



## RESEARCH ARTICLE

### HOUSING CONDITIONS IN RURAL AREAS OF DHARWAD TALUKA

\*<sup>1</sup>Geeta Chitagubbi, <sup>2</sup>Annapurna Pujar, <sup>3</sup>Ashwini Morab and <sup>4</sup>Shreedevi Mugalkhod

<sup>1</sup>Professor and Jr Scientist, AICRP-HSc(FRM), MARS UAS Dharwad

<sup>2</sup>Department of Extension Education, UAS Dharwa

<sup>3</sup>Graduate Assistant, AICRP-HSc(FRM), MARS UAS Dharwad

<sup>4</sup>SRF, AICRP-HSc(FRM), MARS UAS Dharwad

#### ARTICLE INFO

##### Article History:

Received 27<sup>th</sup> June, 2016

Received in revised form

23<sup>rd</sup> July, 2016

Accepted 15<sup>th</sup> August, 2016

Published online 30<sup>th</sup> September, 2016

##### Key words:

Type of house,  
Size of room,  
Housing conditions.

#### ABSTRACT

The present study was conducted in Dhawad taluka. A total of 120 rural households have been selected for the study, to select the 24 rural houses from each village. The result of study showed that seventy five percent of respondents were residing in pucca houses, whereas lesser percentage of them was residing in katcha houses. Were that most of rural houses had large / big sized living room. The average size of living was found 14.83 sq.mt. This is because of living room was used as multipurpose room like keeping animals, storing grains so they had large sized living room. Majority of the respondents (65.83 %) used burnt brick and mud for construction of wall for their houses followed by burnt brick and mud, stone, unburnt brick and brunt brick and thatched houses. Kadapa stone was used by major percent of the respondents. Materials used for construction of roof majority (53.33%) of the houses were having tiled roof followed by mud and others (19.17%). Major percentages (14.17%) of rural families were keeping their domestic animals inside the houses only. More than ninety percent of the respondents were cleaning and brooming their houses daily whereas, least percentage of them were cleaning and brooming house every alternate days.

Copyright©2016, Geeta Chitagubbi et al. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Citation: Geeta Chitagubbi, Annapurna Pujar, Ashwini Morab and Shreedevi Mugalkhod, 2016. "Housing conditions in rural areas of Dharwad taluka" *International Journal of Current Research*, 8, (09), 39141-39144.

## INTRODUCTION

Housing is one of man's primary needs and as such is a matter of permanent importance to human society. Housing is one of the three basic needs of man next to food and clothing. Housing provides place for an individual not only in his family but, also in the community and society. Housing is an important indicator of the level of a country's and satisfied resider will contribute towards social stability and productivity of the members and in turns country's development. Housing may affect the social and affectional aspects of family life and has an important place in development of an individual and his personality. Housing in the modern concept includes not only physical structure producing shelter but, also the immediate surroundings. Therefore shelter is term used to describe the housing. World Health Organization defined housing or shelter as an enclosed environment in which man finds protection against the natural elements with safety and security from hostile forces. Owning a house which one call "his / her own" has sentimental value and thus is of great psychological

significance. Today housing means provision of comfortable and rich surrounding and services which would keep a man healthy and cheerful. Dividas (1983) pointed out two types of human needs as survival needs and socio-physiological needs. Housing is one of the significant assets in the fulfillment of these needs. Rapid growth of production cost, inflation of the house buildings materials and slow rate of house construction have aggravated the housing problem in the country. The problem of housing in our country is diverse in nature and enormous in magnitude. In India 38.5 percent people live in one room houses and 30 percent live in two room houses. However this picture is still worse and conditions are far from satisfactory in rural India. Low cost rural dwellings are usually small and in sanitary often in dilapidated conditions. Mahatma Gandhi had once said the cities are capable of taking care of themselves: it is the villages have to. He had dreamt of an Indian village with cottages having sufficient light and ventilation, built of the materials obtainable within radius of five miles of it. He had favored the use of mud, dry stalks or clay tiles / wood and bamboo for roofing which are easily available in almost, every village. Housing becomes not only a basic necessity but also a psychological advantage. It is primarily a self help activity for the majority of households for

\*Corresponding author: Geeta Chitagubbi,

<sup>1</sup>Professor and Jr Scientist, AICRP-HSc(FRM), MARS UAS Dharwad

which they go through all efforts to possess one of in rural areas. In general, 40-70% of the dwelling units are katcha units, and at least one third of them are highly congested, single room units. Several of these katcha rural houses lack adequate floor space and amenities, leaving aside environmental sanitation given this housing scenario, the accumulation of housing data not growing a place with the mounting awareness of the problem. There are not even uniform precise and reliable estimates of housing shortage in rural areas of the country, except the few surveys like National Sample Survey. (Sangeeta Singla *et al.*, 1994) The psychological dimension of housing makes it necessary to view problem of housing in the back group of overall environment of human settlement. The physical dwelling units are not the sole element of housing; equally important is the provision of basic services like portable water, sanitation, drainage, and electricity. It is these services which make a 'house' a 'home'. Therefore, the housing situation should discuss not only physical availability / non- availability of the basic civic amenities which go with housing. In the later category falls water, sanitation, drainage, electricity and the physical condition of the house.

A large number of people in India are living in more than half a million villages with different geo-climatic conditions, living patterns, socio-economic conditions, and rich cultural heritage. Majority of the people are deprived of decent living conditions. Hence, it is necessary to study the extent to which rural rooms are expressed to unhealthy and uncomfortable living conditions. Hence researcher felt the need for making an intensive study with the following objectives:

- To study the building pattern of rural households.
- To study the privacy pattern of rural houses
- To study the maintenance pattern of rural house buildings.
- To suggest appropriate measures for improving their housing conditions.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

The present study was conducted in the villages of Dharwad taluka namely Hebballi, Uppinbetageri, Kavalgeri, Nigadi, and Nayakana Hulikatti. A total of 120 rural households have been selected for the study purpose. Random sampling method was used to select the 24 rural houses from each village. Self structured and pre-tested questionnaire was used for collection of data. Data was collected by interviewing the residents of individual and households. Statistical tools like frequencies, percentages were used for analyzing the data. Extension methods like group discussion, group meeting were used for giving suggestion for improving their housing conditions.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 shows that socio economic background of the respondents. Majority of the respondents belonged to low age

group i.e. < 41 years of age followed by high age group (>51 years). Less percentage of the respondents was in median age group. Regarding educational status of the respondents fifty percent of them had primary level education and only three percent of them studied up to PUC level and meager percent of them (0.83 percent) were found to have professional level of education. Around fifty percent of the respondents belonged to nuclear families followed by joint and extended families (29.17% and 21.67% respectively). Highest percent of respondents were from medium families (4 -7 members), substantial percent of them belonged to small families (< 4 members), whereas, only 22.50 percent of them were from large families (>7 members). More than sixty percent of the familiars were having medium level of income (Rs 24470 – Rs 62613) and around 23 percent of them belonged to low income

**Table 1. Socio-economic background of the selected household residents**

Personal Characteristics	Frequency (%)	N=120
Age		
Low (< 41yrs)	48 (40.00)	
Medium (41-54yrs)	28 (23.33)	
High (> 54yrs)	44 (36.67)	
Education		
Illiterate	60 (50.00)	
Primary	42 (35.00)	
High school	13 (10.83)	
PUC	4 (3.33)	
Professional	1 (0.83)	
Family type		
Nuclear	59 (49.17)	
Joint	35 (29.17)	
Extended	26 (21.67)	
Family size		
< 4 members	43 (35.83)	
4 -7 members	50 (41.67)	
>7 members	27 (22.50)	
Income		
Low (Rs.<24470)	27 (22.50)	
Medium (Rs.24470-62613)	73 (60.83)	
High (Rs.>62613)	20 (16.67)	
Main Occupation		
Agriculture	62 (51.67)	
Agricultural Labour	33 (27.50)	
Government servant	3 (2.50)	
Others	22 (18.32)	
Subsidiary Occupation		
Agriculture	3 (2.50)	
Agricultural Labour	11 (9.17)	
Government servant	1 (0.83)	
Others	19 (15.82)	
Land holding		
Landless	49 (40.83)	
Small farmers	49 (40.83)	
Medium farmers	18 (15.00)	
Big farmers	4 (3.33)	
Ownership of house		
Own	110 (91.67)	
Rented	9 (7.50)	
Lease	1 (0.83)	
Domestic animals		
Cattles >2 No.	62 (51.66)	
< 2 No.	3 (2.50)	
Total	65 (54.16)	

**Table 2. Type of house possessed by respondents of the selected rural houses**

Type of house	Pucca			Total	Katcha		Total
	RCC	Mud	Tiled		Thatched	Sheet	
Frequency	8	23	64	95	18	7	25
(%)	(6.67)	(19.17)	(53.33)	(79.17)	(15.00)	(5.83)	(20.83)

group (Rs < 24470) whereas only 16.67 percent of the respondents were in high income group (Rs > 62613). Forty-one percent of each respondents belonged to landless and small farmers group. Around 15 percent of them belonged to medium farmers group whereas least percent of them were big farmers (3.33percent). Majority of the respondents possessed own houses whereas only 7.50 percent of them were residing in rental houses and meager percent of them were living in leased houses (0.83 percent). More than fifty percent of respondents' possessed domestic animals (cattle). Among these, majority of them were having less than 2 cattle whereas only 2.50 percent of respondents were rearing more than 2 cattle. Majority of respondents (51.67%) had Agriculture as their main occupation followed by agricultural labour (27.5%). 18.32% were involved in laundry, carpentry work, milk selling, tailoring, priest, cloth merchant and stationary shop etc. Less than three percent of the respondents were in govt services as their main occupation, whereas, majority of respondents (15.82%) had subsidiary occupation like priest, cloth merchant, stationary shop, driving, laundry, carpentry work, milk selling tailoring. Type of houses possessed by respondents is depicted in Table (2). The results of the study shows the similar results to the study of Suchitra and Renuka, 1990. More than seventy five percent of respondents were residing in pucca houses, whereas lesser percentage of them was residing in katcha houses. Among pucca houses, majority of houses were titled (53.33%) followed by mud and RCC respectively (19.12 % and 8%). Among katcha houses 15 percent of them were thatched houses and only 5.83 percent of them were having sheet roof houses.

**Table 3. Average size of the rooms in the selected rural houses**

Room	Area (sq.mt)
Living room	14.83 sq.mt
Bed room	3.59 sq.mt
Kitchen	9.09 sq.mt
Store room	0.83 sq.mt
Puja room	1.27 sq.mt
Bath room	1.04 sq.mt
Toilet	0.48 sq.mt
Average built up area	44.90 sq.mt

**Table 4. Materials used for construction of wall of the selected rural houses N=120**

Wall	Frequency (%)
Burnt brick and mud	79 (65.83)
Burnt brick and cement	3 (2.50)
Stones	2 (1.67)
Concrete	1 (0.83)
Thatched	1 (0.83)
Un burnt brick and mud	7 (5.83)
Asbestos sheets	1 (0.83)
Burnt brick and mud, stone	9 (7.50)
Burnt brick and mud, thatch	6 (5.00)
Burnt brick and mud, grass	1 (0.83)
Burnt brick and mud, wood	1 (0.83)
Burnt brick and mud, Un burnt brick and mud	5 (4.17)
Burnt brick and cement, stones, wood, bamboo wood	1 (0.83)
Stones and wood	3 (2.50)

The rural houses also had large kitchen (average size 9.09 sq.mt) this is because most of them had bathroom inside the kitchen where as selected rural houses had comparatively small

sized bedroom, bathroom, pujaroom and toilet (size of the rural bedroom was about 3.59 sq.mt, bath room - 1.04 sq. Puja room -1.27 sq.mt and toilet-1.28 sq.mt) and commonly selected rural houses had very small store rooms (average size -0.83 sq.mt because these rural families used living rooms as storage of grains also). The average total built-up area of selected rural houses was- 44.90 sq.mt

**Table 5. Materials used for construction of floor of the selected rural houses**

Floor	Frequency (%)
Mud	31 (25.84)
Tiles	4 (3.33)
Cement	8 (6.67)
Kudapa stone	34 (28.33)
Red oxide	12 (10.00)
Mud, cement	2 (1.66)
Mud, Kudapa stone	21 (17.50)
Mud, Red oxide	2 (1.67)
Tiles, Kudapa stone	1 (0.83)
Cement, Kudapa stone	3 (2.50)
Cement, Kudapa stone, mud	1 (0.83)
Kudapa stone, red oxide	1 (0.83)

The common features observed from this Table 3 were that most of rural houses had large / big sized living room. The average size of living was found 14.83 sq.mt. This is because of living room was used as multipurpose room like keeping animals, storing grains so they had large sized living room. The finding of study revealed that apart from the type of material used for construction, qualitative improvements have also been observed on the count of decline in proportion of households having no exclusive room & 1 room, increase in proportion of households having 2 & 3 rooms along with decrease in proportion of households with 3 or more married couples according to census 2011.

Table 4 reveals that materials used for construction of walls majority of the respondents (65.83 %) used burnt brick and mud for construction of wall for their houses followed by burnt brick and mud, stone, unburnt brick and mud, and burnt brick and thatched (7.50 %, 5.83 & 5.00% respectively). Whereas only 2.50 percent of them used stone, wood & burnt brick and cement. Meager percent of them used concrete, thatched, burnt brick, and stone and wood, bamboo as base sheets for construction of walls. Easy accessibility of burnt brick and mud in their region might be the reason for using these materials more for construction of walls & cost may be the reasoning factor for lesser usage of cement & concrete, stones for construction rural houses. The result of study in line with significant improvement in quality of housing has been observed with increased proportion of population moving away from katcha materials like thatch, grass, bamboo, mud etc both for walls and roof and decline in mud as material of floor. The finding of result supported by census 2011. Kadapa stone was used by major percent of the respondents (28.33%) followed by mud, kadapa stone and cement (Red oxide) (25.83%, 17.50% and 6.67% respectively). Whereas less and equal percent (3.33%) of them used tiles, mud, and cement and kadapa stones for construction of floors. Meager percent of them used tiles, Kadapa stones & cement, mud for construction of their house flooring (83%). Kadapa stones are locally available at reasonable cost and their easy

maintenances were in the reasons for more using of these materials for construction of flooring by majority of the respondents Table 5.

**Table 6. Materials used for construction of roof**

Roof	Frequency (%)
Cement	8 (6.67)
Tiles	64 (53.33)
Mud and others	23 (19.17)
Asbestos sheet	7 (5.83)
Others	18 (15.00)

Table 6 shows that materials used for construction of roof. Majority (53.33%) of the houses were having tiled roof followed by mud and others (19.17%) whereas cement and asbestos sheets were used as roofing materials by lesser percentage of the respondents (6.67 % and 5.83% respondents). Cost effectiveness and easy accessibility might be the reasons for using tiles as major roofing materials by large no. of respondents.

**Table 7. Space for keeping domestic animals and disposal of animal excreta**

Space for keeping domestic animals	Frequency (%)
Front yard	9 (7.50)
Separate cattle shed	9 (7.50)
Backyard	12 (10.00)
Inside house	17 (14.17)
Space for disposal animal excreta	Frequency (%)
Open space	17 (14.17)
Pits	30 (25.00)
Any where	0 (0.00)

Table 7 present the space for keeping domestic animals and disposal of animal extracts of the selected rural houses. Major percentages (14.17%) of rural families were keeping their domestic animals inside the houses only. Because this was the common style of construction of rural houses since long time and were following the same tradition. Around 10 percent of them kept their domestic animals at the backyard whereas, equal percentages of them were keeping them in front yard in separate. The results also reveal that pits were used for disposal of animals extract (cow dung) by majority of rural families (25 %) as they used this cow dung for preparation of FYM for their fields whereas, lesser percentage of them disposed animal extract in the open space. All selected rural houses were found to have living room, kitchen, and bathroom. Among these, 86 houses had bath room with the kitchen. But only 45 percent of the houses were found to have bedrooms, 32.5 percent of them were with single bedroom and 12.50 percent of them with double bedroom & only least percentage (1.67%) of the houses were with three bedrooms. It is good sign to know that, more than fifty percent of the houses were having toilet facility in their houses. Whereas around 32 percent of them were having pooja room and least percent of them have store room (15.83%) and (27.50% and 16.67%) whereas almost equal percentage of them were having 5 rooms and 6 rooms houses (10.83% and 10% respectively).

The results of the study was supporte to the results of Prema Talwar, 2009. Major percentage of selected rural houses were having 2 roomed houses (35%) followed by 3 roomed and 4 roomed respectively.

**Table 8. Maintenance of the house**

Maintenance pattern of house	Frequency (%)
Cleaning	
Daily	109 (90.83)
Alternative day	6 (5.00)
Weekly	5 (4.17)
Brooming	
Daily	109 (90.83)
Alternative day	9 (7.50)
Weekly	2 (1.67)
Wiping	
Daily	55 (45.83)
Alternative day	48 (40.00)
Weekly	14 (11.67)
Cleaning agents	Frequency (%)
Phenyl	19 (15.83%)
Detergent	9 (7.50%)

Table 8 reveals that maintenance pattern practiced by respondents. More than ninety percent of the respondents were cleaning and brooming their houses daily whereas, least percentage of them were cleaning and brooming house every alternate days and once in a week (5.00 percent and 4.17 percent respectively), where as, 98.83% were broom their houses daily. Regarding wiping of house around 46 percent of them were wiping their house daily and others on alternate day (40 %) and only 11.67 of them were cleaning their houses weekly. The table also reveals that less than 25 percent of the respondents were using cleaning agents like phenyl (15.83%) and detergent (7.58%) for wiping the floor.

## Conclusion

The present rural housing conditions are not in conformity with norms of healthy living of the rural masses. Hence, conditions must be created for better housing facilities through appropriate home science educational activities. can be conducted in rural areas focusing on improving housing conditions-creating appropriate low cost facilities like partition with cattle shed, separate bathroom, toilets, windows of appropriate size for proper ventilation.

## REFERENCES

- Census India 2011, [www.censusindia.net](http://www.censusindia.net) com  
 Prema Talwar, 2009. Housing situation, policies and programmer in India, AUICK News letter No. 29, [www.quickorg.com](http://www.quickorg.com).  
 Sangeeta Singla, Krisna Oberoy and Miglani, S.S. 1994. Existing sanitation and health status of rural and urban families of Bathinda district, *Research Journal of Punjab Agricultural*, 31 (1) : 248-256.  
 Suchitra, M. and Renuka, S. 1990. Existing living conditions of selected multi storied buildings. *Indian Journal of Home Science*, 20 :71-74.

\*\*\*\*\*