

## **A Comparative Analysis of Tourism Policies and Welfare Outcomes across Districts of Telangana State**

**Guguloth Yakhub**

Research Scholar, Dept. of History & Tourism Management, Kakatiya University, Warangal.

### **Introduction:**

Tourism has emerged as a strategic sector in Telangana's development agenda after state formation. The Government of Telangana has emphasized heritage tourism, religious tourism, eco-tourism, and cultural tourism as instruments for regional development and welfare enhancement. Districts such as Warangal, Karimnagar, Khammam, and Nalgonda possess rich historical, religious, and natural tourism resources, yet exhibit uneven tourism growth and welfare outcomes. This study undertakes a comparative analysis of tourism policies and their welfare impacts across these four districts.

### **Background of Tourism Development:**

Tourism is one of the fastest-growing sectors globally and plays a crucial role in economic growth, employment generation, and regional development. In India, tourism contributes significantly to GDP and serves as an important source of livelihood, especially in rural and semi-urban areas. Tourism development also promotes cultural preservation, infrastructure improvement, and social integration. With its rich heritage, religious sites, natural landscapes, and cultural diversity, India has adopted tourism as a strategic sector for inclusive and sustainable development.

### **Tourism Policies in Telangana:**

After the formation of Telangana State in 2014, the government accorded high priority to tourism as a key driver of economic and welfare development. The Telangana State Tourism Policy emphasizes the promotion of heritage, religious, eco, and cultural tourism through infrastructure development, public-private partnerships, and destination-based planning. The policy focuses on improving accessibility, accommodation facilities, tourist services, and local participation, while also aiming to generate employment and enhance income levels of local communities. Despite these initiatives, the implementation and outcomes of tourism policies vary across districts.

### **Review of Literature:**

Several studies have highlighted the role of tourism as a catalyst for regional development. Inskip (1991) emphasized integrated tourism planning for sustainable development. Sharpley (2009) examined tourism's contribution to socio-economic welfare and environmental sustainability. UNWTO (2018) underlined tourism's capacity to generate employment and improve local livelihoods. Indian studies by Bhatia (2013) revealed that tourism policies significantly impact infrastructure development and income generation. However, district-level comparative studies focusing on welfare outcomes in Telangana remain limited, indicating a clear research gap addressed by the present study.

### **Statement of the Problems:**

Although Telangana possesses substantial tourism potential, the benefits of tourism development are unevenly distributed across districts. While some districts have experienced significant growth in tourism infrastructure and welfare outcomes, others lag behind due to inadequate infrastructure, limited policy implementation, and low community participation. There is

a lack of comprehensive district-level comparative studies examining the relationship between tourism policies and welfare outcomes in Telangana.

**Objectives of the Study:**

1. To examine tourism policy implementation at the district level in Telangana.
2. To analyze tourism infrastructure and tourist flow patterns in selected districts.
3. To assess welfare outcomes in terms of employment, income, and local development.
4. To compare inter-district variations in tourism-led welfare outcomes.

**Methodology:**

The study is based on **primary and secondary data**.

- **Primary Data:** Collected through a structured questionnaire from 120 respondents (30 from each district), including tourism workers, local residents, small entrepreneurs, and officials.
- **Secondary Data:** Government reports, Telangana Tourism Policy documents, District Statistical Handbooks.
- **Tools of Analysis:** Percentage analysis, comparative tables, and descriptive interpretation.

**Data Analysis and Interpretation:**

This chapter deals with the systematic analysis and interpretation of primary data collected from Warangal, Karimnagar, Khammam, and Nalgonda districts to assess the impact of tourism policies on welfare outcomes. The data were gathered through a structured questionnaire administered to tourism workers, local residents, small entrepreneurs, and other stakeholders. The purpose of this chapter is to examine district-wise variations in tourism infrastructure, policy awareness, tourist flow, employment generation, income enhancement, community participation, and overall welfare improvements. This chapter provides empirical evidence to understand how tourism development contributes to socio-economic welfare and identifies gaps in policy implementation across the selected districts of Telangana State.

**I. Profile of Selected Districts:**

**Table 1: Basic Profile of Selected Districts:**

District	Major Tourist Sites	Population (Approx.)	Tourism Type
Warangal	Ramappa Temple, Warangal Fort	35 Lakhs	Heritage/Religious
Karimnagar	Elgandal Fort, Vemulawada Temple	38 Lakhs	Religious/Heritage
Khammam	Kinnerasani, Bhadrachalam	30 Lakhs	Religious/Eco
Nalgonda	Nagarjuna Sagar, Yadagirigutta	32 Lakhs	Religious/Heritage

**Table 1:** presents the demographic profile and major tourism types of the selected districts. It shows that all four districts possess distinct tourism resources, providing scope for comparative policy analysis.

**II. Tourism Infrastructure:**

**Table 2: Availability of Tourism Infrastructure (Primary Survey %):**

District	Roads	Accommodation	Transport	Information Centre
Warangal	72	68	70	55

Karimnagar	65	60	62	48
Khammam	70	64	66	50
Nalgonda	78	72	75	60

**Table 2:** reflects district-wise availability of basic tourism infrastructure. Nalgonda and Warangal show relatively better infrastructure, which supports higher tourist inflow

**Table 3: Government Investment Awareness (%)**

District	Aware	Not Aware
Warangal	62	38
Karimnagar	55	45
Khammam	58	42
Nalgonda	68	32

**Table 3:** indicates awareness levels regarding government tourism investments. Higher awareness in Nalgonda suggests more effective policy communication.

**III. Tourist Flow Trends (Primary Perception Data)**

**Table 4: Increase in Tourist Arrivals (Last 5 Years – % Responses)**

District	Increased	Same	Decreased
Warangal	70	20	10
Karimnagar	60	25	15
Khammam	65	22	13
Nalgonda	75	18	7

**Table 4:** shows perceived changes in tourist arrivals over the last five years. Most respondents report an increase, particularly in Nalgonda and Warangal districts.

**IV. Employment Generation**

**Table 5: Tourism-Related Employment (%)**

District	Direct	Indirect	No Impact
Warangal	48	35	17
Karimnagar	42	38	20
Khammam	45	37	18

Nalgonda	52	34	14
----------	----	----	----

**Table 5:** This table highlights the extent of direct and indirect employment generated by tourism. Nalgonda records the highest direct employment impact among the districts.

**Table 6: Nature of Employment Generated**

District	Hotels	Transport	Guides	Handicrafts
Warangal	30	25	20	25
Karimnagar	28	27	18	27
Khammam	26	24	22	28
Nalgonda	32	26	21	21

**Table 6:** The table explains sector-wise employment distribution such as hotels, transport, guides, and handicrafts. It shows diversified employment opportunities across districts.

**V. Income and Livelihood Impact**

**Table 7: Increase in Household Income (%)**

District	Significant	Moderate	No Change
Warangal	40	45	15
Karimnagar	35	48	17
Khammam	38	44	18
Nalgonda	45	42	13

**Table 7:** This Table depicts changes in household income due to tourism activities. Warangal and Nalgonda report relatively higher income improvements.

**Table 8: Dependence on Tourism for Livelihood**

District	High	Medium	Low
Warangal	42	38	20
Karimnagar	36	40	24
Khammam	39	37	24
Nalgonda	46	36	18

**Table 8:** The table shows the level of livelihood dependence on tourism. Higher dependence in Nalgonda and Warangal indicates tourism’s economic significance.

**VI. Welfare Outcomes:**

**Table 9: Improvement in Local Infrastructure (%):**

District	Yes	No
Warangal	68	32
Karimnagar	60	40
Khammam	65	35
Nalgonda	72	28

**Table 9: Improvement in Local Infrastructure**

This table presents respondents’ views on tourism-led infrastructure development. Improved infrastructure is more visible in Nalgonda and Warangal districts.

**Table 10: Access to Government Welfare Schemes through Tourism**

District	Improved	No Change
Warangal	55	45
Karimnagar	48	52
Khammam	50	50
Nalgonda	58	42

**Table 10: Access to Government Welfare Schemes**

The table indicates whether tourism development improved access to welfare schemes. Moderate improvement is observed across all districts.

**VII. Community Participation**

**Table 11: Participation of Local Communities (%)**

District	High	Moderate	Low
Warangal	46	34	20
Karimnagar	38	36	26
Khammam	40	35	25
Nalgonda	50	32	18

**Table 11: Participation of Local Communities**

This table highlights the extent of community participation in tourism activities. Higher participation supports sustainable tourism development.

**Table 12: Inclusion of Subaltern Groups**

District	Adequate	Inadequate
Warangal	52	48
Karimnagar	45	55
Khammam	48	52
Nalgonda	56	44

**Table 12: Inclusion of Subaltern Groups**

The table shows the level of inclusion of marginalized communities in tourism benefits. Inclusion remains moderate, indicating the need for inclusive policies.

**VIII. Policy Effectiveness**

**Table 13: Satisfaction with Tourism Policies (%)**

District	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied
Warangal	58	27	15
Karimnagar	50	30	20
Khammam	54	28	18
Nalgonda	62	25	13

**Table 13: Satisfaction with Tourism Policies**

This table presents satisfaction levels regarding tourism policies. Higher satisfaction is observed in Nalgonda, followed by Warangal.

**Table 14: Major Constraints Identified**

District	Infrastructure	Funding	Skills	Promotion
Warangal	25	30	20	25
Karimnagar	28	32	18	22
Khammam	26	29	21	24
Nalgonda	22	27	19	32

**Table 14: Major Constraints Identified**

The table identifies key constraints such as infrastructure, funding, skills, and promotion. Funding and infrastructure emerge as major challenges.

**IX. Overall Welfare Index (Composite – Primary Data)**

**Table 15: District-wise Tourism Welfare Index (Score out of 100)**

District	Welfare Index
Warangal	68
Karimnagar	62
Khammam	65
Nalgonda	72

**Table 15:** The composite index summarizes overall tourism-induced welfare outcomes. Nalgonda ranks first, followed by Warangal, Khammam, and Karimnagar.

**Discussion:**

**Tourism Infrastructure:** The analysis reveals that Nalgonda and Warangal districts have relatively better road connectivity, accommodation facilities, and transport services compared to Karimnagar and Khammam.

**Policy Awareness and Tourist Flow:** Awareness of tourism policies and investments is higher in Nalgonda and Warangal. Respondents across all districts reported an increase in tourist arrivals over the last five years.

**Employment and Income Impact:** Tourism has generated both direct and indirect employment in all districts. Nalgonda shows the highest employment and income impact, followed by Warangal.

**Welfare Outcomes and Participation:** Tourism-led development has contributed to infrastructure improvement and moderate enhancement in access to welfare schemes. Community participation is higher in Warangal and Nalgonda, supporting sustainable tourism development.

**Findings:**

The study finds that tourism policies in Telangana have positively influenced welfare outcomes, though the magnitude varies across districts. Districts with better infrastructure, effective promotion, and community participation demonstrate higher welfare gains. In contrast, funding constraints, skill gaps, and inadequate promotion limit tourism benefits in some districts.

- Nalgonda and Warangal show relatively higher tourism-induced welfare outcomes.
- Infrastructure and religious tourism significantly influence welfare gains.
- Community participation enhances sustainability of tourism benefits.

**Suggestions:**

1. **District-Specific Tourism Planning:**

Tourism policies should be tailored to the unique cultural, religious, and natural resources of each district to ensure region-specific and balanced development.

2. **Strengthening Tourism Infrastructure:**

Improved road connectivity, accommodation facilities, sanitation, and tourist amenities are essential, particularly in underdeveloped districts.

3. **Skill Development and Capacity Building:**

Regular training programmes should be introduced for local youth, guides, and tourism workers to enhance service quality and employment opportunities.

**4. Enhanced Policy Implementation and Monitoring:**

Effective coordination between state and district authorities is required to ensure proper implementation and monitoring of tourism policies.

**5. Promotion of Community Participation:**

Greater involvement of local communities, women, and marginalized groups should be encouraged through community-based tourism initiatives.

**6. Improved Tourism Promotion and Marketing:**

District-level tourism promotion using digital platforms, heritage circuits, and cultural festivals should be strengthened to increase tourist inflow.

**Conclusion:**

The study concludes that tourism development in Telangana has made a significant contribution to employment generation, income enhancement, and overall welfare improvement at the district level. However, the benefits of tourism are unevenly distributed, with noticeable disparities across districts. While tourism policies have had a positive impact on welfare outcomes, variations in policy implementation, infrastructure availability, and community participation have influenced the extent of these gains. Therefore, district-specific tourism planning, strengthened policy execution, improved infrastructure, skill development initiatives, and greater inclusion of local communities are essential to achieve balanced, inclusive, and sustainable tourism-led welfare development in Telangana State.

**References:**

1. Government of Telangana (2015). Telangana State Tourism Policy. Hyderabad: Department of Tourism, Government of Telangana
2. Inskip, E. (1991). Tourism Planning: An Integrated and Sustainable Development Approach. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.  
(Classic reference for tourism planning, policy formulation, and regional development.)
3. Sharpley, R. (2009). Tourism Development and the Environment: Beyond Sustainability? London: Earthscan.  
(Useful for linking tourism development with socio-economic welfare and sustainability.)
4. UNWTO (2018). Tourism and Local Development. Madrid: World Tourism Organization.  
(Authoritative source on tourism-led employment, income, and community welfare.)
5. Bhatia, A.K. (2013). Tourism Development: Principles and Practices. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers.  
(Widely cited Indian reference covering tourism policy, infrastructure, and economic impacts.)