HEALTH PROBLEMS FACED BY WOMEN SANITARY WORKERS IN THANJAVUR TOWN - A STUDY

N.Rajavel

Assistant Professor, Department of Social Work, Bharathidasan University, Tiruchirappalli-620023.

ABSTRACT *The employment provide the empowerment in all aspect, this transition of women's states, doubt brings many healthy and positive changes for them. One cannot ignore or underestimate the inherent psychological and sociological problem of working women in general. In addition to the demographic factor, certain psychological and sociological factors influence the behavior of working women in the culture context. Such factors remain unexplored and no one tries to make an attempt to study Indian working women, Moreover, research studies in the above said areas are attempted in this present study which aims to study the socio-economic background, standard of living, health, decision making and social attitudes with a view to prepare a profile of women sanitary workers. Majority (60per cent) of the respondents are facing discrimination based on gender. Majority 67 percent of the respondents having skin disease. Majority (81per cent) of the respondents are illiterate. There is a significant relationship between the age and years of experience and the domain 3 of quality of life of the respondents.*

Introduction

The rapid industrialization paves the way to one important factor namely, women employment. the undue importance to material wealth and the economic necessity attracted woman to take employment public and private sectors, which in turn has given rise to changes in their roles and status in India. Working women, especially the sanitary workers have to perform both the domestic (child- rearing, taking care of husband if married and home management)as well as occupational roles simultaneously which needs adequate adjustment within themselves.

Methods & Materials
Objectives

- To study the socio-economic conditions of women sanitary workers in Thanjavur municipal corporation.
- To study the health problems of women sanitary workers in Thanjavur municipal corporation.
- To study the life status of women sanitary workers in Thanjavur municipal corporation.
- To analyze the level of decision-making in the family.
- To analyze the working condition in the job.
- To give suggestion for the improvement of women sanitary workers.

Descriptive research Design was adopted. Thanjavur Municipal Corporation was the universe of the study in which 123 women sanitary workers are employed. The researcher adopted census method and selected all the women Sanitary Workers employed at Thanjavur Municipal Corporation. A self prepared semi structured interview schedule was used to collect the socio- demographic details of the respondents. It consisted of personal details, family details and intervening questions. To assess the 'Quality of Life' of the respondent, the researcher used the WHOQOL-BREF instrument.

Results and Discussions

Table -1
Distribution of the respondents by their Age

S. No	Age	Frequency	Percentage
1	Below 40 years	29	23.6
2	41 to 49 Years	62	50.4
3	Above 50 years	32	26.0
Total	123	100.0	

The above table reveals that half 50 per cent of the respondents are in the age group between 41 to 49 years, a little more than one fourth 26 per cent of the respondents are in the age group above 50 years and the remaining 24 per cent of the respondents are in the age group of below 40 years.

Table -2
Distribution of the respondents by their Education

S.No	Education	Frequency	Percentage
1	Illiterate	100	81.3
2	Primary	18	14.6
3	Secondary	5	4.1
Total	123	100.0	

It could be inferred from the above table reveals that majority 81 per cent of the respondents are illiterate, a little 15 per cent of the respondents are studied up to primary school level and the remaining 4 per cent of them completed their secondary school education.

Table -3
Distribution of the respondents by their Caste

S. No	Caste	Frequency	Percentage
1	MBC	31	25.2
2	ST	18	14.6
3	SC	74	60.2
Total	123	100.0	

From the above table indicates that majority 60 per cent of the respondents belongs to Scheduled Caste community, one fourth 25 per cent of them belongs to Most Backward Class community and the remaining negligible amount 15 per cent of the respondents belongs to Scheduled Tribe community.

Table -4
Inter correlation matrix between the Socio Demographic variables and domains of Quality of Life and total Quality of Life

Variables	Age	No. of family member	Income per month	Year of experience	Dom.1	Dom.2	Dom.3	Dom.4	Qol
Age	1								
No. of family member	.171	1							
Income per month	.318**	-.018	1						
Year of experience	.770**	.251**	.277**	1					
Domian1	-.165	.048	-.049	-.134	1				
Domian2	-.059	.097	.012	-.015	.070	1			
Domian3	-.203*	-.063	-.111	-.18*	.058	-.202*	1		
Domian4	-.059	-.050	.129	-.004	.076	.417**	-.257**	1	
Quality of life	-.225*	.049	-.014	-.163	.830**	.482**	.087	.479**	1

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
 * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The above table stats that there is no statistically significant relationship between the age group, number of family members, income per month and years of experience and the domain 1 of quality of life of the respondents.

There is no statistically significant relationship between the age group, number of family members, income per month and years of experience and the domain 2 of quality of life of the respondents.

There is a statistically significant relationship between the age and years of experience and the domain 3 of quality of life of the respondents. Where as there is no statistically significant relationship between the number of family members and income per month and the domain 3 of quality of life of the respondents.
There is no statistically significant relationship between the age, numbers of family members, income per month and years of experience and the domain 4 of quality of life of the respondents.
There is a statistically significant relationship between the age group and total quality of life of the respondents but there is no significant relationship between the no. of family members, income per month and years of experience and the total quality of life of the respondents.

Age Group & Quality of Life of the Respondents

Table-5 One way analysis of variance between Age group and Quality of Life

S. No	Variable	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Statistical inference
1	Below 40	29	86.4828	8.64631	F-4.214 df-2,120 Sig.-0.017 p<0.05
2	41 to 49 Years	62	83.6935	4.20612	
3	Above 50	32	82.4688	4.10338	
Total		123	84.0325	5.69287	

H_0 - There is no statistically significant difference among the age group of the respondents in the mean score of Quality of life.

H_1 - There is a statistically significant difference among the age group of the respondents in the mean score of Quality of life.

Results: F (2,120) – 4.214 p - Sig 0.017

Conclusion
Since p value = sig 0.017 <0.05, H0 is rejected and H1 is accepted.

Table-5 clearly reported that the calculated F value is greater than the table value at 0.05 level, the null hypothesis is rejected and concluded that "There is a statistically significant difference the age group of the respondents in the Quality of life".

Table -6
One way analysis of variance between Marital Status and Quality of Life

S. No	Marital status	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Statistical inference
1	Married	2	85.5000	2.12132	F-3.113 df-3,119 Sig.0.029 p<0.05
2	Unmarried	84	84.8333	6.39057	
3	Divorced	4	77.5000	3.41565	
4	Widow	33	82.6970	2.72127	
Total		123	84.0325	5.69287	

H_0 - There is no statistically significant difference among the marital status of the respondents in the mean score of Quality of life.

H_1 - There is a statistically significant difference among the marital status of the respondents in the mean score of Quality of life.
Results: F (3,119) 3.113 p - Sig 0.029

Conclusion
Since p value = Sig 0.029 < 0.05, H0 is rejected and H1 is accepted.

Table-6 highlighted that the calculated F value is greater than the table value at 0.05 level, the null hypothesis is rejected and concluded that "There is a statistically significant difference among the marital status of the respondents in the Quality of life".

Table-7
One way analysis of variance between Educational Qualification and Quality of Life

S.No	Education	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Statistical inference
1	Illiterate	100	83.3900	4.64039	F-4.195 df-2,120 Sig.0.017 p<0.05
2	Primary	18	87.5000	9.53785	
3	Secondary	5	84.4000	2.07364	
Total		123	84.0325	5.69287	

H_0 - There is no statistically significant difference among the educational qualification of the respondents in the mean score of Quality of life.

$F_{(2,120)}$ – 4.195 p - Sig 0.017. Since p value = Sig 0.017 <0.05, H0 is rejected and H1 is accepted.

Table-7 depicts that the calculated F value is greater than the table value at 0.05 level, the null hypothesis is rejected and concluded that "There is a statistically significant difference among the educational qualifications in the Quality of life".

Table-8
One way analysis of variance between Caste of the Respondents and Quality of Life

S.No	Caste	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Statistical inference
1	MBC	31	83.8710	3.15956	F-.598 df-2,120 Sig.0.552 p>0.05
2	ST	18	85.3889	11.01944	
3	SC	74	83.7703	4.60954	
Total		123	84.0325	5.69287	

H_0 - There is no statistically significant difference among the caste of the respondents in the mean score of Quality of life.

$F_{(2,120)}$ – 0.598 p - Sig 0.552. Since p value = sig 0.552>0.05, H0 is accepted and H1 is rejected. Above table -8 shows that the calculated F value is less than the table value at 0.05 level, the null hypothesis is accepted and concluded "That there is no statistically significant difference among the Caste of the respondents in the Quality of life."

Table -9
One way analysis of variance between Respondents Income and Quality of Life

S.No	Income	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Statistical inference
1	Rs. 10000 to 11000	33	83.3939	6.19949	F-.803 df-2, 120 Sig.0.450 p>0.05
2	Rs. 11001to12000	66	84.6364	6.02976	
3	Above Rs. 12001	24	83.2500	3.66238	
Total		123	84.0325	5.69287	

H_0 - There is no statistically significant difference among the income of the respondents in the mean score of Quality of life.

$F_{(2,120)}$ – 0.803 p - Sig 0.450. Since p value = sig 0.450>0.05, H0 is accepted and H1 is rejected. As per table-9, calculated F value is less than the table value at 0.05 level, the null hypothesis is accepted and concluded that "There is no statistically significant difference among the income range of the respondents in the Quality of life".

Table-10
One way analysis of variance between Respondents Years of Experience and Quality of Life

S.No	Years	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Statistical inference
1	Below 15 Years	44	84.9773	7.63861	F-1.016 df-2,120 Sig.0.365 p>0.05
2	16 to25 years	72	83.4306	4.14466	
3	Above 26 years	7	84.2857	5.15475	
Total		123	84.0325	5.69287	

H_0 - There is no statistically significant difference among the year of the respondents in the mean score of Quality of life.

$F_{(2,120)}$ – 1.016 p - Sig 0.365. Since p value = sig 0.365> 0.05, H0 is accepted and H1 is rejected. As per table-10, calculated F value is less than the table value at 0.05 level, the null hypothesis is accepted and concluded that "There is no statistically significant difference among the years of experience in the Quality of life."

Majority (60 per cent) of the respondents are facing discrimination based on gender. Majority 67 percent of the respondents having skin disease. Majority (81per cent) of the respondents are illiterate. There is a significant relationship between the age and years of experience and the domain 3 of quality of life of the respondents. There is a significant relationship between the age and quality of life of the respondents but there is no significant relationship between the number of family members, income per month and years of experience and the quality of life of the respondents.

Conclusion
Due to the transition in the role performance of women sanitary workers they face many adjustment problems when they play a dual role at their working places as well as their homes. Half of the respondents are in the age group of 41 to 49 years, majority of the respondents are illiterate, majority of the respondents are belongs to SC community and more than two third of the respondents are unmarried. All the respondents are reported that they are not associated with any trade union, majority of the respondents are reported that they are taking insurance policy, majority of the respondents reported that they don't have a knowledge about schemes of sanitary workers and they don't know about sanitary workers policy.

REFERENCE 1. Ambekar AN, Bharadwaj RS, Joshi SA, Kagal AS, Bal AM. Sero surveillance of leptospirosis among sewer workers in Pune. Indian J Public Health. 2004; 48:27–9. | 2. D.Rajan (2012) Occupational Stress among Sanitary Workers International Journal of Business and Management Tomorrow Vol. 2 No. 9 ISSN: 2249-9962 September|2012 | 3. Friis L, Engstrand L, Edling C. Prevalence of Helicobacter pylori infection among sewage workers. Scand J Work Environ Health. 1996; 22:364–8. | 4. Friedrich M, Cermak T, Heiller I. Spinal troubles in sewage workers: Epidemiological data and work disability due to low back pain. Int Arch Occup Environ Health. 2000; 73:245–54. | 5. FAHIM A. E and EL-PRINCE M (2012) Passive Smoking, Pulmonary Function and | 6. Bronchial Hyper-responsiveness among Indoor Sanitary Workers. Industrial Health 2012, 50, 516–520. | 7. Nayak S et al. (2013) . Dermatologic Evaluation of Street Sanitation Workers. Indian J Dermatol. 58(3): 246. | 8. Richardson DB. Respiratory effects of chronic hydrogen sulfide exposure. Am J Ind Med. 1995; 28:99–108. | 9. Santiso, R. 1997, 'Effects of chronic parasitosis on women's health', International Journal of Gynecology & Obstetrics. Second World Report on Women's Health, vol. 58, no. 1, pp. 129-136. | 10. Taha, A. Z., Shahidullah, M., Sebai, Z. A. & Ahmed, M. H. H. O. 2000, 'Assessment of Water Use and Sanitation Behaviour in a Rural Area of Bangladesh', Archives of Environmental Health, vol. 55, no. 1, pp. 51-57. | 11. Arvanitidou M, Constantinidis TC, Doutsos J, Mandraveli K, Katsouyannopoulos V. Occupational hepatitis B virus infection in sewage workers. Med Lav. 1998; 89:437–44. | 12. Cairncross, S. & Kolsky, P. 2003, WELL Advocacy Document - Environmental Health and the Poor: our shared responsibility, Water and Environmental Health at London and Loughborough (WELL), UK. | 13. Cave, B. & Kolsky, P. 1999, WELL Study: Groundwater, latrines and health (Task No: 163), Water and Environmental Health at London and Loughborough (WELL), London. | 14. De Serres G, Levesque B, Higgins R, Major M, Laliberte D, Boulianne N, et al. Need for vaccination of sewer workers against leptospirosis and hepatitis A. Occup Environ Med. 1995;52:505–7. | 15. Elledge, M. F. 2003, Sanitation Policies: Thematic Overview Paper, IRC International Water and Sanitation Centre. | 16. Food Processing HR Council (2011) Trends and new technologies affecting The Work Performed by Sanitation Workers in the Food Processing Industry | 17. http://www.fphrc.ca/uploads/products/product-pdf/sanitation%20report_English.pdf. | 18. http://www.lboro.ac.uk/well/resources/fact-sheets/fact-sheets-htm/ehp.htm [June 2006].