RESEARCH ARTICLE Bhartiya Krishi Anusandhan Patrika, Volume 40 Issue 2: 166-172 (June 2025)

Agricultural Disparities among Tribal Communities in Telangana: Causes and Consequences

Santhosh Gugulothu[1]

10.18805/BKAP843

ABSTRACT

Background: Agriculture remains the principal source of livelihood in rural India, with over half of the population dependent on it. Among tribal communities, who traditionally practiced hunting and food gathering, there has been a historical transition to shifting cultivation and eventually to settled agriculture. Today, agriculture constitutes the primary livelihood for most tribal groups. In Telangana, where diverse tribal communities such as the Lambadi, Gond, Koya, Kolam and Chenchu reside, agriculture continues to be central to their sustenance. However, these communities experience unequal access to agricultural resources, leading to disparities in livelihood outcomes.

Methods: This study investigates the nature and extent of disparities in agricultural practices among tribal communities in Telangana, as well as the underlying causes and socio-economic consequences of these disparities. The research is based on primary data collected from five tribal communities through a mixed-methods approach. Data was gathered from 400 surveyed households, 10 focus group discussions (FGDs) and several key informant interviews conducted across selected tribal regions.

Result: The study reveals substantial inter-community disparities in agricultural access, practices and outcomes. These disparities are driven by factors such as landholding patterns, irrigation access, government scheme implementation and socio-political marginalization. The consequences include rising indebtedness, distress-driven land sales and an increasing shift toward alternative and migratory livelihoods. The findings underscore the need for targeted policy interventions to address structural inequalities and enhance agricultural sustainability for tribal populations.

Key words: Agricultural disparities, Crop selling, Indebtedness, Tribal communities.

INTRODUCTION

Agriculture is the backbone of rural economies in India, with 54% of the population dependent on it for livelihood (2011 Census). The Food and Agriculture Organisation estimates that 70% of the rural population is engaged in agriculture and allied activities. For tribal communities, agriculture shapes their cultural, social and ecological landscapes. However, tribal agriculture relies on traditional practices, limited access to modern technology and rain-fed irrigation, resulting in lower productivity and income. Historically, tribes depended on hunting, gathering and shifting farming. Burman and Sharma (1970) noted that tribal groups practised shifting cultivation.von Fürer-Haimendorf (1982) documented tribes like the Kolam, Naikpod, Gond and Koya in Adilabad engaging in it until legal restrictions in the 1990s. Today, most tribal communities are settled as permanent cultivators. The Press Information Bureau (2018) reported that two-thirds of the tribal population relies on agriculture as cultivators or labourers. The Agriculture Census 2015-16 indicates that Scheduled Tribes operate 12.67 million holdings covering 17.78 million hectares, averaging 1.40 hectares per holding: 56.3% are marginal holders, 23.5% are small, 14% are semi-medium, 5.6% are medium and 0.8% are large holders.

Telangana, a newly formed state carved from Andhra Pradesh, is home to diverse tribal communities. According to the Andhra Pradesh Recognition Act (2014), the state has 32 Scheduled Tribal communities, constituting around 9% of the total population (Tribal Welfare Department, Government of Telangana, 2019). As per the Agriculture Census 2021-22, tribal communities in Telangana operate 8.34 lakh operational holdings, covering 7.53 lakh hectares. Most holdings (67.24%) are marginal, with an average size of 0.90 hectares, below the national average for Scheduled Tribes. Landholding sizes and access to irrigation vary across tribal groups, contributing to agricultural disparities. Communities with more land and irrigation facilities achieve better production, while those geographically isolated or restricted by forest laws experience lower yields, affecting their livelihoods. Selling crops also highlights disparities. Some tribes sell in markets, while others rely on mediators, further broadening economic disparities. Although previous studies, such as those by Lakshmi and

[1]Centre for Economic and Social Studies, Begumpet, Hyderabad-500 016, Telangana, India.

Corresponding Author: Santhosh Gugulothu, Centre for Economic and Social Studies, Begumpet, Hyderabad-500 016, Telangana, India. Email: santhoshguguloth4@gmail.com
ORCID: 0009-0001-0450-1051

How to cite this article: Gugulothu, S. (2025). Agricultural Disparities among Tribal Communities in Telangana: Causes and Consequences. Bhartiya Krishi Anusandhan Patrika. 40(2): 166-172. doi: 10.18805/BKAP843.

Submitted: 07-03-2025 **Accepted:** 11-05-2025 **Online:** 10-06-2025

Paul (2019) and others, have examined land alienation and tribal exploitation, agricultural disparities among tribal communities in Telangana remain the least focused. Several studies, including Sushmitha (2019) and Omkar (2020) and others, focus on the socioeconomic status of the tribes in Telangana. Gugulothu and Korra (2025), discusses the unequal access to education and employment, whereas the disparities within tribal communities have not been studied widely. Therefore, understanding these disparities is essential to comprehending how they affect tribal communities. It is crucial to understand the factors that enable some tribal communities to thrive while others struggle. The study primarily aims to examine the existing disparities within tribal communities and analyse their impact on their socio-economic conditions.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Since there is no tribe-wise data on agriculture for tribal communities in Telangana, the study has relied on the primary data collected from the five tribal communities, Lambadi, Koya, Gond, Kolam and Chenchu, selected purposively based on their population in the state. Further, for these tribes, four districts were purposively selected where the population of the sample tribe has moderately prevailed. The selected districts are Adilabad for Kolam and Gond, Mulugu for Koya, Mahabubabad for Lambadi and Nagarkurnool for the Chenchu tribe. Further, for each tribe, two tribal villages were chosen. Subsequently, ten villages were selected to conduct the field study. 40 households were surveyed in each village. Consequently, 400 households have been covered in all the villages. The data was collected from March 2023 to July 2023. The study adopted quantitative and qualitative approaches to understand the disparities and their causes and consequences. The quantitative data has been collected using a structured household schedule, which has been used to collect the data, including various socioeconomic parameters such as occupation, size of landholdings, income, access to irrigation, crop yielding and crop selling practices; for qualitative data, ten focused group discussions and personal interviews have been conducted. The analysis was carried out based on simple percentages and a thematic approach.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Landholding

The distribution of agricultural land ownership (Table 1) varies among tribal communities. It can be observed that most households in all the communities own agricultural land, ranging from 82.5% to 86.3%. However, among the Chenchus, 55% of the households have agricultural land ownership, comparatively less than the other studied communities. The traditional occupation of the Chenchu community is hunting and gathering and most of the Chenchu, particularly those residing in the forest, practice their traditional occupation. In contrast, those residing with non-tribal people are engaging in cultivation. Swamy *et al.* (2018) found that the Chenchus shifted to agriculture under the influence of the non-tribal communities. While the government allotted the land to Chenchu, most had not visited those lands for years; later, the non-tribal people occupied them.

The data in Table 1 also displays the different sizes of agricultural landholdings within these groups. Most landholdings across the communities fall under the “Small” category, holding 1 to 2 hectares. Among these, the Chenchus have the highest percentage of marginal farmers, at 40%. Among Kolam and Gond, semi-medium and medium farmers are more prevalent. Large farmers, holding more than ten hectares, are less common across the communities, which is less than 2%. The average landholdings among the tribes are as follows: Gond-1.8 hectares, Koya-1.3 hectares, Chenchu-1.1 hectares, Kolam-1.8 hectares and Lambadi-1.3 hectares. All the communities’ average landholdings fall within the small farmer category. Significant people across the communities have patta landholdings, whereas a minor portion of the people, less than 10%, have assigned lands provided by the government. Further, people from Gond, Kolam, Chenchu and Koya also hold Podu land, which is unregistered.

Access to irrigation

The availability of irrigation plays an important role in agricultural production. Nevertheless, most tribal communities reside in the forest and hilly areas, so they possess or have less access to irrigation and depend on rain-fed agriculture. A report titled “Compendium of Best Practices Water Management in Tribal Areas (2021)”, which covered the eight states in central India, stated that access to

Table 1: Size of landholding among tribal communities (%).

Tribe	Land ownership	Size of landholding					Average land size (hectares)
	Total	Margin	Small	Semi medium	Medium	Large	1.8
Gond	86.3	24.0	34.0	29.0	11.0	2.0	1.3
Koya	83.8	27.0	38.6	26.5	7.9	0.0	1.1
Chenchu	55.0	40.0	34.0	22.5	3.5	0.0	1.8
Kolam	82.5	21.5	34.2	30.4	12.3	1.6	1.3
Lambadi	85.0	28.2	34.2	27.0	9.4	1.2	1.8

Source: Field survey by Author, 2023 (Note: The source remains the same for all the following tables).

irrigation is half in tribal areas compared to the non-tribal areas. The report highlights several factors, such as hilly and mountain areas and sloping agricultural land, which are obstacles to access irrigation for tribal communities. The analysis of the present study also resembles the same.

Table 2 provides the percentage of households that have access to irrigation facilities among the tribal communities in the state. The Koya tribe (81%) have the highest percentage of households with access to irrigation facilities. The Lambadi tribe (78%) also possess a significant portion of the households' access to irrigation. It has been observed that most of them bore well, followed by canal irrigation. Among the Gond community, only 17.6% of households have access to irrigation, which indicates that the community is facing challenges in accessing irrigation facilities. Likewise, the Kolam community encounters a challenge similar to the Gonds as they struggle with limited access to irrigation, with only 21% of households possessing irrigation facilities and benefiting from nearby streams. Among the Kolam, many residents have installed motors in the stream, but inaptly, it only functions during the rainy season, as stated by the participants. The Chenchu community faces the most critical disparities in access to irrigation facilities, with only 25.3% of households having access to irrigation. Most of these households are residents of the nearby town and villagers. The Gond, Kolam and Chenchu communities living in the forest lack access to electricity for their farms and proper road infrastructure. Additionally, they need permission from the forest department to access these facilities, creating obstacles for them. This situation limits their access to irrigation and forces them to rely mainly on rain-fed agriculture, which is highly vulnerable to weather fluctuations and often results in lower crop yields. Adopting essential strategies for sustaining crop productivity under water-scarce conditions, as suggested by Reddy and Nayak (2018), would help the communities with low irrigation access.

Crop grown practices

The crop choices among tribal communities are influenced by environmental conditions, traditional knowledge and market access. Studied tribal groups cultivate various crops, including cotton, paddy, maize, pulses and chillies, based on factors such as soil fertility, water availability and subsistence needs. Table 3 presents the crop distribution among different tribal communities in percentage terms, highlighting their agricultural preferences. Among the Gond community, cotton is the dominant crop, accounting for 51.2% of their cultivation, followed by pulses (39.0%), while maize (2.4%) and paddy (7.3%) are cultivated in smaller proportions. The Koya tribe primarily grows paddy (57.0%), with significant cotton cultivation (37.2%), but their involvement in maize (4.7%) and chillies (1.2%) is relatively minimal. The Chenchu community shows a more diversified cropping pattern, with maize (33.1%), paddy (27.8%) and cotton (36.3%) being their major crops, while pulses (2.8%) and chillies are grown in negligible amounts. The Kolam tribe relies mainly on cotton (40.2%) and pulses (35.4%), with paddy (24.4%) as another significant crop, but they do not cultivate maize or chillies. The Lambadi community exhibits a distinct preference for paddy (45.1%), followed by cotton (34.5%) and maize (8.0%), with a notable presence of chillies (12.4%), whereas they do not grow pulses at all.

Since access to irrigation varies among tribal communities, crop yields are also impacted significantly, especially in those tribes with limited irrigation facilities. The disparities in crop yields among the studied tribal groups are influenced by irrigation access, soil fertility and farming practices. The data discloses (Table 4) that the Lambadi community records the highest cotton yields at 8 quintals per acre, followed by the Koya community at 7.8 quintals per acre. The Lambadis also achieve the highest chilli yields (4.8 quintals per acre). The maize production is higher among the Koyas, yielding 20 quintals per acre in the *Kharif* season and 25 quintals per acre in the *Rabi*

Table 2: Difference in access to irrigation facility by tribe (%).

Tribe	Access to irrigation	Source of irrigation		
	Total	Well	Bore well	Canal/stream
Gond	17.6	23.0	77.0	0.0
Koya	81.3	16.0	41.0	43.0
Chenchu	25.3	0.0	100.0	0.0
Kolam	21.7	13.0	47.0	40.0
Lambadi	78.3	4.0	58.0	38.0

Table 3: Crop distribution among tribes (%).

Tribe	Chillies	Cotton	Maize	Paddy	Pulses
Gond	0.0	51.2	2.4	7.3	39.0
Koya	1.2	37.2	4.7	57.0	0.0
Chenchu	0.0	36.3	33.1	27.8	2.8
Kolam	0.0	40.2	0.0	24.4	35.4
Lambadi	12.4	34.5	8.0	45.1	0.0

season. Moreover, the paddy production is also higher among the Lambadi and Koyas. The Gond community shows more productivity in pulses (4 quintals per acre) and maize, though their cotton yields are comparatively lower. Similarly, the Chenchu and Kolam communities report lower crop yields across most categories, which can be attributed to irrigation and soil fertility. During an interview with a member of the Gond community, Athram Ravi, 34, who has leased ten acres of land from a relative, the individual shared their concern regarding the insufficient rainfall. The red gram crop on their ten acres has failed, yielding just 25 kilograms. Despite this low yield, the individual must pay the landowner at least half the lease amount. He expressed that they could have expected a yield of 15 to 20 quintals if adequate rainfall had prevailed. These yield patterns underscore the influence of irrigation availability and land management strategies on crop productivity among these tribal communities. While the Lambadi and Koya tribes exhibit more crop yields in key commercial crops such as cotton and maize, the Gond, Kolam and Chenchu communities face limitations that impact their overall agricultural output.

Agriculture remains the primary source of income for all these tribal communities and as observed, landholding is relatively substantial in most tribes. On the other hand, noteworthy disparities exist in income from agriculture, which can be attributed to access to irrigation facilities. As aforementioned, some tribal communities benefit from well-irrigated farmlands, allowing them to cultivate multiple crops and achieve higher yields, whereas others rely on rain-fed agriculture, which leads to lower productivity. This unequal access to irrigation causes income disparities among the tribal communities.

As data indicates in Table 5, the income distribution from agriculture among tribal communities across different income brackets. (The household's agricultural income has been determined by comparing crop production for the last year (2022) season to the market rates at which the crops were sold.) It reveals that each community has a unique profile in terms of income from agriculture. Starting with the Gond community, 35.2% of households fall in the 50 k to 1 lakh income bracket, indicating a significant portion in this mid-range. Additionally, 16.9% and 14.1% fall in the 1 to 2 lakh and 2 to 5 lakh brackets. The Koya community displays a balanced distribution, with the highest percentage (28.1%) in the 1 to 2 lakh income bracket and significant proportions in the 50k to 1 lakh (22.8%) and 2 to 5 lakh (22.8%) brackets, showcasing a diversified income structure. Conversely, most of the Chenchu tribes have incomes below 50 thousand, with a substantial 58.8% falling in this category. This suggests a higher dependence on lower income levels from agriculture within this community. The Kolam community demonstrates that 25.7% fall in the 1 to 2 lakh bracket and 12.9% in the 2 to 5 lakh bracket. Lastly, the Lambadi community have 36.8% of households in the 1 to 2 lakh income bracket, indicating a relatively higher income from agriculture within this range. Additionally, 23.5% fall in the 2 to 5 lakh bracket, reflecting a diverse income profile. Overall, the Lambadi and Koya communities appear to have a relatively higher income from agriculture, especially in the 1 to 2 lakh and 2 to 5 lakh income brackets.

Causes of disparities in crop yield and income

Crop selling practices

The data concerning the place of market for their crop selling reveals the diverse strategies adopted by different tribal communities in selling their produce (Table 6), which also causes the disparities between tribes. Nearly 100% of the Gond, Kolam and Chenchu tribe relies heavily on mediators. In contrast, the Koya (64%) and Lambadi (58%) communities prefer market channels. The relationship between the Gond and Kolam communities and the local fertilizer shop owners highlights a substantial reliance dynamic that impacts their economic status. These communities depend on the shop owners for necessary

Table 4: Difference in crop yielding in quintal per acre.

Tribe	Chilli	Pulses	Cotton	Maize		Paddy	
				Kharif	*Rabi*	*Kharif*	*Rabi*
Gond	0.0	4.0	3.8	12	14	15	15.1
Koya	0.3	0.0	7.8	20	25	18.5	22
Chenchu	0.0	0.3	3.5	15	16	15.5	16
Kolam	0.0	4.8	4.0	0.0	0.0	15.2	18
Lambadi	4.8	0.0	8.0	20	24	20.4	22.1

Table 5: Income from agriculture in rupees (%).

Tribe	Below 50 k	50 k to 1 lakh	1 to 2 Lakh	2 to 5 Lakh	5 to 10 Lakh
Gond	32.4	35.2	16.9	14.1	1.4
Koya	26.3	22.8	28.1	22.8	0
Chenchu	58.8	23.6	17.6	0	0
Kolam	40	21.4	25.7	12.9	0
Lambadi	19.1	17.6	36.8	23.5	2.9

agricultural inputs such as seeds, fertilizers and pesticides, which are provided on credit at the beginning of the cropping season. In return, the farmers commit to selling their produce to these shop owners, who then deduct the owed amount for the inputs from the crop sales revenue. From interviews and observations, it is apparent that some farmers are uninformed of the interest rates charged on these credits, with stated rates sometimes exceeding three per cent. Moreover, there is a lack of transparency and consideration regarding the pricing of fertilizers and pesticides. For example, Bhimrao, 54, a respondent from the Kolam community, said borrowing twelve thousand rupees and some pesticides. After selling 2.5 quintals of cotton to the shop owner, his entire earnings were deducted and he was also asked to pay an additional three thousand rupees.

This situation suggests a cycle of dependency and potential exploitation. The farmers feel obliged to continue this practice because they lack alternative sources of credit. Shop owners provide essential supplies on demand, which local markets or other institutions do not offer, making this relationship requisite for the farmers. However, this system places farmers in a vulnerable position where they may end up paying more than the market rate for inputs and receiving less for their crops, thus maintaining their economic hindrance. The Chenchus have different reasons for depending on mediators. Some face challenges taking their low-crop production to the market due to transportation and labour burdens. Therefore, they prefer to sell their crops to mediators who come directly to their farms. On the other hand, forest-dwelling Chenchus do not sell their crops at all. It has been noted that there is a higher percentage of Koyas and Lambadis in the market due to lower prices offered by the mediator, which is usually 300 to 500 rupees less than the market price, resulting in lower profits. Many of those with higher crop yields tend to go to the market, while those with products such as paddy and maize sell to procurement centres. They opt to sell in the market for crops like chilli and groundnuts.

Table 6: Crop selling practice among tribes (For 400 Sample Households).

Tribe	Local Mill	Market	Mediator
Gond	0.0	0.7	99.3
Koya	0.0	64.5	35.5
Chenchu	0.0	0.0	100.0
Kolam	0.0	0.0	100.0
Lambadi	29.2	58.5	12.3

Consequences of disparities

Income disparities force marginalized tribal households to rely on high-interest loans for basic needs and agricultural investments, pushing them into cycles of debt. When they fail to repay these loans, they are compelled to sell their land, which further deepens their financial instability. This loss of land not only reduces their economic security but also limits future livelihood opportunities. The disparities highlighted above have significant implications for tribal communities. Table 7 shows that many households across these communities rely on credit, with borrowing rates ranging from 58% to 83%. The primary reason for debt is agricultural investment due to lower agricultural production and frequent crop failures; the Gond, Chenchu and Kolam communities face difficulty repaying their debts. The data shows the Lambadi community has the highest borrowing rate at 83%, while the Chenchu community has the lowest at 58%. The data also reveals the primary purpose of borrowing: 67% of Gond and 64% of Kolam households take credit mainly for agricultural needs, while 58% of Chenchu households do so. In contrast, only 41% of Lambadi and 38% of Koya households borrow for agriculture. However, the credit sources vary among communities, with most tribes relying on informal credit. Over 80% of Gond and Kolam households borrow at high interest rates from informal sources such as moneylenders, though many also access credit from ITDA and banks. Among the Chenchu, Koya and Lambadi communities, 48%, 78% and 82% of households, respectively, have previously taken credits and primarily relying on the formal sources for credit. Farmers with ‘patta’ land benefit from the ‘Rythu Bandu’ scheme and ‘PM Kisan’ Though all eligible respondents reported receiving benefits from these schemes, the landless individuals, tenant farmers and those in remote areas continue to face significant challenges, particularly due to delayed disbursement and exclusion from formal land ownership records. While the scheme provides vital financial support to farmers across Telangana, it has been critiqued for not adequately addressing the specific needs of small and marginal and tenant farmers (Katherasala and Bheenaveni, 2024). Other schemes like Agri-Clinics and Agri-Business Centres aim to support agri-entrepreneurship, nonetheless their reach in tribal regions remains limited. Bharathi and Sudhakar (2023) note that only 42% of trained

Table 7: Prevalence of debt among tribal communities (%).

Tribe	Taken credit	Source of credit		Purpose	
		Formal	Informal	Agri-purpose	Other purpose
Gond	78	30	70	60	40
Koya	81	50	50	45	55
Kolam	80	26	74	64	36
Chenchu	58	40	60	40	60
Lambadi	83	70	30	20	80

Table 8: Prevalence of land selling and its causes (%).

Tribe	Sold land in the last ten years	Reason for land sale		
	Yes	Financial hardship	Other reasons	Total
Gond	28	79	21	100
Koya	23	70	30	100
Kolam	27	72	28	100
Chenchu	19	81	19	100
Lambadi	31	31	69	100
Total	26	74	26	100

Table 9: Wage labour, MGNREGA and migration (%).

Tribe	Wage labour	MGNREGA	Migration
Gond	82.0	68.0	23.0
Koya	46.0	62.0	38.0
Kolam	85.0	79.0	26.0
Chenchu	69.0	81.0	18.0
Lambadi	55.0	65.0	47.0

graduates established ventures, with minimal success in hilly and underserved areas, highlighting systemic gaps in implementation.

Borrowing for agricultural purposes is common among tribal communities, but those with lower agricultural incomes mostly struggle to repay their debts, leading to financial hardship and land sales. As Table 8 indicates, on average, 26% of households across five tribal communities have sold land in the past ten years, with financial hardship cited as the primary reason for 74% of these sales. The Gond tribe shows a slightly higher incidence at 28%, with 79% attributing their sales to financial difficulties. The Koya and Kolam tribes also report significant land sales at 23% and 27%, respectively, with 70% and 72% of these sales due to financial hardship. Among the Chenchu tribe, 19% of households sold their land, with 81% citing financial troubles, the highest among the tribes. The Lambadi tribe has the highest land sale rate at 69%, but a lower percentage (31%) attributes it to financial hardship, with 31% citing other reasons. These findings determine that financial hardship considerably drives land sales in tribal communities. Regardless of having comparatively better agricultural incomes, the Koya and Lambadi tribes sell land for various expenses, including children's education and investments, not solely due to agricultural challenges. This shows the economic disparities: communities with lower incomes, like the Gond, Kolam and Chenchu, face issues such as crop failure and basic needs, selling land out of necessity, while the Koya and Lambadi communities sell land primarily for investment and improving their educational and economic status.

The consequences of lower agricultural yield are not just limited to debt and land sales; they are also forcing people to depend on alternative livelihoods like engaging in daily wage labour, participating in MGNREGA work and migrating for work. According to the Press Information Bureau (2018) by the Ministry of Tribal Welfare, there has been a 9% increase in agricultural labour among STs, while there has been a 10% reduction in cultivators. This indicates insufficient income from agriculture, leading to a dependence on alternative sources. The data in Table 9 exhibit that a substantial portion of people depend on wage labour, MGNREGA and opt for migration work to earn their livelihood. Communities such as the Kolam and Gond highly depend on wage labour, with 85% and 82%, respectively. Similarly, a considerable percentage of people also rely on the MGNREGA scheme, which is a crucial source of employment for all communities. Migration is another livelihood source. It can be observed that most of the Lambadi (47%) and Koya (38%) households have at least one person who has migrated for work. Among the other communities, households with migration are comparatively fewer. The Lambadi and Koyas migrate to urban areas like Hyderabad and engage the private sector. On the contrary, tribes such as the Gond and Kolam migrate seasonally and mostly engage in agricultural work for their survival. Income disparities significantly contribute to unequal access to health care and education among these communities (Gugulothu, 2024).

CONCLUSION

This study reveals deep-rooted agricultural disparities among tribal communities in Telangana, driven by differences in landholding size, irrigation access, crop productivity and market linkages. While agriculture remains the primary livelihood source for all the studied tribes, communities such as the Gond, Kolam and Chenchu face significant disadvantages due to poor irrigation infrastructure, lower crop yields and dependence on exploitative credit systems. In contrast, the Lambadi and Koya communities benefit from relatively better access to irrigation and markets, leading to higher incomes and diversification opportunities. Despite receiving support through schemes like Rythu Bandhu, many tribal households, especially landless individuals, tenant farmers and those in remote areas, remain excluded or underserved due to structural barriers and implementation delays.

Addressing these disparities requires targeted and tribe-specific interventions focusing on improving irrigation facilities, ensuring equitable access to credit, strengthening agricultural extension services and enhancing market access. A more inclusive approach, one that acknowledges

inter-tribal inequalities and prioritizes sustainable development, is essential for empowering tribal communities and ensuring long-term agricultural resilience in Telangana.

Disclaimer

The views and conclusions expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of their affiliated institutions. The authors are responsible for the accuracy of the information provided.

Conflict of interest

The author declares that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this paper. No financial, personal, or professional affiliations have influenced the research or the conclusions presented in this work.

REFERENCES

Aga Khan Rural Support Programme (India) and Axis Bank foundation. (2021). Compendium of best practices: Water management in tribal areas.

Bharathi, G.V. and Sudhakar, P. (2023). Progress and performance of agri-clinics and agri-business centres scheme in India. Bhartiya Krishi Anusandhan Patrika. 38(1): 76-79. doi: 10.18805/BKAP436.

Burman, B.K. and Sharma, P.S. (1970). Tribal agriculture in India. Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics. 25(3): 149-160.

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). (n.d.). India at a Glance. Retrieved from https://www.fao.org/india/fao-in-india/india-at-a-glance/en/.

Gugulothu, S. (2024). Understanding the health disparities: A study of tribal communities in Telangana. South India Journal of Social Sciences. 22(4): 44-55. doi: https://doi.org/10.62656/SIJSS.v22i4.1194.

Gugulothu, S. and Korra, V. (2025). Unequal Access to Education and Employment: Emerging conflicts among tribal communities in Telangana. Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies. 51(5): 612-622. https://doi.org/10.9734/ajess/2025 v51i51944.

Katherasala, S. and Bheenaveni, R.S. (2024). Reevaluating the rythu bandhu scheme: Toward sustainable and inclusive agriculture in Telangana: A review. Bhartiya Krishi Anusandhan Patrika. 39(2): 125-130. doi: 10.18805/BKAP728.

Lakshmi, V.V. and Paul, M.M. (2019). Socio-economic conditions of tribal communities in Telangana and Andhra Pradesh-A review. Acta Scientific Agriculture. 3(8): 104-109.

Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers Welfare. (2021). Operational guidelines for implementing agriculture census 2021-22. Government of India. https://agriwelfare.gov.in/sites/default/files/Operational_Guideline2021_22.pdf.

Omkar, A.C. (2020). Changing pattern of tribal livelihoods: A study of Adilabad district (a case study of Narnoor and Jainoor Mandals). Retrieved from repository.tribal.gov.in.

Press Information Bureau, Government of India, Ministry of Tribal Affairs. (2018). Migration of Tribals. PIB Delhi. Retrieved from https://www.pib.gov.in/.

Reddy, S.R. and Nayak, P. (2018). Crop production with limited irrigation: A review. Agricultural Reviews. 39(1): 12-21. doi: 10.18805/ag.R-1680.

Sushmitha, S. (2019). A comparative study of the socio-economic-political background of the dominant and primitive tribes in Andhra Pradesh and Telangana.

Swamy, G.A., Enarth, S. and Reddy, V.N. (2018). Changing trends in the lifestyle of Chenchu tribes-A study in Atmakur Mandal of Kurnool District, Andhra Pradesh. Journal of Rural Development. pp 501-518.

Tribal Welfare Department, Government of Telangana (2019). Empowering Tribals- Annual Report 2018-19. Telangana: Tribal Welfare Department.

von Fürer-Haimendorf, C. and Von, F.H.C. (1982). Tribes of India: The Struggle for Survival. University of California Press.