### MANAGEMENT PRACTICE, ADOPTION AND PRODUCTIVITY OF SMALL-SCALE COMMERCIAL AQUACULTURE PRODUCTION IN OGUN STATE, NIGERIA

### ASHLEY-DEJO S. S., SULE S. O., OYETUNJI O. T., DUROJAIYE F. A., OJETAYO T. A. and AKINSETE O. T.

Department of Forestry, Wildlife and Fisheries, Faculty of Agricultural Production and Renewable Resources, College of Agricultural Sciences, Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ogun State, Nigeria. **Corresponding author email address:** ashleydejosamuel@gmail.com,

Phone Number: +2348036584136

### ABSTRACT

This study investigated the management practice, adoption and productivity of commercial aquaculture in Abeokuta, Ogun State, Nigeria. The study was conducted in Abeokuta, Ogun State. One hundred and fifty respondents (150) were selected using multi-stage sampling technique. It was observed that majority were married males, educated and within active economic age with mean household size of 4.83. The mean output per production cycle was 1,236.91±752.41 kg, and the most commonly reared fish species was *Clarias spp*. The most commonly practiced culture system was earthen ponds. Also, the result revealed that easy access to inputs is the most available factor of production, with a mean score of 1.66 ranked first, followed by conducive environment/climatic factors (1.63 ranked Second). Majority (55.3%) of the respondents fell within the medium adopter category, while 25.3% classified as high adopters while 19.3% of fish farms are classified as low adopters. This investigation reveals that education, experience, training, extension services, and participation in cooperative societies are critical factors that promote the adoption of scientific aquaculture management practices in commercial fish farms. The study also indicate that farmer needs competent knowledge, skills and techniques to maximize profit.

Key words: Adoption, Fish farming, Innovation, Techniques, Scientific.

### INTRODUCTION

quaculture plays an important role in nation economic development, potentially offering valuables, skillbased employment opportunities and stabilizing the economy (Nuseibeh, 2023; Nwuba et al., 2022). Aquaculture is the rearing of fish in an enclosed and fairly shallow body of water where all its life processes can be controlled. It is an important sector for the nation's economic development, at a time when government is seeking for ways to diversify the economy, from being purely oil based. It is a potential means of contributing to the food security of the nation, directly by producing fish for food and indirectly by generating employment for the teaming unemployed populace, save foreign exchange and generate foreign exchange through export of fish and fish products (Dev et al. 2010).

As human standard of living continues to improve, especially in developing countries, a number of economic activities have continuously become important sources of livelihood, providing the much-needed food and income. Thus, aquaculture sector plays a significant role in reducing protein deficiency and malnutrition, generating employment and earnings foreign exchange.

Fishing contributes about 5% of the per capita animal in-take and employs about 8 million people worldwide (Abulude and Kolawole, 2020). Fish is an important and indispensable source of animal protein which provide at least 50% of the mineral intake and essential animal protein for over hundred million of people from the poorest South Asian and African countries (Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) (2019). The industry helps in improving the nutrition and health of families, increasing people's income, and acts as active agent of economic development and social change (Ifejika *et al.*, 2008).

In Nigeria, fish production is from both external and internal sources. The internal sources, after captured fisheries the second most important is aquaculture. To fulfil the excess demand of growing population, aquaculture productivity needs to be increased. The aquaculture subsector is considered a very viable alternative to meeting the nation's need for self sufficiency in fish production. This is based on its high reliability in return on investment. Nigeria is blessed with numerous opportunities for largescale aquaculture; although the opportunity seems to be over ride by challenges. The main input of fish production is feed account for about 70% of total production cost (Khan *et. al.* 2021, International Journal of Organic agricultural Research & Development Volume 19 (4) (2024)

Ashley-Dejo *et. al.* 2017, Alam et. al. 2012). Another important input that moves-up the productivity of aquaculture is good quality fingerling.

Profitability and productivity are inseparable entities in commercial aquaculture (FAO, 2018). Therefore, analysis and understanding of these important factors for different fish culture systems, is paramount. Profitability and productivity in aquaculture cannot be overemphasized because the two factors largely depend on the level of investment in appropriate technologies and sufficient capital management. Thence, the larger the investment the higher the profit often associated with economies of scale (FAO, 2018).

One way to boost fish production is through the adoption of aquaculture technologies, improve self-sufficiency in fish production and contribute to food security in Nigeria. Rogers (2003) described the adoption process as a mental process through which an individual pass from learning of new idea. The decision to adopt or reject the new idea depends on farmers and their environment, the appropriateness and gains of such innovation. These factors are therefore pre-requisite for adoption of improved farm technology and cultural practices essential for the achievement of self sufficiency in the production of food. Peace Corps (1976) postulate that farmers must pass through five stages of adoption before the idea is accepted. If they are not aware of the ideas, they will not be interested; if they are not interested they cannot evaluate its usefulness; if they do not evaluate, they will never try it, and if they do not try it they would certainly not adopt it. These five stages of adoption are inseparable as a link of a chain. Adoption takes place after people have successfully passed through the five stages. Williams (1968), explained the adoption process with the following steps: awareness; interest; action; desire; conviction and satisfaction. Thus, this study investigated the management practice, adoption and productivity of commercial aquaculture in Abeokuta, Ogun State, Nigeria.

### MATERIALS AND METHODS Study area, sampling size and data analysis technique

The study area is Ogun State situated within the tropics and located in the rain forest belt. The state is located in the rainforest vegetation belt of Nigeria within longitude 2°45′E and 3°55′E and latitudes  $7^{\circ}01'N$  and  $7^{\circ}8'N$  in the tropics. The state is bounded in the West by the Benin Republic, in the South by Lagos State and the Atlantic Ocean, in the East by Ondo State and in the North by Oyo and Osun State. Multistage sampling procedures were used to select respondents for this study. In the first stage Abeokuta zone was purposively selected out of four Agricultural Development Zones in Ogun State. The selection was based on the intensity of fish farming activities. In the second stage, three (3) Local Government Areas (LGAs) were selected from the six (6) LGAs using simple random sampling. Snowball technique was used in the identification of 484 fish farmers and simple random sampling technique was used in the selection of 150 respondents. The data for this study were subjected to both descriptive (percentages, mean, frequency count, standard deviation) and inferential (multi-variance logistic regression) analysis using.

The explicit form of the multi-variance logistic regression model is expressed as shown below:

 $Y = a + b_1 X_1 + b_2 X_2$  ------  $B_n X_n$ Where

Y = Factors affecting adoption of scientific aquaculture management practices

- a = Constant.
- $X_1 = Age$
- $X_2$  = Educational qualification
- $X_3$  = Household Size
- $X_4 =$  Fish farming experience
- $X_5 = Training$
- $X_6$  = Extension services
- $X_7$  = Participation in cooperative society

#### **RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

## Socio-economic characteristics of the Respondents

Table 1 provides socio-economic characteristics of commercial fish farmers in the study area. Out of the 150 respondents, 83 (55.3%) were male, and 67 (44.7%) were female. In most cases, fishing activities were done by men, although women were more engaged in the processing and marketing activities. The findings were similar with the study conducted by (Ajabe *et al.*, 2022).

This becomes prevalent because in most communities almost every adult female is likely to be married. This is verified from the result in this study as majority (67.3%) of the respondents were married with a mean household size of 4.83. The mean age of the sampled group was 39 years, this indicated that the respondents were relatively young. The mean age of farmers in Nigeria is usually between 45-48 years (Adeoye 2020; Ogunwale, 2000). More-so, this age range has been tagged productive age as well as active economic age (Ashley-Dejo and Adelaja 2022, Ashley-Dejo et al., 2017). Literacy level was assessed through educational qualification, about 64.7% had tertiary education and only 7.3% had no formal education (Table 1). This implies that respondents in the study area had very high literacy levels which might positively affect the management practices and adoption level. Olaifa *et al*, (2022) pustulated that farmers with low literacy levels hardily adopt nor appreciate most of the improved technologies. Results showed that the fish farmers made an average income of N861,360 per production cycle. Fish farmers in the study area were experienced with an average experience year of 8 years this could made them capable of knowing how best to carry out the production exercise (Table 1). This finding is supported by results of (Ozoemena et al, 2022) who asserted that the more years acquired by producers, the more they know about the activities carried out. Such knowledge also translates to lowering cost of production, which consequently increase income generated from production and sales with majority of the respondents.

# Factors contributing to management practice, adoption and productivity of fish production

The factors that contribute to management practice, adoption and productivity of fish production in the study area is presented in Table 2. The table shows that easy access to inputs is the most important factor, with a mean score of 1.66 and ranked first, followed by conducive environment/climatic factors (1.63). Other factors that ranked high include a ready market for output, closeness to the source of the market, and accessibility of extension agents. On the other hand, availability of basic/social amenities was the least available factor (Table 2). The finding was similar with Yusuf *et al.*, (2022) who reported that access to fish farm input, climatic factor, closeness to source of market were ranked high among other factors considered in their study.

# Adoption level of aquaculture management practice

The adoption level of aquaculture management practices by fish farmers in the study area is presented in Table 3. The table indicates that majority (55.3%) fell within the medium adopter category, while 25.3% are classified as high adopters while 19.3% are classified as low adopters. This suggests that most fish farmers have adopted management practices to a significant extent, with a considerable proportion classified as high adopters. The adoption of management practices is crucial for the growth and success of fish farming businesses. Management practices help fish farmers to optimize production, improve efficiency, and reduce risks. The findings from this study suggest that fish farmers have recognized the importance of adopting management practices in their operations and it supports the findings of Ashley-Dejo et al., 2016 whose research showed that higher proportions of fish farmers were aware, tried and adopted most of the improved aquaculture technologies with some of the fish farmers also discontinuing most of the previously adopted technologies.

# Constraints to management practices adoption

Information on the constraints to the adoption of management practices and productivity of fish farmers in the study area is presented in Table 4. The table shows that inadequate capital, high cost of input, high cost of fish feed, land acquisition system, inadequate extension services, and pollution were the most serious constraints to the adoption of management practices and productivity of commercial fish farming. These findings suggest that access to capital, quality inputs, and extension services can facilitate the adoption of improved management practices and enhance the productivity of fish farming. The constraints identified in this study are consistent with previous research on the challenges facing the aquaculture sector in developing countries (Assefa *et al.*, 2018; Little *et al.*, 2018). Similarly, inadequate extension services have been identified as a significant constraint to the dissemination of knowledge and adoption of best practices in aquaculture (Assefa *et al.*, 2018).

### Regression analysis on the factors affecting adoption of scientific aquaculture management

The results of regression analysis examining the factors that affect the adoption of scientific aquaculture management practices in the study area is presented in Table 5. It was observed that several variables are significant predictors of the adoption of these practices.

Firstly, educational qualification has a significant positive effect on the adoption of scientific aquaculture management practices, with a coefficient of 1.63 and a p-value of 0.01. This finding is consistent with previous studies that have identified education as a critical factor in the adoption of modern farming practices (Akinwumi et al., 2018). Secondly, fish farming experience also has a significant positive effect on the adoption of scientific aquaculture management practices, with a coefficient of 1.89 and a p-value of 0.05. This finding suggests that farmers with more experience are more likely to adopt these practices, perhaps because they have encountered more challenges and realized the benefits of using scientific management approaches. Thirdly, training has the most significant positive effect on the adoption of scientific aquaculture management practices, with a coefficient of 11.74 and a pvalue of 0.01. This result highlights the importance of training programs in promoting the adoption of modern farming practices (Rahman et al., 2017). Lastly, extension services and participation in cooperative societies also have significant positive effects on the adoption of scientific aquaculture management practices. These findings support the idea that access to information and social networks can facilitate the adoption of modern farming practices Akinwumi et al. (2018).

# CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

This study examined the demographic characteristics, management practices, and productivity of small-scale fishers in commercial aquaculture. The results showed that the majority of the respondents were male, most of the respondents had tertiary education, and the average household size was 4.83. Additionally, adoption of management practices such as easy access to inputs, a conducive environment/climatic factors, a ready market for output, and closeness to the source of the market contributed to the productivity of commercial aquaculture farms. The study also found that earthen ponds were the most common type of culture system used. Adoption of scientific aquaculture practices was average. Also, education, experience, training, extension services, and participation in cooperative societies are critical factors that promote the adoption of scientific aquaculture management practices in the study area.

However, the availability of certain factors such as basic amenities and suitable government policies can pose a challenge to the success of the farms. Thus, there is a need for policymakers to provide an enabling environment for the growth of the aquaculture industry in terms of infrastructure, funding, and policy support. The study indicate that farmer needs competency in knowledge, skills and techniques involved in the efficient management of fish to maximize profit, provision of basic infrastructures, electricity and quality water supply, provision of extension services including education program to fish farmer.

### REFERENCES

- Abulude, I., & Kolawole, E. A. (2020). Extent of Arable Crop Farmers' Involvement in Non- Farm Activities in Ondo State. Available at SSRN 3709332
- Adeoye, A. S. (2020). Assessment of gender roles in fish farming activities among rural farmers in Afijio Local Government Area of Oyo State, Nigeria. *Nigeria Agricultural Journal*, 51(2): 406-412.
- Ajagbe, S., Ajagbe, R., Abdulazeez, F., Ojubolamo, M., Olomola, A., Oke, O., & Adekanmbi, T. (2022). Analysis of Socioeconomics and Feed Efficiency of Catfish Production in Oyo State, Nigeria. *Ife Journal of Agriculture*, 34(1): 67-75.

- Akinwumi, J. A., Adepoju, A. O., & Daramola, A. O. (2018). Analysis of factors influencing farmers' adoption of cocoa production technologies in Osun State, Nigeria. Journal of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences. 7(2): 52-61.
- Alam, M. F., Khan, M. A., & Huq, A. A. (2012). Technical efficiency in tilapia farming of Bangladesh: a stochastic frontier production approach. *Aquaculture International*, 20: 619-634. http://doi.org/10.1007/s10499-011-9491-3.
- Ashley-Dejo, S. S., & Adelaja, A. O. (2022). Economics of catfish hatchery farmers and its contribution to household poverty alleviation in Nigeria. *Agricultura Tropica* E t S u b t r o p i c a, 55: 19-29. https://doi.org/10.2478/ats-2022-0003.
- Ashley-Dejo, S.S., Olaoye, O.J., & Adelaja, O.A. (2017). Analysis of profitability of small-scale catfish farmers in Oyo State, Nigeria. *Malaysian Journal of Animal Science*, 20(2): 11–24.
- Ashley-Dejo, S. S., Omoniyi, I. T., Olaoye, O. J., Fakoya, E. O., & Adelaja, A. O (2016).
  Adoption of improved fish hatchery production technologies and information by fish hatchery farmers in Oyo State, Nigeria. Nigeria Journal of Animal Production, Volume 43(2): 399 411.
- Assefa, Y., Gebremedhin, B., & Mohammed, A. (2018). Constraints to the adoption of fish farming technology in Ethiopia. African Journal of Agricultural Research
- Dey, M.M., Kumar, P., Paraguas, F.J., Chen, O.L., Khan, M.A., & Srichantuk, N. (2010). Performance and nature of genetically improved carp strains in Asian countries. *Aquaculture Economics and M a n a g e m e n t*, 14(1): 3-19. https://doi.org/10.1080/13657300903566 846.
- Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), (2019). FAO in Nigeria: Nigeria at a glance. Retrieved from http: //www.fao.org/nigera/fao-innigeria/nigeria-at-a-glance/en/- new.
- Food and Agriculture Organization, (FAO) (2018). Dietary Assessment: A resource guide to method selection and application in low resource settings, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome, Italy. ISBN 978-92-5-130635-2, 172 pp.

- Ifejika, P. I., Akinbile, L. A., Ifejika, I. I., & Oladeji, J. O. (2008). The socio-economics effects on adoption of aquaculture technologies among fish farmers in Anambra State, Nigeria. Journal of Agricultural Extension 11Khan, M. A., Begum, R., Nielsen, R., & Hoff, A. (2021). Production risk, technical efficiency, and input use nexus: Lessons from Bangladesh aquaculture. Journal of the World Aquaculture Society, 52(1): 57-72. https://doi.org/10.1111/jwas.12767.
- Little, D. C., Newton, R. W., & Beveridge, M. C. (2018). Aquaculture: A rapidly growing and significant source of sustainable food? Status, transitions and potential. Proceedings of the Nutrition Society.
- Nuseibeh, R. A. (2023). The Political Economy of Youth Exclusion. In Urban Youth Unemployment, Marginalization and Politics in MENA (pp. 43-81). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Nwuba, L. A., Ude, E. F., & Ogbonnaya, H. F. (2022). Current Trends in Fisheries and Aquaculture. *International Journal of Agriculture, Food and Biodiversity*, 1(1), 64-69.
- Ogunwale, A. B. (2000). The role of rural women in food production and income generation: A case study of small-scale fish farming in Ogun State, Nigeria. In T. F. Daramola (Ed.), Women in Agriculture: The Nigerian Experience (pp. 25-40). Heinemann Educational Books.
- Olaifa, E. S., Osabuohien, E. S., & Issahaku, H. (2022). Enhancing fish production for food security in Nigeria. Materials Today: Proceedings, 65: 2208-2214.
- Ozoemena, F., Agbo, J. U., & Eze, M. E. U. (2022). Economic Analysis of Fish Farming and its Contributions to Household Poverty Alleviation in Ebonyi State, Nigeria. *Escet Journal of Educational Research and Policy Studies*, 2(1): 20-32.
- Peace Corps (1976): Contribution to Agricultural Development through Extension. USA
- Rahman, S., Dey, M. M., Saha, M. B., & Ferdous, M. J. (2017). Impact of training on farmers' knowledge and adoption of shrimp farming technologies in Southwest Bangladesh. Journal of Agriculture and
- 276 Rural Development in the Tropics and Subtropics

Roger, E. M. (2003). Diffusion of Innovations, 5th Edition, New York: Free Press.

Williams, R. L. (1968). A model of adoption behavior. Journal of the Market Research Society. Yusuf, S. A., Ayanboye, A. O., Azeez, K. A., & Adesina, M. A. (2022). Food Insecurity and its Correlates: Empirical Evidence from Fish Farming Households in Nigeria. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Rural and Community Studies*, 4: 60-70.(01): 74-86.

|  | Table 1: Soci | o-economic | characteristics | of the | Respondents |
|--|---------------|------------|-----------------|--------|-------------|
|--|---------------|------------|-----------------|--------|-------------|

| Variable                                   | Frequency | Percentage | Mean±SD     |
|--|-----------|------------|-------------|
| Gender                                     |           |            |             |
| Male                                       | 83        | 55.3       |             |
| Female                                     | 67        | 44.7       |             |
| Age (years)                                |           |            |             |
| Less than 25                               | 17        | 11.3       |             |
| 25 - 35                                    | 44        | 29.4       |             |
| 36 - 45                                    | 41        | 27.3       | 39.64±11.06 |
| 46 - 55                                    | 39        | 26         |             |
| 56 and above                               | 9         | 6.1        |             |
| Religion                                   |           |            |             |
| Christianity                               | 119       | 79.3       |             |
| Islam                                      | 31        | 20.6       |             |
| Marital status                             |           |            |             |
| Single                                     | 29        | 19.3       |             |
| Married                                    | 101       | 67.3       |             |
| Widowed                                    | 16        | 10.7       |             |
| Divorced                                   | 4         | 2.7        |             |
| Educational level                          |           |            |             |
| No formal education                        | 11        | 7.3        |             |
| Adult education                            | 8         | 5.3        |             |
| Primary education                          | 5         | 3.3        |             |
| Secondary education                        | 29        | 19.3       |             |
| Tertiary education                         | 97        | 64.7       |             |
| Household or family size                   |           |            |             |
| Less than 4                                | 31        | 20.6       |             |
| 4 - 6                                      | 97        | 64.7       | 4.83±1.95   |
| Above 7                                    | 22        | 14.8       |             |
| Do you attend any training program on fish |           |            |             |
| farm management                            |           |            |             |
| Yes  | 106       | 70.7       |             |
| No   | 44        | 29.3       |             |
| Reason for farming venturing into fish     |           |            |             |
| farming                                    |           |            |             |
| Subsistence                                | 50        | 33.3       |             |
| Demand for fish                            | 29        | 19.3       |             |
| Price                                      | 11        | 10.4       |             |
| Household consumption                      | 16        | 10.7       |             |
| Years of Fish Farming Experience           |           | • •        |             |
| Less than 5                                | 57        | 38         |             |
| 5-10                                       | 51        | 34.1       | 8.05±6.121  |
| 11 and above                               | 42        | 28         |             |
| Participation in cooperative society       | (D)       |            |             |
| Yes  | 69        | 46         |             |
| No<br>Source: Field survey, 2022           | 81        | 54         |             |

Source: Field survey, 2022

International Journal of Organic agricultural Research & Development Volume 19  $\,$  (4) (2024)

| Available | Not  | Mean  | Rank   |
|-----------|--|---|--|
|           | available  | score   |  |
| 99 (66.0) | 51 (34.0)  | 1.66  | 1 <sup>st</sup>  |
| 95 (63.3) | 55 (36.7)  | 1.63  | $2^{nd}$   |
| 91 (60.7) | 59 (39.3)  | 1.61  | 3 <sup>rd</sup>  |
| 90 (60.0) | 60 (40.0)  | 1.60  | 4 <sup>th</sup>  |
| 89 (59.3) | 61 (40.7)  | 1.59  | $5^{\text{th}}$  |
| 75 (50.0) | 75 (50.0)  | 1.50  | $6^{\text{th}}$  |
| 72 (48.0) | 78 (52.0)  | 1.48  | $7^{\rm th}$   |
| 64 (42.7) | 86 (57.3)  | 1.43  | 8 <sup>th</sup>  |
| 64 (42.7) | 86 (57.3)  | 1.43  | 8 <sup>th</sup>  |
| 53 (35.3) | 97 (64.7)  | 1.35  | $10^{\text{th}}$   |
| 41 (27.3) | 109 (72.7)   | 1.27  | 11 <sup>th</sup>   |
|           | 99 (66.0)<br>95 (63.3)<br>91 (60.7)<br>90 (60.0)<br>89 (59.3)<br>75 (50.0)<br>72 (48.0)<br>64 (42.7)<br>64 (42.7)<br>53 (35.3) | available99 (66.0)51 (34.0)95 (63.3)55 (36.7)91 (60.7)59 (39.3)90 (60.0)60 (40.0)89 (59.3)61 (40.7)75 (50.0)75 (50.0)72 (48.0)78 (52.0)64 (42.7)86 (57.3)64 (42.7)86 (57.3)53 (35.3)97 (64.7) | availablescore99 (66.0)51 (34.0)1.6695 (63.3)55 (36.7)1.6391 (60.7)59 (39.3)1.6190 (60.0)60 (40.0)1.6089 (59.3)61 (40.7)1.5975 (50.0)75 (50.0)1.5072 (48.0)78 (52.0)1.4864 (42.7)86 (57.3)1.4364 (42.7)86 (57.3)1.4353 (35.3)97 (64.7)1.35 |

### Table 2: Factors contributing to management practice, adoption and productivity of fish production

**Source:** Field survey, 2022

#### Table 3: Adoption level of aquaculture management Practice

| Adoption level category | Adoption range (%) | Percentage of adopter |
|-------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| Non-adopter             | 0                  | 0.0                   |
| Low adopter             | 1 - 33.33          | 19.3                  |
| Medium adopter          | 33.34 - 66.66      | 55.3                  |
| High adopter            | 66.67 - 1000       | 25.3                  |

Source: Field survey, 2022

#### Table 4: Constraints to management practice adoption

| Constraints                           | Very<br>serious | Serious  | Not<br>Serious | Not a<br>Constraint | Total<br>score | Mean | Remarks |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------|----------|----------------|---------------------|----------------|------|---------|
| Land acquisition system in Nigeria    | 62(41.3)        | 36(24.0) | 19(12.7)       | 33 (22.0)           | 427            | 2.85 | S       |
| Inadequate capital                    | 71(47.3)        | 63(42.0) | 6(4.0)         | 10 (6.7)            | 495            | 3.3  | S       |
| Inadequate extension services         | 40(26.7)        | 39(26.0) | 28(18.7)       | 43 (28.7)           | 376            | 2.51 | S       |
| Low quality of fish seed              | 36(24.0)        | 57(38.0) | 33(22.0)       | 24 (16.0)           | 405            | 2.7  | S       |
| Pollution                             | 37(24.7)        | 49(32.7) | 49(32.7)       | 15 (10.0)           | 408            | 2.72 | S       |
| Managerial problem                    | 35(23.3)        | 35(23.3) | 58(38.7)       | 22 (14.7)           | 383            | 2.55 | S       |
| Flooding                              | 66(44.0)        | 39(26.0) | 28(18.7)       | 17 (11.3)           | 454            | 3.03 | S       |
| High cost of input                    | 86(57.3)        | 34(22.7) | 25(16.7)       | 5 (3.3)             | 501            | 3.34 | S       |
| Predators                             | 28(18.7)        | 48(32.0) | 54(36.0)       | 20 (13.3)           | 384            | 2.56 | S       |
| Harvesting cost                       | 29(19.3)        | 45(30.0) | 43(28.7)       | 33 (22.0)           | 370            | 2.47 | NS      |
| Poaching                              | 28(18.7)        | 32(21.3) | 65(43.3)       | 25 (16.7)           | 363            | 2.42 | NS      |
| Insufficient water for production     | 29(19.3)        | 46(30.7) | 45(30.0)       | 30 (20.0)           | 374            | 2.49 | NS      |
| Disease and pest infestation          | 35(23.3)        | 32(21.3) | 63(42.0)       | 20 (13.3)           | 382            | 2.55 | S       |
| Poor performance of species of fish   | 42(28.0)        | 23(15.5) | 58(38.7)       | 27 (18.0)           | 380            | 2.53 | S       |
| High cost of fish feed                | 96(64.0)        | 29(19.3) | 19(12.7)       | 6 (4.0)             | 515            | 3.43 | S       |
| Lack of fisherman cooperative society | 25(16.7         | 58(38.7) | 41(27.3)       | 26 (17.3)           | 382            | 2.55 | S       |
| Inadequate information                | 50(33.3)        | 46(30.7) | 32(21.3)       | 22 (14.7)           | 424            | 2.83 | S       |

**Source:** Field survey, 2022

#### Table 5: Tobit regression for factors affecting adoption of scientific aquaculture management practices

| Adoption                             | Coefficient | Standard error | <b>P-value</b> |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|----------------|----------------|
| Constant                             | 37.73       | 15.63          | 0.02           |
| Age                                  | -0.26       | 0.34           | 0.53           |
| Educational qualification            | 1.63***     | 0.63           | 0.01           |
| Household size                       | 1.26**      | 1.45           | 0.05           |
| Fish farming experience              | 1.89**      | 0.89           | 0.05           |
| Training                             | 11.74***    | 4.51           | 0.01           |
| Extension services                   | 2.74**      | 0.34           | 0.03           |
| Participation in cooperative society | 8.63*       | 1.74           | 0.06           |
| F-value                              |             | 61.63          |                |
| P-value                              |             | 0.00           |                |

Significance level: \*\*\* for 1%, \*\* for 5% and \* for 10% **Source:** Field survey, 2022