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#### Abstract

Handloom Industry play vital role in the economic development of the country. In this paper covers that socio-economic conditions of handloom weavers in kothapalli village. Which are age wise, area wise, religion, caste, educational qualification, type of the family, size of family, type of the occupation, type of the house, type of the ration card, land owned, assets owned, loan, monthly income, working status, working hours, experience profile, number of family members involving in weaving, purchase of raw material and type of the loom. To offer the suggestions for the development of handloom industry.
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## Introduction:

Handloom Industry is an ancient cottage industry with a decentralized setup. It is one of the largest economic activities after agriculture, providing direct employment to more than 43 lakhs, indirectly 1 crore people. There are totally 30 lakhs handlooms in the whole world, 85 percent of handlooms representedly to 23.77 lakhs looms located in India. Out of this, 19.96 looms are in the Rural Areas, while 3.80 lakhs looms are in the urban areas. This sector contributes nearby $15 \%$ of the total cloth produced in the country and also contributes to the export earning Rs.3,000Crores, $95 \%$ of the world Handloom fabric comes from India.
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## Review of Literature:

IANS (2011)has noted that Indian consumers need to think 'swadeshi' rather than 'videshi'. The greatest tragedy weavers' face is being ignored not just by people but by designers as well. The fashion industry is a very powerful platform to convey the message across the masses that fashion is more than chic dressing there has to be an essence to it.

Prachi (2010) has observed that Indian handloom is growing in its popularity not only among the people in India, but also among the people admiring Indian handloom and Indian handicrafts from around the globe. In spite of having distinct styles and ways of weaving, there is a lot of exchange of styles that happened among the diverse Indian handloom styles.

ShijinaShiji (2009) has marked that the weaving process is central to the quality of the handloom rugs and carpets is an age-old profession practiced by village artisans, who under threat of closure as they are encountering stiff competition globally from powerloom Units.

## Objectives of the Study:

The study will focus on the following objectives:

1. To study the overview of Handloom Industry.
2. To examine the Socio-Economic Conditions of Handloom Weavers.
3. To offer suggestions for the development of the Handloom Industry

## Scope of the Study:

The study broadly examines the Socio-Economic Conditions of Handloom Weaver in Kothapalli Village from 2013-2018. i.e., 5 years period.

## Methodology:

Sources of Data: The required data has been collected using both the primary and secondary data.

Primary Data: The main source of the primary data are the weavers themselves and executive members of the societies by serving a structured questionnaire a part from this, personal interviews, group discussions and observations methods were used in collecting the first hand information

Secondary Data: Secondary data for the study has been collected using published reports by the government, departments, offices Centre's consequently with the industry, published research papers in the reputed journals, books, thesis and dissertation and wisiting websites relating to the presented research.

## Tools of Data Analysis:

The collected data has been classified, tabulated and summarized in a significant manner. For the data analysis simple statistical tools have been used such as percentages and averages.

Sample Design: The selected 100 Respondents from Kothapalli Village.

## Limitations of the Study:

However, the present Article is not free from the following limitations:

1. The study is essentially a micro level study.
2. The information through the questionnaires may not have covered correct figures Socio-Economic Conditions of Handloom Weavers in Kothapalli Village.
3. The opinions and expressions of weavers are based on the personal experience with the societies.

## DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

An attempt is made in this paper is to examine the socio-economic conditions of handloom weavers focusing on the basis of age wise, area wise, religion, caste, educational qualification, type of the family, size of family, type of the occupation, type of the house, type of the ration card, land owned, assets owned, loan, monthly income, working status, working hours, experience profile, number of family members involving in weaving, purchase of raw material and type of the loom.

TABLE - 1
AGE WISE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS

| AGE (YEARS) | NO.OF RESPONDENTS | PERCENTAGE |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| BELOW 40 | 0 | 0 |
| $41-50$ | 15 | 15 |
| $51-60$ | 60 | 60 |
| ABOVE 60 | 25 | 25 |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |

Source: Field survey

The above table shows the Age wise distribution of Respondents.15\% of the Respondents are in the age group of 41-50, $60 \%$ of the Respondents in the age group of 51-60 and $25 \%$ of the Respondents in the age group of above 60 years.

The majority of Respondents in the age group of 51-60 years are $60 \%$.

## TABLE -2

## AREA WISE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS

| AREA | NO.OF RESPONDENTS | PERCENTAGE |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| RURAL | 75 | 75 |
| URBAN | 25 | 25 |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |

Source: Field survey
From the above table shows the Area wise distribution of Respondents. 75\% of the Respondents belonging to Rural area and $25 \%$ of the Respondents belonging to Urban area. The majority of Respondents belonging to Rural area 75\%.

TABLE - 3
RELIGION WISE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS

| RELIGION | NO.OF RESPONDENTS | PERCENTAGE |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| HINDU | 95 | 95 |
| MUSLIM | 0 | 0 |
| CHRISTIAN | 5 | 5 |
| OTHERS | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |

Source: Field survey
From the above table shows the Religion wise distribution of Respondents. $95 \%$ of the Respondents belonging to Hindu religion, 5\% of the Respondents belonging to Christian religion and there are no respondents belonging to Muslim religion.

The majority of Respondents belonging to Hindu religion 95\%.

TABLE - 4
CASTE WISE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS

| CASTE | NO.OF RESPONDENTS | PERCENTAGE |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| BC | 100 | 100 |
| SC | 0 | 0 |
| ST | 0 | 0 |
| OC | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |

Source: Field survey
From the above table shows the Caste wise distribution of Respondents $100 \%$ of the Respondents belonging to BC and there is no Respondents are SC, ST and OC.
The majority of Respondents belonging to BC $100 \%$.

TABLE -5
EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION OF THE RESPONDENTS

| EDUCATIONAL <br> QUALIFICATION | NO.OF <br> RESPONDENTS | PERCENTAGE |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| ILLITERATE | 60 | 60 |
| PRIMARY LEVEL (1-5) | 40 | 40 |
| SECONDARY LEVEL (6-10) | 0 | 0 |
| HIGHER SECONDARY (10-12) | 0 | 0 |
| HIGHER EDUCATION (13-15) | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |

Source: Field survey
From the above table shows the Educational qualification of the Respondents. $60 \%$ of the Respondents are illiterate and $40 \%$ of the Respondents studied primary level.
The majority of Respondents are illiterate $60 \%$.

TABLE - 6
TYPE OF THE FAMILY

| TYPE OF THE FAMILY | NO.OF RESPONDENTS | PERCENTAGE |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| NUCLEAR | 95 | 95 |
| JOINT | 5 | 5 |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |

Source: Field Survey
From the above table shows the Type of the family $95 \%$ of the Respondents live in the Nuclear family and remaining 5\% Respondents live with the Joint family.
The majority of Respondents live in the Nuclear family $95 \%$.

TABLE - 7
SIZE OF THE FAMILY

| FAMILY SIZE | NO. OF RESPONDENTS | PERCENTAGE |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| SMALLL(up to 3) | 5 | 5 |
| MEDIUM(4-6) | 85 | 85 |
| LARGE(above 6) | 10 | 10 |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |

Source: Field survey
Family size and system are important features that contributed to the family income. It is found that the Joint family still prevails in the weavers, community with 4-6 members. The weaving occupation is one such profession which involves all family members from children to elders who contribute their valuable service in pre-weaving, weaving and post-weaving process.
From the above table shows the Size of the family. 5\% of the Respondents family size small, $85 \%$ of the Respondents family size medium, $10 \%$ of the Respondents family size large.

The majority of the Respondents family size medium 85\%.

TABLE - 8
TYPE OF THE OCCUPATION

| TYPE OF THE <br> OCCUPATION | NO. OF RESPONDENTS | PERCENTAGE |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| HEREDITARY | 95 | 95 |
| NON HEREDITARY | 5 | 5 |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |

Source: Field survey
From the above table shows the Type of the occupation $95 \%$ of the Respondents are occupied by Hereditary and 5\% of the Respondents are still to be Non-Hereditary.
The majority of Respondents are occupied weaving from Hereditary 95\%.
TABLE - 9
TYPE OF THE HOUSE

| HOUSE | NO. OF RESPONDENTS | PERCENTAGE |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| BUILDING | 0 | 0 |
| REKULA SHED | 20 | 20 |
| TILES | 60 | 60 |
| KUCHA | 5 | 5 |
| RENT OR LEASE | 15 | 15 |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |

Source: Field survey
From the above table shows the Type of the house. 20\% of the Respondents are living in the Shed, $60 \%$ of the Respondents are living in the Tiles, $5 \%$ of the Respondents are living in the Kucha and $15 \%$ of the Respondents are living in the Rent or Lease house.

The majority of Respondents living in the Tiles $60 \%$.

TABLE - 10
TYPE OF THE RATION CARD

| RATION CARD | NO.OF RESPONDENTS | PERCENTAGE |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| ANTODAYA ANNA <br> YOJANA (AAY) CARD | 60 | 60 |
| BELOW POVERTY LINE <br> (BPL) CARD | 40 | 40 |
| ABOVE POVERTY LINE <br> (APL) CARD | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |

Source: Field survey
From the above table shows the Type of the family. $60 \%$ of the Respondents are having Antodaya Anna Yojana (AAY) card and $40 \%$ of the Respondents are having Below Poverty Line (BPL) card.

The majority of the Respondents are having Antodaya Anna Yojana (AAY) card 60\%.

TABLE - 11
LAND OWNED

| LAND(ACRES) | NO. OF RESPONDENTS | PERCENTAGE |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| NILL | 70 | 70 |
| BELOW 1 | 20 | 20 |
| $1-2$ | 10 | 10 |
| $2-4$ | 0 | 0 |
| 4 ABOVE | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |

Source: Field survey
From the above table shows the Land owned. 70\% of the Respondents doesn't have the land, $20 \%$ of the Respondents have below 1(Acer) of land and $10 \%$ of the Respondents having 12(Acers) of land.

The majority of Respondents doesn't have any Land 70\%.

TABLE - 12
ASSETS OWNED

| CATEGORY OF ASSETS | NO. OF RESPONDENTS | PERCENTAGE |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| MOTOR CYCLE | 20 | 20 |
| BICYCLE | 80 | 80 |
| CAR | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |

Source: Field survey
The above table shows the Assets owned. 20\% of the Respondents are using Motor cycle and $80 \%$ of the Respondents are using Bicycle.

The majority of Respondents are using Bicycle $80 \%$.

TABLE - 13
LOAN

| LOAN | NO. OF <br> RESPONDENTS | PERCENTAGE |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| BANK | 60 | 60 |
| MICRO FINANCE | 20 | 20 |
| FINANCIAL INSTIUTIONS | 0 | 0 |
| OTHERS(FRIENDS/RELATIONS) | 20 | 20 |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |

Source: Field survey
The above table shows the $60 \%$ of the Respondents taking Loan in bank, $20 \%$ of the Respondents are taking Loan in Micro Finance and 20\% of the Respondents are taking Loan from the others.

The majority of Respondents are taking Loan from the Bank $60 \%$.

TABLE-14
MONTHLY INCOME OF RESPONDENTS

| MONTHLY INCOME | NO. OF RESPONDENTS | PERCENTAGE |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Below 2000 | 20 | 20 |
| $2000-4000$ | 80 | 80 |
| $4000-6000$ | 0 | 0 |
| $6000-8000$ | 0 | 0 |
| 8000 above | 0 | 0 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |

Source: Field survey
The above table shows the Monthly income of the Respondents $.20 \%$ of the Respondents are earning below 2000 and $80 \%$ of the Respondents are earning 2000-4000.

The majority of the Respondents are earning 2000-4000 in 80\%.

## TABLE - 15

WORKING STATUS

| TYPE OF WEAVER | NO. OF RESPONDENTS | PERCENTAGE |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Independent weaver | 15 | 15 |
| Weaver under middle man | 0 | 0 |
| Co-operative society weaver | 80 | 80 |
| Master weaver | 5 | 5 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |

Source: Field survey
From the above table shows the Working status. 15\% of the Respondents are independent weaver, $80 \%$ of the Respondents are co-operative society weaver and 5\% of the Respondents are master weaver.

The majority of Respondents are Co-operative society weaver $80 \%$.

TABLE - 16
WORKING HOURS

| WORKING HOURS PER DAY | NO. OF <br> RESPONDENTS | PERCENTAGE |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Below 8 hrs | 65 | 65 |
| $8-10 \mathrm{hrs}$ | 20 | 20 |
| $10-15 \mathrm{hrs}$ | 15 | 15 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |

Source: Field survey
From the above table shows the Working hours. $65 \%$ of the Respondents are engaged in weaving for below $8 \mathrm{hrs}, 20 \%$ of the Respondents are engaged in weaving for 8-10 hrs and $15 \%$ of the Respondents are engaged in weaving for $10-15 \mathrm{hrs}$.

The majority of Respondents are engaged in weaving for below 8 hrs (65\%).

TABLE - 17
EXPERIENCE PROFILE

| YEARS | NO. OF RESPONDENTS | PERCENTAGE |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Below 10 | 0 | 0 |
| $10-20$ | 0 | 0 |
| $20-30$ | 15 | 15 |
| $30-40$ | 60 | 60 |
| 40 ABOVE | 25 | 25 |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |

Source: Field survey
From the above table shows the Experience profile. 15\% of the Respondents are weaving experience 20-30 years, $60 \%$ of the Respondents are weaving experience $30-40$ years and $25 \%$ of the Respondents are weaving experience above 40 years.

The majority of the Respondents are weaving experience $30-40$ years in $60 \%$

TABLE - 18
NO. OF FAMILY MEMBERS INVOLVING IN WEAVING

| MEMBERS | NO.OF RESPONDENTS | PERCENTAGE |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| ONE | 10 | 10 |
| TWO | 90 | 90 |
| THREE | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |

## Source: Field survey

From the above table shows the No. of family members involving in weaving. $10 \%$ of the Respondents are one family members involving in weaving and $90 \%$ of the Respondents are two family members involving in weaving.

The majority of Respondents are two family members involving in weaving $90 \%$.

TABLE - 19
PURCHASE OF RAW MATERIAL

| PURCHASE OF RAW <br> MATERIAL | NO. OF RESPONDENTS | PERCENTAGE |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| LOCAL RAW MATERIAL <br> DEALER | 15 | 15 |
| DIRECT PURCHASED | 5 | 5 |
| CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETY | 80 | 80 |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |

Source: Filed survey
The above table shows Purchase of raw material $15 \%$ of the Respondents purchased Raw material from local raw material dealer, 5\% of the Respondents purchased Raw material from direct purchased and $80 \%$ of the Respondents purchased Raw material from co-operative society.

The majority of Respondents purchased Raw material from Co-operative society $80 \%$.

TABLE - 20
TYPE OF THE LOOM

| TYPE OF THE LOOM | NO.OF RESPONDENTS | PERCENTAGE |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| TRADITIONAL | 0 | 0 |
| THROW SHUTTLE | 0 | 0 |
| FLY SHUTTLE PIT | 15 | 15 |
| FLY SHUTTLE FRAME | 85 | 85 |
| JACQUARD | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |

Source: Filed survey
The above table shows the $15 \%$ of the Respondents are using fly shuttle pit loom and $85 \%$ of the Respondents are using fly shuttle frame loom.

The majority of Respondents are using fly shuttle frame loom $85 \%$.

## Summary of Findings:

The following are the summary of findings presented below:

1. $60 \%$ Respondents are age group 51-60 years.
2. $75 \%$ Respondents belongs to rural area.
3. $95 \%$ Respondents belongs to hindu religion.
4. $100 \%$ Respondents belongs to BC.
5. $60 \%$ Respondents are illiterate.
6. $95 \%$ Respondents are live in the nuclear family.
7. $85 \%$ Respondents family size medium.
8. $95 \%$ Respondents are occupied weaving from hereditary.
9. $60 \%$ Respondents are living in the tiles.
$10.60 \%$ Respondents are having antodayaannayojana card.
$11.70 \%$ Respondents are doesn't have any land.
10. $80 \%$ Respondents are using bicycle.
$13.60 \%$ Respondents are taking loan from bank.
$14.80 \%$ Respondents are earning 2000-4000.
11. $80 \%$ Respondents are co-operative society weavers.
12. $65 \%$ Respondents are engaged in weaving for 8 hours.
$17.60 \%$ Respondents are weaving experience $30-40$ years.
$18.90 \%$ Respondents are two family members in weaving.
13. $80 \%$ Respondents are purchased raw material from co-operative society.
$20.80 \%$ Respondents are using fly shuttle loom.

## Suggestions:

After going through the above summary of findings the following suggestions are offered for the development of handloom Industry.

1. State and Central governments should strictly implement the handloom Reservation Act 1985, which helps not to copy the handloom reserved items by mills and powerlooms.
2. Most of the children of handloom weavers are not continuing for higher education, for encouraging them, the Telangana government has to take some measures in order to improve the educational standards of children as the Tamilnadu government implementing scholarship programme (MGR Handloom Education Fund) in supporting the children of handloom weavers (Approximately Rs 3,000 per month paid each student).
3. Government has to provide Anthyodaya Anna Yoajana (AAY) card, construction of pucca houses, at least three acers of land (like provided to SCs and STs) schemes to handloom weavers.
4. It is suggested the Banks (SIDBI, IDBI, ICICI, NABARD and DCCB) to increase loan amount from Rs. 10,000 to 50,000 per year, with no interest or 0.25 paisa interest like farmers and DWACRA groups.
5. Government has to purchase the whole stock of handloom cloth in order to fixing minimum price, based on the quality of cloth.
6. Government has to ensure to sea all the schemes should implement in an efficient way.
7. Government has to provide raw material directly to the weaver with subsidy and also provide training in order to maintain looms.
8. Central and state governments have to increase budget allocation for handloom industry.
9. Government has intuition in order to increase the handloom melas and exhibitions.
10. Government has to provide marketing facilities, increase TSCO shops or stores and take necessary steps in order to sale the handloom product through e-commerce like amazon, snapdeal and flipkart, etc.
11. It is suggested the government to establish spinning mills and handloom clusters in every district.
12. Government should conduct training programmes to develop new designs for handloom weavers.
13. It is also suggested the Government need to conduct free heath chekup camps regularly and to provide health cards to handloom weavers.
14. Government need to increase compensation for suicide victims.
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