A STUDY ON THE TRAINING NEEDS OF FISH FARMERS ABOUT COMPOSITE FISH CULTURE TECHNOLOGY IN JABALPUR DISTRICT (M.P.)

Sushant Punekar[1] & N.K. Khare[2]

In Jabalpur district of Madhya Pradesh State, there is good potential for fisheries development. Training is an integral part of any development activity and is the method of educating farmers on improved package of practices. Government of India has encouraged to set-up FFDA's at District and Block headquarters. However, the impact of training should reflect in terms of increase of knowledge and adoption of improved fisheries technology. But training can become effective only when it is in accordance with the needs of the trainees. Keeping the above fact in view, the present study was undertaken with the objectives.

1. To study the profile of the fish farmers.
2. To understand the expectations of the fish farmers about various aspects of the training programmes in fisheries.
3. To assess the specific training needs of the fish farmers in term of places, frequency, duration and physical facilities of training etc.

METHODOLOGY

The present study was conducted in Jabalpur district of Madhya Pradesh in the year 2001. Out of seven development block of Jabalpur district, six blocks viz-Jabalpur, Patan, Panagar, Shahpura, Sihora and Kundam were selected purposively they are having maximum Gram panchayat leased fish pond. A list of the fish farmers were obtained from the office of the Fish Farmers Development Agency [FFDA], Jabalpur. From each block all leased fish ponds were selected randomly for the study. Thus, a total sample size of fish farmers was 175.

Training needs of practising fish farmers was operationally defined as the level of training need expressed by the fish farmers themselves. The important areas of fisheries (fish farming) were selected in consultation with the fisheries experts to assess the training needs of fish farmers. The intensity of training needs in respect of fish farming was measured with help of an index. The data were collected through personal interview method with the help of specially developed pre-structured interview schedule for this purpose as per the objectives of study. The interview schedule consisted 10 main area under fisheries. Fish farmers opinion about various aspects of training need were obtained. The data was analysed in each of the areas on three point continuum namely most important, important and less important respectively. Finally all the obtained data was analysed, tabulated calculated and presented for the interpretation of the result.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The finding of the study in line with the objectives set forth is presented here under.

[I] Profile of the Fish Farmers–The data pertaining to selected personal

1. Fisheries, KVK, Indian Veterinary Research Institute (IVRI), Izatnagar, Bareilly (U.P.)
2. Associate Professor (Extension Education), College of Agriculture, JNKVV, Jabalpur (M.P.)

characteristic of the fish farmers are presented in Table-1.

The results in Table 1. indicate that the higher percentage of fish farmers belonged to middle age group (36 to 50 years) and were other backward class category and with 81.72 per cent fish farmers were literate having a total farming experience of above 10 years (more farming experience) and majority of fish farmers were living in nuclear farming system. Majority of the fish farmers possessed kaccha house and belonging to high annual income group (Income more than Rs.50,000/-). The implies that majority of the fish farmers were attended by belonged to trained category through FFDA and the gain in knowledge on various technologies related to composite fish culture practices.

Table 1. Profile of the fish farmers

S. No.	Characteristic	Category	Frequency	Percentage
1.	**Age**	A. Young age group (21 to 35 yrs)	71	40.58
		B. Middle age group (36 to 50 yrs)	86	49.14
		C. Old age group (Above 50 yrs)	18	10.28
2.	**Caste**	A. General	06	03.42
		B. Other backward class	100	57.14
		C. Scheduled caste	10	05.72
		D. Scheduled tribe	59	33.72
3.	**Education**	A. Illiterate	32	18.28
		B. Upto primary	54	30.86
		C. Upto middle	51	29.14
		D. High school and above	38	21.72
4.	**Family type**	A. Nuclear	116	66.28
		B. Joint	59	33.72
5.	**House**	A. Hut	02	01.14
		B. Kaccha house	156	89.16
		C. Pacca house	06	03.42
		D. Mixed (Kaccha & Pacca)	11	06.28
6.	**Annual income**	A. Low income (Annual income less than Rs. 25,000)	23	13.14
		B. Medium income (Annual income Rs. 25,000 to 50,000)	40	22.86
		C. High income (Annual income more than Rs. 50,000)	112	64.00
7.	**Farming experience**	A. Less experience (1-5 years)	61	34.86
		B. Medium experience (6-10 years)	47	26.86
		C. More experience (above 10 years)	67	38.28
8.	**Training**	A. Trained	104	59.42
		B. Untrained	71	40.58

[II] Training Needs of the Fish Farmers About Fisheries–The observation pertaining to intensity of training needs in respect of specific areas and other aspects namely, place, frequency in year, duration and physical facilities for trainings are given discussed in this part.

[A] Intensity of Training Needs in Respect of Specific Areas–The fish farmers belonged to ten areas of training however, their

training needs were assessed not only in respect of their own subject but also with regard to their areas of their interest. This was thought necessary considering interdependence of the concerned disciplines. The finding are presented in Table 2.

It is seen from Table 2. that three areas namely, fish disease and their control, Integrated fish farming and problem of freshwater aquaculture and control measures with the respective TNS of 128,80 and 77 were the most important areas in which the fish farmers needed training.

Table 2. Intensity of training needs in respect of specific areas

S. No.	Main areas of training needs	Training Needs Score (TNS) (n-175)	Rank
1.	Integrated fish-framing	80***	II
2.	Maintenance, construction and cleaning of pond for fish culture	19*	VIII
3.	Prawn culture	31**	V
4.	Net making & their care and preservation	16*	IX
5.	Magur breeding and culture	54**	IV
6.	Fish disease and their control	128***	I
7.	Fish preservation and by product	26*	VI
8.	Fish seed production and transportation	11*	X
9.	Problem of freshwater aquaculture and control measures	77***	III
10.	Any others (leasing system, loan facilities and extension activities etc.)	24*	VII

*** **Most important** ** **Important** * **Less important**

The areas namely, fish preservation and by product (26), any others need i.e. leasing pattern, loan facilities and extension activities etc. (24), maintenance, construction and cleaning of pond for fish culture (19), net making and their care and preservation (16) and fish seed production and transportation (11) were considered to be less important by the fish farmers for receiving training.

This might have happened because of two possible reasons. One, the fish farmers might have been possessing good knowledge about these areas and two, the areas might not be directly concerned with the job performance of the fish farmers.

Priority assigned to fish disease and their control and integrated fish farming is quite justified for the obvious reason that both the aspects of fish cultivation closely associated with economic advantage to the farmers. Both the aspect are complex in nature and in order to understand in their real perspective under going training with priority assigned is essential.

[B] Needs About Various Aspects of Training–It is seen from Table-3 that 48.57 per cent of the fish farmers preferred place of training at fish farm/research station. While 38.85 per cent of them desired to have training Block/Tehsil place. Majority (58.85%) of the fish farmers desired to receive (Frequency of training) training once in a year, while 37.15 per cent expressed the need to have training twice in a year. Maximum number (47.42%) of the fish farmers stated that they would like to have duration of training for one week and 20.58 per cent needed training of 5 days duration. With regard to physical facilities for training, a large number (81.14%) of the fish farmers desired free boarding, lodging, transport and stipend followed by other facilities namely, practical training (16.00%) and library facilities (02.86%) respectively.

Table 3. Needs of the fish farmers in various aspect of training

[Expectations about training aspects]

S. No.	Particulars	Training aspects	Frequency (n-175)	Percentage
1.	**Place of training**	A. Own village	08	04.58
		B. Nearly village/ Gram Panchayat	14	08.00
		C. Block/Tehsil place	68	38.85
		D. Fish farm/ Research station	85	48.57
2.	**Frequency of training**	A. Once in a year	103	58.85
		B. Twice in a year	65	37.15
		C. Prior to each season/ (summer/winter)	07	04.00
3.	**Duration of training**	A. Upto 2 days	10	05.71
		B. 5 days	36	20.58
		C. One Week	83	47.42
		D. Fifteen days	24	13.71
		E. One Month	22	12.58
4.	**Physical facilities for training**	A. Free boarding, lodging, transport and stipend	142	81.14
		B. Practical training	28	16.00
		C. Library facilities	05	02.86

CONCLUSION

It could be concluded that the training needs in various areas furnished in order of priority were fish disease and their control, integrated fish farming, problem of freshwater aquaculture and control measures, magur breeding and cultures, prawn culture, fish preservation and by product, any others need (i.e. leasing pattern, loan facilities and extension activities etc.), maintenance, constriction and cleaning of pond for fish culture, net making and their care and preservation, fish seed production and transportation, which clearly indicated the relative importance and weightage assigned to the respective area. Further, it could also be concluded that they expect be organized training at Fish farm/Research station, preferably once in a year for 7 days duration and free boarding, lodging, transport arrangement and stipend need of physical facilities for training to the fish farmers.

REFERENCES

1. Bhaumik, Utpal, Sengupta, K. and Saha, S.K. (1994). Training need of the producers of giant freshwater Prawn in some areas of West Bengal. *J. Inland Fish Soci. India*. 26(2) : 85-89.
2. Sasmal, Debasis and Qureshi, T.A. (2001). Inter-relations of the multitudinous factors influencing the socio-economic status of fisher communities at Hoshangabad, Fishing Chimes, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 106-108.
3. Sharma, O.P. and Kumar, Anup (2001). Socio-economic status of fishermen in relation to fisheries of lake Jaisamand. Fishing Chimes, Vol. 20, No. 112, pp. 45-47.

• • •