


Water consumption habits of a north-western Turkish community: a cross-sectional study

Unal Ayrançi ^{a,*}, Merve Sezer Yildiz ^b and Ahmet Demirci ^c

^a Health Ministry, Kurtulus Family Health Center, Eskisehir, Turkey

^b Midwifery Department, Faculty of Health Sciences, Bilecik Seyh Edebali University, Bilecik, Turkey

^c Obstetrics and Gynecology Clinic, Bilecik Seyh Edebali University Ministry of Health Bilecik Training and Research Hospital, Bilecik, Turkey

*Corresponding author. E-mail: uayranc@yahoo.com

 UA, 0000-0001-5064-7388; MSY, 0000-0001-7061-3302; AD, 0000-0003-1711-7128

ABSTRACT

The aim was to determine the drinking water preferences of people applied to a family health center. This cross-sectional study was carried out from 1 April to 31 May 2022. The data were evaluated using the chi-square test and percent ratios with a significance of $p < 0.05$. The mean age of all 432 respondents was 48.03 ± 15.86 . It was determined that those aged 31–45 had drunk more bottled water ($p < 0.01$) and more spring water ($p < 0.001$), than those aged 65 and above and had more purified water ($p < 0.001$), than women who had more tap water ($p < 0.001$), than married people who had more demijohn and tap water ($p < 0.001$, each one), than divorced/widows who had more packaged and purified water ($p < 0.001$, each one), than the illiterate/literate who had bottled water ($p < 0.001$, per one) and than those who had no income/people who lived on the state or municipal assistance who had only carboy water ($p < 0.001$). This study suggests that the biggest factor that positively affected the drinking water preference was the packaging of the water. However, the drinking rates of mains water and spring water were quite low. Convincing the authorities to make the mains water drinkable is of great importance in terms of overcoming the public's distrust of mains water.

Key words: consumer preference, drinking water, water consumption, water usage purposes

HIGHLIGHTS

- This study aimed to close the gap in the studies related to water.
- People had to use the water options available to them.
- The biggest factor that positively affected the drinking water preference was the packaging of the water.
- Convincing the authorities to make the mains water drinkable is of great importance.
- The only way to prevent environmental pollution caused by packaging water is to switch to mains water.

GRAPHICAL ABSTRACT



INTRODUCTION

Water is one of the most valuable resources necessary for all living things to survive and is an indispensable element (Borlu *et al.* 2017; UNESCO 2021). This resource, called ‘blue gold’, has important health, social and cultural values in the heart of human communities (UNESCO 2021). Water allows all organs in our body to live in a humid environment, keeps body temperature balanced by moisturizing all tissues, activates the body’s metabolism, ensures that the blood pressure is kept balanced and is an indispensable element for the functioning of the entire digestive system, prevents constipation, and ensures that waste and toxic substances are removed from the body (Wenger 1972; Mentés 2006; Jéquier & Constant 2010). Although it decreases with age (75 to 50% from infancy to old age), approximately 60% of an adult’s body weight is water (Mentés 2006).

Access to clean water and sanitation is an indispensable rule for hygiene. This main rule is guaranteed by the laws of each country and by the joint resolutions of the United Nations (Sustainable Development Goals 2019; Spicer *et al.* 2020). At the ‘International Conference on Primary Health Care’ held in Alma-Ata in the year 1978, removing the obstacles to accessing clean and potable water and ensuring access to water was one of the important agenda items (Declaration of Alma-Ata 1978). At the Millennium Development Goals Summit in September 2010, an ambitious action plan was developed by world leaders; under the title of ‘Ensuring environmental sustainability’ (Goal 7), it was aimed to halve the proportion of people without permanent access to safe drinking water by 2015 (UNDP 2015a). Within the scope of Clean Water Sanitation (Goal 6), which is one of the goals of the Sustainable Development Goals, which came into force in 2016 after the Millennium Development Goals; global plans were established to ensure safe and accessible clean drinking water for all by 2030 (UNDP 2015b). However, according to the World Health Organization (WHO) 2019 report, it has been reported that approximately 829,000 people die each year from diarrhea, which is a preventable disease due to unsafe drinking water, sanitation, and hand hygiene (WHO 2019).

Water resources in our world are scarce for 8 billion people. As the population grows, millions of people who are already dying or dying of thirst will not be able to escape this future. While non-human beings would succumb to their fate and prefer death when they could not find water, it seems that people would prefer to kill their fellow humans in the near future in order to live when they are without water.

Despite the availability of mains water among the improved usable water resources and the increasing access to mains water, the demand for packaged water has been increasing in recent years (Geerts *et al.* 2020). As a result of this, bottled water consumption has reached the level of insanity by allowing plastic pollution and indirectly causing drought and water scarcity (Free *et al.* 2014). Because when compared to tap water, producing packaged water causes much more energy release, cost, and pollution (Gleick & Cooley 2009). Considering that bottled water production has reached 100 billion gallons, although it varies between countries, the gravity of the event is obvious (Rodwan 2017).

For drinking water purposes in our country, packaged water including carboy water, tap water/mains water, boiled tap water, spring water, well water, purified water, and stream water are used. 98% of the households in our country have access to an improved drinking water source (TNSA 2018). Turkish Statistical Institute (TSI) in 2020 reported that 98.8% of the total population (98.7% of the municipal population and 99.3% of the village population) is served by drinking and utility water networks (TSI 2020). However, since human beings have full confidence in closed and unopened products in terms of hygiene and the absence of contamination, their consumption is incomparably higher than in other drinkable waters.

The lack of supervision of local governments plays a major role in this. Not paying attention to infrastructures, not renewing the infrastructure in a timely manner, the increase in infectious intestinal infections such as typhoid fever as a result of the mixing of sewage wastes with tap water in some parts of our country, and the lack of good taste and appearance of tap water also prevent people from consuming tap water. People who do not trust the hygiene and quality of tap water provided by the municipality may turn to alternatives such as carboy, packaged water, and spring water (Uzundumlu *et al.* 2020). In this study, it was aimed to determine the drinking water preferences of people who applied to a family health center according to their sociodemographic characteristics and to discuss the reasons for their preference for these preferences.

METHODS

Setting

Eskisehir is a semi-rural province situated in the western part of Turkey, with a population of about 898,369. The socio-economical level of the city is average compared to other cities in the country. There are significant disparities in the socio-economic characteristics between the quarters of the city. It includes three universities; and also has a cosmopolitan structure with refugees from Iran, Iraq, Afghanistan, Ukraine, and Syria. The neighborhood where the study was conducted has a middle-income group. This study was conducted with patients registered to the family physician Dr Unal Ayrancı in a family health center called Kurtulus. At the time of the study, the total number of patients registered in the family medicine unit was 3,998. The number of patients aged 18 and above was 3,178.

The study time, type, and purpose

This study is a cross-sectional-type study, which was conducted to determine the drinking water habits according to the socio-demographic characteristics of men and women aged 18 and above, who applied to a family health center located in a city called Eskisehir in the northwest of Turkey between 1 April and 31 May 2022.

The questionnaire

'Kalabak' water, which belongs to the Eskisehir province, where only the study is carried out in Turkey, is brought to the houses of thousands of people in the form of a carboy every day by pick-up trucks called SAKA. Kalabak water is a drinking water that is identified with Eskisehir and brought to the city in 1936, thanks to the founder of the country, Ataturk. Thanks to the special siren, those who want to get water go out to the street to get water with empty carboy bottles. Since this was a special situation in the place where the study was conducted, although it was packaged in the questionnaire, carboy water was included differently from packaged water. The questionnaire used in this survey was created taking into account the drinking characteristics of the place where the study was conducted. The data of the study were collected by a survey form, which was formed as a result of the review of the literature (Ward *et al.* 2009; Durduran *et al.* 2017; Yigit *et al.* 2021), the compilation of similar studies, and the clinical observations and experiences of the researcher. The questionnaire consisted of 25 questions in total, six questions consisting of demographic information of the patients and 19 questions to

determine the drinking water usage preferences and reasons. While preparing the questionnaire, attention was paid to preparing the questions in a way that would reach the targeted information. While giving the questionnaire form to the participants, the purpose of the study was explained in a short explanation and demonstrated how to answer questions. As the survey would not tire the participants, sociodemographic questions were placed at the beginning of the survey form and special opinion questions were placed at the end. The questionnaire, consisting of 25 questions in Turkish, was divided into two broad sections: sociodemographic characteristics and drinking water habits. The questionnaire was then pre-tested on a sample of 32 participants from the same quarter of the city. Alpha coefficients for reliability and internal consistency of the questions were found to be 0.791 about drinking water habits. Then the completed questionnaires were checked for consistency and completeness.

The sample size of the study

The sample number was determined as 331 among 3,178 people above the age of 18, male and female, registered to the family medicine unit of the Family Health Center, using the Epi Info program, bottle water usage prevalence in the city (40%), with a 5% error in the 95% confidence interval.

Procedures

During the study period, each individual who was aged 18 and above was told the purpose of the study and asked whether they would like to take part in the study ($n = 512$). Those who agreed to participate in the study ($n = 432$) were asked to fill out the questionnaire after an informed verbal consent was obtained. The researchers assisted in areas not understood by the participant. Considering that it is difficult for ignorant and literate people to fill out the survey, the researchers read the survey questions to these participants face-to-face and marked the answers on the survey form. The blank spaces were given to the participants again and they were asked to complete the questionnaire. Considering that the participants would not want to explain their income numerically, they were asked to mark their income levels according to themselves. All subjects (432/512, 84.4%) were told that participation in the investigation was strictly voluntary and was told that the data collected would not be used for anything except the research aim. Those who agreed to participate were given a questionnaire to complete. The duration for completing the questionnaire was between 10 and 15 min per subject. The principal investigator met weekly with the data collectors to ensure the quality of data collected.

The inclusion criteria were as follows: volunteering to participate in the study, having the ability to understand Turkish, being 18 years or older, and not having a physical/mental/psychological disorder that would prevent participation and/or interview.

Limitations of the research

The research was conducted in one of the provinces of Turkey where the socio-economic situation is the best. Eskişehir is a province with a good financial situation when compared to other provinces. Conducting the study here may hinder the generalization of our results.

Kalabak water, which is the local and national water drink of Eskişehir even in packaging, is delivered to everyone's streets with sirens every morning; in a sense, it is brought to people's homes with the help of apartment officials. This situation may have paved the way for more carboy drinking.

The large population of research, and the fact that it is not possible to reach everyone in terms of time and money, may not allow the results to be applied to the general population. For this reason, it was tried to increase the power of the study by reaching 101 more participants than the minimum number of samples.

Legal ethical consent

Ethical permission for the study was obtained prior to collecting data, by contacting and receiving approval from the appropriate management authority (the University Ethics Committee, 30 March 2022, meeting/decision: 2/2), i.e., the health directorship of the city involved. Participants were assured of the confidentiality of their responses and provided an informed verbal consent.

Statistical analyses

The statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) version 20.0 (Chicago, IL, USA) was used to enter and analyze data on a personal computer. Obtained data were evaluated by frequency and percentages ratios, Chi-square (χ^2), and *t*-tests. The measure for statistical significance was established a priori as $p < 0.05$.

RESULTS

The mean age (\pm SD) of all the respondents was 48.03 ± 15.86 (20–75, $n = 432$). This figure was significantly lower in women [45.59 ± 14.82 (20–75, $n = 241$)] for the women than in men [$51.11 \pm (26-70, n = 191)$], ($\chi^2 = 3,252.49$, $df = 1$, $p = 0.000$). More respondents were female (55.8) and married (55.8%), were in the middle and older age group (83.6%), and had attained the level of primary education or above (86.2%). Most participants had a household income level (94.4%) and were homeowners (66.4%). The characteristics of the participants are presented in Table 1.

Considering the drinking water habits of the participants by age groups, it was determined that, compared to other age groups, the 31–45 age group had drunk more bottled water ($p < 0.01$), the 46–64 age group had drunk more packaged water ($p > 0.05$), the 31–45 age group had consumed more spring water ($p < 0.001$), and those aged 65 and above had drunk more purified water ($p < 0.001$). Considering the drinking water habits of the participants according to their gender, it was determined that women had drunk more bottled water and tap water ($p > 0.05$ and $p < 0.001$, respectively), whereas men had drunk more packaged water, purified and spring water ($p > 0.05$, each one). Considering the drinking

Table 1 | The respondents' sociodemographic characteristics

	Number ($n = 432$)	Percentage (100.0%)
Gender		
Male	191	44.2
Female	241	55.8
Age (years)		
18–30	71	16.4
31–45	144	33.3
46–64	96	22.2
≥ 65	121	28.1
Marital status		
Single	119	27.5
Married	241	55.8
Widowed/divorced/separated	72	17.7
Educational levels		
Ignorant–literate	121	28.0
Primary–secondary	120	27.8
High school	95	22.0
Higher education	96	22.2
Family's total income level		
None or state/municipal assistance	24	5.6
Low	145	33.6
Average	216	50.0
High	47	10.9
Situation at home		
Homeowner	287	66.4
Tenant	145	33.6

water habits of the participants according to their marital status, it was determined that married people had drunk more demijohn and tap water ($p < 0.001$, each one), whereas divorced/widows had drunk more packaged and purified water ($p < 0.001$, each one). Considering the drinking water habits of the participants according to their educational status, illiterate/literate people drank bottled water at the lowest rate compared to other education levels ($p < 0.001$, per one), primary–secondary school graduates drank tap water at the highest rate ($p < 0.001$), and illiterate/literate people drank purified water at the highest rate. Considering the drinking water habits of the participants according to their income, it was determined that those who had no income/people who lived on a state or municipal assistance had drunk only carboy water at the highest rate and had not drunk any other water ($p < 0.001$). It was determined that those with the highest income had drunk more carboy and purified water ($p < 0.001$, per one), whereas those with low income had drunk more packaged, spring, and tap water ($p < 0.001$, per one). More detailed data are presented in [Table 2](#).

100% of those who drank carboy water stated that they had drunk carboy water because it was ‘clean and safe’, followed by ‘easy access’ with 87.5%.

Similarly, a great majority (90.9%) of those who drank packaged water stated that they had preferred packaged water because it was ‘easily accessible’, followed by ‘clean and safe’ with 81.7%. 100% of spring water drinkers stated that ‘the cost is affordable’ as the reason for drinking spring water, followed by ‘good taste’.

A very large proportion (91.7%) of those who had drunk tap water stated that the reason for drinking tap water was ‘affordability’. 100% of those who drink the purified water stated that the reasons for drinking the purified water were ‘easy access’ and ‘the cost is affordable’.

Considering the reasons for not drinking, the majority of those who do not drink demijohns (71.4%) stated: ‘inability to access easily’ as the reason for not drinking demijohns, this rate was followed by ‘inexpensive cost’ with 51.1%. The vast majority (97.1%) of those who had not drunk packaged water stated that the reason for not drinking the packaged water was ‘the cost is not affordable’. The vast majority (78.2%) of those who had not drunk spring water stated ‘inability to access easily’ as the reason for not drinking spring water. A great majority (87.5%) of those who do not drink tap water stated that they do not drink tap water as it is ‘not clean and safe’. This was followed by ‘not liking the smell’ with a rate of 63.1%. More detailed data are given in [Table 3](#).

One-hundred percent of those who used tap water for non-drinking purposes stated that they had used tap water for brushing teeth, taking a shower, and cleaning after the toilet. However, 100.0% of the participants stated that they had not used demijohn/package water for non-drinking purposes, such as brushing teeth, taking a shower, or cleaning after the toilet. The proportion of those who had used tap water and carboy/package water for making tea/coffee other than drinking was equal (50%, each one). Whereas 67% of those using tap water for non-drinking purposes had used tap water for cooking, while this rate was only 34.3% for those using demijohn/package water for non-drinking purposes ($p < 0.001$). Detailed data are given in [Table 4](#).

When asked what needs to be done to make tap water safe, a large majority of the participants stated that they had not drunk tap water (384/432, 88.9%).

As a result of this rate, 100% of the participants stated that ‘tap water is not currently safe’, 62.3% (269/432) said that ‘tap water should be clean and taste good’, 96.5% (417/432) stated that ‘tap water should be proven to be safe by the authorities’, and 67.6% (292/432) of them stated that ‘there should be an incentive for the use of tap water in TV and social media’. When the participants ($n = 383$) using demijohn water were asked whether they had cleaned the demijohn pump and apparatus; it was determined that 27 people had never used it (7.1%), 72 people had cleaned it once a week (18.8%), 143 people had cleaned it once a month (37.3%), 48 people had cleaned it once a year (12.5), and 93 people had never cleaned it and had thrown it away when it was broken down (24.3%).

DISCUSSION

In the literature review, no study was found that examined the drinking water usage preferences in the study place, Eskisehir. This study aimed to close this gap. In the world and in our country, especially in large settlements, the need for drinking water is mostly met with packaged water. Eskişehir, the province where our study was conducted, is already at the forefront of this packaged water. Because it is engraved in the memories as the local and national beverage of the city, people see ‘Kalabak’ water, which is a kind of water sold in carboy packages, not as packaged water, but directly as mains water. This is why calabash water called ‘kalabak’ is widely used. In the province where the study was conducted, mains water is used only for

Table 2 | Drinking water habits of the participants according to their sociodemographic characteristics

Socio-demographic characteristics	Drinking demijohn water n (%)			Drinking bottled water n (%)			Drinking spring water n (%)			Drinking tap water n (%)			Drinking purified water n (%)		
	Yes 383 (88.7)	No 49 (11.3)	Total 432 (100)	Yes 263 (60.9)	No 169 (39.1)	Total 432 (100)	Yes 97 (22.5)	No 335 (77.5)	Total 432 (100)	Yes 48 (11.1)	No 384 (88.9)	Total 432 (100)	Yes 72 (16.7)	No 360 (83.3)	Total 432 (100)
Age (years)	$\chi^2 = 17.5$, df = 3, $p = 0.001$			$\chi^2 = 6.4$, df = 3, $p = 0.09$			$\chi^2 = 31.02$, df = 3, $p = 0.000$			$\chi^2 = 46.3$, df = 3, $p = 0.000$			$\chi^2 = 34.09$, df = 3, $p = 0.000$		
18–30	71 (86.6)	11 (13.4)	82 (19.0)	48 (58.5)	34 (41.5)	82 (19.0)	5 (6.1)	77 (93.9)	82 (19.0)	0 (0.0)	82 (20.1)	82 (19.0)	7 (8.5)	75 (91.5)	82 (19.0)
31–45	145 (94.8)	8 (5.2)	153 (35.4)	96 (62.7)	57 (37.3)	153 (35.4)	52 (34.0)	101 (66.0)	153 (35.4)	24 (15.7)	129 (84.3)	153 (35.4)	28 (18.3)	125 (81.7)	153 (35.4)
46–64	97 (90.7)	10 (9.3)	107 (24.8)	73 (68.2)	34 (31.8)	107 (24.8)	29 (27.1)	78 (72.9)	107 (24.8)	0 (0.0)	107 (26.2)	107 (24.8)	6 (5.6)	101 (94.4)	107 (24.8)
≥65	70 (77.8)	20 (22.2)	90 (20.8)	46 (51.1)	44 (48.9)	90 (20.8)	11 (12.2)	79 (87.8)	90 (20.8)	0 (0.0)	90 (22.1)	90 (20.8)	31 (34.4)	59 (65.6)	90 (20.8)
Gender	$\chi^2 = 0.51$, df = 1, $p = 0.476$			$\chi^2 = 0.292$, df = 1, $p = 0.589$			$\chi^2 = 1.41$, df = 1, $p = 0.235$			$\chi^2 = 32.06$, df = 1, $p = 0.000$			$\chi^2 = 1.41$, df = 1, $p = 0.235$		
Female	216 (89.6)	25 (10.9)	241 (55.8)	144 (59.8)	97 (40.2)	241 (55.8)	49 (20.3)	192 (79.7)	241 (55.8)	24 (12.6)	167 (87.4)	241 (55.8)	0 (0.0)	241 (100)	241 (55.8)
Male	167 (87.4)	24 (12.6)	191 (44.2)	119 (62.3)	72 (37.7)	191 (44.2)	48 (25.1)	143 (74.9)	191 (44.2)	24 (5.6)	408 (94.4)	191 (44.2)	72 (37.7)	119 (62.3)	191 (44.2)
Marital status	$\chi^2 = 50.07$, df = 2, $p = 0.000$			$\chi^2 = 30.903$, df = 2, $p = 0.000$			$\chi^2 = 29.71$, df = 2, $p = 0.000$			$\chi^2 = 20.114$, df = 2, $p = 0.000$			$\chi^2 = 40.033$, df = 2, $p = 0.000$		
Married	216 (89.6)	25 (10.4)	241 (55.8)	73 (30.3)	168 (69.7)	241 (55.8)	73 (30.3)	168 (69.7)	241 (55.8)	24 (10.0)	217 (90.0)	241 (55.8)	48 (19.9)	193 (80.1)	241 (55.8)
Single	119 (31.1)	0 (0.0)	119 (27.5)	48 (40.3)	71 (59.7)	119 (27.5)	24 (20.2)	95 (79.8)	119 (27.5)	0 (0.0)	119 (100)	119 (27.5)	0 (0.0)	119 (100)	119 (27.5)
Divorced/widowed	48 (66.7)	24 (33.3)	72 (16.7)	48 (66.7)	24 (33.3)	72 (16.7)	0 (0.0)	72 (100)	72 (16.7)	0 (0.0)	72 (100)	72 (16.7)	24 (33.3)	48 (66.7)	72 (16.7)
Educational status	$\chi^2 = 142.056$, df = 3, $p = 0.000$			$\chi^2 = 53.71$, df = 3, $p = 0.000$			$\chi^2 = 1.43$, df = 3, $p = 0.699$			$\chi^2 = 66.071$, df = 3, $p = 0.000$			$\chi^2 = 85.26$, df = 3, $p = 0.000$		
Ignorant/literate	72 (59.5)	49 (40.5)	121 (28.0)	48 (39.7)	73 (60.3)	121 (28.0)	25 (20.7)	96 (79.3)	121 (28.0)	0 (0.0)	121 (100)	121 (28.0)	48 (39.7)	73 (60.3)	121 (28.0)
Primary-intermediate	120 (100)	0 (0.0)	120 (27.8)	96 (80.0)	24 (20.0)	120 (27.8)	24 (20.0)	96 (80.0)	120 (27.8)	24 (20.0)	96 (80.0)	120 (27.8)	24 (20.0)	96 (80.0)	120 (27.8)
High school	95 (100)	0 (0.0)	95 (22.0)	71 (74.7)	24 (25.3)	95 (22.0)	24 (25.3)	71 (74.7)	95 (22.0)	0 (0.0)	95 (100)	95 (22.0)	0 (0.0)	95 (100)	95 (22.0)
University	96 (100)	0 (0.0)	96 (22.2)	48 (50.0)	48 (50.0)	96 (22.2)	24 (25.0)	72 (75.0)	96 (22.2)	0 (0.0)	96 (100)	96 (22.2)	0 (0.0)	96 (100)	96 (22.2)
Income	$\chi^2 = 73.42$, df = 3, $p = 0.000$			$\chi^2 = 246.39$, df = 3, $p = 0.000$			$\chi^2 = 68.66$, df = 3, $p = 0.000$			$\chi^2 = 102.48$, df = 3, $p = 0.000$			$\chi^2 = 73.42$, df = 3, $p = 0.000$		
High school	23 (48.9)	24 (51.1)	47 (4.7)	23 (48.9)	24 (51.1)	47 (4.7)	0 (0.0)	47 (100)	47 (4.7)	0 (0.0)	47 (100)	47 (4.7)	24 (51.1)	23 (48.9)	47 (4.7)
Average	432 (47.4)	0 (0.0)	432 (42.8)	240 (55.6)	192 (44.4)	432 (42.8)	96 (22.2)	336 (77.8)	432 (42.8)	0 (0.0)	432 (100)	432 (42.8)	48 (11.1)	384 (88.9)	432 (42.8)
low	72 (16.6)	363 (83.4)	435 (43.1)	360 (82.8)	75 (17.2)	435 (43.1)	147 (33.8)	288 (66.2)	435 (43.1)	72 (16.6)	363 (83.4)	435 (43.1)	72 (16.6)	363 (83.4)	435 (43.1)
None/state or municipality	96 (100)	0 (0.0)	96 (9.5)	0 (0.0)	96 (100)	96 (9.5)	0 (0.0)	96 (100)	96 (9.5)	0 (0.0)	96 (100)	96 (9.5)	0 (0.0)	96 (100)	96 (9.5)
Total	527 (52.2)	483 (47.8)	1,010 (100) ^a	623 (61.7)	387 (38.3)	1,010 (100) ^a	243 (24.1)	767 (75.9)	1,010 (100) ^a	72 (7.1)	938 (92.9)	1,010 (100) ^a	144 (14.3)	866 (85.7)	1,010 (100) ^a

^aMarking more than 1.

Table 3 | Reasons for the participants to drink and not drink water

	Drinking demijohn water (n = 383)	Drinking bottled water (n = 263)	Drinking spring water (n = 97)	Drinking tap water (n = 48)	Drinking purified water (n = 72)
Reasons for drinking	$\chi^2 = 447.98, df = 16, p = 0.000$				
Easy access	335 (87.5)	239 (90.9)	24 (24.7)	24 (50.0)	72 (100.0)
Being clean and reliable	383 (100.0)	215 (81.7)	24 (24.7)	20 (41.7)	44 (61.1)
Good taste	311 (81.2)	24 (9.1)	73 (75.3)	21 (43.7)	45 (62.5)
Affordable cost	311 (81.2)	20 (7.6)	97 (100)	44 (91.7)	72 (100.0)
Not being odor	240 (62.7)	44 (16.7)	73 (75.3)	23 (47.9)	31 (43.1)
	Those not drinking carboy water (n = 49)	Those not drinking bottled water (n = 169)	Those not drinking spring water (n = 335)	Those not drinking tap water (n = 334)	Those not drinking purified water (n = 360)
Reasons for not drinking	$\chi^2 = 1,159.44, df = 16, p = 0.000$				
Not being easy to reach	35 (71.4)	102 (60.4)	262 (78.2)	48 (12.5)	72 (20.0)
Not being clean and reliable	6 (12.2)	22 (13.1)	168 (50.1)	336 (87.5)	192 (53.3)
Not having tasted good	6 (12.2)	87 (51.5)	95 (28.4)	191 (49.7)	159 (44.2)
Inappropriate cost	25 (51.1)	164 (97.1)	41 (12.2)	18 (4.7)	0 (0.0)
Not having smelled good	6 (12.2)	21 (12.4)	72 (21.5)	242 (63.1)	181 (50.3)

general needs such as brushing teeth, taking a shower, washing dishes, and laundry. Tap water is not preferred for eating and drinking.

As can be seen in our study results, although the rates are low, people have turned to different drinking water sources for many personal reasons such as the price of water and the difficulty of transportation. Doria in her study examining how tap water and packaged water are perceived by consumers determined that the reason for the increase in packaged water, which is more expensive than tap water, was mainly due to taste and health risk concerns (Doria 2006). Quansah *et al.* (2015) highlighted that advertising and news about bottled water are important factors for consumers in Ghana.

Among the participants participating in our study, the first preferred water (87.5%) was carboy water. In our city, the carboy pump is also used as an integral part of the carboy.

Although the participants stated that the water they trusted the most was carboy, it is useful to be careful in this regard; it has been shown that there are chemical and microbiological changes in the very reliable carboy water, as a result of not

Table 4 | Reasons for non-drinking use of tap water and carboy/package water

	Reasons for using tap water for non-drinking purposes n (%) = 432 (100.0)	Reasons for using carboy/package water for non-drinking purposes n (%) = 432 (100.0)
Reasons	$\chi^2 = 694.85, df = 4, p = 0.000$	
Making tea/coffee	216 (50.0)	216 (50.0)
Cooking food	284 (65.7)	148 (34.3)
Brushing teeth	432 (100.0)	0 (100.0)
Having a shower	432 (100.0)	0 (100.0)
Washing the breech area after toilet	432 (100.0)	0 (100.0)

keeping the expired carboys and carboys in suitable cold environments and leaving the SAKA carboys carrying the carboys in the sun. Again, not cleaning the carboy pumps periodically is also of great importance in increasing the contamination (Demirci *et al.* 2007). As a matter of fact, when the participants ($n = 383$) who used carboy water in our study were asked whether they cleaned the carboy pump and apparatus, 48 people stated that they had cleaned it once a year (12.5%), 93 people stated that they had never cleaned it and discarded it when it broke (24.3%). Considering that the rate of those who changed only once a year and never change (36.8%) was almost 40% (38.8%), this is a number that cannot be underestimated. This result was compatible with the study result of Tas *et al.* (2020); in this study, 31% of the participants stated that they had never changed the carboy pump. It is a contradiction that the participants both turn to carboy water because it is clean and reliable; and that they do not show the necessary hygienic importance to the carboy pump and apparatus, which is a source of contamination. The phrase ‘to be filled with hail while escaping from the rain’, which is used very often in our country, is a good example of this.

Participants in our study, 100.0% of those who used tap water other than drinking, stated that they had used tap water for brushing teeth, taking a shower, and washing the breech area after the toilet. Again, half of the participants stated that they had used tap water for making tea/coffee and 65.7% for cooking. The fact that 100% of the participants used tap water for brushing teeth, taking a shower, and after the toilet is the instinct to prevent mains water from entering the body through the digestive system. Because the possibility of mains water causing digestive system diseases is a common concern in society. The fact that half or more of the participants used the mains water for tea/coffee and meals is also based on the knowledge that the mains water is free from microbes during boiling, and therefore, the purification of the water by boiling the water may have increased the confidence in the water.

In our study, it was determined that those with the highest income had drunk more carboy water ($p < 0.001$). This result was found to be compatible with the result of a study conducted in Suriname, which showed that those with higher incomes had consumed more packaged water (Durga 2010). In this study by Durga, it was understood that the biggest factor was quality and brand (Durga 2010). These results show that those who were in good financial standing give importance to quality and brand and did not compromise on these in order to be healthy. Moreover, hygiene problems arose in the past in this market, which became an unregulated sector in human memory. In addition to waters with high nitrate content and causing infectious diseases, waters containing heavy metals are also easily sold in the market (Doria 2006). Therefore, drinking brand water such as ‘Carboy’ in our working area has gained importance.

In our study, the rate of drinking tap water (11.1%) was quite low compared to packaged water (88.7% for carboys and 60.9% for packaged water). This result showed similarity to another study conducted in our country; in this study conducted in 2020 by Tas *et al.*, only 16% of the participants reported that they had used tap water as drinking water (Tas *et al.* 2020). However, these rates were much higher (between 70 and 90%) in developed countries such as Canada and Sweden (Westrell *et al.* 2006; Roche *et al.* 2012; Daley *et al.* 2014). In their study conducted by Pintar *et al.* in Ontario, Canada, in 2019, this rate was more than half (51%) (Pintar *et al.* 2009). These values show that the importance given to mains water has increased in direct proportion to the development level of societies.

Our results revealed distrust of drinking tap water if it is to be used for drinking purposes; 100% of our respondents said ‘tap water is currently unsafe’, and over 60% (62.3%) ‘tap water should be clean and taste good’, and almost 100% (96.5%) tap water needs to be proven safe by authorities’. These answers given by the participants clearly reveal what the authorities should do. In addition, the definition of packaged natural springs or packaged natural mineral waters as water that is under the control of the MoH, packaged without changing its natural structure from the source, containing various minerals beneficial to health, and offered for consumption under extremely hygienic conditions has also caused people to turn to packaged waters (Tumer *et al.* 2011). The fact that our state attaches special importance to packaged water has further increased the tendency towards packaged waters; the regulation of the Ministry of Health on the ‘Production, Packaging and Sale of Natural Resource Mineral and Drinking Water and Medical Waters’ published in the Official Gazette dated 18 October 1997 and numbered 23,144 has paved the way for many companies to invest in the sector. Seeing this aspect of the market, the companies exaggerated the business and turned to the sale of water in recycled 19-L polycarbonate carboys, which are marketed by dealers with the method of delivery to homes and offices (Tosun 2005). Another reason for the low consumption of tap water may be that some studies in our country proved that some of the mains water is not suitable for consumption chemically or microbiologically, and this result may have caused people to be afraid of tap water (Elal Mus & Cetinkaya 2017; Tuluk *et al.* 2017).

In our study, the majority (87.5%) of those who did not drink tap water stated that the reason for not drinking tap water was ‘not being clean and safe’. This was followed by ‘disliking the smell’ with a rate of 63.1%. In a study on consumer behavior and

awareness of water use in our country, the rate of thinking that the mains water is dirty was found to be as high as 70% (Ciner 2017). These results show that the mains water is not trusted. On the other hand, our participants stated that they were ready to consume tap water in a sense; 96.5% of our participants stated that 'if the reliability of tap water is proven by the authorities', 67.6% of them stated that 'it is possible if there is an incentive for the use of tap water on TV and social media'. For this reason, state and government officials should deal with this issue away from commercial concerns, make confidence-building actions to increase the use of mains water, and share it with users.

In our study, it was determined that those with the highest income had drunk more purified water, and those with low income had drunk more packaged, spring, and tap water ($p < 0.001$, per one). According to the research conducted by Tosun (2005), one of the reasons for this may be the high nitrate rate in some packaged water, which is far from inspection, even if it is packaged, the detection of infectious disease-causing organisms, and the detection of heavy metals in it, which may have pushed people to establish their own purification systems (Tosun 2005). One reason why the purification system is used only by the wealthy may be that since these systems are generally expensive systems imported from abroad, only those who have money have access to these treatment systems. It is clear that the reason for the increase in the use of purified water, which is more expensive than tap water, is mainly due to taste and health risk concerns (Doria 2006).

Considering the drinking water habits of the participants according to their gender, it was determined that women had drunk more tap water compared to men ($p < 0.001$, respectively).

Although there is no explanation for this in the literature, an explanation for this may be that women in Turkey may have turned to tap water when there is no packaged water due to the fact that they are not sufficiently engaged in business life and therefore stay at home all the time.

In our study, participants suggested the clean, safe, and taste of the water as the reason for consuming more of their preferred water. Similar results were found in another study conducted in another province of our country; in this study, the participants stated hygiene and taste as the most preferred reason (Uzundumlu *et al.* 2016; Tokay *et al.* 2020). Our study and other studies show that the drinkability of water determines its safety, hygiene, and taste.

CONCLUSION

Despite the dangers of plastic in the world and in our country, the use of packaged water has increased and seems to increase gradually. In this increase, it does not seem like due importance will be given to mains water, since local governments do not pay due attention to the infrastructure of mains water, and instead of spending the municipality's resources on invisible infrastructure, they allocate more attention to flowers, festivals, concerts, street decorations, soup kitchens, and competitions that voters will like more. However, mains water is of vital importance as it will minimize the use of environmentally-friendly plastic wastes. People have been compelled to categorize fresh water as drinking water or potable water, they have been prevented from considering using water, which they think is not clean and safe, as a risk factor for taking a shower, brushing teeth, and washing the breech area after toilet.

This study once again reveals that even if the province where the study is conducted has a special situation such as KALABAK water, it is a necessity to bring all water to the houses through the mains in order not to cause non-environmentally-friendly wastes. It is clear that there is a need for awareness and training programs that will increase the public's water consumption awareness in order to force the municipalities in this respect.

AUTHORS' ETHICS

- Our paper is our original work and where our study has included the work of others as this has been fully and appropriately acknowledged.
- We all as the authors made significant contributions to the manuscript.
- As the corresponding author, I must ensure that all co-authors have approved the final version of the paper and have agreed to its submission for publication.
- We have not published this manuscript in another journal nor our paper is currently being considered for publication in another journal.
- There are no sources of financial support.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors acknowledge the valuable support and time to the participants.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

All relevant data are included in the paper or its Supplementary Information.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare there is no conflict.

REFERENCES

- Borlu, A., Balci, E. & Ozturk, A. 2017 Opinions and behaviors of those who applied to family health centers in Kayseri city center regarding the use of ready water. *Turkish Bulletin of Hygiene and Experimental Biology* **74**, 113–118.
- Ciner, F. 2017 Consumer behavior and awareness in water use – a field study in the case of Nigde. *Pamukkale University Journal of Engineering Sciences* **23** (9), 1019–1026.
- Daley, K., Castleden, H., Jamieson, R., Furgal, C. & Ell, L. 2014 Municipal water quantities and health in Nunavut households: an exploratory case study in Coral Harbour, Nunavut, Canada. *International Journal Circumpolar Health* **73**, 1–9.
- Declaration of Alma-Ata. 1978 *International Conference on Primary Health Care*. Available from: https://www.who.int/publications/almaata_declaration_en.pdf (accessed 9 June 2022).
- Demirci, A. S., Gumus, T. & Demirci, M. 2007 The effect of pump cleaning on the microbiological quality of demijohn water. *Tekirdag Ziraat Fakultesi Dergisi* **4** (3), 271–275.
- Doria, M. F. 2006 Bottled water versus tap water: understanding consumers' preferences. *Journal of Water and Health* **4** (2), 271–276.
- Durduran, Y., Uyar, M., Boyraz, Y. K., Demir, L. S., Tekin, O. & Sahin, T. K. 2017 Drinking water usage preferences of women applying to family health centers in Meram district of Konya province. *Turkish Bulletin of Hygiene and Experimental Biology* **74**, 125–130.
- Durga, M. 2010 *Consumers' Buying Behavior of Bottled Water in Suriname*. MSc Thesis, Department of Health New York State, Surinam.
- Elal Mus, T. & Cetinkaya, F. 2017 Investigation of the presence of indicator and some pathogenic bacteria in drinking and utility water in Bursa. *Soil Water Journal* **6** (1), 1–6.
- Free, C. M., Jensen, O. P., Mason, S. A., Eriksen, M., Williamson, N. J. & Boldgiv, B. 2014 High-levels of microplastic pollution in a large, remote, mountain lake. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* **85** (1), 156–163.
- Geerts, R., Vandermoere, F., Van Winckel, T., Halet, D., Joos, P. Van Den Steen, K., Van Meenen, E., Blust, R., Borregán-Ochando, K. & Vlaeminck, S. E. 2020 Bottle or tap? Toward an integrated approach to water type consumption. *Water Resources* **15** (173), 115578.
- Gleick, P. H. & Cooley, H. S. 2009 Energy implications of bottled water. *Environment Research Letters* **4** (1), 1–6.
- Jéquier, E. & Constant, F. 2010 Water as an essential nutrient: the physiological basis of hydration. *European Journal of Clinical Nutrition* **64** (2), 115–123.
- Mentes, J. 2006 Oral hydration in older adults. *American Journal of Nursing* **106** (6), 40–49.
- NSA 2018 *Turkey Demographic and Health Survey*. Available from: http://www.sck.gov.tr/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/TNSA2018_ana_Rapor.pdf (accessed 9 May 2022).
- Pintar, K. D., Waltner-Toews, D., Charron, D., Pollari, F., Fazil, A., McEwen, S. A., McEwen, S. A., Nesbitt, A. & Majowicz, S. 2009 Water consumption habits of a south-western Ontario community. *Journal of Water and Health* **7**, 276–292.
- Quansah, F., Okoe, A. & Angenu, B. 2015 Factors affecting Ghanaian consumers' purchasing decision of bottled water. *International Journal of Marketing Studies* **7** (5), 76–87.
- Roche, S. M., Jones, A. Q., Majowicz, S. E., McEwen, S. A. & Pinta, K. D. M. 2012 Drinking water consumption patterns in Canadian communities (2001–2007). *Journal of Water and Health* **10** (1), 69–86.
- Rodwan, G. J. 2017 Bottled water 2017. Staying strong: U.S. And international developments and statistics. Available from: <https://www.bottledwater.org> (accessed 7 June 2022).
- Spicer, N., Parlee, B., Chisaakay, M. & Lamalice, D. 2020 Drinking water consumption patterns: an exploration of risk perception and governance in two first nations communities. *Sustainability* **12** (17), 6851.
- Sustainable Development Goals 2019. Available from: <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdg6> (accessed 7 May 2019).
- Tas, A., Bilgin-Kahveci, P. & Evci-Kiraz, E. D. 2020 Drinking water preferences and reasons of students receiving preclinical education in a medical school. *Türk Hijyen ve Deneysel Biyoloji Dergisi* **77**, 179–186.
- Tokay, A. A. O., Deniz, S. & Pehlivan, E. 2020 Investigation of drinking water consumption behaviors of individuals above 15 years old living in Akcadag District of Malatya Province. *Türk. Hij. Exp. Biol. J.* **77**, 149–158.
- Tosun, M. 2005 *Drinking and Mineral Water Sector Research*. Development Bank of Turkey, pp. 1–61.
- TSI 2020 *Water and Wastewater Statistics*. Available from: <https://data.tuik.gov.tr/Bulten/Index?p=Water-and-Wastewater-Statistics-2020-37197&dil=2> (accessed 9 May 2022).
- Tuluk, B., Kayserili Orhan, F. & Kasali, K. 2017 A research on the physical, chemical and microbiological qualities of the mains waters of Erzurum province. *Journal of Turgut Ozal Medical Center* **24** (1), 25–30.

- Tumer, E. I., Birinci, A. & Yildirim, C. 2011 Determining the factors affecting the consumption of packaged water: the case of Keçiören District of Ankara Province. *Alinteri Zirai Bilimler Dergisi* **21** (B), 11–19.
- UNDP 2015a *Millennium Development Goal*. Available from: <https://www.tr.undp.org/content/turkey/tr/home/mdgoverview/overview/mdg7.html> (accessed 9 May 2022).
- UNDP 2015b *Sustainable Development Goals*. Available from: <https://www.tr.undp.org/content/turkey/tr/home/sustainable-development-goals.html> (accessed 22 June 2022).
- UNESCO 2021 *Valuing Water*. Available from: <https://www.unesco.org/reports/wwdr/2021/en> (accessed 22 June 2022).
- Uzundumlu, A. S., Fakioglu, O., Kokturk, M. & Temel, T. 2016 Determination of the most suitable drinking water preference in Erzurum province. *Alinteri Zirai Bilimler Dergisi* **30** (1), 1–7.
- Uzundumlu, A. S., Askan, E. & Celik, Z. 2020 Determining the place of municipal mains water in consumer preferences as drinking water: the case of Iğdir Province. *Journal of The Institute of Science and Technology* **10** (2), 1350–1360.
- Ward, L. A., Cain, O. L., Mullally, R. A., Holliday, K. S., Wernham, A. G., Baillie, P. D. & Greenfield, S. M. 2009 *Health beliefs about bottled water: a qualitative study*. *BMC Public Health* **19** (9), 196.
- Wenger, C. B. 1972 *Heat of evaporation of sweat: thermodynamic considerations*. *Journal of Applied Physiology* **32** (4), 456–459.
- Westrell, T., Andersson, Y. & Stenström, T. A. 2006 *Drinking water consumption patterns in Sweden*. *Journal of Water Health* **4** (4), 511–522.
- WHO 2019 *Drinking Water*. Available from: <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/drinking-water> (accesses 6 June 2022).
- Yigit, E., Ozdemir, A. T., Gungor, A., Gokce, A. & Ozer, A. 2021 Drinking water preferences of students in the faculty of medicine and sports sciences of İnönü University. *Firat Medical Journal* **26** (4), 224–229.

First received 3 July 2022; accepted in revised form 28 July 2022. Available online 9 August 2022