

**98 Sanitation Coverage: A Study in four Villages of Rajshahi Division**  
(Published in January 1997)

**a) Researchers' Identity**

1. M. Fazlul Haq, Director  
M.A. (Economics), Dhaka University.  
M.A. (Economics), University of the Philippines, Deliman, The Philipines
2. Nargis Jahan, Deputy Director  
M.Sc. (Geography), Rajshahi University
3. H.M. Alauddin, Deputy Director  
M.S.S. (Political Science), Dhaka University

**b) Objectives**

The objectives of the study are:

- i. to study the existing excreta disposal system;
- ii. to explore the socio-economic background of water-sealed latrine users and non-users;
- iii. to assess the extent of usage of water-sealed latrine by male, female and children;
- iv. to find out the causes of not having water-sealed latrine;
- v. to find out the sources of different types of water-sealed latrine;
- vi. to find out where subsidy is needed to provide water-sealed latrine among the rural poor; and
- vii. to know whether community support or organization is needed to encourage rural poor to have water-sealed latrine.

### c) Executive summary

The study was conducted in four villages of three districts of Rajshahi division. Of the four villages, Magurgari and Juanpur were selected from Bogra district where RDA Bogra implements its action research projects. The other two villages, Tobaripara of Raigonj Thana and Banihara of Kalai Thana were selected from Sirajgonj and Joypurhat districts respectively where there are no project activities. The objectives of the study were to explore the existing excreta disposal system, socio-economic background of latrine (WSL), sources and mode of payment of WSL and role of community organization in installing WSL.

In the four study villages there were 612 households of which 327 (53.43%) installed water-sealed latrines and the rest of 285 (46.57%) did not have such latrine. Positive relationship between level of education and landholding size with WSL installation was observed in these villages.

More than half of the households (53%) in project villages and only 19% in non-project villages owned WSL. A majority of females (77.61%) and males (82.42%) of non-project villages used open space for defecation whereas only 40.52% and 45.58% representing respectively female and male in project villages used open space for defecation. It was found that 81% of the respondents in project villages procured WSL from NGOs whereas 58.54% in non-project villages procured such latrines from private producers. More than two-third of the respondents have single ownership of latrine both in project and non-project villages. In the case of joint ownership, number of users varied from 3 to 11.

More than two-third of the respondents in project villages mentioned that they used 5 rings whereas 52.38% of the respondents in non-project villages mentioned that they used 6 rings in the installation of SWL. It was found that a vast majority (73.11%) of the respondents procured latrines through credit in project villages. There was no such facility in non-project village.

Most of the households (83.40%) in project villages installed latrines beyond 20 feet distance from homestead whereas in non-project villages 62.50% households set up latrines beyond 20 feet distance from homestead. Majority (53.36%) of the respondents fenced latrines with straw.

More than half of the respondents (58.10%) cleaned their latrines once a month whereas 10% had not cleaned them at all. Nearly two-third of the respondents in project and non-project villages washed their hands after defecation by using soil and water.

Nearly 80% of the respondents in project villages mentioned about the availability of credit as the major role of social organization in setting up of latrines.

Two-third of the respondents in project villages and nearly 90% respondents from project and non-project villages mentioned about financial constraints, lack of space or land as reasons for not installing latrines.

As for steps to be taken for installation of latrine, respondents pointed out four areas such as availability of credit facilities, publicity on the advantages of using latrine, low price of latrine and publicity about disadvantages of not using a latrine. Majority of the respondents (73.85%) in project villages and 63.23% in non-project villages mentioned availability of credit facilities as an effective step for installing latrines.

