

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

Locating heterogeneity in Menstrual Hygiene Scheme impact on Indian adolescent girls

Olivia Sarkar^{1*} †, Arijita Dutta^{1†}

¹Department of Economics, University of Calcutta, India

*oliviasarkar94@gmail.com (OS)

21 **Abstract**

22 India has seen Menstrual Hygiene Scheme for 15-19 aged adolescents as a mass movement in
23 2011 with Intervention, Education, Communication (IEC) interventions and subsidized menstrual
24 product. While the phenomenal increase in hygienic menstrual usage during 2010-20 is celebrated,
25 it leaves us to question if this is the MHS in play or a gradual transition due to overall
26 developmental drive. As the age-cohorts move out of the beneficiary net over time, sustainability
27 of the program can only be reflected if there is a behavioral change which is captured through
28 difference in choice patterns over duration of program exposure. Using triple difference-in-
29 difference methodology on unit level data from NFHS 4, the results find that overall the program
30 fails to mark any significant effect on choice of hygienic product in India. However, the low rung
31 of the cohorts in terms of education and media exposure reap the benefit of the scheme, leaving
32 the better-off counterparts unaffected. This concludes that the issues targeted through the scheme
33 is holistic to reach the lowest strata of the society, but a proper choice of target cohort can
34 considerably reduce the project cost, free it of supply side inefficiencies and enhance targeting of
35 IEC techniques, thereby making the scheme more effective.

36 **Introduction**

37 Recently, the discourse on menstrual health has been the top of talks for its contribution
38 towards multi-dimensional inequality in a women's life [1-5]. From driving absenteeism in
39 workplace, dropouts from school to morbidities associated with menstruation, it has augmented
40 the persistent gender inequality. To worsen the scenario of menstrual experience, the associated
41 taboos and shame invariably across religions, menstruation cycle acts as a hindrance to attaining
42 sustenance, empowerment and health equality [6-9]. Restriction to access of food, shelter and

43 religious rights in family houses are what a woman faces monthly as part of their menstrual
44 experience. The periodic shaming and associating taboos categorizing women as impure, belittles.
45 Thereby, qualifying as an overall oppressive system impeding attainment of the core values of
46 development, menstruation stands out to drive the attention of policy makers.

47 Following the research on linkage between lack of menstruation hygiene and general
48 women health, dialogues on menstruation has opened up at the policy level, introducing Menstrual
49 Hygiene Scheme (MHS) in 2011 in selected 152 districts in India [10]. This paper, using unit level
50 data from NFHS 4, identifies various sources of differential uptake of improved sanitary products
51 in India, depending upon the duration of exposure of the girls in the program (based on their age),
52 geographical location of the household (rural or urban) and the districts where they lived in. Using
53 triple difference-in-difference [11,12] mechanism, the study finds that there is significant impact
54 of shifting to hygienic products *only* among women with poorer education and low media
55 exposure. The program could not mark any difference on behavioral changes in already better-off
56 cohorts.

57

58 **Literature Survey**

59 A predominantly large set of literature advocate for an urgent bridging of the existing
60 knowledge gap in the arena of menstrual health as a solution [13-15]. The Intervention, Education,
61 Communication (IEC) to follow, may take different forms of individualistic or community based
62 approach [1,16]. Studies have compared the present scenario of Menstrual Hygiene Management
63 (MHM) across countries and found that not many girls across developing countries knew about
64 the menstruation process before menarche [14]. In primary surveys conducted in the respective
65 countries, only 35% of girls in Bangladesh had reported a priori knowledge about the menstruation
66 process and in India the corresponding share was 75.60%. However, untimely or inadequate
67 sources of information are reported to be the mothers, sisters or friends. In Nepal, school text books
68 are the most commonly reported source, while 75% of them had no menstrual information source.
69 Parents find it inappropriate to talk about menstruation which is related to child birth and sex,
70 letting it be a topic least talked about.

71 The concern even more aggravates for women in the developing countries due to lack of
72 material resources for managing menstruation, like inadequacy of WASH facilities along with
73 unaffordability of hygienic absorbents. Lack of hygienic menstrual products were found to be
74 crucial in determining menstrual choice in low income countries like Kenya and have witnessed
75 the onset of menstruation in turning girls into objects of sex [9]. Sex is often bartered for hygienic
76 menstrual products. Studies in similar country setups highlights the need to improve infrastructure
77 along with WASH facilities for better management of menstruation [16-18].

78 Given this backdrop of menstrual health scenario in developing countries, Government of
79 India in 2011 had launched Menstrual Hygiene Scheme (MHS) [10] that used supplied subsidized
80 sanitary pads and also generated awareness to attain the goal of improving menstrual health among

81 adolescent girls in the rural area. Though the program seems quite holistic in terms of the
82 intervention channels chosen, several studies have suggested that a single product solution without
83 consideration of the context has often failed. While menstrual cup was a much celebrated solution
84 for responsible period hygiene, an experiment in Uganda showed that the uptake of menstrual cup
85 though free, wasn't high. The reason being the lack of WASH infrastructure [4, 20]. Similar is the
86 contrast of preference between re-usable pads and single-use pads. Where disposal is an issue, girls
87 preferred reusable pads over single use products [21, 22] but in places that lacked adequate WASH
88 facilities single use pads were preferred over reusable [23]. Solution to hygienic management of
89 menstruation thus stands out to be contextual and dependent on the socio-cultural conditioning
90 [4,21,24,25,26]. The paper so tries to examine if MHS has been the right mix of strategies opted
91 to alter menstrual behavior and has located heterogeneity in the impact of the MHS for different
92 cohorts.

93 **Materials and Method**

94 **Data**

95 The analysis uses secondary data from multiple sources. Data on menstrual choice,
96 individual and other household characteristics was obtained from women's questionnaire file of
97 the 4th round of National Family Health Survey, India (NFHS 4) carried out in the year 2015-16.
98 Other district level controls like number of health centers was sourced from Rural Health Statistics
99 in India, 2010 and nightlight data from the link [http://blog.isharadata.com/2017/09/nightlights-](http://blog.isharadata.com/2017/09/nightlights-satellite-nightlight-data.html)
100 [satellite-nightlight-data.html](http://blog.isharadata.com/2017/09/nightlights-satellite-nightlight-data.html), respectively.

101 **Variables**

102 The analysis uses a host of individual characteristics and district level characteristics to control
103 for potential co-founding factors that affect menstrual health and to improve precision of estimates.
104 The individual characteristics used as control are such as water source, toilet facility, religion,
105 media exposure, beneficiary status under RSBY, status of health worker meet in last 3months,
106 hemoglobin level, education and wealth index. The district levels control used are night light
107 average and PHC per thousand population. Listed below are the variables that are redefined for
108 the study purpose.

109 • *Media exposure* is categorized into two categories namely low exposure and high exposure. A
110 low media exposed individual is defined as one who is not at all exposed to any one of the
111 following: reading newspaper or magazine, watching television or listening to radio. Else an
112 individual is assumed to be high media exposed.

113 • *Hemoglobin level* is also redefined to form a bivariate. An individual is marked as below normal
114 if hemoglobin level is less than 12g/dl, above normal if otherwise.

115 • *Type of toilet facility* as defined in NFHS4 had multiple categories. Redefinition has now,
116 identified toilet type into three broad categories: flush toilet, pit toilet and no facility/dry toilet,
117 renaming the variable as toilet facility. Flush toilet category comprises of flush to piped sewer
118 system, flush to septic tank, flush to pit latrine, flush to somewhere else, flush, don't know where.
119 Pit toilet category comprises of ventilated improved pit latrine (v.i.p.), pit latrine with slab and
120 composting toilet. No facility/bush/field, dry toilet, other and not a de jure resident are compiled
121 to form the third category.

122 • *Night light* average data collected over May 2012 to April 2013 is averaged and normalized over
123 area per square kilometer.

124 • *Wealth index* is a composite measure of a household cumulative living standard. Uses household
125 ownership of selected assets such as television, bicycles, materials used for housing construction,
126 type of water access and sanitation facility.

127 Menstrual product usage which is the focal variable of study is at times classified into two
128 types based on hygiene. The first category of hygienic menstrual product usage indicates usage of
129 either locally made sanitary napkins or sanitary napkins or tampons and the second category of
130 unhygienic menstrual product indicates usage of nothing/other or clothes for managing menses.
131 Individuals using a mix of menstrual products are not included in the study. Only usage of
132 exclusive menstrual product is used for the analysis.

133 **The program**

134 Government of India in 2011 had launched Menstrual Hygiene Scheme (MHS) in rural
135 areas of 152 selected districts and 21 states [10]. The scheme adopts two key strategies to improve
136 menstrual health among girls of the age group 10-19years:

137 • Demand generation through ASHA and other community mechanisms such as Women's Groups
138 / *Kishori Mandals*. An additional mechanism for in-school youth would be that of the Adolescent
139 Education Programme through the life skills courses for Classes IX and XI. (Kishori Mandal
140 meetings are held to provide a platform for girls aged 11-16 to build their self-confidence by giving
141 them inputs in life skills and information on topics they would not readily receive at home or in
142 their school curriculum)

143 • Supply side intervention through ensuring a supply of a product (locally made sanitary napkin)
144 which is reasonably priced and of high quality.

145 State criteria for selection of districts where this intervention was taken up were related to
146 existing adolescent health programme, strong presence of Adolescent Education Programme(AEP)
147 intervention, active Self-Help Group (SHG) federations, effective Accredited Social Health
148 Activist (ASHA) training and support systems.

149 **Table 1** check for adherence to the district selection strategy using proxies indicating the
150 spread of other government health programs. The proxies included meeting with Angawadi
151 worker, ASHA or other health worker in the last 3 months, uptake of Rashtriya Swastha Bima
152 Yojana (RSBY) and hemoglobin level. Hemoglobin level was used to capture the effect of “*The*
153 *National Iron Plus initiative for Anemia Control among six months onward population*”. **Table**
154 **1(Panel A)** shows significant better utilization of health programs in the treated district, thereby
155 confirming that the districts were well targeted as laid in the policy documents. The paper does not
156 look into how equitable the MHS design was, but explores the effect of the scheme given the
157 selection bias present in choosing districts for program implementation. Individual, household and
158 district level characteristics (**Table 1: Panel A and B**) too show significant differences across the
159 treatment status of districts. According to many indicators the treatment districts appeared to have
160 better development indicators.

161 **Table 1. Composition of individual, household and district level characteristics across**
 162 **treated and control districts.**

		Treated districts	Control districts	Chi Square values
		Population percentage		
Panel A: Individual & Household level characteristics				
Proxy for ongoing other Govt. Health Programs				
Met with a community health worker in last 3 months	Yes	24.01	20.27	3.00*10 ^{8***}
Enrolled in Rashtriya Swasthya Bima Yojana (RSBY)	Yes	8.65	5.26	7.10*10 ^{8***}
Hemoglobin level	Above normal	45.48	45.41	5.90*10 ^{4***}
Water Source	On premises/delivered at home	60.06	61.75	4.40*10 ^{7***}
	Otherwise	39.94	38.25	
Toilet facility	Flush toilets	45.55	47.85	7.80*10 ^{7***}
	Pit toilets	5.98	4.67	
	no facility/dry toilet	47.48	48.47	
Media exposure	Low media exposure	22.25	23.47	3.00*10 ^{7***}
	High media exposure	77.75	76.53	
Religion	Hindu	78.99	82.22	5.40*10 ^{8***}

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](#) .

	Muslim	17.51	13.41	
	Christian	1.17	1.66	
	Other	2.33	2.71	
	Don't know	0.72	0.79	
Wealth index	Poorest	20.74	18.16	1*10 ⁹ ***
		Mean values		Z-Score
Education in single years		8.65	8.71	1.977***
Panel B: District level characteristics				
Night light average of 12months		3.86	8.94	63.318***
Primary health center per lakh population		19.01	19.29	5.162***
Total observations		39154	114537	

163 Source: Author's own calculation from unit level NFHS4 data, Rural Health Statistics in India,
164 2010 and nightlight data from the link [nightlight-data.html](http://blog.isharadata.com/2017/09/nightlights-satellite-
165 <a href=)

166 **Identification Strategy**

167 The data used in the paper is from NFHS4 conducted in 2015-16, i.e. 5years after the roll
168 out of MHS. Information for menstrual product usage is only available for girls between the age
169 of 15-24yrs, which corresponded to MHS beneficiary cohort at the program initiation year. As the
170 girls grew above 19years, they moved out of the program net, so the cohort 20-24years is no more
171 currently exposed to the program. The program effect may seem to be lying in the difference of
172 usage in hygienic menstrual product usage between the currently exposed 15-19years girls in the
173 treated vis-a-vis the control district. Doing this would however over-report the effect of MHS by
174 increased usage due to subsidized availability of sanitary napkins (supply effect). The effect thus
175 doesn't lie in assessing usage for currently exposed cohorts across treatment, but rather over
176 behavioral change. Behavioral change takes time and is expected to work better with more time to
177 treatment. We therefore use difference in duration of exposure for impact assessment. On being
178 calculated since the roll-out of program in 2011, the 15-19years old cohort was exposed to the
179 program for a full term of 5years and for the 20-24yrs cohort, exposure ranged in between 1-
180 5years. The 15-19years so classified into high exposed cohort and the 20-24years as the low
181 exposed cohort.

182 The objective is to see if greater exposure to MHS has increased the probability of using
183 hygienic menstrual product in the treated districts. The first difference compares this outcome
184 between the high exposed cohort and the low exposed cohort of rural areas. However, this
185 difference may be due to more instances of going out of the house during menstruation, found
186 among the younger cohort on account of attending school or remaining within the program scope.
187 We so use the urban cohort which was out of the program scope, as counterfactual to find second
188 difference.

189 A systematic gap among the urban cohorts over usage is expected to be low even in the
190 absence of MHS due to overall better awareness, compared to the rural cohorts. We therefore,
191 construct a triple difference estimate of program impact by comparing the second differences of
192 the treated district with the same second differences of control district. We have controlled for
193 socio-economic variables and availability of healthcare facilities that are likely to affect menstrual
194 choice. Hence, second differences for the districts can be expected to be same in absence of the
195 program. Any difference in second differences (triple difference) can hence be inferred as the
196 impact of MHS. The equation below models the triple difference through the coefficient, β_7 .

$$\log\left(\frac{P_v}{1-P_v}\right) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Treateddistrict} + \beta_2 \text{Rural} + \beta_3 \text{Highexposure age cohort} + \beta_4$$
$$\text{Treateddistrict} * \text{Rural} + \beta_5 \text{Rural} * \text{Exposure duration} + \beta_6 \text{Exposure duration} * \text{Treated}$$
$$\text{district} + \beta_7 \text{Treated district} * \text{Rural} * \text{High exposure age cohort} + \beta_8 \text{Individual controls} +$$
$$\beta_9 \text{District level controls} + \beta_{10} \text{Other Govt.health programs} + \varepsilon$$

.....(1)

202 P_v is the probability of using a particular variant (V^{th}) of menstrual product, 1 being usage and 0
203 being non-usage (ordered logit).

204 **Results**

205 **Menstrual product usage scenario of women in NFHS4**

206 The choice of menstrual product for different age groups of women from NFHS 4 is shown
207 in **Table 2**. Menstrual product usage differs across age cohorts and usage of hygienic menstrual
208 products is found to be statistically higher (Chi-square= $3*10^6$) among the younger cohort. Cloth
209 is the most popular choice of menstrual product with 53.89% usage, followed by a 33.27% usage
210 of sanitary napkins. Nothing and others are the least opted choice for menstrual management,
211 whereas, locally made sanitary napkins and tampons are used moderately by women in the sample.
212 Unhygienic menstrual product which comprises of cloth and nothing/other is used by more than

213 half of the population while the use of hygienic menstrual product i.e. locally made sanitary
214 napkins, sanitary napkins and tampons is used by only 45.43% of the population. The usage of
215 hygienic products is more among currently exposed cohort of 15-19 years, rather than those who
216 have shifted out of the program net.

217 **Table 2. Choice of menstrual product among women in NFHS4(%).**

Choice of menstrual product	15-19 Years	20-24 Years	15-24 combined
Nothing /Other	0.64	0.72	0.68
Cloth	53.72	54.05	53.89
Locally made sanitary	11.02	10.62	10.82
Sanitary napkins	33.29	33.26	33.27
Tampons	1.32	1.35	1.34
Total	100	100	100
Hygienic product	45.64	45.23	45.43
Unhygienic product	54.36	54.77	54.57
Total sample size	77275	76416	153,691

218 Source: Author's own calculation from unit level NFHS4 data

219 **Exploring the difference in menstrual product usage across** 220 **individual and household categories**

221 A look through into **Table 3** identifies that apart from age, other individual, household and
222 district level characteristics of women also serves to be a basis of differential menstrual hygiene
223 management choice. Differences in choice of menstrual product across variable categories is
224 evident. High media exposure, high level of education, improved flush toilet facility and supply of
225 water on premises are factors that positively affect usage of hygienic menstrual products. These
226 findings reiterate the importance of bridging the knowledge gap and improving WASH facilities
227 to ameliorate menstrual hygiene management decision.

228 We have also explored the difference in usage for socio-demographic variables such as
 229 religion, owing to close association of social taboos and local knowledge with menstrual practices.
 230 Plotting differences in such practices over religion reveals that a higher share of Christians uses
 231 more hygienic menstrual product in comparison to the rest of the religions. Additionally, places
 232 with high economic activities and richer individuals are seen to be using more hygienic menstrual
 233 products.

234 **Table 3. Difference in menstrual product usage within individual, household and district**
 235 **level variables.**

		Unhygienic menstrual product usage	Hygienic menstrual product usage	Chi Square
		Population percentage		
Panel A: Individual and household characteristics of women				
Met with any community health worker in last 3 months	No	52.1	47.90	1.6*10 ^{9***}
	Yes	63.67	36.33	
Enrolled in Rashtriya Swasthya Bima Yojana (RSBY)	No	53.85	46.15	5.6*10 ^{8***}
	Yes	65.44	34.56	
Hemoglobin level	Below normal	57.55	42.45	7.7*10 ^{8***}
	Above normal	50.99	49.01	
Water Source	On premises/delivered at home	48.66	51.34	4*10 ^{9***}
	Otherwise	63.93	36.07	
Toilet facility	Flush toilets	35.31	64.69	2.3*10 ^{4***}

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) .

	Pit toilets	51.92	48.08	
	no facility/dry toilet	73.87	26.13	
Media exposure	Low media exposure	87.64	12.36	2.4*10 ¹⁰ ***
	High media exposure	44.62	55.38	
Religion	Hindu	54.56	45.44	1.3*10 ⁹ ***
	Muslim	59.8	40.20	
	Christian	29.81	70.19	
	Other	40.16	59.84	
		Mean values		Z-score
Wealth index		-0.46	0.61	-2.5*10 ² ***

Panel B: District level characteristics

Education in years	6.89	10.86	-2.0*10 ² ***
Night light average of 12 months	4.28	11.36	-54.84***
Primary health center per thousand	0.20	0.19	17.46***

236 Source: Author's own calculation from unit level NFHS4 data, Rural Health Statistics in India,
 237 2010 and nightlight data from the link [http://blog.isharadata.com/2017/09/rnightlights-satellite-](http://blog.isharadata.com/2017/09/rnightlights-satellite-nightlight-data.html)
 238 [nightlight-data.html](http://blog.isharadata.com/2017/09/rnightlights-satellite-nightlight-data.html)

239 Interesting results surface across differences in health care utilization. Women who has
 240 reported greater interaction with health workers and enrollment under RSBY scheme, are the ones
 241 with higher usage of unhygienic menstrual products. Being over-deterministic of various other
 242 individual and household characteristics, the simple descriptive statistics results (and not
 243 correlations) do not infer on the direction of usage of menstrual products.

244 The sample characteristics of individuals stylize the treated districts by higher proportion
 245 of factors that contribute towards a more unhygienic management of menstruation such as use of
 246 pit toilets, water source outside premises, higher share of Muslims, lower level of education, lower

247 economic activities, higher share of women meeting health workers in the last 3 months and higher
248 exposure to RSBY in treated districts, which is a indication to targeting districts that performed
249 poorer in respect to menstrual hygiene. Our exercise of triple difference so controls for these
250 individual, household and district level characteristics when comparing MHS impact between the
251 treated and control districts.

252 **Triple difference-in-difference results**

253 Triple difference in difference measures the MHS impact by looking at the menstrual
254 choices of individual who has been exposed to the program for a longer time and belongs to rural
255 area of the treated district using the β_7 coefficient of the estimated equation. The estimation
256 equation has been used with individual and district level health facility controls that otherwise
257 would show a biased menstrual choice results for the selected districts. Descriptive statistics find
258 that a well laid out district selection strategy for program roll-out in the policy document has
259 carefully encompassed those, where adolescent program was already on the go and created higher
260 chances of already hygienic menstrual product usage even in absence of MHS intervention,
261 through channels of health awareness and thus calls for controls.

262

263

264

265

266

267 **Table 4. Triple difference results showing impact of MHS on usage of different menstrual**
 268 **products.**

		Nothing	Cloth	Locally made sanitary napkin	Sanitary napkin	Tampons
Panel A: Treated Districts						
Rural	High exposed	0.0069 (0.0003)	0.5405 (0.0063)	0.1158 (0.0005)	0.3232 (0.0055)	0.0135 (0.0006)
	Low exposed	0.0089 (0.0004)	0.5730 (0.0057)	0.1130 (0.0006)	0.2945 (0.0050)	0.0106 (0.0005)
First Difference Rural		-0.0020	-0.0324	0.0028	0.0287	0.0030
Urban	High exposed	0.0045 (0.0003)	0.4874 (0.0077)	0.1186 (0.0004)	0.3697 (0.0067)	0.0197 (0.0010)
	Low exposed	0.0073 (0.0004)	0.5463 (0.0069)	0.1154 (0.0006)	0.3180 (0.0061)	0.0130 (0.0007)
First Difference Urban		-0.0027	-0.0590	0.0032	0.0517	0.0068
Second Difference Treatment		-0.0007	-0.0265	0.0004	0.0230	0.0038
Panel B: Control Districts						
Rural	High exposed	0.0085 (0.0003)	0.5667 (0.0058)	0.1136 (0.0006)	0.3001 (0.0051)	0.0111 (0.0005)
	Low exposed	0.0099 (0.0003)	0.5856 (0.0044)	0.1117 (0.0005)	0.2833 (0.0039)	0.0096 (0.0004)
First Difference Rural		-0.0013	-0.0189	0.0019	0.0167	0.0015
Urban	High exposed	0.0043 (0.0002)	0.4814 (0.0067)	0.1188 (0.0003)	0.3749 (0.0059)	0.0205 (0.0009)

Low exposed	0.0062	0.5263	0.1168	0.3357	0.0150
	(0.0003)	(0.0060)	(0.0005)	(0.0053)	(0.0007)
First Difference Urban	-0.0019	-0.0449	0.0020	0.0392	0.0055
Second Difference Control	-0.0005	-0.0260	0.0001	0.0225	0.0040
Third Difference $D3=D_{2T}-D_{2C}$	-0.0002	-0.0006	0.0004	0.0006	-0.0002
	(0.0005)	(0.0091)	(0.0006)	(0.0080)	(0.0010)

269 Source: Author's own calculation from NFHS4

270 # The values in tables represent average margins estimated by ordered logit regression and S.E.
271 are in parenthesis.

272 ## Inference: Level of significance - *** p<0.01; ** p<0.05; * p<0.1

273 The MHS impact as captured through D3 in **Table 4** clearly indicates that no significant
274 alteration in the product choice was found over MHS coverage. Usage of all kind of menstrual
275 products remained unchanged for the treated group with longer exposure. The sample as a whole
276 finds MHS to be ineffective in bringing about any significant behavioral change.

277 **Heterogeneity check for MHS effect**

278 MHS might however be found to have differential effect over cohorts based on their socio-
279 economic characteristics. As already found in literature, contextual parameters play an important
280 role in determining one's adaptability to a product. We explore the MHS effect through triple
281 difference-in-difference as earlier but for different cohorts. The choice of socio-economic
282 variables was to see if the interventions were well targeted towards unaffordability and lack of
283 awareness, we so divided the cohort according to their wealth, media exposure and education
284 (**Table 5**). We find that individuals with no exposure to mass media saw all kind of shifts to
285 hygienic menstrual product as an impact of MHS. Effect of MHS was absent among the girls with
286 high media exposure. Only changes in usage of locally made sanitary napkins was observed,

287 standing at a low of 0.09% increased probability. Moving on to the next variable used as proxy for
 288 awareness, education was dichotomized into below 10years education and above 10 years of
 289 education. Triple difference in difference results show that there was a significant shift to sanitary
 290 napkins (both locally made and others) from cloth and no protection for the individuals with less
 291 than 10years of education, only. The cohort with higher education saw no significant changes in
 292 usage of any of the menstrual product.

293 **Table 5: Cohort-wise triple difference (D3) results showing impact of MHS on usage of**
 294 **different menstrual products**

	PANEL A			PANEL B		
	No exposure to mass media			Exposed to mass media		
	D ₃	Std. Err.	P>chi2	D ₃	Std. Err.	P>chi2
Nothing	-0.0062***	0.0023	0.0077	0.0001	0.0003	0.8335
Cloth	-0.0642***	0.0223	0.0040	0.0076	0.0113	0.5038
Locally made sanitary napkins	0.0167***	0.0057	0.0034	0.0009***	0.0004	0.0161
Sanitary Napkins	0.0490***	0.0170	0.0039	-0.0076	0.0106	0.4751
Tampons	0.0047***	0.0017	0.0061	-0.0009	0.0009	0.2846
	Education less than 10yrs			Education more than 10yrs		
	D ₃	Std. Err.	P>chi2	D ₃	Std. Err.	P>chi2
Nothing	-0.0025***	0.0009	0.0081	0.0006	0.0004	0.1712
Cloth	-0.0234*	0.0130	0.0719	0.0141	0.0127	0.2693
Locally made sanitary napkins	0.0055***	0.0025	0.0244	0.0010	0.0016	0.5382
Sanitary Napkins	0.0192*	0.0105	0.0675	-0.0141	0.0128	0.2697
Tampons	0.0012	0.0010	0.2184	-0.0015	0.0019	0.4356
	Wealth below mean			Wealth above mean		

	D ₃	Std. Err.	P>chi2	D ₃	Std. Err.	P>chi2
Nothing	0.0015	0.0011	0.1804	-0.0005	0.0005	0.3685
Cloth	0.0362*	0.0191	0.0577	-0.0186	0.0125	0.1356
Locally made sanitary napkins	-0.0065*	0.0038	0.0874	-0.0033*	0.0017	0.0526
Sanitary Napkins	-0.0277*	0.0147	0.0593	0.0194	0.0127	0.1276
Tampons	-0.0035**	0.0017	0.0400	0.0030	0.0018	0.1026

295 Source: Author's own calculation from NFHS4 using ordered logit

296 #D₃ represents average margins estimated using ordered logit regression.

297 ## Inference: Level of significance - *** p<0.01; ** p<0.05; * p<0.1

298 Dichotomizing the wealth variable gives us interesting results. It is seen that usage of
299 sanitary napkins post-MHS intervention for the targeted has decreased while increasing the usage
300 of cloth by 3.6% for the less wealthy individuals. Even though similar pattern of decreased
301 hygienic product usage was observed for the richer individuals, it was almost insignificant in
302 magnitude. The usage of locally made sanitary napkins decreased by 0.3% for the richer cohort.

303 **Conclusion**

304 The paper finds that controlling for most of the characteristics that guide menstrual hygiene
305 to minimize the self-selection into program bias, renders MHS ineffective. The program has failed
306 to bring significant behavioral change among adolescent girls. With a limited time, product support
307 the cohort seems to resort back to their initial choice and behaves much like the non-treated cohort.
308 Even longer exposure to the program could not alter the menstrual behavior of individuals. The
309 high reported percentage of using hygienic menstrual product in NFHS4 can so be seen as not an
310 effect of Government interventions but an increase in overall development trend. Development of
311 an economy is stylized by certain events like market expansion in remote areas and increased
312 exposure to information through greater access to mobile phones which are also conducive to

313 increased hygienic menstrual usage. Over the years, these things might have improved the product
314 choice with and without MHS. However, saying this would be too simple to consider MHS as
315 completely ineffective. A careful dive into the design of MHS strategies would help us understand
316 that affordability and awareness was targeted to improve menstrual hygienic condition. The current
317 analysis so used proxies for this target characteristics and divided the cohort accordingly. It is seen
318 that the individuals with low education (less than 10years) and low media exposure has
319 experienced the behavioral change owing to MHS, indicating that though the development
320 activities were conducive to increased usage, not all could reap benefits of the same. A strategy
321 like MHS addressed the marginalization of the cohort with lower awareness and altered their
322 menstrual behavior. The maximum shift being to sanitary napkins.

323 **Table 5** shows that with longer exposure to MHS, the cohort with wealth below the mean
324 has shifted to using cloth from sanitary napkins and tampons, whereas the counterpart shows no
325 such impact. The impact of MHS thus seems to have adversely affected the poorer cohort and
326 appears confusing. “*Period poverty*” has been the most highlighted problem associated with
327 menstrual hygiene in developing countries like India and MHS had rightly tried to address the
328 issue by providing subsidized napkins. The effect may however seem to vanish as the cohorts
329 move out of the benefit net. Any behavioral impact of MHS on the cohorts with different wealth
330 levels so shouldn’t be assessed in the light of increased usage of marketed goods. The reverse
331 results might so be interpreted as a shift to using traditional methods of protection like cloth in a
332 hygienic manner, which would rather be sustainable even in the absence of program. We might so
333 conclude that MHS has rightly filled in the knowledge gap and helped girls to resort to hygienic
334 and sustainable changes.

335 **Policy prescription**

336 As MHS was found to be effective only for cohorts with lowest awareness, a proper
337 targeting of cohorts should be done to considerably reduce the program cost and free the scheme
338 of supply side fund constraints. As the marginalized section actually needed the program to shift
339 to hygienic choices, more concerted efforts should be targeted towards them. Further, the fund
340 saved could be reallocated to include older cohorts under the program scope, so that they do not
341 slip back to unhygienic products just because of poverty. Also with a reduced sample of
342 beneficiaries IEC interventions are likely to be implemented with greater effectiveness and
343 contribute in increasing the probability of using hygienic products by a greater extent.

344 **Acknowledgement**

345 The authors thankfully acknowledge the insightful advices from Ishita Mukhopadhyay (Professor,
346 Department of Economics, University of Calcutta) and S Anukriti (Senior Economist,
347 Development Research Group, The World Bank, Washington DC) as members of Research
348 Advisory Committee of author, Ms. Olivia Sarkar.

349 **Ethical Statement**

350 The study is based on freely downloadable secondary NFHS4 data, obtained from Demographic
351 Health Survey (<https://dhsprogram.com/methodology/survey/survey-display-355.cfm>) and hence
352 doesn't have ethical compliances.

353 **References**

- 354 1. Harlow SD, Campbell OM. Menstrual dysfunction: a missed opportunity for improving
355 reproductive health in developing countries. *Reproductive health matters*. 2000 Jan
356 1;8(15):142-7. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0968-8080\(00\)90016-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0968-8080(00)90016-8)
- 357 2. McMahon M, Martin M, Forde C. Contemporary issues in learning and teaching. *Contemporary*
358 *Issues in Learning and Teaching*. 2010:1-232. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446251805>
- 359 3. Muvea F. Menstruation a hindrance to girls education in Kenya. *Ezine Articles*. 2011. Retrived
360 from: http://EzineArticles.com/?expert=Felix_Muvea.
- 361 4. Mason L, Laserson KF, Oruko K, Nyothach E, Alexander KT, Odhiambo FO, Eleveld A, Isiyi
362 E, Ngere I, Omoto J, Mohammed A. Adolescent schoolgirls' experiences of menstrual cups and
363 pads in rural western Kenya: a qualitative study. *Waterlines*. 2015 Jan 1:15-30.
364 <http://dx.doi.org/i03362/i756-3488.2015.003>
- 365 5. Malusu LN, Zani AP. An evaluation of the perception of secondary school students towards
366 menstruation in Kenya. *African Journal of Education and Technology*. 2014;4(1):83-96.
367 [https://www.academia.edu/6694052/An_Evaluation_Of_The_Perception_Of_Secondary_Sch](https://www.academia.edu/6694052/An_Evaluation_Of_The_Perception_Of_Secondary_School_Students_Towards_Menstruation_In_Kenya_pp_83_96_Authors_MALUSU_Lucille_Ngayila_and_ZANI_Agnes_Philomena_)
368 [ool_Students_Towards_Menstruation_In_Kenya_pp_83_96_Authors_MALUSU_Lucille_Ng](https://www.academia.edu/6694052/An_Evaluation_Of_The_Perception_Of_Secondary_School_Students_Towards_Menstruation_In_Kenya_pp_83_96_Authors_MALUSU_Lucille_Ngayila_and_ZANI_Agnes_Philomena_)
369 [ayila_and_ZANI_Agnes_Philomena_](https://www.academia.edu/6694052/An_Evaluation_Of_The_Perception_Of_Secondary_School_Students_Towards_Menstruation_In_Kenya_pp_83_96_Authors_MALUSU_Lucille_Ngayila_and_ZANI_Agnes_Philomena_) .
- 370 6. Laws S. Gynaecology: One Patriarchal Mode of Knowledge On Menstruation. In *Issues of*
371 *Blood: The Politics of Menstruation* 1990 (pp. 133-159). London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.
372 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-21176-0_7 .
- 373 7. Fenster T. Space for gender: cultural roles of the forbidden and the permitted. *Environment and*
374 *Planning D: Society and Space*. 1999 Apr;17(2):227-46. <https://doi.org/10.1068/d170227> .

- 375 8. Nightingale AJ. Bounding difference: Intersectionality and the material production of gender,
376 caste, class and environment in Nepal. *Geoforum*. 2011 Mar 1;42(2):153-62.
377 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2010.03.004> .
- 378 9. Jewitt S, Ryley H. It'sa girl thing: Menstruation, school attendance, spatial mobility and wider
379 gender inequalities in Kenya. *Geoforum*. 2014 Sep 1;56:137-47.
380 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2014.07.006> .
- 381 10. National Rural Health Mission, Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of
382 India. Operational guidelines: promotion of menstrual hygiene among adolescent girls (10–19
383 years) in rural areas 2010. Retrieved from <https://sanitation.indiawaterportal.org/> .
- 384 11. Han S, Branas CC, MacDonald JM. The effect of a Sunday liquor-sales ban repeal on crime:
385 A triple-difference analysis. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research*. 2016
386 May;40(5):1111-21. <https://doi.org/10.1111/acer.13047> .
- 387 12. Muralidharan K, Prakash N. Cycling to school: Increasing secondary school enrollment for
388 girls in India. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*. 2017 Jul 1;9(3):321-50.
389 <https://doi.org/10.1257/app.20160004> .
- 390 13. El-Gilany AH, Badawi K, El-Fedawy S. Menstrual hygiene among adolescent schoolgirls in
391 Mansoura, Egypt. *Reproductive health matters*. 2005 Jan 1;13(26):147-52.
392 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0968-8080\(05\)26191-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0968-8080(05)26191-8) .
- 393 14. Paria B, Bhattacharyya A, Das S. A comparative study on menstrual hygiene among urban and
394 rural adolescent girls of West Bengal. *Journal of family medicine and primary care*. 2014
395 Oct;3(4):413. <https://doi.org/10.4103%2F2249-4863.148131> .
- 396 15. Chandra-Mouli V, Patel SV. Mapping the knowledge and understanding of menarche,
397 menstrual hygiene and menstrual health among adolescent girls in low-and middle-income

- 398 countries. The Palgrave handbook of critical menstruation studies. 2020:609-36.
399 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12978-017-0293-6> .
- 400 16. McDevitt J, Havens KK, Mundt M. Changes in Wellness Practices and Health Care Utilization
401 after an Educational Intervention for Perimenopausal Women. *Women's Studies Quarterly*.
402 2003 Apr 1;31(1/2):125-36. <https://doi.org/42.110.148.174> .
- 403 17. Mahon T, Fernandes M. Menstrual hygiene in South Asia: a neglected issue for WASH (water,
404 sanitation and hygiene) programmes. *Gender & Development*. 2010 Mar 1;18(1):99-113.
405 <https://doi.org/10.1080/13552071003600083> .
- 406 18. House S, Mahon T, Cavill S. Menstrual hygiene matters: a resource for improving menstrual
407 hygiene around the world. *Reproductive Health Matters*. 2013 May 1;21(41):257-9.
408 [https://doi.org/S0968-8080\(13\)4171](https://doi.org/S0968-8080(13)4171) .
- 409 19. Girod C, Ellis A, Andes KL, Freeman MC, Caruso BA. Physical, social, and political inequities
410 constraining girls' menstrual management at schools in informal settlements of Nairobi, Kenya.
411 *Journal of Urban Health*. 2017 Dec;94:835-46. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11524-017-0189-3> .
- 412 20. Hyttel M, Thomsen CF, Luff B, Storrusten H, Nyakato VN, Tellier M. Drivers and challenges
413 to use of menstrual cups among schoolgirls in rural Uganda: a qualitative study. *Waterlines*.
414 2017 Apr 1:109-24. <http://dx.doi.Org/W.3362/17S6-3488.16-0> .
- 415 21. Shah SP, Nair R, Shah PP, Modi DK, Desai SA, Desai L. Improving quality of life with new
416 menstrual hygiene practices among adolescent tribal girls in rural Gujarat, India. *Reproductive*
417 *Health Matters*. 2013 Jan 1;21(41):205-13. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0968-8080\(13\)41691-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0968-8080(13)41691-9) .
- 418 22. Garikipati S, Boudot C. To pad or not to pad: towards better sanitary care for women in Indian
419 slums. *Journal of International Development*. 2017 Jan;29(1):32-51.
420 <https://doi.org/10.1002/jid.3266> .

- 421 23. Rajagopal S, Mathur K. ‘Breaking the silence around menstruation’: experiences of adolescent
422 girls in an urban setting in India. *Gender & Development*. 2017 May 4;25(2):303-
423 17.<https://doi.org/10.1080/13552074.2017.1335451> .
- 424 24. Sommer M. Structural factors influencing menstruating school girls' health and well-being in
425 Tanzania. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*. 2013 May
426 1;43(3):323-45. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2012.693280> .
- 427 25. Blake S, Boone M, Yenew Kassa A, Sommer M. Teaching girls about puberty and menstrual
428 hygiene management in rural Ethiopia: Findings from a pilot evaluation. *Journal of Adolescent*
429 *Research*. 2018 Sep;33(5):623-46. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0743558417701246> .
- 430 26. Hennegan J, Shannon AK, Rubli J, Schwab KJ, Melendez-Torres GJ. Women’s and girls’
431 experiences of menstruation in low-and middle-income countries: A systematic review and
432 qualitative metasynthesis. *PLoS medicine*. 2019 May 16;16(5):e1002803.
433 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1002803> .