

Comparative analysis of economic profile of fish farmers and fishers in Kamrup District, Assam

Economic analysis of Fish farmers and Fishers in Kamrup District, Assam, India

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to explore the understanding of economic condition of Fish farmers and Fishers in inland fisheries of Assam, a north-eastern state of India that is rich in inland fisheries resources and represent the condition of many developing countries. A survey of 60 fish farmers and 60 fishers was conducted in Kamrup, a representative district of the Indian state, from 1 October to 31 December 2015. Fish farmers and fishers are selected randomly. An ex-post-facto research design was followed to carry out the study that have already occurred. A structured Interview schedule was developed incorporating relevant points to accomplish the Objectives set for the study. It is observed that fish farmers of Bazera development block are lagging behind from fish farmers of Hajo Development Block. The study revealed that fish farmers has a better income as compared to fishers purely from fisheries sector alone and block wise analysis revealed that Hajo block is better positioned in terms of the income of both fishers and fish farmers as compared to Bezera block. This paper explores to understand the status and cause of existing income so that developmental policies and conservation measure of resource can be oriented in right perspective.

Keywords: *Fishers, Income, Block, Fisheries.*

INTRODUCTION

India is the second largest fish producing and second largest aquaculture nation in the world [1]. The total fish production during 2015-16 (provisional) is at 10.79 million metric tonne (MMT) with a contribution of 7.21 MMT from inland sector and 3.58 MMT from marine sector. Inland fisheries have emerged as a major contributor to the overall fish production in the country with a share of 66.81% [2]. Within this sector aquaculture has emerged as the major contributor. Its share to the total inland fish production has improved from 34 percent in mid-1980s to about 80 percent in recent years [3]. India is endowed with huge inland water resources which comprises 29,000 kms of rivers, 0.3 million ha of estuaries, 0.19 million ha of backwaters and lagoons, 3.15 million ha of reservoirs, 0.2 million ha of

32 floodplain wetlands, 2.36 million ha of ponds and tanks and 0.72 million ha of upland lakes. Though
33 the production breakup of different water bodies is not available, it is established that ponds and tanks
34 are the major sources of aquaculture production whereas capture fisheries production from rivers and
35 estuaries contribute only a small share of the total inland catch. The bulk of the inland capture
36 production comes from reservoirs and floodplain wetlands, which are managed on the basis of
37 culture-based fisheries or various other forms of enhancement [3]. Roughly 14.5 million people are
38 directly involved in the fisheries sector of the country. This sector besides meeting the domestic
39 needs and livelihood of such huge population also generates foreign exchange earnings to the tune of
40 US\$ 3.51 billion (2012–13) which amply justifies the importance of the sector on the country's
41 economy and in livelihood security [4].

42 Assam is the most water resourceful state in the North East part of the country. Fisheries
43 sector is considered as an important economic activity in the state of Assam. The state with a
44 geographic area of 78,438 km² (30 % of the North Eastern Region) is gifted with vast aquatic
45 resources comprising of floodplain wetlands (locally known as *beels*), swamps, reservoirs and ponds
46 in addition to the two major river systems viz. the Brahmaputra and the Barak with their tributaries [5].
47 The total fish production in Assam during the year 2016-17 is 3.07 lakh tonnes, while the state
48 requires 3.36 lakh tonnes of fish, considering a per capita requirement of @ 11 kg [6]. Kamrup district
49 of Assam which is situated between latitudes 25°46' and 26°49' N and between longitudes 90°48' and
50 91°50' E. The district has a total geographical area of 4345 km² and is endowed with a good numbers
51 of fisheries resources. The total fish production in the district stands at 22,150 tonnes during 2014-15
52 and is the third major fish producing district of the state. Besides the total fish seed production in the
53 district is to the tune of 127.65 million numbers during 2014-15 [7]. Rivers, particularly the mighty
54 Brahmaputra flowing through the heart of the district and *beels* form the major source of capture
55 fisheries for the fishers of the district, whereas ponds and tanks are the major source of aquaculture.
56 Though the exact contribution from capture and culture fisheries to the total fish production of the
57 state and that of the district yet to segregated officially, nevertheless the present national scenario
58 suggests that inland capture fish production has stagnated while the production from aquaculture has
59 been on the rise over the last few decades, which has an indirect bearing on the economic profile of
60 fishers and fish farmers. Information on economic as well as social profile of fishers and fish farmers
61 is an essential requirement towards successful implementation of developmental programmes [8].
62 Though numerous economic surveys has been carried out in fisheries sector across the country [9],
63 [10], [11], [12] and [13] such critical information is limited for fishers and fish farmers of Assam. In
64 recent time many more research has been carried out in the field of fish culture [14], fish marketing
65 strategy [15] and socio economic condition of fish farmers [16] and [17]. The present study was
66 carried out to assess the economic profile particularly the income generated through fish farming and
67 fish capture of fish farmers and fishers respectively of Kamrup district of Assam which will be help in
68 comparative analysis of the two groups and provide basic information for formulation and
69 implementation of developmental projects.

70 MATERIALS AND METHODS

71 Locale of the Study

72 Kamrup district is situated between 25°46' - 26°49' N latitude and 90°48' - 91°50' E longitude
73 of the state of Assam, India. Kamrup district represents sizable presence inland water bodies with an
74 average to represent the state. Two Development Blocks, namely, Hajo which comprises 94 villages
75 and 16 Gaon Panchayats and Bezera with 57 villages and 7 Gaon Panchayats were selected for the
76 present study. The two blocks were selected based upon fish production with Hajo having the highest
77 fish production and Bezera with lowest fish production among all the Development Blocks of the
78 district. Moreover the selected blocks had sizable number of fish farmers and fishers. Names of fish
79 farmers and fishers from both the selected blocks were collected from officials of DoF. Thirty fish
80 farmers and the same number for fishers were randomly selected from each block. Therefore, from
81 both the blocks a sum total of 120 samples were chosen for the study. A structured interview
82 schedule was developed to collect relevant data.

83 Selection of Respondent

84 In the study, a fish farmer is taken to be a person who possessed some land and was
85 engaged in piscicultural activities on any part of that land throughout the last 365 days during the time
86 of survey and a fish farmer household was defined as one which had at least one farmer as a
87 member. Names of Fish farmers were collected from Matsha Mitra and Department of Fisheries
88 (DOF) for both the selected blocks. Thirty respondents for culture fisheries and the same number for
89 capture fisheries (river and *beel* fisheries) were randomly selected from each of the block. Therefore,
90 a sum total of 120 sample size chosen for the study. Survey was conducted from the month of
91 October to the month of December' 2011.

92 Methods of data collection

93 A structured interview schedule and questionnaire was developed incorporating relevant
94 variables to accomplish the objectives set for the study. An attempt was made to prepare an
95 unbiased, clear, concise, complete and comprehensive interview schedule. The selected farmers
96 were interviewed personally at their home.

97 RESULTS

98 The block-wise breakup of Gaon Panchayat (GP) in Kamrup district is given in Table 1.

99 Table 1: Block wise Gaon Panchayat in Kamrup district

Block Name	No. of GP	Block Name	No. of GP
Bongaon Dev. Block	4	Kamalpur	12
Bezera Dev. Block	7	Rangia	20
Boko Dev. Block	11	Bihidia Jajikona	13
Chaygaon Dev. Block	7	Goewswar	12
Chayani Dev. Block	11	Rani Dev. Block	8
Chamaria Dev. Block	15	Rampur Dev. Block	10
Hajo Dev. Block	16	Goroimari Dev. Block	8
Sualkuchi Dev. Block	8		

100 The district is endowed with 167 ha of forest fisheries, 1418 ha of *beels*, 3043 ha of ponds and tanks
101 and 322 ha of derelict water bodies (Table 2).

Comment [h1]: If farmers were interviewed personally then no need to write questionnaire. Write interview schedule.

Comment [h2]: What are the objectives of the study. Add objectives otherwise remove the objectives.

102 **Table 2: Fisheries resources of Kamrup district**

Types of Resources	Number	Area in ha
Forest Fisheries	2	167
Floodplain wetlands / <i>Beels</i>	59	1418
Ponds and Tanks	21709	3043
Swamp and Derelict water bodies	116	322

103 **Income of fish farmers and fishers**

104 A total of 120 respondents were interviewed in the present study. 60 respondents, 30 each
 105 from both the blocks associated with aquaculture (fish farmers) and another 60 respondents, 30 each
 106 from both the blocks associated with capture fisheries (fishers) were selected. Table 3 reveals that
 107 income of fishers purely from fisheries sector was much lower as compared to fish farmers in both the
 108 blocks. Overall income of fish farmers and fishers in Hajo block was higher than that of fish farmers
 109 and fishers of Bezera block (Fig. 1 and Fig. 2). Thus we can conclude that fish farmers have a better
 110 income as compared to fishers which has a direct bearing on their economic profile and from block
 111 wise point of view Hajo block is better positioned as compared to Bezera. The annual income of
 112 fishers of Hajo block is almost 1.5 times higher than fishers of Bezera block and fish farmers of the
 113 former is having an annual income about 2 times higher than fish farmers of the later. At the same
 114 time fish farmers of Hajo block is having an annual income approximately 4 times higher than the
 115 annual income of fishers of the same block, whereas fish farmers of Bezera block has an annual
 116 income approximately 3 times higher than fishers of the block.

117 **Table 3: Income of fish farmers and fishers purely from fisheries in Hajo and Bezera block of**
 118 **Kamrup district, Assam**

Category	Hajo (n=60)		Bezera (n=60)	
	Income per annum (Rs.)	Monthly income (Rs.)	Income per annum (Rs.)	Monthly income (Rs.)
Fishers (n= 60)	30706	2559	19750	1646
Fish farmers (n = 60)	117682	9807	59857	4988

Comment [h3]: No need of tab same data. Add either table or figu

119




Fig 1.: Bar diagram showing the Fisheries Income of Hajo Dev. Block and Bazera Dev. Block

Comment [h4]: No need of tab same data. Add either table or fig




Fig 2.: Bar diagram showing the Fisheries Income of Hajo Dev. Block and Bazera Dev. Block

Comment [h5]: Data in Table 3 is totally same.

DISCUSSION

During the study it was seen that income of fishers in Hajo block was comparatively higher than Bezera block. This is due to the fact that almost all the open water fisheries resources (rivers and beels) in Bezera block are leased out to individuals so-called *leasee*. As per this system a definite percentage of fishers catch or income goes into the hands of the *leasee*. This significantly reduces the fisher's income. In the study area, it is observed that capture fisheries is a revenue earning source for the government and are managed by Assam Fisheries Development Corporation (AFDC) which manage these fisheries by leasing them to the private parties or to the cooperatives, assuring the local fishers 60 percent of the value of catch. However, actually the private party or the cooperatives only give 30 percent of the catch value to the local fishers and thereby making beel fisheries unattractive livelihood option for the younger fishers [18]. There are numbers of fisher cooperatives exist in Assam but have no

135 meaningful function. The members are often ignorant about their rights and roles. They work as wage
136 labour for the lessee who is usually the leader of the cooperative [19].

137 In Hajo Dev. block only limited numbers of fishers are related to leasee. This directly has an
138 effect on the income of fishers. Moreover, large numbers of fishers in Bazera Dev. Block are depended
139 on river fisheries where as more number of fishers of Hajo Dev. Block are depended on beel fisheries.
140 This also indicates the nature of comparative exploitation vis a vis status of fisheries resources in the
141 river and the beels. As far as aquaculture is concerned fish production is higher in Hajo block as
142 compared to Bezera block. This can be attributed to the fact that fish farmers of Hajo are more
143 experienced in terms of fish farming as compared to that of Bezera block (Table 4). Almost all the
144 schedule caste people inhabited in Hajo Dev. Block are associated with fisheries related activity from
145 many generations. Table 5 shows the distribution of fish farmers and fishers of both the block with
146 respect to their involvement in fisheries activity viz. 'culture fisheries' and 'capture fisheries'. Most
147 56.67% and 53.33% of the fish farmers associated in culture fisheries fall within the age bucket of 40-49
148 years and 30-39 years in Hajo and Bezera dev. Block respectively. This age bracket is a productive age
149 which portends better future for catfish production also it is considered as economically active age [20].
150 The table also indicates that very few young and old people are involved in fish farming. This is because
151 fish farming requires adequate attention and a lot of sense of responsibility.

Table 4. Distribution of fish farmers and fishers on the basis of age (n=120)

Age in years	Hajo				Bezera			
	Culture Fisheries (n=30)		Capture Fisheries (n=30)		Culture Fisheries (n=30)		Capture Fisheries (n=30)	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
0-29	1	3.33	2	6.67	2	6.67	0	0
30-39	6	20.77	6	20.00	16	53.33	6	20.00
40-49	17	56.67	9	30.00	9	30.00	5	16.67
50-59	6	20.00	10	33.33	3	10.00	7	33.33
> 60	-	-	3	10.00	3	10.00	12	40.77
Total	30	100	30	100	30	100	30	100

152

Table 5. Distribution of fish farmers and fishers on the basis of experience (n=120)

Duration in years	Hajo				Bezera			
	Culture Fisheries (n=30)		Capture Fisheries (n=30)		Culture Fisheries (n=30)		Capture Fisheries (n=30)	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
01 – 10	3	10.00	0	0	8	26.67	0	0
11 – 20	18	60.00	7	23.33	16	53.33	3	10.00
21 – 30	9	30.00	8	26.67	6	20.00	4	13.33
> 30	-	-	15	50.00	-	-	23	76.67
Total	30	100	30	100	30	100	30	100

153

154 Moreover during the survey it was seen that most of the farmers in Hajo adopts scientific fish
155 farming, whereas in Bezera the prominence of scientific fish farming is quite limited. Increased fish
156 production has resulted in increased income for farmers of Hajo block. Moreover the fish marketing
157 channel in Hajo is more organized as compared to Bezera. This has resulted in an efficient fish
158 marketing system with limited middle man and has helped in enhancing farmers' income. Again it was

159 seen during the survey that Department of Fisheries, Assam has played an efficient role in promoting
160 scientific fish farming in Hajo block by training fish farmers through the Matsya Mitra scheme while such
161 initiatives may be lacking in Bezera block.

162 As far as the disparity in income between fishers and fish farmers is concerned this can be
163 attributed to the fact that aquaculture production has increases at a rapid speed over the years, both at
164 the national and state level. On the contrary capture fisheries production has stagnated over the years.
165 The contribution of aquaculture to the total inland fish production has improved from 34% in mid-1980s
166 to about 80% in recent years [1]. At the same time production from inland capture fisheries sector is
167 more or less to the tune of 1 million tonnes with a very slow growth rate over the years. Moreover
168 production from inland capture fisheries sector cannot be increased beyond a certain level as it would
169 render the whole resource unsustainable. This gap in production and the growth rate in terms of
170 production has effect upon the farmers' income. Organized marketing channel in the aquaculture
171 sector with limited middle man and absence of leasing system like policies are few other factors
172 responsible for increased income of fish farmers.

173 Community mobilization may be initiated through the formation of Self Help Group (SHG) /
174 Farmers Group that may help the community to run the smooth functioning of banking sector. The
175 article 19 (Phasing - Covering blocks and districts in phased manner) the National Rural Livelihoods
176 Mission(NRLM), Framework for Implementation, Ministry of Rural Development, Government of India,
177 has suggested "Public-Private-Community-Partnerships for last mile service delivery of entitlements,
178 public services and livelihoods support services [21].

179 CONCLUSION

180 Sustainability of the resource cannot be developed and imposed on a community, small or
181 large scale. Success depends on the participation and implementation by the community. Community
182 members need to be the driving force for sustainable quality of life for all members, now and for future
183 generation. Because sustainability is a dynamic concept, decision makers need to be flexible and
184 willing to modify their approaches. In this context economic status of fishers and farmers cannot be
185 overlooked for preparation of state policy for resource management and upliftment of target
186 communities. There is an urgent need to recognised that that open water (and open access) capture
187 fisheries have declined substantially and have affected the livelihoods of rural people, especially the
188 poor. The need to amend the state fisheries policies and create an enabling framework, to re-define
189 and strengthen the Department of Fisheries, to establish an appropriate legal framework, to promote
190 greater participation of a wide range of stakeholders in the policy and management process, and to
191 develop and implement new methods of fisheries enhancement and aquaculture.

192 REFERENCES

- 193 1. <http://www.fao.org/docrep/016/i2727e/i2727>
- 194 2. Anonymous. Annual Report 2016-17. Department of Animal Husbandry Dairying and Fisheries.
195 Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers Welfare, Government of India. 2017. Pp. 162.
- 196 3. Ayyappan S, Sugunan VV, Jena JK and Gopalakrishnan A. () Indian Fisheries. In: Handbook of
197 Fisheries and Aquaculture. DKMA, ICAR, New Delhi. 2011. Pp. 1116.

- 198 4. FAO. National Aquaculture Sector Overview India. FAO, Rome. Available at:
199 http://www.fao.org/fishery/countrysector/naso_india/en. 2005.
- 200 5. Borah S, Bhagawati K, Barman J, Chetia BR and Nath KD Present Status of Fisheries in
201 Assam: An Overview. Fishing Chimes. 2014. 34(1): 58-59.
- 202 6. Das BK, Bhattacharjya BK, Borah S, Das P, Debnath D, Yengkokpam S, Yadav AK, Sharma
203 N, Singh NS, Pandit A, Ekka A, Mishal P, Karnatak G, Kakati A, Saud BJ and Das SS.
204 Roadmap for Development of Open Water Fisheries in North Eastern States. ICAR-CIFRI,
205 Policy paper No. 6. ISSN 0970-616X. 2017. Pp. 101.
- 206 7. Anon. Economic Survey Assam 2015-16. Directorate of Economics and Statistics, Assam,
207 Planning and development Department, Government of Assam. 2016. Pp. 279.
- 208 8. Goswami M, Sathiadhas R, Goswami UC and Ojha SN. Socio-Economic Dimension of Fish
209 Farming in Assam. Journal of the Indian Fisheries Association. 2002. 29: 103-10.
- 210 9. Panikkar KKP. Coastal rural indebtedness-A case study. Mar. Fish. Informat. Serv. T&E Ser.
211 1980. 18: 1-12.
- 212 10. Sathiadhas R and Venkatraman G. Impact of mechanized fishing on the socio-economic
213 conditions of the fishermen of Sakthikulangara Nendakara, Kerala. Mar. Fish. Informat. Serv.
214 T&E Ser. 1981. 38: 17-19.
- 215 11. Rao DLP and Kumar RY. Impact of mechanization on a traditional economy: A case study of
216 fishermen in Vishakhapatnam. Man Life. 1984. 10(1&2): 31-42.
- 217 12. Rao NS. Economics of Fisheries: A Case Study of Andhra Pradesh. Daya Publishing House,
218 Delhi. 1986. Pp. 160.
- 219 13. Sathiadhas R and Panikkar KK. Socio-economics of small scale fishermen with emphasis on
220 costs and earnings of traditional fishing units along Trivandrum coast, Kerala - A case study.
221 Sea Food Export J. 1988. 20(2): 21-36.
- 222 14. Saud BJ., Chetia M, Borah S, Ramteke KK, Kashyap D and Sharma P. Growth surveillance of
223 *Labeo rohita* (hamilton, 1822) fingerlings fed on two formulated feeds. 2013. 19(04): 1085-88.
- 224 15. Nath KD, Majumdar RK, Borah S, Saikia D and Kalita P. Marketing System of Dried Fish
225 Products and Socio-Economic Condition of the Retailers in Local Markets of Agartala, Tripura.
226 Environment & Ecology. 2013. 31(2C): 1092-94.
- 227 16. Pandey DK and Upadhyay AD. Socio-Economic Profile of Fish Farmers of an Adopted Model
228 Aquaculture Village: Kulubari, West Tripura. Indian Research Journal of Extension Education.
229 2012. Special issue (II) 55-58.
- 230 17. Gupta T and Dey M. Socioeconomic and cultural profile of Fish farmers: a study in and around
231 Lumding town, nagaon district of assam. Int. J. LifeSc. Bt & Pharm. Res. 2014. 3(4) 83-93.
- 232 18. Choudhury M and Bhattacharjya BK. Fisheries Resources of Northeastern Region of India:
233 Management Issues and Strategies. In: Vass KK, Mitra K, Suresh VR, Katiha PK Srivastava
234 NP, editors. River Fisheries in India - Issues and Current status. Inland Fisheries Society of
235 India, Barrackpore, WestBengal, India; 2006.
- 236 19. Baruah UK, Bhagowati AK, Talukdar RK and Saharia PK. Beel Fisheries of Assam: Community-
237 based Co-management Imperative. Naga, The ICLARM Quarterly. 2000. 23(2): 36-41.

- 238 20. Olowosegun T, Sanni AO, Sule AM and Bwala RL. Contribution of Women to Fisheries
239 development in Kainji Lake Basin, in 2004 FISON Conference proceedings. 2004. Pp 91-97.
- 240 21. Anonymous. National Rural Livelihoods Mission (NRLM), Framework for Implementation,
241 Ministry of Rural Development, Government of India. 2011.