

A STUDY SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CONDITION OF THE FISHER COMMUNITY IN INDIA

NAGARAJ SURESH KALMANE, Research Scholar, Kannada University, HAMPI
Karnataka

Dr.SHANTAMALLAPPA Y HONNUNGAR, Assistant Professor, SSMS Degree College,
ATHANI, Karnataka

Abstract

The socio-economic conditions of fishermen in India are poor. Fishers typically reside in substandard housing and pursue more inadequate education. Due to a relatively low revenue from fishing, fishermen are driven to borrow money to support many families. Fishing activities in India demonstrate the nation's cultural variety. To increase the overall productivity of India's fisheries, it is necessary to strengthen fishery management rules, input supply, and technical and social assistance.

Keywords: Fisheries; Education; Income; Productivity.

Introduction

With 1.27 billion people, India is the world's second most populous country [1]. In India, agriculture still provides a living and a source of income for 65 % of the population [2]. Fisheries constitute a significant source of protein for the country's population. According to the 2003 Livestock Census, India's fishermen population is 14,485,354 [3]. Fisheries are essential to the Indian economy; however, the economic position of fishermen is relatively low. Currently, the fisheries sector in India employs 5.97 million people, 2.40 million of whom are full-time fishermen [4]. In 2002, 74% of the 38 million fishermen worked in catch fisheries, while 26% worked in aquaculture. Small-scale fisheries are the primary source of income for the poor category of fishermen. One of the most fundamental factors for fishermen's poor economic situation is a lack of awareness among fishers and fishing communities. Relevant and cost-effective solutions to the complex problem of fishers, new policies and strategies, various economic, cultural, resource, institutional, and political conditions, active participation of social scientists and training programs organized by different types of trainers, focusing on these primary goals, the paper will review the state of various socio-economic profiles of Indian fishermen.

Fishers' social profiles

The reviews of fishermen's social profiles are grouped into eleven categories. Age, Education, Family Type, Family Size, Religion and Cast, House and Habitation, Training Programs Attended, Social Involvement, Scientific Orientation, Sex Composition, and their contribution are all factors to consider.

Age: Age structure is essential to a community's socio-economic system. The ages of Indian fishermen have been mentioned in several research articles by various authors. Bhoumik and Pandit evaluated the generations of fishermen in seven West Bengal belts and found that they ranged from 18 to 62 years old [5]. 8.75 % were between the ages of 12 and 18, 50.83 % were between the ages of 19 and 40, 26.25 % were between the ages of 41 and 60, and 14.65 % were beyond 60. According to a study on the adoption behaviour of traditional fishermen, 38.33 % of fisher folk are in their middle age group, 48.33 % are in their old age group, and the majority of trawler owners are in their middle (43.33 %) and old age (35 %) groups, respectively [6]. Immanuel revealed in her study on links among research, extension, and clientele systems in Kerala marine fishers that 52.67 % of the fishermen are in their middle age group, 27.33 % are in their elderly age group, and 20 % are in their young age group. [7] A young age group. Santosh Ram et al. studied the socio-economics of the

fishermen community around the Junglighat fish landing centre in South Andaman and found that the age group between 21 and 40 years was the most common, followed by 41-60, 11-20, >60, and 0-10 in descending order, with values of 44.44 %, 25.93 %, 12.97 %, 9.26 %, and 7.4 % in the case of 0-10 [8].

Education: Soumyendra et al. described in their study on socio-economic appraisal of culture-based fishermen in a part of West Bengal that qualification-wise illiteracy rate was highest in the case of four F.C.S. (Fisheries Cooperative Society) that is, Ausgram (71.42 %), Sankai (55.88 %), Naliapur (54.9 %), and Notu (44.82 %) in second, third, and fourth position respectively [9]. Interestingly, the lowest degree of illiteracy was seen in Chhatadighi (50 %), Khatpukur (60 %), and O.C.P (42.85 %), whereas O.C.P (42.85 %) occupied the upper ranks in terms of above-primary level education of fishermen. According to a study on the utilization of indigenous technological knowledge by Mumbai coastal fishermen, 46 % had an elementary level of education, 20 % understood how to read and write, 18 % had a high school education, and 16 % were illiterates [10]. Mukesh et al. described no formal education (46 %), elementary level (30 %), secondary level (15 %), and only 9 % are higher secondary level in their study on the profile of socio-economic condition of fishermen in selected villages in Kabirdham district, Chhattisgarh state [11]. It hinders skill development, exposure to production technologies, and marketing methods due to a lack of underprivileged conditions and education awareness.

Family type: According to Utpal et al., in their study on some socio-economic aspects of the fishermen of twin-pronged floodplain wetlands in West Bengal, 85 % of Purba Helatala Fishermen Co-operative Society members preferred the nuclear type of family, while 84.72 % of Barhal Fishermen Co-operative Society members preferred nuclear type of family [12]. Anon et al. discovered in their study on the socio-economic analysis of Nuvvulrevu village in the Srikakulam district of Andhra Pradesh that 87 % of respondents had nuclear families, while 13 % had joint families. In their study on the socio-economic and cultural profile of fishermen in the Puducherry region, Karuppusamy et al. found that out of 200 fishermen, 130 or 65 % lived in nuclear families and 70 or 35 % in mixed families [14]. The type of family is a significant component in the socio-economic status analyses of fishermen.

Family composition: According to a study on the fisheries status and socio-economic conditions of the fisher community in the Dholi region of Muzaffarpur, Bihar, India, most families are medium-sized. Composed of 5 to 6 persons, followed by huge families with seven or more individuals. The lowest %age of tiny families with two to four members is 26% [15]. Shankar et al. discovered that 30.66 % of fishermen had families with fewer than five members, and 69.34 % had families with more than five members [16]. According to a study on the socio-economic profile of fish farmers in Nizamabad District, Telangana, 60 % of the farmers belong to the medium family consisting of 4 to 6 members, 26 % of the farmers belong to the large family consisting of more than six members, and 14 % of the farmers belong to the small family consisting of fewer than four members [17]. Family size, which indicates the availability of family labour, plays a crucial role in fish farming.

Religion and caste: In a study on the profile of the fishing community in the riverside villages of West Bengal, it was determined that 40.83 % of the population belonged to Other Backward Class (OBCA&B), 36.25 % were Schedule Cast (S.C.), 15.42 % were of Scheduled Tribe (S.T.), and only 7.50 % were general, while 58.75 % of respondents were Hindu, 37.91 % were Muslim, and 7.50 % were Christian. Mukesh et al. studied the socio-economic profile of fishermen in a village in Chhattisgarh state and reported that most farmers practice Hinduism and no other religion. In the case of caste, the majority of farmers (36.4%) belong to the Kewat tribe, followed by the Dhimar (32.7%), Malha (22%) and Baiga tribes (8.7 %). In his study on the economic feasibility of fish

cultivation in the district of Faizabad (U.P.), Pandey and Mishra discovered that 100 % of the fishermen are Hindu and belong to the Pasi, Kumhar, and Rajput castes [19].

In a study of socio-economic evaluation of culture-based fishermen in West Bengal, 59 % of the households live in pucca houses in Sankai and Naliapur, and 41 % and 75 % have accepted in-house toilet regulations as a result of a sanitation campaign headed by Panchayet. In their study on the socio-economic level of fishermen and diverse fishing gear used in Beki River, Barpeta, Assam, Gourav et al. discovered that 96.74 % of respondents had kaccha ghar and 3.26 % had pakka ghar [20]. Vischara found that most local male fish workers (75 % in Versova and 100 % in Satpati) lived in their own homes, while the remainder rented [21]. Also, most native male fishermen (about 80 to 90 %) in both villages were found to have modest house areas, but most migrant fish workers (approximately 60 to 100 %) had minimal house areas.

Training programs participated in: A socio-economic investigation of a hamlet in the district of Srikakulam, Andhra Pradesh, revealed that none of the respondents had received training in any area of the fishery or related activities.

Subaschandra, in his study titled Consequence of adoption of fish culture practices by fish farmers, found that 84.14 % of farmers had a medium to a low degree of social participation [22]. In his research on knowledge attitude, 23.84 % and 23.08 % of adopters of social participation belonged to the medium and high levels of social participation, respectively [23].

In his study on the profile of saffron growers, Kubrevi and Khare found that 90 % of small farmers had a low level of scientific orientation, 10 % had a medium level of scientific exposure, and none of the respondents fell into the category of having a high level of scientific direction [24]. Shankar discovered that 56.66 % of respondents had a medium degree of scientific orientation, followed by 23.33 % with a low and 20 % with a high level.

Along their study on the socio-economic state of fishing villages in the Narmada river's reach, Vivek et al. reported that of the 2,406 participants, 1,264 were males and 1,144 were females. Males make up 52.53 % of the area's population, while females account for 47.47 %. It was also determined that women are not directly active in fishing but indirectly support fishing activities by preparing and repairing nets and acting as a market supply chain for fish. In her study on fisher's livelihood and fisheries management in the Loktak lake region of Manipur, Devi discovered that women participated equally with males in many decision-making processes [25]. Men participated in decision-making activities such as fishing and social occasions, whereas women mostly made decisions regarding fish sales and household management.

Economic and lifestyle characteristics of fishermen

The fishermen's economy and way of life comprise employment patterns, average annual expenditure, credit orientation, and way of life, which are examined below.

In their study on the characteristics of rural youth and their participation in fish farm activities, Shivalingaiah et al. discovered that 100 % of small farm youth had a low to medium yearly income, whereas 92 % of large farm rural youth had a medium to significant annual income [26]. Nirmaleet et al. observed in their study on the utilization of indigenous technical knowledge by Mumbai's coastal fisherfolk that 40% of the fishermen had a medium level of experience, 34% had a high level of experience, and 26% had a medium level of expertise. Kubrevi and Khare discovered that most farmers, 81.25 % of respondents, were engaged in agriculture in addition to service and business activities. It was followed by agriculture (8.75 %), agriculture + labour (6.25 %), and agricultural + cast jobs (3.75 %).

Average yearly spending: Sathiadhas et al., in their study on traditional fishermen in low-income trap, a case study in Tamil Nadu, determined that the average annual household expenditure of a

fishermen family is Rs. 8,685 at Mallipattinam and Rs. 6,808 at Keechankuppam [27]. In addition, they reported that 58 % and 85 % of the household budget in these two areas is spent on food alone. S. Jayaselvi examined the economic and health state of fishermen in Tiruchendur and reported that 50 % of respondents spent more than Rs. 6,000 out of the total expenditure pattern of the household [28]. 26% of respondents spent between Rs. 2,000 and Rs. 20 % spent between Rs. 4,000 and Rs. 6,000, while 4 % of the respondents paid a minimal sum.

Rahman et al. discovered that fishermen had no access to scheduled banks for loans due to insufficient collateral security [29]. According to a study on the socio-economic and livelihood state of the Fishermen community in Cumilla, the fishermen obtain loans from various N.G.O.s for a variety of reasons comprising boat construction (20%), net purchasing (30%), and marriage (5 %), food and medicine (5 %), home construction (35 %) [30].

Sustenance: Carney [31] defines capabilities, activities, and assets (including both material and social resources) that contribute to a means of sustenance. Salagrama revealed that the fisheries industry comprises a wide range of livelihood activities, from production and processing to marketing and extra chores, but that many of those involved were not recognized as fish workers [32, 33].

Conclusion

According to various studies and research on the issue of socio-economic conditions and the culture profile of fishers in different parts of India, socio-economic research in India is somewhat developed, but a broad range of studies on socio-economic conditions within the region ranges from highly qualitative to descriptive. Furthermore, based on these many reviews, it can be stated that for the overall growth of the socio-economic and cultural development of fishermen, scientists and policymakers should place a greater emphasis on establishing backwards and forward linkages. If all higher authorities in India concerned with fisheries think closely about these variables and take the required steps, the socio-economic situations of the fishermen will improve, and, according to fisheries reproduction in all sectors, India will reach the top of the world in one day.

References

1. F.A.O. in India, India at a glance.
2. Bijaylakshmi ND, Ngangbam Kumar Ajit (2014) Socio-economic conditions and cultural profile of the fishers in India-a review. IOSR J Agric Vet Sci 7: 42-48.
3. Fishery Survey of India.
4. Nayak, L, Mishra AK (2008) Socio-economic condition of fishermen and its effect on environment: A case study of Ganjam district, Orissa. Nat Environ Pollut Technol 7: 111.
5. Bhaumik U, Pandit PK (1991) Socio-economic status of fishermen in some beels of West Bengal. Ecol Environ 93: 600-603.
6. Sujath Kumar NV (1988) Adoption behaviour of traditional fishermen and trawler owners—A comparative analysis.
7. Immanuel S (2004) Linkage among research, extension and clientele systems in marine fisheries in Kerala, Unpub.
8. Ram BS, Kumar RR, Malakar B (2015) Socio-economics of fishermen community around the Junglighat fish landing centre, South Andaman- a case study. J Biol Res.
9. Datta SK, Kundu R (2007) Socio-economic appraisal of culture based fishermen: Case study in West Bengal. J Soc Sci 15: 255-262.
10. V.H. N, BS S, R.S. B, S.Y. M, SL C (2007) Use of indigenous knowledge by coastal

11. Bhendarkar MP, Sarang N, bhosale M, Rathod RH, Verma L, et al. (2017) A study on profile of socio-economic condition of fishermen in selected village in Kabirdham District, Chhattisgarh State, India.
12. Bhaumik U, Mittal IC, Das P, Paria T (2005) Some socio-economic aspects of the fishermen of twin pronged floodplain wetlands in West Bengal.
13. Anon (2005) Report on the socio economic analysis of Nuvvulrevu village in Srikakulam district of Andhra Pradesh.
14. Parashar V, Bara SK, Damde D, Kumar A, Vyas V (2016) Assessment of the socio-economic status of fishermen communities: a case study from a selected reach of River Narmada, India. *Int J Res Fish Aquac* 6: 47-59.
15. Kumar D, Mehta R., Yadav R, Kumar S, Kumar M (2018) Studies on fisheries status and socio-economic conditions of fisher community in Dholi region, Muzaffarpur, Bihar, India. *J Entomol Zool Stud* 6: 76-80.
16. Shankar S (2010) An analysis of the knowledge level of fisherfolk about marine fisheries management and resource conservation. Unpub. M.F. Sc (thesis), Central institute of Fisheries Education, Mumbai.
17. Mohan M, Swetha M, Naaiik B R.V.T., Rajkumar BV, Bhavyamanjari M, et al. (2020) Socio-economic profile of fish farmers of Nizamabad District, Telengana. *J Entomol Zool Stud*.
18. Panigrahi AK, Bakshi A (2014) A Study on Profile of Fishing Community of the River Side Villages of River Churni, Nadia, West Bengal With Special Reference to Socio-economic and Technological Appraisal of Fishermen. *Int J Res Appl Natural and Social Sciences*.
19. Pandey AC, Mishra JP (2001) Economic feasibility of fish culture in the district Faizabad (UP), India a case study. *Encyclopaedia of Agricultural Marketing*, NaurangRai for Mittal Publications 7: 263-270.
20. Kalita JG, Goswami P, Sarma K Pradip, Rout S (2015) Socio-economic status of fishermen and different fishing gear used in Beki river, Barpeta, Assam. *J Entomol Zool Stud* 3: 193-198.
21. Vichare PS (2010) A study on effect of migration on livelihood of coastal fishers in Maharashtra. Unpub. M.F. Sc (thesis), Central Institute of Fisheries Education, Mumbai.
22. Subashchandra R (1986) Consequence of adoption of fish culture practices by fish farmers. Unpub. M. Sc. (Agri) Thesis, TNAU, Coimbatore.
23. Nagarajaiah CR (2002) A study on Knowledge attitude and extent of adoption of composite fish culture practices in southern Karnataka.
24. Kubrevi SS, Khare NK (2006) Profile of saffron growers. *Indian Research J Ext Educ* 6: 1-6.
25. Devi N.B.L., Ngangbam AK, Biswal NN (2014) A review on the current fisheries management system in Manipur with special reference to LoktakLake. *J Agric Vet Sci* 7.
26. Shivalingaiah YN, Veerabhadrarai V, Suresha SV (1996) Socio-economic characteristics of rural youth and their participation in farm activities. *JEE* 7: 1460-1463.
27. Sathiadhas R, Panikkar K.K.P., Kanakkan A (1994) Traditional fishermen in low income trap—A case study in Thanjavur coast of Tamil Nadu. *MFIS, Technical and Extension Series* 135: 5-10.
28. Jayaselvi S (2016) An economic and health status of fishermen in Tiruchendur. *Shanlax Int J Arts Sci. Hum* 4: 35-53.
29. Rahman MM, Haque MM, Akhteruzzaman M (2002) Fishing Community beside the Old Brahmaputra River, Mymensingh, Bangladesh. *Asian Fish Sci* 15: 371- 386.
30. Uddin MK, Hasan MR, Paul SK, Sultana T (2020) Socio-Economic Condition and Livelihood Status of the Fishermen Community at Muradnagar Upazila in Cumilla. *Fish Aquat J* 11: 1c-1c.
31. Carney D (1998) Sustainable livelihoods. *Sustainable Livelihoods: What contribution can we make*.
32. Salagrama V (2006) Trends in poverty and livelihoods in coastal fishing communities of Orissa State, India. *F.A.O*.
33. Karuppusamy R, Karthikeyan K (2018) A study on socio-economic and cultural profile of fishermen in Puducherry region, India. *IJAR* 5: 1752-1761.