

## CHAPTER II

### HOUSEHOLD AND RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS

This chapter provides information on background characteristics of the eligible women aged 15-49 years covered under the survey. Besides, data has also been presented in this chapter on household characteristics which includes economic indicators such as land and livestock holding, ownership of house, type of house, type of toilet, possession of household assets and source of energy for lighting and cooking in the household.

#### 2.1 Socio-Economic Characteristics of eligible women and spouse

Table 2.1 shows that nearly three-fourth of the eligible women (73 percent) covered under the study belonged to Hindu religion whereas a little more than one-fourth (26 percent) were from Muslim households. Proportion of Muslim women covered in urban areas was higher (30 percent) as compared to those covered in rural areas (26 percent). As regards the caste, while the proportion of eligible women belonging to other backward caste households was about 51 percent, SC/ST accounted for nearly 31 percent of the sample.

Education level has an important influence on women's health seeking behavior. Forty six percent of the eligible women were illiterate. A significantly higher proportion of women in rural areas were illiterate (51 percent) against their counterparts living in urban slums (37 percent). Sixteen percent of eligible women had less than middle school (less than 8<sup>th</sup> grade) education whereas about 25 percent had completed middle and high school (8-11<sup>th</sup> grade). Twelve percent of the eligible women had attained higher secondary and above (12+ grade). As the analysis by different levels of education shows, eligible women in urban slums were better educated than those in rural.

However, it can be seen from the table that spouses of the eligible women had better education with almost eight out of ten having passed different grades of education. For instance, only 22 percent of the husbands were illiterate while this figure was 46 percent in case of their spouses. Less than one-fifth of the husbands had less than middle school education i.e. less than 8<sup>th</sup> Grade. Around one-fourth had passed middle and high school but had not attained higher secondary education. Proportion of those who had passed 12+ grades was 18 percent.

As regards the main occupation of eligible women, table shows that an overwhelming majority of them were housewives and involved in daily household chores. Analysis of the main occupation of their husbands indicates that more than one-fifth in rural areas was engaged in agriculture as main source of livelihood. However, nearly one-third were earning their sustenance through unskilled jobs both in urban slums and rural areas. Overall, one-fifth were engaged in skilled jobs with significantly higher proportion of husbands working as skilled workers in urban slums (29 percent) than

their counterparts in rural areas (17 percent). Less than one-tenth of the respondents had reported service as the main occupation (urban slum-12 percent; rural-7 percent).

**Table- 2.1 Socio-Economic characteristics**

Particulars	Percentage		
	Urban Slum	Rural	Total
<b>Religion</b>			
Hindu	69.0	75.6	73.4
Muslim	30.5	24.2	26.3
Others	0.5	0.2	0.3
<b>Caste</b>			
SC/ST	32.0	30.4	30.9
OBC	48.5	51.9	50.8
Others	19.5	17.7	18.3
<b>Education of women</b>			
Illiterate	37.2	50.8	46.2
Literate (without formal schooling)	2.2	1.4	1.7
Lit (<8 <sup>th</sup> Grade)	17.5	14.8	15.7
Lit (8-11 <sup>th</sup> Grade)	27.2	23.4	24.6
Lit (12+ Grade)	15.9	9.6	11.7
<b>Education of Husband</b>			
Illiterate	22.6	22.4	22.5
Literate (without formal schooling)	1.7	1.2	1.3
Lit (<8 <sup>th</sup> Grade)	19.4	17.8	18.4
Lit (8-11 <sup>th</sup> Grade)	36.6	41.1	39.6
Lit (12+ Grade)	19.6	17.5	18.2
<b>Eligible women's (Housewife)</b>	<b>94.9</b>	<b>96.9</b>	<b>96.2</b>
<b>Husband's Occupation</b>			
Agriculture labour	1.1	8.4	5.9
Farmer	1.9	22.1	15.3
Artisan	1.9	1.1	1.4
Petty trader	16.1	9.3	11.6
Business	3.6	0.9	1.8
Unskilled worker	30.3	31.4	31.1
Skilled worker	28.7	17.1	21.0
Self employed	1.4	0.7	0.9
Service	12.3	6.8	8.6
No work/unemployed	1.4	1.3	1.3
Other	1.5	0.9	1.1
<b>Total Percent</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Number of Women</b>	<b>3925</b>	<b>7816</b>	<b>11741</b>

## 2.2 Demographic characteristics of respondent

Table 2.2 gives the percentage distribution of eligible women by age and parity according to place of residence. It may be mentioned here that the eligible women in the sample were those who had delivered a child during the period between April 01, 2012 and March 31, 2013. As the table reveals, overall less than 8 percent of the

eligible women were in 15-19 age group. Forty-four percent belonged to 20-24 age group with no significant difference observed in proportions of women between urban slum (43 percent) and rural areas (44 percent) in this age group. Again, around 30 percent were in the age group of 24-29 with percentages of urban slum and rural areas being 33 and 28 percent respectively. A large proportion of respondents belonging to prime fertility period of 20-29 was for the fact that the eligible women considered for the study were those who had delivered a child during the period of 12 months just before the survey hence tend to be more younger if we take into consideration the age pyramid of currently married women aged 15-49 in general population.

Proportion of mothers with higher order births was higher in rural areas than their counterparts in urban slum. If we look at the analysis, it can be noticed that percentage of currently married women with three or higher birth order was higher (42 percent) in rural areas than in urban slum (34 percent). Again, mean number of children ever born to the eligible women was higher in rural areas (2.9) than the eligible women in urban slum (2.5). Similarly, mean number of children surviving too was observed to be slightly higher (urban slum-2.3; rural-2.6).

**Table- 2.2 Demographic characteristics of respondents**

Particulars	Urban Slum	Rural	Total
<b>Age Group</b>			
15-19	6.2	8.9	8.0
20-24	42.7	44.5	43.9
25-29	32.8	28.3	29.8
30-34	13.5	12.9	13.1
35-39	4.2	4.2	4.2
40-45	0.6	1.0	0.8
45-49	0.1	0.2	0.2
<b>Parity</b>			
0*	0.4	0.7	0.6
1	35.6	29.3	31.4
2	28.8	28.0	28.2
3	17.7	18.8	18.5
4+	17.5	23.2	21.3
Mean number of children ever born	2.5	2.9	2.8
Mean number of children living	2.3	2.6	2.5
<b>Total Percent</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Number of Women</b>	<b>3925</b>	<b>7816</b>	<b>11741</b>

\*Percentage of women who had no live birth earlier but had a still birth between April 01, 2012 and March 31, 2013

### 2.3 Household amenities

Table 2.3 shows the percent distribution of households according to the place of residence by various household amenities such as type of dwelling, sanitation facility, source of lighting as well as energy for cooking. Regarding the type of dwelling, analysis reveals that slightly less than two-fifth of the households (39 percent) lived in Pucca house (made with high quality materials throughout, including the roof, floor and walls). However, proportion of households living in Pucca dwellings in urban

slums was as high as 73 percent while this proportion for rural areas was only 21 percent. On the other hand, 61 percent of the households in rural areas lived in Semi-Pucca houses (using partly low quality and partly high quality materials) while about 23 percent in urban areas lived in Semi-Pucca dwellings. However, it was important to note that a little higher than one-tenth lived in Kutcha houses.

**Table-2.3 Percent distribution of household according to basic housing amenities**

Particulars	Percentage		
	Urban Slum	Rural	Total
<b>Type of House</b>			
Pucca	73.0	21.3	38.6
Semi-Pucca	22.6	61.1	48.2
Kutcha	4.4	17.6	13.2
<b>Sanitation Facility</b>			
Own Flush Toilet	50.8	7.1	21.7
Own Toilet (Pit)	30.6	23.1	25.6
Open space/Field	16.8	69.0	51.6
Other	1.9	0.9	1.2
<b>Source of drinking water</b>			
Piped water	35.3	7.7	17.0
Hand pump (Domestic)	34.8	53.2	46.2
Public hand pump (IM II)	14.3	35.5	29.1
Submersible	7.6	3.6	5.0
Other	8.0	0.0	2.7
<b>Source of lighting</b>			
Electricity	76.5	26.2	43.0
Kerosene	22.1	71.5	55.0
Other	1.4	2.4	2.0
<b>Source of energy for cooking</b>			
LPG	55.9	6.4	22.9
Wood	28.2	38.4	35.0
Crop residue	1.5	13.6	9.6
Dung cakes	11.5	41.2	31.3
Other	2.9	0.4	1.2
<b>Total Percent</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Number of Women</b>	<b>3925</b>	<b>7816</b>	<b>11741</b>

Sanitation facilities tend to have a direct bearing on the health of the family members. Analysis indicates, majority of the households in rural areas (69 percent) do not have access to any kind of sanitation facility thus they were defecating in open space/field. As against this, 81 percent households in urban areas had access to toilet facility in the form of own flush toilet and own pit toilet.

Access to potable water is an important determinant of the quality of life and also has bearing on the health of the people particularly the children in the household. Seventeen percent of the households had access to piped drinking water (urban slum-35 percent; rural-8 percent). Overall, 46 percent of the households depended on Hand pump (domestic) with as much as 53 percent mentioning about the same as a source

of drinking water in rural areas (urban slum-35 percent). Again, 29 percent of the households mentioned India Mark II Hand Pump as source of drinking water. This figure was significantly higher in rural areas (35 percent) as compared to urban slums (14 percent). Around 8 percent households in urban slum used submersible pump for drinking water while nearly 4 percent did so in rural areas.

Forty-three percent of the households used electricity as source of lighting while 55 percent used kerosene. There were obvious urban-rural differences in use of source of lighting with as much as 76 percent of the households using electricity in urban slum as compared to 26 percent in rural areas.

Regarding the fuel used for cooking, 56 percent households in urban slum used LPG while 28 percent depended on wood. The rural households primarily depended on wood (38 percent) and dung cakes (41 percent) as source of energy for cooking purposes. Around 14 percent also relied on crop residue as fuel for cooking in rural households.

## **2.4 Household assets**

Table 2.4 presents data on household assets such as ownership of house, land, livestock and household durable assets indicating the socio-economic status of the households by place of residence. Ninety nine percent of the households (urban slum-97 percent; rural 100 percent) had their own houses. Sixty percent of the households in rural areas had their own agriculture land while this figure was merely about 12 percent in urban areas. It is evident that the rural households primarily depended on agriculture and related economic activities for their sustenance. Proportion of households who owned livestock in rural households was 60 percent while 12 percent households reported so in urban slum.

The ownership of household durable goods demonstrates the socio-economic level of the households. For instance, access to radio or TV may expose the household members to messages and ads intended to generate awareness about health and reproductive health issues; having a telephone or mobile and means of transportation makes it easier for them to solicit help in emergency situation and also in seeking access to services outside the local area. Having a refrigerator can preserve the medicines and wholesomeness of food items. A large majority of households own cot/bed (97 percent), a mobile phone (85 percent), mattress (81 percent), a clock or watch (76 percent). The other household durable goods found were chairs (66 percent), pressure cookers (65 percent), electricity fans (62 percent), tables (50 percent), color television (45 percent), sewing machine (34 percent), black and white television (6 percent), land phone (3 percent) and computer (3 percent). While 4 percent were reported to have water pumps and 1 percent thresher.

As regards the means of transport, 73 percent of the households had cycle/bicycle with proportions of rural households owning bicycle being comparatively higher (75 percent) than the urban slum households (69 percent). Thirty-two percent urban

households owned motor cycles as compared 26 percent rural households. Two percent households in urban slum owned a car while one percent in rural areas. Expectedly, nearly 4 percent households in rural areas owned a tractor but this figure was negligible for urban slum.

**Table- 2.4 Household possessions, ownership of house, agriculture land livestock**

Particulars	Percentage		
	Urban Slum	Rural	Total
<b>Ownership of House</b>			
Same house	88.5	98.5	95.2
Another house	8.2	1.1	3.5
Own agriculture land	11.8	60.3	43.8
Own livestock	12.2	61.4	45.0
<b>Households Goods</b>			
Mattress	89.6	76.9	81.1
Pressure cooker	86.2	54.7	65.2
Chair	80.5	59.0	66.2
Cot/Bed	97.5	96.7	97.0
Table	64.9	42.4	49.9
Electricity fan	81.9	52.1	62.0
Radio /Transistor	6.6	5.2	5.7
Black and white television	8.0	4.7	5.8
Colour television	67.3	34.3	45.3
Sewing machine	43.0	29.8	34.2
Mobile phone	85.6	84.4	84.8
Land phone	4.4	2.9	3.4
Computer	5.9	2.0	3.3
Refrigerator	43.8	16.8	25.8
Clock or watch	84.0	72.8	76.5
Water pump	3.3	5.1	4.5
Thresher	0.2	1.4	1.0
<b>Means of Transport</b>			
Cycle/Bicycle	68.6	75.4	73.1
Motorcycle/Scooter	32.0	23.5	26.3
Car	2.1	1.5	1.7
Tractor	0.4	3.5	2.5
Bullock cart/Horse Cart	1.8	4.4	3.6
<b>Total Percent</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Number of Women</b>	<b>3925</b>	<b>7816</b>	<b>11741</b>