Consumer Research for
Rural Sanitation in Uttar Pradesh

Key Insights and Next Steps
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Glossary
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toilet Owners</td>
<td>Households (HHs) with a toilet in the house (functional, unusable or used for other purposes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHs without Toilet</td>
<td>HHs with no-toilet, broken toilet or toilet under construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to Pay (WTP)</td>
<td>HHs that are willing to contribute (in monetary terms) for toilet construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Willingness to Pay</td>
<td>HHs that are not willing to contribute (in monetary terms) towards toilet construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Users</td>
<td>The household roster for toilet usage only covers members above 5 years of age. If all members covered in the roster state that they always use the toilet, then such households are classified as &quot;Full User&quot; households.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial Users</td>
<td>If one or more members state that they use the toilet but only ‘sometimes’, ‘rarely’ or ‘never’, such households are classified as ‘Partial User’ households.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent Cleaning</td>
<td>HHs that clean the toilet daily; every alternate days or every 2/3 days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrequent Cleaning</td>
<td>HHs that clean their toilets once in a week; as and when they find the toilet smelling or dirty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Wage Earner</td>
<td>HH member making the highest contribution to the total family income.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Objectives
Establish baseline sanitation and hygiene practices

Identify factors that influence sanitation behaviour

Identify the most trusted & appropriate channels of communications
Research Design
## Research Design: A Two Stage Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Design – Qualitative Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sampling and District Selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Target Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Development of Qualitative Research Instruments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Testing of Qualitative Research Instruments and Recalibration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Training Enumerators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Full roll-out of Qualitative Survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Design – Quantitative Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Analysis of Insights from Qualitative Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Formulation of Scale Statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Testing Scale Statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Conduct Principal Component Analysis (PCA) on scales and finalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Finalization of Structured Quantitative Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. District Selection through PPS Sampling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Pre-testing and Calibration of Quantitative questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Full roll-out of Quantitative Survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Qualitative Survey**: (15 districts), (20 FGDs), (600 FGDs)
- **Quantitative Survey**: (100 Respondents), (18 districts), (300 HHs), (5400 HHs)
SAMPLE SIZE

Key Considerations
- Districts/GPs covered in Qualitative Phase will preferably not be a part of the sample of quantitative research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Qualitative</th>
<th>Quantitative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Districts</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGDs</td>
<td>330 (@ 22 per district)</td>
<td>270 (@ 18 per district)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDIs</td>
<td>360 (@ 20 per district)</td>
<td>5400 (@ 15 per GP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FGD: Focus Group Discussion
IDI: In Depth Interview
GP: Gram Panchayat
HH: Household
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Selected Districts

Districts Covered in Qualitative Survey
1. Lalitpur
2. Hardoi
3. Unnao
4. Allahabad
5. Ambedkar Nagar
6. Ballia
7. Azamgarh
8. Sambhal
9. Gonda
10. Kushinagar
11. Mathura
12. Firozabad
13. Shravasti
14. Sonbhadra
15. Baghpat

Criteria for sampling
- Agro-climatic Zones
- Distance from State Capital (Lucknow)
- Economic status (backward and forward blocks)
### Number of FGDs and IDIs per District: Cohort Wise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FGD</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IDI</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FGD</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IDI</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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While ‘Fresh air’ was most commonly mentioned as a key perceived benefit of OD…
...the notion of ‘fresh air’ as a driver for OD seems to be derived from ‘negative toilet use’ experiences.

An attempt to unpack the perceived notion of ‘Fresh Air’ displays that it relates more closely to problem of suffocation rather than the need for ‘fresh air.’ This is particularly visible among households who are exposed to ‘Sarkari’ toilets.

### OVERALL HHs without Toilet

**Perceived benefits of OD**
- Greenery
- Healthy practice (Walking)
- Fresh air
- Social interactions

**Perceived dis-benefit of Toilet Use**
- Bad smell
- Lack of fresh air/Suffocation
- Lack of cleanliness
- Requirement of maintenance
Common exposure to toilets for ‘HHs without Toilet’ are commonly in toilets of relatives or friends in the village followed by public toilets.

Visit to cities/towns:
- Construction Labourers and
- Visit to Relatives

Common Interfaces:
- Hospitals
- Temples
- Railway Stations
- Newly wed women in their maternal/paternal homes
When questioned on the reasons for continuing with OD, lack of money and space figure more commonly than ‘habit’, which displays the presence of a positive disposition to ‘wanting a toilet’ if the structural barriers are met.
This is further reinforced by the insights on ‘competing priorities’ where it figured in the top 3 for women and in the top 6 for men.
The ‘desire for a toilet’ seems to be driven by inconvenience during rains and difficulties faced by the elderly and the women were most commonly identified as key disadvantages of OD by all, with women specifically highlighting ‘fear of sexual violence’.

1. Women, old people & children face inconvenience
2. Trouble in rains due to mud, water logging
3. Creates filthiness
4. Spreads diseases
5. Insect/ animal/ snake/ scorpion bites

1. Insect/ animal/ snake/ scorpion bites
2. Trouble in rains due to mud, water logging
3. Women, old people & children face inconvenience
4. Fear of sexual violence
5. Stand up when any man appear

1. Trouble in rains due to mud, water logging
2. Women, old people & children face inconvenience
3. Creates filthiness
4. During daytime and when stomach is upset
5. Insect/ animal/ snake/ scorpion bites

1. Women, old people & children face inconvenience
2. Trouble in rains due to mud, water logging
3. Insect/ animal/ snake/ scorpion bites
4. No Privacy

1. Trouble in rains due to mud, water logging
2. Women, old people & children face inconvenience
3. Insect/ animal/ snake/ scorpion bites
4. No disadvantages
5. Fear of sexual violence
Space and appeal seem to be key ‘features’ of an ‘aspirational’ toilet

- Toilet should have some door or curtain, with enough space and ventilation inside to sit (3 feet wide and 6 feet tall)
- Septic tanks are more desirable
- The toilet should be outside the house, as it should be away from the kitchen and puja room
- Toilet needs to have plastered walls, be sufficiently wide and tall (2 hands wide and 5 hands tall), and have a strong door/Toilet should be adequately wide (at least 3.5 feet)
- We would prefer ventilation and a light for ease during the night
However there seems to exist certain ‘notions’ about what types of households often build or can afford a toilets, with people with stable incomes and salaried jobs figuring more commonly.
While, women and children are seen to most commonly influence the desire to build a toilet....

- **Triggers**
  - Inconvenience to women and children
  - Old age/illness
  - Old habit from parental house

- **Initiation**
  - Ideas about toilet construction are usually initiated by the Grandfather or the CWE in the house

- **Enquiry**
  - Enquiry regarding materials required, costs, where to shop etc. is asked to either a mason or an existing user
...CWEs are observed to be the decision makers

Planning
- Planning regarding type of super structure, platform/pan and sub-structure is mainly taken by CWE or the mason
- Mother sometimes select the colour of pan/tiles etc.

Purchase
- CWE goes and purchases everything from the market, procure locally available material and arranges for labour etc.

Construction
- Mason usually take care of the construction
- The CWE is actively seen to contribute to construction
- Sometimes mothers and male adolescent also contribute in construction
Roles and Decisions (Summary)

Pre-decision

- Children
- Newly wed daughter in law

Post-decision

- CWE
- Elders in the House

General

- Parents/elders of the house are most respected
- Husband plays a key role for wives

Inside house

Outside house

- Friends and Relatives
- HH with Toilet
- School teacher ANM spread awareness about hygiene and sanitation

- Mason
- HH with Toilet

- Pradhan is respected and important
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inside house</th>
<th>Cohorts</th>
<th>Outside house</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>News (Aaj Tak, India on TV)</td>
<td>mobile for calling, songs</td>
<td>politics, sports in dainik jagran, amar ujala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serials on Z Anmol and Z utsav, colors-Chhoti Bahu, Pratigya, Pavitra</td>
<td>mobile for calling, songs</td>
<td>dainik jagran, amar ujala</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Communication Preferences – CWE and Mothers**

**Frequency of use/visit**

- **HIGH**
- **MEDIUM**
- **LOW**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inside house</th>
<th>Cohorts</th>
<th>Outside house</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>movies (sunny deol, ajay devgan, salman khan; action movies), news (modi politics), cricket (dhoni, virat kohli, sachin tendulkar)</td>
<td>Male adolescents (13-17 years) Poornima mela etc.</td>
<td>Ram lila, holi, eid Close relatives &amp; others in the village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>songs, internet (facebook, facebook, whatsapp, downloading movies) and games</td>
<td>Female Adolescents (13-17 years) Haats, poornima mela etc.</td>
<td>Ram lila, holi, eid Close relatives &amp; others in the village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>serials(chhoti bahu, pratigya, anokha rishta, diya aur baati on star utsav, colors, zee anmol), movies (salman khan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>Radio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

What could be targets/ next steps?

What could be potential conversion levers?

What are convergence and divergence points?
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Households with members involved in time bound economic activity see an advantage in toilets saving time. With increasing movement to “non farm jobs”, this could be a target point.

Male members, especially male elders in the family seem to have a strong influence on decisions (based on user stories) and command respect (non users as well). These could be targets for perception change.

Specific triggers like illness, newly wed-daughter-in law, rainy season and presence of small children, which seem to be linked to need recognition, could be used for focused marketing (e.g., seasons, events like child birth, immediately post illness etc.)
R 1 and R2 seem to be land owners from competing priorities, R3 and R4 seem to be labourers. R3/R4 list lack of space outside for OD as a key OD barrier.

Younger men seem to be build toilets for their aged mothers. On the other hand, older men are champions for building toilets for younger women (e.g. Grandfather built or father in law built). Son could be good target for mothers and father/father-in-law for daughter/daughter-in-laws.

Illness or inconvenience to women are the primary triggers for toilet adoption while the initiation and action is mostly dominated by CWEs and Head of the household.

What could be targets/next steps?
Elderly male members, and the village Pradhan seem to be respected agents who could potentially be leveraged to alter priorities and encourage adoption.

While lack of funds is a key reason for non-adoption, there is wide variation in perceived costs of construction, with Govt. support not figuring as a trigger. This could serve to improve information transmission both ways (Govt. and non-users).

Men usually get to know most of the information through newspapers and news, which they share with women as well in the house. This could be an easy target segment by using newspapers and news channel for sanitation communication.
There is strong convergence on the awareness of importance and benefits of toilets, and the disadvantages of open defecation. However, translation of this into spending priorities is observed in women only.

There is convergence for toilets aspired both for users and non-users across cohorts, as everyone wants the best toilet “eventually”. Some say they would want to improve to a better one when they have enough capital but can work with a less improved version for some time.

There is significant divergence among non-users on the estimated costs of creation of toilets. This ranges from INR 20,000 to INR 80,000; and varies significantly across both age groups, SEC groups and gender groups.

Even HHs with Toilet identify bad smell as a negative while using toilets pointing to poor maintenance. Cost of managing a toilet also emerges as a key barrier to toilet adoption.

What are convergence and divergence points?
Key criteria Influencing Propensity to Adopt Toilets

**Economic Drivers**
- No strong economic drivers for non-farm jobs
- High ratio of farm to non-farm labour high
- Ratio of marginal workers high

**Cropping patterns**
- Sugarcane, paddy and food crops etc
- Single/twin cropping seasons only (the land is available for OD)

**Caste**
- Relatively fewer number of people in high caste categories (such as takurs, patels, yadavs etc) or tribal inhabited areas

**Political representation**
- Politically sensitive districts-high representation of MLAs/MPs

**Flooding patterns**
- Less prone to flooding/heavy rain
- (easier for triggering, harder for maintenance)

**Access to raw material/services**
- Poor access

**Availability of Space**
- High density of population more likely in forward blocks, making space a bigger constraint

**Difficult Districts**
- Presence of strong economic drivers for non-farm jobs
- Ratio of farm to non-farm labour low
- Ratio of marginal workers low

**Easy Districts**
- Horticulture and vegetables (cash crops)
- Multiple crop seasons
- Relatively larger number of people in high caste
- Low representation of MLAs/MPs
- More prone to flooding
- (easier for triggering, harder for maintenance)
- Good access
- Likely to be of lower densities

**Key criteria**

**Influencing Propensity to Adopt Toilets**
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While there was greater homogeneity across blocks in the other districts, the two chosen blocks in three districts namely – Firozabad, Azamgarh and Allahabad displayed stark variation. Thus it may be useful to test the above outlined criteria at the block level and pick blocks where ‘triggering’ can be more successful.
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- A PPS (Probability Proportional to Size) method was used to identify 18 districts for the quantitative survey.
- Only districts that were not part of the qualitative survey were considered.
Within each GP in a district, an approach was chosen to ensure that the socio-economic diversity of the GP was represented.

Key considerations

- In every GP, 2 villages were covered and always included the Main Village.
- The second village was selected based on the population of SC, Maha Dalits and other backward castes, with the village having the highest ratio of backward communities being selected as the second village. For example in the illustration on the left, it is village number 1.
- The households surveyed were equally divided between the main village and the second village based on the ratio of the population of the main village and the other village.
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District-wise Toilet Coverage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Toilet Owners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meerut</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gazipur</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amroha</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moradabad</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilibhit</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shahjahanpur</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hathras</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agra</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahoba</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total sample in each district = 300

- Bottom 33 percentile
- Middle 33 percentile
- Top 33 percentile
Survey Data: Education, Caste and Migrant Worker Status

N = 5,405

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CWE Out-stationed for Work: Yes</td>
<td>83.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWE Out-stationed for Work: No</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uneducated</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary School/Home Schooled/Can only Sign</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle/High School</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Secondary/Graduation</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caste</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Category</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBC</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey Data: Occupation, Income, House Structure

Parameter | %
--- | ---
Occupation | 
Agri/Agri Worker/both | 53.8%
Other Worker | 32.7%
Salaried Emp (Govt./Pvt.) | 4.2%
Self Emp. Business (Small/Big) | 3.8%
Self. Emp. Skilled Worker | 3.7%

Income | 
Up to Rs. 25,000 | 30.3%
Rs. 25,000 – 50,000 | 40.8%
Rs. 50,000 – 1 lakh | 22.3%
Rs. 1-1.5 lakh | 4.3%
> Rs. 1.5 lakh | 2.3%

House Structure Type | 
Pucca | 62.6%
Semi-Pucca/Semi Kutch | 27.7%
Kutch | 9.7%

N = 5,405
Overview of the data: Status of Toilet Availability, Subsidy Received and Usage

1% (#60) of the HHs do not wish to have toilet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>HHs Received</th>
<th>Subsidy</th>
<th>Usage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HH with Toilet (1)</td>
<td>1,379</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH without Toilet (2)</td>
<td>4,026</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (1+2)</td>
<td>5,405</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHs received subsidy (3)</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHs not received subsidy (4)</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (3+4)</td>
<td>1,379</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHs with 100% Users (5)</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHs with less than 100% toilet users (6)</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (5+6)</td>
<td>1,379</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHs cleaning toilet frequently (7)</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHs not cleaning toilets frequently (8)</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (7+8)</td>
<td>1,173</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHs that wish to have toilet (9)</td>
<td>3,966</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH that don’t wish to have toilet (10)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (9+10)</td>
<td>4,026</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHs having Intention to Build Toilet (11)</td>
<td>2,040</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHs not having Intention to Build Toilet (12)</td>
<td>1,926</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (11+12)</td>
<td>3,966</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4. HHs with Toilet vs. HHs without Toilet
5. WTP for Toilet vs. No WTP for Toilet
6. FULL Users of Toilet vs. PARTIAL Users of Toilet
7. Cleaning & Maintenance – Baseline Practices
8. Child Faeces Management
The consumer base is segmented into 6 categories based on the ‘sanitation behaviors’ observed.

At the highest level households are divided into those with toilets and those without toilets and the differences in profiles and drivers were mapped.

Households without Toilets were further divided into those who were willing to pay and those who were not willing to pay for toilets (WTP was used as a proxy for “intent to build”)

Households with toilets were divided into ‘partial users’ and ‘full users’ based on the usage patterns displayed by the members of the HH.
The consumer base is segmented into target behaviors that we want to understand or change. This aligns with the SaniFOAM framework of defining the 'focus behaviors' first before analyzing the opportunity, ability and motivation drivers. This approach was also chosen as it does not make any apriori assumptions about the target consumer. Usage, Cleaning and Maintenance has been clubbed as a single behavioral group with 2 segments namely partial and full users as cleaning and maintenance behaviors are observed to be highly correlated with usage patterns.
For every behavioral cohort information on four key themes is presented as illustrated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUTCOMES</th>
<th>APPROACH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target Profile</strong></td>
<td>SEC and Demographic markers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drivers</strong></td>
<td>A comprehensive assessment of the SaniFOAM attributes influencing the behavioural cohort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Channels</strong></td>
<td>Summary of key influencers and channels of communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Districts</strong></td>
<td>Distribution of the observed behavior across the sample districts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To identify the key attributes (in terms of target profiles and drivers) a simple ‘likelihood assessment’ is carried out, which seeks to identify which attributes are more likely to characterize the behavioral cohort.

For example if representation of people belonging to the general caste is **15%** in the overall sample, but is **22%** in the cohort on HHs willing to pay for a toilet, then there is an increased likelihood of **57%** that this attribute may figure in this specific behavioral cohort.

To ensure that the outcomes of our ‘likelihood assessment are significant, we only take into consideration attributes that are likely to show at least a 10% increase/decrease in occurrence in the sample behavioral cohort.
What unique set of factors (socio-economic-demographic-infrastructure, product attributes/aspirations, etc.) characterize HHs with Toilets and HHs without toilets?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Representation in Total Sample</th>
<th>Representation in HHs with Toilet</th>
<th>Representation in HHs without Toilet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Category HHs</td>
<td>784 (14%)</td>
<td>302 (22%)</td>
<td>462 (11%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Likelihood of finding a General Category (Caste) HH with Toilet** =

- Representation of General Category HHs Willing to Pay for a Toilet (A) = 22%
- Representation of General Category HHs in the Sample (B) = 14%

1.57 (Ratio of A:B)

This implies that the likelihood of finding a General Category HH with a Toilet is 57% more than the rest.

**Inference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors with Ratio &lt; 0.8</th>
<th>Factors with Ratio = 0.8-1.2</th>
<th>Factors with Ratio &gt; 1.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May characterize the counter behavior. For example if the attribute for target behavior (i.e. HH with WTP) for is &lt; than 1, it is more likely to be associated with HHs without WTP</td>
<td>These factors simply display that behavioral cohorts display very common characteristics on those attributes</td>
<td>These factors characterize the research behavior (e.g., HHs with Toilet, HHs without toilet; HHs Willingness to Pay, HHs with no Willingness to Pay etc.). Higher the ratio, greater the significance of the attribute</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What unique set of factors (socio-economic-demographic-infrastructural, product attributes/aspirations, etc.) characterize HHs with Toilets and HHs without toilets?

- Satisfaction with Toilet Usage: No [Factor ratio = 0.43] MAY CHARACTERIZE COUNTER BEHAVIOUR
- Reasons for OD by People: Good health [Factor ratio ~1] NOT SIGNIFICANT
- SEC variable: General Caste [Factor ratio = 1.57] SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENTIATORS FOR THE TARGET BEHAVIOUR

Factors with ratio = 1 or are closer to 1 are observed not to play any role in characterizing the research behavior. These are not useful in differentially identifying the group of interest from the overall population. Hence, these factors are not presented in the analysis.

Our approach has considered only ratios upward of 1.1 to keep the characteristics robust.

Note: Factor ratios have been filtered for representation (i.e., only those factors that have at least a 3% representation in the total sample is considered to rule out attributes that are outliers (for example – Internet Usage).
Data Limitations

While the research design is a comprehensive one and seeks to investigate all the key themes influencing sanitation behavior, the information analyzed only include the ‘stated preferences of the respondents’ and thus may be limited by certain inherent biases.

Further the research instruments have an inherent prioritization with greater focus on ‘toilet construction’ and ‘usage behaviors’ and a smaller focus on ‘Cleaning’, ‘maintenance’ and ‘Child excreta management’, with the information captured on cleaning, maintenance and child excreta management only reflecting baseline practices (i.e. it captures ‘what’ and ‘how’ and not ‘why’).

Another key limitation is that while ‘usage-status’ (use always, sometimes, rarely or never) for all members of the house is captured in the quantitative survey, the drivers for differing usage patterns is captured only at the CWE level. Thus all the insights we have on ‘usage drivers’ of women and adolescents is restricted to what is derived from the qualitative survey.
QUANTITATIVE SURVEY

1. Sampling Strategy

2. Summary Statistics

3. Consumer Segmentation & Analysis Approach

4. HHs with Toilet vs. HHs without Toilet

5. WTP for Toilet vs. No WTP for Toilet

6. FULL Users of Toilet vs. PARTIAL Users of Toilet

7. Cleaning & Maintenance – Baseline Practices

8. Child Faeces Management
HHs with Toilet vs. HHs without Toilet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Have Toilet</th>
<th>Do Not Have Toilet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Users</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness To Pay</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Segment A
HHs with Toilet

Segment B
HHs without Toilet

Segment E
Full Users

Segment F
Partial Users

Segment C
Willingness to Pay for Toilet

Segment D
No Willingness to Pay for Toilet

- Data Overview
- Factors characterizing HHs with Toilet
- Factors characterizing HHs without Toilet
- District Level Analysis
- Trusted Sources of Information & Principal Decision Makers
- Media Channels
Total Sample
N = 5,405

HHs with Toilets
N = 1,379 (26%)

HHs without Toilets
N = 4,026 (74%)

Reasons for Building Toilet

Reasons for Not Building Toilet

Significant factors

Scales

Media Channels

Identification of Low hanging districts
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SANIFOAM Indicator</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Likelihood*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>HHs with Fridge &lt;br&gt;<em>(Also similar characteristics was found with HHs using GAS – 94%, television - 89%, two wheeler – 78%, fan – 54%)</em></td>
<td>217% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HHs with a cumulative annual income in the range of Rs. 1 – 1.5 lakh</td>
<td>115% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HHs were the CWE is a graduate</td>
<td>92% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HHs that belong to GENERAL caste</td>
<td>55% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HHs were the CWE runs a small business</td>
<td>49% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HHs that live in pucca houses</td>
<td>26% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>HHs with their house tap connected to Govt. water pipe</td>
<td>86% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>HHs that have identify “Investment in Production Goods” as their key priority &lt;br&gt;<em>(Followed by Bank deposit – 44%)</em></td>
<td>74% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People who perceive fresh air as the key reason for OD</td>
<td>41% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Attributes</td>
<td>HHs that have water source located inside the house</td>
<td>60% greater</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* HHs with toilet have visible markers that define their profile, with socio economic parameters playing a dominant role in influencing their presence or absence

* Likelihood of occurrence of the attribute among HHs with toilet
Summary of Factors: HHs with Toilets

- HH with Annual Family Income: 1-1.5 Lakh
- HH Caste: Gen Category
- CWE Education: Graduate
- CWE Occupation: Small Business
- HH Structure Type: Pucca
- HH Asset Ownership: Fridge
- Water connection Type: Govt. Water Pipe
- Water location: Inside House Premise
- OD Reason: Fresh Air
- HH with Competing Priority: Prod Goods
Scales – HHs with Toilet
## Scale Statements that Characterize HHs with toilets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saniform Indicators</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Likelihood*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affordability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>&quot;Toilet construction expenditure can be arranged/affordable&quot;</td>
<td>52% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>&quot;Building toilets is a big expenditure of the house&quot;</td>
<td>25% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product Attributes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>&quot;We are satisfied with toilet constructed with government support&quot;</td>
<td>292% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintenance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>&quot;In my family all members clean the toilet&quot;</td>
<td>292% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Toilets can be cleaned any time”</td>
<td>292% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;In the village finding jamadar to clean the toilets is a problem”</td>
<td>292% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Maintenance of two pits is easier than maintenance of one pit toilets”</td>
<td>292% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>&quot;Pits need to be cleaned every two or three years”</td>
<td>292% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;We do not need jamadaar to clean pits, we can clean it ourselves”</td>
<td>292% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Instead of cleaning old over flowing toilets it is better to construct new pits”</td>
<td>292% greater</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Factors that characterize HHs without toilets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SANIFOAM Indicator</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Likelihood*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>HHs with Semi Pucca/Semi Kutcha construction</td>
<td>24% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HHs with cumulative annual income less than Rs. 15,000</td>
<td>23% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HHs where CWE is an agricultural worker</td>
<td>15% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HHs where CWE can only sign</td>
<td>14% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infra</td>
<td>HHs with inadequate water for the entire year</td>
<td>13% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HHs that have water source located outside the house</td>
<td>10% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access and Availability</td>
<td>HHs that DO NOT KNOW whether masons have the skillset to construct septic tanks/ single-double pits/simple pit</td>
<td>21% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HHs that are not fulfilled/satisfied with the available materials</td>
<td>16% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>HHs that DO NOT have extra cash in hand (The response on competing priorities)</td>
<td>12% greater</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With 24% being the highest recorded Likelihood of a particular attribute occurring in the group, these markers have lower “extrapolation value’ (i.e. The strength of the attributes that distinguish this group from the universe are low)
Summary of Factors: HHs without Toilets

- HHs that DO NOT have extra cash in hand (24%)
- HHs that are not fulfilled/satisfied with the available materials (16%)
- HHs that DO NOT KNOW whether masons have the skillset to construct toilets (21%)
- HHs that have water source located outside the house (10%)
- HHs with inadequate water (13%)
- HHs with cumulative annual income less than Rs. 15,000 (23%)
- HHs where CWE is an agricultural worker (15%)
- HHs where CWE can only sign (14%)
- HHs that DO NOT know whether masons have the skillset to construct toilets (21%)
- HHs with cumulative annual income less than Rs. 15,000 (23%)
- HHs that are not fulfilled/satisfied with the available materials (16%)
- HHs that DO NOT have extra cash in hand (24%)
Scales – HHs without Toilet
## Scale Statements that characterize HHs without Toilets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saniform Indicators</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Likelihood*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Affordability**         | **AGREE**  
  "We would like to build toilets only when we have excess money”                                                                 | 35% greater     |
|                           | "We will wait for Government subsidy before building our toilets”                                                                         | 35% greater     |
|                           | **DISAGREE**  
  "We can afford to build toilet”                                                                                                      | 35% greater     |
| **Product Attributes**    | **DISAGREE**  
  "Toilets are unsafe"                                                                                                                                 | 35% greater     |
| **Skills & Self Efficacy**| **DISAGREE**  
  "I trust that members of my family can themselves build safe toilets“                                                                    | 35% greater     |
| **Competing Priorities**  | **AGREE**  
  "Repair of house is more important compared to toilet construction"                                                                     | 35% greater     |
|                           | "Women of our house will have more interest in buying jewelry than using that money to build toilets"                                          | 35% greater     |
|                           | "Compared to toilet construction men of our house would prefer buying livestock or agriculture related equipment"                        | 35% greater     |

* Likelihood of occurrence of the attribute among HHs without toilet
District Wise – Toilet Coverage

- **Meerut**: 58%
- **Gaziabad**: 39%
- **Shahjanpur**: 38%
- **Muradabad**: 37%
- **Varanasi**: 34%
- **Hathras**: 34%
- **Amroha**: 32%
- **Raibareli**: 31%
- **Pilibhit**: 24%
- **Gorakhpur**: 22%
- **Jaunpur**: 19%
- **Agra**: 18%
- **Lucknow**: 17%
- **Mahoba**: 16%
- **Basti**: 15%
- **Barabanki**: 11%
- **Balrampur**: 9%
- **Chandoli**: 5%

**Top 50 percentile**

**Bottom 50 percentile**
### Sources of Information on House Construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>HHs without Toilet</th>
<th>HHs with Toilet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Village Pradhan/GP</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers/Magazines</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends/Relatives/Neighbours</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sources of Information on Toilet Construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>HHs without Toilet</th>
<th>HHs with Toilet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Pradhan/GP</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers/Magazines</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends/Relatives/Neighbours</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Programmes</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Information Channels: Trusted Channels

**Trusted Sources of Information on Health related aspects**

- **TV**: 1% HHs without Toilet, 3% HHs with Toilet
- **PHC/Doctor**: 17% HHs without Toilet, 16% HHs with Toilet
- **Newspapers/Magazines**: 5% HHs without Toilet, 8% HHs with Toilet
- **Mobile**: 6% HHs without Toilet, 5% HHs with Toilet
- **Village Pradhan/GP**: 23% HHs without Toilet, 22% HHs with Toilet
- **Friends/Relatives/Neighbours**: 36% HHs without Toilet, 28% HHs with Toilet
- **Community Programmes**: 18% HHs without Toilet, 15% HHs with Toilet
- **ANM/ASHA/Aanganwadi Worker**: 90% HHs without Toilet, 91% HHs with Toilet

**Trusted Sources of Information on Purchase of HH Goods**

- **TV**: 2% HHs without Toilet, 6% HHs with Toilet
- **Shopkeepers/Retail Sellers**: 31% HHs without Toilet, 48% HHs with Toilet
- **Village Pradhan/GP**: 18% HHs without Toilet, 25% HHs with Toilet
- **Posters/Banners/Brochures**: 2% HHs without Toilet, 3% HHs with Toilet
- **Newspapers/Magazines**: 5% HHs without Toilet, 10% HHs with Toilet
- **Mobile**: 10% HHs without Toilet, 9% HHs with Toilet
- **Friends/Relatives/Neighbours**: 76% HHs without Toilet, 73% HHs with Toilet
- **Children**: 56% HHs without Toilet, 51% HHs with Toilet
- **Billboard/Hoardings**: 1% HHs without Toilet, 2% HHs with Toilet

**Trusted Sources of Information: House Construction**

- **Mason**: 88% HHs without Toilet, 87% HHs with Toilet

- **Friends/Relatives/Neighbours**: 8% HHs without Toilet, 9% HHs with Toilet
- **Village Pradhan/GP**: 1% HHs without Toilet, 2% HHs with Toilet
- **Friends/Relatives/Neighbours**: 88% HHs without Toilet, 87% HHs with Toilet
**Principal Decision Maker**

**Principal Spender in the HH**

- Self: 66% (HHs without Toilet), 56% (HHs with Toilet)
- Head: 27% (HHs without Toilet), 28% (HHs with Toilet)
- Wife and Self both: 5% (HHs without Toilet), 5% (HHs with Toilet)
- Wife: 1% (HHs without Toilet), 1% (HHs with Toilet)

**Principal Buyer of HH Goods (TV, Fridge, Etc)**

- Self: 68% (HHs without Toilet), 60% (HHs with Toilet)
- Head: 37% (HHs without Toilet), 28% (HHs with Toilet)
- Wife: 14% (HHs without Toilet), 5% (HHs with Toilet)
- Wife and Self both: 7% (HHs without Toilet), 7% (HHs with Toilet)
- Son: 6% (HHs without Toilet), 6% (HHs with Toilet)

**Principal Decision Maker for Toilet Construction**

- Self: 62% (HHs without Toilet), 53% (HHs with Toilet)
- Head: 26% (HHs without Toilet), 35% (HHs with Toilet)
- Wife and Self both: 8% (HHs without Toilet), 8% (HHs with Toilet)
- Son: 2% (HHs without Toilet), 3% (HHs with Toilet)

**Potential Influencer: Decision to Construct Toilet**

- Self: 65% (HHs without Toilet), 57% (HHs with Toilet)
- Head: 27% (HHs without Toilet), 28% (HHs with Toilet)
- Wife: 27% (HHs without Toilet), 29% (HHs with Toilet)
- Daughter: 9% (HHs without Toilet), 5% (HHs with Toilet)
- Son: 7% (HHs without Toilet), 4% (HHs with Toilet)
- Village Pradhan: 1% (HHs without Toilet), 7% (HHs with Toilet)
- Daughter-in-law: 5% (HHs without Toilet), 3% (HHs with Toilet)
- Other elders: 4% (HHs without Toilet), 4% (HHs with Toilet)
Television and newspaper are observed to have a better reach among households with toilets.
Radio (1/2)

### Last Instance of Radio Listening

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Instance</th>
<th>HHs with Toilet</th>
<th>HHs without Toilet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Today</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yesterday</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 days before</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This month</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 1 month back</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Languages for Listening Radio

- **Hindi**: 100% 100%
- **Bhojpuri**: 1% 5%
- **English**: 2% 1%
- **Urdu**: 1% 0%

### Common Place for Listening Radio

- **Home**: 60% 42%
- **At friend’s place**: 22% 37%
- **While Moving**: 6% 8%
- **Local shop**: 7% 10%
- **At work place**: 4% 2%

### Convenient Time of Listening Radio

- **Morning**: 17% 25%
- **Afternoon**: 32% 35%
- **Evening**: 39% 35%
- **Night**: 16% 18%
Television (1/3)

Availability of TV in house

- Yes:
  - HHs with Toilet: 85%
  - HHs without Toilet: 56%
- No:
  - HHs with Toilet: 15%
  - HHs without Toilet: 44%

Last Instance of TV Viewing

- HHs with Toilet:
  - Today: 47%
  - Yesterday: 37%
  - 7 days before: 5%
  - This month: 13%
  - > 1 month back: 9%
- HHs without Toilet:
  - Today: 29%
  - Yesterday: 36%
  - 7 days before: 13%
  - This month: 13%
  - > 1 month back: 13%

Common Place for Viewing TV

- At home:
  - HHs with Toilet: 86%
  - HHs without Toilet: 55%
- Friend/Relative/Neighbour's house:
  - HHs with Toilet: 12%
  - HHs without Toilet: 36%
- Community place:
  - HHs with Toilet: 2%
  - HHs without Toilet: 7%

Monthly Expenditure on Cable

- Free Government Connection:
  - HHs with Toilet: 44%
  - HHs without Toilet: 49%
- < Rs. 100:
  - HHs with Toilet: 3%
  - HHs without Toilet: 4%
- Rs. 100-200:
  - HHs with Toilet: 13%
  - HHs without Toilet: 22%
- > Rs. 200:
  - HHs with Toilet: 36%
  - HHs without Toilet: 22%
Television (2/3)

Common genre viewed on TV

- Reality show
  - HHs without Toilet: 2%
  - HHs with Toilet: 4%
- Songs/Music
  - HHs without Toilet: 9%
  - HHs with Toilet: 11%
- Religious Programmes
  - HHs without Toilet: 17%
  - HHs with Toilet: 21%
- Sports
  - HHs without Toilet: 23%
  - HHs with Toilet: 33%
- Films
  - HHs without Toilet: 49%
  - HHs with Toilet: 55%
- Serials
  - HHs without Toilet: 62%
  - HHs with Toilet: 65%
- News
  - HHs without Toilet: 61%
  - HHs with Toilet: 68%

Common TV Channels Viewed

- Sahara Samay Bihar/UP
  - HHs without Toilet: 6%
  - HHs with Toilet: 8%
- E-TV Uttar Pradesh
  - HHs without Toilet: 7%
  - HHs with Toilet: 8%
- Sanskaar
  - HHs without Toilet: 12%
  - HHs with Toilet: 14%
- Aastha
  - HHs without Toilet: 12%
  - HHs with Toilet: 14%
- Zee TV
  - HHs without Toilet: 7%
  - HHs with Toilet: 16%
- Sony TV
  - HHs without Toilet: 12%
  - HHs with Toilet: 19%
- India TV
  - HHs without Toilet: 14%
  - HHs with Toilet: 21%
- IBN 7
  - HHs without Toilet: 12%
  - HHs with Toilet: 23%
- Star Utsav
  - HHs without Toilet: 21%
  - HHs with Toilet: 24%
- Colours
  - HHs without Toilet: 25%
  - HHs with Toilet: 25%
- Zee Cinema
  - HHs without Toilet: 26%
  - HHs with Toilet: 30%
- News 24
  - HHs without Toilet: 22%
  - HHs with Toilet: 33%
- Doordarshan
  - HHs without Toilet: 32%
  - HHs with Toilet: 44%
Television (3/3)

Convenient Time of Viewing TV

TV Viewing: Languages
### Mobile

#### Purposes of Mobile Usage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>HHs with Toilet</th>
<th>HHs without Toilet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To record</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To take Photographs</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film/Song Download/Internet</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Songs</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMS</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calls</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Receipt of Call/SMS on the following Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>HHs with Toilet</th>
<th>HHs without Toilet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business/Trade</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not received</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone company</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Frequent usage of Mobile

- **Yes**
  - HHs with Toilet: 70%
  - HHs without Toilet: 62%
- **No**
  - HHs with Toilet: 30%
  - HHs without Toilet: 38%

#### Monthly Expenditure on Mobile

- **HHs with Toilet**
  - < Rs. 25: 7%
  - Rs. 26-50: 20%
  - Rs. 51-100: 34%
  - > Rs. 100: 35%
- **HHs without Toilet**
  - < Rs. 25: 8%
  - Rs. 26-50: 8%
  - Rs. 51-100: 30%
  - > Rs. 100: 21%
Events in the Village

Awareness about Community Events in the Village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Type</th>
<th>HHs with Toilet</th>
<th>HHs without Toilet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Festivals/Fairs</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local market</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious programmes</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports programmes</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folk Programmes</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Willingness to Pay (WTP) for Toilet Construction vs. No Willingness to Pay for Toilet Construction

### Data Overview

- Factors characterizing HHs with WTP for Toilet Construction
- Factors characterizing HHs with NO WTP for Toilet Construction
- District Level Analysis
- Trusted Sources of Information & Principal Decision Makers
- Media Channels

### Table: Rural Consumer in Uttar Pradesh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Have Toilet</th>
<th>Do Not Have Toilet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Users</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness To Pay</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Segments

- **Segment A**
  - HHs with Toilet
- **Segment B**
  - HHs without Toilet
- **Segment C**
  - Willingness to Pay for Toilet
- **Segment D**
  - No Willingness to Pay for Toilet

- **Segment E**
  - Full Users
- **Segment F**
  - Partial Users
Data Overview

Total Sample
N = 5,405

HHs with Toilets
N = 1,379 (26%)

HHs without Toilets
N = 4,026 (74%)

HHs willing to pay (WTP) for Toilet
N = 2,040 (49%)

HHs not willing to pay for Toilet
N = 1,926 (51%)

No wish to have toilet
N = 60 (1%)

Wish to have toilet
N = 3,966 (99%)

Reasons for Inaction

Reasons for No Intention/WTP

Significant factors
Common Prejudices
Media Channels
Identification of Low hanging districts
Willingness to Pay has been used as a proxy to capture Intention to Construct as formative research on consumer studies closely relate ‘Intention to construct’ to ‘Intent to spend’.

85.34% of respondents have stated that they are willing to pay between Rs 1,000 to Rs 10,000 for toilet construction.

Within this sub-sample, almost 40% are willing to pay more than Rs 5,000.
### Factors characterizing HHs with Willingness to Pay for Toilets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SANIFOAM Category</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Likelihood*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>CWEs that are self employed skilled workers</td>
<td>35% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>HHs with relatively higher standard of living index and with ownership of assets such as gas connection followed by fan</td>
<td>49% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>• Motivation of OD at the HH level is mainly due to socialization followed by health benefits (Practice of OD due to habit appears to be low)</td>
<td>49% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Perceive socialization (meeting friends) followed by health reasons as OD benefits (Practice of OD due to inter-generational habit is low)</td>
<td>63% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• HHs that prefer investing in production goods followed by creating bank deposits during times of excess money</td>
<td>49% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Find OD places to be unsafe due to sexual harassment</td>
<td>27% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ HHs are completely dissatisfied with their OD practice</td>
<td>25% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ HHs that like toilet due to “cleanliness”</td>
<td>20% greater</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Factors characterizing HHs with Willingness to Pay for Toilets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SANIFOAM Category</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Likelihood*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Norms</td>
<td>OD Places in the Village: dam</td>
<td>23% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OD Places in the Village for Men: House compound followed by road</td>
<td>39% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have used toilet in the last 7 days</td>
<td>26% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordability</td>
<td>Perceive toilet cost to be affordable</td>
<td>92% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access and Availability</td>
<td>Find masons inaccessible to construct toilets</td>
<td>62% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Have participated in meetings on toilet types</td>
<td>45% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are aware about toilet subsidy</td>
<td>21% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perceive APL HHs followed by disabled/marginal workers to be eligible for toilet subsidy</td>
<td>38% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have heard about brick layered followed by septic tank substructure type toilets</td>
<td>37% greater</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Likelihood of occurrence of the attribute among HHs with Willingness to Pay for toilet
Aspirational Toilet

HHs with WTP for Toilets
Aspirational Toilet

Platform, Pan Type, Pan Colour

Sub-structure

Super-structure

Wall Type: Brick 69%
Roof type: Brick 86%
Pan Colour: Blue 27%
Pan Colour: White 72%
Pan Type: Urban 73%
Floor Type: Tiles 19%
Floor Type: Cement 77%
Pit Depth: 5 - 8 Ft 48%
No. of Pits: Two 68%
Sub-structure Type: Septic Tank 53%
Scales

HHs with WTP for Toilets
### Saniform Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saniform Indicators</th>
<th>Scale Statement</th>
<th>Likelihood*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affordability</strong></td>
<td>AGREE “Toilet construction expenditure can be arranged/affordable”</td>
<td>23% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AGREE “We can afford to build Toilet”</td>
<td>10% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DISAGREE “Building Toilets is a big expenditure of the House”</td>
<td>11% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product Attributes</strong></td>
<td>DISAGREE “Toilet with pits are as good as those with septic tanks”</td>
<td>12% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DISAGREE “Toilet with shallow pits are less costly and work well”</td>
<td>10% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access and Availability</strong></td>
<td>AGREE “Goods to construct Toilets are always available”</td>
<td>12% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AGREE “Water is hardly an issue impeding people to build latrines”</td>
<td>17% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competing Priorities</strong></td>
<td>AGREE “Pregnant women prefer building toilets compared to buying medicines”</td>
<td>15% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beliefs and Attitudes</strong></td>
<td>DISAGREE “Even if the toilet is built then it should be for use by only women and elder people”</td>
<td>11% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Norms</strong></td>
<td>DISAGREE “In our village OD is a common practice ”</td>
<td>19% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DISAGREE “If there is scarcity of land, then it acceptable to use Toilets together”</td>
<td>10% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AGREE “OD by lower caste people is acceptable”</td>
<td>12% greater</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Likelihood of occurrence of the attribute among HHs with Willingness to Pay for toilet

- Significant Scales Influencing HHs with ‘WTP’
## Factors that characterize HHs with no WTP

*Likelihood of occurrence of the attribute among HHs with NO Willingness to Pay for toilet*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SANIFOAM Indicator</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Likelihood*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>HHs where CWE can only do signatures.</td>
<td>23% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HHs residing in kutcha house structures.</td>
<td>23% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HHs with family income less than Rs. 15,000.</td>
<td>21% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>HHs with inadequate water for the entire year.</td>
<td>50% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competing Priorities</td>
<td>HHs that identify Livestock as a key investment priority.</td>
<td>80% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access and Availability</td>
<td>HHs that have used toilets 5-6 months ago.</td>
<td>29% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HHs that have experienced toilets in a PHC/Hospital.</td>
<td>47% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HHs that DO NOT have land for construction of toilet.</td>
<td>29% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HHs that DO NOT KNOW whether masons have the skill set to construct septic tanks.</td>
<td>35% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>HHs which are not satisfied with available materials for toilet construction.</td>
<td>30% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HHs that DO NOT KNOW about Govt. support for Toilet Construction</td>
<td>39% greater</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Factors that characterize HHs with no WTP include:

1. **SEC**
   - HHs where CWE can only do signatures.
   - HHs residing in kutcha house structures.
   - HHs with family income less than Rs. 15,000.

2. **Infrastructure**
   - HHs with inadequate water for the entire year.

3. **Competing Priorities**
   - HHs that identify Livestock as a key investment priority.

4. **Access and Availability**
   - HHs that have used toilets 5-6 months ago.
   - HHs that have experienced toilets in a PHC/Hospital.
   - HHs that DO NOT have land for construction of toilet.
   - HHs that DO NOT KNOW whether masons have the skill set to construct septic tanks.
   - HHs which are not satisfied with available materials for toilet construction.

5. **Knowledge**
   - HHs that DO NOT KNOW about Govt. support for Toilet Construction.
## Factors that characterize HHs with no WTP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SANIFOAM Indicator</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Likelihood*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation</strong></td>
<td>HHs that feel they do not have extra cash in the family</td>
<td>44% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HHs that feel that OD doesn’t require maintenance</td>
<td>30% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HHs that are satisfied with OD practice</td>
<td>47% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HHs that identify with HABIT as the reason for OD</td>
<td>37% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product Attributes</strong></td>
<td>HHs who perceive that pit depth should be in the range of 3-4 ft.</td>
<td>54% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HHs that prefer brick layered pit as their toilet substructure</td>
<td>20% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intention</strong></td>
<td>HHs that have not planned to construct the toilet until money is available</td>
<td>57% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HHs that do not have intention to take loan</td>
<td>20% greater</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Likelihood of occurrence of the attribute among HHs with NO Willingness to Pay for toilet
Summary of factors: HHs with NO WTP

- HHs where CWE can only sign
- HHs residing in kutcha house structures
- HHs with family income less than Rs 15,000
- HHs with inadequate water for the entire year
- HHs identifying Livestock as investment priority
- HHs that have used toilets 5-6 months ago
- HHs that have experienced toilets in a PHC/Hospital
- HHs that DO NOT have land for construction of toilet
- HHs that DO NOT have extra cash in the family
- HHs that feel OD doesn’t require maintenance
- HHs that identify with HABIT as the reason for OD
- HHs that feel they do not have extra cash in the family
- HHs that are satisfied with OD practice
- HHs that do not have intention to take loan
- HHs that have not planned to construct the toilet until money is available

HHs which are not satisfied with available materials for toilet construction

HHs that DO NOT KNOW whether masons have the skill set to construct septic tanks

HHs that DO NOT KNOW about Govt support for Toilet Construction
Aspirational Toilet

HHs with No WTP for Toilets
Aspirational Toilet

- Sub-structure type: Brick layered pit
- No. of Pits: Two
- Pit Depth: 5-8 ft
- Floor Type: Cement
- Floor type: Tiles
- Pan type: Urban
- Pan colour: White
- Pan colour: Red
- Roof type: Brick
- Wall type: Brick

Aspirational Toilet statistics:
- 45% Sub-structure type: Brick layered pit
- 54% No. of Pits: Two
- 48% Pit Depth: 5-8 ft
- 10% Floor Type: Cement
- 70% Pan type: Urban
- 20% Pan colour: Red
- 74% Pan colour: White
- 83% Roof type: Brick
- 67% Wall type: Brick

Platform, Pan Type, Pan Colour

- Aspirational Toilet
Scales

HHs with No WTP for Toilets
### HHs with no WTP for Toilets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saniform Indicators</th>
<th>Scale Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affordability</strong></td>
<td>AGREE “The possibility of constructing toilets is higher for people who have fixed income”  “Only beneficiaries of government schemes should build toilets”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product Attributes</strong></td>
<td>AGREE “Toilets constructed with government support/subsidy are strong and durable”  “Toilets with shallow pits are less costly and also work well”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access and Availability</strong></td>
<td>DISAGREE “Goods to construct toilets are always available to build latrines”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beliefs and Attitudes</strong></td>
<td>AGREE “Toilet is constructed only for usage by rich people”                      “Even if the toilet is built then it should be for use by only women and elder people”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Norms</strong></td>
<td>AGREE “OD near water sources does not pollutes the water”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emotional, Physical and Social Drivers</strong></td>
<td>AGREE “People who use toilets are more likely to get diarrhea “  “For only high caste families it is a matter of prestige and respect to have toilets”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gorakhpur, Jaunpur, Ghaziabad and Meerut display a much higher ratio of people ‘willing to pay’ and may be districts which may be leveraged for ‘demonstration’ for BCC impact on ‘Toilet coverage’.
District Wise – % HHs with Intent (WTP) among Non Adopters

% HHs with Intent among Non Adopters

% HHs with Intent > 5000 among Non Adopters
Sources of Information on House Construction

- Mobile: HHs Not having Intent to Build Toilet: 1%, HHs having Intention to Build Toilets: 6%
- Village Pradhan/GP: HHs Not having Intent to Build Toilet: 18%, HHs having Intention to Build Toilets: 25%
- Friends/Relatives/Neighbours: HHs Not having Intent to Build Toilet: 53%, HHs having Intention to Build Toilets: 60%
- Mason: HHs Not having Intent to Build Toilet: 93%, HHs having Intention to Build Toilets: 95%

Sources of Information on Toilet Construction

- TV: HHs Not having Intent to Build Toilet: 2%, HHs having Intention to Build Toilets: 2.00%
- Newspapers/Magazines: HHs Not having Intent to Build Toilet: 2%, HHs having Intention to Build Toilets: 4.88%
- Village Pradhan/GP: HHs Not having Intent to Build Toilet: 15.74%, HHs having Intention to Build Toilets: 21%
- Mason: HHs Not having Intent to Build Toilet: 34.81%, HHs having Intention to Build Toilets: 63%
- Friends/Relatives/Neighbours: HHs Not having Intent to Build Toilet: 0.00%, HHs having Intention to Build Toilets: 69.40%
Information Channels: Trusted Channels

**Trusted Sources of Information on Health related aspects**
- Newspapers/Magazines: HHS Not have INT 9%, HHS have INT 2%
- Mobile: HHS Not have INT 11%, HHS have INT 1%
- PHC/Doctor: HHS Not have INT 22%, HHS have INT 12%
- Community Programmes: HHS Not have INT 24%, HHS have INT 12%
- Village Pradhan/GP: HHS Not have INT 29%, HHS have INT 16%
- Friends/Relatives/Neighbours: HHS Not have INT 44%, HHS have INT 29%
- ANM/ASHA/Aanganwadi Worker: HHS Not have INT 90%, HHS have INT 90%

**Trusted Sources of Information on Purchase of HH Goods**
- Newspapers/Magazines: HHS Not have INT 5%, HHS have INT 4%
- Mobile: HHS Not have INT 14%, HHS have INT 6%
- Village Pradhan/GP: HHS Not have INT 20%, HHS have INT 15%
- Shopkeepers/Retail Sellers: HHS Not have INT 32%, HHS have INT 30%
- Children: HHS Not have INT 58%, HHS have INT 54%
- Friends/Relatives/Neighbours: HHS Not have INT 76%, HHS have INT 75%

**Trusted Sources of Information: House Construction**
- Village Pradhan/GP: HHS Not have INT 1%, HHS have INT 2%
- Friends/Relatives/Neighbours: HHS Not have INT 8%, HHS have INT 7%
- Mason: HHS Not have INT 89%, HHS have INT 87%
Principal Decision Maker (2/2)

Potential Influencer: Decision to Construct Toilet

- **Self**: 66% (red), 65% (blue)
- **Wife**: 30% (red), 24% (blue)
- **Head**: 26% (red), 28% (blue)
- **Daughter**: 9% (red), 9% (blue)
- **Son**: 9% (red), 5% (blue)
- **Other elders**: 6% (red), 2% (blue)
- **Daughter-in-law**: 5% (red), 5% (blue)

Legend:
- HHs having Intention to Build Toilets
- HHs Not having Intent to Build Toilet
Summary of Media Channels

Newspaper and TV may have a much lower outreach with respect to households that have no ‘Willingness to pay’
### Last Instance of Newspaper Reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HHs having Intention to Build Toilets</th>
<th>HHs Not having Intent to Build Toilet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Today/Yesterday</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 days before</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Receipt of Newspaper

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HHs having Intention to Build Toilets</th>
<th>HHs Not having Intent to Build Toilet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shop</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self purchased</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taken from friend/neighbour</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Newspaper Brands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HHs having Intention to Build Toilets</th>
<th>HHs Not having Intent to Build Toilet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amar Ujala</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dainik Jagaran</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindustan</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dainik Bhasakar</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Topics Read in Newspaper

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HHs having Intention to Build Toilets</th>
<th>HHs Not having Intent to Build Toilet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local News</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National News</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Television (1/2)

#### Availability of TV/Cable Connection

- HHs having Intention to Build Toilets: 63% (TV), 78% (Cable)
- HHs Not having Intent to Build Toilet: 46% (TV), 65% (Cable)

- **Availability of TV in house**
- **Availability of Cable Connection (HHs having TV)**

#### Last Instance of TV Viewing

- **Today/Yesterday**
  - HHs having Intention to Build Toilets: 72%
  - HHs Not having Intent to Build Toilet: 55%

- **7 days before**
  - HHs having Intention to Build Toilets: 11%
  - HHs Not having Intent to Build Toilet: 16%

- **This month**
  - HHs having Intention to Build Toilets: 7%
  - HHs Not having Intent to Build Toilet: 13%

- **> 1 month back**
  - HHs having Intention to Build Toilets: 10%
  - HHs Not having Intent to Build Toilet: 16%

#### Common Place for Viewing TV

- HHs having Intention to Build Toilets: 62% (At home), 32% (Friend/Relative/Neighbour’s house)
- HHs Not having Intent to Build Toilet: 46% (At home), 42% (Friend/Relative/Neighbour’s house)

- **At home**
- **Friend/Relative/Neighbour’s house**

#### Monthly Expenditure on Cable

- **< Rs. 100**
  - HHs having Intention to Build Toilets: 4.52%
  - HHs Not having Intent to Build Toilet: 19.28%

- **Rs. 100-200**
  - HHs having Intention to Build Toilets: 19.28%
  - HHs Not having Intent to Build Toilet: 24.10%

- **> Rs. 200**
  - HHs having Intention to Build Toilets: 49.10%
  - HHs Not having Intent to Build Toilet: 28.87%

- **Free Government Connection**
  - HHs having Intention to Build Toilets: 3.52%
  - HHs Not having Intent to Build Toilet: 15.49%
  - Government Connection: 49.30%
## Common TV Channels Viewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>HHs having Intention to Build Toilets</th>
<th>HHs Not having Intent to Build Toilet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sony TV</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aastha</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India TV</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBN 7</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanskaar</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colours</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star Utsav</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zee Cinema</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News 24</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doordarshan</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Common genres viewed on TV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>HHs having Intention to Build Toilets</th>
<th>HHs Not having Intent to Build Toilet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>News</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serials</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Films</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Convenient Time of Viewing TV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>HHs having Intention to Build Toilets</th>
<th>HHs Not having Intent to Build Toilet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evening</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afternoon</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morning</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Mobile

#### Frequent usage of Mobile

- **HHs having Intention to Build Toilets:** 64%
- **HHs Not having Intent to Build Toilet:** 61%

#### Purposes of Mobile Usage

- **Calls**
  - HHs having Intention to Build Toilets: 100%
  - HHs Not having Intent to Build Toilet: 99%
- **Songs**
  - HHs having Intention to Build Toilets: 8%
  - HHs Not having Intent to Build Toilet: 7%
- **SMS**
  - HHs having Intention to Build Toilets: 4%
  - HHs Not having Intent to Build Toilet: 1%

#### Receipt of Call/SMS on the following Categories

- **Telephone company**
  - HHs having Intention to Build Toilets: 57%
  - HHs Not having Intent to Build Toilet: 29%
- **Emergency**
  - HHs having Intention to Build Toilets: 44%
  - HHs Not having Intent to Build Toilet: 19%

#### Monthly Expenditure on Mobile

- **< Rs. 25**
  - HHs having Intention to Build Toilets: 8%
  - HHs Not having Intent to Build Toilet: 9%
- **Rs. 26-50**
  - HHs having Intention to Build Toilets: 24%
  - HHs Not having Intent to Build Toilet: 37%
- **Rs. 51-100**
  - HHs having Intention to Build Toilets: 38%
  - HHs Not having Intent to Build Toilet: 35%
- **> Rs. 100**
  - HHs having Intention to Build Toilets: 27%
  - HHs Not having Intent to Build Toilet: 14%
**Usage of Internet & Other Events in Village**

### Place for Using Internet: Home

- **HHs having Intention to Build Toilets:** 57%
- **HHs Not having Intent to Build Toilet:** 29%

### Purposes of Internet Usage

- **Entertainment (Music, Films):**
  - **HHs having Intention to Build Toilets:** 82%
  - **HHs Not having Intent to Build Toilet:** 56%
- **E-mails:**
  - **HHs having Intention to Build Toilets:** 64%
  - **HHs Not having Intent to Build Toilet:** 36%

### Awareness about Community Events in the Village

- **Festivals/Fairs:**
  - **HHs having Intention to Build Toilets:** 70%
  - **HHs Not having Intent to Build Toilet:** 60%
- **Religious programmes:**
  - **HHs having Intention to Build Toilets:** 51%
  - **HHs Not having Intent to Build Toilet:** 57%
- **Local market:**
  - **HHs having Intention to Build Toilets:** 50%
  - **HHs Not having Intent to Build Toilet:** 41%
- **Sports programmes:**
  - **HHs having Intention to Build Toilets:** 23%
  - **HHs Not having Intent to Build Toilet:** 11%
- **Folk Programmes:**
  - **HHs having Intention to Build Toilets:** 14%
  - **HHs Not having Intent to Build Toilet:** 7%
QUANTITATIVE SURVEY

1. Sampling Strategy
2. Summary Statistics
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5. WTP for Toilet vs. No WTP for Toilet
6. FULL Users of Toilet vs. PARTIAL Users of Toilet
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**FULL Users of Toilet**

**vs.**

**PARTIAL Users of Toilet**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rural Consumer in Uttar Pradesh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have Toilet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness To Pay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Segment A**
  - HHs with Toilet
- **Segment B**
  - HHs without Toilet
- **Segment C**
  - Full Users
- **Segment F**
  - Partial Users
- **Segment E**
  - Willingness to Pay for Toilet
- **Segment D**
  - No Willingness to Pay for Toilet

- Data Overview
- Factors characterizing HHs with FULL Users of Toilet
- Factors characterizing HHs with PARTIAL Users of Toilet
- District Level Analysis
- Trusted Sources of Information & Principal Decision Makers
- Media Channels
While statistics for usage is presented both at the individual and household level, the analysis is performed at the HHs level as only the CWE in every House was surveyed.

At the household level even if one individual is considered as engaging in OD sometimes, these households are classified as partial users, while only those HHs where all members use all the time are classified as Full users.
### Data Overview on Usage Statistics at the Individual Level

#### Members Defecating in the Open
- **35125 Members**
- **27132 Members** (77%) Defecate in the Open
- **7993 Members** (23%) Do not OD
- **Total Counts of People in HHs Surveyed**

#### Usage of Toilets
- **6649 Members** (83%) Always Use Toilet
- **1344 Members** (17%) Sometimes Use Toilet
- **6440 Members** (96%) have usable Toilet
- **1201 Members** (90%) use it for other purposes
- **109 Members** (2%) use it for other purposes
- **100 Members** (2%) don’t have toilet
- **71 Members** (5%) don’t have toilet
- **72 Members** (5%) use it for other purposes
- **1086 Members** (4%) Have usable Toilet
- **535 Members** (2%) don’t have toilet
- **1201 Members** (90%) have usable Toilet
- **109 Members** (2%) use it for other purposes
- **72 Members** (5%) use it for other purposes
- **25511 Members** (94%) don’t have toilet
- **6440 Members** (96%) have usable Toilet
- **109 Members** (2%) use it for other purposes
- **72 Members** (5%) use it for other purposes
- **1086 Members** (4%) Have usable Toilet
- **535 Members** (2%) don’t have toilet
- **1201 Members** (90%) have usable Toilet
- **109 Members** (2%) use it for other purposes
- **72 Members** (5%) use it for other purposes
8176 Members have access to a usable Toilet among HHs Surveyed in UP

6440 Members (79%) are FULL Users

1736 Members (21%) are PARTIAL USERS

Data Overview on Usage Statistics at the Individual Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Always Use Toilet</th>
<th>Sometimes Use Toilet</th>
<th>Never Use Toilet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elderly Male</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>323 (73%)</td>
<td>74 (17%)</td>
<td>44 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2603</td>
<td>1857 (71%)</td>
<td>512 (20%)</td>
<td>234 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>1004 (74%)</td>
<td>261 (19%)</td>
<td>85 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4394</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly Female</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>376 (82%)</td>
<td>51 (11%)</td>
<td>33 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2238</td>
<td>1915 (86%)</td>
<td>213 (10%)</td>
<td>110 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>1084</td>
<td>965 (89%)</td>
<td>90 (8%)</td>
<td>29 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3782</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Data Overview on Usage Statistics at the Individual Level

### Subsidy - YES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Always Use</th>
<th>Sometimes Use</th>
<th>OD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elderly Male</td>
<td>55 (63%)</td>
<td>22 (25%)</td>
<td>11 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>349 (53%)</td>
<td>237 (36%)</td>
<td>76 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>271 (61%)</td>
<td>140 (32%)</td>
<td>30 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>445 (78%)</td>
<td>88 (15%)</td>
<td>37 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>304 (86%)</td>
<td>39 (11%)</td>
<td>11 (3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Subsidy - NO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Always Use</th>
<th>Sometimes Use</th>
<th>OD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elderly Male</td>
<td>268 (76%)</td>
<td>52 (15%)</td>
<td>33 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1508 (78%)</td>
<td>275 (14%)</td>
<td>158 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>733 (81%)</td>
<td>121 (13%)</td>
<td>55 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>1470 (88%)</td>
<td>125 (7%)</td>
<td>73 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>661 (91%)</td>
<td>51 (7%)</td>
<td>18 (2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Households which contribute in monetary terms and spend more on toilet construction are more commonly observed to be full users.

Toilet Usage Vs Subsidy

Contribution by HHs in Construction of the SUBSIDIZED Toilets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FULL USERS</th>
<th>PARTIAL USERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Subsidy Received Against Total Cost of Toilet Construction</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Price of ‘Subsidy-based’ Toilets</td>
<td>Rs. 16549</td>
<td>Rs. 7567</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Factors that characterize Full Users of Toilet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SANIFOAM Indicator</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Likelihood *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEC</strong></td>
<td>CWE’s educational level is of graduate professional degree</td>
<td>37% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HHs with Washing machine <em>(Also similar characteristics was found with HHs having mobile internet – 34%, computer 31% &amp; fridge – 31)</em></td>
<td>38% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The CWE is a salaried employee</td>
<td>30% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HHs with overall family income range between 1.5 - 2 lakh</td>
<td>25% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>HHs with their house tap connected to Govt. water pipe</td>
<td>43% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline Practices</strong></td>
<td>HHs which empty the septic tank/pits using tanker/machine</td>
<td>63% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HHs which empty septic tank/pits every 5 years</td>
<td>31% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clean their toilets with cleaning materials alternative days</td>
<td>27% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access and Availability</strong></td>
<td>Perceive availability of materials in the village for construction of door, pan, foot rest &amp; platform in their toilets</td>
<td>23% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation</strong></td>
<td>Are completely satisfied with their toilets</td>
<td>22% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product Attributes</strong></td>
<td>Possess twin pit toilets in their houses <em>(Followed by HHs using septic tanks – 21)</em></td>
<td>24% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toilets also possess bathing space within the toilet</td>
<td>29% greater</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CWE’s educational level is of graduate professional degree

Toilets also possess bathing space within the toilet

Possess twin pit toilets in their houses

Satisfied users of toilet

HHs that perceive toilet construction materials available

Clean their toilets with cleaning materials alternative days

HHs which empty septic tank/pits every 5 years

HHs with Washing machine

The CWE is a salaried employee

Overall family income range between 1.5 - 2 lakh

HHs with their house tap connected to Govt. water pipe

Desluding method: Tanker/Machine

Summary of factors: HHs that are FULL USERS of Toilet
Toilet Characteristics

**Sub-structure**
- Sub-structure type: Brick layered pit
- Sub-structure type: Septic tank
- No. of Pits: One
- No. of Pits: Two
- Pit Depth: 5-8 ft
- Pit Depth: 3-4 ft
- Discharge of Effluent: Open drain
- Discharge of Effluent: Soak pit

**Platform, Pan Type, Pan Material**
- Pan type: Urban
- Pan type: Rural
- Pan material: Ceramic
- Availability of Ventilation Pipe
- Availability of Water Container inside Toilet
- Availability of P-Trap: Yes
- Availability of Ventilation Pipe
- Toilet location: Inside
- Toilet Age > 5 Years
- Toilet location: Inside
- Toilet Age > 5 Years

**Super-structure**
## Scales that characterize HHs that are FULL USERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saniform Indicators</th>
<th>Scale Statement</th>
<th>Likelihood *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affordability</td>
<td>&quot;The possibility of constructing toilets is higher for people who have fixed income compared&quot;</td>
<td>14% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Attributes</td>
<td>&quot;Toilet should be always outside the house&quot;</td>
<td>13% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>&quot;Maintenance of two pits is easier than maintenance of single pit toilets&quot;</td>
<td>18% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access and Availability</td>
<td>&quot;There are lot of space outside for open defecation.&quot;</td>
<td>14% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanctions / Enforcement</td>
<td>&quot;There is no restriction to do OD if people who have toilets do not object&quot;</td>
<td>13% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs and Attitudes</td>
<td>&quot;Pits of toilets will get filled faster if all family members use it&quot;</td>
<td>15% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;OD in fields is not harmful as it works like a natural fertilizer&quot;</td>
<td>14% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Norms</td>
<td>&quot;In our village OD is a common practice&quot;</td>
<td>17% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Despite having toilets in houses men do OD&quot;</td>
<td>14% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>&quot;Modern families who travel frequently to cities have greater interest in building toilets&quot;</td>
<td>13% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANIFOAM Category</td>
<td>Factor</td>
<td>Likelihood *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEC</strong></td>
<td>HHs where CWE can only sign</td>
<td>57% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HHs with Semi Pucca/Semi Kutcha structures</td>
<td>46% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HHs that belong to SC caste</td>
<td>27% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HHs where CWE’s occupation is “Other Work” (which mostly refers to causal labour)</td>
<td>22% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HHs that are below poverty line</td>
<td>22% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HHs where CWE is out of station for work most of the time</td>
<td>21% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infra</strong></td>
<td>HHs with inadequate water for the entire year</td>
<td>35% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HHs that depend on Govt./Community Tap as the water source</td>
<td>31% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline</strong></td>
<td>HHs that did not take any action when their pit/septic tank was filled</td>
<td>65% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HHs that use only water as the cleaning agent</td>
<td>25% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access and Availability</strong></td>
<td>HHs that DON’T KNOW whether masons possess skill to construct septic tank</td>
<td>71% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HHs that DON’T KNOW whether masons are easily accessible for toilet repair</td>
<td>38% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HHs that DON’T KNOW whether workers are easily available for emptying septic tank/pit</td>
<td>28% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge</strong></td>
<td>HHs that have NEVER HEARD of septic tanks</td>
<td>30% greater</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Summary of factors: PARTIAL Users of Toilet**

- **CWE Education:** Can only sign
- **HHs that have not heard about septic tank:** 57%
- **House structure type:** Semi Pucca/Kutcha
- **Caste:** SC
- **CWE Occupation:** Other work
- **BPL HHs:** 46%
- **CWE outstationed most of the time:** 27%
- **Water inadequate for entire year:** 22%
- **Water source:** Govt./Community tap
- **Toilet cleaning agent:** Only water
- **HHs not knowing about availability of workers for desludging:** 30%
- **HHs not knowing about mason's availability for toilet repair:** 28%
- **HHs not knowing about mason’s skillsets for constructing septic tank:** 38%
- **HHs with no action when pit got full:** 25%
- **HHs not knowing about availability of workers for desludging:** 22%
- **HHs not knowing about mason’s availability for toilet repair:** 21%
- **HHs that have not heard about septic tank:** 22%
- **Water inadequate for entire year:** 22%
- **Water source:** Govt./Community tap
Product Attributes

Full Users
### Toilet Characteristics

#### Sub-structure type:
- Brick layered pit
- Septic tank

#### Discharge of Effluent:
- Open drain
- Soak pit

#### No. of Pits:
- One
- Two

#### Pit Depth:
- 5-8 ft
- 3-4 ft

#### Pan type:
- Urban
- Rural

#### Pan material:
- Ceramic

#### Availability:
- P-Trap: Yes
- Ventilation Pipe
- Water Container

#### Age:
- Toilet Age > 5 Years

#### Location:
- Toilet location: Inside

#### Additional Information:
- Toilet location: Inside
- Toilet Age > 5 Years
- Availability of Water Container: Yes
- Availability of Ventilation Pipe: 21.6%
- Availability of P-Trap: Yes
- Pan material: Ceramic
- Pan type: Rural
- Pan type: Urban
- Pit Depth: 3-4 ft
- Pit Depth: 5-8 ft
- No. of Pits: Two
- No. of Pits: One
- Discharge of Effluent: Soak pit
- Discharge of Effluent: Open drain
- Sub-structure type: Septic tank
- Sub-structure type: Brick layered pit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toilet location: Inside</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilet Age &gt; 5 Years</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of Water Container</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of Ventilation Pipe</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of P-Trap: Yes</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan material: Ceramic</td>
<td>97.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan type: Rural</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan type: Urban</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit Depth: 3-4 ft</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit Depth: 5-8 ft</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Pits: Two</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Pits: One</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discharge of Effluent: Soak pit</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discharge of Effluent: Open drain</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-structure type: Septic tank</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-structure type: Brick layered pit</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Significant Scales

Partial Users
### Scales that characterize PARTIAL USERS of Toilet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saniform Indicators</th>
<th>Scale Statement</th>
<th>Likelihood*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EPS Drivers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DISAGREE</strong></td>
<td>&quot;Building a toilet in the house prevents sexual exploitation of women and girls of the house&quot;</td>
<td>36% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;In comparison to OD, defecating in toilet is more comfortable&quot;</td>
<td>20% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGREE</strong></td>
<td>&quot;People who use toilets are more likely to get diarrhea&quot;</td>
<td>26% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;For only high caste families it is a matter of prestige and respect to have toilets&quot;</td>
<td>25% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Using the toilet in the house lets go the opportunity to meet friends&quot;</td>
<td>21% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Toilet should be used only in case of emergencies when going outside is not possible&quot;</td>
<td>26% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beliefs and Attitudes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGREE</strong></td>
<td>&quot;Even if the toilet is built then it should be for use by only women and elder people&quot;</td>
<td>28% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Such toilets are good from which water flows in the open and from which natural fertilizers are produced in the fields&quot;</td>
<td>22% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;OD in fields is not harmful as it works like a natural fertilizer&quot;</td>
<td>22% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Pits of toilets will get filled faster if all family members use it&quot;</td>
<td>22% greater</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Likelihood of occurrence of the attribute among HHs where members partially use the toilet
### Scales that characterize PARTIAL USERS of Toilet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saniform Indicators</th>
<th>Scale Statement</th>
<th>Likelihood*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product Attributes</strong></td>
<td>&quot;Having a toilet inside the house is not good for health&quot;</td>
<td>27% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>&quot;Toilet should be always outside the house&quot;</td>
<td>24% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Norms</strong></td>
<td>&quot;In our village OD is a common practice”</td>
<td>23% greater</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Likelihood of occurrence of the attribute among HHs where members partially use the toilet
Ghaziabad displays a sharp skew in favour of full user HHs owing to its proximity to Delhi. In general the western districts are observed to have much higher ratios of full users compared to the eastern districts.
## Information Channels

### Sources of Information: House Construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>&lt; 100% Members using Toilet</th>
<th>100% Members using Toilet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers/Magazines</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Pradhan/GP</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends/Relatives/Neighbours</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Source of Information on toilet Construction for constructed toilet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>&lt; 100% Members using Toilet</th>
<th>100% Members using Toilet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Villager</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative/Friend</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP/Village Pradhan</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sources of Information on Toilet Construction (In general)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>&lt; 100% Members using Toilet</th>
<th>100% Members using Toilet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Pradhan/GP</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends/Relatives/Neighbours</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Information Channels

- Newspapers/Magazines
- Village Pradhan/GP
- Friends/Relatives/Neighbours
- Mason

- NGO
- Other Villager
- Relative/Friend
- GP/Village Pradhan
- Mason
- Friends/Relatives/Neighbours
- TV
Summary of Media Channels

HHs reading newspaper: 50% (100%) Members Using Toilet, 28% (<100%) Members using Toilet
HHs listening to radio: 14% (100%) Members Using Toilet, 9% (<100%) Members using Toilet
HHs having Mobile: 97% (100%) Members Using Toilet, 92% (<100%) Members using Toilet
HHs viewing Television: 60% (100%) Members Using Toilet, 39% (<100%) Members using Toilet
HHs using Internet: 17% (100%) Members Using Toilet, 5% (<100%) Members using Toilet
Newspaper

Communication Channel: Newspaper

- Newspaper readership: 50% 28%
- Last Instance of Newspaper Reading (Today and Yesterday): 89% 80%
- 7 days before: 5.66% 13.41%
- This month: 4.04% 2.79%

Receipt of Newspaper

- Taken from friend/neighbour: 11.05% 13.41%
- Shop: 26.95% 35.75%
- Purchased: 61.46% 49.72%

Newspaper Brands

- Hindustan: 23.72% 25.70%
- Dainik Jagaran: 46.90% 44.69%
- Amar Ujaala: 41.51% 52.51%

Topics Read in Newspaper

- National News: 39.08% 30.73%
- Local News: 38.54% 44.13%
- Politics: 7.01% 5.59%
- Sports: 4.31% 6.70%
Communication Channel: Television

- TV Viewership: 60% using, 39% not using
- Last Instance of TV Viewing (Today & Yesterday): 88% using, 76% not using
- Availability of TV in house: 88.21% using, 78.88% not using
- Availability of Cable Connection: 87.66% using, 74.75% not using

Common Place for Viewing TV
- Home: 89.12% using, 79.28% not using
- Friend/Relative/Neighbour's house: 8.84% using, 17.13% not using

Monthly Expenditure on Cable Connection
- Rs. 100-200: 15.54% using, 8.78% not using
- > Rs. 200: 41.64% using, 24.32% not using
- Free Government Connection: 38.71% using, 55.41% not using
### Common TV Channels Viewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>&lt; 100% Members using Toilet</th>
<th>100% Members Using Toilet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>News 24</td>
<td>6.77%</td>
<td>38.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zee Cinema</td>
<td>7.97%</td>
<td>23.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doordarshan</td>
<td>10.36%</td>
<td>35.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBN 7</td>
<td>13.55%</td>
<td>27.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India TV</td>
<td>19.52%</td>
<td>40.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colours</td>
<td>22.71%</td>
<td>27.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star Utsav</td>
<td>24.30%</td>
<td>33.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sony TV</td>
<td>22.90%</td>
<td>34.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zee TV</td>
<td>23.13%</td>
<td>30.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-TV Uttar Pradesh</td>
<td>6.77%</td>
<td>36.28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Common genre viewed on TV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>&lt; 100% Members using Toilet</th>
<th>100% Members Using Toilet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serials</td>
<td>36.96%</td>
<td>68.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News</td>
<td>26.29%</td>
<td>72.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>13.55%</td>
<td>36.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Films</td>
<td>10.36%</td>
<td>51.70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Convenient Time of Viewing TV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>&lt; 100% Members using Toilet</th>
<th>100% Members Using Toilet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morning</td>
<td>11.56%</td>
<td>29.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afternoon</td>
<td>18.37%</td>
<td>24.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening</td>
<td>38.25%</td>
<td>29.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night</td>
<td>39.00%</td>
<td>26.29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Mobile Availability and Usage Status
- **Availability of Mobile**
  - 100% Members Using Toilet: 97%
  - < 100% Members using Toilet: 20%
- **Frequent usage of Mobile**
  - 100% Members Using Toilet: 92%
  - < 100% Members using Toilet: 75.53%
  - 100% Members using Toilet: 63.24%

### Receipt of Call/SMS on the following Categories
- **Emergency**
  - 100% Members Using Toilet: 27.43%
  - < 100% Members using Toilet: 22.07%
- **Not received**
  - 100% Members Using Toilet: 66.81%
  - < 100% Members using Toilet: 60.37%
- **Telephone company**
  - 100% Members Using Toilet: 31.03%
  - < 100% Members using Toilet: 20.57%

### Monthly Expenditure on Mobile
- **< Rs. 25**
  - 100% Members Using Toilet: 5.06%
  - < 100% Members using Toilet: 8.26%
- **Rs. 26-50**
  - 100% Members Using Toilet: 18.71%
  - < 100% Members using Toilet: 22.43%
- **Rs. 51-100**
  - 100% Members Using Toilet: 30.80%
  - < 100% Members using Toilet: 38.79%
- **> Rs. 100**
  - 100% Members Using Toilet: 43.32%
  - < 100% Members using Toilet: 25.30%

### Purposes of Mobile Usage
- **Calls**
  - 100% Members Using Toilet: 99.72%
  - < 100% Members using Toilet: 99.66%
- **SMS**
  - 100% Members Using Toilet: 12.38%
  - < 100% Members using Toilet: 4.05%
- **Film/Song Download/Internet**
  - 100% Members Using Toilet: 27.36%
  - < 100% Members using Toilet: 4.05%
- **To take Photographs**
  - 100% Members Using Toilet: 9.85%
  - < 100% Members using Toilet: 3.37%
- **Songs**
  - 100% Members Using Toilet: 9.99%
  - < 100% Members using Toilet: 4.05%
- **Facebook**
  - 100% Members Using Toilet: 10.27%
  - < 100% Members using Toilet: 2.70%
### Communication Channel: Internet

#### 100% Members Using Toilet
- Internet Usage: Yes: 17%
- Place for Using Internet (Home): 50.82%
- Place for Using Internet (Shop): 27.05%

#### < 100% Members using Toilet
- Internet Usage: Yes: 5%
- Place for Using Internet (Home): 53.13%
- Place for Using Internet (Shop): 9.38%

### Purposes of Internet Usage

#### 100% Members Using Toilet
- Email: 60.66%
- Entertainment (Music, Films): 71.31%
- Agriculture or work related: 16.39%

#### < 100% Members using Toilet
- Email: 37.50%
- Entertainment (Music, Films): 68.75%
- Agriculture or work related: 9.38%
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Cleaning – Baseline Practices
74% of all toilet owners seem to agree that all members of the household are involved in cleaning, with almost 70% of them claiming to clean it on a weekly basis using both water and chemicals.
Cleaning Frequency

Cleaning Frequency of Subsidized Functional Toilets

- **Everytime**: 7%
- **Daily**: 4%
- **Alternative Days**: 4%
- **2-3 Days Once**: 19%
- **Weekly**: 38%
- **As & When Required**: 26%
- **Other**: 1%

Cleaning Frequency of Non Subsidized Functional Toilets

- **Everytime**: 4%
- **Daily**: 7%
- **Alternative Days**: 5%
- **2-3 Days Once**: 30%
- **Weekly**: 41%
- **As & When Required**: 13%
- **Other**: 0%

N = 335

N = 838
Maintenance - Baseline Practices
Toilet Repairs

Toilet in good working condition

- Yes, 85%
- No, 15%

N=1,379

Toilet Repair Done

- Repair of toilet pan: 30%
- Repair of toilet pipe: 14%
- Repair of floor: 23%
- Repair of walls: 34%
- Repair of roof: 18%
- Repair of pit/tank: 12%
- Repair of pipe: 10%
- Repair of Tap: 4%

N=1,310

Repair of toilet repairs done

N=83
Number of Toilets Repaired among Subsidized Toilets – 19 Toilets

Functional Status of Subsidized Toilets
- 27% Unusable
- 15% Unusable

Subsidized Toilets – Types of Repair
- Pan: 47%
- Wall: 26%
- Pipe: 21%
- Roof: 16%
- Floor: 16%
- Pit: 16%
- Tap: 0%
- Door: 0%

Number of Toilets Repaired among NON Subsidized Toilets – 64 Toilets

Functional Status of NON Subsidized Toilets
- 9% Unusable
- 15% Unusable

NON Subsidized Toilets – Types of Repair
- Wall: 36%
- Pan: 25%
- Floor: 25%
- Roof: 19%
- Pipe: 13%
- Door: 13%
- Pit: 11%
- Tap: 5%
**Access to Maintenance**

### If easy to find people to repair toilet
- Yes: 79%
- No: 12%
- Unknown: 9%

**N=1,379**

### If the pit was filled or overflowing
- Yes: 12%
- Never filled: 85%
- Unknown: 3%

### Action taken when pit was overflowing
- Don't know: 0%
- Nothing: 52%
- Others (specify): 7%
- Defecating in the open: 1%
- Build/dig another pit: 5%
- Empty and clean pit/tank: 34%

**N = 151**

### Frequency of cleaning pits/septic tanks
- Don't know: 16%
- Others (specify): 7%
- Don't empty: 17%
- When it fills up: 36%
- Every 5 years: 5%
- Every 4 years: 6%
- Every three years: 6%
- Every two years: 4%
- Annually: 4%

**N = 163**
Manner of emptying septic tanks or pits

- Labourer: 73%
- Self/or with the help of family: 13%
- Pumped out by Tanker: 10%
- Others (specify): 4%
- Don’t know: 0%

If easy to find septic tank/pit cleaning services

- Yes: 37%
- No: 46%
- Unknown: 16%

N = 52
N=1,379
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Child Faeces Management
Hand Washing Practices

Percentage of households with children below 5

- Total: 31%
- Adopter: 27%
- Non-Adopter: 26%

N=1,468

If respondent washes hands after feces disposal:

**HHs with Toilet**
- Yes, after cleaning: 25%
- Not after cleaning the child but after cleaning the feces: 73%
- No: 2%

N=427

**Total**
- Yes, after cleaning: 28%
- Not after cleaning the child but after cleaning the feces: 71%
- No: 1%

N=1,468

**HHs without Toilet**
- Yes, after cleaning: 28%
- Not after cleaning the child but after cleaning the feces: 73%
- No: 2%

N=1,041
# Disposal Methods of Infant Excreta in the Village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disposal Method</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
<th>HHs with Toilet (%)</th>
<th>HHs without Toilet (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumed by pigs and dogs</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean with cloth and wash for reuse</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispose on outside land</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put in plastic bags and throw</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Throw it in the forest/bushes</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Throw it outside the compound</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cover it with mud</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispose in the garbage bin/pit</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispose in the gutter / drain</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- HHs with Toilet: 1,379
- HHs without Toilet: 4,026

**Data Analysis:**
- The most common method of disposal in total is to throw it outside the compound (55%).
- In HHs with a toilet, the most common method is also to throw it outside the compound (57%).
- In HHs without a toilet, the most common method is to throw it in the forest/bushes (33%).

**Additional Observations:**
- A small portion of excreta is disposed in the gutter or drain (21% and 20%).
- A negligible amount is consumed by pigs and dogs (7% and 3%).
- Unknown disposal methods account for a very small percentage (1% each).
Disposal Methods of Excreta of Breastfed Infants in the Village

**Total**
- Others: 1%
- Clean with cloth and wash for reuse: 15%
- Put in plastic bags and throw: 21%
- Throw it in the forest/bushes: 33%
- Throw it outside the compound: 64%
- Cover it with mud: 34%
- Dispose in the garbage bin/pit: 30%
- Dispose in the gutter / drain: 19%

**HHs with Toilet**
- Clean with cloth and wash for reuse: 17%
- Put in plastic bags and throw: 25%
- Throw it in the forest/bushes: 30%
- Throw it outside the compound: 66%
- Cover it with mud: 34%
- Dispose in the garbage bin/pit: 32%
- Dispose in the gutter / drain: 21%

**HHs without Toilet**
- Clean with cloth and wash for reuse: 14%
- Put in plastic bags and throw: 20%
- Throw it in the forest/bushes: 34%
- Throw it outside the compound: 63%
- Cover it with mud: 35%
- Dispose in the garbage bin/pit: 30%
- Dispose in the gutter / drain: 19%

N = 5405
N = 1,379
N = 4,026