CHAPTER – VIII

INDIRA AWAAS YOJANA

This chapter exhibits the performance of Rural Housing Programme implemented in the State of Tamil Nadu. Improvements in housing conditions in the villages have manifold significance. Housing encourages economic activities, generates employment opportunities and creates a solid base for healthy and hygienic living. Keeping in view of the magnitude of the problem and its inherent difficulties, the task of improving the housing conditions in rural areas has to be viewed not as an isolated objective but as an integral part of a programme for overall development of the villages. As a policy, the Government of Tamil Nadu provided additional support of Rs. 12000 per house for making fire proof RCC (Reinforced concrete Cement) roofed houses. Besides some special provisions were made by the State Government through the State sectoral programmes. In this context, one could expect the impact of the programmes among the rural households.

The group houses were constructed and offered to the eligible beneficiaries at free of cost. It is expected that the programme carried out as per the guidelines of the central and State Government. These group houses would have created some positive externalities to the beneficiaries as depicted in Table 8.1. There are four positive externalities were identified and explored. They are ‘Employment in Construction’, ‘Increase in Social Status’, ‘Trees and Plants grown’ and ‘Income from construction work’.

The first externality is employment in construction’. The Government has insisted that the beneficiary has to involve in the construction activities to ensure the quality of construction and also they can get some additional employment. On an average, the response was 10 per cent among the zonal villages. The response too varied among the

zones. It shows that some of the beneficiaries had not participated in the construction activities. It could be expected that the sample beneficiaries alone would have enjoyed the benefits. However, in the context of externalities, the various queries were made to assess their perception among sample households. Of the total sample, 187 households were reported that they have received the employment in construction.

In some places, the quality of construction is very poor due to the non-involvement of the beneficiaries in the construction of their houses. According to their officials, the earmarked funds for the construction of a single house is Rs. 32,000 in the normal soil and Rs. 34,000 in the difficult soil. This is not enough to meet the expenditure. The contractors too have agreed the same view. In some regions, the materials are available close to their proximity; hence the transport cost is very minimum. Particularly in the High Altitude Zone, bringing the materials sand, bricks, steel, etc. from the plains involved huge amount of transport cost. Hence the contractors are reluctant to take up the works. Those who have taken up the work, they have compromised the quality.

The second positive externality is ‘Increase in Social Status’. The beneficiaries of the group houses, thy lived earlier in the huts or thatched roof houses. The provision of concrete house in the structured area would have witnessed the social status among the community. Of the total sample, 230 people reported that their social status increased. In the Southern Zone village, only four households reported the same. It shows that their perception varied among the beneficiaries.

The third externality is ‘trees and plants grown’ in their houses offered by the government at free of cost. Of these, only 113 cases were recorded that they have grown some trees, which may help them to meet their needs. In the High Altitude Zone no one has grown trees, since their size of land is small. However, the poorer income groups lived in the risk prone area of landslide.

Another positive externality is ‘income from the construction work’. There is no relationship in between employment and income. It is observed that the contractors employed the beneficiaries and they had not given wages for their work. The government has to ensure the employment and income.

In the context of negative externalities, three queries were made. They are ‘poor quality of materials used’, ‘using the house as a cattle shed or storage of food grains’ and ‘renting out their houses’. Of these three, the response was very high in the use of poor quality materials for the construction of the houses. Of the total sample, 224 cases were recorded. Due to the use of poor quality materials, the life of house came down and it gave lot of problems to the beneficiaries. Other externalities did not arise much among the zone villages. However, some of them have treated their houses as a cattle shed or storage houses. The selection of the beneficiaries was not fair. These beneficiaries had a good house for their living. So they treated their group houses as storage place or rented them to third parties.

Use of Smokeless Chulahs and Toilets

Table 8.2 brings to focus the use of smokeless chulahs and toilets in the seven agro-climatic zonal villages in Tamil Nadu. These additional provisions were made to make the household environment neat and clean. The central Government introduced under ‘Improved Chulahs’ with the aim for construction of fuel energy and to eliminate smoke from kitchen, prevent deforestation and drudgery of rural women. Similarly, toilets were constructed under the rural sanitation programme with the objective of improving the quality of life of the rural people and to provide privacy and dignity to the rural women.

In this context, an attempt has been made to assess the use of chulahs and toilets. Of the total beneficiaries of 378, no one has used the chulahs provided to them. The beneficiaries revealed that they had not used the chulahs due to the size is very small,

Broken, Not given and creates indoor air pollution. Among these reasons, the response varied in between 20 per cent and 30 per cent. It could be said that the money spent on the provision of chulahs, had not reached its goal.

In the context of toilets, only nine beneficiaries used the toilets in the High Rainfall Region. In the rest of the categories they had not used the toilets. Of the total 369 cases, 56 cases were not provided the toilets. It may rather surprise to see this figure. In some other cases, beneficiaries had not used due to incomplete construction, inadequate depth of septic tank, habituated to go for open defecation and converted as firewood / grain storage. It could be concluded that the money spent on chulahs had not created any impact on the beneficiaries.

The group houses made positive and negative non-pecuniary externalities in the study region. Pecuniary externalities were discussed in the previous chapter. In the context of non-pecuniary externalities, the negative externalities are high in the study region, due to some irregularities in execution of the works.

Table 8.1 Positive and Negative Externalities of the CPR - Group Houses

Sl.No.	Externalities	Agro Climatic Zone							
		Cauvery Delta	North East	Western	North West	High Altitude	Southern	High Rainfall	Total
		n = 270	n = 270	n = 270	n = 270	n = 270	n = 270	n = 270	N = 1890
	Positive Externalities								
1	Employment in Construction	15 (5.56)	65 (24.07)	33 (12.22)	20 (7.41)	6 (2.22)	8 (2.96)	40 (14.81)	187 (9.89)
2	Increase in Social Status	14 (5.19)	62 (22.96)	13 (4.81)	46 (17.04)	37 (13.70)	7 (2.59)	51 (18.89)	230 (12.17)
3	Trees and Plants Grown	14 (5.19)	32 (11.85)	9 (3.33)	13 (4.81)	0 (0.00)	10 (3.70)	35 (12.96)	113 (5.98)
4	Income from Construction Work	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	4 (1.48)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (0.37)	5 (0.26)
	Negative Externalities								
1	Poor Quality of Materials used	22 (8.15)	57 (21.11)	26 (9.63)	41 (15.19)	28 (10.37)	26 (9.63)	24 (8.89)	224 (11.85)
2	Using as Cattleshed or Storage Houses	0 (0.00)	2 (0.74)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (0.37)	3 (1.11)	1 (0.37)	7 (0.37)
3	Renting of House	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (0.37)	1 (0.05)

Source: Computed **Note**: Figures in parentheses are Percentages to the total

Table 8.2 Use of Smokeless Chulahs and Toilets by the Beneficiaries of Group Houses

Sl.No.	Particulars	Agro Climatic Zone							
		Cauvery Delta	North East	Western	North West	High Altitude	Southern	High Rainfall	Total
		n = 270	n = 270	n = 270	n = 270	n = 270	n = 270	n = 270	N = 1890
I	**Use of Smokeless Chulahs Reasons for not in use**								
1	Size is very Small	7 (25.93)	23 (34.85)	18 (34.62)	16 (22.22)	1 (1.59)	8 (19.51)	2 (3.51)	75 (20.22)
2	Broken	6 (22.22)	6 (9.09)	29 (55.77)	31 (43.06)	14 (22.22)	8 (19.51)	19 (33.33)	113 (30.46)
3	Not Given	1 (3.70)	37 (56.06)	0 (0.00)	25 (34.72)	1 (1.59)	11 (26.83)	28 (49.12)	103 (28.03)
4	Indoor air Pollution	13 (48.15)	0 (0.00)	5 (9.62)	0 (0.00)	47 (74.60)	14 (34.15)	8 (14.04)	87 (21.29)
	Total	27 (100)	66 (100)	52 (100)	72 (100)	63 (100)	41 (100)	57 (100)	378 (100)
II	**Use of Toilet Reasons for not in use**								
1	No Provision	1 (3.70)	20 (30.30)	0 (0.00)	5 (6.94)	3 (4.76)	0 (0.00)	27 (56.25)	56 (15.63)
2	Construction incomplete	14 (51.85)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	14 (3.77)
3	Inadequate Depth of Septic Tank	9 (33.33)	15 (22.73)	5 (9.62)	0 (0.00)	38 (60.32)	0 (0.00)	2 (4.17)	69 (18.60)
4	Habituated to use Open Defacation	2 (7.41)	31 (46.97)	30 (57.69)	67 (93.06)	22 (34.92)	0 (0.00)	19 (39.58)	171 (46.09)
5	Converted to other use	1 (3.70)	0 (0.00)	17 (32.69)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	41 (100.00)	0 (0.00)	59 (15.90)
	Total Beneficiaries Not Used	27 (100)	66 (100)	52 (100)	72 (100)	63 (100)	41 (100)	48 (100)	369 (100)

Source: Computed **Note**: Figures in Parentheses are Percentages to the total Beneficiaries