

Suggested Citation

Kumar, A. (2014). Devalaya and Shauchalaya: Addressing Socio-Economic Inclusions. *Journal of Studies in Dynamics and Change (JSDC)*, 80-87.

Devalaya and Shauchalaya
Addressing Socio-Economic Inclusions

Arjun Kumar

Research Scholar, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi, India

ABSTRACT

Recent debates over ‘Devalaya and Shauchalaya’ have foregrounded the importance and need of access to sanitation facilities, besides the places of worship, for raising the standard of life. This paper assesses their changes using data from Census of India, 2001 and 2011 and National Sample Survey’s Housing Conditions Rounds unit record data 1993 and 2008/09. Households in rural India and those belonging to weaker sections of society such as Scheduled Tribes, Scheduled Castes, Agricultural Labourers (rural), Casual Labourers (urban) and Poor households were found noticeably lagging and most excluded in access to sanitation. Thus, there is need for more attention towards sanitation facilities especially in rural India and focus on inclusion of various weaker sections of society to raise the overall quality of life and well-being.

Keywords: *Sanitation, Socio-Economic Groups, Weaker Sections, Inclusion, Quality of Life.*

Author Details and Affiliations

PhD Scholar (Economics) at Centre for the Study of Regional Development, School of Social Sciences, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi, India. E mail: arjun40_ssf@jnu.ac.in

The author would like to thank Prof. Sukhadeo Thorat and Prof. Amitabh Kundu for their comments.

Introduction:

“Individual Health and hygiene is largely dependent on adequate availability of drinking water and proper sanitation. There is, therefore, a direct relationship between water, sanitation and health” (GOI, 2012). Recent debates over ‘Devalaya and Shauchalaya’ have foregrounded the importance and need of latrine facilities (or access to sanitation), besides the places of worship, for raising the well-being and standard of life. The issue of access to sanitation, especially latrine facilities was addressed by the Government of India, which “started the Central Rural Sanitation Programme (CRSP) in 1986 with the objective of improving the quality of life of the rural people and also to provide privacy and dignity to women” (GOI, 2012). The ambit of this programme was widened with the launch of a demand driven approach called the Total Sanitation campaign in 1999, that focussed on a broader concept of sanitation, covering “... personal hygiene, home sanitation, safe water, garbage disposal, excrete disposal and waste water disposal.” (GOI, 2012). This programme was renamed as Nirmal Bharat Abhiyan in 2012 after the

success of Nirmal Gram Puraskar that sought to recognise the achievements and efforts made by the Gram Panchayats in ensuring full sanitation coverage. The Twelfth Plan recognises that “Inclusive growth should result in lower incidence of poverty, improvement in health outcomes... and improvement in provision of basic amenities like water, electricity, roads, sanitation and housing. Particular attention needs to be paid to the needs of the SC, ST and OBC population, women and children as also minorities and other excluded group” (GOI., 2011). The important aspects of socio-economic groups in regard with access to latrine facilities have been noticeably missed in the recent debates, primarily because of the superfluous comparisons of sacred places of worship with latrine facilities. Using data from Census of India 2001 and 2011 (Tables on Houses, Household Amenities and Assets, House listing and Housing Data), we have assessed the rise in the number of houses, households and places of worship, followed by the households having and the ones not having latrine facilities in rural and urban India. Further, aspects of socio-economic groups in regard with access to latrine facilities in rural and



urban India are discussed with more information from National Sample Survey's (NSS) Housing Conditions Rounds unit record data, 1993 and 2008/9.

Houses, Households and Places of Worship

The occupied census houses used as residence and residence-cum-other uses in India increased by 30.7 per cent from 2001 to 2011, leading to an addition of 57.5 million from 187.2 million in 2001 to 244.6 million in 2011 (Table 1). The total households in India increased by 28.5 per cent from 2001 to 2011, leading to an addition of 54.7 million from 192.0 million in 2001 to 246.7 million in 2011, and were marginally higher than the occupied census houses used as residence and residence-cum-other uses. The places of worship in India also witnessed a similar trend and reported an increase of 25.6 per cent from 2001 to 2011, leading to an addition of 0.6 million from 2.4 million in 2001 to 3.0 million in 2011.

Further probing into rural-urban break up provides more information on these trends. From 2001 to 2011, the Occupied Census Houses used as 'residence and residence-cum-other uses' and total Households increased by 23.0 and 21.4 per cent, respectively in rural India, and by 50.8 and 46.9 per cent, respectively, in urban India (Table 2). Interestingly, the places of worship also report similar trends, i.e. an increase of 22.1 per cent in rural India and 42.6 per cent in urban India. Therefore, it suggests that increase in the places of worship have possible linkages with increase in the occupied census houses used as 'residence and residence-cum-other uses' and the total households.

Households Not Having Latrine Facilities within the Premises

In comparison with the rise in Houses, Households and Places of Worship, as per census, the *households not having latrine facilities within the premises*¹ (public and open latrine use) in India witnessed an increase of 8.9 million from 122.1 million in 2001 (63.6 per cent of total households) to 131.0 million in 2011 (53.1 per cent of total households). However, households having latrine facilities within the premises (includes water closet, pit and other latrine) in India, report an increase of 45.8 million from 69.9 million in 2001 to 115.7 million in 2011.

¹ **Households not having latrine facility within the premise:** It refers to households having public and open latrine use meaning no latrine facility within the premise. It excludes all the households having 'latrine facility within the premise' including water closet, pit and other latrine facilities. (Data Source: Census of India)

In rural India, the number of households not having latrine facilities within the premises was found to be severe. It witnessed an increase of 8.3 million from 108.0 million in 2001 (78.1 per cent of rural households) to 116.3 million in 2011 (69.3 per cent of rural households), thus contributing to most of the increase in all such households in India (8.9 million). In urban India, the number of households not having latrine facilities within the premises reported an increase of 0.5 million from 14.1 million in 2001 (26.3 per cent of urban households) to 14.7 million in 2011 (18.6 per cent of urban households).

Although the percentage share of the households not having latrine facilities within the premises shows improvement from 2001 to 2011 in both rural and urban India, the absolute number of the households reports marginal increase, and hence suggests the worsening of situation, especially in rural areas. (Table 2)

According to NSS housing condition rounds data, the percentages of houses with '*no latrine facility in the house*'² were 66.4 and 17.7 per cent in rural and urban India respectively during 2008/9, suggesting high levels of deprivation in rural areas (Table 4 and 5). The situation for urban areas seems to be very different from rural areas because of higher attainment of latrine facilities in the houses in urban areas.

The rural and urban India witnessed 1.72 and 4.49 per cent compounded annual decline, respectively, for 'no latrine facility in the house' from 1993 to 2008/9 (Table 4 and 5), with acceleration in the rate of decline of deprivation from 2002 to 2008/09 in both rural and urban India (Kumar, 2014).

This leads us to the question about other aspects of the households not having latrine facilities within the premises, their socio-economic background, their performances over the period, and spatial locations among others. In order to answer these questions, more information from Census and NSS has been captured, focusing on the socio-economic backgrounds of the households.

² **No latrine facility in the house:** It refers to Public/community use and no facility in the house. Exclusive use and shared with other households, both are excluded here. (Data Source: NSS Housing Conditions Rounds)

Households Not Having Latrine Facilities within the Premises and Aspects of Socio-Economic Groups

According to Census 2011 data, percentages of households not having latrine facilities within the premises were found to be higher among Scheduled Tribes (STs) and Scheduled Castes (SCs) than the others in both rural and urban India (Table 3).

As per NSS data, STs and SCs households lagged behind others households, and the poor households lagged behind the non-poor households in the rate of decline for 'no latrine facility in the house' from 1993 to 2008/9 in rural India (Table 4).

The SCs households lagged behind the STs and Others households, and the poor households lagged behind the non-poor households in the rate of decline for 'no latrine facility in the house' from 1993 to 2008/9 in urban India (Table 5).

Even for similar MPCE quintile classes, STs and SCs households were found lagging behind the Others households in having latrine facility in the house in both rural and urban India. "It indicates that even if same economic conditions prevail there is variation in attainment by different social groups. Results suggest that there are factors acting as constraints based on social backgrounds leading to denial on access to basic amenities" (Kumar, 2014).

Disparities in the deprivation in access to Latrine facilities (as measured by Modified Sopher's Disparity Index, where the ideal value for the Index for having no disparity is 0) between ST and SC households and between SC and Other households were observed to be increasing across every MPCE quintiles in both rural and urban India as suggested from the values of the index which increased during 1993 and 2008/9.

In 2008/9, as per the NSS data, in rural India, STs and SCs were found to have very higher percentages of households with 'no latrine facility in the house,' followed by those belonging to Other Backward Castes (OBCs) as compared to the Others. Hindus were found to have higher percentage of houses with 'no latrine facility in the house' than Muslims and Other Religious Minorities (ORMs). Among economic groups, Agricultural Labours (ALs) and poor households were found to have very high percentage of households with no latrine facility in 2008/9. A similar pattern was seen across the Socio-Religious groups and the economic groups for houses with 'no latrine facility in the house' in rural India during 2008/9 (Table 6).

In urban India, SCs and STs were found to have higher percentages of households with 'no latrine facility in the house,' followed by OBCs as compared to the others in 2008/9. Muslims and Hindus were found to have higher percentages of households with 'no latrine facility in the house' than ORMs. Among economic groups, Casual Labourers (CLs) and poor households were found to have higher percentages of houses with no latrine facility in 2008/9. A similar pattern was seen across the Socio-Religious groups and the economic groups for houses with 'no latrine facility in the house' in urban India during 2008/9 (Table 7).

"The insights from the experience of poverty and consumption expenditure changes during the periods 1994-2005 – 2005-10, particularly during the latter period, need to be kept in mind in developing a pro-poor inclusive growth strategy during the Twelfth Plan. The results imply that a broad-based pro-poor policy needs to be supplemented by group specific policy (social, religious and economic groups), and this must be made an integral part of the overall planning strategy" (Thorat & Dubey, 2012). The findings from the analysis of latrine facilities as discussed before also suggest similar inclusions of socio-economics groups and target based approach for access to sanitation.

Summary of Findings and Concluding Observations

Findings suggest that an increase in the places of worship have possible linkages with an increase in the occupied census houses used as 'residence and residence-cum-other uses' and the total households. In 2011, 69.3 per cent of rural, and 18.6 per cent of urban households did not have latrine facilities within the premises. The percentage share of the households which did not had latrine facilities within the premises shows improvement over 2001 and 2011 in both rural and urban India, but the absolute number of the households report marginal increase (8.9 million), suggesting the worsening of situation, especially in rural areas. During 1993 and 2008/9, Poor households, especially the STs and SCs households experienced slow rate of decline of 'no latrine facility in the house' despite having higher percentage of houses with 'no latrine facility in the house' to start with, especially in rural areas. There was acceleration in the rate of decline of deprivation from 2002 to 2008/09 in both rural and urban India. Disparities in the deprivation in access to Latrine facilities (as measured by Modified Sopher's Disparity Index) between ST and SC households and between SC and Other households were observed to

be increasing across every MPCE quintiles in both rural and urban India. The percentage of houses with 'no latrine facility in the house' were found to be higher for rural areas than urban areas in general and specifically for STs, SCs, ALs (rural), CLs (urban) and poor households during 2008/9.

Households in rural India and those belonging to weaker sections of society such as Scheduled Tribes, Scheduled Castes, Agricultural Labourers (rural), Casual Labourers (urban) and Poor households were found noticeably lagging and most excluded in access to sanitation, latrine facilities, preventing the rise of their quality of life and well-being. Therefore, the current debate over 'Devalaya and Shauchalya' highlighting the issue of sanitation needs to incorporate more attention towards sanitations facilities especially in rural India and focus on inclusion of various weaker socio-economic sections of society to raise the overall quality of life and well-being.

Tables Used:

Table 1, Level and Changes of Census Houses, Households, Place of Worships and Latrine Facilities during 2001 and 2011 in India.

Total (Rural and Urban)	Levels		Change
	2011	2001	2001 - 2011
Occupied Census Houses used as Residence and Residence - cum- other use (in millions)	244.6	187.2	57.5
<i>in %</i>			30.7
Total Households (in millions)	246.7	192.0	54.7
<i>in %</i>			28.5
Place of worship (in millions)	3.0	2.4	0.6
<i>in %</i>			25.6
Number of Households not having Latrine facilities within the premises (public and open latrine use) (in millions)	131.0	122.1	8.9
<i>in %</i>	53.1	63.6	7.3
Number of Households having Latrine facilities within the premises (includes water closet, pit and other latrine) (in millions)	115.7	69.9	45.8
<i>in %</i>	46.9	36.4	65.6

Source: Tables on Houses, Household Amenities and Assets, House Listing and Housing Data, Census of India, 2001 and 2011.

Works Cited

- GOI. (2012). *Guidelines, Nirmal Bharat Abhiyan*. New Delhi: Ministry of Drinking Water and Sanitation, Government of India.
- GOI. (2011). *Faster, Sustainable and More Inclusive Growth: An Approach to 12th Five Year Plan*. New Delhi: Planning Commission, Government of India.
- Kumar, A. (2014). Access to Basic Amenities: Aspects of Caste, Ethnicity and Poverty in Rural and Urban India—1993 to 2008–2009. *Journal of Land and Rural Studies*, 2(1), 127-148.
- Thorat, S., & Dubey, A. (2012). Has Growth Been Socially Inclusive during 1993-94 – 2009-10? *Economic and Political Weekly*, XLVII(10).

Table 2, Levels and Changes of Census Houses, Households, Place of Worships and Latrine Facilities during 2001 and 2011 in Rural and Urban India.

	Rural			Urban		
	Levels		Change	Levels		Change
	2011	2001	2001 - 2011	2011	2001	2001 - 2011
Occupied Census Houses used as Residence and Residence -cum- other use (in millions)	166.2	135.1	31.1	78.5	52.1	26.4
<i>in %</i>			23.0			50.8
Total Households (in millions)	167.8	138.3	29.6	78.9	53.7	25.2
<i>in %</i>			21.4			46.9
Place of worship (in millions)	2.4	2.0	0.4	0.6	0.4	0.2
<i>in %</i>			22.1			42.6
Number of Households not having Latrine facilities within the premises (public and open latrine use) (in millions)	116.3	108.0	8.3	14.7	14.1	0.5
<i>in %</i>	69.3	78.1	7.7	18.6	26.3	3.9
Number of Households having Latrine facilities within the premises (includes water closet, pit and other latrine) (in millions)	51.5	30.3	21.2	64.2	39.6	24.6
<i>in %</i>	30.7	21.9	70.1	81.4	73.7	62.2

Source: Tables on Houses, Household Amenities and Assets, Houselisting and Housing Data, Census of India, 2001 and 2011.

Table 3, Households not having Latrine facilities within the premises (public and open latrine use) in Rural and Urban India by Social Groups, 2011 (in %)

	ST	SC	Others	Total
Rural	84.2	77.2	64.4	69.3
Urban	34.0	34.1	15.1	18.6

Note- ST- Scheduled Tribe, SC- Scheduled Caste.

Source: Tables on Houses, Household Amenities and Assets, House Listing and Housing Data, Census of India, 2001 and 2011.

Table 4, Changes in Levels of No Latrine Facility in the House by Social Groups and MPCE Quintile Categories in Rural India, 1993 and 2008-09 (in percentage points and Annual Compound Growth Rate)

CEC	ST	SC	Others	All	Modified Sopher's Disparity Index	
					(SC, ST)	(SC, Others)
Levels in 1993					1993	
0-20	94.65	93.63	90.99	92.26	0.01	-0.02
20-40	91.73	92.03	88.68	89.82	0.00	-0.03
40-60	88.32	90.13	86.93	87.73	-0.02	-0.03
60-80	87.31	88.92	83.18	84.62	-0.01	-0.05
80-100	80.79	82.47	73.57	75.20	-0.02	-0.08
Total	90.83	91.09	85.37	87.24	0.00	-0.05
Levels in 2008-09					2008-09	
0-20	91.07	89.12	80.09	84.63	0.02	-0.08
20-40	79.14	82.79	73.93	76.85	-0.03	-0.08
40-60	71.36	76.62	65.78	68.86	-0.05	-0.10
60-80	66.07	70.97	56.40	60.19	-0.05	-0.15
80-100	47.82	52.17	35.05	38.38	-0.05	-0.22
Total	76.52	77.43	60.92	66.41	-0.01	-0.16
Changes in Levels during 1993 to 2008-09, Annual Compounded					Changes in Index Value	
0-20	-0.24	-0.31	-0.81	-0.55	0.01	-0.06
20-40	-0.93	-0.67	-1.15	-0.99	-0.03	-0.05
40-60	-1.34	-1.03	-1.75	-1.53	-0.03	-0.07
60-80	-1.75	-1.42	-2.44	-2.14	-0.03	-0.10
80-100	-3.27	-2.87	-4.60	-4.18	-0.04	-0.14
Total	-1.08	-1.03	-2.12	-1.72	-0.01	-0.11

Note: ST- Scheduled Tribe, SC- Scheduled Caste.

MPCE: Monthly Per Capita Expenditure. Consumption Expenditure Classes (CEC) MPCE Quintile classes are in percentages.

Modified Sopher's Disparity Index = $\text{Log}(X_2/X_1) + \text{Log}[(200-X_1)/(200-X_2)]$.

Annual compounded growth rate is calculated based upon percentage over percentage of levels of deprivation in respective years.

Source: Author's Calculation using National Sample Survey, Household Conditions Rounds, unit record data for the respective years.

Table 5, Changes in Levels of No Latrine Facility in the House by Social Groups and MPCE Quintile Categories in Urban India, 1993 and 2008-09 (in percentage points and Annual Compound Growth Rate)

CEC	ST	SC	Others	All	Modified Sopher's Disparity Index	
					(SC, ST)	(SC, Others)
Levels in 1993					1993	
0-20	67.22	57.29	46.85	50.26	0.10	-0.12
20-40	57.72	54.64	38.50	42.14	0.03	-0.20
40-60	41.25	42.73	32.76	34.33	-0.02	-0.14
60-80	19.70	36.01	26.85	27.55	-0.30	-0.15
80-100	14.69	35.19	21.06	21.66	-0.43	-0.26
Total	50.74	50.49	33.58	36.60	0.00	-0.22
Levels in 2008-09					2008-09	
0-20	47.48	59.09	37.88	43.33	-0.13	-0.25
20-40	32.43	40.26	24.62	28.31	-0.11	-0.25
40-60	24.33	25.24	15.57	17.40	-0.02	-0.23
60-80	9.73	16.04	8.40	9.29	-0.23	-0.30
80-100	2.12	6.55	3.24	3.40	-0.50	-0.31
Total	25.59	33.50	14.66	17.74	-0.14	-0.41
Changes in Levels during 1993 to 2008-09, Annual Compounded					Changes in Index Value	
0-20	-2.18	0.20	-1.34	-0.94	-0.23	-0.14
20-40	-3.59	-1.92	-2.80	-2.49	-0.15	-0.06
40-60	-3.30	-3.29	-4.61	-4.22	0.00	-0.09
60-80	-4.38	-5.01	-7.11	-6.67	0.07	-0.15
80-100	-11.57	-10.12	-11.21	-11.09	-0.07	-0.05
Total	-4.25	-2.57	-5.13	-4.49	-0.14	-0.18

Source: As in Table 4.

Table 6, No Latrine Facility in the House by Socio-Religious Groups and Economic Groups (Household Types and MPCE Quintile Categories) in Rural India during 2008-09 (in percentage points)

	ST	SC	OBC	Others	Hindu	Muslims	ORM	Total
HH Type								
SEinNA	67.0	65.6	56.9	35.3	56.0	45.6	27.7	53.0
AL	88.4	86.4	85.3	64.5	85.2	70.9	66.5	83.1
OL	87.5	77.1	65.9	43.0	73.0	50.6	33.4	68.1
SEinA	73.6	75.6	73.4	45.4	69.1	42.1	32.6	65.1
Others	37.4	52.9	46.6	29.2	43.6	38.0	17.6	41.3
CEC Quintiles								
0-20	91.1	89.1	86.3	64.7	86.9	68.4	78.3	84.6
20-40	79.1	82.8	81.2	58.3	79.8	58.7	63.0	76.9
40-60	71.4	76.6	74.2	49.7	72.2	50.4	47.5	68.9
60-80	66.1	71.0	64.1	43.7	63.7	41.1	39.6	60.2
80-100	47.8	52.2	44.4	25.0	42.8	21.4	16.6	38.4
Total	76.5	77.4	70.4	44.5	70.0	50.6	38.2	66.4

Note: ST- Scheduled Tribe, SC- Scheduled Caste, OBC- Other Backward Castes, ORM- Other Religious Minorities, SEinNA- Self Employed in Non-Agriculture, AL- Agricultural Labour, OL- Other Labour and SEinA- Self Employed in Agriculture.

Source: Author's Calculation using National Sample Survey, Household Conditions Rounds unit record data, 2008-09.

Table 7, No Latrine Facility in the House by Socio-Religious Groups and Economic Groups (Household Types and MPCE Quintile Categories) in Urban India during 2008-09 (in percentage points)

	ST	SC	OBC	Others	Hindu	Muslims	ORM	Total
<i>Household Type</i>								
SE	29.4	33.8	20.4	9.2	17.8	16.5	8.2	17.0
RWSA	13.8	20.9	13.9	9.5	12.3	18.6	10.4	12.7
CL	73.0	59.6	37.1	35.0	47.4	33.3	27.6	44.2
Others	6.9	13.1	10.2	3.8	7.1	10.9	4.6	7.2
<i>CEC Quintiles</i>								
0-20	47.5	59.1	42.2	29.3	47.8	30.4	33.2	43.3
20-40	32.4	40.3	28.8	18.3	30.4	20.6	26.3	28.3
40-60	24.3	25.2	17.5	13.5	18.1	15.0	13.3	17.4
60-80	9.7	16.0	7.7	8.9	9.2	12.8	5.1	9.3
80-100	2.1	6.6	3.1	3.3	3.1	9.4	2.7	3.4
Total	25.6	33.5	19.8	10.3	18.1	19.2	10.5	17.7

Note: ST- Scheduled Tribe, SC- Scheduled Caste, OBC- Other Backward Castes, ORM- Other Religious Minorities, SE- Self Employed RWSA- Regular Wage/Salary Earner and CL- Casual Labour.

Source: Author's Calculation using National Sample Survey, Household Conditions Rounds unit record data, 2008-09.