Working Paper 354

Own House and Dalit: Selected Villages in Karnataka State

I Maruthi
Pesala Busenna

ISBN 978-81-7791-210-4

Institute for Social and Economic Change (ISEC) is engaged in interdisciplinary research in analytical and applied areas of the social sciences, encompassing diverse aspects of development. ISEC works with central, state and local governments as well as international agencies by undertaking systematic studies of resource potential, identifying factors influencing growth and examining measures for reducing poverty. The thrust areas of research include state and local economic policies, issues relating to sociological and demographic transition, environmental issues and fiscal, administrative and political decentralization and governance. It pursues fruitful contacts with other institutions and scholars devoted to social science research through collaborative research programmes, seminars, etc.

The Working Paper Series provides an opportunity for ISEC faculty, visiting fellows and PhD scholars to discuss their ideas and research work before publication and to get feedback from their peer group. Papers selected for publication in the series present empirical analyses and generally deal with wider issues of public policy at a sectoral, regional or national level. These working papers undergo review but typically do not present final research results, and constitute works in progress.

OWN HOUSE AND DALIT: SELECTED VILLAGES IN KARNATAKA STATE

I Maruthi and Pesala Busenna[1]

Abstract

A house is very important for rural and urban people. A house is a needy economic asset for human beings. It gives dignity and privacy to the families. In India 13 per cent of the people do not own a house. In Karnataka 26 per cent of the people do not own a house. The objectives of this study are i) to investigate the factors which determine the construction of a good house ii) to identify the factors which influence the non-preference for construction of a house in the village? and iii) to record the socio-economic conditions of Dalits in Karnataka. The study followed the multi-stage random sampling method. The total sample size was 1,800 SC (Dalit) households in Karnataka.

The main findings of the study are i) two villages have sufficient water resources and that is one of the main reasons for the construction of good houses and the economic status of these villages is also better than other villages ii) among the selected villages, in Srinivasa Saradgi village of Kalaburagi district the condition of Dalits' houses is very pathetic. Due to lack of financial support the Dalits are unable to construct houses and ii) some of the Dalits are unable to sleep during nights in the rainy season because of water seepage.

Key Words: House and Dalits in Karnataka.

Introduction

Without some sort of shelter it is difficult to imagine the survival of human life. A house is very important social and economic asset because it gives security, dignity and economic power to the owner. Iyer (1996) emphasized that the State has a responsibility to provide shelter to weaker sections of the society. In India as per census data, nearly 90 per cent of the residents in villages live in their own houses. Merely having house is not sufficient for a person but the house has to be habitable. Our study data reveals that most of the Dalits have their own houses in their villages. This paper provides details about houses and their importance in rural areas. Most of the Dalits in rural Karnataka engage in menial work in the agricultural sector.

Dhawan (1996) identified that the rapidly growing population in India was facing housing problems. According to his estimation every year about 20 lakh houses are required for the growing Indian population. In Karnataka the total number of houses owned was 80,28,342 in 2001 of which 60,85,360 was in rural areas and 19,42,982 in urban areas. In 2011 the number of houses owned increased to 97,86,047 and the rural and urban share was 70,72,156 and 27,13,891 respectively. The increase is also observed in the case of rented houses. In 2001 the total rented households was 19,08,864 and in 2011 it increased to 30,33,730. The number of rural rented households was 4,15,592 in 2001 and in 2011 it was 5,86,012.The urban rented households also increased during the above period. In the 'Other' category also, it increased from 2,94,927 in 2001 to 3,60,134 in 2011 (Census: India, 2001 and 2011). At the national level, data shows an increase of 28.4 per cent of own houses, 35.3 per cent for rented households and 7.8 per cent for 'other' households, during 2001 to 2011. In

[1] I Maruthi is an Associate Professor and Pesala Busenna is a Research Associate, ADRT Centre, Institute for Social and Economic Change, Bengaluru – 560072. E-mail: maruthi@isec.ac.in.

This is a part of completed research project entitled "Assessment of Socio Economic Capabilities of Dalit households in Karnataka". The authors thank ICSSR, New Delhi for sponsoring this project.

Karnataka the increase in own households was 21.89 per cent, rented households 58.93 per cent and 'other' households, 22.11 per cent during the same period (Table1). The growth in rented households increased tremendously compared to own and 'other' households.

Table 1: Households by Ownership Status of the Houses - India and Karnataka (in Nos)

Ownership Status	India				Karnataka			
	2001		2011		2001		2011	
	House holds	Percent	House holds	Percent	House holds	Percent	House holds	Percent
Own	166353066	86.7	213,526,283	86.6	80,28,342	78.5	97,86,047	74.2
Rented	20230410	10.5	27,368,304	11.1	19,08,864	18.7	30,33,730	23.0
Others	5380459	2.8	5,798,080	2.4	2,94,927	2.9	3,60,134	2.7
Total house holds	191963935	100	246692667	100	1,02,32,133	100	1,31,79,911	100

Source: Census of India, 2001 and 2011.

Based on this discussion the present study framed certain objectives. They are: investigate the factors that determine the construction of a house. Identify the factors influencing the non-preference for construction of a house in the village. Record socio-economic conditions of Dalits in Karnataka.

Research Methodology and Data Collection of the Study

Karnataka was purposively selected as the study area. The study employed rigorous field work methodology and collected the data for the analysis of qualitative and quantitative information. The study is based on the interdisciplinary approach to understand the persisting socio-economic conditions of the Dalit community. Secondary data was used to obtain background information on the Dalit community in Karnataka. The sample respondents were selected by using the multi-stage random sampling technique and the simplest form of the entire sampling procedure is presented in Table 2. In the first stage, the entire state was divided into three main regions namely, North, Central, and South Karnataka. In the second stage, according to Census 2011, two districts with the highest SC population in each region were selected as the study areas. The selected districts are Belgavi (Belgaum) and Kalaburagi (Gulbarga) in North Karnataka, Chitradurga and Davanagere in Central Karnataka and Mysuru and Tumakuru in South Karnataka. In the third stage, 2 villages with highest SC population were selected in each district. The selected villages are: Harugeri (Population 5,846) and Mugalkhod (5,579) in Belgavi district; Srinivas Saradgi (4,374) and Ravoor(3,794) in Kalaburagi; Naikanahatti (2,759) and Adivala (2,692) in Chitradurga; Towdur (3,387) and Uchangidurga (2,823) in Davanagere; Sosale (5,084) and Muguru (2,995) in Mysuru; Madalur (1,951) and Kodigenahalli (1,764) in Tumakuru (Table 2). Finally, in each village 150 households were selected randomly. The total sample size is 1,800.

Table 2: Population village wise in Karnataka State

Name of the Region	Name of the District	Name of the Village	Village total Population	Total-SC Population	Share of SC population in total village Population	Village share in District Population
North Karnataka	Belgavi	Harugeri	28,754	5,846	20.3	1.30
		Mugalkhod	25,835	5,579	21.6	1.24
	Kalaburagi	Srinivas Saradgi	7,523	4,374	58.1	0.89
		Ravoor	12,117	3,794	31.3	0.77
Central Karnataka	Chitradurga	Naikanahatti	15,545	2,759	17.7	0.83
		Adivala	7,550	2,692	35.7	0.81
	Davanagere	Towdur	6,113	3,387	55.4	1.07
		Uchangidurga	9,781	2,823	28.9	0.89
South Karnataka	Mysore	Sosale	7,260	5,084	70.0	1.34
		Muguru	8,393	2,995	35.7	0.79
	Tumkuru	Madalur	6,518	1,951	29.9	0.45
		Kodigenahalli	7,075	1,764	24.9	0.41

Source: Census 2011.

Religion

Traditionally, religion is part of human life. In the Indian context most of the people are following Hindu culture, traditions, rituals and social practices. Knowingly or unknowingly, most of the Dalits follow Hindu religion in the villages selected for the study. A small per cent of the Dalits are Buddhist and a few are Christians. Most of the Madiga (SC-Sub-caste) caste households believe and are practicing Christianity but they do not have a Christian certificate.

Sub-caste of Dalits

Among the Dalits, there are nearly 101 sub-castes in Karnataka. According to our sample survey among the different sub-castes, Holeya (567) has the highest population, followed by Madiga (506), Adi Karnataka (323), Lambani (276), Bhovi (50), Bangajara (18), Dhora (17), Killi (15),Vaddar (10), Others (8), Madara (7), Samgar (1), Kakanoor (1) and Kudumban (1). In Karnataka the Lambani caste people are ahead in education and government employment compared to other Dalit sub-castes and they are not facing caste discrimination in society.

Own House and Importance

Ownership of a house is very important among the rural people because it is an indicator of social status and economic power. According to Iyer (1996) shelter is an economic asset and the State should provide shelter to the needy. Nearly 90 per cent of the villagers own their houses in India. Our primary survey reveals that nearly 96 per cent of the households have their own house.

The data collected reveals that a large number of Dalits have their own houses in the villages. Dhawan (1996) identified that the rapidly growing population is facing a housing problem in India.

According to his estimation of every year 20 lakh houses are required to accommodate the growing population.

In Karnataka, 7 per cent of the people of North Karnataka region do not own a house. They belong to Harugeri (9%), Ravoor (8%), Mugalkhoda (7%) and Srinivas Saradgi (5%) villages (Table 3). At the same time most of the Dalits owned houses in the South Karnataka region. In addition, 99 per cent of Dalits in Mysuru district owned houses mainly because of the River Kaveri, which provides adequate water to the two villages under this study. In addition, these people get full employment in their villages during the Khariff and Rabi seasons.

Table 3: Extent of Owning Houses in the Selected Villages (in Nos)

Village and District	Own House		
	Yes	No	Total
Harugeri	137 (91.33)	13 (8.67)	150 (100)
Mugalkhoda	140 (93.33)	10 (6.67)	150 (100)
Belagavi District (A)	**277 (92.33)**	**23 (7.67)**	**300** (100)
Ravoor	138 (92.00)	12 (8.00)	150 (100)
Srinivasa Saradgi	143 (95.33)	7 (4.67)	150 (100)
Kalaburagi District (B)	**281 (93.67)**	**19 (6.33)**	**300** (100)
Total North Karnataka (A+B)	**558 (93.0)**	**42 (7.0)**	**600** (100)
Adivala	144 (96.00)	6 (4.00)	150 (100)
Nayakanahatti	144 (96.00)	6 (4.00)	150 (100)
Chitradurga District ©	**288 (96.00)**	**12 (4.00)**	**300** (100)
Uchangidurga	139 (92.67)	11 (7.33)	150 (100)
Towdur	149 (99.33)	1 (0.67)	150 (100)
Davanagere District (D)	**288 (96.00)**	**12 (4.00)**	**300** (100)
Total Central Karnataka (C+D)	**576 (96.0)**	**24 (4.00)**	**600** (100)
Muguru	148 (98.67)	2 (1.33)	150 (100)
Sosale	149 (99.33)	1 (0.67)	150 (100)
Mysuru District(E)	**297 (99.00)**	**3 (1.00)**	**300** (100)
Kodigenahalli	144 (96.00)	6 (4.00)	150 (100)
Madalur	147 (98.00)	3 (2.00)	150 (100)
Tumakuru District (F)	**291 (97.00)**	**9 (3.00)**	**300** (100)
Total South Karnataka (E+F)	**588 (98.0)**	**12 (2.0)**	**600** (100)
Grand Total	**1722 (98.0)**	**78 (4.33)**	**1800** (100)

Source: Primary data, 2014.

Note: Figures in brackets are percentage to row totals.

Rented Households

According to our study, some of the respondents are staying in rented houses. Iyengar (1996) expressed that there was a shortage of housing in rural and urban areas in India. Mukherjee (1996) highlighted the importance of rural housing in India. In the absence of houses the poor people are forced to live in the open. Further, he observed that the poor people do not have their own

house/land/homestead and are staying in other's houses/land. Sharma (1996) expressed a shortage of houses for the growing population in India. He also said that the reasons for houselessness and low quality of houses in rural India are poverty/low income, rapid population growth, social value changes and environmental factors. According to Sharma population growth is only one of the factors responsible for the increase in demand for housing. In addition to that there is a corruption in the identification of the beneficiaries at the gross root level and he suggested that there is no political will to support construction of bulk housing in India. The present study reveals that (4.33%) Dalit families do not own houses (Table 3). Suvarna (1996) explained that a large number of people are homeless/shelter less in India. This situation is gradually increasing. According to Suvarna, "Homelessness is a wretched feeling." A homeless person cannot be happy in his life and he feels rootless, address-less and insecure. Our primary data reveals that 8 members have been staying in their relatives' houses and are not paying any rent while 70 families are paying rent. The average rent paid per year is Rs 5,864. The lowest average rent paid (Rs 250) is in Sosale village and the average highest rent paid (Rs14,400) is in Adivala village (Table 4).

Table 4: Extent of Rent Paid by Households in the Selected Villages in Karnataka

Village / District	Number of Households	Total Rent (2013-14)	Average Rent (2013-14)
Harugeri	12	1,24,800	10,400
Mugalkhoda	10	45,000	4,500
Belagavi	**22**	**1,69,800**	**7,718**
Ravoor	12	31,900	2,658
Srinivasa saradgi	8	7,400	925
Kalaburagi	**20**	**39,300**	**1,965**
Adivala	4	57,600	14,400
Nayakanahatti	2	7,200	3,600
Chitradurga	**6**	**64,800**	**10,800**
Uchangidurga	9	37,390	4,154
Towdur	1	6,000	6,000
Davanagere	**10**	**43,390**	**4,339**
Muguru	2	1,000	500
Sosale	2	500	250
Mysuru	**4**	**1,500**	**375**
Kodigenahalli	6	82,100	13,683
Madalur	2	9,600	4,800
Tumakuru	8	91,700	11,462
Total	**70**	**4,10,490**	**5,864**

Source: Primary data, 2014.

Number of Rooms

Construction of house is not sufficient. The number of rooms in the house is most important for the residents' well-being. In India; most of the rural house comprises a single room for the entire family. This is very bad for human well-being. According to Suvarna (1996) several lakhs of houses are one room only residences. The people living in single-room houses do not have privacy. The importance of a house, she stressed, is that it should ensure well-being and social security of the rural families. The author measured the quality of the house based on four parameters and the number of rooms in the house is the main one. Baker (1996) rightly pointed out that rural houses require a kitchen and energy-efficient fire place with adequate ventilation. If smoke from the kitchen wood fire fills up the house it will have an adverse effect on the health of the residents, especially women, children and aged people. He also emphasized that in rural India people stay together with their children and their aged parents in single room due to lack of rooms. Mukherjee (1996) emphasized that since the house is small and the family size is big there is chance of high incidence of communicable diseases. According to our observation there are separate rooms for couples, elders and children. So, there is no privacy in life in rural areas. According to our study, 46 per cent of Dalit households have two rooms, 26 per cent live in single room, 19 per cent have three rooms and a small percentage has more than three rooms. Surprisingly, in Ravoor village one joint family lives in a house with 8 rooms (Table 5).

Table 5: No of Rooms in the House

Village/District	One Room H/Hs	Two Rooms H/Hs	3 Rooms H/Hs	4 Rooms H/Hs	5 Rooms H/Hs	6 Rooms H/Hs	8 Rooms H/Hs	Total H/Hs
Harugeri	44 (32.12)	58 (42.34)	28 (20.44)	6 (4.38)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.73)	0 (0)	137
Mugalkhoda	57 (40.71)	53 (37.86)	23 (16.43)	5 (3.57)	1 (0.71)	1 (0.71)	0 (0)	140
Belagavi	**101 (36.46)**	**111 (40.1)**	**51 (18.41)**	**11 (3.97)**	**1 (0.36)**	**2 (0.72)**	**0 (0)**	**277**
Ravoor	40 (28.99)	60 (43.48)	22 (15.94)	12 (8.70)	1 (0.72)	1 (0.72)	2 (1.5)	138
Srinivasa saradgi	72 (50.35)	43 (30.07)	22 (15.38)	4 (2.80)	0 (0)	2 (1.40)	0 (0)	143
Kalaburagi	**112 (39.86)**	**103 (36.6)**	**44 (15.66)**	**16 (5.69)**	**1 (0.36)**	**3 (1.07)**	**2 (0.7)**	**281**
Adivala	28 (19.44)	85 (36.65)	20 (13.89)	8 (5.56)	3 (2.08)	0 (0.0)	0 (0)	144
Nayakanahatti	29 (20.14)	56 (38.89)	41 (28.89)	16 (11.1)	2 (1.39)	0 (0.0)	0 (0)	144
Chitradurga	**57 (19.79)**	**141 (48.9)**	**61 (21.18)**	**24 (8.33)**	**5 (1.74)**	**0 (0.0)**	**0 (0)**	**288**
Uchangidurga	50 (35.79)	57 (41.01)	31 (22.30)	1 (0.72)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0)	139
Towdur	29 (19.46)	65 (43.62)	43 (28.86)	11 (7.38)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.67)	0 (0)	149
Davanagere	**79 (27.43)**	**122 (42.4)**	**74 (25.69)**	**12 (4.17)**	**0 (0.0)**	**1 (0.35)**	0 (0)	**288**
Muguru	40 (27.43)	66 (44.59)	27 (18.24)	13 (8.78)	0 (0.0)	2 (1.35)	0 (0)	148
Sosale	30 (20.13)	72 (48.32)	22 (14.77)	15 (10.1)	2 (1.34)	8 (5.37)	0 (0)	149

Mysuru	**70 (23.57)**	**138 (46.5)**	**49 (16.50)**	**28 (9.43)**	**2 (0.67)**	**10 (3.37)**	0 (0)	**297**
Kodigenahalli	19 (13.19)	86 (59.72)	28 (19.44)	9 (6.25)	2 (1.37)	0 (0.0)	0 (0)	144
Madalur	10 (6.80)	96 (65.31)	25 (17.01)	12 (8.16)	3 (2.04)	1 (0.68)	0 (0)	147
Tumakuru	**29 (9.97)**	**182 (62.5)**	**53 (18.21)**	**21 (7.22)**	**5 (1.72)**	**1 (0.34)**	**0 (0)**	**291**
Grand Total	**448 (26.1)**	**797 (46.3)**	**332 (19.3)**	**112 (6.6)**	**14 (0.8)**	**17 (0.99)**	**2 (0.1)**	**1722**

Source: Field data, 2014.

Year of Construction of House

Human beings have a long life span. At the same time, a house also has a long life span. An average life span of a house is nearly 40 years. According to our field data, 26 per cent of the houses were constructed during 1991-2000. Between 2011 and 2014 it was only 15 per cent (Table 6).

Table 6: Period of Construction of House

Village/District	Before 1980	1981-1990	1991-2000	2001-2010	2011-2014	Total
Harugeri	9 (6.57)	22(16.06)	34 (24.82)	49 (35.77)	23 (16.79)	137
Mugalkhoda	19 (13.57)	29 (20.71)	33 (23.57)	38 (27.14)	21 (15)	140
Belagavi	**28 (10.11)**	**51 (18.41)**	**67(24.19)**	**87 (31.41)**	**44 (15.88)**	**277**
Ravoor	25 (18.12)	23 (16.67)	39 (28.26)	29(21.01)	22 (19.94)	138
Srinivasa saradgi	39 (27.27)	26 (18.18)	36 (25.17)	31(21.68)	11(7.69)	143
Kalaburagi	**64 (22.78)**	**49 (17.44)**	**75 (26.69)**	**60 (21.35)**	**33 (11.74)**	**281**
Adivala	24 (16.67)	27 (18.75)	40 (27.78)	33(22.92)	20 (13.89)	144
Nayakanahatti	19(13.19)	15 (10.42)	41(28.47)	42 (29.17)	27 (18.75)	144
Chitradurga	**43 (14.93)**	**42 (14.58)**	**81 (28.13)**	**75 (26.04)**	**47(16.32)**	**288**
Uchangidurga	24 (17.27)	31 (22.30)	28 (20.14)	32 (23.02)	24(17.27)	139
Towdur	28 (18.79)	17 (11.41)	41 (27.52)	29(19.46)	34(22.82)	149
Davanagere	**52 (18.06)**	**48 (16.67)**	**69 (23.96)**	**61(21.18)**	**58 (20.14)**	**288**
Muguru	69 (46.62)	21 (14.19)	27 (18.24)	17(11.4)	14 (9.46)	148
Sosale	38 (25.5)	27 (18.12)	44 (29.53)	27(18.12)	13(8.72)	149
Mysuru	**107(36.1)**	**48(16.16)**	**71 (23.9)**	**44 (14.81)**	**27 (9.09)**	**297**
Kodigenahalli	14(9.72)	24 (16.67)	50 (34.72)	38 (26.39)	18(12.5)	144
Madalur	7 (4.76)	21 (14.29)	43(29.25)	42(28.57)	34(23.13)	147
Tumakuru	**21 (7.22)**	**45 (15.46)**	**93 (31.9)**	**80 (27.49)**	**52(17.87)**	**291**
Total	**315 (18.3)**	**283(16.4)**	**456 (26.5)**	**407 (23.6)**	**261 (15.2)**	**1722**

Source: Primary data, 2014.

Source of Finance

Finance is the life-blood of a house. Without finance a suitable house cannot be constructed. The villagers construct houses by mobilising funds from different sources such as own source, government schemes, banks, co-operative societies, relatives, friends and multiple other sources. The Government of India and the Karnataka government sponsored housing schemes for rural families. Many Dalit

families constructed houses through the Indira Awas Yojana (IAY).Our study data reveals that 68 per cent of the houses were constructed with their own financial resources, 23 per cent through government schemes, banks, relatives and friends and 8 per cent with funds from multiple sources (Table 7).

Table 7: Source of Finance for Construction of Houses

Village / District	Own Source	Govt. Scheme	Banks, Relative and Friends	Multiple Source	Total
Harugeri	114(83.21)	6 (4.38)	5 (3.65)	12 (8.76)	137
Mugalkhoda	79 (56.43)	41(29.29)	1 (0.71)	19 (13.5)	140
Belagavi	**193 (69.68)**	**47 (16.97)**	**6 (2.17)**	**31 (11.9)**	**277**
Ravoor	122 (88.41)	6 (4.35)	4 (2.90)	6 (4.35)	138
Srinivasa Saradgi	136 (95.10)	4 (2.80)	3 (2.10)	0 (0)	143
Kalaburagi	**258 (91.81)**	**10 (3.56)**	**7 (2.49)**	**6 (2.14)**	**281**
Adivala	91 (63.19)	47 (32.64)	1 (0.69)	5 (3.47)	144
Nayakanahatti	109 (75.69)	29 (20.14)	1 (0.69)	5 (3.47)	144
Chitradurga	**200 (69.44)**	**76 (26.39)**	**2 (0.60)**	**10 (3.47)**	**288**
Uchangidurga	94 (67.63)	19 (13.67)	0 (0)	26 (18.71)	139
Towdur	109 (73.15)	29 (19.46)	1 (0.67)	10 (6.71)	149
Davanagere	**203 (70.49)**	**48 (16.67)**	**1 (0.35)**	**36 (12.50)**	**288**
Muguru	134 (90.54)	13 (8.78)	1 (0.68)	0 (0)	148
Sosale	125 (83.89)	23 (15.44)	1 (0.67)	0 (0)	149
Mysuru	**259 (87.21)**	**36 (12.12)**	**2 (0.67)**	0 (0)	**297**
Kodigenahalli	36 (25.0)	91 (63.19)	0 (0)	17 (11.81)	144
Madalur	22 (14.97)	81 (55.10)	1 (0.68)	43 (29.25)	147
Tumakuru	**58 (19,93)**	**172 (59.11)**	**1 (0.34)**	**60 (20.62)**	**291**
Total	**1171 (68)**	**389 (22.59)**	**19 (1.10)**	**143 (8.30)**	**1722**

Source: Primary data, 2014.

Reasons for Non-construction of House

Everybody wants to construct a good house. In the selected villages, 78 Dalit families do not own houses. They said that lack of finance, poverty and lack of land were the major reasons for not having their house. Among the reasons, lack of finance is the main cause for the families for not constructing their own houses.

Electricity Connection to Houses

Electricity connection is very important for a house. Raj (1996) focused on three basic facilities in a house and these are safe drinking water, toilet and electricity. He stressed that electricity is very important for households. According to his observation during 1981 to 1991, nearly 31 per cent of households had electricity connection. Having a house is not sufficient for Dalits. Supply of potable water and electricity and sanitation services are very essential. Now-a-day's electricity is very important for all domestic work like grinding, cooling and sometimes even cooking. Without electricity human

existence is very difficult in rural areas. Our study reveals that 93 per cent of the houses have power connection (Table 8).

Table 8: Whether House is Electrified?

Village/District	Yes	No	Total
Harugeri	131 (95.62)	6 (4.38)	137(100)
Mugalkhoda	121 (86.43)	19 (13.57)	140 (100)
Belagavi	**252 (90.97)**	**25 (9..03)**	**277**(100)
Ravoor	131(94.93)	7 (5.07)	138 (100)
Srinivasa saradgi	137 (95.80)	6 (4.20)	143 (100)
Kalaburagi	**268 (95.37)**	**13 (4.63)**	**281**(100)
Adivala	133 (92.36)	11 (7.64)	144 (100)
Nayakanahatti	133 (92.36)	11 (7.64)	144 (100)
Chitradurga	**266 (92.36)**	**22 (7.64)**	**288**(100)
Uchangidurga	127 (91.37)	12 (8.63)	139 (100)
Towdur	147 (98.66)	2 (1.34)	149 (100)
Davanagere	**274 (95.14)**	**14 (4.86)**	**288**(100)
Muguru	144 (97.30)	4 (2.70)	148 (100)
Sosale	145 (97.32)	4 (2.68)	149 (100)
Mysuru	**289 (97.31)**	**8 (2.69)**	**297**(100)
Kodigenahalli	133 (92.36)	11(7.64)	144 (100)
Madalur	127 (86.39)	20 (13.61)	147 (100)
Tumakuru	**260 (89.35)**	**31 (10.65)**	**291**(100)
Total	**1609 (93.44)**	**113 (6.56)**	**1722**(100)

Source: Primary data, 2014.

Type of House

Based on the structure and materials used for construction, the houses are of three types: pucca (building materials are brick and mortar and other permanent materials), semi-pucca (building materials used for part of the construction of either the roof or the walls are mud or thatch) and Kuchha (materials used for construction are mud and thatch) (Tiwari, 2007).Our primary data reveals that 53 per cent of the families are living in semi-pucca houses, 25 per cent in Kuchha houses and 22 per cent in pucca houses. One-fifth (22%) of the families live in pucca houses and their capabilities are more as compared to those living in semi-pucca and Kuchha houses. Among the villages, 35 per cent of Kodigenhalli Dalits are living in pucca houses followed by Harugeri (33%), Ravoor (28%) and Uchangidurga (11%). Those living in pucca houses are protected from heat in the summer, rain and winds in the rainy season and the cold in winter season and enjoy a high level of dignity in the society/village. Our study reveals that majority of the Dalits live in semi-pucca houses. Among the villages, greater number of Nayakanahatti Dalits (72%) lived in semi-pucca houses followed by Towdur (71%), Adivala (67%) and Srinivasa Saradgi (14%) village. Kuchha houses are not comfortable in rainy season. Due to lack of finance 25 per cent of Dalits live in Kuchha houses. In, Srinivasa Saradgi village 64 per cent of Dalits live in Kuchha houses, 54 per cent in Ravoor, 28 per cent in Kodigenahalli and 12

per cent in Towdur (12%) (Table 9). In Srinivasa Saradgi village the Dalit houses are in a pathetic condition and the families suffer cold winds and heat. During rainy season rainwater enter the houses and they are unable to sleep at the night. Dalits are tolerating this problem. Government has to sanction pucca houses for Dalits in all the villages in Karnataka in general and particularly in Srinivasa Saradgi and selected villages of this study.

Table 9: Structure of Houses in the Selected Villages in Karnataka

Village / District	Type of House			
	Pucca	Semi-pucca	Kuchha	Total
Harugeri	45 (32.85)	69 (50.36)	23 (16.79)	137 (100)
Mugalkhoda	34 (24.29)	84 (60.00)	22 (15.71)	140 (100)
Belagavi	**79(28.52)**	**153 (55.23)**	**45 (16.25)**	**277** (100)
Ravoor	38 (27.54)	26 (18.84)	74 (53.62)	138 (100)
Srinivasa Saradgi	31 (21.68)	20 (13.99)	92 (64.34)	143 (100)
Kalaburagi	**69 (24.56)**	**46 (16.37)**	**166 (59.07)**	**281** (100)
Adivala	19 (13.19)	96 (66.67)	29 (20.14)	144 (100)
Nayakanahatti	22 (15.28)	103 (71.53)	19 (13.19)	144 (100)
Chitradurga	**41 (14.24)**	**199 (69.10)**	**48(16.67)**	**288** (100)
Uchangidurga	15 (10.79)	86 (61.87)	38 (27.34)	139 (100)
Towdur	25 (16.78)	106 (71.14)	18 (12.08)	149 (100)
Davanagere	**40 (13.89)**	**192 (66.67)**	**56 (19.44)**	**288** (100)
Muguru	35 (23.65)	87 (58.78)	26 (17.57)	148 (100)
Sosale	35 (23.49)	91 (61.07)	23 (15.44)	149(100)
Mysuru	**70 (23.57)**	**178 (59.93)**	**49 (16.50)**	**297** (100)
Kodigenahalli	50 (34.72)	54 (37.50)	40 (27.78)	144 (100)
Madalur	24 (16.33)	97 (65.99)	26 (17.69)	147 (100)
Tumakuru	**74 (25.43)**	**151 (51.89)**	**66 (22.68)**	**291** (100)
Total	**373 (21.66)**	**919 (53.37)**	**430 (24.97)**	**1722** (100)

Source: Primary data, 2014.

Type of Flooring

Different types of materials are used for laying the floor of the house. Those who are economically capable, use tiles, cement, stone and sand for floor of the house. The important materials used for flooring are mud, sand, and cement, cement with additional covering, stones, polished stones ceramic tiles and other suitable materials. Our study data reveals that majority of Dalits used cement (46%), mud (30%), stones (17%), others (4%) and wood (2%) for surface flooring. They did not use good materials like tiles and granite for flooring. About 50 per cent of the Dalits are poor and are unable to use good materials to construct their house. The flooring is made of cement most of the villages, Sosale (66%), Madalur (59%), Uchangidurga (56%) and Ravoor (12%) village (Table 10). Mud is not good for flooring. During rainy season water enters the houses and there is no difference between the inside of the house and outside. Srinivasa Saradgi has the highest per cent of houses with mud flooring (46%) followed by Nayakanahatti (41%), Adivala (38%) and Kodigenahalli village. In Kodigenahalli the Dalits

used cement (44%) and stones for flooring. This village is very near the Andhra Pradesh (AP) border and villagers import stones from that state.

Table 10: Raw Material used for Flooring of House

Village / District	Mud	Wood	Cement	Cement with additional covering	Stones	Others	Total
Harugeri	43 (31.39)	4 (2.92)	69 (50.36)	2 (1.46)	17 (12.41)	2 (1.46)	137
Mugalkhoda	52 (37.14)	6 (4.29)	54 (38.57)	4 (2.86)	19 (13.57)	5 (3.57)	140
Belagavi	**95 (34.30)**	**10 (3.6)**	**123 (44.40)**	**6 (2.17)**	**36 (13.00)**	**7 (2.53)**	**277**
Ravoor	47 (34.06)	2 (1.45)	17 (12.32)	2 (1.45)	65 (47.10)	5 (3.62)	138
Srinivasa saradgi	65 (45.45)	1 (0.70)	32 (22.38)	13 (9.1)	23 (16.08)	9 (3.62)	143
Kalaburagi	**112 (39.8)**	**3 (1.07)**	**49 (17.44)**	**15 (5.4)**	**88 (31.32)**	**14 (4.9)**	**281**
Adivala	55 (38.19)	5 (3.47)	51 (35.42)	6 (4.17)	26 (18.06)	1 (0.69)	144
Nayakanahatti	59 (40.97)	2 (1.39)	61 (42.36)	3 (2.08)	13 (9.03)	6 (4.17)	144
Chitradurga	**114 (39.5)**	**7 (2.43)**	**112 (38.89)**	**9 (3.13)**	**39 (13.54)**	**7 (2.43)**	**288**
Uchangidurga	40 (28.78)	2 (1.44)	78 (56.12)	3 (2.16)	11 (7.91)	5 (3.60)	139
Towdur	45 (30.20)	7 (4.70)	71 (47.65)	1 (0.67)	20 (13.42)	5 (3.36)	149
Davanagere	**85 (29.51)**	**9 (3.13)**	**149 (51.74)**	**4 (1.39)**	**31 (10.76)**	**10 (3.47)**	**288**
Muguru	38 (25.68)	0 (0.0)	105 (70.95)	2 (1.35)	0 (0.0)	3 (2.03)	148
Sosale	41 (27.52)	1 (0.67)	98 (65.77)	2 (1.34)	1 (0.67)	6 (4.03)	149
Mysuru	**79 (26.60)**	**1 (0.34)**	**203 (68.35)**	**4 (1.35)**	**1 (0.34)**	**9 (3.03)**	**297**
Kodigenahalli	10 (6.94)	3 (2.08)	63 (43.75)	3 (2.08)	60 (41.67)	5 (3.47)	144
Madalur	18 (12.24)	0 (0)	86 (58.50)	2 (1.36)	32 (21.77)	9 (6.12)	147
Tumakuru	**28 (9.62)**	**3 (1.03)**	**149 (51.20)**	**5 (1.72)**	**92 (31.62)**	**14 (4.81)**	**291**
Total	**513 (29.8)**	**33 (1.9)**	**785 (45.59)**	**43 (2.5)**	**287 (16.6)**	**61 (3.5)**	**1722**

Note: Others means: except mentioned material

Source: Primary data, 2014.

Roof of the House

The roof is one of the most important features of a house because it protects the people from the vagaries of nature like heavy rainfall, hot sunny days, strong winds, snow etc. Without the roof a house is not a suitable shelter for human beings. Evangelista's (2010) study observed that the roofless people are not capable and their choice is based on the scarcity of opportunities. Singh (1996) explained the

importance of construction of house and the materials used for the roof. According to his observation 50 per cent of the houses used biomass (chiefly thatch) material for construction of the roof, followed by mud and stone. Stone was used for construction of walls and is the cheapest material. Bhide *et al* (2009) examined the condition of houses built under the IAY programme. Most of the houses were constructed on small pieces of land (20 sq. ms including the verandah).The beneficiaries used metal sheets for the roof, which is not suitable during summer. The authors observed that low cost materials were used for construction of the roof. The choice of material for the roof will decide the level of protection the dweller will get from the air, sun light and rain. A roof constructed with concrete will have a long life span and protect the residents from harsh sunlight, heavy rains, winds etc. Our study, data reveals that most of the Dalits constructed their house roofs with slate (27%) followed by mud (22%), concrete (21%), stones (17%), multiple combination (1%) and tiles (1%) (Table11).The concrete (mixed with cement, small stones, iron rods and sand) is more suitable for construction of the house. Nearly 21 per cent of the Dalits constructed houses using cement. Among the villages, about 45 per cent of Dalits in Harugeri used thatch followed by Towdur (39%) and Mugalkhoda (31%).Some of the Dalits in Madalur village used timber (44%) and stones (37%) for the roof. Moreover in Srinivasa Saradgi, 40 per cent of the Dalits used mud for roofing followed by Uchangidurga (35%), Towdur (30%) and last place by Madalur village.

Table 11: Raw Materials used for Construction of Roof

Village / District	Mud	Concrete	Stones	Slates	Tiles	Multiple combination	Timber	Total
Harugeri	31 (22.63)	61 (44.53)	13 (9.49)	30 (21.90)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.73)	1 (0.73)	137
Mugalkhoda	40 (28.57)	43 (30.71)	7 (5.0)	47 (33.57)	1 (0.71)	1 (0.71)	1 (0.71)	140
Belagavi	**71 (25.63)**	**104 (37.6)**	**20 (7.22)**	**77 (27.8)**	**1 (0.36)**	**2 (0.72)**	**2 (0.72)**	**277**
Ravoor	36 (26.09)	19 (13.77)	73 (52.90)	3 (2.17)	1 (0.72)	5 (3.62)	1 (0.72)	138
Srinivasa Saradgi	57 (39.86)	19 (13. 29)	57 (39.86)	1 (0.70)	1 (0.70)	3 (2.10)	5 (3.50)	143
Kalaburagi	**93 (33.10)**	**38 (13.52)**	**130 (46.3)**	**4 (1.42)**	**2 (0.71)**	**8 (2.85)**	**6 (2.14)**	**281**
Adivala	28 (19.44)	28 (19.44)	0 (0.0)	78 (54.17)	1 (0.69)	0 (0.0)	9 (6.25)	144
Nayakanahatti	34 (23.61)	39 (27.08)	15 (10.42)	46 (31.94)	2 (1.39)	0 (0.0)	8 (5.56)	144
Chitradurga	**62 (21.53)**	**67 (23.26)**	**15 (5.21)**	**124 (43.1)**	**3 (1.04)**	**0 (0.0)**	**17 (5.9)**	**288**
Uchangidurga	48 (34.53)	33 (23.74)	3 (2.16)	54 (38.85)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.72)	0 (0.0)	139
Towdur	44 (29.53)	58 (38.93)	10 (6.71)	37 (24.83)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	149
Davanagere	**92 (31.94)**	**91 (31.60)**	**13 (4.51)**	**91 (31.6)**	**0 (0.0)**	**1 (0.35)**	**0 (0.0)**	**288**
Muguru	27 (18.24)	23 (15.54)	1 (0.68)	57 (38.51)	1 (0.68)	0 (0.0)	39 (26.3)	148
Sosale	29 (19.46)	17 (11.4)	0 (0.0)	61 (40.94)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.67)	41 (27.52)	149
Mysuru	**56 (18.86)**	**40 (13.47)**	**1 (0.34)**	**118 (39.7)**	**1 (0.34)**	**1 (0.34)**	**80 (26.9)**	**297**
Kodigenahalli	8 (5.56)	19 (13.19)	59 (40.97)	23 (15.97)	2 (1.39)	1 (0.69)	32 (22.2)	144

Madalur	2 (1.36)	1 (0.68)	55 (37.41)	20 (13.61)	2 (1.36)	2 (1.36)	65 (44.2)	147
Tumakuru	**10 (3.44)**	**20 (6.87)**	**114 (39.2)**	**43 (14.78)**	**4 (1.37)**	**3 (1.03)**	**97 (33.3)**	**291**
Total	**384 (22.3)**	**360 (20.9)**	**293 (17.1)**	**457 (26.5)**	**11 (0.64)**	**15 (0.87)**	**202 (11.7)**	**1722**

Source: Primary data, 2014.

Wellbeing of Households

In the discussion it is important to find how the quality of life of Dalits has improved in terms of housing and habitation. Generally rural people work in day time and evening come back to their respective houses/shelters. The house has to provide the security to the person when he is resting. If a house does not fulfill the house holders' needs in terms of facilities, there is no wellbeing in their life. In this context, those who used appropriate raw materials for construction of their house, had adequate number of rooms, a strong roof and safe floor with electricity connection enjoyed higher levels of wellbeing. According to our study, irrespective of the type of house built, 90 per cent of the Dalits reported that they are adjusting with whatever the type of house they owned and 10 per cent admitted they are not comfortable in their houses (Table12).

Table12: Comfortableness in the House (in terms of space, sleeping etc,)

Village/District	Comfortable	Not Comfortable	Total
Harugeri	118(86.13)	19 (13.87)	137 (100)
Mugalkhoda	128(91.43)	12(8.57)	140(100)
Belagavi	**246(88.81)**	**31(11.19)**	**277**(100)
Ravoor	122(88.41)	16 (11.59)	138(100)
Srinivasa Saradgi	135(94.41)	8(5.59)	143(100)
Kalaburagi	**257(91.46)**	**24(8.54)**	**281**(100)
Adivala	132(91.67)	12(8.33)	144(100)
Nayakanahatti	130(90.28)	14(9.72)	144(100)
Chitradurga	**262(90.97)**	**26(9.03)**	**288**(100)
Uchangidurga	134(96.40)	5(3.60)	139(100)
Towdur	146(97.99)	3(2.01)	149(100)
Davanagere	**280(97.22)**	**8(2.78)**	**288**(100)
Muguru	126(85.14)	22(14.86)	148(100)
Sosale	132(88.59)	17(11.41)	149(100)
Mysuru	**258(86.87)**	**39(13.13)**	**297**(100)
Kodigenahalli	118(81.94)	26(18.06)	144(100)
Madalur	133(90.48)	14(9.52)	147(100)
Tumakuru	**251(86.25)**	**40(13.75)**	**291**(100)
Total	**1554(90.24)**	**168(9.76)**	**1722**(100)

Source: Primary data, 2014

Reasons for not Comfortable in the House

We asked the respondent if they were satisfied with their houses and they gave various answers ranging from' house is very small, no space ,family size is big, single room, very old, damaged, possibility of collapse of roof/walls etc'. Due to poverty they were unable to construct a better house.

Conclusion and Findings of the Study

Our primary investigation finds that 99 per cent of Dalits in Mysuru district owned a house. In Mysuru district, the River Kaveri provides water to the two villages throughout the year. In addition, the Dalits get employment in their villages in the Khariff and Rabi seasons. However, there are no separate rooms for parents, elders and children. Privacy is lacking in rural households. Nearly 46 per cent of the Dalit households lived in two-room houses, 26 per cent in single room houses and 19 per cent in three-room houses. In Srinivasa Saradgi, the houses of Dalits were vulnerable to cold winds, harsh sun light. Finally, due to lack of financial support, the Dalits constructed roofs with mud.

Lack of finance, poverty and lack of adequate land are the major factors preventing Dalit families from constructing their own houses. The government has to sanction pucca houses for Dalits in all the villages in Karnataka state in general and Srinivasa Saradgi village in particular.

References

Dhawan G (1996). Families: Victims of Poverty and Homelessness. *Kurukshtra*, XLIV (8 & 9): 25-28.

Evangelista Fernandez Guillem (2010). Poverty, Homelessness and Freedom: An Approach from the Capability Theory. *European Journal of Homelessness*, 4: 189-202.

Iyengar R N (1996). Rural Housing: A Discussion. *Kurukshtra*, XLIV (8 & 9): 10-12

Iyer Krishna V R (1996). Housing As a Human Right. *Kurukshtra*, XLIV (8 & 9): 23-24.

Maruthi I and Busenna Pesala (2014). Small and Marginal Dalit Farmers in Rainfed Agriculture in Karnataka. A paper presented in National seminar on 22nd to 24th of September 2014, held at IDS Jaipur.

Mukherjee, Neela (1996). Rural Poor and Housing: Issues and Approaches. *Kurukshtra*, XLIV, (8 & 9): 29-34.

Raj K N (1996). Rural Housing in India. *Kurukshtra*, XLIV (8 & 9): 3-4.

Rani Suvarna G (1996). Socio-economic Analysis of Housing in India. *Kurukshtra*, XLIV (8 & 9): 51-54.

Sharma A K (1996b). Rural Housing: Problems and Perspectives. *Kurukshtra*, XLIV (8): 35-38.

Sharma S K (1996a). Human Right to Housing Processes. *Kurukshtra*, XLIV (8 & 9): 13-16.

Singh Amita (1996). Designing Clean and Green Villages. *Kurukshtra*, XLIV (8 & 9): 47-49.

Singh Krishna (1996). A Roof Over Your Head. *Kuruksehtra*, XLIV (8 & 9): 43-45.

Tiwari Piyus (2008*). India Infrastructure Report, 2007*. 247-263.

Recent Working Papers

293 Representation and Executive Functions of Women Presidents and Representatives in the Grama Panchayats of Karnataka
Anand Inbanathan

294 How Effective are Social Audits under MGNREGS? Lessons from Karnataka
D Rajasekhar, Salim Lakha and R Manjula

295 Vulnerability Assessment Of The Agricultural Sector In Yadgir District, Karnataka: A Socio-Economic Survey Approach
Sarishti Attri and Sunil Nautiyal

296 How Much Do We Know about the Chinese SEZ Policy?
Malini L Tantri

297 Emerging Trends in E-Waste Management - Status and Issues A Case Study of Bangalore City
Manasi S

298 The Child and the City: Autonomous Migrants in Bangalore
Supriya RoyChowdhury

299 Crop Diversification and Growth of Maize in Karnataka: An Assessment
Komol Singha and Arpita Chakravorty

300 The Economic Impact of Non-communicable Disease in China and India: Estimates, Projections, and Comparisons
David E Bloom, Elizabeth T Cafiero, Mark E McGovern, Klaus Prettner, Anderson Stanciole, Jonathan Weiss, Samuel Bakkia and Larry Rosenberg

301 India's SEZ Policy - Retrospective Analysis
Malini L Tantri

302 Rainwater Harvesting Initiative in Bangalore City: Problems and Prospects
K S Umamani and S Manasi

303 Large Agglomerations and Economic Growth in Urban India: An Application of Panel Data Model
Sabyasachi Tripathi

304 Identifying Credit Constrained Farmers: An Alternative Approach
Manojit Bhattacharjee and Meenakshi Rajeev

305 Conflict and Education in Manipur: A Comparative Analysis
Komol Singha

306 Determinants of Capital Structure of Indian Corporate Sector: Evidence of Regulatory Impact
Kaushik Basu and Meenakshi Rajeev

307 Where All the Water Has Gone? An Analysis of Unreliable Water Supply in Bangalore City
Krishna Raj

308 Urban Property Ownership Records in Karnataka: Computerized Land Registration System for Urban Properties
S Manasi, K C Smitha, R G Nadadur, N Sivanna, P G Chengappa

309 Historical Issues and Perspectives of Land Resource Management in India: A Review
M S Umesh Babu and Sunil Nautiyal

310 E-Education: An Impact Study of Sankya Programme on Computer Education
N Sivanna and Suchetha Srinath

311 Is India's Public Debt Sustainable?
Krishanu Pradhan

312 Biomedical Waste Management: Issues and Concerns - A Ward Level Study of Bangalore City
S Manasi, K S Umamani and N Latha

313 Trade and Exclusion: Review of Probable Impacts of Organised Retailing on Marginalised Communities in India
Sobin George

314 Social Disparity in Child Morbidity and Curative Care: Investigating for Determining Factors from Rural India
Rajesh Raushan and R Mutharayappa

315 Is Access to Loan Adequate for Financing Capital Expenditure? A Household Level Analysis on Some Selected States of India
Manojit Bhattacharjee and Meenakshi Rajeev

316 Role of Fertility in Changing Age Structure in India: Evidence and Implications
C M Lakshmana

317 Healthcare Utilisation Behaviour in India: Socio-economic Disparities and the Effect of Health Insurance
Amit Kumar Sahoo

318 Integrated Child Development Services in India – A Sub-National Review
Jonathan Gangbar, Pavithra Rajan and K Gayithri

319 The Infrastructure-Output Nexus: Regional Experience from India
Sumedha Bajar

320 Uncertainty, Risk and Risk Mitigation: Field Experiences from Farm Sector in Karnataka
Meenakshi Rajeev and B P Vani

321 Socio-Economic Disparities in Health-Seeking Behaviour, Health Expenditure and Sources of Finance in Orissa: Evidence from NSSO 2004-05
Amit Kumar Sahoo and S Madheswaran

322 Does Living Longer Mean Living Healthier? Exploring Disability-free Life Expectancy in India
M Benson Thomas, K S James and S Sulaja

323 Child and Maternal Health and Nutrition in South Asia - Lessons for India
Pavithra Rajan, Jonathan Gangbar and K Gayithri

324 Reflecting on the Role of Institutions in the Everyday Lives of Displaced Women: The Case of Ganga-Erosion in Malda, West Bengal
Priyanka Dutta

325 Access of Bank Credit to Vulnerable Sections: A Case Study of Karnataka
Veerashekharappa

326 Neighbourhood Development and Caste Distribution in Rural India
Rajesh Raushan and R Mutharayappa

Price: ₹ 30.00 ISBN 978-81-7791-210-4

INSTITUTE FOR SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CHANGE
Dr V K R V Rao Road, Nagarabhavi P.O., Bangalore - 560 072, India
Phone: 0091-80-23215468, 23215519, 23215592; Fax: 0091-80-23217008
E-mail: vani@isec.ac.in; Web: www.isec.ac.in