0	4.4	4.9	4.1	-0.9	-17.3
Gujarat	3.1	2.8	2.4	2.0	-1.2	-36.9	3.7	3.2	2.7	2.6	-1.1	-28.9
Karnataka	2.8	2.1	2.1	1.8	-1.1	-37.7	4.1	2.8	2.2	2.1	-2.0	-48.9
Madhya Pradesh	3.5	3.1	3.2	2.3	-1.2	-34.7	4.1	3.5	3.1	2.5	-1.7	-40.6
Jharkhand*	0.0	0.0	3.0	2.5	-0.5	-15.6	0.0	0.0	4.2	2.9	2.9	-29.8
Rajasthan	3.4	3.4	3.1	2.4	-1.1	-31.7	3.8	4.7	4.0	3.1	-0.7	-18.6
Tamil Nadu	2.7	2.4	1.8	1.7	-1.0	-37.5	2.8	2.9	2.2	1.7	-1.1	-38.4
India	**3.3**	**2.8**	**2.7**	**2.1**	**-1.2**	**-35.5**	**4.4**	**3.6**	**3.1**	**2.6**	**-1.8**	**-40.8**

$ Relative change = (NFHS4-NFHS1)/NFHS1*100 * Relative change is shown between NFHS3-NFHS4

Table: 2.2 Mean Children Ever born among currently married women (15-49) by religion, in Fourteen selected states in India, 2015-16														
Background Characteristics	**Jammu & Kashmir**		**Madhya Pradesh**		**Uttar Pradesh**		**Bihar**		**Jharkhand**		**West Bengal**		**Assam**	
	Hindu	**Muslim**	**Hindu**	**Muslim**	**Hindu**	**Muslim**	**Hindu**	**Muslim**	**Hindu**	**Muslim**	**Hindu**	**Muslim**	**Hindu**	**Muslim**
Use of Contraception														
Not Using	1.8	2.2	2.1	2.4	2.6	3.1	2.6	3.3	2.1	2.8	1.4	2.2	1.9	2.7
Using	2.6	2.9	3.1	3.2	3.3	4	3.7	4.2	3.1	3.4	2	2.6	2.2	2.9
Sex Preference														
Equal Preference	1.4	1.4	2.4	2.6	2.6	3.2	2.7	3.3	2.3	2.8	1.9	2.3	2	2.6
Daughter Preference	2.2	2	2.9	3.1	3.4	3.7	3.2	3.1	2.5	2.9	1.4	2.7	2.5	3.4
Son Preference	2.5	2.1	3.3	3.3	3.5	3.7	3.2	3.5	3	3.3	1.8	2.7	2.5	3.3
Women's Education														
No Education	3.1	3.1	3.3	3.6	3.8	4.2	3.4	3.9	3.1	3.8	2.6	3.5	3	3.7
Primary Education	2.7	2.8	2.6	2.9	3	3	2.7	3	2.6	2.9	2.1	2.7	2.5	3
Secondary Education	1.9	2.1	1.8	2.1	2.1	2.2	2.1	2.1	1.9	2	1.5	1.7	1.7	2
Higher Education	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.6	1.4	1.5	1.5	1.3	1.5	1.5	1	1.1	1.1	1.3
Husband's Education														
No Education	3.1	3.4	3.6	3.6	3.9	4	3.5	3.8	3.2	4.1	2.6	2.9	3	3.5
Primary Education	2.8	3	3	2.9	3.4	3.7	3	3.3	2.9	3.5	2.1	2.5	2.6	3
Secondary Education	2.1	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.8	2.9	2.8	2.9	2.3	2.5	1.7	2	1.8	2.1
Higher Education	1.6	1.9	1.8	1.9	1.9	1.8	2.1	3	1.9	2.6	1.2	1.8	1.4	2.4
Place of Residence														
Urban	2	2.2	2.3	2.6	2.5	3.2	2.7	3.2	2.3	2.7	1.7	2.4	1.7	2.1
Rural	2.3	2.7	2.8	3	3	3.6	2.9	3.3	2.6	3.1	2	2.5	2.1	2.8
Mass Media Exposure														
No Exposure	3	3.1	3.1	3.4	3.4	4	3.1	3.6	2.8	3.6	2.3	2.9	2.6	3.1
Exposure	2.1	2.5	2.5	2.7	2.6	3.1	2.5	2.9	2.3	2.6	1.8	2.3	2	2.4
Work Status														
Not Work	2.3	2.6	2.5	2.6	2.7	3.3	2.8	3.2	2.4	3	1.8	2.4	2	2.8
Working	2.1	2.5	3.1	3.1	3.6	4.2	3.5	4	3	3.3	2.3	2.7	2.4	3.2
Wealth Index														
Poor	2.9	3	2.9	3.4	3.3	4	3	3.5	2.7	3.2	2.1	2.6	2.4	2.9
Middle	2.4	2.7	2.5	3	2.7	3.5	2.6	3.2	2.5	3	1.8	2.4	1.9	2.5
Rich	2	2.2	2.1	2.5	1.6	3	2.4	2.6	2.2	2.5	1.5	2	1.6	2

Table 1.2 cont.

Background Characteristics	Rajasthan		Maharashtra		Gujarat		Andhra Pradesh		Karnataka		Tamil Nadu		Kerala	
	Hindu	Muslim	Hindu	Muslim	Hindu	Muslim	Hindu	Muslim	Hindu	Muslim	Hindu	Muslim	Hindu	Muslim
Use of Contraception														
Not Using	1.9	2.6	1.3	1.8	1.8	2.2	1.2	1.5	1.3	1.8	1.5	1.6	1.2	1.7
Using	3.0	3.3	2.5	3.0	2.6	2.8	2.4	2.6	2.5	3.0	2.3	2.4	2.0	2.6
Sex Preference														
Equal Preference	2.3	2.7	2.0	2.3	2.1	2.4	2.0	2.1	1.9	2.3	1.8	1.9	1.6	2.1
Daughter Preference	2.7	3.3	2.3	3.0	2.5	2.6	2.4	2.2	2.2	2.5	2.2	2.3	1.8	2.3
Son Preference	3.3	3.4	2.4	2.9	2.7	3.2	2.4	2.8	2.2	2.5	2.0	2.0	1.7	2.3
Women's Education														
No Education	3.2	3.6	2.9	3.3	3.1	3.3	2.4	2.6	2.5	2.9	2.3	2.4	2.4	2.7
Primary Education	2.4	2.5	2.4	3.0	2.4	2.7	2.1	2.4	2.2	2.8	2.3	2.5	2.0	2.6
Secondary Education	1.8	1.8	1.8	2.1	1.8	2.1	1.7	1.8	1.7	2.0	1.8	1.8	1.7	2.2
Higher Education	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.4	1.2	1.4	1.3	1.4	1.1	1.7	1.3	1.2	1.3	1.2
Husband's Education														
No Education	3.6	3.7	2.7	2.7	3.3	3.1	2.4	2.2	2.5	3.0	2.3	1.9	2.1	2.2
Primary Education	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	2.8	3.1	2.4	2.2	2.3	2.3	2.2	2.4	2.2	2.8
Secondary Education	2.4	2.7	2.0	2.3	2.1	2.3	1.9	2.0	1.7	2.2	1.8	1.9	1.7	2.1
Higher Education	1.6	2.1	1.5	1.6	1.5	1.1	1.5	1.6	1.6	2.0	1.4	1.2	1.2	1.5
Place of Residence														
Urban	2.3	2.6	1.9	2.4	2.0	2.4	1.9	2.1	1.8	2.3	1.7	1.9	1.6	2.1
Rural	2.6	3.1	2.2	2.5	2.4	2.6	2.1	2.2	2.0	2.3	2.0	2.0	1.7	2.2
Mass Media Exposure														
No Exposure	3.0	3.6	2.6	2.7	2.9	3.0	2.3	2.7	2.4	2.6	2.3	2.4	1.8	2.1
Exposure	2.3	2.6	2.0	2.4	2.1	2.4	2.0	2.1	1.9	2.3	1.8	1.9	1.6	2.1
Work Status														
Not Work	2.5	2.9	1.8	2.3	2.0	2.4	1.9	2.0	1.8	2.4	1.8	1.8	1.6	2.2
Working	2.9	3.1	2.4	3.4	2.5	2.2	2.3	2.3	2.1	2.2	2.0	2.1	1.7	2.1
Wealth Index														
Poor	2.9	3.5	2.4	2.8	2.7	3.1	2.2	2.0	3.3	2.6	2.1	2.1	1.9	2.5
Middle	2.5	2.9	2.2	2.5	2.4	2.7	2.1	2.2	2.0	2.4	2.0	2.1	1.8	2.3
Rich	2.2	2.5	1.9	2.4	1.9	2.2	1.9	2.1	1.7	2.3	1.8	2.0	1.6	2.1

Tables 3.1 Trends of contraceptive prevalence rate among currently married women among Hindus and Muslims in fourteen selected states of India, NFHS-1, 2, 3 & 4 (1992-2015)

STATE	HINDU						MUSLIM					
	NFHS1 (1992-93)	NFHS2 (1998-99)	NFHS3 (2005-06)	NFHS4 (2015-16)	Absolute Change	Relative Change	NFHS1 (1992-93)	NFHS2 (1998-99)	NFHS3 (2005-06)	NFHS4 (2015-16)	Absolute Change	Relative Change
Jammu & Kashmir	51.8	52.6	56.5	60.4	8.6	16.7	34.3	46.1	49.9	55.8	21.5	62.6
Assam	48.3	48.6	61.3	53.6	5.3	11.0	32.3	33.5	46.1	50.1	17.8	55.1
West Bengal	61.3	69.8	75.1	73.6	12.3	20.1	43.0	56.3	61.1	63.9	20.9	48.5
Uttar Pradesh	21.2	29.2	46.3	46.9	25.7	121.3	10.5	21.0	29.6	38.8	28.3	269.6
Jharkhand*	-	-	40.5	45.1	4.6	11.3	-	-	26.7	28.3	1.6	5.9
Bihar	25.9	27.3	36.9	26.4	0.5	1.9	7.6	9.1	19.0	10.8	3.2	42.5
Madhya Pradesh	36.1	44.0	55.5	51.7	15.7	43.5	38.6	45.3	54.9	45.2	6.6	17.2
Gujarat	50.3	59.0	67.0	47.5	-2.9	-5.7	35.1	58.0	60.9	40.5	5.5	15.6
Maharashtra	56.6	62.0	68.0	65.1	8.5	15.0	36.0	49.1	58.3	58.5	22.5	62.5
Rajasthan	32.3	41.5	47.8	61.0	28.7	89.0	18.4	25.4	38.8	46.4	28.0	151.7
Kerala	72.5	71.6	74.4	57.4	-15.1	-20.8	37.8	47.2	54.6	43.4	5.6	14.8
Tamil Nadu	50.1	52.3	61.5	53.6	3.4	6.8	45.8	48.9	57.0	49.3	3.5	7.6
Karnataka	50.7	60.1	64.7	52.9	2.2	4.4	37.0	44.2	56.2	46.2	9.3	25.1
Andhra Pradesh	47.0	61.1	68.1	64.0	17.0	36.1	44.9	46.7	62.3	56.0	11.2	24.9
India	**41.6**	**49.2**	**57.8**	**54.4**	**12.8**	**30.8**	**27.7**	**37.0**	**45.7**	**45.3**	**17.6**	**63.5**

$ Relative change = (NFHS4-NFHS1)/NFHS1*100 *Relative change is shown between NFHS3-NFHS4

Tables-3.2 Contraceptive prevalence rate among currently married women by religion in fourteen selected states by background characteristics, 2015-16														
Background Characteristics	**Jammu & Kashmir**		**Madhya Pradesh**		**Uttar Pradesh**		**Bihar**		**Jharkhand**		**West Bengal**		**Assam**	
	Hindu	**Muslim**	**Hindu**	**Muslim**	**Hindu**	**Muslim**	**Hindu**	**Muslim**	**Hindu**	**Muslim**	**Hindu**	**Muslim**	**Hindu**	**Muslim**
Sex Preference														
Equal Preference	59.3	56.3	50.2	43.8	45.9	37.2	24.0	10.1	43.7	29.1	74.3	63.5	53.3	50.8
Daughter Preference	56.5	53.5	40.2	29.4	34.9	24.3	19.6	6.1	36.5	24.5	70.1	64.3	57.7	52.1
Son Preference	65.1	54.9	58.1	51.4	49.6	40.6	30.0	12.0	48.7	27.1	70.0	65.7	54.1	47.1
Women's Education														
No Education	65.1	56.6	58.2	46.8	47.0	39.5	26.7	11.0	48.2	29.6	75.1	65.9	50.4	46.3
Primary Education	69.1	62.2	54.0	43.3	48.5	33.5	26.1	9.0	51.3	29.2	77.2	67.2	52.0	50.0
Secondary Education	57.3	54.3	43.8	44.3	46.1	38.6	26.2	12.0	40.7	25.5	72.1	60.7	55.2	52.5
Higher Education	57.0	51.5	44.0	47.9	46.9	37.3	25.5	13.1	37.4	32.3	69.4	63.8	53.5	0.0
Place of Residence														
Urban	72.1	61.0	52.5	45.8	59.4	46.2	39.8	15.3	50.6	33.3	70.8	62.4	56.3	48.9
Rural	57.6	58.4	51.4	44.1	43.5	32.6	24.7	10.0	43.1	25.7	74.9	64.5	53.1	50.1
Mass Media Exposure														
No Exposure	57.0	45.0	48.4	55.5	39.9	31.1	24.7	10.0	40.3	24.5	69.6	61.3	50.6	47.8
Exposure	61.0	58.0	53.0	54.2	50.9	42.6	28.4	13.2	48.2	30.7	74.2	65.1	54.4	52.6
Work Status														
Not Work	61.3	56.6	50.1	51.0	45.7	38.3	28.1	12.4	44.9	28.6	74.1	64.9	55.7	52.9
Working	68.8	57.4	64.2	64.0	57.2	46.8	33.2	19.2	51.1	34.6	82.5	76.2	63.8	61.2
Wealth Index														
Poor	57.7	48.9	50.3	42.6	41.1	30.6	24.0	10.0	41.1	24.7	74.4	63.2	53.1	49.2
Middle	58.4	57.3	53.5	45.0	48.1	39.5	30.4	12.3	53.6	29.5	74.0	63.4	53.4	54.0
Rich	62.0	59.3	53.4	46.4	56.6	44.7	36.2	14.6	51.6	35.2	71.8	66.4	55.0	50.6
Partner's Education														
No Education	65.0	57.7	56.7	47.5	45.3	39.0	25.8	11.5	43.3	26.8	78.6	66.1	55.4	53.4
Primary Education	69.9	56.9	57.1	55.0	45.5	45.3	29.7	13.0	47.9	23.3	82.3	72.8	56.9	57.7
Secondary Education	62.1	56.3	53.8	55.1	49.2	37.3	30.2	14.7	46.4	30.1	72.2	63.0	56.7	52.1
Higher Education	59.1	56.7	50.1	51.2	48.1	34.7	30.1	18.4	49.7	37.7	74.1	61.1	59.8	43.2

Table 2.2 cont.

Background Characteristics	Maharashtra		Gujarat		Rajasthan		Andhra Pradesh		Karnataka		Tamil Nadu		Kerala	
	Hindu	Muslim	Hindu	Muslim	Hindu	Muslim	Hindu	Muslim	Hindu	Muslim	Hindu	Muslim	Hindu	Muslim
Sex Preference														
Equal Preference	64.3	57.8	46.6	38.8	59.3	45.6	69.6	62.8	53.2	46.2	53.7	50.1	57.7	43.6
Daughter Preference	62.4	64.9	43.1	48.9	54.1	28.5	76.1	52.8	45.1	36.6	52.5	53.5	64.4	42.4
Son Preference	72.3	59.7	53.2	48.7	66.7	49.6	71.1	79.8	55.3	50.0	53.3	43.7	53.1	43.8
Women's Education														
No Education	76.6	68.1	53.4	33.5	66.3	46.2	79.8	77.1	66.9	58.1	60.6	54.9	83.9	47.1
Primary Education	72.0	66.6	52.1	43.6	59.7	43.9	78.3	64.1	58.5	54.1	63.6	56.4	66.2	56.3
Secondary Education	61.9	53.3	43.8	42.5	55.1	47.4	62.3	52.5	48.9	40.4	52.7	49.1	61.4	45.2
Higher Education	56.2	52.3	41.9	43.4	51.0	59.2	47.1	36.1	28.7	34.4	38.2	31.0	48.8	27.5
Place of Residence														
Urban	64.1	58.5	47.6	43.2	66.3	52.6	70.1	62.3	48.1	47.8	54.6	49.4	59.1	59.2
Rural	65.8	58.3	47.2	35.8	59.3	41.4	69.6	74.3	55.7	42.2	52.6	48.7	56.5	51.7
Mass Media Exposure														
No Exposure	66.6	51.0	43.2	31.2	56.2	33.7	72.2	66.5	58.6	42.6	56.3	66.4	58.6	25.9
Exposure	64.9	59.5	48.2	42.2	62.5	51.1	69.8	61.6	52.4	46.5	53.5	48.9	58.0	43.7
Work Status														
Not Work	64.8	62.5	41.7	43.1	59.7	42.9	64.4	56.4	50.2	49.4	50.0	48.2	56.6	49.5
Working	76.3	77.1	59.4	46.1	70.2	39.0	83.3	77.5	61.9	61.0	63.4	61.5	60.7	60.6
Wealth Index														
Poor	65.1	57.0	43.1	24.9	56.0	34.7	65.8	60.3	56.5	57.3	52.2	59.4	59.9	53.1
Middle	64.1	54.0	48.4	40.6	62.0	46.9	70.5	63.6	55.5	43.6	52.7	52.5	60.3	56.6
Rich	65.6	60.8	48.9	42.7	63.4	53.0	71.1	61.4	49.1	45.1	54.4	48.4	57.1	42.1
Partner's Education														
No Education	73.6	59.9	56.8	47.8	66.4	27.7	82.5	71.9	67.3	68.3	60.7	59.4	71.1	4.8
Primary Education	82.3	57.2	51.6	41.3	64.8	37.6	82.1	68.1	56.9	57.8	62.4	61.0	78.9	59.1
Secondary Education	67.6	59.3	45.7	45.2	61.0	49.6	63.5	55.8	51.6	42.3	53.5	51.0	58.7	40.1
Higher Education	60.6	67.1	43.1	35.3	58.9	59.5	57.8	38.1	41.7	51.7	41.3	37.0	44.3	29.7

Table-4.1: Poisson Regression Analysis (Incidence Rate Ratio, IRR) of recent fertility with background characteristics among currently married women by religious groups in major Indian States.

Background Characteristics	Jammu &Kashmir	Uttar Pradesh	Bihar	Jharkhand	West Bengal	Assam	Andhra Pradesh	Karnataka	Tamil Nadu	Kerala	Madhya Pradesh	Maharashtra	Gujarat	Rajasthan
Religion														
Hindu®														
Muslim	1.007	1.066***	1.068	1.022	1.050	1.005	1.006	1.118	1.090	1.139	0.978	1.051	1.117	1.124
Others	0.913	0.764	1.983	0.942	1.100	1.188***	1.047	1.320	1.209	1.357	1.029	1.032	1.278	1.219
Age group														
15-24®														
25-34	0.913**	0.976	1.039	0.94*	0.918	0.922**	0.816***	0.987	0.990	1.155	0.983	0.891***	0.972	1.034
35+	0.784***	0.799***	0.833	0.789***	0.831**	0.823***	0.693**	0.859	0.888	1.136	0.82***	0.831**	0.820	0.930
Use of Contraception														
Not Using®														
Using	0.925***	0.942***	0.974	0.888***	0.908*	0.918**	1.213***	1.115	1.211	1.198	0.903***	0.994	0.968	0.920
Place of Residence														
Urban®														
Rural	1.047	1.049**	1.069	0.963	0.970	0.989	1.013	1.054	1.107	1.080	1.038	1.021	1.089	1.121
Women's Education														
No Education®														
Primary Education	1.038	1.005	1.061	0.975	0.993	0.987	0.931	1.099	1.122	3.550	1.008	1.014	1.101	1.095
Secondary Education	1.016	0.964*	1.072	0.944	0.949	0.971	1.090	1.061	1.191	3.463	1.015	0.992	1.031	1.107
Higher Education	0.956	0.947	1.142	0.883	0.857	0.945	1.032	1.066	1.231	3.627	0.963	0.901	0.963	1.091
Partner's Education														
No Education®														
Primary Education	0.984	1.002	1.013	1.028	0.898	0.935	1.009	1.181	1.187	1.214	0.988	1.036	1.091	1.118
Secondary Education	1.018	1.006	1.012	0.979	0.925	0.905**	0.917	1.103	1.156	1.283	0.937**	1.069	1.016	1.026
Higher Education	1.065	0.934**	0.974	0.926	0.891	0.919	0.907	1.215	1.238	1.228	0.877**	1.082	1.122	0.983
Wealth Index														
Poor®														
Middle	0.957	0.972	0.995	0.957	1.015	0.987	0.910	1.027	1.031	1.578	0.943*	0.897**	1.020	1.051
Rich	0.914**	0.912***	0.943	0.975	0.953	0.923	0.916	0.949	0.945	1.565	0.891***	0.895**	0.979	1.008
Work Status														
Not Working®														
Working	0.971	0.939***	0.991	0.916**	0.922	1.019	0.939	1.027	0.981	1.145	0.927***	0.953	0.989	1.001
Mass Media Exposure														
No Exposure®														
Media Exposure	1.015	1.062***	1.048	0.971	0.9*	0.926*	0.963	1.191	1.037	1.791	0.966	0.978	1.029	0.971
Sex Preference														
Equal Preference®														
Daughter Preference	0.978	1.012	1.190	0.996	1.035	0.994	1.165	1.266	1.219	1.478	1.017	1.087	1.345	1.508
Son Preference	0.992	1.015	1.100	1.039	0.989	1.081**	1.174	1.149	1.192	1.235	1.017	1.102*	1.194	1.113

***p<0.01, **p<0.05, *p<0.10; ®indicates reference category

Table-4.2: Poisson Regression Analysis (Incidence Rate Ratio, IRR) of recent fertility with background characteristics among currently married women by religious groups in major Indian States.

Background Characteristics	Jammu &Kashmir		Uttar Pradesh		Bihar		Jharkhand		West Bengal		Assam		Andhra Pradesh	
	Hindu	Muslim	Hindu	Muslim	Hindu	Muslim	Hindu	Muslim	Hindu	Muslim	Hindu	Muslim	Hindu	Muslim
Age group														
15-24®														
25-34	0.855**	0.928	0.975	0.987	0.998	0.965	0.95	0.889	0.931	0.91	0.954	0.877**	0.788***	0.84
35+	0.709***	0.797***	0.78***	0.859***	0.784***	0.799***	0.812***	0.691***	0.807	0.886	0.882*	0.758***	0.649***	0.831
Use of Contraception														
Not Using®														
Using	0.915	0.93**	0.967**	0.879***	0.923***	1.022	0.901***	0.882	0.951	0.847*	0.908**	0.938	1.221***	1.096
Place of Residence														
Urban®														
Rural	1.06	1.027	1.049*	1.031	1.006	0.986	0.951	0.972	1.047	0.881	0.982	1.157	0.996	1.035
Women's Education														
No Education®														
Primary Education	0.988	1.04	0.985	1.04	1.01	0.957	0.965	0.977	1.057	0.962	0.933	1.039	0.842	1.517
Secondary Education	1.023	1.006	0.97	0.924*	1.004	1.094	0.929	0.941	1	0.881	0.945	1.001	0.986	1.79*
Higher Education	0.975	0.943	0.963	0.828*	1.01	0.848	0.874	0.863	0.923	0.852	0.96	0.786	0.971	1.5
Partner's Education														
No Education®														
Primary Education	0.935	0.991	0.997	1.027	0.956	0.948	1.032	0.969	0.931	0.896	0.967	0.904	1.074	0.723
Secondary Education	1.017	1.024	1.002	1.022	0.962	1.004	0.976	1.026	0.981	0.813	0.895	0.908	0.966	0.833
Higher Education	0.978	1.089	0.937*	0.85	0.908*	0.764*	0.945	0.857	0.977	0.759	0.823	1.228	0.96	0.768
Wealth Index														
Poor®														
Middle	1.052	0.935*	0.986	0.918**	0.934*	0.938	0.925	1.041	0.974	1.116	0.995	0.982	0.946	0.437
Rich	0.949	0.9**	0.899***	0.93*	0.842***	0.892	0.922	1.235	0.932	1.2	0.927	0.81	0.937	0.607
Work Status														
Not Working®														
Working	1.011	0.965	0.938***	0.914**	0.951*	0.898*	0.871***	1.038	0.893	1.055	1.002	1.034	0.977	0.696
Mass Media Exposure														
No Exposure®														
Exposure	0.994	1.017	1.051***	1.081**	1.009	0.961	1.02	0.782***	0.874*	0.892	0.932	0.92	1.054	0.776
Sex Preference														
Equal Preference®														
Daughter Preference	1.069	0.955	1.037	0.968	0.998	1.135	0.965	1.014	1.062	1.378	0.953	1.091	1.24	0.589
Son Preference	1.035	0.977	1.003	1.042	1.052**	1.114**	1.054	1.081	1.142	0.824	1.024	1.132**	1.195	0.81

***p<0.01, **p<0.05, *p<0.10; ®indicates reference category

Table4.2cont.

Background Characteristics	Tamil Nadu		Karnataka		Kerala		Madhya Pradesh		Maharashtra		Gujarat		Rajasthan	
	Hindu	Muslim	Hindu	Muslim	Hindu	Muslim	Hindu	Muslim	Hindu	Muslim	Hindu	Muslim	Hindu	Muslim
Age group														
15-24®														
25-34	0.925*	0.801	0.893**	0.935	1.032	0.939	0.985	1.011	0.872***	0.9	0.921**	0.812*	0.967	1.099
35+	0.715***	0.73	0.697***	0.802	1.095	0.835	0.827***	0.764*	0.834**	0.857	0.74***	0.706**	0.815***	1.017
Use of Contraception														
Not Using®														
Using	1.134***	1.092	1.069	0.951	1.175	0.925	0.893***	1.032	1.007	1.069	0.904***	0.972	0.883***	0.783***
Place of Residence														
Urban®														
Rural	1.022	1.009	0.962	0.95	0.937	0.997	1.023	1.172*	1.028	1.054	1.003	1.117	1.01	1.156
Women's Education														
No Education®														
Primary Education	0.927	1.037	0.931	1.141	1.532	0	1.003	1.063	1.025	0.824	0.993	1.145	1.035	0.862
Secondary Education	1.004	1.249	0.892*	1.228	1.404	0.982	1.012	1.004	0.984	0.852	0.941	1.034	1.032	0.956
Higher Education	1.03	1.352	0.844	0.896	1.516	1.017	0.943	1.084	0.929	0.602	0.804**	0.925	0.931	1.396
Partner's Education														
No Education®														
Primary Education	1.02	1.155	0.991	1.149	0.723	0	0.978	1.155	1.034	0.979	1.005	0.825	1.062	0.979
Secondary Education	1.019	0.912	0.973	1.072	0.741	1.173	0.938**	1.008	1.084	0.932	0.937	0.828	0.938*	1.136
Higher Education	1.018	1.218	0.99	1.332	0.662	1.039	0.877**	0.951	1.089	0.889	1	0.841	0.858***	0.928
Wealth Index														
Poor®														
Middle	0.937	1.194	0.94	0.895	0.997	0	0.947	0.879	0.886**	0.959	0.941	1.059	0.977	1.068
Rich	0.849***	1.192	0.834**	0.79*	0.999	1.033	0.884***	0.93	0.853**	1.062	0.877***	1.084	0.968	0.899
Work Status														
Not Working®														
Working	0.894**	1.028	0.897*	1.021	0.945	0.818	0.93***	0.924	0.931	0.873	0.923**	0.784	0.966	0.783**
Mass Media Exposure														
No Exposure®														
Exposure	0.96	0.738	1.062	0.941	0.99	1.314	0.978	0.794*	0.99	1.008	0.957	0.956	0.94*	0.733***
Sex Preference														
Equal Preference®														
Daughter Preference	1.136**	1.03	1.063	1.196	1.556**	1.043	0.999	1.251	1.057	1.078	1.193**	0.884	1.311	0.99
Son Preference	1.109**	0.88	1.047	0.904	1.29	0.946	1.019	1.024	1.057	1.164	1.088**	1.322**	1.062**	1.006

***p<0.01, **p<0.05, *p<0.10; ®indicates reference category

Table-4.3 Estimates of Odd Ratio from Logistic Regression Analysis of Background Factors affecting Current Use of Contraception among currently married women by states, 2015-16

Background Characteristics	J&K	Madhya Pradesh	Uttar Pradesh	Bihar	Jharkhand	West Bengal	Assam	Andhra Pradesh	Karnataka	Tamil Nadu	Kerala	Gujarat	Maharashtra	Rajasthan
Women's Current Age														
15-24 ®														
25-34	3.46***	4.23***	3.05***	6.5***	5.35***	2.75***	2.07***	6.39***	6.11***	3.6***	4.52***	2.8***	4.43***	4.16***
35+	5.99***	6.31***	3.97***	9.28***	7.72***	1.97***	1.27**	11.52***	11.9***	5.77***	9.11***	4.98***	9.72***	7.12***
Religion														
Others®														
Hindu	0.92	1	0.29**	1.13	2.64***	2.41***	1.01	0.66	1.42	1.24	1.2	1.41	1.01	1.1
Muslim	0.84	0.97	0.17***	0.41	1.23	1.45	1.01	0.45**	0.96	0.99	0.67**	1.35	0.85	0.5***
Place of Residence														
Urban®														
Rural	0.89	1.14*	0.79***	0.74***	1.03	1.21	1.18	1.25	1.09	1.01	0.92	1.04	1.31***	0.97
Women's Education														
No Education®														
Primary Education	1.24	0.99	1.01	1.19	1.2	1.18	1.21	1.27	1.22	1.16	0.11***	1.19*	0.97	0.91
Secondary Education	1.02	0.73***	0.94	1.18*	0.78**	1.02	1.46***	0.73	0.89	1.09	0.14***	0.83**	0.9	0.82**
Higher Education	0.72**	0.58***	0.78***	0.88	0.43***	0.74	1.29	0.41***	0.42***	0.72**	0.09***	0.68**	0.68**	0.58***
Wealth Index														
Poor®														
Middle	1.07	1.15*	1.31***	1.08	1.66***	1.09	0.77**	1.69**	0.91	1.15	1.53	1.31***	0.81*	1.08
Rich	1.05	1.1	1.5***	1.22	1.65***	0.95	1.01	2.12***	0.92	1.34***	1.43	1.29**	0.97	1.37***
Mass Media exposure														
No Exposure														
Exposure	1.47***	1.38***	1.42***	1.13	1.45***	1.2	1.19*	1.32	1.09	0.91	1.23	1.27**	1.53***	1.65***
Work Status														
No®														
Yes	1.05	1.46***	1.38***	1.17*	1.27***	1.54***	1.5***	1.76***	1.25**	1.48***	1.22	1.73***	1.36***	1.31***
Sex Preference														
No Preference®														
Daughter Preference	1.07	0.67**	0.75	0.68	0.78	1	1.05	1.08	0.52***	0.89	1.1	1.04	0.72*	0.94
Son Preference	1.1	1.03	1.21***	1.21***	1.01	1.13	1.07	0.76	0.94	0.89	1.08	1.28***	0.99	1.25***
Partner's Education														
No Education®														
Primary Education	1.42**	1.15*	1.12	1.25**	1.53***	1.33*	0.95	1.24	0.87	1.12	3.5**	0.99	1.39*	1.28**
Secondary Education	1.01	1.31***	1.13**	1.29***	1.46***	0.86	0.91	0.8	0.8*	0.96	2.61*	0.97	1.14	1.09
Higher Education	0.99	1.19	1.01	1.15	1.63***	1.08	0.86	0.7	0.65**	0.73**	2.03	0.87	0.92	1.24

***p<0.01, **p<0.05, *p<0.10; ®indicates reference category

Table-4.4 Logistic Regression Analysis of Background factors affecting current use of Contraception among currently married women in Fourteen Selected states by Religion, 2015-16

Background Characteristics	Jammu & Kashmir		Madhya Pradesh		Uttar Pradesh		Bihar		Jharkhand		West Bengal		Assam	
	Hindu	Muslim	Hindu	Muslim	Hindu	Muslim	Hindu	Muslim	Hindu	Muslim	Hindu	Muslim	Hindu	Muslim
Women's Current Age														
15-24 ®														
25-34	3.5***	3.76***	4.36***	2.61***	3.15***	2.49***	6.59***	6.2***	5.82***	2.47***	2.28***	4.11***	2.03***	2.22***
35+	5.55***	6.46***	6.6***	3.31***	4.39***	2.47***	9.75***	6.37***	9.11***	2.23**	1.71***	3.18***	1.33**	1.14
Place of Residence														
Urban®														
Rural	0.54***	1	1.19**	0.83	0.83***	0.67***	0.71***	0.88	1.11	0.9	1.18	1.47	1.16	1.22
Women's Education														
No Education®														
Primary Education	1.3	1.19	0.99	1.16	1.12	0.68***	1.25*	0.98	1.19	0.77	1.17	1.55	1.12	1.38
Secondary Education	0.78	1.17	0.7***	1.11	0.96	0.91	1.14	1.78*	0.78*	0.51*	1.06	1.33	1.53***	1.33
Higher Education	0.49**	0.86	0.56***	0.64	0.81**	0.7	0.9	0.72	0.39***	0.72	0.63	1.58	1.15	2.19
Wealth Index														
Poor®														
Middle	0.87	1.17	1.14*	1.18	1.32***	1.14	1.17	0.45**	1.67***	2.33**	1.12	1.05	0.74**	0.97
Rich	0.88	1.2	1.11	1.01	1.61***	1.12	1.24	0.94	1.54***	2.91***	0.93	0.97	0.93	1.28
Mass Media exposure														
No Exposure														
Exposure	1.16	1.59***	1.42***	0.99	1.36***	1.72***	1.09	1.53*	1.52***	1.48	0.97	1.25	1.15	1.16
Work Status														
No®														
Yes	1.2	0.99	1.44***	1.82**	1.37***	1.45***	1.16*	1.26	1.17	1.67	1.42**	2.21**	1.48***	1.45
Sex Preference														
No Preference®														
Daughter	1.3	1.06	0.72*	1***	0.7*	1.04	0.55	5.26	0.75	0.94	1.1	0.66	0.92	1.13
Son	1.19	1.05	1	1.47	1.22***	1.14	1.21***	1.11	1.05	1.15	1.14	1.05	0.97	1.11
Partner's Education														
No Education®														
Primary Education	1.72*	1.22	1.14	1.37	1.07	1.3*	1.26**	1.18	1.46**	1.16	1.16	1.5	0.92	0.98
Secondary Education	1.11	0.99	1.3***	1.43	1.2***	0.9	1.3***	1.15	1.5***	1.28	0.78	0.93	0.9	0.83
Higher Education	1.24	0.84	1.2	1.73	1.06	0.77	1.14	1.41	1.72***	1.17	1.1	1.06	1.01	0.47*

***p<0.01, **p<0.05, *p<0.10; ®indicates reference category

Table4.4 cont.

Background Characteristics	Andhra Pradesh		Karnataka		Tamil Nadu		Kerala		Gujarat		Maharashtra		Rajasthan	
	Hindu	Muslim	Hindu	Muslim	Hindu	Muslim	Hindu	Muslim	Hindu	Muslim	Hindu	Muslim	Hindu	Muslim
Women's Current Age														
15-24 ®														
25-34	6.41***	30.81***	6.65***	3.8***	3.76***	2.02	6.68***	3.7***	2.87***	2.02*	4.74***	3.83***	4.3***	3.08***
35+	10.65***	36.54***	12.77***	7.3***	6.23***	2.15	12.45***	7.3***	4.96***	4.63***	9.24***	10.12***	7.48***	4.68***
Place of Residence														
Urban®														
Rural	1.13	1.34	1.18	0.72	1.03	0.89	0.86	1.09	0.99	1.24	1.33**	1.37	1.02	0.8
Women's Education														
No Education®														
Primary Education	1.27	0.83	1.39**	0.63	1.18	0.68	0.18*	0	1.15	1.9*	0.98	1.22	0.89	0.92
Secondary Education	0.72	0.37	1	0.48**	1.11	0.62	0.13**	1.51	0.8**	1.24	0.96	0.9	0.78**	1.2
Higher Education	0.38***	0.32	0.43***	0.37	0.74*	0.43	0.08***	1.84*	0.62***	2.42	0.72	0.48	0.6***	1.28
Wealth Index														
Poor®														
Middle	1.88***	2.03	0.95	0.63	1.18*		1.33	2.96	1.41***	0.65	0.86	0.68	1.09	0.98
Rich	2.14***	6.44*	0.98	0.84	1.41***	1.44	1.68	1.86	1.28**	1.07	1.14	0.67	1.32**	1.75
Mass Media exposure														
No Exposure														
Exposure	1.35	1.33	1.09	1.18	0.94	0.51	1.08	1.05	1.26**	1.27	1.59***	1.17	1.63***	1.95**
Work Status														
No®														
Yes	1.94***	1.95	1.27**	1.32	1.46***	2.2*	1.21	0.73	1.76***	1.01	1.3**	2.73**	1.34***	0.91
Sex Preference														
No Preference®														
Daughter	1.26	1***	0.54***	0.38**	0.85	1.29	1.33	1.24	0.93	2.56	0.73	0.67	1.15	0.69
Son	0.76	1.27	0.98	1.07	0.85*	0.7	0.62*	2.1***	1.31***	0.97	1.02	0.93	1.24**	1.43
Partner's Education														
No Education®														
Primary Education	1.24	0.75	0.94	0.64	1.16	1.45	3.96*	0	0.99	0.89	1.6**	0.9	1.27*	1.37
Secondary Education	0.78	0.79	0.82	0.72	0.96	1.67	2.28	1.01	0.95	0.94	0.98	1.67	1.04	1.55
Higher Education	0.76	0.78	0.6***	1.21	0.72**	0.79	1.6	0.97	0.9	0.62	0.79	1.14	1.23	1.29

***p<0.01, **p<0.05, *p<0.10; ®indicates reference category