



A STUDY ON SOCIO ECONOMIC CONDITIONS OF THE FISHER FOLK COMMUNITY IN KRISHNA DISTRICT OF ANDHRA PRADESH

V. Nageswara Rao, Research Scholar, Dept. of Sociology and Social Work, Acharya Nagarjuna University, Nagarjuna Nagar.

Dr. M. Trimurthy Rao, Professor, Dept. of Sociology and Social Work, Acharya Nagarjuna University, Nagarjuna Nagar.

Fisheries area gives direct work to around 1,000,000 individuals in India. It additionally gives roundabout work in unified exercises, for example, net production, pontoon building, fish handling, fish transportation, crate making, ice assembling and salt production. In India during 1977 there were 0.892 million individuals occupied with fishing, barring fish handling and other associated activities. At present there are 6 million individuals occupied with fishing and its connected exercises.

India positioned seventh on the planet in fish production, delivered 2.5 million tons in 1983 when the absolute world production was 76.47 million tons. As per 1999-2000 registration, India was delivering 2.83 million tons in marine fish production. The fishing industry in India is significant from the perspective of fare profit. In 1981-82 the estimation of marine items sends out was Rs.286.1 crores. It was expanded to Rs.384.29 crores in 1984-85. It has expanded to Rs.51167 million out of 1999-2000. Taking into account the excessive cost offered for shrimps, the fisherfolk focus on the catch of prawns, the most ordinarily accessible shrimps in Indian waters. The automated fishing sectors in India have developed quickly because of the excessive cost offered for prawns. India has a coastline of 8129 km. which starts close to Kandla in Gujarat in the West Coast and finishes at Gopalpur in West Bengal in the east coast with a complete mainland rack of 0.5 million square kilometres.

India has announced through Act of parliament in August 1976, an Exclusive Economic Zone of 2.02 million miles square kilometre to investigate, exploit, oversee and preserve the living and non-living assets of her oceans. This measure was embraced, observing the overall agreement among countries and the developing patterns of the U.N. Meeting on the law of the oceans.

The share of marine fisheries is important to total fish production. In the year 1951-52, the fish production was 7.52 lakh tons, of which 0.22 lakhs tons (about 2.9%) was sent out. This fare was short of what one per cent (0.45%) of the all-out fare estimation of India. Yet, from that point fish production in India,

both marine just as inland, gained quick ground because of improvement of innovations in the field of production, transport (protected vans), cold stockpiles, handling and marketing. Consequent upon increase in production, exports also rose more rapidly and achieved great success.

The study conducted with the objective of to study the socio-economic characteristics of fisher folk in Krishna District of Andhra Pradesh. The sample selected for the study, the respondents are selected 30 in each village in sequential order by using simple random sample method. Thus, a total of 360 (44.0 per cent) respondents from all the 12 villages are finalised.

Table – 1: Place of Residence

Sl.No	Place of Residence	Frequency	Percent
1	Koduru	90	25.0
2	Krutivenu	90	25.0
3	Machilipatnam	90	25.0
4	Nagaya Lanka	90	25.0
Total		360	100.0

The table 1 depicted that the area selected for study Koduru, Krutivenu, Machilipatnam and Nagaya Lanka madals of the Krishna District, Andhra Pradesh. About 360, the sample was selected equally by 90 respondents from each mandal to assess the socio-economic development and livelihood risks and challenges of fisher folk community.

Table – 2: Age of the Respondents

Place of Residence	Age					Total
	< - 25	26 - 35	36 - 45	46 - 55	56 - >	
Koduru	21	24	32	7	6	90
	5.8%	6.7%	8.9%	1.9%	1.7%	25.0%
Krutivenu	21	24	35	6	4	90
	5.8%	6.7%	9.7%	1.7%	1.1%	25.0%
Machilipatnam	21	24	36	9	0	90
	5.8%	6.7%	10.0%	2.5%	.0%	25.0%
Nagaya Lanka	21	24	36	9	0	90
	5.8%	6.7%	10.0%	2.5%	.0%	25.0%
Total	84	96	139	31	10	360
	23.3%	26.7%	38.6%	8.6%	2.8%	100.0%

Table 2 shows that the age group composition of Fisher folk community sample respondents. In order to facilitate further analysis, five age categories have been developed. The table shows that in the age group of 36 to 45 years are 38.6 per cent followed by 26 to 35 age group constitute 26.7 per cent, followed by 23.3 per cent are belongs to below 25 age group, 8.6 per cent is in the age group of 46-55 years and remaining a negligence 2.8 per cent belongs to 56 and above age group. Hence, the majority are 36 to 45 years of the respondents are leading and the average mean age of the respondents are 36.4306 years.

Table – 3: Education of the Respondents

Place of Residence	Education				Total
	Illiterate	Primary	Secondary	Degree & above	
Koduru	43	29	15	3	90
	11.9%	8.1%	4.2%	.8%	25.0%
Krutivenu	43	29	14	4	90
	11.9%	8.1%	3.9%	1.1%	25.0%
Machilipatnam	42	28	15	5	90
	11.7%	7.8%	4.2%	1.4%	25.0%
Nagaya Lanka	42	27	15	6	90
	11.7%	7.5%	4.2%	1.7%	25.0%
Total	170	113	59	18	360
	47.2%	31.4%	16.4%	5.0%	100.0%

Education is one of the important indications of socio-economic development of society. It gives analyzing capacity and wisdom to thinking and decision capacity. Education improves awareness for better life and generates positive impulses for socio-economic advancement. It controls the attitudes, opinions and behaviour of the people and influences the economic destiny of the family. Of the total respondents, 47.2 per cent are illiterates, 31.4 per cent educated upto primary level, followed by 16.4 per cent studied up to secondary level and 5.0 per cent are studied inter and above.

Table – 4: Occupation of the Respondents

Place of Residence	Occupation				Total
	Fishing	Fish vender	Fish processor	Fish marketing	
Koduru	43	32	8	7	90
	11.9%	8.9%	2.2%	1.9%	25.0%
Krutivenu	40	36	7	7	90
	11.1%	10.0%	1.9%	1.9%	25.0%
Machilipatnam	45	38	4	3	90
	12.5%	10.6%	1.1%	.8%	25.0%
Nagaya Lanka	40	36	6	8	90
	11.1%	10.0%	1.7%	2.2%	25.0%
Total	168	142	25	25	360
	46.7%	39.4%	6.9%	6.9%	100.0%

The researcher examined the socio-economic characteristics of the sample respondents of the fisher folk community. Table 4.7 shows that the majority (46.7 per cent) respondents are their main occupation is fishing, followed by 39.4 per cent are belongs to fish venders. Among 6.9 per cent and 6.9 percent are belongs to fish processor and fish marketing respectively.

Table – 5: Hereditary of Profession

Place of Residence	Was your profession hereditary		Total
	Yes	No	
Koduru	56	34	90
	15.6%	9.4%	25.0%
Krutivenu	73	17	90
	20.3%	4.7%	25.0%
Machilipatnam	74	16	90
	20.6%	4.4%	25.0%
Nagaya Lanka	73	17	90
	20.3%	4.7%	25.0%
Total	276	84	360
	76.7%	23.3%	100.0%

The table 4.8 reveals that hereditary of the profession, the majority 76.7 per cent of the respondents taken this profession as hereditary and remaining 23.3 per cent of the respondents it has taken by their choice.

Table – 6: Monthly Income of the Respondents

Place of Residence	Income					Total
	< 5000	5001 - 10000	10001 - 15000	15001 - 20000	20001 - >	
Koduru	14	9	22	31	14	90
	3.9%	2.5%	6.1%	8.6%	3.9%	25.0%
Krutivenu	13	10	23	32	12	90
	3.6%	2.8%	6.4%	8.9%	3.3%	25.0%
Machilipatnam	16	11	47	15	1	90
	4.4%	3.1%	13.1%	4.2%	.3%	25.0%
Nagaya Lanka	18	12	48	9	3	90
	5.0%	3.3%	13.3%	2.5%	.8%	25.0%
Total	61	42	140	87	30	360
	16.9%	11.7%	38.9%	24.2%	8.3%	100.0%

Mean Income Rs. 14,162/-

Table 4.9 portray the monthly income of the fisher folk community. It is evident that the vast majority of the respondents are below the poverty line with low income. About 16.9 per cent are earning below Rs. 5000 per month followed by 11.7 per cent getting Rs. 5001 – 10000 of income, the majority 38.9 per cent earning 10001 – 15000. About 24.2 per cent and remaining 8.3 per cent are earning between 15001 – 20000 and 20001 and above income. It is a good trend for getting some income through various sources such as MGNERGA job card. The average monthly mean income of the respondents are Rs. 14162/-. Thus, the majority of respondents are having the MGNREGA job card through that they also are getting some partly income by engaging in this work at their village level.

Table–7: Particulars of Domestic Assets

Sl. No	Domestic Assets	Yes	No	Total N=360
1	TV	72.0	28.0	100.0
2	Two-wheeler	22.0	78.0	100.0
4	Auto	03.7	96.3	100.0
5	Mobile Phone	98.2	1.8	100.0
6	Refrigerator	4.1	95.9	100.0
7	Gas stove	59.7	40.3	100.0
Total Average Per centage		43.3	56.7	100.0

The above table 7 reveals the particulars of domestic assets of the sample households in the selected areas. In the overall study out of, 72.0 per cent are having TVs, 22.0 per cent having two-wheeler, subsequently, 98.2 per cent of the respondents having mobile phone, followed by 59.7 per cent of the respondents are having gas stoves and 4.1 per cent are owned the refrigerator. A negligible number of 3.7 per cent respondents having autos.

The mobile as the domestic asset is at the top in the sample area, Television are in the next place. In overall observation the domestic assets are TVs, Gas stove are relatively more in the study area.

The overall total percentage 43.3 per cent of the respondents having of the domestic assets whereas, 56.7 per cent of the respondents didn't have the domestic assets.

Table – 8: Electrification of the House

Place of Residence	Electrification		Total
	Yes	No	
Koduru	81	9	90
	22.5%	2.5%	25.0%
Krutivenu	85	5	90
	23.6%	1.4%	25.0%
Machilipatnam	83	7	90
	23.1%	1.9%	25.0%
Nagaya Lanka	81	9	90
	22.5%	2.5%	25.0%
Total	330	30	360
	91.7%	8.3%	100.0%

However, the housing conditions are pathetic since they lack basic facilities. But, the majority of the households do have access to electricity (91.7 percent). The facility of electricity available in the houses of the fisher folk can be considered as an indicator of socio-economic transformation. In this context it is imperative examine the details of the electrified houses of this fisher folk communities. Table 8 shows the facilities available in the houses of these communities.

Table – 9: Toilet Facility of the House

Place of Residence	Toilet		Total
	Yes	No	
Koduru	61	29	90
	16.9%	8.1%	25.0%
Krutivenu	62	28	90
	17.2%	7.8%	25.0%
Machilipatnam	62	28	90
	17.2%	7.8%	25.0%
Nagaya Lanka	66	24	90
	18.3%	6.7%	25.0%
Total	251	109	360
	69.7%	30.3%	100.0%

The toilet facility is also not available to the fisher folk households and still 30.3 percent of them accepted that they do not have latrines. They used to either manual scavenging toilet or forced to defecate in the open. Among the total sample, 69.7 percent households constructed their toilets away from the house. In coastal areas usually toilets are built in a very corner place of their houses. Majority of the households have not attached to their houses. The toilet facility has been reported to somewhat dissatisfactory in all the places of study areas (Table 4.21).

Table – 10: Water Facility of the House

Place of Residence	Water facility		Total
	Yes	No	
Koduru	63	27	90
	17.5%	7.5%	25.0%
Krutivenu	72	18	90
	20.0%	5.0%	25.0%
Machilipatnam	67	23	90
	18.6%	6.4%	25.0%
Nagaya Lanka	75	15	90
	20.8%	4.2%	25.0%
Total	277	83	360
	76.9%	23.1%	100.0%

The table 10 shows that water facility whether available or not at sample villages. The sample villages are located in the sea shore area and usually, the ground water filled with salt water. About 76.9 per cent of the respondents said that the government providing water facility to these villages and remaining 23.1 per cent of respondents said that there is no water supply.

Table – 11: Own of Agricultural Land

Place of Residence	Agricultural land		Total
	Yes	No	
Koduru	32	58	90
	8.9%	16.1%	25.0%
Krutivenu	28	62	90
	7.8%	17.2%	25.0%
Machilipatnam	30	60	90
	8.3%	16.7%	25.0%
Nagaya Lanka	30	60	90
	8.3%	16.7%	25.0%
Total	120	240	360
	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%

Most of the respondents are landless (66.7 per cent), however the 33.3 per cent possessing small and marginal land holdings. The landlessness has been reported high in the study area where they mostly belong to underprivileged sections of the people and depends upon daily wages. The study reveals that the majority of the respondents are marginal landholders. About the majority of the households own less than two acres of land.

Table –12: Extent of Agricultural Land

Place of Residence	Extent of land			Total
	1-2 acre	3-4 acres	No land	
Koduru	31	1	58	90
	8.6%	.3%	16.1%	25.0%
Krutivenu	27	1	62	90
	7.5%	.3%	17.2%	25.0%
Machilipatnam	30	0	60	90
	8.3%	.0%	16.7%	25.0%
Nagaya Lanka	30	0	60	90
	8.3%	.0%	16.7%	25.0%
Total	118	2	240	360
	32.8%	.6%	66.7%	100.0%

More than 32.8 per cent of them have an average holding of less than two acres. More than 0.6 per cent of them hold in between 3-4 acres each acres of land. The majority about 66.7 per cent of the respondents are not having any land. The per centage of those possessing less than 10 cents is also comparatively very low.

Conclusion:

The socio-economic context of the Fisher folk community of the Krishna District deliberated on various subjective characteristics like age, occupation, and education. The major occupation is fishing and the majority of the respondents are no land. The domestic assets of the fisher folk which are to be more understanding of their socio-economic status. They most backward and socially deprived while leading their day to day life.

References:

1. Asian Development Bank (1993), Fisheries Sector Profile of the Philippines. Agriculture Department. Division 1. June 1993. 88 pp.
2. Balasubramaniam S, BankeyBihori and Braj Mohan, (2001) *Socio-Economic status of Marine Fishermen in two Fishing villages of Orissa*, Fishery Tehnology, Vol.38(1) p.51, 2001.
3. Government of India, (1979) *Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries Division*, Hand Book on Fisheries Statistics, 1979, p.14.
4. Government of India, (2001), *Handbook of Fisheries Statistics 2000*. Ministry of Agriculture, New Delhi.
5. Nammalwar.P. and Prakasam.V.R., (1979) *Present Status and Problems of Fishermen in the Marine Fishing Industry*, Sea Food Export Journal, 11(2): 1979, pp.27-30.
6. Ramani.N., (2004) "A *Study of the Economic Activities of the Marine Fisherwomen in Ramanathapuram District*, Tamil Nadu, India" Ph.D., Thesis submitted to Madurai Kamaraj University, Madurai, 2004, pp. 185 - 198.