

A Study of Human Capital In Glassware Industry of Firozabad in The Context of One District – One Product Policy of Uttar Pradesh

Ms. Shina Yadav¹, Dr. Shalu Agarwal²

¹Research Scholar, Institute of Business Management and Commerce, Mangalayatan University, Aligarh, Uttar Pradesh.

²Assistant Professor, Institute of Business Management and Commerce, Mangalayatan University, Aligarh, Uttar Pradesh.

Abstract

The One District One Product (ODOP) initiative has emerged as an important policy approach for promoting district-specific products, strengthening traditional and local industries, encouraging entrepreneurship and generating employment. The approach is based on the recognition that locally embedded products, traditional skills, specialised knowledge and established production systems can provide a foundation for decentralised economic development when supported through training, finance, technology, infrastructure, branding and market linkages. Human capital occupies an important position within this framework because the performance and sustainability of traditional industries depend substantially upon the knowledge, skills, experience, productive capabilities and adaptability of artisans, workers and small entrepreneurs. The present paper reviews the relationship between ODOP and human capital development on the basis of selected studies contained exclusively in the two literature-review documents considered for the study. A descriptive and thematic review approach has been followed, with the literature organised around major areas including localised development, skill formation, employment, entrepreneurship, institutional and financial support, market access, technology, digitalisation and inclusive development. The reviewed literature generally indicates that ODOP can contribute to human capital development by strengthening occupational skills, improving employment and income opportunities, encouraging entrepreneurial activity, facilitating access to finance and markets and supporting technological adaptation. At the same time, considerable variations are observed across districts and sectors. Skill gaps, inadequate awareness, limited access to institutional credit, infrastructural deficiencies, technological constraints, digital limitations and uneven administrative capacity continue to restrict the effective utilisation of ODOP support. The review further indicates that the existing literature has concentrated more strongly on exports, production, marketing, regional development and overall scheme performance than on the direct and integrated assessment of human capital outcomes. The paper concludes that the long-term developmental contribution of ODOP depends not merely upon the promotion of district-specific products but also upon sustained investment in the capabilities of the people engaged in their production.

Keywords: One District One Product, ODOP, Human Capital, Skill Development, Employment, Entrepreneurship, Artisans, Traditional Industries, Regional Development, Uttar Pradesh.

1. Introduction

Local and traditional industries occupy an important position in the economic and social structure of India. A large number of such industries have developed around specialised products that are closely associated with particular districts, communities and inherited production traditions. Their significance extends beyond the monetary value of their output because they generate employment, support small and household enterprises, preserve local knowledge and provide economic opportunities to artisans and workers who may have limited access to large-scale organised employment. The productive strength of these industries is therefore closely connected with the capabilities of the people engaged in them. Skills acquired through experience, apprenticeship and intergenerational learning often constitute an important productive resource, particularly where craftsmanship and specialised occupational knowledge determine the quality and distinctiveness of a product.

The One District One Product initiative provides a policy framework through which these local economic strengths can be identified, supported and connected with wider markets. The ODOP framework in Uttar Pradesh has emphasised district-specific products, employment generation, preservation and enhancement of local skills, improvement in product quality, financial support, technical training, marketing assistance and the development of Common Facility Centres. The significance of such an approach lies in its attempt to combine the existing productive identity of a district with institutional interventions capable of improving production, marketability and enterprise development. Instead of treating traditional products simply as remnants of local economic history, ODOP provides a mechanism through which their productive and commercial potential can be strengthened.

The human capital dimension of this process is particularly important. Human capital broadly refers to the knowledge, skills, experience, training, competencies and other productive capabilities embodied in individuals.

In traditional industries, however, human capital cannot be understood exclusively in terms of formal education or certified technical qualifications. Artisans may possess considerable productive knowledge acquired through years of practical experience even where formal educational attainment remains limited. Such knowledge has economic value because it influences product quality, efficiency, innovation and the ability to preserve specialised forms of craftsmanship. At the same time, contemporary markets increasingly require traditional producers to supplement inherited skills with knowledge of technology, quality standards, finance, enterprise management, branding, packaging, digital platforms and changing consumer preferences.

The available literature generally presents ODOP as a promising instrument of decentralised economic development. Tripathi and Agrawal (2021) associate the programme in Uttar Pradesh with export promotion, employment generation and skill development, while also emphasising the importance of public participation, institutional support and continuous monitoring. Kumar and Gupta (2023) similarly connect ODOP with employment opportunities, sustainable income, skill development and entrepreneurial empowerment. Tiwari, Pandey and Upadhyay (2023) highlight the role of financial support, Common Facility Centres, marketing assistance and skill-development initiatives in strengthening local entrepreneurship and traditional industries. These studies indicate that the development of district products involves not merely the expansion of physical production but also an improvement in the capabilities of the individuals and enterprises responsible for such production.

More recent literature strengthens this interpretation. Patel (2025) associates ODOP with employment generation, MSME formalisation, training, financial assistance, branding and e-commerce integration, while simultaneously identifying skill deficiencies, infrastructural limitations, restricted financial access and marketing weaknesses as important constraints. Meena, Tripathi and Kulshreshtha (2025) report improvements in skills, market access and living standards among artisans in selected handicraft sectors, whereas Kanujiya and Sahni (2026) identify improvements in technical knowledge, production quality, entrepreneurial confidence and livelihood opportunities among beneficiaries. Such findings make it appropriate to examine ODOP through the perspective of human capital rather than limiting its assessment to production and exports.

The present paper accordingly reviews the relationship between ODOP and human capital development in traditional and local industries. It does not attempt to evaluate any single district or product. Instead, the purpose is to synthesise the available literature around the major mechanisms through which ODOP can influence human capabilities and to identify the constraints that affect this process. Particular attention is given to skill development, employment, entrepreneurship, finance, institutional support, market access, technological adaptation, digitalisation and inclusion. This broader approach is consistent with the nature of the available literature, which covers different districts, products and implementation experiences rather than providing evidence restricted to a single industrial cluster.

2. Objectives of the Study

The present paper has four closely related objectives. First, it seeks to examine the contribution of the One District One Product initiative to human capital development through skill enhancement, employment generation and entrepreneurship. Second, it analyses the role of institutional support, financial assistance, technology and market access in strengthening the productive capabilities of artisans, workers and local entrepreneurs. Third, it identifies the principal constraints affecting the effective development and utilisation of human capital under the ODOP framework. Finally, it synthesises the major findings of the selected literature to identify the areas in which further research is required for a better understanding of the relationship between district-based product development and human capabilities.

3. Review Methodology

The present paper is descriptive and review-based in nature and does not involve primary empirical investigation. The literature used for the paper has been selected exclusively from the two review documents supplied for the underlying research. No external study has been introduced into the substantive review. The studies were selected according to their relevance to the central concern of the paper rather than merely because they appeared in the supplied documents. Greater emphasis has therefore been placed on literature dealing with skill development, employment, entrepreneurship, income, financial support, institutional capacity, technology, marketing, artisan welfare and the implementation of ODOP. Studies dealing with particular products or districts have been used where their findings provide useful evidence regarding these broader themes.

A thematic rather than a purely chronological or author-by-author approach has been adopted. The findings of different studies have therefore been brought together under common areas of analysis so that similarities,

differences and recurring concerns can be identified. This approach is appropriate because the reviewed literature is methodologically diverse. Some studies rely upon field surveys and beneficiary responses, whereas others use secondary data, policy documents, case studies or descriptive analysis. Their findings cannot therefore be combined through a single statistical procedure, but they can be compared and synthesised around common developmental issues. Thematic synthesis is an established way of organising findings from multiple studies while retaining an explicit connection between the synthesis and the underlying evidence. The external methodological sources cited in this paragraph explain the choice of review organisation only; they are not used as substantive evidence about ODOP and are consequently not included in the paper's ODOP reference list. The review is selective rather than exhaustive. This limitation is deliberate because the purpose of the paper is not to reproduce every review contained in the two source documents. Instead, studies have been selected according to the requirements of the paper and then organised around the principal dimensions through which ODOP may affect human capital. Particular care has also been taken to maintain correspondence between studies actually used in the discussion and entries included in the reference list. The resulting synthesis should therefore be understood as a focused review of the available material rather than as a systematic review of the entire literature on ODOP.

4. ODOP, Localised Development and Human Capital

The basic principle underlying ODOP is that individual districts possess distinctive economic strengths that can provide a foundation for development. Such strengths may originate in natural resources, agricultural specialisation, established production clusters, cultural traditions or accumulated craftsmanship. The district becomes an important unit of economic intervention because locally specialised products are often supported by networks of workers, artisans, enterprises, suppliers and institutions that have developed over long periods. A district-based strategy can therefore build upon capabilities that already exist rather than attempting to create an entirely new productive identity.

The Government of Uttar Pradesh's ODOP framework reflects this approach through its emphasis on district-specific products, local employment, preservation of traditional skills, product improvement, financial assistance, technical training, Common Facility Centres and marketing support. These interventions are important from a human-capital perspective because several of them directly influence the knowledge and productive capabilities of artisans and entrepreneurs, while others create an environment in which existing skills can be used more productively. Training may improve occupational capability, financial assistance may facilitate investment in better tools and technology, and improved market access may increase the economic return obtained from specialised skills.

Tripathi and Agrawal (2021) examine ODOP as an economic revitalisation programme in Uttar Pradesh and connect district-level specialisation with employment generation, skill development and export growth. Their analysis also emphasises that public participation, institutional support and continuous monitoring are important for sustaining programme outcomes. Tiwari, Pandey and Upadhyay (2023) similarly identify ODOP as an initiative capable of promoting local entrepreneurship, preserving traditional crafts and generating employment. They discuss support mechanisms such as Common Facility Centres, Marketing Development Assistance, Margin Money assistance and skill-development initiatives, indicating that the effectiveness of local product promotion depends upon the combination of production support with finance, skills and markets.

NITI Aayog (2022) also associates the ODOP approach with district specialisation, value addition, capacity building and institutional support. The cases reviewed in the supplied literature indicate that coordinated interventions involving training, market linkages and collective organisation can strengthen production and income opportunities. NABARD (2022) similarly considers district-level product development in relation to rural entrepreneurship, value-chain strengthening, credit, cluster development and capacity building. These perspectives are significant because they place the producer within a broader local economic system. Product development depends upon the interaction of human capabilities with finance, infrastructure, institutions and markets rather than upon any single intervention.

The literature nevertheless indicates that localised development does not produce uniform results. Maurya and Misra (2021), in their comparison of two agricultural products in Eastern Uttar Pradesh, observe substantial differences in implementation and outcomes. Their analysis indicates that administrative involvement, stakeholder awareness, value-chain conditions and the suitability of product support influence the effectiveness of ODOP. Such variations demonstrate that identification of a district product is only the beginning of the development process. A district may possess specialised productive knowledge, but that knowledge needs

appropriate institutional and economic support if it is to generate sustainable improvements in employment, income and enterprise development.

The human-capital perspective consequently adds an important dimension to the understanding of localised development. Traditional skills represent an existing stock of productive capability, but this stock is not static. It can be strengthened through training, improved through interaction with technology and weakened if younger generations cease to acquire occupational knowledge or if poor working conditions reduce the sustainability of traditional occupations. ODOP therefore has the potential to contribute to local development not simply by increasing the visibility of a product but by improving the capabilities of the people and enterprises associated with its production.

5. Skill Development, Employment and Entrepreneurship

Skill development represents the most direct mechanism through which ODOP can influence human capital. Traditional industries frequently possess substantial stocks of occupational knowledge that have been accumulated through experience and transferred through families, communities and informal apprenticeship. Such knowledge provides an important foundation for production, but changes in technology, product standards and consumer demand increasingly require workers to combine traditional capabilities with newer technical and commercial skills. Training under ODOP can therefore perform two related functions: it can strengthen existing craftsmanship and enable producers to acquire competencies required by changing production and market environments.

Tiwari, Pandey and Upadhyay (2023) identify skill-development initiatives as an important component of ODOP support for artisans and micro-enterprises. Their discussion is particularly relevant because it places training alongside financial assistance, Common Facility Centres and marketing support. Skill development is therefore not treated as an isolated activity but as part of a wider support system. Patel (2025) similarly identifies training as one of the mechanisms through which ODOP has contributed to productivity and market access in Uttar Pradesh, while also recognising that significant skill gaps continue to exist. The coexistence of training programmes and continuing skill deficiencies suggests that human-capital formation requires sustained rather than one-time intervention.

Beneficiary-level studies provide more direct evidence. Meena, Tripathi and Kulshreshtha (2025), in their analysis of the handicraft sector in selected districts, report improvements in skill enhancement, market access, sales and living standards among artisans. Their findings emphasise the importance of combining training with financial assistance, infrastructure and marketing support. Kanujiya and Sahni (2026), examining the experience of beneficiaries in Shravasti district, report that skill-development initiatives improved production quality, technical knowledge and entrepreneurial confidence. These studies indicate that training can affect several dimensions of human capital simultaneously, including technical competence, confidence and the ability to participate more effectively in economic activity.

Employment generation represents another important dimension of the relationship between ODOP and human capital. Tripathi and Agrawal (2021) associate the programme with employment creation alongside skill development and export expansion. Kumar and Gupta (2023) similarly identify positive outcomes in employment, income and entrepreneurial empowerment. Patel (2025) reports employment generation and MSME formalisation among the broader economic outcomes of ODOP. Employment is important not merely because it provides income but also because productive work allows skills to be practised, refined and transferred. Where employment becomes more stable and productive, workers may have greater incentives to invest in further skill acquisition.

Singh, Gangal and Gogia (2025), while concentrating primarily on export performance in selected districts of Uttar Pradesh, also associate the post-ODOP period with improvements in local employment and production capabilities. Their study illustrates a recurring characteristic of the literature: human-capital outcomes frequently appear alongside other economic effects rather than being examined as the principal subject. This makes it necessary to distinguish between evidence that directly measures changes in workers' capabilities and evidence from which such changes can only be inferred.

Entrepreneurship further extends the human-capital dimension of ODOP. An artisan primarily engaged in production may possess highly specialised craft knowledge but relatively limited knowledge of finance, branding, marketing or enterprise management. When such a producer attempts to establish or expand an independent enterprise, the required skill set becomes wider. Tiwari, Pandey and Upadhyay (2023) associate ODOP with the development of local entrepreneurship, while Meena, Tripathi and Kulshreshtha (2025) report increased entrepreneurial participation and financial independence among some beneficiaries. Kanujiya and Sahni (2026)

also identify movement from casual labour towards self-employment and enterprise-based activity in their study area.

These findings suggest that the human-capital contribution of ODOP should not be assessed solely through the number of people receiving technical training. A broader assessment should consider whether artisans and workers acquire competencies that improve productivity, employment quality, enterprise management and adaptability. Technical skill, entrepreneurial confidence, financial knowledge and the ability to respond to changing market requirements are interconnected forms of capability. The literature therefore supports a broader understanding of skill development in which occupational training forms the foundation but not the complete content of human-capital development.

6. Institutional Support, Finance and Market Access

Human capabilities cannot be developed or utilised independently of the institutional environment. Training programmes, credit facilities, infrastructure and market-support schemes reach producers through administrative and financial institutions, making institutional capacity an important determinant of ODOP outcomes. Sharma and Srivastava (2021), in their study of the perfume industry in Kannauj, examine the relationship between administrative skills and programme success. Their findings indicate that planning, organisation, evaluation and brand-building functions are positively associated with the perceived effectiveness of ODOP. The study consequently demonstrates that policy design must be accompanied by administrative capability if intended benefits are to reach local producers.

Maurya and Misra (2021) provide additional evidence regarding the importance of implementation. Their comparison of district experiences suggests that administrative involvement, stakeholder awareness and alignment between policy support and local production conditions influence outcomes. This finding is significant for human capital because access to training or financial assistance depends partly upon the ability of institutions to identify beneficiaries, communicate programme provisions and provide appropriate support. Weak implementation can therefore reduce the human-capital effect of a programme even where training and financial schemes formally exist.

Financial access represents another important supporting condition. Small and informal producers frequently require finance to purchase equipment, improve production, adopt technology, expand enterprises or meet market requirements. Kapoor (2021) finds that many ODOP beneficiary units remain small, informal and family-based and that procedural delays, documentation requirements, collateral conditions and inadequate awareness can restrict their access to institutional credit. The study also identifies difficulties affecting informal operators and women entrepreneurs and emphasises the importance of financial education and simplified credit delivery. These findings demonstrate that access to finance is partly a question of institutional provision and partly a question of beneficiary capability. Producers require sufficient financial knowledge to understand schemes, complete documentation and make informed borrowing decisions.

Kumari and Mohammad (2025) similarly analyse financial interventions under ODOP and associate margin-money assistance, Common Facility Centres, skill-development programmes and market-development initiatives with improvements in employment, entrepreneurship and income. Their study also indicates that training and toolkit distribution can improve skills and productivity, while financial-literacy gaps continue to constrain outcomes. Financial capability can therefore be regarded as an increasingly important element of human capital among small producers and entrepreneurs. Improved occupational skill may have limited economic impact if a producer lacks the resources or financial understanding required to convert that skill into productive enterprise. Market access performs a similarly important function. Gaur (2023) examines ODOP in relation to district-based export promotion and highlights the importance of branding, formalisation, value addition and international market access. The study also identifies fragmented value chains, limited awareness, logistical weaknesses and inadequate policy convergence as important constraints and recommends stronger coordination and targeted export training. Srivastava and Fatima (2025) focus more directly on marketing and identify government-supported promotional platforms, exhibitions, trade fairs and digital channels as mechanisms for increasing the reach of ODOP products. At the same time, weak branding, inadequate packaging and limited professional marketing knowledge continue to restrict producers.

These findings broaden the concept of economically relevant human capital. A traditional producer may possess excellent manufacturing skills but may still remain dependent upon intermediaries if knowledge of markets, branding and commercial processes is weak. The ability to understand consumer preferences, product presentation, quality requirements and marketing channels increasingly determines the economic return

obtained from traditional skills. Institutional support, finance and market capability should therefore be viewed as complementary to technical training rather than as separate areas of development.

7. Technology, Digitalisation and Inclusive Development

Technological change presents both opportunities and challenges for district-specific traditional industries. Appropriate technology can improve productivity, quality, consistency and working processes, but its successful adoption depends upon the knowledge and adaptability of workers and entrepreneurs. Yadav (2024), in examining the Amla industry under ODOP in Pratapgarh, reports that technological innovation and value addition contributed to improvements in production, product quality, market reach, employment and income. At the same time, the study identifies infrastructural and organisational limitations and emphasises the importance of capacity building and supporting institutions. This indicates that technology alone cannot generate productive transformation unless producers possess the capabilities and supporting conditions necessary to use it effectively.

Veerbhan and Malik (2025), studying changes in jaggery production, similarly identify movement towards improved mechanisation, hygiene and market practices in some areas, while observing slower adoption elsewhere because of differences in awareness and implementation. The unevenness of technological adoption demonstrates that modernisation is not simply a process of providing new equipment. Workers must understand the technology, perceive its usefulness and possess the resources required for its adoption. Training and technological support therefore need to proceed together.

Digitalisation has introduced another dimension to this process. Srivastava and Gupta (2025) discuss the contribution of e-commerce integration and public-private partnerships to market accessibility while also identifying technological gaps and regional disparities. The reviewed literature also indicates that digital platforms can create opportunities for more direct market participation and potentially reduce excessive dependence upon intermediaries, although digital illiteracy and infrastructure deficiencies restrict these benefits. Digital competence is therefore becoming an increasingly relevant component of human capital in local industries.

Modernisation should nevertheless be understood in relation to the distinctive nature of traditional products. The economic value of many ODOP products arises partly from inherited craftsmanship, specialised local knowledge and cultural identity. Technology should therefore supplement rather than unnecessarily displace these capabilities. The developmental objective is not to substitute traditional knowledge with standardised production wherever such knowledge contributes to product distinctiveness, but to combine established craftsmanship with improvements in quality, productivity, safety, marketing and enterprise management.

The issue of inclusion is closely connected with technological and institutional development. Meena, Tripathi and Kulshreshtha (2025) report improvements in financial independence, social recognition and entrepreneurial participation among women artisans. Kanujiya and Sahni (2026) similarly identify increased participation of women and marginalised communities together with improvements in skills, income and employment. Srivastava and Gupta (2025) also associate ODOP with greater participation of artisans and marginalised groups while recognising that technological and regional disparities continue to affect the distribution of benefits.

Kapoor's (2021) findings provide an important qualification. Informal producers and women entrepreneurs may experience greater difficulty in accessing institutional finance because of documentation, awareness and other constraints. Consequently, the formal availability of a scheme cannot be treated as equivalent to effective accessibility. Human-capital development becomes inclusive only when training, finance, technology and markets are accessible to producers operating at different scales and under different social and economic conditions.

Regional differences reinforce this conclusion. Patel (2025), Maurya and Misra (2021), Veerbhan and Malik (2025) and Thomas (2026) all identify variations in ODOP performance associated with differences in infrastructure, institutional capacity, technology, finance or implementation. Thomas (2026), in particular, associates regional disparities with differences in infrastructure, credit, technology and institutional capacity. Human-capital development under ODOP should therefore be understood as a locally conditioned process. A uniform policy framework may require different forms and intensities of support across districts depending upon the existing capabilities and constraints of producers.

8. Major Challenges and Analytical Synthesis

The reviewed literature presents a generally positive assessment of the developmental potential of ODOP, but it also identifies a recurring set of constraints. Skill gaps remain among the most frequently observed problems.

Training programmes exist, yet several studies indicate that producers continue to require improvements in technical knowledge, quality control, enterprise management and market-related capabilities. This suggests that skill development should be treated as a continuing process. Traditional industries operate within changing technological and commercial environments, and the skills required for competitiveness consequently evolve over time.

Limited awareness constitutes another recurring constraint. Producers may not possess adequate information regarding training opportunities, financial schemes, marketing assistance or other programme provisions. Such informational limitations reduce the effective reach of policy. Infrastructure deficiencies create additional difficulties by restricting production, logistics, connectivity and technological adoption. A skilled producer cannot make full use of acquired capabilities where suitable equipment, facilities or market connections are unavailable. Human capital and physical infrastructure should therefore be regarded as complementary forms of productive capacity rather than substitutes.

Financial constraints are equally significant. Kapoor (2021) demonstrates the difficulties that informal enterprises can experience in obtaining institutional finance, while Kumari and Mohammad (2025) identify continuing financial-literacy gaps. The relationship between finance and human capital is therefore reciprocal. Better financial knowledge can improve access to institutional support, while access to finance can enable investment in training, tools and technology. Similarly, technological and digital limitations can restrict the benefits of improved market access. E-commerce opportunities are valuable only when producers possess sufficient digital capability and connectivity to participate in them.

Marketing and branding present another important challenge. Srivastava and Fatima (2025) identify weaknesses in packaging, branding and professional marketing support. Such findings demonstrate that the traditional distinction between production skills and commercial skills is becoming less useful. As local producers enter wider markets, their economic success increasingly depends upon a combination of production knowledge, enterprise management, financial understanding, quality awareness and marketing capability.

The literature also shows that the relationship between ODOP and human capital operates through several interconnected mechanisms rather than through training alone. Training and capacity-building initiatives can strengthen technical and entrepreneurial capabilities, while access to finance can enable artisans and small producers to invest in improved tools, technology and enterprise development. Infrastructure and institutional facilitation provide the environment within which these capabilities can be productively utilised, whereas improved market access can increase the economic return associated with skills and enterprise development. Employment, productivity and income outcomes should therefore be understood as emerging from the interaction of human capabilities with financial, technological, institutional and market conditions.

This interpretation avoids treating ODOP as a simple linear process in which a particular intervention necessarily produces a predetermined outcome. The reviewed studies show considerable variation between districts, products and beneficiary groups. Improvements in skills may not translate into higher incomes where market access remains weak, and financial assistance may have limited impact where producers lack technical or entrepreneurial capability. Similarly, digital platforms may create new opportunities without benefiting producers who lack digital literacy. The effectiveness of one form of intervention therefore frequently depends upon the presence of others.

A further conclusion is that traditional and modern capabilities should not be treated as competing forms of human capital. Traditional craftsmanship represents accumulated productive knowledge and can provide an important source of product differentiation. Modern skills can enhance rather than replace this knowledge by improving quality, productivity, safety, business management and market connectivity. The challenge for ODOP is therefore to facilitate adaptation without weakening the local knowledge that gives many district products their distinctive economic identity.

Institutional quality emerges as a particularly important connecting factor. Training, credit, technology and marketing programmes require effective local implementation. Differences in administrative capability and stakeholder participation can therefore produce different outcomes even under a common policy framework. This helps explain why the reviewed literature reports positive results in some districts alongside limited awareness, weak infrastructure and slower adaptation in others. Human-capital development under ODOP is consequently best understood as the outcome of interaction among individuals, enterprises, institutions and markets.

9. Research Gaps and Future Directions

Despite the growing literature on ODOP, direct and integrated research on human capital remains comparatively limited. A substantial part of the existing literature concentrates on exports, production, product promotion, branding, marketing, regional development and general programme performance. Employment and skill development are frequently mentioned as outcomes, but the knowledge, competencies, training experiences and occupational development of workers are rarely examined together as a distinct field of investigation. The source review itself identifies this limitation and notes that existing research gives comparatively less attention to the foundational role of workforce knowledge, skills, competencies and experience in sustaining traditional industries.

One important area requiring further investigation is the effectiveness of training. The existence of skill-development programmes or the number of individuals trained provides only limited information about human-capital outcomes. Future studies should examine whether training produces measurable improvements in occupational competence, productivity, product quality, earnings, employment stability or entrepreneurial capability. It is equally important to determine whether acquired skills continue to be used over time and whether the content of training corresponds to the actual needs of particular industries.

Intergenerational transmission of traditional skills constitutes another important gap. Many district-specific industries depend upon knowledge that has historically been transferred through families and informal apprenticeship. The sustainability of such industries partly depends upon whether younger workers continue to acquire these capabilities and whether traditional forms of learning can interact effectively with formal training. Research is required to understand whether modernisation strengthens, modifies or weakens inherited occupational knowledge and how policies can preserve economically valuable craftsmanship while supporting technological adaptation.

Financial and digital capabilities also require closer empirical attention. Existing studies identify credit barriers, financial-literacy limitations, e-commerce opportunities and digital constraints, but these issues are seldom examined together with technical skills and employment outcomes. Future research can investigate whether financial education improves access to institutional credit, whether digital training increases direct market participation and whether these capabilities produce sustained improvements in income and enterprise development.

Regional and sectoral differences represent another major area for future research. The reviewed literature clearly indicates that ODOP outcomes vary across districts because of differences in infrastructure, institutional support, product characteristics, market conditions and existing skill bases. Findings from one product cluster cannot therefore be assumed to apply automatically to another. Comparative research across industries and districts can help identify which combinations of training, finance, technology and market support are most effective under different local conditions.

The distribution of human-capital benefits also requires greater attention. Women, informal workers, marginalised communities and very small producers may encounter different barriers to participation. Future studies should therefore examine not only average programme outcomes but also the accessibility and distribution of training, finance and market opportunities across different groups. Such analysis would provide a more complete understanding of whether ODOP contributes to inclusive as well as aggregate development.

Finally, there is a need for research that examines human capital as an integrated concept rather than treating skills, employment, productivity, income and entrepreneurship as unrelated outcomes. The available evidence suggests that these dimensions are strongly interconnected. A worker's technical capability may influence productivity, but the economic return to that capability may depend upon employment conditions, finance, technology and market access. Future empirical research should therefore examine these relationships together and provide clearer evidence regarding the pathways through which ODOP contributes to the long-term development of local productive capabilities.

10. Conclusion

The One District One Product initiative represents an important approach to localised economic development because it attempts to build upon productive capabilities that already exist within particular districts. Traditional products are supported not merely as commodities but as elements of local production systems involving artisans, workers, small enterprises, institutions and markets. The reviewed literature generally indicates that ODOP has contributed positively to employment, entrepreneurship, production, income opportunities, market access and the visibility of traditional industries. Training, financial assistance, Common Facility Centres, technology, branding and institutional support constitute important mechanisms through which these outcomes can be strengthened.

From the perspective of human capital, the principal significance of ODOP lies in its potential to improve the productive capabilities of artisans, workers and local entrepreneurs. Technical training can strengthen occupational knowledge, employment can provide opportunities for skills to be practised and developed, financial assistance can support investment and enterprise expansion, and improved market access can increase the economic return obtained from specialised capabilities. Entrepreneurship further expands the range of relevant human capital by creating a need for financial, managerial, marketing and decision-making skills in addition to production knowledge.

The literature nevertheless demonstrates that positive outcomes cannot be assumed merely from the existence of policy support. Skill gaps, inadequate awareness, weak infrastructure, difficulties in accessing institutional credit, technological constraints, digital limitations, marketing deficiencies and uneven administrative capacity continue to restrict programme effectiveness. Differences across districts and sectors further demonstrate that the impact of ODOP depends substantially upon local conditions. Human-capital development is therefore not a separate or automatic consequence of product promotion but a process shaped by the interaction of training, finance, institutions, technology and markets.

Another important conclusion is that traditional knowledge and modern capabilities need to be developed together. Many district-specific products derive their identity and competitiveness from specialised craftsmanship accumulated over generations. The objective of modernisation should therefore not be to displace this knowledge but to strengthen its productive value through appropriate technology, quality improvement, enterprise development and wider market access. A sustainable local industry requires workers who can preserve valuable occupational knowledge while adapting to changing economic conditions.

The review also identifies a significant limitation in the existing research. Although human-capital themes appear frequently in ODOP literature, relatively few studies examine human capital directly and comprehensively. Production, exports, marketing and regional development receive greater attention than the development of workers' knowledge, skills and adaptive capabilities. This creates a clear need for more focused empirical research examining training quality, intergenerational skill transfer, financial and digital capabilities, employment conditions, productivity and the distribution of programme benefits among different groups.

Overall, the available evidence suggests that the long-term developmental value of ODOP depends as much upon the development of people as upon the promotion of products. Physical infrastructure, branding and marketing can create favourable conditions, but the sustainability and competitiveness of local industries ultimately depend upon the knowledge, skills, adaptability and entrepreneurial capabilities of those engaged in production. Human capital should therefore occupy a more central position in both the implementation and evaluation of ODOP. By combining traditional productive knowledge with contemporary skills, institutional support, accessible finance, appropriate technology and wider market opportunities, ODOP has the potential to contribute not only to district-specific product development but also to more sustainable and inclusive local economic development.

11. References

1. Gaur, P. (2023). Promoting districts as export hubs in the export policy: India's experiment with the One District One Product Programme (RIS Discussion Paper No. 285). Research and Information System for Developing Countries.
2. Government of Uttar Pradesh. (2018). One District–One Product Scheme. Invest UP.
3. Kanujiya, P. K., & Sahni, H. (2026). ODOP scheme and inclusive rural development: Analyzing socio-economic empowerment in Shravasti district, U.P. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research in Arts, Science and Technology*, 4(1).
4. Kapoor, G. T. (2021). A study of production pattern and ease of loans under ODOP programme in Uttar Pradesh. *Shodh Sarita*, January–March 2021.
5. Kumar, A., & Gupta, L. S. (2023). Unlocking economic growth: Empowering local industries through the One District, One Product initiative and export expansion (case study of Uttar Pradesh). *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 8(6), 3310–3318.
6. Kumari, D., & Mohammad, A. (2025). The economic evaluation of ODOP scheme's financial interventions and its contribution to Uttar Pradesh regional development. *International Journal of Economic Practices and Theories*, 2025(1), 133–146.
7. Maurya, N. K., & Misra, R. (2021). One District One Product (ODOP) Scheme: A tale of two agricultural products in Eastern Uttar Pradesh (Working Paper No. 145). Giri Institute of Development Studies, Lucknow.

8. Meena, R., Tripathi, V., & Kulshreshtha, K. (2025). Performance of handicraft sector under the One District One Product (ODOP) scheme: A comprehensive study in selected districts. *TPM: Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 32(S6), 1226–1238.
9. Ministry of Commerce and Industry, Government of India. (2024). Implementation status of One District One Product (ODOP) initiative (Rajya Sabha Unstarred Question No. 1317).
10. National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development (NABARD). (2022). One District One Product (ODOP).
11. NITI Aayog. (2022). One District One Product scheme. Government of India.
12. Patel, A. (2025). A study on the impact of One District One Product (ODOP) scheme on economy of Uttar Pradesh: An economic analysis. *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, 7(3).
13. Sharma, H., & Srivastava, S. K. (2021). A study of the role of administration skills in the success of One District One Product Scheme in Uttar Pradesh. *International Journal of Innovative Research in Engineering & Management*, 8(5), 68–72.
14. Singh, A. K., Gangal, V. K., & Gogia, J. (2025). Impact of One District One Product (ODOP) programme on export performance: A study of selected districts of Uttar Pradesh. *IOSR Journal of Economics and Finance*, 16(3), 40–45.
15. Srivastava, I., & Gupta, H. (2025). Policy and governance mechanisms driving the success of the One District One Product initiative. *GAP Bodhi Taru: A Global Journal of Humanities*, 8(Special Issue), 249–256.
16. Srivastava, P. S., & Fatima, A. (2025). From local to global: Promotion and marketing of ODOP products in Uttar Pradesh. In A. K. Singh, S. P. Pandey, & A. Chowdhary (Eds.), *One District One Product (ODOP): Perspective, issues and strategies*. Weser Books.
17. Thomas, R. (2026). One district one product in Uttar Pradesh: A review. *International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Scientific Research*, 9(1).
18. Tiwari, A., Pandey, A. C., & Upadhyay, S. (2023). One District One Product Scheme: A new step towards development. *International Journal of Research and Analytical Reviews*, 10(3), 177–187.
19. Tripathi, A. P., & Agrawal, N. (2021). Impact of an economic revitalization programme on export and employment generation: A case study of One District One Product Programme in Uttar Pradesh, India. *Public Administration and Policy*, 24(3), 306–319.
20. Veerbhan, K., & Malik, A. (2025). Evaluating changes in jaggery production patterns using Likert-scale responses from Northern India. *Archives of Current Research International*, 25(12), 8–24.
21. Yadav, M. K. (2024). Exploring market dynamics and product development under the 'One District, One Product' scheme: Insights from the Indian gooseberry industry in Pratapgarh District, Uttar Pradesh. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 30(1), 3936–3946.