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Nowadays, changing in environment influences on humans’ adjusting and seeking fertile sources. People having more modern tools take an advantage over limited new resources. Local fisherman has to unavoidably face the problem of these limited resources’ portion. In addition, when considering the number of Thai’s small-scaled fisheries, it was found that the total household of fishery was 56,859 which 82% of them were a small-scaled fishery (National Statistical Office of Thailand, 2000).

This study is a part of ECOST Project in Sociology’s part which be analyzed in the overall image, aims to explore the job satisfaction of Thai’s small-scaled fisheries by accessing the qualitative and quantitative method. The data were collected from 54 samples using questionnaires and in-depth interview. These samples use trawls, push nets, gill nets, and shellfish collecting for working in the north and the east area at the Gulf of Thailand. Samutsakorn and Cholburi, the provinces located in the north and the east of Thailand, are the industrial areas where many commercial fisheries are found. This shows that small-scaled fisheries have to deal with a large amount of commercial fisheries concerning the limited sources’ problem. It is interesting to study the job satisfaction of Thai’s small-scaled fisheries among this changed situation.

For pre-testing the reliability, the questionnaires were distributed to 20 samples. Likert scale was employed to measure the level of the job satisfaction based on a five-point scale ranking from one to five (Very satisfied, satisfied, neutral, dissatisfied, and very dissatisfied). Additionally, the researcher found that Thai’s small-scaled fisheries can not express their satisfaction by using the Likert scale but they can give their opinions on each question better.

The collected data consisted of two parts as follows:

Part 1: Personal Data
- 85% were male and 15% were female.
- 70% were married.
- 96% were buddhist.
- 74% finished a primary school.
- 82% were fisherman.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>personal data</th>
<th>percents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All of them</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>single</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>married</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>divorce</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>religious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddha</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>below primary school</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>finished a primary school</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upper than secondary school</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the second job</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general employee</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sell goods</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Personal data

Part 2: Job Satisfaction

- From the score of 1.00, the mean score was 0.26 of job satisfaction.
- From the total score of 22.00, the total mean score was 5.78 of job satisfaction.

The above scores showed that the samples were less satisfied in their job. However, each reason can describe what problems influencing on their less satisfaction.
The table 2 and 2.1 showed both the mean score and the overall scores of each item of satisfaction. The questionnaire contained 5 negative questions (question no. 3, 4, 5, 6, and 17) from the total of 22 questions. The mean score of “-1” can be indicated “Yes” and “1” can be indicated “No”. From the table 1, the results showed that the mean score was 0.26.
The highest mean score (0.85) belonged to the question no.11 “The time available to recreate with your family.”

The lowest mean score (0.85) belonged to the question no.4 “Working hard.”

In addition, the results can be described based on four types of job satisfaction as follows:

1) Basic needs satisfaction
2) Social needs satisfaction
3) Management satisfaction
4) Self-realization satisfaction

1) Basic needs satisfaction

![Diagram of Basic needs satisfaction](image)

**Table 3: Basic needs satisfaction**

The basic needs satisfaction in nine items as follows:

Item 1 The predictability of your earnings
Item 2 Your ability to feed your family
Item 3 The physical fatigue that is caused by your work
Item 4 Working hard
Item 5 The mental pressure in you job
Item 6 The healthfulness of your job
Item 7 The satisfaction of present earning place
Item 8 The level of your catches in the past
Item 9 The stability and your physical safety

From nine items of the basic needs satisfaction, it was found that the highest mean score (0.67) belonged to the question no.8 “The level of your catches in the past.” The lowest mean score (-0.85) belonged to the question no.4 “Working hard.”

1. The predictability of your earnings
37% answered “Yes”. Most of the samples (63%) answered “No” because of changeable weather. However, they might fail in fishing despite nice weather - it was difficult to predict their earnings. Hence, they strongly believed in “the Holy Boat Nymph” that would make them work successfully.

2. Your ability to feed your family
63% answered “Yes”. They thought that fisheries can feed their family everyday. 33% answered “No” because they had to pay other expenses such as utility cost and children’s education fee. Some families had to borrow money to pay such expenses. The remaining 4% of them can not answer this question because of uncertain earnings.

3. The physical fatigue that is caused by your work
The majority of them (89%) answered “Yes”. However, they can rest whenever they were tired because the timeline of fisheries was quite flexible. 11% answered “No”.

4. Working hard
The majority of them (93%) answered “Yes”. They often ached and had a symptom of painful muscles. Although a particular gender was not a problem for fisheries, but males more worked hard than females. Hence, males can express their feeling clearly than females for this question. The remaining 7% answered “No”.
5. The mental pressure in your job

70% answered “Yes”, 26% answered “No”, and 4% were not sure. Most of them gave reasons that they worried about having enough productivity when compared with their expenses. Accordingly, families getting into debt were likely to be stressful than others.

6. The healthfulness of your job

33% answered “Yes”. They thought that fisheries were a hard working career which caused health problems such as muscle pain. In addition, they had to suffer the dusting smoke and the sound of the fishing engine in the boat. 56% answered “No”. They believed that fisheries made them healthy because they are close to the nature since they spent most of their working time in the ocean. The remaining 11% were not sure.

7. The satisfaction of present earning place

70% answered “Yes” because they actually earned their living in the place where their home were as well. Moreover, they will not move to stay in other places no matter what will happen. 15% answered “No” because they were not satisfied with their earnings. The remaining 15% were not sure.

8. The level of your catches in the past

Most of them (81%) answered “Yes” when they comparing with the productivity of more than last 5 years. Oceans in the past were more fertile, more varieties, the catches were more of the bigger sizes, and more spaciousness. On the contrary, fisheries at present face the problems of water pollution. However, 15% of them answered “No” because they had a share in the market portion caused by increasing fishing engine ships. The remaining 4% could not answer.

9. The stability and your physical safety

33% answered “Yes” because they believed that fisheries were a stable career which they will work through their life. Most of them (63%) answered “No” because it was risky at all of their working time. The remaining 4% could not answer. However, one
fisherman commented that stability and security were different. One could have a stable job even though the income might be little but as long as you could be assured that your children and grand children would always have the job. This was “stable”. But security meant not dangerous. You could have a stable job but not secured.

2) Social needs satisfaction

![Table 4: Social needs satisfaction](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The time you spend away at sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The time available to recreate with your family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The time available to recreate with you friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>The opportunity to be your own master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The community in which you live</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From five items of social needs satisfaction, it was found that the highest mean score (0.85) belonged to the question no.11 “The time available to recreate with your family.” The lowest mean score (-0.07) belonged to the question no.13 “The opportunity to be your own master.”
10. The time you spend away at sea
89% answered “Yes”, 7% answered “No”, and 4% were not sure.

11. The time available to recreate with your family
The majority of them (93%) answered “Yes” and 7% answered “No”. They thought that fisheries gave them enough time for their families. Furthermore, some families worked out together.

12. The time available to recreate with you friends
Most of them (82%) answered “Yes” and 18% answered “No”. Their friends and relatives were co-workers who would meet during working.

13. The opportunity to be your own master
44% answered “Yes” because they believed that a loan could support them to be owners in the future. 52% answered “No” because they thought buying modern tools, ships and hiring laborers, was a large investment and it was too difficult for them. 4% were not sure.

14. The community in which you live
78% answered “Yes” because they were satisfied with their fisheries’ community where they were born. Some people (7%) thought that there was selfishness and conflict between rich and poor people.
3) Management satisfaction

Table 5: Management satisfaction

The management satisfaction in four items as follows:

Item 15 The good management of your fishery group
Item 16 The rules and regulations available in your fishery
Item 17 The conflict in your fishery
Item 18 The way in which conflicts are resolved in your fishery

From four items of management satisfaction, it was found that the highest mean score (0.37) belonged to the question no.15, 16, and 18. The lowest mean score (-0.22) belonged to the question no.17.

15. The good management of your fishery group
56% answered “Yes”, 22% answered “No”, and 19% were not sure.

16. The rules and regulations available in your fishery
59% answered “Yes”, 22% answered “No”, and 19% were not sure.

17. The conflict in your fishery
52% answered “Yes”, 30% answered “No”, and 18% were not sure.

18. The way in which conflicts are resolved in your fishery
56% answered “Yes”, 18% answered “No”, and 26% were not sure.
From the answers mentioned above, it showed that 50-60% answered “Yes” and 40-50% answered “No”. The samples (Thai’s small-scaled fisheries) registered the formal province’s group which supported only commercial fisheries. Also, they rarely participated in this group. Some group participated in an informal relative community.

4) Self-realization satisfaction
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**Table 6: Self-realization satisfaction**

The self-realization satisfaction in four items as follows:

- Item 19 The cleanliness of your working environment
- Item 20 The worth of your job
- Item 21 The adventure offered by your job
- Item 22 The challenge offered by your job

From four items of management satisfaction, it was found that the highest mean score (0.81) belonged to the question no.20 and 22. The lowest mean score (0.48) belonged to the question no.19.

**19. The cleanliness of your working environment**

70% answered “Yes” because oceans were their life and earnings. They will not work during the reproductive season. They will not let their boats get dirty because
they believed in the boat nymph. However, some fishermen might unwittingly pollute the oceans such as oil from engine ships. In addition, 22% answered “No” and 8% were not sure.

20. The worth of your job
Most of them (85%) answered “Yes” because they believed that fisheries were a legal career and were inherited from their ancestors. Least of them (4%) answered “No” because of little earnings. 11% were not sure.

21. The adventure offered by your job
85% answered “Yes” because they can not guess anything that might happens all the working time. Fisheries depended on a climate, so they respected “the boat nymph” for being lucky. However, 11% answered “No”. They though that fisheries had a usual lifestyle – it was not challenging for them. The remaining 4% were not sure.

22. The challenge offered by your job
Most of them (89%) answered “Yes”. They did not know what exciting happens they might confront in each day. They can not estimate how many fishes they will get. In addition, they can take a longer time for fishing or go home early depending on they needs. 7% answered “No” and 4% were not sure.
Furthermore, 68% gave their opinions on a future plan that they needed to quit fisheries because of increasing commercial fisheries. However, the government should support them to work in industrial seafood or commercial ship as laborers. In addition, the government should promote part-time jobs for them in order that they can earn a living by themselves.

74% did not support their children to do fisheries but 22% did. The remaining 4% were not sure. The majority of them though that fisheries were a freedom career. They can live their life in the way they want and can earn their families. Whereas 22% believed that reduced resources made them difficult to earn so, they did not support their children to continue working.

Table 7: The overall image of job satisfaction
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Additionally, from interviewing the samples (Thai’s small-scaled fisheries), the problems concerning local fisheries were as follows:

**Firstly**, it was an oil price. They wanted the government to control the oil price because it was the main cost of fisheries.

**Secondly**, it was a water pollution caused by industrial factories. They wanted the government issued strict rules for this problem.

**Lastly**, it was fisheries’ rules. They believed that the government issued rules supporting only commercial fisheries bringing about the decreasing number of small-scaled fisheries. For example, the limited area of 3,000 meters from seashore was suitable for only commercial fisheries. They wanted the government to allow the small-scaled fishery in this restrict area because they did no harm to the environment, besides, they could not afford to go too far from the shore. Moreover, the government should give knowledge of fisheries’ rules to them.
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