

INVOLVEMENT OF RURAL PEOPLE IN SWACHH BHARATH MISSION - A STUDY ON SOCIO ECONOMIC PROFILE

ABSTRACT

Study was carried out in 2020-2021 from Dharwad taluk (Dharwad district) and Muddebihal taluk (Vijayapura district) of Karnataka. The present research aimed to explore the existing awareness and involvement about Swachh Bharath Mission among rural people. A total of 320 respondents were selected for the study through purposive random sampling technique. Data was collected through personal interview method and analyzed through frequency and percentages. Swachh Bharath Abhiyan is not a new programme. Launched in 1986 as the central rural sanitation programme, the scheme advanced became the total sanitation campaign (1999) and nirmalbharathabhiyan (2012). Some regard it as simply a rebranding. It can be concluded from the study that, higher percentage of the respondents belonged to poor class of socio-economic status. Half of the respondents were members of self-help groups. Maximum per cent of respondents possessed television followed by mobile and radio. Gram panchayath was the Source of SBM information according to majority of respondents. Most of the respondents had simple Indian toilets at their houses and more than half of the respondents constructed the toilets through government financial support. Large majority of the respondents carrying the water in bucket to the toilet and little more than the one third of the respondents mentioned inadequate water facility as the reason for non-construction of toilet. Nearly half of the respondents were using cotton cloths during menstruation. Major per cent of the respondents were practice of changing pads/cloths during menstruation at an interval of 5-7 hrs. Large majority of the respondents had open drainage system and majority of the respondents did not practice segregation of wastes and majority of the respondents disposing waste in garbage pit.

Keywords: Nirmal Bharath Abhiyan, Total Sanitation Campaign, Rural Women, Rural Sanitation.

Introduction

India houses about one-sixth of the world's population. Around 68 per cent of the country's population lives in the rural areas. It is the seventh largest economy in world and the third largest by purchasing power parity adjusted exchange rates. It also has the one of the fastest growing service sectors in the world. There are however, significant, challenges to the provision of environmental services such as water, sanitation, solid waste management and drainage. More than 50 per cent of the Indians especially in the rural areas continue to defecate in the open. Abhimanyu, and Anshu, 2010, Alka, (2017).

The current status of sanitation in India is reflected in the extract below from Joint Monitoring Programme (JMP) of the WHO and UNICEF the sanitation coverage increased from 1 per cent in 1981 to 9 per cent in 1991 to 22 per cent in 2001. In 2011 also, the census reported the coverage to be around 31 per cent, 31 per cent in 2012 to 38.81 per cent in 2013 and 49.02 per cent as on 2015. 93.3 per cent in 2019. Chakkarwarand Kinge (2018), Desai (2018).

India is still slave to polluted and unhygienic conditions even after decades of independence which could be seen in the difficulty of rural vulnerable people. Rapid population explosion and industrial growth has led to solid and liquid waste management problems and water availability for toilets in every household. Change in attitude and behaviour about toilet use is required. Problem is not the accessibility of resources but the awareness in rural areas. Devendra (2016), Dhamija (2016), Shilja and Vivek (2015).

Methodology

The study was conducted in Northern Karnataka districts in the year 2020-21. Dharwad and Vijayapur districts were considered for the study further Dharwad and Muddebihal taluks were selected from chosen districts of Northern Karnataka (Dharwad & Vijayapur). From each selected taluk gram panchayath was carefully chosen for the study. Thus Hebballi and Hadalagerigram panchayath were selected from Dharwad and Muddebihal taluk. About 80 men and 80 women respondents from each of selected gram panchayath were selected at random to form a sample of 160 respondents. Thus a total of 320 respondents formed the sample for the study through purposive random sampling technique.

Comment [DS1]: Based on which factor???

Data was collected through personal interview method and analyzed through frequency and percentages.

ResultsAnd Discussion

Socio economic profile of the rural people

The demographic profile of the rural people from Muddebihal and Dharwadtaluksof Hadalageri gram panchayath and Hebballi gram panchayath are presented in Table 1.

Age

The age of the respondents from Hadalageri gram panchayath observed that more than forty-oneper cent (41.88 %) of the respondents belonged to the young age group (<35 years) followed by middle aged group (36-55 years) (36.25 %) and only 21.87 per cent of the respondents belonged to old age group (> 55 years). From Hebballi gram panchayath,more than forty per cent (42.50 %) of the respondents were in middle age group followed by young

Table 1: Socio economic profile of the rural people

n = 320

Variables	GP1 (n ₁ = 160)		GP2 (n ₂ = 160)		Total n = 320	
	F	%	F	%	F	%
Age (years)						
Young (<35)	67	41.88	59	36.87	126	39.38
Middle (36–55)	58	36.25	68	42.5	126	39.37
Old (> 55)	35	21.87	33	20.63	68	21.25
Gender						
Male	80	50.00	80	50.00	160	50.00
Female	80	50.00	80	50.00	160	50.00
Education						
Illiterate	51	31.88	43	26.88	94	29.38
Primary school (1 st - 4 th)	45	28.12	71	44.37	116	36.25
Middle school (5 th - 7 th)	06	3.75	06	3.75	12	3.75
High school (8 th - 10 th)	49	30.62	30	18.75	79	24.68

Pre-university (11 th -12 th)	06	3.75	06	3.75	12	3.76
Graduation	03	1.88	04	2.5	7	2.18
Caste						
Upper caste	33	20.63	89	55.63	122	38.12
OBC	43	26.88	02	1.25	45	14.06
SC	21	13.12	29	18.12	50	15.63
ST	63	39.37	40	25.00	103	32.19
Religion						
Hindu	144	90.00	147	91.88	294	91.88
Muslim	16	10.00	13	8.12	29	9.062
Marital status						
Married	139	86.88	144	90.00	283	88.43
Unmarried	18	11.25	05	3.12	23	7.19
Widow/widower	03	1.87	11	6.88	14	4.38

age group (36.87 %) and least per cent (20.63 %) of the respondents comes under old age group.

Overall, irrespective of the gram panchayaths it was found that equal per cent (39.37 %) of the respondents belonged to young (<35 years) and middle age groups (36-55 years) and only 21.25 per cent of the respondents belonged to old age group (>55 years).

Gender

Gender of the respondents depicted in Table 1. On the examination of the data, irrespective of the gram panchayaths half of the respondents (50.00 %) were male and female.

Education

Level of education as indicated in Table 1 revealed that among the respondents from Hadalageri gram panchayath less than one third (31.88 %) of the respondents were illiterates, followed by high school level (30.62 %), primary school education (28.12 %). Least and equal per cent (3.75 %) of the respondents educated up to middle school, Pri-university

education and meagre per cent (1.88 %) were graduates whereas 44.37 per cent of the respondents from Hebballi gram panchayath had studied up to primary school education, followed by illiterates (26.88 %), high school education (18.75 %) and equal per cent (3.75 %) of the respondents had finished middle school and pre-university level of education and only 2.5 per cent were graduates.

Table 1Cont...

Variables	GP1 (n ₁ = 160)		GP2 (n ₂ = 160)		Total n = 320	
	F	%	F	%	F	%
Family type						
Nuclear Family	97	60.62	97	60.65	194	60.62
Joint Family	53	33.13	63	39.38	116	36.25
Extended	10	6.25	-	-	10	3.13
Family size						
Small (1-4) members	57	35.62	102	63.75	159	49.69
Medium (5-8) members	100	62.5	52	32.5	152	47.5
Large (> 9) members	03	1.88	06	3.75	9	2.82
Occupation						
Government service	10	6.25	03	1.88	13	4.07
Service in private	30	18.75	43	26.88	73	22.81
Farming	62	38.75	47	29.37	109	34.06
Self employed	24	15.00	31	19.37	55	17.18
Labourer	34	21.25	36	22.50	70	21.88
Family income						
Low (<4)	86	53.75	49	30.63	135	42.18
Medium (4-6)	33	20.62	69	43.12	102	31.89
High (>6)	41	25.63	42	26.25	83	25.93

Note: GP1 = (Hadalageri)
GP2 = (Hebballi)

Generally, more than one third (36.25 %) of total respondents had primary school education followed by illiterates (29.38 %), high school education (24.68 %). Least and equal per cent (3.76 %) of the respondents had studied up to middle school and pre-university level education and only 2.18 per cent of the respondents had graduation.

Caste

With respect to caste category (Table 1) revealed that among Hadalageri gram panchayath nearly forty per cent (39.37 %) of the respondents belonged to ST category, followed by OBC category (26.88 %), upper caste category (20.63 %) and lesser per cent (13.12 %) of the respondents belonged to SC category. Regarding Heballi gram panchayath more than fifty per cent (55.63 %) of the respondents were in upper caste category followed by Schedule Tribes (25.00 %), Schedule Caste category (18.12 %) and least number of the respondents were in OBC category (1.25 %).

As a whole, nearly forty per cent (38.12 %) of the respondents were in upper caste category followed by Schedule Tribes (32.19 %), Schedule Caste category (15.63 %) and only 14.06 per cent of the respondent were comes under OBC category.

Religion

The data on religion depicted in the Table 1 shows that Hadalageri gram panchayath maximum per cent (90.00 %) of the respondents belonged to Hindu religion and rest of the respondents were Muslims (10.00 %). The same trend continued in case of Hebballi gram panchayath where in greater majority (91.88 %) of the respondents belonged to Hindu religion and only 8.12 per cent of the respondents were Muslims.

Generally, the same trend continued in case of total respondents where in maximum per cent (90.88 %) of the respondents belonged to Hindu religion and least per cent (9.12 %) of the respondents belonged to Muslim religion.

Marital status

Marital status of the Hadalageri gram panchayath respondents is depicted in the Table 1 shows that majority (86.88 %) of the respondents were married followed by unmarried (11.25 %) and meagre per cent (1.87 %) of the respondents were widow/widower. Whereas in Hebbali gram panchayath maximum per cent (90.00 %) of the respondents were married and lesser per cent (6.88 %) of them were widow/widower followed by unmarried (3.12 %).

In general total respondents, it is clear that high majority (88.43 %) of the respondents were married and least number were unmarried (7.19 %) followed by widow/ widower (4.38 %).

Family type

Family type of the respondents is depicted in the Table 1 indicates that most (60.62 %) of the Hadalageri gram panchayath respondents had nuclear family followed by joint family (33.13 %) and least number of the respondents belonged to extended family (6.25 %). With regard to Hebbali gram panchayath, most (60.65 %) of the respondents had nuclear family followed by joint family (39.38 %) and none of their respondents were having extended family.

Overall irrespective of the gram panchayaths family types, it indicates that most (60.62 %) of the respondents belonged to nuclear family followed by joint family (36.25 %) and least per cent (3.13 %) of the respondents comes under extended family.

Family size

Regarding family size of the Hadalageri gram panchayath most (62.50 %) of the respondents had medium family size (5-8 members) followed by small family size (1-4 members) (35.62 %) and meagre per cent (1.88 %) of the respondents were in large family (>9 members). More than sixty three per cent (63.75 %) of the respondents from Hebbali gram panchayath were in medium family size (5-8 members) followed by small family category (1-4 members) (32.50 %) and least per cent (3.75 %) of the respondents belonged to large family size (>9 members).

In total, it shows that nearly fifty per cent (49.69 %) of the respondents belonged to medium family size (5-8 members) followed by small family size (1-4 members) (47.50 %) and lesser per cent (3.13 %) of the respondents belonged to large family size (>9 members).

Occupation

Among the Hadalageri gram panchayath more than one third (38.75 %) of the respondents had farming as main occupation followed by labourer (21.25 %), private service (18.75 %), self-employed (15.00 %) and only 6.25 per cent of the respondents had government service. With respect to Hebballi gram panchayath nearly thirty per cent (29.37 %) of the respondents were having farming as main occupation followed by private service (26.88 %), labourer (22.50 %), and self-employed (19.37 %) and meagre per cent (1.88 %) of the respondents had government service.

In case of total respondents, it is observed that more than one third (34.06 %) of the respondents doing farming followed by private service (22.81 %), labourer (21.88 %), self-employed (17.18 %) and only 4.07 per cent of the respondents had government service.

Family income

Among the Hadalageri gram panchayath, more than fiftythree per cent (53.75 %) of the respondents had annual family income up to Rs.15000 *i.e.* low category. 25.63 per cent and 20.62 per cent of the respondents belonged to high income *i.e.* (>Rs 21000) and medium income categories *i.e.*, (Rs.15000-21000) respectively. In case of Hebballi gram panchayath less than fifty per cent (43.12 %) of the respondents belonged to medium income category (Rs.15000-21000) whereas, 30.63 per cent and 26.25 per cent of the respondents were in low income *i.e.*, (Rs.15000) and high income categories *i.e.*, (>Rs.21000) respectively.

With regard to whole sample less than fifty per cent (42.18 %) of the respondents had low income *i.e.*, (Rs.15000) followed by medium income *i.e.*, (15000-21000) (31.89 %) and high income *i.e.*, (>21000) (25.93 %) categories respectively.

Socio-economic status

The socio-economic status of the respondents was further studied by using the Aggrwalet *al.* (2005) scale and is presented in Table 2 & Fig 1. As per the scale, data was categorised into *viz.*, upper high, high, upper middle and lower middle, poor and very poor

group. Among the Hadalageri gram panchayath it is clear that, most (68.75 %) of the respondents were in poor class category further 18.75 per cent of them belonged to lower middle class. Only 12.5 per cent of them were very poor category of socio-economic status. With respect to Hebballi gram panchayath nearly fifty per cent (49.38 %) of the respondents were in poor class category followed by lower middle class (33.12 %). lesser per cent (17.5 %) of them fell in very poor category of socio-economic status.

Generally with respect to total respondents, it is clearly observed from the Table 2& Fig 1 that, nearly sixty per cent (59.06 %) of the respondents belonged to poor class category followed by lower middle class (25.94 %) and only 15.00 per cent of them were in very poor category of socio-economic status.

Social participation of the rural people

The data reported in the Table 3 indicates the social participation of rural people

From Hadalageri gram panchayath half (50.00 %) of the respondents were members of SHGs of which more than fifty three per cent (53.75 %) of the respondents participated

Table 2: Distribution of respondents based on their socio economic status

n = 320

Socio-economic status	GP1 (n ₁ = 160)		GP2 (n ₂ = 160)		Total n = 320	
	F	%	F	%	F	%
Upper high (>76)			-		-	
High (61-75)			-		-	
Upper Middle (46-60)			-		-	
Lower Middle (31-45)	30	18.75	53	33.12	83	25.93
Poor (16-30)	110	68.75	79	49.38	189	59.07
Very poor (<16)	20	12.5	28	17.5	48	15.00

Note: GP1 = (Hadalageri)

GP2 = (Hebballi)

Table 3: Social participation of the rural people

n = 320

Types	GP1 n ₁ = 160		GP2 n ₂ = 160		Degree of participation						Total n = 320		Degree of participation		
	M	OB	M	OB	GP1			GP2			M	OB	R	O	N
					R	O	N	R	O	N					
SHG	80 (50.00)		80 (50.00)	-	43 (53.75)	22 (27.5)	15 (18.75)	43 (53.75)	22 (27.5)	15 (18.7)	160 (50.00)	-	86 (53.75)	44 (27.5)	30 (20.00)
Gram panchayath	10 (6.25)		12 (7.5)		2 (20.00)	8 (80.00)		2 (16.66)	10 (83.33)	-	22 6.87	-	4 18.18	18 81.81	-
Village corperative societies	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-					
Taluk panchayath	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-					
Zilla panchayath	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-					

(Figures in the parentages indicate percentages)

Note: GP1 = (Hadalageri) M = member R = regularly O = occasionally N = never
 GP2 = (Hebballi) OB = office bearer

regularly whereas 27.5 per cent respondents participated occasionally remaining 18.75 per cent of respondents did not participated in SHGs and only 6.25 per cent of respondents were members of gram panchayath of which majority (80.00 %) of respondents participated occasionally and lesser per cent (20.00 %) of them participated regularly.

Similar trend was seen with respect to membership and degree of participation in the SHGs activities in case of respondents of Hebballi gram panchayath. With respect to total respondents half (50.00 %) of the respondents were members of SHGs of which more than fifty three per cent (53.75 %) of respondents participated regularly whereas 27.5 per cent respondents participated occasionally remaining 20.00 per cent respondents were did not participated in SHGs activities. Only 6.87 per cent of the respondents were members of gram panchayath of which majority (81.81 %) of respondents participated occasionally and only 18.18 per cent respondents participated regularly.

1.2 Extent of utilization of mass media by the rural people.

Data pertaining to extent of utilization of mass media participation by the respondents are depicted in Table 4. It is interestingly noted from the Table 4 that from Hadalageri gram panchayath majority (84.37 %) of the respondents possessed television followed by mobile (68.75 %). Lesser percentage (31.25 %) of the respondents were subscribers of newspapers. 25.00 per cent of the respondents possessed radio and 18.12 per cent of respondents possessed magazines. The data pertaining to mass media utilization revealed that, maximum per cent (92.59 %) of the respondents viewed television programmes regularly, while 7.40 per cent of them were occasional viewers. Regarding listening behaviour of the radio, majority (72.5 %) per cent of respondents were occasional listeners of radio programmes. The radio programmes were never listened by 5.00 per cent of the respondents. With respect to use of mobile, nearly forty five per cent (45.47 %) of the respondents were regular users of mobile followed by occasional users (43.64 %) remaining 10.90 per cent were never used mobile. Majority (82.75 %) of the respondents were occasional readers of the newspapers. Least and equal per cent (6.66 %) were regular and non-readers of newspapers respectively. Major per cent of the respondents (82.75 %) were occasional readers of magazines and 13.79 per cent were

Table 4: Extent of utilization of mass media by the rural people

n = 320

Media exposures	GP1	GP2	Frequency of use						Total n = 320	Frequency of use		
	n ₁ = 160	n ₂ = 160	GP1			GP2				R	O	N
	S/P	S/P	R	O	N	R	O	N				
News paper	50 (31.25)	60 (37.5)	3 (6.00)	44 (88.00)	3 (6.00)	2 (3.33)	56 (93.33)	2 (3.33)	110 (34.37)	5 (4.54)	100 (90.90)	5 (4.54)
Magazines	29 (18.12)	36 (22.5)	1 (3.46)	24 (82.75)	4 (13.79)	2 (5.55)	31 (86.11)	3 (8.33)	65 (20.31)	3 (4.61)	55 (84.61)	7 (10.76)
Radio	40 (25.00)	55 (34.37)	2 (5.00)	29 (72.5)	9 (22.5)	3 (7.5)	41 (74.54)	11 (20.00)	95 (29.68)	5 (5.26)	70 (73.68)	20 (21.05)
Television	135 (84.37)	155 (96.87)	125 (92.59)	10 (7.40)	-	145 (93.54)	10 (6.45)	-	290 (90.62)	270 (93.11)	20 (6.89)	-
Mobile	110 (68.75)	126 (78.75)	50 (45.47)	48 (43.64)	12 (10.90)	54 (42.85)	52 (41.26)	20 (15.87)	236 (73.75)	104 (44.07)	100 (42.38)	32 (13.55)

(Figures in the parentheses indicate percentages) Note: GP1 = (Hadalageri) GP2 = (Hebballi) S = subscriber P = possession R = regularly O = occasionally N = never

never read the magazines. The regular reading of the magazines was observed among only 3.46 per cent of respondents.

The same trend was continued in case of respondents of Hebballi gram panchayath where in maximum per cent (96.87 %) of the respondents possessed television followed by mobile (78.75 %) and lesser percentage (37.5 %) of the respondents were subscribers of newspapers. More than one third (34.37 %) of the respondents possessed radio and 22.5 per cent of respondents subscribed magazines.

The data pertaining to mass media utilization revealed that, maximum per cent (93.45 %) of the respondents viewed television programmes regularly, while 6.45 per cent of them were occasional viewers. Regarding listening behaviour of the radio, majority (74.40 %) of respondents were occasional listeners of radio programmes. The radio programmes never listened by 20.00 per cent of the respondents. Concerning the mobile, nearly forty two per cent (41.26 %) of the respondents were regular users of mobile followed by occasional users (42.85 %). Remaining 15.87 per cent were never used mobile. Maximum per cent of the respondents (93.33 %) were occasional readers of the newspapers. Least and equal per cent (3.33 %) were regular and non- readers of news- papers respectively. Major per cent of the respondents (86.11 %) were occasional readers of magazines and 8.33 per cent were never read the magazines. The regular reading of the magazines was observed among only 5.55 per cent of respondents.

In total maximum percentage (90.62 %) of the respondents possessed television followed by mobile (73.75 %). More than one third (34.37 %) of the respondents were subscribers of newspapers. Nearly thirty per cent (29.68 %) of the respondents possessed radio and 20.33 per cent of respondents subscribed magazines.

The data pertaining to mass media utilization revealed that, maximum per cent (95.21 %) of the respondents were regular viewed of television programmes while 6.89 per cent of them were occasional viewers.

Regarding listening behaviour of the radio, majority (73.68 %) of respondents were occasional listeners of radio programmes. The radio programmes never listened by 21.05 per cent of the respondents.

As regards the mobile, nearly forty five per cent (44.07 %) of the respondents were regular users of mobile followed by occasional users (42.38 %) remaining 13.55 per cent were never used mobile.

Maximum per cent of the respondents (90.92 %) were occasional readers of the newspapers. Least and equal per cent (4.54 %) were regular and non- readers of news- papers respectively.

Majority (84.62 %) of the respondents were occasional readers of magazines and 10.76 per cent were never read the magazines. The regular reading of the magazines was observed among only 4.54 per cent of respondents.

1.3 Source of information about Swachh Bharath Mission

The Table 5 and Fig 2 depict the source of information by the respondents about SBM programme. From Hadalageri gram panchayath, most (71.87 %) of the respondents had received the information through gram panchayath whereas equal per cent (36.87 %) of them received the information by health workers and anganwadi workers followed by television (21.25 %), news- paper (10.62 %), radio (1.87 %), and local leaders (20.00 %). Equal and least per cent (0.62 %) of them received the information through mobile and magazines. In case of Hebballi gram panchayath higher percentage (98.75 %) of the respondents had received the information through gram panchayath while 31.27 per cent and 24.37 per cent of them got information by health workers and television respectively. Lesser percentages of respondents received the information by anganwadi workers (20.00 %), local leaders (16.87 %), news-paper (11.25 %) and radio (8.12 %). Meagre and equal per cent (0.62 %) of them received the information through mobile and magazines.

Overall, irrespective of the gram panchayaths it was observed that majority (85.31 %) of the respondents received information through gram panchayaths followed by health workers (34.37 %) television (22.81 %), anganwadi workers (21.25 %), local leaders (18.43 %), news- paper (10.93 %), and radio (5.00 %). Meagre and equal per cent (0.62 %) of them received the information through mobile and magazines.

4 Sanitary practices followed by the respondents

In this section results pertaining to the place of defecation, toilet constructed by, type of toilet, frequency of toilet cleaning, and mode of water supply to toilet.

Table 5: Source of information about SwachhBharat Mission**n= 320**

Sources	Panchayaths				Total n = 320	
	GP1 n ₁ = 160		GP2 n ₂ = 160			
	F	%	F	%	F	%
Television	34	21.25	39	24.37	73	22.81
Newspaper	17	10.62	18	11.25	35	10.93
Radio	03	1.87	13	8.12	16	5.00
Magazine	01	0.62	01	0.62	02	0.62
Mobile	01	0.62	01	0.62	02	0.62
Gram panchayath	115	71.87	158	98.75	273	85.31
Health workers	59	36.87	51	31.87	110	34.37
Local leaders	32	20.00	27	16.87	59	18.43
Anganwadi workers	59	36.87	32	20.00	68	21.25

*Multiple responses

Note: GP1 = (Hadalageri) GP2 = (Hebballi)




Figure 2 : Source of information about swachh Bharat mission

Place of defecation

From the Hadalageri gram panchayath Table 6a it indicates that little more than half (58.75 %) of respondents had latrines at their houses followed by open air defecation (41.25 %), none of the respondents used community latrines. With respect to Hebballi gram panchayath, most (73.13 %) of respondents had latrines at home while 26.87 per cent of respondents were practicing open air defecation, none of the respondents used community latrines.

Generally, the same trend continued in case of total respondents where in most (65.94 %) of respondents had latrines at their houses while 34.06 per cent of respondents were practicing open air defecation. None of the respondents used community latrines.

Toilets constructed by

The data presented in the Table 6a revealed that nearly sixty per cent (59.57 %) of the Hadalageri gram panchayath respondents were constructed toilet through government financial support, while 40.43 per cent respondents constructed on their own toilets. In case of Hebballi gram panchayath more than fifty-three per cent (53.85 %) of respondents took government financial support for construction of toilet however 46.15 per cent of the respondents were having own toilets.

The similar trend was seen in case of total respondents where in more than fifty five per cent (56.39 %) of the respondents constructed toilets through government financial support however 43.61 per cent of the respondents had constructed toilets on their own.

Type of toilets

Regarding Hadalageri gram panchayath (Table 6a) it was observed that, those respondents who were using toilets, where in most (58.75 %) of the respondents had simple Indian toilet and none of them used pit toilet. Among Hebballi gram panchayath where in majority (73.12 %) of the respondents had simple Indian toilet and none of the respondents used pit toilet.

In case of total respondents, most (65.93 %) of respondents had simple Indian toilet. None of them used pit toilet.

Table 6a: Sanitary practices followed by the respondents

n=320

Particulars	Panchayaths					
	GP1 n ₁ = 160		GP2 n ₂ = 160		Total n = 320	
	F	%	F	%	F	%
Place of defecation						
Latrine at home	94	58.75	117	73.13	211	65.94
Community latrines	-		-	-	-	-
Open air defecation,	66	41.25	43	26.87	109	34.06
Toilet constructed by						
Government	56	59.57	63	53.85	119	56.39
Own	38	40.43	54	46.15	92	43.61
Type of toilet						
Simple Indian toilet	94	58.75	117	73.12	211	65.93
Pit toilet	-		-		-	
Toilet cleaning						
Every day	2	2.12	1	0.86	3	1.43
Twice day	21	22.35	23	19.66	44	20.85
Weekly	57	60.64	62	52.99	119	56.39
Monthly	14	14.89	31	26.49	45	21.33
Mode of water supply to toilet						
Carrying in bucket	82	87.23	95	81.19	177	83.88
Fix tap inside the toilet	12	12.77	22	18.81	34	16.12

Note: GP1 = (Hadalageri) GP2 = (Hebballi)

Toilet cleaning

As the data explained related to toilet cleaning practices, it is evident from the Table 6a that most (60.64 %) of respondents of Hadalageri gram panchayath cleaned their toilets weekly, whereas 22.35 per cent and 14.89 per cent of them were in practice of clean their toilets twice a day and monthly respectively and only 2.12 per cent of were in habit of cleaning their toilets every day. Whereas in case Hebballi gram panchayath more than fifty two per cent (52.99 %) of the respondents were clean their toilets weekly. however 26.49 per cent and 19.66 per cent of them were in habit of cleaning their toilets monthly and twice a day respectively. Meagre per cent (0.86%) of them had habit of cleaning their toilets every day.

Overall, more than fifty five per cent (56.39 %) of the respondents irrespective of the locale of the study cleaning their toilets weekly whereas 21.33 per cent and 20.85 per cent of the respondents were cleaning their toilets monthly and twice a day respectively. Remaining 1.43 per cent of respondents were in habit of cleaning their toilets every day.

Mode of water supply to toilet

From the Table 6a it is depicted that among the Hadalageri gram panchayath respondents majority (87.23 %) of them carrying the water in bucket to the toilet. Rest 12.77 per cent of them had provision of taps inside the toilet. The similar trend was seen in Hebballi gram panchayath where in majority (81.19 %) of respondents carrying the water in bucket to the toilet. Rest 18.81 per cent of them had provision of taps inside the toilet.

On the examination of the data, irrespective of the gram panchayath with total sample same trend was continued where in majority (83.88 %) of them carrying the water in bucket to the toilet. Remaining 16.12 per cent of them had facility of fixed tap inside the toilet.

Reasons for non- construction of sanitary latrines

Among the Hadalageri gram panchayath it was observed that from the Table 6b, that more than the one third (37.87 %) of respondents opined inadequate water facility, was the reason for

non-construction of sanitary latrine at home. followed by lack of space (31.82 %) and lack of money (24.25 %) respectively, While least per cent (4.54 %) of them mentioned

Table 6b: Reasons for non -construction of sanitary latrines at home

Particulars	Panchayaths					
	GP1 n ₁ = 160		GP2 n ₂ = 160		Total n = 320	
	F	%	F	%	F	%
Lack of money	16	24.25	10	23.25	26	23.86
Lack of space	21	31.82	11	25.58	32	29.36
Lack of interest	01	1.52	04	9.30	05	4.58
Staying in rented house	03	4.54	04	9.31	07	6.42
Inadequate water	25	37.87	14	32.56	39	35.78

Note: GP1 = (Hadalageri) GP2 = (Hebballi)

the reason of staying in rented house. Only 1.52 per cent of them lack of interest was the reason. The same trend continued in case of Hebballi gram panchayath less than the one third (32.56 %) of respondents mentioned inadequate water facility followed by lack of space (25.58 %) and lack of money (23.25 %) respectively. However, least and almost equal per cent of the respondents indicated reasons of staying in rented home (9.31 %) and lack of interest (9.30 %) for non-construction of sanitary latrine.

Generally, the same trend continued in case of total respondents more than the one third (35.78 %) of them the reason of mentioned inadequate water facility followed by lack of space (29.36 %) and lack of money (23.86 %) respectively for non-construction of sanitary latrine and only 6.42 per cent and 4.58 per cent of them quoted staying in rented house and lack of interest were the reasons for non-construction sanitary latrines.

Conclusion

Swachh Bharath Abhiyan is not a new programme. Launched in 1986 as the central rural sanitation programme, the scheme advanced became the total sanitation campaign (1999) and nirmal bharaath abhiyan (2012). Some regard it as simply a rebranding. It can be concluded higher percentage of the respondents belonged to poor class of socio-economic status. Half of the respondents were members of self-help groups. Maximum per cent of respondents possessed television followed by mobile and radio. Gram panchayath was the Source of SBM information according to majority of respondents. Most of the respondents had simple Indian toilets at their houses and more than half of the respondents constructed the toilets through government financial support. Large majority of the respondents carrying the water in bucket to the toilet and little more than the one third of the respondents mentioned inadequate water facility as the reason for non-construction of toilet. Nearly half of the respondents were using cotton cloths

during menstruation. Major per cent of the respondents were practice of changing pads/cloths during menstruation at an interval of 5-7 hrs. Large majority of the respondents had open drainage system and majority of the respondents did not practice segregation of wastes and majority of the respondents disposing waste in garbage pit.

REFERENCE

- Aggarwal, O. P., Bhasin S. K., Chhabra, P., Aggarwal, K. and Rajoura, O. P., 2005, A new instrument (scale) for measuring the socio demographic variables of the study: A preliminary study. *Ind. J. Comm. Med.*, 34 (4): 111-114.
- Abhimanyu, and Anshu, 2010, Sanitation of toilets in elementary and senior secondary schools located in rural areas of Uttarkhand state in India. *Int. J. Sociol. & Anthopomet.*, 2 (8): 178-184.
- Alka, C., 2017, Swachh Bharath Mission-Need objective and Impact. *Int. J. Res. in Mngt. Pharma.*, 6 (5):24-27.
- Chakkarwar, P., and Kinge, A., 2018, A cross sectional study on assessment of epidemiological factors associated with open field defecation in a tribal community. *Int. J. Commun. Med Public Health*, 6 (1):164-167.
- Desai, S., 2018, A Review of Cleanliness Mission “Swachh Bharath Abhiyan” A Survey done for Thane District. *Int. J. Trend in Scient. Res. & Dev.*, 2 (4): 2824-2830.
- Devendra, 2016, Swachh Bharath Abhiyan Clean India Abhiyan. *Int. Res. J. Mngt.*, 3 (3): 75-81.
- Dhamija, A., 2016, Swachh Bharath Abhiyan at village tilpat-failure or success. *Int. J. Business Mngt. & Res.*, 6 (1): 7-14.
- Shilja, B., and Vivek, S., 2015, Management Lessons from Swachh Bharath Mission. *Int. J. Adv. Res. in Sci. & Engg.*, 4 (1): 214-220.

UNDER PEER REVIEW

