International Journal of Social Science and Human Research

ISSN (print): 2644-0679, ISSN (online): 2644-0695

Volume 07 Issue 03 March 2024

DOI: 10.47191/ijsshr/v7-i03-74, Impact factor- 7.876

Page No: 2083-2092

A Study of the Attitude of Women towards Environmental Sanitation

B.R. Leelavathi¹, P. Adinarayana Reddy²

¹Research Scholar, Department of Adult and Continuing Education, Sri Venkateswara University, Tirupati-517 602. Andhra Pradesh. India

²Prof. P. Adinarayana Reddy, Director (Rtd), Department of Adult and Continuing Education, Sri Venkateswara University, Tirupati-517 602. Andhra Pradesh, India.

ABSTRACT: Recognizing the relationship between attitude and personal characteristics, the study was taken up to identify the personal characteristics of the self-help group women, household head characterize and the family background their attitude towards environment sanitation with special reference to the areas of cleanliness, self-hygiene, drinking water and sewage and sewage disposal and the effect of the personal characteristics on the environmental sanitation.

The study was conducted in the Anantapur district of the Rayalaseema region of Andhra Pradesh. The attitude scale to measure environmental sanitation developed by the investigators has been administered to 400 randomly selected self-help group women. The collected data was analyzed by using statistical techniques like percentages, Mean, SD,t test and ANOVA to study the influence of personal characteristics on the attitude towards Environmental sanitation.

The finding of the study shows that the self-help group women are not similar in their characteristics. There is a significant difference between caste, and age groups of the women in the areas of cleanliness, Drinking water, and Sewage and sewage disposal but not in the case of sewage and sewage disposal. The women with different levels of education do differ in the areas of self-hygiene, drinking water, Sewage, and sewage Disposal but they do have similar attitudes in the case of cleanliness. The women with number of children do not differ from each other in all the areas. The Household heads of different age and Educational groups differ in their attitude towards Self Hygiene, Drinking water, Sewage and Sewage Disposal but have similar attitudes toward Cleanliness. The Male and Female groups of household heads differ from each other in all the areas of attitude indicating that Gender has a role in attitude formation toward Environmental Sanitation

The family background of the women i.e, the members in the family occupation, income ownership of the residence, and type of family has similar attitudes in the areas viz., Cleanliness, Self-Hygiene, Drinking water, Sewage, and sewage Disposal. It indicates that the family background of the sample does not have any role in the formation of attitudes toward Environmental Sanitation

KEYWORDS: Environmental sanitation, Cleanliness, Self-hygiene, drinking water, sewage and Sewage disposal, Self-help groups.

There is a direct relationship between health and environmental sanitation. Sanitation, safe water, and personal hygiene are directly related to diarrhoea. The communicable diseases can be effectively managed through improved sanitation and practice. It is proven that safe disposal of waste including faeces can reduce waterborne diseases significantly. Safe drinking water is attributed as an important factor for public health. Environmental sanitation includes safe drinking water and its storage, and disposal of wastewater, excreta, and refuse. The poor management of environmental sanitation is attributed as a threat to socio-economic development and human survival. Environmental sanitation helps to reduce tropical diseases, the spread of intestinal worms, reduces the impact of malnutrition, and promotes the dignity and safety of women and girls, prevents the spread of disease, protects from natural diseases leading to healthy living. Recognizing the importance of environmental sanitation, several efforts have been made such as the Central Rural Sanitary Program, Total Sanitary Campaign, Swachh Bharath Mission, National School Sanitary Initiative, Rajiv Gandhi National Drinking Water Mission (RGNDWM),Jal Jeevan Mission, Swachh Bharath Abhiyaan Mission etc. to promote environmental sanitation. The success of the programs largely depends upon the participation of the target for whom the programs were designed. The participation of the target largely lies in their knowledge and attitude towards these programs. In other words, before launching these programmes an effort should be made to create awareness in the community.

The facilities created or available for safe drinking water and sanitation do not serve the purses if they are not used adequately. To promote health which is an important indicator of human resources, efforts are required to promote the healthy habits

of consumption of safe drinking water and practice of good sanitation. The sanitary and hygienic practices mostly depend on the women who are taking care of it both inside and outside and their knowledge and attitude towards them.

In other words, the women's participation in maintaining environmental sanitation depends on their attitude. Further attitude development also depends on the knowledge of the above. Bad environmental sanitation affects the health of the people and quality of the human resources. It was rightly said that inadequate access to sanitation and hygiene disproportionally affects poor women and girls as they are often faced with additional challenges relating to menstrual hygiene, personal safety, sexual harassment, and violence. Without access to latrines, many women and girls become prisoners of daylight, using only the night as privacy. Nighttime trips to fields and roadsides expose them to risk and physical attack and sexual violence. Ignoring their natural bodily functions, out of fear, causes discomfort but also increases the risk of being affected by health problems such as urinary tract infections, chronic constipation, and mental stress. In many countries, school attendance by girls is lower and dropout rates are significantly higher in schools that have low access to safe water and no separate toilet facilities for boys and girls (SIDA, 2016). In most Societies, women have primary responsibility for the management of household water supply and health. They are so involved in food production and preparation, care of domestic animals, personal hygiene, care of the sick, cleaning and washing, and waste disposal (U.N. WATER-2006).

Lack of sanitation facilities and poor hygiene causes waterborne diseases, such as diarrhea, cholera, typhoid, and several parasitic infections. Moreover, the incidence of these diseases and others linked to poor sanitation- e.g., roundworm, whip worm, guinea worm, and Schistosomiasis – is highest among the poor, especially school-aged children. Each year more than 2.2 million people in developing countries die from preventable diseases associated with lack of access to safe drinking water inadequate sanitation and poor hygiene. The social and environmental health costs of ignoring the need to address sanitation (including hygiene and wastewater collection and treatment) are far greater.

A survey by water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) in India (2008) estimated that with regards to sanitation most of India's population (69%) did not use improved sanitation. In rural parts of India,79% of the population used unimproved sanitation facilities. Over 50% of India's population defecated in the open field the majority (88%) of the population in India had access to improved sources of drinking water. One-fourth of the population has water availability in their household premises. The majority (87%) of women used to collect water. Most (67%) of Indian household do not treat drinking water in any form. Hand washing with soap and water was practiced by 53% after defecation, 38% before eating, and 30% before preparing food. The report showed that most (80%) of the child's stool was not disposed of safely. The study stressed the importance of maintaining good sanitation facilities and develops hygienic practices.

The Hindu newspaper reported that out of 2.26 lakh rural households, almost seven and half lakh (7,758) households in Udupi Taluk, 13,395 households in Kundapura Taluk, and 4,084 household in Kerala Taluk do not have toilets. The survey stressed on the importance of toilet. Deshpande K., Kakkar R. and Diwan V reported that the majority (84%) of households did not have water sources within their household area. Most of the females in the household (58%) spent 1 hour 25 minutes to collect water from a stored vessel. Almost all (100%) practiced filtering water by cloth or plastic sieve. The study concluded that people were not aware of water purification.

The above clearly highlights that the women who are the custodians and caretakers of the health in the families do not have access to adequate health facilities and awareness to make use of them. Hence, there is a need to create awareness among them about environmental sanitation and its effect on their family to develop proper attitudes. In order to provide that there is a need to assess the attitude possessed by the women in selected areas of environmental sanitation.

In view of the above an effort has been made to review the literature and the studies conducted in the area of environmental sanitation show that significant studies have been undertaken in areas such as environmental health, environmental knowledge, sanitation and sanitary practices mostly in terms of KAP studies on various issues such as Reshma, Mamatha, Pai and Manjula (2016), Mohd R, Malik (2017), Rima Kumari Sah, Prem Kumar Sah, Jitendra Kumar Sah, Sudip Chiluwal, Sanjeev Kumar Shah (2017), Sangita Singh (2019), Anita Dewi Moelyaningrum (2019), Almasi, A., Mohammadi, M., Azizi, A., Berizi, Z., Shamsi, K., Shahbazi, A. and Mosavi, S.A. (2019), Godfred Safo Adu, Ruby Hanson (2019), Khushbu Yadav, Basant Kumar Yadav, Satyam Prakash (2020), Seth Senyo Osafo, Nelson Kojo Brany, Wisdom Kwaku Yegbe (2020), Maria Zakria, Sumaira Raiz, Muhammad Afzal and Syed Amir Gilani Abdul Majad (2021), Sushma Katkuri (2021), Muiz Uddin Ahmed Choudhury, Monowar Ahmad Tarafdar, Md. Abdul Majid Miah, Shila Rani Das, Tonim Amir Haque, Syed Shawkat Ahmed (2021), Manisha B Sinha, Surabhi Sahay (2023), Raza R, Khan R, Ahmed F, Urooj S, Khan N, Chishti DK (2023), The review of the literature shows that not many attempts have been made to study women's attitudes in different aspects of environmental sanitation. Hence present study was taken up to measure the attitude of the women and factors contributing to the same. The specific objectives of the study are as follows.

Objective Of The Study

1. To identify the profile of the women participating in the Self-Helf Groups

- 2. To study the role of personal characteristics of the sample women on their attitude towards different areas of Environmental Sanitation.
- 3. To understand the role of the characteristics of the household head on the attitude possessed by the Self-Help Group women towards different areas of Environmental Sanitation.
- 4. To study the attitudinal differences of the women belonging to different family background groups in different areas of environmental sanitation.

The Hypothesis Of The Study

- 1. The women participating in the Self Help Groups are not similar in their personal characteristics
- 2. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of different groups of the personal characteristics of the sample in the areas of cleanliness, drinking water, and sewage and sewage disposal.
- 3. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of different household head groups of the sample in the areas of cleanliness, drinking water, and sewage and sewage disposal.
- 4. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of the different family background groups of the sample in the areas of cleanliness, drinking water, and sewage and sewage disposal.

METHODOLOGY

The study was conducted in the Rayalaseema region of Andhra Pradesh State which is a newly carved state in the southern part of the country with 4.93 crores of population with literacy rate of 67.40%. Among the total population, 48% are women. Geographically, the state has 3 regions northern coastal Adhara, southern coastal Andhra, and Rayalaseema. Rayalaseema is most backward in terms of education and socio-economic status. There are 8 Districts in the region. For the present study, Anantapur was selected as an area of the study as it is one of the most backward districts of the region. The district was divided into 3 Revenue Divisions viz, Ananthapuramu, Gunthakal, and Kalyanadurg, which are further subdivided into 32 Mandals headed by a Sub Collector. There are about 36 thousand Self Help Groups in the district. For the present study, a random sampling method was adopted for the selection of the sample. Out of 32 mandals, 10 manuals were selected randomly in the first stage of sample selection. In the second stage, from each mandal 40 members were drawn randomly from 10 Self-help Groups i.e., 4 from each group. Thus, the sample of the study includes 400 members of self-help members.

RESEARCH TOOLS

The present study aims to study the attitude of the Self-Help Group women towards Environmental Sanitation with special reference to Cleanliness, Self-Hygiene, Drinking water, Sewage and Sewage Disposal. As there are no readily available standardized tools, the investigator attempted to develop a tool consisting of two sections. section I is designed to identify the personal background of the sample. The part II is intended to identify the attitude of the sample towards Environmental Sanitation. The items were drawn from the review of the literature and supplemented from the sample of the study. Initial they were 50 items. The list was submitted to a panel of five experts to review the items. The panel has deleted 10 items and suggested to include a scale with 5 cues to measure the attitude of the sample. The items were classified into 4 groups i.e., Cleanliness, Self-Hygiene, Drinking water, Sewage and Sewage Disposal. The sample has to go through the attitudinal items and should agree with one of the cues given to rate their level of attitude. Out of 40 items, an equal number of them represented positive and negative items.

DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

Before administering the research tool, the investigator contacted selected sample self-help groups in each division individually and informed them about the importance of the study, tentative date and time was fixed to meet the sample selected for the study and the schedule prepared for the present study was administered to the selected sample individually. The responses were noted in verbatim to get accurate and qualitative data for all the sections of the tool.

The data collected from the various groups of women representing self-help groups had been pooled. While pooling the data, the information was drawn from the two sections of the tool viz., personal information inventory and attitude scale. they were classified into different groups based on their personal characteristics. The attitude item scores were pooled together and the sample was categorized into different attitudinal groups. Further, 't' test Chi-square test, and ANOVA tests were applied to establish the difference or relationship, or association among the independent and dependent variables to test the hypotheses.

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

As one of the objectives of the study is to present the profile of the Self-Help Group women members to understand their personal, household head, and Family background. The variables like Age, Caste, Education, Marital status, and Number of children, come under personal characteristics. The details like Age, Sex, Status of Marriage, and Education, were collected under Household head characteristics. Under family details, number of persons in the family, Occupation, Type of house, Family income, and type of

family were considered. The collected data was pooled together and classified the sample into different groups based on their personal characteristics. The details are presented below.

PERSONAL BACKGROUND OF THE SAMPLE

The sample was classified into different groups based on their Age, Caste, Level of Education, Marital status, and Number of Children. The Analysed information is presented in the table.1

1. The Age-wise classification of the sample

In order to examine the distribution of the sample based on their age, they were classified into 4 groups less than 30 years,31-40 years,41-50 years, and 51 and above. The classification of the sample shows that 34.8% were from 31-40 years of age followed by 41-50 years and >51 with 27% and 27.2% respectively. Contrary to the above, only 11% of the sample was from less than 30 years. The overall trend shows that the majority of the sample was from middle-aged (31-40)

Table.1: Personal Characteristics of the sample

| S.No. | Character | Group | F | % |
|-------|----------------|---|-----|-------|
| 1 | Age | < 30 years | 44 | 11.00 |
| | | 31-40 years | 139 | 34.80 |
| | | 41-50 years | 108 | 27.00 |
| | | 51 > years | 109 | 27.25 |
| 2 | Caste | SC and ST | 96 | 24.00 |
| | | BC | 230 | 57.50 |
| | | OC | 74 | 18.50 |
| 3 | Education | Illiterates | 164 | 41.00 |
| | | Five years of schooling | 94 | 23.50 |
| | | 6 th to 10 th class | 92 | 23.00 |
| | | Intermediate | 34 | 8.50 |
| | | Graduate and above | 16 | 4.00 |
| 4 | Marital Status | Married | 364 | 91.00 |
| | | Unmarried | 1 | 0.20 |
| | | Widow | 35 | 8.80 |
| 4 | No of children | No children | 50 | 12.50 |
| | | 1 | 140 | 35.00 |
| | | | | |
| | | 2 | 159 | 39.80 |
| | | 3 > | 47 | 11.80 |

2. Caste-wise classification of the Sample

The sample was divided into three caste groups as SC& ST, BC, and OC. The result of the division of the sample based on the caste presented in the table shows that the majority of the sample comes from Backward communities (57.5%) followed by SC and ST groups with 20% and 18.5% respectively. The trend of the representation of the sample shows that the majority of the sample came under BC and the least was from ST category.

3. Educational status of the self-help group women

The sample based on the education were classified into five groups as illiterates, School-educated (up to 5^{th} class), 6^{th} to 10^{th} Class, Intermediate, Graduation, and above. The division of the sample shows that 41% of them were illiterates, approximately an equal number of them had attended five years of schooling, and others with 10 years of schooling. Against this, 8% of the women have completed their intermediate education and 4% have completed

their graduation. From the above, we can conclude that the majority of the members of self-help group members are illiterate or low-educated.

4. Marital status and number of children

The marital status of the sample presented in the table shows that the members of the self-help groups are married except one and 8.10 % of them are widows. Further, the sample was also classified based on the number of children as no children, one child, two children, and three or more. The findings reveal that 39.8% of them have two children, one child (35%), no children (12.50%), and have three or more children (11.80%).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE SAMPLE BASED ON THE HOUSEHOLD HEAD

To examine the distribution of the sample from different household head backgrounds, they were classified into different groups based on the age, gender, and education of the head of the family and No of children in the family. The classified information is presented in

Table 2.

The age of the household head of the sample shows that one-third (33%) of them were in the age group of 41-50 years followed by 51-60 years (30.2%) and 31-40 years (27%). Further, it is also observed that only 2.25% of them were younger in age group (less than 30 years) and about 6.85% of them were elders (61 and above years of age).

The gender of the head of the family revealed that the majority of the households were headed by males (90%) and only 10% of the households were headed by females. The marital status shows that 91% were married and only 0.2% of the sample were unmarried. Further 8.8% of the sample were widows. The education level of the head of the household shows that 35.50% of them were illiterate and 64.50% were literate. Under the literate group, 20.75% have come under the 6th to 10th class and 18.75% of the household heads have inter qualification. 11.70% of the household heads completed their graduation and above. completed their intermediate level. Contrary to this13.25% were low educated.

FAMILY BACKGROUND

The range of the number of members in a family was 1 to 6. The majority of the families (37.8%) had 4 members followed by 3 members (28%). It also shows that 18.8% of the sample had only 2 members in a family and 10.2% of the sample had 5 members. Contrary to this only 3.5% of the sample had only one member followed by 1.8% who had 6 members in the family.

To examine the distribution of the sample from different income groups, they were classified into 3 groups as those with below 50,000 incomes per annum, Rs. 50,001-1,00,000, and more than one lakh income per annum. The representation of the sample shows that only 4 % of them were from a low-income group and majority of them were from middle-income groups and 11.8% of them were from high-income groups.

Table 2: Household head background of the self-help group women

| S.No. | Variable | Group | F | % |
|----------|----------------------|---|-----|-------|
| 1 | | Below 30 years | 9 | 2.20 |
| | Age | 31-40 Years | 108 | 27.00 |
| | | 41-50 years | 135 | 33.80 |
| | | 51 and above years | 147 | 37.00 |
| 2 | Gender | Male | 360 | 90.00 |
| | | Female | 40 | 10.00 |
| 3 | Education | Illiterates | 142 | 35.50 |
| | | Literates | 37 | 9.25 |
| | | Up to 5th class | 16 | 4.00 |
| | | 6 th to 10 th class | 83 | 20.75 |
| | | Inter | 75 | 18.75 |
| | | Graduation and above | 47 | 11.75 |
| Family B | Background | | | |
| 3 | No of members in the | 1 | 14 | 3.50 |
| | family | 2 | 75 | 18.80 |
| | | 3 | 112 | 28.00 |
| | | 4 | 151 | 37.80 |
| | | 5 | 41 | 10.20 |
| | | 6 | 7 | 1,80 |
| 4 | Income | Less than 50,000 | 16 | 4.00 |
| | | 50001 to 1,00,000 | 337 | 84.20 |
| | | One lakh and above | 47 | 11.80 |
| 5 | Type of family | Nuclear | 368 | 92.00 |
| | | Joint | 32 | 8.00 |
| 6 | Occupation | Business | 32 | 8.00 |
| | | Agriculture | 76 | 19.00 |
| | | Private employee | 78 | 19.50 |

| | | Labour work | 214 | 53.50 |
|----|-------------|-------------|-----|-------|
| 7 | Residence | Own | 374 | 93.50 |
| | | Rented | 26 | 6.50 |
| 8. | No of Rooms | 1 | 8 | 2.00 |
| | | 2 | 358 | 89.50 |
| | | 3 | 17 | 4.20 |
| | | 4 > | 17 | 3.50 |

To understand the ownership of the residential accommodation, the sample was divided into two groups residing in the Owen house and rented accommodation. The details presented in the table show that 93.5% of the sample possessed their own houses and only 6.5% of them were in rented accommodation, especially in urban areas.

The occupation of the head of the household shows that more than half of them were daily wage earners (53.50%). Approximately an equal proportion of them were from private employees and agriculturists respectively. Further 8% of the heads of the household depends on business. The sample based on the type of their residence were categorized as sample residing in their own houses and rented. It is observed that the majority of the sample had their own houses (93.50%) and only 6.50% of them were in rented accommodation.

The size of the accommodation shows that it ranges between one to five rooms. The majority of the families (89.5%) had two rooms and a smaller proportion of the families possessed 3 and more than 5 rooms i.e. 4.2% and 3.5% respectively. Further, only 2% of them were having 4 rooms.

The analysis shows that the sample selected for the study are from different groups. Majority of the sample are above 41 years backward caste, illiterates, married more than two children. The household head is 51 years above male and illiterate. The family background of the sample shows that there are more than three persons in the family, middle income, nuclear families, daily wage earners, residing in their own residences and having two rooms. The representation of the sample shows that they are heterogenous. Hence the hypothesis "The women participating in the Self Help Groups are not similar in their personal characteristics" is not accepted.

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS VERSUS ENVIRONMENTAL SANITATION

To identify the role of personal characteristics on Environmental Sanitation, the sample was classified into different groups based on their Age, Caste, Education, and Number of Children. Further, the attitude scores of the above groups have been segregated and applied F/t-test to find out the differences among the different groups in the areas of Cleanliness, Self - Hygiene, Drinking water, Sewage and Sewage Disposal, and attitude as total. The findings of the above analysis are presented in the following table.

Table 3: Personal Character, Group, N, Mean, SD, and obtained F value for the areas of cleanliness, Self-hygiene, Drinking water, and Sewage and its disposal.

| S. | Characte | Group | N | Clean | liness | | Self-H | Iygiene | | Drink | ing wat | ter | Sewage and Disposal | | |
|----|----------|---------|----|-------|--------|-------|--------|---------|-------|-------|---------|-------|---------------------|-----|---------|
| No | r | | | Mea | SD | F | Mea | SD | F | Mea | SD | F | Mea | SD | F value |
| | | | | n | | value | n | | value | n | | value | n | | |
| 1 | Age | <30 | 44 | 14.9 | 14.9 | 4.09* | 47.5 | 4.15 | 1.67 | 23.4 | 3.6 | 3.27* | 30.8 | 3.0 | 4.28** |
| | (Years) | | | 1 | 1 | * | 7 | | @ | 5 | 3 | | 0 | 1 | |
| | | 31-40 | 13 | 14.1 | 14.1 | | 47.0 | 3.79 | | 23.4 | 3.4 | | 30.5 | 2.9 | |
| | | | 9 | 4 | 4 | | 6 | | | 3 | 6 | | 5 | 2 | |
| | | 41-50 | 10 | 14.6 | 14.6 | | 47.6 | 4.97 | | 23.9 | 3.5 | | 31.0 | 2.7 | |
| | | | 8 | 4 | 4 | | 9 | | | 2 | 8 | | 3 | 3 | |
| | | 51> | 10 | 14.8 | 14.8 | | 48.2 | 3.92 | | 24.8 | 3.7 | | 31.8 | 2.5 | |
| | | | 9 | 3 | 3 | | 7 | | | 0 | 7 | | 1 | 7 | |
| 2 | Caste | SC & ST | 96 | 14.2 | 2.06 | 3.05* | 46.4 | 5.92 | 6.77* | 23.4 | 3.0 | 3.99* | 30.2 | 3.4 | 0.00@ |
| | | | | 6 | | | 0 | | * | 0 | 4 | | 0 | 3 | |
| | | BC | 23 | 14.5 | 1.75 | | 47.7 | 3.13 | | 23.8 | 3.3 | | 31.2 | 2.3 | |
| | | | 0 | 4 | | | 8 | | | 4 | 6 | | 0 | 5 | |
| | | OC | 74 | 14.9 | 1.56 | 1 | 48.6 | 4.23 | | 24.9 | 4.7 | | 31.6 | 3.0 | |
| | | | | 5 | | | 9 | | | 3 | 9 | | 9 | 7 | |

| 3 | Educatio | Illiterate | 16 | 14.5 | 1.58 | 0.74 | 46.7 | 46.7 | 5.76* | 23.6 | 2.9 | 7.52* | 30.8 | 2.8 | 3.39** |
|---|----------|-------------------------|----|------|--------|------|------|------|-------|------|-----|-------|------|-----|--------|
| | n | | 4 | 2 | | @ | 0 | 0 | * | 3 | 6 | * | 4 | 4 | |
| | | Literate | 44 | 14.5 | 1.84 | | 46.7 | 46.7 | | 23.7 | 4.0 | | 30.5 | 3.1 | |
| | | | | 2 | | | 3 | 3 | | 7 | 2 | | 9 | 2 | |
| | | < 5 th class | 50 | 14.4 | 2.20 | | 47.6 | 47.6 | | 23.5 | 3.2 | | 30.8 | 2.6 | |
| | | | | 2 | | | 4 | 4 | | 0 | 1 | | 8 | 9 | |
| | | 6-10 th | 92 | 14.5 | 1.81 | | 48.7 | 48.7 | | 23.7 | 3.7 | | 31.1 | 2.5 | |
| | | class | | 1 | | | 7 | 7 | | 5 | 8 | | 4 | 6 | |
| | | Inter | 34 | 14.6 | 2.15 | | 48.5 | 48.5 | | 24.3 | 4.2 | | 31.4 | 2.5 | |
| | | | | 2 | | | 6 | 6 | | 8 | 4 | | 7 | 5 | |
| | | Graduate | 16 | 15.3 | 1.86 | | 50.7 | 50.7 | | 29.0 | 4.1 | | 33.6 | 3.1 | |
| | | and above | | 8 | | | 5 | 5 | | 6 | 7 | | 2 | 4 | |
| 4 | No of | 0 | 50 | 14.5 | 1.93 | 0.35 | 47.7 | 3.84 | 0.49 | 24.1 | 3.1 | 0.81 | 30.8 | 2.6 | 2.82@ |
| | Children | | | 0 | | @ | 6 | | @ | 2 | 1 | @ | 4 | 5 | |
| | | 1 | 14 | 14.5 | 1.74 | | 47.4 | 3.47 | | 24.2 | 3.5 | | 31.5 | 2.8 | |
| | | | 0 | 4 | | | 4 | | | 4 | 1 | | 4 | 2 | |
| | | 2 | 15 | 14.4 | 1.81 | | 47.5 | 3.74 | | 23.7 | 3.7 | | 30.6 | 2.7 | |
| | | | 9 | 9 | | | 2 | | | 9 | 9 | | 2 | 8 | |
| | | 3 and | 51 | 14.7 | 1.87 | | 48.2 | 7.04 | | 23.4 | 3.8 | | 31.2 | 2.9 | |
| | | above | | 8 | 1 44 . | | 4 | | | 1 | 8 | | 5 | 7 | |

[@] Not significant. * Significant at 0.05 level, ** significant at 0.01 level

The findings presented in the table reveal that the difference between mean attitude scores is significant in the caste, age of the sample in the areas of cleanliness, Drinking water, and Sewage and sewage disposal and not significant in the case self-hygiene. The caste groups of the sample do differ in the areas of Cleanliness, Self-Hygiene, and Drinking water but not in the case of sewage and sewage disposal. The mean differences between groups of samples with different levels of education do differ in the areas of self-hygiene, drinking water, Sewage, and sewage Disposal but they do have similar attitudes in the case of cleanliness. In the case of the number of children, it is observed that the difference between groups of samples with different numbers of children does not differ from each other in all the areas. It implies the number of children does not have any influence on their attitude towards Environmental Sanitation.

Table. 4: Household head background, Group, N, Mean, SD, and obtained F/t value for the areas of Cleanliness, Self-hygiene, Drinking water, and Sewage and its disposal

| S. | Character | Group | N | C | leanlin | ess | Se | elf-Hygi | ene | Dri | nking v | vater | Sewage and Disposal | | |
|----|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----|-------|---------|--------|-------|----------|--------|-------|---------|--------|---------------------|------|-------------------|
| No | | | | Mean | SD | F/t | Mean | SD | F/t | Mean | SD | F/t | Mean | SD | F/t |
| 1 | Age in | < 30 | 9 | 14.11 | 2.52 | 1.21@ | 45.44 | 4.90 | 5.86** | 23.44 | 4.39 | 5.86** | 29.22 | 3.93 | 3.68* |
| | (years) | 31-40 | 108 | 14.42 | 1.86 | | 46.47 | 3.83 | | 23.49 | 3.16 | | 30.66 | 3.03 | |
| | | 41-50 | 135 | 14.44 | 1.89 | | 47.70 | 4.69 | | 23.56 | 3.48 | | 30.93 | 2.76 | |
| | | 51 > | 148 | 14.76 | 1.63 | | 48.51 | 3.77 | | 24.64 | 3.94 | | 31.55 | 2.56 | |
| 2 | Gender | Male | 360 | 14.47 | 1.83 | 2.61** | 47.34 | 4.12 | 3.91** | 23.66 | 3.50 | 4.79** | 30.94 | 2.81 | 4.79** |
| | | Female | 40 | 15.25 | 1.43 | 2.01 | 50.05 | 4.40 | 3.91 | 26.48 | 3.79 | 4./5 | 32.05 | 2.78 | 7.77 |
| 3 | Education | Illiterates | 164 | 14.52 | 1.58 | | 46.70 | 46.70 | | 23.63 | 2.96 | | 30.84 | 2.84 | |
| | | Literates | 44 | 14.52 | 1.84 | | 46.73 | 46.73 | | 23.77 | 4.02 | | 30.59 | 3.12 | 1 |
| | | <5th class | 50 | 14.42 | 2.20 | | 47.64 | 47.64 | | 23.50 | 3.21 | | 30.88 | 2.69 | |
| | | 6 ^{th-} 10 th | 92 | 14.51 | 1.81 | 0.74@ | 48.77 | 48.77 | 5.76** | 23.75 | 3.78 | 7.52** | 31.14 | 2.56 | 3.39** |
| | | class | | | | 0.74@ | | | 3.70 | | | 1.52 | | | 3.39 |
| | | Inter | 34 | 14.62 | 2.15 | | 48.56 | 48.56 | | 24.38 | 4.24 | | 31.47 | 2.55 | - - |
| | | Graduation | 16 | 15.38 | 1.86 | | 50.75 | 50.75 | | 29.06 | 4.17 | | 33.62 | 3.14 | |
| | | and above | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

[@] Not significant ** significant at 0.01 level

The results presented in the table clearly demonstrate that there is a significant difference between different groups in the areas of cleanliness, drinking water, sewage and sewage disposal. Hence the hypothesis "There is no significant difference between the attitude of different groups of the sample in the areas of cleanliness, drinking water and sewage and sewage disposal "is not

accepted in case of age in the area of cleanliness, caste, and education in self-hygiene, age, caste and education in drinking water and age and education in sewage and sewage disposal. However, the hypothesis is accepted in the case of age, self-hygiene, caste in sewage and sewage disposal and education, in cleanliness and number of children in all the areas.

HOUSEHOLD HEAD CHARACTERISTICS VERSUS ENVIRONMENTAL SANITATION

To study the role of Household head characteristics in the attitude of Environmental Sanitation of the sample, they were classified into different groups based on the Age, Gender, and Education of the Household head. The mean attitude scores of these groups were calculated and the t/F test was applied to study the differences in their attitudes If any. The calculated results are presented in the table.4.

The result presented in the table shows that the mean attitude scores in the areas of Self Hygiene, Drinking water, Sewage and Sewage Disposal of the different age and Educational groups of Household heads of the sample do differ from each other. On the other hand, they have similar attitudes in the case of Cleanliness. The mean attitude scores of the sample from Male and Female groups of household heads differ from each other in all the areas of attitude indicating that Gender has a role in attitude formation towards Environmental Sanitation. Hence the hypothesis 'There is no significant difference between the attitude of different household head groups of the sample in the areas of cleanliness, drinking water, and sewage and sewage disposal' is not accepted in case of the age and education in the area of cleanliness and it was not accepted in case of other areas and groups.

FAMILY BACKGROUND VERSUS ATTITUDE TOWARDS ENVIRONMENTAL SANITATION

The sample belongs to a different number of members in the family. Income, Type of family. Occupation, Residents were classified into different groups and calculated their respective mean attitude scores, and applied the t/F test to study the differences if any among them. The results of the above analysis are presented in the following table.5.

Table 5: Family Background, Group, N, Mean, SD and obtained F/t value for the areas of cleanliness, Self-hygiene, Drinking water, and Sewage and its disposal.

| S.N | Charac | Group | N | Cleanl | ness | | Self-H | ygiene | | Drinkii | ng wat | er | Sewage | e and Di | sposal |
|-----|--------|--------|-----|--------|------|-----|--------|--------|-----|---------|--------|-------|--------|----------|--------|
| o | ter | | | Mea | SD | F/t | Mea | SD | F/t | Mea | SD | F/t | Mea | SD | F/t |
| | | | | n | | | n | | val | n | | value | n | | value |
| | | | | | | | | | ue | | | | | | |
| 1 | No of | 2 | 89 | 14.51 | 1.77 | | 47.45 | 3.8 | | 23.81 | 3.2 | | 30.93 | 2.50 | |
| | membe | | | | | | | 3 | | | 3 | | | | |
| | rs in | 3 | 112 | 14.39 | 1.96 | | 47.07 | 3.5 | | 24.11 | 3.4 | | 31.23 | 3.11 | |
| | the | | | | | 0.6 | | 0 | 1.7 | | 3 | 0.23 | | | 1.13 |
| | family | 4 | 151 | 14.62 | 1.77 | 0@ | 47.77 | 3.8 | 8@ | 23.81 | 3.8 | @ | 30.81 | 2.81 | @ |
| | | | | | | | | 5 | | | 5 | | | | |
| | | 5 | 48 | 14.77 | 1.60 | | 48.69 | 6.7 | | 24.17 | 4.1 | | 31.58 | 2.71 | |
| | | | | | | | | 4 | | | 0 | | | | |
| 2 | Incom | Low | 16 | 14.44 | 1.63 | | 46.38 | 3.8 | | 23.06 | 3.7 | | 30.44 | 2.76 | |
| | e per | | | | | | | 1 | | | 3 | | | | |
| | annum | Middle | 337 | 14.45 | 1.83 | 4.1 | 47.50 | 4.0 | 2.8 | 23.74 | 3.3 | 6.14 | 30.94 | 2.79 | 3.58 |
| | | | | | | 5@ | | 9 | 5@ | | 5 | @ | | | @ |
| | | More | 47 | 15.26 | 1.58 | | 48.85 | 5.0 | | 25.62 | 4.8 | | 32.04 | 2.93 | |
| | | | | | | | | 5 | | | 9 | | | | |
| 3 | Family | Nuclea | 368 | 14.52 | 1.77 | 0.9 | 47.54 | 4.1 | | 23.89 | 3.5 | | 31.01 | 2.82 | |
| | | r | | | | 6@ | | 7 | 1.2 | | 0 | 0.96 | | | 1.07 |
| | | Joint | 32 | 14.84 | 2.19 | | 48.53 | 4.6 | 8@ | 24.53 | 4.9 | @ | 31.56 | 2.81 | @ |
| | | | | | | | | 9 | | | 0 | | | | |
| 4 | Occu- | Busine | 32 | 14.06 | 2.05 | | 47.72 | 3.3 | | 23.50 | 4.4 | | 30.44 | 2.59 | |
| | pation | SS | | | | | | 4 | | | 0 | | | | |
| | | Agricu | 76 | 14.51 | 1.73 | | 47.24 | 3.4 | | 23.87 | 3.1 | | 31.67 | 2.59 | |
| | | lture | | | | 3.3 | | 5 | 4.4 | | 9 | 10.90 | | | 6.87 |
| | | Servic | 78 | 15.08 | 1.51 | 2@ | 49.14 | 4.0 | 9@ | 25.92 | 4.1 | @ | 31.99 | 2.90 | @ |
| | | e | | | | | | 4 | | | 7 | | | | |
| | | Labor | 214 | 14.44 | 1.86 | | 47.18 | 4.5 | | 23.30 | 3.1 | | 30.58 | 2.79 | |
| | | | | | | | | 3 | | | 7 | | | | |

| 5 | Res- | Own | 372 | 14.59 | 1.73 | | 372 | 47. | | 372 | 24. | | 372 | 31.23 | |
|---|--------|--------|-----|-------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-------|------|
| | idence | | | | | 1.8 | | 78 | 2.8 | | 05 | 2.24 | | | 4.81 |
| | | Rented | 28 | 13.93 | 2.62 | 8@ | 28 | 45. | 6@ | 28 | 22. | @ | 28 | 28.64 | @ |
| | | | | | | | | 43 | | | 46 | | | | |

[@] Not significant.

The results presented in Table 5 clearly show that the mean attitude scores among different groups in all the areas viz., Cleanliness, Self-Hygiene, Drinking water, Sewage and sewage Disposal do not differ from each other. It indicates that the family background of the sample does not have any role in the formation of attitudes toward Environmental Sanitation and also reveals that all the groups have similar attitudes. Hence the hypothesis "There is no significant difference between the attitude of the different family background groups of the sample in the areas of cleanliness, drinking water, and sewage and sewage disposal" is accepted.

CONCLUSIONS

Majority of the self-help group women are above 41 years, backward caste, illiterates, married, with more than two children. The household head is about 51 years and above, male and illiterate. The family background of the sample shows that there are more than three persons in the family, middle income, nuclear families, daily wage earners, residing in their own residences and having two rooms.

There is a significant difference between caste, age groups of the women in the areas of cleanliness, Drinking water, and Sewage and sewage disposal and not significant in the case self- hygiene. The caste groups of the sample do differ in the areas of Cleanliness, Self-Hygiene, and Drinking water but not in the case of sewage and sewage disposal. The women with different levels of education do differ in the areas of self-hygiene, drinking water, Sewage, and sewage Disposal but they do have similar attitudes in the case of cleanliness. The women with number of children does not differ from each other in all the areas. It implies the number of children does not have any influence on their attitude towards Environmental Sanitation.

The Household heads of different age and Educational groups differ in their attitude towards Self Hygiene, Drinking water, Sewage and Sewage Disposal but have similar attitudes in of Cleanliness. The Male and Female groups of household heads differ from each other in all the areas of attitude indicating that Gender has a role in attitude formation towards Environmental Sanitation

The family background of the women i.e, no of members in the family occupation, income ownership of the residence, type of family have similar attitude in the areas of viz., Cleanliness, Self-Hygiene, Drinking water, Sewage and sewage Disposal. It indicates that the family background of the sample does not have any role in the formation of attitudes toward Environmental Sanitation

REFERENCES

- 1) Reshma, Mamatha S, pai and Manjula (2016), A Descriptive study to assess the Knowledge and Practice regarding Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene among women in the Selected village of Udupi District, NIHE University journal of Health Science, March 2016 Vol,6, No.1, pp.21-27.
- 2) Mohd R, Malik I (2017) Sanitation and Hygiene Knowledge, Attitude and Practices in Urban Setting of Bangalore: A Cross Sectional Study. J Community Med Health Educ 7: 540.
- 3) Rima Kumari Sah, Prem Kumar Sah, Jitendra Kumar Sah, Sudip Chiluwal, Sanjeev Kumar Shah (2017). Assessment of the knowledge, Attitude and Practices regarding water sanitation and mother of under five children in rural household of Sapthagiri District, Nepal, American Journal of Public Health Research, 2017, vol. 5, no 5, pp. 163-169.
- 4) Sangita Singh (2019), A Study to assess the Knowledge and Attitude of women regarding household waste management in the Urban population of Patna, Int. J. Nur. Edu. and Research.2019; vol. 7(3). 318-324.
- 5) Anita Dewi Moelyaningrum (2019), Women and Household Waste Management: Knowledge, Attitude, Practice and Economical Perception International Journal of Advances in Social and Economics (IJASE) 2019, Vol 1, No 5.
- 6) Almasi, A., Mohammadi, M., Azizi, A., Berizi, Z., Shamsi, K., Shahbazi, A. and Mosavi, S.A. (2019) Assessing the Knowledge, Attitude and Practice of the Kermanshah Women towards Reducing, Recycling and Reusing of Municipal Solid Waste. Resources, Conservation and Recycling,141329-338.
- 7) Godfred Safo Adu, Ruby Hanson (2019) Practices and Knowledge about Environmental Sanitation and Hygiene Among Urban Dwellers in Gomoa East District, Ghana, European Journal of Earth and Environment. January 2019, Vol.6, No. 1, pp 1-11.
- 8) Khushbu Yadav, Basant Kumar Yadav, Satyam Prakash (2020) Knowledge, Attitude and Practice on Hygiene and Sanitation among population of selected districts in Province No. 2, Nepal South East Asia j. med. sci. 2020, vol.4 (4) pp.1-9.

- 9) Seth Senyo Osafo, Nelson Kojo Brany, Wisdom Kwaku Yegbe (2020), Attitude of Traders towards Environmental Sanitation In Ghanaian Market Case a Study of Hohoe Main Market. American Journal of Environmental Protection, 2020, Vol. 8, No. 2, PP.58-69.
- 10) Maria Zakria, Sumaira Raiz, Muhammad Afzal and Syed Amir Gilani Abdul Majad (2021), To Assessed The Knowledge, Attitude And Practices Of Water Sanitation and Hygiene In The Community, International Journal of Medical Science, Engineering and Technology: A Refereed Research Journal Vol 10 / No 1 / Jan-Jun 2021.
- 11) Sushma Katkuri (2021), Knowledge, Attitude, and Practices on Sanitation, Water, and Hygiene among mothers of under five children in rural area A cross-sectional study, Journal of Health Sciences, April-June 2021, Volume .9, Issue 2,pp.51-55.
- 12) Muiz Uddin Ahmed Choudhury, Monowar Ahmad Tarafdar, Md. Abdul Mojid Miah, Shila Rani Das, Tonim Amir Haque, Syed Shawkat Ahmed (2021). Study on Knowledge, Attitude and Practice of Personal Hygiene among Selected Rural People, Volume 2, Number 1, January 2020, pp.1-15.
- 13) Manisha B Sinha, Surabhi Sahay (2023), Health and Hygiene in pubertal girls of Chhattisgarh: Knowledge, Attitude, and Practices, Indian Journal of Clinical Anatomy and Physiology, 2023 vol,10(1),pp.32–36.
- 14) Raza R, Khan R, Ahmed F, Urooj S, Khan N, Chishti DK (2023), A study to assess the Knowledge and Practice regarding Sanitation and Hygiene among women in parts of Delhi, India Journal of Drug Delivery and Therapeutics. 2023; 13(9):28-32



There is an Open Access article, distributed under the term of the Creative Commons Attribution – Non Commercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0)

(https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/), which permits remixing, adapting and building upon the work for non-commercial use, provided the original work is properly cited.