



**IMPACT OF GOVERNMENT WELFARE POLICIES ON THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC
DEVELOPMENT OF TRIBAL COMMUNITIES IN TELANGANA**

Saduvally Mahesh Sai Kiran
Department of Political Science
maheshsaikiran123@gmail.com

Article Received: 10-05-2026 Article Modified: 20-06-2026
Article Accepted: 29-06-2026 Article Published: 30-06-2026
DOI: 10.37854/UIJMR.2026.3.3.175

Abstract

Government welfare policies play an important role in promoting social justice, reducing socio-economic inequalities, and improving the living standards of tribal communities. Various welfare measures are implemented in Telangana to provide educational opportunities, healthcare, livelihood support, housing, employment, and social security to Scheduled Tribes. Although these initiatives aim to improve the socio-economic conditions of tribal communities, their effectiveness depends on beneficiary awareness, accessibility of services, administrative efficiency, and the relevance of schemes to household needs. The present study attempts to examine the impact of government welfare policies on the socio-economic status of tribal communities in Telangana, focusing on awareness of welfare schemes, access to government benefits, educational opportunities, healthcare facilities, employment, income, and living conditions. The study adopts a descriptive and analytical research design. A total of 90 respondents were selected through purposive sampling from three villages in Kesamudram Mandal, Mahabubabad District. Primary data was collected through an interview schedule, while secondary data were obtained from government reports, policy guidelines, and relevant literature. The data was analysed using frequencies, percentages, cross-tabulations, and appropriate statistical techniques. The study seeks to highlight the contribution of government welfare measures to tribal socio-economic development and identify the challenges affecting their effective implementation.

Keywords: Public Policy, Tribal Communities, Government Welfare Policies, Socio-Economic Development, Scheduled Tribes, Telangana, Social Justice, Welfare Programmes.

Introduction



United International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (UIJMR)

An International Peer-Reviewed and Refereed Multidisciplinary Journal

ISSN: 3048-6726 www.uijmr.in Impact Factor: 6.934 (SJIF) Vol-3, Issue-2 ; April, May & June, 2026

Public policy plays an important role in addressing social inequalities and improving the living conditions of disadvantaged sections of society. Governments introduce different welfare programmes to provide basic services, improve economic opportunities, and ensure social protection for vulnerable communities. Tribal communities need special attention in this process because they often face difficulties related to geographical isolation, limited educational opportunities, insecure livelihoods, inadequate access to public services, and problems concerning land and natural resources.

Telangana has several tribal communities with their own cultural traditions, social practices, and ways of earning a livelihood. Their socio-economic conditions vary depending on their location, education, employment opportunities, and access to government services. Many tribal households depend on agriculture, agricultural labour, daily wage work, livestock rearing, forest resources, and other small economic activities. Therefore, tribal development should not be understood only in terms of income. It also involves education, healthcare, housing, employment, social security, and improvements in overall living conditions.

To address these needs, the Central and Telangana governments have introduced various welfare programmes for Scheduled Tribes. These initiatives include educational scholarships, residential schools, healthcare services, nutrition programmes, employment opportunities, housing assistance, livelihood support, and social security benefits. Constitutional provisions and special legislation also aim to protect tribal rights and support their development.

Despite these efforts, all eligible tribal households may not receive welfare benefits equally. Some people may not have sufficient information about available schemes, while others may experience difficulties with documentation, application procedures, administrative delays, or access to government offices. In some areas, geographical barriers and limited coordination among departments may further affect the delivery of services. The success of welfare policies, therefore, should not be measured only by the number of schemes introduced or beneficiaries covered. It is also important to understand whether these programmes have helped families improve their education, health, income, employment, housing, and general standard of living.

Against this background, the present study examines the role of government welfare policies in the socio-economic development of tribal communities in Telangana. It considers respondents' awareness of welfare schemes, their access to government benefits, their perceptions of changes in living conditions, and the difficulties they face in obtaining assistance. By examining these issues at the household level, the study aims to understand the contribution of welfare programmes to tribal development and identify areas where implementation can be improved. The findings may help suggest practical measures to make welfare services more accessible and responsive to the needs of tribal communities.

Review of Literature



United International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (UIJMR)

An International Peer-Reviewed and Refereed Multidisciplinary Journal

ISSN: 3048-6726 www.uijmr.in Impact Factor: 6.934 (SJIF) Vol-3, Issue-2 : April, May & June, 2026

1. **Muravath, M., & Muravath, R. (2024).** examined the role of government schemes and policies in the economic development of tribal communities in Telangana. The study highlighted welfare initiatives related to education, employment, livelihood support, infrastructure, and financial assistance. It emphasised that effective implementation, community participation, and regular monitoring are essential for improving tribal living standards and promoting inclusive development.
2. **Margaret and Sujatha (2025)** analysed the socio-economic conditions of 300 Scheduled Tribe respondents across Mahabubnagar, Warangal, and Adilabad districts of Telangana. The study identified educational disadvantages, landlessness, low income, and limited awareness of welfare schemes. It recommended participatory policy implementation, improved awareness, livelihood support, and stronger educational facilities for tribal development.
3. **Vijaya Kumar (2017)** studied the impact of tribal welfare schemes on income levels and employment generation in Telangana. The study focused on the contribution of government interventions to improving beneficiaries' annual income and employment opportunities. It provides a relevant regional reference for examining whether welfare programmes support livelihood security and economic improvement among tribal households.
4. **Suresh Kumar and Shobana (2023)** examined government schemes intended to improve tribal development in Nagaland. Their study discussed welfare assistance in education, healthcare, housing, sanitation, agricultural productivity, and income-generating activities. It emphasised the importance of financial and technical support, capacity building, and effective implementation in improving the living standards of tribal communities.

Objectives of the Study

1. To assess tribal communities' awareness of and access to major government welfare schemes in Telangana.
2. To analyse the perceived contribution of welfare schemes to the socio-economic development of tribal households, particularly in education, healthcare, employment, income, and living conditions.
3. To identify the major barriers to accessing welfare benefits and suggest measures to improve their implementation and effectiveness.

Need for the Study

Government welfare policies aim to improve the socio-economic conditions of tribal communities through education, healthcare, employment, housing, livelihood support, and social protection. However, their effectiveness depends on beneficiary awareness, accessibility, and proper implementation. Lack of information, documentation difficulties, administrative delays, and



United International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (UIJMR)

An International Peer-Reviewed and Refereed Multidisciplinary Journal

ISSN: 3048-6726 www.ujmr.in Impact Factor: 6.934 (SJIF) Vol-3, Issue-2 ; April, May & June, 2026

geographical barriers may prevent eligible households from receiving benefits. Therefore, the present study examines tribal respondents' awareness of welfare schemes, access to benefits, and their perceived contribution to improved living conditions. It also identifies major implementation challenges and suggests measures to strengthen welfare delivery. The study may help policymakers and administrators promote inclusive development and ensure that welfare benefits reach deserving tribal households.

Research Methodology

The study adopts a descriptive and analytical research design to examine the impact of government welfare policies on the socio-economic development of tribal communities in Telangana.

Study area: The field study covers Kesamudram Mandal of Mahabubabad District, Telangana, and includes three selected villages: Mangya Tanda, Earya Tanda, and Kistapur.

Sample size: The study covers a total of 90 respondents, with 30 respondents selected from each village.

Sampling technique: Purposive sampling is employed to select respondents who are relevant to the study and have knowledge of, or experience with, government welfare programmes. The selection of respondents is guided by the objectives of the research.

Sources of data: Primary data are collected through a structured questionnaire or interview schedule administered to tribal respondents. Secondary data are obtained from government reports, official policy documents, publications of the Ministry of Tribal Affairs, Census publications, and relevant academic literature.

Methods of data analysis: Frequencies and percentages are used to describe respondents' characteristics and experiences. Cross-tabulations are used to examine relationships between selected variables.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

Table 1: Village-wise Distribution of Respondents

Village	Frequency	Percentage
Mangya Tanda	30	33.3
Earya Tanda	30	33.3
Kistapur	30	33.3
Total	90	100.0

Source: Primary field data.



United International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (UIJMR)

An International Peer-Reviewed and Refereed Multidisciplinary Journal

ISSN: 3048-6726 www.uijmr.in Impact Factor: 6.934 (SJIF) Vol-3, Issue-2 ; April, May & June, 2026

The table presents the distribution of respondents across the three selected villages. Each village contributes 30 respondents, representing approximately one-third of the total sample. This equal allocation provides a balanced basis for comparing respondents' experiences of welfare programmes across the selected locations. However, equal sample allocation does not necessarily reflect the actual population distribution of tribal households in these villages.

Table 2: Educational Status of Respondents:

Educational status	Mangya Tanda	Earya Tanda	Kistapur	Total
Illiterate	5 (16.7)	6 (20.0)	7 (23.3)	18 (20.0)
Primary education	9 (30.0)	8 (26.7)	7 (23.3)	24 (26.7)
Secondary education	8 (26.7)	7 (23.3)	8 (26.7)	23 (25.6)
Intermediate or equivalent	5 (16.7)	6 (20.0)	5 (16.7)	16 (17.8)
Degree and above	3 (10.0)	3 (10.0)	3 (10.0)	9 (10.0)
Total	30 (100.0)	30 (100.0)	30 (100.0)	90 (100.0)

Source: Field data

From the above table, it can be noted that out of 90 respondents, 26.7% had primary education, followed by 25.6% who had secondary education. About 20% of the respondents were illiterate, while 17.8% had completed intermediate education. Only 10% had a degree or higher qualification. In Mangya Tanda, most respondents (30%) had primary education. In Earya Tanda, 26.7% had primary education, while 23.3% had secondary education. In Kistapur, 26.7% of the respondents were illiterate. The table shows that most respondents had primary or secondary education, while only a few had completed higher education.

Table 3: Village-wise Occupational Status of Respondents

Occupation	Mangya Tanda	Earya Tanda	Kistapur	Total
Agricultural labour	12 (40.0)	10 (33.3)	11 (36.7)	33 (36.7)
Cultivation	5 (16.7)	7 (23.3)	6 (20.0)	18 (20.0)
Wage employment	5 (16.7)	4 (13.3)	5 (16.7)	14 (15.6)
Forest-based livelihood or collection	3 (10.0)	4 (13.3)	3 (10.0)	10 (11.1)
Self-employment or small business	3 (10.0)	3 (10.0)	3 (10.0)	9 (10.0)
Other occupations	2 (6.7)	2 (6.7)	2 (6.7)	6 (6.7)
Total	30 (100.0)	30 (100.0)	30 (100.0)	90 (100.0)

Source: Field data



United International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (UIJMR)

An International Peer-Reviewed and Refereed Multidisciplinary Journal

ISSN: 3048-6726 www.ujmr.in Impact Factor: 6.934 (SJIF) Vol-3, Issue-2 : April, May & June, 2026

From the above table, it can be noted that out of 90 respondents, 36.7% were agricultural labourers, followed by 20% who were engaged in cultivation. About 15.6% were involved in wage employment, while 11.1% depended on forest-based livelihoods or collection. Self-employment or small businesses accounted for 10% of the respondents, and 6.7% were engaged in other occupations. In Mangya Tanda, 40% of the respondents were agricultural labourers, compared with 33.3% in Earya Tanda and 36.7% in Kistapur. The findings show that agriculture and agricultural labour were the main sources of livelihood among the respondents, while only a small proportion were engaged in business or other occupations.

Table 4: Village-wise Awareness of Government Welfare Programmes

Awareness level	Mangya Tanda	Earya Tanda	Kistapur	Total
High	2 (6.7)	3 (10.0)	4 (13.3)	9 (10.0)
Moderate	6 (20.0)	8 (26.7)	8 (26.7)	22 (24.4)
Low	22 (73.3)	19 (63.3)	18 (60.0)	59 (65.6)
Total	30 (100.0)	30 (100.0)	30 (100.0)	90 (100.0)

Source: Field data

From the above table, it can be noted that out of 90 respondents, 65.6% had low awareness of government welfare programmes, while 24.4% had moderate awareness. Only 10% of the respondents had high awareness. In Mangya Tanda, 73.3% of the respondents had low awareness, followed by 63.3% in Earya Tanda and 60% in Kistapur. Kistapur had the highest percentage of respondents with high awareness at 13.3%. The findings indicate that most respondents had low awareness of government welfare programmes. Therefore, more awareness programmes and information campaigns are needed to help people understand and access the benefits available to them.

Table 5: Village-wise Access to Government Welfare Benefits

Access status	Mangya Tanda	Earya Tanda	Kistapur	Total
Regular access to eligible benefits	16 (53.3)	11 (36.7)	9 (30.0)	36 (40.0)
Partial or irregular access	9 (30.0)	9 (30.0)	8 (26.7)	26 (28.9)
Applied but benefits not received	2 (6.7)	4 (13.3)	5 (16.7)	11 (12.2)
Not accessed or not applied	3 (10.0)	6 (20.0)	8 (26.7)	17 (18.9)
Total	30 (100.0)	30 (100.0)	30 (100.0)	90 (100.0)

Source: Field data



United International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (UIJMR)

An International Peer-Reviewed and Refereed Multidisciplinary Journal

ISSN: 3048-6726 www.ujmr.in Impact Factor: 6.934 (SJIF) Vol-3, Issue-2 : April, May & June, 2026

From the above table, it can be noted that out of 90 respondents, 40% had regular access to eligible government welfare benefits, while 28.9% had partial or irregular access. About 18.9% had not applied for or accessed these benefits, and 12.2% had applied but had not received them. In Mangya Tanda, 53.3% of the respondents had regular access, compared with 36.7% in Earya Tanda and 30% in Kistapur. Kistapur had the highest percentage of respondents who had not accessed or applied for benefits (26.7%). The findings show that many respondents were not receiving government welfare benefits regularly, indicating a need for better implementation and support to help eligible people access these benefits.

Table 6: Village-wise Educational Benefits Received by Respondents' Households (N=30)

Educational benefit	Mangya Tanda	Earya Tanda	Kistapur	Average
Scholarships or financial assistance	25 (83.3)	23(76.7)	24(80.0)	72 (80.0)
Residential school or hostel facilities	17 (56.7)	17 (56.7)	17 (56.7)	17 (56.7)
Other educational support	3 (10.0)	3 (10.0)	3 (10.0)	3 (10.0)
No educational benefit received	00	01 (3.3)	00	1 (1.1)

From the above table, it can be noted that scholarships or financial assistance were the most common educational benefits received by households in all three villages. In Mangya Tanda, 25 households (83.3%) received scholarships, followed by 24 households (80.0%) in Kistapur and 23 households (76.7%) in Earya Tanda. Residential school or hostel facilities were received by 17 households (56.7%) in Mangya Tanda, 19 (63.3%) in Earya Tanda, and 15 (50.0%) in Kistapur. Other educational support was received by 3 households (10.0%) in Mangya Tanda, 4 (13.3%) in Earya Tanda, and 2 (6.7%) in Kistapur. Only one household (3.3%) in Earya Tanda reported not receiving any educational benefit, while no such households were reported in Mangya Tanda or Kistapur. The findings show that scholarships were the most common form of educational support among the surveyed households.

Table 7: Village-wise Access to Healthcare and Nutrition Services

Level of access	Mangya Tanda	Earya Tanda	Kistapur	Total
Good access	8 (26.7)	6 (20.0)	5 (16.7)	19 (21.1)
Moderate access	14 (46.7)	12 (40.0)	10 (33.3)	36 (40.0)
Limited access	8 (26.7)	12 (40.0)	15 (50.0)	35 (38.9)
Total	30 (100.0)	30 (100.0)	30 (100.0)	90 (100.0)

Source: Field data



United International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (UIJMR)

An International Peer-Reviewed and Refereed Multidisciplinary Journal

ISSN: 3048-6726 www.ujmr.in Impact Factor: 6.934 (SJIF) Vol-3, Issue-2 : April, May & June, 2026

From the above table, it can be noted that 40% of the respondents had moderate access to healthcare and nutrition services, while 38.9% had limited access. Only 21.1% had good access to these services. In Mangya Tanda, 46.7% had moderate access, while in Earya Tanda, 40% had limited access. In Kistapur, 50% of the respondents had limited access, which was the highest among the three villages. The findings show that many respondents faced difficulties in accessing healthcare and nutrition services, particularly in Kistapur.

Table 8: Village-wise Perceived Impact of Welfare Policies on Household Income

Perceived change	Mangya Tanda	Earya Tanda	Kistapur	Total
Significant improvement	6 (20.0)	4 (13.3)	3 (10.0)	13 (14.4)
Some improvement	12 (40.0)	10 (33.3)	8 (26.7)	30 (33.3)
No major change	10 (33.3)	13 (43.3)	15 (50.0)	38 (42.2)
Deterioration or uncertain change	2 (6.7)	3 (10.0)	4 (13.3)	9 (10.0)
Total	30 (100.0)	30 (100.0)	30 (100.0)	90 (100.0)

Source: Field data.

From the above table, it can be noted that 42.2% of the respondents reported no major change in household income due to welfare policies, while 33.3% experienced some improvement. About 14.4% reported significant improvement, and 10% reported deterioration or uncertain change. In Mangya Tanda, 40% experienced some improvement, whereas in Earya Tanda, 43.3% reported no major change. In Kistapur, half of the respondents (50%) reported no major change. The findings indicate that welfare policies have provided some income benefits, but their impact on household income remains limited for many respondents.

Table 9: Village-wise Problems in Accessing Welfare Programmes

Reported problem	Mangya Tanda	Earya Tanda	Kistapur	Total
Lack of awareness	19 (63.3)	18 (60.0)	19 (63.3)	56 (62.2)
Documentation difficulties	9 (30.0)	11 (36.7)	10 (33.3)	30 (33.3)
Administrative delays	17 (56.7)	14 (46.7)	10 (33.3)	41 (45.6)
Difficulties travelling to offices	4 (13.3)	6 (20.0)	3 (10.0)	13 (14.4)
Delays in receiving benefits	14 (46.7)	9 (30.0)	11 (36.7)	34 (37.8)
Lack of assistance with applications	13 (43.3)	11 (36.7)	14 (46.7)	38 (42.2)

Source: Field data



From the above table, it can be noted that lack of awareness was the major problem, reported by 62.2% of the respondents. Administrative delays were reported by 45.6%, while 42.2% faced a lack of assistance with applications. About 37.8% reported delays in receiving benefits, and 33.3% faced documentation difficulties. Only 14.4% reported difficulties travelling to government offices. The findings show that lack of awareness, administrative delays, and insufficient assistance with applications were the major barriers to accessing welfare programmes among the respondents.

Table 10: Village-wise Perceived Impact of Government Welfare Policies on the Socio-Economic Development of Tribal Communities

Perceived impact	Mangya Tanda	Earya Tanda	Kistapur	Total
Significant improvement	6 (20.0)	4 (13.3)	3 (10.0)	13 (14.4)
Some improvement	12 (40.0)	10 (33.3)	8 (26.7)	30 (33.3)
No major improvement	10 (33.3)	13 (43.3)	15 (50.0)	38 (42.2)
Deterioration or uncertain impact	2 (6.7)	3 (10.0)	4 (13.3)	9 (10.0)
Total	30 (100.0)	30 (100.0)	30 (100.0)	90 (100.0)

Source: Field data

From the above table, it can be noted that 42.2% of the respondents reported no major improvement in their socio-economic conditions due to government welfare policies, while 33.3% experienced some improvement. About 14.4% reported significant improvement, whereas 10.0% indicated deterioration or an uncertain impact. In Mangya Tanda, 40.0% experienced some improvement, compared with 33.3% in Earya Tanda and 26.7% in Kistapur. Half of the respondents in Kistapur reported no major improvement, representing the highest proportion among the three villages. The findings suggest that although welfare policies have contributed to perceived improvements for some households, their benefits have not translated into substantial socio-economic progress for many respondents.

Findings of the Study

1. **Village-wise distribution:** The study includes 90 respondents, with 30 respondents each from Mangya Tanda, Earya Tanda, and Kistapur. This equal distribution facilitates descriptive comparisons across the selected villages.



United International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (UIJMR)

An International Peer-Reviewed and Refereed Multidisciplinary Journal

ISSN: 3048-6726 www.ujmr.in Impact Factor: 6.934 (SJIF) Vol-3, Issue-2 : April, May & June, 2026

2. **Educational Status:** The study found that 26.7% of the respondents had primary education, followed by 25.6% with secondary education. About 20% were illiterate, while only 10% had a degree or higher qualification. This indicates that educational attainment remains limited among a considerable proportion of the respondents.
3. **Occupational Status:** Agricultural labour was the principal occupation, accounting for 36.7% of respondents, followed by cultivation at 20%. Wage employment accounted for 15.6%, while 11.1% depended on forest-based livelihoods. These findings indicate considerable dependence on agriculture and labour-based activities.
4. **Awareness of Welfare Programmes:** A majority of respondents (65.6%) reported low awareness of government welfare programmes. About 24.4% had moderate awareness, while only 10% had high awareness. This suggests that insufficient information may restrict the effective utilisation of welfare schemes.
5. **Access to Government Benefits:** The findings revealed that 40% of respondents had regular access to eligible welfare benefits, while 28.9% had partial or irregular access. About 12.2% had applied but had not received benefits, and 18.9% had not accessed or applied for them. Thus, access to welfare programmes remains uneven.
6. **Educational Benefits:** Scholarships and financial assistance were the most frequently reported educational benefits, received by 80% of households. Residential school or hostel facilities were also reported by a substantial proportion. These findings highlight the importance of educational assistance in supporting tribal students and their families.
7. **Healthcare and Nutrition:** About 40% of respondents reported moderate access to healthcare and nutrition services, while 38.9% reported limited access. Only 21.1% reported good access. Kistapur recorded the highest proportion of respondents with limited access, at 50%, indicating the need to strengthen service accessibility.
8. **Impact on Household Income:** About 42.2% of respondents reported no major change in household income following welfare-policy interventions. While 33.3% experienced some improvement and 14.4% reported significant improvement, 10% indicated deterioration or uncertain change. The findings suggest that the perceived income benefits of welfare policies remain limited for many households.
9. **Problems in Accessing Welfare Programmes:** Lack of awareness was the most frequently reported barrier, affecting 62.2% of respondents. Administrative delays were reported by 45.6%, lack of assistance with applications by 42.2%, and delays in receiving benefits by 37.8%. Documentation difficulties affected 33.3% of respondents.
10. **Village-wise Differences:** Mangya Tanda recorded a higher proportion of respondents with regular access to welfare benefits (53.3%) than Earya Tanda (36.7%) and Kistapur (30%). Kistapur also recorded a higher proportion of respondents who had not applied for or accessed benefits. These differences indicate that access conditions vary across the selected villages.



Suggestions

1. Strengthening Awareness of Welfare Programmes: Government departments and local institutions should conduct regular awareness programmes in tribal habitations. Information should be communicated in accessible language and should explain scheme objectives, eligibility criteria, application procedures, required documentation, and available benefits. Community-level information sessions can help reduce gaps in awareness.

2. Simplifying Application Procedures: Application procedures should be made accessible to eligible households, particularly those facing literacy, digital access, or documentation barriers. Assistance with completing forms, obtaining necessary documents, and tracking applications can reduce avoidable difficulties and improve access to benefits.

3. Improving Educational Opportunities: Educational assistance should be supported by adequate school infrastructure, residential facilities where appropriate, scholarships, learning support, and guidance for higher education. Monitoring should consider school attendance, retention, completion, and learning outcomes rather than focusing only on enrolment.

4. Enhancing Healthcare Accessibility: Healthcare services should be strengthened through accessible public health facilities, outreach services, appropriate transport arrangements, and timely information about eligible healthcare and nutrition programmes. Improvements should focus on service availability, continuity of care, and the practical accessibility of facilities.

5. Promoting Sustainable Livelihoods: Welfare assistance should be complemented by livelihood development initiatives suited to local circumstances. Agricultural support, skills training, small enterprises, market access, and other appropriate economic activities can help households strengthen income security and reduce vulnerability to economic shocks.

6. Strengthening Housing and Basic Amenities: Eligible households should receive appropriate support through relevant housing and basic-services programmes. Policy implementation should pay attention to the quality and functionality of housing, drinking water, sanitation, electricity, roads, and other essential infrastructure.

7. Improving Administrative Coordination: Coordination among tribal welfare, education, health, rural development, and other relevant departments should be strengthened. Clear responsibilities, timely communication, and effective monitoring can reduce administrative delays and improve the delivery of eligible benefits.

8. Establishing Effective Grievance Mechanisms: Accessible grievance mechanisms should enable beneficiaries to report delays, difficulties with applications, exclusion from eligible benefits, and other service-related problems. Complaints should be recorded, reviewed, and



addressed within reasonable timelines, with information about action taken communicated to applicants.

9. Promoting Community Participation: Tribal households and appropriate local institutions should be involved in identifying development needs, reviewing welfare-programme accessibility, and monitoring implementation. Community participation can help ensure that programmes respond to local priorities and the diverse circumstances of tribal households.

10. Strengthening Monitoring and Evaluation: Welfare programmes should be assessed using measurable indicators relating to benefit receipt, educational continuity, healthcare utilisation, livelihood security, housing conditions, and reported changes in living standards. Programme monitoring should examine not only expenditure and beneficiary numbers but also the accessibility and usefulness of delivered services.

11. Promoting Evidence-Based Policy Planning

Government institutions should use reliable household-level information alongside administrative records to identify implementation gaps, underserved groups, and changing development needs. Evidence-based planning can improve resource allocation and strengthen the responsiveness of tribal welfare programmes.

Conclusion

Government welfare policies are important instruments of public policy for promoting social justice, reducing socio-economic inequalities, and ensuring inclusive development among tribal communities in Telangana. The present study examines the implementation and perceived impact of welfare programmes among 90 respondents from Mangya Tanda, Earya Tanda, and Kistapur in Mahabubabad District. The findings reveal that educational assistance is an important form of welfare support; however, low awareness, irregular access to benefits, limited healthcare accessibility, and modest income improvements remain significant concerns. From a public policy perspective, these findings highlight the gap between policy formulation and effective implementation at the grassroots level. The success of welfare programmes depends not only on government expenditure and scheme availability but also on administrative efficiency, transparency, accountability, and equitable service delivery. Strengthening local institutions, simplifying application procedures, improving interdepartmental coordination, and establishing effective grievance redressal mechanisms can enhance policy outcomes. Community participation and evidence-based planning are equally important for ensuring that welfare interventions reflect the actual needs of tribal households. Since the study uses purposive sampling and covers three selected villages, its findings should be interpreted within these limitations. Ultimately, responsive governance, effective monitoring, and participatory policy implementation are essential for translating welfare commitments into sustainable socio-economic development and inclusive growth among tribal communities in Telangana.



United International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (UIJMR)

An International Peer-Reviewed and Refereed Multidisciplinary Journal

ISSN: 3048-6726 www.uijmr.in Impact Factor: 6.934 (SJIF) Vol-3, Issue-2 ; April, May & June, 2026

References

1. Government of India. (1996). *The Provisions of the Panchayats (Extension to the Scheduled Areas) Act, 1996*.
2. Government of India. (2006). *The Scheduled Tribes and Other Traditional Forest Dwellers (Recognition of Forest Rights) Act, 2006*.
3. Muravath, M., & Muravath, R. (2024). Impact of government schemes and policies on the economic development of tribal communities in Telangana. *International Journal of Creative Research Thoughts*, 12(2), a851–a858.
4. Margaret, P. P., & Sujatha, N. (2025). Disparities and development: A statistical exploration of Scheduled Tribes' socio-economic conditions in Telangana. *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, 7(4).
5. Vijaya Kumar, P. (2017). A study on impact of tribal welfare schemes on income levels and employment generation in Telangana State. *International Journal of Current Advanced Research*.
6. Suresh Kumar, J., & Shobana, D. (2023). Impact of government schemes on tribal development in Nagaland. *Shanlax International Journal of Economics*, 11(3), 15–25.