Chapter – 5

PAPs: Before and After Displacement

In the light of the understanding about the socio-economic impact of NTPC on the local community in general and the displaced persons in particular, it is essential to look into the socio-economic status of PAPs after displacement. For this, the current situation of PAPs in comparison with their status before displacement needs to be analysed. The ensuing sections of this chapter deal with the aspects relating to this. The survey is related to the period 1988-89, the time of displacement and 2006-2007, the period of data collection.

Before analyzing the impact of the project on PAPs, this chapter unfolds the present socio-economic condition of the displaced persons. As discussed in the methodology part of chapter I, 300 displaced persons were selected as sample for the study. Their socio-economic background is analysed first in the ensuing section.

5.1 Socio-economic background of PAPs

Before getting into the details of economic activities of PAPs, it is essential to examine the socio-economic background of the PAPs. The aspects like religion, nature of family, age, sex etc are considered and each of them is discussed below.
5.1.1 Religion

Categorisation of the households according to religion can be used to study social backwardness. Such categorization is done in diagram 5.1 and it shows that the majority (80.33 percent) of the respondents belong to the Hindu community, followed by Christians with 15.67 percent. The remaining respondents belong to Islam (4 percent).

**Diagram 5.1**

![Distribution of PAPS by religion](image)

*Source: Survey data*

In the displaced villages the main religions are Hindus, Christians and Muslims and the study findings agree with the general religious composition of the district, where as Hindus, Christians and Muslims are in the order of 69.09, 20.94 and 9.86 per cents respectively (Panchayat Level Statistics, 2006).
Table 5.1

Distribution of PAPs by Caste

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caste</th>
<th>No of Persons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forward Caste</td>
<td>137 (45.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backward Community</td>
<td>158 (52.66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled Caste</td>
<td>5 (1.67)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data

Table 5.1 shows the community composition of the PAPs. It is evident from the table that there is a dominance of backward and marginalized groups among the PAPs. 53.33 per cent emanates from socially backward categories. Thus displacement mainly affected the backward and marginalized communities in the project affected areas.

5.1.2 Nature of family

Data presented in table 5.2 shows that 90 percent of the displaced households under study have a nuclear family system. The rest have a joint family system (10%).

Table 5.2

Distribution of PAPS by the Nature of Family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Family</th>
<th>No of Persons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joint</td>
<td>30 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>270 (90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>300 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data

The joint family system, which was common in the agrarian set-up naturally declined with the downswing of agriculture. This can be one immediate and important reason for the large number of nuclear families that emerged in the displaced villages.
5.1.3 Sex - wise Distribution

The sex-wise distribution of the PAPs is given in diagram 5.2.

![Diagram 5.2: Distribution of PAPS by Sex](image)

*Source: Survey data*

The study reveals that 53 per cent of the households are female-headed. The time factor is a reason for the large number of women-headed households as male heads died during the lapse of time. Increased number of female-headed families can probably lead to high rate of marginalization.

5.1.4 Age-wise Distribution of the Heads of Households

Age-wise distribution is a major determinant of the livelihood of a family. The details of the same are given in table 5.3.
Table 5.3
Age-Wise Distribution of Heads of Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>No of Persons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 – 40</td>
<td>7 (2.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 – 50</td>
<td>39 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 – 60</td>
<td>108 (36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 – 70</td>
<td>83 (27.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 – 80</td>
<td>56 (18.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 – 90</td>
<td>7 (2.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>300 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data

Table 5.3 illustrates the large concentration of heads in the age group 50-60 (36%) followed by 27.67 per cent in the age group 60-70. The arithmetic mean of the age is worked out as 60.43. This finding shows that the displaced were in the most productive period of life when dislocated by land acquisition, which took place in the latter half of the 1980s. The survey data also reveals that the percentage of the 60 plus population is 48.7.

5.1.5 Level of education

The level of education is shown in diagram 5.3.
The classification of respondents on the basis of educational attainment shows that the area is inhabited by a literate and educated population. Education liberates and transforms any society. In the study area 74 per cent of the PAPs have an education of matriculation and above. The number of undergraduates is found to be 27.67 percent while 30 per cent of the respondents are graduates and 6.3 per cent have post graduate degrees. This may be one reason for less preference for the unskilled jobs which NTPC offered the PAPs at the time of project construction. Among the surveyed households, about 3.6 percent of the respondents have technical education.
5.1.6 Nature of Ration Card

The data regarding the nature of the ration cards held by the PAPs is shown in diagram 5.4.

**Diagram 5.4**

**Nature of Ration Card**

```
Source: Survey data
```

Diagram 5.4 shows that the majority (92%) of the households are APL card holders. However, the field data shows that 31 per cent of them have an annual income below Rs.50, 000.

The five variables discussed above--- religion, sex, nature of family, age and education—represent the social background of the PAPs. The large majority of the respondents are Hindus, followed by Christians and Muslims. Displacement mainly
affected the backward and marginalized communities in the project affected areas. The majority of households are headed by women, because of the fact that male heads died during the lapse of time after displacement. Further, almost half of the respondents are 60+. The respondents have good educational background, which is reported as a hindering factor in accepting low-paid unskilled jobs in NTPC. As a miniature of the Kerala scenario almost all households are nuclear in nature. The sixth variable discussed namely the nature of the ration card is an indication of their economic background. In short, the socio-economic analysis of the PAPs gives us a mixed picture of their condition, though a considerable number are poor.

In the light of the socio-economic background of the PAPs as outlined above, the impact of the project on PAPs can be analysed. The economic status of the households can be analysed by comparing their present situation to the past. To begin with, the impact on occupation can be looked into.

5.2 Occupation Pattern

The survey data throws light on the occupation pattern of the displaced before and after land acquisition.

5.2.1 Occupation Pattern of PAPs before and after Displacement

The data pertaining to the period 1988-89 shows the socio-economic impact of the project on the PAPs. A comparison of occupation and income before and after land acquisition is also made. Table 5.4 gives the occupation pattern before displacement.
Table: 5.4

Occupation Patterns of PAPS Before and After Displacement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>No of Persons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Before DP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>172 (57.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coir Products</td>
<td>49 (16.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>15 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govt. Jobs</td>
<td>5 (1.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Job</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>4 (1.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>5 (1.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRK</td>
<td>6 (1.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>32 (10.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>9 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>300 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Survey data. Figures in bracket represent percentage*

Table 5.4 shows that the majority (57.5%) directly depended on land as their main source of livelihood before displacement. The percentage of respondents who depended on coir-related jobs (agro-based) is 16.7, and five per cent of them are in the category of fishing community. These three sub sectors together provided employment to a huge share (79.2%) of PAPs. This shows the importance of land for the ousted population. The displaced persons also include Government employees, businessmen, professionals, Gulf Malayalees, teachers etc. ‘Others’ include construction workers and manual labourers. However, most of the displaced were engaged in one or the other economic activity before displacement, as is evident from the data that only three per cent of them were not engaged in any kind of activity before displacement.
A drastic change is seen in occupation pattern in the project-affected area after land acquisition. Table 5.4 makes it clear that the majority (73%) comes under the category of ‘no occupation’ at present. However, if the case of 60+ PAPs (48.67%) is discounted, the real percentage of the oustees in search of jobs is only 24.33. In addition, the 60+ group could not find employment during the post-displacement period. At present only four per cent depends on agriculture as against 57.5 per cent before displacement. Before displacement, 75 percent of the households under study had agriculture and related activities as their main occupation. Due to land acquisition, availability of land decreased very much. Moreover, a major part of the available land became uneconomic and unsuitable for cultivation due to unscientific filling by NTPC for their various constructions and also by the local people. Water-logging has become a serious problem because it makes even the dry land unsuitable for cultivation. So agriculture as an occupation has come down. Another area of employment was coir-related works. With the inception of the project, this occupation also lost its significance as dry land cultivation declined, hence the majority who depended on land, the kayal farm and water bodies for livelihood became unemployed. Those who depended on fishing sector were totally away from that sector because of location disadvantage after the displacement. It must be noted that the number of persons employed in the Gulf countries has marginally increased and a new group who managed to get employment in the private sector also emerged. Those depending on business also increased form one to 2.33 per cent. This shows the dynamism of a small group of the displaced.
The above discussion shows that the most adversely hit category is those who were engaged in the agriculture sector. When fishing is included, it can be concluded that the development project has adversely affected the livelihoods of those who were engaged in the primary sector, as has been the case in other parts of the country. The only agro-based productive activity namely manufacturing of coir became a distant dream to those who engaged in that sector. To sum up, the project not only did not create additional job opportunities for the local people as expected by them but also totally reduced the inherent job potential of the area. The same conclusion has been arrived at in the previous chapter (section 4.4) through focus group discussion.

5.3 Impact on Income

To obtain a reliable picture of the economic impact of displacement on the oustees, their present income has to be compared with the income before displacement. Income from land assets and occupation are the major sources of livelihood for the rural population. Income from land has been analysed first.

5.3.1 Income from Productive Activities

Land being the main source of livelihood of the majority, the impact of the project can well be measured by calculating the net income earned at the time of acquisition. For this the yield, cost of production, price and the income from wet land and dry land is calculated. To consider the inflationary trend all the variables are calculated both at the base and current year prices.
5.3.1.1 Net Income from Wet land Cultivation

Out of the total land acquired, a sizeable area was wet land. Here the wet land had intensive cultivation -- paddy twice and sesame once before displacement. Table 5.5 depicts the average yield from wet land. In the study, one acre of land is taken as a unit.

Table 5.5
Average Yield of Wet land Cultivation at Base Year and Current Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Base Year Value*</th>
<th>Current Year Value**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paddy</td>
<td>546.39</td>
<td>3278.33</td>
<td>13113.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sesame</td>
<td>66.46</td>
<td>664.63</td>
<td>3323.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Base year quantity X base year price **Base year quantity X current price

Source: Survey Data

When agricultural operations were in full swing, a farmer could produce 546.39 kg of paddy and 66.46 kg of sesame in a year. Assuming the same level of output, table 5.5 observes that, between the base year and the current year, the increase in the prices of paddy and sesame are 4 and 5 times respectively. In practice, the ousted farmers could not enjoy the benefit in the appreciation of crop prices. The benefit can be evaluated in terms of the net income. The cost of cultivation and the net average income is reported in table 5.6.
Table 5.6
Average Annual Net Income from Wet Land for Base Year and Current Year
(in rupees)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base Year</td>
<td>Paddy</td>
<td>546.39</td>
<td>3278.33</td>
<td>1639.18</td>
<td>1639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sesame</td>
<td>66.46</td>
<td>664.63</td>
<td>199.38</td>
<td>465.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2104.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Year</td>
<td>Paddy</td>
<td>546.39</td>
<td>13113.33</td>
<td>6556.67</td>
<td>6556.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sesame</td>
<td>66.46</td>
<td>3323.14</td>
<td>996.94</td>
<td>2326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8882.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data

At the current value, the cost of production of paddy and sesame increased four and five times respectively. However, the total cost of production of sesame is lower than that of the paddy, as the labour days needed are much less than for paddy cultivation. So sesame cultivation is always a profitable occupation for agriculturalists. In the base year, the cost of production for paddy in one acre of land was Rs.1639.17 and Rs.198.65 for sesame. It increased to Rs.6556.67 and Rs. 993.26 respectively in the current year, i.e. there is a four times increase in the average cost of paddy and five times increase in that of sesame cultivation.

Even if output had remained constant, it is calculated that the percentage increase in the income would have been 354 and 500 respectively for paddy and sesame. The average net income from the wet land cultivated at base year price is Rs. 2104.25 and at current year price is Rs. 8882.66 which depicts a four times increase in the income. The farmers got this income at a time when government gave least support to agriculture. This
positive change in income reveals that even when the increased cost of production is considered, the income level of the cultivator should have remained at least the same.

### 5.3.1.2 Average Annual Income from Dry land cultivation

The topography of the village under study shows that the rich soil of the dry land of the area is immensely suited for cultivation of a multitude of agricultural products. Table 5.7 depicts the main items cultivated and its prices are calculated at the base year and current year to calculate the income of the cultivators.

#### Table: 5.7

**Average Annual Income from Dry Land Cultivation for Base Year and Current Year Prices (in rupees) with Percentage Change**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Base Year output at base year price</th>
<th>Base year output at Current year price</th>
<th>Current year output at base year price</th>
<th>Change (col.2-col4)</th>
<th>% change (col5/col.2*100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coconut</td>
<td>1354.28</td>
<td>3345.87</td>
<td>1018.93</td>
<td>-335.4</td>
<td>-24.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aracanut</td>
<td>365.95</td>
<td>1097.86</td>
<td>282.36</td>
<td>-83.59</td>
<td>-22.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tapioca</td>
<td>186.71</td>
<td>746.85</td>
<td>144.26</td>
<td>-42.45</td>
<td>-22.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pepper</td>
<td>373.42</td>
<td>2389.91</td>
<td>288.53</td>
<td>-84.89</td>
<td>-22.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetables</td>
<td>74.68</td>
<td>373.42</td>
<td>51.71</td>
<td>-22.97</td>
<td>-30.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banana</td>
<td>368.44</td>
<td>1742.64</td>
<td>284.41</td>
<td>-84.03</td>
<td>-22.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruits</td>
<td>311.19</td>
<td>1394.11</td>
<td>237.11</td>
<td>-74.08</td>
<td>-23.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>348.53</td>
<td>448.11</td>
<td>257.96</td>
<td>-90.57</td>
<td>-25.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2565.27</td>
<td>-817.9</td>
<td>-24.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Survey data*
While considering the productive activities, it is found that the overall trend in the value of output from the dry land declined by 24.18 per cent. Great changes are seen in the case of vegetables, for which the value decreased by 30.76 per cent. The project area, which had market surplus once, now depends on other markets for vegetables. The study also shows that the value of tapioca, which is a starch substitute, has changed by -22.74 per cent. While the value of coconut showed a decline by 24.18 in percentage terms, in absolute terms there is a significant change of – 335.4. It can be inferred that the project has a negative impact on the production system of the area, which is Rs. 817.9

5.3.1.3 Impact on Total Income

The socio-economic study of the DPs shows that after displacement the total income has also come down. It is shown in table 5.8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Income</th>
<th>No of Before DP</th>
<th>Households After DP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-50000</td>
<td>211(70.33)</td>
<td>93(31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50000-100000</td>
<td>62 (20.67)</td>
<td>109(36.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100000-150000</td>
<td>15(5)</td>
<td>66(22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150000-200000</td>
<td>9(3)</td>
<td>17(5.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200000-250000</td>
<td>3(1)</td>
<td>9(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250000-300000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>300(100)</td>
<td>300(100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data
Table 5.8 depicts that the majority (70.33 %) fall in the category of income below Rs.50000 before displacement. It comes to the extent of 91 per cent under the income group Rs 0-1 lakh. Before displacement, the majority of the DPs (79.2%) depended on agriculture, agro-based and fishing activities. The annual average income for the corresponding period is derived as Rs. 46,833. If it is converted to the current wage rate, the present value of the then income would be Rs. 2, 34, 166.67. It can be inferred that if they had not been displaced their present income level would have been five times more than what they were earning before displacement. This shows the project has reduced the earning capacity of the PAPs.

After displacement, 10.67 per cent of households comprise of NRK, professionals, post graduate teachers and other well placed in government jobs, which fall in the income bracket of Rs. 1.5 to 3 lakhs. Out of these, 5 percent has an income range between Rs. 2 and 3 lakhs. They are the better off groups in the project area categorised as the higher income group. Only 31 percent is classified as lower income with an income ranging between 0 and50,000, but majority of the displaced face the risk of joblessness. That is, there is no direct link between the levels of income and the level of employment of the displaced.

Presently 73.33 percent report that they have no work. They are surviving either on their past income or the little savings left out of the compensation amount or depending on
the earning of the other members of the family. In this context the utilization of the compensation may be looked into.

5.3.2 Utilization of the compensation money

Utilization of the compensation money can be taken as the index of the present socio-economic condition of PAPs. Table 5.9 gives the details of the utilization of the compensation money by the sample households.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose of expenditure</th>
<th>No of Household</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction of House</td>
<td>146 (48.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of Land</td>
<td>65 (21.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>27 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>25 (8.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td>18 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self employment</td>
<td>9 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan repay</td>
<td>5 (1.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>3 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food/Clothing</td>
<td>1 (0.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>1 (0.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>300 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data

Table 5.9 makes it clear that about 48.67 percent of the households utilized the compensation for constructing houses in their remaining land. Purchase of land was preferred by 21.67 percent. This means that they still have willingness to invest in a permanent asset like land. The households that gave importance to education were nine
per cent. In the absence of agriculture, better job opportunities outside the village definitely depend on education and skill. Expenditure for marriages comes to six percent, which shows that the attitude towards social customs has not changed. Self-employment, a source of regular income which reduces the negative impact of land acquisition, has been selected by a mere three per cent.

So far the discussion centered on the PAPs listed by the NTPC. But it is seen that there are others who have been omitted by the authorities. One such group in the PAAs is the farm labourers. The discussion will be complete only when their problems are also discussed.

5.4 Impact on Farm Labourers

5.4.1 Occupation distribution of farm labourers

To study the socio-economic status of the farm labourers, who were not considered as PAPs, their occupation and income before and after land acquisition are considered and compared. The findings are given in table 5.10.

Table 5.10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Before DP</th>
<th>After DP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>29 (58)</td>
<td>2 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coir</td>
<td>12 (24)</td>
<td>2 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>3 (6)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cashew Industry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>6 (12)</td>
<td>8 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28 (56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data. *Figures in bracket represent percentage
The table 5.10 shows the fact that the farm labourers have suffered almost the same fate as the identified PAPs. Those labourers who were actively engaged in the agricultural and coir sectors have been adversely hit by the project. The proportion of farm labourers who depended on agricultural sector decreased from 58 per cent to a mere four per cent, whereas it came down from 24 per cent to four per cent in the case of the coir sector. The six per cent of farm labourers who also depended on fishing have abandoned the job as in the case of PAPs due to lack of opportunities. The unemployed comes to the extent of 56 per cent, though 24 per cent found some source of income in cashew and other sectors like construction.

The above information throws light on the fact that 88 per cent of the labour force, who relied directly and indirectly on land, gave up the operations. When the project came, NTPC completely neglected them as they did not get any consideration in SES. This is a matter of serious concern in the resettlement programme of NTPC. The gender-wise analysis about the farm labourers has been done and it is given in table 5.11 and 5.12.

### Table 5.11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>No of Labourers</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>21 (72.41)</td>
<td>8 (38.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coir</td>
<td>2 (6.90)</td>
<td>10 (47.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>2 (6.90)</td>
<td>1 (4.76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>4 (13.79)</td>
<td>2 (9.52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29 (58)</td>
<td>21 (42)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data  figures in bracket represents percentage
Table 5.12

Occupation Wise Distribution of Farm Labourers after Land Acquisition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>No of Persons</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>1 (7.14)</td>
<td>1 (2.78)</td>
<td>2 (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coir</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>2 (5.56)</td>
<td>2 (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cashew Industry</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>6 (16.67)</td>
<td>6 (12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>3 (21.43)</td>
<td>1 (2.78)</td>
<td>4 (8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Works</td>
<td>2 (14.29)</td>
<td>6 (16.67)</td>
<td>8 (16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>8 (57.14)</td>
<td>20 (55.56)</td>
<td>28 (56)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14 (28)</td>
<td>36 (72)</td>
<td>50 (100)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data  figures in bracket represents percentage

The tables 5.11 and 5.12 show that males and females have been adversely affected by the project. But it is severe among the males. A larger percentage of them became unemployed. They could not find employment in coir and cashew sectors as in the case of females.

To sum up, the prominence of both agriculture and industry came down during the post-implementation stage. However, the decline was prominent in the case of agriculture. At present, a majority (56%) of farm labourers are unemployed. The only area that offers some opportunity is the cashew industry, which is a relief for the marginalised women workers. However, the male participation in the farm and industrial sectors is negligible. As there are no regular opportunities in these areas, joblessness did seriously affect the displaced farm labourers.
5.4.2 Income level of Farm labourers before and after land acquisition

To assess the impact of land acquisition their economic status is measured with income level before and after land acquisition as given in table 5.13.

Table 5.13
Income Level of a Farm Labourer Before and After Land Acquisition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Before DP</th>
<th>After DP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>9603</td>
<td>12750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coir</td>
<td>5833</td>
<td>13400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>8733</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cashew Industry</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>21600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>47333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>8108</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Survey data*

Table 5.13 shows that the average income of all sectors has gone up. But it is of interest to note that the number of persons depending on the previously employed sector has come down. Table 5.14 and 5.15 substantiates this. It means that though the average income of the sector has increased, the average income of the PAPs has tremendously reduced as the number of unemployed has increased.

Table 5.14
Income Level of Farm Labourers before Land Acquisition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Average annual Income</th>
<th>No of Persons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>10500</td>
<td>7250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coir</td>
<td>8750</td>
<td>5250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>9850</td>
<td>6500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>8500</td>
<td>7325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Survey data figures in bracket represents percentage*
From table 5.14, the arithmetic mean is worked out as Rs 8467. This average income was earned by the farm workers at a time when the cost of living was many times lower than that at present. An important fact observed is that nobody remained unemployed. It can be inferred that joblessness was not experienced, hence no marginalization, and the workers were better off.

The post-acquisition condition of the farm labourers in terms of economic condition is depicted in Table 5.15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>No of Persons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>10500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coir</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>13000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cashew Industry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>50000</td>
<td>42000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other works</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data figures in bracket represents percentage

Mean income after land acquisition is calculated as Rs 5554, which is less than the AM before acquisition. From Table 5.12 it is observed that 56 per cent of the farm labourers are unemployed. If the average annual income of pre-land acquisition is converted to current year wage rate, it will be Rs 43654, which is 5 times more than the base year income. This opportunity has been lost due to the coming of the project. As their average annual income is Rs 5554 it is inferred that they are below poverty line. So serious marginalisation is seen in the case of the displaced farm labourers.
5.5 Summary

The term ‘socio-economic’ signifies the combination of social and economic factors. Economic factors considered in respect of the displaced are income, yield from occupation, nature of ration card and income from self-employment. The social factors considered have two dimensions: cultural and environmental. Religion, education, age, sex, marital status and nature of family generally come under the category of social factors. The social background analysis in terms of religion, sex, nature of family, age and education explains that the large majority of the respondents are Hindus, followed by Christians and Muslims. The majority of households are headed by women because male heads died during the lapse of time after displacement, almost half of the respondents are 60+ people. Households are nuclear in nature with reasonable educational background. The economic variable viz. the nature of ration card shows a clear reflection of the state and district phenomenon as the majority of the respondents possess APL cards. The socio-economic analysis of the PAPs gives us a mixed picture about their condition, though an appreciable number are poor.

The project has adversely hit those who were engaged in the agricultural sector. When fishing is included, it can be concluded that the development project has adversely affected the livelihoods of those who engaged in the primary sector, as in other parts of the country. The only agro-based productive activity namely, manufacturing of coir became a distant dream to those who engaged in that sector. To sum up, the project not only did not create additional job opportunities for the locals as expected by them but
also totally reduced the inherent job potential of the area. The prominence of both agriculture and industry came down during the post-implementation stage. However, the decline was prominent in the case of agriculture. At present, a majority (56%) of farm labourers are unemployed. The male participation in the farm and industrial sectors is negligible. As there are no regular opportunities in these areas joblessness did seriously affect the displaced farm labourers.

The socio-economic analysis derived the conclusion that the project has adversely affected the local community and the PAPs. Still, a concrete statement about the condition cannot be given with the help of the above discussion. How far they are adversely affected is a question to be answered. For this, a suitable framework and model has to be applied. The next chapter is an attempt to quantify the impact of the project on PAPs with the help of ‘Risk Model’.