



International Journal of Advanced Academic Studies

E-ISSN: 2706-8927

P-ISSN: 2706-8919

www.allstudyjournal.com

IJAAS 2025; 7(4): 01-05

Received: 17-02-2025

Accepted: 19-03-2025

Mohanambigai D

Department of Social Work,
Bharathidasan University,
Tiruchirapalli, Tamil Nadu,
India

Rajavel N

Assistant Professor,
Department of Social Work,
Bharathidasan University,
Tiruchirapalli, Tamil Nadu,
India

Corresponding Author:

Mohanambigai D

Department of Social Work,
Bharathidasan University,
Tiruchirapalli, Tamil Nadu,
India

Challenges in education faced by children in a development-induced displaced population

Mohanambigai D and Rajavel N

DOI: <https://www.doi.org/10.33545/27068919.2025.v7.i4a.1408>

Abstract

In order to create massive development projects like dams, reservoirs, power plants, highways, plantations, urban redevelopment, and oil, gas, and mining projects, millions of people throughout the world are moved and resettled every year, taking them away from their homes and ways of life. People who are displaced lose a variety of things, some of which are vital to their existence, such as their homes, valuable possessions, culture, means of subsistence, the environments most suited to their talents and practices, social networks, and a sense of identity. People have been uprooted not just from their homes but also from their possible ancestral homelands. The poorest, most socially and economically vulnerable, and marginalized segments of society, including women, children, minorities, and indigenous peoples, are always impacted by forced evictions, which exacerbate inequality, social strife, and segregation. Those impacted by particular projects have, for the most part, not received adequate rehabilitation and relocation measures for their well-being. Rehabilitation and resettlement negatively affect the education system of children and it alternatively affects the nation's future. In social work, there is a scope in study of development induced displaced populations in children. Many people evacuated to make various development projects in Chennai and rehabilitated in Semmencherry. Therefore, this paper focussed to challenges in education faced by children in a development-induced displaced population resettled in Semmencherry. In this study, the data collected from 214 children, and out of which 106 children are males and 108 children are females. Lottery method of sampling is used for this study. And this study finds significant difference between socio demographic characters with regards to Environmental Challenges, Health Challenges, Socio-Cultural Challenges, and Economic Challenges in development induced displaced populations of children resettled in Semmencherry. Findings shows that, there is a significant difference between gender, educational status, religion and caste with regards to Environmental Challenges, Health Challenges, Socio-Cultural Challenges, and Economic Challenges in development induced displaced populations of children resettled in Semmencherry.

Keywords: Development induced displacement, displaced population, resettlement, rehabilitation, educational challenges

Introductions

The forceful purchase of land for large-scale development projects has been one of the main features of development initiatives in India after independence (Cerena, 2000). People may be forced to leave their homes, means of support, traditions, and cultural ties as a result of these initiatives, which might result in their involuntary displacement. Those who experience this kind of displacement are uprooted from their homes, sources of support, and lands (Black, 2002) [3]. It also has additional catastrophic psychological and societal effects. Involuntary relocation typically results in serious economic and social issues as well as long-term misery and poverty (Berman, 1998) [2]. As people move, their productive abilities may be less relevant and resource rivalry may be more intense in the new location. Although the government and non-government organizations in charge of the projects promise to offer some compensation, the requests of the displaced people have not been met (Anuradha, 2002) [1].

Large development projects have been established in various sections of the country as a result of the socio-economic development process that was sparked by the subsequent five-year plans (Collins, 1986) [5]. Since they are frequently adopted in underdeveloped regions where contemporary development has not yet begun, they have come to represent progress. The local population's living standards are being raised as part of this development process,

although this is not happening consistently (Costa, 2015) ^[6]. This process of development has a negative impact on some segments of the local people. Those that are displaced due to development projects typically experience significant social, economic, ecological, and environmental issues. Family as a system break broken, and the ties that have been long formed by ancestry and legacy are dispersed (Dutta, 2009) ^[9]. When kin groupings scatter and community structures and social networks deteriorate, so do cultural identity, traditional power, and the likelihood of cross-community assistance. Values, belief structures, attitudes, customs, and traditions suffer significant setbacks. Both the nature of religious worship and the family as a system of production is impacted (Fahim, 1981) ^[10].

Although mankind has been aware of mining, irrigation, transportation, and large-scale industrial operations for many years, the negative impacts that come from these activities were not fully recognized as existent. Natives are forced to endure hardships for their survival because so much fertile land and settlements are being used for developmental programs (Ganguly, 2005) ^[12]. Economic liberalization now poses a challenge to the conventional means of subsistence. The suffering of the displaced is brought to light by the size of the displacements brought on by large dams. Many impacted people lose possessions or lose prospects for a living but are not usually physically evacuated as a result of home expropriation (Fuggle, 2000) ^[11]. Those concerned with resettlement must look beyond dams and the rural model to displacements caused by highways, trains, urban infrastructure upgrades, tourism, and private sector projects as demands for new and upgraded infrastructure increase. Development has always been accompanied by forced migration, ecological shifts, and environmental deterioration, which have affected both industrialized and developing nations (Howard, 1997) ^[14]. The construction of large hydropower dams, drinking water and irrigation systems, the extension of highway networks, and other infrastructure projects like hotels, resorts, airports, towns, sewage systems, sub-ways, and intra-city roads, among others, have resulted in extensive and difficult population displacement. Every single development project ultimately needs a sizable piece of land, which forcibly uproots the locals-usually the poorest members of society-who live in the most isolated areas of the nation. Involuntary resettlement refers to the forcible transfer of individuals without the consent or previous authorization of the individuals being relocated (Guggenheim, 1993) ^[13]. Comparably less damage was produced by industrial and infrastructure developments than by development. So, it stands to reason that its applicability would be vigorously contested. The outcry of the affected individuals opposing the forced relocation prompted the project's supporting organisations to explore for efficient resettlement strategies (Mahapatra, 1996) ^[16].

Displaced people are those who are compelled to leave their homes and properties as a result of natural or man-made calamities. Forced relocation directly affects the resettlers' health. Offering adequate and comparable living circumstances to those that existed before the population was displaced is one of the most difficult tasks undertaken by all development efforts. The economic and sociocultural issues brought on by relocation disrupt people's social networks and living conditions (Meher, 2010) ^[18]. Affecting the entirety of customary activity with established social

structures, this pushes displaced people to look for new sources of support in an unfamiliar setting. Those that are relocated as a result of development initiatives frequently experience poorer economic outcomes than they did previously. They suffer harm in addition to losing their land and means of subsistence. Traditional informal social networks that facilitate mutual aid disintegrate. Furthermore, the community cannot help them since its ability to handle crises has significantly diminished. The cumulative result of such disruptive actions is typically widespread destitution (Mireri, 2000) ^[19]. The current study covers the fundamental issues and crucial requirements of the Semmencherry project-displaced children. The research will describe the sociodemographics of the children who have been uprooted due to development in Semmencherry. The impact of industrialization and the difficulties experienced by project-affected children throughout the eviction process are assessed. The results of this study will contribute to raising educational standards and their subsequent impact on the next generation.

Literature Review

Every year between 1980 and 2000, around 10 million people were displaced due to development in some part of the world, according to the World Bank. In the latter two decades of the 20th century, development programmes caused the relocation of 10 million people annually, or 200 million people worldwide, throughout that time. India has the greatest incidence of development-induced displacement in the world, with an estimated 100 million people having been uprooted due to large-scale development during the previous ten years. (Dias, 2000) ^[8]. The extent of land acquisition for the sake of development and associated displacement in Gujarat is highlighted by a research by the Center for Culture and Development on the displacement caused by development in Gujarat between 1947 and 2004. According to the report, 7.220 communities and 1.92 million hectares of land have been purchased for different water resource projects, as well as for transportation and industrial developments (Lobo, 2008) ^[15].

1500 acres of land for the Konkan Railway, 1,900 acres for the Mangalore Refineries and Petro Chemicals, 3,000 acres for a large industrial estate, 2,000 acres for the Nagarjuna Steel Plant, 1200 acres for Cogentrix, 1350 acres for the UshaIspat Plant, and 550 acres for Grasim Industries were all purchased in the Dakshina Kannada region of Karnataka. For the Upper Krishna Irrigation Project, the Maharashtra Irrigation Project, and the Sardar Sarovar Project, which affected 297 villages and uprooted more than two lakh people, more than 13,000 households were forced to leave their homes in the Singrauli area of Uttar Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh (Sharma, 2003) ^[23]. In Andhra Pradesh, the huge multipurpose Polavaram Dam has uprooted 42,701 households and 53, with 17% of the displaced persons being STs and 12.58% being SCs (Mariotti, 2015) ^[17]. In order to alleviate the water and electrical concerns in northern India, the Tehri Dam was built in the state of Uttarakhand. The whole population of old Tehri town was uprooted by the new dam, and currently just 12,500 of the former citizens of old Tehri town remain (Newton, 2008) ^[20]. 32,530.87 acres of land were bought for the Upper Indravati Hydroelectric Project in Orissa, which also had an impact on 97 villages in the Kalahandi and Koraput districts. 5463 Displaced Families (DPFs) in all have been relocated to several

resettlement camps (Dash, 2008) [7]. 2737 families were impacted by the coal mines of Mahanadi Coalfield Limited (MCL), and 2197 of those families are currently residing in mine quarters. In addition, 742 families were resettled at their own discretion, and the remaining families were relocated to seven resettlement colonies in the Talcher and Ib valleys, where they helped 5277 land losers find work through R&R programmes. 3,614 acres of land have been purchased for the Talcher Super Power Project (TSPT), which has impacted 940 households from 53 communities (Somayaji, 2008) [24].

Early relocation cases in India were initiated by the British before to independence. Brits suggested moving local communities. The first real evacuation had place when two communities left the Assamese Kaziranga reserve in 1908. Ten villages in Dachigam, Kashmir, were expelled from Shikar Reserves in 1910. The Brits then forced the Baigas (indigenous tribes) out of the Banjar Valley Reserve forest. Following 1947, there were several examples of forced relocation, including those at the Sariska Wild Life Sanctuary in Rajasthan, the Gir Forest Project in Gujarat, and the Kanha National Park in MP. The author notes that with the enactment of The Wildlife (Protection) Act (WLPA) in 1972 and the beginning of the tiger project, relocation became widespread in the 1970s (Lasgorceix & Kothari, 2009).

Objectives and Hypotheses

The objective of this study is analyse Health challenges, environmental challenges, economic challenges and socio-cultural challenges that impact the education of children in a development induced displaced population resettled in semmencherry.

Based on these objectives the hypotheses formulated for the study are

- **H01:** There is no significant difference between gender with regard to Environmental Challenges, Health Challenges, Socio-Cultural Challenges, and Economic Challenges.
- **H02:** There is no significant difference between educational status with regard to Environmental

Challenges, Health Challenges, Socio-Cultural Challenges, and Economic Challenges.

- **H03:** There is no significant difference between the religion with regard to Environmental Challenges, Health Challenges, Socio-Cultural Challenges, and Economic Challenges.
- **H04:** There is no significant difference between the caste with regards to Environmental Challenges, Health Challenges, Socio-Cultural Challenges, and Economic Challenges.

Methodology

Methodologically the study falls into an exploratory cum descriptive in nature. The total population of this study includes 500 families who are displaced and resettled in Semmencherry, Tamil Nadu Slum Clearance Board Tenements due to various development Project in Chennai. A base line survey was conducted by the researcher and she selected the children between the age group of 11-17 years. These children constitute the universe of the study. Among these children the researcher selected the samples who are studying in the schools. Individual respondents were selected by using lottery method. Sample size of the study is 214. The collection of data consists of both primary data and secondary data. The Primary data shall be collected by floating a semi structured interview schedule. Before finalizing the interview schedule, the questions would be subjected to pilot testing. The statistical tool used for analyzing data is t-test and ANOVA using SPSS 23.0 software. The secondary data would be collected from the following sources.

- a) Books and Journals relevant to the study conducted.
- b) Published and unpublished research report.
- c) Unpublished data that came to the knowledge from the records of reputed organizations.
- d) Various Websites related to rehabilitation and resettlement.

Analysis and Result

Testing of hypotheses

H01: There is no significant difference between gender with regard to Environmental Challenges, Health Challenges, Socio-Cultural Challenges, and Economic Challenges.

Table 1: t-test for test significant difference between gender with regard to Environmental Challenges, Health Challenges, Socio-Cultural Challenges, and Economic Challenges.

Variables	Gender	N	Mean	t value	p value
Environmental Challenges	Male	106	61.0000	-1.658	0.006*
	Female	108	62.4562	-1.682	0.002*
Health Challenges	Male	106	45.0603	-7.686	0.000*
	Female	108	54.4228	-7.620	0.000*
Socio-Cultural Challenges	Male	106	105.1121	2.907	0.004*
	Female	108	101.7383	2.934	0.003*
Economic Challenges	Male	106	5.1532	-2.315	0.021*
	Female	108	5.5672	-2.312	0.021*

* Significant at 5% level

Table 1 shows that the Null Hypotheses is rejected as the p value is lesser than the significant level for the dimensions Environmental Challenges, Health Challenges, Socio-Cultural Challenges and Economic Challenges under study. Therefore, there is a significant difference between gender with regard to Environmental Challenges, Health

Challenges, Socio-Cultural Challenges, and Economic Challenges.

H02: There is no significant difference between educational status with regard to Economic Challenges, Environmental Challenges, Health Challenges, and Socio-Cultural Challenges.

Table 2: ANOVA for test significant difference between educational status with regard to Economic Challenges, Environmental Challenges, Health Challenges, and Socio-Cultural Challenges.

Dimensions		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig
Economic Challenges	Between Groups	83.532	3	27.511	15.013	.000*
	Within Groups	475.653	211	1.899		
	Total	581.185	214			
Environmental Challenges	Between Groups	2861.716	3	953.905	24.056	.026*
	Within Groups	10349.590	211	39.654		
	Total	13211.306	214			
Health Challenges	Between Groups	4113.687	3	1371.229	17.287	.000*
	Within Groups	20702.335	211	79.319		
	Total	24816.023	214			
Socio-Cultural Challenges	Between Groups	23878.367	3	7959.456	128.715	.004*
	Within Groups	16139.694	211	61.838		
	Total	40018.060	214			

* Significant at 5% level

Table 2 shows that the null hypotheses is rejected as the p value is lesser than the significant level for the dimensions Economic Challenges, Environmental Challenges, Health Challenges, and Socio-Cultural Challenges under study. Therefore, there is a significant difference between educational status with regard to Economic Challenges,

Environmental Challenges, Health Challenges, and Socio-Cultural Challenges.

H₀₃: There is no significant difference between the religion with regard to Economic Challenges, Environmental Challenges, Health Challenges, and Socio-Cultural Challenges.

Table 3: ANOVA for test significant difference between religion with regard to Economic Challenges, Environmental Challenges, Health Challenges, and Socio-Cultural Challenges.

Dimensions		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig
Economic Challenges	Between Groups	19.946	2	9.973	4.656	.010*
	Within Groups	561.239	212	2.142		
	Total	581.185	214			
Environmental Challenges	Between Groups	1888.902	2	944.451	21.855	.000*
	Within Groups	11322.404	212	43.215		
	Total	13211.306	214			
Health Challenges	Between Groups	1748.026	2	874.013	9.927	.000*
	Within Groups	23067.996	212	88.046		
	Total	24816.023	214			
Socio-Cultural Challenges	Between Groups	1326.270	2	663.135	4.490	.012*
	Within Groups	38691.791	212	147.679		
	Total	40018.060	214			

* Significant at 5% level

Table 3 shows that the null hypotheses is rejected as the p value is lesser than the significant level for the dimensions Economic Challenges, Environmental Challenges, Health Challenges, and Socio-Cultural Challenges. Therefore, there is a significant difference between the religion with regard to Economic Challenges, Environmental Challenges, Health Challenges, and Socio-Cultural Challenges.

H₀₄: There is no significant difference between the caste with regards to Economic Challenges, Environmental Challenges, Health Challenges, and Socio-Cultural Challenges.

Table 4: ANOVA for test significant difference caste with regard to Economic Challenges, Environmental Challenges, Health Challenges, and Socio-Cultural Challenges.

Dimensions		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig
Economic Challenges	Between Groups	43.126	2	21.563	10.500	.000
	Within Groups	538.059	212	2.054		
	Total	581.185	214			
Environmental Challenges	Between Groups	410.659	2	205.329	4.203	.016
	Within Groups	12800.647	212	48.857		
	Total	13211.306	214			
Health Challenges	Between Groups	2994.866	2	1497.433	17.979	.000
	Within Groups	21821.156	212	83.287		
	Total	24816.023	214			
Socio-Cultural Challenges	Between Groups	392.959	2	196.480	1.299	.005
	Within Groups	39625.101	212	151.241		
	Total	40018.060	214			

* Significant at 5% level

Table 4 shows that the null hypotheses is rejected as the p value is less than the significant level for the dimensions Economic Challenges, Environmental Challenges, Health Challenges, and Socio-Cultural Challenges under study. Therefore, there is a significant difference between the distance of school with regards to Economic Challenges, Environmental Challenges, Health Challenges, and Socio-Cultural Challenges.

Conclusion

This research aims to provide a thorough analysis of the consequences that forcibly removing children from their educational environment has on them. Hence, the study is essential for learning about the impacts of project-induced relocation in children since it will help develop a better rehabilitation strategy for the next projects. The current study covers the fundamental issues and crucial requirements of the Semmencherry project-displaced children. The research describe the socio demographics of the children who have been uprooted due to development in Semmencherry. The impact of industrialization and the difficulties experienced by project-affected children throughout the eviction process are assessed.

There is a significant difference between gender, educational status, religion, and caste with regard to Environmental Challenges, Health Challenges, Socio-Cultural Challenges, and Economic Challenges in development induced displaced populations of children resettled in Semmencherry. The results of this study would contribute to raising educational standards and their subsequent impact on the next generation.

The absence of precise goals, regular procedures, and adequate resources for dealing with resettlement had serious detrimental impacts on the displaced people (Sathe, 2013)^[22]. This impact's characteristic undermines institutional capacity and prevents the adoption of participatory practises and tools for monitoring implementation success. The anger of those who have been evicted from their homes and places of employment is growing, and it frequently shows itself as protests. Brutal repression typically comes after protests against displacement (Vithayathil & Sunny, 2009)^[25]. Several demonstrators have lately died in India as a consequence of police shooting; this situation cannot continue indefinitely. It is essential that the government create clear policies in order to ensure that a participatory approach is employed to carry out development infrastructure projects (Padel & Das, 2011)^[21].

References

- Anuradha K. Comparative study of the Resettlement and Rehabilitation Policy of NALCO & Upper Kolab Project in Koraput District, Orissa. *J Inf Technol Impact*. 2002;10(2):111-128.
- Berman M. *Resettlement and Development: The Bankwide Review of Projects Involving Human Resettlement 1986-1993*. Washington, DC: World Bank; 2012. 28(3):512-120.
- Black M, Maggie H. *The No-Nonsense Guide to International Development*. Oxford: New Internationalist Publications Limited/Verso; 2002. 2(3):23-39.
- Cernea MM. For a New Economics of Resettlement: A Sociological Critique of the Compensation Principle. *Int Soc Sci J*. 2000;(175).
- Collins R. *Weberian Sociological Theory*. New York: Cambridge University Press; 1986.
- Costa D. Sentimental capitalism in contemporary India: Art, heritage, and development in Ahmedabad, Gujarat. *Antipode*. 2015;47(1):74-97.
- Dash SP. Resettlement and rehabilitation in Orissa: A study of the upper Indravati hydro-electric project. *Soc Change*. 2008;38(4):661-688.
- Dias SP. The human ecology of big projects: River basin development and resettlement. *Annu Rev Anthropol*. 1973;2:45-55.
- Dutta M. Nokia SEZ: Public price of success. *Econ Polit Wkly*. 2009;44(40):23-25.
- Fahim M. *Anthropological Approaches to Involuntary Resettlement: Policy, Practice and Theory*. Boulder (CO): Westview Press; 1981.
- Fuggle S. The Maharashtra Rehabilitation Act 1989. In: Fernandes W, Paranjpye V, editors. *Rehabilitation Policy and Law in India: A Right to Livelihood*. New Delhi: Indian Social Institute; 2000. p.169-191.
- Ganguly K. Analysis of SEZs in India with special reference to employment generation, export promotion and attracting investment. *Man Dev*. 2011;33(2):11-24.
- Guggenheim S. Peasants, planners, and participation: Resettlement in Mexico. In: Guggenheim S, Cernea M, editors. *Anthropological Approaches to Resettlement: Policy, Practice, and Theory*. Oxford: Westview; 1993. p.201-228.
- Howard M. *Research Methods in Anthropology: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. 4th ed. Lanham (MD): Altamira Press; 1997.
- Lobo L. Development induced displacement in Gujarat 1947-2004. In: Mehta U, Puniyani R, editors. *Sectarianism, Politics and Development*. Jaipur: Rawat Publications; 2008.
- Mahapatra LK. Testing the Risks and Reconstruction model on India's resettlement experiences. In: Cernea M, editor. *The Economics of Involuntary Resettlement: Questions and Challenges*. Washington, DC: World Bank; 1996. p.189-230.
- Mariotti C. Resettlement and risk of adverse incorporation: The case of the Polavaram dam. *Dev Pract*. 2015;25(2). doi:10.1080/09614524.2015.1052373.
- Meher R. How mineral-based industrial development marginalizes and displaces people in India: Three case studies. Lewiston (NY): Edwin Mellen Press; 2010.
- Mireri C. The impact of export processing zone development on employment creation in Kenya. *Singapore J Trop Geogr*. 2000;21(2):149.
- Newton J. Displacement and development: The paradoxes of India's Tehri Dam. *Geogr Bull*. 2008;49:19-32.
- Padel F, Das S. Resettlement realities: The gulf between policy and practice. In: Mathur HM, editor. *Resettling Displaced People: Policy and Practice in India*. New Delhi: Routledge; 2011.
- Sathe D. Land acquisition act and the ordinance: Some issues. *Econ Polit Wkly*. 2013.
- Sharma RN. Involuntary displacement: A few encounters. *Econ Polit Wkly*. 2003;38(9):907-912.
- Somayaji S. Man-made disasters: Displacement, resettlement and rehabilitation in Orissa: Reflections from the field. *Soc Change*. 2008;38(4):689-704.
- Vithayathil PN, Sunny C. Development projects and human rights protection: The CIAL in Kerala. *Rajagiri J Soc Dev*. 2009;5(1).