A Study on Socioeconomic Anaysis of Powerloom Owners in Ichalkaranji City

Anirudha Pandit Kamble[1], Dr. M. M. Munshi[2]

[1]*Ph. D Research Scholar, Assistant Professor, VTU, Belgavi, India*
Email: anirudha.kamble@sanjayghodawatuniversity.ac.in
[2]*Associate Professor, MBA Department, Visveshvaraya Technological University, India.*
Email: mmmunshi@rediffmail.com

This research paper is based on a study that was carried out in the Kolhapur district of Maharashtra's Ichalkaranji city. In the state of Maharashtra, Ichalkaranji is sometimes referred to as Manchester City. This study aims to determine the socioeconomic standing of powerloom owners. For gathering data for the current inquiry, 120 owners in total were chosen. The sample respondents were personally interviewed to obtain the primary data on various socioeconomic variables using pre-written schedules and questionnaires. The socioeconomic position of powerloom owners was examined using Udai Pareek's socioeconomic scale, which combines social and economic factors. The study sheds light on the owners' socioeconomic situation.

Keywords: Socioeconomic status, powerloom owners, Uday Pareek's socioeconomic scale.

1. Introduction

Powerlooms, one of the main sources of income for the Indian textile industry, are used to generate the majority of the country's textiles. India's textile sector is one of the main drivers of the country's economy, making powerloom business important. In India, power looms are used in 58.4% of textile production. The powerloom industry is a major supplier to the country's home textile and ready-to-wear industries. As of April 2022, there were 385,596 powerlooms in India. Maharashtra is the state with the most powerlooms, accounting for 39% of all powerlooms as of April 2022. Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, Uttar Pradesh, Karnataka, and Tamil Nadu are a few of the other states in India that produce many powerloom items.

India is the sixth-biggest exporter of textiles and apparel in the world. This country is home to the second-largest mill sector globally. Powerlooms in India produce a wide range of fabrics, such as blended cotton, synthetic, and other fibers, gray, patterned, and cotton. Throughout India, there are more than 2.6 million powerlooms. With direct and related sectors, powerlooms are one of the main employers in India, where the textile industry employs over 45 million people.

The position of an individual or a group on the socioeconomic scale is referred to as their "socioeconomic status". Many social and economic elements determine this status, such as income, education level and kind, type and prestige of work, place of residence, and, in certain civilizations or portions of society, ethnic origin or religious background. When socioeconomic status is examined, disparities in access to resources and issues with privilege, power, and control are often revealed.

This paper will discussed about socioeconomic status analysis of powerloom owners in Ichalkaranji city. By using Udai Pareek's socioeconomic scale, it has become easy to categorize powerloom owners into different class as mentioned.

2. Objectives

1)   To study the socioeconomic status of powerloom owners in the Ichalkaranji city.

2)   To categorize the socioeconomic class of powerloom owners in the Ichalkaranji city.

3. Research Methodology

The sample powerloom owners were personally interviewed to gather the primary data on a variety of socio-economic factors, including caste, occupation, education, land, social participation, homes, farm power, material possessions, family type, and monthly income. Structured schedules and questionnaires were used for collecting data from respondents. Powerloom owners' socioeconomic position was examined using composite scales, such as the Udai Pareek updated scale-2019, which combines social and economic factors. Upper class, upper middle class, middle class, lower middle class, and lower class socioeconomic status scales for farmers were divided into these categories.

4. Results and Data Analysis

Table No. 1. Socioeconomic Status of Powerloom Owners						
(As per Revised Udai Pareek's SES Scale) n=120						
Sr. No	Variables	Frequency	Percentage	Sr. No	Variables	Frequency	Percentage
	Caste				Occupation		
1)	SC/ Scheduled Caste	25	21	2)	Not doing anything	0	0
	Lower Caste or Subordinate Caste	32	27		Laborer /workers	70	58.5
	Artisan Caste or Craftsman Clade	35	29		Caste occupation or caste based occupation	35	29
	Agriculture Caste or Kunabi	15	12		Business or self employment	0	0
	Prestige Class or higher level	8	7		Independent Profession or Freelancer	0	0
	Dominant Class or	5	4		Cultivation or Growing	15	12.5

	leading social group				Services related occupation	0	0
3)	Education			4)	Land		
	Illiterate or Lack of literacy	16	13		No land	105	87.5
	Can read only	10	8		<1 acre	9	7.5
	Can read and write	8	7		1-5 acre	6	5
	Primary	28	23		5-10 acre	0	0
	Middle	36	30		15-20 acre	0	0
	High School	16	14		>20 acre	0	0
	Graduate and above	6	5				
5)	Social Participation			6)	Material Possessions		
	None	13	11		Bullock cart	0	0
	Member of one organization	107	89		Cycle	37	31
	Member of more than one organization	0	0		Radio	15	12.5
	Office holder in such an organization	0	0		Chairs	84	70
	Wide public leader	0	0		Mobile Phone	90	75
7)	Family Member				Television	110	92
	Up to 5	86	72		Refrigerators	23	19
	>5	34	28				
8)	House			9)	Farm Power		
	No house	62	52		No draft animals	95	79
	Hut	0	0		1-2 draft animals	17	14
	Kutcha house	13	11		3-4 draft animals	8	7
	Mixed house	39	32		5-6 draft animals	0	0
	Pucca house	6	5				
	Mansion	0	0				

(Source – Primary data)

Table No. 2. Distribution of Socioeconomic Status of Respondents (Udai Pareek revised scale-2019)				
Sr. No.	Class	Scale Score	Powerloom Owners	Percentage
1	Upper Class	Above 43	0	0
2	Upper Middle Class	33-42	7	6
3	Middle Class	24-32	97	81
4	Lower Middle Class	13-23	16	13

5	Lower Class	Below 13	0	0

(Source – Table No.1)

5. Data Analysis and Interpretation

Considering the information collected through table No.1 following are the some findings -

1)   Caste - 29% of the respondent powerloom owners are belongs to Artisan caste i.e Hindu - Devang Koshti (Special Backward Class). 27% and 21% of respondents are come from lower and schedule caste background respectively.

2)   Occupation - Almost 58.50% are common Labourer and 29% of respondents are doing their caste occupation.

3)   Education - Education level of powerloom owners are quite satisfactorily. Total 72% of respondents are educated.13 percentage respondents are illiterate.

4)   Land - 87.50 % of respondents are not having any land occupancy with them. 12.50% Powerloom owners those who belongs to rural area they have farming land up to 5 acres.

5)   Social Participation – 89 % of powerloom owners' are connected with Trade Unions.

6)   Material Possessions - Due to availability of easy funding facilities from banks, credit societies, NBFCs and finance companies 92 % of respondents are having television in their home. 75% respondents are possessed mobile phones with them.

7)   Family Members – 72% of respondents said that their family size is limited upto 5 members.

8)   House – 52% of respondents do not have their own house. They prefer to use rented house.

9)   Farm Power – 79% of respondents said that they do not have farm power like draft animals. 21% of respondent Owners are having draft animals with them for the purpose of agriculture and cultivation.

6. Conclusion

it is concluded that, 13% of the powerloom weaver respondents are fall under lower middle class category as per the Udai Pareeks Scale.97 respondents out of 120 (i.e.81%) are under middle class category. Only 6% respondents are belongs to upper middle class. With the help of data analysis and interpretation it is fount that, no powerloom weaver belongs to upper class and lower class category.

References
1.   Digambar, T. N. (1987). Socio economic study of power-loom owners in Vita (Khanapur) dist-Sangli.
2.   Gangadhar, D. K., & Madhuri, N. SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONDITION OF POWERLOOM

OWNERS: A STUDY OF MALEGAON CITY.

3. Holyachi, S., & Santosh, A. (2013). Socioeconomic status scales-An update. Annals of community health, 1(1), 24-27.

4. Kumari, J., Dubey, R., Bose, D. K., & Gupta, V. (2018). A study on socio-economic condition of Tharu tribes in Bahraich district of Uttar Pradesh in India. Journal of Applied and Natural Science, 10(3), 939-944.

5. Majumder, S. (2021). Socioeconomic status scales: Revised Kuppuswamy, BG Prasad, and Udai Pareekh's scale updated for 2021. Journal of Family Medicine and Primary Care, 10(11), 3964.

6. Raju, G. N., & Rao, K. V. (2014). A Study on the Socio-economic Conditions of Handloom Owners. Journal of rural development, 309-328.

7. Singh, T., Sharma, S., & Nagesh, S. (2017). Socio-economic status scales updated for 2017. Int J Res Med Sci, 5(7), 3264-7.

8. Singh, Y. P., & Pareek, U. (1966). Socio-economic characteristics of key-communicators. Sociological Bulletin, 15(1), 52-60.