

Tribal Livelihood in the Age of Globalization: Some Critical Reflections

AMIT KUMAR VENKTESHWAR
Sarojini Naidu Centre for the Women's Studies
Jamia Millia Islamia (New Delhi) India

ABSTRACT

The LPG model of development in India is depriving the tribal people by taking over the life sustaining resources and pushing them into a further marginalized state of living as a result of displacing them from their land and homes. At the time of globalization, tribes have systematically been dispossessed of the ownership of their means of production. They have become subordinate in their own land. The very nature of the present development paradigm does not provide for the absorption of these poor people into the organized non-farm sector economy by either developing their skills or providing them with technical education. So, major population which was marginalized earlier, will be further marginalized in the era of globalization. Changes in their land based livelihood pattern and unable to incorporate them into the mainstream economy and their situation has been deteriorating. In recent time they are also adopting new pattern of livelihood like agricultural labourers, industrial labourers, government jobs, self-employment in agriculture or in non-agriculture activities etc. Structural changes in the Indian economy have not benefitted at all and greater degree of deprivation is still persisting among them. Thus, this paper primarily discusses and analyses the changes in the lives and livelihoods of the tribal people more specifically in terms of landlessness; dispossession; occupational changes; deprivation and migration among tribal communities, which have caused due to neo-liberal policies and the aggressive spread of capitalist relations in tribal dominated areas.

Key Words : Tribal livelihood, Age of globalization, LPG model

INTRODUCTION

Since 1991 in the era of globalization², private capital has emerged as an important player and entered with a great pace who played ruthlessly in the name of development process. Which increased the pace of infrastructure development in terms of rapid urbanization and huge demands of land for industries and housing

projects. It made possible through the massive acquisition of land which resulted in the impoverishment and displacement of the masses. Since most of the resources like, metallic and non-metallic minerals, forests, water resources, etc. are abundantly found in the tribal inhabited regions. Invariably, several projects materialized in the tribal inhabited regions. Simultaneously, it resulted into the loss of tribal land and livelihood. The Planning

1. The scholar is the awardee of ICSSR Post-Doctoral Fellowship (2022-24). This paper is largely an outcome of the Post-Doctoral Fellowship sponsored by the ICSSR. However, the responsibility for the facts stated, opinions expressed, and the conclusions drawn is entirely of the author. The author is presently associated with the Sarojini Naidu Centre for the Women's Studies, Jamia MilliaIslamia (New Delhi).
2. It is a process of trans-nationalization of production and capital, and standardization of consumer tastes and their legitimization with the help of international institutions like World Bank, IMF and WTO and therefore obviously the process is a move towards a borderless regime of free trade and transactions based on competition. (Oommen, M.A., 2001, Globalization and Poverty: The Indian Case, Malayala Manorama Year Book, p. 563).

How to cite this Article: Venkteshwar, Amit Kumar (2023). Tribal Livelihood in the Age of Globalization: Some Critical Reflections. *Internat. J. Appl. Soc. Sci.*, **10** (5&6) : 328-334.

Commission mentioned, both state and private entities are relentlessly active in the land acquisition in and around of important urban centres³. Reports of several agencies and data⁴, released by the Government of India also depict that almost 5.2 million hectares of land has been increased (21.09 to 26.29 million hectares) in the non-agricultural uses during 1990-91 to 2011-12, primarily increased due to construction of dams and irrigation projects, development of roads, infrastructure, urbanization, deforestation and mining etc. lead to displacement and depriving of livelihood without physical relocation. During 1980-2014, about 35 per cent of total diverted land belong to forest land (4.19 lac hectare out of 11.89 lac hectare) acquired by the central government. Bhalla (2014) staunchly mentioned that, during the last three decades (1980-81 to 2010-2011)⁵, more than two million hectares per decade of agricultural land has been shifted to non-agricultural uses. Moreover, under the pressures of neo-liberal policies, several laws were amended or promulgated overnight in an unseemly haste to create investor-friendly conditions, regardless of what happened to the livelihoods of the dependent people whose lands will be acquired for a pittance (Mathur, 2008). Thus, this paper primarily discusses and analyses the changes in the lives and livelihoods of the tribal people (rural) which have caused due to neo-liberal policies and the aggressive spread of capitalist relations in tribal dominated areas.

METHODOLOGY

The present study is based on the secondary sources comprise of various articles from journals and books, various survey rounds of the National Sample Survey Organisation (NSSO), the Censuses of India, Parliamentary debates, Annual Reports published by Government of India like Ministry of Rural Development and Ministry of Tribal Affairs; and by Non-Governmental Organization like Centre for Science and Environment. Various used data in this study have been taken from studies conducted by independent researchers and

reports published.

Understanding Tribal Livelihood: Salient Features and Issues:

It is very difficult to define the economic system of tribes because the economic life of tribal communities is highly intermingled with their socio-cultural activities. So their social actions and economic activities become interdependent to each other. Hence the economic system of tribal could not be understood as scientifically as modern economic system. Despite these limitations, however, some scholars have tried to do so. According to George Dalton,

“All societies have structured arrangements to provide the material means of individual and community life. It is these structured rules that we call an economic system” (Dalton, 1971, p.89).

Traditionally, tribal communities in India follow an economy that is based around their nature and use indigenous technology. It reflects their dependency on the natural resources like forests, water, land, etc. which is easily available in their surroundings. Some scholars have provided typology of traditional patterns of tribal livelihood in different ways. For example, Majumdar and Madan has provided six fold classification of traditional tribal livelihood patterns such as activities of hunting and food gathering, shifting cultivation, settled agriculture, pastoralist, handicraft and industrial labour (Majumdar and Madan, 1970). J.H. Hutton has divided tribes on the basis of their livelihood patterns. According to him, tribes earn their livelihood from the forest based activities, hunting, fishing, pastoral, agricultural, and industrial activities (Vidhyarthi and Rai, 1985). The pattern of tribal livelihood as suggested by L.P. Vidhyarthi is as follows: forest, shifting cultivation, simple artisan, plain agriculture nomadic activities, folk artist, agricultural and non-agricultural labour, skilled job, and trading activities (Ibid). Though, it should be kept in mind that these typology or classification of tribal livelihood patterns should not be accepted in the regard of all tribes in particular as such

-
3. The Planning Commission of India has mentioned that since economic liberalization conversion of large tracks of agricultural land for the purpose of commercial and real estates have been noticed (Report of the sub-group on land related issues, Planning Commission, Government of India, 2007, pp.128-131).
 4. Data calculated from land use statistics from Directorate of Economics and Statistics, Ministry of Agriculture, Government of India. Data extracted from <http://eands.dacnet.nic.in/>.
 5. Bhalla, Sheila (2014), ‘Scarce Land: Issues, Evidence and Impact’, in *Institute for Human Development, Working Paper Series*, pp.5, retrieved from, <http://www.ihdindia.org/working%20papers/2014/Sheila%20Bhalla.pdf>, accessed on 30-03-2015.

because each tribe has their own means of survival on the basis of their geographic, ecological and economic circumstances. But it is also true that given typology to a great extent provides a generalized picture of tribal livelihood pattern.

Over the period, the tribal economic system and their livelihood approaches have experienced significant changes. Since the tribal communities were, traditionally, more reliant on the natural resources available in their habitat, so the changes were more discernable due to the depletion of these resources. Since independence, in the name of national interest, the Government of India initiated various developmental projects like building multipurpose river valley projects, mines, industries, power plants, defence, parks and sanctuaries, etc. which alienated the tribes from their traditional resource base and forced them to search for newer livelihood options. Due to alienation from natural resources and several other reasons like increase in population, lower availability of food, etc. made them dependent on urban markets and for searching of employment, most of the tribal people left their homes and migrated to other areas. Moreover, who did not left their original habitat tried to diversify their livelihood approaches to ensure their sustenance (Xaxa, 2014).

Changes in the ownership: Landlessness and Dispossession:

It is evident from extant literature that land and forests are the major source of the tribal livelihood from the ancient time as well as they are socially and culturally deeply associated with these resources (Preet, 1994). Tribal do pay tribute to mother earth through various religious practices. Unlike other societies tribal society is

heterogeneous which differs in terms of culture, social and economic aspects from one tribe to another. It is meant that one tribe depends for its livelihood on shifting cultivation, another on the settled cultivation, others on forest gathering. So, there can be variations in the patterns of traditional livelihood depending on geographical locations and social norms (Vidyarthi and Rai, 1985). Despite all the differences, it can be said that land is the vital component of tribal livelihood pattern. Hence, the size of landholdings and its possession become more significant to understand the adverse changes which have caused due to neo-liberal policies in the tribal livelihood has been discussed as follows.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The Table 1 reveals that landlessness among rural tribal households has increased. As well as the proportion of such tribal households who have ever cultivated any kind of land has also declined. Such kind of trends are showing the increasing pauperization among substantial section of tribal communities.

The data reflect that the share of rural tribal households who do not own any kind of land, not even homestead or bari⁶ land has increased from 16 per cent of all tribal households in 1987-88 to 24 per cent in 2011-12. An important classification is also of those rural tribal households who have land whether they own it or not. This classification includes those tribal households who have some piece of land in their possession, whether it is taken on lease, whether it is being cultivated or occupied in some way and so on, but they do not have the ownership papers of this land. In this category, the increase has also noticed from 13 per cent in 1987-88 to

Table 1: Proportion of Tribal Households that did not own, possess and cultivate any land (in %)			
Year	Households that did not own any land	Households that did not possess/have any land	Households that did not cultivate any land
1987-88	16	13	28
1993-94	19	13	30
1999-2000	10	7	32
2004-05	24	23	34
2009-10	24	31	39
2011-12	24	25	39

Notes: Data on ownership and possession of land cover all types of land. For consistency over different rounds of NSS surveys, only landholdings above 0.01 hectare were counted.

Source: Based on unit-level data from various rounds of the NSSO's Surveys of Employment and Unemployment.

6. Which is used for backyard gardening and very common in the rural areas.

Table 2: Changes in numbers of Operational Holdings among Scheduled Tribes					(In %)
Types of holding	1995-96	2000-01	2005-06	2010-11	2015-16
Marginal	45.95	47.1	49.48	53.9	56.26
Small	24.53	25.64	25.62	23.97	23.46
Semi-medium	18.67	17.58	16.44	14.88	13.98
Medium	9.43	8.32	7.38	6.33	5.55
Large	1.42	1.36	1.08	0.92	0.75
Total	100	100	100	100	100

Source: Agricultural Censuses of various years

25 per cent in 2011-12 (the estimation for 2009-10 was too serious, at 31 %), so the situation is more frightening. The increase in the proportion of tribal households who do not cultivate any kind of land is also more alarming. Its number has increased from 28 per cent in 1987-88 to 39 per cent in 2011-12. Thus, in the last two decades, landlessness and dispossession have become a significant feature among rural tribal households.

Table 2 shows the data on the distribution of operational land holdings of land managed by the tribal households by their size-classes of landholdings, from 1995-96 to 2015-16.

There is an increase in the numbers of marginal land holdings category, although it reduced among all other category, due to the mutual division of the property between the next generations. It shows the grim situation among tribal in landholding category. It would also be interesting to know that the trend of increasing among the marginal holdings has also been reported in the several reports of the NSSO. According to the NSSO Report, “the percentage of marginal holdings among tribal household was 67 per cent in 1982; which increased from 67 to 72 per cent in the year of 1992; again it increased from 72 to 80 per cent in 2003⁷”. Marginal holding is meant for the area which is less than or equal to 1.000 hectare.

On the issue of increasing landlessness and dispossession among rural tribal areas, several scholars have come forward with their arguments. Prasad mentioned that, due to mainly three reasons landlessness and dispossession has increased in the tribal areas. These are as follows: first, to make distress sales; second, to give up a part of their lands due to indebtedness; third, the increase in the encroachment of lands (Prasad, 2010). In the age of neo-liberalism, mining activities has increased in the state and it caused for the emerging of

several new industries. It has caused further dispossession of tribe's land (Areeparampil, 2002). Karat and Rawal argued that, in the era of globalization state sponsored appropriation and illegal land-grabbing are the major reason of dispossession of the tribal households. In the name of state control over mineral resources, mineral rich land has been taken over by the state and “leased” to the private sector, including foreign and domestic corporations (Karat and Rawal, 2014). Deshingkar *et al.* argued that, the on-going development activities are capitalistic in their nature and setting up any industry in the tribal areas is to driven by maximization of their profits. Because natural resources are found easily in these regions as well as best utilization of surplus labour is possible. So, all these developmental activities have resulted into environmental degradation, de-peasantisation, dispossession and loss of livelihood of tribal communities (Deshingkar *et al.*, 2006).

Increasing in the landlessness and dispossession among the tribal people was the major reason of transformation in the occupational structure *i.e.* tribal cultivators turned as agricultural labourers or industrial daily wage workers (Prasad, 2014). This harsh truth is also substantiated by the Raghuram Rajan Committee which was constituted in 2013 on the Composite Development Index of States.

Changes in Occupational Structure:

Tribes were mainly dependent on the forest and land for their sustenance. An analysis of the Census data reveals that there has been an occupational change and the over the period of time, number of tribal cultivators has reduced while the number of tribal marginal worker has increased. Hence, changes in the occupational structure of the tribes become an important issue at the present time which helps to analyse the current situation

7. NSS Land and Livestock Holdings Survey, 59th Round, 2003.

Table 3: Occupational Classification of Main Workers (in %)

Year	Cultivator			Agricultural Labourer			Household Industry			Other Workers		
	SC	ST	OSG	SC	ST	OSG	SC	ST	OSG	SC	ST	OSG
1961	37.76	68.18		34.48	19.71		6.56	2.47		21.20	9.64	
1971	27.87	57.56		51.74	33.04		3.31	1.03		17.06	8.37	
1981	28.17	54.43		48.22	32.67		3.31	1.42		20.30	11.8	
1991	25.44	54.50		49.06	32.69		2.41	1.04		23.08	11.7	
2001	20.0	44.7	32.5	45.6	36.9	20.7	3.9	2.1	4.6	30.5	16.3	42.2

Note: OSG denotes Other Social Group

Source: From Statism to Neo-Liberalism edited by V. Upadhyay and Shakti Kak, p.260

of the tribal communities in the Indian society.

Analysing the Table 3 gives us a comparative picture of occupational pattern among different social groups including Scheduled Tribes. The proportion of STs as a cultivator has decreased from 68.18 per cent of 1961 to 44.7 per cent in 2001. It is much higher than other social group or SC counterparts. Data also reveals that they have fallen into agricultural labourer category from the cultivators over the period of time and it has resulted into increase in the numbers of agricultural labourers from 19.71 per cent of 1961 to 36.9 per cent in 2001. As per the "Report of the Expert Committee on Tribal Health"⁸, tribal people are increasingly moving from being cultivators to agricultural labourers and it has also been stated that in the last decade, about 3.5 million tribal people have left agriculture and agriculture-related activities and entered into the informal labour market. At present, one of every two tribal households relies on manual labour for survival. A comparison between Census 2001 and 2011 depicts that the proportion of cultivators has decreased by 10 per cent and on the other hand the proportion of agricultural labourers has increased by 9 per cent among Scheduled Tribes. As per Census 2011, over two-thirds of the tribal population is still working in the primary sector (as against 43 % of the non-tribal population) and heavily dependent on agriculture either as cultivators or agricultural labourers.

Migration and Livelihood of Tribal

Migration is not a new phenomenon for tribal because in their early stage of civilization, they used to migrate from one place to another place in search of food. The practice of shifting cultivation or Jhum farming and wandering of tribes can also be listed as the best examples of migration in search of livelihoods. In the

age of globalization, the interaction with non-tribal and rapid pace of industrialization, urbanization has given boost to tribal migration. The study of Rao *et al.*, show that recently migration has come out as significant livelihood alternative in tribal areas (Rao *et al.*, 2006, p. 5404). According to the NSSO survey report on migration for the years 1993 to 2007-08 has revealed that the fraction of migrant households of STs was recorded greater than all social groups. The gender issue is also important with the issue of tribal migration because the given NSSO data also reveals that tribals consist the dominant group among female migrants. Circulatory type of migration is a common feature of tribal migration. It is meant that they used to migrate yearly from their home and returning to their home, and sometimes two or more times in a year (Mazumdar, 2014; Karat and Rawal (n.d.)). However, most of the tribal women are engaged with unskilled job, seasonal work like construction works and domestic works in the urban area (Mosse, Gupta and Shah, 2005).

It is evident from extant literature that, development has failed to reach the tribal communities in an adequate and sustainable way which is resulting in increasing migration of tribes to developed areas of India in search of opportunities and livelihood. Several studies stressed that, the period of liberalization witnessed the increasing crisis in the agriculture and allied sector which used to support a large chunk of population and subsequently, due to loss of traditional means of livelihood, underemployment and unemployment in the rural areas get accentuated. Their vulnerability increases as they have meagre physical assets, inability to adapt new economic production methods and prevailing rural infrastructure deprivations, clubbed with the fact that they largely belong to socially deprived groups (Mitra, 2010;

8. Tribal Health in India: Bridging the Gap and a Roadmap for the Future. Ministry of Health and Family Welfare and Ministry of Tribal Affairs, Government of India.

Deshingkar *et al.*, 2006). Some studies (Srivastava and Sasikumar, 2003; Mosse *et al.*, 2002) mentioned that historically poor household migrate extensively searching for livelihood in several regions of India and some new studies reconfirmed the fact that migration is a significant livelihood strategy for poor households especially in the Eastern, Central and Western regions of India which have low agricultural productivity (Mosse *et al.*, 2002; Rogaly *et al.*, 2001, Srivastava, 1998). Since 1980 and onwards, tribal families started to migrate to bigger cities like Delhi, Kolkata and Mumbai. Now-a-days they are driven by poverty and sending unmarried daughters to cities in search of work (Sinha and Mishra, 2012). Census data from some districts in Jharkhand indicate that one out of every two household had a migrant labourer at the beginning of this century (Deogharia, 2012). Kulkarni *et al.* (2013) mention, during lean seasons, tribal women from Adilabad (Andhra Pradesh) migrate to neighbouring districts of Maharashtra to do chili-picking. The recent remarkable feature of tribal migration was noted as massive exodus of single women to cities in search of livelihood and became prone to exploitation; unlike the previous trend where men only migrated to urban centres (Planning Commission, 2010).

Ekka (2005) argues, though migration is universal phenomenon, but its intensity is more evident among tribal communities in Jharkhand. The primary reason of migration is the prevailing stark poverty among tribes. So, migration becomes a survival strategy. And depending upon the intensity of poverty either the whole family or only a few members migrate in search of livelihood. The available data sets and literatures substantiate the argument of Ekka. Temporary migration rate of Jharkhand (36 per 1000) was the second highest in India after Bihar (50 per 1000) (NSS 64th Round), which reveals the intensity of temporary migration, especially amongst the socio-economically deprived groups in rural Jharkhand. The rate is highest amongst the STs (44 per 1000) inhabiting rural Jharkhand (Keshri and Bhagat, 2012). Another study by Disha Foundation reveals, in Jharkhand, 9 out of 10 tribes migrated for livelihood, and out of it 80 per cent preferred interstate migration while rest preferred intra-state migration (Disha Foundation, 2020).

Conclusion:

Tribal are the still confronting with their issue of better livelihood. They are mainly engaged in the primary

sector. Despite the various governments supports, policies and programmes they are lagging behind in the mainstream development. Poverty among this social groups is still very high than others. On the one side agriculture as a profession is not very remarkable for the weaker communities and the other side the number of engaged tribal population is still very high than other communities. Their income level has not increased. Fragmentation and landlessness has also become a matter of concern for tribal population since the past two decades. Dispossession of land has been increasing. Occupational structure has also changed adversely and they fall into the category of agricultural labourers from cultivators. Despite the FRA 2006 and PESA 1996 the restoration of alienated land is very less in tribal dominated states. Hence, they have become the worst victims of the so called development in the neo liberal economy.

The community who are completely dependent on the land for their livelihood get impoverished not only economically but socially and culturally as well. Most of the landless tribal people are completely dependent on the common property resources (CPR) for their maintenance. The loss of the CPR does not show up in the government statistics. Developmental projects harshly affect these landless people. The process of dispossession of tribal land continues much more rampantly today than ever before. This has caused a severe threat to the tribal people's very existence and identity. The gradual increase of the non-tribal people in the tribal dominated areas and the anti-tribal policies of the government have further aggravated the situation.

REFERENCES

- Areeparampil, Mathew (2002). *Tribals of Jharkhand: Victims of Development*, Indian Social Institute, New Delhi.
- Bhalla, Sheila (2014). 'Scarce Land: Issues, Evidence and Impact', in *Institute for Human Development, Working Paper Series*, pp.5
- Dalton, G. (1971). *Economic Anthropology and Development*. New York: Basic Books.
- Deogharia, P.C. (2012). Seasonal Migration from Rural Areas of Jharkhand: A Study of remote Tribal Villages of South Chotanagpur Region. *J. Economic & Social Development*, **8** (1): 49-60.
- Ekka, B. (2005). Social Empowerment vis-à-vis Social Exclusion" in Ekka B. and A. Prasad (Eds.), *Social Empowerment through Development Interventions*. Ranch: Catholic

- Press, pp. 67-69.
- Karat, B. and Rawal, V. (n. d.). *Scheduled Tribe Households: A Note on Issue of Livelihood*. Retrieved October 7, 2022, from <http://www.ras.org.in>.
- Keshri, K. and Bhagat, R. B. (2012). Temporary and Seasonal Migration: Regional pattern, characteristics and associated factors. *Econ. & Political Weekly*, **47** : 81-88.
- Kulkarni P., Das, K. C. and Pardeshi, V. (2013). Understanding Mobility among tribal Population: A Study in Andhra Pradesh, India. *The Maharashtra Association of Anthropological Sciences (MAAS)*.
- Majumdar, D. N. and Madan, T.N. (1974). *An Introduction to Social Anthropology*. Bombay: Asia Publishing House.
- Mathur, H.M. (2008). *India-Social Development Report: Development and Displacement*, Oxford University Press: USA.
- Mazumdar, I. (2014). *Unfree Mobility: Adivasi Women's Migration*. Occasional Paper no 60. Centre for Women's Development Studies.
- Mitra, A. (2010). Migration, Livelihood and Well-being: Evidence from Indian City Slums. *Urban Studies*, **47** (7) : 1371-1390.
- Mosse, D., Gupta, S., Mehta, M., Shah, M., Reej, J. and KRIBP Team (2002). *Brokered Livelihoods: Debt, Labour Migration and Development in Western India*. *J. Development Studies*, **38** : 59-88.
- Mosse, D., Gupta, S. and Shah, V. (2005, Jul. 9-15). On the Margins in the City: Adivasi Seasonal Labour Migration in Western India. *Economic & Political Weekly*, **40**(28) : 3025-3038.
- Oommen, M.A., (2001). *Globalization and Poverty: The Indian Case*, Malayala Manorama Year Book
- Prasad, A. (2010). Neo-Liberalism, Tribal Survival and Agrarian Distress. In *Alternative Economic Survey, India: Two decades of Neo liberalism*. New Delhi: Daanish Books.
- Prasad, A. (2014). *Structural Transformations in Tribal Societies, 1999-2011: Evidence from Least Developed States*.
- Preet, S. (1994, December). Tribal Problem: A Gandhian Perspective. *Indian Anthropologist*, **24**(2) : 29-38
- Rao, S. L., Deshingkar, P. and Farrington, J. (2006, December 30 – 2007, January 5). Tribal Land Alienation in Andhra Pradesh: Processes, Impacts and Policy Concerns. *Economic & Political Weekly*, **41**(52) : 5401-5407.
- Rogaly, B., Biswas, J., Coppard, D., Rafique, A., Rana, K. and Sengupta, A. (2001). Seasonal Migration, Social Change and Migrants' Rights: Lessons from West Bengal. *Economic & Political Weekly*, **36** : 4547-4559.
- Sinha H. and Mishra P. (2012). Seasonal Migration and Children's Vulnerability: Case of Brick Kiln Migration from Ranchi District. *J. Economic & Social Development*, **8** (1): 37-48.
- Srivastava, R. (1998). Migration and the Labour Market in India. *The Indian J. Labour Economics*, **41** (4) : 583-617.
- Srivastava, R. and Sasikumar, S. K. (2003). An overview of migration in India, its impacts and key issues. Paper presented at Regional Conference on Migration, Development and Pro-Poor Policy Choices in Asia, Dhaka
- Vidyarthi, L.P. and Rai, B. N.(1985). *Tribal Culture of India*. New Delhi: Concept Publishing Company.
- Xaxa V. (2014). *Report of the High Level Committee on Socio-Economic, Health and Educational Status of Tribal Communities in India*. Ministry of Tribal Affairs, Government of India

Reports:

- (2003-04). *Annual Report*. Ministry of Tribal Affairs, Government of India.
- (2004-05). *Employment-Unemployment Survey, NSS 61st Round*.
- (January- December 2003). *All India Debt and Investment Survey, NSS 59th Round*
- (July,2007-June,2008). *Migration in India. NSS Report NO.533*.
- Agricultural Censuses of different years*
- Disha Foundation Report (2020). *Tribal Livelihood Migration in India-Situational Analysis, Gap Assessment and Future Directions in 12 States in India*
- Planning Commission Report (2010). *Migration of Tribal Women: Its Socio-Economic Effects- An in-depth Study of Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand, M.P. and Orissa*.
- Report of the Expert Committee on Tribal Health (2013). *Tribal Health in India: Bridging the Gap and a Roadmap for the Future*.
