

## **Hierarchy, Power-relation and Domination in a Handloom ‘Field’**

Tanusree Shaw<sup>1</sup>, Soumi Dey<sup>2</sup> & Arnab Das<sup>3</sup>

1(Doctoral Researcher, Dept. of Anthropology, University of Calcutta, India)

2(Assistant Professor, Department of Anthropology, Haldia Government Collage, India)

3 (Associate Professor, Dept. of Anthropology, University of Calcutta, India)

---

**Abstract:** Handloom industry is an organization which has some essential characteristics such as technology rules, regulation, hierarchical organization of different actors (namely merchant guilds or traders or mahajan and weavers or tanti), power relation between them, and conflict. These components are greatly significant to understand of an industry as a whole. To understand the handloom industry, the present paper has tried to study the hierarchy, power-relation and domination in the handloom weaving industry through the lens of Bourdieu's notion of field, capital and habitus. For this purpose, Murshidabad of West Bengal was selected as a field site. Data were collected through in-depth interviews, participant observation, unstructured interview and case study. For qualitative data like weaving technique, organizational system, social connections, conflict regarding prestige and power 150 participants (100 weavers and 50 mahajans or merchant) were selected according to the available informed consents. Some numerical data like literacy rate, monthly income, types of loom, categories of the weavers, and possession of the loom have covered so far total 142 households on the same basis of informed consent. Quantitative and qualitative data were analysed through the percentage scoring and interpretative analysis respectively. It is found that mahajans possess and compete for all four forms of capital (economic, cultural, social and symbolic) in handloom weaving. The weavers possess strong cultural capital than other resources. Different degree of accumulation of capital formed the hierarchy, power-relation and domination within this industry. This is shaped by their habitus which is produced and reproduced over generations.

**Key words:** Hierarchy, power-relation, domination, Bourdieu, handloom industry

---

### **I. Introduction**

Handloom industry is an organization which has some essential characteristics such as technology, organizational system, rules, regulation, position of different actor namely merchant guilds or traders or mahajan and tanti/weavers, power relation between them, domination, structural hierarchy and conflict. These components are greatly significant to understand of an industry as a whole. The “hierarchy, power-relation and domination are among the most important concerns and characteristics of organisations and institutions” (Jenkins, 1992: 123) [1]. Lake (2007:50) defined hierarchy as a situation “when one unit, the dominant state, possesses authority over a second, subordinate state” [2]. Hierarchy exists when one actor possesses authority over a second. Lake (2009) explained that “authority is understood to emerge from 'practice' based on an exchange of public goods and services by the ruler for compliance and obligation by the ruled” [3].

To understand the hierarchy, power- relation and domination, the present study has selected Bourdieu's notion of field, capital and habitus as an analytical tool. The handloom weaving always acts as a cultural ‘field’ of Bourdieusian sense. According to Bourdieu (1985), cultural ‘field’ consist of series of institutions, rules, rituals, conventions, categories, designations, appointments and titles which constitute an objective hierarchy, and which produce and authorise certain discourses and activities [4]. Thus, cultural ‘field’ is the relationship between people's practices and the contexts in which those practices occur. He refers to discourses, institutions, values, rules and regulations as contexts—which produce and transform attitudes and practices (Bourdieu, 1985, 1990b, 1990c) [5]. In the Handloom weaving ‘field’ mainly two performers are found i.e. mahajan and weaver/ tanti who are related to each other through the network of relationship and these actors are supposed to constitute an objective hierarchy (Bourdieu, 1977, 1990b, 1998) with certain rules and this hierarchy base on the power relation, domination and conflict [6]. There are always conflicts among (social) positions to determine what constitutes capital within that ‘field’, and how those capitals are to be distributed (Bourdieu, 1977, 1986). Capital refers ‘power’ or ‘resources’ or ‘resource of power’. Bourdieu showed that power also takes the forms of resources which he termed as capital that can be created, accumulated, exchanged, and consumed (Swartz, 2005) [7]. Bourdieu (1985: 737) explained that “the structure of the social world is defined at every moment by the structure and distribution of the capital and profits characteristic of the different particular fields” and it is important to work out the correct hierarchy “of the different forms of capital” [4]. The power of an agent to accumulate various forms of capital, and to define those forms as legitimate, is proportionate to their ‘position’

in the social space. In weaving 'field', *mahajans* and *tanti*/weavers possess all the capital (cultural, social, economic and symbolic) but the degree of possession is not same. That's why someone holds more power than others and dominates on the powerless people and takes position on top in the hierarchy. One can hold his position and can sustain his endeavour by the possession of capital. Thus, capital(s) play very imperative role any individual's life to obtain a position in the society.

Among different capital, the cultural capital (education, artistic taste, knowledge and skill) serves as a power resource, or a way for groups to remain dominance or to gain status. The *mahajans* possess knowledge of production and marketing or trading whereas weavers possess knowledge and skill of art of weaving and it exists as an embodied state (cultural knowledge), i.e. in the form of long-lasting dispositions of the mind and body and that becomes an integral part of their endowments and dispositions, i.e., what Bourdieu labels as habitus. The accumulation of cultural capital in its embodiment begins in early childhood and it requires 'pedagogical action', i.e. the investment of time by parents, other family members to sensitize the child to cultural distinctions (Cheung and Andersen, 2003; Lareau, 2003) [8]. Adoption of weaving art is of course a time consuming process. They hardened to unable to spend much time simultaneously with schooling. So, possession of cultural capital by means of education is not essential either to sustain in this community or to hold a position in a structure. Embedded knowledge and skill gained through learning, experience and connections (social capital) is the important. Next, the social capital is very much required resources to acquire success in handloom weaving industry. Individual's 'social capital' might consist of institutionalized networks which hold together only by the material or cultural exchanges between their members. The individual's amount of social capital depends on how large network of relations he/she effectively can mobilize and on the volume of capital (cultural, economic and symbolic), each member of the network possesses (Bourdieu, 1986) [9]. Besides the cultural and social capital, the economic capital is fundamental assets to run a business. It is the most liquid capital in that it may be more readily converted into other capitals (Rudd, 2003) [10]. Otherwise, one capital easily converts into another capital when it exercises. Bourdieu (1986) refers to 'economic capital' as income and other financial resources and assets [9]. Weavers do not have as much wealth like *Mahajans*. So, weavers do not engage themselves in production and marketing 'field'. The fourth form of capital i.e. symbolic capital designates the effects of any form of capital when people do not perceive them as such. The underlying principles of symbolic capital is that individuals derive their existence by living through other's points of view, they become entrapped in a web of total dependence on how others perceive them and how others define who they 'really' are (Bourdieu, 2000a:166) [11]. Bourdieu defined, "Symbolic capital is a credit; it is the power granted to those who have obtained sufficient recognition to be in a position to impose recognition" (Bourdieu, 1989) [12]. The possession of symbolic capital is a product of domination. According to Swartz, Bourdieu believed this form of capital "legitimizes domination through social ranking or distinction, allowing symbolic systems to fulfil a political function" (Swartz, 1997:83) [13]. Bourdieu showed symbolic order excludes the possibility of an equitable return which is structured (habitus). This structure is accompanied by the construction of a kind of common historical transcendental, i.e. common symbolic frames of thought, understanding and/or a certain kind of reason, which after a long process of incorporation becomes immanent to all its 'subjects' (Kalpagam, 2006) [14]. It is a universal capital because any form of the fundamental (or structural) types of capital discussed above has its own mode of symbolic (or representational) capital (Bourdieu, 1985) [4].

In handloom weaving 'field', *mahajan* possess more social, economic and symbolic capital than weavers. Weavers possess art of weaving (how to weave perfectly) but they do not have enough social, economic and symbolic capital to get position like *mahajan*. Automatically, *mahajan* have power to exercise control over weavers by means of domination. The dominant have more possession of capital than the dominated (Bourdieu, 1984) [15]. Bourdieu termed as it Symbolic power. According to Bourdieu's definition, "symbolic power is a power of constructing reality", it is "invisible power which can be exercised only with the complicity of those who do not want to know that they are subject to it or even that they themselves exercise it" (Bourdieu, 1985: 164) [4]. Symbolic power is a subordinate power: it is a transformed, i.e. not recognized, transfigured and legitimated form of other forms of power, similarly as transmutation of the different kinds of capital (economic, cultural or social) into symbolic one. The power is something that can be accumulated or lost. Bourdieu (1985:164) told that "Agents possess power in proportion to their symbolic capital, i.e. in proportion to the recognition they receive from group" [4]. One class dominates another (symbolic violence) by bringing their own distinctive power to bear on the relations of power which underlie them (Bourdieu, 1985: 167) [4]. Dominated group or class are "always tends to set the specific capital, to which it owes its position, at the top of the hierarchy of principles of hierarchization" (Bourdieu, 1985:168) [4].

Practices generated by dispositions, perceptions and appreciations that can be objectively adapted to their outcomes without presupposing a conscious aiming at ends. Power as domination is internalised as part of the habitus. Bourdieu claimed that "the effectiveness of power as domination is enhanced by its 'naturalization,' where what is arbitrary and unequal appears to actors as natural and objective, and by the 'misrecognition' of its origins and modes of operation" (Lukes, 1974:146) [16]. In the weaving field, habitus develops through

practical engagement with weaving culture. *Mahajans* and weavers are habituated with their practices and action. The distinctive practices of habitus are imprinted and encoded in a socializing process that commences during early entry into the weaving field. It is during this socialization process that the 'practical transmission' of 'knowledge' via older generations' and peers' effects, and observation, become embodied. It is transformed into structure habitus. The habitus is always 'of the moment', brought out when a set of dispositions meets a particular problem, choice or context. Finally, habitus operates at a level that is at least partly unconscious, in a sense, entirely arbitrary; there is nothing natural or essential about the values we hold, the desires we pursue, or the practices in which we engage (Bourdieu, 1992) [17]. Thus, habitus is both the "embodiment of our social location" (i.e., class, ethnicity, race, sexuality, gender, generation, and nationality) (Noble & Watkins, 2003: 522) [18] and "the structure of social relations that generate and give significance to individual likes (or taste) and dislikes with regard to practice and action" (Lalonde, 1995:136) [19].

## II. Objective

The present study has tried to understand the hierarchy, power-relation and domination in the handloom weaving industry through the lens of Bourdieu's notion of field, capital and habitus.

## III. Methodology

This research selected purposively Murshidabad (eastern region) of West Bengal which has global acclaim for handloom silk weaving. In rural area of Murshidabad district, for easier access one community development block and two Gram Panchayats (GP) of this CDB were selected. One weaving village i.e. Mirzapur weaving village which comprises both the areas Mirzapur and Bijoypur was selected as a field site. The Mirzapur village is situated in the Mirzapur Gram Panchayat, block- Raghunath Gange-1, Mouza-Mirzapur, Post Office - Gankar and J.L. no is 131. It is small weaver village where total population is 4204 among whom males are 2171 and females are 2033 (Census Report, 2001) [20]. Mirzapur silk weavers are predominantly of Hindu *Tanti* caste. There are 142 weaving households. Total population is about 603, of which 332 are males and 271 are females (household survey, January 2011), all of them depend on weaving. In this village, there are different caste groups but all weavers are '*tantubay*' in caste.

Total 142 household has taken for knowing their socio-demographic profile such as literacy rate, monthly income, types of loom, categories of the weavers, and possession of the loom. For knowing the qualitative data like weaving technique (cultural capital), the organizational system (field), the social connections (social capital), the conflict regarding prestige (symbolic capital), capital and power and between groups and individuals, data were collected through the in-depth interview, participant observation and case study. For this purpose 200 participants (150 *tanti*/weavers and 50 *mahajan*) were selected. Quantitative and qualitative data were analysed through the percentage score and interpretative analysis respectively.

## IV. Structure of the 'Field'

Bourdieu (1985) believe that 'field' is a space of relations rather than that of structures [4]. These relationships exist apart from an individual's consciousness or will. In Murshidabad, the handloom weaving community is totally based on the relationship between the *mahajan* and the *tanti*/weaver who are occupying different positions with different roles connected to each other in weaving practice.

This term '*Mahajan*' is very popular in Murshidabad. *Mahajan* means an entrepreneurial group who invest their capital in the several stages from production to trading. These stages include buying of raw material, colouring and preparing threads, weaving, polishing and at last marketing of the finished product. *Mahajan* is only investor of Murshidabad. The weavers or *tantis* takes raw material (yarn) from the *mahajan*. After finishing the product, it is taken to the *mahajan*. The *mahajan* sends it to the local market, local shops and market outside the locality. There is no marked division (like big, small etc.) among the *mahajans* in Murshidabad for the production of the silk material. They all are same in status and hierarchy. In Mirzapur, *mahajans* have sufficient resource to run at least 10-20 looms and 50 *mahajans* are found.

The second group is weaver, is the class of employee who performs the process of weaving in a network. The local name in Murshidabad is '*Tanti*'. The *mahajan* gives only yarn to the weavers and weavers take it to the home. Weaver's family members mainly women folk help for such works like dyeing, operating the charka and making bobbins. Other works are done by male members. After finishing the product, *mahajan* only pays wage to the weavers. In Murshidabad, three types of weaver found such as weavers who are work under the *mahajan*, independent weavers and cooperative weavers. In the Mirzapur village, most of the weavers 87.32% are under the *mahajan*, 9.15% were independent, and only 3.53% (Table 1) are under the co-operative society's control which is locally named as '*Samitee*' or '*Samabay*'. The independent weavers are economically stronger than those who work under *mahajan*. Unlike the weavers working under *mahajan*, independent weavers' possess own capital. However, the independent weavers are indirectly dependant on the *mahajan* too. Independent weavers buy yarn from market and weave independently but trade their products to the *mahajan*.

*Mahajan* is the only man who would decide the price of the products. The authority of bargaining in this case goes on always in favour of the *mahajan*. An independent weaver is compelled to do so without having any other option as they are not acquainted with the network of market directly. This is the reason why *mahajan* can exploit independent weavers as much as he can. On many occasions, they do not get wage due to any damage appearing on sari at the time of weaving.

*Mahajan* controls over the weavers in a way i.e. the '*Dadan*' System. The local name of this kind of a system varies. A merchant (*mahajan*) supplies yarn to the small weavers on the condition that all the products are to be sold to the *mahajan*. The money includes wages for weaving of products. If there is any kind of damage seen in the sari, the *mahajan* never takes any responsibility for that sari (women's cloth). The price at which the products are sold to the *mahajan* may be termed as '*dadan* price' which is below the ruling market price. The *dadan* price is lower than the market price because the *mahajan* undervalues it by using his monopoly power in setting the price of the handloom product which, in effect is collateral (see Shaw and Das, 2011) [21]. If the value of the products at *dadan* price exceeds the value of yarn plus cash amount (if any), taken as loan from the *mahajan* to meet the working capital requirement, the excess is receivable from the *mahajan*, and is to be finally paid by the *mahajan* to the *dadan* taker. The situation usually is otherwise. The small weaver usually has a negative balance with the *mahajan*. Over time, therefore, the *dadan* taker becomes indebted to the *mahajan* who gains in two ways; first, by charging excess yarn price (difference between transfer price and cost price) and secondly, from excess market price over *dadan* price. The long-term consequence of this process is the expropriation of the small weavers.

## V. Allocation of Capital

The handloom cultural 'field' is consisted of two performer i.e. dominant group (*mahajans* or merchant) and subordinate group (*tanti* or weavers). Distribution of capital (cultural, social, economic and symbolic capitals) and the habitus of the performers determine the objective hierarchical structure.

### V.1 Dominant Group

The *mahajan* is the entrepreneurship person who possesses all the four forms (i.e. cultural, social, economic and symbolic) of capital. *Mahajans* do not know the skill of art of weaving but they play two fold roles in weaving i.e. role to organise production and marketing unit involving capital. *Mahajan* is also the key person in the handloom production value chain. The chain starts right from the purchase or take of yarn to delivery of the final product. Production knowledge means how to organise the weaver in one place, make final design and colour, allotment of works, distribution of the yarn to the weavers and supervision of the whole. Many times, the *mahajan*'s responsibility is to make the design and colour finally according to demand of client. The marketing knowledge means the tricks to deal the clients and to capture the market. This knowledge is learned in early stage when a person enters into this job. This embodied cultural capital (knowledge and skill of production and marketing) is acquired at home through socialization and exposure to a given set of practices. Acquisition of cultural capital and behaviour disposition necessarily presupposes the investment of time devoted to learning and/or training. Fifty three years old *mahajan* said- "*When I was 17 years old involved in my family business. At first my father used to inform me about the clients and their location. Then I had visited the client with my father and observed how my father deals with the clients and makes the new clients. Spending three years I could deal with the clients directly in presence of my father. He gives me 'tips' about the business. I always give high importance to his thoughts. Such a prolonged exposure made me a successful business man. It helps me holding the position.*"

Cultural 'habits and dispositions' comprise a resource capable of generating 'profits'; they are potentially subject to monopolization by individuals and groups; and, under appropriate conditions, they can be transmitted from one generation to the next. This way cultural capital helps to keep up the position in a 'field'.

The social relationship between the *mahajan* and their clients produce resources, advantages and opportunities available to individuals to build the social capital. For example, in Mirzapur weaving village, *mahajans* have strong ties with their commercial clients and weavers. *Mahajan* has connection with two types of clients i.e. core and occasional client. The clients owning retail stores when purchase regularly they are considered to be core clients; there are others who are irregular or occasional clients. An average *mahajan* has about 10 to 15 wholesale clients of which 5 to 7 are likely to be core clients. A successful *mahajan* will have about 50 to 60 wholesale clients and 15 to 20 core clients. Table 2 shows that the *mahajan* of Murshidabad in case of domestic and non-domestic markets. In order to market his products and recover his credit, the *Mahajan* makes trip to each of his core clients at least once a month. According to table 3 *mahajans* seem to have significant number of relationships spanning more than 10 years, irrespective of the network size. In addition an entrepreneur meets about a quarter of his alters on a daily basis and almost half at least on weekly basis. Production does not sustain unless there is frequent contact with the weavers; clients do not return the credit unless they are prompted regularly. While visiting his clients, a *mahajan* tries to gauge the market demands.

Each store has different clientele depending on location and different customers require different product ranges. The size of network determines *mahajan's* economic and other capitals and hierarchical position of a merchant class in a society. Not only keep network with the clients and weaver, always maintain relationship with other members of the society. They also participate in every social affairs of weaving community. They believe that one cannot survive in the business if he is not involved in all these. This is symbolically help to get more status in the weaving community. Their higher position in weaving community assigns the responsibility of these events. Forty six years *mahajan* shared that- *"We not only maintain relations with people concerning business but also with people belonging to all strata of the society. We attend social gatherings; take part in political event, any other function and community meetings. We will be present if there is a meeting or seminar of weaver community. There we try to analyze their problems and find solutions. There we find ample scope for interaction with various kinds of people and build up relationships."*

As *mahajans* related to business, they always have strong economic resources such as property, money and other assets. It inherited through the families or individual form it. Those who have more wealth with large business, their position automatically become high in handloom weaving. They symbolically represented as big *mahajan* which other members of the 'field' recognised and legitimatised.

## V.2 Subordinate group

The weavers (*tantis*) possess strong cultural capital (art of weaving) than other resources. In handloom industry, the art (knowledge and skill) of weaving is the primary cultural capital rather than education of the weavers. The handloom weaving is always complex work as it is continuous learning process since childhood like education. The art of weaving cannot be learnt efficiently unless one is born in the family of weavers. Weavers have invested a lot of time to acquire this skill. From the table 4 it is seen that maximum weavers (65.33 per cent) spend 9-12 years to learn how to weave. Minimum years of skill to learn of weaving are required 5-8 years. It is also revealed from the table 4 that 62.67 per cent and 37.33 per cent weavers are still running their tradition in 5<sup>th</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> generation respectively. Thus it is still bounded within a traditional group of people. Kailash narrated- *"When I was 12 years old, started my journey. My grand-father used to weave and I used to sit beside him to help him with the shuttle. I used to observe the way he used to work, and take note of the steps he used to follow one after another. Four years went by this way. Every day I used to assist my grand-father and learn. He often used to give me advices on the nuances of good quality weaving. One cannot become an adept weaver without the knowledge of these finer aspects. The actual issue is how to make the product exclusive and eye-catching."*

Since childhood it becomes an embodied form of cultural capital which is a 'competence' or skill that cannot be separated from its 'bearer' (that is, the person who 'holds' it). The weavers and weaving skill are bound to each other like soul bothers. It is evident from the field site that some weavers have become a renowned weaver only for their possession of cultural capital i.e. art of weaving. The weavers do not learn higher education because they engage in this job from childhood as a helper of his father. It is found from the table 1 that maximum year of education of the weavers (51.06 per cent) is 5-8 years. Only 12.39 per cent and 10.27 per cent weavers could spend 9-10 years and above 11 years of education respectively and this ratio is seen among the younger generations. Now a day, younger generation is more interested in education than earlier. It is also true that all weavers do not possess same degree of knowledge and skill (cultural capital) and according to performance there is gradation among the weavers. Because it is an integral part of the person, into a habitus, cannot be transmitted instantaneously by gift, exchange or purchase. Therefore, they maintain earlier status and prestige in handloom field. This cultural capital of the weavers helps them earning wages (economic capital), prestige (symbolic capital), demand in the weaving 'field' (social capital).

In Murshidabad, the weavers maintain only connection with the *mahajans* but not form any networking with the outsider business man. They always tried to keep good relation with the *mahajans*. It is also seen that weaving is restricted in the *tantubay* caste. The weaving activities bounded in family and kin group. Very few people (others not from weaving community) learns this art but not to the mark and in crisis period when production increases, then weavers keep them as hired labour. Thus, weavers do not form large network with outsider and their network is limited in the weaving community mainly control of *mahajans*. For instant, Bhuvan told that- *"It is our traditional job. From my forefather it continues. After my father death, I run two handlooms. One handloom became doomed. After my death, my son will run this and taught him the art of weaving. Now he can run handloom"*.

Economically weavers are not strong like *mahajans*. Weavers have only assets i.e. their looms, without this they do not possess property, bank accounts and money. They get wages from the *mahajan*. The wage of weaving a '*Garod Jamdani*' (sari or cloth of women) is rupees 280 to rupees 400 per sari and a weaver can weave maximum 5 '*jamdani*' in a month. So, his income is restricted within rupees 1400 to 2000/month. Those who have two or three looms their monthly income is high than others. Table 1 showed that maximum weavers (75.35 per cent) have one loom due to the decline situation of the handloom. 23.25 per cent weavers possess two

looms and only 0.7 per cent weavers have three to four looms. For that reason, they could not income more. 47.89 per cent and 14.8 per cent weavers belong to the income group of rupees 1501 to rupees 2500 and rupees 2501 to rupees 3500 respectively. Only 2.81 per cent weavers' income are rupees 4501 to rupees 5500. One weaver shared that- "everybody wants to run his own business and make money but shortage of capital tied our hands to work independently. Not only money, to search out proper and genuine clients is another factor to run a business smoothly. Always there is an anxiety regarding the honesty of client whether they may be a cheater or benefactor". Generally we do not take any risk. We are used to in our present condition. We are happy with this".

## **VI. Understanding Power-relation and Habitus**

'Fields' are spaces of power relation between *mahajan* and *tanti*/weaver (dyadic relationship). Organizational actors (*mahajans* and weavers/*tantis* in a top-down hierarchy) distinguish themselves from others within their 'field' by means of symbolically meaningful position-holdings, power relation (possession of capital), habitus and conflict. The *mahajan* belongs to a dominant and higher class, and the weaver posits as subordinate artisan class. In this space, dominant (*Mahajan*), and subordinate group of weavers (*Tanti*) struggle for control over capitals and is potentially always subject to change of positions and production of capitals. Some weavers struggle with the power of different forms of capital (knowledge, skill, social connection and network, and wealth) but they could not obtain all the capitals. Weavers possess strong cultural capital than other forms of capital. The knowledge of design (cultural capital) is crucial part in weaving. Some designs have acquired the status of art and popularity; the weavers who have made them become renowned (symbolic capital) in that 'field'. The knowledge of weaving is an 'embodied' form that may be acquired by weavers since early age. This form of cultural capital allows the well-endowed weavers to make profit in ways that those lacking in cultural capital cannot, thereby helping to reproduce the social world that originally produced it. Then, people recognised and legitimatised them as renowned weavers and they get high position than other weavers. Apart this section, other weavers use their cultural capital to accumulate wages but they have not earn enough money to trade their product directly to the *mahajans* in the market. Lack of networking with the clients and lack of relationship in the community, have hindrance to achieve success and get position in society. For the lack of all resources they do not uplift their position in the hierarchical relation. This 'rule of the game' is shaped by their habitus. The habitus consists of deeply internalized disposition, schemas and forms of know-how which are acquired by the individual through early childhood socialization. When children brought up in the family of *mahajan*, are far more likely to develop their own business ability and acquire the dispositions and the know-how to appreciate good business performers than if they were born in the family of weavers. The children are socialized in a manner that how to learn about the tricks of business knowledge, how to accumulate power or resources, how to dominate others and how to hold higher position. It is generated first through family members, and then develops after entering into the job (practice). Similarly, a child is born in a weaver family is likely to develop an appreciation for art and will acquire the knowledge to understand, criticised and appreciate works of art (weaving product). With this, they also being habituated to work under the *mahajan* and compel to deed whatever *mahajan* expect due to have lack of resources. This is their structured habitus and social origin decides the individual's habitus. This social position one is born into strongly influences the opportunities they have to develop capital in the family, later on in the workplace. These are instrumental resources, and each is needed to ensure the handloom entrepreneurship growth and success. One individual can generate new forms of action (with internalized disposition) that reflect the original socialization process i.e. his structuring habitus. For example, weavers who learn the art of weaving at an early age are likely to go on in later life to become renowned weaver and thereby constitute and reproduce the world of art. Habitus generates perceptions, expectations and practices that correspond to the structuring properties of earlier socialization (Bourdieu, 2000) [11].

Again, habitus gives practices a particular manner and style. The disposition of habitus identifies *mahajans* as risk taker, as bold and as dominated where as weavers as caution, as timid and as balanced. Weavers are habituated with simple, hedonistic and traditional life style. They do not take any risk in their life due to insufficient economic and social capitals. For example, few independent weavers tried to sell their product directly in the outside market. But they lost their every thing (products and money) instead of success. After all, they return to the *mahajans* for selling their product and subsistence of the family. Others never tried this after the incident. In this ways they internalised from the past experience. They do not simple conform to the external constraint and opportunities given them. They adapt to or resist and in this way miss the chance. The habitus helps to understand their (*tanti*/weaver, and *mahajan*/merchant) differences among them. The weaving habitus means that agents' (*mahajan* and *tanti*) habitus as a product of historical schemes that in turn produce social and cultural practices in weaving field. Those schemes has been produced and reproduced over generations.

## VII. Conclusion

It is concluded that hierarchical arrangement depends on the possession of capital and habitus that can impact upon the formation of 'class' in the 'field' of handloom. *Mahajan*/merchant group tops the hierarchy and have power to dominate the weavers. *Tanti*/weavers, by virtue of their cultural capital, have also power to resist domination, but they frequently fail and negotiate in that because they survive on those capitals at the mercy of more powerful ones (*mahajans*). The lack of capital and social milieu or social origin give rise to certain class habitus which creates transposable disposition and creates the illusion that the social order is natural. By applying of Bourdieu's theory (concept of capital, habitus and field) to understand 'hierarchy, power-relation and domination' in handloom weaving industry is a new one and though this research has covered one cluster but it represents the scenario of the wider population of handloom entrepreneurs of India. So, it can be concluded the study 'hierarchical, power relation and domination issues' is an entrepreneurial attempt.

## Acknowledgement

This article is a part of doctoral thesis. I would like to express deep gratitude to my all participants. Without their participation and contribution it would be not possible. I would also like to thanks to the University Grants Commission for their financial help and the Department of Anthropology, University of Calcutta to support me.

## References

- [1]. R. Jenkins, Pierre Bourdieu (London and New York: Routledge, 1992).
- [2]. D. A. Lake, Escape from the State of Nature: Authority and Hierarchy in World Politics, *International Security*, 32 (1), 2007, 47-79.
- [3]. D. A. Lake, *Hierarchy in International Relations* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 2009).
- [4]. P. Bourdieu, The forms of capital, in J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (New York: Greenwood, 1985), 241-258.
- [5]. P. Bourdieu, *Logic of Practice* (Oxford, Polity, 1990b/1980). P. Bourdieu, *Practical Reason* (Oxford, Polity, 1990c).
- [6]. P. Bourdieu, *Practical reason-On the theory of action* (Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1998).
- [7]. P. Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (Cambridge, UK, Cambridge University Press, 1977).
- [7]. D. L. Swartz, *Recasting power in its third dimension*, Review of Steven Lukes, *Power: A Radical View*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005).
- [8]. Y. S. Cheung and R. Andersen, Time to Read: Family Resources and Educational Outcomes in Britain, *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 34, 2003, 413-433.  
- A. Lareau, *Unequal Childhoods: Class, Race, and Family Life* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003).
- [9]. P. Bourdieu, The Forms of Capital, in J. G Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education* (Greenwood Press, New York, 1986), 231-258.
- [10]. T. Rudd, *ICT and the Reproduction of Inequalities: A Bourdieuan Perspective*, PhD thesis, Graduate School of Education: University of Bristol, 2003.
- [11]. P. Bourdieu, *Pascalian meditations* (Stanford, CA: Stanford university Press, 2000).
- [12]. P. Bourdieu, Towards a reflexive sociology: A workshop with Pierre Bourdieu, *Sociological Theory*, 7, 1989, 26-63.
- [13]. David L. Swartz, *Culture and Power: The Sociology of Pierre Bourdieu*, (University of Chicago Press, 1997).
- [14]. U. Kalpagam, *Development and empowerment: rural women in India* (Jaipur : Rawat Publications, 2006).
- [15]. P. Bourdieu, *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1984).
- [16]. S. Lukes, *Power: A radical view* (London: Macmillan, 1974).
- [17]. P. Bourdieu and L. J. D. Wacquant, *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1992).
- [18]. G. Noble and M. Watkins, How did Bourdieu learn to play tennis? Habitus, consciousness and habituation, *Cultural Studies*, 17 (3/4), 2003, 520-538.
- [19]. S. Laberge, Toward an interpretation of gender into Bourdieu's concept of cultural capital. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 12, 1995, 131-146.
- [20]. Census Report, Government of India, 2001.
- [21]. T. Shaw and A. Das, De-skilling in Handloom Sector: A study of the handloom Weavers of Varanasi district, Uttar Pradesh in India. *Antrocom Online Journal of Anthropology*, 9 (2), 2013, 319-335.

**Table 1 Socio-demographic profile of the weavers.**

| <b>Mirzapur handloom village of Murshidabad</b> |       |
|---|-------|
| <b>Years of Education</b>                       |       |
| 0   | 9.06  |
| 1-4   | 17.22 |
| 5-8   | 51.06 |
| 9-10  | 12.39 |
| 11+   | 10.27 |
| <b>Monthly Income of the weavers</b>            |       |
| > 1500  | 26.06 |
| 1501-2500                                       | 47.89 |
| 2501-3500                                       | 14.08 |
| 3501-4500                                       | 7.75  |
| 4501-5500                                       | 2.81  |
| 5501+   | 1.41  |
| <b>Types of Loom</b>                            |       |
| Simple loom                                     | 97.22 |
| Jaquard loom                                    | 2.78  |
| <b>Possession of the loom</b>                   |       |
| One loom  | 75.35 |
| Two loom  | 23.25 |
| Three loom                                      | 0.7   |
| Four loom                                       | 0.7   |
| Seven loom                                      | 0.0   |
| <b>Categories of the weavers</b>                |       |
| Under <i>Mahajan</i>                            | 87.32 |
| Self weaver/ Independent weaver                 | 9.15  |
| Under co-operative society                      | 3.53  |

**Table 2 Network size of the *Mahajan* in domestic market and outside market**

| Network Size | Murshidabad (in percentage) |                |
|--------------|-----------------------------|----------------|
|              | Domestic market             | Outside market |
| 1-4          | 15.1                        | 34.9           |
| 5-8          | 30.6                        | 23             |
| 9-12         | 22.2                        | 19             |
| 13- 16       | 21                          | 13.1           |
| 17 -20       | 11.8                        | 10             |

**Table 3 Relationship between *mahajans* and their clients.**

| Network Size | Duration of contact (in percentage) |                       |                   | Frequency of contact (in percentage) |        |             |         |
|--------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------------|--------|-------------|---------|
|              | More than 10 years                  | Between 10 to 5 years | Less than 5 years | Daily                                | Weekly | Fortnightly | Monthly |
| 1- 4         | 98                                  | 10.02                 | 0                 | 68                                   | 27     | 18          | 0       |
| 5- 8         | 71.12                               | 23                    | 11                | 57                                   | 31.25  | 22          | 15      |
| 9-12         | 67                                  | 29                    | 13                | 36                                   | 33.32  | 19          | 20      |
| 13 -16       | 65                                  | 37                    | 20                | 27                                   | 35     | 21          | 17      |
| 17- 20       | 60.5                                | 44                    | 22                | 24                                   | 37.67  | 26          | 19      |

**Table 4 Years of learning of weaving and generation involved.**

| Years of skill to learn weaving     | Number | Frequency |
|-------------------------------------|--------|-----------|
| 1-4                                 | 0.0    | 0.0       |
| 5-8                                 | 52     | 34.67     |
| 9+                                  | 98     | 65.33     |
| Total                               | 150    | 100       |
| <b>How many generation involved</b> |        |           |
| 1st                                 | 0.0    | 0.0       |
| 3rd                                 | 56     | 37.33     |
| 5th                                 | 94     | 62.67     |
| Total                               | 150    | 100       |